Engraved by Thomson from a scarce Dutch Print.

JAMES ARMINIUS, D.D.

Professor of Divinity in the Univ. of Leyden

BORN A.D. 1560 DIED 1609.

Ecce Concordia Fratrum!

London: Published by James Wilkie, Warwick Square, Ludgate Street.

THE WORKS

OF

JAMES ARMINIUS, D.D.

FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY

IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LEYDEN.

Translated from the Latin.

TO WHICH ARE ADDED,

BRANDT'S LIFE OF THE AUTHOR, WITH CONSIDERABLE AUGMENTATIONS;

NUMEROUS EXTRACTS FROM HIS PRIVATE LETTERS;

A COPIOUS AND AUTHENTIC ACCOUNT OF THE SYNOD OF DORT

AND ITS PROCEEDINGS;

AND SEVERAL INTERESTING NOTICES OF THE PROGRESS OF

HIS THEOLOGICAL OPINIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND ON THE CONTINENT.

BY JAMES NICHOLS,

Author of "Calvinism and Arminianism Compared in their Principles and Tendency."

IN THREE VOLUMES,

VOLUME I.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, BROWN

AND GREEN.

1825.

JAMES NICHOLS, PRINTER,
2, *Warwick Square, Newgate Street.*

PREFACE.

"THERE is a country almost within sight of the shores of our island," says a highly accomplished writer, "whose literature is less known to us than that of Persia or Hindostan: A country, too, distinguished for its civilization, and its important contributions to the mass of human knowledge.* Its language claims a close kindred with our own; and its government has been generally such as to excite the sympathies of an English spirit. It is indeed, most strange, that while the Poets [and may I not add *the Divines?*] of Germany have found hundreds of admirers and thousands of critics, those of a land nearer in position—more allied by habit and by history with our thoughts and recollections—should have been passed by unnoticed.

"Classics painters, men of science—such names as Erasmus, Grotius, Lipsius, and Boerhaave—fill the pages of the literary history of the Netherlands; and it would be strange indeed, if these pages were quite deserted by the sons of song.

"Events the most extraordinary, and characters the most original and sublime, arrest the attention in the varied but interesting history of Holland. Nothing can be more imposingly tragic than the story of the old Barneveldt and of the hapless De Witts. The struggles in favour of civil and religious freedom, and their triumphant results—the proud march of the Batavian republic in increasing influence and dignity†—every thing seems to have conspired to

* "We owe to the Dutch the discovery of the arts of Printing and Oil Painting; we owe to them the Microscope and the Pendulum."

† In enumerating "the circumstances which brought on, together with the destruction of Laud, the overthrow of the Church and State, the murder of King Charles the First, and the long miseries of the nation," Mr. Southey with great propriety mentions "the establishment of the Dutch Republic as one of those causes."—"Nothing in the history of the modern world had as yet so strongly and so worthily excited the sympathy of upright and intelligent minds, as the struggle in which the Netherlanders engaged, for their civil and religious liberties. Never was good cause more virtuously and gloriously defended. But by those wars the way was prepared for that preponderance of the French power which has produced such evils to Europe, and in all human likelihood will yet produce more: And as the doctrinal disputes which in their consequences subverted the Church of England, were principally derived from the Synod of Dort; so from the Dutch wars were the seeds of English Republicanism imported. English and Scotchmen were trained in those wars as soldiers of fortune ready to embark in any cause. A great proportion of the trading part of the community, especially of the Londoners, seeing the commercial prosperity of the Dutch, imputed it to the form of their commonwealth; for they were too ignorant to know what had been the previous condition of the Low Countries. And at the same time, many of the higher classes had imbibed, from their classical studies, prejudices in favour of a popular government, which are as congenial to the generous temper of inexperienced youth, as they are inconsistent with sound knowledge and mature judgment. Thus while some men of surpassing talents were so far infatuated with political theories, that, for the prospect of realizing them, they were willing to incur the danger and the guilt of exciting a Civil War, others were ready to co-operate with them for the purpose of destroying Episcopacy, and establishing with the discipline of Geneva, the irreversible decrees of Calvinism by rigorous laws: And they who, for these secret purposes *which they dared not* as yet avow, systematically attacked the

give interest to a literature and a language which have hitherto scarcely penetrated beyond their own natural and narrow bounds. The land that gave birth to a Laurence Coster—to him who created the means by which knowledge and civilization were conveyed through half the world,—cannot be neglected in days like these. The country of Rubens and Vandyck, of Rembrandt and Ruysdaal, and a hundred besides—'whose glory is gone forth to the ends of the earth,' has children too of the elder—the diviner art. In Holland the seeds of poetical genius have been scattered—in Holland they have budded and blossomed—they have been brightened by the dew of natural feeling—they have been shone on by the sun of enthusiasm: They are fair—they are fragrant—and we have ventured to gather and transplant them to our own flower-garden.

"Nor, among the claims of Holland to the attention of mankind, should it be forgotten that it was the country in which Haller, and Linnæus, and Descartes pursued their studies and formed their characters.

"Many causes have contributed to the neglect of the Dutch writers; and some of those causes have no doubt had their origin in a false estimate of the character of the people, and in their own inattention to their language and literature. A more potent cause, however, has been a real ignorance of the existence of any thing that could put in its claim to the name of Belgian Poetry. The essential character of the Poetry of Holland—that which marks it in every age and in all its varieties—is a high tone of religious feeliug, a sublimity borrowed from devout associations, and especially from the sacred writings.*

"The sixteenth century is not celebrated for its poets only. It had its heroes in De Ruiter and Van Tromp: Its statesmen in Barneveldt and the De Witts. Its learned writers, are Huig de Groot (Grotius), Daniel and Nicolaus Heins (Heinsius), P. Schryver (Scriverius), Salmas (Salmasius), John Frederick Gronov (Gronovius), Caspar van Baerle (Barlæus), John Vos (Vossius), and many other eminent Classics. Its men of science—Leoninus, Aldegonde, and Dousa. For its painters it had Rubens, Vandyk, Rembrandt, Mierevelt, the Teniers, the Van de Veldes, Jordaans, Kuyp, the Ostades, Gerard Douw, Mieris, John and Philip Wouvermans, Metsu, Berchem, Paul Potter, Pynaker, the Ruysdaels, Van Huysem, Wynants, Steen; and during this period the Universities at Groningen, Utrecht, and Gelderland, and the celebrated school at Amsterdam were established.

"'The age of which we speak,' says the learned professor Siegenbreek, 'and more especially the earlier part of it, was in every

government, were strengthened by the aid of many wise and moderate men, (the best of the nation,) who from the purest motives opposed the injurious measures of the crown, till the same sense of duty which had induced them to resist it in its strength, made them exert themselves and sacrifice themselves for its support in its hour of weakness and distress."—*Book of the Church.*

* The very name of Grotius calls up all that the imagination can conceive of greatness and true fame. His most elaborate poem in the Dutch language, *Bewijs van den Waeren Godtsdienst*, "Evidence of True Religion," was written during his confinement at Loevestijn, in the year 1611. He laid the ground-work of that attention to religious duties which is so universal in Holland. The authority of his great name, always associated with Christianity—with peace—with literature—with freedom and suffering and virtue—has ever been a bulwark of truth and morals.—BOWRING'S *Batavian Anthology.*

'point of view so glorious to the Dutch nation, that it would be 'difficult to discover, in the history of any other people, a period of 'such resplendent fame and greatness.'"—BOWRING'S *Bot. Anthology.*

I re-iterate the complaint of our neglect of Dutch writers, which Mr. Bowring has so eloquently stated in the preceding paragraphs; and I apply it to ARMINIUS, and to his doctrinal system, which has received higher commendations from men of opposite religious persuasions than any other since the days of the Apostles, and which therefore, on this occasion, requires the less of my sincere praise to recommend it to universal regard. The rise of Arminianism was only a continuation of the struggle for religious liberty in the Low Countries, between the learned among the Laity and the Calvinistic clergy, as has been correctly related by Le Vassor* and other equally impartial

* At the time when Pope Paul the Fifth was exerting himself to suppress the disputes concerning Grace and Predestination in his Church, the Protestants of Holland were divided among themselves upon the same questions. Whether influenced by former prepossessions in its favour, or because it appeared to them better adapted for confuting the dogmas of the Romish Church, and establishing those of the Reformation, Luther and the principal Reformers had hastily embraced the hypothesis of St Augustine. But Luther himself, or at least his early disciples, soon perceived the inconvenient and troublesome consequences of the Augustinian System; and as that of the Greek Fathers appeared both more ancient and more rational, Melanchthon adopted it; and his moderate sentiments prevailed among those who adhered to the Augsburgh Confession. Calvin, Zanchius, Beza, and the major part of the Reformed, continued steadily attached to the dogmas of St. Augustine; which some of them greatly overstrained, by employing more difficult expressions, as the rigid Thomists have done in the Church of Rome. About the beginning of that age, many of the Reformed divines began to open their eyes to the example of the Lutherans; and after having examined the holy scripture with much attention, the opinion of St. Chrysostom and of the ancient Greek Fathers appeared to them preferable to that of [St. Augustine] the Bishop of Hippo, whose acquaintance with either the Old or the New Testament was certainly very superficial.

As the writings of Erasmus, Melanchthon, and Bullinger, were highly esteemed in Holland, where those works had greatly contributed to make the Reformation palatable, the Magistrates and well-informed laymen of the Province evinced a stronger inclination for the mild and moderate opinions of these divines respecting Grace and Predestination, than for the hypothesis of the rigid Reformed: At all events, they believed them to be perfectly tenable and consistent with the Reformation embraced by the Province. But, on the other hand, the greatest part of the Ministers, who had studied religion only in the writings of Calvin and Beza, obstinately maintained the doctrines of their masters; so that a great difference of principles existed between the Clergy and the Magistrates. Each of them had conceived a contrary idea of that which they called THE REFORMATION, or REFORMED DOCTRINE. The clergy understood by these words, the doctrines of theology, as explained by their great authors, and inserted in the Confessions of Faith which the early Reformers had drawn up. Those primitive servants of God were influenced by good intentions; but they did not perceive that in endeavouring to furnish, in the formularies of faith and in the Catechisms, a complete and consistent system of divinity, they had embodied in them their own private speculations, as if they were something undoubted and essential. The Magistrates and learned laymen of Holland, on their side, contended, that, as the Reformation comprised only a purer form of worship, divested of the vain superstitions of the Church of Rome, with a greater liberty concerning doctrines which are not clearly revealed in the holy scripture, it could not be said, the Reformation was founded on what some persons have deemed the most difficult and thorny questions in Theology.

The ministers, always warm in the defence of their own opinions and prejudices, frequently exclaimed, that the Magistrates were wanting in zeal for sound doctrine; and they, in their turn, complained, that the clergy were hard and inflexible folk, who would have the whole world blindly to embrace their peculiar sentiments. When the zealous churchmen brought before the magistrates those who opposed the theory of Calvin and Beza concerning Predestination and Grace, and accused them as persons who overthrew the foundations of the Reformation, the wisest and most discerning of

authorities: And though the modest defence of his own scriptural sentiments, respecting the perfections of God as exemplified in his gracious and equitable conduct towards mankind, was both in its tendency and in its results, one of the greatest blessings which Arminius could have conferred on his country; yet we are to this day accustomed to hear the insidious lamentations of the semi-infidel Bayle,* concerning "the impolicy of mooting those questions," repeated by intelligent persons without due reflection and in the absence of the requisite information.—See pages 66—75.

I had prepared a Preface, which contained many needful explanatory notices respecting my author: But the Testimonies which I have quoted in elucidation of his personal character and the effects of his doctrines, occupy, with greater profit to the reader, the pages which it was my intention to devote to this purpose. An opportunity will hereafter be afforded of explaining myself more fully, in a General Introduction, which I reserve for the commencement of the Third Volume: In this, I shall be the more readily excused, since I have so recently given my opinion of Arminius, in that voluminous performance, "*Calvinism and Arminianism Compared in their Principles and Tendency,*" against which some of my high Predestinarian friends have manifested great displeasure. In the mean time, I leave the learned among my countrymen to decide upon the manner in which this Translation has been executed; and may be permitted to declare, that it has been my endeavour to make it clear and faithful, particularly in those instances in which doctrinal matters are

the Magistrates used to ask these new inquisitors, if it was impossible to be a good Reformed Christian without receiving the doctrines of St. Augustine and his followers? From the commencement of the Reformation in Holland, the sentiments opposed to the system of that doctor had always prevailed in the town of Tergow: The States of Holland had not granted even their formal approbation of the Confession of Faith received in the Belgic Churches. Was not this then a proof, that those prudent magistrates believed that articles had been put into this formulary, which were not absolutely necessary, and which should have been expressed in a manner more mild and less liable to scandalize those who could not relish all the peculiar opinions of the first Reformers? This appears very probable, when history informs us, that the States of Holland, otherwise strongly opposed to the convention of a General Synod of the seven United Provinces, consented, in the year 1597, that such an assembly should be held, for the purpose of narrowly revising the Confession of Faith and of correcting it in a peaceful and charitable spirit.—LE VASSOR's *Hist. Louis XIII.*

* Bayle, in his disputes against the wisdom and the goodness of God, being pushed by his antagonists, and compelled to declare what sort of a Christian he pretended to be, professed himself *a Predestinarian Protestant of the most rigid sort;* but no Protestant of any denomination ever was simple enough to believe him. Bayle frequently took occasion to shew his disapprobation of the Remonstrants. The true cause of his disgust seems to have been this; they endeavoured to prove the reasonableness of Christianity, and to vindicate the goodness of God, and would not give up the divine perfections as unintelligible and indefensible.—"They ought not," says he, "to have removed the bounds set up by their fathers." I should have thought that the apostles and evangelists were to be looked upon as our Christian fathers, rather than the Calvins and the Bezas.—*They ought not*, says he, *to have made disturbances.* But that was not their fault; it was the fault of those who quarrelled with them, and would not tolerate them.—"Their refinements," says he, "signified nothing, and they could not defend Christianity any better than the Calvinists; for it is all one, whether God be the author and the punisher of sin, or whether he foresees sin, and permits it, and then punishes it with eternal misery." These and the rest of his objections drawn up with such a profusion of words, and so much pains, and parade, and indecent language, were considered and fully confuted by Le Clerc in his *Bibliotheque Chois.* "The system of the Remonstrants," as he is pleased to observe, "is full of considerable errors." This is the mean and spiteful remark of a man who knew almost as little of divinity as he did of natural philosophy.—JORTIN's *Dissertations.*

concerned: In other passages, I have observed greater freedom, but without departing from the meaning of my author.

In elucidating the early history of Dutch and English Arminianism, in this and my former production, I have often accounted it my duty to corroborate my statements and views by apposite quotations from approved authors, some of whose works are of rare occurrence. Had my motive, in adopting this practice, been the mere love of display, I should have presented my extracts in the languages in which they were severally written, without subjecting myself to the harassing yet necessary labour of translation. But this method had its source, I hope, in something more nearly allied to humility: I knew that, whatever observations such an obscure person as myself could make, they would be regarded by the public only as my own individual assertions; and that, how just and reasonable soever they might appear in the abstract, they were capable of being neutralized by the contrary assertions of some one equally "to fortune and to fame unknown." But when strengthened by respectable authorities,—many of which consist of original documents, while others often serve to illustrate more than the subject immediately under review,—the remarks of an individual assume greater importance and prefer higher claims to general credence.

In conclusion, after thanking the Giver of all good for having preserved me, through numerous perils and difficulties, to see the completion of this volume, the composition of which has cost me more labour than would have sufficed for the mere translation of the whole of ARMINIUS's *Works;* I wish to bespeak the forgiveness of all those good and pious men, who may feel their spirits wounded by any observations which I have made upon their party and their practices. I allude more particularly to some of the most forward and worst-qualified of the writers among the modern Independents, who exhibit much declamation and small research when delivering their precipitate judgments on doctrines which they never understood, and on ecclesiastical occurrences about which they are equally ignorant. I also allude to those privileged persons who assume the office of dictators, both on matters of fact and of doctrine, to the evangelical clergy; and whose pertinacious adherence to the convicted mis-statements of some among their former leaders, is the more culpable, because they possess better opportunities, than the forward among the Congregationalists, of gaining accurate historical information about the doctrines in dispute between themselves and the Melanchthonian compilers of the *Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.* To both these classes of men, who, unlike the amiable and moderate of their brethren, are the vilest traducers of Arminianism, I wish to offer the same apology as the benevolent Mosheim did when writing on a similar subject:

Modestiam colere, Christiani est; at ejusdem tamen est, id quod res est sine acrimonia dicere, quando libertas illa rem sacram fortassis adjuvare potest. Spero ea ratione id a me factum esse, ut nusquam animum maledicendi studio inquinatum, æquitatis expertem, aut in adversariorum vitiis exultantem prodiderim. Si quid secus, ut homines sumus, præter spem evenerit, id me data occasione emendaturum esse, publice polliceor.

LONDON, JAMES NICHOLS.
Warwick Square.

CONTENTS.

PREFACE iii
Testimonies from various Authors ix
Dedication by the nine orphans of Arminius 5
BERTIUS's Funeral Oration on Arminius 13

ORATIONS.

I. THE Object of Theology 257
II. The Author and the End of Theology 284
III. The Certainty of Sacred Theology 310
IV. The Priesthood of Christ 339
V. On reconciling religious Dissensions among Christians . . . 370
DECLARATION of the Sentiments of Arminius, delivered before the States of Holland 516
APOLOGY against Thirty-one Defamatory Articles 669

APPENDIX.

A. HEINSIUS's Verses on Arminius 48
B. The Conference of Foissy 53
C. Arminius's proficiency in Logic and Metaphysics 55
D. ——— call to the Ministry 57
E. The pamphlet which Arminius was desired to answer . . . 59
F. The change effected in his sentiments—Animadversions on Bayle . 61
G. Description of Arminianism—Its existence before the time of Arminius—Baro's Summary—Arminius's defence of himself before the Amsterdam Presbytery 85
H. Further defence of himself 112
I. Account of his father-in-law, and the sufferings of the early Protestants . 119
K. The Personal History of Arminius 126
L. Account of Junius, and his judicious advice to the early Independents . 137
M. ——— Trelcatius, Sen. 165
N. ——— Gomarus 166
O. The Personal History of Arminius 172
P. Account of Uitenbogaert and Vorstius 158
Q. R. and S. The Personal History of Arminius 237
T. The Apostacy of Bertius 268
V. W. and X. The Personal History of Arminius 285
Y. The abuse of Anagrams 304
Z. and A A. Arminius's last Will and Testament, Death and Character . 305

NOTES.

ACCOUNT of the Proceedings of the Synod of Dort . . . 409—515
CHARACTER OF ARMINIUS, by Beza 24; by Grynæus 25; by the Senate of the University 318; by Casaubon 662; by Poelenburgh 317
LETTER from Fusselius 420; Paræus 203; Pezelius 204; Eustachius 280; Vorstius 204, 214, 222, 499, 508; Borrius 211, 300, 466; Nœranus 281; Uitenbogaert 212, 218, 229, 232, 272; Poppius 625; Vossius 270; Lipsius 284; Bertius 285; King James 439, 455; Grotius 274, 313, 609; Saravia 656; S. Lubbertus 523; Piscator 633; Poelenburgh 643, 661; M. A. De Dominis 440; Episcopius 444; Bogerman 500; Arminius, Hales and Balcanqual, *passim.*
CHARACTER of Hemmingius and Baro 89; M. Lydius 103; J. Taffin 104; G. Snecanus 127; F. Hommius 405, 466; King James I. 411, 456, ; A. Thysius 183, 465; Episcopius 319; Dutch Commissioners at the Synod 441; Bogerman 443; Lubbertus and Gomarus 465; Triglandius 465; Damman 466; Faukelius and Rolandus 466; Koolhaes, Herberts, Wiggertson and Tako Sybrants 538.
REMARKS on the Rev. T. Scott 511, 575, 601; Limborch 604; Dr. Twisse 585; Melancthon, Cranmer, Luther, Erasmus 596, 602, 607; Assurance of Salvation 603; Perfection of Believers 614; Imputed Active Righteousness of Christ 632; Formularies of Faith 637, 666; Disputes about Predestination among the early English Martyrs 648; Origin of the Dutch Confession 664; *Absolute and* Hypothetical Necessity 686, 693.

TESTIMONIES

IN ELUCIDATION OF ARMINIUS AND HIS DOCTRINES.

THESE TESTIMONIES, *from authors of almost every denomination of professing Christians, have been selected chiefly with a view to the varied information which they convey,—though it is not in all instances the most accurate. With the exception of Spondanus, however, they exhibit the character, conduct, and doctrines of Arminius himself to great advantage: And, after making some allowance for the prejudices of the different writers, many of whom were opposed to him in their religious tenets, they represent him as a man who is eminently entitled to the respect and admiration of a free people, and whose "meekness of wisdom" is worthy of imitation by all the real followers of Christ Jesus.*

JOHN AIKIN, M.D.—1799.

THE personal character of Arminius was irreproachable; and he attracted the esteem and applause of his very enemies by his amiable manners, his candid spirit, his diffidence and modesty, and his inflexible integrity. He was a friend to universal toleration, and established it as a fundamental principle, that Christians are accountable to God alone for their religious sentiments, and that no individual can be justly punished by the magistrate for erroneous opinions, while he conducts himself as a virtuous and obedient subject, and makes no attempts to disturb the peace and order of civil society. If the controversy in which Arminius was a leader is now subsided, either because it has ceased to be thought important, or because it has been found to be above human comprehension, or because it has been superseded by other systems, it must, however, be allowed, that the discussion of these points fostered a spirit of enquiry, and prepared the way for other more useful or more satisfactory researches.—*General Biography.*

DOMINIC BAUDIUS, D. D.—1610.

I have not been induced by any vain ambition to dedicate to your High Mightinesses these verses on the death of that reverend and MOST FAMOUS MAN, JAMES ARMINIUS; nor have I performed this act of piety to an old friend, with any sinister view of obtaining some office from your kindness. I have honoured the memory of the happy Arminius with a long poem, that a testimonial of my judgment may exist on record, in this public monument, concerning that excellent man whom, while living, I sincerely loved, and whom, now that he is dead, I esteem as *one that abounded in the* CHOICE ENDOWMENTS OF GENIUS and was adorned with the HIGHEST ACQUIREMENTS OF LEARNING.—*Dedication.*

In the long list of my old friends, for whom I cherish the highest and most particular regard, none can be compared to you, my friend Uitenbogaert, and to Arminius now in possession of endless felicity. I am not so unobservant of the duties of humanity or so forgetful of the claims of ancient friendship, as to be guilty of an act of injustice to the deceased, when I was among the few who highly venerated THE EMINENT ACCOMPLISHMENTS of his mind, as long as he lived.* Nothing can be elicited from the tenour of the whole poem, except that Arminius was assailed by prejudices, suspicions

* The long poem which Baudius composed on the death of Arminius, and of which Uitenbogardt complained, was of a very dubious character, and stood so much

and calumnies, and that the attacks against him were conducted not so much by open warfare as by undermining artifices,—all of which may befal any person of the greatest integrity and most unsullied innocence. He was never legitimately convicted of holding any error, or condemned on that account. Up to the very last breath which he drew, he adorned that province which he had undertaken according to the decree of our Curators and Burgomasters; and he died in possession of that most honourable office. All good men ought therefore to suffer his memory to live in their grateful recollection. His death has created within me the deepest regret; and I never indulged in any wish so eagerly as in this—to see that day arrive when he might be able to defend his own innocency against the rumours which envy had spread abroad and which credulity had rashly believed.—*Epist. Eccl.*

THOMAS BENNET, D. D.—1714.

It is to me a most astonishing thing, that the patrons of *Absolute Predestination* are able to persuade themselves, that *Conditionate Predestination* is condemned, in this [the 17th] Article, by our Church. For every body that understands their notions must be forced to see, that there is not one syllable in this Article but what the patrons of Conditionate Predestination most heartily approve and teach. It would be endless to enumerate all the authorities, by which this might be made appear. Let it therefore suffice, that the only part wherein any difficulty can be pretended, is the first paragraph; and that ARMINIUS himself, not to mention others his professed followers, does manifestly assert every branch of it, as appears from his own words quoted in the margin, [the quotations consist of the four decrees described by Arminius in page 589, and the 15th of his Public Disputations,] which the reader may easily compare with the aforesaid first paragraph:* And, by such comparison, he cannot but observe an exact harmony between our Church and the author above mentioned.—See also the 40th, 41st, 42nd, and 43rd of his [Private] Disputations, which are too long to be inserted: Nor could I have prevailed upon myself to insert so much as I have done already, were it not to convince the most obstinate by producing such full and plain testimonies.—*Directions for studying the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.*

in equilibrio as to be easily interpreted either in favour or in disapprobation of the deceased. Like his friend Heinsius, as soon as he found the Calvinists to be the ascendant party, he deserted his old friends, and paid court to their enemies.

* Dr. Bennet, and Plaifere, quoted in page xxviii, are the two authors to whom Dr. Waterland refers, in his *Supplement to the Case of Arian Subscription*, as having satisfactorily established the proper Arminian character of the 17th Article. Both of them had actually read and examined the Works of Arminius, which is more than can be said of several who speak dogmatically concerning that great man and his system: They found an exact similarity between his doctrine of Divine Predestination and that contained in the Seventeenth Article of our Church. In that very able pamphlet, *An Apology for the Church of England: In a letter to the author of the "Enquiry into the Causes of the Decay of the Dissenting Interest;"* and in HORSLEY'S *17th Article Explained*, both the authors arrive at the same conclusion, the former of them quoting several passages out of Arminius. See also Dr. WINCHESTER'S *Dissertation;* Dr. KIPLING'S *Articles of the Church of England proved not to be Calvinistic;* and Dr. LAURENCE'S *Attempt to illustrate those Articles of the Church of England, which the Calvinists improperly consider as Calvinistical.* Other excellent treatises are extant on the same subject; yet many of the evangelical clergy write still, as though nothing had ever been published to controvert their unfounded opinions *vecting* the 17th Article.

THE REV. GERARD BRANDT.—1688.

Geleerde en schrandre man, hoe hebt, gij in uw leven, &c.

WISDOM and VIRTUE garlanded a life
Spent in the search of Truth, above the strife
Of human hate and human guile; and Death
Heard these last accents from his parting breath:
"TRUTH no vain questions, but good actions needs;
"I serv'd the Church and State by righteous deeds."

Zoo't heusch gemoet, de Wysheyt, en Geleentheyt, &c.

Can KNOWLEDGE, WISDOM, and AN HONEST WILL,
Perversity and Error's laws fulfil?
See in this portraiture *a stingless bee*,
And thou shalt our serene ARMINIUS see!

*** I am reluctantly compelled, for want of room, to omit some beautiful Latin *Epicenia* on the Death of Arminius, by several eminent Dutch Poets.

JOHN BUXTORF, *Professor in the University of Basle.*—1610.

The unexpected extinction of JAMES ARMINIUS, that GREAT AND FAMOUS LUMINARY of the Low Countries, most justly excited within my mind emotions of the deepest grief, both on account of the general loss which the Church has thus sustained, and on account of the sad interruption to my further intimacy with SUCH A GREAT MAN, which I have personally to lament at the very moment when I was becoming better acquainted with him. For I had fondly indulged the hope, that he would have succeeded to that place in my esteem which the learned SCALIGER held, that illustrious hero of pious memory! who was also removed from me much too early.—*Ep. Ec.*

ISAAC CASAUBON, *Keeper of the Royal Library in Paris.*—1610.

I have no doubt, that Arminius of blessed memory, whom you mention, was A GREAT MAN; though I have not yet found one among our ministers, [the French Protestants,] who does not account him *an infamous heretic.* The reason of this is, because they hold the opinion of Calvin as the standard of the truth: For this man [Calvin] I have a great respect, yet I cannot endure those persons who evince a bitter hatred towards all who dissent from his opinions. Neither can I bear those persons, who, to the great offence of intelligent men and to the utter scandal of learning, distort and mangle in a shocking manner the writings of the pious Ancients, for the purpose of proving that the articles of their belief were similar to those which are generally held in our days.—*Epist. Eccles. et Theolog.*

ADAM CLARKE, LL. D.—1802.

James Arminius was born at Oudewater, in Holland, in 1560. He became professor of Divinity at Leyden in 1603; and having lived a most exemplary life, hated and persecuted by the Gomaristic party because he taught and demonstrated, "that the God of mercy willed *the salvation* OF ALL MEN," he died October 19th, 1609.—His motto was, BONA CONSCIENTIA PARADISUS.—*Bibliog. Dict.*

JEREMY COLLIER, M. A.—1713.

JAMES VAN HARMIN, or Arminius, Preacher at the Great Church at Amsterdam, being something shocked with Perkins's *Armilla Aurea*, wrote animadversions upon it, entituled *Examen Prædestinationis Perkinsianæ.* This performance being well received, and Junius, *Divinity Professor* at Leyden, dying in the year 1603

Arminius was chosen by the University to succeed him. The Calvinians, displeased with his preferment, charged him with several heterodoxies, and preferred an information against him to the States. When the business was heard at the Hague, Arminius was acquitted and sent to Leyden with a strong recommendation from the Church of Amsterdam. Thus he continued Professor till his death, which happened in October, 1609.

Arminius had distinguished himself by his learning, diligence, and exemplary behaviour. To give him his due, he had a good reasoning head, and was no ordinary genius. By the strength of these advantages, he gained upon the audience, and left a strong party behind him. The controversy, between the Calvinists and those of Arminius's persuasion, was reduced to Five Points: These questions were held, by the former, to the same sense with the Lambeth Articles.—*Ecclesiastical History.*

J. J. CONYBEARE, M. A.—1824.

In respect to the immediate subject of our inquiry, [to ascertain the limits of the secondary and spiritual interpretations of scripture,] it does not appear that Arminius himself had dissented in any measure from the more prudent expositors of his age and country. Admitting fully the existence of the typical and allegorical sense, he qualifies the admission by such cautions only as had the general concurrence of all sober and reasonable divines.

Episcopius, the well-known and able advocate of the Arminian tenets, though inclining more strongly to the literal and parctical exposition, neither rejects the authority nor denies the value of that which is mystical and typical.

But the author, whose opinions, or rather whose practice, upon this point attracted a degree of notice and animadversion far beyond that which had been excited even by that of Calvin, was one who, in this instance alone, seems to have chosen the path of the great Reformer. I allude to the illustrious and accomplished champion of the Remonstrant cause, Hugo Grotius. In his commentaries upon the scriptures, especially on those of the Old Testament, this eminent scholar betrayed an attachment, perhaps somewhat excessive, to the more learned and temperate of the Jewish expositors; and, after their example, restricted to the immediate history of the chosen people many passages that had hitherto been more generally considered as prophetic of the Messiah and his Kingdom.

It was not to be expected that the Remonstrants, either from the general character of their theological views, or from the feelings with which they were but too naturally inclined to regard their Calvinistic adversaries, should do otherwise than oppose that theory of interpretation which had been, in the first instance, opposed to themselves. The well-known P. a Limborch censures only the violence done to the sacred text, by extorting from it at every step prophetical and spiritual meanings, which were unauthorized by its obvious scope and tendency. Many, however, among the Remonstrants were far from imitating the pious and Christian reverence with which Limborch, after the example of his predecessors Arminius and Grotius, was disposed to regard and treat the inspired word. Some of them inclined, on various points, much more decidedly to the Socinian scheme; and these found, so far at least as our present subject is concerned, a popular and indefatigable champion in the well-known Le Clerc. *This ingenious* but often injudicious writer, disposed to question

almost every opinion which had received the sanction of his predecessors, and constantly mistaking boldness and novelty of assertion for liberality and freedom from prejudice, not only rejected those spiritual expositions of the Old Testament which were not immediately confirmed by the authority of the New, but carried his notions of accommodation to such an excess as nearly to invalidate the prophetic character of the former, and, indirectly at least, to depreciate the divine authority of the latter and of Him who was its Minister.—*Bampton Lectures.*

THE REV. TOBIAS CONYERS.—1657.

In as much as the name of Arminians is violently obtruded upon us, who believe, that Christ died for all, and tasted death for every man, according to the scriptures, whereby our persons are endeavoured to be rendered odious, and the blessed word of the kingdom in our mouths scandalous and offensive,—I judged it reasonable to offer the author's judgment to English view: Not that I desire the translation of his [judgment] should be looked upon as the interpretation of mine, but that I might put an opportunity into the hands of indifferent men of resolving themselves, that Arminius was no such monster in religion as some men have attempted to represent him, and that his name stands undeservedly blotted in the ecclesiastic rolls of continual obloquy.

It was a worthy essay of your Highness upon occasion at Whitehall, "That it was not so much what a man held, but how he held it." A religious calenture hath always been a dangerous malady in the eye of state-physicians. I am confident the doctor [Arminius] in this draught of himself will abundantly please you, in whom Learning and Ingenuity, Piety and Moderation contend together for the mastery, and this by the happy ducture of christian principles; which if the like tenderness, candour, and modesty, had been used by the Reformed Churches in Scotland and Geneva, they had not given that cause, by their faction and disobedience, to the Duke of Savoy, and other persons of great and lesser quality, to complain of them, and to endeavour the extirpation of their religion. Witness those sad massacres in France, that lately in Piedmont, so fatal to the Hugonots barricadoed from the stroke of justice with their own engines.

It is well known, my Lord, what countenance the scriptures carry with the doctrine of General Atonement, and how mnch it looks like *the doctrine of the Church of England,** (so we call it,) and that the major part of the Bishops and Doctors, during the Episcopal Hierarchy, were deeply baptized thereinto, and the late king [Charles the First] himself: Yet did they never discountenance piety and learning in men of the contrary judgment, either in country or University, by rendering them uncapable of employment either civil or ecclesiastic, or draw them to recant their opinions before their institution and induction into any place: Witness the credit and promotion of Sibbes, Preston, Prideaux, Holdsworth, Brownrigg, Love, Hull, &c. Nay, great Strafford, President of the

* This is a very important testimony in favour of the genuine Arminian complexion of the doctrine of the Church of England. It proceeded from a man who entered into the ministry during the Inter-regnum, and became a celebrated Independent minister. He preached before the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, only a short time before the Restoration. The anecdote about the Earl of Strafford, and the impartiality displayed by the royal government in the distribution of church preferment, are exceedingly interesting, and were never contradicted in that age of contradiction.

Court in the North, did, in the hearing of some persons who are still living testimonies thereof, publicly rebuke some ministers of *the Arminian party*, so called, (though he himself a great promoter of that interest,) for bearing themselves high upon court-favour, and told them, "It was the will of his master, [king Charles I,] "and of the doctors of the Church, *that all moderation should be used* "*herein!*" — The scene is altered: These plucked off the stage, and your Lordship taken up. I should be highly injurious to those many sacred vows and protestations your Highness hath so often made for CHRISTIAN LIBERTY, should I entertain a thought you would act your part *with less tenderness and indulgency*, than any of those that have had their fatal exit.

My Lord, you have been a man of war: LIBERTY was that motto in your ensign which encouraged the soldiers of Christ to fight and pray under you, and for which (I make no question) victory came so often and lighted upon your banner. I beseech you, by the mercies of God and by whatever is dear or near unto you, that you would not expose us by your authority to the wills of those who are straitened in their principles, as their affections in BROTHERLY TOLERATION are shut up against us likewise; but that all your Acts of Grace, like the orders of Heaven issuing out from your Great Master, may *impartially look to the good of all.** I cannot, with the zeal of Arminius, petition your Highness for a National Synod, and to establish ECCLESIASTIC SANCTION by *civil authority*, lest it have the same event (or somewhat worse) with the Dort Conference, Anno 1618, and 1619. But salving the honour and consciences of those gentlemen, *the Commissioners for Approbation of Ministers*, I must needs think the nature of ORTHODOX and HETERODOX would be better proved by a subscription to a known CONFESSION OF FAITH drawn up in scripture terms and phrases, according to which the preachers of the gospel might and ought to frame and level their judgments and doctrines, than by the sudden and extempore resolves to a few unpremeditated questions till the present occasion locked up in the breasts of some particular men.—*Dedication.*

It is the chief intent of the author, (as far as I can judge,) next to the vindication of truth and himself, to set thy judgment right in the great points of PREDESTINATION and PROVIDENCE, and to shew the happy compliance betwixt the free and unmerited grace of God and man's will; not sacrilegiously admitting *the latter* as a co-partner with *the former* in the work of Conversion, but with much respect subordinating the one to the other, reserving unto each their peculiar virtues and operations, making the New Creation so to animate the Old, as to restore weakened powers and debilitated faculties to much of their ancient strength and vigour, and fit them for action. Surely had I thought the Doctor had been an enemy to Grace, as too many of the great clerks of the world are, I should have wished his JUDGMENT had for ever slept in darkness, and never been awaked by me or any other to see the English light!

* Conyers urges old Oliver in this place with a true Arminian argument; and it is known to have had its effect: For after the experience which he had personally had of the hollowness and insincerity, not only of the Presbyterian Calvinists, but likewise of several of the Independents, he paid many marked attentions to the Arminians, who were then under oppression. Those of them who met his advances, and whose number was very small, were treated with great kindness by the Protector.

Conyers alludes in this paragraph to the shameful proceedings of the Calvinistic *Commissions of* TRIERS AND EJECTORS; for a most ample account of whom, consult JACKSON's *Life of John Goodwin.*

But by that lively portraiture which he hath drawn of himself, I am apt to think his mind was well beautified with many fair ideas of truth, and his understanding enlightened with a ray from that DIVINE LIGHT *which lighteth every one that cometh into the world.* (John i. 9.)

"I cannot attribute the growth and increase of the Supralapsarian and Sublapsarian doctrine, in some of the Reformed Churches, to any thing so much as the untutored zeal of some men, (otherwise eminent in their generation,) in the beginning of the Reformation; who, having fallen out with the Church of Rome, and that upon the account of their strange innovations and ungodly errors, their mass, sacraments, works, merit, indulgences, pardons, &c., they tore away indeed much of this superstition, and testified to the world their dislike of all such erroneous tenets and cursed practices. But when, like wise surgeons, they should have known when the cure had been nigh finished, they still continued lancing the sore deeper and deeper, till they had let out some of the very vitals of religion, and maimed the doctrine of Christianity in some of the principal members thereof. What was *orthodox* at Rome must needs be *heterodox* at Geneva, for fear (as I imagine) lest the orifice should close, and the body ecclesiastic return to its former temper. How doth Calvin beat his head, through the whole body of his INSTITUTIONS, (the more to alienate, as I conceive, the minds of men from the Romish religion,) to draw up the Protestant principles in the greatest contrariety imaginable to those of Rome, fearing lest he should never get far enough both in doctrine and discipline from them.†

Neither am I engaged in my judgment against all or half of the Protestant Churches: The major part are of the same mind in the doctrine of Predestination, as the author will satisfy thee in the ensuing discourse. I know no rigid Predestinarians, but those of Subauda [Savoy] and Geneva, the Presbyterate Scots, (who, according to their ancient league and friendship to comply with the French, have fetched much of their religion thence,) and those at home [in England] upon whose spirits the doctrine of *the Kirk* hath been too much ascendant.—*Preface to "the Just Man's [Arminius's] Defence."*

JOHN A. CORVINUS.—1613.

At the very commencement of the Reformation, there were not wanting men of piety and lovers of peace, who, as they foresaw the certain destruction of the reviving church if this evil was not timely prevented, devoted all their powers to crush those early contentions in their origin. In these our days, also, there have not been wanting mediators of peace, who admonished the defenders of the Truth, that there has been contention enough for TRUTH in the Christian world, that a retreat must at length be sounded, and that the camp of their allies and that of the opposite party, which have been too long at a distance from each other, must now be united. Amongst these peace-makers, that reverend man, James ARMINIUS, of pious memory, is entitled to one of the highest places. He was much affected on contemplating the miserably convulsed state of Christendom; the continued and anxious thoughts and cares about the establishment of a peace so greatly and so long desired preyed on his mind: And as he felt the greatest possible concern for the success of this pacification, so he omitted no opportunity of instilling similar feel-

† On this subject see the Letter of Grotius to Thuanus, page 314; and the remarks of Vassor, page v.

ings and thoughts, both in public and private, into the minds of his co-pastors, and of the youth who were committed to his care and intended for the sacred ministry. Because he knew it to be some advance towards the completion of this concord, if every one would purge out of his own mind the leaven of hatred, malice and contention, would apply himself to true piety, would abstain from forming unjust judgments about his neighbour, would purely and with sincerity treat the word of the Lord, and, discarding thorny questions, would pursue those things alone which conduce to edification; he therefore exhorted all men, each for himself, to attend to these serious studies.

But Satan disappointed these his pious endeavours: For while he was engaged in them, he was oppressed with suspicions of a nature directly contrary, and was attacked by accusations, as if, under the impulse of ambition and the desire of glory, he was attempting to innovate in affairs that were securely settled, clandestinely to introduce pernicious opinions into the Church, and to destroy all ecclesiastical concord. Thus was the man traduced who was bestowing benefits; and thus was he misrepresented as desirous to wound and lacerate the peace of the Church, whose principal concern it was to heal her wounds, and to collect and bind together her lacerated members. Arminius, however, relying on the testimony of his conscience, endured all this contumely for some time in silence, and with Christian patience and modesty; for he thought the result would be, that in process of time the hollowness and falsity of these suspicions and accusations would be rendered apparent. But when they increased beyond his expectations, after the conference which was instituted between him and his colleague before the Senate of the Supreme Court, for the purpose of appeasing and destroying them, he at length produced, before a full meeting of their Mightinesses the States of Holland and West Friezland, *a true and open Confession* of his Faith on some of the principal articles of the Christian Religion, respecting which he was reported to have cherished certain monstrous heresies, and *a luminous testimony* of his earnest desire for the peace of the Church of Christ, and of a mind that was averse to every species of strife and altercation. As Arminius did this with the design to approve his innocency before the Supreme Magistracy, and to remove all the apprehension, which had been excited by these frequent accusations, of a schism originating with him; so, I have no doubt, both these objects were answered with all those whose minds had not been too much pre-occupied with prejudice. The Declaration therefore of this good man, was, after his death, translated into Latin, by a certain learned individual who was a passionate admirer of truth and peace, out of Dutch, in which the author had composed it, and was published in both those languages, to defend his fair reputation from the calumnies with which it had been on all sides assailed, and to manifest his ardent desire for peace.—*Preface to the Defence of the Sentiments of Arminius.*

STEPHEN DE COURCELLES.—1645.

In this posthumous production of Arminius, of blessed memory, may be observed the same ingenious dexterity, strength of demonstration, and perspicuity of learned discourse, as in his former works. So that in our Arminius you behold a lively representation of the Scribe, who is well-instructed for the kingdom of Heaven, concerning whom *the Lord Jesus* speaks in St. Matthew's Gospel, and who, as an

opulent householder, brings forth out of his treasury things new and old. If any man ever was most passionately attached to peace and concord, it was he; and if Gomarus had cherished the same regard, that dreadful schism, which now disturbs the Churches of the United Provinces, would probably have been stifled in its origin. —*Preface to Arminius's Examination of the Theses of Gomarus.*

CYRIL, *Patriarch of Alexandria.*—1613.

There are some things of greater necessity than these, about which I might write to you,—things which relate to the topics which are in this age discussed by the learned, such as the Freedom of the Will, Predestination, and Justification, concerning which it has not yet been made evident to the world what ought to be received for certainties. But my want of leisure prevents me at present from writing on these subjects: And I consider such a labour unnecessary, because it is better suited to men of greater gravity and learning. This labour has been executed in a compendious manner by JAMES ARMINIUS, who was, in my judgment, A LEARNED MAN. But since the theses which he wrote contain matters of great importance, it is necessary to give his book a careful perusal, and not (as I have done) cursorily to look over its contents.—*Epist. Eccles. et Theolog.*

THE EDINBURGH ENCYCLOPÆDIA.—1811.

By all, except the bigotted few, who are so much attached to the doctrines of election and reprobation as to think a belief in them necessary to salvation, Arminius has ever been regarded as a man of unaffected piety and upright conduct, of principles and of character that were truly Christian, and fully justified the hopes of immortality which supported him through life, and consoled him at death. His learning was considerable; his understanding was at once solid and acute; his discourses from the pulpit were impressive, eloquent, and useful; his labours as a minister, and as a professor of divinity, were faithful and productive; his private life was animated with the spirit, and adorned with the grace, of the religion which he taught; and his writings, which are more excellent than numerous,* are distinguished by a great deal of accurate thinking, by distinct views of the subjects he discusses, and by a simple and perspicuous style.

EDITOR OF HERVEY'S LETTERS.—1760.

Arminius was Professor of Divinity in the University of Leyden, a man of great learning, of a strict life, and of a most meek spirit. His attachment to his principles exposed him to great sufferings, which affords a strong presumption of his sincerity. It is likely, that he and his followers mean pretty near the same thing by the word GRACE, which the Calvinists do by IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS. Each party maintains, that without holiness no man shall see the Lord; and that there is no name under heaven given unto men, whereby we must be saved, but only the name of the Lord Jesus. If any one had asked Arminius, *Whether he did not hold that heaven,* that is to say, *our inheritance in it, was the sole purchase of Christ's*

* The writer of this excellent article immediately adds, "though in many places deformed by that scholastic jargon which characterized his age, and in some *by a coarseness and bitterness of invective* which, in his case, excites more regret than surprise."—Of the many authors who have described Arminius, this is the only one who has charged him with the faults just enumerated. I could point out the origin of this writer's mistake,—how, by merely turning over a leaf in one of his references, he has claimed the faults of Episcopius for Arminius.—See my remarks in pp. 673—74.

blood, he would have undoubtedly answered in the affirmative. And if, on the other hand, one had asked Mr. Calvin, *To whom is it that Christ is the Author of Salvation?*, his answer would have been, *To those that obey him.*—I would not be understood to assert, that there is no difference of opinion between Arminians and Calvinists: My meaning is, that it is not near so great as it is apprehended to be, and the way to heal, is not by railing and reproachful language, but by fair and calm reasoning, and modest appeals to the Holy Scriptures.—*Preface to a Collection of the Letters of the late Rev. James Hervey, A.M.*

SIMON EPISCOPIUS, D. D.—1623.

Arminius, that servant of Christ, in order to approve himself before God, chose to endure the hatred and contradiction of all mankind, rather than to violate his conscience.—He held out to the whole Christian world the ensign of peace and concord, and he wished a commencement to be made in the Reformed Churches. Being a man of prudence and mild in spirit, he perceived that those Churches were distracted and separated from each other in many ways, and that in these days neither measure nor end was observed in making secessions; that endeavours were therefore to be used to induce the contending parties to lay aside animosity, and to sing a funeral song over their unnecessary enmities and quarrels; that every exertion was then to be employed, to take an accurate account of such doctrines as are absolutely necessary, and each party to confine itself within those limits; that, with regard to all the rest, whatever was capable of being tolerated, or did not hinder salvation, should receive toleration; that the rule of Prudence and Charity alone is sufficient for this purpose; and that, without these, continual strife and hatred must be perpetuated, which would cause the tears of the Church afresh to flow. This was the design of Arminius; and he persisted in it to the close of his life, nothing being such a source of grief and sorrow to him, as the obstinate resistance of those who ought to have shewn themselves the most favourable to this design. Whether it was laudable or not, let those judge who are affected with commiseration at the sight of the whole of Christendom divided into most minute parties: I entertain no doubt myself of its being a pious purpose.

Arminius was too great an admirer and practiser of that Apostolic direction, *Let your moderation be known to all men*, ever to indulge in bitter or reviling expressions. He will never be detected in having traduced, much less in having rendered odious and infamous, or in having injured by a single word, those whom Capellus calls "the Reformers." Indeed, no one ever dissented from them with greater moderation. Let the writings of Arminius be inspected, and my assertion will be found correct. Such, in fact, was the modesty of this pious and learned man, that he thought all errors, especially those which he accounted to be injurious to piety, ought to be attacked with boldness and according to the meaning of their authors; but that the wanderers in error themselves ought to be treated with mildness and according to the mind of Christ Jesus. For he knew, how easy it is to commit a mistake, how unjust to visit with reproaches him who is in error, how disgraceful to speak evil of a pious man, and how necessary it is for a Christian, and particularly for a Bishop, *to be no striker, but patient*, (1 Tim. iii. 3,) *gentle to all men, and in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves.* (2 Tim.

ii. 24.) Such were his sentiments, such was his conduct,—most opposite to those opprobrious arts which Capellus employs!

Arminius was as averse to a new Confession, as he was to a schism. Those things which he considered as *desiderata* in the Church, he wished to be corrected by the Church and within herself; and he thought those things could be amended there more efficaciously and with greater safety. From new Confessions he did not hope for a remedy, but feared more dangerous paroxysms. To adhere to the scriptures alone; or, where any Confession was established, to tolerate certain improper phrases, solely through a hatred of schism, and either to reconcile them with scripture by the benefit of a mild interpretation, or to correct them by the aid of a lawful revision,—was, in his opinion, a much better course than to expend labour upon new Confessions which might serve to foment schisms. For as a prudent man he perceived, in this age fruitful in strifes and quarrels, the usual consequence is, that wherever new Confessions are formed, there the minds of men are separated and distracted by their different opinions.—At no period of his life did he assert, much less did he contend, that the article on Predestination in the Dutch Confession was false or bore evident marks of falsehood, that it contained heresies or abounded with them, much less that it abounded with a multitude of them: As an unexceptionable proof of this it may be stated, that he always endeavoured to establish his sentiments by many and strong arguments from the Dutch Confession itself; and he professed that he was prepared to retire from the ministry, if at any time, either in secret or in public, he had spoken or written any thing contrary to that formulary. He always denied, that the sentiments which he opposed were those of the Confession: He said, they were those of some particular divines, from which he was perfectly at liberty to dissent.

Arminius never said, that the whole human race was at the same time reconciled and healed by the satisfaction of Christ. He was a man of greater accuracy, than to speak in that manner. He has said, that mankind were *reconciled* by the satisfaction of Christ: But who, except a dotard, would say that they were *healed*? Arminius only teaches, that God for Christ's sake bestows, on those who are reconciled to Him through Christ, a new power [ability], when they are called by the Gospel, that they may be enabled to free themselves from that servitude, provided they use diligent endeavours, and be not wanting to themselves and to the grace of God. But he who teaches this, teaches a doctrine contrary to that which Capellus wishes. For such a man teaches, that those who are reconciled are still under the servitude of sin; but that, by the aid of grace which is newly bestowed on them by God, it is possible for them to be gradually healed of that servitude. For it is one thing *to impart an ability to any one, by which he may come out of his servitude:* It is another thing, *actually to come out of servitude, or to be healed of it.*

Those persons who have lived with Arminius, and who, as the phrase is, have eaten a bushel of salt in his company, can bear testimony to his candour and integrity. France, your country, never produced a spirit possessed of greater integrity. Unless he had been studious of these virtues, he would neither have incurred the chance of so much hatred, nor have subjected himself to the peril of such

obstinate contradiction. If he occasionally used prudence, out of a greater regard to his own conscience and to the public peace, he did nothing more than what was the duty of a good man and a Christian. He could do this, and he actually did it, without any design to deceive; nay, he did it with the design to approve himself the more to God, who alone inwardly inspects the heart, and to whom, he knew, a hypocrite is more hateful than a man that is openly wicked: For when a bad man wishes to appear a good one, he is then the worst of all.

What could any one desire that was more open, candid, and nervous, than the Declaration of Arminius before the States of Holland? I wish his adversaries had, with equal candour and ingenuousness, declared their sentiments on Reprobation, at the Hague Conference, and more recently at the Synod of Dort! But if ever any persons employed dissimulation, or declined to disclose their sentiments, they were certainly the members of those two assemblies. Indeed it is a thing common in its occurrence,—for a man, when he perceives himself to be guilty of a crime, to use indecent haste in boldly charging it upon others, that he may seem to be at the greatest possible distance from it himself.

In conclusion therefore I say, that Arminius acted in all things with perfect good faith and candour; that he openly professed the doctrine which he held; that according to his own declaration, he always ingenuously believed this doctrine to be contained in the formularies of the Churches; that he never condemned those formularies; and that he never disclosed, except in the assembly of the States and at their command, the considerations which he had marked down according to the decree of the Supreme Magistrate and at the request of the Synod. Capellus therefore, without any just cause, laments the absence of candour in this most candid breast.—*Examen Thesium I. Capelli.*

THE REV. JOHN FLETCHER.

Among the divines abroad, who have endeavoured to steer their doctrinal course between the *Pelagian* shelves and the *Augustinian* rocks, and who have tried to follow the reconciling plan of our great Reformer Cranmer, none is more famous, and none came nearer the truth than Arminius. He was a pious and judicious Dutch minister, who, in the beginning of the last century, taught Divinity in the University of Leyden in Holland. He made some noble efforts to drive Manicheism, and disguised Fatalism, out of the Protestant Church, of which he was a member: And, so far as his light and influence extended (by proving the evangelical union of Redeeming Grace and Free-will) he restored Scripture-harmony to the gospel, and carried on the plan of reconciliation, which Cranmer had laid down. His sermons, lectures, and orations, made many ashamed of absolute reprobation, and the bad-principled God, who was before quietly worshipped all over Holland.

Jansenius, a Popish bishop, overdoing after Augustine, brought the doctrines of unscriptural grace and free-wrath with a full tide into the Church of Rome: While Arminius, (or, at least, some of his followers,) drove them with all his might out of the Protestant churches. Many countries were in a general ferment on this occasion. A great number of Protestant Divines assembled at Dort in Holland, confirmed

Calvin's indirect opposition to the doctrines of justice, and condemned Arminius after his death; for, during his life, none dared to attack him: Such was the reputation he had, even through Holland, both for learning and exemplary piety! On the other hand, the Pope, with his conclave, imitating the partiality of the Synod of Dort, injudiciously condemned Jansenius and his Calvinism, and thus did an injury to the doctrines of grace, which Jansenius warmly contended for. But truth shall stand, be it ever so much opposed by either partial Protestants or partial Papists. Therefore, notwithstanding the decisions of the Popish conclave, Jansenism and the doctrines of Grace continued to leaven the church of Rome: Whilst, notwithstanding the decisions of the Protestant Synod, Arminianism and the doctrines of Justice continued to spread through the Protestant churches.

Archbishop Laud, in the days of King James and Charles the first, caused in the gospel-scales the turn, which then began to take place in our church in favour of the doctrines of justice.* He was the chief instrument, which, like Moses's rod, began to part the boisterous sea of *rigid* Calvinism. He received his light from Arminius: But it was corrupted by a mixture of Pelagian darkness. He aimed rather at putting down absolute reprobation and lawless grace, than at clearing up the Scripture-doctrine of a partial Election, doing justice to the doctrines of Grace, and reconciling the contending parties, by reconciling the two gospel-axioms. Hence, passing beyond the Scripture-meridian, he led most of the English clergy from one extreme to the other. For now it is to be feared, that the generality of them are gone as far west, as they were before east in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Free-will is, in general, cried up in opposition to free grace, as excessively and Pelagianistically (if I may use the expression) as, in the beginning of the last century free grace was unreasonably and Calvinistically set up in opposition to free-will. I say *in general*, because, although most of our pulpits are filled with preachers, who Pelagianize, there are still a few divines, who strongly run into the Calvinian extreme.

But however, sooner or later, judicious, moderate men will convince the christian world, that the gospel equally comprises the doctrines of Grace, and of Justice; † and that it consists of promises to be believed, and precepts to be observed.—*Equal Check.*

JOHN GOODWIN, A. M.—1659.

The cross of Arminius is grown so heavy amongst us, and the

* In England, at the time of the Synod of Dort, we also were much divided in our opinions concerning the controverted articles; but our divines having taken the liberty to think and judge for themselves, and the civil government not interposing, it hath come to pass that, from that time to this, almost all persons here of any note for learning and abilities have bid adieu to Calvinism, have sided with the Remonstrants, and have left the Fatalists to follow their own opinions, and to rejoice (since they can rejoice) in a religious system, consisting of human creatures without liberty, doctrines without sense, faith without reason, and a God without mercy.—*Jortin's Disser.*

† This able and very amiable writer, after a more accurate inspection of *the Works of Arminius*, which he had previously used merely as a book of reference in his successful controversy with his bitter adversaries the HILLS, acknowledged that the system of Arminius was the golden mean which "equally comprises the doctrines of Grace and Justice."

generality of professors so weak, that the greater part of them are no not able to take it up, though Truth be tied fast to it, and the bur den of it hereby made much more easy and light. Yet, if many o those who occupy the places of the learned, were not more contradic tious than their opinions, or, at least, than many of their sayings, th cross we speak of would soon be abolished, and the offence of th innocent doctrine, disguised with the vizard of Arminianism pu upon the face of it, would presently cease. And the certain truth is that the unhappy dividing character—between those who, measurin themselves by themselves, call themselves *orthodox*, — and thos whom, because they cannot and do not measure themselves by thei measure, they vote *Arminian*,—doth stand in this, that the latter [th Arminians] are more uniform, steady, and coherent with themselve in their notions and doctrines; whereas the former [the Calvinists] ar desultory, and themselves as it were possessed of a spirit of *Amphibology* which sometimes taketh and casteth them into the fire of Calvinism and other while into the waters of Arminianism so called. And thi declaring of themselves, *toties quoties* and from time to time, for th *Contra-remonstrant tenets*, is their expiatory sacrifice, to cleanse then from the guilt of being thought Arminian, notwithstanding thei never so palpable and clear asserting the *Remonstrant principles* a other times. Yea, let the minister commit the foul crime of Armi nianism never so openly in one part of his sermon, and but d penance in a fair contradiction in another part of it, hereby he stand *rectus in curia;* ORTHODOXISM and SOUNDNESS IN THE FAITH ar imputed unto him. Whereas they who shall, in their doctrine deliver the express matter and substance of what was taught by th other, yea, though they should deliver it in the self-same words an expressions, yet, unless they shall ever and anon be pulling dow with their left hand what in this kind they build up with thei right, they shall be debtors, and be compelled to bear the cross o Christ, under the name and notion of *Arminius*. The necessity an power of those tenets or doctrines, nick-named *Arminian*, is so grea for the accommodating and promoting the affairs of Christianity that even those persons themselves who get a good part of thei subsistence in the world by decrying them, and declaiming agains them, yet cannot make earnings of their profession, are not able t carry on their work of preaching, with any tolerable satisfaction t those that hear them, without employing and asserting them ver frequently. Yea, the truth is, that the grounds and principles o the *Remonstrant Faith*, (for so we have been and are unhappil constrained to distinguish them,) are, as it were, some of the choices and most useful implements or tools, with which they work upo their art whereby they get their living.—*Banner of Justification.*

HUGO GROTIUS.—1609.

ON THE DEATH OF ARMINIUS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE LATIN BY MR. JABEZ HUGHES, BROTHER T THE CELEBRATED JOHN HUGHES, ONE OF THE WRITERS IN TH SPECTATOR.

THOU great researcher into truth profound,
A soul sublime, with erudition crown'd,
Distinguish'd pattern of a piercing mind,
ARMINIUS, from an age perplex'd and blind
Serenely thou art call'd, with happy flight,
To the calm regions of celestial light.

Pure were thy views; and whether thou hast serv'd
Truth's glorious cause and in no notion swerv'd,—
Or, by the lot attending human kind,
Which dimly sees with faculties confin'd
In any part, unheeded error spread
Her obvious snare, and thy pursuit misled;—
(A curious question, and for them to show
Who have both right to judge, and skill to know:)
Yet wast thou seen, in this unhallow'd age,
A strict peruser of the sacred page;
Nor didst thou in the words of men confide,
Relying rashly on a dubious guide:
For which th' applauses of a conscience clear,
Obedient still, still humble and sincere,
At heaven's impartial bar thou dost with rapture hear.
There from the sorrows of this life releas'd,
Of perfect ease, and perfect joy possess'd,
The science thou so long pursu'dst below,
Thou hast obtain'd, and now dost truly know.
From that irradiance of untroubled day,
Thou seest what mists obscure our darken'd way;
How vain the thing which knowledge here we name,
An empty vapour, and an idle dream.
Yet puff'd with this, we others proudly spurn,
And are again insulted in our turn.
Hence wars of sour disputing doctors rise,
The people's rage, and endless enmities.
While holy truth, of holy peace the friend,
Escapes unseen, as fiercely they contend.
From whence this lust of quarrel and debate,
This zeal of parties, and pernicious hate?
Has our dear Lord's infernal foe, conceal'd,
Sown this bad seed, and scatter'd o'er his field?
Or does the hasty wrath of mortal man,
And wit deprav'd, th' untemper'd strife maintain?
And to vile ends the cause of God, profane?
Or while the world, inquisitive to know,
All secrets scans, and things forbid below,
Is this the righteous punishment assign'd,
T' abash the boldness of the curious mind?
As when of old the madding people strove,
From their proud tow'r to scale ev'n heav'n above,
A thousand erring tongues their speech embroil'd,
And with wild jargon the vain counsel foil'd.
Ah! what do we attempt! the little stock
Selected from the world, the purchas'd flock
Invades itself, and rends with mutual spite,
While *Turks* rejoice, and *Jews* applaud the sight.
Bless'd the religion, which from factious heat
Chastely preserv'd, and arts of human wit,
Shines in its own simplicity complete!
Which pardon, by our Saviour's death procur'd,
Expects with steadfast faith, and hope assur'd;
Salvation as the gift of heav'n receives,
And punishments ordain'd for sins believes.
Of gentle love the kind indulgence tries,
Content to be with moderation wise;
Which never will in rash inquiries strive,
Whether events by a fix'd fate arrive;
How, void of evil, by establish'd laws,
The Sov'reign Ruler, as the Sov'reign Cause,
Decrees and disallows committed ill,
And, by a pow'rful nod, conducts the human will.
And bless'd the man! who from ambition free,
Designs not gain, *nor earthly vanity;*

Nor meanly courts the flatteries of praise,
But does to heav'n his glad devotion raise:
To know the Deity his study bends,
And in the flames of angels' zeal ascends.
Who safely guided by th' unerring clue
Of sacred writ, its precepts does pursue;
And thro' the maze of various life, with care
Directs his way, and 'scapes the ready snare;
With charity his freedom tempers well,
And can in peace with diff'ring parties dwell:
Pious and just, who does contention shun,
Of others damn'd, himself condemning none;
Who never will with confidence presume,
But now disputes for truth, and now for peace is dumb.
These lessons often, nor without success,
Thou didst in public, and in private press;
These with redoubled energy commend,
When nearer now approaching to thy end;
Worn with the labours of exerted life,
And nauseating an age involv'd in strife,
Full of itself, beyond instruction wise,
Ungrateful, and delighting to despise;
Broke in thy worse, but in thy nobler part
Firm and entire, thou didst with ardent heart,
(So did thy soul the rapt'rous prospect fire!)
To that blest kingdom earnestly aspire,
To which, while heav'n prolong'd thy useful stay,
Thou hadst to thousands pointed out the way.
There now a star, with rays eternal grac'd,
Within the temple of thy Father plac'd,
In pray'r to God, thou humbly dost unite,
To shed upon his fold sufficient light,
And grant they may with that rest satisfi'd;
Teachers to give them, pure from worldly pride,
To propagate his gospel, not an art,
And union send of tongues, at least of heart:
Of controversies blind to chase the night,
With his own lustre, prevalently bright;
That the whole church of Christ, made one in love,
May persevere, and, aided from above,
Their Life to men, their Faith to Heav'n approve.

PETER HEYLIN, D. D.—1666.

JUNIUS, a very moderate and learned man, and one of the Professors of Divinity in the Schools of Leyden, departed out of this life in the same year also; into whose place the Overseers, (or "Curators," as they call them,) of that University, made choice of JACOB VAN HARMINE, a man of EQUAL LEARNING and NO LESS PIETY. Towards which, the Testimonial-letters sent from Amsterdam, where he had, for fifteen years before, been Pastor, did not help a little; in which he stands commended for a man of *an unblameable life, sound doctrine, and fair behaviour,* as by their letters may appear, exemplified in an Oration which was made at his funeral.

By which ATTRACTIVES he prevailed as much amongst the students of Leyden, as he had done amongst the merchants at Amsterdam. For during the short time of his sitting in the chair of Leyden, he drew unto him a great part of that University; who by the PIETY of the man, his POWERFUL ARGUMENTS, his EXTREME DILIGENCE in that place, and the CLEAR LIGHT OF REASON which appeared in all *his* discourses, became so wedded at the last unto his opinions, that *no time or trouble* could divorce them from Harmine.—*Aeri. Redi.*

THE REV. THOMAS JACKSON.—1822.

The cultivation of this ingenuous temper prepared Mr. Goodwin's mind for important changes in his religious sentiments; and ultimately led him, to renounce the bold and daring school of Calvinian theology, and avow himself a convert to the mild and moderate system of the amiable, pacific and learned Arminius.—

When therefore it had become the full conviction of his mind, that the Calvinian doctrine of election and reprobation was not only destitute of scriptural authority, but, when received as a principle of action and applied to practical purposes, was unfriendly in its influence upon personal religion; he did not hesitate to renounce it, and to maintain with Arminius, That whatever partiality the blessed God may display in the gratuitous distribution of talents amongst men, and in the bestowment of religious advantages, during their probationship in this world; his Decrees, according to which their Eternal States will be appointed, though absolute and unchangeable in themselves, are respective of character, and therefore conditional in their application to individuals. According to his apprehension, God has immutably decreed to elect or choose to eternal life all that believe in Jesus Christ, and to reprobate or abandon to endless misery all that neglect or refuse to believe in him: Graciously affording them, at the same time, every requisite assistance for the acquisition and continued exercise of that faith upon which their everlasting happiness is suspended.—*Life of John Goodwin.*

THE REV. PHILIP LIMBORCH.—1715.

Arminius was a pious and godly man, prudent, candid, mild and placid, and most studious to preserve the peace of the Church. But he fell on evil times, and he had to do with Gomarus, a person of an angry and very ungovernable spirit.—But, lest any one should charge me with having written this through some sort of undue feeling, I will subjoin the judgment formed concerning both Arminius and Gomarus by those persons who will give the least cause of suspicion [of partiality] to such as hold sentiments contrary to the Remonstrants. [After quoting Hornbeck, Martinius, and Balcanqual, he adds,] The author of "The Life of Anthony Walæus," which is extant in *Vitæ Selectorum Aliquot Virorum,* though he generally abounds in intemperate invectives against the Remonstrants, gives the following character of Arminius: *He was a man of a subtle genius, sound learning, and irreproachable in his manners.* But he describes Gomarus in a manner vastly different: *Francis Gomarus was a person of extensive erudition, fervid in his zeal and vehement.* He then adds: "*Gomarus granted too much indulgence to his passions.* He was not crabbed or malignant, but irascible and destitute of self-possession on any sudden emergency."—*Relatio Historica de Orig. et Prog. Cont.*

MATTHIAS MARTINIUS, *Professor of Bremen, and afterwards a famous Member of the Synod of Dort.*—1609.

The death of ARMINIUS is confirmed. He appeared to me to be *a man who truly feared God,* of the DEEPEST ERUDITION, *uncommonly well versed in theological controversies,* and POWERFUL IN THE SCRIPTURES. He also exercised extreme caution and accuracy in accommodating the terms of philosophy to theological subjects. I have not yet been able to discover his errors, (if he had any,) with their number or their magnitude: *God knows the* state of that matter.—Ep. Ec.

J. L. MOSHEIM, D.D.—1726.

The Arminians derive their name and their origin from James ARMINIUS, or *Harmensen*, who was first Pastor at Amsterdam, and afterwards Professor of Divinity at Leyden, and *who attracted the esteem and applause of his very* ENEMIES, by his acknowledged CANDOUR, PENETRATION, and PIETY.—Arminius, though he had imbibed in his tender years the doctrines of Geneva, afterwards embraced the principles and communion of those whose religious system extends *the love of the* SUPREME BEING, *and the merits of* JESUS CHRIST *to* ALL MANKIND.

As time and deep meditation had only served to confirm him in these principles, he thought himself obliged, by the dictates both of candour and conscience, to profess them publicly, when he had obtained the chair of divinity in the University of Leyden, and to oppose the doctrine and sentiments of Calvin on these heads, which had been followed by the greatest part of the Dutch clergy. Two considerations encouraged him in a particular manner, to venture upon this open declaration of his sentiments; for he was persuaded, on the one hand, that there were many persons, beside himself, and, among these, some of the first rank and dignity,* that were highly

* For my part, when I reflect on the disputes which have produced such a lamentable division in Holland, I can hardly comprehend how men of genius could persuade themselves, that the dogmas of St. Augustine on Predestination and Grace are essential to the Reformation of Christianity: For there were many holy men, in the purest ages of the Church, who thought directly the reverse of that Father. Cannot we renounce the monstrous and ridiculous doctrine of Transubstantiation, the Religious Worship of Saints and Images, the Fable of Purgatory, the Indulgences, the false Traditions of the Church of Rome, and the Tyranny of the Pope, without believing in Absolute Predestination, and Irresistible Grace? What was thought of the hypothesis of the Bishop of Hippo, by all those respectable individuals who, struck with the absurdity and falsehood of the doctrines I have just enumerated, embraced the Reformation in the last century? Did they give themselves the trouble of examining whether it was true or false? These difficult and abstract questions occupied the sole attention of the divines, who took it into their heads to form a complete system of Divinity; and among them who chose that employment, there were many who having more carefully examined the Holy Scripture, and Ecclesiastical Antiquity, preferred the moderate sentiments of the ancient Greek Fathers. Even Calvin himself was not persuaded, that his own notions respecting Predestination and Grace were essential to Religion: For he took the trouble of translating into French *the Common Places* of Melanchthon,—who thought very differently from him on those controverted subjects, —and in the preface which he prefixed to that work, he bestows on the author all imaginable praise. Could he conscientiously have acted thus, if he had been persuaded that the sentiments of Melanchthon sapped the foundations of the Reformation? Many eminent Reformed Divines have openly maintained, that the doctrines of Universal Grace, of the Power to resist its operation, and of Conditional Predestination, are in the number of those Articles which every one may believe without renouncing the principles of Religion.

Some learned Hollanders had boldly defended this doctrine, before ARMINIUS became a minister at Amsterdam, and a Professor at Leyden, and likewise before Gomarus had risen up against him. Their writings are still extant; although it is true, that certain ministers who were too hasty, exerted themselves to bring those authors and their productions into disrepute: But the States of Holland uniformly checked this impetuous zeal. [See p. p. 537—541.] The Professors of Leyden were allowed a perfect liberty of teaching conformably to the sentiments of Melanchthon; and when Arminius was called to that University, his opinions were generally known: For he had declared them in the Church of Amsterdam, from [the consistory of] which he received very honourable testimonials. Gomarus, and many others of the same opinion, having entered into conversation with Arminius, made no scruple of acknowledging immediately that the difference of sentiments which existed between *them, did not at all concern* the foundations of the Reformation. True it is, that

disgusted at the doctrine of absolute decrees; and, on the other, he knew that the Belgic doctors were neither obliged by their Confession of Faith, nor by any other public law, to adopt and propagate the principles of Calvin.

They who would form a just and accurate notion of the TEMPER, GENIUS, and DOCTRINE of this Divine, will do well to peruse, with particular attention, that part of his works which is known under the title of *Disputationes publicæ et privatæ*. There is in his manner of reasoning, and also in his phraseology, some little remains of the scholastic jargon of that age;* but we find, nevertheless, in his writings, upon the whole, much of that SIMPLICITY and PERSPICUITY which his followers have always looked upon, and still consider, as among the principal qualities of a Christian Minister.

THE REV. JOHN NARSIUS,—1612.

I have frequently heard Dr. ANTHONY THYSIUS testify 'that he never knew a man *endowed with more virtues* or of a higher cast, than those which ARMINIUS possessed; and that no one could be *liable to fewer faults* or those of a more trivial description. His spirit breathed so much PIETY and CANDOUR, such HUMILITY, KINDNESS, and AFFABILITY in their highest degrees,—it was so *studious of peace* and so *patient under the heaviest injuries*,—that it would have been his choice to endure all kinds of calumnies and reproaches, diseases, and even death itself, rather than enlarge by a great display of retaliation the wound already afflicted on Christendom, and especially on our Reformed Churches. He was a man whose EQUAL I do not think this age has produced.—*Epist. Eccles.*

DANIEL NEAL, A. M.—1738.

This year died the famous JACOBUS ARMINIUS, Divinity Professor in the University of Leyden, who gave birth to the famous sect still called by his name. Being desired by one of the Professors of Franequer to confute a treatise of Beza's upon the supralapsarian scheme of Predestination, he fell himself into the contrary sentiment. —He is represented as a Divine of considerable learning, piety, and modesty, *far from going the lengths of his successors*, Vorstius, Episcopius, and Curcellæus.

THOMAS PIERCE, D. D.—1657.

They who have been taught rather to *hate* ARMINIUS than *understand* him, may very usefully be taught some few things of him:

Arminius disputeth against God's *absolute Power* or *Will* as it is separated from his *Justice;* and Mr. B. confesseth, that Calvin doth the same, yea, that he bitterly declaims against it. Arminius holds, that God never intended to punish any one with temporal, and then less with eternal, death, except for sin.

For myself I do declare, that I was then in the opinions I am now in, when I had not read one page of Arminius's Works. Nor do I

Gomarus did not remain long on good terms with Arminius. Whether he had taken umbrage at the reputation of his new colleague, or the enemies of Arminius had found means to provoke the anger of Gomarus by some artful insinuation or other; he violently set his face against a man whom, some time before, he looked upon as orthodox.—LE VASSOR'S *History of the Reign of Louis XIII.*

* *See the Remarks pp.* 251—255.

agree with him any further, than he agrees with Scripture, Antiquity the Church of England, and with Melanchthon after the time of hi convertion from the errors of Luther and Calvin. This Melanchthoı at first had been, as it were, the scholar of Luther, and drew fron him his first errors: But, being a pious, learned, and unpassionat man, (pursuing Truth, not Faction,) he saw his error and forsook it embracing those opinions concerning *the Liberty of the Will, the Caus of Sin, the Universality of Grace,* and *the Respectiveness of God's De crees,* that I asserted in those Notes against which Mr. B. now de claims. This Melanchthon was and still is the darling, more tha any one man, of the Reformed part of the Christian World; so muc the rather, because, beside his vast Learning, unbiassed Judgmen and transcendent Piety, he was almost proverbial for MODERATIOI For this, he was chosen to write the Augustan Confession: Fc this, he was much considered by them that composed our *Book c Articles,* and our other *Book of Homilies* which shews us what is th doctrine of *the true Church of England:* For this, he was imitated an admired by the glorious Martyrs of our religion in the days c Queen Mary: For this, he was esteemed far above Mr. Calvin b Jacobus ARMINIUS, the famous Professor of Divinity in the Univer sity of Leyden, who, however a Presbyterian as to matter of Disci pline, did yet so very far excel the other divines of that sect i EXACTNESS OF LEARNING as well as LIFE, that we may say, he becam MELANCHTHON'S CONVERT.

Mr. B. and his masters have fastened the name of ARMINIANISI upon so many very good and very necessary doctrines, that some c the wisest of their own party have been heard to say, "that when a "comes to all, if they intend to preach to the people so as to d "them any good, they must preach Arminianism do what they can. For if the will of man is not free to avoid the sins which ar preached down, (by the mighty assistance of God's Free Grace, and to perform the duties which are preached up, (by the sam assistance of the same grace,) but so tied, and fettered and predeter mined that it cannot possibly be one jot better, or one jot worse, tha now it is, all our laws and precepts, consultations and condition exhortations and admonitions, promises and threats, praises and dis praises, rewards and punishments, would not only be useless bu ridiculous things. And therefore, as we tender the good of souls an desire to be useful in what we speak or write, we must be so far i danger of being called Arminians, as to endeavour by our doctrine of *Grace* and *Liberty,* (of *Liberty* by and under *Grace,)* that all care and diligence, and circumspection, may not be banished out of th world, as nothing else but names and notions.—*The Divine Philan thropy Defended.*

JOHN PLAIFERE, B. D.—1651.

The Fourth opinion of Divine Predestination is that of Melanchton Hemmingius, and the Lutherans that follow the Augustan Confessio and *Formulam Concordiæ;* of the Remonstrants, or Arminians, and c many Papists, &c. It was condemned in the late Synod at Dort.

The Fifth opinion is that of ARMINIUS, if he be interpreted accord ing to his own principles in his *Theses de Natura Dei,* and of Vorstiu in his Treatise *De Deo,* and of the Jesuits Malina, Vasquez, Suarez Becanus, and others; and may therefore be less acceptable to som *for the sake of the* teachers and defenders of it: But a lover of trut

will not be prejudiced against it, because such and such spoke it. However, it hath, beside these, the unanimous suffrage of the Fathers, Greek and Latin, before St. Augustine, if their doctrine concerning Prescience be rightly examined and explained.—*Appello ad Evangelium.*

*** This excellent treatise was republished, in *A Collection of Tracts concerning Predestination and Providence,* at Cambridge in 1719; and in the Preface the Editors say:—"We may by the way observe, that the Fourth and Fifth opinions proposed by Plaifere seem to be very little different; or, rather, the latter to be only the other more fully expressed, and better guarded from cavils and exceptions: And if so, the objections made by him against the Fourth must be of no great weight, as they do not indeed appear to be, if they are well considered. But the name of a REMONSTRANT or ARMINIAN was, in his days, very odious;* nothing being more common, in many of the invective writings of that age, than to jumble Arminians, Papists, and Atheists together, as if they were synonymous terms. It is no wonder therefore, that the author endeavoured to screen himself a little from the iniquity of the times, by distinguishing *his* tenets from those of *the Arminians,* which caution is also observable in Dr. Potter's letter."

CHRISTOPHER POTTER, D. D.—1629.

I neither am, nor ever will be, Arminian: I am resolved to stand fast in that liberty which my Lord hath so dearly bought for me. In Divine Truths, my conscience cannot serve men, or any other Master beside HIM who hath his chair in Heaven. I love Calvin very well; and, I must tell you, I cannot hate Arminius: And, for my part, I am verily persuaded, that these two are now, where they agree well, in the kingdom of heaven; whilst some of their passionate disciples are so eagerly brawling here on earth. I should honour Truth if I heard it out of the Pope's mouth, or the Devil's: Nor can I believe a falsity, though published by an Angel. For my life, I cannot obtain of my conscience to declaim, and revile, and cry down an opinion, when I cannot see any solid satisfying answer to many contrary scriptures and reasons. Blindfolded, many follow their leaders. Therefore they believe all their dictates, as if they were divinely inspired and spake oracles, without examining, which eases them of much trouble and difficulty in sifting and judging.

For some years in my youth, when I was most ignorant, I was most confident; before I knew *the true state* or *any grounds* of those questions, I could peremptorily resolve them all: And, upon every occasion, in the very pulpit, I was girding and railing upon *these new heretics,* the Arminians; and I could not find words enough to decipher the folly and absurdity of their doctrine; especially I abhorred them as venemous enemies of the precious *Grace of God,* whereof I ever was, and ever will be, most jealous and tender, as I am most obliged, holding all I am, or have, or hope for, by that glorious grace. Yet all this while I took upon trust all this that I talked; and knew not what they said or thought, but by relation from others, and from their enemies. And because my conscience in secret would

* And yet we are told by some of our admired historians, who are not the most accurate, that Arminianism, at the period (1630) when Plaifere wrote, was eminently triumphant—an assertion which I have disproved in another place.

often tell me, that railing would not carry it in matters of religion, with reason and Divine Authority; I betook myself seriously and earnestly to peruse the writings of both parties, and to observe and balance the scriptures produced for both opinions. But my aim in this enquiry was, not to inform myself whether [of the two] held the Truth, but the better to fortify *our* tenets against *their* cavils and subtleties. Though, I must confess, I much favoured my own side, and read what was written against it with exceeding indignation, especially when I was pinched and found many objections to which I could find no answers.* Yet, in spite of my judgment, my conscience stood as it could; and still multiplying my prayers, and recurring to my oracle [the word of God], I repelled such thoughts as temptations. Well, in this perplexity I went on, and first observed the judgments of this age since the Reformation; and here I found, in the very *Harmony of our Confessions*, some little discord in these opinions, but generally and the most part of our Reformed Churches favouring the Remonstrants: And, among particular writers, many here differing in judgments, though nearly linked in affection, and all of them eminent for learning and piety; and, being all busied against the common adversary, the Church of Rome, these little differences amongst themselves were wisely neglected and concealed. At length, some of our own gave occasion, I fear, to these intestine and woeful wars, letting fall some speeches very scandalous and which cannot be maintained.—The late Arminians often protest deeply before God Almighty, that, out of mere tenderness of conscience and zeal to piety and God's glory, they desired a moderation in some rigorous opinions, but, however, a mutual toleration of one another's errors and infirmities, still keeping the ligament of Christian communion inviolable. But principally, next after the Bible, they insist with great boldness upon their appeal to venerable Antiquity, which they challenge entirely to side with them: All the Greek and Latin Doctors, for six hundred years after the Apostles, having expressly declared themselves against us, and many of them in whole treatises of purpose. I must confess, these reasons have convicted me, not so far as absolutely to yield to them, or to take part with them in any faction, but so far as not rashly to censure, damn, or anathematize them, till I can see their pretensions voided: But I was specially nettled with this confident appeal to Antiquity. Upon this occasion, I betook myself to notes and exceptions; and, in truth, found nothing in them that favoured those opinions that I favoured; I observed many shrewd and pertinent passages alleged by the Arminians, even out of St. Augustine and Prosper, and, upon trial, found their quotations very faithful.—*Letter to Mr. Vicars, vindicating his sentiments touching the Predestinarian Controversies.*

THE QUARTERLY THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.—1825.

We will conclude this branch of our subject with a quotation from the Works of Arminius, which may be new to many who are

* This fine account of the progress of truth on an ingenuous and accomplished mind, that adhered long and tenaciously to its old Calvinistic notions and partialities, is worthy of the great man who wrote it, in defence of a sermon which he had preached at the consecration of his uncle, in 1628, to the Bishopric of Carlisle. That preferment was obtained for a staunch old Calvinist by Dr. Laud's interest; and it is far from being a solitary instance of his impartiality in the distribution of church preferment.

taught to believe, that this learned man was necessarily, and from his own system, unsound upon the cardinal doctrine of Divine Grace. We very much doubt whether in the writings of any Reformer of our own or any foreign country, there is to be found a statement on this point, which tends more to exalt the grace of God who giveth salvation, and humble the self-sufficiency of man who is mercifully allowed to receive it:

"In his lapsed and sinful state, man is not capable, of and by himself, either to will or to do that which is really good; but it is necessary for him to be regenerated and renewed in his intellect, affections, or will, and in all his powers, by God in Christ, through the Holy Spirit, that he may be qualified rightly to understand, esteem, consider, will, and perform whatever is truly good. I ascribe to Divine grace—the commencement, the continuance, and the consummation of *all good*—and to such an extent do I carry its influence, that a man, though already regenerated, can neither conceive, will, nor do any good at all, nor resist any evil temptation, without this preventing and exciting, this following and co-operating grace."

FREDERICK SANDIUS, *Senator of the Court of Guelderland and of the County of Zutphen.*—1612.

I am unwilling that Arminius, the pious deceased, should be loaded with my prejudice; and I have no doubt that, on the subject of religion, injurious and unjust suspicions have occasionally been circulated concerning him. But those persons appear to me to form a wrong judgment who suppose, that his sentiments on the subject of Predestination are those of Socinus: I consider them to be exactly the same as those of Melancthon, John Anastasius, Nicholas Hemmingius, and of Gellius Snecanus, and plainly contrary to Socinianism: Principally in this respect, that their doctrine derives all good from above, and maintains that, in the matter of salvation, we can do nothing without this preventing and co-operating grace, and that we are saved solely by the merits of Christ when they are apprehended by faith.—*Epist. Ec.*

HENRY SPONDANUS, (DE SPONDE,) *Bishop of Pamiers in Navarre.*—1641.

In October, this year, (1609,) died James Arminius, a native of Oudewater, and Professor of the Calvinian Theology at Leyden. From his doctrine, which was in many respects different from that of Calvin and from his co-pastors, arose great disturbances. But the principal controversy among them was about Predestination and Reprobation. Francis Gomarus, of Bruges, a man of the same Calvinian school, but who had, prior to Arminius's arrival, taught Divinity at Leyden, opposed his sentiments, and afterwards those of Vorstius. The affair proceeded at length, from words and pens, to arms and blows; for the chief men of the country and the magistrates divided into parties. While they abhorred the name of *the Roman Catholics*, they preferred to listen to the followers of Vorstius and Arminius,—not to mention *the Socinians, Gomarists,* and *the Coornhartians,* (so called from Theodore Koornhert, Secretary to the States-General, whose principal error consisted in a denial of Original Sin,) and other pestilential men of the same class, that

have infected those provinces. Such indeed is the piety, such is tl concord of sectaries!

But the Arminians may be called "mild Calvinists," whe compared with the Gomarists who are of the rigid class, and ten ciously adhere to the opinions of Calvin. The same distinction *Mild* and *Rigid*, was formerly made, and still exists, among tl Lutherans.

A great assembly of [Dutch and foreign] ministers was held Dort in 1618, against the Arminians, in the presence of Prince Ma rice and other leading characters. Yet it could make no certa determination of the controversy respecting Predestination; for tl ministers were divided among themselves, and the Arminians raise their objections, because they could not be heard in their own defen through the prevalence of the faction that maintained the predestin tion of Gomarus and Calvin. But the issue of the Dort assembly wa the banishment of the Arminian ministers, and the condemnation Barneveldt who had been seized and arraigned as the author of tl seditious proceedings of the Remonstrants: He was beheaded at tl Hague, May 13, 1619, in the seventy-third year of his age; and tl Arminians began to honour him as a martyr.

The Calvinists in Holland were at this time divided into six pri cipal sects, those who followed Calvin as a Pope, [*Calvino-Papistæ* the Puritans, the Brownists, the Broughtonians, the Gomarists, an the Arminians. At the same period also, in England, several perso revived the ancient heresies of the Origenists, the Ebionites, th Sabellians, and the Anabaptists; others assumed the office of pr phets, or taught new doctrines, which yet were not much dissimil to those of Calvin. Nor will there ever be an end to such busy-bodie until all of them bring their understandings into captivity to th obedience of Christ, and of his Church,* "which God hath given fo the work of the ministry, that we should henceforth be no mo children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby the lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow u into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ."—*Continuatio of the Annals of Baronius.*

THOMAS STACKHOUSE, A.M.—1734.

Arminius, a Professor in Leyden, wrote against Perkins, [wh asserted the supralapsarian points,] upon which Gomarus and h had many disputes, and their opinions bred great distraction ove all the United Provinces, till at length a great Synod met at Dor which condemned the tenets of Arminius. What contributed to th condemnation of the Arminian doctrine, was a political question

* This was the insidious manner, by which the Popish writers of that age ende voured to profit by the quarrels of the Protestants; but their success, during th Inter-regnum in England, was far greater, especially among the Calvinists, than was at any period in Holland. These remarks, however, come with a very bad grac from a man who had himself apostatized from Protestantism!

† In the beginning of the last century, the contest was vehement between th Remonstrants and the Calvinists in Holland. The latter engaged Prince Maurice o their side, artfully turned a religious into a political quarrel; and, being superior i power, overcame their antagonists who surpassed them as much in judgment, learning probity, and every thing that was commendable. They held a Synod at Dort, an established their Calvinistical decrees by cruel insolence and oppression. Thus th *Remonstrants* were obliged to fly their country, and seek for refuge where they coul *find it, amongst the Papists*, to shun the barbarity of their fellow-citizens, who ha

that had some time been agitated and occasioned a difference of opinion, viz. *Whether the war should be carried on with Spain or propositions of a peace be entertained?* The followers of Arminius were almost all for a peace; and the others, among whom the Prince of Orange was chief, were as generally for a war: Hereupon the Arminians were represented as men disaffected to their country, and whose opinions inclined them to Popery, and therefore it is less wonder to find them condemned in a Synod which was convened in a country where such misrepresentations of them had been industriously spread.

When these disputes crossed the sea and came amongst us, they were soon carried to so great a height, that a proclamation was issued out, requiring divines to preach no longer upon these heads. But, as the Arminian tenets were greatly encouraged by Archbishop Laud, they very much prevailed; until unhappy disputes falling in at that time, concerning the extent of the royal prerogative, and the Arminians declaring for it, though they were favoured at Court, yet they were censured in Parliament, which brought their doctrine under a very hard character all the nation over. The subversion of the government, that afterwards followed, gave a fatal blow to the Arminian doctrines; most of the sectaries that then prevailed, embraced Calvin's notions in point of Predestination, and held all other opinions in great detestation: But, when the government came to be re-established, the exploded doctrines revived, and were the kindlier used and cultivated for having suffered so hardly before. At present they are become the general profession of almost all the clergy of the Church of England, as the others are made the favourite and distinguishing opinions of most Dissenters.—*Body of Divinity.*

THE REV. RICHARD THOMSON, *Cambridge.*—1605.

I view with approbation what you write concerning Arminius;—though we in England are not so ignorant of his REPUTATION, as you seem to apprehend. For I formerly knew him very well, before he became Professor of Divinity; and since he entered on his new office, he has begun to be well-known to many others in this country. As often, therefore, as any students come from Leyden to Cambridge, our Professors make particular enquiries about Arminius. I am truly glad, for the sake of your University, that she contains SUCH A GREAT MAN.—*Epist. Eccl.*

N. TINDAL, M. A.—1758.

Arminius and his followers declared, that God decrees not "absolutely" any person to be saved or damned, but "conditionally," or according to what He foresaw they would do: That Christ did not die only for a particular number whom God intended to save, but for all men, &c.—When the Arminian scheme began to spread

not learned from their own sufferings the rights of conscience, and the necessity of mutual forbearance. But these violent men trod in the steps of their own fathers; for the litigious temper of many of the Reformed in the Low Countries, their dogmatical derisions of unimportant speculations, their immortal hatred of toleration, their zeal for imposing confessions of faith, and the fanatical, ambitious, and turbulent spirit of several of their ecclesiastics, make it a matter of wonder to posterity how the Protestant religion was ever established there. Nothing but the diabolical cruelty of the Spanish government, which became insupportable even to the Dutch Papists, could, humanly speaking, have brought about a Reformation.—*Jortin's Dissertations.*

in Holland, and to be favoured by the government, as more rational in itself and more intelligible by the people than the Calvinistical, the Predestinarian party, who were most prevalent there, grew outrageous at the progress of the Arminian doctrines, and called the authors of them "Devils" and "Plagues," animating the magistrates to extirpate and destroy them, and utterly refusing to enter into any treaty of reconciliation. They never ceased till they had leave to hold a National Synod at Dort, in 1618, from which all the Arminian divines being expelled, their tenets were condemned, and the Predestinarian or Calvinistical doctrines more firmly established.—*Continuation of Rapin's History.*

THE REV. JOHN UYTENBOGARDT.—1612.

The Remonstrants thank God, that they have been permitted to know, to hear, and to see SUCH A MAN AS ARMINIUS, and to enjoy the benefit of his GREAT ABILITIES. They look upon this church to be happy in having had such a light, and unhappy in having lost it so soon; but still more unhappy are those who, when they might, did not learn of him.—I have written to the Patriarch, [Cyril, of Alexandria,] but I have not sent him an Account of the Conference [at the Hague in 1611,] because it is not yet translated into Latin, and he does not understand the Dutch language. I have only transmitted to him the Disputations of Arminius, because they contain a sort of BRIEF SYSTEM OF DIVINITY, on which I am very desirous to obtain his opinion.—*Brandt et Epist. Eccl.*

JOHN WESLEY, M.A.—1778.

Meantime, from others, ARMINIUS underwent almost continual persecution, and was treated with the most flagrant injustice. *Thirty-one Articles,* containing many things which he utterly denied, as well as the most senseless and wilful misrepresentations of what he maintained, were circulated through Holland, as an exact code of his doctrines. He, more than once, in his answer, complains of his enemies making him a fool, as well as a heretic.—THE DECLARATION OF HIS OPINIONS, which he spake in an assembly of the States, serves at once by facts to evidence the unfair usage he met with, and to proclaim to the world AS MANLY and RATIONAL A SYSTEM of DIVINITY as any age or nation has produced. His uncommon MILDNESS and FORBEARANCE, (rendered still more extraordinary by the age in which he lived,) is apparent in every page of his writings: And his disputes with the celebrated Junius, and our English Perkins, on the subject of Predestination, are, for the POLITE and GENEROUS MANNER in which he has conducted them, AN HONOUR TO HUMAN NATURE.—*Arminian Magazine.*

James Harmens, in Latin, Jacobus Arminius, was first one of the ministers of Amsterdam, and afterwards Professor of Divinity at Leyden. He was educated at Geneva; but, in the year 1591, began to doubt of the principles which he had till then received: And being more and more convinced that they were wrong, when he was invested with the Professorship, he publicly taught what he believed of the truth, till, in the year 1609, he died in peace. But a few years after his death, some zealous men, with the Prince of Orange at their head, furiously assaulted all that held, what were called, *his Opinions,* and having procured them to be solemnly condemned, in *the famous Synod of* Dort, (not so numerous or learned, but fully as

impartial as the Council, or Synod of Trent;) some were put to death, some banished, some imprisoned for life, all turned out of their employments, and made incapable of holding any office, either in Church or State.

The errors charged upon these (usually termed Arminians) by their opponents, are five, (1.) That they deny Original Sin.—(2.) That they deny Justification by Faith.—(3.) That they deny Absolute Predestination.—(4.) That they deny the Grace of God to be irresistible;—and, (5.) That they affirm, a Believer may fall from Grace.

With regard to the two first of these charges, they plead, Not guilty. They are entirely false. No man that ever lived, not John Calvin himself, ever asserted either Original Sin, or Justification by Faith, in more strong, more clear, and express terms, than Arminius has done. These two points, therefore, are to be set out of the question: In these, both parties agree.

But there is an undeniable difference between the Calvinists and Arminians, with regard to the three other questions. Here they divide: The former believe Absolute, the latter, only Conditional Predestination. How can any man know what Arminius held, who has never read one page of his writings? Let no man bawl against Arminians, till he knows what the term means. And then he will know, that Arminians and Calvinists are just upon a level. And Arminians have as much right to be angry at Calvinists, as Calvinists have to be angry at Arminians. John Calvin was a pious, learned, sensible man: And so was James Harmens. Many Calvinists are pious, learned, sensible men: And so are many Arminians. Only the former hold Absolute Predestination, the latter Conditional.—*What is an Arminian?*

JOHN WILKS, Esq.—1822.

In all his Lectures, Arminius was attended by a numerous audience, who admired the strength of his arguments, and were astonished at the great learning which he displayed: This exposed him to the contempt of his brethren, who treated him with harshness and cruelty. Gomarus was his greatest persecutor.

Arminius was a faithful and energetic minister of the Gospel. His voice was firm, but moderately low; and his conversation such as became a Christian: While it was pious and judicious, it was intermixed with that politeness of conduct and elegance of manners, which delights the young, and insures the approbation and esteem of the aged. His enemies, indeed, endeavoured to represent him in the most disadvantageous light; but his memory has been sufficiently vindicated by men of the greatest distinction and eminence: And, in spite of all the malevolence and enmity of his antagonists, his character was in very many points highly commendable, and worthy of imitation.—*Christian Biographical Dictionary.*

LAURENCE WOMACK, D. D.—1658.

When those points of doctrine maintained by Melancthon and other moderate Lutherans, came to be managed by the acute wit, solid judgment and great learning of James Hermine, Public Reader in the University of Leyden, they appeared to the unprejudiced examiners so much more consonant as well to the Sacred Scriptures and right reason as to primitive Antiquity, and so much more agreeable to the Mercy, Justice and Wisdom of Almighty God, and so much

more conducing unto Piety, than the tenets of the rigid Calvinists, that they quickly found a cheerful reception and great multitudes of followers in the Belgic Churches. Hereupon their adversaries, (having so passionately espoused the contrary opinions, and being so vehemently carried on with a prejudice against these,) that they might the more effectually decry and suppress the propugnators of them, caused some of their confidants to represent them and their doctrine under such odious characters as were indeed proper to their own opinions. It was given out that, among their heresies, they held: First, "That God was the author of sin," and Secondly, "That He created the far greatest part of mankind, only of purpose to glorify himself in their damnation,"—with several others of like nature; which indeed are not only the consequence and results of Calvin's doctrine, but positively maintained and propagated by some of his followers.—*Examination of Tilenus.*

SIR HENRY WOTTON.—1616.

AND to another that spake indiscreet and bitter words against Arminius, I heard him (Sir Henry Wotton,) reply to this purpose:

In my travel toward Venice, as I past through Germany, I rested almost a year at Leyden, where I entered into an acquaintance with ARMINIUS, (then the Professor of Divinity in that University,) a man much talked of in this age, which is made up of opposition and controversy: And, indeed, if I mistake not Arminius in his expressions, (as so weak a brain as mine is, may easily do,) then I know I differ from him in some points; yet I profess my judgment of him to be, that he was A MAN OF MOST RARE LEARNING; and I knew him to be of A MOST STRICT LIFE, and of A MOST MEEK SPIRIT. And that he was so mild, appears by his proposals to our Master Perkins, of Cambridge, from whose book, *Of the order and causes of salvation*, (which was first writ in Latin,) Arminius took the occasion of writing some queries to him concerning the consequents of his doctrine; intending them (it is said) to come privately to Mr. Perkins' own hands, and to receive from him a like private and a like loving answer; but Mr. Perkins died before those queries came to him; and it is thought Arminius meant them to die with him; for though he lived long after, I have heard he forbore to publish them (but since his death, his sons did not). And it is pity, if God had been so pleased, that Mr. Perkins did not live to see, consider, and answer those proposals himself; for he was also of a most meek spirit, and of great and sanctified learning. And though since their deaths, many of high parts and piety, have undertaken to clear the controversy, yet, for the most part, they have rather satisfied themselves, than convinced the dissenting party. And doubtless, many middle-witted men, (which yet may mean well,) many scholars that are not in the highest form for learning, (which yet may preach well,) men that are but preachers, and shall never know, till they come to heaven, where the questions stick between Arminius and the Church of England, (if there be any,) will yet in this world be tampering with, and thereby perplexing the controversy, and do therefore justly fall under the reproof of St. Jude, for being *busybodies*, and for *meddling with things they understand not.* — ISAAC WALTON'S *Life of Sir Henry Wotton.*

END OF TESTIMONIES.

THE DUTCH EDITOR'S

ADDRESS

TO THE CHRISTIAN READER.

WE HERE present to thee, Christian Reader, the small treatises of JAMES ARMINIUS, Doctor of Divinity, all comprised in one volume. It was necessary to satisfy the desires of those persons whom the author pleased, as well as those whom he displeased. Of both these descriptions there are some in this country and elsewhere, who, that they may not be thought to have loved or condemned the man without proper consideration, wish to hear him speak in his own works. It is the lot of all writers to be blamed by some men, and to receive commendation from others. The same dainties are not equally relished by all palates; nor have the most dogmatical doctors been able satisfactorily to prove to every one the truth of their sentiments. There are those who, by too great an attachment to their teachers, are so blinded, as to admire nothing but what is dictated by them, and to regard their opinions with the same veneration as they would look upon a sacred shield sent down from heaven. There are also those in whom prejudices and preconceived opinions pervert a good understanding; and they estimate what is true, not by reason, but by persons, by times, and (may I add?) by their own private interest. The two faults of which I here complain, are not peculiar to our times, but belong to former ages. I dissent from both these classes; and Arminius would himself, while he lived, much sooner have had a hearer divested of all bias, than one who was a violent partizan. The exercise of his own liberty

is as proper an act in a citizen of the Celestial Republic, as in a member of political society in an earthly commonwealth. In a state of servitude all things are hard and difficult; but wherever there is permission granted to understand and perceive those things which God, reason, and pious antiquity have taught, and to profess and declare them to the glory of God and for the edification of the churches,—there piety without guile, religion unaccompanied by superstition, and truth divested of hypocrisy, make rapid advances towards maturity. Read and consider the sentiments of the author's mind, with a freedom similar to that which inspired him when he taught them. We here present every work which he either published in his life-time, or of which he approved. His remarks on the prophet Malachi, which were delivered with great effect from the chair in the University of Leyden, as public exercises, against Popery and Socinianism, are preserved in various places in the notes of his pupils. Every one would scruple to publish loose papers of this kind; because, being noted down in haste as they proceeded from the mouth of the speaker, they might, by a defect in the hearer or by his carelessness in writing, subject the unconscious professor to a punishment which he had not merited.

Prefixed to the work stands the Funeral Oration of the very learned P. Bertius, in which he spoke much in favour of the author, and of those churches which were afterwards the objects of his aversion. The work itself commences with four discourses founded on strong scriptural reasoning, which, to the delight of the auditors, were pronounced as inaugural orations when the author first occupied the chair of Divinity Professor: Their titles are (1) *On the priesthood of Christ;* (2) *The Object of Theology;* (3) *Its Author and its End;* and (4) *its certainty.*—To these succeeds a fifth, *On*

reconciling religious differences among Christians, the mode and theory of which might, he believed, be proposed with much greater ease than the practice could be enforced.—To this discourse is appended a *Declaration*, in which he professes his sentiments on *Predestination, the Providence of God, Free-will, the Grace of God, the Divinity of the Son of God*, and *the Justification of man before God*; in which he contends that while he neither confined himself to the opinions of other men nor implicitly adopted their phrases, he was yet removed far from the boundaries of Pelagianism and Socianism. —Next comes his *Apology for the thirty-one Articles which were dispersed abroad;* and it acts the part of an arbitrator between a pleader and a person accused.—After these follows a compendium of nearly the whole of Theology, comprehended in various *Disputations*, in which the sacred meaning is defended by passages of scripture, selected with much judgment and inserted in the margin.—To these are subjoined his *Private Disputations*, which, in a learned and appropriate manner, treat on the economy of our salvation, and complete the series of the divine actions.—We add to these the *Friendly Conference on Predestination* which he held by letter with that respectable and famous divine, Francis Junius. This production excels in the ingenuity of its interpretations, and the number and weight of its arguments: By it two of the greatest divines, discordant indeed in sentiment but harmonious in spirit, have afforded an example to their followers of the possibility of discussing the maxims of the schools without the least breach of friendship or affection. —The same method of conducting a dispute is taught in his *Examination of a Pamphlet by Perkins*, than whom Great Britain did not contain a theologian of deeper learning or greater candour.—The *Analysis of the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the*

Romans, treats on those high and adorable counsels of God which relate to men's eternal salvation and damnation; and the discriminating marks adduced in that chapter, which some authors have been pleased to apply simply to persons, he teaches us to apply to believers and unbelievers.

At the end of the book stands a *Dissertation on the true and genuine sense of the Seventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans:* in which our author exhibits the appearance of a regenerate and an unrenewed man, and depicts with the greatest fidelity the degrees through which the former must pass in completing his course. It also shews what a great distance there is between THE LAW and GRACE, between RIGHTEOUSNESS and THE LAW; and how REASON and DESIRE, THE FLESH and THE SPIRIT differ from each other in their dispositions and pursuits. Indeed, throughout the whole work the reader will soon acknowledge the sentiments propounded, to be those which received the approbation of the ancient Fathers.—The *Articles* which conclude the volume, contain what cannot be deemed in every instance the fixed opinions of the author, but such conjectural propositions as might perhaps have been discussed with some profit by those who are skilled in sacred subjects.

This is a summary of the whole volume. The copies of these small treatises had been published in detached parts and were all sold off, when I incorporated them into one volume, and thus relieved the purchaser at once of part of the price which he otherwise must have paid, and of the inconvenience of having a number of separate treatises. Whoever thou art, look favourably on my labour. If thou hadst any knowledge of the author, retain the judgment which thou hast formed of him and his opinions; but, if thou hast not had that pleasure, learn, from these his writings, the man, his doctrines, and his purposes.

DEDICATION,

BY THE

NINE ORPHAN CHILDREN

OF

ARMINIUS.

TO THE MOST NOBLE THEIR LORDSHIPS THE CURATORS OF THE UNIVERSITY, AND THE HONOURABLE THE MAGISTRATES OF THE CITY OF LEYDEN.

Most Noble and Honourable Sirs,

As it ought undoubtedly to be the wish of as many of us as have minds averse to contention and strife, to entertain the same sentiments among ourselves concerning every thing with which any truth has to maintain a contest, (for truth being always at unity with itself, is most simple in its nature,) so, more particularly, is this unanimity desirable in religion and sacred theology; and, in whatever other pursuit or science this concord may be neglected, in these it ought to be an object of constant solicitude and unwearied prosecution. This is an observation self-evident to all, except to those who are quite ignorant of the nature of religion, or of the immense evil introduced into it by means of dissensions, and how greatly they tend to hinder its progress and to wound its interests.

When those who treat on Divinity dispute with each other, they evince far more fierceness and asperity, than is manifested in quarrels among the professors of other arts and sciences. What a lamentable example, when, however the rest of mankind may angrily contend together, this course is pursued, in a manner much more unbecoming, by those whose whole duty, or nearly the whole of it, consists in preaching the glad tidings of peace, in personally cherishing a quiet disposition, instilling the same into others, and inculcating on all men, on peril of their eternal salvation, the cultivation of a peaceable spirit,—as well befits the sons of peace in subordination to Him who is the God of peace! But if a Divine, and a Professor of one of the Arts and Sciences, were each to institute within himself a

fuller and more accurate examination of the method pursued by the different bodies to which they belong when they disagree among themselves,—he would perceive, that there is scarcely any place in which the Professors of Arts and Sciences perfectly accord in sentiment; and that, notwithstanding, they plot nothing of an atrocious character one against another, nor plan its execution. But (most Gracious God!) of what outrages are not some of us guilty, against others who profess the same Christian religion, and who yet differ from us in some of their sentiments! We fight together with quills whose offensive properties are far more noxious than those of weapons made of steel; and our controversies do not confine themselves within the bounds of dissension, hatred, or eternal enmity. We drive away each other from the celebration of the just observances of our holy religion, and we sentence those who oppose us to the loss of salvation. Nay, we frequently carry our base antipathies so far as to employ halters and other barbarous instruments of extreme punishment, our magistrates at the same time through a blind zeal giving countenance to the perpetration of these enormities. The recollection of them is yet much too recent, to require any recapitulation to make it stronger. How often indeed, through the show of a pious ardour for Christ, have we poured out the blood of those men who had entirely dedicated themselves to the interests of Christ, had bent all their attention to piety and salvation, had passed their lives in the greatest innocence, and who had not done the least injury to any person living! Yet these cruelties have been practised by some persons, for whom Christ had shed his blood, to prevent them from shedding the blood of others.—But it has sometimes occurred to us as a matter of great wonder, what profit or utility there can be in all this, since truth alone is in every place alike and at unity with itself, and falsehood always becomes an object of the greatest detestation. If we look also at the conduct of proficients in other Arts and Sciences towards those amongst themselves who, they are fully persuaded in their own minds, have been guilty of palpable errors, and who have asserted and propagated what is known to be false, they do not revile the offenders with more acrimony, nor evince greater hostility against them, than, according to their own opinion at least, the demerits of such persons may demand;—although in such an instance falsehood can be the less easily endured, because it consists of something near us, which it is possible for us to know, and which is not out of the reach

of our apprehensions and capacities. If these be just statements, there seems to be good reason why we, who are devoted to religion, should cherish less of a contentious spirit, concerning that with which it is our endeavour to obtain some acquaintance; and this consideration ought to have the greater weight when we find it written, that '*our knowledge is but in part*,' (1 Cor. xiii, 9.) and that God, in the distribution of his gifts, does not place us all on an equality. (1 Cor. xii. 4.)

But it is always customary to drag in this suggestion, "in the matter of religion very great danger lurks under the garb of error, and, on this account we ought to grant in such a case scarcely any indulgence, or, rather, none at all, to each other." We will here say nothing about the manner in which it becomes us to conduct ourselves towards those who attack the very spirit and life of religion: Gracious God, forbid that we should hold any thing in common with such men, except that we are human beings and have a right to exist! But in reference to those who have founded their religious superstructure on the same principles as ours, and who have with us rejected the insane worship of Popish idols, they do not desire to exercise a mutual tyranny over each other, the secular sword readily offering its aid, and they differ among themselves only in the minute examination of certain abstruse points, and (in one expression to sum up all,) they stand in close proximity to our religion, while they are at an immense distance from that of the Roman Catholics. Does it not then appear very proper to make this a subject of discussion, What is the nature of that opinion beneath which error may be suspected to lurk? And to what extent may such an opinion be entertained by any man, without subjecting him to the loss of salvation? especially when none of those who are thus suspected clears himself by penitence from the charge before God; but, without the least obstinacy, malice, or remorse of conscience, he seems in his own eyes to hold sentiments equally correct with ours and with an equal degree of firmness; and with the same confidence of mind, in the integrity of his heart, and in reliance on the word of God alone, he adheres with delight to his opinions to the very close of his life,—and all this amidst as great a show of magnanimity as the bravest of us could display on any occasion. And as a proof that every opinion which appears heretical to us, is not damning in its tendency, we are daily affirming against many anathemas of the Fathers and Councils.

Does it not seem proper, that whatever is precisely necessary to be believed, hoped, and performed, (not only in reference to its being true, but also in reference to its being thus necessary,) ought to be proved out of the scriptures? This should be done with such clearness, that all men, even the uninstructed part of the people, and as many as by the preaching of the law and their own consciences are convinced of their misery and have begun to be greatly athirst for their individual salvation, may instantly understand and apprehend it, and may be able in some measure '*to handle it with their hands.*' This was the practice of Jesus Christ, whose words, when uttered, were devoid of all obscurity. But ought any contention to be raised concerning an opinion, the necessity of which to salvation cannot be clearly, perspicuously, and unanswerably proved among Christians themselves? Or should even a conference of the mildest character be held upon it, without a breach of that peace by which the whole church is held together? Because neither of the two parties, through tenderness of conscience, would dare to advance their sentiments any further; being certain that the more danger is to be apprehended the greater the distance they recede from the shore. Those doctrines which are really of this description, should never have been called in question by any Christian Council, or they ought first to have been decided, since their certainty is far superior to all Councils,—nay, they ought to have taken precedence of every Council that has yet been held. If this mode of composing differences had been long since adopted, we should have had to notice fewer periods on account of the schisms which occurred in them, and another course would have been pursued in hindering the propagation of opinions, or in determining them.

Besides, is it not proper to enquire, Is that practice a correct one which has nearly proved fatal to Theology, and by which that sacred science is most reluctantly forced to become scholastic and contentious, through the accurate and laboured disputations of the Professors of Divinity in Universities and Schools? for in such exercises no limits are placed to the eager desire implanted in all men to know every thing. In this way, Theology is made to embrace an immense number of most perplexing conclusions arising from each other, and placed in a regular concatenation of mutual dependence. In what state then must practical religion necessarily be, which ought to be common to the condition of all those whom by

means of it the ever-blessed and Almighty God has been pleased to save, and to take them to himself for a holy inheritance without spot or wrinkle? When divines, therefore, of the most chastened judgment and acute intellect are sometimes not able to agree among themselves concerning the decision of a question which may have been debated, and to the determining of which they could with difficulty be induced to admit one thing in a thousand that may have been advanced, or rather one in many thousands,—but when, on the contrary, they are discovered one after another to break off the discussion and to separate themselves from the rest, ought the Churches, which are collected together by Christ Jesus, instantly to follow these their masters and foremost guides, each of them sending a bill of divorcement to the rest, and denying one to another the rights of brotherhood? And yet, through Jesus Christ alone, they invoke the same Father with those whom they would proscribe, and being washed with the same baptism, they diligently employ themselves, by the grace of God, as much as possible, in walking under the same hope and in the same obedience of faith. These churches chiefly consist of persons of the more simple sort, not a few of whom, through the multiplicity and weight of their daily occupations, are unable to turn the acumen and sagacity of their minds to those abstruse disquisitions; and yet not one of all these men incurs any risk in the matter of his salvation, provided he apply himself to it with the least willingness.

Does it not also seem right to ask this question, How far may a person be permitted to penetrate into the deepest and most hidden meanings of holy writ, to form aphorisms in religion? And ought we not occasionally to meditate on this expression by the Apostle?—'*I say to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly.*' Must we not also at some point or other prescribe limits to ourselves? chiefly because the matters contained in the scriptures are divine, while we are but human beings; it is '*the glory of God to conceal each of his matters;*' (Prov. xxv. 2.) simplicity frequently extricates itself from difficulties from which subtlety cannot be disengaged; '*charity edifieth,*' as the Apostle says, while '*knowledge puffeth up;*' (Rom. viii, 1.) and because at this day we may engage in controversies of a description that will admit of no termination, unless God from heaven become himself the interpreter of his own words, as of old by means of the URIM and THUMMIM.

Yet if even this should be done, we might, not long afterwards, have one thing after another to urge as fresh objections. But it would be wonderful if there were not in Divinity, as well as in other sciences, many things on which, when we are consulted, it may often be proper in us to deliver our opinion, without any prejudice to a more correct judgment, every one being left in possession of his own liberty of prophesying according to the scriptures; and if any man dissent from that opinion, we must bear with him and forbear. But it is no less expedient, that, without contention, we refer all the discoveries which we make, by constantly reading and examining the sacred scriptures, to the promotion of our individual holiness, and, as much as possible, the piety of many others. We believe, if we be led by the same Spirit, we shall easily think the same things, and be animated in the same manner. (Matt. xii, 50.) '*The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him.*' (Psalm xxv, 14.) The mysteries of the kingdom of heaven are revealed unto babes; and the best knowledge of God, and the whole duty of man, are comprised in the fear of God and obedience to his commandments. (Eccles. xii, 13.) Whatever delight others may find in contention, let it be our part only to contend, one against another, which of us can be the most pious.

The mind of our beloved father was strangely exercised with many thoughts of this kind, which often drew tears from his eyes, and excited sensations painful beyond any thing that he ever experienced. For by his incredible sagacity he could discern how the dissensions of friends, while they operated as losses to themselves, were advantageous to their enemies. The whole of these considerations he has most accurately expressed in his elaborate oration on this subject. With this view, under the divine favour, he most diligently and mildly applied the powers of his mind to effect a complete union of the Churches, at least of those which differed very little from each other; and in this way endeavoured according to his ability to remove sects from the Reformed Portion of Christendom, a measure most offensive to them, and to destroy the kingdom of Antichrist,—always stipulating for the inviolability of that truth by which we either stand or fall, and having a due regard to the preservation of their own names to all those to whom such an object was of consequence. He was desirous to point out in a sparing manner the method by which this design might be accomplished, through a lure to others; by which means he studied to procure commendation for them, rather than seem

himself to seek his own honour by prescribing a method to his governors and fellow ministers, to all of whom he paid a most willing homage. But against this plan, he thought, party feelings would be excited, chiefly perhaps through too great zeal on the part of some persons. At length (alas!) it so happened, in the Divine administration of human affairs, that the last day of his life closed (by a doleful calamity!) on the University, of which you, honourable and noble sirs, are the patrons and governors; on the churches, which were seriously occupied in accomplishing that pacific object which had engaged so much of his attention; and, privately, on us also his nine children. What a loss the University and those churches to which we allude, have sustained in the death of our revered and ever-honoured parent, may be appreciated by the sentiments of some persons of eminence, which have not been concealed from us, but the repetition of which we modestly omit. Through a regard to propriety we the more readily indulge in this becoming silence, because we should otherwise seem to be giving testimony in our own cause, when we ought to acquiesce, which we do with the greatest willingness, in the very favourable judgment entertained by your honours, and which you have proved in a lucid manner by many arguments.

But in reference privately to ourselves, what calamity could have befallen us of a more deplorable nature? That parent we have lost who was at once the ornament and the support of our family. We were deprived of him, too, at an age when he was still vigorous, and when his years had not been so far spent as to have prevented him, if it had so pleased God, from employing usefully a longer period of it, if we may judge by the length of life to which men usually attain. Many of us though there be, no child has yet exceeded eighteen years of age, and not one of us is capable by himself of managing the concerns of the family. Then again, of all things which we could ardently desire, what was there wanting? For this, all the praise is due to God alone. If we needed tuition, he incessantly favoured us with his instructions, he imbued our minds with the fear of God and all piety, and he formed our manners. If we departed from our duty, he recalled us into the right path; and if we wanted comfort, he administered it to us in every form. And had we by God's grace been favoured with his presence a little longer, under him who was our domestic preceptor, into what flourishing trees, by the blessing of God, should we have grown? But he being now

suddenly removed from us, all our hopes have fallen with him, and we afford another instance of the instability of the condition of man. However happy we are in being descended from such a parent, the recollection of whom through our future days cannot fail of acting upon us as an incitement to increase in piety, we should still be the most miserable of mortals if it had not seemed good to our most merciful and gracious God, to raise up your honours in our father's place as our DEFENDERS and PATRONS, and to incline you to take us under your protection. We promise your honours to be grateful to you, under these endearing titles, through the whole of our future lives. And that our professions of thankfulness may not be confined to mere words, behold we at present offer to you some proof of our grateful sense of your favours in certain of our revered father's lucubrations, which he composed under your honourable auspices in the University;—some of them when he was about to take up his degree of *Doctor of Divinity*, after a severe disputation both in the forenoon and in the afternoon, and when he began to execute the duties of his Professorship;—and others of them on his resigning the office of *Rector Magnificus* in the University, an employment in which he had acquitted himself with honour. But we principally dedicate to you that DECLARATION in which he professed, in a most luminous manner, before the illustrious the States General, his sentiments concerning Predestination and other articles of that description, in the interval of his public labours as Professor. This Declaration has with all possible fidelity been translated into Latin.

May God grant unto us, that, as with minds most devoted we now present these treatises to you, with all the excellences or imperfections which they may possess, so you may favourably accept of them. In the mean time, we pray the God of all might and goodness, that he will be pleased to defend and protect your honours from all evils on every side; and that he will long continue to bless you in every affair which you undertake in the name of their Lordships the States General, and in all your private concerns.

So pray those who are most attached to your honours,

THE NINE ORPHAN CHILDREN OF JAMES ARMINIUS
OF OUDEWATER.

AN ORATION

ON THE

Life and Death

OF THAT REVEREND AND VERY FAMOUS MAN

JAMES ARMINIUS, D. D.

AND PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY
In the University of Leyden:

DELIVERED IN THE GREAT HALL OF THAT UNIVERSITY,
AFTER THE MOURNFUL CELEBRATION OF HIS OBSEQUIES, ON THE 22D DAY
OF OCTOBER, 1609.

BY THE REV. PETER BERTIUS,
Regent of the College of Divinity.

MY most honourable, reverend, noble, respected, and learned Auditors,

On former occasions I have sometimes experienced what a difficult and arduous enterprise it is to say any thing concerning distinguished men, in an assembly of other famous individuals; but I now feel that difficulty in its full force, when I have to speak in this place concerning that revered man, James Arminius, Doctor of Divinity, after having committed to the tomb his mortal remains. For since a good man is a rule and measure of things, he who may be desirous of describing such a person must be careful to select and propose those facts and topics which may be advantageous to human life, and may contribute to aid mankind in their study of virtue. Those traits of goodness which formerly lay hidden, must be produced on the stage, and exposed to public view; and when the curtain is drawn up and the light admitted, the speaker must openly display and describe, in suitable expressions, those qualities or circumstances which had either been concealed by modesty, diminished through malice, distorted by calumny, or had escaped the observation of heedlessness: An opportunity

is thus afforded to all men to discover, in any one, whatever may be an object of praise and worthy of their imitation. In this view, the more conspicuous for virtue any man becomes, to talk about him is a work of the greater difficulty. For the greatest portion of envy always accompanies the most eminent display of virtue. Besides, as a wise man does nothing without a good and sufficient reason, it is no easy matter at all times to explain the principles and motives of each of his actions. Yet on the determination of these depends the correct judgment of the most minute affairs. Hence arises the extreme difficulty of coming to a right conclusion respecting celebrated men, whose whole life is a continued series of correct sentiments and becoming actions. In addition to this, he who attempts such a description must very often revert from the law to the life; and, as often, on the contrary, from the life to the law. For the one requires aid from the other; and while the law serves to remind us of those things which *ought to be done*, the life demonstrates *the possibility of their accomplishment*. But, in a wise man, both these properties are included. In this respect he evidently conforms himself to the example of Christ our blessed Lord and Saviour, who first said, '*Learn of me*;' and to that of the Apostle, who thus admonished the people of his charge, '*Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ*.' (1 Cor. xi. 1.) Polycletus, too, of old, did not content himself with having composed a book, in which he had noticed all the *minutiæ* to be observed by those sculptors who might wish in the most exquisite and skilful manner to form a human statue; but afterwards, that he might not seem to give such directions to others as had not been followed by himself, he finished a statue of the human frame, and having placed it in a convenient situation for public inspection, he gave it the name of "CANON," and directed the lineaments of the art to be gathered from it as from a *law* or *ordinance* on that subject. In the same way, when a good man has admonished others of that which *it is their duty to do*, he is himself the first person to *execute what he has prescribed*. —Another difficulty occurs in not being able either to assign to each of the actions of a wise man its proper motive and the particular rule by which it ought to be judged,—or to discover examples of all such rules in one man's personal history.

This day, when, before the present most celebrated assembly of learned men, I am about to make some observations on the Life and Death of that reverend and incomparable man,

Doctor JAMES ARMINIUS, not only do all the difficulties which I have enumerated, but several others present themselves as most formidable obstacles, and have an oppressive effect on my spirits. I am overpowered with grief at the recent removal of my dear friend, and distressed when I consider the mournful situation of his sorrowing family,—his widow overwhelmed with affliction, and his nine children now orphans and bereaved of a father; the lamentations uttered by the members of this University, powerfully affect my feelings; and the bare recollection, that our Republic and the Church are now deprived of such a great man, discomposes my mind and overcomes all my firmness. But it may readily be supposed, that all these circumstances, when combined with the recent wound which has not had time to heal, are sufficiently powerful to expel from the understanding of any man, however well cultivated, almost every thing which he had intended to say, and to produce an utter destitution of judgment in a person possessed of the greatest discretion. It must likewise be remembered, that Arminius, as long as he lived, expressed his entire disapprobation of all such funereal pomp as this,—the external apparatus and circumstances of sorrow for the illustrious dead. For he was aware, that, however well conducted, and worthy of those whose excellencies they were designed to celebrate, these solemn observances in former ages became the first steps in the adoration of saints; and he thought them not at all suitable examples for us to follow, since we have witnessed the dangerous consequences which flow from the celebration of such solemnities. But the greatest perils which we have to apprehend, are not from this quarter; for (alas!) we have arrived at that period when it appears to be an object of greater anxiety to deliberate concerning the establishment of religion than the banishment of superstition. Since such is the present aspect of our affairs, and as it is a duty which concerns every one to bring forth to open view eminent examples of virtue, and to display them as spectacles on which all the world may look,—according to custom on similar occasions, at the request of my friends, and by desire of the Senate, I have undertaken a province, which I could not possibly refuse without a violation of Christian charity, and an infraction of that friendly compact into which I entered with Arminius at an early period of my life, and the terms of which I have not ceased to fulfil to this day, with the greatest sincerity. Having offered these preliminary remarks, and described my situation and

feelings, I hope that there is no individual, in this assembly of eloquent and accomplished persons, who will censure me for this attempt to fulfil my duty; although, I am persuaded, there is not one of those who now hear me that would not discharge such an office to better purpose, and in a much more respectable and perspicuous manner, than I can hope to do. In the mean time, I beg and intreat you, my most honourable, reverend, noble, respected, and learned auditors, to allow those particulars which I shall relate, to obtain credence from you, and to be treated as authentic.

We have just committed, to the bosom of the earth, the body of that revered man, JAMES ARMINIUS,* as a real temple of the Holy Spirit, but shaken, worn down, and broken in pieces, by labours, watchings, contests, diseases, and afflictions. To the dust we have committed his remains, in certain hope of a blessed resurrection,—which, while he lived, was one of the articles of his firm belief, and toward which his thoughts and his counsels were constantly directed. The place of his nativity was OUDEWATER, a small town through which flows the river Isala, and which has long been distinguished for the pleasantness and fertility of the surrounding country, and for the frugality and industry of its inhabitants. In that town he first saw the light, in the very year† in which was commenced

* Dr. Heylin calls him, in the French style, HARMINE; but his real name was JAMES HERMANS, or according to the Dutch mode of paternity, HERMANSON. In imitation of other learned men, who chose such Latin names for themselves, as agreed most nearly in sound or signification with their own *cognomina*, he judiciously selected that of ARMINIUS, the name of the famous deliverer of Germany, who defeated Quintilius Varus, Germanicus, and other Roman Generals. The Latin and Dutch names of Arminius more nearly correspond together than those of Erasmus and *Gerritson*, Grotius and *De Groot*, Junius and *Du Ion*, Melancthon and *Schwartzerd*, Holyoake and *De Sacra Quercu*, or Smith and *Fabricius*.—See, in Appendix A., the beautiful verses of Heinsius on the two eminent men, who, in different ages, bore the name of ARMINIUS.

† On this subject the Dutch Biographer of Arminius introduces a very important remark: Arminius was born in the very year in which Philip Melancthon died. When the Emperor Ferdinand heard of the death of that great Divine who conferred immortal honour on the Reformation, he is said to have exclaimed, "The counsels of that good man were always tempered by moderation." In this manner has it pleased the Great Architect to direct the affairs of mankind. As in the circle of the heavens, at one moment some of the stars are concealed, and immediately afterwards others of them are seen emerging from obscurity; so in these lower regions when any man dies who has been celebrated for learning or piety, another instantly rises up and advances towards maturity; till he at length becomes eminent among mortals, as a star of considerable magnitude, and suffers nothing in a comparison with his predecessors, who had been, during life, famous for the endowments of their minds, and the correctness of their moral conduct, and who, at length,

Their bodies with their charge laid down,
And ceas'd at once to work and live.

the Conference of Poissy, in France, the year 1560: In which Conference our deputies pleaded the cause of two thousand one hundred and ninety churches, that in a most earnest, yet suppliant manner, asked of the King of France peace, tranquility, and the liberty of conscience, in the open and unmolested profession of their religious belief, and in the exercise of that mode of worship which, in their views, accorded with the scriptures.* In that year, Oudewater, like another SPARTA, presented these realms with our young LACEDÆMONIAN. The same small town has also been at different periods the birthplace of JOHN DE VETERI AQUA, (or OUDEWATER,) CORNELIUS VALERIUS, and that venerable and celebrated veteran whom you here behold, RUDOLPH SNELLIUS, and who is not only an honour to the place of his nativity, but the ornament of all this University and of the Senatorial order itself. Arminius, while quite an infant, lost his father. His widowed mother, as long as she survived, led a life of piety, and was called to the exercise of the utmost frugality in the maintenance of herself and her three fatherless children.†

At the time of his father's death, a clergyman resided in the town, who was a person of great honour and respectability. His name was THEODORE ÆMILIUS, and, on account of his singular erudition and holiness, his memory is to this day cherished by the living with the greatest veneration. When this good man had conceived a taste for religious doctrines of a superior kind and of greater purity than those in which he had been educated, he determined at once never again to celebrate that abominable sacrifice of the Mass; and, for this reason, at various times he changed the place of his abode, and occasionally resided at Paris, Louvain, Cologne, and Utrecht. Finding young Arminius without a father, this excellent clergyman charged himself with his education; and as soon as his tender age was thought capable of receiving the elements of learning, he had him carefully instructed in the rudiments of the Latin and Greek languages, and his mind imbued with principles of religion and virtue. After he had discovered in his pupil traits of uncommon genius, he took frequent opportunities of exhorting him to lay aside and reject every consideration of worldly advancement, and to view himself as devoted to God and free to follow the dictates of his enlight-

* See Appendix B.

† The parents of Arminius were respectable people of the middle rank of life. His father was an ingenious artist, by trade a cutler; and his mother, whose maiden name was Angelica Jacobson, was a native of Dort.

ened conscience. He pointed out to him the extreme brevity of the earthly existence of every human creature; and described that state of being which succeeds the present life, as one concerning which no adequate judgment can be pronounced from a cursory survey of the different badges that now distinguish a slave from a free-man, but which is to be estimated only by an eternity of blessedness, or a repetition of the horrors of the second death in dreadful perpetuity. Arminius was much affected by such exhortations as these; they sunk deeply into his tender mind, and made a lasting and most salutary impression, which was afterwards improved and confirmed by a constant perusal of the scriptures, and a strict course of devout meditation. From that period, therefore, he thought no labour too great, no danger too formidable, to be encountered for such an important object; but he performed every thing in a glad and cheerful spirit, while he was inspired with the bright hopes of that better state of existence.

After he had thus, for some years, in a most exemplary manner, advanced in his studies and in personal piety, and had resided at Utrecht, in the house of Æmilius, his opening prospects were suddenly beclouded by an unexpected calamity, in the sudden death of that excellent and religious old clergyman, his patron. But this misfortune was in a short time repaired, by the benign and provident kindness of our gracious God; for scarcely had the venerable Æmilius been consigned to the tomb, when RUDOLPH SNELLIUS made an excursion from Hessia to his native country.* He had long been absent from the Low Countries; having fled from the tyranny of the Spaniards, and taken up his abode at Marpurgh. When he had discovered at Utrecht a young man from Oudewater, the place of his own birth, destitute of all human aid and without a protector, his feeling heart prompted him to become his benefactor, and he accordingly took him into Hessia, on his return to that part of Germany, in the year 1575. Arminius had but just become comfortably settled with his new patron, when news arrived, in the month of August, of the destruction of Oudewater. The Spaniards had besieged the town and taken it by storm. They killed the garrison, slew all the citizens that could be found, and burnt their dwellings.†

* ARMINIUS was now in his fifteenth year. SNELLIUS was a profound mathematician and possessed great skill in the languages. He placed Arminius as a student in the University of Marpurgh.

† In this dreadful carnage, neither matrons, virgins, nor infants, were spared. The minister of the town, JOHN GELASIUS, endured the agony of be-

This dreadful intelligence affected the susceptible heart of the youth to such a degree, as to cause him to spend the whole of fourteen days in weeping and lamentation, almost without intermission. At length, in all the impatience of youthful affection, he left Marpurgh, and hastily returned to Holland, being determined either to look once more upon his native town, though in ruins, or to meet death in the attempt. On his arrival at Oudewater, he could discover nothing but heaps of rubbish, and the intelligence was soon but too truly confirmed to him, that scarcely a single inhabitant had escaped the general carnage, and that his mother, sister, brother, and other relations, had unfortunately perished. The only object which remained, and possessed the power of rivetting for a moment his attention, was

"The lovely plain on which his Ilion once had stood."

Having fully gratified the first wish of his heart, he returned with mournful steps to Marpurgh, performing the journey entirely on foot between Holland and Hessia.

In the midst of these occurrences, the building of this new Dutch University [at Leyden] was commenced under the aus-

holding his own son murdered before his eyes, and his excellent wife wounded in many places, without being able to offer them any relief: He was himself carried away prisoner, the Spaniards not having then discovered his sacred calling. After he had been a short time in their power, they agreed to liberate him for a ransom of 500 Guilders, when, just as the bargain was completed, a Beguine Nun, to whom his countenance was familiar, denounced him to his enemies as the Protestant pastor of the town, and the infuriated Papists instantly hung him on a gallows.—CHRISTIAN DE LA CUEILLERIE, the minister of the French Protestant congregation, did not act so heroic a part, but, in contradiction to his name, saved his life by an *unchristian* artifice. For he told his captors, that he was a soldier of the name of Anthony, and they restored him to liberty for a ransom of 500 crowns.

This terrible event made a deep and mournful impression on Arminius. For a long time he cherished the recollection that he was a native of Oudewater. An elegiac poem, which he addressed some years afterwards to a friend at Delft, commences with the following plaintive strains.

Ah! fuit in Batavis urbecula finibus olim,
Quæ nunc Hispani strata furore jacet,
Huic UNDÆ VETERES *posuerunt nomina prima;*
Hæc mihi nascenti patria terra fuit.

Which may be thus translated:

"Ah! once a small but lovely city stood
Within our lines; its ancient name was gain'd
From the OLD WATERS of the passing flood;
But now by Spanish hordes with gore dis-stain'd,
Laid even with the ground, and still as death,
Is that dear spot where first I drew my breath."

pices of the most illustrious the Prince of Orange.* As soon as Arminius had heard, in Hessia, of its completion, and that it had been opened for the reception of students, he instantly began to make active preparations for returning to the land of his birth. In consequence of this resolution, he came to Rotterdam, which was then a place of refuge for the few that had escaped from the destruction at Oudewater,—

> "The scattered remnant who from pitiless
> Achilles and the Grecians fled,"—

and a resort for many of the faithful who were exiles from Amsterdam.† At that period, my excellent father, Peter Bertius, discharged the duties of the pastoral office to the Church of Christ in Rotterdam; and John Taffinus was at the same time French preacher to the Prince and one of his Council: Both of them were wonderfully pleased with the fine disposition of young Arminius, with his sprightliness, prompt and ready wit, and his great genius. My father had not entered on the study of the Latin language till after he had attained to the age of thirty years: Being himself a student from that advanced period of life, he readily acceded to the wishes of the friends of Arminius, who had requested that the youth might be received into my father's house, where he

* This University was founded on the 6th of February, 1575, by WILLIAM I., the Prince of Orange, as a reward for the courage and constancy displayed by the inhabitants of Leyden. This city had early in the preceding year been invested by the Spanish troops, who were compelled to raise the siege by the opportune arrival of a great body of mariners from Zealand, who, on their march into Holland, decorated their hats with silver crescents, on which was inscribed the significant sentence, RATHER TURKS THAN PAPISTS!—The first Divinity Lectures in this University, were delivered by Jasper KOOLHAES, a minister of the city, who acted as *locum tenens* till the arrival of William FEUGUERÆUS, the first Professor of Divinity. The persecuted Arminians afterwards remembered with gratitude, that this amiable man published, in the year 1570, a small tract, which he dedicated to the Prince of Orange, in whose commendation he declared, that, "in propagating the Reformed Religion, the Prince had neither employed all kinds of men nor all kinds of measures; but believing that religion ought to be planted and cultivated, he adopted such methods for this purpose as were neither destructive to the country nor injurious to religion itself; for he was convinced, that *on the subject of religion men may be drawn, but not driven.*"

† Amsterdam had then been for some years in the hands of the Duke of Alva, a name celebrated in the Low Countries only for cruelty. Several of the other cities and towns in Holland had broken the yoke of the proud conquerors and regained their freedom; but Amsterdam was doomed still longer to endure the iron rod of tyranny. All the principal Protestants had fled to places of safety; some to Rotterdam, at that time in the hands of the Prince of Orange, and others to Embden. The Duke of Alva cited many of the Refugees to return, but without effect; and subsequently banished many more of their Protestant brethren. Some conception may be formed of the persecutions which these pious sufferers were called to endure in a righteous cause, from the narrative given in Appendix I.

experienced a most hearty welcome and was treated with paternal regard. Those who had provided for him that temporary asylum, intended to place him as a student in this new University; and my father, thinking it an opportunity not to be neglected, recalled me from England, where I then resided for the purpose of pursuing my studies. We were therefore sent off in company to Leyden; and from the moment when, together, we first entered within the walls of this University, the greatest unanimity subsisted between us, and we were most intimately connected in our tempers, studies, pursuits and desires. But I will not attempt in this place to relate how pleasantly that important æra in our lives passed along. I will only state, that the contention was so strong between the students, in regard to their progress in literature and wisdom, so profound was the reverence which they evinced towards their teachers, and the zeal and impulse of true piety were so great in them, as scarcely to be exceeded. But the only one of our order who meritoriously distinguished himself above the rest of his companions, was Arminius. If any of us had a particular theme or essay to compose, or a speech to recite, the first step which we took in it, was, to ask for Arminius. If any friendly discussion arose among us, the decision of which required the sound judgment of a Palæmon, we went in search of Arminius, who was always consulted. I well recollect the time when Doctor Lambert Danæus,* our learned Professor, paid him a public compliment and eulogized him for the endowments of his genius, and his proficiency in learning and virtue; he also urged us who were Divinity students, to imitate the example of Arminius, by the same cheerful and diligent attention to the study of sacred Theology. Why should I here recount his talents for poetry, in which he particularly excelled?† Or why should I advert to his skill in the Mathe-

* LAMBERT DANÆUS was a man as highly celebrated for his proficiency in Philosophy as in Theology. His acquaintance with the writings of the Christian Fathers and with Scholastic Divinity was most profound. In the latter species of learning he is said not to have had an equal. That honour to polite literature, and the noble ornament of the University of Leyden, the elder DOUSA, recorded the praises of Danæus in a Latin poem composed in iambic metre, and styled him "the Father of the Sciences and of eloquence, and the Architect of the new University."

† Our author was early in life captivated with a passion for poetry; and not only at that period, but to the very close of life, he was accustomed to call in the sweet and powerful aid of the Muses to soothe his spirits, whenever they were distracted by weighty cares or oppressed by sorrow. His various epigrams and poems of every description, remain as evidence of his powers in this spe-

matics, and other branches of philosophy* in which his attainments were solid and profound? There was no study of that description into which his genius had not penetrated; and he never engaged in any literary undertaking which he did not happily complete.†

Thus prosperously did he proceed from one learned triumph to another, till the year 1582, when the honourable Senate of Amsterdam took upon themselves the expence of sending him to the University of Geneva, for the purpose of his further improvement in sound learning.‡ When he had reached that city, he went to hear THEODORE BEZA, that venerable old man of blessed memory, who was then expounding the Epistle to the Romans, to the great and deserved admiration of the multitudes who heard him. For Beza, beyond all men living, possessed a persuasive method of speaking that could incline the mind to almost any purpose; his oratory also was free and fluent, his language perspicuous, and his voice sweet and mellifluous: But it was in his doctrines, in which, according to the judgment of all the learned, lay his chief excellence. Arminius therefore chose him out, in preference to every other, as a model which he might profitably copy and safely

cies of composition. Many playful and elegant specimens of his wit and genius, in his own hand-writing, were preserved by some of his surviving literary friends among their choicest treasures. The chief companions of his studies in polite literature at that period, were three young men of uncommon talents, whose intimate friendship he continued to enjoy,—J. Gruterus, R. Hogerbetius, and G. Benedicti of Haerlem, whose epigrams and other highly finished poetic productions were afterwards published by the very learned P. Scriverius.

* See Appendix C.

† While yet an under-graduate at Leyden, ARMINIUS acquired a competent knowledge of Hebrew learning: His preceptor was HERMAN RENNECHERUS, a Westphalian.

‡ Arminius was in his twenty-first year, had been six years a student at Leyden, and had afforded to all the University most flattering hopes of his becoming a great man and a useful teacher in the Christian Church, when he was recommended by the honourable the Burgomasters of Amsterdam, and by the resident ministers, to the master and officers of the Guild of Merchants in that city. This recommendation was received with such complacency, that the members of that corporation immediately took the young man under their patronage, and promised with cheerful and pious minds that they would appropriate a part of the annual revenues of their company, to pay for his education during a few more years, till he had completed his academic studies in some foreign University. On his part, Arminius, by a bond in his own hand-writing, which he sealed and delivered into the hands of the Magistrates, promised to consider himself engaged, during the rest of his life, exclusively in the service of that city; and to devote himself, after being admitted into holy orders, to no other church in any city or town whatever, unless by the special consent of those who for the time being might execute the office of Burgomasters.

imitate.† But, after a short time, he was compelled to repair to the University of Basle, because he could not secure the favour and regard of some of the principal men in Geneva. I state the real cause, when I say, that he removed solely on account of his invincible attachment to the philosophy of Peter Ramus, which he publicly defended in the warmest manner, and which he taught in private to such auditors as were admirers of that logical system.‡ Those who were the companions of his journey to Basle, can bear witness to the great honours which were conferred on the young man in that city, and the deference which was paid to his abilities and integrity. They are also well qualified to relate the nature of those numerous predictions, from men of all ranks, concerning the future success of that virtue which had even then displayed a masculine growth and was still in a course of increase and expansion. But Arminius received all these acclamations and flattering opinions with a marked diffidence, that kept his mind from any undue elevation or the least appearance of arrogant feeling. On such occasions, he in reality shewed, that he would on no account endeavour by ambitious intrigues to attain to that honourable station to which, by the Divine Benignity, he had been destined, but would try to reach it by the exercise of true virtue.

It is a custom at Basle, during the Autumnal recess, for some of the under-graduates, who are the greatest proficients in learning, to deliver public lectures on Theological subjects, out of the ordinary college course, for the sake of salutary mental exercise. That gratuitous duty Arminius undertook without the least reluctance;‖ and for the able manner in

† Our author likewise frequently attended the sermons and lectures of ANTHONY FAYE, CHARLES PERROT, and other learned men of that Church and University.—At Geneva was laid the foundation of that close and uninterrupted friendship which throughout life subsisted between Arminius and John UITENBOGARDT of Utrecht. They both studied under the same Professors of Divinity, and became greatly attached to each other.

‡ At first he only defended Ramus and his Dialectics, while he impugned Aristotle, in private; but, after some time, at the request and earnest intreaties of many students, of whom Uitenbogardt was one, he was induced to give lessons on the Logic of that great master in his chambers,—by which act he gave serious offence to some of the chief directors of the University of Geneva. But he received the greatest tokens of ill-will from the Professor of Philosophy, who was by birth a Spaniard and a violent champion for the Aristotelian system. It was by the efforts of this man that a public edict was passed, interdicting Arminius from teaching the Philosophical system of Ramus.

‖ The subject which Arminius chose for his public exercise on this occasion, was an exposition on a few chapters of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, which he expounded in such a judicious manner as was creditable to his talents and obtained applause from all the learned.

which he acquitted himself, he received the thanks of the Rev. James Grynæus, who also occasionally honoured him by his personal attendance at the lectures. When the same pious man perceived a serious difficulty to have been raised against any of the arguments in his own public disputations, or when a knotty point occurred which required the aid of an adept to unravel it, he was not afraid, on account of the imaginary infringement of his own reputation, to call out Arminius from the seat which he occupied in the midst of his numerous fellow students, and to say aloud, "Let my Dutchman answer for me!" In the motives for such a frank and encouraging address as this, every one must admire the candour of Grynæus. While Arminius was a resident in Basle, he was held in such high estimation, and was so celebrated for erudition, that the faculty of Theology in that University offered, on the eve of his departure to Geneva, to confer upon him at the public expence the title of DOCTOR. For the proposed honour he thanked the reverend and learned faculty, but with the greatest modesty begged to decline the acceptance of it,—alleging as a reason, that to bestow a Doctor's degree on a person so youthful in appearance as he was, would tend to diminish the dignity and respect which should always attach to that sacred title.

On his return to Geneva, in the year 1583, the minds of his friends, that had been inflamed against the philosophy of Ramus, were found to be in a more tranquil state on that point.† On his part, therefore, he judged it proper to curb

† The following is an extract of a letter which BEZA wrote on the third day of June, 1583, in answer to one which he had received from the Rev. MARTIN LYDIUS, a very learned Divine belonging to the Church of Amsterdam, who had, in the name of his brethren in the ministry and of the magistrates, requested Beza's opinion of Arminius, (their adopted son,) and his attainments. Beza writes thus, in the name of the Theological College at Geneva:

"Dearest Brother,

"Your letter was some time since delivered to us, in which, both on account of the determination of your church assembly and at the desire of their honours the Magistrates, you ask our opinion of James Arminius, the young man whom you have taken under your patronage. Although we returned an answer to that letter soon after we had received it, yet since in these perilous times that answer may never have reached you, and a favourable opportunity now offering itself for transmitting another copy by a safe courier, we have thought proper to write you a second answer, that no detriment may accrue to the studies of Arminius through our further delay.

"To describe all in a few words, be pleased to take notice, that from the period when Arminius returned from Basle to us at Geneva, both his acquirements in learning and his manner of life have been so approved by us, that we form the highest hopes respecting him, if he proceed in the same course as

his former impetuosity; and his subsequent deportment was so unexceptionable as to afford a proof to every one, that when piety is united with transcendent talents in young people, it becomes their greatest and most distinguished ornament.‡ The sons of the principal noble and honourable

that which he is now pursuing, and in which, we think, by the favour of God, he will continue. For the Lord has conferred on him, among other endowments, a happy genius for clearly perceiving the nature of things and forming a correct judgment upon them, which, if it be hereafter brought under the governance of piety, of which he shews himself most studious, will undoubtedly cause his powerful genius, after it has been matured by years and confirmed by his acquaintance with things, to produce a rich and most abundant harvest.—These are our sentiments concerning Arminius, a young man, as far as we have been able to form a judgment of him, in no respect unworthy of your benevolence and liberality."

How mysterious are the ways of Divine Providence! Little did the aged Beza suppose, at the time when he wrote this letter commendatory, that the subject of it, then a mere stripling, would afterwards become the founder of a scriptural system, which would gradually overturn all those frightful theories of fate and restricted grace that Beza had laboured to invent and perfect, with a zeal second only to that of Calvin. Yet such has been the result; and the triumphs of Arminianism are every succeeding year becoming more numerous. It is long since the zealots of Calvinism abandoned the doctrine of *reprobation*, though always reckoned by the Fathers of that system collateral with *election*; and it is now their commendable endeavour to soften down some of the other asperities which deform their code, and to suffer their peculiarities to merge into a doctrinal scheme that bears a greater outward resemblance to the pacificatory plan of Baxter than to the rigid scheme of Calvin.

‡ A similar tribute to the talents and piety of Arminius was tendered, about the same time, by GRYNÆUS:

"GRYNÆUS TO ALL PIOUS READERS SENDETH GREETING.

"Since we ought to refuse, to no learned and pious man, such testimonials as are worthy of obtaining credit for learning and piety in behalf of those to whom they are granted,—such testimonials are on no account to be denied to JAMES ARMINIUS, of Amsterdam. For he lived in the University of Basle a life of piety, temperance and study; and in our Theological disputations he very often proved to all of us that he possessed the gift of the spirit of discernment, in such a measure as to elicit from us our sincere congratulations. Lectures were likewise lately delivered out of the ordinary course, at the request and by command of the Faculty of Theology; on which occasion he publicly expounded some chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, and excited within us the greatest hopes of his soon becoming qualified to undertake and sustain the province lawfully assigned to him of communicating instruction, with great profit to the Church, provided he continues to stir up the gift of God which is in him.—I commend him therefore to all pious persons, and especially to the Church of God which is collected together in the famous city of Amsterdam; and I reverently ask it as a favour, that some regard may be paid to this learned and pious youth, and that he may never be compelled to experience any interruption in his Theological studies which have been happily commenced and continued to the present time. Fare you well.

"Basle, 3d Sept. 1583. JOHN JAMES GRYNÆUS,

"*Professor of Sacred Literature, and Deacon of the Theological Order, having written these testimonials with my own hand.*"

After having had such high commendations bestowed on him, he pursued his studies in Divinity, three years longer, in the University of Geneva, and sedulously applied himself to obtain a deeper and more accurate acquaintance with the sacred writings.

personages in our country, resided at that time in Geneva, many of whom have since been called to occupy some of the chief stations in the Commonwealth, and have gained a high reputation in the discharge of their functions. When some of these young men had departed on a tour through Italy, and others of them had been recalled home, Arminius found himself alone, and deserted by the rest of his companions except one, who is a person holding one of the most dignified offices in Holland;‡ he therefore determined to make a similar excursion into Italy. One grand inducement was the fame of James Zabarella, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Padua, who was then delivering his lectures to crowded auditories. For the sake of attending the course of this learned Professor, Arminius took up his abode for a short time at Padua, and there employed himself in teaching logic to some German noblemen. But he afterwards visited somewhat rapidly other parts of Italy, having only spent seven months in the whole journey; during which, and especially at Rome, he was not separated a moment from his Achates, the friend who had accompanied him on his tour; for it had been a part of their agreement before they left Geneva, that they should travel in company. The two young travellers, therefore, occupied the same lodgings, and enjoyed all things in common; they took their meat from the same table, and slept on the same couch; they went out together, and returned in each other's company; and, for their exercise in godliness, they carried about with them a Greek Testament and Hebrew Psalter. I recollect often to have heard him mention, that "Italy had been in some respects beneficial to him, and in others disadvantageous." Among the BENEFITS which he derived from that excursion, the principal one was, that he had seen at Rome '*the mystery of iniquity*' in a more foul, ugly, and detestable form than his imagination could ever have conceived. For he declared, that all the accounts which he had heard from travellers concerning the Antichristian court at Rome, and all that he had read in histories, were mere trifles in comparison of those scenes of which he had been a spectator.—Among the DISADVANTAGES he reckoned the circumstance of his having incurred by that act the temporary

‡ This friend was that most excellent youth, ADRIAN JUNIUS, who has been mentioned in a preceding note. He was then studying the law, and was afterwards promoted to be one of the Senators of the Provincial Court. The younger Brandt says, "It was at the continued and pressing intreaties of Junius, that Arminius undertook the journey into Italy, in the year 1586."

displeasure of the most honourable the Senate of Amsterdam,† who were offended in consequence of the artful insinuations of some persons that misrepresented the whole of that transaction. Those persons would, however, have been better employed, had they entirely suspended their judgment on his conduct until the period of his return. They seized upon this opportunity most industriously to circulate a report, that Arminius had stooped down and kissed the Pope's slipper, although he had never seen the sovereign Pontiff, except once, when he, with a multitude of other spectators, saw him at a distance. Besides, it is well known, that it is not the custom of '*the beast*' to grant *such an honour* to any but kings and nobles. The same officious persons asserted, that he had frequented the company and the assemblies of the Jesuits,—men whom he had never heard; that he had formed an acquaintance with Cardinal Bellarmine,—whose face he had never beheld; and that he had abjured the true and orthodox religion,—for which he was prepared manfully to contend, and even to shed his blood in its defence. Yet let those pious youths who are dedicated to the service of Christ in his church, learn from the perils of another person, that it would have been far better never to have gone to Italy, than to have become acquainted with the mysteries of Antichrist at such a great risk of reputation. Not that there would be greater danger in visiting Italy than the contiguous cities of Antwerp, Brussels, or Bruges; for though in the former country there is an appearance of far more liberty, and in the latter cities more superstition exists, yet it is permitted to survey every thing in Italy with greater safety than in Brabant or Flanders. But it is a more excellent and advisable course, to prevent such unpleasant consequences by removing from enemies all pretexts for calumny, and from inconsiderate persons every cause of evil imagination and premature surmise. It is also far better not to furnish food for scandal, than to offer an excuse for a fault when once it is committed.

On leaving Italy he settled at Geneva, in which city, after a residence of a few months, he received orders of recal to Amsterdam. He accordingly returned, in the autumn of the year 1587, to his patrons and benefactors, furnished with a lucid "testimony by the grace of Christ" from the Genevan church,

† Arminius was blamed by men of the greatest gravity and moderation for a degree of youthful rashness, in proceeding to Italy without consulting his patrons on the subject.

and "possessing a mind most admirably prepared to fulfil his duty, if it should please the Lord God to accept of the use of the young man's ministry for his own work in his Church." These are some of the expressions which Beza adopts in a letter on this subject, the autograph of which I now hold in my hand.

At Amsterdam he easily cleared himself before respectable and prudent persons, and refuted all the calumnies which had been propagated concerning his tour in Italy. But some weak brethren persisted in condemning that youthful deed, and in giving a wrong colouring to it, in the different private circles in which they moved. This petty species of persecution Arminius had to endure, till the time when he began to be heard in the Church;† for as soon as he was seen in the pulpit, it is impossible to describe the extraordinary grace and favour which he obtained from men of all ranks, who were eager to hear him and to profit by his discourses. This flattering reception ought to excite no wonder; for—I speak before those who knew him well,—there was in him a certain incredible gravity softened down by a cheerful amenity; his voice was rather weak, yet sweet, harmonious, and piercing; and his powers of persuasion were most admirable. If any subject was to be displayed to great effect, in all its native adorning, Arminius disposed of it in such a manner as in no instance to overstep the truth. If any doctrine was to be taught, he enforced it with perspicuity; and if he had to discuss any topic in an argumentative style, he treated it with clearness. The melodious flexibility of his voice could be so accommodated to different subjects and occasions, as to seem to have its origin in them, and to receive from them the tone and impression which it ought then to take. He disdained to employ any rhetorical flourishes, and made no use of the honeyed sweets collected for this purpose from the Greeks;—either because his nature was abhorrent to such accompaniments, or because he thought it a degradation to the majesty of Divine things, to admit into the discussion of them these false ornaments and adscititious finery, when naked truth is of itself sufficient for its own defence. Yet the persuasion which he employed was rendered so efficacious, by the force and weight of his arguments, the importance of his sentiments, and by the authority of the scriptures which he adduced, that no man ever listened to him who did not confess himself to be greatly moved.

† See Appendix, D.

Many people, therefore, styled him "the file of truth;" some called him "a touch-stone for the trial of men of genius," and others "a razor to cut down the budding errors of the age;" and it was generally believed that nothing could be discovered in religion or sacred theology, which Arminius had not found out and understood. Even the ministers and preachers of that city, the whole of them learned and eloquent men, rendered homage to his erudition, by ingenuously acknowledging that every time when they enjoyed the privilege of sitting under his ministry they derived the greatest profit from his sermons.

In this manner was Arminius borne along to fame and to glory, with sails full-stretched, prosperous gales, and with his company of rowers in a complete state of efficiency; he had gained the approbation and favour of all who knew him, when it pleased God to exercise his servant with adversity, and to put his modesty and patience to the test by means of the cross and afflictions. To learn the commencement of these trials, and what effects they produced, are objects worthy of our inquiry and will amply repay us for our labour. At the time of which we are now speaking, there happened to be circulated among some pious people a pamphlet against Beza, composed by certain good brethren who belonged to the Church of Delft, and entitled, *An answer to some of the arguments adduced by Beza and Calvin; from a treatise concerning Predestination, on the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.* This pamphlet had been transmitted to Arminius by Martin Lydius of blessed memory, who formerly discharged the pastoral duties in the Church of Amsterdam, but who was at that period Professor in the new college at Franeker in Friezland; the copy of the work was accompanied with a particular request, that Arminius would undertake the defence of Beza against the Delft brethren. He was considered by Lydius to be a person well qualified for such an enterprize; for he had heard by report, and had known in part by personal experience the sagacious and penetrating genius, and the acute and masculine judgment which Arminius possessed, and what wonderful powers he could display when they were called forth in the varied work of public instruction or refutation. Arminius himself also was not averse to this proposal; for, having recently left the University of Geneva, his ears seemed to retain the sound of Beza's lectures and arguments on this subject: * He made the requisite preparations, therefore, and betook himself

* See Appendix E.

to the work. But while he was contriving a proper refutation, and had begun accurately to weigh the arguments on both sides, and to compare different passages of scripture together, —while he was thus harrassing and fatiguing himself, he was conquered by the force of truth, and, at first, became a convert to the very opinions which he had been requested to combat and refute. * But he afterwards disapproved of them, as promulgated by the brethren of Delft, because he did not think the doctrine contained in them to be correct according to the scriptures: It stated, "that after God had made a decree for the creation of mankind and had foreseen the fall of Adam, he positively and absolutely determined to elect to eternal salvation certain persons, without any antecedent reference to Christ Jesus."—The opinions on this subject which had been instilled into his mind at Geneva by Beza, were, "that the eternal decree of God in predestination, was positively and absolutely to elect to eternal salvation certain persons whom he had not then decreed to create."—But the deep and interesting inquiries into which his mind was led on this occasion, were, by the Divine rod of direction and the guidance of the Holy Spirit, turned towards those opinions which he finally embraced, and which to the close of life he constantly maintained: They assumed, "that the decree of God, in respect to Predestination, was, out of men already created and fallen, to elect those who would answer, by the true obedience of faith, to the call of God." This view of Predestination was held and vindicated by the very learned Melancthon, Nicholas Hemingius, and many other Divines. Our churches formerly enjoyed the privilege (which is continued to this day in many places,) of being always permitted to embrace any one of the several sentiments that have been published on this controversy, which has never yet been decided by the judgment of any ancient Synod or Council: They were also allowed to elect a teacher, that entertained sentiments similar to their own: And both these privileges they could exercise without giving offence to any person. As an instance of this, omitting all others, I may adduce Doctor John Holmanus Secundus, †

* See Appendix F.

† This good man was one of the early professors of Divinity in the University of Leyden, having entered on that office in 1574. Though on the subject of Predestination he entertained opinions similar to those of Melancthon, yet he was strongly recommended to the University by Theodore Beza, who thought Melancthon's Divinity was better suited and more edifying than any other to the inhabitants of the Low Countries. In one of his public disputations with

who, at the pressing instance and by the mature advice of profound Divines, and particularly their Lordships the Curators, received a call to this University, (after Pezelius, Mollerus, and some others had been in vain solicited to accept of it,) and publicly taught in the very place in which I am now standing: Yet we all know, that he had embraced the doctrine of Hemingius respecting Predestination, and was one of its warmest advocates. *

Though this liberty was formerly granted, yet there were not wanting some persons in Amsterdam who would have brought Arminius into trouble on that occasion, and wished to accuse him of departing from the common and received opinion of our churches. † But their violent impetuosity was suddenly restrained by the authority of the Senate and the moderation and candour of the brethren: So that he always lived with his colleagues at Amsterdam in a state of tranquility; nay, their friendship and union were of a most fraternal description, and at no time obscured by the least cloud or speck of concealed animosity, hatred or envy. ‡ This man of

Donellus, who had imbibed and maintained the Genevan opinions concerning Predestination, Holmanus said, "You make God both a Tyrant and an executioner!" Meursius, in his *Athenæ*, styles him "an extraordinary man." He died in 1586, and bequeathed his valuable collection of books to the public library of the University, for the use of the students.

* See Appendix G. ‡ Appendix H.

† After having been settled upwards of two years as minister at Amsterdam, and immediately subsequent to his discovery of the true and scriptural doctrine of predestination, he resolved to marry, being then in the thirtieth year of his age. He had for some time previously paid his addresses to a young lady of great accomplishments and eminent piety; and was united to her in the holy bands of matrimony, on the sixteenth day of September, 1600, in the Old Church at Amsterdam,—his reverend colleague, John Ambrosius, performing the sacred ceremony. The name of this lady was Elizabeth, the daughter of LAURENCE JACOBSON REAL, one of the Judges and Senators of Amsterdam, whose name is immortalized in the annals of the Dutch historians for the prudent and decided part which he took in promoting the Reformation from Popery in the Low Countries,—and this during the Spanish tyranny, often at the risk of all his property as well as his personal safety.—See in Appendix I, a few more particulars of this excellent person and of the infant Church to which he belonged. The daughter of such a man was a great acquisition to Arminius in his subsequent conflicts; for she was nurtured in the school of adversity, having, when only fourteen years old, accompanied her beloved parents in their exile, when Holland was subjected to the Duke of Alva's bloody administration. In addition to her great genius, she possessed uncommon firmness of mind and an unsubdued courage,—for which it was unhappily her lot to find sufficient exercise in the untoward events which ensued. But those unpleasant circumstances were only "from without;" in the bosom of her family, she enjoyed uninterrupted and enviable felicity; living in the greatest connubial harmony with her admirable husband, and superintending the early part of the education of nine children, (seven sons and two daughters,)

God was indeed not only naturally formed for candour, but was likewise further moulded by the sanctifying precepts of Christ, and by his Holy Spirit, so as to bear with placid composure any one who differed from him in sentiment. Neither was he inclined easily to be in despair concerning any man, provided he was willing to listen to the voice of Christ speaking in the scriptures. All of us knew his divine moderation and equanimity: These virtues have been more the objects of our admiration, on account of the greater distance at which we perceive ourselves yet to be removed from them, our own consciences being witnesses. *

When those celebrated and distinguished individuals, Doctor JUNIUS, † and LUKE TRELCATIUS, Sen. ‡ died, this University, deprived of two of its Professors, required a Hercules that was capable of bearing on his shoulders this world in miniature; the burden of which was in the mean time sustained solely by that Atlas and reverend person, Doctor FRANCIS GOMARUS, who, by the lamented decease of his colleagues, was destitute of all collateral support. § In this state of affairs, by the unanimous voice of all men, and at the general request of his country, recourse was had to Arminius; from whose mind nothing was further removed than the thoughts of such an application; and who had then, for fifteen years, had the charge of the church of Christ in Amsterdam. ‖ But when the inhabitants of that city declared, that they could not dispense with his assistance, because they esteemed him the chief and most successful opposer of those monstrous heresies which had sprung up in that part of the country,—no one can express the uncommon consternation among all good men which this intelligence created. Various were the public deliberations at this juncture; and nothing that could be done, was left unattempted. The most noble DOUSA and D. NEOSTADIUS, two of the Curators of our University, with that most honourable man NICHOLAS ZEYSTIUS, the Syndic of

all of whom survived their beloved father, and a few years after his death the elder of them, in the name of the rest, published his theological works in Latin, to the five divisions of which they prefixed most interesting dedications —all of which the Christian and the scholar will peruse with satisfaction and delight. Inheriting all her father's virtues and his amiable manners, she accounted it her felicity to share all the joys and sorrows of her husband, one of the greatest and best men that ever lived. Many pleasing testimonies of affection for his wife and children will be found in some of his letters at the close of the APPENDIX.

* See Appendix K. † Appendix L. ‡ Appendix M.
§ Appendix N. ‖ Appendix O.

our city, proceeded in the public name to Amsterdam. To this commission were also appointed at the same time, by the most illustrious the Prince of Orange, John Uitenbogardt, minister of the Church at the Hague, * and Nicholas Cromhoutius of the supreme court. All these great men tried by various means to prevail with the discreet and wise Senate of that city, and with the Presbytery of ministers and elders, and to incite them to a compliance with the public wishes. It was at length with the utmost difficulty obtained, after great assiduity, many intreaties, and at the intercession of the most illustrious Prince himself, that Arminius should have leave to depart, and to perform the important services which this University demanded from a Professor of Divinity.

Yet some obstacles to this felicitous arrangement were raised, by means of several slight rumours of suspicions, which too often frustrate attempts the most praiseworthy and subvert the best-concerted enterprizes. But Arminius opposed to these the shield of his innocence, candour, and erudition; and, sheltering himself beneath it, he waited with calmness and security in expectation of receiving the blessing of God, whatever might be the consequence of these unfounded reports. After this matter had been investigated, heard, and debated, at the Hague, before their Lordships the Curators, and in the presence of certain grave and respectable divines, it was discovered, "that those suspicions were badly supported; and that no cause existed, why any person should entertain a disadvantageous opinion of this faithful servant of Christ. For in the exercise of that liberty of prophesying in the Church which is generally granted, he had taught nothing that was inimical to the Christian religion." †

A Doctor's degree was then solemnly conferred on him, with the approbation of both God and man, in this hall, by that reverend man, Doctor Francis Gomarus, in the year 1603; and he was the first person that had been publicly presented with that title in this University. Thus, therefore, was James Arminius finally appointed to the office of Professor of Divinity, which had become vacant by the death of Francis Junius; and, by the command of the Curators, he began to execute its duties. That nothing might be wanting in this place to confirm his credit and authority, which the sinister reports at Amsterdam had attempted to impair, the ecclesiastical presbytery of that city were pleased,

* See Appendix P. † Appendix Q.

on his departure, to commend him with the utmost confidence to all men of piety, virtue, and learning, and to present him with testimonials of a very flattering description. That document is expressed in the following manner:

THE TESTIMONY OF THE CHURCH OF AMSTERDAM.

"Since in the social intercourse of mankind, a consideration of equity alone has long since required it to be established as a law, that they who had on any account deserved well of the Commonwealth, should be accounted worthy of singularly eminent commendation and honourable testimonials to the truth; more abundantly worthy of such an honour are those persons who labour in God's word, and who, with remarkable success and to their singular praise, have during many years discharged the duties of the sacred ministry of the gospel in the church of our Lord Jesus Christ. Wherefore, as JAMES ARMINIUS, Doctor of Divinity, our reverend brother in the Lord, has now required such a testimonial from us, we think that it ought by no means to be refused.

"By these presents, therefore, we desire to testify to all and every one, that the high integrity of the above-named most accomplished man and greatly beloved fellow-steward with us of the mysteries of God, (both in regard to the innocency of his life, the soundness of his doctrine, and the propriety of his manners,) has by means of an uninterrupted acquaintance and constant intercourse been so fully known, tried, and confirmed by us, as to cause us to account nothing dearer to us, or of greater value, than always to enjoy the benefit of his counsel, aid, conversation, and intimacy, and to be permitted to cultivate that friendship which has now for a long period subsisted between us. But since it has pleased Almighty God otherwise to dispose of him and us, it is a circumstance on account of which we yield great and unfeigned thanks to the Lord our God for his marvellous kindness hitherto manifested towards us and the whole of this our Church, and which has afforded us the opportunity to behold such fruits as are not to be lamented, and with the greatest pleasure to perceive the success which has accrued from the study and labours of this the before-named gentleman and fellow-labourer in the vineyard of Christ, who is most ardently beloved by all of us; which labours he unweariedly and most cheerfully sustained, in

company with us, among the people of our charge. All of us confess with a very willing mind, that there is nothing which is not due from us to this our much-beloved brother in the Lord, for the exertion of his powers in common with our own in the Lord, for the cheerfulness with which he sedulously undertook the maintenance of equal portions of the pastoral office, in conjunction with ourselves, and for the very ready communication of his counsel to us on all occasions. Wherefore, since his piety, consummate probity, and rare erudition seem in their own right to claim such a token of approbation from us,—and, that we may briefly compress into a single sentence all that we desire to say,—we commend to all men of piety, honour, and learning, this most respectable gentleman, and most venerable brother in Christ; and it is not possible for us to frame any recommendation with greater affection and favour, or more heartily than we do this.—Given in our Presbytery at Amsterdam, the Eighth Day of September, 1603.

"Signed in the name of the whole Church,

"JOHN URSINUS, *Minister of God's word and President of the Council.*

"JOHN HALLIUS, *Minister at Amsterdam.*

"JOHN HALSBERGIUS, *Pastor of the same Church.*"

The general class of that city also presented him with letters of recommendation in the following form:—

THE TESTIMONY OF THE AMSTERDAM CLASS.

"To all and to every one who may read or hear these presents our testimonials, salvation and peace through Christ, our only Mediator.

"Since that most accomplished and very learned man, JAMES ARMINIUS, has been called out (by the illustrious and most celebrated for their learning, their Lordships the Curators of the University of Leyden,) from the holy ministry, (the functions of which he has now for many years discharged with the highest reputation in the Church of Amsterdam,) to the high office of Professor of Divinity, into which he has been publicly installed,—we have been desirous on his departure to commend him, by our present document, (although it is very brief,) to the same illustrious persons, and to all men of probity, and, as is the practice, to dignify and honour him with these our testimonials.

"We, therefore, the servants of Jesus Christ, with the elders of the same Amsterdam Class, do testify, that the before-mentioned Doctor ARMINIUS has now been upwards of fifteen years a member of our Class, during which period he has purely taught sound doctrine with much profit; administered the sacraments according to our Lord's institution; with exemplary zeal has propagated the true and Christian religion; by his diligent attendance has constantly honoured the meetings of the Class; by his prudent counsel has adjusted and settled with others affairs of the greatest difficulty and of the utmost importance; has at all times promptly sustained all the burdens imposed on him, that had a reference to the edification of the Churches; and has to this day adorned his holy calling by the probity and the honourable and virtuous tenour of his life. In short, he has conducted himself in such a manner as it becomes every true servant of Christ to do, both in the discharge of his sacred functions and in his conversation and behaviour towards all men; so that we here present him with these most cordial expressions of our immortal thanks, for his kindness towards us and for the courtesy and politeness which he has manifested towards each of us.

"We ask and require it, therefore, of all and every one, of what rank soever they may severally be, that they account, acknowledge, embrace and cherish the before-named Doctor James Arminius as a person answering to the description which we have here given; that they likewise honour him in such a manner as his merits demand, and especially on account of the transcendent and luminous endowments of his genius, and the rare and singular gifts which he possesses; and that, to the extent of their ability, they aid him in his holy attempts, for the glory of God's name, and the edification of the University and the Church. —To this end, we, his colleagues and fellow-servants, all most heartily unite in supplicating for him the manifold grace of the Holy Spirit.

"AMSTERDAM, from the meeting of our Class, the First Day of September, 1603.

"Signed, in the name of the Class,

"JOHN HALSBERGIUS, *President of the Class.*

"JOHN HALLIUS, *Minister at Amsterdam, and Secretary to the Class.*"

Have not these brethren testified, in a strain sufficiently honourable and laudatory, their approbation of Arminius? He came to this University with such testimonials as these; and, from that period, all his colleagues found in him a most faithful and agreeable friend; the colleges,—a Senator, Professor, and Rector; and all the students,—a most humane father.

Scarcely had he entered the University, when he discovered that the Divinity Students involved themselves in the intricacies of disputations and controversies, and that they had become the sectaries of certain knotty theorems and difficult problems, to the neglect of the sacred scriptures. After conferring with his colleagues, he endeavoured to correct this evil; and succeeded in a great degree. For he recalled that ancient, masculine, and hardy method of study; and, as far as possible, he withdrew these erratic candidates for holy orders from their wanderings, and brought them back to the fountains of salvation,—those pure fountains whose pellucid streams refuse to flow in muddy channels. His object in this, was, that the search for religion might be commenced in the scriptures;—not that religion which is contained in altercation and naked speculations, and is only calculated to feed their understandings;—but that religion which breathes forth charity, which follows after the truth that is according to godliness, by which young men learn '*to flee youthful lusts*,' and by which, after they have completely overcome the allurements of the flesh, they are taught to avoid '*the pollutions that are in the world*,' and to do and suffer those things which distinguish a Christian from a heathen. He repeatedly inculcated on their minds that doctrine which our Saviour has expressed in these words: '*Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.*' *

In the mean time, the consideration of the miserably torn and distracted state of Christianity greatly affected his mind.† This was a subject which he could seldom mention without tears; and his conversation about it was always accompanied with deep sighs. He shewed great solicitude, that the scattered members of the Church should no longer remain in a state of separation, but should now at length, according to their Lord's command, be incorporated into one body. In his judgment, which in this instance is supported by facts, the Court of Rome does not seek those things which are Christ's, but the pleasures, the

* See Appendix R. † Appendix S.

honours, the profit, and the splendour of this world, and a system of tyranny over both the minds and the bodies of men; and he therefore considered it neither possible nor proper for any person to enter into consultation with that harlot respecting the concerns of salvation, or the establishment of peace throughout the Christian community.* In other religious denominations he could generally perceive a studied regard and attention to conscience and piety; and that these parties did not intentionally or by design offend against the integrity of the Church, so much as by doubtful ambiguities or intricate enquiries. Among the causes of the existing separation, some may reckon their ignorance, and others the authority of their ancestors. Some may have been expelled from the general concord through a pertinacious adherence to dogmatical principles which have either been laid down by themselves or which they have long defended; others, through a false shame of revoking what they may have written, or of retracting their opinions; and others, through a partial and unjust judgment concerning their brethren. To all these, it was his opinion, a remedy might be applied,—not by swords, halters, racks, gibbets, or by burning people alive,—but by entreaties, by gentle and friendly instructions, and by the example of a holy conversation. He therefore exhorted all men to the exercise of piety; and it was a more peculiar object of his care and study, *first*, to cut off those intricate questions and to break in pieces that immense mass of vague and useless assertions with which THE SCHOOLS resound; and, *then*, to excite men to search out, in the scriptures alone, those things which might contribute to the necessity of faith, and which might teach them how to pass their lives in a state of holiness and happiness in Christ Jesus.

To render these noble attempts abortive, or to elude their efficacy, Satan endeavoured to excite a persuasion in certain inconsiderate persons, that in all these things Arminius was actuated by a selfish desire to procure his own glory, to make an ostentatious display of the force of his genius, to introduce innovations into the Church, and to put in motion the recriminating saw of mutual contentions and altercations. This suspicious snd ill-advised suggestion again stirred up the evil flavour of the ancient CAMARINA; but the Professors, his colleagues, crushed it in the bud, in compliance with the prudent advice given by the Curators. For the correctness of this remark, I have judged it necessary to produce the following document:

* See Appendix T.

EXTRACT FROM THE ACTS OF THE UNIVERSITY.

"The Professors of the Faculty of Theology had been informed that the Dort Class had preferred, amongst other grievances, one conceived in these terms:

'Since there is a rumour of certain controversies having 'arisen, in the Church and University of Leyden, con- 'cerning the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, this 'Class judged it necessary that the Synod should deliber- 'ate respecting the safest and most speedy mode of settling 'those controversies, that all the schisms and causes of 'offence which spring out of them may be seasonably 'removed, and that the union of the Reformed Churches 'may be preserved inviolate against the calumnies of 'adversaries.'

"When their Lordships the Curators and the Burgomasters had enquired of the Professors, whether any controversies, of the kind here described, had been observed by them,—after the question had been first examined among themselves and considered apart,—they unanimously replied, 'That they 'wished the Dort Class had in this affair acted with greater 'discretion and in a more orderly manner; that, in their 'opinion, the students were engaged in more disputes than 'was agreeable to them as Professors; but that among them- 'selves, that is, among the Professors of the Faculty of 'Theology, no difference existed that could be considered as 'in the least affecting the fundamentals of doctrine; and that 'they would endeavour to diminish the number of disputes of 'that kind which might arise among the students.—Dated, 'August 10, 1605.'

(Signed,) "JAMES ARMINIUS,
"*Rector of the University for the time being.*
"FRANCIS GOMARUS.
"LUKE TRELCATIUS.

"On the same day, after the above declaration had been submitted to John Kuchlinus, Regent of the Theological College, he answered, 'that he perfectly assented to those 'statements which had been made by the Professors.'

(Signed,) "JOHN KUCHLINUS, *Regent.*"

Such were the transactions of those days. Soon afterwards, the Senators of the Supreme Court, by desire of their High Mightinesses at the Hague, took cognizance of the reports which were then in circulation. I would here relate what

were their sentiments on the whole affair, did I not think that all persons now present are well acquainted with the result. †

But while engaged in these struggles, this valiant soldier of Christ was at length confined to his bed by a disorder which he had contracted through unremitted labours, continued sitting, perpetual study, and contests which occurred without intermission. It can excite no astonishment, that he should feel a degree of disquietude at the loss of his reputation, the impugning of his salvation, and the waste of his labours; because nothing can be dearer to a good man than his reputation, nothing of greater consequence to a Christian than his own salvation, and nothing more valuable to a Professor of Theology than those demonstrations which he carefully deduces from the scriptures. '*Oppression*, it is said, by the son of Syrach, *makes a wise man mad.*' This was the real cause of the grief which Arminius felt; and that grief produced the subsequent disorder which terminated fatally in his death. Oppression! thou malignant evil! foul, hateful, and poisonous! thou art the offspring of the lowest hell!—How often have we heard Arminius in private quote with sighs that exclamation of the Prophet! '*Woe is me, my mother, that thou hast borne me,—a man of strife and a man of contention to the whole earth! I have neither lent on usury, nor have men lent to me on usury; yet every one of them doth curse me!*' (Jer. xv. 10.) Yet he soon recalled himself within the boundaries of reason and tranquility, being at no time destitute of an elevated and noble spirit, which at the same time displayed itself in benevolent kindness and ingenuous affability towards his brethren,—for the sake of whom he was always ready meekly to receive and quietly to digest the reproaches of the malevolent, however grievous they might be, not in the proud stomach of a Cato, but in the abasement and humility of the Spirit of Christ.

The latent disease, which had till then been confined within his bowels, burst forth, on the seventh of February in the present year, and manifested such alarming symptoms, as caused the physicians instantly to determine on the necessity of adopting a slow and cautious mode of cure. Though, at the commencement of the attack, he was so much indisposed as scarcely to be able to move his body along, yet at intervals, as the state of his health permitted, he did not discontinue the labours connected with his lectures and his regular vocation, and never lost an opportunity of advocating his own cause

† See Appendix V.

when he deemed it necessary. His presence having been required at the Hague, he made several excursions to that place; and, on one of these occasions, he made a noble *Declaration of his Sentiments*, and an excellent profession of his faith, in the presence of many witnesses. After the last friendly conference, he derived consolation to himself from this single circumstance,—next to God and the testimony of his own conscience,—that a patient hearing had been granted to him, by the kindness of his merciful rulers, in the grand assembly of these provinces, consisting of representatives from every part of Holland and West Friezland. So highly did he estimate the prudence and sagacity of that august body, as to hope, in case of his death, that some of them would not fail to defend, by the patronage of their wisdom and favour, the justice of that cause which had once been offered to them for examination and approval.

Being conveyed home from the Hague, he had but just applied himself to obey the commands of the States of Holland, and accurately to write out the propositions which he had stated in the friendly conference, when the disorder again made its appearance with redoubled violence. † This attack was the more severe on account of the great ascendancy which the complaint had gained through a lingering delay and a diminution of strength. Oppressed by his disorder, in a letter addressed on the twelfth of September to their lordships the States of Holland, he offered a modest excuse for himself for not having been able to comply with their pleasure on the day which they had appointed, and stated, that "he was confined to his bed through indisposition, and had already "written a great portion of what had been required of him, "when (such was the good pleasure of God!) he was compelled to desist. He had previously obtained a hearing "from them, when every thing had been exhibited in a "written form; and that former document, it was possible, "might satisfy the urgency of their present demand. But "if it were their express wish to have those parts which "he had transcribed, he would make such dispositions and "arrangements as to put them in possession of the whole in "an entire and perfect state, in case of his restoration to "health by the grace of Christ; but if his sickness should be "unto death, they should have them in their present unfinished and imperfect condition. In regard to the Confession

† See Appendix, W.

" or Declaration which he had delivered before them, so far
" was he from entertaining any doubts concerning it, that, on
" the contrary, in his deliberate judgment he considered it to
" agree in every particular with the word of God: He there-
" fore persisted in it, and with the faith which he had then
" professed he was prepared to appear, at that very moment,
" before the judgment-seat of Jesus Christ, the Son of God,
" and the Judge of both the living and the dead."

In the mean time, his complaint daily acquired fresh strength. Those celebrated and most experienced physicians, Doctors Pavius, Sebastian Egberts, Henry Saelius, and Reiner Bontius, attempted to hinder its progress, and gently to call forth the inert powers of nature, as far as art and industry enabled them to accomplish these objects. But all their endeavours were fruitless; for the unsubdued obstinacy of the disorder mocked their art, and set all their remedies at defiance. Its roots had spread themselves and descended too deeply to be easily eradicated; and its devastations were indicated every day by new and varying symptoms,—such as feverish affections, a cough, an extension of the vitals, difficulty of breathing, oppression after taking food, disturbed and unrefreshing sleep, atrophy and the gout. Such a complication of disorders allowed the sufferer no intermission or repose. These complaints were soon succeeded by pains in the intestines, both the ilion and colon, with an obstruction in the optic nerve of the left eye, which produced great dimness.

During this alarming progress of disorders, the rage of calumny never ceased, and relaxed in no part of its accustomed atrocity. Of this I will here relate a dreadfully cruel, astonishing, foul, and horrible example, worthy of being recorded in historic annals and to live in the recollection of posterity:

When it was generally known, that his left eye had become dim, there were some persons who had the audacity to reckon this circumstance among those punishments which God threatens to inflict on his enemies, and on the impious despisers of his holy name. They also affirmed that Arminius had been, above all other men, singularly wicked, from the very nature of his chastisement. That a degree of consistency and some plausible colouring might be communicated to this foul slander, this incredible and wicked fiction, they ransacked the contents of the sacred Books of the Old and New Testament, to which no true Christian can approach in any other manner than with reverence and prayer. The following passage in

the Prophecy of Zechariah was considered to be well suited to their purpose:—'*And this shall be the plague wherewith the Lord will smite all the people that have fought against Jerusalem: Their flesh shall consume away while they stand upon their feet, and their eyes shall consume away in their holes, and their tongue shall consume away in their mouth.*' (xiv. 12.) Also the following passage in the same prophecy:—'*Woe to the idol shepherd that leaveth the flock; the sword shall be upon his arm and his right eye; his arm shall be clean dried up, and his right eye shall be utterly darkened.*' (xi. 17.) This text, wrested from its real meaning, was attempted to be hurled against Christ's holy servant, who was then greatly afflicted in body, but who at no time exhibited any other frame of mind than that of a happy man,—now indeed in the possession of the most exalted happiness!

I shudder at the bare recollection of such an enormous, detestable and impious deed! '*Who art thou, O man, who condemnest thy brother*' for whom Christ shed his precious blood? Why dost thou attack God's servant; and, by prophecies drawn, in some sort, from the very heavens, dost inveigh against him whom a generous and not ungrateful posterity will acknowledge to have in an eminent degree deserved well of the Church Universal?* What kind of judgment dost thou assume to thyself over thy brother, whom the Lord hath commanded thee to love? Hear what thy Lord says: '*Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents. But these things are done, that the works of God should be made manifest in him.*' (John ix. 3.) Hear him again: '*Judge not, that ye be not judged.*' (Matt. vii. 1.) Listen also to an Apostle: '*But with me it is a very small thing, that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment. He that judgeth me, is the* LORD, *therefore judge ye nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall every man have praise of God.*' (1 Cor. iv. 5.)—Art thou so well assured of all that shall befal thee, as to be confident that thou wilt not be afflicted with a more severe disorder and stronger pains?

Yet, after all their profane appeal to scripture, it was not '*the right eye*' of Arminius that was disordered, but THE LEFT ONE: Neither was it an '*utter darkening*,' but only A DIMNESS; and his arm was not '*clean dried up*,' on the contrary it was MUCH SWOLLEN. His *tongue* also did not '*consume away in*

* See Appendix X.

his mouth,' but it readily PERFORMED ITS FUNCTIONS, even in the very article of death. In this manner are things above and below, on the right hand and on the left, Divine and human, pressed alike into the service of these miserable interpreters of sacred mysteries!—There were those likewise who played on the name of ARMINIUS, from which, with his Christian name JACOBUS, they contrived to produce this Anagram, VANI ORBIS AMICUS, "the friend of a vain world;" as though the same buffoonery had not formerly been practised against the sacred name of CHRIST!*—Away, ye vile detractors, the black voracious beetles of the present age! What machinations against the servant will you not devise, who have not spared God himself, the Lord of life and glory?

But I return to that part of the narrative at which this digression commenced. Worn down and fatigued with all this accumulation of maladies, Arminius still preserved his usual firmness of mind and placidity of temper. During the whole of his indisposition, he abated nothing of his cheerful converse and pleasing manners; he continued to shew his accustomed hilarity of countenance, and to manifest the same courteous and gentle disposition,—while he ceased not to approach to God with most ardent prayers for himself and for the concord of the Church of Christ. How frequent and how fervent were the ejaculations which he breathed forth to Jesus Christ his Lord, under the pressure of his multiplied pains and distempers! What heavenly joys did he promise to himself! With what persevering faith did he expect and long for the last day which he would be permitted to spend upon earth! If his brethren knelt down to prayer in his presence, and if he were prevented from uniting with them in devotion on account of the strong pains which at that instant assailed him, he often desired them to wait till he had recovered from the paroxysm and regained his composure, that he might with them discharge this solemn and fraternal duty.

The following are a few of the many forms of prayer which he addressed to his Heavenly Father: "O thou great Shep-
"herd, who by the blood of the everlasting covenant hast been
"brought again from the dead, Jesus, my Lord and Saviour,
"be present with me, a sheep of thine that is weak and
"afflicted!"

"O Lord Jesus, thou faithful and merciful High Priest,
"who wast pleased in all things to be tempted as we are, yet
"without sin, that, being taught by such experience how hard

* See Appendix Y.

"and painful a thing it is to obey God in sufferings, thou "mightest be touched with the feeling of our infirmities,— "have mercy upon me, succour me thy servant, who am now "laid on a bed of sickness and oppressed with these numerous "maladies. O thou God of my salvation, render my soul fit "for thy heavenly kingdom and prepare my body for the "resurrection!"

But as the virulence of his disease daily advanced, his physicians intimated to him the uncertain continuance of his life, and the consequent necessity of '*setting his house in order*,' and disposing of every matter on which he might wish to communicate his last instructions. This kind suggestion he received with the greatest equanimity, and prepared to meet death with such composure and calmness of spirit, that his friends, who stood round him at the time and had been throughout life close observers of his manners, were filled with admiration at this noble display of moderation and heroic firmness in the closing scene of his earthly existence, and intreated that they might be permitted to profit from a sight of his *happy death*,—the last example which they could enjoy who had already received from him so many models of *a holy and correct life*. When therefore he perceived that the time of his dissolution was drawing near, and as he was not ignorant of the crafty wiles of the devil, he accounted it to be his first duty, in framing his will, to dictate a brief statement of the reasons for his designs and for the tenour of his life. Since this extract from his will contains the duty of a faithful teacher, I will here repeat it, as an example to others and as a testimony in his favour:

EXTRACT FROM THE WILL OF ARMINIUS.

"Above all, I commend my soul, on its departure out of the "body, into the hands of God, who is its Creator and faithful "Saviour; before whom also I testify, that I have walked "with simplicity and sincerity, and '*in all good conscience*,' in "my office and vocation; that I have guarded with the great- "est solicitude and care, against advancing or teaching any "thing, which, after a diligent search into the Scriptures, I "had not found exactly to agree with those sacred records; "and that all the doctrines advanced by me, have been such as "might conduce to the propagation and increase of the truth "of the Christian Religion, of the true worship of God, of "general piety, and of a holy conversation among men,—and

"such as might contribute, according to the word of God, to "a state of tranquility and peace well befitting the Christian "name; and that from these benefits I have excluded the "Papacy, with which no unity of faith, no bond of piety or "of Christian peace can be preserved." *

Having soon completed all his worldly arrangements, he spent his few remaining days in calling upon Christ, in devout thanksgiving, and in meditating upon a better life; during which period he was visited by John Uitenbogardt and Adrian Borrius † more frequently than by any other persons: Both of them were united to him by the strictest bonds of ancient friendship and by their mutual participation of various dangers. Borrius was likewise most assiduous in performing the daily office of prayers for the dying saint. At length, on the Nineteenth Day of October, about noon, after this faithful servant of God had valiantly fulfilled all the duties of his warfare, had finished his course, had fought the good fight, and had kept the faith,—with his eyes lifted up to heaven, amidst the earnest prayers of those who were present, he calmly rendered up his spirit unto God the Father his Creator, to the Son his Redeemer, and to the Holy Ghost his Sanctifier, while each of the spectators exclaimed, '*O my soul, let me die the death of the righteous!*' In this placid manner Arminius resigned his spirit, tired as it was of the cares of this world, and satiated with toils and afflictions;—but it had begun greatly to long for its liberation, was already favoured with a blessed foretaste of the joys of the saints, and seemed to behold Christ its God and its Redeemer!

Thus set this sun! Thus died this righteous man, '*of whom the world was not worthy!*' Thus was lifted up, from us, the father of such a number of prophets! Thus was borne up on high JAMES ARMINIUS, in '*the chariot of Israel* and by *the horsemen thereof!*' And now, discharged from all earthly service, freed from every incumbrance, and no longer incommoded by troubles, he possesses a crown which had been the object of his ardent desires, amidst so many labours, such perseverance of faith, and such holiness of life, as he had manifested; and he is now in the enjoyment of '*the Heavenly Jerusalem, among an innumerable company of angels, and the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven.*' There he beholds '*God the Judge of all, the spirits of just men made perfect, Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant, and the*

* See Appendix Z. † Appendix Aa.

blood of sprinkling, which speaketh better things than that of Abel.' (Heb. xii. 22—24.) He waits for that important day on which God will restore the lifeless body that we have just deposited in the earth, '*fashioned like unto the glorious body of his Son, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.*' (Phil. iii, 21.)

But we must be tossed about by these waves as long as it shall be the will of God, until he at length have mercy upon us, and call '*each of us away in his own order,*' from the mire and clay of this world, to the joys of heaven. In the mean time, we will preserve alive, in the congregation of the saints, the blessed memory of JAMES ARMINIUS, by this descriptive eulogy, THERE LIVED A MAN, WHOM IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE, FOR THOSE WHO KNEW HIM, SUFFICIENTLY TO ESTEEM; THOSE WHO ENTERTAINED NO ESTEEM FOR HIM, ARE SUCH AS NEVER KNEW HIM WELL ENOUGH TO APPRECIATE HIS MERITS.

What remains, my most excellent, reverend, honourable, noble, and very learned hearers, but that I exhort you to cultivate the lovely peace of the Church, in opposition to the scandalous reports and unjust surmises of the present age? In doing this, can I employ more appropriate words, than these by the Apostle John? '*Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love.*' (1 John iv, 7, 8.)

APPENDIX.

A.——Page 16.

THE name of DANIEL HEINSIUS, Professor of History in the University of Leyden, is familiar to all the learned, for his critical labours, but more particularly for the decided part which he took in the religious disputes which arose after the death of Arminius. Heinsius was ambitious; and, though on terms of intimacy with some of the most eminent of the Remonstrants, as soon as he perceived a turn in the tide of their affairs, he changed his course and sought for secular advancement from the prevailing party. In consequence of the zeal which he displayed in his new career, he was appointed secretary to the Lay Commissioners at the Synod of Dort, and played a distinguished part in that memorable assembly.

When Arminius died, many of the most learned men of that age wrote elegiac Latin verses, on the mournful occasion. The following is a copy of those which Heinsius composed, and which he addressed to the Rev. John Uitenbogardt, the most intimate friend of the deceased. It reflects no small disgrace on the memory of Heinsius, that from every printed edition of his works he carefully excluded these charming verses, which are honourable alike to his understanding, to his talents and his feelings. But his *prudent* reasons for such exclusion, every reader of discernment will easily conjecture.

IN OBITUM REVERENDI D. IACOBI ARMINII SUMMI PONTIFICIORUM OPPUGNATORIS.

Ingentem dominum rerum Martisque nepotem
Germanis olim fregit Arminii vigor.
Ausus inaccessam Romano opponere gentem,
Nihil timere doctus et fortis mori.
Horruit et nostro Tiberis se subdidit Albi,
Martisque gentem fœdus invasit timor.
Quintiliæ cecidere acies, terramque momordit
Ferox juventus, unico minor viro.
Nunc alter Batavo de sanguine, fortis et acer,
Et veritate armatus, et fandi potens,
Mendacem invasit sublimi pectore Romam,
Hoc quem sepulchro terra victorem tegit.
Sic fuit in fatis: laudem hanc Germania servas,
Bis Roma nostros non tulisti Arminios.

For the sake of the English reader, these verses may be thus translated; though the tameness of the version will be but too apparent when it is compared with the spirit of the original:—

ON THE DEATH OF THAT REVEREND MAN, DR. JAMES ARMINIUS, A CONSUMMATE AND MOST SUCCESSFUL ASSAILANT OF THE PAPISTS.

Lords of the world, his Roman foes,
  Of old great HERMAN's vigour brav'd;
He led, the tyrants to oppose,
  A people never yet enslav'd;
Ready for death, of nought afraid,
His Germans soon were warriors made.

Affrighted Tyber then began
  To yield our Elbe the tribute meet;
Romans by bands in terror ran
  And laid their arms at Herman's feet;
But the young troops, the flow'r of Rome,
Preferr'd to this an early tomb.

We have as brave a HERMAN seen,
  Who rests beneath this sacred earth;
He, arm'd with truth, for combat keen,
  Honour'd the country of his birth,
And all the Papal glory marr'd,
When call'd by heaven to his reward.

Apostate Rome he overcame
  By potent words, with dauntless breast;
She knew too well the dreaded name,
  And HERMAN's might again confess'd:
This boast to Germany remains,—
TWICE HAVE HER SONS HELD ROME IN CHAINS!

The elder Brandt says of him: "Pursuant to the eleventh article of their instructions, they appointed Daniel Heinsius their secretary,—a man who has rendered his name sufficiently notorious, by his skill in the Latin and Greek languages, and especially by his poetry. He was considered to be well qualified for that office, on account of the great facility to which he had attained both in speaking and writing Latin. But it was the opinion of the Remonstrants, that he was much prejudiced against them, because some ministers of their persuasion had frequently reproved him for his dissolute course of life. They affirmed also, that his knowledge of Theological affairs was very defective; that he was exceedingly inconstant in the business of religion, turning first to one party and then to another, at one time praising and at other times condemning the same things, according to the point to which the wind of prosperity happened to veer about; and that he associated

himself now to one body of men and then to another, just as he found it to be subservient to his worldly interests."

His officiousness against the cited Remonstrants was very conspicuous during the whole of the Synod; but one of the greatest subjects of complaint against him by the Remonstrants, is, that, at the conclusion of the Synod, when they were required by the Commissioners, as a *sine qua non*, to subscribe the Canons or "to be deprived of their offices, benefices and public ministrations," Heinsius falsified their answers.—"Then the Secretary read to each of them separately the answers which he had composed from their several verbal declarations the day before, and required every man to sign his own answer. But they declared, that he had not taken a correct copy of what each of them had said; and among his general interpolations they noticed certain invidious expressions which had been uttered only by one or two of their body when examined separately, such as, 'We are resolved to preach, in defiance of the edicts of the States General,' and 'Such edicts are inconsistent with the word of God.'"

"About the time when the Canons of Dort first appeared, the Professor Heinsius published a Dissertation, which he had pronounced in the University, on John xvii, 9; in which he treated on *Election* and the doctrine of the *Five Points* connected with it. This small tract he dedicated to their Lordships the States General, but presented copies of it to none but such as were members of that august body, and to a few of his particular friends. He did not, however, allow it to obtain any further publicity, for the whole edition amounted only to fifty impressions. He sent a copy of it to the learned Father Paul, renowned for his *History of the Council of Trent*, who, entertaining the opinions of the Dominicans on the matter of *Predestination*, extolled this performance very highly, and declared, that he discovered, on perusing it, how conversant Heinsius was with Theological topics.

"But one of the most learned of the Remonstrants, who had also perused the book, assures us, 'that Heinsius did not in that dissertation follow his reason and judgment so much as his passions; he often repeated the same observation, by means of a slight variation in expression; his style was diffuse and obscure; he frequently wandered from his text, and, in all the boldness of poetic licence, wrested the holy scriptures according to his own peculiar humour, as though he was interpreting one of the fables of Ovid; he was also guilty of sundry palpable

mistakes, and often wronged or misrepresented the Remonstrants.'

"In his dedication to the States General, Heinsius had intimated, among other things, that he *had during the whole of his life been a strict lover of piety.* Upon this subject, the Remonstrant to whom we have now alluded, thus interrogates him: 'Is it an argument of virtue and piety, to write such verses as a woman the most abandoned would scarcely venture to utter? Is it a mark of piety, to defame your colleagues with verses and prefaces dipped in gall? It it piety, to sit and drink bumpers with your friend Baudius, and to spend whole days besotting yourself in a tavern? Do you esteem it as an act of piety, to traduce the reputation of those gentlemen without whose assistance you must have starved, or to avoid the conversation of those the entertainment of whose table and kitchen you formerly accounted your chief felicity? —But perhaps,' continues this author, 'he might at that time have had some love for piety, though he did not even then shew himself much addicted to its practice. But he who pretended to love that which was good, and yet practised that which was evil, could not fail of becoming a bad man.—It was astonishing to find him asserting in his Dedication, that *for several years he had cherished a great reverence for the Holy Scriptures*, when his method of treating sacred subjects was a matter of notoriety; for he was accustomed to publish a hymn to *Bacchus*, and another to JESUS CHRIST, in the same book, thus uniting sacred things with profane, heavenly with infernal, and God with Baal.'—Our Remonstrant concludes his animadversions with this severe sentence: 'Ambition has conceived this Dissertation, Calumny has furnished the materials, Ignorance has imparted shape to it, the Poet has polished it, the Orator pronounced it, and Covetousness inscribed it to the States General.' "

From a letter which Vossius addressed to Grotius, in the year 1639, it appears, that Salmasius, the famous opponent of Milton and the regicides, became the castigator of Heinsius, who felt the merited correction. He says, "*The Exercitations of Heinsius on the New Testament* are published at length; and, I am inclined to think, you will have received them before the arrival of my letter. I have glanced, in a cursory manner, at a few of his remarks; the more deeply I investigate them, the more intense is the desire which I feel for a sight of those observations on the same books of scripture, which now for

some years you have had in a course of preparation. I am also exceedingly desirous, that the celebrated Salmasius may have leisure to finish his labours on the New Testament which he has promised to the public. In them he designs to refute innumerable passages in Heinsius, and all those in particular which are obviously drawn from his own treasury. I can easily conceive, that this contest will greatly detract from the reputation of Heinsius. But I am partially consoled by the consideration, that all people are aware of this being a disaster brought down upon himself, by the incessant slanders which he pronounces against every man who has attained to any distinction in the Republic of Letters. The hope and probability of the beneficial results of this contest, likewise yield me some comfort. For undoubtedly Salmasius is capable of instructing even the most learned men in something of which they had been previously ignorant. From him, perhaps, Heinsius will learn to have more modest views of himself; and will be thus induced to make this addition to the other traits in his character which entitle him to commendation,—to manifest less credulity in listening to those gross flatterers who more truly *oppress* than *caress* him, when by way of eulogy they style him the Phænix, the Dictator, and the Atlas of studies. What can we do with those persons who in our days account Heinsius the only man of learning? Indeed both he and these his admirers are all thrown into a dreadful ferment, from merely reading the preface which Salmasius has prefixed to his book *De Modo Usurarum*: but it is my intention to persuade Salmasius to evince less acerbity towards a man of such eminence in literature, on condition of that man refraining from his usual acts of defamation.—To me, however, it seems a humbling spectacle, when learned men quarrel in this way with each other. Yet, I own, it is unjust that greater and better men, than he whom it is tedious more frequently to mention, should be held in such small esteem as to occupy no station among men of learning, except he accounts them worthy of the lowest place among the rough and rusty grammarians."

B.——Page 17.

In the distracted state of France, during the sixteenth century, various were the expedients to which the contending parties had recourse for the purpose of settling their religious differences. Sometimes they severally appealed to the sword;

and at other times they attempted to effect their designs by the milder yet more artful weapons of diplomacy. Of the latter kind of expedients was the CONFERENCE OF POISSY, which, as involving the rights of toleration in nearly all the extensive dominions at that period under the rule of the different branches of the powerful House of Bourbon, was a very interesting assembly. In it were debated some of the most important points in controversy between the Papists and Protestants, in the presence of Charles the Ninth, King of France, the Queen Mother, the King of Navarre, the Prince of Condé, and the rest of the States of the kingdom.

Among the several able advocates of the Reformation from Popery convened on that occasion, was the celebrated Theodore Beza, who also appeared as one of the representatives of the 2190 Protestant churches of which Bertius speaks in his Oration. The historians of that period charge Beza with being the cause of the sudden and unsuccessful termination of the Conference. In that imposing assembly in which the king and other illustrious personages were his auditors, he was directed to deliver his views on THE REAL PRESENCE in *the Lord's Supper;* and in the course of the powerful arguments which he employed, he made this bold declaration:—"We say, that *the body of Jesus Christ* is as distant from the bread and wine as the highest heaven is from the earth!" Speaking of this occurrence in his own *Ecclesiastical History*, he says: "Though Beza had uttered other expressions full as contrary and repugnant to the doctrine of the Romish Church, yet this single assertion caused the Popish Prelates to express their disapprobation by noises and murmurs. Some of them cried out, 'He has spoken blasphemy!' Others arose to depart, not being able to manifest their ire in any worse form, on account of the king's presence. Among the rest, the Cardinal de Tournon, Dean of the Cardinals, who occupied the first seat, required the King and Queen either to silence Beza, or to permit him and his friends to retire. The King, however, did not move from his place, neither did any of the princes; but leave was granted to Beza to proceed, who, after silence had been obtained, said, 'Gentlemen, I desire you to listen to my conclusion, which will give you satisfaction.' He then resumed his discourse and continued his remarks."—Mezerai states, that Beza's proposition was violent and shocking; that Beza was ashamed of it himself; that it horribly wounded Catholic

ears; and that the Prelates, when they heard it, trembled with horror.

But, how plausible soever such a comparatively trifling occurrence may appear as a reason for closing this important Conference, the real cause of that result is to be sought in the artful policy of Cardinal Charles of Lorrain, a member of the proud and ambitious family of GUISE, whose highest gratification seems to have consisted in the utter extirpation of Protestantism from their native country. Besides, Beza and the other champions of the Reformation had only been induced to enter into a conference with the Papists, on the express condition, which was ratified to them by the word of the King, that the Prelates and clergy should not be their judges, but that the whole should be under the management of Commissioners appointed by his Majesty. When this Cardinal therefore perceived at the Conference that the Reformed Churches were about to obtain the long-desired toleration of their religious tenets and mode of worship, he proposed that the AUGUSTAN CONFESSION, which had been exhibited in 1530 to the Emperor Charles, should be the only ground of pacification and agreement between the two adverse parties of Papists and Protestants. This Prelate knew, that between the LUTHERANS (the articles of whose belief were embodied in that Confession,) and the CALVINISTS (who dissented from that formulary in the essential points of *the Lord's Supper* and *Predestination*,) there existed almost as deadly a hatred as between either of them and those of the Romish Church. Indeed, their unchristian rancour, which had frequently displayed itself, was at that time only suppressed by the imminent dangers which seemed to threaten both of them from their common enemy. Had the Calvinists consented to these terms, a lasting tranquility on the subject of religion would probably have been established in France and its dependencies. But Beza and his friends refused to subscribe the Augustan Confession; further deliberations therefore became unnecessary; the Conference was dissolved;—and some of the sad consequences which soon followed, have been among the foulest blots in the history of that kingdom, and are too notorious to require any repetition.

To this artifice of the Cardinal, Arminius alludes, in strong terms of just reprehension, near the close of his *Oration on composing Religious Dissensions.*

C.——Page 22.

PETER RAMUS, who had formerly been Professor in the University of Paris, appeared to Arminius to possess attractions far superior to all other philosophers; and so completely had he imbibed the style of philosophizing and the method of conducting an argument which that celebrated logician inculcated, that he soon appeared to be another Ramus. It is generally understood, that his acquaintance with the writings of this philosopher commenced at an earlier period than that which is now under our observation: Indeed, the foundations of his logical knowledge were laid by his early teacher and patron, Rudolph Snellius, of whom MEURSIUS in his *Athenæ Batavæ* relates, that "after he had obtained the first sight of the Logic of Ramus while he resided at Marpurgh, he was so delighted with it, that from that period he addicted himself entirely to that system, although he had previously taught Aristotle for three years together in the University of Cologne."—It was under the auspices of Snellius, that Arminius, about the close of the year 1578, was invited by the Curators, (or *Visitors)* of the University of Leyden to give lessons in the elements of Mathematical science; and while engaged in the performance of that duty, he made no small progress in pure Mathematics and Astronomy.

Whoever is acquainted with the excellences of the *Dialectics* of Ramus, (one of the best books, by the aid of which a wise man may tutor and school his thoughts,) will soon perceive, that an under-graduate who had mastered that treatise and was familiar with its contents, and who had in addition obtained such a deep knowledge of Mathematics, as to receive a regular appointment from the Heads of the University, to teach the rudiments of that important *help to correct thinking*, must have amassed ample materials for forming himself into a consummate logician. These materials were improved by Arminius to the greatest advantage,—in giving lucid order and methodical arrangement to the operations of an understanding that was naturally vigorous,—in chastening the decisions, and in communicating a right direction to the deductions, of a judgment that was then beginning to form its earliest conclusions on subjects of the greatest interest,—and in prescribing bounds to the excursions of a most fertile imagination: The effects which were produced in Arminius by this most whole-

some discipline of mind, are visible in every page of his compositions. For in an age that was remarkable for a cultivation of close and terse reasoning, this great man surpassed his fellows in an accomplishment, which was then accounted a necessary appendage to every one who made any pretensions to literary eminence. But his talents, thus tutored, were most conspicuously displayed in his oral disputations and discourses with men of other sentiments. His measured words, with his mild and winning manner, often made a deep and salutary impression, even on the minds of his adversaries; and the truth of God was never injured by any unwary speech that escaped from his lips. His enemies, therefore, like the earliest '*accuser of the brethren*' when he tempted Christ, could '*find nothing in him*' that suited their purpose: They generally departed from his presence, either regretting the falsity of the representations that had been previously made to them by other persons, or signifying in a convenient and polite manner their assent to every argument which he had advanced, and which they usually found themselves incompetent to answer. The late amiable Dr. George Campbell, himself no contemptible logician, discerned in Arminius the existence of this qualification in an eminent degree; but he does not express himself on this subject in such terms as the reader will immediately construe into those of professed admiration, though they indirectly convey a compliment to the reasoning powers of Arminius. His words are these: "In one paraphrase, Jesus Christ appears a bigoted Papist; in another, a flaming Protestant. In one, he argues with all the sophistry of the Jesuit; in another, he declaims with all the fanaticism of the Jansenist. In one, you trace the metaphysical ratiocinations of Arminius; in another, you recognize the bold conclusions of Gomarus: and, in each, you hear the language of a man who has thoroughly imbibed the system of one or other of our Christian Rabbis. How different is his own character and dialect from them all!" (*Philosophy of Rhetoric*, Vol. II. 291.) The reader will judge for himself whether the epithets in this quotation be the dictates of genuine criticism, or sarcastic remarks,—by one who had been educated in all the prejudices of Calvinism and who manifested a sort of hereditary dislike to every thing connected with the name of our author. He will also determine, whether any other system has ever had greater need of "metaphysical ratiocinations" than Calvinism has had, and

whether there is any one upon which more metaphysical science has been wasted, to give it the semblance of Christianity, and in vain to distinguish its notions of *Predestination* from the *Fate* of Heathenism.

D.——Page 28.

The intervening circumstances may in this place be briefly related: On the twelfth of November, Arminius presented himself before the ecclesiastical senate, from the members of which he experienced a very kind reception, and exhibited to them the testimonials which he had obtained from Beza, Grynæus, and others. At the same time, he professed to be inflamed with an ardent desire of edifying the Church of God, and of being willing to devote to that purpose all those endowments which had been communicated to him, as soon as he might receive canonical ordination. He then offered apologies and excuses for his Italian excursion, adducing the personal testimony of Adrian Junius, his only and inseparable companion. He also requested permission of the magistrates to go to South Holland, before he began to modulate his voice and to form a proper style for public speaking, about which he was very diffident. The magistrates not only granted leave, but furnished him with money for the expenses of his journey, which he undertook, for the sake of visiting some of his relations and friends, and to settle some affairs relating to his family.

On his return from South Holland, he spent some weeks in a diligent application to the composition of sermons, and in delivering private exhortations. In the beginning of the year 1588, he offered himself to the Amsterdam Class for examination. After he had stated at some length his belief on each of the grand doctrines of Christianity, and when testimonials in his favour had been read from several famous Divines, the whole Class unanimously pronounced him competent and worthy to enter upon his public ministry. On the 4th of February, after the Ecclesiastical Senate had deliberated on the matter, with the consent of the Magistrates, he began to be heard from the pulpit of the Church at Amsterdam, and during every week preached a sermon and conducted the evening service. His public performances were received with such applause, that the Presbytery of that city, after having convened all the Deacons, by common suffrage without one dissenting voice, offered him the sacred ministry of the Church of Amsterdam. The magistrates having intimated their assent

to this arrangement, and the same call being offered by the whole of the Presbytery to Arminius, on the 11th day of August, being the Saturday previous to the celebration of the Lord's Supper, he was initiated into his sacred office, by the solemn rite of imposition of the hands of the Presbytery, after the customary proclamations had been made and he had pledged himself faithfully and strenuously to fulfil the duties of his holy calling after the manner of his colleagues.

Though he was then but twenty-eight years of age, yet he displayed at once all the abilities of a consummate preacher, and not only realized, but far exceeded the expectations which had been formed concerning him by his patrons. His discourses were distinguished for their masculine vigour and sound erudition. Whatever might be the subject of which he treated, his manner of discussing it shewed him to be a Divine not of a youthful and common mould, but one of great judgment, ability and accomplishments, and possessing a mind well furnished with copious stores of knowledge both in human and sacred literature. These qualifications rendered his ministry acceptable to the highest as well as the lowest portion of the community.

That he might confine his public ministrations within certain limits, he determined to deliver a regular series of sermons on the Prophecy of Malachi and on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. His first discourse on this epistle was preached on Sunday, the 6th of November 1588. In treating on this subject, he adduced nothing remarkable, except the primary intention of the Apostle in laying the foundation of the justification both of Jews and Gentiles in evangelical justification; and he demonstrated to the church, in a clear and luminous manner, the necessity of faith and the grace of the gospel, as well as the inefficacy of the deeds of the law. While he exerted himself to the extent of his abilities in performing these duties of his profession, he greatly increased his reputation as a clergyman of consummate erudition, and gained favour and good-will from all who listened to his discourses, how different soever his sentiments and theirs might occasionally appear.—For after he had once sworn fealty to Divine Truth, and was inspired with a particular attachment to it, his chief attention was directed, at the very commencement of his ecclesiastical functions, to this single object,—to lay aside all prejudices, and, devoting himself entirely to the interests of truth, to do and say nothing contrary to the testimony of an undefiled conscience. Whatever degree of vener-

ation he felt for those to whose tutelage he was indebted for his earliest initiation into the heavenly doctrines of the gospel, and under whose standard he had subsequently ranged himself, —he was by no means prepared to adopt without reserve the whole of their opinions, but it was his great desire to follow the directing look of Christ alone, the Supreme Guide and Teacher of his people. This course he began openly to pursue in the succeeding year.

E.——Page 29.

This was the pamphlet which Arminius was desired to answer; but it purported to be an answer to one that had been written by Richard Folkertson Coornhert, who, in the year 1578, held a public disputation with two Calvinistic Ministers at Delft, Arnold Cornelius or Cornelison, and Reyner Donteklok. The cause of the controversy was this: Coornhert one day entered into conversation with a man who made a great boast of having left the communion of the Church of Rome, and joined the Reformed or Calvinists. Coornhert, perceiving from his conversation, that this proselyte from Popery could adduce no solid reason for the change, dryly observed, "It is a matter that may admit of some doubt, whether the profession of religion which you have abandoned, or that which you have embraced, be the better." This expression being repeated with a few obnoxious additions, as is the general custom in cases of this kind, excited the sensitive zeal of the two Calvinist ministers, and in the heat of their passion they challenged Coornhert to a public controversy on *the Characteristics of the true Church.* Coornhert maintained, that the congregations that believed and professed the doctrines of Calvin, could not be true churches: to prove this thesis, he reprobated in a masterly and popular manner their peculiar views of *Predestination*, *Justification*, and *killing Heretics.* After this public conference had been conducted on both sides a short time, it was prohibited by order of the States General,—but resumed a few weeks afterwards at Leyden, where certain deputies were appointed by their High Mightinesses to attend as moderators in the assembly. Coornhert relates, that he was not allowed by these commissioners of the States, to mention the subject of *punishing Heretics with death;* and he was compelled to follow the two ministers in the order in which they chose to conduct the dispute and to answer the questions which they proposed. Yet though he

had to maintain his cause against two subtle opponents, and before Judges who were themselves of the Calvinistic persuasion, he completely silenced the chief speaker Cornelison, who, being greatly enraged, was not able to proceed with his intended arguments. Donteklok came to his assistance, but soon caught the infectious stammering and hesitation of his colleague, and when he was obliged suddenly to stop, either through a defect of recollection or a want of argument, Coornhert, who was a bold and witty man, said rather smartly, "What! is this the doctrine of Calvin and Beza?" Their honours the Commissioners, thinking this a good opportunity for relieving the embarrassment of the discomfitted ministers, turned round to Coornhert and reprimanded him severely for having mentioned the names of those two venerable reformers. Another person also added something in the way of reproof, to whom Coornhert, having given an answer in kind, proceeded to say, "We are permitted to repeat the name both of God and the *devil*, without being called to an account for such words; why then ought we to be blamed for speaking of two mortal men that were liable to error?" Many warm expressions followed on both sides, and Coornhert left them, declaring before the hundreds of assembled hearers, that he should reason no longer with men who would not concede to him the right of reply.

Each party, as is usual on such occasions, claimed the victory for itself. Coornhert was for some years prohibited from publishing his remarks on this or any other religious controversy, although he petitioned the States, without effect, against such a severe and sweeping restriction. But the ministers of Delft,—willing to give the best colouring to the doctrine of Calvinistic predestination, some time about the year 1589, wrote the popular pamphlet, the title of which has already been given, and in which they defended the lower or *sublapsarian* scheme.

This controversy had occurred ten years before; yet, in consequence of it, Coornhert had frequently become the object of pulpit vituperation. Some of his theological opinions were certainly too loosely expressed, and were such as could not be maintained by any conscientious Arminian,—a term of distinction at that time unknown among professors of religion. He was a man of great sincerity, a hater of persecution on religious account, and his life and conduct were most holy and exemplary. He had rendered important services to his country on various trying emergencies at the risk of his life, and had

been a most zealous and active champion in the cause of the Reformation. Yet he was loaded with reproaches, and his name was cast out as evil. "The Heretic" and "The Libertine" were the usual epithets by which he was known among his enemies; and to refute his supposed errors from the press and the pulpit, was the labour which almost every petty synod in the United Provinces delegated to one of the most able of its members. When Lydius, therefore, who was an admirer of Beza and consequently a *supralapsarian*, had sent the pamphlet published by the ministers at Delft, and had solicited Arminius to defend the sentiments of his old master, against those which were then considered to be much too mild and fraught with error,—at the very same period the ecclesiastical senate of Amsterdam preferred a request to him that he would undertake the province of exposing the errors of Coornhert. Thus, by a remarkable co-incidence, was committed into the hands of Arminius, a young divine of the greatest promise, the momentous charge of refuting what were deemed to be two very opposite heresies. The providence of God, under whose control are all the affairs of his church, seems, for the wisest and most beneficent purposes, to have brought into immediate contact, at a remarkable crisis, two clashing propositions involving an important verity of christian doctrine, that they might arouse the attention and excite the energies of a mortal who had been highly gifted of God, and upon whom had been bestowed an enlarged and most capacious understanding, and a mind so peculiarly trained to close thought and logical deductions, as if it had been educated with the sole intent of skilfully eliciting the portion of conflicting truth contained in each of these propositions, and of framing from them a grand and scriptural system which most signally "justifies the ways of God to man."

F.——Page 30.

Bertius has correctly stated the progress of conviction, which a gradual developement of truth produced on the mind of Arminius at this most interesting period. But as every circumstance, however trivial in appearance, becomes of importance when connected with the name of our author, and with the consequences which resulted from his lucubrations, it may be proper to add, that Lydius was not disinclined to answer the pamphlet written by the Delft brethren, and had pledged himself to perform that duty, but he preferred engaging

Arminius; and, to induce him to undertake this province, he not only urged the propriety of defending his old tutor, but hinted that such an employment would be an excellent preparative for his refutation of Coornhert, which had been assigned to him by the ecclesiastical senate of Amsterdam. It has been already related, that when he had maturely weighed all the arguments that might be produced against the supralapsarian scheme of Calvin and Beza, he felt inclined to subscribe to the milder scheme of the sublapsarians; but on further research and study, which he never remitted till he had satisfied his own mind on this important point, he at length settled in a firm belief of that particular view of predestination which now bears his honoured name, and which may be clearly demonstrated from the scriptures themselves, and which receives additional confirmation from the writings of the early Christian Fathers. This view of predestination attributes the electing grace of God solely in its application to christian CHARACTERS, *as such*, and only while their dispositions and conduct remain truly *christian*; but both the other views have respect entirely to *persons* who have once been the subjects of divine grace, without making any abatement or surcease in God's electing love on account of any subsequent misconduct and unchristian practices on the part of such *persons*. The opinions finally adopted by Arminius respecting predestination, were, with some guarded modifications, the same as those which had been espoused and defended by Coornhert, and which had likewise, in the best and purest periods of Church History, found patrons and advocates among the ablest both of ancient and modern divines.

In this state of mind, and having never accustomed himself to slight the dictates of an enlightened conscience, he determined to act with prudence, and to do nothing unworthy of a sincere and impartial enquirer after truth, by prematurely opposing either the one scheme of doctrine or the other. He therefore abandoned the task of refutation which had been assigned to him, and betook himself, at every moment of leisure which he could abstract from the duties of his profession, to a still deeper research into these matters, by diligently reading the sacred scriptures and comparing them with the writings of the Primitive Fathers and of later divines. After all his study, he was the more confirmed in the recent discovery which had been made to his mind, of the true and scriptural doctrine of predestination; yet he was particularly

guarded in his expressions, and did not venture at first to say any thing in public against the current dogmas on this subject, but for the sake of peace he concealed that, and some other truths allied to it, within the sanctuary of his own bosom.

In the course of a few months, however, when their truth was made still more apparent, he felt an impression on his mind, that it was inconsistent with his vocation, as a teacher and propounder of the mysteries of God, to defer so far to the erroneous prejudices of some good men as to hide within his own heart that which had been committed to his trust for the common benefit of others. He resolved, therefore, in a modest manner, to testify his dissent from some vulgar and received errors, in his occasional discourses on such passages of scripture as obviously admitted of an interpretation that accorded with his more enlarged views of God's economy in the salvation of sinners, and contributed at the same time to promote practical godliness. This became a settled practice with him in the year 1590.

To trace the progress of truth on an ingenuous spirit, is a task that yields both pleasure and improvement. On more closely inspecting this change in the sentiments of Arminius, his conduct appears to be entitled to particular commendation. As soon as the first glimmerings of the light of truth broke in upon his mind, he did not confer with flesh and blood, but yielded to the force of his convictions. When further light from heaven was communicated to him, he abandoned without regret the sublapsarian scheme which he had recently embraced, and intrenched himself within the scriptural stronghold of General Redemption. In both instances, that which appeared erroneous was instantly abandoned; and on neither of those occasions did he betray any wish to fortify himself in falsehood, by seeking out subterfuges which might enable him still to profess his former opinions, or the most ingenious mode of mystifying those doctrines of the truth of which he had been convinced. But both the supra-lapsarian and the sublapsarian systems were at that time popular in Holland, while General Redemption was so imperfectly understood or in such small esteem, as to be usually classed with Arianism or Socinianism. If Arminius therefore had any possible inducement to prefer one of the prevailing schemes to the other, his worldly interest must have evidently been in favour of supralapsarianism, which he had forsaken on the outset of this investigation. Honour and renown would have been his re-

ward, and no eulogy would have been considered too great to bestow upon him, had he successfully defended the popular doctors of that æra, against what were received by their adherents as most pernicious novelties. Or if he had even proceeded no further than *sublapsarianism*, and refrained from shewing any attachment to *General Redemption*, he would still have conciliated some of the regards of the followers of Calvin. But being led on by the guiding star of truth, and disregarding all inferior considerations, he fearlessly pursued his course, and only stopped at that place to which it pointed. To produce doctrines that were subversive of *Particular Redemption*, was looked upon as an unpardonable offence; and which must always experience the greatest share of obloquy from the pharisaical adherents to the dogmas of mere earthly teachers. But his doctrines were all drawn from a higher source than any thing earthly; and when they were first espoused, there was no man living, whom, in relation to their bearing and application, he could call MASTER. He expected no mercy from those who derive all the principles of their religious belief from human authority alone, and either never try them by the elevated standard of the scriptures, or attempt to bring the scriptures down to the level of their principles. Yet, knowing all this, and having counted the cost, Arminius voluntarily subjected himself to many years of ignominy and painful suffering, rather than be found to compromise the highest interests of the truth of God, the convictions of his illuminated conscience, or the spiritual welfare of his fellow-creatures,—all of which were implicated in the doctrines which he had been drawn by the Spirit of God to espouse and defend. Indeed, no other course of conduct could be expected from the man, who, while but a youth, had behaved with such courage and resolution at Geneva, in reference to the philosophy of Ramus; and, in the face of the whole University, had defended that excellent system in opposition to the subtleties of Aristotle.

There are certain doctrines, as well as facts, which, having been imbibed in early life and held as axioms on the subjects to which they relate, are not discarded without much regret,—even after we have discovered that the principles, on which they professed to rest, are false and untenable. They are so associated with the beloved teachers from whom we received them, are so entwined with the endearing remembrance of our youthful friends in whose company they were first instilled into us, they frequently derive so much interest from the situations

or the circumstances in which they were inculcated, and are so interwoven with other incontrovertible doctrines and facts,—as not to be withdrawn or separated from all these attractions without a most distressing effort, a kind of mental amputation. With sensations somewhat allied to these, Arminius parted from the supralapsarian doctrines, which he had imbibed in his very boyhood, and which were afterwards confirmed and fixed in him by the authority and persuasive eloquence of the venerable Beza, who had magnified them into such importance as to make the recognition of them and of all their eventful consequences a *sine qua non* to salvation. But it is not intended by these remarks to detract from Arminius any portion of that praise to which he was eminently entitled for his noble resolution, when he soared above his own personal feelings, and declared himself much more friendly to the dictates of truth than to the dogmas of any human system,—though the latter were, in this instance, arrayed in all the seductive attractions to which allusion has been made in the preceding part of this paragraph. Such a triumph over a man's tortured feelings, is a real sacrifice to principle; and in this way Arminius approved himself to be a great and estimable character.—To withdraw himself from the sublapsarian doctrines cost, comparatively, no painful effort, because to him they appeared as acquaintances of only a few months' standing; but to bid adieu to associations long cherished and highly prized, and to admit others that had nothing to recommend them except the severe yet chaste lineaments in which truth had depicted them, was a considerable trial to his mild and grateful spirit. But as his judgment had been strongly convinced and his understanding greatly enlightened, he espoused the good cause to which he was invited, and held fast his integrity. This sacrifice of our feelings is the price which we are sometimes compelled to pay for the correction of previous errors and the reception of clearer truths; but it is a price which, we are assured by our subsequent experience of the purchase, is neither exorbitant nor has been foolishly expended. Other persons beside Arminius have complied with this demand; and, through many years of suffering, apparently arising from the choice which they had then made, have reflected on their determination with no such feeling of regret as that which they at first endured.—To the eye of a philosopher this topic presents one of those anomalies of which man is said to be a compound: Man loves truth, and is earnest and sincere in his enquiries after it; yet

it is seen that the discovery of it is occasionally no subject of exultation to his affections, whatever it may be to his understanding. But to an infinitely Greater than the greatest of finite minds, such a sight is not without interest: God has himself formed the mind of man for the reception of truth; and when that lovely object is offered to the mind at the same time with other attractions,—to prefer truth to the rest, is a sacrifice with which He is well pleased.

The *free-thinking* BAYLE says, in the first volume of his *General Dictionary* under the article ARMINIUS: "It were to be wished, *that he had made a better use of his parts;* for although it is very probable that his intentions were good, we may say, He made innovations without any necessity, and under circumstances in which innovation was a source of disorders, that ended in schism." As some elucidation of his meaning, he adds in the notes:—"St. Paul, that great Apostle, inspired of God, and guided by the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit in all his writings, started to himself the objection which natural reason might raise against the doctrine of ABSOLUTE PREDESTINATION: '*God hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth.*' This is St. Paul's maxim. Now, see the difficulty which he proposes to himself from it: '*But thou wilt then say unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? for who hath resisted his will?*' It is impossible to urge this objection further; nor could the most subtle Molinists in twenty pages have said any thing more to the purpose. For what is the most they could have concluded from it, but that, according to the hypothesis of Calvin, 'it is agreeable to God's will that men should sin?' Now this is exactly the objection, as St. Paul has stated it. But how does he answer it? Does he call to his aid any nice distinctions, or endeavour to qualify it by any forced interpretations? Does he deny the consequence, or strive to evade any part of it? Does he enter into any series of arguments, or take away the equivocation of the words? No: he does nothing of all this. He only has recourse to the sovereign power of God, and to the supreme right which the Creator enjoys to dispose of his creatures as seemeth good to himself: '*Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?*' He acknowledges here an incomprehensibility, which ought to put an end to our disputes, and impose a profound silence on our reason. He breaks out, '*O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and*

knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!' All Christians ought to look upon this as an irreversible decree, as the *dernier resort* from which there can be no appeal touching disputes upon grace. Or rather they ought to learn, from this conduct of St. Paul, never to dispute at all upon Predestination, but at the first to oppose this as a barrier against all the subtleties of human wisdom, whether they arise in our minds while we meditate on this great subject, or are proposed to us by others.—Had Arminius done this every time his reason suggested to him any difficulties against the hypothesis of the Reformers, or whenever he saw himself called upon to answer his antagonists, his conduct then would have been truly sage and apostolical, and he would have made a proper use of his intellectual faculties. If he met with any knotty points which his reason could not untie in the ordinary doctrine, or if he found himself better disposed to cherish a less rigorous opinion, he was at liberty to give his private sentiments their full scope; but then here he ought to have stopped, and to have enjoyed the benefit of them in silence,—I mean, without attacking *the rights of possession*, seeing it was not possible for him to do that without raising terrible tempests and hurricanes in the Church."

Whenever I read such passages as these in the writings of Philosophical Deists, I feel thankful to Providence that almost all that race, including the cognate tribe of Socinians, shelter themselves beneath the doctrine of FATALITY, of which *Calvinian Predestination* is nothing more than a specious modification. Had the mass of these men held any opinions in common with us on the subject of Predestination, ARMINIANISM would have had more dreadful consequences imputed to it, than it is now possible with any semblance of truth to invent. —How plausible is the whole of Bayle's tirade, till it be subjected to a critical examination! Arminius is here accused of not acknowledging, with St. Paul, *the incomprehensibility of the Divine counsels*, and of having no recourse to *the sovereign power of God* for the resolution of his doubts respecting Predestination. Now, the fact is, Arminius most unequivocally subscribed to St. PAUL'S DOCTRINE in both these relative cases: But his great crime, in the eyes of the FATALISTS to whatever school they belong, is, that his understanding could not concoct the subtle and unscriptural refinements of CALVIN, which, Bayle ought to have known, had, only some fifty years before

that period, been invented and imposed on the people of Geneva, who in return felt desirous of imparting them to others. No portion of these Calvinian subtleties was known in the ancient Church, till the days of St. Augustine. Like a judicious Rhetorician, (which was formerly his profession,) this very eloquent father, after defeating the Manichees with one weapon of excellent temper, invented another to meet the attacks of the Pelagians; and he experienced the same complete success with the latter as with the former. But, it is worthy of note, that this question has yet to be settled,—"Is St. Augustine against the MANICHEES, or St. Augustine against the PELAGIANS, the sounder Divine?" All the most learned among the Arminian writers quote him in the former capacity, more frequently than any other Christian Father; while the Calvinists adduce his authority, in the latter capacity, far more sparingly than any one would imagine who is not aware of the fact—that *Augustine against the Pelagians* is not sufficiently *high in doctrine* for modern Predestinarians. Several of Mr. Bayle's remarks would be perfectly in point, were they applied to that prying into the mysteries of God's mind which is practised by the Calvinists, "as if they had been at the Divine council-board" when these "secret things" were enacted. Thus the niceties of God's *secret* and *revealed will*, and of *common* and *special grace*, unnecessary distinctions to which the scriptures of truth give no countenance, are inventions of the Calvinistic school with which all the initiated are quite familiar.—But Bayle's observations on this subject, and others about which he seems equally ill-informed, prove to the world, that he knew—just nothing at all about the labours or the spirit of Arminius: Had he known both of them a little better, he would have uttered a true saying by declaring, that NO MAN EVER DEFERRED TO THE WILL OF GOD WITH MORE SINCERITY AND REVERENCE THAN ARMINIUS. In his works will be found abundant proofs of his teachable disposition and profound humility; and many of the letters which I shall quote in the Appendix, will contain testimonies equally potent in confirmation.

But the man has displayed some of his usual drollery, I suppose, when he states, that "the conduct of Arminius would have been truly sage and APOSTOLICAL, and he would have made a proper use of his intellectual faculties," had he had recourse to the "irreversible decree every time his reason suggested to him any difficulties against the hypothesis of the

Reformers," which, in another part of the same paragraph he calls "the hypothesis of Calvin," and immediately states the substance of it in these words: "It is agreeable to God's will that men should sin!" How far from "Apostolical" must the conduct of that man have been, who entertained strong doubts respecting the truth of this unscriptural position, and yet consented to sin against his own soul and the souls of others, by "enjoying the benefit of his private sentiments in silence," and by neglecting to warn those who embraced such a desecrating opinion of the imminent peril of their situation! How different from this was the "Apostolical" conduct of St. Paul, when, soon after his last journey to Jerusalem, he met Peter at Antioch, and '*withstood him face to face, because he was to be blamed*' (Galat. ii, 12.) for exhibiting a portion of that *temporizing spirit* which Bayle thus industriously inculcates! What would have become of the Christian religion itself, (leaving out any allusion to the Reformation,) if, at its first planting, the primitive disciples had consented to hide their Lord's talent, when they "met with any knotty points in the *ordinary doctrine*" of that period, "which their reason could not untie?" Must they have pursued this empiric's GENERAL SPECIFIC, and "enjoyed the benefit of their sentiments in silence, *without attacking the right of possession*,—seeing it was not possible for them to do that without raising terrible tempests and hurricanes?" If therefore RIGHTS of this unalienable character are conferred by POSSESSION alone, the world would at this day have been divided between the moral misrule of Judaism and Paganism. But those ancient worthies, instead of adopting "the truly sage conduct" of this weak man, were willing to be '*accounted fools for Christ's sake*;' and though they were men of peaceable and quiet habits, the greeting with which they were received in some cities was this, '*Those that have turned the world upside down, are come hither also!*'—But, in reference to Arminius, never was a more unfounded charge than this adduced against him by his virulent enemies; for his sentiments, heavenly and scriptural as they were, could have been propounded by no man with greater modesty, prudence, and caution, than they were by him,—as will be evident in subsequent parts of this Appendix.—Such indeed were his humility and circumspection in all things, that this became the constant burden of complaint with the Calvinists, "We are not able to draw any thing from him, which can, by a stretch of ingenuity, be construed into heresy!" And yet, after having

nfessed their inability to fasten on a single expression from s lips which might promote their sinister designs, they did ot cease for many years to assert, that combustible materials f heterodoxy were pent up within him, and would, in spite of ll his caution, produce an early explosion. But their predictions were falsified in the event; for Arminius was gathered to his fathers, without having a single stain of heresy attached to his character. "The combustible materials" were found to be the unsanctified passions of the Calvinists, which, about ten years afterwards, produced a terrible explosion at the Synod of Dort.

To give some countenance to this advice, Bayle refers his readers to a letter of eulogy on the pious and learned JUNIUS, which Bishop HALL wrote soon after the decease of the Professor. In that letter, he says, "If I might challenge aught in that your acute and learned ARMINIUS, I would thus solicit and conjure him; 'Alas! that so wise a man should not know 'the worth of peace! What mean those subtle novelties? 'If they make thee famous and the Church miserable, who 'shall gain by them? Is singularity so precious, that it should 'cost no less than the safety and quiet of our common mother? 'If it be truth thou affectest,—what alone? Could never any 'eyes till thine be blessed with this object? Where hath that 'sacred verity hid herself thus long from all her careful inqui-'sitors, that she now first shews her head to thee unsought? 'Hath the gospel shined thus long and bright, and left some 'corners unseen? Away with all new truths! Fair and 'plausible they may be, sound they cannot: Some may admire 'thee for them, none shall bless thee. But grant, that some 'of these are no less true than nice points; why do these 'unseasonable crotchets and quavers trouble the harmonious 'plain-songs of our peace? Some quiet error may be better 'than some unruly truth. Who binds us to speak all we 'think? So the Church may be still, would God thou wert 'wise alone!' &c." &c.

This is certainly a very *apposite* quotation. But however great may be our admiration of the good Bishop's piety, we cannot compliment his judgment, charity, or discrimination for such a production as this, which can only be viewed as an apology for Calvinism, whose '*craft was then in danger*.' What would the good Bishop have said, if, when his favourite Calvin first published his *improvements* on the doctrines of St. Augustine, any one had thus addressed him in the Bishop's own words?

"Away with all *new* truths! Fair and plausible they may be, sound they cannot. Some *quiet error* may be better than some *unruly truth*. So the Church may be still, would God thou wert wise alone!" Many parts of this expostulation might have been addressed with much truth to Calvin; for, if his biographers give us correct relations, he did not always bring with him "fair peace wherever he arriv'd." The *quiet error* of Popery would have remained dominant in some places, had it not been conquered by the spirited exertions of this Reformer. The reader will experience no difficulty in soon determining for himself, by means of facts which will be laid before him, whether more of the spirit of the bold Luther or of the retiring Melancthon was apparent in the mental composition of Arminius.—In the mean time, though Dr. Hall's letter does not breathe that impartiality and moderation which ought to have been among the prime requisites of one who had to sit as a judge, at the Synod of Dort,* on the opinions which he has here so prematurely condemned, we must do him the justice to state, that his manifest predilections had not altogether beclouded his judgment. For, in another clause of the same letter, a part of the truth discovers itself, when the good Bishop changes his address and thus speaks of Gomarus: "Neither Gomarus, nor your other grave fraternity of reverend

* Bishop HALL, then *Dean of Worcester*, was one of the Divines deputed by King James I. to attend the Synod of Dort as representatives of the Church of England. He had the honour of preaching the first sermon before that reverend assembly. It was delivered in Latin, as were all the subsequent discourses and discussions. The text was a remarkable one: '*Be not righteous over much, neither make thyself over wise.*' (Eccles. vii, 16.) In the course of his sermon, says the memorable JOHN HALES of Eton, who heard it, "He taxed the Divines for presuming too far in prying into the judgments of God, and so came to reprove the curious disputes which our age hath made concerning Predestination: That this dispute, for its endlessness, was like the mathematical line, *divisibilis in semper divisibilia;* that it was in Divinity, as *the Rule of Cos* in Arithmetic. For the ending of these disputes his advice unto the Synod was, that both parts contending should well consider of St. Paul's discourse in *the ninth to the Romans;* and, for their final determination, both should exhibit unto the Synod a plain, perspicuous, and familiar paraphrase on that chapter. For if the meaning of that discourse were once perfectly opened, the question were at an end. From hence he came to exhort them to stand to the former determinations, which had hitherto most generally passed in Reformed Churches, in these points; and told them, that it was an especial part of his majesty's Commission to exhort them to keep unaltered the former Confessions.—How fit it was to open so much of their commission, and thus to express themselves for a party against the Remonstrants, your honour can best judge."

On the 17th of January 1619, Bishop Hall sent in his farewell address, to the Synod, in writing; in which he lamented "his indisposition which had forced him away unseasonably from the Synod. There was no place upon earth which

Divines have been silent in so main a cause. I fear rather too much noise in any of these tumults: There may too many contend, not intreat.....WISDOM and CHARITY could teach us to avoid the prejudice of these differences. If we had but these two virtues, quarrels should not hurt us, nor the Church by us. But (alas!) self-love is too strong for both these. This alone opens the flood-gates of dissension, and drowns the sweet but lowly valley of the Church. Men esteem of opinions, because their own; and will have truth *serve* not *govern*. What they have undertaken must be true; *victory* is sought for, not *satisfaction*; victory of the *author*, not of the *cause*. He is a rare man that knows to *yield* as well as to *argue*."—These reflections are exceedingly judicious, especially in reference to Gomarus and his party. It is painful at all times to animadvert upon any of the expressions of such a pious and highly estimable character as Bishop Hall: To avoid such an ungracious employment, I have chosen to devote an additional page to Master Bayle, knowing that my remarks on such a partial writer will elicit some tokens of approbation even from the pious Calvinists. Since these persons in modern times openly avow their love of peace and Christian concord, I would not have them to indulge the imagination, that

Mutato nomine de te fabula narratur.

Yet it is a persuasion of which I cannot divest myself, and which I find is not alien to the minds of authors in general, that a perusal of the whole of this APPENDIX would still farther improve their spirit,—gracious although it is, benevolent and kind.

An objection is then raised by Bayle in the following form: "But, it may be said, Would it not be acting the part of a prevaricator, and beneath the dignity of a minister, to be guilty of any neglect in informing his hearers, and setting them to rights when they were under any error in point of doctrine?" —To this he replies: "Two capital reasons dispensed with his doing this.

so much resembled heaven, as that city, and in which he would have preferred to take up his abode." He had, some time before, removed to the Hague for the benefit of the air; but his distemper still increasing, the King gave him leave to return to England. "But," says the elder Brandt, "some are of opinion, that, under the pretence of indisposition, he prudently and seasonably withdrew himself from the Synod, that he might not have any hand in many things which afterwards happened, and which he expected would come to pass. He signified in particular to the English Ambassador, Sir Dudley Carlton, by Balcanqual the Scottish Divine, about the time of his departure, that he *could by no means* agree with Deodatus of Geneva!"

"THE ONE is, Because he did not believe that the hypothesis of which he disapproved was prejudicial to salvation.—There is no error, however trifling and inconsiderable, which is not better rectified than retained: But when circumstances of time and place do not suffer us to propose novelties (though ever so true,) without at the same time introducing a thousand disorders into Universities, private families, and into all the State, it is much better to let matters remain as they are than to set about a reformation of them, since the remedy would be worse than the disease. I except all those cases in which the salvation of souls is concerned, and in which we are obliged to deliver them from the jaws of Hell: In such cases charity does not permit us to be inactive, how great soever the disturbances may be which happen in the conclusion; but we must refer the issues to the care and direction of Providence. Arminius had no motive of this kind which prompted him to oppose the common and received doctrine; nor was it his opinion, that to follow the hypothesis of Calvin was to risk one's salvation.

"THE OTHER is, Because his new method could be of no service in clearing up the principal difficulties, which occurred on the subject of Predestination.—He substituted, in the room of one hypothesis, which abounded with great difficulties, another, which at the bottom was attended with no less. For the Arminians have no sooner answered certain objections, which, as they pretend, cannot be refuted by the system of Calvin, than they find themselves exposed to others, out of which they cannot extricate themselves, except by ingenuously confessing the weakness of the understanding, or by paying their humble submission to the infinite incomprehensibility of God." —On the latter part of this reply it is scarcely necessary to animadvert: For the Arminians account it no small recommendation of their mode of interpreting the revealed will of God, that, after they have defended this scriptural position, '*The Lord is good to* ALL, *and his tender mercies are over* ALL HIS WORKS,' and after they have demonstrated its harmony with other divine declarations, and especially with the account which the Almighty has been pleased to give of his perfections,—they can then, without solicitude, leave all those counsels of the Divine Mind which have not been direct subjects of revelation, and can most sincerely unite with the Apostle in this appropriate exclamation, '*How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!*' They do not imitate the Calvinists in obtruding themselves as forbidden and ungracious guests

into the *arcana* of heaven, or in rashly stating all the stipulations of a supposed covenant entered into, between God the Father and God the Son, long before the worlds were made: The Arminians do not presume to be wise above what is written, in this and in other instances, by a vain attempt to fathom '*the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God.*' —From the reasoning employed throughout the whole of this paragraph, it is evident, that Bayle has deduced his conclusions from wrong premises. On these points he has been misled by his authorities; and has erroneously attributed to Arminianism, as a system, the difficulties that occur in some parts of the scriptures themselves, and particularly in a few chapters of St. Paul's writings. St. Peter, when speaking of the latter, informs us, that in them '*are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.*'

The former part of Bayle's reply, is, in brief: "Arminius was not of opinion, that to follow the hypothesis of Calvin was to risk one's salvation." Such a circumstance, instead of detracting from the great merits of this excellent man, or preventing him from propounding his sentiments in a free community, ought, on the contrary, to serve the more highly to exalt his character. His gentle and tolerant spirit knew, and he was not afraid to avow, that the errors into which Calvin and his friends had fallen were only those of the judgment; and his evangelical charity, '*which hoped all things,*' would not allow him even to insinuate, that the Calvinistic doctrines necessarily tended to make shipwreck of faith, or to produce loss of salvation, in all those by whom they were embraced. His conduct in this respect was eminently generous, manly, and Christian. Contrast it with that of a gloomy zealot, the passionate Gomarus: In the Conference between him and Arminius, holden in 1608, in the presence of the Great Council of the States of Holland, after each of them had explained his sentiments, the Advocate of Holland told them, in the name of the States, "that he thanked God because there was no considerable difference between them, at least not in relation to any of the capital points of the Christian Faith;" and he required both of them, afterwards to observe silence about the transactions of that Conference. Gomarus then requested to have permission to speak, and declared, "that the sentiments of his colleague, in reference to the points in dispute between them, were of such a description as would make him unwilling

to appear before God his Judge, if he himself entertained any that resembled them!"—This natural stroke of Calvinian bitterness was a source of the greater surprise to the whole assembly, because every man in it who was possessed of common understanding had perceived, from the explanations into which the two Professors had then entered, that the difference between them did not affect the fundamental doctrines of religion. The conduct of Gomarus on that occasion elicited the following remark from one of his shrewd cotemporaries: "I should much sooner choose to appear before the judgment of God with the FAITH of Arminius, than with the CHARITY of Gomarus!" Bayle himself, in mentioning this circumstance, offers for it the subjoined charitable apology, "We ought to impute to *a personal animosity* the cruel opinion of this adversary of Arminius." Some persons, however, will be inclined to impute it to the intolerant and exclusive spirit which Calvinism, *when unadulterated*, displays in all situations in which it obtains the supremacy.

A similar instance of the ungovernable maliciousness of Gomarus is thus stated: When about to proceed to the Synod of Dort, at the close of the year 1618, he waited at Groningen for the Divines who had been deputed from Bremen, that he might travel in their company to Dort. He expected that Dr. Matthias Martinius, the eldest of those Divines, would be of the same sentiments with himself on doctrinal points, that is, a bigotted Supralapsarian; and he hoped to be able, by offering inducements to him on the journey, to have his support in carrying those high doctrines, and imparting stability to them, by obtaining for them the great ecclesiastical sanction of the approaching Synod. But he found himself mistaken in the man. When he had accompanied them as far as Amsterdam, he there entered into discourse with them about the Remonstrants and the deceased Arminius; but when he heard Lewis Crocius, the learned Colleague of Martinius, say, with the usual courtesy in the course of conversation, "Arminius of pious memory!" he fell into a great passion, spat upon the ground, and cried out, "What! he of pious memory? Nay, his memory is detestable!" In a great rage he instantly left the inn, and accomplished the remainder of the journey by himself.

If Arminius had on any occasion discovered such an unamiable disposition as this, or had his manners been equally rude and ungracious, Bayle might have had some semblance of

reason for talking about "introducing a thousand disorders into Universities, private families," &c. But the truth is, it was the insolent and boisterous behaviour of such pragmatical and hot-headed Calvinists as Gomarus and his party that was the only proper cause of the disorders which afterwards arose. And the magnitude of those disorders has been greatly exaggerated: There was then an attempt to palm the dogmas of restricted grace and inevitable salvation on the consciences of a whole people, contrary, as it will be seen, to the ancient doctrines and practice of the Belgian Churches: One individual was raised up by Providence to counteract the poison of such opinions, and to exhibit the Divine Philanthrophy in all its native loveliness. But he did this in the spirit and after the manner of his Great Master, from whom, as Head of the Church Universal, he had received his commission. '*He did not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street:*' He left that course to be adopted by his clamorous assailants, who never forgave the noble stand which he made against their attempts; and who were highly indignant at the immense number and the great respectability of those who, by his engaging conduct and the soundness of his arguments, became converts to the scriptural doctrines of General Redemption.—Let the benevolent sentiments, and courteous yet dignified behaviour of Arminius, be no longer thus sophistically warped to his disadvantage, or become the themes of malicious invective! If they be viewed without prejudice, they will excite general admiration, and appear, in their true colours, as strong traits of a great and liberal mind, that disdained to stoop to mean and petty artifices for the purpose of magnifying into undue importance its own opinions, or of traducing those of its adversaries.

These observations on Bayle will be closed by an extract somewhat humorous, which, after our way has thus been circumstantially cleared, will bring us to the point at which this necessary digression had its commencement. Having quoted the passage in the preceding Oration, (page 40,) in which Arminius adopts the dolorous exclamation of the prophet Jeremiah, and having given a bad translation of that passage, in which, among other errors, he makes it appear as if it had been spoken in a sort of delirium,—Bayle proceeds to reason upon it in the following manner as an expression of disappointed ambition, which was obviously contrary to the sense of the extract, and to the intention of Bertius:—"One cannot reflect upon this,

without lamenting the vanity of human affairs. We are apt to look upon stupidity as a great misfortune; and those fathers who are clear-sighted enough to discern the dulness of their sons, make it a matter of great affliction to themselves. They wish to see them possess a great genius and deep learning; and if they find these, their joy is inexpressible. But (alas!) this too often proceeds from not knowing what they do, or what are the objects of their wishes. To have been a dunce, would have been a hundred times better for Arminius, than to have been a man of such parts and learning. For, the glory of having a Sect to take its rise and name from him, which sect has made no mean figure in the world and produced some men of great genius, is but a very chimerical happiness when compared with the more substantial evils,—the sorrows, vexations, and bitter sufferings which he underwent in his life-time, and which shortened his days: These he would never have known, had he been only a Divine of the common stamp, a block-head, and in short of that class of men to whom they apply [in France] that prediction, *They will never make* HERESIARCHS!"

Suffering this *undesigned* compliment to the talents of Arminius to pass without comment,—and marking with the strongest disapprobation the *designed* and untrue reflection, at the close, on the general deficiency of genius and capacity in the clergy as a body, (a species of remark in which writers of this class are fond of indulging,)—we may observe, that he who wishes in this manner to represent Arminius as a HERESIARCH, and to intimate that he panted after "the glory of having a Sect to take its rise and name from him," has a very imperfect acquaintance with this great Divine and the views which he entertained. There was nothing Sectarian in his spirit: To succeed in an emprise of such hazard, required a person of greater boldness. His sentiments on the integrity of the Church, and on the patient endurance even of its pious and abused members, were most correct and elevated. In forsaking what his opponents called "the old paths," for those which he found to be of still higher antiquity, Arminius had no desire to be the founder of a sect: Such a petty and unchristian ambition formed no part of his views. His public declaration, as well as his confidential letters, contradict this assumption; and it was never urged as a serious charge against him by the most prejudiced of his enemies. To enjoy the liberty of publishing his sentiments in quietness, and of meekly teaching what was in his conception the real doctrine

of the scriptures, formed the boundaries of his ambition,—if a heavenly desire merit such an epithet.† The sin of schism he never incurred, but studiously avoided every approach to it, as one of the greatest injuries that could be inflicted on the Protestant religion in that agitated state of European affairs. The extremities to which he was willing to be reduced, and the ills which he would have voluntarily endured, before he thought it lawful in any one to resort to such a measure, may be seen in his very able *Oration on composing religious differences.* From that document and the amiable disposition of Arminius, it was an opinion which prevailed among many of the most judicious and moderate Dutch Divines, that, had he been spared a few years longer to his country, the Remonstrants would not have been ejected‡ from the communion of the Reformed, and the cruelties inflicted on the unoffending followers of Arminius would have been prevented. Such an opinion, however, appears to have scarcely any foundation on which to rest, except it be the following circumstance:—The audacity of Gomarus and his party derived a fresh *impetus* from the death of Arminius,—in himself a host, whose well-tried mental prowess not a man among them durst encounter. Since the leader was removed, his enemies thought they might with impunity oppress his scattered and appalled friends, and crush his budding sentiments before they had attained to maturity. Though all the Protestants in the Low Countries, but especially the Reformed, had recently escaped from the cruel bondage of Popish tyranny, yet, as far as Divine Providence permitted, they acted, with variations of the greatest severity, the very tragedy of which the Spaniards, their common oppressors, had been guilty. But

† Two years after the death of Arminius, VORSTIUS, who held some doctrines in common with the Remonstrants and in others differed widely from them, made the following remarks in a letter to the celebrated PARÆUS: "Concerning what you are pleased to call the ARMINIAN SCHISM, you either form a wrong judgment through perverse feelings, or you seem to have received from others information that was not sufficiently true and exact. For that man does not cause a schism who modestly exposes those noxious errors which rage in the Church of Christ Jesus; and who, according to the duty of his office, endeavours to rectify them. This has been an object of most strenuous exertions on the part of Arminius; and we, by God's assistance, after his example will persevere in the same course. Those persons are rather to be blamed who proudly reject all that give them good advice, and who cannot endure to hear of any correction, however just and lenient it may be."

‡ Grotius says, in his *Vote for the Peace of the Church*, "The pious and learned men, who were condemned in the Synod of Dort and afterwards expelled from their native land, had previously delivered to their rulers a statement of their opinion on Predestination, which is the same as Melancthon's, and has had many defenders in those parts. The first men who effected the separation, were not the Remonstrants, but their adversaries."

God raised up among the Remonstrants able men, who, young and inexperienced as they generally were, conducted themselves with such exemplary moderation, and with a firmness and prudence so well-attempered, as to remove from their enemies every just cause of offensive or harsh measures. Yet the rage of Calvinism was not to be appeased, except by ejecting *ex aris et focis* its innocent victims. Indeed, Calvinism, in its constitution, is as exclusive as Popery; and, when possessed of power, the professors of both these intolerant systems have, (unhappily for the peace of society!) demonstrated to the world the very small portion which they have imbibed of that sublime yet humble charity which '*suffereth long and is kind, which envieth not and vaunteth not itself, which doth not behave itself unseemly, is not easily provoked and thinketh no evil.*'

The following very just observations on this subject, were delivered in a speech by C. P. Hooft, in the year 1598, when he was for the fifth time Burgomaster of Amsterdam, before the rest of the magistrates, when they had met together to "determine the punishment to which they should adjudge a certain heretic:" "Perhaps it may be objected, 'The Spaniards persecuted *without reason*, but we *with reason*.' But the Papists and the Lutherans make the same remark, in whatever place they obtain the supremacy. Every one thinks REASON to be on his side, and none will long wait for a pretence to proceed to the exercise of similar cruelty. If we adopt that practice, the ruin of our country will be the necessary consequence. We ought therefore to oppose the very beginning of that mischief: Instead of external force, spiritual and edifying means should be employed, the fruits of the Spirit,—knowledge, moderation and gentleness. In this way the true church is built. If now we should treat with severity this person for understanding the scriptures in too *literal* a sense, and the Enthusiasts for interpreting them in too *mystical* a manner, then shall we cause the persecution to rage in the same moment at the two extremes, and shall probably prolong it till it arrives at the middle, especially if we hearken to the counsels of some ministers. But it would be much better, and a plan of greater safety for the State, if these their exasperations were prohibited by authority, and if they were commanded to contain themselves within the limits of their calling. —Experience teaches us, that many of these ministers can scarcely contain themselves if we make them too many concessions, and that they not only endeavour to revive the

times of persecution against other sects, but also to excite disturbances among their own people and tumults against the government. Thus some of them, when Leicester was at the helm of our affairs, pointed in their sermons, as if with their fingers, at the best of our magistrates, and brought their lives into the utmost danger by inflaming the people against them; not because those magistrates had changed their religion, but only because they did not govern according to the fancy of the Clergy. What occurred in Scotland about a year ago will be remembered by some of the gentlemen now present, when the ministers induced the people to take up arms against the King, and then ascribed their doings to the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.—I do not mention these things by way of reproach; but only to shew, that it would not be a work of difficulty to find matter of complaint against some of the clergy themselves, if to foment divisions were a good service rendered to our country: I mention them likewise, for the purpose of convincing you how vain a thing it is to place entire dependence on mere men. I recollect, about sixteen years ago, the judges of this city, for some reason or other, desired to have the advice of the ministers about certain points of great nicety and importance: The ministers accordingly delivered their opinions in writing, in which they gave a tolerably broad hint, that the person concerned ought to die. But the judges differed so much in their sentiments from the pastors, that they suffered the man to escape,—and this conduct of the judges was never mentioned as a scandal or offence.—If, for our satisfaction, we were to compare the opinions and doctrines of the Clergy with the holy scriptures, what text should we find in the New Testament to justify persecution for the sake of religion? We must not infer it from remote consequences and forced conclusions: To hazard body, life, and salvation, upon the subtle niceties of the learned,—seems to me a matter far too dangerous. Nor ought these teachers to employ their learning in raising persecutions against those who mistake through ignorance: It is their duty rather to consider into what gross errors even some of the principal and most ancient Fathers of the Church have fallen. *In particular it is very strange, that those who so strenuously maintain the* DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION *should thus insist upon persecution or the forcing of conscience;* for if their predestination be founded on correct principles, *no man can avoid the error to which he is ordained.*—As for the quotations which are made

from the Old Testament, some of the learned have justified persecution, and others disproved it, from the very same texts. It may be sufficient for our purpose here to state, that the Pharisees, Sadducees, and other sects among the Jews, did not persecute each other on account of any difference of belief; and that BAD MEN HAVE ALWAYS PERSECUTED THE GOOD. I can never consent, that this poor creature shall be hurried to the Hague, and shut up in prison, to the utter ruin of his five small children, and of his wife who is now far advanced in pregnancy. I remember how the late Burgomaster Dr. Martin Koster in a very serious and moving manner, acquainted the Senate, in a speech which he delivered before them eleven years ago, that the King of Denmark and other Potentates had, according to the best information, entered into a resolution to offer their mediation for terminating the war between Spain and these provinces,—but with this preliminary condition, 'that as they and other princes compelled their subjects to 'embrace such a religion as they thought proper, we likewise, 'the inhabitants of this country, should receive such a form of 'religion as the King of Spain might think fit to impose upon 'us.' Against which unreasonable condition, that gentleman urged the following position with many just arguments, that NEITHER PRINCES NOR MAGISTRATES HAVE ANY AUTHORITY OVER THE CONSCIENCES OF THEIR SUBJECTS IN MATTERS OF RELIGION; and he exhorted them never to depart on any account from that correct sentiment." The spirit of the Calvinistic Clergy when in power, may be perceived from this extract; and the sequel of this affair will not be uninteresting to the pious reader: The mild measures recommended by the Heer Hooght, were pursued towards the person then under accusation, who, instead of being burnt at the stake, was banished from the city. This lenient course produced a salutary effect on the mind of the poor heretic, who, in a short time, abjured the most noxious of his errors, and, after an absence of a few months, obtained permission from the magistrates to return to Amsterdam, where he resided as a reclaimed character and lived in union with the Church of Christ in that city.

As an appropriate close to this long article, we shall present our readers with the following extract from JACKSON's *Life of John Goodwin*, an able work now in the press, which contains a most interesting history of the agitated period in which that redoubtable English Arminian lived.

After noticing the change which Goodwin experienced, with the steps which led to it, and the well-known change in the opinions of Arminius, Dr. C. Potter, Mr. John Hales, Archbishop Usher, and Dr. D. Whitby,—Mr. JACKSON produces the following list of eminent Divines who were induced to adopt milder sentiments about Predestination than those in which they had been educated:

The celebrated MELANCTHON, Luther's friend and coadjutor, was at first Luther's scholar, and drew from him his earliest religious opinions. But being a learned and dispassionate man, pursuing truth, he saw his errors and abandoned them; and espoused sentiments concerning the respectiveness of God's decrees, widely different from those he had formerly held.—PIERCE'S *Divine Philanthropy Defended*, p. 14, Edit. 1657.

LUTHER also went on long as he at first set out, with so little disguise, that whereas all parties had always pretended that they asserted the freedom of the will; he plainly spoke out, and said the will was not free, but enslaved. Yet, before he died, he is reported to have changed his mind: for though he never owned that, yet Melancthon, who had been of the same opinion, did freely retract it; for which he was never blamed by Luther.—BURNET *on the Seventeenth Article*.

DANIEL TILENUS, Professor of Divinity at Sedan, a man not less acute in judgment, than versed in all kinds of learning, distinguished himself by decided hostility to the sentiments of Arminius. Convinced at length by the arguments of his opponents, he changed sides, and proved the genuineness of his conversion by submitting to share with the Remonstrants in those severe persecutions which were inflicted upon them by the Dutch Calvinists.—BRANDT'S *History of the Reformation*, Vol. II. p. 137, Edit. 1721.

Of Dr. THOMAS JACKSON, President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, Prynne has given the following account: "Dr. Jackson is a man of great abilities, and of a plausible, affable, courteous deportment.—Of late he hath been transported beyond himself, with metaphysical contemplations.—The University of Oxford grieves for his defection" [from the doctrine of absolute predestination.]—*Anti-Arminianism*, p. 270, Edit. 1630.

BISHOP ANDREWS is generally allowed to have been one of the most learned and pious men of the age in which he lived. Concerning him, Dr. Pierce observes, "That that inestimable Bishop, in his most mature and ripest years, was

very severe to those doctrines which are commonly called Calvinistical, is a thing so known, that I cannot think it will be denied."—*Divine Purity Defended*, p. 125, Edit. 1657

Dr. THOMAS PIERCE, one of the ablest opponents of Calvinism that system has ever had, states concerning himself: "I was, in my childhood, of the opinions [concerning Election, Reprobation, &c.] Mr. Barlee doth now contend for. But, through the infinite mercy of God, I have obtained conversion: and being converted from the practice, as well as from the opinion, which I was of, I will, to my poor utmost, endeavour to confirm or convert my brethren."—*Divine Philanthropy Defended*, p. 15.

Mr. SAMUEL HOARD, author of a very able work entitled, "God's Love to Mankind Manifested,"— a work which produced a considerable effect among the national Clergy, in the early part of the seventeenth century,—says, "I have sent you here my reasons which have moved me to change my opinion in some controversies, of late debated between the Remonstrants and their opponents."—See the tract itself, p. 1, Edit. 1633. WHISTON's *Memoirs*, Vol. I. p. 10, Edit. 1749.

Dr. THOMAS GOAD was a person every way eminent, having the repute of a great and general scholar, exact critic and historian, a poet, orator, schoolman, and divine. He was a member of the Synod of Dort, and acquitted himself therewith great applause, in opposition to the opinions of the Remonstrants. He at length saw cause to alter his judgment; and, in defence of those principles he had formerly opposed, wrote a very able work entitled, "A Disputation concerning the Necessity and Contingency of Events."—ECHARD's *History of England*, Vol. II. p. 122, Edit. 1718. *Collection of Tracts on Predestination*, Preface.

Dr. ROBERT SANDERSON, Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, and afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, has given an interesting account of the progress of his mind, from the sublapsarian scheme, to the mild sentiments of Melancthon and Arminius.—HAMMOND's *Pacific Discourse concerning God's Grace and Decrees*, p. 8, Edit. 1660.

Mr. RICHARD BAXTER, at the commencement of his Theological career, was eager in his attachment to the peculiar doctrines of Calvin. But when his judgment was more matured, though he still maintained the absolute Election of some men to Life Eternal, he contended strenuously for General Redemption, and for Universal Grace.—BAXTER's *Catholic Theologie*, Preface.

Bishop Davenant appears to have undergone a change of sentiment similar to that of Baxter. For Archbishop Usher "freely declared himself for the doctrine of General Redemption, and owned that he was the person who brought both Bishop Davenant and Dr. Preston to acknowledge it."—Calamy's *Abridgment of Baxter's Life and Times* p, 405, Edit. 1713.

Calvin himself, according to Dr. Watts, is entitled to a place among those divines whose attachment to the doctrines of limited mercy and partial redemption abated as they advanced in years. After noticing the difference between his sentiments as expressed in his Institutions and in his Commentaries, the Doctor says, "It may be proper to observe, that the most rigid and narrow limitations of grace to men, are to be found chiefly in his Institutions, which were written in his youth. But his Comments on Scripture were the labour of his riper years, and maturer judgment."—Works, Vol. III. p. 472. Edit. 1800.

G.——Page 31.

The truly evangelical system of religious belief which is known in modern days under the name of Arminianism, has acquired that appellation, not because Arminius was the sole author of it, but, (as I have shewn in the Preface to this work,) because he collected those scattered and often incidental observations of the Christian Fathers, and of the early Protestant Divines, which have a collateral relation to the doctrines of General Redemption, and because he condensed and applied them in such a manner as to make them combine in one grand and harmonious scheme, in which all the attributes and perfections of the Deity are secured to him in a clearer and more obvious manner than by Calvinism, and in which man is still left in possession of his free-will, which alone places him in the condition of an accountable being. The high rank which it is entitled to hold among the great pacificatory plans of the Reformers and more recent Divines, I have demonstrated in another place; and the judicious reader, after a careful perusal of the works of Arminius, will consider the pre-eminence there assigned it, to be, in strict justice, only that which its unobtrusive excellences demand. It is not to be denied, that upon this scriptural foundation some individuals do not hesitate to declare, that they have reared a grand edifice of their own; but this, on examination, proves to be only a flimsy structure of

'*wood, hay, stubble*,'—doctrines which lose all that *decidedly gracious aspect* which, in conformity with the scriptures, Arminius had communicated to them. These men are therefore much mistaken in the alliance which they have thus preposterously claimed: for it is not the evangelical system of Arminius upon which they have ventured to build, but it is the legal and pharisaic foundation of Pelagius, which, though extremely slight, is sufficiently stable to sustain the lumber of their inventions; and the fabric of their erection has accordingly obtained the very appropriate appellation of "Semi-Pelagianism."—The reflection, however, is a pleasant one, that the great majority of our English Divines, and especially of our national clergy, have, as it became the most learned and enlightened body of Theologians in the world, built upon the noble foundation of Arminianism a goodly fabric of '*gold, silver, and precious stones*,'—doctrines which hold "the golden mean" between the extremes of CALVINISM and PELAGIANISM, and between the two intermediate and milder contradictions of SEMI-PELAGIANISM and BAXTERIANISM.—Those ministers of '*the truth as it is in Jesus*' who allow to scriptural PRIVILEGES and to scriptural DUTIES their respective provinces, are the only men who can conscientiously delight to propagate Arminian doctrines in their native purity, as they came from the hands of the most eminent Professor that ever adorned the chair of Divinity in the University of Leyden.

The reader will derive much information, about the state of these doctrines previous to the days of Arminius, from the following abridgment of Dr. Heylin's very accurate remarks in his HISTORIA QUINQUARTICULARIS, or *A Declaration of the Judgment of the Western Churches, and more particularly of the Church of England in the controverted Points reproached in these last times by the name of* ARMINIANISM.

He observes, in his preface, that if "Tertullian's rule be good, that those opinions have most truth which have most authentic Antiquity, (*id verum est, quod primum*, as his own words are,) the truth must certainly run most clearly in that part of the controversy which has least in it of the Zuinglian or Calvinian doctrines." About the year 180, Florinus, and some others at home, had expressly affirmed, that God was the Author of sin; which assertion was immediately attacked by St. Irenæus, who published a discourse intitled,* "GOD, not the Author of Sin." This doctrine was afterwards proposed in

* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib.v, cap. 20.

another form by the Manichees, and always considered by the Ancients as the most dangerous heresy. Nay St. Augustine himself, notwithstanding all his zeal against Pelagius, asks this question: † "Which of us affirms that free-will is perished utterly from mankind by the fall of the first man?" He replies to this: "Freedom indeed is destroyed by sin: but it is that freedom only, which we had in paradise, of having perfect righteousness with immortality." For otherwise, as Dr. Heylin observes, ‡ it appears to be his opinion, that man was not merely passive under all the influences of grace, according to that celebrated expression of his, "He, who first made thee without thy help, will not save thee at last without thy concurrence." But if any harsher expressions have escaped his pen, as it often happens in the heat of dispute, they are to be qualified by this last rule, and another of his, in which it is affirmed, that God could not with justice judge and condemn the world, if the sins of all men did not proceed from their own free will, but from some over-ruling Providence which constrained them. §

In the Council of Trent there was a contest between the Dominicans and Franciscans upon the subject of the decrees. The most considerable Divines there inclined to the opinion of the great school Divines, St. Thomas Aquinas, Scotus, and others who affirmed that God before the creation, out of the mass of mankind, did from mere mercy elect some for glory, for whom he hath effectually prepared the means to obtain it; that their number is certain and determined, and none can be added to them. And that others, who are not predestinated to salvation, cannot complain, since God hath afforded them sufficient assistance for this purpose, although none but the elect can be saved. This doctrine they endeavoured to prove from the Epistles of St. Paul and the works of St. Augustine. But the Franciscans represented it as injurious to the attributes of the Deity, since he would act partially, if without any cause he should elect one, and reject another,—and unjustly, if he should damn men for his own will, and not for their faults, and create so great a multitude of men to condemn them. Catarinus, who was in favour of a medium between the two opinions, observed, that the doctrine of St. Augustine was not heard of before his time; and he himself has confessed, that it cannot be found in the works of any preceding writer. He added,

† Lib. i, contra Epist. Pelag. cap. 2.

‡ Hist. Quinq. cap. i. p. 9. § Idem, cap. i. p. 9.

that the warmth with which he opposed Pelagius, had transported him too far. *

It appears upon a general view, that the Franciscans among the Papists, and the followers of Melancthon and of Arminius among the Protestants, were on one side with regard to the divine decrees; and the Dominicans, the rigid Lutherans, who followed Flaccius Illyricus, and the Sublapsarian Calvinists on the other; while Catarinus took the middle way, in which he was afterwards followed by Dr. Overal, Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and successively Bishop of Litchfield and Norwich. † Calvin found out a way by himself, which neither the Dominicans, nor any other of "the followers of St. Augustine's rigours," as Dr. Heylin expresses it, ‡ had previously found out, by making God to have imposed upon Adam an unavoidable necessity of falling into sin and misery, in order that he might shew his mercy in electing some few of his posterity, and his justice in the absolute rejection of all the rest. This scheme appeared very shocking to many of the Papists, and so offensive to the Lutherans in general, that they have professed a greater readiness to return to Popery, than to give their assent to it.‖ But by the interest of Calvin it was almost universally received in all churches of his platform, though strongly opposed by Sebastian Castalio in Geneva itself, who met with severe treatment from Calvin and Beza on that account. The terror of this example, and the great reputation which Calvin had gained by his preaching and writing, not only confirmed his power at home, but also made his doctrines the more easily admitted abroad. His system, therefore, was zealously adhered to in all those churches which either had received the discipline of Geneva, or whose divines endeavoured to advance it. By this means, as Mr. Hooker observes § in the preface to his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, "that of what account the *Master of the Sentences* was in the Church of Rome, the same and more amongst the preachers of the Reformed Churches Calvin had purchased, so that the perfectest Divines were judged they who were skilfullest in Calvin's writings. His books almost the very Canon, by which to judge of doctrine and discipline. The French Churches, both under others abroad or at home in their own country, all cast according to that mould, which Calvin had made. The Church of Scotland in erecting the fabrick of their Reforma-

* Idem, cap. ii. † Idem, cap. iv, p. 34, 35. ‡ Idem, cap. iv, p. 35.
§ Page 9. ‖ Idem, cap. iv, p. 36.

tion took the self-same pattern." This was received not long after in the Palatine Churches and those of the Netherlands; in all which as his doctrine made way to bring in the discipline, so it was no difficult matter for the discipline to support the doctrine and oppress all those who durst oppose it.*

We may observe, however, that Beza and his followers proceeded to a much greater excess of rigour in fixing the decree of Predestination before the fall, which Calvin had himself placed in *massâ corruptâ*, the corrupted mass of mankind; and which was maintained by the more moderate Calvinists.—But as they agreed with the rest with regard to personal election and reprobation, in restraining the benefit of our Saviour's sufferings to the elect, and asserting the irresistible efficacy of grace, with the impossibility of falling from it, there was hardly any notice taken of their deviation, though they differed in the foundation; and they passed under the general name of Calvinists. Those Divines of the Low Countries, who were of the old Lutheran stock, were more inclined to the sentiments of Melancthon concerning Predestination, than to those of Calvin; yet knowing the prodigious esteem in which the latter was held amongst them, or being unwilling to engage in any disputes, they suffered his opinions to prevail without opposition.

In this manner affairs stood till the year 1592, when Mr. Wm. Perkins, an eminent divine of Cambridge, published his Book, called *Armilla Aurea, &c.*, containing the doctrine of Predestination as it is represented by Beza, but digested into a more distinct and methodical form. This induced our Arminius to oppose the current of those opinions, which appeared to him extremely shocking and injurious to all our natural notions of the Deity. †

But in order to shew that the doctrine of the Remonstrants was more ancient than Calvinism in the Churches of the Low Countries, we may observe, that those Provinces embraced the Reformation at first, according to the Lutheran model. About the year 1530, the Reformed religion was admitted into East-Friesland, under Enno the first, upon the preaching of Hardinbergius, a learned man, and one of the principal reformers of the Church of Embden, a town of the greatest eminence in that Earldom. From him Clemens Martini received those principles, which he afterwards propagated in the Low Countries, where the same doctrine concerning Predestination had been publicly maintained in a Book intitled *Hodegus Laicorum* or

* Heylin, Hist. Quinq. cap. iv p. 37., † Idem, cap. iv, pag. 38

The Layman's Guide, published by Anastasius Veluanus in 1554, and highly commended by Henry Antonides, Divinity-Professor in the University of Franeker. But on the other hand, the French Ministers having settled themselves in those parts which either used the French language, or anciently belonged to the Crown of France, and exerting themselves with more vigour than the other party, prevailed so far with William of Nassau, Prince of Orange, that a confession of their own drawing up was presented to the Lady Regent, ratified, as Dr. Heylin says, * in a forcible and tumultuous manner, and afterwards by degrees obtruded upon all the Churches in the Low Countries. However, the Ministers successively in the whole Province of Utrecht adhered to their former doctrines, and were not considered upon that account as less Reformed; nor were there wanting some persons of great distinction among them, who opposed the doctrine of Predestination contained in that confession, which was first published in the year 1567.—Johannes Isbrandi, one of the Preachers of Rotterdam, openly professed himself an Anti-Calvinist, as well as Gellius Snecanus in West-Friesland, who esteemed those of Calvin's judgment as innovators in the doctrine which had been first received among them. We also find the same account of Holman, one of the professors at Leyden, of Cornelius Meinardi, and Cornelius Wiggeri, two persons of great reputation, before the name of Arminius was ever mentioned.†

In addition to the great Divines here enumerated by Dr. Heylin, as favourers and defenders of conditional Predestination prior to the time in which Arminius flourished, we may specify the names of Erasmus, Bullinger, Sarcerius, Latimer, Duifhusius, Dr. Overal, Bishop Andrews, Dr. Clayton, and last, but not least, the two learned Professors, *(formosi ambo!)* HEMMINGIUS ‡ of Copenhagen, and BARO of Cambridge.—The following epistle which the latter of these learned

* Idem, cap. v, pag. 47. † Idem, cap. v. p. 48.

‡ HEMMINGIUS was born in the isle of Laland, a part of the King of Denmark's dominions, in the year 1513; and, after having made considerable progress in learning during his youth, he was sent to the University of Wirtemburgh, where for the space of five years he was one of the most assiduous of Melancthon's auditors. He supported himself at that seat of learning by performing part of the duties of a tutor, and by writing for some of those students who are distinguished in almost every University for their opulence and their idleness. By Melancthon's interest he was admitted into a gentleman's family, as tutor to his daughters. After a faithful and exemplary discharge of his trust in that situation, he received the appointment of Minis-

Professors addressed to the former, will still further illustrate the state of public opinion on Predestination, a few years prior to the time when Arminius began to publish sentiments.

ter to the Church of the Holy Ghost in Copenhagen, and of Professor of Hebrew in that University; in which, when in 1557 he had taken his degree of DOCTOR OF DIVINITY, he was made Professor of Theology. In 1579 he obtained a Canonry in the Church of Roschild, which preferment he happily enjoyed till the period of his death, on the 25th of May 1600. He was blind during the latter part of his life; which circumstance can excite no surprise when it is considered that he had always been a hard student and attained to the advanced age of eighty seven years. Hemmingius was not a proselyte to all the doctrines that had been propagated by Luther; for in his mature years he explained *the real presence* in THE LORD'S SUPPER according to the views of Calvin; which at that time caused him some trouble. But on the subject of predestination he was one of the ablest opponents of the tenets of the Genevan school; and became, under Divine Providence, the principal cause of preserving an immense number of the Churches in the North of Europe sound in the faith on that most importaut doctrine.

His friend PETER BARO was born in France, and admitted a licentiate in the University of Bourges; but, being of the Protestant Religion, he was compelled to leave his native country, to avoid persecution. He retired into England; and, being a very learned person, was humanely entertained in the family of that great man the Lord Treasurer Burleigh, who, after he had himself been chosen Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, recommended Baro as a person well qualified for the situation of Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity. To that high and responsible office he was elected some time prior to 1574, and became at the same time a member of Peter House. Upwards of twenty years he manfully stemmed the torrent of Calvinism which threatened to uproot every thing that opposed its progress. This intrepid conduct occasioned him much trouble from that bitter Calvinist Dr. Whitaker, and his powerful allies, Archbishop Whitgift, Bishop Vaughan, Dr. Tyndal and others. When these Divines, in their zeal for rigid Predestination, had in 1595, of their own authority, framed the notorious *Lambeth Articles*, which at Queen Elizabeth's command they were compelled almost immediately to recal and suppress, they were with exultation conveyed to Cambridge by Dr. Whitaker, (who died within a few days afterwards,) and were tendered as a sort of test to Dr. Baro. He had much to endure from the schemes of these men, who misrepresented his proceedings both to Lord Burleigh, and, through the Archbishop, to her Majesty. Baro, however, though only a stranger naturalized, displayed all the intrepidity of a native Briton, and exculpated himself to the satisfaction both of his patron and his Grace of Canterbury. He was cited before Dr. Goad, the Vice-chancellor; but when his judicious friend the Chancellor heard of the nature of the process and the grounds of accusation, he discountenanced that mode of persecution. In the spring of 1596, "finding his doctrine crossed by the Lambeth Articles, and afterwards his peace distracted by several informations brought against him by the adverse faction," he voluntarily vacated his Professorship, and retired to London, where he died about three or four years afterwards, and was interred with great honour in the parish church of St. Olave, Hart-street: His pall was supported by six Doctors of Divinity, and his remains were attended to the grave by all the ministers of the city, according to an order by Dr. Bancroft, then Bishop of London.

It was in the last year of his Professorship that he addressed to Hemmingius the interesting letter inserted in the text, in which he distinctly alludes to the treatment that he and the supporters of his doctrines were then receiving at the hands of their adversaries. But instead of indulging in despair, he strengthens the hand of his brother champion, and encourages him in his laudable exertions.

To the most famous Mr. NICHOLAS HEMMINGIUS, *Professor of Divinity in Denmark*, a man worthy to be held in the highest honour and esteem by me, PETER BARO.

DEAR SIR, *my Reverend Father in Christ, and worthy of receiving from me proofs of the most sincere esteem,*

Since I have been drawn to love and reverence you solely on account of the truth which shines with such transcendant lustre in your writings, I hope this letter, which I have now a favourable opportunity of transmitting, will not prove disagreeable to you. By it I wish in the most friendly and pleasant manner possible to congratulate you and wish you the enjoyment of health and every blessing; and at the same time earnestly to request you, that, although you have already bestowed uncommon labour in explaining and illustrating the opinion of Master Philip [Melancthon] on predestination, you will yet proceed in such a desirable employment. For since those persons who contradict that opinion are at length brought to admit things of the greatest absurdity and which had never before been heard in the Church of God, and are not ashamed to defend them; and since the eyes of some people are dazzled by the productions of such writers, we must not on any account desist from the defence of truth which we have undertaken. But the eyes of all men are turned towards you, a man of the greatest celebrity on account of your age, your piety and erudition: The matter itself also appears to require this at your hands,—to continue drawing out of the storehouse of your riches whatever your prudence may have considered to belong to the elucidation of a question of such vast importance. We also prefer the same request to you, and form the same hopes; that, being clad in your armour, we may be able in this part of the world the more easily to offer resistance to the adversaries, and to defend the truth.—Most excellent man, you are aware that all your smaller treatises were published some few years ago at Geneva, but with a preface of such a description, as, from its style, seems to be the production of Beza. In that preface, although he appears wishful of giving a favourable and just interpretation of your sentiments, yet he draws it over to his own meaning in such a way as to make it difficult to perceive what are your real opinions. By this means he has excited doubts in the minds of many persons, which you can remove if you please, and no longer allow your opinion to be thus unfairly wrested.

In this country we have hitherto been permitted to hold the same sentiments as yours on grace; but we are now scarcely allowed publicly to teach our own opinions on that subject, much less to publish them. Had the latter indulgence been granted us, we have certain works prepared, and of them the number is not small, which seem to be advantageous to this doctrine. I wish greatly that they were in your hands, and that, after revising and amending them, you would have the goodness to publish them. But since this is not practicable on account of the immense distance of your place of residence from mine, I will only send you this very small pamphlet, entitled "A Summary of three Opinions on Predestination," from which you will be able to form a judgment concerning the quality of the remainder. Dispose of this small affair according to your pleasure; you are quite at liberty to add it to any of your own works, when next you favour the world with some more of your publications. But we wait in expectation of seeing your productions; and we unite in earnest supplication to God Almighty, that he may be pleased long to protect you, reverend sir, in safety, and to preserve you for the propagation and defence of his own truth.

Your's in the bonds of the greatest sincerity and friendship,

CAMBRIDGE, *April* 1st, 1596. PETER BARO.

PETER BARO'S SUMMARY
OF THREE OPINIONS
CONCERNING PREDESTINATION.

"IN the Protestant Church, three principal opinions exist respecting the eternal Predestination of men: In this enumeration we omit the opinions of Pelagius and of others on this subject, which have been condemned by the Church.

"The FIRST of these opinions, which has in our days obtained great celebrity, and which has on the other hand been as greatly impugned, is the opinion of Calvin and Beza, and, as these two good men wish it to appear, it was also the more mature opinion of Luther and St. Augustine. It is to this effect: 'God decreed from all eternity to create mankind for this express purpose,—to choose or elect certain men (suppose PETER, JOHN, JAMES, &c.,) and to reject or reprobate all

the remainder, to illustrate and display his mercy in the former, his justice in the latter, and his glory in both of them. In making this decree of election and reprobation, he had no regard whatever either to Christ the Mediator or to faith in relation to the former, and no regard to any kind of sin either original or actual in relation to the latter; but he decreed absolutely to elect the former and to reprobate the latter, without respect to any thing out of himself, but solely because thus it pleased him to display his own glory.—But, to carry this decree of his into effect, he decreed *in the second place*, (though this was also *from all eternity*,) that the first man should fall before he begat any one, that by his sin the whole of the human race might be corrupted and rendered obnoxious to condemnation: —That by these means he might shew mercy to those whom he had formerly purposed to elect, and for whose sakes likewise he had resolved to send Christ in whom he might adopt them for sons to himself and might finally save them:—But that, by the same means, he might not only not shew mercy to the others whom he had by the same decree determined to reprobate, but that, deserted as they were in that mass of perdition and destitute of Christ the Deliverer and of every aid to salvation, he might at last also miserably destroy them on account of their sins, although those sins had been committed through his own inevitable decree.' For they wish to represent this decree as the energetic and efficient principle of all things; being that by which God resolved that all affairs and actions should certainly and necessarily be done and take place, as well as their circumstances, place, time, means,—whether they be of a good description by which the elect are saved, or of a bad kind by which the reprobate perish. For he who willeth the end, willeth also the means: So that it is utterly impossible for those who are of the former number to do otherwise than believe, lead a pious life and be saved; nor, on the other hand, is it possible for the rest to believe, lead a life of piety, or to be saved. Yet if this be laid down as a position, it is scarcely (and not even *scarcely*,) possible to understand how God may not be accounted the Author of that which is evil as well as of that which is good, and of men's destruction as well as of their salvation.

"The SECOND opinion on predestination is that which St. Augustine, and Sohnius, Professor of Divinity in the University of Heidelbergh, held in the latter part of their lives. It is likewise the sentiment of Zanchius and of certain other Protestants, as well as of Cardinal Bellarmine; all of whom unite

in disapproving of the *first* opinion, and agree together in representing this as a Predestination to be computed only from the fall of Adam. St. Augustine bears his testimony in favour of it when he thus writes: 'From the condemned origin or stock 'of Adam, as from a single mass delivered to merited damnation, 'of some God made vessels of wrath to dishonour, and of 'others vessels of mercy to honour,—rendering to the former 'in punishment that which was their due, and to the latter in 'grace what was their due.'—This kind of Predestination is thus defined by Sohnius: 'The Predestination of men is an 'eternal and immutable decree of God, by which, according 'to his own good pleasure, he has fore-ordained to eternal life 'or eternal death the whole of the human race foreknown by 'him, and considered in the state and circumstances in which 'they would be after the creation and the fall, that is, as 'corrupt and called to Christ by the gospel,—for an eternal 'declaration and expression of his transcendant mercy and 'justice, and, therefore, of his glory.'—Bellarmine wishes it to be understood, that the following statement is from the doctrine of St. Augustine: 'Predestination is the Providence of 'God, by which certain men who have been mercifully selected 'from the mass of perdition, are directed by infallible means 'to life eternal.'—(1) But this *second* opinion agrees in one point with the *first*,—both of them desire to exhibit God as having 'decreed from all eternity to elect a certain number of certain men and to reprobate the rest, for a declaration of his mercy in the former, and in the latter of his justice.'—(2) They also concur in another particular,—for the sake of the former, the Father sent Christ in whom he might adopt them as sons to himself, and might save them; but, by the counsel of God himself and according to the mind of Christ, his benefits had no more reference to the redemption of the rest, than to the redemption of brute creatures or of stones, because they did not belong to that certain number,—although he daily invites ALL to repentance, and, as Bellarmine expresses himself, 'he offers grace to each of them, and to some of them even in his word and sacraments, to all of them indeed he makes an offer of *sufficient* grace but not of *efficacious*.'—(3) The last point of their agreement is,—that, according to both of them, those certain individuals can by no means avoid believing or fail of being saved, while the rest are not able to believe or to be saved in him. And, by this means, not only are the ends of both certain and defined, but the means also by which those ends are attained.—From these premises it is manifest, that

both these opinions impose on men an inevitable necessity,—on the one description of men the necessity of being saved, on the other the necessity of perishing. Numberless absurdities arise from these sentiments.

"But there are likewise some points of difference between them: (1) The *first* opinion states, that men are created and formed by God, *out of an entire or pure mass*, purposely for these very ends. But the *second* states, that *out of a corrupt mass* some of them are mercifully elected by God, but that the rest are justly deserted and rejected in the same corrupt mass. St. Paul says, '*Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?*' (Rom. ix, 21.) Now according to Calvin and Beza, this passage is to be understood of *the creation of men;* but, according to Sohnius and Bellarmine, we must understand it partly of the retrieving and recovery of the human race after the fall, and partly of their perdition.—(2) They also differ in this respect,—The *first* of these two opinions is desirous of having no other cause assigned for election and reprobation than the will of God alone, by which he has been pleased to illustrate and display his mercy and justice in electing the former and in reprobating the latter; that Christ may be not the cause of election but of salvation, he being subordinate to the execution of that decree of God.—But it is a definition of the patrons of the *second* opinion, that the cause of election, at least its material cause, must be sought in Christ the Saviour, and that of reprobation in sin; predestination therefore has, according to their scheme, its commencement from the fall, in order to avoid the inconveniences of the preceding opinion. In this view they would display more equity than their predecessors, if they could in reality perform what in words they promise. But if they be much pressed, they must of necessity have recourse to that *absolute will* which it is their study to avoid. For since all men are equally included in the mass of perdition, and are all on that account sinners, why does God desert in that mass some of them rather than others? Sin cannot possibly be the cause of this difference, because it is no less in those who are delivered than in those who are deserted. They are forced therefore to confess, that this difference depends on the *absolute will* of God, whose pleasure it is to apply the merits of Christ to the elect but not to the reprobate. From these premises it is evident, even according to this milder opinion, that God had determined within himself thus to act before the fall

of man, and that he had created the reprobates for one purpose and the elect for another. So that this opinion, though it seem desirous of having predestination to take its commencement only from the fall, comes back in substance to the *first* which it is desirous to avoid. Thus far, then, may these two opinions be accounted one.

"But *the third opinion* is that of the Fathers who flourished prior to the age of St Augustine; It is also the opinion of St. Augustine himself before his contest with Pelagius, at which period he changed some of the sentiments which were entertained by the Ancients, as is apparent from his *Retractations* and others of his works. These changes excited very great clamours in the Church, which although he afterwards endeavoured to allay, this on Predestination always became from that period a subject of litigation. Those in the Reformed or Protestant Church who have espoused this third opinion and defend it, are, Philip Melancthon in Germany, Nicholas Hemmingius in Denmark, Gellius Snecanus in Friezland, and not a few of other Divines in various countries. Its tenour is this: 'Since God, who is in his nature good, created man for what is good, that is, for a life of blessedness, and, after his fall, promised his Son to him as a Deliverer, by whom he might bruise the serpent's head, and therefore imposed this law according to which he will form a final judgment concerning every man, '*Whosoever believeth in Christ, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned;*' he likewise every day truly calls and invites ALL MEN, without any definition, to repentance, faith and salvation.'—Since these are its terms, it is manifest that Christ is the stone of probation, by which the elect may be discerned from the reprobates; and that no other secret decree of God respecting the salvation and destruction of men has been revealed and made known to us in the written word of God, than this, '*Whosoever believeth, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned.*' Wherefore God has predestinated such as he from all eternity foreknew would believe on Christ, (who is the only way to life eternal,) that they might be made conformable to him in glory. But he hath likewise from all eternity reprobated all rebels, and such as contumaciously continue in sin, as persons unfit for his kingdom.

"That this is the opinion of the Ancient Fathers of the Church, is attested both by their writings, and by those likewise who have declined from them in this matter. This is confirmed by Beza, who, when writing on the *second verse* of the *eleventh chapter* of the Epistle to the ROMANS, '*God hath not cast away*

his people whom he foreknew,' produces this remark, 'Nor are we on any account to listen to the Fathers, who refer this to FAITH FORESEEN.' Beza therefore entertains no doubt respecting its being the opinion of the Fathers; but he thinks his own opinion is to be preferred to it. But his opinion is denied by others, who, choosing in preference to adhere to the Fathers, believe, that God determined to create the first man and all his posterity for a participation of eternal felicity; that he was prepared to bestow upon every one of them all the aids both of nature and grace, that were necessary for obtaining that blessedness, and to remove out of the way those hindrances which might prevent them from obtaining it; and that he has not willed concerning any man, to exclude him from the society of the blessed, or to be consigned to eternal torments, without having previously taken his sins into consideration.

"The *third* opinion agrees with *the two* preceding in this circumstance,—that it holds the election and reprobation of men by God to be eternal and determinate. It has this also in common with *the second* alone,—that, (since GOD chose us in CHRIST before the foundation of the world, and separated us from reprobates and unbelievers,) it holds CHRIST to be the cause of election, as we have already observed, and SIN the cause of reprobation,—both which tenets are denied by the *first* of these opinions.—But these are the only points of agreement of the three severally between each other. For the *third* differs egregiously and in many points from the *two others*,—which declare, 'that God had purposely and absolutely decreed from eternity to create the greatest part of mankind for destruction, (according to the *first* opinion,) or to leave them in the fall of Adam without any hope of pardon, (according to the *second*,) and, therefore, that Christ hath profited these miserable beings nothing to salvation, according to the decree of God himself and the personal will of Christ: but that Christ has been sent by his Father, or has suffered death, not so much for them, as for brutes, stones, or for even devils themselves, (yet to the latter of these, it is obvious, the benefits of the death of Christ can on no account be extended,) and that it is not therefore possible for these miserable reprobates ever to believe and be saved.' The *third* of these opinions disapproves of both these dogmas; and the Theology which it inculcates constantly holds the two following axioms as the greatest verities and depending on the plain and manifest word of God: (1) "IT IS THE WILL OF GOD, THAT ALL MEN BE SAVED

AND THAT NONE PERISH; and (9) CHRIST HAS DIED FOR ALL: God therefore never has hated or purposed to hate any one in reference to his being a man formed by him, but only *in reference to his being a sinner.* On the contrary, he has promised and sent Christ to all those who have fallen in Adam and are sinners, that he may bruise the head of the serpent and restore that which had perished. It has also been his will, that the Gospel should be published to every creature, that is, to each of the human race, that all and every one of them may come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved:—this is called, by the ancient Fathers, 'the *antecedent* will of God.' It is therefore of God and of his mere grace that certain individuals are saved; and it is through their own perverseness and depravity that others are damned:—this is called, 'the *consequent* will of God,' because it is a consequence of the impenitency of men who persevere in sin. For they are damned, because '*they would not receive the love of the truth that they might be saved,*' as the Apostle expresses it, (2 Thess. ii, 10.) or in the words of Christ, '*because they loved darkness rather than light:*' (John iii, 19.) that is, because they would not obey Christ, when he called them and wished to gather them under his wings, and because, in St. Stephen's language, '*they always resisted the Holy Ghost.*' (Acts, vii, 51.) So that this declaration, by the Prophet, has become a standing truth, '*O Israel,* THOU HAST DESTROYED THYSELF! *But* IN ME IS THY HELP!'" (Hosea xiii, 9.)

"Such are the points in which these three opinions agree and disagree among themselves; so that the *first* and *second* include within them and impose upon men the *necessity* both of damnation and salvation. The *third* opinion has not that tendency: For though it allows Predestination to be immutable in the Divine Mind, yet it denies that such Predestination renders the wills of men immutable, and imposes necessity on them, lest by such conclusions it should cause God to appear as the Author of sin and of man's destruction. From these statements it is evident, that the whole of this controversy respecting Predestination turns upon this hinge, 'Is Beza's opinion, to which we have assigned the *first* place, and into which the *second* merges, to be preferred to this *last* which was patronized by the Christian Fathers?' Beza declares, that 'this is a point on which these Fathers can on no account be heard:' This assertion is denied by those who espouse the *third* opinion. We consider it lawful for us to enquire into the truth, and

especially when it relates to an important matter, in which the eternal felicity and the eternal misery of mankind are concerned. Nay, we contend, that it is not only lawful, but that we ought with the greatest diligence to institute and continue such a necessary enquiry; and that we must not recede from the opinions of the Fathers, until we have some determinate and plain reason for such a departure. But since all these three opinions are entertained in different parts of the Protestant Church, of which it is not possible for more than one to be true, let every one consider and seriously reflect which of the three he ought to reject and which he ought to embrace; and let no man addict himself to the author of one of these opinions or of that which is contrary to it, or adopt the sentiments of either, without a previous diligent exercise of his judgment, if it be his wish to have a proper regard to his own salvation.

"I repeat it therefore, that *two* of these opinions rest on the foundation,—'that God, by an immutable and irrevocable decree, has, without any reference to sin, but by his own absolute will which no man is able to resist, determined within himself from all eternity to reprobate by far the largest portion of the human race, and (according to the *first* opinion,) to create them for eternal destruction, or (according to the *second*,) to desert them from the time when Adam sinned; that some of those who are of the number of the reprobate are every day necessarily and inevitably coming into existence and perishing, —they being persons to whom God has never vouchsafed his grace; or, if in his word or sacraments, he makes an offer of it to some of them, as to those who have some connection with the Church of God, such an offer is not made by him with seriousness as though they should be saved by that grace, but, on the contrary, it is made that they may be rendered less excusable, and may at last be more grievously punished; that the advent and the death of Christ have not been undertaken on their account; and that the benefits of his death have no more reference to men of this description, than to stones, brutes, or even devils themselves, because they have been from all eternity reprobated by God and purposely created, or (which bears the same import,) have been left in a lost mass, that they might be consigned to eternal destruction.'—This is the foundation on which the *first* and *second* rest, but which is rejected by the *third* as a falsehood, and contrary both to the Sacred Scriptures and to the goodness of God. The two others object against the *third*, but very undeservedly, that it is Pelagianism. For

among the Pelagians neither were those Fathers numbered who flourished before the time of Pelagius, nor were St. Jerome and St. Augustine prior to their contest with the Pelagians; and yet all of them openly professed this third sentiment: Nor are those Reformed Churches that embrace it in the present age, in the least inclined to Pelagianism,—for instance, the Churches in the greater part of Germany, and in the whole of Denmark and Norway. Philip Melancthon, who composed the Augustan Confession, of which the other Protestant Churches have expressed their approbation, was not a Pelagian; nor yet are different good and learned men in various countries Pelagians, because they think the *third* opinion which has been adduced on this subject is preferable to *the two others*.—Banish then such an illiberal calumny as this, which has been invented for the purpose of overpowering truth; nor let it operate as a hindrance on any one in diligently and repeatedly prosecuting an inquiry into the truth of this question."

CONTINUATION OF THE PERSONAL HISTORY OF ARMINIUS.

A brief history of the progress of CONDITIONAL PREDESTINATION and GENERAL REDEMPTION prior to the time of Arminius, has been given in the preceding paragraphs. Let us now resume the personal History of this great man, whom we left (page 63) possessed of some correct and scriptural views on PREDESTINATION, and resolved to publish them to others from the pulpit, prudently and in season.

A most favourable opportunity presented itself to Arminius in the beginning of 1591, when, in the regular course of exposition which he had adopted, he came to the fourteenth verse of the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, '*For we know that the law is spiritual: But I am carnal; sold under sin.*' He thought that the interpretation generally given to this passage, as if it applied to a man that was really and fully renewed by the grace of the gospel, was an egregious imputation on the efficacy of christian regeneration, and manifestly tended to abate that intense desire for kindred piety which it is the province of grace invariably to excite. By such an interpretation, the entire exercise of Divine worship, all the obedience required by the gospel, and that "new creature" which the evangelical writers so frequently and earnestly inculcate, would be forced to encounter this formidable difficulty,—they would seem to consist only of affections and desires, instead of effects and realities. Having,

therefore, accurately weighed in the balances of his judgment the connection of all the parts of that chapter, and calling in to his aid the commentaries of Bucer and other writers on that subject, he openly taught and established this proposition:—"St. Paul does not in this passage speak of himself in reference to what he then was, neither does he allude to a man "who is living under the grace of the gospel; but he personifies the character of one who was placed under the law, on "whom the law of Moses had discharged its office, in whom "true contrition on account of sin had been effected by the aid "of the Holy Spirit, and who, being experimentally convinced "of the weakness of the law and its incompetency to procure "salvation, was seeking a Deliverer, and although such a "person could not be called *regenerate*, yet he was in the very "threshold of regeneration."

Such was his clear illustration of a difficult passage in St. Paul's writings; and though in that discourse he studiously refrained even from an allusion to the adverse interpretation of other divines, yet it brought down upon him the most virulent expressions of malevolence; and the only requital which he received from several of his brethren in the ministry, for this novel elucidation of the whole chapter, was not of the most gratifying description. Some of them attempted to charge him with Pelagianism, because he had attributed too great a portion of goodness to an unregenerate man. Others made the same charge against him, for no other reason than because Socinus, under the feigned name of Prosper Dysidæus, had expounded this chapter of the Epistle to the Romans in nearly the same manner. Several persons were loud in their complaints that he had uttered many things from the pulpit which were repugnant to the Confession of the Belgic Churches and to the Palatine Catechism; and had rashly adduced, in support of his opinions, the testimony of some of the Ancient Fathers of the Church, and other Divines who lately flourished.

In the infancy of the liberties of the United Provinces, when the legitimate boundaries of neither Church nor State had been accurately defined, reports and surmises of this kind would operate injuriously against the individual accused, because every patriot was a professor of religion, and scarcely a religious man could be found that was not a patriot. For this reason, the least variation from the religious opinions espoused by the prevailing party was viewed with great jealousy, and was frequently denounced as a crime that had some affinity to both

treason and blasphemy. This remark, while it is no excuse for persecution, is some clue to the extreme animosity with which religious disputes were at that time conducted.—The Ecclesiastical Senate of Amsterdam therefore were soon informed of these charges, and passed a decree "to summon Arminius before them, that after they had instituted a conference with him, he might be convinced of his error and of his perverse doctrine, and be brought to adopt an interpretation of his sentiments that accorded better with the standard of purity."—When Arminius heard of this decree, he declared himself perfectly ready to enter into the proposed Conference, provided it was held before the magistrates of the city or their delegates; or, if that was thought to be an improper request, he should be allowed to discuss this affair with his brethren in the ministry, in the absence of the Elders of the Church.—The meeting took place according to the terms of the latter stipulation.—After prayer had been offered up to God, the debate commenced between Arminius and Peter Plancius; in which many objections were urged against the former, that were proved never to have been uttered in the course of his sermon, or to have been delivered by him with another intention, and in a different sense to that which had been affixed to them. To the charge of Pelagianism he replied with much spirit, that he entirely rejected those errors which were commonly attributed to the Pelagians, and that they could on no account be collected from his explanation of the Apostle's meaning; on the contrary, he asserted that those errors were in direct opposition to the arguments which he had employed on that occasion. As to the authorities cited in his discourse, he confessed that he had said "the chief of the Ancient Fathers both of the Greek and Latin Churches were favourable to his exposition," and he was prepared to defend that remark by a multitude of quotations. He declared his unconsciousness of having produced any modern doctors of the Church as supporting his sentiments on that subject, except Bucer, who had adopted a different mode of expressing his meaning; yet Desiderius Erasmus, a name deservedly held in high estimation among the Reformed, had given a similar interpretation of that passage.—Plancius then began to speak greatly in disparagement of the authority of the Ancient Fathers, and to weaken their credit.—Arminius highly disapproved of what Plancius was pleased to say, and asserted that it neither became him nor any modern teacher in the Church to think or to speak in such slighting terms of those

great and holy men, to whom all Christendom was under the greatest obligations.—Some mention having then been made of the Confession and Catechism, Arminius showed at great length, that he had taught nothing against those two formularies of mutual consent, and that the doctrine which he had delivered was quite in unison with them. He added that he considered himself as by no means bound to adopt all the private interpretations of the Reformed, and that he was undoubtedly at liberty and had the power to expound the lively oracles of God, and any passage in them, according to the dictates of his conscience; and that he always exercised extreme caution in the doctrines which he taught, lest any of them might be perverted to root up the foundations of the Christian Faith.

In the course of this debate reference was frequently made by Plancius to the matter of Predestination, all notice of which Arminius studiously avoided; and when he was pressed to explain his views on that point, he refused, alleging that in his exposition of this seventh chapter he had spoken nothing that bore at all on that controverted subject. Being further interrogated respecting his sentiments on *the perfection of man in this life*, he replied, that such a requisition appeared to him to be quite unnecessary, when he had more than a hundred times stated his views of that subject, while engaged in expounding the sixth and seventh chapter of that Epistle. Some of his answers to other objections of this description, may be seen in his very accurate *Dissertation on the true and genuine sense of the Seventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans*, which, in consequence of these commotions, he afterwards wrote at his moments of leisure and completed it about the beginning of the year 1600.

But the strong reasons which he adduced on that occasion, for the purpose of disproving the crimes with which he was charged, did not prevent some men from creating him almost daily disquietude: Peter Plancius was the leader of this party of traducers. These sinister reports and accusations arose to such a height, in the year 1592, that after Martin Lydius,* the very

* This was among the last public acts of the very useful life of MARTIN LYDIUS, for he died in 1600. He was born at Lubec. After having been many years minister of the Church at Amsterdam, during which period he watched over the expanding energies of the mind of Arminius with almost parental solicitude, he was chosen Professor of Divinity at Franeker in Friezland. He was well versed both in Sacred and Profane learning. His love of peace prompted him to compose all the differences which arose among the Clergy. Very few of his literary productions were published. His grandson James

learnedperson who had requested Arminius to answer the Delft brethren, had heard of them, he proceeded to the Hague and earnestly implored the assistance of John Uitenbogardt in terminating these ecclesiastical controversies. Lydius accosted this good man in most persuasive language, and besought him (by the tender affection which he entertained for the flourishing church of Amsterdam, that had some years before been under his pastoral care,) to address a conciliatory letter to Arminius, against whom, he confessed, the Presbytery had proceeded in a manner much too peremptory,—or rather to go to Amsterdam, and persuade him, for the sake of preserving peace, to yield a little on his side to his brethren in the ministry and to the Presbytery, as far as that could be done without compromising his principles, or wounding his conscience. Lydius felt no doubt respecting the readiness of Arminius to attend to the suggestions of his friend, on account of the great influence and authority which Uitenbogardt possessed in almost every Church within the United Provinces, and on account of the intimacy which had then for a long time subsisted between them. Induced by these intreaties, Uitenbogardt travelled to Amsterdam, and, as the best course for him to pursue, he went in the first instance to the house of the Rev. John Taffinus, minister of the Walloon Church,* to whom, before he had spo-

Lydius, minister of Dort, had in his possession some of his grandfather's manuscript Discourses on several parts of the Old Testament, and a justification of Erasmus, which, it is said, proved his discretion and good temper in matters of religion.

* From the remarkable commercial posperity of Holland, which was at that period one of the most flourishing marts for trade in Europe, the continued influx of foreigners into its various large towns and cities was uncommonly great. To meet the religious wants of such occasional visitors, and of the resident foreigners who in the capacity of agents transacted business for their principals in other parts of Europe,—the fathers of the infant republic were anxious to provide suitable public means of religious instruction; and as the French language was then most generally understood and employed in commercial as well as diplomatic intercourse, Christian Ministers were appointed, to preside in nearly every large town over French congregations, which were called "Walloon Churches," but which resembled the other churches of THE REFORMED in being subject to regular Presbyterian jurisdiction.

Over one of the Walloon churches John TAFFINUS presided successively in Antwerp, Haerlem, and Amsterdam. In the latter of these cities he died, in the year 1602, aged 73 years. He was descended from a family of high respectability. His brother, Mr. Du Pre, was *Charge d'Affaires* from the States General to the Court of France. Taffinus was much respected for his learning, moderation and experience in public affairs. The chief reputed blemish in his character was his zeal against the Anabaptists,—a sect that had, by the revolutionary principles avowed by some branches of their community, rendered themselves almost as much suspected as the Jesuits. Taffinus, several years before his death, advised the Rev. J. Uitenbogardt to improve his residence as Walloon minister at the Hague, to the general benefit of the

ken to any one else, he communicated his reasons for undertaking this journey; and, having learnt from him the actual bearing of the whole controversy, he strongly importuned him to lend his assistance in healing these wounds and appeasing these distractions. Taffinus, who was a great admirer of peace and christian piety, very readily complied with this request, and gladly entered with Uitenbogardt on the blessed office of peace-makers. When therefore they had advised with each other, uniting their forces they went first to the Presbytery and afterwards to Arminius, and made a humble offer of their services to effect a reconciliation and to restore their former concord. Both parties gratefully accepted the proffered mediation, and intimated that nothing could occur to them of a nature more agreeable, than to have suitable means devised for bringing about this most salutary measure. A meeting therefore was soon appointed to be held in the house of Taffinus; and the duty of managing this affair on behalf of the Presbytery was committed to certain members of their own body.—From this meeting, after the party that preferred the accusations and the party accused had been heard, they both retired without having effected an union. But Taffinus and Uitenbogardt thought, that they ought not to cease from their pacific endeavours, although the commencement of them had not been very gratifying; and they prevailed on the members of the Ecclesiastical Senate soon afterwards to summon an extraordinary session, at which they presented a form of renewed amity between the parties, conceived in the following terms;

'The testimony of James Arminius,—Although he is 'unconscious of holding or teaching any sentiments that are at 'variance with the contents of the Confession and Catechism, 'or of having afforded just cause to any one to cherish 'such a suspicion against him; yet, for the sake of testifying 'his earnest desire for the peace of the Church, and that he may 'eradicate from the minds of some persons all the undue preju-'dices which they have conceived against him, by volun-'tarily subscribing his name to this document he is desirous of 'solemnly pledging himself,—that he will, hereafter, not only

Church, by endeavouring to gain and secure the favour of Oldenbarnevelt, the Advocate of Holland, and next to the Prince of Orange in official authority. To excite him to this laudable enterprise, he stated, "that the Clergy had formerly cultivated too little correspondence with the Advocate,—although all public matters passed through his hands, and he had it in his power to render great services to the Church." The effects of that advice will be discovered in a succeeding part of this narrative. The Motto of Taffinus was, To God thy life, in God thy end.

'not deliver to the Church any doctrine different from that 'which is contained in the writings of the Prophets, but will 'deliver the very same, according to the exposition of those 'writings in the Catechism and Confession, and as such doc-'trine is generally taught in the Reformed Churches; that he 'will have regard to the same regulation in his sermons and 'exhortations, (which he thinks he has already had,) that just 'cause of suspicion may never be afforded to any one, of his 'entertaining any sentiments respecting doctrine and ecclesias-'tical discipline, varying in the least from those which are com-'prehended in the Confession and Catechism and in the articles 'of the last general Synod;—that, should scruples afterwards 'occur concerning any articles of doctrine, he will be cautious 'not to speak of them in his sermons or in any other public 'manner;—that in such case he shall be permitted to confer 'with his brethren;—and that, if he do not find himself satis-'fied by their arguments, and think that his scruples are not 'thereby removed from his mind, in such a state of things he 'will of his own accord impose silence on himself, till a General 'Council of the Churches be convened by whose advice and 'judgment he is willing to abide.

'Lastly, for the purpose of causing mutual peace and con-'cord to flourish the more and to remain unimpaired among the 'ministers of the sanctuary, although the colleagues of Armi-'nius consider such a measure superfluous on their part, since 'they have at no time afforded occasion to any person to indulge 'in the least doubt concerning their fidelity and their duty, 'yet they vow and promise, that they will be especially careful 'both in the delivery of their public discourses and in private 'conversation, not to afford any person grounds to suspect that 'there is a disagreement among them;—yet on this condition, 'that when, for the defence of the true faith, they employ 'themselves in refuting the arguments of their opponents ac-'cording to the formulary of Reformed doctrine which is in use 'in the Low Countries, they shall be considered to have fulfilled 'their promise.

'These stipulations having been made and heard, the Eccle-'siastical Senate, on account of these impeding causes, have, in 'their care for the peace of the church, judged it proper to 'suspend their judgment upon the protestation of Arminius, 'which is mentioned in the first part of this document, and to 'commit to silence the whole of this matter; at the same time 'they earnestly beseech Almighty God to command felicity and

'success to attend this attempt, to the glory of his name and 'the edification of his Church.'

When this form of restoring concord had been drawn up and delivered, no impartial person felt any doubt respecting both parties readily agreeing to these conditions and promises, and thus concluding the matter. But in this hope they were deceived. Arminius was ready to embrace these laws with both arms, but the Ecclesiastical Senate rejected them by a great majority. After Taffinus and Uitenbogardt had encountered all these labours for the peace of the Church, to such a small degree of commendation did some persons think them entitled, that they spread insidious reports about them through the city, and represented them as friendly to heterodox opinions. Although both of them perceived that they had spent their labour in vain, and that they could derive no hopes from the great body of the Clergy of restoring peace, yet, for the purpose of vindicating their reputation, they resolved once more to convoke the Ecclesiastical Senate. When it was assembled, they maintained by various arguments the innocence and impartiality of their conduct, and animadverted with great spirit and boldness upon the injurious treatment which they had received from those foul slanderers who had thus egregiously misrepresented their mediation. They likewise beseeched the brethren, and required of them to regard their design with kindness and to receive it as the expression of candid minds: They added, that it was their determination to proceed no further with their well-intended labours, and to commit the whole affair to the decision of Divine Providence.*

* During this pacificatory visit, Uitenbogardt had heard from some of the Amsterdam Ministers, that little attention was paid to his advice, principally on account of the particular intimacy which subsisted between him and Arminius. The following narrative will confirm the truth of their remark:

A few days previous to the arrival of Uitenbogardt, when it was determined to present Jeremiah Bastingius with a call to the Church in Amsterdam, the Magistrates strongly intimated that they had no higher wish than to behold the commencement of a serious deliberation on the part of the Ecclesiastical Senate respecting giving a call, not only to Bastingius, but also to the very eloquent Uitenbogardt, at that time minister at the Hague, and one whom they had then some expectations of obtaining. The Presbytery was convened for this purpose, on the 14th of January; and when each of the ministers was asked to deliver his sentiments, according to the dictates of his conscience, concerning the advice of the magistrates, Plancius rose up and declared, "that he had heard some reports concerning Uitenbogardt, which might induce one to suspect that he hesitated about some doctrines of the Christian faith; and chiefly about the doctrine of *Original Sin*, for the confirmation of which the fifth chapter of Genesis, and some other passages are commonly cited, and yet Uitenbogardt was said to have intimated that they are not applicable to that subject. Besides, he had in his presence occasionally given a

In this state of ecclesiastical matters, the magistrates of Amsterdam were pleased to invite Taffinus and Uitenbogardt, who was making preparations for returning home, to the council-chamber, and to learn from them the progress of this affair and to what point they had brought it. Those two ministers most promptly complied with this request; and having disclosed to their worships every thing which seemed to relate to the amicable termination of the affair, they obtained leave to depart, after thanks had been mutually tendered.

Uitenbogardt returned to the Hague; and soon afterwards, at the annual election of magistrates, the new Burgomasters, Reiner Cantius, William Bardesius, C. F. Teilingius, and N. F. Octgenius a Waveren, cited together before them all the

few suspicious hints about certain questions that occur in the Catechism; had once declared, when a work on Arianism was mentioned, that it was incapable of refutation; and had expressed a desire that it were allowed him to behold a solid refutation of Coornhert's book. In addition to these things it had been whispered, that he maintained the same sentiments as Arminius on the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. For these reasons, it appeared to him as not making in the least for the interests of the Church, to present such a man with a call on that occasion."—When Arminius heard these and similar defamatory expressions concerning an absent friend whom he most affectionately regarded as a brother, he opposed himself to such slanders, and shewed that these accusations had no better foundation than the mere suspicions of the speaker, and would speedily vanish into airy nothing as soon as Uitenbogardt should be heard in his own defence. Arminius therefore and some other members of the Presbytery delivered it as their advice, that they should comply with the wishes of the magistrates and treat with Uitenbogardt. But a majority voted against this advice; and it was resolved to ask the magistrates, by a deputation from that meeting, to grant their permission for completing the call which had been given to Bastingius; and to intimate to them, at the same time, that the Presbytery had their own reasons for omitting to promote a call to the Pastor of the Church at the Hague. That deputation consisted of two elders, Thomas Kronenburgius and John de Vry, both of them respectable men and of the senatorial order; and they were empowered to disclose those reasons, if the magistrates appeared solicitous to know them.

After Uitenbogardt had received an intimation of this circumstance, although the first object of his journey to Amsterdam was principally for the sake of Arminius and the Church in that city, yet he thought the opportunity of vindicating his own reputation was not to be neglected. With this object in view, he waited immediately upon P. Plancius, the principal fabricator of those injurious surmises in which some persons had indulged themselves against him; and, having seriously expostulated with him concerning all the reports which had been industriously retailed to his disadvantage, he reduced him to such difficulties, that he confessed he had been guilty of great imprudence, and faithfully promised to acquaint the Ecclesiastical Senate with all those particulars which had then transpired in conversation. This promise he fulfilled before the whole Presbytery, on the twenty third day of the same month; and to those two men who had before been deputed to meet the magistrates, was committed the province of assuring their worships, in the name of the whole assembly, that all those scruples and doubts which were entertained by some people against Uitenbogardt, had disappeared as soon as he and Plancius had come to an explanation.

ministers of religion, on the eleventh of February, at three o'clock in the afternoon; and, that this affair might be conducted with greater authority and to better effect, they invited those most respectable individuals, P. Bomius, C. P. Hoofdius, and B. Cromhoutius, who had recently discharged the office of chief magistrates of the city. The ministers met the magistrates at the time appointed, and Cantius, who executed the office of President, addressing the reverend gentlemen in the name of his brother magistrates, said, 'he had been much 'grieved to perceive, both from the public discourses which 'had been delivered some time before, and from the complaints 'of some citizens, that the ministers of religion did not agree 'well among themselves; that such dissensions must be resisted 'in their commencement, lest they should some time or other 'break out and prove destructive to the church and to the 'commonwealth; that it was the wish and the command of 'the magistrates, in accordance with the duty which their office 'imposed, to see them hereafter apply themselves to the study of 'peace and concord, for which they had been distinguished and 'cited as examples for the imitation of other churches, and no longer 'to give occasion by their declamatory expressions for any per-'son to suspect that some grievous animosities were cherished 'among them; that if there happened some discrepancy of 'judgment among them on certain subjects, they were at liber-'ty to institute among themselves private and friendly confer-'ences; that, above all things, they must be careful not to 'allow these dissensions to proceed from the Ecclesiastical 'Senate to the pulpit, and from thence to the people; and if 'they should prove deficient in this their own duty, the 'magistrates would be compelled to employ other remedies, 'that neither the Church nor the commonwealth might sustain 'any injury.'

The ministers, having retired for a few minutes to advise together, on their return gave the following answer, by the Rev. J. Ambrosius, 'They thanked the magistrates for the 'care which they manifested for the welfare of the Church of 'Amsterdam; that they were impressed with a most ardent 'desire of preserving peace, which they had not ceased sacredly 'to cultivate during a period of thirteen years, and had at no 'time given any man just reason for thinking otherwise con-'cerning them; that if any member of their body should 'think his conduct resembled that which had been described, it 'was his duty to free himself from the imputation; that they

'had hitherto taken uncommon pains by means of friendly conferences to compose the differences which had arisen between 'Arminius and the Presbytery; and that they would exercise 'great watchfulness in this affair and would sedulously labour for 'the restoration of peace.'

Arminius having then obtained leave to speak, addressed his discourse to the magistrates and solemnly assured them, 'that, 'in his interpretation of the seventh chapter of the Epistle to 'the Romans, which was a little different from the exposition 'of it given by many of the Reformed, he had taught and 'wished to teach nothing that was in any wise repugnant to 'the Confession and the Palatine Catechism; that in conformity 'with the liberty of treating on sacred subjects which belonged 'to every private christian and to every teacher of Christianity, 'he had felt no doubt concerning his right to expound any 'passage of the sacred volume according to the dictates of his 'conscience; that, since the point on which this controversy 'principally turned, was, the opinion of some ministers that 'his sentiments on that chapter were opposed to those formula-'ries of consent, and that he might be easily proved guilty of 'that charge,—he was prepared, for the further defence of his 'character, to enter into a conference with his brethren in the 'ministry, but he earnestly begged that such conference might 'be held in the presence of the magistrates or of their dele-'gates; and that he should form greater hopes of the success-'ful issue of this affair, if such respectable individuals would 'not only become witnesses of the arguments which might be 'adduced on both sides, but would have the goodness to act as 'moderators and just judges.'

As soon as Arminius had ceased, the Rev. J. Kuchlinus animadverted on some of his expressions, and prefaced his speech with a few observations on the fidelity which he had himself displayed during thirteen years, in the discharge of his ministerial functions. He also begged in opposition to Arminius, that the conference which had been mentioned, and which was an object of much importunity to many persons, might be held in the presence of the Presbytery alone, according to the received usage of the Churches.

At length, when both parties had been heard with the greatest attention, and after the ministers had been requested to withdraw for a season, the magistrates seriously deliberated on the whole affair; and on the ministers being called in again, the respectable Cantius intimated to them, in the name of all

that honourable meeting, 'that the magistrates having consult-
'ed together had come to a determination to command the
'Ecclesiastical Senate to let the whole of this business rest,
'and to suffer whatever dissensions had formerly been raised
'concerning it to be buried in oblivion; that a new conference
'on this subject appeared to them to be neither proper nor use-
'ful; that each of them must hereafter avoid broaching new
'doctrines in a sermon; that it was the duty of every one,
'whose opinions differed from those of other teachers, and in
'the more intimate knowledge of which he might rejoice, to
'reserve them to himself, and to confer about them in a friend-
'ly manner with his brethren in the ministry: and that, in the
'mean time, those who held different sentiments, provided
'they could not be convicted of error, should be treated
'with kindness, until the questions be decided by the authority
'of some Council.'

When this affair was finished, and the peace of the Church had in some measure been restored, Arminius resumed his series of discourses on the Epistle to the Romans, which were attended by crowds of persons of high and low degree, and of different sentiments in religion. But the design of all his auditors was not alike; some of them were drawn by a genuine attachment to the man and by the high celebrity of his reputation. Others, on the contrary, with a kind of blind impulse obtruded themselves, and frequented his sermons for no other cause than to extract something from them, by which they might diminish his increasing fame, and excite against him the vilest and most detractive envy. He perceived these designs in his enemies, and on that account thought it his duty to be the more circumspect, that, while on the one hand he refrained from sinning against his conscience, by propounding certain doctrines of whose truth he doubted,—he might not, on the other hand, deliver any thing which differed in any material point from the current opinions, or which might justly and deservedly offend the ears of those who differed from him in sentiment. But with whatever prudence and industry he aimed at this object, either by means of moderation or suppression, he found it impossible fully to expel, from the minds of his brethren in the ministry and of those who depended on their authority, the wrong judgment of him which they had once formed.

H.——Page 31.

The reader will perhaps think, from the contents of Appendix G, that, when Bertius made this remark, he was not supported by facts; and, on perusing the subjoined account, he will be still more confirmed in such a supposition:

In the year 1593, Arminius began in his regular course to expound the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Romans. When he revolved this subject in his mind, and was conscious that it was generally cited by the Reformed teachers as the chief prop of their sentiments concerning Absolute Predestination, he determined to utter nothing either in defence of those sentiments or in contradiction to them. He only asserted, that the Apostle, in this chapter, adhered to the same design and pursued the same course of reasoning, as that which he had prescribed to himself in the preceding chapters,—which was to vindicate his doctrine of *the justification of a man by faith*, from several objections which had been raised by the Jews. Those objections Arminius refuted in various sermons and with solid arguments. Though in the estimation of many persons he seemed to discharge the part of an able and successful defender of the Christian Religion, yet his conduct was viewed by others in an unjust light. For when, in elucidating the design of St. Paul and in explaining this very celebrated chapter, he adopted a plan in some respects different from others, and passed over in silence the crude opinions of some persons which are commonly deduced from this portion of scripture, many of his brethren in the ministry began to murmur; but they expressed their disapprobation more loudly when they perceived him to rise in reputation among the Lutherans, Mennonites, and others, who were displeased with the austere and rigorous assertions which certain of the Reformed used in relation to this doctrine. The ecclesiastical senate, therefore, having assembled together once or twice in the absence of Arminius, at length on the 25th of March began to proceed against him openly on this account. The Rev. J. Hallius, in the name of all the Presbytery, addressing him, intimated, 'that his mind was deeply grieved at the complaints 'of some citizens who had been much disturbed by his ser-'mons on the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Romans; that 'the professed adversaries of the church had from that cir-'cumstance taken occasion to cavil against the doctrines of the 'Reformation; and grounds were also thus afforded to many

'pious people to suspect that a degree of dissension respecting 'some doctrines was cherished between him and the other 'sacred heralds of the heavenly word; that it had appeared 'proper to the Presbytery, for the sake of providing against 'any further estrangement of mind, to admonish him of this 'matter, and to beseech him that he would preach the same 'doctrines as his colleagues, and openly testify from the pulpit 'that he had never said any thing against the Confession and 'Catechism, and that those who had suspected him of any 'such thing had given very little attention to his discourses.'

Arminius replied, 'that with no less grief of mind had he 'heard by report of the clandestine slanders of some persons, 'and in what manner he was traduced under the title of a 'HERETIC, a LIBERTINE and PELAGIAN; that he had never 'given just cause to any person to have such a bad opinion of 'him; that he had never spoken any thing in contradiction to 'the Reformed Confession and Catechism, but had at all times 'taught what agreed with them, and had, on more occasions 'than one, given testimony to this fact in his sermons; that if 'any one would before that assembly openly accuse him, and 'should think it possible to convict him of this crime, he was 'prepared instantly to hear his reasons, and to enter into a 'defence of his own innocency; that it was their duty, on 'giving their consent to a candid hearing of this cause, to 'remove from the minds of others all unjust suspicions of this 'description, and to suffer him long to take delight in being 'entitled to the name of A GOOD MAN, till by indubitable tes-'timony it should be proved that he was no longer worthy of 'such a name, and had forfeited all title to that character; 'that he considered this admonition of the Presbytery 'uncalled-for as it respected him, and, in virtue of the same 'right as that which his brethren had exercised towards him, 'and with the same desire to preserve peace, he would advise 'and beseech them not to deliver any thing which was at 'variance with the sacred scriptures or with the received forms 'of consent, and to adopt no mode of speaking not recognized 'by them, so as to cause any kind of scruple or doubt to arise 'in the minds of the weak or to afford ground for scandal; 'and that, since no one openly accused him, and since only a 'report was spread *that one of the sermons lately delivered by 'him (whatever its import might be,) had afforded a pretext 'for dissension between him and his brethren in the ministry*,— 'it ought to be as much their care to live in amity with him, as

'for him to be on similar terms with them, while both sides 'should labour to preserve concord in those things to the truth 'of which all of them had subscribed.'

Arminius spoke with much animation; and after some warm words had arisen between him and his adversaries, one of the elders at length expressed himself to this effect: 'He perceived 'the arts of the devil employed in disturbing the peace of that 'church; and some of the magistrates had endeavoured to 'contribute to this effect. Arminius had in vain appealed to 'the Confession and Catechism, when he had already explained 'two passages of scripture contrary to the meaning of those 'two forms. Having heard Arminius explain the seventh 'chapter of the epistle to the Romans, he could never after-'wards derive any profit from his discourses.'

To these remarks Arminius modestly replied, 'that by the 'favour of God *he would never become a leader and author of* '*dissensions.* A strict enquiry ought to be instituted into the 'persons and intrigues employed by the sworn enemy of man-'kind, when he tries to sow strife and to introduce discord. 'He hoped better things of his merciful rulers, the courteous 'magistrates of that city, than had been expressed by the pre-'ceding speaker: So far was he from thinking any one of 'them capable of aiming at such an object, that he was more 'inclined to believe, whatever might be the portion of autho-'rity which they possessed, that it would be administered by 'them with the greatest moderation, in reducing to order and 'obedience those ecclesiastical personages who, forgetful of 'their duty, might attempt to produce a division in the 'church. His conscience bore him testimony, and he knew, 'from the communications of several persons, that his dis-'courses had been rendered useful, and their delivery attended 'with profit. In reference to those passages of scripture 'which, it was asserted, he had expounded in a sense contrary 'to that of the Confession,—no person could convict him of 'that offence: He confessed, that the eighteenth verse of the 'seventh chapter of the Romans was cited in the margin of 'the Confession in a sense somewhat different. Yet, if it was 'incumbent on every teacher of the Reformed Church to 'adhere thus strictly to the terms of this Confession,—and if, 'when any one in quoting passages of scripture departed even 'a hair's breadth from those terms, it was instantly construed 'into an enormous offence,—it would not be a matter of diffi-'culty for him to prove the greater part of his fellow-labourers

'guilty of the same crime, and of having more than once 'taught such doctrine as was not only contrary to the passages 'of scripture quoted in the margin, but at variance with those 'which are given at large in the text of the Confession.'

The Rev. J. Kuchlinus owned, that he could not deny the truth of this last observation, and added, 'that if there was a 'perfect agreement in those principal points which were the 'very hinge of the articles of the Confession, there needed to 'be no apprehension about the rest.' Nothing further was then said on this topic; but some questions were asked respecting the duty of the elders, and about ecclesiastical discipline, on which neither Arminius nor his reverend colleague John Halsbergius was thought to have correct ideas. Both of them defended themselves in a long reply, and refuted the objections which had been raised against them.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the reverend J. Hallius, who was, for the time being, the president and moderator of the Presbytery, addressing himself to Arminius, publicly testified the pleasure which he felt on perceiving the promptitude of mind which he had evinced to cultivate union with his brethren in the matters of doctrine and ecclesiastical discipline: He begged God to favour this auspicious commencement with his blessing, and to make the whole of this affair a source of further prosperity to his church; and then dissolved the assembly.

Yet certain preposterous zealots, thinking that matters ought not to be suffered to remain in this state of tranquility, began to excite other complaints against Arminius; and by the numerous slanders which they propagated, they were enabled to prevail with the Presbytery, that had assembled on the 22nd of April without his knowledge, to pass a resolution to this effect: "That the said Arminius shall be asked to declare without any obscurity or wary circumlocution his sentiments on all the articles of faith; and, in case of his betraying any reluctance to comply with this request, certain theses and anti-theses shall be prepared, on the subjects of which a conference shall be held with him." On the 6th of May when Arminius first heard of this resolution and of the advice which it contained, he was not hasty in replying to it, but more inclined to ask the Presbytery to grant him a longer period for deliberating on that proposition. A few weeks afterwards, (on the 20th of May,) when some members of the Presbytery reminded him of this affair, and would not desist from

repeating old grievances, rising up in the midst of the meeting, in an animated tone, he challenged all those to come forward, whosoever they might be, that might wish to communicate any particulars in his sermons which they had deemed worthy of reprehension. When no one arose, some person made a solitary remark,—" that it might be rationally concluded from the testimony of the Lutherans, the Anabaptists, and persons of Libertine habits, (who boasted of his discourses on the ninth chapter of the Romans,) that he taught and defended something that was quite at variance with the doctrines which were delivered by his brethren in the ministry and by the Reformed pastors in general."—Arminius would not allow this to be a necessary consequence, and declared, " that it appeared wonderful to him how persons of so many discordant opinions could unite together in applauding his discourses; but that no person who was of the same sacred order with him, and a member of that assembly, had at any time heard such things as were manifestly repugnant to the sacred volume or the received forms of consent."—In reply to this, one of the elders said, " that it must indeed be confessed he had carefully guarded against declaring any thing openly that deserved to be an object of censure, yet he had indulged in ambiguous and equivocal modes of expression."—After Arminius had declared his innocence of this charge, and had demanded some proof of the accusation thus preferred against him, that he might afterwards the more carefully avoid expressions of that kind, not a man was found among them to produce a single proof.

The next meeting of the ecclesiastical senate was held on the 27th of the same month, when Arminius, perceiving the minds of several persons still to be unappeased, two or three times invited the clandestine slanderers of his name to make their appearance, and commanded them openly to divulge those things which they had to allege against him. This challenge having been repeated, Kuchlinus immediately asked, " Where is Plancius?" and when he was found, Kuchlinus began to remind him, " that he had occasionally in the absence of Arminius stated some doubts which he felt about his doctrine, and that he ought now to state them in his presence and hearing. That was the proper scene of action, and the object which claimed his present attention." Being thus unexpectedly summoned, and having been also desired by Arminius to stand forward as his *adversary*, Plancius refused to assume

that invidious character; yet he confessed, that he had observed some things in his sermons, which did not accord exactly enough with the sentiments entertained by the Reformed Church. The sum of his accusation reduced itself to these points:

1. "While Arminius was interpreting the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, he had taught, that *no one was condemned except for sin*, and that all infants were for that reason excluded from condemnation.

2. "That he had likewise said, *It is scarcely possible to attribute too much to good works: We cannot say enough in commendation of them, provided we abstain from ascribing to them any portion of merit.*

3. "And that he had avowed, *The angels are not immortal.*"

Arminius answered each of these charges, thus:

1. "In reference to *the first objection*, when he was preaching on sin as the cause of condemnation, he did not by those words exclude original sin; but Plancius had not correctly understood the nature of *the original stain*, if under the name of *sin* he was desirous to have it excluded.

2. "So far was he from denying the *second assertion* respecting GOOD WORKS, that he chose rather to defend it as a correct saying."—Plancius then asked, "Is *justification* therefore to be ascribed to good works, provided no merit is attributed to them?"—Arminius replied, "Justification is not assigned to works but to faith:" In confirmation of this he quoted ROMANS iv, 4, 5: '*Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.*'

3. "With regard to the *third* matter of which he was accused, he had never uttered such a sentiment about the angels in public, but had, he confessed, once mentioned it privately in the house of Plancius, and had established it by solid arguments,—but with this addition, that he still thought *immortality* to be an attribute properly belonging to God alone, which was manifest from Paul's testimony, (1 Tim. vi, 16,) *The blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords;* WHO ONLY HATH IMMORTALITY, *dwelling in the light to which no man can approach,*' &c. Angels are indeed happy spirits, and are now and will ever be immortal, not by their own nature, but by the external sustentation of God

which preserves them: Much in the same way human bodies had been mortal before the fall, and capable of dissolution; yet they would never have been called to endure death, unless sin had intervened."

When he had in this manner answered all the objections of Plancius, he added, "that he had never been conscious of having hitherto taught any thing contrary to the Confession and the Catechism; that he received each article and doctrine of faith contained in those writings, in the very sense in which they are severally expounded by nearly all the Reformed Churches; that he then felt no scruple or doubt about any thing except the interpretation of the sixteenth article of the Belgic Confession, to the words of which he was nevertheless willing to adhere."

In the *Acts of the Presbytery at Amsterdam*, it is officially stated, as the result of the discussions in that meeting, "After these things had been understood, the assembly determined, that they had no further business to transact with Arminius respecting this controversy, till, by the blessing of God and the interpretation of a General Synod, the true and genuine sense of the before-mentioned article be made more fully known to him."

Thus ended the troubles of Arminius, while he was a resident minister in Amsterdam; and if the expressions of Bertius were intended to apply to the period which intervened between the commencement of the year 1593 and the middle of 1603, when he was called to the Professorship at Leyden, his remarks are perfectly just,—for he lived in a state of the greatest amity with his colleagues, and was highly respected by the people of his charge. Private detraction, however, the constant attendant on merit, did not cease its offensive operations; but it shewed itself in a more pointed manner, when, in the course of his observations on the epistle to the Romans, he came to expound the thirteenth chapter, and treated in a learned and profound manner on the various duties which were there inculcated on Magistrates and those under their authority. Some persons thought, that in those discourses Arminius ascribed too extensive a jurisdiction to the civil power in matters of religion. Indeed this was afterwards almost as great a point of difference, between the Arminians and the Calvinists in the Low Countries, as that of predestination. The Arminians paid great deference to the constituted authorities in the State; and several of them manifested a strict adherence to

those principles under most trying circumstances. On the contrary, nearly as high notions about *the power of the Keys* were entertained by the Calvinists, as by their predecessors the Papists; and they generally claimed for ecclesiastical jurisdiction such matters as could by no ingenuity be made to rank among the duties of the clergy or could properly come under their cognizance.

I.——Page 31.

LAURENCE JACOBSON REAL was one of the earliest assertors of religious liberty in Holland. Mention is made of his zealous exertions as early as 1565. He was a man of wealth and consideration in Amsterdam, and his fellow-citizens elected him several times as one of the *Schepens* or Aldermen of that city, in which he also filled other offices of trust and honour, and at last became one of the Admiralty Directors of Zealand. In conjunction with five other of the principal burghers of Amsterdam, he introduced the preaching of the gospel into the province of Holland. JOHN ARENTSON, a basket-maker, was the preacher, and delivered an excellent discourse, on the 14th of July, 1566, in a field near Horn. The lively singing of the congregation was heard in an adjoining monastery, in which the police magistrate of Horn, his deputy, and two young gentlemen, were dining with the monks of the establishment, all of whom went out to hear the basket-maker, and at first seemed by their actions as if they wished to intimidate him; but John Arentson was a man not easily frightened. One of the Monks then leaped over a ditch, and made a hideous noise for the purpose of dispersing the congregation; but they remained unmoved, and the preacher pursued his discourse, to the whole of which the magistrate, his deputy and two friends listened with the greatest attention, and, on their return, informed the Monks that they were not displeased with what they had heard. On the 21st of the same month, Peter Gabriel, a Fleming preacher, delivered an excellent discourse from Ephes. ii. 8—10, to a great multitude. Though he was an infirm man, he preached four hours, in the middle of a hot day, without intermission. That meeting was attended with several remarkable circumstances, and served greatly to strengthen the hands of the Reformed. The Popish magistrates of Amsterdam seemed to have lost their wonted energy; and the Reformed, after hearing preaching in several of the neighbouring towns and villages, at last ventured, on

the 21st of August, to assemble together for the purpose of Divine worship, at Lastaedie, one of the suburbs of Amsterdam, and soon afterwards introduced the public exercise of the Protestant religion into the city itself.

Real was a man that had great influence with the common people, and opposed the progress of image-breaking, as well as every other work that savoured of violence. In the early part of the Reformation, he was actively engaged in procuring Protestant ministers from various parts to supply Amsterdam and other towns in Holland. The following account extracted from *Brandt's History* and his own *Memoirs*, will convey some idea of the labours which he voluntarily undertook to serve the good cause, while it presents an engaging picture of primitive Christian simplicity in the Church of Amsterdam,—a picture by no means of uncommon occurrence in the infancy of such Churches as are called to vegetate and increase in times of persecution, being sound in the faith and holding Christ Jesus as the Head of the body:

In the middle of August, 1566, Reinier Kant and Laurence Real, according to the directions of the Church, went to the village of St. Martin, near the Sijp, in North Holland, to call Nicholas Scheltius, the pastor of that village, to the exercise of the ministry in Amsterdam. They found him still retaining the habit of a Popish Ecclesiastic, and residing with his wife and six children in the house of the parish-priest. They proceeded to acquaint him with the object of their commission, and represented to him that their preacher John Arents had informed them of his having acquired a full knowledge of the truth, and of having frequently conversed with him about forsaking Popery, when the probable support of his wife and children seemed to be the only obstacles in his way; that God had now furnished him with an opportunity of providing for his family by means of the Reformed Church at Amsterdam; that, the time having at length arrived of rendering yet greater service to religion, he ought not to hide that light which was kindled in him, but to impart it to the world at a period when some liberty of conscience was permitted; and that, in case of his refusing to comply with their request, he must answer for his neglect, before the bar of God.—To these representations he replied, "Since such an opportunity is offered to me, and since the Lord seems as if he intended to draw me out of the abominations of Popery, before I accede to your wishes I will go to Embden to consult about this matter with Cornelius

Koltiun, my old acquaintance." He added a promise, that he would not engage himself in the service of any other Church except that of Amsterdam, provided he entered into the ministry among the Protestants. Scheltius was faithful to his promise; having consulted his friend, he embraced the call, and shortly afterwards preached his first sermon among the Reformed, (from that passage in St. Matthew's Gospel which relates the produce of a grain of mustard-seed,) near St. Anthony's Gate, in the Leper's Church, Amsterdam, where the Protestants were accustomed to hear preaching in bad weather, according to the terms of the agreement of the 26th of August: For this purpose it had been cleared of images and other insignia of Popery.

The Reformed at Amsterdam had, beside Nicholas Scheltius, other two preachers, Peter Gabriel and John Arents; and all the three were much beloved by the people. 'For they 'did not aim at any scandalous gain, lived very temperately, 'were hospitable, admitted every body that came to ask their 'advice or assistance, did not seek the tables of the rich, but 'visited the rich and poor indifferently, and despised all dain-'ties, contenting themselves during the Spanish persecution 'with feeding chiefly upon whey and milk with the servants. 'As for their clothing, it was mean but decent.'—SCHELTIUS, born at Warmenhuisen in North Holland, was well versed in the Hebrew tongue, was a perfect master of the Greek language, and spoke the Latin in its purity. He had thoroughly studied the writings of the Christian Fathers, preached with great learning, (as the Monks themselves acknowledged,) taught with no less charity, confuted his adversaries with much temper, and led a life of virtue and piety.—PETER GABRIEL was tolerably well skilled in the Latin and Greek tongues. He could repeat from memory nearly the whole of St. Paul's Epistles, had read the productions of most of the writers in that age, and was in consequence expert in disputing and convincing.—JOHN ARENTS knew little more than his native language, but, on the other hand, he was endowed with much good sense and a sound judgment; by this means he taught with great method and regularity, deriving much assistance from his wonderfully intimate knowledge of the scriptures. His zeal rendered him bold and free; by his eloquence he was enabled to move the hearts of his hearers; he argued very acutely and with great strength of mind; and could silence all his antagonists, whether they were Papists, Arians, Anabap-

tists, or Enthusiasts. Yet he was moderate in such religious differences as were not fundamental or necessary, and endeavoured to compose them by gentleness and yielding.

Such preachers as these could not fail to increase the number of their hearers, and consequently the number of the poor. About this time, therefore, or a little earlier, it was determined to choose Deacons, according to the pattern of the first Apostolic Church, that they might collect alms at each of their meetings. The collection was in those early days made in wooden dishes. Some elderly and virtuous matrons were also chosen as Deaconesses. Many persons were induced to bring their superfluous jewels and clothes to the Deacons, or the money obtained by selling them, and to place it in their hands as a sacred deposit. According to *the Memoirs of Laurence Real*, "These Deacons conducted themselves with strict fidelity in the impartial distribution of the public charities: giving to all that were in want, without distinction of persons, to whatever religious persuasion they might belong."

The Duchess of Parma, the illegitimate sister of Philip II, King of Spain, not being able to introduce a public conformity to Popery in the Low Countries, was about to be displaced by the Duke of Alva as governor of those provinces. To prove, however, that her administration was not deficient either in energy or cruelty, she adopted measures of greater severity against the Reformed in all parts of her dominions. This was the period to which the following extracts refer:

At Amsterdam, the flight of multitudes of people from all parts was the harbinger of the approaching distress. These poor creatures, after having long waited at the gates were refused admittance, and required by the magistrates instantly to depart. A dismal spectacle it was, to see so many of them, with their wives and children, standing on the dykes, having been driven from their own habitations and denied entrance into the city, without support and without hope, falling from one distress into another. Pitied they were indeed both by Protestants and Papists; and some of the most tender-hearted burghers sheltered them in their country-houses and gardens which were situated in the suburbs. But the magistrates would not allow them as much time as was requisite to provide necessaries for a longer journey. A collection therefore of victuals, clothes and money was hastily made for them, and several ships were hired to convey them to Embden and other places of safety.

This was also the period when Laurence Real and his friends became voluntary exiles from their native country, on account of the lowering and hopeless aspect of public affairs. The Heer Brederode, who had for some weeks been in Amsterdam as a leader in favour of the Prince of Orange, left that city on the 27th of April, 1567, and retired to Embden.—The Reformed and their ministers had held several conferences together, respecting the course of conduct, which, under existing circumstances, it would be proper for them to pursue. It was at length determined unanimously, that the fear of man should not cause them to refrain from the exercise of their religion, but that they ought to proceed as they had formerly done, at least till they were prohibited. After this, as their dangers increased, on the 20th of April, they gave themselves to fasting and prayer. Perceiving that the fire of persecution which had broken out in Flanders and Brabant, daily approached nearer to their city, they spontaneously proposed to the magistrates at the close of their fast, that they would cease from holding any more meetings, on condition of a mutual agreement not to admit any foreign soldiers into the town; and that the Reformed, in virtue of the stipulations of former treaties, should be allowed a sufficient time to dispose of all their real estates, and to remove with their goods out of the country. The required agreement was concluded and ratified by the magistrates on the 26th of the same month.

The Reformed were indeed the strongest party in the city of Amsterdam, but had little to expect from the country around. They were disheartened by the rumour of Noirkarmes, and much more so by the approach of his troops. Those therefore who had been the most zealous in their exertions for the Reformation, and who had on that account become most obnoxious to the ruling powers, began to look out for a safe retreat, and to hasten away, in the first instance, to Embden, at that time a general asylum for the distressed. Some of the exiles, before their departure from Amsterdam, procured certificates under the city-seal, testifying that they had always conducted themselves with approved loyalty and fidelity. The Burgomasters granted certificates of this description even to those persons who had been the objects of their greatest detestation. They adopted this plan, only to tantalize and deceive them, and to allure others to imitate their example by quitting the city. Those however who had placed any

reliance on these certificates of good conduct, and who had either remained in Amsterdam or afterwards returned to it, soon found their unsuspecting confidence to have been wofully misplaced.

Reinier Kant commenced his journey on the evening of the 27th. The next day Laurence Real received advice, as if immediately from the magistrates, to retire for a season, till they ascertained what would be the issue of national affairs. He expected to receive from them an honourable testimonial under their seal, by way of passport; but, when he applied for it, he was told that they were much engaged with other business, and could not then give him one. However, they solemnly assured him that it should be sent after him at their expense, provided he acquainted them with his intended route. Without the least hesitation, he informed them that he was about to proceed to Medenblick; and immediately afterwards embarked on board a small vessel, taking with him his wife and daughter, then a girl about fourteen years of age, Francis de Wael, Matthias Johnson a Hatter, and Adrian Cromhout. —No sooner had they arrived at Medenblick, an open town, than it was intimated to them, that a party of horse was marching towards the town from Alkmaer. On receiving this intelligence, they hurried into a herring-boat and set sail; but meeting with another vessel laden with the goods of Refugees, and none but a boy on board, they proceeded in it with all dispatch to Wieringen, at which place the skipper (or boatman,) overtook them next day, and said, that they had scarcely sailed from Medenblick when about forty horsemen arrived at their inn, and, having searched for them in vain, would have pursued them if they could have found a ship at the quay, ready for sailing. Still devoid of suspicion, they thought the soldiers had been the bearers of the testimonial or pass which the magistrates had undertaken to forward to them. A young man was therefore deputed to request this promised document for the four citizens; but he was tartly told "that they might come for it themselves." They did not, however, wait his return, but prevailed with the skipper to convey them to Flieland. When they arrived at Flieland, they found themselves in still greater distress; for neither a boat nor any other vessel could be found, every thing that carried a sail having been previously engaged in transporting the refugees and their property to Embden, Bremen, and other free towns. Letters had also arrived, addressed to the sheriff of that island

by the magistrates of Amsterdam; they contained a description of four persons, (Real and his three friends,) and desired the sheriff to take them into custody if they came within the precincts of his jurisdiction. But the sheriff had died a few days before; and the letters came in the course of business into the hands of Adrian Cornelison, a goldsmith of Alkmaer, who then resided at Flieland and executed *pro tempore* the office of sheriff: This person very kindly communicated their contents to the parties concerned, and advised them to depart without delay. An old crab-schute or boat, of three tons burden, which had remained under water nearly half a year, was raised up for them in the night. In this, as soon as day-light appeared, they put out to sea; but had not sailed far before they were compelled to run into Harlingen, on account of the leaky state of their boat. Just as they were entering the harbour, they perceived a ship full of soldiers boarding another: This was a sight which they contemplated with terror, and they quickly steered away towards the large sand-bank called "the Abbot," where they stopped the leaks of their frail vessel as well as they could with their linen. At length, after many delays and dangers, they arrived at Embden on the 22d of May, and were there delighted to find many of their friends whom they had left behind at Amsterdam, and who had likewise betaken themselves to flight after their departure. Elizabeth Real, who afterwards became the wife of the renowned Arminius, shared with her parents and their three friends in all the disasters of this perilous voyage.

John Arentson, Peter Gabriel, and Nicholas Scheltius, the three Reformed ministers from Amsterdam, came to Embden. Two of them, Nicholas Scheltius and Peter Gabriel, received their entire support from the Amsterdam Refugees, on engaging to devote their ministerial labours exclusively to the congregation of that city, at all times and in whatever place it might ultimately settle.—But Scheltius in a little time received a call from the people of Embden to become their minister; with which he complied, after permission had been granted to him by his friends from Amsterdam, who also continued to give him a small stipend, that they might retain their right in him. But the plague, which raged grievously in that town, attacked and killed him and several other ministers, who, according to the usage of that church, visited the sick in person. In the year 1572, when Holland took up arms against the Spaniards, Peter Gabriel entered into the service of the people of Delft,

but only as a borrowed man, and died there in the year ensuing.—John Arentson returned, in 1568, to Alkmaer, the place of his nativity, which, soon after his arrival, was besieged by the Spanish army, and regularly invested on the 21st of August, 1569. But the resistance of the brave inhabitants, who opened several of the sluices and pierced some of the dykes, and the continued rains which augmented the mass of circumjacent waters, forced the Spanish general to raise the siege on the 8th of October. During this siege John Arentson died in the town, after having exerted himself greatly in the cause of the Reformed. On his death-bed he sent for his particular friends, Nanning van Foreest, who was afterwards member of the Great Council, Philip Cornelison, and others, —and, as a dying man, earnestly exhorted them to act with courage and resolution, consoling their drooping minds with an assurance of approaching deliverance. He said, "God will grant you good success, and the enemy shall not at this time enter the town."

It seems not to have been till after the pacification of Ghent, in the year 1577, that Laurence Real and his family, with the rest of the exiles from Amsterdam, returned to their native city.

This account was due to the memory of the father-in-law of Arminius, that intrepid assertor of the liberties of his country, and whose daughter proved herself to be in every respect worthy of her high birth and extraction. It is also inserted with the intention to give the reader some faint conception of the actual state of the Low Countries about the time when Arminius first came into public notice.

K.——Page 32.

In the year 1594, when it was in contemplation to reform the initiatory schools, the honourable Senate of Amsterdam thought proper to choose Arminius in preference to his brethren, and to confide to him the province of conducting this affair in the name of the public. On that occasion he performed the duties of a most faithful schoolmaster, that he might reduce the practice of the schools to better order. He prepared those laws which contain the duties both of masters and scholars, and which are recited to this day, according to ancient custom, by the Rectors of those schools in the Choir of the New Church, each half year, immediately after the public examination in Spring and Autumn. The learned Professor Lim-

borch had in his possession, many years afterwards, the manuscript in which Arminius wrote these laws for the government of the schools and their better management.

Arminius continued to devote himself to a deeper and more accurate search into those opinions concerning predestination which are generally defended by the Genevan school, that he might be enabled to free himself from those difficulties and doubts under which he had hitherto laboured. While he was thus engaged, nothing yielded him greater satisfaction, than to perceive other Protestant ministers, conspicuous for their doctrine, piety, and learning, occupied with the same care and desire. Among such worthies, Gellius Snecanus, a very learned minister in Friezland, was at that period one of the most eminent.* When

* The elder Brandt says, "The same year, (1590,) GELLIUS SNECANUS, an elderly, learned, and pious clergyman in Friezland, published a book, in which he treated of Predestination agreeably to the opinion of Melancthon, and maintained, that the doctrine of a *Conditional Predestination* was not only consistent with the word of God, but could not be accused of novelty. He affirmed, that those who, at the commencement of the Reformation, taught the contrary doctrine in Friezland, were considered innovators."—On account of a circumstance which transpired at the time when he was about to publish this work, and which proved that some change had in this respect occurred, he was induced "to print his writings privately; yet he openly prefixed his name, and dedicated his book to the States, the Nobility, the great men, and the towns of Friezland, as well as to the Stadtholder, without receiving any censure either from the government or the clergy, or experiencing any kind of trouble on that account.—At the close of his preface, he says, 'Let all orthodox Professors of Divinity, publicly and without any hesitation about naming Calvin or other great men, exhort their disciples and scholars not to ascribe to the writings of any man more authority than the rule of faith allows.'

"Beza, having some time afterwards seen this book, addressed letters to some of the clergy in Holland, in which he did not conceal his dislike. In one which he wrote to Uitenbogardt, and which I have perused, Beza says, 'You will be informed by our very worthy brother Taffinus, what I have 'written to him at greater length concerning the treatise of one of our Friez-'land brethren, named Gellius Snecanus, a person who seems to me to be 'learned, but who, in my opinion, would have acted much more wisely had 'he discussed the matter with some of his brethren before he ventured to 'publish his notions.—I think it absolutely necessary, that some care be 'taken about these matters in that quarter as soon as possible, and that it 'should be *once for all*, if that were practicable. For if we must descend to 'Defences and Justifications, we shall never be done. Besides, if we should 'proceed to answer Gellius, a houseful of books might soon be written.' At the close he entreated that his letter might be favourably interpreted, and not as though he assumed any authority in the affair. But his advice respecting opposing Gellius in some other manner than by writing, produced no effect."

How difficult to forget bad habits! Calvin, Beza, and others of the same school, having only just forsaken a Church that interposed the strong arm of AUTHORITY whenever it could not answer the ARGUMENTS of those who opposed its dogmas, adopted a similar practice themselves: To save the precious time of those *who had placed themselves* in the sure and certain scale of Election, they appealed to the secular power, the spring of which was in

this excellent man had, in the year 1596, published his *Introduction to the Ninth Chapter of the Romans*, that work communicated the greatest delight to Arminius, because he perceived that the view which Snecanus had taken of that chapter co-incided in nearly every particular with his own. Having read the whole of the brief commentary on the chapter, he immediately perceived that the author, on whose profound judgment he placed great reliance, had evidently held the same sentiments with him on the design of the Apostle and the chief arguments employed by him in enforcing his proposition; and they were the same as those which he had used, not long before, in illustration of that chapter, before his own congregation at Amsterdam. In a letter of thanks to Snecanus for the confirmation of his own views on this subject, he ingenuously confessed, that the deepest shadows had always appeared to rest on that chapter, and he had found it most difficult of explanation, till he entered into that path along which both Snecanus and himself had lately walked, when the light of heaven had dispelled that darkness and removed all the previous difficulties. He transmitted to him at the same time his *Analysis on the Ninth Chapter of the Romans*, for the purpose of testifying their mutual agreement, and of proving that the highly eulogized decree of *absolute election and reprobation* which many persons were desirous to elicit, could not be deduced from that portion of the Apostle's writings, which indeed contributed nothing towards what such persons wanted.

In the beginning of the year 1597, he went to Leyden to be present at the nuptials of the Rev. J. Kuchlinus, who had accepted of a Professorship in that University, and married the aunt of Arminius. One afternoon, while at the house of his new relation, he had a long conversation with Doctor Francis Junius, then the chief Professor of Divinity at Leyden; the subjects which they discussed were, *the cause of the fall of our first parents, its mode, contingence, and necessity.* This was the commencement of that *Friendly Conference* of which some further account will be given in the Second Volume.

reality held in their own hands; and thus, when they had no *popular* or *cogent* reasons to urge, (arguments *of that kind* being confessedly scarce in the scheme of rigid predestination,) they called their adversaries "mad-dogs and Heretics," and tried to silence them by oppression and cruelty. O FESTUS DIES HOMINIS, for a better knowledge both of civil and religious freedom in the Low Countries, when Arminius was born!

The ardour of our author's mind, and the satisfaction which he received from Junius, are well described in a familiar letter, which he addressed to his friend Uitenbogaert, Feb. 7, 1597. Arminius embraced that fine opportunity of communicating his views to Junius; and their correspondence on these interesting topics was conducted under the mutual promise of inviolable secrecy. This promise was violated, unwittingly, on the part of Junius: One of the young theological students who lodged in the aged Professor's house, and on whom his confidence was misplaced, had seen and perused the letters that passed between these two eminent men, and afterwards copied them in secret. From the copy, thus surreptitiously obtained, several others were transcribed; and Arminius was surprised one day, while conversing with his violent colleague Plancius, to receive from him this sarcastic reproach, "The answers of Junius have closed your mouth." Arminius had not closely pressed his venerable correspondent with such arguments as, he was conscious, would have exposed the fallacies in several of those answers; he therefore resolved to complete his design; and addressed a number of remarks to Junius on the different points upon which the latter had pronounced a final but not a satisfactory decision. Junius had those additional observations in his possession upwards of six years before his death, but never attempted to reply.

Our author, however, did not desist from his eager search after Truth, but was "prepared to embrace her with both hands, by whomsoever she might be shewn." With this design in view he implored the assistance of no man with greater earnestness than that of John Uitenbogaert, the eloquent minister of the church at the Hague, whose chaste judgment and polished understanding he held in such esteem, as to think that scarcely any one could form a more correct and decisive opinion about these controversies. This was the reason why Arminius submitted his final remarks on the answers of Junius, to the revision of this friend alone, before he transmitted them to the Professor. The reader will be gratified with the following extract from the letter which he addressed to Uitenbogaert at the time (Oct. 19, 1597) when he transmitted those papers for his friendly perusal: "We must endeavour to seek out arguments for such truths as are already acknowledged,—solid arguments by which those truths may be confirmed, and plain ones by which they may be recognized as truths by those who are gainsayers through simplicity of heart and the decision of their consciences: Among gainsayers of this description I number my own name, if on any point I have erred from the truth. But I cannot sufficiently won-

der at the overweening boldness of some men, who, with their censorial rod, place the mark of heresy on every thing that is not agreeable to their palate. For they wish to bestow scarcely any pains in obtaining a knowledge of controversies; and, if they were ever so desirous, they would not be able to know them, because they are destitute of the erudition necessary for deciding matters of such great moment. Truth, even theological truth, with regard to the accurate knowledge of this kind of controversies, lies immersed in a deep well, out of which she cannot be drawn up without great labour. This is so manifestly true, in the article upon which Junius and I are treating, that he who denies the fact, declares by his denial, that he never instituted a serious consideration with his own mind on the subject. But I entreat the God of *Truth* to grant it to me at some time for the tranquillity of my spirit: I shall then rejoice as though I had found out a most precious treasure, and shall own myself to have been for several reasons under the weightiest obligations to all those who have afforded me any assistance in the discovery."

In the following year, (1598,) Arminius transmitted to the same friendly divine, for the purpose of shedding more light on these controversies, a certain Theological Table on Predestination, in which, as in a mirror, were represented in one view all those things relating to that topic, which offered themselves as worthy of discussion. Entertaining the opinion, that the elucidation of this point ought not to terminate his enquiries, he soon afterwards wished to make the experiment, if it was not possible to extricate himself, by the aid of foreign divines, from those scruples which were to him a fruitful source of anxiety. William Perkins, a celebrated divine in the University of Cambridge, a short time previously had published, "*A Christian and Plain Treatise of the Manner and Order of Predestination and of the Largeness of God's Grace.*"* The name of this great man had already become famous by the publication of other books of a better character; Arminius therefore thought, that he ought to purchase this pamphlet, and not to peruse it with indifference. After he had read it, having perceived himself still to be involved in the same doubts and difficulties, he conceived that there would be no impropriety in commencing a correspondence with that divine on the subject of his pamphlet. He embraced that opportunity, therefore, to compose his very elaborate and modest "Examination" of this Treatise by Perkins; and would undoubtedly have sent it to that very learned individual, had it

* This is the title which Francis Cacot and Thomas Tuke gave to their English translation of this treatise in the year 1606.

been announced to him, at the very moment when he was ut to finish the last part of his own production, that this emi- t divine of the Church of England and of the University of ıbridge had recently departed this life, and exchanged it for :tter state of existence. From that period he confined the ıuscript of this small work, and others of the same kind, ıin a select circle of his friends.

t was nearly at the same period too, that he diligently devoted attention to the commencement of *A Synopsis of Common ces in Divinity*. His sole reason for engaging in this under- ng, was, that he might be more deeply imbued and become ıer acquainted with that heavenly wisdom which presents itself he understanding in every part of the Sacred Writings, and the investigation of which he was transported with a ceaseless inexhaustible desire. With the same object in view, in the owing year, (1599,) he resolved to peruse the writings of all ancient or modern divines which he had in his own possession, which he might have an opportunity of seeing, to examine ry passage with accuracy, to mark such as were worthy of ervation, to refer each of them to its proper class, and to ject to close investigation those which might be deemed wor- of more special notice. The younger Brandt, who had seen y the remains and a small part of these *Common Places*, refers readers to the ninety-eighth and a few others of the *Epistolæ estantium Virorum*, for an account of the progress which ninius made in this undertaking.

n the same year, (1599,) Arminius displayed in a very con- :uous manner his kind regard for that most famous man, John usius, who was at that period a Professor of Hebrew, in- ıcting with the greatest applause the students of the Univer- of Franeker in Oriental learning. It was the opinion of ninius, which he did not conceal from others, that this cele- ted scholar was born to promote Hebrew literature, and to ive from the Hebrew fountains themselves the genuine inter- tation of the Old Testament. He therefore left nothing un- mpted, by which the Christian Church might procure such efits as were meet from the labours of Drusius. About that e frequent mention was made of a new translation of the le into the Dutch language; and the States General had, years previously, committed the province of preparing such ıslation to Philip Marnixe, Count of Aldegonde, who soon rwards died. It became then an object of great solicitude h the deputies of the North and South Holland Churches, ıave this most important work, which had been commenced

under happy auspices by Aldegonde, either entirely completed according to his plan, or begun on some other. When they seemed inclined to present a petition to the States on this subject at the first opportunity, Arminius exerted himself greatly to induce the government to consult Drusius, and to pay some attention to his opinion about this matter.* He thought he had the most satisfactory reasons for recommending Drusius before all others,—both on account of that learned man's well-known and long-approved skill in the oriental languages,—and also because the Count of Aldegonde, at the very time when many persons first requested his assistance, advised the Churches to direct their attention to Drusius in preference to himself.† But the cause why the recommendation of Arminius and Uitenbogaert was unsuccessful, will be found in the unfair judgment which some Pastors of the Church had formed respecting this very famous divine and his orthodoxy. Having previously, in a meeting of the South Holland Synod, passed a resolution, which circumscribed within very narrow limits those who were appointed to superintend the version of the Bible, and having entertained a suspicion that he cherished some sort of monster within his breast, and that he gave too great a scope to his imagination in explaining certain passages in the Holy Scriptures, these Pastors excluded Drusius not only from executing any part of the translation, but likewise from being an inspector. Yet to avoid the appearance of treating with neglect such a learned individual as Drusius, the States General commanded him, the following year, to write a Commentary or Notes on the more difficult passages of the Old Testament, and duly to consult and examine the Chaldee, Greek and Latin Interpreters on those passages. For this service he was to receive, for some years, an annual salary of four hundred Guilders.

In the mean time, while Arminius was watching with the utmost anxiety over the interests of other persons, whose aid he accounted exceedingly necessary for reducing ecclesiastical affairs to a better state, he was compelled to endure much obloquy and slander, and to submit to many erroneous judgments which some men had conceived respecting his studies. The views of his mind at this period with respect to the affairs of the Church may be ascertained from a familiar letter which he addressed to his friend Uitenbogaert, Aug. 1, 1599, and in which he disburdened his oppressed spirit that sighed on account of the afflictions of our common Christianity: "How can that man be joy-

* Epist. ad Uitenbog. 8 Sept. 1599.

† Epist. Aldegondii ad Drusium, (17 Jan. 1594.) Vitæ Drusii insertum.

us who, in addition to the general impiety and injustice which spread their devastations through the whole earth, beholds in the Church of Christ, in Christianity itself, such a diversity of sentiment on religion,—such licentiousness in one race of men in uttering any kind of opinions against the truth,—and such boldness and vehemence, in most of those who have attained to some degree of authority among their own party, in obtruding on the whole Christian Church all the dogmas which appear to themselves proper to be prescribed as articles of faith necessary for salvation! While I reflect on these things my spirit faints within me, and is hurried onward and tormented by such a torrent of various thoughts, as to be compelled, after I find myself too ignorant to say what ought to be done in these tumults, to cry to my God:—'Grant peace, O Lord, to thine Israel! May peace 'be within her outworks [walls] and prosperity in her palaces! 'Heal the stripes and bind up the wounds of Joseph, that bre-'thren and neighbours, being joined together in the sole bond of 'that truth which is necessary for thy glory and for the salvation 'of mankind, and in the unity of firm charity, may give praise 'to thee in thy house from generation to generation.'—But whither has my grief transported me? Such thoughts as these ought not to be committed to paper, which is too frequently unfaithful to the trust reposed in it: I will wait, therefore, till I can ease my mind by pouring them into your friendly bosom."

In nearly the same state of mind, he contemplated his own peculiar situation; and disclosed his thoughts on the subject in the following extract of a letter to his friend Uitenbogaert, dated September 8, 1599: "I am doing all that I am able, by teaching the truth with which I am already acquainted, and in inquiring after that of which I am yet ignorant; I am likewise engaged in investigating still further what I know, and in strengthening and confirming it by solid reasons. But I do all this in silence and in hope; and have, in the mean time, to endure the unseasonable zeal of certain persons and their almost insufferable vehemence, until God is pleased to release me from this inconvenience, or to bestow upon them the spirit of discretion and prudence which may temper and moderate their zeal. But I seem to myself to have the most satisfactory reasons for ascribing to them zeal without knowledge: For I see them engage in any thing, rather than in that to which they are bound in virtue of their office, the most considerable part of which is placed in the investigation and search of truth. But the reason why they neglect this important duty, is the opinion or persuasion which they have imbibed that *they have attained to the Truth*. This notion is

so powerful in some of them, as to render them daring enou to pronounce an *extempore* and peremptory sentence on any mat whatever, even on one of the greatest difficulty, which had been previously made an object of their consideration. Th precipitancy is undoubtedly injurious to the Christian Chur and must be detrimental to truth."—So far the younger Bran

It was in this year too, (1599,) that Arminius, and Jo Taffin, Pastor of the Walloon Church at Amsterdam, wrote official letter to Dr. Francis Junius, Professor of Divinity Leyden, respecting the doctrines and conduct of the Engl Brownists or Independents, whose outrageous anti-ceremon zeal,—having neither Prelates, Service-book, Surplice, nor Ri on which to wreak its vengeance in Holland,—began to dir its energies to the reformation of the church-government of t Dutch Presbyterians, among whom they had found an asyl when they fled from England. In Appendix L, I have given translation of this letter, because it affords a good explanati of the malevolence subsequently displayed, by that class of a taries, beyond all others, against every thing that bore the nam er savoured of the doctrines, of Arminius. Of the emin men among the early Independents, the only one who l manifested any wish to become acquainted with the syst of Arminius, was the famous William Ames,—though it m be seen, in his dispute with Grevinchovius, that on Gene Redemption he was a more disingenuous adversary, than when t rites and ceremonies of the Church of England were the obje of his marked vituperation. The ignorance which the mode writers of that denomination have displayed, respecting the d trines of Arminianism, and the facts connected with its ea history, may, perhaps too charitably, be imputed to the want a learned education, under which those of them labour w abound most in empty declamations and unfounded assertio and in which ecclesiastical researches of this kind ought, for t reputation of the body, always to form no inconsiderable p tion.

In the beginning of the year 1600, the Churches of Sou Holland, at their annual Synod, assigned to him the task of futing the Anabaptists. It had been hoped, by some of t zealous promoters of this appointment, that, as the Anabaptis among other doctrines, were themselves at issue with the Dut Calvinists on Predestination and the Freedom of the Will, A minius would, in his reply to them, be under the necessity disclosing more fully his own sentiments on those points. consulting the note in a subsequent page, (530,) the reader w

perceive, that Arminius had formed a correct judgment of the motives of those by whom that task was imposed: But this did not deter him from the attempt to execute the commission, since it was his opinion that "the labour thus bestowed, would be useful to the Church of Christ." But his varied occupations after becoming Professor of Divinity, and his consequent want of leisure, prevented him from making any considerable progress in this undertaking: And the last notice which we have of this subject is in the year 1607, when the reply of Arminius concerning that matter, to the deputies of the South Holland Synod, "was the cause of much conversation on both sides."—Brandt says:

In a letter to his friend Uitenbogaert, of the date of May 26, 1600, he adverts to one of the grievances which the Haerlem Class proposed for discussion, at the next Annual Synod of the Churches of South Holland, and which was expressed in these terms:—"Is it not proper, that the Pastors of the Churches "should every year renew their subscription to the Confession "and Catechism, since persons may be found, who, though they "subscribed them at their first entrance into the sacred office, "yet afterwards gave manifest indications of a change in their 'sentiments?"—"I wonder at the improvident minds of these men," says Arminius, "who do not perceive that, by this method, they not only call in question the fidelity of all ministers, as persons that must be compelled to constancy in the Faith by annually subscribing their names [to the two ecclesiastical formularies,] and likewise sow the seeds of daily dissensions: As if it is an impossible case for a person, who at the time of his entering on the ministerial functions had no doubts, and therefore conscientiously subscribed, to begin in process of time to feel doubts about some article, from which he cannot extricate himself before the period for subscribing afresh has again returned! Besides, this is a matter which belongs equally to all churches: And what prudent man ever thought it profitable either to the Commonwealth or to the Church, to institute an enquiry into crimes which have not yet manifested themselves, and to drive into open dissension those who cherished no evil cogitations? But do not such actions as these seem like the foundation of a new Spanish Inquisition, or one of the Council of Trent? I write thus, not because I should refuse to subscribe, but on account of the thing itself." At the close of the same letter, he animadverts on similar practices in some of the Dutch Churches, in the following manner: "It seems to me, many persons are so afraid of appearing not sufficiently anxious concerning ecclesiastical matters, that they meditate whole nights and days whether they

likewise cannot propose something for discussion in the different Synods. Such men ought to be reminded of the Apostolic admonition: *Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.*"—In that part of ministerial duty which Arminius thus recommended to others, how little he was himself deficient, is evident from the circumstance, that, in the space of thirteen years, he not only expounded in public the prophecy of Malachi, but likewise nearly the whole of Mark, the prophecy of Jonah, and St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians; and he finished the exposition of that Apostle's Epistle to the Romans, on the last day of September in the year 1601.

On the 11th of January, 1601, he commenced a course of sermons on the Epistles to the seven Asiatic Churches, which are contained in the second and third chapters of the Revelation. In the course of the same year he approved himself as a pious and diligent pastor of the Church: For at that period, a fiery pestilence, which spared no description of men, raged through all the country, and especially in Amsterdam, the principal city of Holland and the emporium of the whole world. Yet, at that crisis, Arminius considered it a miraculous circumstance, and a most evident proof of the singular providence of God, that, during the prevalence of this destructive plague throughout the city, the infection was not communicated that year to any individual among the Magistrates, the Judges, the Treasurers, the Guardians of orphans, the Ministers of religion, the Elders, the Deacons, the Visitors of the sick, or among the Governors and Teachers of the Schools. In those days of public calamity, Arminius never ceased to pour out ardent prayers to God for the safety of his country, to exhort the people to prayer and serious amendment of life, to elevate the hearts of the pious both in public and in private by consolatory discourse, and to devote every moment of time, which he could spare from the discharge of his ordinary and extraordinary functions, not so much to the acquisition of knowledge, as to imbuing his own mind with solid piety. When this extensive field of pastoral fidelity and godliness offered itself to him, he executed the labour which seemed to be providentially assigned him, with such vigour as to be worthy of having his name recorded among those excellent men whose examples are held forth for the imitation of all the ministers of the Christian Church. He performed the offices of humanity, with equal assiduity, both to the poor and the rich; and never allowed himself to be deterred from the discharge of his duty as a diligent pastor, through the fear of catching the contagion. One day, when Arminius was passing through one

of the meanest precincts of the city, he heard the cries of human voices proceed out of a common dwelling-house. He soon learnt from the neighbours, that the entire family was seized with this contagious disorder, and were tormented with a most dreadful thirst; and he not only offered to the bystanders money with which to purchase drink for the sufferers, but, when no man among them durst enter that infected house of the poor, laying aside all consideration of the danger to which by such an act he would be exposing himself and his family, he intrepidly entered the lowly dwelling, and refreshed each member of the distressed family both in body and in mind.—A very interesting account of his feelings and conduct, when called to the performance of these arduous duties, is given by himself in a long letter, which the reader will find at the commencement of Appendix O.

L.—Page 32.

Although JUNIUS is here placed first in order by Bertius, he died two months after his colleague Trelcatius. As I shall have occasion to make a few remarks on Junius, in the second volume of this Translation, at the commencement of *the Epistolary Conference* between him and Arminius, I shall there give a few of the most interesting particulars in that good man's Life. He has composed an account of himself, which is prefixed to his Theological Works: In it he relates some strong things against himself, much after the manner of St. Augustine's *Confessions*, or our pious countryman's (John Bunyan's) *Grace abounding to the Chief of Sinners.* Such narratives are highly interesting to mature christians,—to all who are practically acquainted with the work of grace on the soul of man; but to those who have no relish for divine things, and who are mere "outward-court worshippers," they appear the warm and exaggerated effusions of religious enthusiasts,—though related by some of the wisest men of the different generations in which they lived. But this was the misapprehension of men of perverted minds, with regard to inward christianity, from the beginning: For *the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: Neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.* (1 Cor. ii. 14.) The following account of Junius, from the pen of the elder Brandt, will suffice to afford the reader a general view of his character and acquirements:

"A few weeks after Trelcatius, on the 23rd of October, 1602, FRANCIS JUNIUS was visited with the plague; and died after an illness of three days, to the great loss of the University and of the Reformed Churches, in the 57th year of his age; for he was

born at Bourges in the Dutchy of Berri, on the first of May, 1555.—In the preceding Books [of *the History of the Reformation in the Low Countries*] are recorded the zeal and prudence which he displayed, and the dangers which he incurred, in promoting the business of Reformation [from Popery] in this country; for these were the most remarkable parts of his life and actions.

"After his departure from the Netherlands, he resided some time in the Palatinate, and exercised his ministry about Heidelberg: After which, he went into France, on a visit to his mother and relatives. On his return to the Palatinate, the Elector sent him to the Prince of Orange's camp, at the time of the unfortunate expedition over the Maese in 1568; and on that occasion he remained three days without meat or drink, and could procure nothing better than a few green herbs on the third evening. In Kempen he had a narrow escape from being frozen to death: In Lorraine, his horse was stolen from him; and there was scarcely any kind of trouble which he was not called to endure. He resolved therefore to retire into Germany, though he incurred great danger in making the attempt: But the Prince of Orange detained him, much against his will, for the purpose of enjoying his christian ministrations.

"On his second return to his congregation in the Palatinate, the Elector wished to send him again to the Prince, and refused to listen to any of his excuses; but in consequence of the bite of a dog, (an accident for which he thanked God,) he was detained from the seat of war. He afterwards preached at a place called Schonaw till the year 1573, when the Elector ordered him to remove to Heidelberg, that he might be engaged, in conjunction with Emanuel Tremellius, in translating the Old Testament out of Hebrew into Latin. In 1578, he went to Newburg, where he exercised his ministry fourteen months: In the following year, he was sent to officiate as pastor to the Church of Otterburg: He remained there till 1582, when he was called to the Academy at Nieustadt, and thence, in 1584, to the Professorship of Divinity in the University of Heidelberg. In that situation he continued till 1591, when family affairs required his presence in France: But before his arrival in that kingdom, in his journey through the Netherlands he visited the city of Leyden, in which he met with such a favourable reception, that, in the year 1592, he was chosen Professor of Divinity, and continued there, ten years, to the period of his death, a great luminary of learning and piety.

"The famous Joseph Scaliger preferred him to all other

divines for his accurate judgment. It is recorded of him, that he was a very acute disputant in matters of religion, being able with great dexterity to employ the arguments of his adversaries against themselves, or, so to express myself, to turn upon them their own artillery; though he commonly did this in a very gentle, civil, and friendly manner: For, in his writings, he attacked even the Papists with much more temper, than many of the Protestant sects treat each other in our days, though differing among themselves only in trifles.

"On the subject of Predestination, he endeavoured to defend the opinion of Calvin, by rendering it a little more palatable: For he did not maintain, that the divine Predestination had respect to mankind either *antecedent to the decree of their creation*, or *subsequent to their creation on a foreknowledge of their fall;* but that it had respect only to *man already created, so far as, being endowed by God with natural gifts, he was called to a supernatural good.* On that account, James ARMINIUS, then one of the ministers of the Church at Amsterdam, entered into an epistolary conference with him, and tried to prove, by certain conclusions, that the opinion of Junius, as well as that of Calvin, inferred *the Necessity of Sin*, beside other absurdities; and that he must therefore have recourse to a third opinion, which supposed man, not only *as created*, but *as fallen*, to have been the object of Predestination. Junius answered his first letter with that good temper which was peculiar to him, but seemed to fabricate, out of the various opinions concerning Predestination, one of his own, which, Arminius thought, contradicted all those which it was his endeavour to defend. That answer, being copied by some of Junius's family, was subsequently circulated among the students, though the previous stipulation between him and Arminius had been to a different effect;* and it was even reported that it might probably be printed. This circumstance induced Arminius, who had otherwise intended to break off the correspondence, to compose a Rejoinder to the Answer of Junius, which he transmitted to the Professor, who retained it full six years, to the time of his death, without once attempting to return a word in reply: Whether his silence proceeded from a reluctance to discuss this affair any further, through a fear lest it might occasion quarrels and contentions in such suspicious and uncharitable times: Or, whether it was that he found himself too hardly pressed, and, as the friends of Arminius think, knew not what to say to some of the points in his Rejoinder. In 1608, the Works of Junius were

* See, in page 129, a more correct account of this transaction from the pen of Brandt's son.

published at Heidelberg, in two volumes, folio; but the papers which he exchanged with Arminius are not there; nor are certain answers to several questions delivered by him *extempore* at his own house, a little before his death, and copied by some of the students.

"Concerning Junius it is likewise related, that he was averse to every method of proving the deep point of the Holy Trinity, except that from the Holy Scriptures. He considered it a fault in Mornay and others, to pretend, by arguments from nature and Platonical testimonies, (which were usually not very appropriate,) to establish a doctrine which ought never to be brought into discussion with Atheists, Heathens, Jews, and Mahometans: For all these people should be referred to the Holy Scriptures, for the purpose of extracting from them such things as, without a Divine Revelation which they contain, they could never of themselves have learned.—In 1593, he wrote that famous Irenicon, entitled, *The Peaceable Christian*, which, on its first appearance and when some copies of it were delivered to the Deputies of the States, received their high commendation. But above all, it was his greatest praise, that *he was himself the very* PEACEABLE CHRISTIAN *whom he had depicted*,—a title which was as justly due to him, as those of *the divine*, *Chrysostom*, or *the golden-mouthed*, *the acute*, &c. were bestowed on certain eminent divines in former ages, on account of their gifts or learning, which, without a peaceful disposition, are either fruitless or hurtful.—In a company of French divines, of whom Polyander was one, (at that time minister of Dort, and since Professor of Divinity at Leyden,) the following question was asked of Junius, 'If you 'were doomed to lose all your writings, except one, which of them 'would you wish to retain?' He instantly replied, 'THE PEACE-'ABLE CHRISTIAN: *For I wrote my other books as a Divine*, but 'this as a Christian.'"

But the circumstance of greatest interest to "a true-born Englishman," in the life of Junius, is that of his having been the first eminent person in Holland who detected and mildly rebuked the restless and innovating humour of the English Puritans, and advised them to thoughts of peace. But, though they had sought and found an asylum and generous reception in Holland, they replied to this, one of the meekest of men, with all that fierceness of spirit, which some of them or of their immediate successors displayed, forty years afterwards, not merely in *speech* and *writing*, but in fearful *action*. Any Briton who has perused, with some attention, the long correspondence between this most amiable and philanthropic divine, and the headstrong Puritans, will

easily form some correct notion of the peculiar kind of persons with whom the ecclesiastical rulers of the Church of England had to contend, from the days of Whitgift to those of Laud, and who were subsequently let loose as Furies upon their countrymen in 1641. But he who has not read those or similar documents, and who has not accurately observed the litigious and intolerant conduct of the discordant Calvinistic sects towards each other in New England, or among their Predestinarian brethren in Holland, has formed his opinions, about these commonly-reputed fathers of English liberty, upon the erroneous assertions of their ignorant admirers: Such a man, however well-read on other matters, knows nothing of the fierce Puritanic spirit, which was imported, as our old historians express themselves, "by the zealots who flocked from Scotland, New England, and Holland, like vultures and other birds of rapine, to seek after the prey." —When "the shackles upon their consciences" were removed, (the main pretence for their disorderly conduct in England,) and when they were at perfect liberty in Amsterdam, and in other towns of Holland, (as well as in America,) to worship God "according to their hearts' desire" without molestation, they exhibited no less malignant a disposition than when in their own country, and wished to introduce, into the established religion* of their new Calvinistic neighbours, certain reputed refinements in the doctrinal construction of passages of scripture, and in the

* Calvin, who was equally eminent as a Politician and a Divine, was not so fastidious about Established Churches and their concomitants, as many of his modern followers are in Great Britain. He composed a liturgy for the use of the church of Geneva. He also acted according to the doctrine of expediency, in accommodating several of his political opinions to the exigences of the times, and the varying circumstances of the people who asked them: Thus, though many passages may be gleaned, from his writings, against Protestant Bishops; yet his testimonies in favour of them, will be found to be nearly equal in number. The account of his letter to King Edward the Sixth, contained in Sir H. SIDNEY'S *Romish Policies*, is strong confirmation of his real attachment to Episcopacy. Queen Elizabeth's council, "upon her Highness's discourse, concluded, that Calvin would have established Episcopacy beyond seas, had he been consulted herein, and that the hindrance of this offerture caused much animosity between Reformers."

The following extract from BARROW'S *Brief Discovery of the False Church* will prove the offence which the Grand Master of the modern Predestinarian Scheme gave to one of his strict doctrinal followers, by the close connection between church and state which he established at Geneva:—"Such like detestable stuff hath Master Calvin in his ignorance brought to defend his own rash and disorderly proceedings at Geneva, whiles he at the first dash made no scruple to receive the whole state into the bosom of the church: Yea, that which is worse, and more to be lamented, it became a miserable precedent and pernicious example to all Europe, to fall in the like transgression, as in the confused estate of all those regions where the gospel is thus orderly taught, is more than plain."

regimen of their churches.—The following is Brandt's account of these people, and of their conduct in Holland:

"About this time, (1599,) or rather earlier, was wafted over hither from England a new sect of people, who, intent on *reforming the Reformation*, separated themselves from the rest of *the Reformed*. These people, having been expelled by Queen Elizabeth, and for their pretended purity called PURITANS, or BROWNISTS from Robert Brown one of the first founders of this sect, fixed themselves chiefly at Leyden and Amsterdam.

"These people had printed and published, in the year 1598, (which they styled, *the last year of the patience of the saints,*) a certain Confession of Faith. In this, which was for the most part conformable to the Genevan doctrine in the main and fundamental points, they said, 'That the Antichrist, that man of sin, 'had corrupted and overturned the holy laws, offices, and em-'ployments of the Church, with the rest of the Articles of the 'Christian Faith; and had introduced and established, instead 'of them, a new-fangled Religion, Liturgy, and Hierarchy: 'That the kings, nations, and inhabitants of the earth, had 'been made drunk with this cup of fornications and abomina-'tions: That all the Hierarchy, which was still retained in the 'Church of England, (of Metropolitans, Primates, Archbi-'shops, Bishops, Suffragans, Deans, Prebends, and Canons,) 'was, with all its appurtenances, a new and antichristian admi-'nistration: That all such persons as were sincerely desirous of 'securing their own eternal welfare, were bound, by virtue of 'God's command, to withdraw as soon as possible from this anti-'christian constitution: That it was the duty of all princes and 'governments to displace and root out all false and will-worship, 'all human inventions in matters of religion; to abolish all ado-'ration of idols and images, all altars and ecclesiastical vest-'ments, and all other superstitious trumperies; and to convert 'to their own and to the public use all the idolatrous edifices, '(such as temples, chapels, and all other places, formerly dedi-'cated and employed by the Heathens and Antichristians in 'their false and will-worship,) with all the revenues and funds of 'the Hierarchy and unlawful church-ministry.'*

"In consequence of the publication of this Confession, several letters were exchanged between Francis Junius, Professor of

* This is only a very brief abstract of the outrageous and unjust remarks of the Independents upon the ecclesiastical regimen and practice of the Church of England. Yet, brief as it is, the reader will discover in it plenty of the leaven which fermented among their connections, till it burst forth in 1640.

Divinity at Leyden, on the one part,—and Francis Johnson, Henry Ainsworth, Daniel Studley, George Kniveton, Christopher Bowman, Stanshal Mercer, and other ring-leaders of this sect, on the other. Junius endeavoured to convince them, that their proceedings were far from tending to peace, and advised them to abstain from further disputes. But they, on the contrary, pressed for more positive answers, and demanded that their opinions should be either refuted or approved: Nay, they declared at last, that they interpreted his silence into consent. On the other hand, he endeavoured to cut all short with the following answer, which, though written later [July 16th, 1602,] and only a little before his death, deserves to be inserted in this place, to which, on account of its matter, it belongs:

"'FRANCIS JUNIUS *wishes health in Christ to the* ENGLISH BRETHREN.

"'Dear Brethren, last night I received from you an immense parcel of letters.* The advice which I gave, was, to abstain from the discussion of questions; in which you command me to engage. I remain firm to my determination: For I place a higher value on the peace of the church, than on the seeds of quarrels. Those persons who feed upon such seeds, will reap a correspondent harvest. The conclusion is false, which

* These Independent Calvinists, who evinced much ability and shrewdness in their controversy with Junius, had, in the first instance, printed their own letters entire, and no part of his except their own inferences. After the quotation in the text, Junius adds, in the same letter, "I have now, for the first time, learnt from yourselves, that my letters have been translated into English: I was ignorant of the fact. You object, *that my letters have not been shewn by you:* I believe it: For I have been informed, by many persons, in letters as well as in private discourse, that they have not been shewn. Shew them, if you please: For this you have my full permission. All men will then perceive the falsity of the reports about them which have been circulated. I am neither ashamed of my letters, nor will I ever be. But I speak from my heart [when I say], that I pity you, who, instead of my letters, have presented the public with your own conclusions. With good men it is necessary to act in a good [or *equitable*] manner."

In the close of their reply, they inform him that they have published his letters, and then retort the words of Junius, in the following style: "Since you now write that such is your wish, we will exhibit your letters, in conjunction with our own, publicly among all men: And if some persons *have circulated any false reports concerning them*, they may be ashamed of them.—You behold your letters now rendered into English and published: We have therefore given our own likewise, both [*pro*] before them and with them; and we shall thus render it manifest, *that with good men we have acted in a good* [or equitable] *manner*. You may bestow on them [our letters] what appellation soever you please; to us that is of trivial consequence. The object of our desire, after which we earnestly strive, is, to make known still more among all men the simplicity of the gospel of Christ, and the iniquity of the apostacy of Antichrist. If therefore *you pity us*, we will bear it, and will pray God in Christ to pity [*have mercy upon*] you."

you make and proclaim, *that my conduct intimates my assent to you!* I have, respecting your affairs, imposed silence on myself; and though teased with a hundred of your importunate letters, I shall adhere to my design of giving you advice, till I have seen you enter on some other method. If my resolution displease you, bear with it: For the discussion of questions is at this time unpleasant to me. It is more in accordance with the will of God, that I should refrain from meddling with questions in this state of affairs, than that both you and I should be entangled in them. You moot many topics in your letters: But I will abstain from those matters, and will religiously employ myself in the work of the Lord. Christian prudence will never suffer me to say any thing about controverted questions, while the opposite party remains unheard.'

"This letter could not stop the mouths of the English, who were resolved to have the last word, and told him his silence was occasioned by want of arguments. In their letter, which I have had the good fortune to see, they say, 'If we should err 'from the true Faith, with the Papists, the Anabaptists, and 'other persons of that description, we have no doubt that you 'would open your mouth, to answer, to refute, and to convince 'us. But because you can point out no error in our Faith, and 'yet because at this time and in the present state of affairs, it is 'not agreeable to you to abide by us and our cause, the safest 'course which you can pursue is *to be silent.* This indeed is an 'act of prudence, but not of piety: For, in his denunciations 'by the Prophet, God has said, *Cursed be he that doeth the work 'of the Lord deceitfully, and cursed be he that keepeth back his 'sword from blood!* (Jer. xlviii, 10.) And, on the contrary: '*O Daughter of Babylon, who art to be destroyed! Happy shall 'he be that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us! Happy shall 'he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones!* 'If these denunciations were uttered against the material Moab 'and Babylon, with how much greater propriety may they be 'denounced against Antichrist, and spiritual Babylon, and all 'her daughters and abominations! If this be the judgment 'against the type and shadow, how much more is it against the 'body itself and the substance!' This was the language of those people who held religious meetings at Amsterdam after their own way, by the connivance of the Magistrates: And we find, that there are in that city, and in other places, some remains of them to this day—a living monument of the misfortunes which attended the Reformation."

This brief yet very sententious remark was made by Brandt,

exactly a century after this quarrelsome race of religionists was permitted to exhibit, to all the world, the dreadful evils entailed on churches that are constituted on the purely Independent scheme, and left to frame and execute their own laws of church-government. These excellent men were, as individuals, among the very mildest of their race. No theological student will require to be reminded of the numerous amenities in the private character of Henry AINSWORTH, the celebrated and very able commentator on the Pentateuch and on the Psalms. His co-pastor ROBINSON is styled, by one of the most violent of his adversaries, "the most learned, polished, and modest spirit that ever "that sect enjoyed: It had been truly a marvel, if such a man "had gone on to the end a rigid Separatist!" Several of the rest were persons of considerable talents and irreproachable in their general conduct; and their church did not run into such an excess of schism as marked the Independent Church at Rotterdam, which claimed the regicide, Hugh Peters, for its founder.* But, when acting the part of church-censors and reformers, they could agree neither with those who adhered to a different ecclesiastical regimen, nor with each other. The following is a brief description of their quarrels and divisions, by that famous Scotch Presbyterian, Robert BAYLIE, in his *Dissuasive from the Errors of the Times*, published in 1645:

* "Their first church in Holland was that of Rotterdam, which Master PETERS, not the most settled head in the world, did draw from its ancient Presbyterial constitution. This Church became no sooner Independent, than it ran into the way of such shameful divisions as their mother at Amsterdam had gone before them. Their pastor, Master Peters was soon weary of them, or they of him; for what causes, themselves best know: But sure it is, he quickly left them and went for New England. The church was not long destitute of pastors; for, about that time, Master Ward and Master Bridge came over to them from Norwich, where they ever had lived fully conform. So soon as they came to Rotterdam, they conformed themselves to the discipline which Master Peters had planted. They renounced their English ordination and ministerial office, joining themselves, as mere private men, to that congregation which afterward did choose and ordain both of them to be their ministers. It was not long before Master Simpson also came hither from London; and, renouncing also his ordination, joined himself as a private member with them.—Then did the spirit of division begin to work among them; and so far to prevail, that Master Simpson, malecontent with Master Bridge for hindering the private members of the flock to prophesy after the Brownists' way, did separate himself and erect a new congregation of his own. Betwixt these two churches the contentions and slanders became no less grievous, than those of Amsterdam between Ainsworth's and Johnson's followers; and, in this, much worse—that they of Rotterdam abode not at one schism, but, after Master Simpson's separation, broke out again into another subdivision. Master Bridge's congregation was so filled with strife, so shameful slanders were laid upon his own back, that displeasure did hasten the death of his wife, and did well near kill himself, making him oft profess his repentance that ever he entered into that society."—BAYLIE'S *Dissuasive*.

"The third master of this sect was Barrow, the most bitter and clamorous censurer of all the Reformed Churches of any that yet hath put pen to paper, choose whom you will of the most despiteful Jesuits. However, before he could gather any formed congregation, his invectives against the Faith, Baptism, and Laws of England were so excessive, that Queen Elizabeth, impatient of his contumelies, by the evil advice of the cruel Prelates about her, caused him in a morning to be hanged on the Tower-hill.—The fourth leader of this way was Master Johnson, who, afraid at Barrow's execution, got over, with the church he had gathered, to Amsterdam; and there, for many years, was pastor to the first settled congregation of Brownists we read of. This man, with Ainsworth his Doctor, sent out to all the Reformed Churches the Confession of their Faith, in the year 1602.* But long it was not till it appeared to the world, that no better spirit did reign in that company than in the former societies of this way. For, incontinent, three shameful schisms, one upon the neck of another, broke out among them:—First. Many of them turned Anabaptists, and were excommunicated. —Secondly. Master Johnson fell to so great odds, first with his brother Master George for small matters, and afterward with his father, that he excommunicated them both; and was cursed by both, when he had rejected peremptorily the mediation of the Presbytery of Amsterdam for reconciliation.—Thirdly. The remnant of the company, a little after, rent into two, upon needless questions: Master Ainsworth, the Doctor, with his half, did excommunicate Johnson and his half, who were not long behind, for they also did quickly excommunicate Ainsworth and all his followers.—Hereupon, the war betwixt these two handfulls of people became so sharp, that Amsterdam could not keep them both: For Johnson, with his side of the house, got away to Embden, where, after his death, that little company, as I suppose, dissolved and vanished. Ainsworth's company, after his death, remained long without all officers, very likely to have dissolved: Yet, at last, after much strife, they did chuse one Master Canne for their pastor, but could not agree, till very lately, upon any other officer; and, even yet, they live without an eldership, as they did before without a pastor."

Such were the disgraceful acts of these "new disciplinarian brethren" in foreign lands! We should have witnessed similar

* They sent a copy in Latin to Junius, in 1596; and one at the same time to "the Professors of Divinity at St. Andrews in Scotland, Heidelberg, Geneva, and the other christian Universities in Holland, Scotland, Germany, and France." The allusion in the text is to the English translation of it in 1602.

scenes among the modern Independents, had not both ministers and people long since perceived it to be their duty as well as their interest, to establish, *virtually* though not *nominally*, a species of Presbytery in all the most respectable of their congregations. To this expedient, indeed, they were compelled to resort in an early period of the history of Independency;* but not generally with favourable results. By this method, though the pastoral deputies from "neighbour churches" are invested with no *ostensible* authority, yet they *really* possess the power of keeping out improper persons from the ministerial office, and of giving *advice* (which is only not called *judgment*) in all contests between pastors and their people, and between the different members of the same churches. This effect is also to be attributed, in no inconsiderable degree, to the *extensive* but *often unacknowledged* influence of the mild principles of Arminianism: Nine-tenths of the modern Independents may claim the title of BAXTERIANS, with far greater propriety than that of CALVINISTS. This effect, indeed, cannot have been produced by the amenity which has been derived from any supposed superiority of learning in the modern Independents: For the advantages were, in this respect, decidedly in favour of Ainsworth, Johnson, Kniveton, and their associates; but, in those ancient worthies, was not fulfilled the truth of the often-quoted Latin axiom: "*Ingenuas didicisse*

* "As for Master Ward, his ministry [at Rotterdam] became so unsavoury to that people, that they did never rest till judicially, by their own authority alone, they had deposed Master Ward from his pastoral charge. This act was much stumbled at by divers, who were fully persuaded of Master Ward's integrity; and at last, by the intercession of some from the church of Arnheim, he was restored to his place: But the ground of the controversy was no way touched. For when the four commissioners from Arnheim, Master [Thomas] Goodwin, Master Nye, Master Laurence, and another, had met in a chamber of a private house in Rotterdam, with some members of that faulty congregation,—and so made up their famous Assembly, which the Apologists [the authors of the *Apologetical Narration*] are pleased to equal, if not to prefer, to all the Assemblies they ever had seen: Whether [it were] that National Synod, wherein Master Nye had seen the flower of the Scottish nation enter into the covenant with very great devotion: Or this great Assembly at Westminster, where he and his brethren oft have seen sitting the Prince Elector, [Prince Rupert's eldest brother,] the most noble members of both Houses of Parliament, the prime divines of all England, the commissioners of the Church of Scotland. That Assembly, I say, of Rotterdam did not so much as touch the main question: They drew a thin skin over the wound, but durst not assay to lance it to the bottom. For did they ever rebuke, or so much as once speak to, the people of that congregation, for usurping a tyrannical authority to depose their pastor? Did they ever attempt to cognosce on the great scandal, the ground of all the rest, Master Simpson's separation? &c. It seems the Assembly was wiser, than to meddle with evils which they found much above their strength to remedy." BAYLIE'S *Dissuasive*.

This author's choler was excited by the comparison, thus instituted by Nye, between the paltry *chamber meeting at Rotterdam*, and the *Westminster Assembly of Divines*, in which Baylie was then sitting (1645) as one of the Scottish Commissioners.

fideliter artes, emollit mores," *&c.* Learning neither "softened their manners," nor prevented them from exhibiting the detestable "ferocity" of the Papists. The commendable improvement, then, which we are permitted to behold among this denomination of Christians, is a *doctrinal* amenity attributable to Arminianism, and has no reference whatever to *higher advance in learning.*

In the preceding brief notice of early Independency, the reader will have recognized the names of several persons who afterwards bore a conspicuous part in the Grand Rebellion, and whose scriptural motto (profanely abused) was then, what they had formerly avowed it to be, (p. 144,) "*Cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood! Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones!*"—Yea, rather happy would it have been for these flaming Calvinists themselves, had they had a better understanding in the spirit of the gospel, and had been under the salutary control of its peaceable and hallowing principles. Yet I have, in this instance also, often admired the wonderful economy of Divine Providence in the over-ruling of evil: This inconsiderable sect, the scum of Holland and the bane of New England, was permitted, for a series of years, to wage successful war with the intolerant principles of the Presbyterian Calvinists,—though its own, when fully explained, were not one whit more liberal; and when they bore the semblance of Toleration, they were assumed for mere temporary purposes, and the Toleration of the Independents was applied to those alone who with themselves, held what they called "the doctrines of grace," as I have shewn in my "*Calvinism and Arminianism Compared.*" This contest continued till the introduction of sounder and more liberal principles of religious liberty among them, by some of their own body,* who during the Interregnum became Armini-

* In addition to the numerous proofs of this fact, which I have given in the work quoted in the text, (which proofs might easily be increased a hundred-fold,) the reader will recognize, in the following brief Questions and Answers, composed by the celebrated John Goodwin, some resemblance of the enviable civil and religious liberty which we now enjoy:

Q.—Is it not an ungodly thing to suffer men to be of any religion?

A.—No: For both our Saviour and the Apostles, and the primitive Christians, did the same.

Q.—Ought we not, at least, to keep our different opinions and religion unto ourselves, in obedience to the civil magistrate that commands it?

A.—No: Because it is better to obey God than man.

Q.—But if Jesuited Papists and other subtle heretics be suffered, will they not seduce many unto their seditious by-paths?

A.—Though a toleration of erroneous opinions may gain some to Satan, yet Truth, being therewith to be published and approved, will, in all probability, not only gain so many more to God; but any one, thus won to the Truth, is worth thousands of these that fall from it.—*Answer to A. Stewart's Second Part.*

ans, and who in consequence were called to endure all the rage of their brethren and of the Presbyterians.

But happier still would these Independent Calvinists themselves have been, and the cause of much happiness to others, had they listened to the advice contained in the following extract of a letter, which Professor Junius addressed to them:

"I observe, in your pamphlet, three things which you seem to have transmitted for our advice, and on which you desire our opinion.—The First is *The Doctrine* which you maintain in your pamphlet.—The Second is *The Fact* of which you accuse the English Churches.—The Third is *The Conclusion* which you infer from a comparison of your doctrine and of that act of the Church of England; that is,—you cannot with a good conscience hold communion with such churches, but feel towards them the greatest aversion of mind.—On these three topics, therefore, I will with much brevity deliver my sentiments, beseeching you as a brother to receive this my reply with complacency.

"I. I wonder, beloved brethren, that you have transmitted the statement of your doctrine, or the pamphlet of your Confession to me; and I am equally amazed at your having sent it 'to 'all those who profess Sacred Literature in all Christian Univer-'sities.' For if there is a certain consent of doctrine, as you pretend, I do not really perceive what necessity existed for you to publish a new Confession in this consent of the holy and ancient doctrine. But if, perchance, there exists some dissension in doctrine, or rather some verbal discrepancy, such dissension ought by no means to be concealed, since you have considered it necessary to give an account of your doctrine. And then, why do

The philanthropy manifested in this quotation is much superior to that displayed in the following extract from *An Answer to Thirty-two Questions, by the Elders of the Churches in New England*, which was published, by Hugh Peters, in 1643: "If that discipline which we here practise, be the same which Christ hath appointed, and therefore unalterable, we see not how another can be lawful. So if a company of peop shall come hither and set up another, we cannot promise to approve of them in so doing." On these principles of exclusion this insignificant denomination acted, with considerable severity, both in New and in Old England.

The following extract, of an earlier date, (1590,) from Barrow's *Plain Refutation*, proves, that the founders o this sect, in common with their Calvinistic brethren of that age, did not disavow the use of force in "matters of the mind:" The only point which they were anxious to establish, was, that the temporal sword would be wielded to much better effect, by themselves, than by their opponents: "We acknowledge, the prince ought to compel all his subjects to the hearing of God's word, in the public exercises of the church: Yet cannot the prince command any to be a member of the church, or the church to receive any without assurance by their public profession of their own faith, or to retain them any longer than they continue to walk orderly in the faith."

you send to me what relates to a public Confession? I am truly in wonder and amazement, brethren, at your intentions, both in regard to the purpose which you have in view, and in regard to the act itself.

"(1.) If you have published this Confession with a design to clear yourselves, tell me, brethren, why do you wish yourselves cleared before such a number of souls, who never yet knew that you were accused, who never will be able to take cognizance of the lawfulness or the injustice of the accusation, and who are not called to that province by any just reason? And, what is still more grievous, why are you desirous of exposing this fact [of their having been accused] before so many men who are in decided hostility to God and the Church, who thirst for nothing with such avidity as for the blood of the church, and who rejoice exceedingly at the increase of the wounds which are inflicted by our own imprudence, that through these wounds they may draw out the blood of Truth and the moisture of Charity from the Church, that precious body of Christ? Why do you expose your grievances before such a number of infirm souls, since they have scarcely learnt that you are in existence; and (if I may so express myself,) they are offended with the fœtid and cadaverous stench of schisms in the Church, before they know its body to which they may safely adhere? Ah, Brethren, Brethren! Is this clearing of yourselves of so much consequence to you, as on account of it to put the common good of the Church into imminent hazard? A christian, humble and pious mind must evince its wisdom after another fashion; and, laying aside all regard to its private concerns and feelings, will constantly form these resolutions: 'Let the earth first open for me in its deepest caverns,' would be the exclamation of such a wise man, 'rather may I 'become anathema for my brethren, than, through me and on 'account of my reputation, any offence be given even to one of 'the least of these people, to prevent his coming to Christ, and 'his continuance in Christ who is my Salvation! Let any de-'traction be made from my reputation, who am a Christian, let 'me be trodden under foot by all men, provided I detract not 'the least thing from Christ and his body!'—Such, my brethren, I am fully persuaded, ought to be your resolution and the object of your deliberations; and to this very point ought all your labours to be directed. But what end have you in common with this? Alas! Pardon my freedom of speech, for you requested me to speak out: In this particular affair you seem to have gone astray. As far as I can perceive, in the contemplation of your own personal case you have been deceived. This circumstance

I hope, will not escape your own observation, if you will allow yourselves to be moved only a little from the judgment which you have formed of your own case, and from the degree of feeling with which it is regarded.—I have shewn, that some error lurks in the end which you have in view: Let us now come to the act itself.

"(2.) It is in the act that you commence the clearing of yourselves. Such a privilege is denied to no man, provided a due regard be observed concerning the cause, the method, the place, and the time. But, brethren, why do you attempt to clear yourselves before me? For I neither hear any of those accusations against you; and if I should hear them, I would not rashly receive them. Why will you do it before the public? For you know it frequently happens, that they who produce apologies for themselves before they have been accused, either betray themselves, or bring down far more suspicions upon themselves, than they can afterwards readily efface. You also know, that the public are seldom just judges; and that they are scarcely ever a legitimate tribunal, because evil prevails so much among them and holds the ascendancy. To these judges, therefore, you now appeal, who are neither accustomed to form a judgment, nor to obtain correct information: Indeed, the public are [in this case] neither judges nor witnesses. But such a course of proceeding is never advantageous to a private cause, and it is generally injurious to a public one, in several respects.—You will probably ask, 'Who then must they be? To whom shall we appeal as judges 'and as witnesses?' Your own Preface will give you a reply, instead of me. For, when you there announce, 'that you have 'now found a place of tranquillity,' (I think, you will recognize your own expressions,) you plainly testify two things: (i.) If you have found a place of tranquillity, you will act with great prudence by not removing when you can remain at rest.—(ii.) In that place in which you have received the rites of hospitality, and a peaceful station, you ought to obtain a judgment about your doctrine and faith, if you wish it to be legitimately known and approved. You reside in the midst of a church which is well furnished with servants of God, whose piety, erudition, and fraternal regard to the members of Christ, are fully known to good men.* It is indeed an illegitimate course, to neglect those among whom you reside, and to appeal separately or in common

* This excellent character of the ministers of Amsterdam, included that of Arminius, who was generally considered the chief of them in every respect: It also proves the high estimation in which Junius held Arminius, even after the papers which had passed between them.

to another church, to the public at large, to this University, or to me who am a feeble member of Christ in them. This order [which I have now pointed out] is one which is pious, just, and legitimate, and pertains to peace and edification: By it, you ought in the first place to have a modest regard to yourselves; and by it, I, an infirm brother, am bound in fraternal duty to recal my erring brethren,—but not to act precipitately, or to rush into any cognizance of the cause which may be offered in this way, beyond what is equitable, good, and according to order. Until you shall have adopted that course, I admonish, exhort, request, and intreat you, by the most sacred name of Christ, to appeal neither to me, to any other persons, nor to the public itself. For by this preposterous method, if it may be so styled, you do not, as you suppose, divest yourselves of envy, or crime, if any can attach to you; but, on the contrary, you burden with suspicions and prejudices your cause, to which, I religiously declare before God, I bear no prejudice whatever. Let those persons deliver their judgment, among whom you sojourn, and whom you do not deny to be your brethren: If on this point they do not give you satisfaction, or you do not give them, it will then be competent for you to institute a new mode of proceeding according to legitimate order; and no good man will refuse you the exercise of such privilege. But until you have made this attempt [with those among whom you sojourn], the adoption of any other course will be really useless to yourselves and prejudicial to the church. But neither I, my colleagues, nor other considerate men, will ever arrive at such a height of imprudence, as to remove the cognizance of this affair out of the hands of those to whom in due order it belongs, or to take the precedence of them in hearing the cause.—So much in reference to doctrine.

"II. I now come to the accusation, which you employ against the English churches, according to your writing. But, my beloved brethren, I affectionately request you to bear it with an equal mind, if I admonish you of a few things in this your accusation, which I view, I think, in a proper light. First, What necessity is there for you to accuse them? You have departed out of the country, and have passed into another forum, if I may use the expression. The reasons for your departure no one is solicitous to know, or vexes you on that account. If I grant that injustice has been done to you in England, (it being no part of my business to affirm or deny this circumstance, because I have no knowledge of it,) yet that injustice ceased to follow you as soon as you departed. What is it that compels you to be thus

disquieted, and to take upon yourselves the burden of accusations? Since you are now placed beyond the reach of their darts, why do you not keep at peace? Why do you not rather conceal the past injustice? Why do you not bear it in silence and hope, (if there be any yet to be endured,) rather than arouse one that is at rest? It is evidently the act of a Christian, to endure: Of a prudent man, to refrain from disturbing an evil which is quietly deposited,—not to employ a more vulgar phrase: And of an impotent man, to do exactly the contrary. For what purpose, I beseech you, is all this done? Is it to clear yourselves? But, in this country, there is no one to invent these accusations afresh, or again to upbraid you with them: What benefit then is there in clearing yourselves? Is it, that you may give utterance to reports, equal to those of which you complain? This, however, would not be a christian act; and I cannot indulge the supposition, that you would be guilty of it. Is it, that you may effect their reformation? This is indeed a holy desire: Yet, just reflect within yourselves, if you were not able to do this when you were with them, what effect can you produce when absent? But, in the first place, consider the methods by which you enter on this plan,—that is, by repeating accusations before me and others, addressing them to the public, in the theatre of the Church, in the circus of the world. Ah! my beloved brethren! was it ever heard from the mouth of man, that by this mode any private individual, (to say nothing about a great community,) was ever amended? Then observe, I beseech you, the persons before whom these proceedings are instituted. I will now speak of myself, in whose custody it was your wish to deposit one of your pamphlets. I am ignorant of the character in which you appeal to me in this your pamphlet,—whether in that of *a Mediator*, of *a Proctor* to receive depositions, or in that of *a Judge*.—For if you address yourselves to me as *a Mediator*, ought you not to have poured your complaints [privately] into my bosom, rather than to have exposed them abroad to the public, (a course which seems intended to procure infamy,) and thus [*pulsari typis impressionis vestræ*] to have impressed them, by the types of your edition, on the church of Christ, on innumerable souls, who are ignorant and weak, and not your own countrymen? It is quite evident, that the persons concerning whom you complain, will be still further exasperated by such a stinging production.—If I am addressed as *a Proctor* to receive depositions, what right should I have to usurp such an office? For I have legitimately no authority, either from God, the Church, the Magistrates, or from both the parties concerned, to

take cognizance of this matter. Nor would I easily be induced to accept of such authority, were it offered to me;—so conscious am I of my own insignificance! For, who or what am I? Or by what means shall I obtain information, respecting each of those things which are necessary for forming a just knowledge about you or them? Yet a just method of taking cognizance requires such correct information. If I were to do otherwise, I should incur the censure of the prudent Seneca, who says, 'The 'man that passes judgment when only one of the parties has been 'heard, though the judgment which he forms may be perfectly 'right, is yet an unjust person.' You are not a little deceived, beloved brethren, in this the judgment which you have formed; for you, in some measure, inflict an injury on me, when you call upon me as '*a busy-body in other men's matters*,' or when you think I would become one, after taking upon myself the province of *Proctor*, or that of *Judge*, which is still more invidious and disagreeable. Reflect, therefore, brethren, that the same answer which I give, concerning myself, will be returned by the other brethren belonging to the different Churches and Universities in every part of the world. No wise man will rashly descend into that *arena*, or will ascend into that tribunal. Something indeed might be said concerning your Faith or Doctrine, if you disclosed it, and the matter were conducted in an orderly method: But no man in his senses, I can assure you, will on this condition take upon himself the burden of forming a judgment about the accusations which you prefer against your countrymen, and about the transactions which have taken place on one side or the other. Weigh well, by the Immortal God, the consequences of such a procedure on my part. For what benefit would accrue, if it were commenced according to your wishes? It would undoubtedly neither be advantageous to you, to those whom you accuse, to the people among whom you now sojourn, nor to the church of God. But, on the contrary, what persons are there to whose injury it would not operate?—Such a course would more highly inflame yourselves; because contentions usually become hotter the more they are moved.—It would alienate still further *those who, you pretend, are already too unjustly alienated from you:* For that is not the way to communicate instruction and information, or to conciliate.—*The good people, whose hospitality you now so advantageously enjoy*,* would by this means be either

* Every benevolent mind must sympathize with those who were compelled, for conscience sake, to leave their native country and all its delights. Those Puritans, however, who afterwards became the founders of Independency, probably suffered less than any of the parties that successively became the objects of persecution in Eng-

separated from you, or would be divided among themselves into various parties. And their kind entertainment of you has not merited at your hands this unfriendly office.—It would bring into *the whole Church* still more grievous incendiary matter, and would disperse it through all the joints and members—which may God avert!—But it would render the imprudent man, who had usurped these parts of authority, the butt of slanderers, while all good men would unite to pity his attempts and your expectations. I add this, in the last place, (and by this you may perceive in how sincere and fraternal a manner I act towards you,) though I might be both able and willing to give sentence legitimately concerning your Faith which you disclose, and concerning the fact of Accusation which you direct against your own

land. They received *secret*, and some of them *avowed*, support from those noblemen, and men in official stations, who afterwards, in their own persons or in those of their successors, joined the party of the Parliament against the Monarch, to their subsequent great injury. No man of generous feelings will stop to enquire what opinions, religious or political, these banished men professed; but he will rejoice, that, as they held them conscientiously, they obtained patronage for themselves in quarters in which it was frequently least to be expected. How extensive and efficient this patronage was, we have since learned, and are still learning, from the numerous and instructive pieces of auto-biography which have been published from the family-papers of various eminent individuals. This fact, and others of a similar kind, have taught politicians at length, that when they employ persecution in the suppression of religious sentiments, they excite such powerful sympathies, for the oppressed maintainers of those sentiments, as would otherwise in many cases have remained latent.

Had the following paragraph been written by an Arminian, I should have been ashamed for him: But it is the warm effusion of a Presbyterian Calvinist, disclosing some unpleasant secrets concerning his brethren of the Independent persuasion, who, in their celebrated "Apologetical Narration, humbly submitted to the Honourable House of Parliament," in 1643, had given a piteous description of the sufferings of their members for righteousness sake: To this account a reply was published in 1644, by the notorious Thomas Edwards, entitled, "Antapologia, or a full Answer to the Apologetical Narration," &c., who says: "How dare you affirm, that for your consciences you were deprived at once of whatever was dear to you? Were not your wives, children, estates, friends, and lives dear to you? Had you not all these with you, and did you not in the Netherlands live in the best places, in much plenty, ease and pomp? What great deprivation is this of whatever is dear, for men to take their own times, and to go in summer, with knights, ladies, and gentlewomen, with all necessaries, into Holland, and there to take choice of all the land, and with wives, children, friends, and acquaintance, free from the fears and possibilities of vexation from the spiritual courts and prisons, to enjoy all plenty and freedom as you did? Many would have been glad, and still would be, to be so exiled into Holland, and to be able to spend there two or three hundred pounds per annum."

This was very different treatment to that which the English Arminians afterwards received,—though on the point of persecution even Laud himself was the least culpable of all his predecessors, and exercised it the shortest time; while the other Arminians, his celebrated contemporaries, among whom Hales and Chillingworth hold high rank, were decidedly opposed to restrictions on conscience, long before their own was rudely invaded by their usurping Calvinistic countrymen.

countrymen; yet, by this mode of proceeding, you have yourselves taken from me the authority of doing that which you desire: By this form of request, you place an effectual barrier against your own petition. You will probably be amazed at what I say; and yet it is quite true: For you request the favour of my judgment, just as you do that of the Universities and of all studious persons together. If you ask this *generally*, you are not therefore desirous that I alone should pass sentence: But if you ask it *particularly*, do you suppose any of us to be so destitute of reason, when the judgment and the aid of such a number of good men are required, as for some one Palæmon among us to assume the supremacy, and singly to decide about a matter, the decision of which is asked of so many persons equal in learning, and indeed much more learned [than myself], and who are far better adorned with piety, judgment, and experience; a matter which demands serious deliberation, holy intercourse and exchange [of counsel], and a mature and irreprehensible judgment?

"III. But what shall I say on the THIRD Point? My very dear brethren, you perceive, I think, if I neither am able nor ought on those conditions to return an answer concerning the two preceding Points, it would evidently be an act of injustice were I to determine any thing at present, in favour of either party, respecting the CONCLUSION which you draw from those premises. But I hesitate, brethren, I demur in this cause, as I am commanded to do by God and nature, by reason and by all laws. From the things which you have just read, you will, I think, have discerned the causes of my hesitancy; and you will learn them, besides, from other things which God, I hope, will supply through the Spirit of truth and of prudence. I neither ought to form a judgment within my own mind concerning things of which I am ignorant, or which are undoubtedly not yet sufficiently proved; nor ought I, before you or other people, to deliver such a judgment with still more precipitate boldness, when it is not evident enough to myself. The Lord knows and judges, to whom as many as are his servants either stand or fall. But if this were not the case, I believe you are not ignorant, that there are three things which the holy Fathers have always, from the very infancy of the Church, wished to be discerned in the people of God, according to his word: *Their Faith or Doctrine, their Mode of Life or Manners, and the Order of their Discipline.* But all wise men have, with one consent, taught, and delivered the fact to posterity, that, wherever the foundation of the doctrine of truth remains, which is the citadel of salvation, although

it may be associated with manners and discipline the most corrupt, there THE CHURCH continues in existence; and that it is not the duty of any man rashly to separate himself from that Church, while he can abide in it with safety to his faith and to his conscience, or to refuse it the title of *a Church*. This is especially the case, since Pastors and a Flock constitute every Church: Now, if some Pastors or Superintendents disturb a Church, it is improper to deprive the other Pastors of their title; this is testified by Christ himself in the word of truth: Neither can the Flock be deprived of its title [*a Church*], because Christ has purchased it with his blood, and sanctifies it daily by the laver of regeneration through the word.—This ought to suffice you, if in any respect you did not stand in an amicable relation with your countrymen, that the fatherly providence and indulgence of God have now manifested a special regard for you in another country. In brief, while you attack those Churches, you will not by such means render this your cause any better, or even cause it to wear a greater air of plausibility, among good men. If you have not yet formed a due conception of this truth, from reason, from my advice, or from the admonitions of those who are desirous of your welfare, all these consequences will at length be verified to you by sad experience itself: God grant that such experience may not be too late! And may He instruct you Himself in that which is good! For you will approve yourselves and your cause, by the truth of your doctrine, by the sanctity of your lives, by the work of your faith and patience, and by your offices of charity, even towards those by whom you declare yourselves to have been offended; and to much better effect, than by clamours, or publications: In this way our Saviour himself is said to have brought forth judgment to victory, not by crying aloud, and causing his voice to be heard in the streets, but by blowing gently the smoking flax, and gently shaking the bruised reed. Since these are important truths, I beseech you, well-beloved brethren in Christ, by that most holy name of Christ which you profess, and by those bowels of mercy with which Christ from above hath embraced you, direct your attention to some other method, enter upon another way to salvation, to edification and peace. If your Faith be accordant [with that of other churches], do not compose it again and present it for discussion by new reasons: Your motives are suspected. But if it be necessary for your [Confession of] Faith to be discussed, account it enough if it obtain, in the first instance, the approval of those servants of God in the midst of whom you now reside: This method is undoubtedly legitimate.

With christian charity forgive those who have inflicted injuries on you, if any such there be; and with christian prudence conceal those injuries from other people: By this course you need not be afraid of bursting; for God will enlarge your bowels by the Spirit of charity, in a manner the most opportune and beneficial. Attend to yourselves; let all acerbity and bitterness of mind be laid aside; that ye may be acceptable to Christ and useful to the Church; and that the savour of your piety, being most fragrant, may, by your doctrine, life, and order, be diffused abroad among all the godly, without the nauseous smell of schisms and envyings. Judge not, that ye be not judged. But refrain from those more grievous determinations and conclusions (as they are called) against others. Strive not to obtain abettors in support of that your former judgment;—for such conduct on your part would be said to have the semblance of faction, and, on the part of your supporters, the semblance of imprudence; and do not lead them to an unseasonable, uncivil, improper and dangerous declaration of their opinions. [*Misereat*] Have pity, I beseech you, well-beloved brethren, have pity on yourselves, and on the whole flock that is collected among you. Have pity on those by whom (through error and infirmity) you declare yourselves to have been molested. Have pity on those in the midst of whom you enjoy the rites of hospitality; among whom it would be most iniquitous for you to sow these tares, especially after you have been admonished to the contrary; and whom it would be improper to excite, by these your clamours and writings, to entertain suspicions and to form unjust judgments about you, about those whom you account your adversaries, or about both parties. Have pity, in the last place, upon the Church of Christ; for it is neither decent nor expedient, nay it is highly improper, that she, who has had so many and such deep wounds inflicted on her from all sides, should receive from you this particular wound. Thus, may the Omnipotent God love you! and may Jesus Christ, that merciful Lord and our Saviour, have mercy upon you.—But if I shall be able to contribute any thing beneficial in the cause between you and the public, rest assured that I will spare no toil, labour, or trouble, to cement the union between you and us, that all of us may together, in holiness and peace, (without both of which no man shall see God,) be filled with the good things of the Lord in his house and immediate presence. 'Now may the God of peace, that brought again 'from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the 'sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make 'you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you

'that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ: 'To whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen! And I beseech 'you, brethren, suffer this word of exhortation: For I have 'written a letter to you in few words.' The grace of God be with you all. AMEN.—LEYDEN, *the Sabbath, January* 9, 1599."

Some readers will probably think, that the last clause of Junius's quotation from scripture *(a letter in few words)* is not very appropriate, when applied to his production,—certainly not one distinguished for brevity. But the boisterous reply of the Independents was still more prolix, and breathed the same querulous and litigating spirit as their other productions.

About two months afterwards, in the same year, (1599,) Arminius and John Taffin, Pastor of the Walloon Church at Amsterdam, addressed a letter to Professor Junius at Leyden, which, though omitted by the biographers of our author, is deserving of a distinct notice in this place;—not merely because it exhibits, in a forcible manner, the disingenuous conduct of the Brownists, (or *Independents*, as they were soon afterwards called,) at a time when all around were on friendly terms with them, and desirous to shew them every indulgence in their banishment;—but because this sect long remembered and resented the decided part which Junius and Arminius took in their affairs, though it will be seen that the latter acted only *ministerially* in behalf of the Dutch Pastors, as Taffin did in behalf of those of the Walloon Church. No wonder, therefore, that the Independents shewed themselves to be the most bitter and unfair adversaries, whom Arminianism had in its infancy to encounter either in Holland or England. The following is a translation of the letter:

"JOHN TAFFINUS *and* JAMES ARMINIUS *wish Grace and Peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ, to* FRANCIS JUNIUS.

"Most famous Man and our reverend Brother in Christ,

"We have received the letter that you had directed to the brethren of the English Church which is among us, and have read it, according to your wish, with uncommon delight of mind. We were more particularly glad to find, that your judgment and our own were in exact unison respecting the matter which those English brethren are discussing. We therefore thought it both useful and necessary to deliver it to the English brethren; and we conceived no small hopes, that, after considering like saints and pondering in the Lord the importance of the reasons and arguments which are so plentifully and with great force produced by you, they would desist from their purpose, and would devote

themselves to quietness, which, they may truly boast, they have found in this country. But the result was different from what we had expected: For it has seemed good in their eyes to oppose to your letter a reply sufficiently prolix, which they delivered to us, that we might read it through, and afterwards transmit it to you. They have employed the same mode of treating the subject, as you had previously done. We therefore judged it proper to read it in the first instance, and then undertake to convey it to you according to their request. But while in the act of complying with their wishes, we observe certain things interspersed in their answer which concern us, and which are of such a nature as, in our opinion, imposes upon us the necessity of writing to you somewhat more at length respecting them, that the truth of those things which we relate may appear to you with greater clearness, and that you may the more correctly determine what will be further necessary to be done: This we leave entirely to your charity and prudence.

"The first matter in which we are concerned is this: They say, in the first line of the second leaf, that 'the description 'given in their Confession, is not obscure respecting those points 'on which there is not yet an accordance between the Churches 'of this city and theirs.' But this description, neither you, most learned man, nor any one else, though he be one of the most quick-sighted, will easily discover in their Confession. For in that production no mention whatever occurs of any controversy which they have with our churches, much less any express proposition of the points in controversy. Certain things, it is true, concerning which some controversy lies between them and us, are intermixed with the Articles of that Confession; but they are proposed there under the form of simple affirmation and Confession, and in such words as admit of an interpretation which, without any kind of wresting, is not in the least dissimilar to our sentiments. For the purpose of shewing you this, we present you with the subjoined Articles, which they propounded to a certain pious and learned man, (who was not long ago an elder of their Church, and who now exercises the functions of Joint-Rector in the Public School in the upper part of this city,) that, after having enticed him away from our church-meetings, (of which he is a member according to the office that he sustains and by his own willing and conscientious assent,) they might draw him back again to their assemblies. The Articles are these:

"'I. The constitution of the Church of Amsterdam is so confused, that (1.) The whole church never assembles together at one time.—(2.) The ministers as well as their flocks never

nctify the Lord's day.—(3.) They can never be assured of the resence of church-members.—(4.) Lastly, no public act, whe-ner it be excommunication or any thing else, can be properly erformed.

"'II. They receive to baptism the seed of those who are not embers of the visible church; and yet, after the baptism of hese individuals, they manifest no care for them as members.

"'III. In the public worship of God they employ their ima-inations, and use another form of prayer than that which our ord Christ commanded in Matthew vi.

"'IV. That command of Christ, in Matthew xviii, 15, 16, 7, [*Go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone, &c. Tell it unto the Church, &c.*] they neither observe themselves, or suffer it to be properly observed by others.

"'V. They worship God in the idol-temples of Antichrist.

"'VI. Their ministers are maintained in a different manner rom that which Christ has appointed, in 1 Cor. ix, 14. [*They hich preach the gospel, shall live of the gospel.*] And the mode f their maintenance is of such a description as would suffice for ny sort of a priesthood, whether it were that of the Papists or ny other.

"'VII. Their Presbytery is annual, and not perpetual.

"'VIII. They celebrate marriage in the Church, as though formed a part of ecclesiastical administration, when its nature as regard only to civil polity.

"'IX. In the act of suspending, they use a new censure, hich Christ has not prescribed.

"'X. They consecrate particular days to the Nativity, the esurrection, the Ascension of Christ into heaven,' &c.

"According to our judgment, and indeed because they are e subjects of debate, they have expressed these Articles with-it any obscurity in their Confession. For they seem to have rved out the 22d Article of their Confession to the VIth of ese; the 23rd, to the VIIth; the 24th, to the Ist and IXth; e 33rd, to the Xth; the 35th and 37th, to the IInd; the 8th, to the Ist; the 39th, to the Vth; and the 45th of the onfession, to the IIIrd of these. But, on collating the Con-ssion and these ten Articles together, it appears very plainly, at the words of the Confession cannot be interpreted, even by en of the greatest sagacity, as conveying a sufficiently explicit timation of these articles forming the points of controversy tween us and them. Besides, these ten Articles themselves quire a fuller explanation, that we may understand the mean-; which the authors of them intended to convey. But the ex-

perience which we ourselves have had, while we were unable to comprehend their meaning without some explanation, will likewise be yours if you wish to understand these Articles, and to deliver your judgment on them: If you resolve to decide about them, and we be made acquainted with your determination, we will transmit to you in writing the oral explanation which we have received from themselves.

"These are succeeded by some other expressions, in which they seem obliquely to reflect upon us, and only just avoid actually accusing us, by employing the connective particle 'if' and a conditional mode of speech, which it is easy for any prudent person to change into a simple affirmation according to their wishes and design, as on some subjects they do themselves.—They say, 'that the repose, about which the conversation on both 'sides has arisen, was granted to them by the Magistrates, and 'not by the Ministers.' This is quite correct: For the Magistrates are the guardians of the public tranquillity; and it is in their power and in that of the laws of our country, to receive whom they please into the city, and under their protection.—But they seem to insinuate, that they have obtained their present state of quiet in opposition to the wishes of the Ministers, who impeded their attempts. But on this point they are seen to bear false witness. For when we had understood that they were come to this city and were collecting a congregation, we considered it to be our duty, not only to warn them against making any attempts here without the leave of the Magistrates, but likewise to give the Magistrates notice of their meetings: This we did, not out of any unkind feeling towards them, but because we were afraid of falling under the just displeasure of the Magistrates if we kept silence. We performed this office of admonition towards them before their departure to Narda; and after their return from that place, we repeated our warning, for which at that time they returned us their thanks. Besides, since they gave no obscure indications of some dissent from our Churches, we thought it appertained to us, to learn from them in what points that difference consisted, and then to ascertain from other persons what judgment was formed of them by the English Church, and by our own [the Dutch and French congregations] in England. Our design in this was, that when we were interrogated about them, as from the manner and usage of our Magistrates we could not be ignorant would be the case, we might be able to give a certain reply. But when we were asked by the Magistrates, (which, if our recollection serve us aright, was occasioned by a certain humble petition, that they offered to the

gistrates for obtaining leave to hold their public assemblies,) answer we gave was what we had learned from themselves, d from the letters of others: And we tendered this information th far greater moderation and forbearance than it had been nmunicated to us.

"They add, 'that they shewed us their Confession three years go, nay during the last year, that we might either declare our pproval of it, or might confute it, if on any point it should em to have swerved from the truth.'—This statement is quite rect: Yet they omit the answer returned by us, which was, at it did appear to us unnecessary for them to compose a Con-ssion; and that it might be sufficient for their defence if they mply subscribed the Confession of our Churches, and in this anner testified that doctrinal agreement with us, to which they ade some pretence in the very petition which they presented to e Magistrates.'

"The charge, however, which they immediately subjoin, is ch more serious—'that some of us have denounced them as retics and schismatics.'—Of this fact we declare ourselves to be irely ignorant. We certainly endured, with such a degree of row as was not improper in us, this secession of theirs from r Churches; and we signified the same in their presence, with fraternal declaration of our sincere regret. But we did not sure their defection with any such ignominious epithets, be-se we were prohibited solely by our brotherly feeling towards m, and our christian sympathy. Had not these prevented us, re than one occasion would have occurred both of mourning r them, and of making a declaration of a more serious nature ainst them.

"They proceed to complain of us, 'that we have received ertain articles which have been distributed against them, and hich are full of lies and calumnies; and that, even when sked, we have not, to the present day, delivered them a copy.' The matter stands thus: In consequence of the secession of e John de Lescluse from the Walloon Church in this city to English [Independent] congregation, a letter was addressed the French Church at London in England, that they would pleased to give us information, not only about this John de scluse, who had been for some time a member of their Church, t likewise about the opinions of those Englishmen who live re in a state of exile. To this request the ministers of that urch willingly acceded. But whatever the information may which we have received, we have kept it within ourselves: d so far are we from having published it abroad, that we have

not even communicated it to the whole of [the members of] our [two] Presbyteries. It is wonderful, therefore, whence they have been able to ascertain, that the information transmitted to us contains only calumnies and lies. And, since these articles against them have (according to their own assertion) been dispersed abroad, it is no less wonderful, that they have never been able to obtain a copy. They never requested a copy of these articles from us, until we had privately admonished them concerning a particularly grievous calumny, which they had printed and published against us in the Dutch language, in a brief Preface that they prefixed to their Confession: The latter also was so badly translated into Dutch, that its expressions might easily afford occasion to a heresy. To this our admonition they were able to oppose nothing, except a request that we would deliver to them a copy of these articles: And yet their public dispersion is the subject of complaint, through the whole of that brief Preface, and they employ words that are very bitter, and not a little injurious to our reputation. On this we could have entered an action against them for slander, and could have dealt with them according to law, had not our regard for the christian name, and our sympathy for these unhappy persons, commanded us to be content with that brotherly admonition alone.*

"But the corruptions which, they say, still remain in our Churches, are contained in these ten articles, unless perhaps they are acquainted with others. Concerning some of these, there was a discussion between them and us; yet we can with a good conscience declare, that no stain of impurity was objected by them against our Churches, which we did not completely obliterate by the aid of a good and substantial refutation. But this controversy is still undecided, each party, as is usual, pronouncing judgment in favour of itself.

"They repeat the assertion twice or thrice, 'that they are 'accused, in this country and every where, of heresy, schism, and sedition,' and from this circumstance they wish it to appear that they have just cause for clearing themselves and publishing their Confession. They do this, however, to no purpose, while they attach any credit to that narrative which they prefix to their Apology as its foundation: This cannot be done legitimately by the mere production of two or three of the populace, who may have charged them with those crimes. They say, 'that

* What a noble and christian course did these Dutch pastors pursue! What contrast does it present to what was passing at that very period in the metropolis of England, and to what actually transpired in Amsterdam itself, in less than two years afterwards, with regard to the followers of Arminius!

many persons are urgent to learn their reasons for leaving England.' If this has been the case, such persons are only some of the common people, who are not in the discharge of any public functions, and who therefore have neither the authority nor the permission of taking cognizance of their affairs. They might have given a proper answer to these persons in one short sentence, if they had said, 'We have reasons that are satisfactory to ourselves for our departure out of England; and we are prepared to disclose our reasons for it, if it be required of us by those to whom its cognizance properly belongs.'

"We have considered it well, to make these brief remarks on those matters which relate to us; so that, after you have ascertained the truth about them, you may with the greater certainty determine, according to your piety and prudence, what ought to be further done by you, for the good of those brethren, and for the cause of the christian church. We beseech the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that He would endue you yet more and more with the gifts of his Spirit, and that he would graciously from heaven bless your holy labours to the sanctification of his name and the benefit of his church.—Farewell, most famous man, and our reverend brother in Christ! Continue to love us, who highly esteem you, only in the Lord.—AMSTERDAM, *March* 3, 1599.

"*Yours in the Lord,*
"*Ministers of the Walloon and Dutch Churches,*
"*And in the Name of all our Co-pastors,*
"JOHN TAFFINUS,
"JAMES ARMINIUS."

M—Page 32.

The elder Brandt gives the following account of Trelcatius, in his History of the Reformation:

"On the 28th of August, 1602, Luke TRELCATIUS, Professor of Divinity and Minister of the Walloon congregation at Leyden, was hurried out of this world by the plague. He was born at Erin, near Doway, in 1542. Having been maintained at school by his aunt, who was Abbess of a Nunnery in Doway, and being afterwards sent to Paris, he perfected himself in the Languages and Sciences under the famous John Mercer and Peter Ramus, and by these means discovered the superstition and abuses of the Church of Rome. In consequence of this, he lost the accustomed assistance of his friends; but he was compensated for this loss, by some merchants of Lisle, on condition that he would officiate as minister to their persecuted church. Whilst pursuing his studies at Paris and Orleans, a new storm

of civil commotions arose, which drove him over to England, where he, and his wife whom he had married at Sencerre in France, procured a livelihood by teaching school, and in the mean time he pursued his theological studies. The Protestants of Lisle, in virtue of their right, then called Trelcatius to the service of their church: He departed, therefore, from England, with his wife and four children, and went to Antwerp, where he passed his examination in Divinity; and, being declared competent for the exercise of the ministry, he was sent to Lisle. But the difficulties of the times would not allow him to remain long there; wherefore, by consent of the people, he went to Brussels, and served the Walloon Church in that city six years, till 1585, when the city was surrendered to the Spaniards. Retiring to Antwerp, he was detained eight months by the siege of that city. Receiving afterwards a call to the exercise of the ministry from several churches, he would not himself make choice of any, but referred it entirely to his brethren, lawfully assembled in a Synod: For he knew what a fruitful source of scandal and prejudice it was for ministers, by their private intrigues, to render themselves suspected of levity or self-interest. The Synod appointed him to serve the Walloon church at Leyden, where he remained nearly seventeen years. In the second year of his ministry in that city, his great learning procured him the Professorship of Divinity in the University. His diligence, zeal, piety, and other virtues, exerted in both functions, are highly extolled in a funeral oration delivered over his corpse by Francis Junius, his colleague. He left a family of ten children; of whom, his son Luke Trelcatius became his successor in office."

N.—Page 32.

Bertius speaks with great respect of Gomarus, in this passage as well as in some others. What little effect such conciliatory expressions produced on the illiberal mind of Gomarus, will be best understood by the following passage from BRANDT's *History of the Reformation:*

"It was now (1610) likewise found, that the peace of the Church in Holland became daily more and more disturbed. Gomarus, believing that the anonymous *Exhortation to Peace* addressed to Donteklok proceeded from Uitenbogaert, though written in reality by John Arnold Corvinus, whetted his pen against him. But he previously acquainted Oldenbarnevelt with his intentions, and said, *that he could not remain silent without inflicting an injury on the* TRUTH. The Grand Pensionary replied, 'That TRUTH ought, undoubtedly, to be asserted above

'all things; but that PEACE should stand next to it in value.' The States of Holland, when they heard of his purpose, earnestly exhorted him, on account of the public tranquillity, to refrain from writing. Notwithstanding, Gomarus published his Answer under the title of *A Warning;* and endeavoured to prove in it, that the author of *The Exhortation* sought to make alterations in religion: To this he added his own interpretation of those articles which were debated between him and Arminius at their last conference, his reflections on the funeral oration of Bertius, and on the Memorial presented to the States respecting the doctrine and conduct of Arminius. In that production he spared neither the dead nor the living: In consequence of which, Bertius wrote an address to Gomarus, in defence of the deceased, and published it in 1610. Gomarus answered it by *A Trial*, published, as the title says, *in honour to the Truth, as a touchstone of the persons who meditate changes in Religion, and for the edification of the Church.* Corvinus, as it was thought, composed *A View* of this 'Trial,' in which he professed to clear those faithful ministers from the calumny and reproach of attempting any alterations in religion, and explained to the people those points which were then so zealously patronized: He also wrote *A Reply* to the 'Warning' of Gomarus, in which he largely maintained, that the author of the *Exhortation* had no thoughts of innovating in religious matters.

"The publication of Gomarus's Memorial or Remonstrance against Arminius, incited his widow and her brothers to print the Declaration which the deceased Professor had delivered in the Assembly of the States, in October, 1608; and they prefixed to it a strenuous Preface against Gomarus, in which he was plainly told, 'that he suffered himself to be too far transported, by his 'rage and other violent passions, against his deceased colleague; 'that his Remonstrance did not contain the least grain of charity, 'but abounded with misconstructions, forced meanings, strictures, 'and satire; for he represented Arminius as a mere cheat and 'impostor, devoid of all conscience or fear of God. Nevertheless,' say they, 'he was esteemed, by all that knew him, as a 'treasure of learning and a mirror of virtues, an enemy to insincerity, and an example of plain, open, and true-hearted Dutch honesty.' With regard to the charge, which Gomarus had made against him, of being *dubious, circumspect and cautious in his manner, both in proposing and maintaining his opinions,* that proceeded,' they thought, 'from no other motive, except from that of a tender upright conscience, inclining him not to assert any thing positively, which he was not sure of proving or

'verifying,* and from a just apprehension of being attacked by 'those who, he was aware, lay in wait every moment for an op- 'portunity of exposing him; that the complaint, which he was 'forced to make to the States, was not done *with the design to* '*shun the light, to avoid the right way, and to pass by Consistories* '*and Synods*, as Gomarus falsely alleged; but that, on the con- 'trary, it was done to come into the light and to expose the errors 'of Gomarus, and to bring the whole matter before a lawful 'Synod, in which the civil government, as well as other people, 'might have eyes, ears, and a mouth.' The Preface concludes with these expressions: 'It is to be wished, that people would 'employ themselves in other matters, than in writings of this 'kind: For it is always more commendable to excuse, than to 'accuse. But since the accuser has been heard fully and at 'large, the accused ought likewise to be heard at last in his own 'defence.'

"As the Universities, or their Professors, were looked upon as the causes of the ecclesiastical dissensions; so, on the other hand, the Curators of that of Leyden seemed very solicitous to promote mutual toleration and peace in their Academy. Francis Gomarus had, with some discontent, left that place during the year preceding, (1611,) and had gone to Middleburg in Zealand, where he was called to the ministry, and to

* Several instances of this hesitancy will occur in the narrative. The following is a very good description of it in the words of Arminius, from a letter addressed to Drusius, April 6, 1608, about a year prior to his death:—"Proceed, therefore, to deserve well for your theological studies. This endeavour, though it may seem to be expended over a small matter, will procure for you, yet more and more, the commendations and favour of those who are not ashamed to learn those things of which they are ignorant, and which they are unable to learn by themselves: I profess myself to be one of this number. But you have two qualities, above all others, which cannot but extol: The FIRST is, that you openly declare, that you are still in doubt, and suspend your judgment, where, after the arguments have been produced, you are afraid of giving a full assent. The SECOND is, that you do not refuse at this period of life to change your opinions, even after you have been for many years so well versed in these matters. I love these two properties in you so much the more because they approach the more nearly to my own intentions. For there is not such a vast difference between those subjects which engage your attention and those which engage mine, as not to allow me in some instances to hesitate and suspend my decision, since all religious doctrines are not equally necessary. For this conduct of mine I am calumniated by many persons, who carry *the knowledge of all things* inclosed within the casket of their own breast, from which whenever they are interrogated on any subject, they suppose that they utter forth nothing less than oracles which must be received with open ears and hearts. Neither am I ashamed to have occasionally forsaken some sentiments which had been instilled by my masters, since it appears to me that I can prove by the most forcible arguments, that such a change has been made for the better: This I am prepared to demonstrate, as soon as it is possible to do it to good effect without any tumult."

instruct the youth of that town in the Hebrew language, as well as in Divinity. The Remonstrants tell us, that he, perceiving the flames of the fire which he had kindled, to blaze above the tops of the houses, was apprehensive of being consumed; and that he therefore fled from it as fast as he could; and besides, that not long afterwards he went to France, where, being made Professor in the University of Saumur, he quarreled with the famous Du Plessis, the great pillar of the Reformation in that kingdom.

"But the Contra-remonstrants say, that, having experienced much trouble from Arminius, he feared that Vorstius, who was then expected to be made his colleague at Leyden, would give him as much; and that, being quite weary of these vexations, he had reason enough to resign his office, into which the Curators installed John Polyander, minister of the Walloon Church at Dort, and a promoter of the Contra-remonstrant opinions, but who was considered more moderate and peaceable than others, which rendered his learning the more valuable. To this succeeded the call, to the Divinity Professorship in the same University, of Simon Episcopius, minister of Bleiswick, who was every where known to be a Remonstrant, and had assisted in the defence of their opinions at the Hague Conference. The Curators thought, that the circumstances and necessity of the University required this addition,—there having previously been only one Professor of Theology. This introduction of Episcopius and Polyander together tended, as the Curators alleged, to secure the liberty of prophesying, or expounding the Holy Scriptures, in the University; and, in time, by their example and by the practice of mutual toleration in the Schools, to induce the young students to promote peace in the church, when they should be called to the exercise of the ministry."

Beside the notices of Gomarus which the reader will find in pp. 74, 465, 479, &c., I subjoin the following brief account of him. He was born at Bruges, Jan. 30, 1563: So that he was three years younger than Arminius. The parents of Gomarus, having embraced the Reformed Religion, retired into the Palatinate in 1578, to profess it without disturbance; and they sent their son to prosecute his studies at Neustadt, to which place the Calvinistic Professors of Heidelberg had been compelled to retire, as the Elector Lewis would tolerate none except the Lutherans. At the close of the year 1582, Gomarus came over to England; and heard the Divinity Lectures of Doctor John Rainolds at Oxford, and at Cambridge those of Dr. William Whitaker. In June, 1584, he took the degree of Bachelor of Divinity. The Elec-

tor Palatine died in 1583, and was succeeded by his brother Casimir, who favoured the Calvinists and restored the professors of that persuasion to their former offices in the University of Heidelberg: In consequence of this happy change, Gomarus spent the years 1585—6 in that city. In 1587 he received a call from the Flemish church at Frankfort; he accepted the invitation, and exercised the ministerial functions in that city till 1593, when the church was dispersed by persecution. In 1594 he was invited to the Divinity Professorship in the University of Leyden: He accepted the office; but, prior to his entrance on it, he visited Heidelberg, where a Doctor's degree was conferred on him. He had resided in Leyden ten years, when Arminius became his colleague: His conduct, subsequent to the election of that great man, forms a part of this Memoir. In 1611 he retired from Leyden to Middleburg; and in 1614 became Professor of Divinity in the University of Saumur. After remaining there four years, he accepted a call to Groningen, in which University he was principal Professor of Divinity and of the Hebrew Language when he was summoned, in 1618, to celebrate a signal triumph at the Synod of Dort over the manes of his former opponent, and over his pious and accomplished successors. He lived at Groningen twenty-two years after the conclusion of that Synod in which he had acted so furious and ignoble a part; and the public neglect which he experienced in that retirement, must have been exceedingly galling to his feelings, if he retained that choleric and hasty temper which had distinguished him in early life. But there are strong reasons to believe, that when he was thus partially deserted, the benefits of self-reflection were as conspicuous in the amelioration of his disposition, as the advantages of a cooler and more mature judgment were apparent in his amended creed,* which contained greater and more extensive corrections

* "Gomarus, therefore, according to my judgment, acted wisely, when, having perceived that his sentiments on the object of Reprobation were pressed with this absurdity, *that they made God the Author of Adam's sin*, he took refuge in *Conditional Foreknowledge*, 'by which, according to the infinite light of his knowledge, God foreknew certain future things, not absolutely, but under a certain condition,' as he expresses himself in his latter Theses on Predestination, which were inserted in his Works. By this means he very conveniently avoided the blow: For since Conditional Knowledge is antecedent to God's decree, Gomarus did not consider it necessary, as some other [Calvinists] do, to suspend the foresight of Adam's fall on any decree, which imposed on him the necessity of sinning.—Walæus followed his example in his *Common Places*, who is also happily conveyed past that rock.—Of Calvin's disciples, I know only these two who own [the existence of] such knowledge in God; although it might prove very useful to them, in extricating them out of various difficulties in which they remain implicated. But since it seems to suppose *freedom of will* in man, against which they feel the greatest abhorrence, this is the true cause why they have thought proper to have it entirely exploded." COURCELLES *De Jure Dei in Creaturas.*

f doctrinal errors than had ever before been made by one who nost inconsistently remained in other respects "a thorough-paced Calvinist."

Gomarus possessed considerable skill in the Oriental languages; nd, like some other learned men, imagined that he had discovered he true rhythmus of the Hebrew Psalms. In reference to this natter, Rivet, one of his greatest admirers, has said: "Not long go, the very famous and learned Francis Gomarus published is *Lyra Davidis*, in which he thought he had so far reduced the erses of David's Psalms to Horace's metres, and to others of hat kind, that he had discovered the true nature of the poetry f the Hebrews. But Lewis Capellus, in his book of *Animadversions*, has endeavoured to confute that whole work of Gomarus."—The famous Scaliger had no esteem for Gomarus. In the Scaligerana it is said: "If any one shall ask Gomarus and Snellius, whether the present age will produce greater men than he preceding, they will undoubtedly answer YES, because they hink themselves the greatest scholars in the world. Gomarus is f Bruges: He is learned on this account—he has a fine library; e has a great number of Ramists, for he is a good master of Analytic, which is the characteristic of a Ramist. He imagines himself to be the most learned of all the divines. He understands Chronology, as much as I do how to make false money."—The mild and excellent Junius, whose praise is in all those churches in which moderation is valued, was accustomed to say of Gomarus: 'That man pleases himself most wonderfully by his own remarks. He derives all his stock of knowledge from others; he brings forward nothing of his own: Or, if at any time he varies from his usual practice, he is exceedingly infelicitous in those occasional changes."—In some animadversions on the unmanly attack which Gomarus made on Arminius immediately after his decease n his *Warning*, Taurinus alludes to the expression of Bertius, respecting *Gomarus being an Atlas*, in the following words: 'When I read that bitter production, at first I was astonished at the scoffing and the malevolence of the man; but I afterwards congratulated myself and friends, when I had perused his frigid arguments and inappropriate solutions. What explanations, utterly unworthy of a divine, does not this man invent! And with what confidence, not to say impudence! Such explanations, indeed, as learned interpreters never saw, even during sleep! Do these proceed from that ATLAS who was alone capable of sustaining heaven? What tyro, I pray, who had only just entered on the threshold of Theology, would not have given as good a reply as this out of Ursinus and Bucanus, with the exception of some

acute inventions and the explanation of certain passages, such as Isaiah the Fifth?"

O.—Page 32.

In the preceding Appendices, (L and M,) it will be seen, the two Professors of Divinity, Trelcatius, sen. and Francis Junius, became victims to the dreadful plague which has been described in Appendix K. When the University was deprived of these powerful props and required a new Atlas as successor to each of the mighty deceased, the wisest men in Holland scarcely saw how any adequate remedy could be applied to this recent wound. Arminius himself was much affected with the mournful condition of the University; and in a letter to Uitenbogaert, dated Nov. 3, 1602, he informs his friend, that, in what direction soever he cast his eyes, he could see exceedingly few among the foreign divines who were competent to the undertaking, or who could occupy the places of the deceased Professors according to their dignity. From France no hope seemed to dawn, since there was scarcely any prospect, in the churches of that kingdom, of obtaining even persons of mediocrity in that department of sacred literature. When he extended his thoughts into Germany, not more than one or two could be found who were men of any reputation. Pezelius was worn out with age; Grynæus likewise had passed beyond his sixtieth year. Paræus was considered as being too closely bound to the Palatinate. But Arminius thought, that, among all the German divines, no one was better qualified to undertake this province than the famous John Piscator, who, in his judgment, was deservedly eminent for erudition, diligence and perspicuity, and who, by his writings, had procured for himself no small degree of celebrity and reputation.

The thoughts, however, of the most honourable the Curators of the University, on this subject, were very different from those which Arminius had entertained: For they were of opinion, that no reference in this matter was to be had to the foreign divines, and spontaneously turned their entire attention to Arminius and Trelcatius, jun. as the most suitable persons to succeed the two deceased Professors. The Rev. John Uitenbogaert, who was at that time chaplain to that valorous hero, Prince Maurice, and in attendance at the camp at Grave in Brabant, had, soon after the death of Trelcatius, been informed, by the letters of friends, of this benevolent feeling towards Arminius, on the part of those most honourable individuals, and of the greatest part of the students. The first intimation which he received of this kind partiality,* was from the letters of the celebrated Hugh

* Uitenb. Hist. Eccles. p. 312.

Grotius, (then a young man,) and of Anthony Thysius, both of whom were profuse in their praise of the extraordinary endowments of Arminius, and most earnestly besought Uitenbogaert, that he would not refuse to interpose his good offices, and to exhort Arminius to accept that situation, if it should be offered to him. In the letter of Thysius, Arminius is extolled to the skies, and styled [*Lumen Belgarum, et ad Scholas natum*] THE LUMINARY OF THE NETHERLANDS, AND BORN FOR [THE GOOD OF] THE UNIVERSITIES.

After Uitenbogaert had returned from the camp to the Hague, and was present at a public entertainment, fresh and honourable mention was made before him concerning the call of Arminius to the Professor's chair, by those most honourable Senators, Neostadius, Franckius, and R. Hogerbeets; the first of whom was one of the Curators of the University, and the very famous John Dousa, Lord of Norderwick, was the other: Franckius and Hogerbeets had, in their youthful days, been fellow-students with Arminius.* When this conversation commenced, Uitenbogaert was silent; but, being interrogated by the noble company, he willingly gave his opinion in favour of their proposition, and added his vote to their honourable suffrages.—A few days afterwards, Nicholas Zeystius, the Syndic of Leyden, addressed a letter to Neostadius, in which he said, that nearly all the students in the University had turned their eyes towards Arminius, and that it was their intention earnestly to urge his call to the vacant Professorship, by a humble petition, which was to be presented at the next meeting of the Curators.

When Arminius had been informed of all these propitious circumstances by Uitenbogaert, he was so far from evincing any ambition for the situation which many persons had designed for him, that, on the contrary he daily revolved in his mind the strong reasons which ought entirely to deter him from accepting it.—Such is the account given by the younger Brandt, of the commencement of this call to the Professor's chair.

The reasons of Arminius are so justly and elegantly described in the following letter to his friend Uitenbogaert, as to induce me to present it to my readers without abridgment. The conclusion is the only part which contains his views respecting the proposed call to Leyden: But the earlier parts of it, which relate to his conduct as an affectionate Christian Pastor, and as a sound divine, are highly worthy of distinct notice on account of the connection in which they are placed.

* Uitenb. Vita, cap. v.

"JAMES ARMINIUS wishes Health, and Welfare throug Christ, to his friend JOHN UITENBOGAERT.

"Your letters are always most agreeable and acceptable t me; but that written by you on the 22d of September, which received on the 27th, was in our present circumstances more tha usually longed-for and esteemed. For it administers great com fort to me, by the bare mention of your solicitude concernin me and mine, and of your prayers to God, which I know to b most fervent and effectual. Indeed, I am fully persuaded, tha through your prayers principally and those of our Church, have to the present moment remained uninfected by the pesti lence which still dreadfully rages and spreads its devastation and which I have been among the first to bring down from hea ven upon our devoted heads. I also feel a confidence that I sha still be free from it, through the great mercy of God, if h know that my safety will in that case conduce to his glory, to th edification of the Church, and to my own salvation as well as t that of my family. But I have now for a long time offered my self and my life to Him; and I am daily waiting till he requir it of me, and [*meliorem cum fœnore reponat*] bestow upon me better life with interest: I do this with a mind that is calm tranquil, and undismayed. I mention with confidence my free dom from terror, that I may cause you to rejoice. And I beseec Him who is the God of all consolation, to preserve in me to th end the same tranquillity of spirit. I most earnestly request nay I command you, to unite in this entreaty with me, who a ready on my part to perform for you the same office of friend ship. When this fatal distemper first began to hurl desolatio all around, and to raise its immense piles of victims, my min was much affected with anxious thoughts about my wife an children: For, the small portion of substance which I shoul be able to leave them, was a subject of serious concern. But by the goodness of God, I overcame that temptation; and now entertain no doubt that they will be objects of special regar to the Lord God, who is the Father of widows and of orphan I did not arrive at this conclusion because I had conducted my self towards Him in such a manner, as to be enabled [*confidere* to be confidently assured that his favour would be continue towards those who are dear to me after my decease; no, bu because I dare hope for it [*præfidente fiduciâ*] with a believin trust.

"The consideration of those trifles of mine which I have a intervals committed to paper, has pestered me greatly, and i

even now a source of uneasiness. While standing on the brink of the grave, I have not been bold enough to order them to be burnt, because, it is possible, they might be useful to me, if, beyond human probability, I should survive this general calamity. I find much greater difficulty in bringing my mind to the resolution of suffering them to remain as posthumous papers after my decease. For I know them to be unworthy of inspection, or to be submitted to the judgment of even such a very friendly man as yourself. I rejoice indeed, that I occupy such a place in your esteem as I now do; and it is my wish to be equally high in your esteem after I am dead. This station in your affections, however, I shall not be able to hold, if these productions should manifestly declare, that I have been most unworthy of it,—and this is sure to be the consequence as soon as they are inspected. But I make this communication to you, and I desire it may stand in the place of my last Will, that I wish my papers to fall into the hands of no one, except James Bruno and yourself, both of whom, I know, will use them with equity and indulgence, and would correct them for the benefit of my heirs, if any part of them, after a slight degree of correction, might see the light.

"I will here add some further particulars concerning my studies. I have now, for some time past, turned my attention to *the Providence of God*, to the consideration of which subject I have indeed been constrained by the peculiar exigences of these times; and I am of opinion, that some things are yet among the *desiderata* for a more ample and accurate explanation of it, in addition to those which have been delivered in a most learned and accurate manner by our authors. I have perused Ursinus, Zanchius, and Gomarus, all of whom have professed to discuss this topic. I frequently ponder, according to the slenderness of my capacity, upon each [of the arguments which they advance.] I animadvert on a few things in Gomarus, because his production is brief; and I shall probably make some remarks on the others: These I will communicate to you when I have finished,—not for the purpose of teaching you, but of obtaining your judgment, which I have ever highly valued. I gladly enter upon studies of this kind according to the inclination of my nature, which always evinces a propensity for a further search into truth, and does not know how to leave off, till it has gone completely through with the search, or, at least, till it supposes that it has done so. But in the present lamentable condition of our Republic, various important duties operate as hindrances: Some of those duties are to be performed to friends and neighbours, in

strengthening their minds against the fear of death; others of them must be performed to sick persons, who, oppressed with the heavy burden of their sins, scarcely dare repose hope in God through Christ.

"I account it necessary to relate to you what has twice happened to me within a few days. The first case was that of a woman, who was seized with a contagious fever; and the other was that of a man, who was labouring under a very baleful species of the plague. Both of them were members of our Church, persons of good life and unspotted reputation, and, in my opinion, both were true christians. She was a woman of strong judgment, and conversant with sacred things far above her sex. The man was so familiar with the same things, as to have been considered a suitable person for administering consolation to others. They were totally unknown to each other: I add this circumstance, lest you should suppose that the one was drawn by the example of the other, into these temptations. Both of them began to be troubled in their minds, because they could not feel in their hearts [*certitudinem*] the assurance of the remission of their sins, and [*alloquium*] the comfortable attestation of the Holy Spirit, especially at that juncture of time, when they accounted such perceptions the most needful. They had indeed attempted, by serious meditations on the word of God and by prayer, to excite these sensations, if by possibility they might be concealed in their hearts; but their endeavours were fruitless and their exertions unsuccessful. The woman vented her feelings in floods of tears; the man compressed his grief within himself: Yet neither of them despaired, but were extremely distressed on account of what I have just mentioned. To confess the truth, I listened to them with a sad heart, and was touched with serious commiseration; I tried to apply a suitable remedy to this temptation, and succeeded in both my attempts.—I enquired into the cause of their excessive anguish on account of this matter.—They replied, (and the thoughts of both had been on this point alike,) that they accounted *the assurance of the remission of sins*, and *the testimony of the Holy Spirit*, in the hearts of believers, to be THAT FAITH by which a man who believes is justified;* and therefore, because they were at this

* As the views of Arminius on this doctrine are exceedingly important, and necessary for the correct understanding of his evangelical system, I give the subjoined extract of a letter to his friend Uitenbogaert, dated the third of August, 1604, which exhibits some of his appropriate illustrations: "This is the distinction between FAITH and [*Fiducia*] CONFIDENCE, [Trust or Assurance]: The latter is a necessary consequence or effect of the former; yet, in my opinion, it scarcely appertains to

time destitute of this assurance and testimony, that they were likewise destitute of faith itself.—I then began to ask them, if they did not believe that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ sent by

the substance of the former as a part of it. For Faith has its place in the assent; and this assent is either entirely that *of the understanding*, or *of the affections* in addition to the understanding, or also that *of the practice*, according to the diverse nature of its object. Confidence or Trust seems to have its place in that part of the soul which is called *the irascible*.—The following is a more ample explanation: A mere *Intellectual* Assent is that which assents to a true proposition, without any consideration whether that proposition also contains any good; thus we believe, that an eclipse is an opposition of the Earth between the Moon and the Sun.—An Assent [*Affectivus*] *of the Affections* occurs, when the proposition is both true, and has something good joined with it which we are desirous or inclined to obtain; thus we believe, that God is good, full of clemency and mercy, and ready to do his creatures good.—A *Practical* Assent occurs, when the proposition is true, and when it also proposes a good which must be performed by us; thus we believe, that the Lord our God must be loved.—Faith has its place in the Assent *of the Affections*. This distinction will assist us in understanding the phrases, *To believe God, and To believe in God*.—'To believe God' is a *general* mode of speech, which implies our believing Him when he declares any thing, whether the proposition which He utters is merely true, or whether it also contains something good.—'To believe in God,' has a signification somewhat *more special*, when the proposition lays down such a thing as we wish to be true for our own benefit; thus we believe, that he is wise, just, good and merciful;—though *To believe in God* is sometimes received in *a general sense*, as a belief in Him who is true in all his sayings. From this faith in God, or this Assent *of the Affections*, springs Confidence or Trust in Him, which reposes on Him, as on one whom we know with such an affection or feeling as we have described, and which has respect to those things which we expect and hope from Him. It is on this account that Confidence or Trust is not unaptly denominated by the Schoolmen [*robusta seu roborata*] 'strong or corroborated Hope.' But it is utterly impossible, that such a true Faith, as God requires [to be exercised] towards Himself, should not produce of itself this Confidence or Trust, at the very moment indeed in which it first has conceptions of God as the Being whom we have described: For this is the native relation between that understanding *of the Affections*, and this affection which we call Confidence or Trust. But that article of faith, *I believe in God the Father*, is not an article of Legal but of Evangelical Faith. For though the description of God be legal; yet the faith in Him, which is expressed in those words, is not Legal but Evangelical. For no man, who is a sinner according to the law, believes in God with this faith *of the affections* of which we are now treating, and from which springs Trust or Confidence. But Providence is comprehended under creation,—not only because it is a continuation of creation by the preservation and the governance or direction of all things,—but likewise because faith is not exercised on Him, unless conceptions be formed of Him as Preserver and Governor. Indeed, Power, Wisdom, and Goodness, according to which God deserves to have faith reposed in Him, are implied in the word CREATION: But it is necessary that, by this Wisdom, Goodness, and Power, He should likewise manifest his care for us, or else we cannot believe in Him. In some of my former communications to you, I have explained the reason why God desires rather to be believed in, than to be known and understood: I now add, that *the Understanding* appropriately corresponds to the explanation of a thing, which is instituted according to the very nature of the thing in order to its being known; but Faith corresponds to the revelation of a thing, which is instituted according to the capacity of him to whom the revelation is made, that some other act, of a thing which is partly known, may be performed."

An allusion to the concluding remark, about God choosing rather to *be believed* in

the Father into the world, and that he is the true and the only Saviour of the world? If they did not assuredly know, that God the Father had in this only Saviour reconciled the world unto Himself, by not imputing to them their trespasses; that the same Jesus had received power from the Father to forgive sins, however aggravated they might be, and to bestow the Spirit of adoption on those who believe in Him; and that Christ is himself in every respect prepared to use this power for the salvation of believers, nay, has he not solemnly promised that He will thus employ it?—They answered, they firmly believed all these things. —I then said, This is the faith which is imputed for righteousness; but remission of sins is the fruit of this faith; and a sense of the remission of sins in the heart of a believer necessarily follows it, in the order of *nature* at least, if not in that of *time*: For the Apostle says, *Being justified by faith, we have peace with God.* The same observations apply to the gift of the Spirit, which is bestowed on those who believe in Christ; and on whomsoever it is bestowed, it begins to operate [in such a way] as the Spirit itself knows will contribute to the salvation of those to whom it is given.—When I had said this, they began to pay attention and to receive encouragement,—the man more particularly, for he was assisted by his wife's sister, who, in a manner the most appropriate, explained his meaning, and her own at the same time. Both the sick people openly confessed, that they had hitherto considered *the sense of the remission of sins* to be *faith itself*.—But I proved by several passages of scripture which I produced, that justifying faith, the remission of sins, and the sense [or perception] of this remission, are all distinct things in

than *to be known*, occurs in a letter addressed by Arminius to Uitenbogaert in July 1604, in which he expresses his partial approbation of his friend's commencing series of Discourses, before the Court at the Hague, and taking the different articles of the Apostles' Creed as separate subjects; because the topic of "the *Authority* of the Holy Scriptures, on which their *Truth* depends, must require a more extensive and laborious discussion, than the circumstances of the time, the place, and of the auditory, will permit."—Arminius closes his remarks in the following words: "But the question, *Why does God prefer being believed upon to being seen?*, is most elegantly expressed, and worthy to be discussed as a preliminary to the whole explanation. The discussion will not be inappropriate if due attention be given to these five particulars: (1.) What is contained in *the vision of God!*—(2.) What is meant by *Faith in God?*—(3.) What is the duty of a rational creature?—(4.) What is befitting and suitable to God and his Majesty? From these four questions the following Theme might arise: It does not become God and his Majesty to endue a creature that He has created after his own image, with a sight of His Glory and majesty, before such creature has performed the duty which God has prescribed, has sought for his happiness from God, and has exercised hope for its attainment. This performance of duty, search for happiness, and exercise of hope, rest upon Faith as their foundation, according to Heb. xi, 1, 6."

the holy scriptures, and consectaries to each other.—After these remarks they felt still more encouraged. I also explained the causes why this assurance and comfort of the Spirit are not always felt in an equal degree by believers. By the blessing of God, the final result was, that both being elevated in hope were emboldened to commend their souls to God in hope and patience, and to wait with a tranquil mind for the hour of their dissolution. Two days after this conversation, the man died in the Lord.—From these circumstances I have been confirmed in my former opinion, that it is necessary to make an accurate distinction between things that are most closely united among themselves, lest confused notions respecting them should produce in the consciences of men uncomfortable uncertainty and perturbation, which cannot be removed except by such a distinction as is agreeable to the intimate nature of the things themselves.*

* Uitenbogaert alluded to this subject about two years afterwards, and Arminius replied to him, on the 31st of January, 1605, in the following language: "I now come to the question that you put to me, in consequence of a letter which I addressed to you some time since, and in which I related what transpired when I visited some sick persons who were exercised with doubts respecting their salvation. On the subject of *Historical Faith* you ask, 'Is it not to believe that Jesus is this, that He is able to do this, and that He has promised this to believers?' This is quite correct so far as such a faith is reposed on the mere narration itself: But that which is reposed on the command to believe, and on the promise, is not *Historical* but *Saving Faith*. A man believes, because he knows [what is said] to be true; but a man believes, because he knows it to be true and beneficial to himself,—for this reason, *that he may obey God who issues the command, and may obtain the promise attached to that command*. The former therefore is an *Historical* Faith, the latter is a *Justifying* Faith, which is likewise called *the obedience of Faith*.—Let these be taken into consideration in regular order: This word is preached, *He who shall believe in Jesus Christ shall be saved*, or, *Jesus Christ will be a Saviour and Redeemer to him who believes*. Now this is preached to men, and not to a devil,—although it is impossible for the latter not to know that it is preached, and that it is truly preached. If any one therefore considers it thus as not belonging to himself, although he may believe that it is true, yet he does not believe truly and in such a manner as this [declaration] ought to be believed, and as he ought to believe it. For it is announced that it may be thus believed, and it is announced that he may believe it; that is, he is bound to believe this very thing, and when he believes it, he is commanded to believe in Jesus Christ, further, it is the cause of his believing in Jesus Christ, being induced by this argument—that, otherwise, he will not be able to obtain salvation and life eternal. The foundation of Faith then is contained in the united proposition of *our duty* and of *the divine reward*, which is resolved into the requirement of the act of believing, and the promise of life eternal. The answer to the requirement is Justifying Faith; but that answer I am induced to make, because I believe that this connection is certain—*Life shall be bestowed on him who believes, and death awaits him who does not believe.*—Yet a distinction likewise be made between *Him who is constituted a Saviour*, and *actual salvation*: For the former denotes the ability, will, and power to save; and the latter denotes the execution and bestowing of salvation. If therefore I believe, as I am bound to do, that Christ is constituted a Saviour, that is, possesses the power, ability and will to save, and if I thus through Faith deliver myself up to him, I shall in this case actually obtain salvation from him, that is, remission of sins, the Spirit of

"I now come to that which is the principal subject latter part of your letter,—the Professorship of Theology University of Leyden, which is vacant in consequence death of that very famous and excellent man, TRELC You and a certain other learned man are of opinion, that I be a suitable person for that office, provided I would con undertake it. I will not begin to say, that you are gre error, lest I appear in your eyes desirous of producing pe cuses, if I labour to evade that function; yet those whic make, shall be real excuses. I yield at once to your supp that I shall not be totally unfit for promoting theological s if I be diligent and studious, and devote my entire po this matter. But, in opposition to it, many things rise u persuade me neither to desert the function in which I n nor to change it for the other.—The First is *the extreme k regard of the church towards me;* and truly I consider equitable to remunerate her for these by a mutual love, an may be permitted so to speak, I attempt this with all my On this account, therefore, it will be with the greatest di that this Church and I can part from each other. Yo likewise the amazing difference between the intense affectio sheep evince towards their shepherd who is always with and that temporary affection which even the most virtu students manifest towards a man who is their instructor o a few years.—Another consideration is *the edification of conscience,* to the cultivation of which, (I may declare without blushing,) I should not have paid such great att had not God admitted me into this holy function. I ha abundant experience to prove, that the personal sanctifica a man set apart to the sacred office, is vastly promoted discharge of his hallowing duties. Hypocrites alone, an too of the most infamous class, can perform the duties office so sacred without [deriving from it the benefit of] p sanctification. It is proper, I know, and the order of things re that the private sanctification of such a person ought to p his separation to his public functions; and I own, that blessed are those who may be allowed, on this account, to

grace, and life eternal. In these expressions, therefore, *I believe that Chr Saviour of the world, yea that He is the Saviour of believers and* OF ME, lowing are not included, I *believe that I have remission of sins, I believe th eternal life;* but this is included in them, *I believe that I shall have the name. For since I believe that I shall obtain these blessings on my believing I believe in him that I may actually have them, and then I actually receive* The confounding of these matters is the cause why our divines occasionally sp less propriety concerning Justifying Faith."

in the Lord. But the reflection is consoling to me, that those also are blessed who are compelled, by the public discharge of their holy duties, seriously to think upon their own private sanctification. Whatever may be the occasion and the cause of an entrance into a Divinity Professorship, neither of them can be equally powerful and efficacious, in this respect, [with the exercise of the Christian ministry.] I declare to you, that my too intense desire to investigate different subjects has deprived me of much of that time, which I might have devoted with more propriety, and, I am sure, with greater profit, to the edifying and hallowing of my own soul. What will become of me, when I shall have dedicated myself to that employment, which prefers far larger demands for the contemplation and discussion of difficulttopics?—I live also in a Republic, to *the Supreme Magistracy of which I can, with the greatest ease and without any stain of conscience or molestation, give complete satisfaction.* I leave you to determine, whether I ought to change my situation under such a government, for one under any other. I am resolved always to preserve an upright and unbiassed spirit, and not to force my conscience for the sake of any man living: Yet, not to be able to please Christ without displeasing the magistrates, is occasionally a matter of regret. This unshaken resolution contributes to impart extreme joy and gladness to one's spirit.—To these inducements for my continuance at Amsterdam, may be added *a regard for my family affairs*, which deservedly affects the most excellent of men, in this view at least—that they may consult the future prospects of those who are dear to them,—and not that they may scrape together immense riches: The latter course, you and all who know me can testify, I have never pursued. Yet it is necessary, that this care should not fill me with anxiety, when I ought to have my mind engaged in contemplating matters of the greatest importance. While I remain at Amsterdam, I persuade myself that I can preserve my mind free from this extreme solicitude. For I am in the enjoyment of an honourable stipend; an augmentation of which I think I could readily obtain, if the necessity for such an increase should ever occur. For the Republic is well able to defray these charges; and, unless I have grievously deceived myself, [*suscitavi istam existimationem*] the magistrates have conceived such a high opinion of me, as to induce me, while I am content with things necessary, not to indulge in wishes for more. And since I neither exert myself to raise an inheritance for my children, nor should I be able were I with much anxiety to make the attempt; still I am not a little refreshed by the circumstance, (in the hopes of which I may

certainly be permitted to indulge,) that the Church [in this city] will have a due regard to my offspring, and will make a needful provision for them, for the sake of their father, how feeble soever his ministrations may have been.—These considerations produce the effect, (nay they have long since produced it,) of discarding from my mind all desires for a change; indeed, I never cherished a settled thought about any such thing. I have certainly wished at some seasons to have a little more time and leisure for pursuing my studies; but I have learnt by degrees to place a less value upon this privilege, and to prefer to it the edification of my conscience. I have breathed many fervent wishes for the nearer presence and society of you and Thysius: To the present moment, I cherish the same wishes, the fulfilment of which I should esteem a greater prize than the treasures of the Arabs and Lydians. I should prefer the acquisition of your company, before any thing dear and acceptable which could befal me in this life, in whatever region of the earth it might possibly happen.

"Yet the motives which I have now enumerated, have not such a powerful influence over me, as to make me desirous of despising the judgment of pious and learned men, and especially of the Churches of Christ, if they should consider that my labours might be more usefully applied in that situation than they can be at Amsterdam. But a slight additional importance is given to my view of this matter, from the fact of *our Republic possessing the entire right over me;* for she afforded me maintenance while I pursued my studies, and has till now educated and brought me up, that I may be able to perform for her some useful service. The principal persons in the government [of the city] might probably be induced with considerable difficulty to yield me up to those of Leyden, or, as that very learned person expresses it, 'to Batavia herself.' This opinion of mine does not depend on a consciousness of my own sufficiency; for I know that such a noble church as this deserves to possess better and more learned ministers than I am; but I am also aware, that it is usual with men in eminent stations to evince an excess of attachment towards those upon whom they have bestowed their benefits. For as they know that they have firmly engaged and bound such persons to themselves, they look in return for a grateful recollection of the benefits conferred, and for a reciprocity of affection. If the matter be referred to the Church, no less a difficulty will arise. And who am I, that such a stir should be created on my account?

"These things I was desirous to transmit to you, not because the mention of them was necessary, but because I can refuse no-

thing which you may require. For I understand, that the person whom you describe in your letter will, in the course of a few days, enter upon the vacant situation for the sake of experiment. He has my good wishes in his enterprize, though for many reasons I should have preferred the vocation of Thysius* to that office; to whom indeed, I think, a direct application ought to be made, if that which I have heard respecting him is not successful.

"Behold, my Uitenbogaert, what a long epistle I have written! Yet, I know, from it you will receive with much gladness the intelligence, that I am still alive, and in the enjoyment of good health, by the great blessing of God my most Merciful Father, who, by his own right hand, has hitherto powerfully preserved me and my family, in the midst of the excessive carnage and masses of dead bodies. I do not cease to intreat Him by ardent prayers, still to grant me his protection. Unite your prayers to mine, as I know you do, not for me only and for mine, but for the whole of our Republic. The necessity of the case demands such intercessions: For the plague not only does not abate, but daily rages with equal fury, and continues its terrible devastations. May the Lord Jesus preserve you in safety to his Church, to your family and to me; and may He endue you yet more with his gifts to the glory of his Divine Name and to the profit of his Church! Farewell, my prudent friend, *animæ dimidium meæ!* Cease not to love me, and be mindful of me before the Lord.—AMSTERDAM, *Oct.* 1, 1602."

The epistolary correspondence on this subject between Arminius and Uitenbogaert, of which the preceding letter affords a pleasing specimen, is of the most interesting description, and highly indicative of the modesty, evangelical sentiments, and moderation of our author.—I now proceed to give an account of the progress of the call of Arminius, as related by the younger Brandt.

When certain ecclesiastics beheld the predilection for Arminius which was evinced by the Curators and others, they could not

* Anthony Thysius had then recently accepted the Divinity Professorship at Harderwick, and was occupying that situation when Arminius removed to Leyden. Thysius is here recommended as a fit person to succeed to one of the vacant Divinity-Professors' Chairs at Leyden; in a preceding letter to Uitenbogaert, dated May 26, 1600, Arminius says: "You know that our Thysius has returned from France. I wish him to be appointed to some office in our neighbourhood, and, if possible, at Leyden: The propensity of his mind is towards Hebrew Literature. I am of opinion, if that Professorship were assigned to him, he would endeavour to discharge its duties in an honourable manner. He is a most diligent as well as a curious enquirer into those things which relate to Hebrew learning."

endure the sight, and left nothing unattempted by which they might divert their thoughts and affections from him to a foreign divine.—One of "the deputies of the Churches," as these meddling personages were honourably styled, came about this time to the Curator Neostadius [Newstead], and tried in every possible way to detract from the praises of Arminius, by saying, "I never "discovered any great thing in him, except that he was an ex-"pert logician; but I do not know, that he is such an excellent "divine as it would be proper to entrust with the occupancy of "the Academical Chair."

But the intended appointment of Arminius was opposed with far greater violence and acrimony by John Kuchlinus, the principal Moderator of the Theological College, who was his uncle by marriage, and had formerly been his colleague at Amsterdam.* He expostulated most vehemently with Uitenbogaert about this matter, and began to express his doubts, "that Arminius was infected with the heresy of Coornhert;"† and concluded his harangue with the confident affirmation, "that his father-in-law, Laurence Real,‡ was too much addicted to that heresy."—Soon afterwards he inveighed, even before the Curators of the University, against the inclination for novelties, which, he said, was manifested by Arminius; and having made many rash assertions concerning his alleged itch for disputation, he concluded with these words, "What can I do, an aged man? Can I suffer "my students to attend the University, to hear new doctrines "every day and to bring them home? I will not allow it, I will "not endure it! I should prefer shutting up my college!" But a most judicious man, John Hauten, who was at that time Secretary to the University, repressed the indignation of Kuchlinus, by his sudden arrival; which was in this case most opportune, since his arguments brought back the old man within the limits of moderation, and induced him afterwards to adopt a milder mode of discourse.

On the same day, too, being that on which the Academical Convocation was held respecting the call of Arminius to the Divinity Chair, the celebrated Gomarus requested permission to speak, and, after presenting to the Curators of the University a Funeral Oration,§ which he had delivered in honour of Junius at the time of his interment, he informed their Lordships, "that Junius had requested of him, almost in the very article of death, that he would commend in his name to their Lordships the Curators the care of the University, and of the Professorship of The-

* Uitenbog. Diary. † See page 59. ‡ Page 119. § Uitenbog. Diary.

ology." "Having now executed the commission with which I was charged," added Gomarus, "I cannot with a good conscience so far dissemble as not to express my apprehensions, that the call of Arminius, for the promoting of which I understand you are now convened, will in my judgment be the cause of most serious injury to the University, on account of the heterodoxy which he maintained, and which he had openly avowed, not merely in his sermons on the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, but likewise in his very grievous dissensions with Junius on the subject of Predestination. Junius himself had not entertained favourable sentiments concerning Arminius, who, while he remains at Amsterdam, can infect only one Church; but on his removal to Leyden, he will have it in his power to infect many churches, not only in this country but also in other regions. The former city contains many persons who can contradict his assertions and oppose themselves to his attempts; but the number is very small of such persons in Leyden. In an University greater latitude is allowed for disputations, than in the church; on this account, therefore, contentions will undoubtedly arise. To raise himself the more easily to the Professorship, Arminius will probably promise [*meliora*] amendment: But no confidence must be reposed in his words, and it is necessary to act with the utmost caution in an affair of such great moment, lest the introduction of such a man and of his novel dogmas conduce to the detriment of this most worthy University."—The judgment formed by this eminent divine seemed to their Lordships the Curators much too virulent and intemperate, especially when it was applied to a celebrated minister who had, up to that period, lived in the highest estimation among the people of his charge, and who had never manifested the most distant appearance of aspiring after the situation. Those honourable personages therefore asked Gomarus "if he was himself well acquainted with Arminius, and had read the conference which he had held with Junius?" To which he candidly replied, "that he had paid his personal respects to Arminius only once, and that was when he saw him at a distance. But that, with regard to the disputation with Junius, he certainly had not read it through, but had been made acquainted with it by ministers who were highly deserving of credit."—Being further pressed and asked "who were the fabricators of these charges?," he at length named Plancius.

But the Supreme Governors of the University, having considered that no great reliance was to be placed on such testimony as this, proceeded no further with the affair at that time, till they enquired more accurately into all those accusations with which

Arminius was charged. Having therefore first taken counsel on John Oldenbarnevelt, Prime Minister to the States of Holland, the honourable the Curators thought proper to consult Uitenbogaert respecting all these matters, and to learn of him the best course to be pursued for the benefit of the University. That pastor, having previously taken time for deliberation, began to "complain of the injury which Gomarus and Kuchlinus had inflicted on Arminius." He afterwards gave a narrative of "the controversy which arose in Amsterdam, some years before, on occasion of the course of sermons which Arminius delivered on the Seventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans:"* He then read "the Preface and Conclusion of the disputation with Junius;" and proved most evidently, "that what Gomarus called *very grievous dissensions* had rather been *Friendly Conferences;* and that Junius himself had cultivated a sincere friendship with Arminius, and had occasionally spoken of him after [their amicable dispute] not without a due preface of praise." But it was Uitenbogaert's opinion, "that since the affair was agitated with this uncommon animosity by Gomarus, and this undoubtedly at the instigation of others who possessed great authority in ecclesiastical matters, the call of the University should be given to another person rather than to Arminius; that the greatest doubts were entertained respecting the wishes of Arminius to undertake the office of Professor, and that it was still more uncertain, whether the people of Amsterdam would dismiss him, even if he were to evince a willingness to accept of the call: That this seemed to him a business full of hazard and difficulty, and so much the more difficult, by how much greater was the prejudice with which Gomarus, as he had heard, was inflamed against Arminius; and that the tendency of the whole would be, that whatever the other might produce in defence of his own reputation and of his fidelity, would soon afterwards be disparaged and overturned: That he [Uitenbogaert] was unwilling to take upon himself an affair of so much difficulty, or to have it determined solely by his own judgment; and, though he had adduced according to his conscience those things which tended to recommend Arminius, and though he was quite confident that Arminius would never do any thing that was unworthy of himself or of the University, yet that he preferred to commit the whole matter to the care and decision of the honourable the Curators themselves: But that, if their Lordships still adhered to their resolution of calling this divine, he thought it was exceedingly proper, that

* Pages 100—111.

Arminius should be apprised of all that had been said or done against him, so that, after his answer had been heard, they might be enabled the better to consult the real interests of the University."

Such was the substance of Uitenbogaert's speech before the Curators: On the same day he testified, before that right honourable person who enjoyed the highest dignity in the Dutch Republic, John Oldenbarnevelt, "that Arminius,—nay that a hundred Arminiuses were not of such estimation in his eyes, as to make him wishful of disturbing the Church and the University for the sake of seeing him promoted."

Arminius was soon afterwards summoned by letter to Haerlem, and required by the Curators "to disclose with fidelity all that had been previously done." They likewise earnestly requested, "since in this instance his own individual affair was not the only one under discussion, but sincethat of the whole Church was concerned, that he would not refuse to reveal his mind about this matter candidly, freely, and without any evasion." This summons and request were received by Arminius with great admiration;* and, in obedience to them, he gave an account of all the controversies which had ever been raised against him on account of doctrine, and the method which he had always pursued to allay them. The Professorship was the next subject of discussion, and the extreme good-will manifested towards him by the Governors of the University.

Uitenbogaert, according to the province which had been assigned to him by the Curators, then asked Arminius what were his feelings and intentions respecting his entrance on the Professorship? To which he replied, "that there appeared many reasons why he should prefer remaining at Amsterdam." He confessed, indeed, "that he was more inclined to the scholastic mode of speaking, and not destitute of freedom to write something in a style which might be of service to the republic; but that he was nevertheless deficient in many of those endowments of mind and genius which were necessary for the proper management of such an office." He said, besides, "that since he was by no means his own master he was desirous to refrain from deciding either way, before the Church and Magistracy of Amsterdam had granted him full liberty of choice: That when this was done, he would deliberate about what might be most for the interest of the University and himself: That at all events he would never be induced to devote his services to the honourable the Curators,

* Uitenbogaert's Diary.

until he had removed from the mind of Gomarus, in a previous friendly conference, all the scruples which he had conceived about him: That he knew how much was to be conceded to the peace of the University, and how exceedingly necessary it was to apply the most prompt and effectual relief to the lamentable dissensions of the Churches, rather than to supply new materials for increasing the discord: That he would never, for the sake of any dogma, afford even the slightest occasion of disturbing the peace of the Church; and that, with the same disposition of mind, he would receive in good part, and would bear with patience, whatever Gomarus had done against him at the instigation of others, rather than of his own accord."

Uitenbogaert related this answer to the honourable the Curators of the University. When their Lordships had considered the matter a little more accurately, and when they had reflected that the divines of the Reformed Church had not always maintained the same sentiments on the subject of Predestination,—that no Council of Primitive Christianity had ever determined any thing about it,—and that the famous J. Holman had warmly defended, in the University of Leyden, the same opinion as that which Hemmingius maintained on this point,—when they had maturely considered all these things, they determined that they ought no longer to hesitate about calling Arminius to the vacant Professorship. As soon as they had come to this decision, those most excellent men, C. Neostadius and N. Zeystius went to Amsterdam for the purpose of obtaining their wishes: But their journey was unsuccessful, for on the 19th of November, 1602, the honourable magistrates of that city declared, not only that they could not dispense with the services of Arminius, but that they would not permit these two honourable persons to discuss the matter with the members of the Presbytery.

When this resolution of the Magistrates was made known, the deputies of the churches left nothing unattempted by which they might hinder the call of Arminius and retard its progress. Having convened an extraordinary meeting at the Hague, these ecclesiastics thought proper to require the attendance of others of their body, and, among the rest, they sent for Uitenbogaert. After prayers, Arnold Cornelison,* who was Chairman of the

* In the year 1605, this aged divine departed this life; and, as in the case of Halsbergius, who had likewise been his personal enemy at one time, Arminius poured forth the affectionate feelings of his heart on that mournful occasion, in the following lines to his friend Uitenbogaert:

"Arnold Cornelison, minister of Delft, died the day before yesterday, to the real detriment of that church, and also to the whole of Holland! He was a man of mod-

Meeting, suggested, "If it would not be advantageous to the Church, seriously and gravely to warn the honourable John Oldenbarnevelt, as well as the Curators of the University, of the dangers which threatened the Church and the University, from the call of a man who was so much suspected of holding wrong opinions; and to entreat them to think about inviting some other person, who might be equal to the burden of the situation, and free from suspicions of this description."*—Uitenbogaert was among the first who were asked for their opinion about this advice: He declared, that he would not be one who consented to any such counsel. Having afterwards alluded to the danger to which the authors of this advice would expose themselves, if they should not be able to prove the charges which they preferred against Arminius,† he explained at greater length what he had himself known about this matter, and shewed that the accusations against that divine derived their support from suspicions more than from reason.—The old complaints were then repeated to satiety, about the very serious differences which had subsisted between Arminius and Junius; and about the affair relative to his interpretation of the Seventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans; and the chairman of the meeting openly declared, "that Arminius was no divine, but a mere stripling, destitute of experience, and inclined to quarrels and petty disputes."

Uitenbogaert, on the contrary, asserted, "that Arminius was generally accounted an eminent divine; and that his present accuser could not be ignorant of his great skill on sacred affairs, for he had totally declined a friendly conference on the subject of religion, which was offered to him, not long ago, by Arminius. That the frivolous objections about his youth applied equally to Gomarus himself, but more especially to the younger Trelcatius, concerning whom, however, there was in this meeting a deep silence: That Arminius was of mature age, [being then 42 years old,] and possessed a judgment that was at once highly cultivated, chaste, and confirmed: That the office of Professor was one

eration; and by this temperate mildness of spirit, he was enabled to keep the more ardent of his co-pastors in their duty, on account of the privilege which was due to his age, erudition, and piety. Yet God will not fail towards his church. May we all contemplate with seriousness the brevity of our own lives, and may we zealously devote what remains of them to the service of God and of his church! The things which distract our attention are numerous; but when we are free from them, let us direct our meditations to this important point, and fix them there. Let us not be too solicitous what a human day of judgment may decide concerning us, provided we are enabled to appear before God and Christ with an approving conscience in that tremendous day!" See in Appendix R, the fine sentiments of our author, on forgiving injuries, in a letter dated November 1, 1604.

* Uitenb. Diary. † Uitenb. Life, c. 5.

which appertained to theory, rather than to practice: That experience was not so requisite in Universities, as it was in the Churches; and that he must not be supposed to be *destitute of experience*, who had for so many years sustained with high commendation the load of a church that was by far the most celebrated [in Holland]: That, besides, if discussions were occasionally raised about sacred things, this was a proof, not of a quarrelsome disposition, but of an exquisite genius, and a clear indication that Arminius was born for the benefit of the Universities rather than for that of the Churches."

Another member of the meeting objected, "That if Arminius did not dissent [from his Calvinistic brethren] in *essentials*, he did so at least in *accidentals;* and that it was possible to connive at such conduct in the Church, but it certainly could not be endured in the University."—Uitenbogaert replied, "That the liberty of raising controversies, on subjects which did not overturn the foundation of faith, was by no means to be banished from the Universities: That those seats of learning, as well as the Churches, were never in such complete order as to exclude dissensions on sacred subjects, which were sometimes most important, and yet the concord of the Church was preserved: That not even Junius had agreed on all points with his colleague at Heidelberg; and when he removed to Leyden, the agreement between him and his colleague Gomarus was not very remarkable: That the same observation was applicable to this affair: That Arminius was studious of peace; and that no dissension was to be apprehended from him, although his opinions on some subjects were different from those of other people."

Scarcely had Uitenbogaert finished the last sentence, when another of the Pastors bawled out, "We ought to entertain fears about all things, even about those which seem to be safe and secure." To which the most eloquent minister of the church at the Hague replied, with much animation, "That such expressions as these were diametrically repugnant to Christian charity; and that it was far more desirable, in all the ministers of the Church, often to call to mind the declaration of St. Paul, *Charity thinketh no evil.*"

When Uitenbogaert had in this manner delivered his sentiments, he added a very grave admonition, "that the brethren would treat this business with circumspection, and would attempt nothing of which they might afterwards repent:" And, having obtained leave of absence, he left the meeting.—The members, however, did not think proper to attend to this admonition; but soon afterwards disclosed to the Grand Pensionary of the States

of Holland, and to the Curators of the University, the same scruples respecting Arminius, as they had proposed at this meeting. They also recommended the University to the care of those honourable personages, and subjoined a humble request, that they would make such provisions as might prevent the peace of the University from being disturbed: The only answer which they received was in these general terms, "That they would pay attention to this matter."

But the Curators, not without good reason, suspected that some individuals agitated this affair with far too much earnestness and animosity, that much personal envy against Arminius was concealed under their proceedings, and that if under this pretext of heterodoxy he were debarred from receiving the Professorship, his further services in the very church to which he had devoted himself would be rendered completely useless. They resolved therefore to persevere in the call which they had given.

Arminius was, at that juncture, (Jan. 21, 1603,) at the Hague, whither he had proceeded in the name of the Amsterdam Class, for the purpose of expediting some ecclesiastical business. The Curators sent for him, and communicated to him this their determination; and they requested him to afford them grounds to hope, that he would accept the office of Professor, and would actually give a promise to that effect. They engaged on their part, to use every exertion to induce the Magistrates and the Church of Amsterdam to give their consent to this arrangement. But Arminius with great modesty refused to give any such pledge and returned the answer that he had previously given to Uitenbogaert and the other delegates of the Senate of the University.*

* The intervening circumstances, as related by the younger Brandt, are embodied in this note:—

Soon after his return, Arminius had an opportunity of instituting a familiar conference with the minister from Delft, (Arnold Cornelison,) who had been president of the meeting at the Hague, which has already been described, and who was then, (January 27th,) passing a few days in Amsterdam. He began freely to converse with him, partly complaining about the unhandsome judgment of him which some men formed, and partly excusing and defending himself. He also intimated, "that such a mode of conduct did not seem to him to be sufficiently christian; and that a different course ought to be adopted, which would be more definite and in more complete accordance with christian candour." In the same letter, to Uitenbogaert, January 28th, 1603, from which the preceding is an extract, after having mentioned this conference, and the proceedings of the deputies of the Churches against him, Arminius adds, "I think I can perceive, that all their consultations and actions have their origin in a certain vain fear, which has been formed in consequence of the unfaithful accounts of me, that have been given by some people, whom, I have said, I can easily convince by the force of Truth itself, provided an opportunity and a place be afforded for defending myself."

But the suspicion once conceived respecting the heterodoxy of Arminius, had fixed

its roots far too deeply in the minds of those persons to whose care had been committed the safety of the Churches, to allow themselves to be deterred from their purpose by any reasons which he could produce. In reference therefore to the proceedings of the Curators of the University, an ecclesiastical deputation went to the Hagus about the end of February, and renewed before Oldenbarnevelt the complaint which they had formerly made, concerning the dangers to which the University would be exposed, if the call to Arminius was persisted in: They subjoined a request, that he would not refuse to employ his authority with the Curators to hinder the further progress of that call. They used the same arguments as before, with the addition of one by Werner Helmichius, who said, "that his colleague Arminius had very lately declared in a sermon, that *God had not yet sent to the Church of Rome a bill of divorce.*" Arminius had uttered this sentiment in his exposition of the second chapter of the Revelation: and, from that, some of his enemies took occasion to suspect, that he was unduly attached to this most impure Church, and had become its avowed defender. For it had escaped the observation both of Helmichius, and of the most honourable the Grand Pensionary of Holland, to whom this saying at first sight appeared absurd, that the recently deceased Professor Junius had not only frequently and openly defended the same sentiment in his public Lectures and Disputations, but had likewise expounded that text in nearly the very same words in a particular treatise written on *the Church.* As soon, then, as Uitenbogaert was informed of this secret accusation, he presented Junius's treatise to Oldenbarnevelt for his perusal; and assured that very eminent man, that many others beside Junius, and such as possessed high reputation among the Reformed Divines, had asserted the same thing, not for the purpose of patronizing an adulterous Church, but rather of magnifying the kindness of the Almighty, who, since some vestiges of Christianity still remained in that Church, continued to invite her to repentance. [See also the preceding page .]

But this behaviour of Helmichius appeared to the friends of Arminius to be very unbecoming: For they thought it exceedingly unjust, not only that this celebrated minister had dared before an individual high in authority to asperse the reputation of his absent colleague, to whom he had never spoken on this subject; but likewise that Helmichius had desired this eminent man, to preserve in silence what he had related to him, and not to mention it to Arminius. His friends could endure this conduct with the more difficulty, because they knew for a certainty that this very Helmichius had been called to the exercise of the ministerial functions, chiefly through the recommendation of Arminius. A few days afterwards, Uitenbogaert shewed this Amsterdam Pastor how unworthy such conduct was of a famous herald of heavenly Truth; and, in their discourse on the occasion, much mention was made, on both sides, of Arminius and the Professorship which had been offered to him.—Uitenbogaert expressed his astonishment, that the deputies of the Churches should build their projects against Arminius on such a slender foundation.—On the contrary, Helmichius thought that the Churches had the most weighty reasons for resisting this call.—Uitenbogaert complained of the injury which was caused by the clandestine slanders of the brethren; and declared that the solicitude of the deputies was too great; that these attempts of theirs would not prove advantageous to the interests of the Church; but that, by such a mode of proceeding, they would rather diminish their own influence with the States; and that the proof of this assertion had been felt, on more occasions than one, by experience.—Helmichius confessed, that many false accusations had been made against Arminius; yet that he had shewn with sufficient openness, that he did by no means subscribe to the great Calvin's sentiments on Predestination, and from this circumstance the University was threatened with much danger.—Uitenbogaert acknowledged that this opinion was burdened with great difficulties, to the defence or removal of which he did not consider himself equal; yet that no fear of dissension could arise from it, provided Arminius, while quietly avowing his own milder opinions on this point, received in a tolerant spirit the moderate vindication which Gomarus and others might wish to offer for their opinions. To this Helmichius replied, that the doctrine of the absolute decree of Reprobation had been received by the Reformed

[Calvinistic] Church; and that those who entertained contrary sentiments on that subject might be tolerated in the Church, provided they would impose silence on themselves, and would speak nothing in its disparagement.—Uitenbogaert declared, that, for his part, he was one of those who could not assent to that doctrine, [of absolute Reprobation,] for it was one that ought on account to be ascribed to the whole Church of the Reformed, but solely to certain particular divines; and that on the contrary, those persons who rejected this *horrible decree*, (which is Calvin's own epithet for that doctrine,) ought to be asked to endure with kindness and forbearance its patrons and defenders. When Helmichius had further asserted with too much rashness, "that there were certain persons in Amsterdam who would prefer greater and more serious accusations against Arminius, if his call to the Academic chair should be be persisted in;" Uitenbogaert replied, "that slanders of this description were evidently made against the law, not only of Charity, but of Truth itself; that he perceived there was introduced into the Reformed Church an entirely new species of tyranny, which he would by no means endure; and that there were people who spoke in such a manner about the Church, as if she was liable to no errors, and did not require any more reformation; that this was the cause why any man, who differed ever so little from her, could not be tolerated, but was immediately aspersed with the foul blots of heresy by those who might bear witness to some slight difference in opinion, or trifling scruple about any article of Faith or Doctrine; that from this fountain had proceeded the audacity with which one of the ecclesiastic order had dared to call Arminius a HERETIC; and that, by this means, all the liberty of holding friendly conferences on the heads of christian doctrine would be destroyed, and a just fear ought to be entertained lest still greater inconveniences should thence arise.

This conversation with Helmichius was scarcely finished, when the celebrated Gomarus also came to the Hague, and had much discourse with Uitenbogaert on the same subject. Gomarus, with a mind full of agitation, as one might perceive from his countenance, began to upbraid him for having recommended Arminius, whom he called "a man of impure doctrine," and added, that he had rashly intermeddled with the affairs of the University.—When Uitenbogaert apologized for that deed in many arguments, and endeavoured with all his might to wipe off the aspersions which had been cast upon his absent friend; Gomarus, instantly producing the Reply which Arminius had given to the remarks of Junius, (which, he said, had been delivered to him a few days previously by Casimir, the son of Francis Junius,) declared, "that he would prove Arminius to be the patron not only of impure, but likewise of impious doctrine." In proof of this assertion, he immediately quoted from the manuscript the following sentence, *The human will is not determined either to the one part or the other by any divine decree;* and then exclaimed, "There is an impious sentiment!"—To this observation Uitenbogaert replied, that there was no impiety in saying, "God does not determine those things which he is unwilling to determine;" that Arminius would produce sound reasons for that assertion; and that the famous Junius had asserted nearly the same thing in his pamphlet *on the First Sin of Adam*.—Dismissing this topic, Gomarus directed the discourse into another channel, and affirmed, "that the sentiments of Arminius on the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans was manifestly in opposition to the doctrine of the Churches."—Uitenbogaert enquired after the particular article in the [Dutch] Confession and the [Heidelberg] Catechism, against which that interpretation offended.—Gomarus said, "that a judgment must be formed about the doctrines of Churches, not only from these acknowledged formularies, but chiefly from the consentaneous opinions of the Pastors."—But Uitenbogaert rejoined, that such an expression as that savoured of Popery, and that he was acquainted with no other consent of the Churches, except that which is contained in the express words of the Confession. Mention having afterwards been made of the affair of Predestination, Gomarus confessed "that it was possible to discuss this decree with modesty, and to tolerate Arminius, provided he conducted himself with moderation."—Uitenbogaert seized this opportunity, and in a serious yet courteous spirit advised this divine, not to grant an undue indulgence to his passions, nor to

suffer himself to be hurried away by the sinister reports which other people fa respecting Arminius. He also added, that Arminius would not undertake this o until he had previously instituted a friendly conference with him [Gomarus] a these and other difficulties; that he had no higher wish than that of cultivating him a fraternal friendship; and that his resolution was fixed, rather to refrain fr from the exercise of the Professorial functions, than to afford even the slightest o sion of disturbance to the Churches; that, in other quarters, troubles were suffici numerous; and that, if regard was had to peace, he had no doubt of Arminius gi him abundant satisfaction.—To these suggestions Gomarus mildly and frankly rep "that this, also, was the sole object of his desire; that Arminius would prove a acceptable colleague to him; and that he would tolerate all things which it was sible to bear, for the sake of peace and with a safe conscience."

P.—Page 33.

John Wttenbogaert (or Uitenbogardt) was one of the belo fellow-students of Arminius in the University of Geneva. afterwards became the most eminent Protestant Pastor in United Provinces, and for many years Domestic Chaplain Prince Maurice. On all ecclesiastical matters of importance was consulted by the men in power; and his prudence, firmne moderation, and personal piety, rendered him a desirable arbit tor in the religious differences which not unfrequently aro about that period, between discordant parties.* His great ex rience in public affairs, and his consummate powers of eloquen for which he was deservedly called "the Dutch Cicero," insu him the respect of all who were acquainted with his uncomm merits. His friendship for Arminius was of the greatest serv

* Charles Perrot, one of the Professors at Geneva, gave the subjoined advi Uitenbogaert when he had completed his studies in that University: "Take c "when you are called to the holy ministry, that you never assist in condemning "persons, for not agreeing in every point of religion with the established Church, "long as they adhere to the Fundamentals of Christianity, and are disposed to m "tain the peace of the Church, and to bear with others their brethren who do "reject the Fundamentals of Religion, though differing a little from them: For "is the way to avoid schisms, and to procure the godly union and tranquillity of "Christian Church."—Immediately after he had said this, he wrote the follo sentence in Uitenbogaert's *Album*, "Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall called THE CHILDREN OF GOD!"—I never heard or read of a divine in any co try, to whose subsequent conduct this inspired apophthegm was so applicable, as to t of Uitenbogaert: And though a man of capacious genius and extensive acquireme yet such was the depth of his humility, that approving Heaven vouchsafed to him fulfilment of another of our Saviour's *beatitudes:* "Blessed are the meek, for t shall inherit the earth." After all his trials, which he bore in a truly christian sp he lived to the advanced age of nearly ninety years.

The Perrot mentioned in this note is the person introduced by Casaubon in a sub quent page, (661.)—He was one of the first of the Geneva divines that soared above narrowness of Calvin's creed; but his liberality, which differed *in toto* from the d gerous latitudinarianism of the modern divines of that degenerate Church, was enlarged to be endured. He wrote an excellent treatise entitled, *De extremis in ligione vitandis;* but it was speedily suppressed by authority in that petty and in erant Republic.

to that very amiable and highly-injured individual; his name will frequently occur in this volume, and the familiar letters, which passed between these two noble-spirited men, are among the most interesting of its contents. Uitenbogardt survived his friend thirty-five years, and after the Synod of Dort was, in conjunction with Episcopius, accounted the leader of the Arminians. He wrote an *Account of his own Life*, and *A History of the Ecclesiastical Occurrences in the Low Countries*, which contain numerous facts illustrative of our national history, as well as that of Holland. He was the author of several treatises, some of which were on the difficult subject of *the proper jurisdiction of the Magistracy with regard to religion*, in the discussion of which he discovered consummate ability.

If I be permitted to "see many days," it is my intention to introduce Uitenbogardt in a more formal manner to the British Public. In the mean time, since it is high commendation to receive *praise* from a man who is himself eminently *praiseworthy*, I quote a few of the brief yet characteristic allusions to Uitenbogardt, which Grotius makes in his familiar letters to his brother:—"*June* 11, 1639. I perceive how that excellent old man Uitenbogardt has defended himself against the charge of Socinianism. I have read his swan-like homilies, and must acknowledge that he is not at all changed from the man who was formerly heard with attention in a great assembly [the Church at the Hague.] I am of opinion, that the works which I have published, and may yet publish, are sufficient to secure for me the reputation of being orthodox."—"*June* 2, 1640. I wish you to say to the most excellent Uitenbogardt, that, if he will spend with me the remainder of his days, no guest in the world will be more agreeable; and that I have no doubt, he would be able to contribute much towards laying the foundations of a [general] Christian pacification."—"*September* 17, 1644. The departure of Uitenbogardt to a better life, although at an extreme old age, has deeply affected my mind: For I have lost one, whose counsels I had hoped would be of the greatest use to me. I have done honour to his memory in the following verses:

Utenbogardi funus quæ prima celebret
  Virtutum certat sancta frequensque cohors:
Pacis amor patriæque, pia prudentia mentis,
  Ingeniique ingens, eloquiique vigor.
Attamen has omnes sperat Patientia laudes
  Vincere, per Batavos, si licet ista loqui.*

* The num'rous band of holy graces strove
Which of them first her deep-felt grief should prove

I request you to inquire what posthumous pieces of his the p lic may expect, in addition to his History."

The schism artfully created in 1616, by Henry Rosæus, of Uitenbogardt's colleagues at the Hague, was a source of g disquietude to this lover of concord. The account of i BRANDT's *History of the Reformation*, is exceedingly inte ing, and stands to this day in proof of the base machination the Dutch Calvinists. The old historian commences the n tive by observing, "Some of the violent Contra-remonstr were of opinion, that the cause of the Remonstrants stood up bad foundation, being nothing more than the artifice of a fa that had its capital seat at the Hague; and that, as the powerful patrons of it resided there, it would be necessar break the neck of it in its head-quarters. They cried, Uitenbogardt, who was now looked upon as one of the gre enemies of the Church, must be attacked in his own ke They were of opinion, that the received doctrine of the Refo tion could be no longer preserved in its ancient purity, wit a total separation from the Remonstrants; which was not very practicable whilst the States maintained their resolution promoting mutual toleration and the peace of the church a Hague, for from thence the influence of their authority diff itself through most towns of the province." Rosæus, like n of those who subsequently became most outrageous in their position to the Remonstrants, had previously been moderat his religious sentiments and on terms of intimacy with Uite gardt. He had received part of his theological education u the Professor Vorstius; and when that persecuted individual treated like an outcast in Holland, Rosæus, without the k ledge of the Consistory at the Hague, introduced him to sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and hospitably entertained at his own house. But being a young and ambitious ecclesia and perceiving that the influence of the Remonstrants bega decline, he commenced his public attacks upon them and t patrons, but only in general terms and without mentioning

At Wittenboogart's much-deplor'd decease:
For combat ready stand, *Regard for Peace:*
Sweet *Piety* with lovely *Prudence* join'd,
The noble *Vigour of a gifted mind,*
Love patriotic for his country's weal,
And *Eloquence* which taught mankind to feel.
But PATIENCE hopes, by means of Dutchmen, now
With victor wreaths to decorate her brow;
For they alone,—allow the just surmise,—
Have call'd this virtue into exercise.

s. The Contra-remonstrants however understood his inde- phraseology, and by degrees absented themselves from ıbogardt's sermons and then from the sacrament. Rosæus ılf raised a separate congregation in 1616 at Ryswick, a short ıce from the Hague, and refused to listen to all the sugges- of the States of Holland for an accommodation between him Uitenbogardt. The latter in discourse with a particular l of Rosæus, told him, "I am ready to pass by all consi- ions and to bear with the opinions of Rosæus, provided he ıear with mine," &c. The reply was, "that the separation ; Hague was produced at the request of other churches, in to support them in their separation, and thus to obtain a ly; and that Rosæus was obliged to maintain a correspon- : with those churches and to pursue their methods." This soon rendered too obvious in the proceedings of various estine meetings composed of deputies from the Contra- nstrant Churches, in which the Pastors adopted what they l *the Act of Union*, and determined to separate from the onstrants as false brethren. Grotius says, in his Apology, ere were also covenants and engagements drawn up by the ra-remonstrants, [of which he gives authentic copies,] im- ng that they would hold no communion with those who itted to the ecclesiastical constitution of the year 1591, ch, for the sake of peace, the States had re-enacted.] It is as some allege, that the Remonstrants likewise have had te meetings, and drawn up instruments of agreement; but s never said, that they did this in order to separate from who were willing to maintain unity with them, much less it be proved."—Rosæus and his violent partizans soon pro- d to greater extremities, and in 1617 seized upon one of the ches at the Hague. "Before this seizure of the Cloister ch," says Brandt, "there were great instances made, even is excellency the Prince himself, for bringing the separatists the Great Church, by introducing one of their own persua- to preach there in the turn of Rosæus. But neither could States Committee, the Magistrates, nor the Consistory of the ıe, be induced to give their consent; since, in their opinion, ıded to establish a formal schism in one and the same church, visible danger of riots and seditions, by the people affront- ach other, during the existing alienation of men's minds and nutual animosities of parties: They were sufficiently well- ıed to call another Contra-remonstrant minister, provided he d comply with the resolutions of the States respecting *Mu-* Forbearance, and would hold communion with Uitenbogardt

and his two colleagues. But Prince Maurice was of a different opinion, and thought, that both parties might celebrate the Lord's Supper apart, and yet that this would be no schism. The minister La Motte, who, though of the Contra-remonstrant opinion on the subject of Predestination, had hitherto held communion with Uitenbogardt, now thought it a proper season to unite more closely with the discontented party: He received the sacrament with the separatists, continuing however to preach in the Great Church in regular course with Uitenbogardt and La Faille; which was then connived at, to avoid further trouble. By this seizure of one of the public churches at the Hague, the separation of the Contra-remonstrants was sufficiently established, in contempt of the States, who gave them no trouble on that account.—On the 23rd of July, 1617, a fortnight after the seizure of the Cloister Church, Prince Maurice absented himself from the service of the Great Church, and proceeded the same day to the meeting of the Separatists, with Count William Louis of Nassau, Stadt-holder of Friezland, and a great company that increased daily. But the Princess Dowager of Orange and her son Prince Henry Frederick adhered to the Great Church. The latter Prince declared plainly, that he did not believe the doctrine of Rosæus; and his mother made an equally open declaration, that she would continue to hear Uitenbogardt in the presence of the Synod or of any other persons, as long as the States would permit him to preach, and that she could engage that her son would do the same."—Grotius says, in his Apology, (book 19,) "His excellency Prince Maurice, many years after the controversy arose about Predestination, had approved of the Toleration by his own example, in hearing the sermons of Uitenbogardt and communicating with him at the Lord's table, long after that pastor had publicly joined the Remonstrants. Nay, even since that period, in the years 1610 and 1614, the Prince had been pleased to employ Uitenbogardt as his private chaplain in the expeditions of Juliers and Rees; and, in the year 1616, requested the States of Utrecht, (who claimed a right to him, and strenuously insisted upon his returning to them,) to forego their claim, and permit him to remain at the Hague, for the benefit of his excellency and the church in that place: The Prince continued in the same communion with him till the seizure made on the Cloister Church. His excellency likewise for a long time looked upon the resolutions of the States about a Toleration, without once admonishing that they did amiss, or that it would be more advantageous for the country and the church to proceed on some other plan. In these Provinces, therefore, it could be no secret, that it was not

any religious consideration which induced some persons to advise the Prince to oppose the resolutions of the States concerning ecclesiastical affairs."*

I have given this brief notice of Uitenbogaert's case, because it is one of the most favourable specimens of the outrageous and intolerant behaviour of the Dutch Calvinists, in possessing themselves of nearly every church in which the Arminian ministers had been accustomed to officiate.† This affair at the Hague was conducted with comparative decency, though with great duplicity: In other cities, towns, and villages, the persecuted Remonstrants had to endure all the evils which could be inflicted by a half-educated commonalty, or by petty magistrates, (for the immense number of whom that populous country was then remarkable,) whose minds were under the influence of a malevolent zeal and a senseless bigotry. In such a state of affairs, Uitenbogaert was induced to continue in the administration of

* In another passage Grotius says: "Some advice, not very consistent with the nature of our constitution or with the laws and usages of the country, had been given to his excellency, who had hitherto kept himself quiet and unconcerned in these quarrels, and who, being much occupied with military affairs, interfered very little with the administration of the civil government: The consequence of all these was, that he began at length to manifest his dislike of the resolution of the States in favour of Toleration, to forsake the public churches, and to unite himself to the Separatists."

† "The Contra-remonstrants, who had thus separated themselves, were not content, after the example of the primitive christians, with the exercise of their religion in private houses, but presumed, of their own accord, to render themselves masters of the public churches, partly by making an open schism in the church, in which all the members had previously been at unity, by establishing a distinct Consistory, and administering the Lord's Supper by themselves, and by not permitting a Remonstrant minister even to sit in the *parquet* [a place in front of the pulpit, inclosed with rails, for the accommodation of ministers and elders] when a Contra-remonstrant had to preach, as was the case at Oudewater;—partly by irregularly introducing ministers, as was done at Heusden;—partly by extorting churches from the magistrates by threats, as at the Bril, where some persons had the assurance to declare, *that they were resolved to seize upon a Church, whatever the consequence might be;*—and partly by actually dispossessing the occupiers of churches, as in the case of those of the separate meeting at the Hague, who, after they had obtained the Hospital Church, under a promise of not erecting a distinct Consistory, immediately violated their promise and took possession of the Cloyster Church, and conveyed into it a pulpit and some seats, and causing persons to preach there,—though they did not so much as *ask* leave of the States themselves, to whom the ground and edifice belonged, or that of the magistrates of the Hague, much less without *obtaining* such leave. Nay afterwards, (which seemed to be done still more in contempt of the orders of the States,) Henry Rosæus, who had been suspended by the States from his ministry, was employed by them as preacher. Now if every one of the various sects should pretend to seize upon a public church, nothing but bloodshed would ensue: Wherefore none, except the government, ought to determine to whom the use of the public churches belongs: And accordingly the Roman or Civil Law reckons the right of ordering the public worship of God, to be one of the prerogatives of the sovereign power. Whatever is done in any other manner, cannot but be esteemed irregular and unlawful by all wise Civilians and Statesmen."—GROTII *Apologia.*

his pastoral duties, only at the earnest solicitation of the Princess Dowager of Orange, and of her son Prince Henry Frederick. He had been present at a consultation, which was held in his own house at the Hague, on the 3d of July, 1618, between Van Ledenbergh, secretary of the States of Utrecht, who requested to be favoured with the advice of De Haan, Hogerbeets, and Grotius, the Pensionaries of Haerlem, Leyden, and Rotterdam, about the new Warders or Militia, whom some of the states and cities had raised, for the defence of their several liberties against the aggressions of Prince Maurice: When he found them engaged in the discussion of this important affair of state at such a critical juncture, he attempted twice to leave the room, but was as often called back by those gentlemen, and thus unwillingly was present at their conference. Uitenbogaert was most probably aware of the fatal consequences which might accrue from the misinterpretation which Prince Maurice, and his powerful party, would give to this action, as well as to every other in which the Remonstrants were then concerned:* He therefore prepared himself for the worst that could happen; and at the earnest entreaty of his friends, he retired from the Hague on the evening of the very day, (Aug. 29, 1618,) on which the Grand Pensionary Oldenbarnevelt was taken into custody.† He proceeded immediately to Antwerp, having previously obtained from his consistory a complete and honourable discharge. In a Memorial which he transmitted to the States General of the United Provinces, and to their Stadtholder, in justification of himself against certain rumours that were in circulation, he declared, "that, in the existing situation of affairs, he could neither wake nor sleep at the Hague; that he could neither speak, hold his peace, nor do any thing but what would be misconstrued, wrested, and represented in the very worst sense, in order to load him with new crimes."‡ This

* In consequence of his alleged political conduct on that occasion, and on some others which were worse defined, all his property was confiscated, and he was condemned to perpetual banishment on pain of death if he ventured to return.

† "Some think that the apprehension of Oldenbarnevelt was done with the knowledge of the English Ambassador, Carleton, who arrived on the preceding evening from England, and had been in conference with Prince Maurice till late the preceding night."—BRANDT.

‡ The three principal crimes of which Uitenbogardt was accused, beside the dreadful one of *contempt for the authority of the Synod*, are thus described in their Acts:—"Whereas the said Uitenbogaert has acted in a manner unbecoming his character, not only by putting himself at the head of a party, and by having been the chief director and manager of all the troubles of the Church, as appears by that Remonstrance which he first presented, and that protection from the ordinary church-censures which he obtained for ecclesiastical persons; but likewise by his publishing several slan-

consideration was his principal inducement for retiring; and, soon after his departure, he was warned from good authority, (from the Princess Dowager of Orange and her son Prince Henry Frederick,) not to return to Holland, even though he might receive a safe-conduct. Proceedings were commenced against him before the civil and ecclesiastical tribunals. On the 29th of October, a summons was issued for his appearance before the South Holland Synod at Delft; and, because he did not appear within the stipulated time, (six days,) he was deprived of all ecclesiastical functions, till he should give full satisfaction to the Synod or its Deputies respecting the offences with which he was charged.* In a conversation between Oldenbarnevelt and Uitenbogaert, in February 1618, the Grand Pensionary told the latter, *that he was then disposed to consent to a Synod on the old conditions.* To which Uitenbogaert replied, "Would to God that you had been of this mind above a year ago, when I advised it! It is now too late: Then you would not hear of it, and now you must give me leave to be gone."† Oldenbarnevelt opposed his departure, and said, "If you go, all honest men both of the Clergy and Laity will lose their courage, and the Church and State will be ruined." In the month of May, the Grand Pensionary asked him, "Whether the Remonstrants could not draw up a confession in the name of the whole party?" Uitenbogaert replied, "No: I cannot advise it. There are confessions enow; nay, too

lerous books and papers against many eminent pastors of the Church, tending to defame the true religion: It having been also considered, that he has unfaithfully deserted his church, under the pretence that his Consistory has granted him a temporary leave of absence, and that he is still a fugitive," &c.

* He also addressed a letter to Prince Maurice, in which he endeavoured to remove the displeasure of his excellency, and to demonstrate his own innocency. But this produced no better effect, than the Memorial which he had presented to the States and to his excellency, and which was published at the same time at Leyden, with his name subjoined: But it was read by few persons.

† It was early in 1617, that Uitenbogaert, aware of the baneful consequences of the reigning disputes, intreated Oldenbarnevelt to have matters so disposed as to convoke a Synod in what manner soever it might be desired. To his request the Grand Pensionary replied, *If you be inclined to sacrifice the rights of your country, I am not.*

"But Uitenbogaert was of opinion, that the Contra-remonstrants and their supporters were resolved to carry their point about a Synod, though it were purchased by an entire revolution in the government, from which the ruin of the Remonstrants was inseparable; but that, if the government stood, the Remonstrants might still hope for some protection though they might be condemned by the Clergy: For a government cannot always hinder what they may afterwards redress.—With the same object in view, this prudent man again advised his Remonstrant brethren, with great earnestness, simply to desire a Synod: But they would not listen to his counsel, but pleaded their consciences, which (they said) would not allow them to join in promoting what they believed would tend to suppress the truth."—BRANDT.

many." When Oldenbarnevelt said, "Then they [the Calvinists] will condemn you as contumacious;" Uitenbogaert answered, "Let them do it: We are weary of their company. The States will at least do so much for us, as to let us live here in our own country, and enjoy the freedom of it, as well as the Lutherans and other sects. But, let what will happen, it would be better for us to suffer any thing, than to afford an occasion to the effusion of blood, or a civil war." But in the month of June, he found matters to have become much worse, and therefore told the Grand Pensionary, "I see, the government either cannot or will not protect us any longer: They should tell us so, that we may consider what we have to do." But Oldenbarnevelt replied, "that he had still hopes of a happy issue." These conversations are important when viewed in connection with the Synod of Dort, which was convened a few days after the last had occurred. Uitenbogaert's prudent conduct amidst the numerous snares that were laid for him and his friends, and his able management of the affairs of the society, during the long and unexpected exile of some of the most pious and learned men of that age, were highly to his credit; but the bare allusion to them must, in this place, suffice.

But there was no circumstance in the life of Uitenbogardt which gave him and his friends so much trouble and uneasiness, as the call of Conrad Vorstius to the chair of Divinity in the University of Leyden, as the successor of Arminius. This eminent man was one of the brightest theological luminaries, and, as Bayle very justly observes, "would probably have been considered orthodox at the time of his decease, had he not accepted the invitation to Leyden." He was born at Cologne, July 19, 1569. He entered on his classical studies at Dusseldorf where he remained till 1586, when he removed to St. Laurence's College in Cologne; but did not graduate there, because he and his parents had then become Protestants, and he could not with a good conscience take the oath prescribed by the statutes—*that he would abide by the decisions of the Council of Trent.* His father, having experienced some reverses of fortune, then resolved to educate him for business; and young Vorstius accordingly spent two years in acquiring a knowledge of Arithmetic, French, Italian, and other branches of learning which might afterwards prove useful in his commercial pursuits. But his mind having a marked predilection for studies of a higher order, he was permitted to resume them, and went to the University of Herborn, in 1589, to study Divinity under the famous Piscator. His progress was very extraordinary, and he soon had the privilege of acting as tutor to the sons of noblemen, with some of whom he

Heidelberg in March 1593, and took his Doctor's degree niversity in July 1594. In 1595, he visited the Uni- of Switzerland, and that of Geneva; and, in the latter, uest of the aged Beza, he read Divinity Lectures, with est applause. The Theological Professorship was of- him, but he declined it, in consequence of having the of being appointed Professor of Divinity in the Univer- infurt, then recently founded by the generous Arnold, Bentheim. The letter, which contained the invitation, to him at Geneva, in February 1596; and he imme- cepted of the honourable situation, the duties of which rged for fifteen years with the highest credit to himself e benefit of the students. In the year 1598, reports ilated to his prejudice, that he was secretly a Socinian. nt of Bentheim therefore, with great propriety, and at suggestion through his friend Pezelius of Bremen, m to clear his character of these aspersions, before the hat University in which he had taken his Doctor's de- long correspondence accordingly ensued between him ivines of Heidelberg,* in which he acquitted himself to

Paræus, one of the Heidelberg Professors, had very kindly acquainted a letter dated June 1598, with some of the rumours concerning him, and owing among other remarks: I wish this which is no very secret rumour Socinianism, was (what you say it is) only a vain calumny, and that brethren were not compelled to fear that there is some truth in this say- *e lies concealed in the grass.* Are you desirous that I should not believe at is this, I pray, which you write to your friends, 'that you have at ied, out of the books of the Socinians, to discuss theological subjects; r evangelical divines hold things, which are not a little doubtful, as *cer-* nd things which are false, as *truths?*' What is the fact—that the first Theses which you have written to Tossanus, [another of the Heidelberg esemble those of the Socinians, as much as one egg does another? What the more you explain your meaning, the nearer approaches you make to , how artfully soever you may study to varnish it over?—At length, that ke the point at which you are aiming, more plainly appear, you stretch still further, and in the very commencement of the manuscript exhibited n the 17th of June, you have without any dissembling rejected the doc- hurch concerning justifying faith and concerning justification itself: And onger agreeable to you, 'that a sinner is justified before God by this faith, es, that is, if he is confidently assured, that Christ had endured for him rnal death, and all the punishment of the damned.' On the other hand, faith and justification seem to be more congenial to your views, 'that we into favour, if we believe in Christ and obey him;' which two doctrines edience] are of equal avail to Socinus. So that now you have no imputed tifyiug faith, that is, a faith receiving a gratuitous justification on ac- nly and perfect merits of Christ: But, with you, justifying faith is a obedience yielded to Christ, or to God through Christ. You know, Soci- s: Nay, with you, conversion is antecedent to faith and to forgiveness of ne is antecedent to its effects, and is in our own power, &c. By the glory

their satisfaction. He also corresponded on the subject with the Basle Divines, who shewed themselves to be equally well

therefore of our most righteous God, by the most holy and plenary satisfaction of the Son of God, by his wounds and death, by your own eternal salvation, by the peace of the christian church, by whatever things are dear to you, I entreat you to reflect upon what you are doing, and to use no tergiversation. Artful colouring and varnish will not serve you long for a covering: Truth is the daughter of time. Think only what a thing it is, to prefer one Socinus, a Samosatenian heretic, to all the orthodox divines; and, for a few empty subtleties, to renounce the faith and the consent of the Christian church. Reflect upon the just indignation of your most excellent patron, the scandal of the church, the triumphs of the enemies whom you will excite, the destruction of the youth under your care, and your own peril. Free me, and all your friends, from this anxiety and dread; and, with us, openly detest the heresy of Socinus," &c.

Pezelius also, to whom he had written, addressed a letter to him, on the 14th of January 1599, of which the following is an extract: "But, in the first place, I congratulate you on your marriage, a sacred contract into which you have recently entered; and I pray and beseech, that it may be sweet, fruitful, and fortunate. I now return you thanks for having freed me from the doubts which had been injected into my mind concerning you, by those whom I understood to be affected with no malevolence towards you, but who with christian sympathy lamented your misfortune in having come under suspicion among some persons, not so much about that opinion of Piscator's, as about that much more important controversy relative to the eternal Divinity of the Son of God, which contains the foundation of our faith and salvation. The epistolary discussion into which you entered with that most accomplished man, Vivian of pious memory, and his answers to you about this principal article of faith, I have not seen, but I have heard casually by report. But in Mensoe's letter to me, he did not conceal the complaints which were raised against you in your diocese. I do not remember, however, that Du Moulin made any other than an honourable mention of you; except that he expressed his surprise at your discourse on that occasion: For when the Socinian dogma became incidentally a topic of conversation, you immediately exclaimed, 'I have no doubt at all, that, before the last advent of Christ, some extra-'ordinary light will arise, even on this doctrinal article, such as has never yet appeared 'in the church!'"

This last very innocent expression would be quite enough, with such a suspicious disposition as Du Moulin's, to dub Vorstius as a heretic: His swerving a little from the usual Calvinistic interpretation of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, (on which see his master's, Piscator's, sentiments in page 633,) would give countenance to his unsoundness on the divine nature of the Son of God. I copy a few sentences from the Defence of himself, which was addressed to the Heidelberg Professors on the 25th of July, 1598. "In this University, during the last year, I have from the word of God defended Christ's Divinity against heretics in such a manner, as it is impossible for me to have exceeded either in strength or clearness: In which defence, (all praise to God be given!) I still persevere. This is the substance of what I teach concerning the office of the Mediator: I maintain, that he is [*ex gratia*] graciously given to us by God the Father, to merit eternal salvation for us by his obedience, and to make us partakers of it by the virtue of his Holy Spirit, and thus, both by merit and efficacy to become our perfect Saviour. From these premises I infer, with the Holy Scriptures and the Confessions of the Reformed Churches, that we are justified by faith alone in Christ; that we depend on Christ's rightcousness alone, which is gratuitously imputed to us before God; and that our conversion to God, as well as the remission of our sins and life eternal, must be considered as received solely through the grace of God, and through the alone merits and efficacy of Christ, to the exclusion of all merit and worthiness on the part of faith itself, as well as of our works. Are these the sentiments of the Arians and Socinians concerning the *person* of Christ, or those of

atisfied. In the autumn of 1599, he had a personal interview ith the Professors of Heidelberg at which Pezelius was present;

e Papists concerning his *office?* Nay, will you not much sooner effect an union tween fire and water, than between the Confession which I have here made and eir opinions? Those persons who have suspicions of my being attached to Popery, ve apparently blamed me for the occasional preference which I seem to give to the ncient Fathers and the Schoolmen before modern divines: For instance, I choose in is controversy to speak in the language of St. Augustine and of Aquinas on the nesity of satisfaction, rather than in that of some modern doctors. But I will ask you, est eminent men, are such proofs as these sufficient to support such a serious charge? 'this be the proper mode of proceeding, who then will be innocent! Zanchius has passage in some part of his writings in which he says, *that he drinks old wine in preference to new*: And he interprets this of the ancient Fathers, whom he judges to be ry properly preferred to the moderns, in the discussion of all questions which are not pressly explained in the Holy Scriptures, as is the case with our present subject.

"Those who seem to suspect me of Arianism or Socinianism, blame me principally r two things: The FIRST is, that I make too familiar a use of some phrases which e Socinians employ. The SECOND is, that I still defend certain hypotheses on hich their whole heresy seems to depend.—To the FIRST I reply, that liberty was ways granted in the Church, especially to the Professors of Sacred Literature, to read the fear of the Lord and to pass judgment upon the writings and disputations of all rned men, to what sect soever they may belong; and that no small part of this erty, which Christ has claimed for us by his blood, consists of the fact—*that in the atter of conscience or religion we are the slaves of no man;* since 'all things are rs, but we are Christ's alone,' according to the saying of the Apostle. It is therere impossible for the following law to be prescribed to Christians without injustice;—ways to use the same words and phrases, in the explanation of any question, which ther, for instance, or Melancthon, or Calvin has employed. I have indeed always ghly admired, and do now admire, not only *ingenuousness* in professing that which u hold as being true, but also *plainness of speech* in giving utterance to your sentiments: Nor do I deny, that I have read with attention some of the books of these hetics, and have examined them according to the small measure of faith with which I a endued. From this circumstance perhaps it has resulted, that the phrases and ntiments of that author whom I have last read, provided they appear true and pericuous, are used by me with greater familiarity, than others which are employed by her authors. But what man is so ignorant as not to know, that in this case regard ust be had to a difference in sense and faith, and not to any diversity of style? St. ugustine undoubtedly accounts it useful for learned men to write and to treat upon e same questions in a different style, but not with a different faith. It is sufficient if e retain that example of phraseology which the Sacred Scriptures employ: I should ish this to be done by all divines, so as to bind themselves by an oath, in which they ould promise to define nothing about any doctrine of belief, which they are unable explain in the phraseology of the scriptures. For if this single rule were generally obtain, we should have fewer useless disputes and far more solid truth. But I am willing, reverend and most famous men, that you should understand these expressns as if the phrases of those heretics on this subject were exceedingly grateful to me: r on this matter I choose in preference the words and sentiments of St. Augustine, d the Schoolmen, nay of Musculus and others, whom no one ever reprehends on that count. Yet I confess, that, some years ago, an opportunity was afforded to me, by e writings of Socinus, of thinking more deeply on this subject. In reference to this inion, I have probably written to some friend, (of which, however, I am not now nscious,) *that I had learned out of the books of the Socinians the true method of theoising.* The only thing which I understood by 'the opportunity afforded to me by se books,' was, that the perusal of them induced me to think with greater diligence

and, after a full and voluntary explanation of his sentiments on the disputed points, received fresh testimonials of his ortho-

on some sacred questions, on which probably I should under other circumstances have never thought at all. For I confess this to the glory of God, that I have been excited by their books to a more correct understanding of some things, than I had ever previously been. But I account it the duty of a man who is capable of gratitude, to acknowledge the benefit, which God bestows, whose hand soever it may be by which it is conveyed; as I also think, it is the part of a prudent man, to attend to what is said and not to him who says it. But, on the contrary, it has always been found that those who have thought this liberty to read and prove all things should be entirely discontinued, have been themselves desirous of domineering over the faith of other men, and of commanding their consciences. Wherefore, since I am firmly of opinion, that your sentiments and mine co-incide on this point, I cannot persuade myself, that you will hereafter be so offended with this my ingenuousness, as to indulge the suspicion of my holding the same sentiments with those heretics, because of some similarity in the in the phrases employed.

"To the SECOND objection, which is somewhat more specious, I reply, that on this subject I never invented any new hypotheses; but that I have always, and (I think) on very just grounds, defended those which had the approbation of St. Augustine and others. But how happens it, that the same judgment should not be passed upon all of us who are concerned in the same cause? For no one has yet been found, who urged it as an objection against St. Augustine and the Schoolmen, that they prepared a way for Arianism by acknowledging God's absolute power [capability] to forgive sins without [exacting] punishment, if such be his pleasure. Might not the same danger arise from such an assertion at that time, as this of which we are now afraid? Besides, I do not recollect to have read in the writings of those heretics that mode of argumentation, which is deduced from the non-absolute necessity of satisfaction, to deny the Divinity of Christ. But, on the contrary, I know that no argument is urged by them with greater force against the satisfaction of Christ, than that which is drawn from his Deity: For they say 'Christ has neither satisfied [Divine Justice] 'nor could satisfy it, if he be the true and eternal God; since no one can yield a 'satisfaction to himself, or can pay to himself any debt; and it is always necessary, 'that he who has to appease another, must be a different person from that other.' Nor is it possible to give a solid answer to this argument, except by having recourse to the free will of God, and to his gracious appointment: As may be seen from the first defence of Junius, towards the conclusion."

Vorstius added a number of other arguments and copious quotations in this large Apology: The preceding extracts, however, will suffice to shew the tendency of his remarks and the frankness of his character. In a private letter to Tossanus and Paræus, about the same time, he says: "I openly condemn the errors of Socinus and of others respecting the person and the office of Christ, and others of a similar description: And I peruse their writings with no other design than that with which you usually read them. Yet if from that perusal, any thing has adhered to my discourse or style which is in the least abhorrent to the Holy Scriptures, let that be [considered as] neither spoken nor written.—But I call God to witness, that I have done nothing in a perverse spirit; nothing which can justly offend the true church of Christ, as such; and nothing which is repugnant to the oath which I have taken. For the true church of Christ and its pastors grant free permission to every one to investigate the truth, to prove the spirits, and, after due proof has been had, to embrace that at length in religion, especially in those abstruse questions, which each of them may have found to be most consonant to the word of God and to right reason. The true church of Christ does not [*jactat*] publish any consent beyond the word of God; nor does it bind any person to the hypotheses of men, however excellent; nor does it urge any thing in the matter of faith which is not God himself and his word. These observations are ex-

loxy. In the year 1602, the famous Du Plessis Mornay, and he Church at Saumur, invited him to become Professor of Divinity in that University. In 1606, Maurice, Landgrave f Hesse, made Vorstius a similar tempting offer of the Divinity Professorship at Marpurg, to the acceptance of which he as also solicited by some of the ablest and most learned of he contemporary Divines.* He was also invited to that of Hanau. Such was his reputation throughout Germany, for many years after the explanation of his sentiments at Heidelberg, which circumstance was no secret to the divines of Saumur or to the Prince of Hesse! But the Count of Bentheim, ully aware of his great merits, would not dispense with his ervices. He appointed him one of the ministers of Steinfurt, commissioner (in conjunction with others) to take cogni-

ndingly familiar to you, and have frequently been explained in an accurate and pro-it manner against the Papists and the Ubiquitarians, [the Lutherans,] who are the ials over other men's faith, and who inculcate even to disgust, *the Church, consent, ssord*, and other things of the same kind. Put therefore, I beseech you, the same ar into force towards me, which you have yourselves prescribed to others towards you. Ou will speedily despatch the business with me, if you will rescue me, from what u conceive to be an error, by sure testimonies and arguments; or if you be not able do that, calmly to bear with me as dissenting from your opinion.— I do not know, hat I have taken any other oath, than one about *delivering the truth from the word of od and the Augsburgh Confession, so far as this Confession agrees with the Scriptures, nd about cultivating an agreement with the brethren.* But the latter clause ought of ecessity to be received with this exception—'so far as those brethren hold no senti-ents contrary to the truth:' For it would otherwise be a conspiracy against God and is Christ, rather than a fraternal consent in Christ. Recollect, I beseech you, ho-oured men, what are those stratagems of the devil, by which he has frequently cast own the greatest men through the semblance of zeal and piety. Beware that this old apostor does not impose on you. For I am not attached either to Socinus or to my wn speculations; but I heartily embrace the word of God and the truth which it contains."

In his spirited yet affectionate reply to his friend Pezelius, he explains very satis-actorily his conversation with Du Moulin, and the rest of the particulars which had een mentioned to his disparagement. He also says very justly, "The unpleasant umour which has been generally circulated concerning me, depends only on mere suspi-ions; as in reality can be evidently proved to any one, from what I have discussed both n my discourses and my writings on the eternal Divinity of Jesus Christ and on his aving office. Such great offence have I given to some persons by that ingenuousness hich I think ought to be used on every religious subject," &c.

* Among others, the celebrated Martinius, who was then joint Professor with the amous Piscator at Herborn, and who soon afterwards became Professor of Divinity nd Minister in the city of Bremen, makes the following observation on the difficulty hich we fallible mortals feel in consequence of our ignorance of future events:—"Of ll those who have given valid proofs of their fitness to teach in illustrious Colleges, ou would have been the only one that could have maintained the authority of that niversity, and could have speedily restored it to its former celebrity. But as I un-nstand from yourself, it has seemed good to God, the Over-ruler of our counsels, herwise to dispose of this matter: For He alone knows where our labours may be pended in the most profitable manner for the edification of his kingdom. Indeed, ese very reasons which appear to us most specious, are not always agreeable to his dgments."

zance of matrimonial causes, and the examiner of young candidates for the ministry, and to assist at Synods and Visitations; and "an extraordinary stipend was allowed to him, as a reward for his exemplary conduct in the discharge of these several offices." He remained in that useful station and quiet retreat till the year 1610, when he accepted the invitation to Leyden, as the successor of Arminius; and repaired to that city with his family, possessed of the most ample testimonials of his orthodoxy and prudent conduct. His call to that University had the sanction not only of the States of Holland, but of Prince Maurice himself, who gave particular orders to the deputies that repaired to Steinfurt, (one of whom was Uitenbogardt, and the other the benevolent Zeystius, advocate of Leyden,) to press Vorstius, in his name, to accede to their urgent intreaties, and fill the vacant Theological chair. Several of the most eminent divines of the Calvinistic party, both in the United Provinces* and in Germany,

* The following extract from Uitenbogaert's letter to John Narsius, 31st December, 1612, is important for more reasons than that of shewing the high character given by Fontanus and Schultetus to Vorstius:—"I have hitherto neither held nor taught any other sentiments about the person and office of our Saviour, and their concomitants, than those which always have been and now are taught on the same points from God's word, by the Universal Church of Christ. To this fact, I hope, my colleagues will bear me witness, as well as both my French and Dutch hearers, and that Christ whom I serve in spirit. I add, and I add with truth, *that I do not know a single Remonstrant who either maintains or teaches any other sentiments:* If there be any such, I declare before God, that is a circumstance with which I am unacquainted. I wonder therefore whence this calumny has arisen: Is it from the vocation of Vorstius? But he is not yet convicted of that heresy: And were he fully convicted of it, he received his call, not as a Socinian, but as a Divine of the Reformed Church; this is abundantly proved by my letter to him, which was published by the magistrates of Leyden. But that he was then accounted such an one, that is, a divine of the purer Reformation, is evident to all men, and therefore to your Fontanus, who indeed had a better opportunity than I of being well acquainted with him, and who at that time bore an exalted testimony before Zeystius. I am likewise in possession of a letter, addressed to me by the very famous Schultetus of Heidelberg, in which he congratulatee us on this call as though it had been accepted; and says, *that he believes there is no man equal in ability to Vorstius to render our University illustrious:* And yet who entertains any doubt, that this person is most averse to Socinianism?

"But why am I so solicitous about the occasion, the cause, and the author of this calumny? I have no doubt, that the devil himself has put it forth, that he may by this dark and black cloud obstruct the lights of truth and innocency. For, I confess, nothing could have been invented of greater detriment to the cause in which we are engaged, than to infuse a persuasion into those who are ignorant of things, *that it is the intention of the Remonstrants, under the pretext of these Five Points, to introduce destructive heresies, which are so injurious to the Son of God, as to have been long ago condemned, proscribed, and exploded, and the propagators of them considered in the judgment of some persons as deserving to be burnt alive.* But, I ask you, What service is rendered to their own cause, and thus to the whole of the Reformed Church, by this black stain with which they asperse us their brethren and fellow-ministers? By such slanders they do no good at all: The only probable result of such conduct is, to fill all things with suspicions; to infuse poison into friendship; to violate charity; to shake or overthrow the consciences of the weak; to expose the

approved of the call of this eminent man, and congratulated him on what was then supposed to be a felicitous event. But some of the most violent of the Contra-remonstrants thought this a most desirable opportunity to injure Arminianism, by opposing the call of Vorstius: Their first effort went only to revive the former slanders about his Socinianism, which had been completely disproved before the Heidelberg Professors in 1599. Some of the young men who had been educated under him at Steinfurt, re-published one of Socinus's treatises in Friezland: The book was condemned to be publicly burnt as heretical; and the familiar letters of some of the Steinfurt students, who had settled in a few of the Dutch States, contained many incautious expressions in praise of what they called "the liberal principles" of Vorstius. It was easy for such men as Sybrands Lubbertus, Peter Plancius, and Festus Hommius, to transfer this fault from the pupils to the master himself; which they did to great effect, and yet with manifest exaggeration. A circular Epistle, containing extracts from the students' letters and highly-coloured statements of trifling facts, was addressed to several foreign Universities, the chief men in which were known to hold sentiments opposed to those of Arminius.—See page 215.

But all these machinations, spiteful and unchristian as several of them were, would have availed little, had not Vorstius himself furnished the most destructive weapons against himself. This he did in his notorious treatise *De Deo, seu Disputationes decem de Natura et Attributis Dei, diverso tempore Steinfurti publice habitæ*, which was printed at Steinfurt in 1610. To those who have an accurate acquaintance with the science of Metaphysics, and this is a kind of knowledge which is rarely possessed even by those who are great braggarts on the subject,) it is unnecessary to remark, that many things may be written *metaphysically* concerning the Deity, his attributes and other subjects, which it would be highly improper to enuntiate or discuss in the language of common life: In this view of the matter, his treatise might admit of much excuse, and actually did receive high commenda-

whole ministry, and thus all our churches, to the scoffs and invectives of our enemies; to arouse, to sharpen, and to furnish the wits of curious men, (whose ears itch for different things,) to inquire into the meaning of these latent heresies, and into the tenets which Socinianism maintains and propagates, to obtain and to read Socinian books, to begin to indulge doubts concerning things which have hitherto been most certain, and to institute among each other disputations and contests, to the great detriment of the public tranquillity, to the greater peril of their own salvation, and to the very great scandal of all good men; and thus to disseminate and scatter abroad the very heresies which we wish to be buried: These are the results of their mode of advocating their cause, and this is their method of bringing good out of evil!"

tions from some of the most learned scholastics in Europe.* Poor Vorstius however, had the misfortune to be made a kind of theological scape-goat. Though it is seen, (p. 207,) that in the liberal dominions of the Counts of Bentheim, he was required only to adhere to the Augsburgh Confession, yet, till the year 1608, his predilections were completely Calvinistic;† and in reference to this point, Arminius gave him some advice in 1609, which I have quoted in page 580, and which Vorstius followed in 1610, when he published his *Anti-Bellarminus contractus, seu brevis Refutatio quatuor tomorum Bellarmini.* This able defence of Protestantism contained many things which were calculated to give umbrage to Archbishop Abbot, a most violent Calvinist, who at that time exercised supreme spiritual authority in England, and swayed the conscience of his royal master almost at his pleasure: It contained an avowal, in opposition to the allegations of the Jesuits in their *Creed of the Calvinists*, "that the sentiments of individual divines ought not to be charged upon the Protestant Church;" and *the liberty of prophesying*, which Vorstius had recommended in the Preface to his *Refutation of Bellarmine*, was one of the particular topics against which Winwood, the English Ambassador at the Hague, was instructed to complain to the States of Holland, and which he requested them, in the King's name, entirely to abrogate. For, how convenient soever the Archbishop afterwards found it, faintly to patronize this very principle, when his power was on the decline, his Calvinistic friends were in disgrace, and Arminianism was gradually rising; yet in 1610, it was a principle exceedingly obnoxious to him, and the existence of which even in another free country he could not endure, but commanded his creature Winwood to procure by most objectionable means the removal of his famous Predestinarian brother AMES, when the latter had found a comfortable asylum in the English Church at the Hague. (See page 453.)

* Among these may be reckoned Martinius of Herborn, Goclenius of Marpurg, Meursius, Bertius, Baudius, and Coddæus of Leyden; James Duport of Saumur, &c.

† Vorstius gave the first intimation of the change in his sentiments on Predestination, in the two books which he published in 1610,—his treatise *De Deo* and his *Anti-Bellarminus*. Old David Paræus in 1612 upbraided him with this change, which was indeed the chief cause of the storm that the Calvinists raised against him, and reminded him what a reverend and candid judgment he had evinced on that subject in 1597, soon after he went to Steinfurt. To that charge Vorstius replied, "I continued then to hold the more rigid opinion of Calvin on Predestination, although I had for some time previously entertained a degree of suspicion about it: But I still adhered to it for certain reasons,—lest I should seem to have changed my opinion on slight grounds, before I had sufficiently investigated the matter, and when I had only just entered on my public Professorship. Such a hasty transition would undoubtedly have produced no slight degree of scandal and danger."

It was another part of Vorstius's misfortune, that he had not only left the various Calvinistic speculators to defend their own unguarded assertions, but by manfully grappling with Bellarmine he had unintentionally intrenched on the province of his Britannic Majesty, who often boasted of his literary and religious prowess against the Jesuits. In admiration of King James's ostensible learning and courage, Conrad Graser, a native of Switzerland and the author of a commentary on the Apocalypse, dedicated his performance to the British Monarch, and, in consequence of the favour with which it was received at the court of England, entitled his work *Plagæ Regiæ*, "Royal Stripes." The usual topic of that age, *the Pope is Antichrist*, was treated with much spirit by Graser, who became a great authority with the excellent Joseph Mede, and with the less excellent interpreters of prophecy during the inter-regnum: This work offended the Jesuits, one of whom, the learned and virulent Becan,* wrote a pamphlet against the author, in which, after having recited eleven "aphorisms" as they were maintained by the Calvinists, added other six, and called them "Atheisms" as held by "Conrad Vorstius the Calvinist." Abbot accounted it a great disparagement to Cal-

* Uitenbogaert gives an account of this affair, in a letter to Vorstius, dated Nov. 8, 1610. But the following is from one of Van der Borre's letters to Episcopius, written three days afterwards. After describing two very interesting conferences between Plancius and Vorstius, in which the latter silenced his adversary and frequently confessed *that Christ was the eternal Son of God*, Borrius says:—"The two conferences seem to have produced some good effects: For if no other good consequence had ensued, undoubtedly the modesty of the man [Vorstius] was of service, since it attracted the minds of the hearers and induced them to have a more favourable opinion of him; especially when they considered the immodesty, malignity, presumption, and bitterness of the adversary with whom he was engaged. But, by the grace of God, he arrived at home in safety, and found all well, as we learn by the letter which he addressed to us from Steinfurt six days ago: He had then heard nothing from Upper Germany which can make a constant man afraid. He is particularly anxious to know what is doing at Leyden, particularly by the hyper-critics. The pamphlet of Becan, 'Ments, in opposition to *the Royal Stripes* of Graser, seems to have been unknown to him: In it Vorstius is subjected to animadversion, and in a manner sufficiently Jesuitical, yet so as not to spare our hyper-critical brethren. You have probably not yet seen that pamphlet; I will therefore describe in few words what it contains respecting Vorstius, because Gomarus and other zealots triumph greatly on that account. Graser, a native of Switzerland, wrote a commentary on the Revelations which he dedicated to the king of Great Britain, and in which he attempts, and bends his whole attention, to shew *that the Pope is Antichrist*. The title which he has prefixed to his commentary, is [*Plagæ Regiæ*] 'The Royal Stripes.' This book is displeasing to the Jesuits. Becan attacks it, and in a small pamphlet endeavours to throw discredit on the testimony of the author. Among his arguments this is likewise one, 'that the author belongs to the Calvinists; and since their doctrine is atrocious, blasphemous, and pestilent, it may easily be understood what credence it deserves.' On this occasion he enumerates certain things, which he calls *Aphorisms*, as many as eleven in number, which the Calvinists hitherto have openly taught:—'(1.) That God is the author of sin.—(2.) That God predestinates men to eternal punishments without

vinism to have these additional stigmas cast upon it; and, like a shrewd politician, he instantly engaged the versatile monarch to write a disavowal and refutation of the principles of Vorstius, and in this he artfully screened his beloved predestinarian doctrines from the severe reprehension to which they were justly exposed. The report of his Majesty's promptitude on this occasion, which

'any fault on their part.—(3.) That God acts towards mankind with dissimulation 'and not with sincerity.—(4.) That Christ did not die for all men.—(5.) That the 'image of Christ crucified ought by no means to be tolerated in churches.—(6.) That 'the saints, who are said to reign with Christ, are *bugbears*, *beasts*, *and hangmen*.— '(7.) That Original Sin is not taken away by baptism.—(8.) That other sins are not 'taken away in justification, but are only covered or hidden.—(9.) That all the works 'of the righteous are nothing less than mortal sins.—(10.) That the grace of God is 'not sufficient for the performance of Good Works.—(11.) That all the children of the 'faithful are holy from the womb of their mothers, and therefore do not require bap- 'tism.'—After these Aphorisms, he subjoins what he calls *Atheisms*, which are in reality extracted from the treatise of Vorstius *On God*, as the words of the Jesuit declare. The words and their connection are the following:—'But the Calvinists, having 'now proceeded still further, are not content with these Aphorisms, but add, besides, 'the following Atheisms:—(1.) That God is not infinite.—(2.) That God is not every 'where present.—(3.) That it is uncertain whether, with regard to his substance, God 'is present in any place except heaven; and, what follows as a consequence from it, 'that it is uncertain whether Christ, when he sojourned on earth, was very God.— '(4.) That there are in God true accidents really distinct from the Divine substance.— '(5.) That the decrees of God are not [*ab æterno*] eternal,—such as the decree of 'predestination or reprobation, or that of the creation of the world.—(6.) That the 'eternity of God is not both indivisible and entire, but successive.—These are the as- 'sertions of Conrad *Vorstius*, a Calvinist, in a treatise on the Divine Attributes which 'he has lately published. What hopes can now be entertained from GRASER, who 'is embued with the same Calvinistic spirit, who runs in the same course, that he may 'obtain the victor's wreath for Atheism?'—Thus far Becan. Before I had seen the book, I thought it contained some great matter for the taste of the hyper-critics; for I heard and perceived that they were generally suffused with gladness. But, now when I have seen it, I make no account of it: For if they can appropriately refute Becan and extricate themselves from the Aphorisms, Vorstius will undoubtedly, with equal ease, extricate himself from those Atheisms with which the Jesuit charges him."

In Uitenbogaert's letter to Vorstius, he says:—"Becan makes no further mention of you throughout the pamphlet; by which act of forbearance, he shews himself more modest than our [Calvinistic] divines, since he is content with six articles, while they have composed forty and upwards, as you are already aware. Becan's pamphlet at first lay neglected in the booksellers' shops; but as soon as it was generally known to contain something against Vorstius, all the copies were bought up with such eagerness and haste, that, in a short time, not a single copy was to be found, though a great price were offered for it. On my return from Leyden, the honourable Van der Myle made some enquiries concerning this pamphlet. Having been previously advised by you, I had purchased a copy of it at the Hague and had perused the whole. I read this entire passage to Barnevelt and Van der Myle: They were both convulsed with laughter, when they understood from me that our hyper-critics wished to produce against you a Jesuit author, and one who has so bitterly animadverted upon themselves. In the [new] edition of your *Exegetical Apology* you ought not to spare this Jesuit. Your two books, *On God* and *Anti-Bellarminus*, are much sought after, and read here at the Hague by the learned."

was industriously circulated and was too complimentary to be officially contradicted, served to flatter the monarch's insufferable vanity, and made him rank at least as a Divine among Kings, if not as a King among Divines. The fact is, the Jesuit Becan had been his majesty's *avant courier*, and by his animadversions, brief though they were, had considerably abridged the royal labour. The king's first communication to the States of Holland on this subject, which I have quoted in page 455, was also in several passages copied, nearly *verbatim*, from the letter which the Dean and Faculty of Theology at Heidelberg had addressed to Plancius, in answer to his circular, and of which his Majesty must have been in possession nearly a year prior to the publication of his own document. How exceedingly ill-qualified King James was to animadvert upon Arminius or Vorstius, is evident from the fact which he himself discloses, in his political manifesto respecting Vorstius in 1611, "that it was our hard hap not to hear of this Arminius before he was dead, [about two years before,] and that all the Reformed Churches of Germany had with open mouth complained of him." The king had not then had such experience of high Calvinism as he afterwards had; nor had ny one been so faithful and frank with him on this subject, as that very amiable and independent character, the learned Tilenus.* In pages 411, 455, 496—503, I have related the whole of the harassing process against Vorstius, in consequence of king James's intemperate conduct; concerning which an able writer, whose political prejudices were entirely in favour of Abbot, has justly observed: "Scarcely any thing can set James the First's pedantry and bigotry in a more contemptible light, than his interfering so warmly in such an insignificant concern as the appointment made by a foreign power

* In an interview with his Majesty, at the palace of St. Theobald's, the year after the conclusion of the Synod of Dort, he said, respecting the Calvinists, who made *God the author of sin*: "This doctrine is so horrible, that I am persuaded, if there were a council of unclean spirits assembled in hell, and their prince the devil were to put the question either to all of them in general, or to each in particular, to learn their opinion about the most likely means of stirring up the hatred of men against God their Maker; nothing could be invented by them that would be more efficacious for this purpose, or that could put a greater affront upon God's love for mankind, than that infamous decree of the late Synod [of Dort], and the decision of that detestable formulary, by which the far greater part of the human race are condemned to hell for no other reason, *than the mere will of God, without any regard to sin*; the necessity of sinning, as well as that of being damned, being fastened on them by that great nail of the decree before-mentioned."

Tilenus writes, "that King James approved of what he had said, and that his Majesty's approbation induced him, on his return to France, to consent to publish what he had written in French, *On the Cause and Origin of Moral Evil*."

to a Professorship of Divinity in one of its own Universities." The true reasons were not known till the year 1725, (when Winwood's Memorials were first published,) why Vorstius was virtually deserted by the States of Holland, and sent into a disreputable sort of exile. In a letter in that collection, the Lord Treasurer Salisbury informs the English Ambassador at the Hague, that his lordship had "entered into thought and conferred with my Lord of Canterbury what expedient might be found out to accommodate things to all parties' contentments, and have at length resolved of this course,—that, seeing the States are resolved to hear Vorstius, as being inforced thereto by the liberty of their countries to yield therein unto him; so the States do suspend any present judgment, until they may have sent the whole process of the cause in writing abroad to the churches of France, Geneva, Switzerland, the Palatinate, and Hessen,* to understand their advices and opinions in it; that so the States may thereby be the better grounded to pass their definitive sentence afterwards, either for or against Vorstius: But with this condition, that after Vorstius shall have been heard,† he be forthwith sent out of the United Provinces, until the States shall resolve (upon knowledge of the opinions of the Churches

* Here was the very germ of the Synod of Dort, and these are the principal States and Principalities that sent deputies to that Calvinistic Assembly. Abbot never lost sight of this plan, till he had, by his crooked arts, obtained a complete triumph for Calvinism in Holland.

† I subjoin part of the Apology which Vorstius addressed to the Curators of the University, immediately after he had offended the Count of Bentheim, by giving him due notice of his final determination to accept the Divinity Professorship at Leyden, and of which all his subsequent Apologies were mere echoes. I omit the long comments on the intercepted letters of some of his pupils, which are written in a more quibbling and Jesuitical strain than the following:

"1. I am not now, nor have I at any time been, a Socinian or an Ebionite, but I am an evangelical christian; and the doctrines which are peculiar to them repecting *the Holy Trinity, the person and satisfaction of Christ, &c.*, I never inculcated on my pupils; but on the contrary, as often as an opportunity occurred, I uniformly refuted them.

"2. I do not acknowledge any *common cause under which Socinianism shelters itself.* Neither do I know any Socinian Church in these regions; but I have always cultivated a true and fraternal communion in religion with all evangelical christians.

"3. On the Sacred Trinity I retain the general and perpetual consent of the Catholic Church, which I have not only expressed in my letter from Deventer, but have made a more ample declaration on that doctrine in some Theses which were at the same time exhibited.

"4. In the mean time I studiously avoid the dangerous phrases of certain persons on this subject, and those curious decisions of the School-men which have no foundation in scripture: Neither do I promiscuously accommodate to this doctrine such scriptural testimonies as I choose. But I entirely acquiesce in the simplicity of the word of God, and endeavour to refer the mystery itself to a pious use by [*economicam*] a plain and systematic consideration of the Trinity.

as aforesaid,) to pass their definitive sentence; for if he be found to be an heretic, we assure ourselves the States will not

"5. I have hitherto perused as many of the productions of the Socinians as I could obtain: And because it was with the greatest difficulty that some of them could be procured, I wrote twice or thrice to them about this matter, in a civil and christian strain, for the purpose of gaining a perfect knowledge of their sentiments. In that business, I think, I have done nothing but what the duty of a good theologian requires,—neither to condemn nor to approve any thing of which he has not had a previous and accurate knowledge.

"6. It is now several years since I discontinued writing to them and broke off the familiar acquaintance which thence arose; but I have done this in such a manner, as still to accustom myself to praise whatever in them seems praiseworthy, and to blame whatever about them appears culpable.

"7. I have never incited my pupils to peruse their books. But when a few of them, especially those who were tolerably well founded in the word of God, have asked me of their own accord and became exceedingly urgent, I have occasionally at the time granted them the use of some book or other: And this I did with the design, that, after they had been fully and gravely settled in the sacred ministry, they might be capable not only of confirming the truth, but likewise of refuting error. For I consider this to be the course which ought to be pursued, in opposition to the practice of some persons, who utter in the Universities or Churches such declamations against the Socinians, as most effectually to deter their hearers in the mean time from reading their books.

"8. I have not imported Socinian publications into these regions: But some members of their own body, many years ago, dispersed them far and wide, as they passed through several provinces.

"9. I have not excited young men of curious genius to search these writings; but those, rather, who at Lectures or Disputations have Socinus frequently in their lips, and who, when they are unable sometimes to solve objections, rave with great fury and weakness of mind against their opponents, as though they were Socinians. For, by this means, the juvenile disputants, especially those of them [*injuriis affecti*] who have had the worst of the argument, are easily impelled to enquiry: For it is a trait in human nature, to attempt what is forbidden.

"10. The Socinian pamphlet, entitled *The duty of a Christian Man*, was clandestinely published, (as God is my witness!) entirely without my privity. I was neither the author nor the encourager of that work; and when I was first informed of the matter, I called into my presence some of those who had been concerned in the publication, and gave them a severe reproof.

"11. If there be any validity in this argument,—*Some of the pupils of Vorstius have superintended the publication of this pamphlet; therefore Vorstius is the author of it or the encourager;* the following will possess much greater validity: *Certain pupils of Sybrands Lubbertus, who were never seen or known by Vorstius, and who live at Franeker, where the pamphlet was published, have procured its publication; therefore, Sybrands is the author or the promoter.* For his pupils could as easily seduce mine, as mine could seduce his, especially when he has the name of Socinus more frequently in his mouth than I have.

"12. If there is any thing which, in opposition to the judgment of some persons, I am desirous of introducing into our churches and universities, it is this, the rejection of the trifling and subtleties of the Schoolmen, which many of our divines urge in association with the opinion about Necessity; and it is my endeavour to persuade all men, that they must rather abide by the pure word of God, and must not adhere so servilely as is common to human writings, not even to those which are publicly received: But that the scriptures must be accounted the sole rule of faith; and that these human compositions must be viewed as formularies of public consent, which

receive him; if not, his Majesty hath not cause to take exceptions against him." This was the course which the States of Holland really took;* and the ultimate despicable management of Abbot, in procuring the condemnation of Vorstius at the

are always liable to correction and examination, provided due order and moderation be observed.

"13. It is likewise my wish and earnest endeavour, to see the subject of Predestination, with its concomitant articles, delivered in the churches and universities in a less rigid and absurd manner than some persons now teach it: and to have the whole of it drawn from the scriptures and referred to progress in practical piety.

"14. It is another of my wishes, that when dissenting one from another on subjects which are not fundamental, we should tolerate each other with greater patience and lenity, manifesting in this way a stronger regard for the peace of the church, and causing both sects and schisms to be diminished.

"15. And because all candidates for the sacred ministry ought, each according to his capacity and vocation, to direct his attention to this one object,—*wisely to refer all things to edification*, on this account I occasionally excite my pupils to the practice of this wisdom, lest an unseasonable zeal produce greater effects in the work of destruction than in that of edification. But the subtle and deceitful counsels which are contained in some parts of those letters, I never suggested to any person living."

The last four of these apologetical remarks, in which may be traced an evident attempt to frame them for the latitude of Leyden, could not operate either as an apology or an excuse for the errors and indiscretions, that are detailed in the least objectionable form in the former eleven articles. After this explanation, and a few more like it, we can feel no surprise at the Curators of the University ultimately acceding to Archbishop Abbot's expedient, as communicated by Sir Ralph Winwood. See page 214.

* Brandt says, "Vorstius asked and obtained a hearing of the States of Holland in March, 1612, when, in a full Assembly, he justified himself against the accusations of his adversaries to the satisfaction of most of the members: He likewise desired, that he might be permitted to avoid the storm which blew so violently upon him, and abstain for a while from the discharge of the office to which he was called, but upon which he had not then entered. The States deliberating upon his business, it was at last resolved, that it would be best for him immediately to deliver copies in Dutch and Latin of the Apology which he had then made, that so the States might notify the same to the king of Great Britain, and the most proper measures might be taken to give that Prince satisfaction, &c. It was likewise ordered, that Vorstius should draw up a clear and full answer, in one Treatise, to all the books and papers that had been published against any of his books, &c., that, in the mean time, till the States should otherwise direct, he should forbear the discharge of his Professorship, of which nevertheless he should enjoy the stipend; and that the Committee of the States, the Curators and Burgomasters of Leyden, should consult with him about a place in which he might dwell quietly and securely, provided it were neither at the Hague nor Leyden. —Pursuant to this resolution, it was thought fit, that he should settle by his own consent at Gouda, for the purposes already mentioned, and for certain reasons of state, but without prejudice to his past and present services, and that he should remain under the protection of the States of Holland. Grotius relates, 'that the States exhorted 'him to examine his words and writings between God and his own conscience, in 'order to defend that which was justifiable; but to atone for what he could not defend 'by a sincere acknowledgment of his mistakes.' This was the more reasonable and necessary, because even some impartial persons, though convinced that he had been too vehemently opposed, were yet of opinion that in his book, *Concerning God and the Divine Properties*, he had sometimes treated of them in such a crude manner, that it looked as if he was about to infuse into the minds of men strange opinions, never heard of before in the church of God."—Vorstius afterwards removed to Torgau, where he remained till the period when the Synod of Dort assembled.

Synod of Dort, is matter of history and does not require to be repeated in this place.

But the most curious part of this long story remains yet to be told: While King James was depicting Conrad Vorstius as a Socinian and an Atheist, he unwittingly suffered the other Conrad (Graser), who was a real Socinian, to escape with impunity. For the Socinian Annalists, who are not very nice in laying claim to eminent persons that never belonged to their fraternity, have seized upon Graser as their own man, and their claim has been allowed without a murmur: But, in setting up their claims to Vorstius, with a modesty that is unusual with them, a degree of hesitation is expressed about admitting him to rank among their party. Into what palpable errors does intemperate zeal hurry

* Of all the proofs produced by the Socinians, to shew that Vorstius was one of their fraternity, "nothing except his Confession of Faith," says Bayle, "written and signed on his death-bed, are of any importance." He adds, in another passage, "But what can be alleged against Sandius, who affirms, 'that, being for some time 'in doubt *whether he should rank Vorstius among such authors as are Unitarians*, he no 'longer hesitated after he saw the Confession of Faith, which Vorstius signed on his 'death-bed; in which he evinces, with sufficient plainness, what was his opinion con-'cerning God and the Lord Christ.'"

The theological reader, however, will not think that the opinion of the dying Vorstius is expressed with any adequate clearness, after he has perused his Confession in the following words, which were dictated when "his strength declined, and his speech began to fail him, so that he could hardly be heard:"

"In the name of God the Lord who made heaven and earth, that only holy and Almighty Being, that King of kings and Lord of lords, who alone hath immortality, and dwells in light inaccessible, which no man hath seen nor can see, beside whom I own no other God, that is the most high Creator of heaven and earth. I moreover acknowledge his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ for such a Creator and Saviour whom we ought to adore and worship with the highest and most perfect reverence, as Him to whom all power in heaven and earth is given, and under whose feet God his heavenly Father hath put all things, without excluding any thing save Him only who hath subjected all things to him; insomuch, that there is nothing in the whole world that is not bound to adore him with the highest divine honour that can be conceived, and finally, that we are all bound to rely upon him for salvation, forasmuch as he has reconciled God his Heavenly Father to us, not only by his doctrine and preaching, his miracles and wonders, and the example of his holy life, but also by his holy death and passion, as with a holy sacrifice, having thus made an everlasting atonement for us.

"If now any person should go about to abuse my little authority, I hereby positively declare, as I have formerly done, that I make a difference between the Lord Jesus the Son of God, our only and eternal Saviour, and Him who is the only True and Almighty God; agreeably to the words and meaning of the Holy Ghost, so frequently expressed in the New Testament."

When Herboldus Tombergius had written thus far, "the sick man had scarcely as much strength left as to sign CONRAD VORSTIUS with his dying hand, in characters hardly legible."

It is difficult to determine from these words what were the real sentiments of Vorstius. He seems to attribute exclusive Divinity to the Father: For, while he denominates Jesus Christ "the only-begotten Son," he does not specify the sense in which

its votaries, and how difficult is it for them to correct a false statement!

This eminent individual, who under proper management might have made an excellent Professor and have redeemed his character for orthodoxy,* remained without employment from the year

he uses that scriptural expression, but appears to make not only a *distinction* between the Father and the Son in regard to personality, (as is done by the orthodox,) but likewise such "a difference" between them as indicates that they are essentially two beings. At the same time, he avows his conviction, that Jesus Christ is the "Creator" and the "Saviour;" that by his "death and passion" he has made an "atonement" for men; that he is invested with absolute and universal dominion; and that, under the character of CREATOR and SAVIOUR, the highest worship is to be ascribed to Him by all intelligent creatures. With these principles, it is impossible that he should have been a Socinian in the proper sense of that term; And yet, had he held the *Divine and Eternal Sonship of Christ* in the orthodox sense, as implying an equality of essence with the Father, the probability is, that he would have declared it. The only conclusion therefore to which we can fairly come on this subject, appears to be, that Vorstius was a strict Arian, who believed that the Son of God was first created by the Father, and then delegated to create the universe,—a sort of inferior deity, who was, nevertheless, entitled to religious homage. This was formerly the creed of many learned and speculative men: But it is connected with so much absurdity and contradiction, as to occasion it at present to be generally abandoned. In modern times, those who deny the orthodox doctrine concerning the Holy Trinity, usually take refuge in Unitarianism, as it is called; which, in point of fact, is not properly *a modification of Christianity*, but *a system of refined Deism.*

One thing, however, must be confessed, that these expressions of Vorstius contain much of that studied ambiguity which he had employed for many years preceding, and which is another instance of "the ruling *habit* strong in death." But as the dying man had not breath to complete this brief Confession, even in the imperfect mode of dictation, and as it is not improbable that he intended to render it less dubious on the one side or the other, it must be viewed with pity and interpreted with charity.

* The following very judicious, discriminating and charitable remarks of Uitenbogaert, addressed to his young friend John NARSIUS, in 1612, are in complete accordance with my own opinion, and finely elucidate the estimation in which Vorstius was held, after all his errors, by those who had the best opportunities of becoming acquainted with his character:

"This is my judgment of the man: It is possible that his extensive and indiscriminate perusal of Socinian books has engendered in his mind some doubts concerning certain doctrinal points of superior importance. But he is not so attached to those opinions, as not to be easily divested of them, and thus the man may be retained within the bounds of Catholic agreement. But the object at which his enemies aim, is, not that he may be retained within the church, but that he may be ejected, and consigned to destruction. Such is that burning and fiery zeal of ours, which breathes out nothing but *faggots*, and *fires*, and *burning alive!* For the sake of retaining him, what would not the Papists do, suffer, conceal, and bear, if they had such an individual among them who was wavering in the matter of religion? This [christian course,] however, seems to form no part of our occupation: But, as if we possessed an abundance of such men as he is, (though there is at the same time the greatest dearth of them,) we prefer suffering the loss of many virtues by our hatred of one fault, to the concealment of one fault by our love of many virtues."

This is highly characteristic of the benevolence of Uitenbogaert's mind, such as have described it at the commencement of this Appendix, p. 194. Yet the successive unpleasant disclosures of the Professor's imprudent proceedings induced Uitenbogaert to acquiesce in his being silenced, in the manner described, (p. 214,) till he could be reclaimed from his errors by mild treatment, and a friendly exposure of his errors.

ll to the year 1621. After the conclusion of the Synod of rt, which had fulminated its anathemas against him, "he took himself this summer," [1622] says Brandt, "to the wly built town of Frederickstadt in Holstein. He was quite ed of the irksomeness of a skulking life. At first [after 1619] kept himself concealed for some time in the province of recht, at the house called *the Chapel*, or thereabouts; and, at other time, within the city of Utrecht, in the house of Dr. ter Van Dam, in continual fear of being discovered and prehended. It was reported, that there was a design of send- g him over to England, in order to deliver him into the hands an unmerciful judge, and to have him burned in a pitch- rrel. He was often hunted after, even by Count Ernest him- f, while he commanded the garrison at Utrecht; the houses ich were suspected of harbouring him being beset by soldiers th loaded pieces. Many nights was he forced to pass without ep, to avoid a surprise; and often, at very unseasonable urs, was he obliged to seek a new shelter.—He had made a evious application, about the close of the year 1621, to the ke of Holstein, through the Heer De Haan, for leave to me and settle in his dominions, on condition that he and other monstrants might enjoy the exercise of their religion. At e same time he sent a short apology for himself, with regard to e heresy of which he was accused by the Contra-remonstrants, d declared that he was of the opinion of the Remonstrants as blished in their Confession; and that the things which his emies were accustomed to lay to his charge, beyond what was ntained in that Confession, were either mere calumnies, or, as r as true, were matters of Philosophy and not of Divinity, ich by no means related to Christian Faith or the practice of ety, as he had frequently shewn and was ready to do so more large. The Duke, having seen his Apology, caused it to be amined by his chief chamberlain, Ægidius de Lange, and by s Superintendant and Chaplain, as well as by other divines; d they all approved of his Apology. The Duke therefore quested De Haan to write to Vorstius, that his arrival in Hol- in would not only be agreeable to the Duke; but that he uld take him into his service as soon as he came, and would aciously grant him protection and maintenance.* As soon as

* "Beside this, Vorstius received another invitation from the Count of Steinfurt, illiam Henry, who expressed such kindness for him, as to send a gentleman in a ash, with John Andrew Konerding, the minister of Gronau, to convey him to Stein- t, where he designed to employ him again in the Church, (notwithstanding the tence passed upon him by the Synod of Dort,) as he had done by Konerding him-

he arrived in Holstein, he was received by the Duke and his Council with great marks of favour, and was created chaplain to the Duke. He was also led to hope, that his salary would be soon augmented; and since there was not then any suitable conveniences for his residence at the new town of Frederickstadt, the Duke ordered that he should lodge with the Heer De Haan in the castle of Tonningen. He flattered himself, that he should there enjoy a little rest, after having been so long in an unsettled state. But, being exhausted and weakened by the many troubles which he had endured, he was seized, in September, with a sickness which became his last, and within a few days reduced him to a corpse. The same day on which he was induced to rejoice at the unexpected arrival of his wife, he was compelled to confine himself to his bed through the increase of his bodily infirmities, which he had till then dissembled. He lay ill about ten days. His faithful friend, Dr. Peter Van Dam, who had followed him from Utrecht, did for him whatever his art could effect or his love could suggest. But it was all in vain. The distemper prevailed; and the patient, at the same time, instructed his physician and the rest of his friends how a christian ought to meet death: He entirely laid aside all worldly cares, and spent the rest of his time in prayer and pious ejaculations. On the 29th of Sept. (old style) he commended his soul to God and Christ his Saviour, and gave up the ghost, gently expiring. Thus died Vorstius, being 53 years, 11 months, and 10 days old. His body was conveyed from Tonningen to Frederickstadt on the fourth day after his decease, attended by his friends in seven coaches, and was interred in a vault under the very place where the church was afterwards erected. The minister Grevius preached his funeral sermon in the Low Dutch language, and described all his good qualities in a very moving manner: The rector Mark Gaulter afterwards composed an encomium on his

self, whom he had preferred, though he had been turned out of the Divinity College at Leyden for his adherence to the doctrines of the Remonstrants. But Vorstius inclined to Holstein in preference, particularly as his wife had an aversion to Steinfurt, where she had a sister so extremely partial and violent on account of the controverted points, as to render it impossible to live with her. He therefore civilly excused himself to the Count, and set out privately, first to Amsterdam, where the famous poet Van der Vondel harboured him several days, and then conducted him to Horn, whence he went by sea to Tonningen, on the 4th of June, 1622."—BRANDT.

This is a good specimen of the trammels in which all the minor German princes were held by the decrees of the Synod of Dort. This Count had refused a previous application from some friends of Vorstius's through fear: But in the interim, Frederick the Elector Palatine lost the battle of Prague, and the kingdom of Bohemia, the Protestants of Europe were delivered from the tyrannical chains which Calvinism endeavoured to rivet on them, and the Count then ventured to invite Vorstius.

life and death, which was likewise printed. As for the Remonstrants, though they did not approve of all his doctrines, yet they thought his errors were too much magnified, and that his peculiar notions, as he himself explained them, were not of such weight as to deserve the hatred and prejudice which had been entertained against them. They said, that no man except Castellio, since the beginning of the Reformation, had been so violently persecuted by his brethren; and that no man had ever treated his *friends* with greater fraternal and Christian love, than Vorstius had done his most implacable *enemies*, who, as far as their power extended, would have committed him and his works to the flames."

Thus it is seen, that, before Vorstius could fully clear himself in Holland from the aspersions cast upon his orthodoxy, the Remonstrants from a change in political affairs could with difficulty maintain their own ground, and were therefore ill-prepared to defend an oppressed individual, as Vorstius will always be accounted, after all his errors and indiscretions: With these, it should be remembered, the Remonstrants were totally unacquainted when they invited him to fill the Divinity Chair at Leyden.* Every well-informed man must blame him for intro-

* That such was the fact, will be seen by the following correspondence between him and Uitenbogaert:

"*To Conrad* VORSTIUS, *John* UITENBOGAERT *wishes health.*

"Most famous man, that I have not written since your departure from us, I wish you to ascribe to grief of mind which has been caused by numerous troubles, and to the multitude of my occupations: If you have neglected to write, I will not demand too rigidly and closely the reasons of the delay. But something has now transpired, which may render a man without tongue loquacious, and may extract words from one that is dumb: It is a report concerning some letters addressed to you by that Ostorodus who is now so much spoken about, but who is to me unknown, and of others from you to him in return. The subject of theirs is said to be, that you have received a call into Poland, that you may lend out on interest your talent of truth, (that is, of Socinian truth,) among those brethren who are now so well known to you: While yours contains this pretence, as an excuse for passing over in a less open manner into their camp, that you think you can bestow your labour to much better effect for them in these provinces. This, or something like it, they say, is the substance of those letters. They add, that there is no room left for subterfuges, but that the letters are in readiness and can be openly shown.—When I heard these particulars from the friendly and benevolent lips of a gentleman of great learning, singular probity, and indeed high in authority, who has also hitherto been extremely favourable to you, I was filled with horror, and I had nothing to say in reply, except that I should soon learn from yourself the real state of the case.—I know this rumour is not yet generally divulged; but it will undoubtedly be quickly trumpeted forth by those whom you know, provided it be supported by any the least semblance of truth. I now leave it to your prudence, most famous man, to conjecture the thoughts that will be entertained, the remarks uttered, and the judgments formed, concerning you and us, and principally concerning that public cause which before God we sustain with a glad conscience, by the

ducing the books of Socinus and of his disciples to unfledged divines, who had not even completed their initiatory academical

brethren, the honourable the Curators, and by their mightinesses the States, if (which God forbid!) these rumours be proved to be true. Will not this blame also fall partly upon us, how undeserving soever we may be, that we have exerted ourselves greatly in bestowing our patronage, such as it is, on men of this description, [Socinians] in introducing them into the very University, with whom, as God is my witness, I never yet held any intercourse, and whose books I have scarcely inspected? Wherefore, not to weary you with any more words, we again and again, in the most earnest manner we are able, ask you, reverend sir, nay, we pray and beseech you by Christ our Saviour, seriously to consider with yourself if it will not be adviseable to inform us yourself as soon as possible respecting the real state of the matter. If these reports be false and fabricated, we can then at once and with a good grace oppose ourselves to this atrocious calumny which ought not to be cast upon any christian, we can defend with all our ability before honourable men your reputation which otherwise is very dear to us, and can thus the more rapidly wipe off this foul blot. Or if it be probable that any such thing remains concealed within your own breast, (which indeed I cannot for a moment suppose;) consider, I beseech you, if it will not be more advisable for you to renounce this call [to Leyden] with all haste, than, by proceeding in this course upon which you have entered, to impose upon us, the University, the Church, the Curators, and the States themselves, and I add, than to place yourself in circumstances of the greatest difficulty: For our rulers expect to have a CHRISTIAN Professor, not one who is a SOCINIAN.

"Since you know my ingenuousness, you will the more readily grant indulgence to this free communication, which has been extorted from me, not without great sadness, by necessity alone; though I am not exactly of opinion, that a sincere admonition requires any indulgence or pardon.—Farewell, reverend and most famous man; and let your reply, which I anxiously desire, raise me up from the depths of sorrow in which I am plunged.—THE HAGUE, June 24th, 1611."

In a few days Vorstius returned the following answer:—"Reverend Sir and very dear Brother in Christ,—Your letter inflicted on me a wound sufficiently severe; and did every thing except actually pierce through my heart. But I readily excuse you in my own mind, since I understand the cause of your grief, or rather of your indignation, to be sufficiently valid. You relate with much regret, that a report prevails among you of an epistolary correspondence between Ostorodus and me; and you are particularly anxious to know the real state of the matter. I will therefore act towards you ingenuously, as it becomes a Christian; and I will conceal from you nothing of which I am at all conscious. I will employ no subterfuges, but will declare every thing as in the presence of God. At the commencement I openly confess, and I have made a similar confession on more than one occasion to other friends, that, above ten years ago, a Polish nobleman, whose name was Jerome Moscorovius, wrote to me, in the name of those churches which are commonly called in that country Anabaptistical or Samosatenian, [Socinian,] and sent a certain person here [to Steinfurt] to treat with me about entering upon the Divinity Professorship among them. This happened in the month of May, 1601. But I replied at the time, and indeed without deliberating a moment, as I have briefly noted it in my memoranda, that I could not give my assent to this call, because I did not hold the same doctrinal sentiments as they did, and because I had here an honourable situation, in which I could with sufficient liberty profess celestial truth, so far as it was made known to me. Whether Ostorodus at that time addressed any thing to me, and whether I wrote a reply,—I cannot with any certainty either affirm or deny. I sacredly declare before God, that, after a most diligent search among my papers, I can neither discover the original nor any copy of a letter sent at that time by him, or of my reply; nor have I the most distant recollection of any such writing. If there has been any thing of that kind, it has been

studies. Our excellent and accomplished countryman Dr. Doddrige has been blamed, and not unjustly, for a similar species of

clandestinely taken from me by some emissary of Satan: But whatever it may be, I will never acknowledge any thing for mine, which is not demonstrated as such under my own hand.

"That I received a call from the Socinians, (and that only once, in the year which I have specified,) I will never deny. That this call was quickly refused by me, and that my refusal was grounded on the two reasons which I have just repeated, those who gave the call will never deny, provided they be good and honest men. But who am I, that I should be able to prevent other people, even though they are heretics, from giving me a call [to the Professorship]? Our party [the orthodox] ought rather to place this fact to my commendation,—that in the very hour in which I understood myself to be invited by those foreigners, I instantly refused it. Concerning this fact, the gentleman whom they deputed, if he be yet alive and willing to speak the truth, can abundantly testify. But it is a false charge against me, that in my reply I gave, as the cause of my refusal, the expressions which you attribute to me, *that I thought I could bestow my labour to much better effect for them in these provinces, or I would otherwise have openly passed over into their camp, &c.* For I find no intimation of this kind in my note-book, in which I inserted a summary of my answer: On the contrary, I find in it, that I could not in all things assent to their doctrine, and that principally on this account I refused to accept of their call.

"But let us for a moment suppose, that something which at least resembles this had been written by me: Does not equity itself require, that my own declaration concerning these expressions, whatever they may have been, should be heard? But I give the following declaration of my mind in this case: I never subscribed in all points to their doctrine, neither could I do so with a safe conscience; but there were certain parts of their doctrine, of which, from the time of my becoming acquainted with them, I had always approved, and which seem to have a very great tendency to promote the study of piety: For instance, those which confirm at once the necessity and the possibility of Christian piety, and which are therefore manifestly repugnant—partly, to God's absolute and fatal predestination, and to the irresistible conversion of man, and, —partly, to the absolute necessity of Christ's satisfaction, and to other opinions of that kind, which are commonly received among our divines. I then thought, and I am still of the same sentiment, that on these doctrines some things are delivered by them with greater correctness than by some of our divines: And, in regard to these points, it is not improbable I might promise to patronize their cause in this part of the world. I say, I may *probably* have done this: For I cannot in my conscience testify any thing with certainty concerning a promise of that description. But if any such promise of mine be in existence, it is improper to understand it in any other manner than with the limitation I have just mentioned. For it will never be proved, except through calumny, that I have cultivated any consent of doctrine with them on the Holy Trinity and on similar articles of faith.

"I know, that I have written twice or thrice to Ostorodus and to other persons in Poland, with the design of obtaining their books from them, which I perceived I could by no other means procure. It is probable, therefore, that, for a temporary purpose and to serve my own cause, I have thought my conduct towards them ought to be somewhat milder and more civil, than it is either the wish or the manner of some zealots to treat them: This I did, that I might with the greater facility obtain the writings which I desired to see, and might in this way perfectly understand all their opinions. Of those doctrines of theirs on Predestination, &c., which I have already mentioned, I sincerely approved; and I proposed queries to them on some others, that I might thoroughly discover their inmost thoughts and perceptions. In the course of our correspondence, too, I sometimes styled them BRETHREN, that is, in reference to the common profession of Christianity; which is the very appellation that St. Augustine,

indiscretion—in laying before his students the ablest writings both for and against the most important doctrines of Christianity, and in leaving them from the native force of the evidence of

and the other Fathers, frequently employed when addressing the ancient heretics. But of the whole of their doctrine I did not formerly approve, neither has it even now gained my approbation.

"Besides, from the time when I had in some degree succeeded according to my wishes, that is, after I had procured the greatest part of their books which I was desirous to possess,—for I believed it to be a part of my profession to peruse and to pass my judgment upon all the productions of every sect,—I immediately refrained from all epistolary communication with them: So that Ostorodus, whose name has now been frequently mentioned, made a serious complaint, about this interruption in our correspondence, to his friends who resided somewhere in Westphalia, and accused me with sufficient acrimony, of hypocrisy and dissimulation; as his letter will testify, the original of which I have still in my possession. For when I plainly perceived from the call which they gave me, and from other tokens, that they had wrought a stronger persuasion within themselves than they were warranted concerning my agreement in doctrine with them, and that I was by this means rendered still more suspected among our own divines; without delay, I broke off all correspondence, and have now, for many years past, neither sent them any letters, nor received any from them.

"Let us then make a supposition, that I had written something perhaps too freely or too imprudently, so many years ago, to Ostorodus or others, (for their letters to me or to others, whatever the import of them may be, cannot operate to my prejudice,) such an act ought to be excused, before all equitable judges of things, on account of the great distance of time since it occurred, and my constancy and perseverance in the general confession of our churches; and thus my published writings, as well as my daily lectures and discourses, might long since have justly wiped off every perverse suspicion concerning me.

"I have a perfect recollection of the promise which I made to their Lordships the Curators, in undertaking the Professorship of Divinity, and within what boundaries of doctrine I circumscribed myself when I entered into a public engagement, *that I would teach according to the word of God which is contained in the Holy Scriptures, and according to the general harmony of Evangelical Confessions.* This indeed I could neither promise nor perform with a clear conscience, if I could subscribe in all respects to the doctrine of those foreigners. At this point then, my censurers and competitors ought to have made their stand, in order to shew that my promise to the Curators was either useless and unlawful, or that I have hitherto violated a single particle of it: But they ought not with an envious curiosity to investigate the topics discussed in the correspondence which I formerly held with Ostorodus and his associates. For, whatever it may be that has been written by either party, as long as I shall with integrity abide by the pledge which I gave to the Curators, (which I am prepared sacredly to perform, by the assistance of a gracious God,) so long, I trust, all good and prudent men will spontaneously acknowledge my innocence in this matter; and they will especially confess, that he is not immediately an Ostorodian who has for certain reasons written with a degree of familiarity to Ostorodus. If it were otherwise, our censurers should by parity of reason prove, that not only I, but also several other evangelicals, ought to be associated with the Jesuits, nay with different sects of heretics, and of infidels themselves; since we have, on more occasions than one, received letters and books from them, and have frequently in return written to them with civility,—sometimes even commending a few things in their religion, and making further enquiries into other points of greater obscurity, &c. Whoever the man may be that is desirous of taking away this liberty of commencing a familiar epistolary correspondence, even though some of the letters be too freely expressed, he in reality is attempting to introduce into the Church of Christ a new species of tyranny. But

truth to draw their own unbiassed conclusions. This injudicious liberality had an imposing appearance: But the result was such as might have been expected, and as had previously occurred in the case of Vorstius,—many of Dr. D.'s students, on leaving his institution, became confirmed Arians and Socinians. Vorstius also seems to have entertained as confused metaphysical notions about the Trinity, as our own admirable Dr. Watts. Yet neither the injudicious conduct of Doddridge, nor the errors of Watts, are thus mentioned to their prejudice, though (all circumstances considered) in the eyes of many people they will seem to have been at least as great as those of Vorstius: The reason of the difference is very apparent; a particular purpose was to be answered by the persecution of the Steinfurt Professor, and he was called to suffer for transactions in which other people had been concerned, and was visited with the vengeance which was intended against his new patrons. All would have been right and fair, had Vorstius adhered to the Calvinistic brotherhood; and he would in that case, like the more daring and heretical Maccovius, have found numerous apologists in the Synod of Dort: But to be deserted by an eminent man, who had acquired in their school all the subtle refinements which were afterwards charged upon him as crimes, was a greater effort of self-denial and magnanimity than could be reasonably expected from his

it who finds fault with that civil and mild method of acting even towards the most hateful heretics, and immediately converts it into matter of unjust suspicion; that man is endeavouring to remove common humanity itself from the society of men, and seems at least to be in some degree ignorant of the demands of Christian Charity, and how far they extend themselves.

"You have now, reverend sir, the whole history of the matter, and, with it, my own brief apology: If according to my hopes it prove satisfactory to you and to other friends, and if it relieve your mind from grief and anxiety, it will be well. But if the result be different, and if any portion of unjust suspicion about me still adhere to you, I must bear it with an equal mind, as I have had to bear many other things that have occurred contrary to my expectations and beyond my demerits. In the interim I will employ myself in humble supplications to God, to have mercy upon me and to defend my innocency from the calumnies of the malevolent, and to endue all of you with the spirit of wisdom and of fortitude, that, being neither broken nor weakened by slight rumours of this description, you may at no time desert that good and otherwise holy cause which is attacked with these arts, by the devil, through my sides.—Farewell, most eminent man and highly honoured brother in the Lord; and continue in the bowels of Christ to love me, who, though much suspected by others, am yet before God innocent as to this matter. It is my wish, that God may be thus propitious to you and to me. I desire you to present my dutiful respects to all the brethren; to those in particular in whose name you have written to me; and to whom I also request my answer to be communicated.—STEINFURT, *June* 20, 1611."

The reader will perceive some discrepancies between this statement of Vorstius, and that which occurs in page 215: He was too astute to make disclosures in the latter, about his invitation to a Socinian Professorship.

high predestinarian accusers. Adventurous, rash, and pestilential as many of the metaphysical vagaries of Vorstius undoubtedly were, a far greater number, more portentous in their import and blasphemous in their consequences, might be selected from the scholastic lucubrations of his celebrated master Piscator, who instigated him to publish some of the very Theses for which he incurred the early reprehension of the Heidelberg Professors.

Vorstius begun his career of theological error, by ridiculing the received and very important doctrine of the eternal Sonship of Jesus Christ. Pezelius has alluded, in a preceding page, 204, to Vorstius "being suspected about *that much more important controversy* relative to the eternal Divinity of the Son of God, which contains the foundation of our faith and salvation." If the remark of Tertullian be correct, "that it is perilous to speak concerning God even those things which are true;" it is much more perilous to speak hastily and without deep thought about any of the circumstances connected with that mystery into which angels desire to look—*the incarnation of God's Eternal Son.* The Eternal Sonship of Jesus Christ is one of the doctrines divinely revealed in the word of God: But had not this been the case, the term itself as well as that of "the Trinity," would have been entitled at least to some respect from all modern divines, on account of its having been employed by the Ancient Fathers in defending some of the most vital portions of Divine Truth against the pernicious errors of particular sects of the early heretics.* It is a culpable flippancy in some men, who have instituted no examination into the *incunabula* of certain very useful ecclesiastical terms adopted by the Primitive Church, and whose course of reading has lain in a different direction, to determine dogmatically concerning the correctness of their application, and rashly to repudiate the doctrines which they serve to uphold. The more slender the stock of requisite information on which such men commence their operations, as theological reformers, the more dangerous is their career, and the greater is the obstinacy which they uniformly exhibit. To some minds, too, and they not of common mould, the easily purchased appellation of

* "It may be easily shewn, and indeed has been shewn, that every Article both of the Nicene and Athanasian Creed, against which they exclaim so bitterly, was occasioned by the new and unscriptural distinctions of subtle corrupters of the Faith. Nor could we guard against the errors of Popery, and of other sectaries, but by using words expressly condemning the unscriptural doctrines which they had introduced. The very persons who make this objection, in their writings and discourses delight themselves in words not occurring in Scripture, and think they can make the doctrines of scripture more plain by words of their own devising."—RANDOLPH'S *Charge*, 1771.

Theological Liberality possesses a charm sufficiently potent o produce within them a contempt for all the ancient way-marks n Divinity,* in whose place they substitute their own wayward ancies and crude conceits. *Call no man* MASTER *on earth*, and 'Think for yourselves," are directions which require some dis-rimination in their application; and before they can be applied t all to good purpose, and according to their usual accommoda-ion to theological studies, the young divine must use with umility the common helps which are within his reach for acquir-ng a good stock of solid information, before he commences the alutary process of rumination and digestion. But it is one of he weaknesses displayed by the most headstrong divines, to act s if they had innate ideas on every subject which they choose o discuss, and as if "they needed not that any should be their nstructors" even in the most difficult points of christian doc-rine. To acquire the character *of an original genius*, and *a an of deep conceptions*, is a temptation which many an ill-fur-ished student is unable to resist; and, in yielding to it, he equently hinders his future usefulness and still oftener makes hipwreck of his reputation. — Much of this applies to the se of Vorstius: He was particularly eminent as a Meta-hysician, but his acquaintance with ecclesiastical history was ither accurate nor extensive. His enemies brought his rash xpressions out of the Schools, and gave them to the public in e language of common life. When they were thus brought rth into another arena, by a frank confession of the impro-

* In one part of his book *De Deo*, he had asserted "*Argumenta quæ adferuntur*, c.: The arguments which are used both by the Fathers, and by modern divines, for e *eternal generation of Christ* are either sophistical or frivolous." On this assertion ing James observes, "Vorstius cannot bethink him of any other evasion, but to d the word *quædam*, 'some arguments,' &c. Now we shall desire thee, good rea-r, here to observe, that this man, condemning some arguments which the Fathers had thered out of Holy Scripture, will be sure, howsoever, not to allege any other argu-ents, either out of the Fathers or of his own brain, which shall be stronger than those hich he hath rejected." If we were at liberty to reject, or to cast doubts upon, all doc-ines on which the Fathers employ "fallacious or frivolous arguments," we might undon every important doctrine of Christianity. That was the very infancy of Bib-al Criticism: Jejune and trifling, therefore, must many of their arguments appear to e moderns, who are favoured with the accumulated lights of pious and learned men, hose elucidations of Sacred Writ have been carefully perpetuated since the revival letters and the invention of printing. Yet with all their defects, the Christian Fa-ers are our safest guides, in subordination to the Holy Scriptures. King James has nother good remark in reference to Vorstius: "It is in no sort lawful to speak of he great mysteries of *the Essence of God*, of *the Trinity*, of *the hypostatical union natures in the person of Christ*, or any such high points, unless we use the same words and manner of speech which the Church of God hath always used in speaking the said mysteries. They that will talk of Canaan, must use the language of Canaan."

priety of some of the very daring and unedifying dogmas which he had propounded, he might have silenced his enemies; but he pursued an opposite course, and exerted his ingenuity in palliating or defending them. His conduct in this respect reminds one of the motions of a fluttering fly, that, however frequently removed from the destructive blaze of a candle, persists to court the pleasing danger, till he falls a victim to his repeated temerity. Had Vorstius really entertained orthodox views, says a certain writer, "he acted very imprudently in treating matters of such high importance in this incautious manner; and it would have been well, if he had explained his opinions so clearly, that good men in particular might no longer have had any cause of suspicion."

The consideration of the principal duty which devolves on a Professor of Divinity, will serve to shew, that Vorstius was not the most suitable person to hold such an important situation. His main business is to direct young divines into such a train of study, as will make them the best parish-priests, and will prove most profitable to them in its results, when they are engaged in the exercise of the holy ministry. His instructions therefore will chiefly comprise subjects of a practical nature, in reference to their future destination and their intended sacred employment. If, to satisfy the inquisitiveness of a few choice wits, he makes an occasional departure from this wise plan, his more refined disquisitions on the *arcana* of certain doctrines will always be conducted with moderation and sobriety. But if we take the treatise of Vorstius *De Deo* as a fair specimen of the topics which were to form the substance of his Divinity lectures at Leyden, his defects as a Professor become apparent, and he shews himself incompetent to train up sound and useful divines. That book exhibits much critical acumen and an astonishing acquaintance with scholastic lore; but, notwithstanding his asseverations to the contrary in page 216, it affords no proof of the wish of Vorstius to substitute the study of the scriptures for the trifling subtleties of the Schoolmen. It was, indeed, too much the theological fault of that day, of which Vorstius partook in common with many others, to state the most alarming paradoxes, and to employ the greatest dexterity in solving them or in proving them to be perfectly innocuous. On this subject the sentiments of the aged Professors Grynæus and Polanus, of Basle, deserve particular attention: "We heartily beseech the Lord Jesus, who is the Giver of true peace, to bestow upon Vorstius, (who, we confess, is otherwise dear to us,) a willingness to omit unnecessary questions, which only produce quarrels and do not

edify the church, and not readily to follow [*quæstionarios* questionable or] torturing divines in the delivery of Theology, but to accommodate the manner of his teaching to the edification of the church, and to consider that no other things ought to be proposed to his auditors from the Professor's chair, than such as his auditors might and ought themselves usefully to propose to the people of God from the pulpit: For [*schola*] scholastic exercises ought not to be subservient to a vain display of bright genius, but to the edification of the church. A Professor of Divinity ought to adopt a different manner of teaching in the Schools, from that which a pastor employs at church in instructing a congregation: But though the *manner* may be different, the *matter* ought in both cases to be similar. We pray likewise, that, instead of the phrases of the unhappy Socinus, he would in preference use the language of the Prophets and of the orthodox Fathers; that we may not only all hold the same sentiments, but may all give utterance to them." Happy would it have been for Vorstius, had he followed this advice! But he seems, on all such occasions, to have made it a point of honour *not to suffer his liberty of prophesying to be abridged*;* and he pertina-

* The ideas of Vorstius respecting the liberty of prophesying were evidently too lax and general. This term is usually understood as synonymous with "freedom of discussion:" But with him, it included not only a licence to peruse Socinian books himself, but to introduce them to his pupils and to publish them to the world. In one of Uitenbogaert's letters to him, that prudent man gave him the following polite hint on this topic: "I entertain the same wishes as yourself respecting *the liberty of prophesying*, but with the accompanying caution, *Not too much of any thing*." Uitenbogaert was desirous to preserve that golden mean; and while anxious that due freedom of discussion should not be wounded in the person of Vorstius, he was equally anxious to restrain the *ne quid nimis*, the excess into which the Professor was liable to run.

A curious instance of this prudent solicitude on the part of Uitenbogaert, occurs in the correspondence between them. A few months prior to Vorstius's appearance at Leyden, before the Curators, to clear himself of the charges which were brought against him, he informed Uitenbogaert of his intention to republish the work of an anonymous author. That good man immediately replied to him in the following terms: "I find some difficulty in conjecturing what that small work, *On the Authority of the Holy Scriptures*, can be: You say that the original author published it anonymously, and that you intend to have it republished. Yet I recollect to have seen a book on that subject, which, if my memory serves me aright, bears the fictitious name of Dominic Lopez, but of which Socinus is himself said to be the author. If that be the book, consider maturely about it, lest by such a publication you render yourself still more suspected; though I do not consider that there is any thing in it which we may not also embrace with both hands. For, the minds of many persons are so prepossessed, that we cannot endure our adversaries, even when they speak the truth and the very same things as we do, especially those of them whose name alone is a stench in our nostrils. I do not write thus to dissuade you from publishing, but only in the way of caution and warning; yet I have done this perhaps with too much freedom, since I ought to submit the whole of this matter to your own prudence and piety.

ciously continued to fish in troubled waters, and to wade within the very verge of danger without being absolutely carried away by the impetuous vortex. The reader will already have perceived, that I do not account him to have been so heretical as any of his adversaries have represented: It is not improbable, however, that he ultimately became somewhat Arianized, and that the intolerance of his enemies engendered in him that obstinacy in error which was so much to be deplored. On this subject Bayle has some excellent remarks, which are repeated in the subjoined note.* But I have always viewed the suspension of Vorstius not only from the exercise of the professorship, but likewise from that of the ministry, for ten long years, as a particular expression of the divine displeasure. In all the dealings of God's Providence with his creatures, I do not recollect an instance in which a man of such vast attainments, sweetness of temper, and previously unsullied reputation, was placed in such peculiar

which are of the greatest possible niceness and accuracy. But probably the book is not the one which I have specified; this, however, we shall know when it is published."

The delicacy of Uitenbogaert's reproof, and the mad imprudence of Vorstius's conduct, need no long remarks: They speak best for themselves. In animadverting on *the Christian and Modest Answer* which Vorstius addressed to King James as a vindication of himself, that monarch says: "Vorstius will neither confess nor deny the accusation; only he saith, that a certain book, entitled *Dominicus Lopez*, which is (as we have heard) a very blasphemous treatise, was suppressed by him for peace sake: But he is so far from condemning it, as that he allegeth the book hath been maintained by others, which in time shall appear." The book accordingly appeared a few weeks after his *Modest Answer* under the following title: *On the Authority of the Holy Scriptures: A work of the greatest utility for these our times, as may be understood from the principal Articles on which it treats.* Vorstius prefixed to it an *Address to the Reader*, in which he pointed out the plan of that edition. To the close of the volume, were subjoined the critical notes of the Basle divines on three passages which were rather too obscure, and which might have furnished an occasion for imbibing erroneous sentiments. The book, though one of Socinus's productions, was afterwards translated, with these real emendations, and published both in the French and Dutch languages.

* "His *Confession of Faith* confirms, in a very powerful manner, the suspicions which had been entertained of him during so many years: But, notwithstanding this, we must conjecture that the disappointments and misfortunes he met with, completed what a too curious and innovating genius had begun. I mean, that he perhaps became a Socinian in good earnest, by being continually accused of that heresy and used ill on that account; and that he would have been cured of his peculiar whimsies, had he been indulged a glorious repose among the Protestants. Nothing makes a person more averse to orthodoxy than persecution. I even believe, that what is but too frequently seen in the articles of Friendship and Fidelity, happens pretty often in matters of Heresy: By suspecting that persons are unfaithful, we render them unfaithful. Nevertheless there are some occasions in which a man does great service to the cause, by exclaiming against such persons as are suspected: It is when they endeavour to pervert every one under the false name of a friend, and assisted by a great reputation. How difficult is it to lay down good rules! Since the same conduct is sometimes pernicious and sometimes advantageous."—BAYLE's *Dictionary*.

circumstances, and rendered so utterly helpless and inefficient. He neither contributed to defend the cause of the Remonstrants by his writings, nor to instruct the people among whom he dwelt by his personal labours. Without any reference to second causes, which God in his infinite Wisdom could at any time remove or control, and concerning which we must according to the doctrine of *Permissive Providence* adhere to the principle implied in the words of David, "Let him alone, and let him curse; for the Lord hath bidden him;"—without any reference to these causes, every accurate observer of "the ways of God to man" must view the prolonged silencing of such a highly-gifted individual, as one of those judicial acts of Heaven, some of the reasons for which we can now understand, though others of them will always in this life appear mysterious.

The difference between Arminius and his intended successor with regard to their respective qualifications, must be obvious to every one. A single point of it is well designated in an expression which Vorstius has employed in a preceding note: (Page 205:) "The phrases and sentiments of that author whom I have last read, provided they appear true and perspicuous, are used by me with greater familiarity, than others which are employed by other authors." This was neither the language nor the practice of Arminius: He never adopted a single term without duly weighing it, and he was particularly scrupulous in adhering to all ancient and well-defined phrases. Several of the most beloved tenets of Vorstius were mere metaphysical quiddities and nice distinctions, which bore no relation to practical piety; while the peculiar sobriety of the views of Arminius, and his antipathy to the use of metaphysics except in the detection of subtle error, gave him a great advantage in inculcating all that was practically good and excellent. The haste with which Vorstius seems to have changed some of his theological opinions, and the boldness with which he adopted others, bore no resemblance to the caution and hesitancy with which Arminius proceeded, who was seven years before his scruples concerning the foundation of the Divine Prescience were resolved, and who had not at the period of his decease fully satisfied himself on some points connected with the doctrine of *the Perseverance of the Saints.* (See page 601.) Other proofs of dissimilarity between the two Professors might be easily adduced, but they will suggest themselves to the intelligent reader while perusing several parts of this volume. I do not stop in this place to advert to the injury that was done, to the cause of Arminius, by having his name associated, by King

James in his famous manifesto, with those of Vorstius and Bertius, neither of whom was so pure in doctrine as Arminius. From the same association arose that often-repeated yet unfounded calumny respecting the Remonstrants, "that Toleration was offered to them at the Hague Conference in 1611, provided they would renounce the errors of Socinianism."

How did the Remonstrants acquit themselves when they discovered the imprudence of which Vorstius had been previously guilty, and the consequent reproaches and calumnies to which he had most unaccountably exposed himself? Though too soon aware of the injury which they would themselves sustain by the completion of his call, with a generosity of mind and an elevation of feeling which have seldom been witnessed among the professors of religion, and which seem in every respect worthy of men who were themselves consistent assertors of civil and religious liberty, they rendered all the assistance in their power towards the just defence of his cause,* as far as it was

* The Remonstrants at first mildly apologized for some of the objectionable dogmas which Vorstius had propagated, while they strenuously defended those points on which they and he were agreed. But after the repeated discoveries of the apparently heterodox leaning of the man, which seemed an inveterate habit, they left him to make his own Apologies, though, like true christians, they performed towards him all the soothing offices of friendship. The following extract of one of Uitenbogaert's letters to Narsius, in 1612, will shew how that good man was affected:

"You say, *that you could not undertake the cause of Vorstius with such confidence, not only because it is displeasing to many persons among you, but likewise because you cannot yourself approve of some things in him.* This is correct: And I add, not only that I cannot undertake the cause of Vorstius with so much confidence, but that I am unwilling on any account to undertake it at all: For, in reality, I cannot grant my approval to it on every point.—Yet, be you of good courage, and continue to defend Truth and Liberty against that dreadful destroyer of conscience and the impending tyranny: For, God requires this of us at the present time. It is not necessary for us to undertake the cause of Vorstius; let him manage that himself. Yet, he is not in the mean time to be deserted in those things in which he has declared himself to be of the same sentiments with us. But on other points we must be upon our guard, lest that moderate *liberty of prophesying* which is circumscribed within its own limits, and is attacked through his sides, should be oppressed in his person."

In a subsequent letter to Adrian Van der Borre, dated Nov. 12, 1614, Uitenbogaert says: "I do not suppose that Neranus is wishful to undertake the defence of Vorstius's cause; neither would I advise him. We must restrain ourselves entirely within the affairs of the Remonstrants: For other matters do not belong to us. Thus those brethren who now lie concealed, must be brought out to the light."

In one of the most remarkable letters in that rich collection, *Præst. ac Erudit. Virorum Epistolæ*, a passage occurs, which explains more fully the feelings and views of the excellent Uitenbogaert, who thus addressed Vorstius, on the 30th of Oct., 1613:—"Believe me, my brother, you will effect nothing by all these your numerous pamphlets, notes, scholia, Anti-Slades, &c. You will never extricate yourself. You will be obliged to choose the one of these two things,—either to engage to revoke certain things that you have written,—or to depart, that is, to abandon your public office. You daily behold new adversaries created against you: You give satis-

apable of being defended; and at their first general assembly fter the Synod of Dort at the close of the year 1619, when the loquy from such a measure would be comparatively trifling, at is particular request they admitted him under certain prudent estrictions* into their society, of which he had not previously een a member. Nay, they seem to have accommodated their Confession of Faith to the circumstances of such doubting morals as Vorstius: This accommodation is rendered apparent n that very able production, *the Apology for their Confession;* nd still more so in the *Theological Institutes* of Episcopius. (Lib. iv. sect. 2, c. 34.) A passage in the latter production† called

lation to none except to those who are themselves suspected of Socinianism, and urely even to them; because you seem to conceal many things, which you dare not now: Yet you have already disclosed yourself so far, as to render it impossible for you o retract.—Grawer, I know, rises to attack, not you alone, but some other men of our Confession. But it will be an easy matter for these to defend themselves; you will scarcely be able to do this: For your errors are more open and numerous, and this is the reason why Grawer produces them generally throughout the whole of that production. These are the thoughts which occasionally occur to me; while my mind is in a state of great anxiety, and not *beclouded with melancholy humours*, as my brethren are sometimes accustomed to object against me. I see the fathers of my country in a state of distress and labouring under great anxiety. I perceive the consciences of the pious to be less and more weakened, and not to know which way to turn themselves. I discern the hatred of the more rigid to be still more excited against us. I behold these Churches daily exposed to the scoffs and ridicule of the Papists and the Lutherans. I have no doubt, that many persons have secretly revolted from the Reformed Church to the Papists. I firmly believe, that Atheism is creeping by degrees into the minds of some individuals. I am filled with horror at the sight of the whole Republic exposed to the impending danger. And cannot these things move us? It is neither three nuts, nor the shadow of an ass, that is here at issue; but it is the very essence of the matter. Let us therefore examine the inmost windings of our consciences. If we have erred, let us acknowledge the error, and, for the sake of Christ and his Truth, not care a straw for all the loss of reputation, which could thence arise."

* Deliberating upon all the circumstances, the assembly declared, "that his reverence Conrad Vorstius should be acknowledged as a member of the Society and treated as such, as well as others, provided he would in all points conform himself to the common rules as they were then or should afterwards be established; but not so as that the Society should be understood to take upon themselves to enter into a justification of all his opinions distinct from those which were in litigation between the Remonstrants and the Contra-remonstrants."

† In reading the above-cited passage in *the Works of Episcopius*, "in which he treats of the necessity of believing the manner of *the Divine Generation of Jesus Christ*, and puts this question, 'Whether the fifth (and highest) manner of Christ's being the Son of God, be necessary to be known and believed; and whether they who deny the same, are to be excommunicated and anathematized?,' Dr. Bull made some remarks upon it for his own private use, and drew up an answer to the arguments of that learned writer, by which he was himself persuaded, that the primitive Catholics did not refuse communion with those who would not receive the article of *the Divine Generation of Jesus Christ*, provided they acknowledged him to be the Son of God *by his miraculous conception of the Holy Ghost, by virtue of his mediatorial office, by his resurrection from the dead, and by his exaltation to sit at the right hand of God the Father*."—BAYLE'S *Dictionary*.

forth Bishop BULL's *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, &c.: "The Judgment of the Catholic Church of the first three Centuries concerning the Necessity of believing, *that our Lord Jesus Christ is the true God*, asserted against Simon Episcopius and others." Though Episcopius himself was accounted "sound in the faith;" yet this unusual latitude of belief, which was granted as the ample terms of church-communion among the Remonstrants, procured for that great man and his liberal associates the suspicion of being themselves inclined to the Arian or Socinian heresy. Indeed, this is the character of them which is generally given by the most candid of our own writers.* There can be no doubt, that, in this instance as well as in others, "evil communications corrupted good manners." For though the first Remonstrants escaped the doctrinal contagion, yet the effects upon their successors were very lamentable: A regular declension from the orthodox Faith in the important doctrine of the Trinity may be traced, in those who successively filled the Professor's Chair at Amsterdam, after Episcopius; and if Courcelles, Poelenburgh, Limborch, Le Clerc, and Wetstein, be severally considered as the proper index of the Faith of the religious community over which they presided, (and their own documents, as well as the histories of those times confirm this view,) then it must allowed, that an excess of candour and libe-

* "In the last century, when the narrow notions of the *Calvinists*, in respect of God's grace and decrees, had provoked the opposition of some persons of a clearer judgment, who, from the *Remonstrance* presented by them to the States of *Holland*, bore the name of *Remonstrants*: This opposition was managed in such manner, that, as it often happens in the warmth of dispute, they seem (some of them at least) not content with correcting the excesses of *Calvin*, to have leaned too much towards the other extreme, and given in with too little guard and caution to the reasonings of *Socinus*. And when they were thus far agreed with him, there were some who scrupled not to follow him in other instances. *Conradus Vorstius* in particular, who had been formerly suspected, did now so fully betray his inclination to heresy, by publishing a noted piece of *Socinus*, as well as others of his own, that he is generally given up by the orthodox writers, and claimed by the *Antitrinitarians*.

"The body of the *Remonstrants* however are not to be charged with this impiety; it must be owned that the generality of them have expressly declared against it. But yet as they were treated not long after by the Synod of *Dort* with great rigour and severity, the ill usage they received had but too natural a tendency to take off their reverence for Synods, and confirm them in the *Socinian* sentiments of the unrestrained authority of private judgment. This naturally disposed them to think amiss of articles of faith prescribed as terms of communion; and from hence it came to pass that they who were the most orthodox among them with respect to the doctrine of the *Trinity*, yet thought the errors in that point were such as ought to be indulged, and were willing therefore to maintain communion with *Socinians*, as with Christian brethren."—BERRIMAN's *Historical Account*.—The several errors in this account will be rectified by a reference to the preceding part of this Appendix, but more particularly to the notes in the pages 208, 210, and 217.

rality in the terms of communion is as injurious to the special purposes of christian edification, as too much strictness can be. This is a subject on which I have bestowed some attention; and the reader will find a copious dissertation upon it in my *Calvinism and Arminianism Compared in their Principles and Tendency*, Appendix H. In that portion of my work I have compared the practice of the Dutch Remonstrants with that of the Church of England; and have, I hope, satisfactorily demonstrated to every candid mind the truly liberal and mild constitution of the latter, and the obviously beneficial results of her combined moderation and firmness, in requiring a rigid adherence to those terms of communion against the strictness of which none were ever found to object, except the men whose laxity of principles disqualified them from becoming members of any Christian Community.* In that "Appendix," too, I have had occasion to combat several of the erroneous statements of the late Archdeacon Blackburne, who in relating *matters of fact* shews himself to have been either culpably ignorant, or guilty of designed perversion.† Had the celebrated

* "They condemned on the one hand the Papists, who asserted *the merit of* GOOD WORKS, and on the other hand the Antinomians who denied *the necessity of them.* And again they condemned the Pelagians, who denied *the necessity of* GOD'S GRACE; and on the other hand the Anabaptists, and others, who denied all FREE WILL. But they so worded their Articles, as to comprehend all those who thought soberly and moderately on these points, though they differed from one another in the manner of explaining them. Our Reformers here in England in king Edward the Sixth's time went on the same plan, and acted with the like prudence and moderation. They were no disciples of Calvin; but they so drew up their Articles, as to include persons of different persuasions in these points. They went, as a Calvinistical writer (Bishop Hall) observes, a midway between both, guarding against the extremities on each side.

"The principal thing, indeed, which seems to be aimed at by most of these reformers, is the doctrine of *the Trinity*, so plainly taught both in our Articles and our Liturgy. This has been always, from the very beginning of Christianity, thought an essential *Article of Faith*; and if any come to us, and bring not this doctrine, we may and ought to shut our gates against him. I cannot but wonder how men of this persuasion should expect or desire to be included in communion with those who believe our blessed Saviour's Divinity. If we believe CHRIST, and the HOLY SPIRIT, to be really and truly GOD, we ought in our public prayers to ascribe to them the titles, the honour, the worship due to God: If we do not believe this, we cannot, I think, pay them such honours without idolatry. How then can there be any communion between persons of sentiments so diametrically opposite? How can they join in worship, who have not the same object of worship?"—RANDOLPH'S *Charge*.

† The Archdeacon's palliative remarks on Archbishop Abbot's injurious description of Grotius, (contained in a letter addressed to Winwood, June 1, 1613, which I have quoted in my *Calvinism and Arminianism Compared*, Introduction, p. cl.,) are a fair specimen of his dashing manner. "Abbot's disaffection to Grotius," says he, "was owing to the endeavours and proposals of the latter, towards a co-alition of the Protestants and Papists, which every wise and consistent Protestant, in every period since the Reformation, as well as Abbot, has considered as a *Snare*, and treated accordingly." Archdeacon Blackburne is here guilty only of a *slight* anachronism; for the fac is, Grotius had not then made *any* "endeavours and proposals towards a co-

author of *the Confessional* known any thing of the true history of the case of Vorstius, he might with his accustomed subtlety have made it exceedingly subservient to the cause which he advocated, and for the triumph of which he would have found in Vorstius a more valuable auxiliary than any of those whom he has quoted, however wrongfully, as his staunch co-adjutors. I conclude this long article with a quotation from Bayle, which, as proceeding from a writer whose prepossessions were decidedly Calvinistic, is entitled to some attention.*

alition of the Protestants and Papists," nor did he write or publish a word on that subject till twenty-nine years afterwards, when Abbot himself had been eight years in his grave!—Other equally glaring misrepresentations concerning the same illustrious man, of whose principles of civil and ecclesiastical liberty he had a very confused knowledge, I have exposed in the work to which there is in this page a previous allusion.

* "I am of opinion, that had not Vorstius been very strongly solicited by the chiefs of the Arminians, he would never have embarked on so stormy a sea. He was beloved and honoured in Steinfurt; he enjoyed the utmost tranquillity, and was in the highest reputation in that city; and he doubtless foresaw, that, in the state in which the controversies of Arminius and Gomarus were at that time, he should meet with great opposition in Holland. He was tempted, if I mistake not, by the glory he should gain by supporting a party which was weakened by the death of Arminius. To this were added motives drawn from conscience: They represented to him, that he would be one day accountable for the ill use he might make of his talents, in case too great a fondness for ease should cause him to neglect such a happy opportunity of establishing the truth in a country in which it had already taken root. However this may be, his evil star separated him from the Count of Bentheim, to convey him to Holland, where, amidst unnumbered rocks and shelves, he at last met with a fatal shipwreck. Had Vorstius continued quiet in Steinfurt, the errors he had inserted in his treatise *De Deo* would not have brought him into much trouble, and he might easily have recovered from that false step which he had taken. But the question being, whether or not he should teach at Leyden, that is, whether a rising party should oblige the other to truckle, nothing was forgiven him; this treatise *De Deo* became a worse book than the Koran.

"Vorstius did great injury to the Arminian party. The prevailing so far as to procure his appointment to the Professorship at Leyden, as the successor of Arminius, [though he never entered on the duties of his profession,] was considered a masterstroke; and yet nothing could have been more advantageous to the adversaries of the Remonstrants. By his new manner of dogmatizing on *the attributes of God*, he furnished them with so many handles, and it was so easy to raise the suspicions of the people against him, that it was no difficult matter to make him become odious. After this, it was very easy for a sect of people, who were not deficient in zeal, tongues, or pens, to cause all the hatred to fall on the new Professor, which had been excited against the Arminian party. Nothing more was requisite, than to represent how urgent the friends of Arminius were to invite Vorstius to Leyden. In this manner the Providence of God every day takes a pleasure in confounding human prudence. That for which we labour most industriously as the most solid foundation of our hopes, is generally that which effects our ruin. It must be observed, that when the friends of Arminius fixed their choice on the Steinfurt Professor, they imagined him to be quite uninfected with the Socinian heresy: But was it easy for them to convince prejudiced people of this, or to prevent such persons from urging the contrary? If the doctrine of Predestination, with its consequences, be strongly asserted by the Protestants, it is because the disputes in it have given rise to two factions, and to a schism which is still in *existence*. The Church of England, which considered itself as a separate body, and

tached from that in which this schism was formed, was not fired with the ardent al which this dispute had excited in the minds of the Contra-remonstrants: Thus it aded, by insensible degrees, towards hypotheses of a milder nature, and very differ-at from Calvinism."—BAYLE'S *Dictionary*.

Q.—Page 33.

The younger Brandt gives the subjoined account of the fur-ther proceedings of the Curators:—Arminius, who was not igno-rant of these machinations against him, attempted to direct his attention to one point—to find out a way, by which he might defend himself against the charges of his adversaries, and might destroy their force: And since he began to discover, that he had been infamously traduced before Oldenbarnevelt, it appeared to him to be the most advisable course—to defend the innocency of his reputation in the presence of that eminent man,—and to give notice of his intention, prior to his appearance at the Hague, to the honourable the Burgomasters, to Helmichius, and others, who had branded his name with infamy. But he was prevented from executing this purpose, and undertaking the proposed journey, through an infirm state of health, produced by a violent catarrh, which had been communicated by the frost, and which had affected the brain and the contiguous parts of his head. When communicating this information to his friend Uitenbogaert, on the 3rd of March, 1603, he disclosed the state of his mind and his wishes in the following words: "I wish he favour could be obtained of the right honourable Barne-elt, to command the deputies of the churches to proceed gainst me personally in his presence. Such a course indeed I equest and desire much more ardently, than that which they uppose to be the object of my desires, that is to say, the Theo-ogical Professorship. But I am fully persuaded within myself, and so undoubtedly it ought to be,) that those good men will ot gain credence among persons of discretion and prudence; specially, when they find, that he who is the object of attack ffers himself to a legitimate defence, and is an elder [Presbyter] igainst whom [according to the scriptures] it is not lawful to eceive an accusation except before two or three witnesses. I m of opinion, therefore, that this excursion is not very necessary t this time, when a great part of the deputies have already leparted, to whom Helmichius might appeal if I commenced a liscussion with him. In the meantime, I retain the proper ight of making a lawful experiment with him, and even with he rest of his associates: But your advice, and that of others, vill determine me in the course which I shall pursue. Yet f you account it necessary that I should disclose my mind on

certain questions, you may transcribe them, and I will return the plainest and most sincere answers. For I am unwilling to commit or to omit any thing, merely because it may serve to promote or to hinder my call. I have resolved indeed to commit myself entirely to the will of God, that I may possess a good conscience, what issue soever the affair may have. In the meantime, I wish you to be in good spirits, and to abate your anguish: For I know the urgent need there is of requiring this favour from you. The Lord God will himself provide, and will grant such success, as he knows will prove most conducive to his own glory, to the edification of his church, and to the salvation of myself and family. On Him I cast my every care: He will bring forth my righteousness as the light, and my judgment as the noon-day."

The honourable the Curators of the University, still promising to themselves better things respecting Arminius than were reported, thought nothing ought to be unattempted, by which they might obtain him who was the object of their wishes. Having consulted the most illustrious Prince Maurice, and communicated to him their deliberations, they added an earnest intreaty, that some one, in the name of his highness, might be associated with them for the purpose of promoting this business among the people of Amsterdam. The Prince kindly acceded to their request; and, on the 13th of March, 1603, he called Uitenbogaert to him, and besought him in the most affable manner not to refuse to undertake this province, which was in a great measure ecclesiastical. He also pledged his faith to furnish him with letters of credence: Uitenbogaert procured his credentials on the 1st of April, and immediately commenced his journey to Amsterdam, in company with the most noble J. Dousa, and N. Zeystius the Syndic of Leyden. They were shortly afterwards joined by the honourable Neostaduis, and N. Kromhoutius, the chief Senator of the High Court, whom the Curators had called in to their aid, and whose influence with the Senate of Amsterdam was very great.

But in order to prepare an easier way to themselves for executing the commission with which they had been entrusted, they thought it expedient to enter into previous conferences with some of the Magistrates and Ministers of the Church. On the 5th of April, therefore, having obtained a public audience with the Magistrates, they explained at large the reasons of the journey which they had taken,—Kromhoutius being the advocate of the Curators, and Uitenbogaert acting in behalf of the Prince of Orange. Their intreaties for gaining Arminius were

ortified by various arguments: But, on the other hand, the Magistrates extolled the merits of their pastor, and declared hat his services were useful and necessary for the refutation of he opinions of different parties on sacred subjects, and that hey could on no account dispense with the ministry of such a reacher.* These, and other arguments of the same kind, were ngeniously and with a greater force turned in their own favour y the Curators; till at length the Magistrates came to a resoution, "That they would deliberate further about this busiess;" and they granted leave to discuss this matter in a meeting of the ecclesiastics.

A meeting of the pastors was therefore convened on the 8th f April, before whom the delegates of the University produced he same arguments for their advice, which they had employed efore the Magistrates: For the sake of promoting this busiess, they likewise held out hopes, and gave their word of onour, that, if the presiding members of the Church of Amterdam resolved to substitute another celebrated Pastor in the lace of Arminius who was to have letters dimissory, or even if hey determined to renew the call which they had previously iven to Baselius, the very eloquent minister of Bergen-op-zoom, rom whom they had received a refusal,—in that case, the lustrious the States and his Highness the Prince would employ ll their influence to effect the object of their wishes.

The Presbytery, having heard all these inducements and aving taken some time for deliberation, thought proper on the 1th of April, to intimate to the Magistrates, by a deputation rom their own body, "that Arminius was, above all others, ound and engaged to their church; and that they should prer his being retained in her service." But since the Magistrates hought, that this opinion of the ecclesiastical assembly was xpressed in terms that were in some measure doubtful and too eneral,† and since they requested their fuller advice and resoution about this affair, the Presbytery determined, that they rould treat with Arminius himself, by the same deputation. These ecclesiastical deputies, therefore, accosted him in all the lluring softness and courtesy of which they were possessed,‡ nd ardently intreated him "to suffer himself to be induced to keep his promise with this church, and to devote his powers to er service." To these intreaties Arminius replied, "that he vas formerly less inclined to take upon himself the professorial

* Uitenbogaert's Diary. † Ibid.

‡ From *the Acts of the Presbytery of Amsterdam*, quoted by Triglandius, in his History, p. 286.

office; but that, in the present state of affairs, he felt more powerfully impelled to embrace it and to petition for his dismissal; that there appeared to him evident reasons why he could no longer render any essential service to the Church of Amsterdam, if his dismissal were refused; that if it were probable, a consideration of the expence formerly incurred in the prosecution of his studies would militate against his obtaining his dismissal, he should much prefer refunding the whole of it, rather than make his call to the Professorship void; and that he was prepared to hold a conference with Gomarus in the presence of the Synod and of the Church."

When the result of this interview was communicated to the Magistrates, they evinced no small solicitude about the matter, and entertained a fear lest, from too anxious a consideration of the refusal of his dismission, Arminius should contract a severe disorder, and thus be rendered useless both to the Church and the University, and lest many unpleasant rumours should thence arise: They demanded therefore, with still greater earnestness, an ulterior deliberation from the ecclesiastical senate. But the reverend members of that body began to invent delays, and to disagree on some points with each other,—some of them accusing Arminius of teaching depraved doctrine,—while others defended him. After the delegates of the University were acquainted with these circumstances, they requested another audience, and, on the 13th of April, after the evening sermon, they presented themselves before the reverend assembly. They tried every method to induce the Presbytery to grant Arminius a dismissal, and pressed to have a full answer from them. They also declared, by Uitenbogaert as their organ,* "that since they perceived the tergiversation and subterfuges of this Meeting rested principally upon the erroneous suspicions which some persons entertained of Arminius, the delegates of the University would instantly desist from urging his call to the Professor's Chair, provided the Ecclesiastical Senate would in open terms accuse him of unsound doctrine; that the University was committed to their care, and its welfare was far dearer to them, than any wish that they could indulge for a connection with a teacher of impure dogmas; that if scruples still remained in the breast of any one, they would faithfully engage that Arminius should not be initiated into this office in the University, until he had given abundant satisfaction to Gomarus, his future colleague."

* Uitenbogaert's Life, c. 6.

When the Presbytery had heard all these things, they held another consultation on the subject; and, at length, granted their assent to the proposed dismissal, with the following stipulations: —"First. That Arminius do not leave Amsterdam, to enter upon his new province, until the Church of this city have some prospect of obtaining another Pastor of learning and piety, and Baselius, if possible. — Secondly. That after the proposed conference with Gomarus, on certain points of Christian Doctrine, in the presence of the Deputies of the Churches, Arminius shall by a candid explanation of his sentiments, remove all suspicion of heterodoxy.—Thirdly. That if circumstances hereafter occur to induce Arminius spontaneously to relinquish the situation of Professor, or if the necessities of the Church of Amsterdam demand his services, he shall be at full liberty to resume his ministerial functions."*

This ecclesiastical decree was presented, on the following day, the 15th of April, to the honourable the Burgomasters of Amsterdam, who had previously convened the Court of Aldermen, and consulted them on the subject; and they readily added their assent to the decree. When the Curators of the University were informed of this general acquiescence, they expressed their gratitude; and, having soon afterwards obtained the personal consent of Arminius, they returned home with uncommon delight.

All these facts concerning the call of Arminius to the Professorship, we have chosen to relate the more diffusely, and with the greater minuteness,† because much light has been shed on this transaction by the manuscript Diary of Uitenbogardt, who was not only present as an eye and ear-witness throughout the affair, but was also himself the principal actor in it; and because some writers in the present day, (1724,) in reviewing those scenes, have amassed many statements concerning them, which far exceed all the boundaries of truth: This has arisen in part from their gross ignorance of the transactions, and in part from bad faith. In this particular, James Triglandius seems deserving of the greatest share of censure: For if this man's testimony,—respecting the frequent and obviously servile and fawning applications which Arminius is said to have made to his colleagues for the purpose of obtaining his dismissal,—and respecting the whole course of his life, of which he makes mention in the 287th page of his Ecclesiastical History:—If this man's testimony deserve to be received, then undoubtedly Ar-

* The Acts of the Amsterdam Presbytery.

† The reader is reminded, that the whole narrative of these proceedings is in the language of the younger Brandt.

minius did many things which must be accounted unworthy of an honourable and serious teacher in the Church.* But we may form some estimate of the infelicitous manner in which he has fulfilled the duties of an ingenuous Historian, from this circumstance,—that most of those things which have the greatest tendency to excite enmity against Arminius, and which, in his narrative of Arminius's call to the Professorship, he pretends to have extracted from the very Acts of the Presbytery of Amsterdam, are certainly not to be found in those Acts which were signed that year by the ecclesiastical senate. The Acts themselves contain no account of that kind, unless we reckon as *the authentic Acts* a certain rude and unfaithful relation of those transactions, which, at a great distance of time, (14 years afterwards,) was composed in the year 1617, during the most feverish heat of the controversies about Predestination: Peter Plancius, that unwearied slanderer of Arminius even after his decease, wrote the greatest part of that narrative, to gratify Adrian Smout, one of the most bitter adversaries which the Remonstrants ever had; and Peter took upon himself the charge of having it then inserted in the Acts of the Amsterdam Presbytery.

John Rulæus, not long ago a respectable minister in Amsterdam, has made it evident that Triglandius had undoubtedly followed in the footsteps of this reviler; and that the account which he has given of the Life of that great man, and of his call to the Professorship, was derived from Plancius's narrative. Rulæus, pressed by the genuine force of truth, was compelled to make this confession, in the very pamphlet in which he had endeavoured

* The very low estimation in which the character of Triglandius was held as an Historian, may be learnt from the following passage in BRANDT's Preface to the Second Volume of *the History of the Reformation in the Low Countries*:—"I beg that my faithfulness and sincerity in accounting for those events may not be called in question: For I sometimes found myself obliged to recede a little from their paths; which is to be understood particularly with respect to that known writer of Memoirs, on whom one of your late [Contra-remonstrant] brethren, the Rev. Abraham Van de Korput, a very industrious author, in his *Life of Melancthon*, passes this censure, 'that he was accustomed to listen to idle tales, rather than the true relation of things; 'that he stuffed his writings with . fles, and seldom considered what he said.' Whence you may judge how far one L . depend upon all those other writers, that follow him, almost on every point, in the accounts which they give of the ecclesiastical differences."—How different was the practice of Triglandius from that of Brandt himself, who in the same preface, having described the use which he has made of his authorities, gives the following account of his own impartiality, a quality which he possessed in greater perfection than any historian whom I have ever perused:—"I will venture to affirm, that I have as little spared the infirmities of my friends and of their patrons, as the crimes of their enemies. History must not conceal Truth, how unpalatable soever it may be: If she does, she will find herself maimed in her best members."

th sufficient acrimony to animadvert upon Arminius, and upon defender, my father Gerard Brandt, of pious memory. The timonies also of the reverend gentlemen, Hall, Ursine, and Le aire, which are cited by Triglandius and added to the statent made by Plancius, do not seem to militate against Arminius: r they relate to the earnest intreaties which he is said to have ployed, and to the promise which he gave, "that he would ver utter any thing in the University of Leyden, which might prejudicial to the peace of the Church; and that he would reve to himself his private opinions and such as were repugnant [*consensui*] the common agreement of the Reformed Churches, til the meeting of the next National Synod." For,—not to ntion the little reliance, which, it may be supposed, can be ced on these private declarations that were signed, upwards of en years after the death of Arminius, for the gratification of zealot Plancius;—Arminius always made the very same laration as that which is contained in these testimonies, and dered the full exposition of his sentiments on Divine Predestina- till a General Council of the Churches should be assembled: t, at length, when the altercations of several persons about this ject had increased, at the command of his superiors, he dised all the sentiments and scruples of his mind in the assembly he States of Holland. The course of the subsequent narra- will shew *whether* and *how far* Arminius can with justice and priety be accounted guilty of having violated his promise, and being the leader and author of breaking the peace of the urch.* The following expressions, which occur in a letter ad-

This is a very satisfactory explanation of all the truce-breaking and unfaithful- which have been falsely attributed to Arminius. When, in consequence of ical events and a sudden change in the constitution of the country, the Dutch inists were encouraged by Prince Maurice to urge their demands for complete iastical supremacy in the United Provinces, one of the weakest and most scurrimen in their body wrote his own unsupported relation of the call of Arminius to Divinity Professorship, fourteen years after the transaction had occurred. As any ation on ecclesiastical or civil usages was tolerated in those days of Calvinistic dancy, Plancius transcribed this *ex parte* narrative in one of the Church-registers 317, not for 1603; and it has since been quoted occasionally by the malevolent, ore frequently by the most ignorant, of the succeeding writers of that party, as *ets of the Amsterdam Class*, though it was not the composition of that body,— Acts, or those of any other assembly, are of no force or validity whatever, they be *bona fide* registers of ecclesiastical transactions, written out at the period they actually occurred. Fortunately however for the interests of historic truth, lant materials for the refutation of this vile misrepresentation of facts exist in the and memorials of several of the Calvinistic contemporaries of Arminius; and ccusation against our author has, in consequence, never been repeated by the table historians of that party.

e late Rev. Thomas Scott, who, when descanting on Arminianism and its early

dressed to his friend Uitenbogaert on the 26th of April, 1603, soon after he had obtained his dismissal, display his modesty of mind, and freedom from even the semblance of ambition, in this crisis of his affairs:—"One thing alone makes me very anxious: How can I satisfy the great expectations which have been raised? How can I render myself deserving to have had such uncommon exertions employed in my favour? But I console myself with this single reflection, that I have made no interest to gain the Professorship; and that, before the Curators formed the resolution to call me to this office, they were warned about the things which have actually happened."

Our author, in the mean time, felt no fear respecting the conference which had been appointed between him and Gomarus, but awaited its issue in complete tranquillity of spirit. And while his familiar friends were discussing among themselves the different advices which ought to be given about the mode of holding this conference,—and there were not wanting persons who were desirous of using their influence with the Curators, to have this conference held in private with Gomarus, rather than in the presence of the deputies of the Churches,—Arminius, so far from wishing to listen to this counsel and to elude the condition which had been stipulated with the people of Amsterdam, adopted the following language, in a letter to his friend Uitenbogaert, on the 30th of April, 1603: "To what suspicions shall I not, in that case, be liable? I shall not only be suspected of heresy; but the surmise will be, that I entertain such a distrust of my own cause, as not to have the courage to enter into a conference in the presence of the ecclesiastical deputies. I would enter into a conference with the whole of the Presbytery, nay with any two Presbyteries, rather than give the slightest occasion of my being viewed in any other light, than that of a man who, using all good conscience in every thing, will not fear the most prolix conference, or even the most rigid examination."

This Conference was appointed to take place on the 6th of May, according to previous stipulation; and it was accordingly commenced on that day, at the Hague, in the house of the noble

history, is certainly not entitled to the appellation of "a competently-qualified historian," makes the following remarks on a much less exceptionable statement of this affair in *the Historical Preface* to "the Articles of the Synod of Dort:"—"How far he [Arminius] fulfilled this solemn promise and attestation, not only the following history, but even the histories of his most decided advocates, fully shew. In fact, he fulfilled it in the very same manner, that the subscriptions and most solemn engagements of numbers in our church, at their ordination, are fulfilled."—The narrative in the text will be deemed, even by the admirers of Mr. Scott, a sufficient reply to this unwarranted conclusion.

Lord of Norderwick, in the presence of Arnold Cornelison and Werner Helmichius, (who attended as the deputies of the Churches of Holland,) and of those very honourable and learned individuals, N. Kromhout, R. Hogerbeets, and J. Uitenbogaert, whom the Curators of the University had specially invited to honour the proceedings with their company.

Gomarus commenced the business, by expressing his surprise and regret at not perceiving, among the company, any deputies from the Church of Amsterdam, though the noble Curators had, by a most polite letter addressed to the Ecclesiastical Senate of that city, requested that some one in their name should be present at this meeting. He did not conceive, the absence of those on whose account principally he had come to the Hague, was a "proper course of conduct." He also affirmed, "that he had little acquaintance with the discourses and the doctrines of Arminius; that the greatest part of the scruples concerning that divine had been circulated by the pastors of Amsterdam; and that they ought therefore to have instructed and informed him about the mode and matter of this conference."—But, when the Curators had briefly explained to him the principal purpose of that meeting, he declared, "that, although he should prefer not to have had this province imposed on him, yet he thought this was due to the cause of Truth—that, at the request of the brethren, he might perform the duties of an advocate, with which he had been invested."

Arminius, on the other hand, testified the extreme pleasure which he felt on beholding the most delightful and long-desired opportunity, which was then offered to him, of vindicating his innocence and reputation.—An agreement having afterwards been made respecting the order and the particulars of the matters to be discussed, he thought this instruction ought to have the precedence of all others: "That not every difference about religion has regard to [*substantiam*] the Fundamentals of Faith; and that those who differ on some points, provided they preserve the foundation entire, ought to be tolerated." For the confirmation of this sentiment, he immediately quoted a remarkable passage from St. Augustine. But when he wished to produce more sentiments to the same effect, from the writings both of ancient and modern divines, he was interrupted by Gomarus, who thought such a course unnecessary, and "that the sole object of their inquiry must be, whether those controverted points upon which they were about to treat ought to be considered as essentials, or not." Gomarus maintained, that they were essentials; and after

Arminius had declared, that they were not, he added a further confirmation of his own opinion.

But that they might not come immediately to close combat, Gomarus began to attack Arminius's sentiments on the Seventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans: He declared and maintained, that it was at variance with the Heidelberg Catechism; and not only quoted certain passages out of that pamphlet, but likewise brought forward to his assistance some of the marginal notes which it contains.

Arminius, on the contrary, refuted the arguments of his adversary, and ably defended his own interpretation from the exceptions which had been taken against it. He likewise maintained, that this clause in the Catechism, "unless we be regenerated by the Holy Spirit," (which was urged against him,) must be explained as referring to the beginning of regeneration. He declared besides, "that he totally rejected and detested the opinions delivered by the Pelagians on this topic; that he approved of those things which had been advanced, by St. Augustine and other Fathers of the primitive Church, against Pelagius and his followers; that he gave his complete assent to the Catechism; that he by no means interpreted this passage of St. Paul (Rom. vii) as applicable to a man entirely unregenerate; that there was the greatest possible discrepancy between his opinion on this subject, and that of Prosper Desidæus, (Faustus Socinus;) and that he had never afforded any just cause to the great debates which were formerly excited [in Amsterdam] about this matter."

After having heard this defence, and considered that Arminius denied many things, and held sentiments on these controverted articles far different from those which he had understood from the relation of others, Gomarus ingenuously declared, "that he had to that hour always thought that Arminius maintained the opinions of Prosper Desidæus, but then he perceived that after a comparison on this subject they were far different; and therefore since he had not apprehended with sufficient clearness the whole of his mind about this matter, he intreated Arminius to grant him the favour of disclosing his thoughts upon it with a little more minuteness and accuracy."

But that honourable man, Neostadius, one of the Curators of the University, expressed his surprise at this request; and intimated that it was incumbent on those at whose desire Gomarus had taken this province upon himself, to have imparted to him better information respecting the sentiments of Arminius, and that it was the duty of himself, [Gomarus,] and of those whom he represented, (and certainly not the duty of Arminius, who stood

the place of an accused person, or defendant,) to produce such ings as might make for his accusation."—Arminius co-incided ith this remark, and added, "that he would say nothing, until omarus and the other deputies of the Churches had absolved m from the calumnies with which he had been assailed."—fter the Curators had given their sanction to this resolution, omarus at last declared, "that since Arminius disavowed elagianism, he felt himself satisfied, and that his interpretation, f Romans vii,] such as it was, might be tolerated."

When the deputies of the Churches had made a declaration arly similar, Arminius immediately took out of his pocket a py of the New Testament, which he always carried about th him, read the whole of the Seventh Chapter of the Epistle the Romans from the beginning to the end, and expounded it such a felicitous manner, that no one, not even Gomarus himself, could say any thing against it: A single objection was ised by Arnold Cornelison alone, but as soon as he heard the lution of it he was silent.

After hearing these things, Neostadius, turning round to the puties of the Churches, said, "And is this the wonderful ntroversy which has been so frequently repeated, and which, r several years past, has excited such great commotions and mour? In a short space of time we have composed this dispute, for the termination of which the people of Amsterdam did t consider many years to be sufficient."

This principal controversy, therefore, having been dismissed, e next discussion which arose, and that only incidentally, was *ncerning the Church of Rome*, and *On the Determination of the man Will by the Divine Decree*, and on other points of this scription, respecting which it had been whispered, by some rsons, that Arminius held sentiments different from those of e Reformed. But his answer to each objection was singularly rned and solid; and he explained and confirmed the opinions ich he entertained on these and other doctrines in such a ppy manner, that Gomarus and the rest of the deputies of e Churches accounted it unnecessary to contend about them y longer. But, that he might totally eradicate all scruples t of their minds, he drew out of his bosom with the same nfidence of heart as that which he possessed when he entered o this conference, and offered to each of them for examination *Dissertation on the genuine Sense of the Seventh Chapter the Epistle to the Romans*, which he had some time preusly committed to writing, having finished it with exquisite e and learning.

When no one took this manuscript from the table, and after he had asked, *Whether the brethren required any thing more from him*, to which no answer was returned, this Conference was terminated with such good success, that all the parties present, without one exception, gave him the right hand of brotherly love, and conducted him to an entertainment, which, by order of the Curators of the University, had been prepared in the Castile Inn at the Hague.

Such is Brandt's full account of the call of Arminius to the Theological Professorship in the University of Leyden: The favourable result of these proceedings is related, by Bertius, in a preceding page, (33;) and the testimonials in his favour, from the Church and from the Classis of Amsterdam, are recorded in pages 34 and 35. The ceremonies observed on his receiving a Doctor's Degree from the hands of Gomarus, will be found in a subsequent page, (339,) and I have subjoined, in a note, a copy of the diploma of the Academic Senate, which is a literary curiosity, from its having been the first Degree in Theology that was conferred in the new University.*

* THE RECTOR AND PROFESSORS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LEYDEN IN HOLLAND, TO THE READER, GREETING.

THE custom is one altogether laudable and founded on the most honourable reasons, which has been introduced by Emperors, Kings, and Republics, and which ordains that any man who has attained to eminent proficiency in any science or art, shall be furnished with honourable testimonials from some University, that he may be well known to all the world by such a public proclamation of his learning and virtue. Since therefore this practice is of the greatest utility in every art and science, it is so much the more necessary in Sacred Theology, by how much the more the teaching [or inculcation] of piety excels all the other arts and sciences, chiefly through the majesty of the Divine subjects upon which it treats. But the utility in general of these Testimonials is two-fold: It seems to affect, in the first instance, those who are honoured with such tokens; and then the rest of mankind. For, FIRST, The true and genuine Doctors of the Church become thus, in some degree, better known: THEN, Those who are well versed in this science, which is the most noble and famous of all, are by this means stimulated and excited to prosecute with the greater diligence these ennobling studies. Those upon whom is conferred such a high dignity, are reminded, *in the First place*, of their own duty, and of the pledge which they have given to Christ and to his Church; and, *Secondly*, they are animated to hold on in the course upon which they have felicitously entered.

Since that most reverend man, JAMES ARMINIUS, (who has been very celebrated for several years past, during which time he has applied his mind to the study of sacred literature,) hath proved at great length to all of us his singular and extensive knowledge of and proficiency in Sacred Literature and Orthodox Theology,—not only in a private examination, but likewise in some Theses *on the Nature of God*, to which he was publicly the Respondent, and answered in the most learned manner the arguments and objections of all who spoke:—We have therefore adjudged him to be a person highly deserving of being honoured by our public testimonials, and of being recommended by us to all men of piety. Wherefore, in virtue of the authority granted to us by that most excellent Prince and Lord of glorious memory, WILLIAM OF

After Arminius had been created Doctor of Divinity, he turned to Amsterdam, settled his affairs in that city, and, immediately after the autumnal vacation, bade farewell to that famous Church, in which, during fifteen years, he had exercised the pastoral office, and by which he was dismissed in a manner highly honourable to himself. He then removed to Leyden, and devoted all his powers to one object—to maintain in a worthy and suitable manner the Profession which he had embraced. In those days, his heart occasionally sunk within him, while he reflected on the splendour of his very important office. But being by degrees encouraged by the kind judgment which most people had formed of him, and by the favour of the whole University, he expressed the increasing confidence of his mind in the following extract of a letter to his friend Uitenbogaert, dated September 2, 1603: "I will therefore enter upon this province under the divine auspices, and will wait for success from God's ample benediction. He knows the intentions which I have had in accepting this office, the expectations that I cherish, and the objects which I have proposed to myself in its administration. With these my purposes and prospects, I know, he is acquainted, and they have his approval. For neither the vain honour of this world, its vapours, its bubbles, nor the wish to amass riches, (which would be a vain wish, were my attempts even the most strenuous,) have impelled me to come to Leyden; but my sole desire is, that I may serve the public in the gospel of Christ, and that I may propound it in the plainest and most substantial manner to those persons who will be afterwards engaged in its further propagation among others."

With such a feeling as this, says the younger Brandt, Arminius ascended the University rostrum, and commenced his Lectures

NASSAU, Prince of Orange, and Governor of Holland and Zealand, &c., and also by the Illustrious the States of Holland and Zealand, we have designated and declared, and do hereby designate and declare, the before-mentioned JAMES ARMINIUS, a Doctor in Divinity,—and may this act of ours be happy and auspicious to the Republic and to the Christian Church! We have also granted to him, and hereby do grant, the faculty [or permission] to interpret the Holy Scriptures both in public and private, to teach the mysteries of religion, to dispute and write about the doctrines of the Christian Faith, to preside over such disputations, to solve theological questions,—and to exercise all those public and solemn acts which appertain to the true functions of a Doctor in Theology; and moreover to enjoy all the privileges, immunities, and prerogatives, which belong either by law or usage to such a station and dignity as that of Doctor of Divinity.

For the fullest proof of all these things, we have caused to be presented to him these public testimonials, corroborated with the Great Seal of the University which has been affixed to them, and subscribed by the hand of the Secretary.

Given at Leyden in Holland, in the year of our Lord, One Thousand, Six Hundred, and Three, on the tenth day of July, New Style.

(SIGNED,) B. VULCANIUS.

with three elegant and polished orations: The First of which treats *on the Object of Sacred Thelogy;* the Second, *on its Author and End;* and the Third, *on its Certainty.* (See pages 257—337.) It was his wish, by this method, to instil into the minds of the students a love for that Divine and most dignified of all the Sciences; and it appeared to him, at the very entrance on his charge, that he might adopt the language of Socrates, the wisest of the Heathens, and say, he had fulfilled the greatest part of his arduous duty, if he had inflamed his pupils with an intense desire for learning.

He raised as a superstructure, upon these foundations, his highly finished and accurate lectures on the Book of the Prophet Jonah, which he had explained from the pulpit, some years before, in the Dutch language. He had scarcely begun to deliver them, when they procured him so much good-will from all ranks of his audience, that they evinced their reverence for this new Atlas of the University; and were almost inclined to suppose, that the deceased Junius was brought to life again principally in this Divine, his celebrated successor.

The Curators likewise, while congratulating themselves and their University on the acquisition of such a man, manifested at the same time their gratitude to those individuals by whose aid and industry they had obtained his dismissal from Amsterdam. As N. Kromhout, an illustrious senator of the Provincial Court, had above all others devoted his energies to this object, the noble John Dousa accounted him worthy of receiving, in the name of the whole University, the following grateful stanzas:

Kromhouti! O Batavi pars haud postrema Senatus!
Kromhouti! O patriæ gloria rara tuæ!
Quod Fori, et assiduo rerum limatus in usu,
Sordida non ulla pectora labe geras.
Multum equidem (quid enim majus dare Numina possint?)
Virtuti debent sæcula nostra tuæ.
Plus tamen, Arminium quod te duce et auspice primum
Hollandæ urbs dederit Amsterodama Scholæ.*

We will here add part of a most elegant poem written by

* The verses on Kromhout will admit of this translation:—

Kromhout! thy country's glory and its pride,
Who dost in Holland's Senate oft preside!
Though vers'd in Courts, with polish'd manners grac'd,
Thy mind by nothing sordid is debas'd.
How much unto thy virtues do we owe!
On thee what higher boon could Heav'n bestow?
Yet nobler praise is thine: For now, through thee,
Arminius in our Colleges we see.

Dousa on the same occasion; and in which he proclaims the praises of the very eloquent JOHN UITENBOGAERT:

> ET sane fateamur hoc necesse est
> Omnes queis pietas, amorque veri,
> Aut res religionis ulla cordi est,
> Istoc nomine nos Uitenbogardo
> Esse ac perpetuum fore obligatos,
> Haud paulo tamen obligatiores
> Recens ob meritum, quod Aurasinæ
> Doctorem ARMINIUM Scholæ dedisti.*

But we must not omit to mention, that Uitenbogaert was honoured with a golden cup, on account of his important services in promoting the call of Arminius: This token of gratitude was presented to him, in the name of the Senate of the University, by those most excellent men, C. Neostadius and N. Zeystius.—Such is the conclusion of Brandt's account of the election of Arminius to the Theological Professorship at Leyden.

* The verses on Uitenbogaert, (a name highly unpoetical,) may be thus rendered intelligible to the English reader:

> ALL those to whom the love of truth,
> The growth of piety in youth,
> Religion's fruits in riper years,
> Are objects of incessant cares,
> Must now and always gladly own,
> To Wittenbogard's name alone
> The praise is due for acts like these,
> Which ev'ry one with pleasure sees.
> Nor are our obligations less
> To him, who, with such good success,
> Procur'd our Schools the further grace
> Of seeing Doctor ARMYN's face.

R.—Page 87.

The great design of Arminius was, that which is here stated by Bertius—"to recal the ancient, masculine, and hardy method of studying the sacred scriptures; to withdraw the students of Divinity from their wanderings among knotty theorems and difficult problems; and to bring them back to the fountains of salvation, those pure fountains whose pellucid streams refuse to flow in muddy channels." The famous Dr. Twisse, in his operose performance entitled, "A Vindication of the Grace, Power, and Providence of God," reprehends these expressions of Bertius, and tries to induce his readers to believe, that the reason why Arminius did not conduct his students through the intricate and

unedifying mazes of Metaphysics, was, because he was totally incompetent through his manifest deficiency in requisite scholastic learning. I have quoted part of the Doctor's amusing tirade in my "CALVINISM AND ARMINIANISM COMPARED," (page 479,) in which he labours hard to prove that "Arminius very seldom employed arguments in combat," and that "he used Logic and Scholastic Theology in a manner the most puerile". The old Doctor's frequent recurrence to this topic in his large work, and the asperity which he manifests in the defence of his own curious genus of Metaphysics, are good specimens of the waspishness of that race of Puritans.—In a long note in the same work, (page 482,) I have given the translation of an excellent letter from Professor Poelenburgh, in which that learned man relates the substance of a similar charge preferred against himself by an ignorant Calvinist. At the conclusion of that letter, the Professor says: "Such, I own, is the small esteem in which I hold these Scholastic trifles, that I think our leisure may be much more profitably occupied in investigating and forming an acquaintance with sacred literature. And, on the other hand, I freely acknowledge, I have bestowed some attention on School Divinity, for the sole purpose of understanding the sophistries of our adversaries, which seize upon words and expressions, and that I may be enabled with the greater advantage to refute them, when I feel any fear about their producing false security."—I must beg the reader to acquit me of vanity, though I append my name to the case of these two able (yet dissimilar) defenders of General Redemption, and adopt Poelenburgh's language as an apology for the knowledge of Metaphysics which I have obtained. One of the minor Dissenting Magazines, which displays greater talent than its compeers, has said, in a Review of my CALVINISM AND ARMINIANISM COMPARED: "We feel no anxiety to run a tilt with this Don of Leyden, for the honour of Geneva. He has been too long among the Dutch, not to have acquired a thorough contempt for Metaphysics: We suppose, it must be from the mistiness of the atmosphere, and lowness of the country thereabouts."—To this personal charge I can only reply in the words already quoted from Poelenburgh; and in reference to the witticism about "the mistiness of the atmosphere" of Holland, and the hebetude of its inhabitants and of their admirers, which is consequently implied, I must suffer the great men whose names stand in the list at the commencement of my Introduction, and who were natives of that European Bæotia, to answer for themselves to an anonymous scribbler, who is evidently

worse qualified than Dr. Twisse to distinguish between Logic
METAPHYSICS.*

could increase the number of these charges, brought against
minians on account of their avowed dislike to the metaphy-
l distinctions, which the Calvinists invent to explain away the
licit declarations of scripture: But these are sufficient to shew,
t the whole scheme of Calvinism, on all the points on which it
t variance with the Church Universal, is built on the frail
ndation of Scholastic niceties. This fact, as I have more fully
wn in a subsequent part of this volume, was avowed by the
mediate successors and the early defenders of Calvin and his
tem of Fatalism. When, therefore, a skilful adversary de-
ys this slender foundation, a zealous Calvinist must naturally
l alarm for the safety of the superstructure; and we cannot
surprised if, in such a state of mind, he vents his chagrin and
tation by calling foul names, or by depreciating the metaphy-
al qualifications of the assailant. Viewing these human sup-
rts of his Predestinarian notions as a sort of *Dii Penates*, he
y be expected to exclaim, when he sees them unceremoniously
moved from their stations, "Ye have taken away my gods
ich I made: And what have I more?"

In order to meet the Calvinists on equal terms, it is necessary
: every Arminian writer who is providentially called to dis-
s the questions in dispute, to be well acquainted with the
tics of his opponents; who, on their part, are prompted to
: study of metaphysical subtleties, by the strong motive of
eserving their frail system from decay. Calvin, Beza, Zanchy,
d Gomar, would have smiled at the vain attempts of some of
eir professed followers in modern times, *to defend high Predes-
narian tenets from* SCRIPTURE ALONE! Arminius, therefore,
o had received a regular Calvinistic education, was exqui-
ely versed in that species of lore, by which the Genevan
ctrines were maintained: His vast attainments in Logic and
letaphysics qualified him, in his very boyhood, to deliver
tures on those sciences in the city of Geneva itself. The
tter which he addressed to Grynæus, at Basle, proves how
eply he had thought, at that early age, on some of the diffi-
ulties of the Predestinarian controversy: This is further illus-
ated by the following extract from one of his letters to Uiten-

* By no race of mortals could the following couplet be more justly applied than by
ethmen to themselves, between the years 1580 and 1680:

> MEN are the nobler growth these States supply,
> And SOULS are ripen'd in our Northern sky.—BARBAULD.

bogaert, dated Aug. 3, 1604, which relates to Piscator's arguments against the imputation of Christ's active righteousness, and which I have quoted in a succeeding page: (635:)

"I also approve of Piscator's dislike to the threefold imputation and the threefold righteousness of Beza; about which, you know, you and I have had frequent discussions, even at the time when we were resident at Geneva." It will be seen, (pp. 29, 61,) that Arminius was chosen, on account of his eminent scholastic acquirements, to answer the celebrated pamphlet of the Delft brethren. These brief facts, which might easily be multiplied, and even a slight inspection of his Works, will convince any man of competent reading, that Arminius was not deficient in metaphysical knowledge, as Dr. Twisse endeavoured to persuade his Puritanic brethren; but that he conscientiously avoided all displays of it, except when the sinuosities of his opponents' arguments demanded an exposure, and then he was compelled to oppose his own syllogisms and definitions to theirs.

But some writers who were competent to form a correct judgment in this matter, have ascribed to him the possession of great scholastic skill. Thus the late Dr. George Campbell is quoted, (p. 56,) as opposing "the metaphysical ratiocinations of Arminius" to "the bold conclusions of Gomarus." Mosheim also, in his Ecclesiastical History, informs us, that "there are in Arminius's manner of reasoning, and also in his phraseology, some little remains of the scholastic jargon of that age; but we find, nevertheless, in his writings, upon the whole, much of that SIMPLICITY and PERSPICUITY which his followers have always looked upon, and still consider, as among the principal qualities of a Christian Minister." An eminent clerical critic who derived from this Church-historian all that he knew about the Dutch Professor, wrote a review in one of our popular Magazines in December 1824, in which the following sentence occurs: "We are persuaded, that higher reason in the correct interpretation of scriptural doctrines has been shewn by our Protestant Divines, from Barrow to Sherlock, than by Calvin or Arminius; because the former have been influenced by Truth and Good Sense alone, and the latter by metaphysical and scholastic quiddities and sophisms." Without animadverting on the laxity of the phraseology here employed, I may be permitted to refer this gentleman to Arminius's "Declaration," his "Orations," "Letters," "Dissertation on the true and genuine sense of the 7th Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans," and his "Answer to the thirty-one defamatory Articles." I may also remind him, that one of the grand criminations of Dr. Twisse against our author was,

fact, that he had directed the attention of theological students to "the ancient, masculine and hardy method of studying the sacred Scriptures;" and that the sole cause why he had withdrawn them "from wandering among knotty theorems and difficult problems," was—because he was totally unfit to instruct them either in Logic or Metaphysics! "I can deliver it," says the old Doctor, "as a fact fully proved by particular evidence, that this divine is by no means qualified to adorn the province to which he has aspired, being a man who employs Logic and Scholastic Theology in a manner the most puerile!" In a subsequent passage Dr. Twisse says, "From these specimens the reader may perceive how ill instructed Arminius was in Logic, and what an unfit Theologian he has proved himself to be, and unqualified to rule in the Schools, when he has never yet learnt to frame the bare analysis of a Logical proposition." On this subject, therefore, our modern Critic and Dr. Twisse are completely at issue; and we leave the former to reconcile, with each other, the contradictory and equally unfounded assertions of the Doctor and himself.

Any one who examines with care the two opposite doctrinal systems, will find a striking corroboration of the preceding remarks, in the abundance of abstruse and recondite terms which the Calvinistic writers have been compelled to invent and employ for the explanation or the defence of their peculiar tenets: While Arminian authors of repute are seen to employ very few terms, and those in general such as were in use, by the Church Universal, long before high Predestinarian notions were propounded as the only true doctrines of the gospel. To this day, indeed, if any ingenious Calvinist supposes himself to be somewhat wiser than his ancestors, and tries to modify and explain the appalling difficulties of his favourite scheme, he always employs a number of new-fangled terms in addition to the old ones. If, in attempting to reply to him, an Arminian occasionally introduces a few ancient scholastic terms, he may make the same apology for the sparing use of them, as Dr. Berriman has done for some that were employed by the orthodox in the earliest ages of Christianity:

"But, *These* [*Arminian*] *terms*, it is alleged, *have drawn men off from the simplicity of the Christian doctrine, into fruitless and unedifying speculations.* As if the blame of *subtlety* and *vain speculation* were chargeable only on the [Arminian] side, and were not rather due to the innovations of the [Calvinists,] who, not content with that simplicity in which the Christian Doctrine was originally proposed, were for inventing such new and

evasive expositions, as retained the *words*, without the *meaning*, of Christianity. When they began to philosophize upon the great mysteries of our religion, and to insist, that they must either be explained in their way, or exposed as *full of absurdity and contradiction;* it was then necessary for the [Arminian] Christians to explain themselves, and shew how their tenets were defensible against those subtle reasoners. When these [Predestinarian] points came afterwards to be discussed in the Schools, it is possible they might be spun into some niceties, too fine for common understandings, and too far remote from the substance of Religion to be necessary for them."—*Historical Account of the Controversies*, &c.

I now proceed, in the words of the younger Brandt, to give a narrative of the manner in which Arminius endeavoured to discharge his important duties, towards the young men with whose theological studies he was entrusted.—Scarcely had he entered the University, when he was requested by two candidates for Holy Orders, Corranus and Jacchæus, to have the goodness to preside over the disputation of their Theses or Propositions, which they had prepared for public examination and to be subject to his superintendence. The Propositions of Corranus were *on Justification*, and those of Jacchæus *on Original Sin;* and though they contained some things which were not exactly in accordance with the sentiments which Arminius had conceived on these controverted topics; yet he did not consider it to be inconsistent with his office, to accept the province which was offered. For he was not ignorant, that some of those who were devoted to the study of Divine Wisdom, on more occasions than one, under the auspices of Gomarus himself and other divines, had at their own risk defended certain dogmas, to which the divines who acted on such occasions as Moderators would not in every respect agree. Arminius therefore, on the 28th of October, 1603, complied with this practice, which is by no means unusual in Universities; but he acted in such a manner, that those very learned young men defended their own cause most strenuously, and did not require the aid and interference of the Moderator.

But since, in this his entrance into office, he perceived with sufficient clearness, that the minds of the youthful students were involved in the intricacies of many useless speculations, he accounted it one of his first duties to retrench, as far as possible, the thorny questions and the immense mass of scholastic assertions, and to inculcate on his pupils that Divine Wisdom, which, when sought for in its purest sources, the Holy Scriptures, would

e be competent to render human life useful and happy.
was the grand object at which he aimed from his earliest
nce into the University, and to the accomplishment of which
deavoured to direct both his public and private labours.
this laudable attempt was in no small degree frustrated,
ly by the envy which some people had conceived against
and partly by a certain inveterate prejudice respecting his
ed heterodoxy: Many of those ministers who had pre-
ly imbibed this unfounded prejudice, excited his colleagues
nst him.

ut the first seeds of this growing envy displayed themselves,
he following year, 1604. Arminius had at first confined
elf chiefly to the interpretation of passages in the Old Testa-
t; yet he occasionally explained in public a few in the New
ament: Gomarus could not endure this, and began to pre-
, that the right of explaining the New Testament belonged to
elf alone, as *Principal Professor of Divinity*, which title had
granted to him by the Senate of the University a short
prior to the arrival of Arminius. Soon after claiming this
t, he accidentally met Arminius, and, not being able to con-
himself, in a choleric mood he exclaimed, "You have
d on my Professorship!"—Arminius replied, "that he
ed not the least tittle of his colleague's pre-eminence, or of
Academic titles and privileges with which he had been
sted, to be either withdrawn or disparaged; and that he had
elf done nothing to his prejudice,—for the honourable the
ators had granted him leave to select at any time the subjects
is Lectures either from the Old or from the New Testament,
vided he did not touch upon the same matter as that upon
h Gomarus might be treating."

ut though the difference which arose from this affair of
ll consequence, was easily settled; yet others afterwards
eeded, which opened the way to greater dissensions, and
as were far more dangerous to the Reformed Church.
inius considered that he ought to do nothing in opposition
n undefiled conscience; and that a moderate liberty of dis-
ing sacred subjects was granted to him, as well as to other
hers of Divine Wisdom: He therefore thought it neither
corous nor unlawful for him to divulge, in a modest manner,
sentiments on the subject of Divine Predestination;—espe-
ly since he had not concealed from the honourable Curators
he University, that he did not hold the same opinions on that
rine, as those which were maintained by the divines of the
ool of Geneva. After the Professors of Divinity had met

together, and [according to custom] had mutually and willingly agreed among themselves about the series and the order in which the disputations were to be held, the province of disputing on Predestination fell to the lot of Arminius, who, on the 7th of February, prepared some propositions on this doctrine, which he exposed for public discussion. The tenour of them was to this effect: "Divine Predestination is a decree of *the good pleasure* of God in Christ, by which from eternity he determined within himself to justify believers, on whom he decreed to bestow faith, to adopt them, and to endow them with eternal life to the praise of his glorious grace. On the contrary, Reprobation is a decree of the wrath or of *the severe will* of God, by which from eternity he determined, for the declaration of his wrath and power, to condemn to eternal death unbelievers, who by their own fault and by the righteous judgment of God will not believe, as men who are placed beyond an union with Christ." But, though these tenets did not in every respect correspond with those which Calvin and Beza had delivered on the subject, yet he esteemed them to be no novelties, but entirely to co-incide with the sentiments which G. Sohnius, and other champions of the Reformed Religion before him, had taught by discourse and by writing. Yet, lest he should incur the just offence of any one by his defence of these propositions, he took special care in this disputation not to detract any thing from the reputation of Calvin and Beza, but spared their names, and animadverted on no man who held the contrary tenets.

In the exercise of the same liberty and moderation of discussion, on the 29th of May, he subjected to public examination his Theses on the *Church*, and *on the Sin of our first Parents*; and he seized on the opportunity, afforded by the discussion of the latter subject, in the presence of Gomarus and Trelcatius, to confute with the most powerful arguments the *Necessity* of that first sin, and to establish its *Contingency*. But though he thought, that many absurd consequences flowed from the opinions of his adversaries on this point, and that all those arguments which are usually produced in apology for this opinion about the absolute necessity of things, deserved to be exploded; yet he conducted his own cause with moderation, both on this and on other controverted topics; and, directing his discourse to the audience, he requested only one favour from them, which was—"that they would themselves diligently examine and investigate the arguments which he propounded." He added a declaration, which he was accustomed to make on every occasion both in public and private, that he was prepared to yield to those

would teach him greater verities. But during this disputa-
, some persons murmured, and could not endure, because
ng the other topics which he defended this was one, "There
o Absolute Necessity in any thing except God: Nay, even
itself does not necessarily burn; but all the Necessity which
be either in things or in events, is nothing more than the
ion of a cause to its effect." *

. short time afterwards, the very learned Helmichius, who
accidentally gone down to Leyden, commenced a controversy
i him on the same subject, and they had much conversation
ther.—Helmichius asserted, that in a diverse respect many
gs are both contingent and necessary.—Arminius denied this
regard to things that are absolutely necessary.—Helmichius
aled to passages of scripture, which manifestly testify, "that
word of God stands, that it cannot be made void, that the
sel of God is fulfilled," &c. And he inferred from them,
what God had decreed must necessarily be done:—Armi-
denied this consequence, because God's decree may justly
properly be said to stand, if that which he decreed be done,
though it be not necessarily done.—Helmichius confessed,
the opinions maintained by Arminius were not subversive of
foundations of the Faith, and could not be called heretical.—
ninius replied, that so far was this opinion from deserving to
branded with such a black epithet, that, he persuaded himself,
ning would more conduce to illustrate the glory of God, than
all Christians to conclude, "that there is nothing necessary
ept God; and that He not only foreknows contingencies, but
wise executes his decrees by contingent events and free
ses."—At length, after much conversation had passed on both
s, a Conference on all the articles of the Christian Religion,
on the whole substance of Theological doctrine, was offered
Arminius to Helmichius, who declined the offer and took
ve in a friendly manner.

n the mean time, the colleagues of Arminius evinced no dis-
ition to enter into dispute with him about these controversies
ch had been excited; and did not give, either in public or
vate, even the slightest indication of an unkind or partial spi-

For though Gomarus, who was at that period engaged in
explanation of the Ninth Chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the
mans, had publicly pledged himself to examine and discuss
ry opinion about Predestination, and to add his own and con-
it by proofs; yet this bold announcement did not terrify

* See page 695.

Arminius, who on the contrary declared, "If that very celebrated man can produce such arguments as will not admit of an answer, I will be one of the first to subscribe to his sentiments and to recant my own."

It was his determination to leave his colleagues in possession of the same liberty of defending their sentiments, as that in which he himself rejoiced; and he hoped, that they would on no account transgress the boundaries of Christian charity and fraternal equity. But while he was in this state of security and thinking no evil, a most dreadful storm arose and rushed upon him. Gomarus considered, that he ought not to wait until a fit opportunity presented itself for him to hold a disputation on the subject of Predestination; and therefore, either of his own accord, or rather at the suggestion of others, he ordered to be exhibited, in opposition to the regular course and out of his turn, certain propositions of his own, upon the very topic, which, according to the invariable practice of the University, Arminius had begun to discuss in the course which had been assigned to him: Reports were at the same time circulated through the city, that he would himself, in open defiance, descend into the arena against Arminius. The day appointed for holding this disputation, was the 31st of October: On that morning, in a preface sufficiently bitter and with an agitated countenance, he explained the reasons which had impelled him to hold this disputation out of its regular course; and said many things in public, which seemed to have an evident tendency to reprehend Arminius. The tenour of the Propositions which he defended, was, "That the object of Predestination was creatures rational, salvable, damnable, creable, lapsible, and restorable: That moreover, out of these, indefinitely foreknown, God as an Almighty Ruler had, on one part, fore-ordained according to his own right and good pleasure some particular creatures to his own supernatural ends, which are life eternal, creation in the innocent state of original righteousness, and holiness of life; and, on the other part, that he had destined others, who were from all eternity rejected from eternal life, to death and endless ignominy, and to the ways leading to them, which are creation in a state of innocence, permission to fall into sin, the loss of original righteousness, and dereliction in the same; and that he had done this for the purpose of making known his most free ability, wrath, and power towards the reprobate, and his saving grace towards the elect." On that occasion Gomarus also defended this assertion which he openly avowed,* "that the

* See pages 253, 556, 617.

Gospel could not simply be called *a manifestation of the Divine Predestination;*" and he added, in the place of corollary, "that Castellio, Koornhert, and the Lutherans, had rashly and falsely objected against the Reformed [Calvinistic] Churches, (but especially against Calvin and Beza who had deserved well of the Church, and of the truth of Predestination against the Pelagians,) *that this doctrine made God to be the author of sin!*"—Arminius, who was present at this disputation from the commencement to the termination, endured the injury which had been inflicted, and took no notice of the envy that had been excited.

Though at that time indisposed in body, but not in mind, on the following day, (November 1, 1604,) he disclosed his feelings to Uitenbogaert in these words: "I know, and my conscience is my witness, that I have neither said nor done any thing by which I could give Gomarus cause of offence. I shall also be easily reconciled to him, though his conduct was most annoying; nay, I will be reconciled even with him of Amsterdam, provided he remain entirely silent. It is unlawful for me to hate any one, or to retain anger, how just soever it may be, against any person: I am taught this doctrine by the word, the Spirit, and the example of that God who is described to us in the scriptures. I wish He would teach me, not to be grieved on account of any thing, unless for that which may deservedly be attributed to me as a real fault. It is no part of my duty, to be responsible for what which another may say or do; and I should be very silly, if I permitted any man to exercise such a power over me, as to be able to disturb me when it is his pleasure. Let this encompass me as a wall of brass, *I have no personal consciousness of being culpable.* I will also proceed in the diligent enquiry into Truth, on which I have commenced; and in that study, by the favour of God, I will die, though I should be doomed to endure the hatred and envy of the whole world on that account. The disciple is not above his Lord. This is no new thing,—for the Truth to be rejected even by those in whom such a deed is most unbecoming, and who wish it not to be perceived."

But that he might not seem to have deserted the vindication of the Truth, which was wounded through his sides, and that he might not appear to be distrustful of his own cause, he composed, not long afterwards, for the sake of those who studied Divinity under his auspices, that most accurate "EXAMINATION *of the Theses publicly proposed by Gomarus for Disputation,*" which, many years after the death of Arminius, (1645,) was brought to light, with the Theses of Gomarus prefixed, by that very learned

individual, Stephen de Courcelles.* We must not omit to notice, on this occasion, that, by certain arguments which Arminius produced in this treatise, he induced Gomarus to change some things for the better in the amended Theses which he afterwards published on the Eternal Decree of God and on Divine Predestination. For he not only discarded the absurd opinion, that "the decrees of God are God himself" and defended the contrary proposition with all his strength, but he likewise gladly acknowledged in God *Conditionate Knowledge*, as the Schoolmen call it; and, by its aid, he attempted to remove from his opinion that great absurdity which would make God the author of the sin of the first man, and thus of all the other sins which have been thence deduced.

But though Gomarus, according to the confession of his chief admirers, seemed to have somewhat exceeded the limits of the Belgic Confession, in the opinion on Divine Predestination which he had publicly defended, and to have risen far higher than the doctrine which was generally delivered in the Reformed [Calvinistic] Churches; yet Arminius had to endure the greatest load of envy, and nothing was left unattempted by his adversaries which could have a tendency to affix a stigma of contumely on his increasing reputation. A rumour was quickly circulated through the city of Leyden, whence it spread through all the United Provinces, that considerable differences had arisen among the Professors of Divinity. Wool-sorters, Furriers, Weavers, and other workmen in that line of business, the principal part of them Flemings, with whom Leyden abounded, were constantly talking on this subject; and, through their gross ignorance of religious controversies, many of them ascribed the sentiments of Gomarus to Arminius, and those of Arminius to Gomarus.

In the beginning of the following year, (1605,) the official staff of the University, and the title of Rector Magnificus, were conferred on Arminius: But though his own dignity, and the benevolence of many persons towards him, were thus augmented; yet he soon found, that the minds of others were not the less alienated from him, and that they did not at all relax in their clandestine designs against him. Several of them also wrested his best words and actions, and gave them the worst interpretation.—If, for the confirmation of his opinions on some controverted points, he occasionally produced certain arguments, which were employed by the Popish writers, the Lutherans, and

* Brandt quotes the admirable commencement and a part of the conclusion, which I have omitted, as the treatise itself is included for the first time in this translation of "The Works of Arminius."

by others beside the Calvinists, ignorant persons immediately exclaimed, that he had deserted and gone over to the camp of the enemy. It was likewise imputed to him as a fault, that according to his expressed opinion, certain [*ficulnea*] flimsy and shallow arguments, which were very inappropriate, but had been used for establishing some of the doctrines of the Christian Faith and for defending their truth from the scoffs of adversaries, ought by all means to be rejected; and that others, which possessed far greater potency, ought in preference to be used: But, in delivering such an opinion as this, he had only imitated Calvin himself, who gave a [novel and] widely different interpretation to several passages in the Old Testament, which had been too frequently quoted in a rash manner, by the Ancient Fathers of the Church, for proving the Eternal Divinity of Christ.—Nor were there wanting persons who converted it into a crime in Arminius, that he had delivered to his pupils, for their private transcription, some of his own treatises in manuscript, which embraced his opinions on several controversies: But those who brought forward this charge, had forgotten, that the celebrated Junius himself and others had, before him, used the same liberty.

Though the dispute on the subject of Predestination was commenced in the University, yet the interests of the Churches would probably not have sustained the least injury, had it been confined within the walls of the University, or to private conferences between Professors and Ministers, and had it been conducted with that good faith, moderation and prudence which such a discussion demanded; yet the Churches incurred far greater danger, after many persons had filled the whole country and the neighbouring districts with false rumours. This was the lamentable origin of those public complaints and acrimonious declamations against Arminius with which the churches in every direction at that time resounded, such as these, "Novel doctrines are introduced: The doctrine which has hitherto been received by the Reformed, is changed: The ancient heresies are suspended on a new pole: And the most sedulous exertions must be used, to prevent the Church from receiving any injury." Among other declaimers of this class who flourished at that period, was Festus Hommius, one of the ministers of the Church at Leyden. This man wounded the reputation of Arminius by clandestine slanders; circulated false and scandalous rumours respecting his words and actions; and imputed many crimes to him when absent, which he refused to mention in his presence.*

* The anecdote, which Brandt immediately adds, is related in a subsequent part of his volume, page 405.

The pupils and admirers of Arminius began, about the same time, to be accused of the very crimes with which he was charged; and the discourses and arguments which they employed to confirm the subjects of christian doctrine, were wrested and misrepresented. A report was raised, that those of them who had left the University, or had gone to other Universities, most perversely insulted the Reformed Churches, by their disputes, contradictions, and reproaches against the received doctrine. Persons were not wanting who, in a subtle and artful manner sedulously watched some of the students of Divinity that were on terms of familiarity with the Professor and attended his private Lectures; and from the incautious answers, which it is not uncommon for very young men occasionally to return, (though often contrary to the sentiments of their master,) these persons derived matter, and embraced the opportunity, foully to traduce Arminius himself among the people.*

* Some of the Classes, and other ecclesiastical assemblies, began to institute a more severe scrutiny among those of his pupils who came before them for examination; and made remarks upon their words and deeds with greater harshness than ought to have been done. In proof of this narrative, the case of John Narsius may be adduced, who at that time studied Divinity in a creditable manner under Arminius, and afterwards became a celebrated pastor of the Church of Grave. Being young man of great experience and of a very polished genius, he was educated at the expence of the Republic of Amsterdam, with a view to Holy Orders. Though, in the year immediately preceding, he had given complete satisfaction to the pastors of that celebrated city when examined by them; yet he could not avoid the suspicion of having imbibed impious opinions from his master. It was the pleasure, therefore, of these pastors, on the 13th of January, 1605, to commit to writing certain theological questions, for the purpose of ascertaining his sentiments, and to command Narsius likewise to return a written answer. That a more accurate judgment may be formed of the controversies which were then under discussion, it will be useful in this place to enumerate those questions, and the answers of Narsius.

I. *Does God direct and govern the free will of man in such a manner, that he neither ought nor can do any thing in any other way, or any further, than in that which God has decreed?*

ANSWER.—I reply in the affirmative, provided this precaution be used, not to represent Divine Providence directing the free will of man, so as to destroy it.

II. *Does God govern the actions of wicked men in such a manner, that they act, or have it in their power to act, in no other way than that which God has determined?*

ANS.—Yes; if this question be received in the sense, that the persons who went to seize Christ were not able to effect their purpose till God granted his permission.

III. *Whatever things are done contingently with regard to men, (that is, so as that they either* MAY *or* MAY NOT *be done, and may come to pass as well in* THIS MANNER *as in that,) are those things also done contingently with regard to Providence and the Divine Decree?*

ANS.—Since the word "contingently" is found neither in the Sacred volume, in the Dutch Confession, nor even in the Palatine Catechism, and since it is understood in various ways by the Scholastic Writers, allow yourselves, I beseech you, brethren, to be satisfied with this my confession: "Nothing happens by chance; but

About the same time when this affair occurred, his uncle and league, John Kuchlinus, regent of the Theological College, ested Arminius no little trouble. For he pretended to feel an

atever things are done, whether they be matters of great or of trivial consequence, od or evil, they are all subject to the governance and direction of Divine Provi-nce: So that those things which to us seem to be uncertain, and to happen nally, do still happen certainly and immutably with regard to the most wise and nipotent Providence of God and of his eternal decree; and yet so, that He is not e author of the evil which is committed."

IV. *Can the same place be always assigned to free will in good and in evil actions?*

Ans.—A free will that is inclined to evil alone, belongs to man since the fall and his depraved state, so that he is the slave of sin and of Satan.

V. *Have men, before regeneration, a good will, which is truly good; and have y true faith?*

Ans.—Man, when considered since his fall, has from himself neither a good will ich is truly good, nor faith, nor regeneration.

VI. *Are all those to whom the Divine Law has been made known, able to exercise e repentance, and duly to turn themselves to God?*

Ans.—By no means,

VII. *Is the power to believe, always supplied to all those to whom the evangelical trine is announced, and by the same labour?*

Ans.—Of himself no faculty [or power] to believe, appertains to man; but who-ever they be who at any time believe, they receive that faith in no other way than the special illumination of the Holy Spirit; So that Faith is the gift of God, be-owed gratuitously, and without any regard being had to merits. But with respect the other questions,—namely, The kind of grace which God bestows through the aching of the gospel, and immediately after it:—By what means that heavenly ace operates on the intellect and the will, and concurs with them:—And whether mmon grace of the same kind be bestowed on those who do not believe in Christ, ough or [*præter*] against the preaching of the evangelical doctrine, by which they e believe, and thus be rendered inexcusable by it:—Concerning these and other estions, I find nothing certain in the Belgic Confession and the Catechism; nor ve I at present determine any thing either on this part or on that. But I am willing to here to the Confession and the Catechism, and I wish to show myself docile.

VIII. *Is there in all men original sin? Whence is it derived into human nature? it through the souls of the parents, through their bodies, or by some other y?*

Ans.—Original sin has place in all mortal men, with the exception of Christ. But hether it descends to us through the soul or through the body, is not, in my opinion, ficiently manifest from the Sacred Writings. But I have believed, that, by the nderful yet just appointment of God, it is derived to us from the fall of Adam, in hom we all have sinned.

IX. *Is it in reference to ecclesiastical discipline that St. Matthew says,* (xviii. 17, 8.) '*Tell it to the Church,*' *&c.:* '*Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound heaven;*' *&c.?*

Ans.—I believe, that ecclesiastical discipline was instituted by God; nor will I ny, that the passage which is cited has reference to that matter.

Such were the answers of Narsius; out of whose mouth, had he happened to ex-ess himself too incautiously, some persons endeavoured to extract something by ich they might assail with cavils Arminius his preceptor. But however great the ation which he employed in the preceding replies, he could not satisfy those eccles-ical hyper-critics. On the contrary, he became the more suspected and odious in ir eyes from the close intimacy which subsisted between him and his master: And he d afterwards to submit to the same treatment as that which Arminius endured;

ardent zeal for the defence of the Truth against new doctrines and against those who invented novelties; and a fear lest the young men, who were the flower of their country and the hopes of the Church, should imbibe pernicious errors: On this account, he left nothing unattempted by which he might drive away from his lectures, the pupils of his honoured colleague. Having therefore changed the hour for the delivery of his Lectures, Kuchlinus chose that in which Arminius had been accustomed to have his Lectures for the explanation of the different articles of the Dutch Confession; and he commanded all the students to be present at these College exercises. But Arminius most resolutely resisted this attempt; and, having lodged a complaint against this new regulation before the honourable the Burgomasters of the city of Leyden, he caused the determination of the whole affair to be deferred to the next meeting of the Curators of the University.

But in order most strenuously to obviate the calumnies of those persons who reported, that he maintained erroneous sentiments concerning Divine Providence, Arminius held a public Disputation, (May 4th, 1605,) *on the Righteousness and Efficacy of Divine Providence concerning Evil;* and, as may be seen in his polished Theses on this subject, he shewed, in a manner the most learned, how the Providence of God concerned itself not only about the beginning, but likewise about the progress and the end of sin. Of this affair, and of the general controversy, he makes the following mention in his celebrated letter to Hippolytus a Collibus: "I carefully guard against two things, both of

after whose death, being opposed by the incessant cruelty of his adversaries, he joined the Society of the Remonstrants, and openly patronised their cause and opinions.

In this place Brandt relates the case of one of the pupils of Arminius, Abraham Christian Vliet, who incurred the indignation of Gomarus, by producing some strong arguments during a disputation, in which this surly Professor acted as Moderator. The reader will find this case recorded in a subsequent page, 594. In the course of his severe animadversions, (continues Brandt,) Gomarus traduced Arminius, in a manner not to be misunderstood, as the person whom he supposed to have been the fabricator and the suggester of the objections which Vliet urged: But in this supposition he was incorrect.—As Vliet had, by his conduct on that occasion, excited the hatred of many people against himself, as if he had tried to raise tumults, Arminius wished this affair not to operate to the injury of a pupil whom he greatly loved, and endeavoured to relieve his wounded reputation by the following written testimonial:—

"I, JAMES ARMINIUS, Rector of the University, *pro tempore*, myself having been an eye and ear witness, being required, DO HEREBY TESTIFY, that ABRAHAM VLIET, in the disputation *on Divine Providence* held on the 30th of April, 1605, was bound, in virtue of the office which he sustained that day in the Hall of Disputations, to raise objections; and that, in the performance of this duty, he confined himself within the limits of modesty, and uttered nothing that was unworthy either of himself personally, or of his audience; and, therefore, that he has given no person any legitimate cause of complaint."

hich are capable of misconception and liable to give offence,—.) not to have God represented as the author of sin,—and (2.) t to have the human will deprived of its own liberty. If any e knows how to avoid these two stumbling-blocks, he will not be le to devise any action whatsoever, which I will not most illingly allow to be ascribed to the Providence of God, proded a due regard be had to the divine excellence."

Soon after the University had listened to the discussions of rminius on Divine Providence, he brought forward, and posed for public examination, (July 23rd) his Theses *on Free Will and its Powers*, to remove from himself the charge of Pelaanism. In a letter to Adrian Borrius, dated July 25th, Arminius says: "I transmit you my Theses *on Free Will*, which I ve composed in this [guarded] manner, because I thought that ey would thus conduce to peace: I have advanced nothing hich I consider at all allied to a falsity. But I have been ent upon some truths, which I might have published: For I now, that it is one thing *to be silent respecting a truth*, and nother *to utter a falsehood;* the latter of which it is never lawl to do, while the former is occasionally, nay very often, expeent." [See pages 272, 644.]

Besides, as he was of opinion that he ought thus to act with ution, and as he considered nothing to be a greater object of s care than to manifest, to all good and prudent men, the justss of his cause and the moderation of his mind; the same conrence on sacred controversies, either public or private, which e had formerly offered to Helmichius, he offered on every occaon to all those who tried to entangle him in debates.

Brandt then proceeds to give an account of the interview, etween Arminius and the three deputies of the South Holland ynod on the 30th of June, 1605. But as a subsequent part of is volume, (pp. 524—527) contains this narrative in our author's wn words, it is here omitted. The just and proper reasons r his refusing to enter into any conference with them, and hers in their official character *as ecclesiastical deputies*, are corded in the following pages, 537—543.

The disposition of mind with which Arminius viewed the unjust achinations of certain persons against him, at that crisis of his fairs, he has himself declared in a letter to A. Borrius, quoted ove and in page 548, in which he says: "My adversaries, perceive, act thus, that they may excite disturbances, and then ay represent me as the cause at least of such disturbances, hich may compel me to rush forth out of my retreat, and make a full disclosure of myself: In that case they seem to

promise themselves an assured victory. But I will be so much the more careful to keep myself at home, and to utter those things which may, in my opinion, be of service to Truth, Peace, and to the present Times;—though I know they would be disappointed of their hope, even if I were to manifest myself openly to them. It is indeed an ancient saying, *To have dragged forth a Heretic and a Heresy to the light, is to have confuted them:* But [as now applied] it is a panegyric, on the part of those who raise their notes of triumph before they have gained the victory. It would be a most difficult enterprize for them to prove those doctrines to be heretical, which, with open mouth, they proclaim as heresies." [The remaining very interesting paragraph of this letter is quoted in a note, page 548.]

S.—Page 37.

The solicitude of Arminius for a general christian pacification among all Protestant communities, is displayed to great advantage, in the dedication which his nine orphan children have prefixed to this volume, in the Fifth of his "Orations," (p. 370—476,) in the Preface, and in Appendix Z.

In elucidation of this subject it was my intention to have subjoined a few brief remarks from the Preface to Corvinus's *Defence of the Sentiments of Arminius*,—the book whose arguments effected the conversion of the celebrated Tilenus from the errors of Calvinism, in the year 1614: But the execution of this purpose must be deferred to some better opportunity—perhaps to the time when I present a translation of that admirable work to the English reader.

T.—Page 38.

How valiantly does Bertius talk, in this passage, against the tyranny of the Church of Rome! His subsequent shameful defection to that most corrupt Church, will remind every humble christian of the fine apostolic caution, *Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall!* Had a prophet from the Lord predicted to Bertius this sad blot in his future character, he would then have indignantly replied in the language of Hazael, *Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this great thing?* Yet, startling as the circumstance in prospect would once have appeared to the individual himself, *this great and horrible thing* actually happened to Bertius, and disgraced the Remonstrants.

In the preceding pages, (20—22,) Bertius has alluded to his own parentage, and to his early friendship with the youthful Arminius. He was pursuing his studies in England, when he

was recalled to his paternal home for the purpose of accompanying his new fellow-student to the University of Leyden, where, after a long residence, he became a great favourite with the famous Lipsius, whom he accompanied, in 1591, in his journey through part of Germany, when that great man deserted the communion of the Protestants and joined that of the Papists.

Bertius was soon afterwards appointed Sub-regent in the Theogical College at Leyden, under Bastingius. Kuchlinus was originally chosen Regent, and came to Leyden to enter on his new and very responsible office: But finding the erection of the College delayed, he returned to Amsterdam, whence he had been called, and remained there till the death of Bastingius, in 1595, when he was again appointed Regent, and executed the duties of that situation till his death in 1610. The reader will have seen, p. 128, that Kuchlinus married the aunt of Arminius as his second wife; and Bertius, who had long been Sub-regent in the College, married one of the daughters of Kuchlinus by his former wife. These family alliances, though they established no actual affinity between the parties, served to cement the friendship which had previously subsisted between Bertius and Arminius.

The temper of Bertius seems to have been naturally stern and unpleasant, and his authority was in consequence reluctantly acknowledged by the students. In October, 1594, the Academical Senate had granted him leave to give public lectures on *the Ethics of Aristotle;* but, in his attempt to deliver the first of the series, he was received with hisses and the most tumultuous conduct by the students, who would not suffer him to utter a syllable. The ferment occasioned by this affair had not quite subsided, when his severity excited a dreadful riot among the students; and, in the first encounter, one of the Beadles of the University was killed in the hall of the Theological College. In a letter which the celebrated printer and Professor Raphelengius addressed to Lipsius at Louvain, in April, 1595, the following brief account is given of this affair: — "You have undoubtedly heard of the Theological College being deserted, on account of a castigation which, it is said, was inflicted with too much severity by Bertius, or rather by the Curators and Magistrates. Men, however, of a sounder judgment ascribe the whole of it to the connivance of Bastingius. But the College will be re-established in the month of May, by the coming of Kuchlinus, who is recalled."—I am not certain whether it was on this, or on a subsequent occasion, that Professor Baudius delivered his celebrated "*Oratio ad Studiosos Leidenses ob Eadem Commili-*

tonis tumultuantes." The tumults excited by the severity of Bertius continued the whole year, during which the Professors could not discharge their several functions, because the students would not return to their duty. The States of Holland at length interposed the strong arm of their authority, and composed the differences between the Professors and their pupils.

Vulcanius attempted, by his powerful interest with the Curators and Burgomasters, to transfer the office of *Secretary to the University* from himself to Bertius; but without effect: For the Senate of the University interfered, and intimated it to be *inexpedient at that time for Bertius to execute the duties of that office;* and they wished the Curators to know, *that the election of a Secretary appertained likewise to the Rector and Assessors.*— Bertius tried again, in 1598, to teach in public; but the Academic Senate signified to him, that he would do better *not to teach at that time, but to defer the execution of his purpose.*

Arminius seems to have been the only person who possessed such strong personal influence over him, as enabled him to check his obliquities and to exercise a salutary control over his motions. The year after the appointment of Arminius to the Divinity Professorship, Bertius was appointed Professor of Philosophy, on which occasion he took his degree of MASTER OF ARTS. On the death of his father-in-law Kuchlinus, in 1610, Bertius was chosen his successor, and remained Regent of the Theological College till the year 1615.

The death of Arminius was a most unfortunate occurrence for Bertius. He had imbibed high ideas of his own superiority,* and of the deference that was due to him from his Remonstrant brethren. It will be seen, from various parts of this volume, that the Remonstrants had found it necessary to associate together as a body, for the purposes of mutual advice, &c. They soon found, by painful experience, that they could discuss no matter of importance in his presence without having it immediately divulged to the notorius Festus Homnius, who was his brother-in-law, and who possessed the art of drawing from Ber-

* Vossius says, in a letter addressed to Grotius, March 15, 1615:—"I feel the highest reverence and esteem for Bertius, as a preceptor of the greatest merits, and as a man of consummate erudition; yet I am afraid, that he will in some degree annoy me in my affairs. I know, he not only holds, but has likewise shewn to other people, the letters which I wrote to you concerning some passages in Erasmus: Among others, he has shewn them to our Rutgersius, to whom he read a considerable portion of them.—I hear likewise, that he is making interest for *the Professorship of Ecclesiastical History;* and since he had formerly indulged in fears about me on this subject, as he had previously done about Vorstius,—for, when the latter received a call to Leyden, Bertius is said to have aspired after *the Divinity Professorship,*—he often says, in allusion to the similarity of my surname and that of Vorstius, *that he always experiences* one hindrance or *another from some* VORSTIUS, *or from some* VOSSIUS!"

tius all the information which he was desirous to obtain. In one of Vossius's letters to Grotius, in giving a very favourable opinion of *Thomson's Diatriba*, he says: "Yet it is no concern of our hero Bertius to know this our judgment, unless you shall otherwise determine: For, even his friends tell me, that he is one who has this in common with the great parent of Roman Eloquence, that it is with great difficulty he can be silent about those things which imperiously require silence." The Remonstrants were occasionally great sufferers by this indiscretion on the part of Bertius, as the reader will perceive by the following extract of Uitenbogaert's letter to Vorstius, under the date of January 29, 1613:

"I do not know what cause Bertius has to complain of us. He was lately called to our meeting with some other brethren, and we treated openly about all things while he was present. Some discourse arose between him and Episcopius, respecting his disputation with Sybrands Lubbertus on the article of Justification; in which Episcopius thought he had observed some things which could by no means be reconciled with the Heidelberg Catechism,* though Bertius seemed desirous to cover himself with this shield. Being hardly pressed, Bertius replied, *that he wished to publish an open disavowal of the Catechism.*—I immediately followed and asked him, 'if he thought such a 'course was lawful for him, by the oath which according to the 'public laws of the college he had given to their Lordships the 'Curators on his entrance into office?—Others of the brethren added, 'Sybrands will sing a triumph, when he has extorted this 'from his adversary.'—But Bertius proceeded much further, and uttered some things about Justification, which neither I nor the other brethren could approve, and which we considered ought on no account to be passed over in silence, lest our silence should some time afterwards be interpreted into a token of approbation.—Borrius, therefore, Episcopius, and myself, each admonished him apart, and told him plainly, 'that we could not approve of 'such assertions till we were better informed.' We added, 'that 'they appeared to us of such importance, that, if they were 'related to those who censured us, they might prove exceedingly 'detrimental to the common cause.'—For it was our fear, and that not a vain one, lest Festus should by chance hear such things occasionally from him (since he is accustomed to hold

* The whole of this discussion is in confirmation of the care with which the immediate followers of Arminius wished to conform to the established formularies of consent, till they might obtain some relief in the decisions of an impartial National Synod.—See page 643.

familiar discourse with him, as he did formerly with their father-in-law,) and lest Festus should, according to his usual custom, take occasion from them to traduce the cause of the Remonstrants in general. We therefore earnestly besought him, to abstain from such practices and to act with greater prudence.*—I observed, that this conversation was not very agreeable to him; yet I can see no reason why it should be so exceedingly displeasing. We undoubtedly had certain and very just reasons for acting towards him in this manner.—I afterwards understood, that he had complained of the interlocutors at the Hague Conference; and I now see, that he has likewise given utterance to some complaints to you; but that he has no cause for such conduct, you already perceive. I know with what views and intentions this Society of Remonstrants was formed: It was determined, that we should abide within the limits which were then laid down by the consent of all, at least until there was a revision [of the formularies.] If therefore any persons, relying on the inventions of their own brains, choose to wander beyond those boundaries, and to raise unnecessary disputations, let them do this at their own peril, and keep their affairs to themselves if they please; but let them not employ the common cause of the Remonstrants as a pretext for their private actions, without even consulting the persons with whom they are associated, and let them not under such pretexts betray that cause."

Soon after the death of Arminius, Bertius published his first and most celebrated treatise entitled HYMENÆUS DESERTOR: *Sive de Sanctorum Apostasia Problemata duo.* "The Deserter Hymenæus, or two Problems† concerning the Apostacy of the

* Another proof of his meddling humour and imprudent conduct is contained in the following extract from one of Uitenbogaert's letters to Vorstius in 1613:—"The pamphlet of Grotius [*The Piety of the States of Holland*] is just published both in Dutch and Latin: and, what will much surprise you, the work was read in manuscript some weeks ago by the King and the English Bishops. This was a most astonishing fact to Grotius, because he was ignorant by whose aid such a premature disclosure could have been effected. Bertius was at length detected as the guilty individual, from whose imprudence and too eager curiosity alone the whole affair had proceeded. It is however, a happy circumstance, that his Majesty was not displeased with it; had the result been different, I am much afraid the work must have been strangled in its cradle. If there ever was a pamphlet published which was calculated to irritate our zealots, according to my judgment it is this. Yet I hope it will be profitable to some persons, and will recal the precipitate judgments of many, although it is not in every part favourable to the designs of certain people who are not evil."

† The two Problems resolved in the book of Bertius, are,—FIRST, That one who is justified may fall from his justification:—SECONDLY, That the justification from which such a man fell, was, nevertheless, a true justification.

King James declared, in his famous manifesto, (see p. 455,) that Bertius had

nts." Without any consideration, he transmitted a copy of book, as a present, to that violent Calvinist, Archbishop bot, who accounted it an insult: And as such it was resented king James, (see p. 455,) who asserted in his famous Declaon, "that the title alone of the book, rendered the author thy of the fire." His true friend, Isaac Casaubon, wrote to tius in October, 1611, and said, "If you had asked my ice, you would never have sent your book to that Prelate. is an eminent man and very pious; but, in the opinion of t men, his sentiments are different from those which you intain."

Scarcely had he recovered from the effects of this act of indision, when in 1615, he published his *Diatribe concerning tifying Faith, and an Apology against Piscator*, in which he anced some doctrines that savoured much of Semi-Pela-

ly in affirming this to be the doctrine of the Church of England. But Bishop al, who had long been Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and who will always knowledged as a more competent theological authority, has justly observed: ainly that notion of *the Perseverance of all those who have once believed and regenerated*, about which there is such cavilling, was never approved by any of Fathers, but rejected by all antiquity; and more than sufficiently confuted by the ual experience of all ages; and it has only been started in these last times, being aced into the Church by the jealousies arisen between Zwinglius and his follow- and Luther."

Bertius wrote an Apologetical Letter to the Archbishop in Feb., 1612, and ber to his Majesty, and requested Casaubon to present them. The Archbishop ved his own; but, after reading that which was addressed to the King, he de- d it for some weeks and then commanded Casaubon to return it to Bertius. aubon had afterwards an opportunity of speaking to his Majesty about Bertius, hom he wrote in March, "I perceive that not only this very wise king, but also principal men of the kingdom who are distinguished for their learning and piety, such an opinion of you, as induces them to regret that your cause has not been rated from that of Vorstius. For they all affirm, that Vorstius has written and maintains those assertions *respecting the Nature of God* which cannot be main- d without the greatest impiety. Your writings do not shew that you hold similar ments to his, and this excellent King and all good men wish that it may prove different from them."

ter this interview with King James, Casaubon informed Bertius that if he would a letter full of moderation, &c., he would present it, and use his utmost ex- ns to secure his Majesty's esteem. Bertius accordingly wrote an ample epistle to aubon in April, the substance of which was related to his Majesty, and Casaubon municated the result in the following words: "I lament from my heart, that tius cannot be recalled to a right mind and to sound doctrine: I return thanks to Almighty, that, in questions of this description, you profess yourself to be opposed st pest! When I had made his most serene Majesty acquainted with this fact, eived no small degree of pleasure from the information. But I wish, you had loyed some other expressions than those which occur in the title of the book that have lately published; you would, in that case, have found the king more equi- , and many other of the best men, who are offended with the very novelty of title. But, if I am not deceived, that doctrine could have been proposed in a ner far less invidious."

gianism, if not of Pelagianism. The contents of his book would have been of a character far more heretical, had not a great part of it been submitted by him, in manuscript, to Grotius, through whose interference and that of Uitenbogaert many objectionable passages were omitted.* These circumstances

* The following is an extract from the letter of Grotius under the date of Aug. 3, 1614:—"Reverend Sir, after I had written to you yesterday, a letter arrived from Bertius with some pages of the work in which he controverts by most solid arguments the horrid dogma of Piscator, and with such perspicuity, that, it appears probable to me, he will be able to prove what he wishes to Piscator himself. He desired to have my judgment: I replied in a friendly and candid manner, that all the points which he opposes in Piscator are highly approved by me; but that, in the mean time, there are certain things which appear to me unsafe, and undoubtedly unseasonable. The latter, however, are exceedingly few, and not in the least necessary to his purpose.—He has inserted in that pamphlet *a Diatribe on the history of Pelagius*, in which, his enemies, or the enemies of the cause which he defends, will exclaim, that he defends or at least excuses Pelagius. He says, that Pelagius proved his sentiments to the Palestine Synod: But, it is evident, he deluded that Synod; for to avoid being himself condemned, he condemned the very things which he soon afterwards disseminated with so much the greater eagerness, &c. Bertius also blames many things in the African Synods. But for what reason? What was there done in them, that could be opposed to him? For there is not in them a single word about *the absolute decree*; still less about *an irresistible force*; and far less still about *the inamissibility of justifying grace*, nay, there are in them several arguments in opposition to those things. These Synods seem to me to have distinguished with sufficient plainness between the dogmas peculiar to St. Augustine which they entirely omitted, and those ancient and catholic doctrines which they defended against Pelagius and Celestius.—Bertius complains, that those who were studious of peace obtained a bad name, and he specifies Cassianus and Faustinus, who are authors of no reputation, and whose sentiments, in the very words of these authors, were condemned by the Fathers of the Council of Orange. And for what end do we excuse those men, when our own sentiments remain unshaken after we have rejected theirs? What pleasure can there be in pronouncing invectives against the African Synods, that do no harm to us? What benefit do we hope from such a course?—I solemnly believe, that these things are not written to obscure the glory which is due to grace; but other persons will believe that they have this tendency. As soon as this book reaches Great Britain, depend upon it, it will be condemned. Then all those who indulge in evil wishes against the States of Holland, will exclaim, 'This is that magnificent commendation of GRACE, by which term they 'understand NATURE! They invent excuses for Pelagius, and praise the Semi-'Pelagians who were condemned by the Council of Orange! This is the object 'which they have in contemplation, and to which that Edict [for a toleration] has a 'manifest reference!'—I seem to hear the Archbishop and Winwood talking in this strain. But among ourselves, all refractory persons will say, 'A commencement 'has been made, by the Regent of the Theological College, of transgressing the boun-'daries of the Decree:' And they will find no difficulty in infusing this persuasion into some people. How eagerly will this intelligence be circulated in Amsterdam, and in Friezland!—Will he not be able to keep at a distance sufficiently great from the rocks of the Absolute Decree, even when he does not ascribe that to Nature which he detests from Grace? Yet, I believe, Bertius writes thus, from a sort of benignant pity towards men who were formerly condemned, rather than from any other cause. For he confesses in another passage, that every good action is prevented [preceded] by Grace. But neither the ostentatious display of our benignant feelings, nor of our erudition, ought to be of such consequence to us, as on their account to deprive ourselves of the ability to assist others, and to burden our country and the Church with

shew, that the Remonstrants had no control over his productions, but were much injured by them, since his sentiments were generally interpreted as those of the body to which he professed to belong. In the same year, he found it convenient to retire from his situation in the Theological College, of which Brandt gives the following account:

"A little time before, Peter Bertius, Regent of the Theological College of the States at Leyden, resigned that office on account of the trouble which it gave him,—particularly in these times, when the exhibitioners and other scholars were so divided into parties, and when some of them, who belonged to the party of the Contra-remonstrants, were privately exercised by Festus Hommius, a minister of Leyden, in disputations and in the composition of sermons, though they had, in Polyander, a Professor of the same sentiments. Some are of opinion, that Bertius had rendered himself so obnoxious, by several imprudent and crude expressions in his work *On the Apostacy of the Saints*, that he could do no more good in the University; and that he had likewise been privately warned by the Higher Powers to quit his place. After that, he was again made *Professor of Philosophy;* and, in his stead, the Curators called to the Regency of the Theological College, Gerard John Vossius, master of the Latin School at Dort, and a person of great learning, discretion, and other virtues."

While the Remonstrants were engaged in the lawful defence of all that was dear to them as men and Christians, they found in Bertius a deserter, who servilely conformed to the persons

unnecessary difficulties. I am surprised that the excellent man did not recollect what ill success he had, solely in the inscription of his late book.

"I have written these things with freedom, for the sake both of Bertius and of the public. I foresee many evils that will ensue, unless these things be altered. The work is not yet finished; it is comprised in a few sheets. What is this, when placed in comparison with the public tranquillity? I request you, reverend Sir, who understand these matters so well, and who are acquainted with our situation and the times in which we live,—I request you, if your sentiments co-incide with mine, to add your authority with my advice: But if your thoughts and mine on this point do not agree, I leave you to receive with complacency my solicitude, that the peace which has been obtained after so many inconveniences, and which is at present in the utmost peril, could no more be dispersed by new offences. I call God to witness, that in this matter I have had regard solely to the honour of Bertius, the tranquillity of the Republic and of the Church, and the removal of envy from the good cause."

Uitenbogaert complied with the wishes of Grotius, and Bertius expunged many of the objectionable passages from his book: Yet a sufficient number was suffered to remain, to prove that the author went beyond Arminius and his followers on some points of doctrine.—These extracts, and those which occur in App. P., serve to shew the uncommon pains that were taken, by such prudent men as Uitenbogaert and others, to keep such aspiring minds as Vorstius and Bertius within the bounds of moderation and orthodoxy.

that had assumed the supreme authority, civil and ecclesiastical. But he was not suffered long to enjoy the fruits of his compliance; for the South Holland Synod met at Leyden on the 23rd of July, 1619, to carry into effect the severe enactments of the Synod of Dort, as sanctioned by the States General. Before that assembly Bertius was summoned, and was treated with great harshness. In answer to some of their insidious questions he declared: — "I am neither an Arian, Socinian, nor Mahometan, but a Christian. With regard to the state of the Church within these Provinces, I own that the Chaff may overpower the Wheat; but I will never consent, that people shall impose Chaff upon me instead of Wheat." He acknowledged himself, at length, to be a member of the Contra-remonstrant Church. In reference to his conduct while Rector of the States' College, he said, "that he had not had many pleasant days in it; that he usually studied, fasted and prayed, whilst others were *merry-making*; and that nothing in all his life ever happened to him that was more agreeable, than his ejectment from that situation." In answer to an interrogation concerning his correspondence with the Remonstrants, he replied, "That he had signed the paper called *the Remonstrance*, but had not been concerned in any other meetings or transactions of the people of that sect; that he received the Five Points as they were proposed by the Remonstrants at the Hague Conference; but that perhaps he should explain them in a different manner from the Remonstrants themselves; and that it was possible, no two men of that denomination explained those Articles in exactly the same way." He acknowledged that he went further than the doctrine contained in the Five Points, as was apparent from the notion of JUSTIFICATION which he had advanced in his *Diatriba de Fide Justificante*. Being asked whether he had any scruples or second thoughts about his opinions, he replied: "The more I contemplate *the nature of* GOD on the one hand, and *the nature of* MAN on the other, the more am I confirmed in my former notions. But, notwithstanding this, I have sufficiently declared, in the Preface to my HYMENÆUS DESERTOR, that I am always ready to be better instructed."*

* Brandt says:—"Thus we find the matter represented in the Synodical Register. But some of the Remonstrants acquaint us, that Festus Hommius, the President, had conceived a great aversion to Bertius, though he was his brother-in-law; each of them having married a daughter of John Kuchlinus, formerly Regent of the Divinity College at Leyden. Bertius, they say, had, for some years preceding, rendered himself obnoxious to the Contra-remonstrants, who had attacked him in every possible way. Festus in particular had railed at him, both in print and private discourse, before persons of all ranks, and had disgraced him to the utmost of his power.

All his explanations were of no avail to those who had formed the previous resolution of effecting his ruin. This Provincial Synod excluded him from the Holy Communion in the Church, and ordered the civil part of his case to be referred to the Curators of the University; who, after receiving the report of the Synod, "discharged from their offices several Professors," says Brandt, "who were either of the sect of the Remonstrants, or not disposed to truckle to the Synod, though their occupations had little or no relation to Divinity: Among others, BERTIUS, the Professor of Ethics, (who had instructed the youth for the space of twenty-six years, either in the Schools, in the College of Divinity, or in the University,) was discharged from his Professorship This gentleman writes, that the Synod of Leyden, by their insinuations and accusations against him, procured an order, that he should be turned out of his office; and not only so, but they obtained a prohibition against his receiving any young men as boarders into his house and under his care, or of reading any Lectures to instruct them in the learned Languages, History, Philosophy, or the principles of Eloquence; and this, notwithstanding the earnest interposition of the Prince of Orange, by whom he was promised, that he should not suffer the least detriment on account of his differing from the Decrees of the Synod. By these means, Bertius found himself deprived of all opportunity of supporting himself and family, and was soon reduced to very great straits."

In a morbid state of mind, and with feelings deeply wounded, he resolved to take a journey to Paris; immediately before which, he wrote to Ruarus, April 6, 1620, and detailed the hard usage which he had received from the Calvinists, but promised at the same time, "that he would afford to posterity a striking example of constancy and moderation," and that, on his arrival in Paris, he would unite himself to the Reformed Church in that city. But this confident declaration, like that of his apostolic namesake Peter, was only the precursor of his sad defection.

The following is Brandt's account of the apostacy of Bertius: "After a very different manner behaved the famous PETER

Yet for a long time he had held no correspondence with the Remonstrants: He avoided them, and they him; for they observed something in his humour which did not please them. At the time of the Synod of Dort, he kept himself neutral: but as soon as the Remonstrants were condemned, he declared for their adversaries, and, in order to win their favour, instantly frequented their sermons and desired to be admitted to their communion. Yet they would not receive him, except upon condition of his first retracting what he had published, which he refused to do: This was followed by his citation before the Synod."

BERTIUS, late Regent of the College of the States, and afterwards one of the Professors at Leyden, who had formerly been a great stickler for the Remonstrants. This man, after his deprivation, had taken much pains to insinuate himself into the good graces of his adversaries, by a constant attendance at the public established worship. This was done, he said, to let the world see, that he had no hand in the late unhappy schism and separation; but that it was to be laid to the charge of such persons alone, as, after having broken the bonds of mutual love and brotherhood, took delight in chasing away those persons whom they might have kept among them by moderation and gentleness. He petitioned the States of Holland in March, [1620,] for a small pension, to enable him to support his numerous family; but it was refused. Thus, not knowing what course to take, he thought that he would go to France, and hoped to meet with some support or favour in that country: For the king had, about two years before, admitted him into the number of his cosmographers, that he might produce a description of that kingdom. There he endeavoured to obtain one year's pension, which was due to him, from the king; but he met with more difficulties than he had expected.*

"On the 11th of June, he had a conference with the ministers of the Reformed Community of Paris, and desired to be admitted to the celebration of the Lord's Supper at Charenton: But they raised several scruples against it, which very much grieved and afflicted him, who was already in great distress. In the meantime, he was attacked on the one hand by several of the Doctors of the Sorbonne, both with arguments and promises of being made a Professor among them, provided he would come over to the Popish religion. Being thus rejected by one party

* This was the method by which the French Papists afterwards attempted to shake the constancy of Grotius, who was a close prisoner in the castle of Louvestein, at the time when Bertius apostatised. But neither the flatteries which were artfully connected with the due payment of his pension, (for the short time it was duly paid,) nor the coolness and indifference exhibited by those who purposely delayed it, could induce Grotius to attend Mass, or even to write a word in favour of a christian pacification between Protestants and Papists. He saw the snare which was spread for him, and, with the deterring example of Bertius before his eyes, avoided the entanglement. If the French Ministry, according to their first proposal, had given him a public appointment *as a Protestant*, Grotius would have remained in France. But he left that country in disgust at the insidious conduct pursued towards him; and, on his return, a few months afterwards, as Ambassador from the kingdom of Sweden to the court of France, he was able, in consistency with his own character and opinions, and with the political views of the Chancellor Oxenstern, to advocate a co-alition between Protestants and Papists, – but it was on such terms as the Church of Rome will never concede as long as she continues to be "the mother of Harlots."— See my *Calvinism and Arminianism Compared*, pp. 582—613.

and courted by another, he resolved at length to throw himself into the arms of those who had made such advances towards him, and with whom he might consequently find the greatest encouragement. Accordingly, on the 25th of June, he declared himself a member of the Church of Rome, by going to Mass, receiving the Sacrament after their manner, and by publicly abjuring all schism and heresy. He was likewise obliged to sign certain articles and engagements, of the particulars of which I could never procure an account. Thus did he forsake the communion of Protestants, and thus was he received into the bosom of the Romish Church: But it soon appeared, by his looks, words, and actions, what were the motives and inducements to this his change of religion.

"The very same day, he waited on the Heer van Langerack, the Dutch ambassador at the Court of France, and with a sad and melancholy countenance, (as that gentleman expresses it in a letter which he wrote home the next day,) acquainted him that he had embraced the Romish religion, and, upon abjuring his own, had been admitted to the Sacrament. He pretended, that he had long since been inclined to this change, after mature consideration of all matters, not only by reason of the violent disputes and quarrels between the Remonstrants and Contra-remonstrants, but more especially because the Synod of Leyden had excluded him from the communion-table, and threatened him with excommunication. The Heer van Langerack immediately notified this event to the minister Peter du Moulin, who joined with that ambassador in using his utmost endeavours to bring him back,—but in vain. He continually exclaimed against the treatment he had met with; and especially his hard usage, as he called it, from his own friends and relations. When he discoursed about the affair itself, he said, 'It was not such 'a strange thing; since it was only returning to the ancient, 'true, catholic Church, scattered abroad over the whole world, 'with which all the Primitive Fathers had held communion.' He added, 'that many more would follow his steps,' without naming any one. He complained besides of his poverty and inability to maintain his own family; and at length owned, that he had given his solemn word and promise to the gentlemen of the Sorbonne, in hopes of some preferment, without having had any discourse with the Jesuits: He added, that he durst not stir out of Paris to fetch his wife and children, for fear of the reproaches which he should encounter; but that his friends and patrons had engaged to procure a recommendation from the King to the States, to obtain their leave for his wife to follow him, and to

bring his effects with her. The Ambassador and Du Moulin advised the States to endeavour to hinder his wife and children from following him, partly by the intreaties of their relations, and partly by the promise of some little assistance: They were in hopes, by this means, to bring him to a better mind. They also said, that his apostacy occasioned great scandal, especially in the city of Paris, and much trouble to those of the Reformed religion; and that Bertius himself was so disturbed in his mind upon that occasion, as to behave like a man who had lost his senses.*

"On the second of September, Bertius himself wrote a letter to the Committee of the States of Holland; in which, after having informed them that he had gone over to the Church of Rome, he added, 'I expect some preferment here; by the help 'of which, I, who have been turned out there [in Holland] and 'judged unfit for all kinds of business, may silently and quietly

* The state of Bertius's mind may be perceived by the following postscript, which was addressed by Robert Eustachius to Gabriel Thrasyllus, July 3, 1620:—"I had written the greatest part of this letter, my Thrasyllus, eight days ago, in daily hopes of the departure of Bertius, to whom I had resolved to commit it. In the mean time, he began to procrastinate; till at length, weary of his continued delay, I thought it better to proceed in some other way. Besides, though he might this very day commence his journey, I should feel unwilling to entrust any thing of mine to a man, who seems to feel no longer any concern either about his religion, or his ancient faith which formerly made me his friend. I will openly declare the fact, which will probably appear to have more of the air of a fable or a calumny, but which, I must say with great horror of mind and the utmost detestation, is much too true. Bertius, alas!, who was once ours, has in this city embraced the party of the Papists, and has not only heard Mass, but has likewise partaken of *the sacrament of the Lord's body*, as they call it, with idolaters, and has subscribed I know not what articles. I had this information first from persons who were highly deserving of credit; and I heard it yesterday from his own lips, so you must not suppose that I indulge in conjectures. You will easily imagine how I received this intelligence: While the unhappy man was communicating it, he stammered and was disordered in mind; one moment he was pale, in the next he sweat; at one moment he staggered in his walking, in the next he sighed and wept. He had nothing which he could set in opposition [to his conduct], except the injuries of those Gomarists, by whom he had been previously harassed in a bitter and wicked manner. Yet I suspect, from certain expressions in his conversation, that he is little or nothing changed in his sentiments; and that he has gone over to that party for no other purpose, than to obtain his stipend from the royal treasury; for which, I know, he had for many days and weeks been piteously begging, but to no good purpose. It is possible, that he has also hopes of other things, which he may himself enjoy, as he wished, since he can sell his soul for money.—In the mean time, I am greatly afraid lest the *Apostacy* of this HYMENÆUS, [see p. 272,] should injure the reputation of our Remonstrants: And this is the sole reason why I have been desirous of giving you immediate information of this affair; of which, on any other account, you should have had my permission to remain in ignorance. You may, if you please, immediately communicate this to those persons whose interest it is to know it, that they may see if they can by any means obviate the inconveniencies of this affair. May Almighty God confirm us in his holy Truth, lest we ever offend after such a foul example! To *Him I again* commend you and all good men."

'spend the little remains of my life, and in some degree sup-'port my family.' He then begged their permission to allow his wife and children to come to him without molestation. It is likewise related of him, that he was heard to say after quitting the Reformed Church, 'I am, in substance, the same man as I formerly was!'

"When the news of his apostacy arrived in Holland, it excited various emotions in the minds of the contending parties. The most violent Contra-remonstrants seemed to be pleased at his inconstancy, and to seize on that occasion to reproach the Remonstrants with his crime. They exclaimed, 'that by this 'event it might plainly be seen what those people intended; 'that Popery lay concealed in their hearts; that their very doc-'trines paved the way for its introduction; that Bertius had led 'the dance, but that Uitenbogaert, Episcopius, Grevinchovius, 'and the rest of them, would soon follow.'*

"But the Remonstrants themselves did not think, that this apostacy of Bertius ought to be imputed to them, as they were altogether unconcerned in the matter. Uitenbogaert, having been informed, by a letter from some one, that Rosæus, one of the Contra-remonstrant ministers at the Hague, was glad of that opportunity to insult the Remonstrants upon the fall of Bertius, returned this answer: 'If Rosæus had any true charity in him, 'he would rather lament than rejoice at the apostacy of Bertius. 'But it is of no consequence to them how they act, provided 'they can but triumph over their adversaries. And yet he knows 'well enough, that it is more than a year since Bertius forsook

* In a letter which Næranus addressed to Vorstius in Aug., 1620, he says:—

"Bertius will not soon erase or obliterate the stain of ignominy which he has fixed upon us. It would probably have been more excusable, had his foul defection occurred when the resources, by which he might maintain himself and his family, had failed. But he has basked in the beams of good fortune so long, as to make it impossible for him to be thus quickly reduced to a state of destitution. But it is not wonderful, that an avaricious man, as he is generally represented to be, and one who has continued in the enjoyment of a liberal stipend, should be impelled, (not so much by the fear of want, as by *a wish for regaining his former condition or one somewhat higher,*) to a step which the fear of being accused of wavering and inconstancy will not easily suffer him to retrace. He will regret this action the more, when he hereafter beholds the affair [of the Remonstrants] which he considered desperate, not to be such as he had imagined, and when he sees that those who *believed in hope against hope* on HIM with whom nothing is impossible, have not had ill success, but have continued and saved themselves for a season of prosperity. In the mean time, Du Moulin will have no cause to upbraid us with the apostacy of Bertius, unless he be desirous of having it retorted on himself, that several evangelical ministers in France have passed over from the Reformed to the Papists, and particularly Ferrers, a man of consummate eloquence, prudence, and authority, who apostatized a few years ago. If Du Moulin should publicly traduce Bertius on this account, he will give Bertius an opportunity of publicly traducing him and Calvinism in return."

'us, and joined himself to the Contra-remonstrants, whose 'churches he daily frequented, and begged to be received into 'their communion. Consequently he was not a Remonstrant, 'but a Contra-remonstrant, when he turned Papist: He did not 'pass over to Popery from us, but from them. And indeed 'they are much nearer, than we are, to that religion.* How 'many Calvinists have in former times turned Papists! Rosæus 'himself has not yet been put to the trial. He sits in his 'mother's lap, and is worshipped like an idol. But if ever the 'tables be turned, we shall also see what he has within him.'

"In another letter which Uitenbogardt wrote about the same time to the Advocate Nicholas van Sorgen, he says: 'The pro-'ceeding of Bertius cannot fail of giving great offence to many. 'But offences must come. The man affected to be one of us; 'but we found, he was not right. We have not, for several 'years, had any communication with him: He avoided us, and 'we him. When the Synod was held at Dort, he pretended to 'be neuter. As soon as he saw us condemned there, he went 'over to the other side. As long as I have known him, he has

* "Edward Poppius, one of the Remonstrants, published a small treatise with the following title, *An Answer to the malicious Slanders of the Contra-remonstrants of the United Netherlands, who, taking Occasion from several frivolous Reasons, and particularly from the shameful Apostacy of Peter Bertius, accuse the Remonstrants of being Papists, or Popishly affected, and endeavour to persuade the Churches of their country that this Charge is true.*—In this treatise, the author shewed the great difference which subsisted between the Remonstrants and the Papists; and that the circumstance of the Remonstrants' taking shelter among the Papists [in Flanders] was no argument of their holding [the same opinions] with them, since they were forced to seek refuge among them, and did not go of their own accord, but, being conveyed thither by the States, found no habitation for themselves in the neighbouring countries, nor thought proper to go too far off, on account of the care which they took of their flocks; that they abhorred the conduct of Bertius; that the Contra-remonstrants, of all men, ought to make the least noise about his apostacy, since according to their [Predestinarian] principles, *he could not avoid falling, neither could his fall prove prejudicial to him;* that many others of the [Calvinistic] Clergy had formerly relapsed to Popery, but that it could not thence be inferred that all the rest would follow, neither was it a fair conclusion that, because Bertius had apostatized, other Remonstrants would follow his example.—This author also maintained, that the Contra-remonstrants followed the example of the Papists; that they had led Bertius by the hand, as it were, into Popery; and that several of their principles and practices agreed with those of the Papists:—As, (1.) That of Predestination, which agreed with the doctrine of the Dominicans:—(2.) The holding human institutions and decrees:—(3.) Their partial condemnation of all such as differed from them:—(4.) Their endeavours to establish a hierarchy, or spiritual dominion:—And (5.) Their attempts to introduce co-ercion of conscience, and the temporal punishment of heretics."—BRANDT.

These animadversions will not be considered unfair, when the Calvinists had avowed persecuting maxims, and when the decrees of the Synod of Dort, as sanctioned by the States General, had carried those principles into effect.

'always consulted flesh and blood: And you know very well, 'Sir, what counsel they give in such extremities. Nothing is 'more difficult, than to despise all worldly things, and, trusting 'in God, to keep the right way.'

"Upon a petition presented by some of the friends of Bertius, to the Synod of South Holland, holden at Gouda, in the preceding month of August, it was agreed, that he should not then be censured, but have three months' time allowed him to consider, and that, in the mean while, a letter should be sent from this Synod to the church of Paris, &c. Upon which, the ministers of the Reformed Church of Paris addressed themselves to Bertius, and employed many arguments to induce him to renounce his scandalous apostacy, and to return into the bosom of the Church: But their admonition was in vain; and they signified as much to the brethren in Holland. The Church of Leyden, therefore, proceeded to his excommunication, which they proclaimed and published on Easter-Sunday, in the following year, at the time of the administration of the Lord's Supper, and in the presence of the whole congregation.

"Some time afterwards, Bertius obtained that reward at which, it was thought, he aimed when he changed his religion: He was admitted Professor of Rhetoric, or Eloquence, in the Becodian College; and on the second of October, when he entered on his office, he made a certain oration, in which he gave an account of the reasons of his leaving Leyden and coming to Paris, and of the motives which inclined him to abandon the Protestant religion, and to embrace Popery. The chief arguments which he produced, and which he extolled very much, were, 'the antiquity of the Romish Church; the succession of 'Bishops, who had always taught the same doctrine; the con-'formity of that doctrine with the sacred writings; the autho-'rity and sanctity of the Fathers; the novelty of the Reformed 'religion; the continual use of tradition in the church; the 'blasphemous doctrines and decrees of the Contra-remon-'strants; the lies which the Calvinists spread against the mem-'bers of the Catholic Church; and his conferences with the 'most learned of that communion.'—Thus did Bertius try to please his new masters."

In this copious enumeration of the reasons assigned by friends and foes for his desertion, the reader will perceive, that all of them allude to his *dread of poverty*, which Burman also gives as the principal cause of his change of communions. But this great critic thinks, that Bertius was inclined to go over to the Church of Rome in 1591, when Lipsius shamefully apostatized.

This is, I think, more than a probable conjecture; as will be evident to every one that has perused his correspondence with Lipsius at that period,* and his subsequent letters to Isaac Casaubon, to both of whom he was eloquent in praise of primitive Christianity and the early usages of the Church Universal.

* In a letter which Lipsius addressed to Bertius, from Liege in Sept. 1591, he said:—"My advice is, that you proceed diligently in the Fathers, and that you will devote yourself to their perusal. Believe me, you will derive from them true erudition as well as piety." In the same letter he says, in answer to the representations which Bertius had given of the emptiness of his purse, after a long sickness at Heidelberg, and subsequent want of employment at Strasburgh:—"Are you still at Strasburgh? You have approved yourself and your manners to me: But your circumstances fill me with anxiety, if they are not yet in a flourishing condition. Can I administer my feeble aid? Be assured of my wishes to help you; inform me of your wants: Nay, were I in some degree settled, I would invite you to my abode, to remain with me as long as you chose. Write seriously and soon, and describe exactly the state of your affairs: We will do something to extricate you. If not, even my recommendation will afford you some assistance among the Dutch."—Through his interest with Hauten, Douza, and others, Bertius received his appointment in the University of Leyden, in June 1593. His previous adventures are exceedingly interesting, and afford a fair specimen of the deplorable straits to which many young "scholars of fortune" were in those days reduced. At intervals between 1590 and 1593, he obtained occasional employment, by academical sufferance or courtesy, in the Universities of Mentz, Heidelberg, Strasburgh, and Altorf. He rendered himself exceedingly agreeable to a young Polish nobleman, during his abode at Strasburgh, and, at his particular invitation, accompanied him and his tutor to Altorf, where they remained some time. They afterwards spent several months in a sort of literary tour through some parts of Bohemia, Silesia, Poland, Russia, and Prussia; and met with an honourable reception from all the literati in those countries, who, in their correspondence with Lipsius, spoke in rapturous strains of the accomplishments of Bertius.

The equally profuse commendations of Lipsius, one of the greatest critics of that learned age, must have been flattering to the youthful vanity of Bertius; and it is almost a miracle that he escaped from the Popish snares that were then spread for his wandering feet. In January, 1592, Bertius, having given Lipsius a detail of his straitened circumstances, at Strasburgh, adds this expression: "May God not shew himself propitious to me if I have communicated to any one in Holland, except yourself, my designs,—not even to my own father: In such high estimation do I hold the humanity and candour of your mind, and such great things do I promise myself from your benevolence towards me!"—In a subsequent letter, Bertius gives certain reasons why he was desirous to apply himself to Classical pursuits, in preference to Divinity, and adds: "The more earnestly I look into Religion, the less am I pleased with the continual disputes of divines about sacred subjects: Not because I either blame or despise that holy study,—for what food can be sweeter to the mind than the knowledge of Truth?,—but because I will avoid that worldly agitations and those unfruitful altercations, which are calculated to excite disturbances, rather than peace in the Churches. But these contentions are now so frequent, that the true worship of God seems to consist in them alone, and without them scarcely any man can profess to be a divine. I have therefore thought, that I shall act properly and usefully, if I follow and do not lead, if I learn Religion and afterwards teach it. I could in the mean time love and honour the Common Parent of mankind. I have chosen you as the perpetual witness and determiner of all my purposes and actions," &c.

The Remonstrants were at that time a dispersed body; and a connection with them would not have suited his pecuniary needs, though agreeable to his religious principles. The Dutch Calvinists had ejected him from their communion; and their French brethren shewed him as little mercy. In the Church of England, moderate as she is in her terms of communion, he could not then have found a place; because Abbot still bore ecclesiastical sway, and had exposed him to the whole world as an abandoned heretic. To a person of his sanguine temperament, therefore, goaded as he was by the reproaches of his wife and her Calvinistic relatives, the change, though a desperate measure, was one which Bertius attempted to justify by the peculiar circumstances in which he was placed, and in particular by his high regard for Antiquity. Nothing, however, can be pleaded in extenuation of an enlightened Protestant, who deserts his own Church and enters into that of Rome. How much more noble does the conduct of the suffering Remonstrant Ministers now appear, who, after enduring for seven years all the evils connected with a state of imprisonment or of exile, were restored to their country and friends in 1626, immediately after the death of their grand persecutor, Prince Maurice!

Bertius lived in a state of great obscurity in Paris, and survived this act of shameful apostacy only a few years: He died in that city of an atrabilious dysentery, in 1629, as the famous Guy Patin informs us, who attended him during his illness and says, that, though Bertius had changed his religion, he was always loud in his commendations of his father-in-law Kuchlinus.

V.—Page 40.

Bertius has well described the charge preferred by the Classis of Dort, respecting some doctrinal disagreement between the different Professors, and the very prudent answer returned by the latter. He then says, that "he would have related the cognizance which the Supreme Court took of these and other reports, had he not thought that all persons then present were well acquainted with the result." The good Dutchmen of that period might be acquainted with all the particulars which preceded the notice that their High Mightinesses took of the affair: To us however, who live two centuries later, the following information from the younger Brandt may be useful:

But some persons, says this able biographer of Arminius, not without just reason wondered by what means Gomarus could bring himself to sign such a testimonial, [as "that no difference existed, among the Professors of Theology, that could be con-

sidered as in the least affecting the Fundamentals of doctrine."] For it was evident, that the opinions which Arminius entertained on Predestination had not only been severely animadverted upon by this man in a public and sufficiently virulent disputation, but he had likewise exaggerated the importance of this controversy in such a manner, as to induce people to think that he viewed it as fundamental. Other persons, on the contrary, collected from this fact, that Gomarus had then purposed, notwithstanding the difference in their sentiments, to cultivate a true friendship with Arminius; and that he really would have cultivated it, had not the clamours of other men prevented him from indulging in these his wishes. That Arminius had cherished similar hopes, is rendered evident by the following expression, which occur in a letter addressed to Uitenbogaert, June 7th, 1605: "I am completely at peace with Gomarus; and am of opinion that it will remain sufficiently firm, unless he listens to that person, [Festus Hommius,] who seems to aim at this one thing alone—that he may not be found to have been a false prophet. It shall, on the contrary, be my endeavour to make my modesty and equanimity conspicuous to all men, that I may be superior at once in the goodness of my cause, and in my mode of acting."—On this occasion, the mention of another circumstance must not be omitted: Some people relate, that Gomarus himself was in the habit of occasionally declaring, not without evident regret, before his familiar friends, "that he could easily be induced to cultivate friendship with Arminius; but that the unceasing importunity of the Churches and their deputies had placed obstacles in the way of this his salutary desire."

A few weeks after the Curators had secured the peace of the University, by calling together the Professors of Divinity, the Synod of South Holland, which met at Rotterdam on the 30th of August, 1605, began to adopt on this subject counsels that were much more hasty and intemperate. When the members of this ecclesiastical assembly had heard, from the delegates of the Dort Classis, the reasons which had induced them to transmit the grievance recorded in page 39, and had likewise learnt from the Synodical deputies the state of the University of Leyden, and the result of their interview with Arminius and the rest of the Professors, [see page 527,] they determined, after mature deliberation, that it was necessary to oppose a timely resistance to this increasing evil, and that the remedy for it ought not to be deferred under the uncertain hope of obtaining a National Synod. They resolved therefore to institute a most rigorous

quiry, by means of their deputies, into the doctrinal articles hich were the chief subjects of discussion among the theolocal students in the University of Leyden; and to request the urators to command the Professors of Divinity to declare their ntiments, with openness and sincerity, on the points under dission. [The result of their interview with Arminius is related, his own words, page 528.]

Notwithstanding these things, says the younger Brandt, Arminus strenuously fulfilled his official duties; and, in the first ace, endeavoured, as far as it was practicable, to propagate ill further the Truth which he knew, without noise or dissenn. For that purpose he was careful, on every occasion, to ntain himself within the terms of the Confession and Cateism, at least, to say nothing which might be confuted by one two documents, nothing, with which they might not be ell and openly reconciled.* For though he had probably served in those formularies of consent a few things that peared sometimes to favour the sentiments which were conary to his own, and which he might wish to have been written phraseology better accommodated to his opinions; yet he lieved it possible for him to keep himself within the same undaries, and by the aid of a mild interpretation to soften the perity of certain phrases, and to wait till they received a fuller terpretation and a complete revision in a National Synod.† or he thought, that he could do this, by the same right as that which all those Calvinists who were subjects to the Emperor Germany, supposed that they could lawfully and with a good nscience subscribe the Augsburgh Confession, and all and each its articles: This, however, it was scarcely possible for them have done, without the help of an indulgent interpretation, since ere is such a semblance of contradiction between the Augsrgh and the other Confessions of Faith, that the Divines of eneva did not consider it proper to publish it [*in the Harony of Confessions*] without the counteracting charm of their n interpretations and cautions.‡ Imitating their example, d rejoicing in the same allowed right, he seemed to himself to doing nothing that was unworthy of a Reformed divine, for the confirmation of his own sentiments on Divine Predestiation and other articles of the Christian Faith, he called to his id not only the sacred oracles, but likewise the two formularies f consent. This was the reason why, at a time when he was

* See pp. 558, 590, 641. † Page 645. ‡ P. 558.

about to hold a disputation on Predestination in his private Class, he ordered the young man who had to act the part of Respondent, to express his Theses on this subject in the very words of the Dutch Confession.* About the same time he held a very learned disputation *on the Comparison between the* LAW *and the* GOSPEL, and on the Agreement and Difference between the Old and the New Testament; the part of Respondent having devolved, under his auspices, on that very accomplished youth, Peter Cunæus, who afterwards became a singular ornament to the University of Leyden and to Literature. Towards the close of this disputation, one of the students raised this objection, "It is impossible for man to do otherwise than transgress the Law, because no resistance can be made to the decree of God, by which it has been determined that the Law shall be transgressed." Though Arminius promptly replied to this objection in virtue of his office, yet he forbade such expressions to be afterwards employed unless accompanied with this or a similar protest, "*Far be blasphemy from the supposition!*" Yet this daring proposition of the candidate for Holy Orders gave much umbrage to some of the Professors, who were present at the disputations; and one of them, who was not the lowest in authority, and of remarkable modesty, took an early opportunity of telling Arminius, that such conduct as that ought to be checked and repressed, and that authority ought to be interposed to prevent such reproachful objections. Arminius excused the deed by remarking, that the youth who urged the objection had been so instructed by certain divines; and that academic authority could scarcely be interposed, on account of the vehemence of some men who entertained opposite sentiments. The Professor declared the pleasure which he felt on hearing Arminius admonishing the young man about blasphemy.†

In the meantime he derived no small degree of strength and confidence from the immense number of auditors whom, at this period, he daily attracted to his public lectures by the singular gracefulness of his speaking and his mode of teaching, and by his perspicuous interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. About the same time, also, his private class was in such a flourishing state, that a single class would not have been sufficient for the number of his pupils, had not several been impressed with a fear, that too close an intimacy with him might at some future time operate to their disadvantage. Since therefore envy is generally considered the attendant on virtue, as well as on real

* P. 590. † Præst. ac Erudit. Viro. Epist. 80.

tradition, it ought to excite amazement in no one if Arminius was likewise compelled to contend with this Hydra, on account of the daily increasing reputation of his learning. The degree of human infirmity which Gomarus displayed on his weak side, may be readily ascertained from this circumstance: One day when Arminius was passing through the Hall of the University, Gomarus accosted him in a manner sufficiently virulent, and with angry emotion exclaimed, *They say, you are more learned than Junius!*

Peter Plancius, one of the ministers of the Church of Amsterdam, about the same time began to assail Arminius, his disciples and admirers, with the most acrimonious clamours from the pulpit: He traduced them under the epithets of *Followers of Coornhert, The New Pelagians, and much worse than Pelagius himself.* Nay, so violent was this fiery zealot, that he seemed to have turned aside the very capacities of those who were not the most skilful, and to have connected together things that were not deducible consequences and had no natural agreement. Some persons also imitated his example, being either inflamed with an inveterate hatred against him, or induced by the pious solicitude with which they embraced the received doctrine: They began to insinuate, in the vulgar tongue before the people, those points which had been disputed with some subtlety in the seats of the University; and this they did, by a manifest departure from the truth, and with minds little disposed to the peaceful edification of Christians. Some inculcated on the promiscuous multitude, that the doctrine of the Belgic Confession, which had been confirmed by the blood of so many Martyrs,* was called in question; and others, that a mixed and confused species of religion was in a course of preparation, and that serious thoughts were entertained about the introduction of libertinism.†—But Arminius, perceiving the necessity, which was thus imposed on him, of vindicating his innocence both in public and in private, managed his cause, in this state of affairs, with a mind that exhibited an abundant calmness and serenity. I employ his own words when I say, "that he considered this to be the most excellent kind of revenge—by doing good to cause it to be seen, that they have fared the worse who spurned the offered friendship and fraternal kindness." Besides, that he might the more deeply imbue the minds of his pupils with the genuine desire for peace, he believed nothing was more necessary to be inculcated upon them than an earnest endeavour to discriminate, according

* See pages 648—657.

† Answer to the Letter of the Minister of Walcheren, p. 9.

to the rule of the Sacred Volume, not only between Truth a Falsehood, but likewise between the greater and the less necessi of different articles.

In the mean time he bestowed no small attention on l Academical Lectures; and, having finished his exposition Jonah's Prophecy, he commenced the new year (1606) with l Lectures on the prophet Malachi.

On the 8th of February, according to annual custom, Arm nius resigned his office of Rector of the University; and, that solemn occasion he delivered a celebrated Oration *On Re gious Dissension, its Nature and its effects;* and he explain its causes and effects with such freedom of speech, as the impo ance of the affair itself and the state of the afflicted chur demanded. But since it was then commonly considered, th the most prompt and effectual remedy which could be devised f appeasing the dissensions on religious subjects, was a Gene Assembly of the parties that differed from each other, (call by the Greeks "a Synod," and by the Latins "a Council,") embraced that opportunity to shew, at some length and in strain of great piety, by what means an Assembly of this ki ought to be convened and conducted, in order to derive from such consequences as might be justly and reasonably expected For he was aware, that by far the greater portion of the Dut ecclesiastics desired nothing with more eagerness, at that perio than for the States General to allow a National Synod to once more convened, which, though then for a long time omitte had usually, in former days, been convoked at the end of eve third year.†

Brandt's account of the controversy relative to the Divini of the Son of God, or rather concerning the proper acceptati of the word αυτοθεος, "very God," is related by Arminius hi self in a subsequent page, 627, as well as in the 21st of t *Thirty-one Defamatory Articles*, and in his celebrated letter Hippolytus a Collibus: Its insertion therefore in this place not required. His Biographer closes his narrative in the follo ing words:

* This charming Oration commences at page 370: And since so much misre sentation has lately prevailed, among the minor and worst-informed Calvinistic wri concerning the Synod of Dort and its proceedings, I have considered it to be a p of my duty, to present the readers of this volume with an authentic account of t celebrated Assembly, in the form of copious Notes to the Oration of Arminius.

† I omit, in this place, Brandt's diffuse narrative of the methods adopted by Dutch Clergy to procure the convention of a National Synod, because I have given whole of it in the General Introduction, and because the reader will find nume elucidations of it in pages 370—384, 636—664.

Yet this very disputation at which Arminius attended as Moderator, afforded fresh nutriment to the unjust suspicions which the malevolent cherished against him; and rumours were circulated in all directions, that he held erroneous sentiments about the Holy Trinity and the Divinity of the Son of God. But in this he accounted himself infelicitous, and lamented that prejudice prevailed so much, that all the blame was immediately cast upon him, whenever any dissension arose, and even when he had defended an opinion which was most generally received; and that those persons were not only excused, but commended, who had given occasion to dissension by their novel and most monstrous modes of speaking. To him, this seemed a strange thing; and he thought there existed no reasons why he could justly and deservedly be supposed, on account of the preceding Disputation, to cherish any thing monstrous in doctrine.* In the same letter he declares, that he had taught nothing on this topic which was not founded on the authority of the Sacred Scriptures, as well as on that of ancient and modern divines; and that it was not his wish to have any correction or amendment made on this point of doctrine as it was generally received by the Reformed Churches in Holland. He likewise adduced Beza, the guide and instructor of his youth, as associated with him in sentiment on this subject: For, in his Preface to *the Dialogues of St. Athanasius on the Trinity*, he makes an excuse for Calvin, "that he did not observe sufficient accuracy in discriminating between the two expressions, *The Son is* [PER] *by himself*, and, *The Son is* [A] *from himself*."

Our author, about the same time, was called to endure another calumny, not much dissimilar to the one to which we have now alluded. The sole cause of it was this: Holding a public disputation *on the person of the Son of God*, he embraced that opportunity, while explaining, in a very learned manner, the economy of our salvation as administered by the Father, through the Son and the Holy Spirit, to admonish his auditors, that an accurate regard must be had to the order which is observed in every part of the Sacred Pages; and that those things which on this subject were peculiarly ascribed to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit, ought to be distinct objects of consideration. Some passages of the Old and the New Testament, which are usually cited in confirmation of the Consubstantiality and Co-essentiality of the Trinity, had been occasionally explained by Arminius in another manner: This circumstance also tended to

* His Letter to Uitenbogaert, 1st Sept., 1606.

increase the audacity of calumny. But he felt confident that all equitable judges of things would be persuaded, that nothing could, by any semblance of truth, be collected from it that was at all adverse to the true Christian faith.—With regard to the first of these occasions of calumniating, he thought it was seized upon to little purpose, since all those who had learnt from the Holy Scriptures, *that the Father was in the Son reconciling the world to himself, and administered the word of reconciliation by the Holy Spirit*, would be abundantly conscious, that, in [contemplating] the economy of human salvation, the order which subsisted between the Persons of the Trinity was to be taken into consideration, and their attributes ought not to be confounded, unless a man was desirous of falling into the heresy of *the Patri-passionists* [those who held, that God the Father suffered on the cross.]—In his opinion likewise, no more labour was to be expended in refuting the second slander, which had been objected against him, of having explained a few passages of Holy Writ in a way somewhat different from that of some others. For if any offence was committed by such a different interpretation, he knew that the same crime must be imputed to Calvin himself, who, beyond most divines, had on this point taken great liberties, and yet had been defended, by the celebrated Paræus, against Hunnius's book, entitled *Calvin Judaizing*.

But from the very elegant Theses which Arminius wrote on this article of the Christian Faith, the equitable reader may decide for himself what his sentiments were respecting the Holy Trinity, and how undeservedly about this period he was accused by some persons of Arianism, Socinianism, and other crimes of that description. He declares, on a different occasion,* in the following words, the aim and the method which he proposed to himself when discussing this subject: — "Most of those who are acquainted with me know the great timidity, and the uncommon anxiety of conscience, with which I treat the sublime doctrine of a Trinity of Persons. My whole method of instruction demonstrates, that, when explaining this point, I feel no delight in inventing new phrases for myself, which were unknown to the Scriptures and to the orthodox among the Ancient Fathers in their explanation of this point, or in employing such novel ones as others have devised. My auditors will bear testimony to my willingness to endure those who use other modes of speaking on this subject, provided the meaning which they intend be sound." In a letter to Uitenbogaert, dated September 1, 1606,

* Answer to 31 Defamatory Articles.

to remove all suspicion of Socinianism, he openly testified, "that so far was it possible for him to be found guilty of this offence, that, on the contrary, he was confident he could produce certain arguments, provided the Synod would grant him its ready attention, which would tend still more forcibly to convict the Socinians, or at least to answer in a more appropriate manner their arguments and objections." On the testimony of John Narsius,* who was one of his pupils, Arminius is said soon afterwards to have publicly and professedly refuted certain of the principal and most high-commended dogmas of Socinus, but especially his book *On the Saviour*: This he did so completely and largely, and with such solidity, as no one before him, and probably none since that time, has done.

The younger Brandt afterwards begins to give an authentic account of *the Preparatory Convention*, and other ecclesiastical transactions of the year 1607, which I have related from him in the General Introduction. He then proceeds to narrate other facts, connected with the history of Arminius, in the following manner:

More ample materials were afforded to the increase of these dissensions, by a little pamphlet which had been published this year (1607) at Gouda: It was designed for imbuing the minds of children with pious principles, and was afterwards known under the title of *the Gouda Catechism*. This small work had been composed, by the pastors of the Church of Gouda, by way of experiment, to try whether the Magistrates of their city could convert it to the use of the common schools, and substitute it in the place of *the Heidelberg Catechism*,† which, they were fully aware, contained questions which were far too lofty, and couched under ambiguous expressions. As soon as this pamphlet was published, it became the subject of very opposite criticisms. The admirers of Arminius praised it, — partly because the authors of it had in the general arrangement of the work followed the Palatine model, and yet appeared to have admitted into it nothing that was opposed to christian doctrine; and partly, perhaps chiefly, because it cut off every pretext for meddling with certain difficult and disputable dogmas, and, breathing the primitive simplicity of Christianity, comprehended the Articles of Belief in few words, and those no other than such as were previously dictated in the Sacred Oracles themselves. But there

* See his Letter to F. Sandius, Senator in the Court of Guelderland, dated Sept. 12, 1612, in *Præst. ac Erudit. Vir. Epistolæ*, p. 327.

† The Heidelberg Catechism could not, up to that period, and till some years afterwards, gain admission into the schools of Gouda.

immediately arose, from the other party, some persons who publicly condemned this small book, and evinced their detestation of it by declaring, "that there never was any monstrous or horrid opinion which might not be veiled under language so general; that simplicity was very suitable to primitive times, when those evils which were then unknown did not require any remedies; but that, when errors afterwards increased, forms of speaking were invented to drive the erroneous wanderers from their hiding-places; that this pamphlet either entirely took away or omitted the principal articles of the Christian Faith, and in this way held out a signal to those who were fond of innovation; and that Servetus himself would have readily subscribed such a document."* Thus that which one party asserted to be *agreeable to Divine Truth*, was called by the other *a covert for heresies*; and *the liberty* of the one was the *complete unsettling of things* according to the other. R. Donteklok embraced this opportunity to grasp his pen, and in a work from the press, not only commenced a refutation of this Gouda Catechism, but, at the instigation of some malevolent individuals, likewise traduced with sufficient virulence those who had held different sentiments from the rest concerning the mode of holding the National Synod: He also obliquely and nearly without disguise pointed at Arminius, as though this small book had been prepared by his assistance. But although Arminius was not greatly averse to its publication, and afterwards acknowledged that the pastors of Gouda had consulted him previous to its appearance, and that he had expressed his assent to the reasons which they gave in explanation why it should be published; yet he never touched any part of the pamphlet, and rendered no assistance whatever in its composition. Besides, in his opinion and that of others, this pamphlet would have laid entirely neglected, had not the indigested clamours of several persons procured for it a higher authority than that to which it was entitled.

But calumny was not content to be confined within these limits; disdaining, therefore, all the restraints of humanity, it circulated, about the same period, a most foul and slanderous rumour about Arminius and Uitenbogaert: It was reported, that the Pope of Rome had addressed them in a letter composed in terms of the utmost courtesy, and, holding out to them the hopes of an immense income, he had recommended them to patronize the Church of Rome. How distant this report was

* See the Letter of Sybrandus Lubbertus to Oldenbarneveldt, dated Oct. 16, 1608, in *Præstant. ac Erudit. Vir. Epistolæ*, p. 215. See also the remarks of Dr. Berriman, p. 234, and Episcopius's character of Arminius in the Preface to this volume.

rom even the semblance of truth, will appear in a subsequent art of this narrative. See Page 298.

Another rumour, nearly allied to this splendid falsehood, was ne which at the same time was circulated among the populace: rminius, it was said, usually recommended to the students under is care, not only the productions of Castellio and Koornhert, ut likewise and principally those of Suarez and other Jesuits; nd he spoke contemptuously of the writings of Calvin, Beza, artyr, Zanchius, Ursinus, and other eminent divines of the eformed Church. These and other slanders of the same kind, hich were spread against him in all directions, through Germany, France, England, and Savoy, were received by Arminius ithout any commotion of spirit, except of pity for the brethren ho could sin so grievously against God and their neighbour: ccording to his own testimony, he considered that no other fect was produced by these attempts and the preposterous diligence of the brethren, "than that he, an insignificant individual, who could not possibly attain to celebrity by his own virtues, nd concerning whom scarcely a person out of Holland would therwise deign either to know or speak any thing,) was thus ndered every day famous and noble."—I wish to relate in his ords, rather than in my own, how remote from the truth was his report of his having recommended authors of inferior note, hen it was first conveyed to different places as well as to Amsterdam. The following is an extract from a letter which he ddressed, May 3, 1607, to Sebastian Egberts, the principal enator in the government of Amsterdam:*—"I can bestow o other title than that of a FALSEHOOD on the report which is in irculation, that I persuade the students to read the books of the esuits and of Koornhert: For none of them have interrogated me n this point, and I never of my own accord uttered a word on the ubject. But, after the Holy Scriptures, (the perusal of which earnestly inculcate more than any other person, as the whole niversity as well as the consciences of my colleagues will tesfy,) I exhort them to read the Commentaries of Calvin, on hom I bestow higher praise than Helmichius ever did, as he nfessed to me himself. For I tell them, that he is incompable in the interpretation of Scripture; and that his Commenries ought to be held in greater estimation, than all that is livered to us in the writings of the Ancient Christian Fathers: that, in a certain eminent Spirit of Prophecy, I give the preiinence to him beyond most others, indeed beyond them all.

* The preceding part of this letter is quoted in p. 671 and 544.

I add, that, with regard to what belongs to Common Places, his *Institutes* must be read after the Catechism, as a more ample interpretation. But to all this I subjoin the remark, that they must be perused with cautious choice, like all other human compositions. I could produce innumerable witnesses of this my advice; while they cannot produce one, whom I have advised to read Koornhert or the followers of Ignatius Loyola. Let them bring forward a single witness, and the falsehood will immediately be manifest: So that, on this point, a history, or rather a fable, arises out of nothing." Then follows the quotation which I have given in pages 671-2.

In the same spirit of conscious rectitude, in the following year, 1608, Arminius undertook the defence of his own cause, before that very noble personage, Hippolytus a Collibus, Ambassador from the illustrious Prince Palatine, Frederic the Fourth, to their High Mightinesses the States General. Being of opinion that no dependence ought to be placed on the rumours which had been circulated at Heidelberg some time before, *that Arminius differed a little from others on some points of christian faith*, and thinking that the party accused ought also to have a hearing, this eminent individual, in a manner the most polite, invited our author to visit him at the Hague. Arminius obtained an interview with him; and, at the commencement of the conversation, after the Ambassador had with singular benevolence of mind disclosed the causes of the unpleasant suspicions concerning him, and on what points Sibrandus Lubbertus had complained of him by letter to the famous Pàræus, Arminius openly and candidly explained his sentiments on all those subjects, but chiefly on *the Divinity of the Son of God, Providence and Divine Predestination, Grace and Free Will, and on the point of Justification*. His explanation of these doctrines was so satisfactory to that illustrious person, as to induce him earnestly to request Arminius to commit it to writing, not only that he might be enabled with greater certainty and firmness to deliver his own judgment on these matters after they had been properly considered, but might likewise communicate it to others, and thus have it in his power the more easily to refute calumny and defend his innocence. On that occasion, therefore, our author composed that very learned epistle, which "smelled of the lamp;" and sent it on the 6th of April, 1608, to the Ambassador of the Elector Palatine. It is still extant in his published Works, and comprehends a succinct defence both of his doctrine and his life. [After quoting the conclusion of this Epistle, and describing the Conference at the Hague between

Arminius and Gomarus, on the 28th of May 1608, of which Brandt's own account is given in the long note, pp. 517-21, that biographer continues his narrative in these words:]

That famous man, Hugh Grotius, alluding to this Conference in a letter which he addressed to his kinsman Reygersbergen at that time, says, that he found Uitenbogaert sadder than usual, and declaring among other things, "that although the Pro-"vincial Synod might proceed, yet since this affair was agitated "with such violent prejudices, and since the private opinions "of divines almost imperceptibly stole into the minds of their "pupils, and, in process of time and through neglect in prose-"cuting a deeper inquiry, were received by the tacit consent of "the Churches,—since these private opinions, by the authority "which they insensibly acquired, destroyed the liberal applica-"tion of men possessed of great talents,—and since the majority, "in the Churches, as well as in other assemblies, [frequently] "prevailed against those who had the better cause,—he could "not hope for a more prosperous result to the affairs of Armi-"nius than that which had been the lot of Castellio, who, "oppressed by the outrageous conduct of his adversaries, was "reduced to such an extremity as to obtain a livelihood by "gathering fuel."—That this fear concerning Arminius, which had occupied the mind of his friend Uitenbogaert, was not a vain one, we may readily suppose, from the foul reproaches and falsehoods with which detraction daily assailed his reputation. For this purpose *Thirty-one Theological Articles* were circulated about that time, some of which were ascribed to Arminius, some to Adrian Borrius, a Pastor of the Church of Leyden, and others to both of them. In dispersing these Articles, his adversaries intended, by placing on them the black mark of HERESY, to excite against them the hatred of the ignorant among the populace, as well as the animosity of those who were at the head of the ecclesiastical and civil affairs of the Republic.

As Nine of these Articles are inserted in this volume, I refer the readers to the commencement of them in page 669, and proceed with the remainder of Brandt's narrative:

At this time, too, was renewed the calumny, which had formerly been objected against Arminius, of his attempts to promote the interests of the Papal Kingdom. To put down this slanderous accusation, he had within the preceding twelve months, composed most learned Theses *on Idolatry*, and had added, by way of Corollary, "that the Roman Pontiff is an idol, and that they are idolaters who consider him to be what he professes;" but he had likewise published other Theses, in which he maintained, "that the Reformed Churches had not made a

secession from the Church of Rome, and that they had acted properly in refusing to hold and profess communion with her in faith and Divine worship." Still further to close the mouths of his detractors, a short time after the Conference held before the Supreme Court, May 24th, 1608, (pp. 517-21,) he held a public Disputation *on the Roman Pontiff*, and defended the position, "that he was an adulterer and the pander of the Church, a false prophet and the tail of the Dragon, the adversary of God and of Christ, the Antichrist, the evil servant who beats his fellow-servants, one who is unworthy of the title of BISHOP, and the destroyer and spoiler of the Church." Yet, even by this declaration, he could not satisfy the suspicious dispositions of certain persons. An individual was found, who, in a letter which he sent into Germany, placed a mutilated title before his Theses *on the secession from the Church of Rome*, from which foreigners and persons unacquainted with these affairs might conclude, that Arminius was most unreasonably attached to the Popish Church. But a certain minister of the Church of Amsterdam, impelled by these popular clamours, publicly inveighed against Arminius "as a most impure Divine, and one who accounted the Roman Pontiff to be a member of the body of Christ: This doctrine," he exclaimed, "was so displeasing to God, that, as it had been observed by some men of prudence, from the time when certain people undertook to defend it, the affairs of the Republic had begun to decline, and some of the most strongly-fortified cities had been seized by the enemy."—To this slander succeeded another, "that Arminius was the cause of the defection of many persons to Popery; and that he afforded an opportunity, to some politicians, less resolutely to deny the exercise of the Popish religion to those by whom it was desired."

But though Arminius esteemed no remedy superior to innocence and patience for dispersing these clouds of detraction, yet he occasionally preferred a complaint, about the injury thus inflicted on him, to the principal men who were distinguished for their wisdom and judgment, but chiefly to the Burgomasters of Amsterdam, in which city the licentiousness of detraction at that period transgressed all limits; and he proved, by his letters, that all these rumours were destitute of truth. The following is a brief declaration of his opinion on this subject, addressed to one of the honourable Burgomasters of Amsterdam, Sebastian Egberts, September 24th, 1608:

"I openly declare, that I do not own the Roman Pontiff to be a member of Christ's body; but I account him an enemy, a traitor, a sacrilegious and blasphemous man, a tyrant, and a violent usurper of most unjust domination over the Church, the

man of sin, the son of perdition, that most notorious outlaw, &c. But, in this description, I understand a Pope who discharges the functions of the Pontificate in the usual manner. But if an Adrian of Utrecht, raised to the Pontifical dignity without intrigues, were to attempt a reformation of the Church;—and were to make a commencement at the Pope himself, the Pontificate, and the Court of Rome;—and if he were to assume to himself nothing more than the name and authority of a Bishop, though holding, according to the ancient canons of the Church, the principal station among the rest of the Bishops;—on such a man I durst not bestow these epithets. For I cannot persuade myself, that an individual whom the satellites of Anti-christianity, and the Court of Rome, hated so dreadfully as to deprive him of existence, is that exceedingly wicked one whom I have described. It is believed, that Adrian was poisoned by those persons who were afraid of his effecting a reform in the Church, and especially in the Court of Rome. Yet I am of opinion, and I think it can be proved with great appearance of probability from the Scriptures, that a reform must not be expected from any one who is elevated to the Roman Pontificate; and that, if a person allows himself to be promoted to that dignity in hopes of personally accomplishing such a reform, he will incur the certain peril of death or exile,—because God himself has so ordered that matter. For the Pope shall be destroyed at the glorious [second] advent of Christ; and, according to prediction, the reform will take place by the separation of the nations from Babylon, which [typical] city will not be destitute of its head.—But if that preacher supposes it to be a consequence which flows from the sentiment which I hold, about *God not having yet sent a bill of divorce to the Church in which the Roman Pontiff presides*, that 'I acknowledge the Pontiff himself is a member of the Church;' by such a supposition he declares himself incapable of distinguishing between *those who have been led astray and still endure the tyranny*, and THE FALSE PROPHET AND TYRANT HIMSELF, who spontaneously divests himself of the appellation of *a member of the Church*, by assuming the title of HEAD OF THE CHURCH, and by actually excommunicating, or holding as excommunicated, all those who are unwilling to recognize him in that character. But if on this account such a charge can lawfully be made against me, I have, as my associates in this crime, Francis Junius and Luke Trelcatius, both of pious memory, beside Gomarus himself and the greatest part of our Divines."*

* On this subject, consult a letter from Arminius, in p. 580.

Brandt next presents his readers with a copious description of THE DECLARATION which Arminius delivered before the States of Holland, on the 30th of October, 1608, and which has received ample illustration between pages 516—668 in this volume.

W—Page 41.

Bertius has described the rapid progress which disease made on the delicate frame of Arminius; and says, "yet he did not discontinue the labours connected with his Lectures and his regular vocation, and never lost an opportunity of advocating his own cause when he deemed it necessary." The younger Brandt, after quoting this sentence, and some others, immediately subjoins:

This was shewn in a very conspicuous manner, at a certain public disputation which was held July 25th, 1609, *On the Calling of Men to Salvation.* On that occasion Arminius was very animated and lively, and in a strain of great eloquence not only denied that irresistible and necessitating force, which, according to the opinion of some among the Reformed, God Almighty employs in the conversion of men; but he likewise maintained, that the Divine Vocation of men to salvation was exercised thus, —God either supplies men with strength [or power,] or He is ready to bestow it, for the performance of that to which He calls men by his vocation.* He also said, "that he neither could nor durst define the method which the Holy Spirit uses in the conversion and regeneration of man: That, if any one else durst define the mode, the proof would rest with that individual: That he could say *how conversion was not effected*, that it was not by an irresistible force; but not *how it was:* That this is known to HIM alone who searches out the deep things of God."—When the opponent asserted, that there was some grace by which men might certainly be converted, and on that founded a

* In Borre's letter, the following very important explanation is added: "This must not be understood as if a man, at the very commencement of his vocation, could instantly perform whatever is required to salvation; *but that, by the assistance of Divine Grace which is always ready, it is in his power to perform that to which he is immediately called by his vocation.* For instance: When a man is called [by the Spirit of God] to the *confession* of his sins, he cannot immediately *repent* of the sins which he has committed, but he can *acknowledge* them. When he is called to serious grief on account of his sins of commission, he may be affected with that, and may conceive in his spirit true contrition, but he cannot immediately believe in Christ: And thus onwards, by always moving forward from the next lower degrees to those which are higher, till at length, being carried up, he is brought to the last of the divine commands, to the performance of which salvation is promised according to the gospel-covenant. I do not add any more, since I am writing to a man of understanding."

further argument for the necessity of conversion, Arminius embraced that occasion to enter into a long discussion on *the Necessity of Infallibility*, as the Schoolmen call it [*magna cum catechresi*] very improperly; and then added, "that the Schoolmen were not to him the rule either of speech or of faith, because they first came into notice at the time when Antichrist was revealed; and because Scholastic Divinity had never become prevalent, except when that which was true and apostolical had been banished."

Almost two full hours had been spent by the two opponents, when, about eleven o'clock, a certain Papist, assuming the name of Adrian Smith, (whom some people supposed to be a Priest, and others a Jesuit,) boldly descended into the arena against Arminius, and by many arguments attacked his sentiments on this subject.* While Arminius was engaged in reply to each of them *seriatim*, the countenance of Gomarus changed colours, and, that he might have the semblance of being only an idle auditor, he occasionally varied his gestures,—sometimes scribbling a little, at other times whispering something into the ears of Everard Vorstius, the Professor of Medicine, who sat next to him,—one moment casting his eyes rapidly over the audience, that was very numerous, and the next moment muttering something between his teeth. He appeared desirous of contradicting what was said in the midst of the disputation; but he restrained himself,—though he suffered these or similar expressions to fall from his indignant lips, *What impudence is this?*—At the close of the disputation, scarcely had Gomarus passed out of the Divinity Hall when he exclaimed, *The reins have been given up to the Papists in fine style, to-day!* and presently joining Arminius, he said to him in the presence and within hearing of the Jesuit, *that he had never before heard such speeches and disputations, by which the door was so widely opened to the Papists.*—Arminius replied, "that he had satisfied his own conscience;" but he denied, that there was "any thing in the disputation which could at all promote the interests of the Papacy."—Gomarus then said, *that he would publicly refute what had been advanced.* Arminius rejoined, "If any thing be spoken in opposition to my conscience, I promise likewise to give it a public contradiction.—Gomarus promptly declared, *I will not be wanting to the cause.* Arminius answered, "I also hope, that I shall not be wanting. But we will make an experiment at the proper time; and I am fully persuaded, that the doc-

* These arguments, and the replies of Arminius, as related in Borre's letter, are highly worthy of perusal.

trine of *Irresistible Grace* [which had formed a part of the disputation] is repugnant to the Sacred Scriptures, to all the Ancients, and to our own Confession and Catechism."

After holding this disputation, he repaired to Oudewater, his birth-place, for the purpose of recruiting his health; and on the evening of the same day, had there to struggle with a most grievous paroxysm, which once more broke his strength, and distracted the minds of all those who enjoyed the benefit of his society and friendship. The depth of sorrow with which the ill health of his great preceptor, whom he always addressed as his Father, affected Simon Episcopius, who had then gone to Franequer principally for the sake of attending the Lectures of Drusius, he has himself testified, in a letter which he sent to Arminius, immediately after the receipt of the preceding letter from Borre,* and of which the following is an extract:

"Reverend Doctor and most honoured Father, although since my departure I have addressed no letter to you, yet I would not have you believe that this has been occasioned by any forgetfulness of you, or by a supine and ungrateful neglect of your merits. But though my dependence on your singular affection for me, from which I have confidently promised myself many and great things; and, chiefly, through the knowledge which I had, that, beside those serious and important occupations all of which now assail you together and devolve on your head, you are likewise distracted with the distressing pain of a pertinacious disorder; I durst not further distract you, when it was not in my power to elevate your spirits or to afford you entertainment, and I was also unwilling to be troublesome to one who was more than sufficiently afflicted: I therefore thought you would be satisfied with my grateful recollection of you, and by the frequent indications of my affectionate regards, through those to whom I occasionally wrote. I wish, and may God grant, that we might be allowed to recollect you, reverend sir, with pleasure in this most desperate age, to which, through you, God Almighty seems to have manifested some remedy: Oh that He had not merely *manifested* it! For, what do we now behold? While we are indulging anxious desires, and at the same time

* At the conclusion of Borre's letter to Episcopius, after alluding to the continued indisposition of Arminius, he says: "I am much afraid, that this most excellent light will be taken away from us before the time. But what can be done? We cannot resist God, who wills nothing but what is good, and what is really good to his people. Let us importunately apply to Him in ardent prayer, and add fasting to our supplications, that God may at least not so speedily deprive us of his presence."—There was much of this spirit of ancient piety among the early Dutch Arminians: They justly attributed great things to the prayer of Faith, especially when united with fasting.

exciting within ourselves the confidence of hope, yet no more agreeable intelligence is conveyed to us, than that your disorder does not abate; but that it continues still obstinate, and that it is irritated by the malignant and choleric actions of some persons, which induce a relapse after the disease had previously seemed to be removed. If you allow it possible for me to ponder over your affairs only for one moment, and to place any value, however inadequate, on both the utility and the necessity of your Lectures, you may easily conceive how afflictive to me must be the tidings of your continued indisposition. I should be very ungrateful, if any day passed by, which did not at frequent intervals admonish and remind me of your malady; the consideration of which does indeed afflict me every day in such a manner, that when it occurs to my mind, a fresh sympathy with the disorder seems to seize and infect me. O that this sympathetic feeling could extend itself so far, as to return you any solace or alleviation! But it will not perhaps be the will of God to bless, by means of you, the men of this unwilling, ungrateful and stubborn age, who are neither desirous to know the things which make for their peace, nor to acknowledge the time of their visitation."

But while fresh controversies had for some time been rising from the Schools to the Pulpit, and had descended even to the markets, the streets, and the porches of houses; and while persons both in high and in low stations occupied themselves in those discussions, and many through ignorance ascribed to Arminius the sentiments of Gomarus, and *vice versa;* some individual, this year, (1609,) published a *Dutch* translation of *the Theses on Predestination*, as they had been defended by each of these Professors some years before, and every one thus had an opportunity of gaining more accurate information on the state of this controversy. The translation of these Theses was soon followed by a Dialogue, the production of R. Donteklok, minister of Delft, in which he asserted, that the opinions of Arminius were in direct opposition to the Reformed doctrine, as received in Holland, and could not be endured in any divine; but that though the opinions of Gomarus, even in his judgment, rose to a greater height than those in common use, yet they were capable of being reconciled together. J. Arnold Corvinus, minister of the Church in Leyden, immediately refuted this Dialogue, in a pamphlet which he published and entitled, *A Christian and Serious Admonition to Christian Peace.* To this pamphlet also Donteklok soon published a reply. To invalidate the unfair and unfounded rumours with which Arminius was

attacked, his friends, about the same time, translated into the Dutch language and published his Theses *On the Providence of God concerning Evil, On Man's Free Will and its Powers*, and likewise those *On Indulgences and Purgatory* which he had written against the Papists. But the union of the Churches was not cemented by these small publications; on the contrary, as discord increased daily from that period, they seem to have operated as oil when it is poured on a fire. In reference to this circumstance, the States of Holland and West Friezland were pleased to command, that a friendly conference should again be held, between Gomarus and Arminius, on the points in controversy between them.

A full account of this meeting, connected as it was with the revision of the ecclesiastical formularies, will be found in the General Introduction to this Work.

X.—Page 33.

I had devoted this Appendix to some of the numerous testimonies in favour of Arminius; but, on account of the press of other important materials, I have been compelled to place those testimonies in the Preface to this volume, to which I refer the reader for further information.

Y.—Page 44.

The Calvinists of that age were remarkably superstitious with regard to Anagrams on proper names. This perverted taste had its origin among the learned of the early Protestants, who, to discover and demonstrate the Apocalyptic number, (666,) and other equally obscure matters, anagrammatized almost every epithet that had been profanely applied to the Pope or to his dominion. It would have been wonderful indeed, if some of those Anagrams had not appeared exceedingly plausible, when the inventors of them considered themselves at liberty to add or omit a letter of the original name, to suit their purpose. To counteract the prejudice created against the Romish Church by this species of literary warfare, some of the shrewdest amongst the Papists proved its inaptitude and inconclusiveness, by shewing that it might be applied with baneful effect to the titles of our Divine Redeemer, and to other sacred names.

On the principle of fighting the enemies of Arminius with their own weapons, one of his friends, by the addition of H which belonged to his Dutch name, composed this Anagram Jacobus Arminius, — Habui Curam Sionis, "I have had a regard to the welfare of Sion:" This comported much better with

he character and conduct of Arminius, than VANI ORBIS AMICUS, hich Bertius has quoted in the text.

In connection with this subject, the subjoined "right merry ory" occurs in HEYLIN's *Life of Archbishop Laud*:—"That the her sex might whet their tongues upon him also, the Lady avies, the widow of Sir John Davies, Attorney-General for ing James in the realm of Ireland, scatters a prophecy ainst him. This Lady had before spoken something unckily of the Duke of Buckingham, importing, 'that he should t live till the end of August,' which raised her to the reputan of a *cunning woman* amongst the ignorant people: And w she prophesies of the new Archbishop, 'That he should e but few days after the fifth of November;' for which, and her prophecies of a more mischievous nature she was after ought into the Court of High-Commission; the woman being own so mad, that she fancied the spirit of the Prophet Daniel have been infused into her body: And this she grounded on Anagram which she made of her name, viz. ELEANOR AVIES, REVEAL O DANIEL: And though the Anagram had o much by an L, and too little by an S; yet she found *Daniel* d *Reveal* in it, and that served her turn. Much pains was ken by the Court to dispossess her of this spirit; but all ould not do, till Lamb, then Dean of the Arches, shot her rough and through, with an arrow borrowed from her own uiver: For whilst the Bishops and Divines were reasoning the oint with her out of Holy Scripture, he took a pen into his and, and at last hit upon this excellent Anagram, viz. DAME LEANOR DAVIES, 'NEVER SO MAD A LADIE:' Which aving proved to be true by the rules of art, 'Madam,' said e, 'I see you build much on Anagrams, and I have found out ne which I hope will fit you:' This said, and reading it aloud, e put it into her hands in writing, which happy fancy brought hat grave Court into such a laughter, and the poor woman hereupon into such a confusion, that afterwards she grew either iser, or was less regarded. This ended as successfully as he ould desire."

Z.—Page 46.

This extract from the last Will and Testament of Arminius, which shews at once his general philanthropy and his particular atred of Popery, as a perversion of Christianity, has been nimadverted upon in a manner the most unaccountable by Mosheim, in his Ecclesiastical History. I had prepared a few emarks on this subject before I saw the very able and

spirited article on ARMINIANISM in the Edinburgh Encyclopædia, from which I make the following judicious and elucidatory extract:

"But the most eminent of those who became Arminians, or who ranked among the professed followers of Arminius, soon adopted views *of the corruption of man, of justification, of the righteousness of Christ, of the nature of faith, of the province of good works, and of the necessity and operations of grace*, that are quite contrary to those which he had entertained and published: Many of them, in process of time, differed more or less from one another, on some or all of these points. Even the Confession of Faith, which was drawn out for the Arminians by Episcopius, and is to be found in the second volume of his Works, cannot be referred to as a standard: It was composed merely to counteract the reproach of their being a society without any common principles. It is expressed chiefly in the words and phrases of scripture, to which, of course, every one would annex his own meaning. Besides, no person, not even a pastor, was obliged, by any form, to adhere strictly to it; but every one was left entirely at liberty to interpret its language in the manner that was most agreeable to his own private sentiments. Accordingly, so various and inconsistent are their opinions, that could Arminius peruse the unnumbered volumes which have been written as expositions and illustrations of Arminian doctrine, he would be at a loss to discover his own simple system, amidst that heterogeneous mass of error with which it has been rudely mixed; and would be astonished to find, that the controversy which he had unfortunately, but conscientiously, introduced, had wandered far from the point to which he had confined it, and that with his name dogmas were associated, the unscriptural and dangerous nature of which he had pointed out and condemned.

"At the same time, it must be acknowledged, that of this state of things, by which his memory is injured and thoughtless people are deceived, he himself laid the foundation. The same temper of mind which led him to renounce the peculiarities of Calvinism, induced him also to adopt more enlarged and liberal views of church communion than those which had hitherto prevailed. While he maintained that the mercy of God is not confined to a chosen few, he conceived it to be quite inconsistent with the genius of Christianity, that men of that religion should keep at a distance from each other, and constitute separate churches, merely because they differed in their opinions as to some of its doctrinal articles. He thought that Christians of all denominations should form one great community, united and

upheld by the bonds of charity and brotherly love; with the exception, however, of Roman Catholics, who, on account of their idolatrous worship and persecuting spirit, must be unfit members of such a society, That this was not only agreeable to the wishes of Arminius, but one chief object of his labours, is evident from a passage in his last will, which he made a little before his death: *Ea proposui et docui quæ*, &c.—All the doc-'trines advanced by me, have been such as might conduce to 'the propagation and increase of the truth of the Christian 'Religion, of the true worship of God, of general piety, and 'of a holy conversation among men,—and such as might con-'tribute, according to the word of God, to a state of tranquillity 'and peace well befitting the Christian name; and that from these 'benefits I have excluded the Papacy, with which no unity of 'faith, no bond of piety or of Christian peace can be preserved.'

"Mosheim has stated this circumstance in a note to his history of the Arminian Church;* but his statement, or rather the conclusion which he deduces from it, is evidently unfair and incorrect. He alleges, that Arminius had actually laid the plan of that theological system, which was afterwards embraced by his followers; that he had inculcated the main and leading principles of it on the minds of his disciples; and that Episcopius and others, who rejected Calvinism in more points than in that which related to the divine decrees, only propagated, with greater courage and perspicuity, the doctrines which Arminianism, as taught by its founder, already contained. These allegations, it is clear, have no sort of connection with the passage from which

* "It is a common opinion, that the ancient Arminians, who flourished before the Synod of Dort, were much more sound in their opinions, and strict in their morals, than those who have lived after this period; that Arminius himself only rejected the Calvinistical doctrine of absolute decrees, and what he took to be its immediate consequences, adopting in all other points the doctrines received in the Reformed Churches: But that his disciples, and more especially Episcopius, had boldly transgressed the bounds that had been wisely prescribed by their master, and had gone over to the Pelagians, and even to the Socinians. Such, I say, is the opinion commonly entertained concerning this matter. But it appears, on the contrary, evident to me, that Arminius himself had laid the plan of that theological system, that was, in after times, embraced by his followers, and that he had instilled the main principles of it into the minds of his disciples; and that these latter, and particularly Episcopius, did really no more than bring this plan to a greater degree of perfection, and propagate, with more courage and perspicuity, the doctrines it contained. I have the testimony of Arminius to support this notion, besides many others that might be alleged in its behalf; for, in the last will made by this eminent man, a little before his death, he plainly and positively declares, that the great object he had in view, in all his theological and ministerial labours, was to unite in one community, cemented by the bonds of fraternal charity, all sects and denominations of Christians, the Papists excepted."—*Ecclesiastical History.*

they are drawn as inferences; and they are wholly inconsistes with the assertions, and reasonings, and declarations of Arm nius, when he is discussing the merits of the question that w agitated between him and the Geneva school. Arminius, i addition to the scheme of doctrine which he taught, was anxiou to establish this maxim, and to reduce it to practice, that, wit the exception above-mentioned, no difference of opinions shoul prevent Christians from remaining in one church or religiou body. He did not mean to insinuate, that a difference o opinion was of no consequence at all; that they who thoug one way, were just as right as they who thought a contra way; or that men have no occasion to be solicitous about th religious tenets which they hold. He did not mean to give u his own system as equally true, or equally false with that o Calvin; and as little could he be supposed to sanction those se timents of his followers, which were in direct opposition to th sentiments which he himself had maintained. But he ende voured, in the first place, to assert liberty of conscience, and o worship; and then, upon that fundamental principle, to pe suade all Christians, however divided in opinion, to lay aside th distinctions of sect and party, and in one united body to consu that tranquillity and peace which is so agreeable to the Chri tian name. This we conceive to have been the object of Arm nius; an object so indicative of an enlightened mind, so con genial to that charity which hopeth all things, and thinketh n evil, and so conducive to the interests of religion and the pea of the world, as to reflect the highest honour on him by whom it was first pursued, and to constitute the true glory of Arm nianism.

"From the remarks which we have made, an accurate idea may be formed of that system which is properly entitled Arm nianism; and consequently of the justice with which those ar called Arminians, who commonly assume that appellation. Th confusion which prevails on this subject, has arisen, in a grea measure, from not attending to the distinction between *holdin purely Arminian doctrine*, and *belonging to the Arminia church*. Even a Calvinist, who necessarily rejects the former may yet be a member of the latter, (though we doubt if ther be any instances of this on record;) because according to th views and wishes of Arminius, that church is, exclusively o Papists, the church universal, actually and freely receivin into its bosom Christians of every sect. The number of tru Arminians has never, we believe, been very great; but i appears, that almost all who have been called Arminians, hav

agreed in being Anti-calvinists, so far as the dogmas respecting unconditional election, particular redemption, and the irresistibility of divine grace, are involved."

A A.—Page 47.

In this Appendix I add, in the words of Brandt, a few particulars concerning Arminius, which were omitted by Bertius.

To those who stood around his death-bed he frequently repeated the 20th and 21st verses of the thirteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, from which he had taken the first of those forms of prayer which are quoted in page 44. Arminius recited this passage of the Sacred Writer with such ardency of mind and fervour of spirit, as fixed it ever afterwards deeply in the memory, and imprinted it on the mind, of the Rev. Bartholomew Prevost, a pupil worthy of such a master, and afterwards Pastor of the Remonstrant Church at Amsterdam. About the same time, too, the very learned Simon Episcopius left Franeker and came into Holland, to perform the last offices of piety to his preceptor: He sedulously remained for some days and nights at the side of the couch of Arminius, with whom he held different conversations on the subject of religion, the state of the Church, the knowledge of the Saviour, and the efficacy of his death and resurrection.

The eldest of Arminius's nine children was only seventeen years of age when his father died. The names of the two daughters were Gertrude and Angelica: The seven boys were called, Herman, Peter, John, Laurence, James, William, and Daniel. Of these, Laurence became a merchant in the city of Amsterdam; and Daniel exercised the profession of Medicine with the highest reputation:* The rest of the children died in the flower of youth, soon after their father.

* When this son, Daniel, was born, (May 2, 1605,) Arminius mentioned the circumstance, at the close of one of his letters to Uitenbogaert, in the following strain of pleasantry:—"But let us turn to more delightful subjects. This morning, half an hour after five o'clock, my wife presented me with a ninth child, and a seventh son in an uninterrupted line, who is a Physician by his very nativity, if any credence may be given to these words of Anthony Ansaldus: *It is proved by sure experience, that the infant who in a continual series is born the seventh male, can cure wens and scrophulous affections by his touch alone. This gift, by a certain rare privilege of God, is likewise granted to our Most Christian Kings of France.* (Cent. iii, sec. 66.)—But if an unwavering faith be required on the part of the parent, that this gift should be rendered apparent in his son, I have my fears of its accomplishment in my boy.—The mother and her child are well; for which blessing I return immortal thanks to God, whom I humbly intreat and beseech to preserve both of them unto me, according to his good pleasure: With these my wishes, I desire you will deign to unite your prayers to the Giver of every good gift. Have the goodness to communicate this my joy to Uytenengius and his wife, that they may offer up intercessions for me and mine."

We subjoin a brief description of his body and mind. In stature he did not exceed the middle size. His eyes were dark and sprightly—the sure indications of quickness of mind and genius. He was of a serene countenance, of a sanguine constitution of body, compact in his limbs, and rather robust, as long as his age permitted it. He possessed a voice that was slender yet sweet, melodious and acute: But it was admirably adapted for persuasion. If any subject was to be adorned, or to be oratorically discussed, it was done distinctly, the pronunciation of the words and the inflexion of the voice being evidently accommodated to the things themselves.

With regard to his civil conversation, he was courteous and affable towards all men, respectful to his superiors, and condescending to his inferiors. He was hospitable, cheerful, and not averse to a little innocent mirth and wit among friends, for the sake of mental relaxation. But in those qualities which constitute a serious man, a good christian, and a consummate divine in the church, he was, as far as human infirmity permitted, second to no one. He reverenced and honoured Almighty God alone, and he suffered no day to pass without pious meditations and a careful perusal of the Sacred Records, always commencing the duties of the morning with earnest supplications and thanksgivings; and, that he might make still greater progress in the study of piety and truth, to these prayers he added frequent fastings. He preferred to be really pious, to the mere appearance of piety; and he accounted no course of conduct so proper, as that of directing all his actions according to the rule of a pure conscience, and not by the opinion of other people: By his own example he confirmed the truth of the motto on his seal, in the sentiment of which he greatly delighted—" A Good Conscience is a Paradise."

There was nothing which Arminius was more desirous to behold, than the extinction of the torch of discord, the established concord of the Christian Commonwealth, divided though it now is into parties, and the exercise of mutual toleration respecting such controversies as do not shake the foundations of a faith that is truly saving. That immoderate passion for condemning those who differ in the slightest degree on the subject of religion, often caused him to weep. When his mind was thus moved, he very frequently repeated this complaint of St. Hilary,—" While one smites another with anathemas, and expels him from communion, very few men pay any regard to Christ!"

He rarely employed oratorical preparatives or the honeyed

rhetoric of the Greeks, either because he was naturally abhorrent to them, or because he thought the use of those showy appendages and adscititious ornaments unworthy the Majesty of Divine Things, when naked Truth is amply sufficient for its own defence. Yet we may perceive, by his letters to Drusius, that he placed a high value on the knowledge of Hebrew and Oriental Literature; by which he considered it possible not only to discover and explain the phrases of the Sacred Language, but likewise the antiquities of the ancient Jewish Church, and the rites, manners and customs of that people both in their sacred and civil concerns: He thought such knowledge useful and necessary for forming a perfect divine, and exhibited no small displeasure against those persons who lightly esteemed these and similar studies. A smart disputant on those subjects which appertain to religion, and skilful in turning the subtleties of his adversaries against themselves, in other respects he shewed himself averse to discussions of an abstruse description except in cases of necessity; and he endeavoured to devote all his learning, and all the powers of his mind and genius, to such a course of living as might be worthy of a christian man. In teaching, he displayed no superciliousness; in interpreting his own thoughts, he was complaisant, mild, and perspicuous; in argumentation, he was circumspect; and he had such slight confidence in himself, that he refused to gratify the wishes of his friends, who urged him to publish some of the works which he had written. In reference to this, he was accustomed to charge his famous colleague, Trelcatius junior, with no small degree of imprudence for having published in his youthful days, "A *Body of Christian Divinity*," in which Arminius thought he had written some things well, but several others in a manner not sufficiently agreeable to the Sacred Writings.

Not only during the life of Arminius, but also after his death, various were the judgments passed on him. Scarcely had Peter Bertius pronounced over him a Funeral Oration, when Gomarus attacked his deceased colleague and the man who celebrated his virtues; and, in a pamphlet which he published against Arminius, he detracted much from the commendations bestowed on him and Bertius. But the eyes of Gomarus smarted greatly at the sight of a poem, with which the honourable Grotius had honoured the memory of Arminius; and he blamed particularly the following lines in it:

> Indigniore parte fractus et languens,
> Meliore sospes, illa millibus multis
> Monstrata per te regna SOLUS arderes.

This word SOLUS, "alone," had procured much ill-will to this very celebrated poet and to Arminius himself; though the offensive word had crept in by the negligence of the printer or of some other person who superintended the publication, and the word TOTUS, "entirely," should have been substituted in its place. Grotius informed Gomarus of this unpleasant mistake in the following letter, which has never before been published, and in which he proved himself to be an appropriate defender of his own Funereal Verses:

"*To that reverend and most famous man,* FRANCIS GOMARUS, *Professor of Divinity in the University of Leyden.*

"REVEREND SIR,

"I suppose you will have already seen my Iambics on the death of Arminius; in which if you found any thing that pleased you, I should feel much gratified. But the very thing which, I understand, has excited your displeasure, is likewise displeasing to me. I had written, that your colleague, while labouring for things of the highest importance, was entirely inflamed in all his powers with the desire of obtaining [for himself and others] a better life in heaven. I know not whose evil hand it is, that has transformed the word TOTUS, 'entirely,' into SOLUS, 'alone;' a substitution that appeared to me so foolish, as to be incapable of receiving any good meaning. Whoever the man may be, I wonder at his audacity and stupidity in making himself so unhappily critical and busy in the productions of another person. But if it was necessary to make any emendation, I ought to have been consulted. Immediately after the publication, I complained to the very learned Heinsius and other friends, that I had reasons for complaining in this particular of the fidelity of the publishers, and of their diligence in several others.

"But, in praising Arminius after his decease, my purpose was, to give to him, to whom while alive I could refuse no kind of service, this testimony—which from the sentiments of my heart I seemed enabled to give,—that he possessed a genius which was by no means of a common description and a certain kind of eloquence, both of which I always admired in him: For I had known the man, though it was only as I knew several others, by no connection of intimate friendship. I also added, that, not only in those things in which he most ably defended the Truth against the Papacy, but likewise in those things in which it was possible for him to be in error, he had done nothing contrary to the dictates of his conscience at the suggestion of

any perverse humour: Such was the judgment which charity dictated. Besides I had declared, that Arminius had directed his wishes to the peace of the Church, especially when he was in the immediate prospect of death.

"With regard, however, to those things in which Arminius was at disagreement with you and other good men, I have not a sufficient knowledge of them; and if I had, I would not rashly intermeddle. That disagreement has its own judges. By the good grace of God, I think it is allowable to us, who are occupied about other matters, to remain in ignorance of many things,*

* Grotius fell into the same mistake as that into which some of our modern statesmen have fallen, who, in attempting to grant increased facilities *for the Roman Catholic religion to spread its paralysing influence more completely over the most ignorant part of the British populace*, have wished to separate the *religious* consideration of that question from the *political*,—but this is impossible, as Milton long ago most ably demonstrated, and as Grotius found it in the case of Arminianism and Calvinism.

In the letter already quoted in page 297, he manifests his *impartiality* in those controversies, if not his *leaning towards the followers of Junius*,—the milder race of Dutch Calvinists. Describing the Conference between Arminius and Gomarus before the States of Holland in 1608, he says to his relative Reygersbergen: "We came afterwards to *the Perfection of Saints*: I know not whether I should call the view which Arminius has of this subject *an opinion*, or *a doubt and question*. I had some conversation with Uitenbogardt about it after the Conference with Gomarus; and the result of what I then learnt and had formerly known, was, that the opinion of Arminius seemed to me repugnant to the definition of the Catechism, in *the negative answer* which is given to this interrogatory, 'Is it possible for the Saints in this life to fulfil the law?' Nor does the remark which Arminius makes appear true,—*that the interrogatory regarded* POSSIBILITY, *but that the answer had reference to* ACTUAL PRACTICE. For the negative reply is a denial of what is stated in the question; although, I confess, the reason which is given, [in the reply,] and the scriptural authority which is subjoined, have a more special regard to *action*: Yet I do not perceive what that *power* or *ability* can be which is never brought forth into *action*."—Grotius was only a raw Theologian when he made this remark; as will be evident to every one who is acquainted with the disputes between very learned and accomplished divines of the Church of England, respecting the import of particular Articles: Thus, for instance, in the Article *on Original Sin*, the expression, "*far gone* from original righteousness," is explained in a different manner by those divines who prefer the reading of the Latin copies, *quam longissime*. The same observation will apply to the Heidelberg Catechism, which was then extant both in Latin, Dutch, French, and German.

In his letter to John Rutgersius of Leyden, in Dec. 1609, Grotius requests that learned man to "lend him his eyes" while his verses on the death of Arminius were passing a second time through the press, "that a similar mistake" to the one which is noted in the text "might not again occur." After giving a summary of his letter to Gomarus, he says, "I ingenuously confess, that I do not understand a great part of these controversies: Nor indeed do they appertain to the duties a Pensionary. A moderate share of Theology is sufficient for us."—But his own conscience soon told him, that he could not properly legislate on subjects which he did not completely understand; and having in his very boyhood evinced his aptitude to receive knowledge of the most abstruse description almost by intuition, he was easily prevailed upon by the most illustrious statesmen in Holland, to apply his great mind to the

and about several others to withhold our consent. But though I do not suspend my faith on human authority, yet I gladly confess that, on those topics on which I entertain any doubts, I

attainment of a correct acquaintance with the subjects then in dispute among the ecclesiastics. The first fruits of his theological studies were displayed in his *Ordinum Hollandiæ ac West Friziæ Pietas*, &c. vindicating the conduct of the States of Holland in their guarded proceedings with respect to the call of Vorstius, &c., against the animadversions of Sybrands Lubbertus. He proceeded with great regularity in these studies, and soon found to which side the Ancient Fathers inclined. In a letter to his friend Vossius in 1613, he says, "I do not profess to be a Divine, except so much of one as is necessary for a Christian; and I know far less than is demanded by the necessity of my office and of the times in which we live. I have hitherto been engaged in reading the Fathers, to assure myself that the doctrine of *an enslaved Will*, and of the *Necessary Perseverance of those who believe*, is not very ancient. You act a friendly part in praying, that I may possess fortitude of mind and strength of body: I also beseech God, to endow me with his gifts, and speedily to recal me into the right way if on any point I have strayed."—The result of his extensive course of reading in Divinity was exhibited, the next year, 1614, in his famous Decree concerning Toleration, (see p. 412,) and in his able defence of it, entitled, *Defensio Decreti Ordinum*, &c.

But the most ingenuous and interesting account of the origin and progress of his theological studies, is that which he gives in a letter to the famous Thuanus, dated June 5, 1615, of which the following is an extract: "I have entered on a controversial species of writing, not by the direction of my own disposition which is not in the least inclined to strife, but I have been impelled by a force of a superior description,—by the advice of prudent men, and by an intense desire to assist my country and the Church; the Church indeed more than my country. For, to declare the truth to you, most illustrious Thuanus, (and in fact what man is there, who is more worthy to hear the truth than yourself?) from the period when I began to think with deeper attention about religious matters, I found, that the complaints had been exceedingly just of those who requested to obtain some amendment [to the existing system,] not only in the explanation of doctrines, but likewise in rites and government; but that as is usual on such occasions, some offence had been committed through an excess of contradiction: Thus while they [the early Reformers] abandoned the dangerous faith in *Merits*, they insensibly contracted sentiments contemptuous of *Good Works*; through a disgust at *Superstition*, all *Forms of public service* [liturgies] were blasted with wonderful frigidity; and from a fear of *Tyranny*, which had been intolerable, they had proceeded to the very confines of *Anarchy*. Wherefore I was always of opinion, that the good men who are [*in nostra parte*] of our party, the Protestants, ought to employ their utmost exertions to bring back again by degrees to a Golden Mean whatever might have erred from a right course [had been *exorbitant*]: This consideration, I perceive, was fixed deeply on the mind of Melanchthon. But no objection produced, I will not say *against our Churches*, but *against the most celebrated divines of our Churches*, is more scandalous than this—that by urging too strongly certain rigid dogmas, which savour more of the Portico of Zeno than of the Porch of Solomon, they ascribe to God the causes of sin, and by their unedifying discourse subvert all regard for godliness. This also was perceived by the same Melanchthon; but, at the warning of Erasmus, being called off and drawn away from those rocks against which Luther had been impetuously driven, he afterwards corrected his course. When certain pastors among us followed in the footsteps of Melanchthon, but, being oppressed by the impetuosity of their colleagues, found the sole refuge in the kindness of the magistrates, I united myself to those who thought a matter past all endurance, that a thing most pernicious in its nature at the very commencement [of the Reformation] should pass for a precedent, and that it should

annot easily be moved from the sentiments of those whom the Church has hitherto acknowledged as standard-bearers in the ure Reformation. But my mind is particularly attached to many of the precepts of Francis Junius, whose memory I highly revere. Besides, in all controversies, I am always inclined wards that party which ascribes the most to Divine Grace, and e least to ourselves. I am grieved at these dissensions: But the Church never yet was long without them, and never will be. It emains, that we bear one with another; and that, amidst the many things which human infirmity renders uncertain, we may old those certain things on which the hopes of our salvation are ounded.

"But I pray God, Reverend Sir, to direct your labours to his object, to which without doubt you have regard,—to the

openly declared concerning such as pursued moderate counsels, *They cannot be tolerated in our churches.* When some violent divines in our vicinity fiercely opposed themselves to this pious design, and connected with it such matters as obviously did not belong to it, solely to excite hatred against the Magistrates while adopting pacific measures; it was deemed proper to shew one of these pragmatical doctors, who far surpassed the rest in violence, and who in a most wicked manner had implored the aid of a foreign power, how those turbulent clamours had no foundation either in law or in equity. I was chosen to execute this task, not because there were not several persons who could have performed it with more correctness, but because that province seemed to belong to the office which I then sustained. Neither was I ignorant of the consequences of irritating wasps; but relying on the consciousness of an honourable purpose, I ventured to offer myself to calumny, from which those persons will never escape who attempt to oppose mature and strong vices.

"But I return you thanks, illustrious man, and at the same time I acknowledge your abundant good-will towards me and your eminent wisdom, for having advised me to abstain in future from contentions of this description. Influenced therefore both by your authority, and entirely inclined by my own choice to practise such prudent counsel, I will anxiously avoid all contests that are not absolutely necessary: The adoption of this course is, I see, of the greatest consequence, as you justly observe, to my tranquillity of mind, and to the health of my body, which is not sufficiently established as I find by experience."

It was after a long and cautious investigation which commenced at the early Christian Fathers, and was continued through the productions of the most eminent modern divines, that Grotius became attached to the principles of the deceased Arminius, and avowed himself the patron of the prudent and tolerant views of his early followers. This great man always admired the moderation displayed by the venerable Reformers of the Church of England; and often mentioned them in his published writings and in his private correspondence, as examples worthy of general imitation. One great object of the long digression about this illustrious individual in my *Calvinism and Arminianism Compared*, was, to vindicate his beloved memory from the unjust attacks of his Popish and Puritanic slanderers. Among those of the former class may be reckoned, his French biographer Burigny, who, contrary to all historic evidence, strives on every occasion to represent him as Papistically inclined; and the bold yet malicious Bishop of Meaux, who, like the most forward and ill-informed defenders of that corrupt church in our days, audaciously maligned Grotius as a Semi-pelagian, —"a man," as Dr. Jortin sententiously observes, "infinitely superior to an hundred Bossuets!"

tranquillity of the church, and to the confirmation of true doctrine.—I am

"*The most observant regarder of your Reputation,*
"HUGH DE GROOT."

But the very same adversaries, with whom he had often before had contests, following the footsteps of Gomarus, traduced Arminius as "a man of well-practised genius; but one to whom nothing was pleasing, unless it presented itself under some semblance of novelty; so that he seemed to nauseate most of the doctrines which were received in the Churches, even on this very account—*because they were received.*"*—There were besides among the foreign divines those who, through a certain blind prejudice, and by attributing more than was just to the clamours of certain zealots, called him "the enemy of God," and "a man of a crafty disposition, who had done every thing in an artful manner, and, in imitation of Ham, had disclosed the shame of his fathers, and who in a scandalous manner had pierced the very body of the Reformed Church through the sides of the most holy chiefs of the Reformation."—John Hornbeck writes, that "Arminius confided too much in his own speculations," and that "he was detected in his eager desires to dissolve other things:" Then adopting the words of Tacitus as his own, he calls Arminius, "a violator of treaties, who broke the promise which he had made to God and the Church; and who, with nefarious daring, at first secretly and afterwards openly, both by himself and by his pupils and associates, began to disturb and pervert the faith of the Churches and the doctrine of Christ, and not the Church only, but likewise the State: And he would have accomplished his design, had not God granted Divine succour when affairs were in this dangerous situation."

On the other part, as Arminius had amply refuted these charges, and many others of the same kind; so the vindication of his blessed memory was undertaken by Bertius, Uitenbogaert, Episcopius, Corvinus, Narsius, Courcelles, Poelenburgh, and others, whom on that account their adversaries began to designate by the name of ARMINIANS. But let us, in the first place, listen to Arnold Poelenburgh, a most worthy vindicator of the Remonstrants, who advocated the cause of Arminius against the accusations of Hornbeck. In reply to the passage just cited,† he says, "Behold how fervid is Hornbeck with a passion for calumny! For, what good purpose did it answer, to traduce

* Historical Preface to the Acts of the Synod of Dort.

† See Poelenburgh's *Letter to Hornbeck*, in which the eighth book of Hornbeck's *Summary of the Controversies* is refuted. Amsterdam, 1655.

ırminius of pious memory as *one who confided in his own specu-tions?*, when he professed to regard the Sacred Scriptures, as ıe sole rule of his faith, and far excelled his adversaries both in ıe number and weight of the scriptural testimonies which he lduced.—What object could be gained by asserting, *that Armi-ıus was detected in his eager desires to dissolve other things?*, ho had no higher wish, than to see the Church restored to its imitive purity and tranquillity.—But, on reading those words which Hornbeck calls Arminius, who was one of the best of en, *a violator of treaties*, I was indeed filled with horror; nor m I adequately imagine whence a man who is writing false-ods, and defending an unjust cause, has obtained such con-mmate and unusual audacity! For is that man to be styled *violator of treaties*, who defends with all his powers the venant which God has made with the whole human race? here is now, therefore, no reason why Hornbeck may not call most all the Ancient Fathers *violators of treaties*, because they ther were ignorant of Absolute Predestination, or were its pposers.—But I seem at length to have discovered to what all is refers—that Arminius did not subscribe to the Dutch Con-ssion and Catechism. But, it has already been stated, that any traces of our sentiments were extant in those writings.* ırminius never so bound his Faith within any human produc-ions, as to suppose that they were not at all times to be examined ı the balances of the Sacred Records. Why does he not style uther, Musculus, and several more, *truce-breakers*, because, hen they were bound by oath to the Papacy, they could not with good conscience remain in Popery? For as the Papists did oth now and in former times, so do the moderns among the leformed,—they unhappily defend certain of their own most rievous errors by the assistance of the Sacred Writings badly nderstood; although we confess, that they do not defend them ı a method entirely similar. That therefore which was lawful ɔ multitudes of others before his time, was likewise lawful to ırminius.—But I form this persuasion within my own mind,—hat it was not merely lawful for this eminent man who was dorned with excellent endowments, but that it was likewise ıcumbent on his office, to resist with all his might those widely-preading errors which were then generally considered as neces-ıry truths."

But without urging the testimonies of Remonstrants, we may nderstand the high estimation in which the most honourable he Curators of the University continued to hold the name of

* See Pages 643, 665.

Arminius, (hateful though it sounded in the ears of several persons,) from the special patronage which they afforded to Elizabeth Real, the widow of this divine, and to her orphan children, and by the grant to them of an annual honorary stipend: The very respectable Senate of the University did not hesitate to bear the subjoined testimony to the deceased, at the request of his family.*

Among the nobles and chief men in his native country, those who were most attached to him were, those honourable Senators and Burgomasters, Nicholas Kromhout, Adrian Junius, Sebas-

* "The Rector Magnificus and the Senate of the University of Leyden in Holland, to all and singular who shall read these Testimonials or shall hear them read, send greeting.

"Since it has seemed good to Almighty God to recal to the heavenly country that famous and reverend man, James Arminius, Doctor of Divinity, and Professor in Ordinary of the same Faculty in this our University, from the professorship which he administered, for no small number of years which he passed here, with singular industry and to applauding auditories,—and since He has granted him an eternal release and discharge from the unceasing labours which he has sustained both in the Church and in the University,—and since the widow of the deceased of most blessed memory, with the children whom she bore to him, now survives her husband, and has requested from the Senate that such Testimonials as are due to his distinguished virtues may be presented to her,—and since the demand for such testimonials seemed to us, to be only an act of justice on account of [*non paucas*] the numerous endowments of the man,—we have willingly contributed to his most desired memory the last office which we can perform for him.—We therefore testify that the before-mentioned James Arminius, D. D., lived in this our University, so as to teach with the utmost care and diligence Sacred Theology, both in public and at his own house —for we leave to other people [the mention of] controversies. But, as it was the first duty of a prudent and discreet man, he defended by his prudence, advice, and authority, in the Senate of the University, not only his own station and dignity, but likewise that of the whole honourable order; and he preferred the public business, which was to be unanimously discussed in our sittings, to his own private affairs: He freely proposed whatever he thought would conduce to the advantage of the University; and proved that he was averse to such things as might have a contrary effect. He brought down no stain or blot, by his life or manners, on his most holy profession; but, as it became a man of probity, he lived in a manner agreeable to his vocation and office. In accordance with the duty of a diligent teacher and divine, he instructed the young men who were committed to his care, with assiduity and industry. We therefore beseech all and every one so to speak and to think of this same man, James Arminius, D. D., of blessed memory, as his erudition, the services which he has performed in this our University, and his excellence, deserve. We have taken care to confirm and corroborate the credit of those testimonials by the hand of our Secretary, and likewise by our Seal.

"This has been compared with the original, and copied out by the command of the Rector Magnificus and of the Senate of the University by me

"DANIEL HEINSIUS."

With regard to the clause, in the middle of this document, about the omission of controversies, Brandt says, it is the same expression which was employed in similar Testimonials that were delivered to Gomarus, by the Academic Senate, when he departed to Middelburg.

tius Egberts, Rumold Hogerbeets; and William Bardesius, Lord of Warmhusen, who did not hold the lowest place among his patrons: For he manifested towards Arminius a constancy of affection; and when he was debilitated by a slow and continued disease, as soon as the disorder, the temperature of the weather, and the intervals between each attack, would permit, Bardesius entertained him in a most friendly manner at his country-house. When Arminius died, he confirmed the same benevolence towards his widow and afflicted family, of which he gave repeated and substantial proofs.

Beside John Uitenbogaert, who has been often mentioned in this history, whom Arminius was accustomed to call *his sacred anchor*, and to whom he could at all times resort for the purpose of obtaining advice and succour, the other friends with whom he was chiefly on terms of intimacy, were the famous John Drusius, Conrad Vorstius,* Anthony Thysius, John Halsberius, Peter Bertius, Adrian de Borre, John Arnold Corvinus, and Rembert and Simon Episcopius, two youths whom he loved in the place of a brother and a son,—the former of them a merchant at Amsterdam, of a chaste and cultivated judgment and of eminent piety,—the latter, one of his principal pupils, who, on account of the signal endowments of mind and genius which Divine Providence had bestowed on him, was afterwards accounted worthy to adorn the province which had been occupied by his beloved preceptor.†

* See Page 580.

† Few men in Europe have contributed more essentially by their writings to the true interests of mankind, than SIMON EPISCOPIUS. In the animadversions which are passed upon his productions, a distinction ought always to be made between *what he wrote in the name and as the accredited organ of the Remonstrant body, in which he was generally guided by the counsel of a few select members*, and *what he wrote in his private capacity as a divine.* By not duly observing this distinction, many persons have blamed him personally for a tone and spirit, which, they aver, are inconsistent with Christianity; when it ought to have been recollected, that many smart sayings and keen replies, which a private divine might have hesitated to employ, are not merely tolerated, but even applauded, by the body that feels itself injured and maligned,—especially when every defence of that body is subjected to the revision and amendments of aspirited deputation: This was actually the case with all that Episcopius wrote for the Remonstrants, and ought to remove much of that load of odium which many partizans of very different religious views, and with opposite intentions, have heaped upon his memory. I hope, I have observed this necessary distinction in the few instances in which I have had occasion to visit him with animadversions.

As a proof of the high estimation in which the productions of Episcopius were held by some of the small number of liberal Popish ecclesiastics, I subjoin the following extract from Father Mabillon's *Treatise on the Studies which are proper for such as live in Monasteries:* "I cannot forbear observing in this place, that if some passages had been left out in Episcopius's *Theological Institutes*, which Grotius

"These things," adds the younger Brandt, "are what I considered necessary to be said about JAMES ARMINIUS, whose piety and simple virtue never sought to obtain any reputation in the earth, not even that a sect should be called after his name! A sect was undoubtedly called after him; but this was subsequent to his death, and after all things were in a disturbed state, Christianity having then suffered another lamentable division, which, according to the present aspect of affairs, no future day seems likely to heal, unless God immediately interpose for the welfare of his Church."

esteemed so much that he carried them with him wherever he went, they might be very useful in the study of Divinity. This work is divided into Four Books, the method of which is quite different from that which is generally followed. His style is beautiful, and his manner of treating his subject answers his style perfectly well: Nor would the time spent in reading it be lost, provided it had been corrected with regard to some passages, in which the author speaks against the Roman Catholics, and in favour of his sect,"—For this free opinion Mabillon was reviled by a Jansenist pamphleteer, to whom the Arminianism of Episcopius could not be very acceptable, and who says, "As soon as Monsieur Nicole heard of this fine encomium, he strongly desired that the author should be advised to suppress it: But this was impossible, for the book was published. Several young Abbots had already requested some booksellers to send them *Episcopius's Works*, the perusal of which was so much recommended by Father Mabillon. It is a great happiness, that the booksellers have not one copy of them: For no divine opposes the doctrine of St. Augustine, and indeed that of the whole Church, so much as Episcopius does, who has even introduced into his sect *the toleration of all religions!* Father Mabillon would be more excusable, had he not read Episcopius's book: But he owns himself, that he had borrowed it from the Archbishop of Rheims's librarian, and kept it above two months!"—"Judge by this," says Bayle, "how scarce Episcopius's Works are in France, since the Benedictines are obliged to borrow them from a Prelate, who collected with a great deal of care those books which it is most difficult to procure!"

The name of EPISCOPIUS is in Dutch "BISCHOP." In allusion to this acceptation of the word, the same as our English word *Bishop*, his distant relative Philip Limborch wrote some beautiful elegiac verses, which have often been engraved under his noble portrait. They commence thus,

Dits Bisschop, die getrow syns Heeren weydden, &c.

Of which the following is a hasty translation from the pen of a learned friend:

A BISHOP, faithful to his heavenly Lord,
An eager listener to his sacred word;
Who truth from falsehood, right from wrong could sever,
In man's free spirit bound in bondage never:
A hero, arm'd for right and liberty,
And suffering exile, but not slavery.

END OF THE LIFE OF ARMINIUS.

[ORATION I.

ORATION I.

THE OBJECT OF THEOLOGY.

This Oration, and the two others next in order and connected with it in subject, were delivered by Arminius as introductory discourses to his Divinity Lectures, when he first occupied the Professor's Chair in the University of Leyden, at the close of the year 1603. *They were then received with tokens of the highest approbation; and, from the first day of their publication, they have been greatly admired by the learned for the taste and elegance displayed in their composition, and by divines for the spirit of evangelical piety which is apparent in every sentence.—In the construction of all the three orations the author has aimed at one object—to prove to his students, that the noble science of Theology is superior to all other objects of human research, and in every respect worthy of their deepest attention.*

To Almighty God alone belong the inherent and absolute right, will, and power of determining concerning us: Since therefore it has pleased him to call me, his unworthy servant, from the ecclesiastical functions which I have for some years discharged in the Church of his Son in the populous city of Amsterdam, and to give me the appointment of the Theological Professorship in this most celebrated University,—I accounted it my duty, not to manifest too much reluctance to this vocation, although I was well acquainted with my incapacity for such an office, which with the greatest willingness and sincerity I then confessed and must still acknowledge. Indeed the consciousness of my own insufficiency operated as a persuasive to me not to listen to this vocation;—of which fact I can cite as a witness that God who is both the Inspector and the Judge of my conscience. Of this consciousness of my own insufficiency, several persons of great probity and learning are also witnesses; for they were the cause of my engaging in this office, provided it were offered to me in a legitimate order and manner. But as they suggested, and as experience itself had frequently taught me, that it is a dangerous thing to adhere to one's own judgment with pertinacity, and to pay too much regard to the opinion which we entertain of ourselves,—because almost all of us have little discernment in

those matters which concern ourselves,—I suffered myself to be induced by the authority of their judgment to enter upon this difficult and burdensome province, which may God enable me to commence with tokens of his Divine approbation and under his propitious auspices!

Although I am beyond measure cast down and almost shudder with fear, solely at the anticipation of this office and its duties, yet I can scarcely indulge in a doubt of Divine approval and support when my mind attentively considers, what are the causes on account of which this vocation was appointed, the manner in which it is committed to execution, and the means and plans by which it is brought to a conclusion. From all these considerations, I feel a persuasion that it has been Divinely instituted and brought to perfection.

For this cause I entertain an assured hope of the perpetual presence of Divine assistance; and, with due humility of mind, I venture in God's holy name to take this charge upon me and to enter upon its duties. I most earnestly beseech all and each of you,—and if the benevolence which to the present time you have expressed towards me by many and most signal tokens will allow such a liberty, I implore,—nay, (so pressing is my present necessity!) I solemnly conjure you, to unite with me in ardent wishes and fervent intercessions before God, the Father of lights, that, ready as I am out of pure affection to contribute to your profit, he may be pleased graciously to supply his servant with the gifts which are necessary to the proper discharge of these functions, and to bestow upon me his benevolent favour, guidance and protection through the whole course of this vocation.

But it appears to me, that I shall be acting to some good purpose, if, at the commencement of my office, I offer some general remarks on SACRED THEOLOGY by way of preface, and enter into an explanation of its extent, dignity, and excellence. This discourse will serve yet more zealously to incite the minds of students, who profess themselves dedicated to the service of this Divine wisdom, fearlessly to proceed in the career upon which they have entered, diligently to urge on their progress, and to keep up an unceasing contest till they arrive at its termination. Thus may they hereafter become the instruments of God's salvation in the Church of his Saints, qualified and fitted for the sanctification of his divine name, and formed '*for the edifying of the body of Christ*' in the Spirit. When I have effected this design, I shall think, with

Socrates, that in such an entrance on my duties I have discharged no inconsiderable part of them to some good effect. For that wisest of the Gentiles was accustomed to say, that he had properly accomplished his duty of teaching, when he had once communicated an impulse to the minds of his hearers and had inspired them with an ardent desire of learning. Nor did he make this remark without reason: For, to a willing man nothing is difficult, especially when God has promised the clearest revelation of his secrets to those '*who shall meditate in his law day and night.*' (Psalm i, 2.) In such a manner does this promise of God act, that, on those matters which far surpass the capacity of the human mind, we may adopt the expression of Isocrates, "If thou be desirous of receiving instruction, thou shalt learn many things."

This explanation will be of no small service to myself. For in the very earnest recommendation of this study which I give to others, I prescribe to myself a law and rule by which I ought to walk in its profession; and an additional necessity is thus imposed on me of conducting myself in my new office with holiness and modesty, and in all good conscience; that, in case I should afterwards turn aside from the right path, (which may our gracious God prevent!) such a solemn recommendation of this study may be cast in my face as a reproach and an eternal disgrace.

In the discussion of this subject I do not think it necessary to utter any protestation before the learned professors of jurisprudence, the most experienced and skilful doctors of medicine, the very acute professors of philosophy, and those high literary characters who have an intimate acquaintance with languages: Before such learned persons I have no need to enter into any protestation, for the purpose of removing from myself a suspicion of wishing to bring into neglect or contempt that particular study which each of them cultivates. For to every kind of study in the most noble theatre of the sciences, I assign, as it becomes me, its due place, and that an honourable one; and each being content with its subordinate station, all of them with the greatest willingness concede *the president's throne* to THAT SCIENCE OF WHICH I AM NOW TREATING.

I shall adopt that plain and simple species of oratory which, according to Euripides, belongs peculiarly to truth. I am not ignorant that some resemblance and relation ought to exist between an action, and the subjects that are discussed in it; and therefore that a certain divine method of speech is required when

we attempt to speak on Divine things according to their dignity. But I choose plainness and simplicity, because Theology needs no ornament, but is content to be taught, and because it is out of my power to make an effort towards acquiring a style that may be in any degree worthy of such a subject.

In beginning to shew the dignity and excellence of sacred Theology, I shall briefly confine it within four titles. In imitation of the method which obtains in human sciences, that are estimated according to the excellence of their OBJECT, their AUTHOR, and their END, and of the IMPORTANCE of the reasons by which each of them is supported,—I shall follow the same plan, speaking, *First*, of THE OBJECT of Theology, *then* of ITS AUTHOR, *afterwards* of ITS END, and *lastly*, of ITS CERTAINTY.

I pray God, that the grace of his Holy Spirit may be present with me while I am speaking; and that he would be pleased to direct my mind, mouth and tongue, in such a manner as to enable me to advance those truths which are holy, worthy of our God, and salutary to you his creatures, to the glory of his name and for the edification of his Church.

I intreat you also, my most illustrious and polite hearers, kindly to grant me your attention for a short time while I endeavour to explain matters of the greatest importance; and while your observation is directed to the subject in which I shall exercise myself, you will have the goodness to regard IT, rather than any presumed SKILL in my manner of treating it.

The nature of this great subject requires us, at this hour especially, to direct our attention, in the first instance, to the OBJECT of Theology. For it is so deeply fixed in the sciences, and so accommodated to their nature, that they acquire from it their application.

But GOD is himself the OBJECT of Theology. The very term indicates as much: for THEOLOGY signifies a *Discourse or reasoning concerning God.* This is likewise indicated by the definition which the Apostle gives of this science, when he describes it as '*the truth which is after godliness.*' (Titus i, 1.) The Greek word here used for *godliness*, is ευσεβεια signifying *a worship due to God alone*, which the Apostle shews in a manner of greater clearness, when he calls this piety by the more exact term θεοσεβεια.* All other sciences have their objects, noble indeed, and worthy to engage the notice of the human mind, and in the contemplation of which much time, leisure and diligence may be profitably occupied. In *general Metaphysics*, the object of study is, "BEING in

* 1 Tim. ii. 10, '*professing to render religious adoration to God.*'

reference to its being;" *Particular Metaphysics* have for their objects "intelligences and minds separated and removed from mortal contagion."—*Physics* are applied to "bodies, as having the principle of motion in themselves."—*The Mathematics* have "relation to quantities."—*Medicine* exercises itself with "the human body, in relation to its capacity of health and soundness."—*Jurisprudence* has a reference to "justice and human society."—*Ethics*, to "the virtues;"—*Economics*, to "the government of a family;"—and *Politics*, to "state-affairs." But all these sciences are appointed in subordination to God; from him also they derive their origin. They are dependent on him alone; and, in return, they move back again, and unto him is their natural re-action. This science is the only one which occupies itself about the BEING of beings and the CAUSE of causes, the principle of nature, and that of grace existing in nature, and by which nature is assisted and surrounded. This object therefore is the most worthy and dignified of all, and full of adorable majesty. It far excels all the rest; because it is not lawful for any one, however well and accurately he may be instructed in the knowledge of all the sciences, to glory in the least on this account; and because every one that has obtained a knowledge of this science only, may on solid grounds and in reality glory in it. For God himself has forbidden the former species of boasting, while he commands the latter. His words by the Prophet Jeremiah, are, '*Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom; but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me.*' (ix, 23, 24.)

But let us consider the conditions that are generally employed to commend the object of any science. That OBJECT is most excellent (1) which is in itself *the best and the greatest, and immutable;* (2) which in relation to the mind is *most lucid and clear*, and most easily proposed and unfolded to the view of the mental powers; and (3) which is likewise able, by its action on the mind, *completely to fill it and to satisfy its infinite desires.* These three conditions are in the highest degree discovered in God, and in him alone, who is the subject of Theological study.

1. *He is the Best Being;* he is the first and chief good, and goodness itself; he alone is good, as good as goodness itself; as ready to communicate, as it is possible for him to be communicated; his liberality is only equalled by the boundless treasures which he possesses, both of which are infinite

and restricted only by the capacity of the recipient, which he appoints as a limit and measure to the goodness of his nature and to the communication of himself.—*He is the Greatest Being* and the only Great One; for he is able to subdue to his sway even nothing itself, that it may become capable of divine good by the communication of himself. '*He calleth those* THINGS WHICH BE NOT, *as though they were*,' (Rom. iv, 17.) and in that manner, by his word, he places them in the number of beings, although it is out of darkness that they have received his commands to emerge and to come into existence. 'ALL NATIONS *before him are* AS NOTHING, *the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers, and the princes* NOTHING.' (Isa. xl, 17, 22, 23.) The whole of this system of heaven and earth appears scarcely equal to a point "before him, whose centre is every where, but whose circumference is in no place."—*He is immutable*, always the same, and endureth for ever; '*his years have no end*.' (Psalm cii. [illegible]. Nothing can be added to him and nothing can be taken from him; with him '*is no variableness, neither shadow of turning*.' (James i, 17.) Whatsoever obtains stability for a single moment, borrows it from him, and receives it precariously and at his pleasure. Pleasant therefore and most delightful is it to contemplate him, on account of his goodness; it is glorious in consideration of his greatness; and it is sure, in reference to his immutability.

2. *He is most resplendent and bright*; he is light itself; and becomes an object of most obvious perception to the mind according to this expression of the Apostle, '*that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us; for in him we live, and move, and have our being; for we are also his offspring*:' (Acts xvii, 27, 28.) And according to another passage, '*God left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness*.' (Acts xiv, 17.) Being supported by these true sayings, I venture to assert, that nothing can be seen or truly known in any object, except in [illegible] we have previously seen and known God himself.

In the *first* place, he is called "Being itself," because he offers himself to the understanding as an object of knowledge. But all beings, both visible and invisible, corporeal and incorporeal, proclaim aloud, that they have derived the beginning of their essence and condition from some other than themselves, and that they have not their own proper existence till the

have it from another. All of them utter speech, according to the saying of the Royal Prophet: '*The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handy-work.*' (Psalm xix, 1.) That is, the firmament sounds aloud as with a trumpet, and proclaims, that it is '*the work of the right hand of the Most High.*' Among created objects you may discover many tokens indicating, "that they derive from some other source whatever they themselves possess," more strongly than "that they have an existence in the number and scale of beings." Nor is this matter of wonder, since they are always nearer to nothing, than to their Creator, from whom they are removed to a distance that is infinite, and separated by infinite space: While, by properties that are only finite, they are distinguished from nothing, the primeval womb from whence they sprung, and into which they may fall back again; but they can never be raised to a Divine equality with God their Maker. Therefore it was rightly spoken by the ancient Heathens,

"Of Jove all things are full."

3. *He alone can completely fill the mind, and satisfy its (otherwise) insatiable desires.* For he is infinite in his essence, —his wisdom, power, and goodness. He is the first and chief verity, and truth itself in the abstract. But the human mind is finite in nature,—the substance of which it is formed; and only in this view is it a partaker of infinity—because it apprehends Infinite Being and the Chief Truth, although it is incapable of comprehending them. David therefore, in an exclamation of joyful self-gratulation, openly confesses, that he was content with the possession of God alone, who by means of knowledge and love is possessed by his creatures. These are his words:—'*Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee.*' (Psalm lxxiii, 25.)

If thou be acquainted with all other things, and yet remain in a state of ignorance with regard to him alone, thou art always wandering beyond the proper point, and thy restless love of knowledge increases in the proportion in which knowledge itself is increased. The man who knows only God, and who is ignorant of all things else, remains in peace and tranquillity, and (like one that has found '*a pearl of great price,*' although in the purchase of it he may have expended the whole of his substance,) he is in earnest while he congratulates himself on the prize he has thus gained.—This lustre or

brightness of the object is the cause why an investigation into it, or an inquiry after it, is never instituted without obtaining it; and (such is its fulness!) when it has once been found, the discovery of it is always attended with abundant profit.

But we must consider this object more strictly; for we treat of it in reference to its being the object of our Theology, according to which we have a knowledge of God in this life. We must therefore clothe it in a certain mode and invest it in a formal manner, as the logical phrase is; and thus place it as a foundation to our knowledge.

THREE CONSIDERATIONS of this matter offer themselves to our notice: The FIRST is, that we cannot receive this object in the infinity of its nature; our necessity therefore requires it to be proposed in a manner that is accommodated to our capacity.—The SECOND is, that it is not proper, in the first moment of revelation, for such a large measure to be disclosed and manifested by the light of grace, as may be received into the human mind when it is illuminated by the light of glory, and (by that process,) enlarged to a greater capacity: for by a right use of the knowledge of grace, we must proceed upwards (by the rule of divine righteousness,) to the more sublime knowledge of glory, according to that saying, '*To him that hath shall be given.*'—The THIRD is, that this object is not laid before our Theology merely to be known, but, when known, to be worshipped. For the THEOLOGY which belongs to this world, is PRACTICAL *and through faith:* THEORETICAL THEOLOGY belongs to *the other world*, and consists of pure and unclouded vision, according to the expression of the Apostle, '*We walk by faith, and not by sight;*' (2 Cor. v, 7.) and that of another Apostle, '*Then shall we be like him, for we shall see him as he is.*' (1 John iii, 2.) For this reason we must clothe the object of our Theology in such a manner as may enable it to incline us to worship God, and fully to persuade and win us over to that practice.

This last design is the line and rule of the formal relation according to which God becomes the subject of our Theology.

But that man may be induced, by a willing obedience and a humble submission of the mind, to worship God, it is necessary for him to believe, from a certain persuasion of the heart:—(1) That it is the will of God to be worshipped, and that worship is due to him.—(2) That the worship of him will not be in vain, but will be recompensed with an exceedingly great reward.—(3) That a mode of worship must be instituted

according to his command.—To these three particulars ought to be added, a knowledge of the mode prescribed.

Our Theology, then, delivers three things concerning this object, as necessary and sufficient to be known in relation to the preceding subjects of belief.—The FIRST is concerning the nature of God.—The SECOND concerning his actions.—And the THIRD concerning his will.

(1) *Concerning his nature;* that it is worthy to receive adoration, on account of its justice; that it is qualified to form a right judgment of that worship, on account of its wisdom; and that it is prompt and able to bestow rewards, on account of its goodness and the perfection of its own blessedness.

(2) *Two actions* have been ascribed to God for the same purpose; they are CREATION and PROVIDENCE. (i.) *The Creation of all things*, and especially of man after God's own image; upon which is founded his sovereign authority over man, and from which is deduced the right of requiring worship from man and enjoining obedience upon him, according to that very just complaint of God by Malachi, '*If then I be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear?*' (i, 6.)—(ii.) That *Providence* is to be ascribed to God *by which he governs all things*, and according to which he exercises a holy, just, and wise care and oversight over man himself and those things which relate to him, but chiefly over the worship and obedience which he is bound to render to his God.

(3) *Lastly*, it treats of *the will of God* expressed in a certain covenant into which he has entered with man, and which consists of two parts: (i.) *The one*, by which he declares it to be his pleasure to receive adoration from man, and at the same time prescribes the mode of performing that worship; for it is his will to be worshipped from obedience, and not at the option or discretion of man.—(ii.) *The other*, by which God promises that he will abundantly compensate man for the worship which he performs; requiring not only adoration for the benefits already conferred upon man, as a trial of his gratitude; but likewise that HE may communicate to man infinitely greater things to the consummation of his felicity. For as he occupied the first place in conferring blessings and doing good, because that high station was his due, since man was about to be called into existence among the number of creatures; so likewise it is his desire that the last place in doing good be reserved for him, according to the infinite perfection of his goodness and blessed-

ness, who is the Fountain of good and the extreme boundary of happiness, the Creator and at the same time the Glorifier of his worshippers. It is according to this last action of his, that he is called by some persons "the Object of Theology," and that not improperly, because in this last act are included all the preceding.

In the way which has been thus compendiously pointed out, the infinite disputes of the schoolmen, concerning *the formal relation* by which God is the OBJECT OF THEOLOGY, may, in my opinion, be adjusted and decided. But as I think it a culpable deed to abuse your patience, I shall decline to say any more on this part of the subject.

Our sacred Theology therefore is chiefly occupied in ascribing to the One True God, to whom alone they really belong, those attributes of which we have already spoken,—his *nature*, *actions*, and *will*.—For it is not sufficient to know, that there is some kind of a NATURE, simple, infinite, wise, good, just, omnipotent, happy in itself, the Maker and Governor of all things, that is worthy to receive adoration, whose will it is to be worshipped, and that is able to make its worshippers happy. To this general kind of knowledge there ought to be added, a sure and settled conception, fixed on that Deity, and strictly bound to the single object of religious worship* to which alone those qualities appertain. The necessity of entertaining fixed and determinate ideas on this subject, is very frequently inculcated in the sacred page: '*I am the Lord thy God.*' (Exod. xx, 2.) '*I am the Lord and there is none else.*' (Isa. xlv, 5.) Elijah also says, '*If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him.*' (1 Kings xviii, 21.) This duty is the more sedulously inculcated in scripture, on account of the powerful inclination or propensity in man to depart from the true object of religious worship, rather than from a correct notion of Deity. For whatever clear and proper conception of the Divine Being the minds of the Heathens had formed, the first stumbling-block over which they fell appears to have been this,—they did not attribute that just conception to him to whom it ought to have been given; but they ascribed it either (1) to some vague and uncertain individual. This may be seen by an expression, employed by one of the personages introduced by a Roman poet: "O Jupiter, whether thou be heaven, or air, or earth!" Or (2) they ascribed it to some imaginary and fabulous Deity, whether it be among created things, or a

* '*I passed by and beheld the objects of your devotions.*'—Acts xvii, 22.—See also 2 Thess, ii, 4.

mere idol of the brain, neither partaking of the Divine nature nor of any other,—which the Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans and to the Corinthians, produces as a matter of reproach to the Gentiles. (Rom. i, and 1 Cor. viii.)—Or (3) *lastly*, they ascribed it to THE UNKNOWN GOD; the title of UNKNOWN being given to their Deity by the very persons who were his worshippers. The Apostle relates this crime as one of which the Athenians were guilty: But it is equally true when applied to all those who err and wander from the true object of adoration, and yet worship a Deity of some description. To such persons that sentence justly belongs which Christ uttered in conversation with the woman of Samaria: '*Ye worship* YE KNOW NOT WHAT.' (John iv, 22.)

Although those persons are guilty of a grievous error who transgress in this point, so as to be deservedly termed ATHEISTS, in scripture αθεοι, [or "men without God,"]; yet they are by far more intolerably insane, who, having passed the extreme line of impiety, are not restrained by the consciousness of any Deity. The ancient Heathens considered such men as peculiarly worthy of being called ATHEISTS.—On the other hand, those who have a consciousness of their own ignorance occupy the step that is nearest to sanity. For it is necessary to be careful only about one thing; and that is, when we communicate information to them, we must teach them to discard the falsehood which they had imbibed, and must instruct them in the truth alone. When this truth is pointed out to them, they will seize it with the greater avidity, in proportion to the deeper sorrow which they feel at the thought that they have been surrounded for a long series of years by a most pernicious error.

But Theology, as it appears to me, principally effects four things in fixing our conceptions, which we have just mentioned, on that Deity who is true, and in drawing them away from the invention and formation of false Deities.—FIRST. It explains, in an elegant and copious manner, the relation in which the Deity stands, lest we should ascribe to his nature any thing that is foreign to it, or should take away from it any one of its properties. In reference to this, it is said, '*Ye heard the voice, but saw no similitude; take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves, lest you make you a graven image.*' (Deut. iv, 12, 15, 16.)—SECONDLY. It describes both the universal and the particular actions of the only true God, that by them it may distinguish the true Deity from those which are fabulous. On this account it is said, '*The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, shall perish from the earth, and from under these hea-*

vens.' (Jer. x, 11.) Jonah also said, '*I fear the Lord, the God of heaven, who hath made the sea and the dry land.*' (i, 9.) And the Apostle declares, '*Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and by man's device:*' (Acts xvii, 29.) In another passage it is recorded, '*I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt;*' (Deut. v, 6.) '*I am the God that appeared to thee in Bethel.*' (Gen. xxvi, 13.) And, '*Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth, which brought up the Children of Israel out of the Land of Egypt, but, The Lord liveth which brought up and which led the seed of the House of Israel out of the North Country,*' *&c.* (Jer. xxiii, 7, 8.)—THIRDLY. It makes frequent mention of the covenant into which the true Deity has entered with his worshippers, that by the recollection of it the mind of man may be stayed upon that God with whom the covenant was concluded. In reference to this it is said, '*Thus shalt thou say unto the Children of Israel, The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.*' (Exod. iii, 15.) Thus Jacob, when about to conclude a compact with Laban his father-in-law, swears '*by the fear of his father Isaac.*' (Gen. xxxi, 53.) And when Abraham's servant was seeking a wife for his master's son, he thus invoked God, '*O Lord God of my master Abraham!*' (Gen. xxiv, 12.)—FOURTHLY. It distinguishes and points out the true Deity, even by a most appropriate, particular, and individual mark, when it introduces the mention of the persons who are partakers of the same Divinity; thus it gives a right direction to the mind of the worshipper, and fixes it upon that God who is THE FATHER OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. This was manifested with some degree of obscurity in the Old Testament, but with the utmost clearness in the New. Hence the Apostle says, '*I bow my knee unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.*' (Eph. iii, 14.)—All these remarks are comprehended and summed up by Divines, in this brief sentence, "That God must be invoked who has manifested himself in his own word."

But the preceding observations concerning the OBJECT of Theology, properly respect LEGAL THEOLOGY, which was accommodated to man's primeval state. For while man in his original integrity acted under the protecting favour and benevolence of a good and just God, he was able to render to

God that worship which had been prescribed according to the law of legal righteousness, that says, '*This do, and thou shalt live;*'—he was able to '*love with all his heart and soul*' that Good and Just Being;—he was able, from a consciousness of his integrity, to repose confidence in that Good and Just One;—and he was able to evince towards him, as such, a filial fear, and to pay him the honour which was pleasing and due to him, as from a servant to his Lord. God also, on his part, without the least injury to his justice, was able to act towards man, while in that state, according to the prescript of legal righteousness, to reward his worship according to justice, and, through the terms of the legal covenant, and consequently '*of debt,*' to confer life upon him. This God could do, consistently with his goodness, by whose advice and instigation he promised that life; and consistently with his justice, which required the fulfilment of that promise. There was no call for any other property of his nature, which might contribute by its agency to accomplish this purpose: No further progress of Divine goodness was necessary than that which might repay good for good,—the good of perfect felicity, for the good of entire obedience: No other action was required, except that of creation, (which had then been performed,) and that of a preserving and governing providence, in conformity with the condition in which man was placed: No other volition of God was needed, than that by which he might both require the perfect obedience of the law, and might repay that obedience with life eternal. In that state of human affairs, therefore, the knowledge of the nature described in those properties,—the knowledge of those actions, and of that will,—to which may be added the knowledge of the Deity with whom they truly agreed, was all that was necessary for the performance of worship to God, and was of itself amply sufficient.

But when man had fallen from his primeval integrity through disobedience to the law, and had rendered himself '*a child of wrath*' and had become devoted to condemnation, this goodness mingled with legal justice could not be sufficient for the salvation of man. Neither could this act of creation and providence, nor this will suffice; and therefore this legal Theology was itself insufficient. For sin was to be condemned if men were absolved; and, as the Apostle says, (in the eighth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans,) '*it could not be condemned by the law.*' Man was to be justified: but he could not be justified by the law, which, while it is the strength of sin, makes discovery of it to us, and is the procurer of wrath.

This Theology therefore could serve for no salutary purpose, at that time: such was its dreadful efficacy in convincing man of sin and consigning him to certain death! This unhappy change, this unfavourable vicissitude of affairs was introduced by the fault and the infection of sin; which was likewise the cause why '*the law which was ordained to life and honour,*' (Rom. vii, 10.) became fatal and destructive to our race, and the procurer of eternal ignominy. (1) Other properties, therefore, of the Divine Nature were to be called into action; every one of God's benefits was to be unfolded and explained; mercy, long-suffering, gentleness, patience, and clemency were to be brought forth out of the repository of his primitive goodness, and their services were to be engaged,—if it was proper for offending man to be reconciled to God and re-instated in his favour.—(2) Other actions were to be exhibited: "A new creation" was to be effected; "a new providence," accommodated in every respect to this new creation, was to be instituted and put in force; "the work of redemption" was to be performed; "remission of sins" was to be obtained; "the loss of righteousness" was to be repaired; "the Spirit of grace" was to be asked and obtained; and "lost salvation" restored.—(3) Another decree was likewise to be framed concerning the salvation of man; and '*another covenant, a new one,*' was to be made with him, '*not according to that former one, because those*' who were parties on one side '*had not continued in that covenant:*' (Heb. viii, 11.) but, by another and a gracious *will*, they '*were to be sanctified*' who might be '*consecrated to enter into the Holiest by a new and living way.*' (Heb. x, 20.)—All these things were to be prepared and laid down as foundations to the new manifestation.

Another revelation, therefore, and a different species of Theology, were necessary to make known those *properties* of the Divine Nature which we have described, and which were most wisely employed in repairing our salvation; to proclaim the *actions* which were exhibited; and to occupy themselves in explaining that *decree* and *new covenant* which we have mentioned.

But since God, the punisher and most righteous avenger of sinners, was either unwilling, or (through the opposition made by the justice and truth which had been originally manifested in the law,) was unable to unfold those properties of his nature, to produce those actions, or to make that decree, except by the intervention of a Mediator, in whom, without the least injury to his justice and truth, he

might unfold those properties, perform those actions, might through them produce those necessary benefits, and might conclude that most gracious decree;—on this account a MEDIATOR was to be ordained, who, by his blood, might atone for sinners, by his death might expiate the sin of mankind, might reconcile the wicked to God and might save them from his impending anger; who might set forth and display the mercy, long-suffering and patience of God, might provide eternal redemption, obtain remission of sins, bring in an everlasting righteousness, ask and procure the Spirit of grace, confirm the decree of gracious mercy, ratify the new covenant by his blood, recover eternal salvation, and who might bring to God those that were to be ultimately saved.

A just and merciful God, therefore, did appoint as Mediator, *his beloved Son, Jesus Christ.* He obediently undertook that office which was imposed on him by the Father, and courageously executed it,—nay he is even now engaged in executing it. He was, therefore, ordained by God as the Redeemer, the Saviour, the King, and (under God,) the Head of the heirs of salvation. It would neither have been just nor reasonable, that he who had undergone such vast labours and endured such great sorrows, who had performed so many miracles, and who had obtained through his merits so many benefits for us,—should ingloriously remain among us in meanness and obscurity, and should be dismissed by us without honour. It was most equitable, that he should in return be acknowledged, worshipped, and invoked, and that he should receive those grateful thanks which are due to him for his benefits.

But how shall we be able to adore, worship and invoke him, unless '*we believe on him? How can we believe in him, unless we hear of him? And how can we hear concerning him,*' except he be revealed to us by the word? (Rom. x, 14.) From this cause, then, arose the necessity of making a revelation concerning Jesus Christ; and on this account TWO OBJECTS (that is, GOD and his CHRIST,) are to be placed as a foundation to that Theology which will sufficiently contribute towards the salvation of sinners, according to the saying of our Saviour Christ: '*And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.*' (John xvii, 3.)' Indeed these two objects are not of such a nature as that the one may be separated from the other, or that the one may be collaterally joined to the other; but the latter of them is, in a proper and suitable manner, subordinate to the former. Here

then we have a THEOLOGY, which, from CHRIST, its object, is most rightfully and deservedly termed CHRISTIAN, which is manifested not by THE LAW, but in the earliest ages by promise, and in these latter days by the Gospel which is called that '*of Jesus Christ*;'—although the words (CHRISTIAN and LEGAL) are sometimes confounded. But let us consider the union and the subordination of both these objects.

I. Since we have God and his Christ for the object of our CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY, the manner in which LEGAL THEOLOGY explains God unto us, is undoubtedly much amplified by this addition, and our Theology is thus infinitely ennobled above that which is legal.

For God has unfolded in Christ every one of his blessings. '*For it pleased the Father, that in Him should all fulness dwell;*' (Col. i, 19.) and that the '*fulness of the Godhead should dwell in him,*' not by adumbration or according to the shadow, but '*bodily:*' For this reason he is called, '*the image of the invisible God;*' (Col. i. 15.) '*the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person,*' (Heb. i, 3.) in whom the Father condescends to afford to us his infinite majesty, his immeasurable goodness, mercy and philanthropy, to be contemplated, beheld, and to be touched and felt; even as Christ himself says to Philip, '*He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.*' (John xiv, 9.) For those things which lay hidden and indiscernible within the Father, like the fine and deep traces in an engraved seal, stand out, become prominent, and may be most clearly and distinctly seen in Christ, as in an exact and protuberant impression, formed by the application of a deeply engraved seal on the subtance to be impressed.

1. In this Theology God truly appears, in the highest degree, the Best and the Greatest of Beings: (1.) The BEST. Because he is not only willing, as in the former Theology, to communicate himself (for the happiness of men) to those who correctly discharge their duty,—but to receive into his favour and to reconcile to himself those who are sinners, wicked, unfruitful, and declared enemies, and to bestow eternal life on them when they repent.—(2.)The GREATEST. Because he has not only produced all THINGS from *nothing*, through the annihilation of the *latter* and the creation of the FORMER,—but because he has also effected a triumph over sin, (which is far more noxious than nothing and conquered with greater difficulty,) by graciously pardoning it and powerfully '*putting it away*;'—and because he has '*brought in everlasting right-*

sousness,' by means of a second creation, and a regeneration which far exceeded the capacity of *the law that acted as school-master*.' (Gal. iii, 24.) For this cause Christ is called '*the wisdom and the power of God*,' (1 Cor. i, 24.) far more illustrious than the wisdom and the power which were originally displayed in the creation of the universe.—(3.) In this Theology God is described to us as in every respect immutable, not only in regard to his nature but also to his will, which, as it has been manifested in the gospel, is peremptory and conclusive, and, being the last of all, is not to be corrected by another will. For '*Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, to-day, and for ever*; (Heb. xiii, 8.) *by whom God hath in these last days spoken unto us*.' (Heb. i, 2.) Under the law, the state of this matter was very different, and that greatly to our ultimate advantage: For if the will of God unfolded in the law had been fatal to us, as well as the last expression of it, we, of all men most miserable, should have been banished for ever from God himself on account of that declaration of his will; and our doom would have been in a state of exile from our salvation. I would not seem in this argument to ascribe any mutability to the will of God. I only place such a termination and boundary to his will, or rather to something willed by him, as was by himself before affixed to it and predetermined by an eternal and peremptory decree, that thus a vacancy might be made for a '*better covenant established on better promises*.' (Heb. vii, 22; viii, 6.)

2. This Theology offers God in Christ as an object of our sight and knowledge, with such clearness, splendour and plainness, that '*we, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changedin to the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord*.' (2 Cor. iii, 18.) In comparison with this brightness and glory, which was so pre-eminent and surpassing, the law itself is said not to have been either bright or glorious: For it '*had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth*.' (2 Cor iii, 8.) This was indeed '*the wisdom of God which was kept secret since the world began*:' (1 Cor. ii, 7. Rom. xvi, 25.) *Great* and inscrutable *is this mystery*: yet it is exhibited in Christ Jesus and '*made manifest*' with such luminous clearness, that *God* is said to have been '*manifest in the flesh*,' (1 Tim. iii, 16.) in no other sense than as though it would never have been possible for him to be manifested without the flesh; for the express purpose '*that the eternal life which was with the Father*, AND THE

WORD OF LIFE *which was from the beginning with God, might be heard with our ears, seen with our eyes, and handled with our hands.*' (1 John i, 1, 2.)

3. The OBJECT of our Theology being clothed in this manner, so abundantly fills the mind and satisfies the desire, that the Apostle openly declares, he was determined '*to know nothing among the Corinthians, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.*' (1 Cor. ii, 2.) To the Philippians he says, that he '*counted all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus; for whom he had suffered the loss of all things, and he counted them but dung that he might know Christ, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings.*' (Phil. iii, 8, 10.) Nay, in the knowledge of the object of our Theology, modified in this manner, all true glorying and just boasting consist, as the passage which we before quoted from Jeremiah, and the purpose to which St. Paul has accommodated it, most plainly evince. This is the manner in which it is expressed, '*Let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth.*' (Jer. ix, 24) When you hear any mention of mercy, your thoughts ought necessarily to revert to Christ, out of whom '*God is a consuming fire,*' to destroy the sinners of the earth. (Deut. iv, 24; Heb. xii, 29.) The way in which St. Paul has accommodated it, is this: '*Christ Jesus is made unto us by God, wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord!*' (1 Cor. i, 30, 31.) Nor is it wonderful, that the mind should desire to '*know nothing save Jesus Christ,*' or that its otherwise insatiable desire of knowledge should repose itself in him, since in him and in his gospel '*are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.*' (Col. ii, 3, 9.)

II. Having finished that part of our subject which related to this UNION, let us now proceed to the SUBORDINATION which subsists between these two objects. We will FIRST inspect *the nature* of this subordination, and THEN *its necessity*:

FIRST. Its NATURE consists in this, that every saving communication which God has with us, or which we have with God, is performed by means of the intervention of Christ.

1. The communication which God holds with us, is (i) either in his benevolent affection towards us, (ii) in his gracious decree concerning us, or (iii) in his saving efficacy in us.

In all these particulars Christ comes in as a middle man between the parties. For (i) when God is willing to communicate to us the affection of his goodness and mercy, he looks upon his ANOINTED ONE, in whom, as '*his beloved, he makes us accepted, to the praise of the glory of his grace.*' (Eph. i, 6.) —(ii) When he is pleased to make some gracious decree of his goodness and mercy, he interposes Christ between the purpose and the accomplishment, to announce his pleasure; for '*by Jesus Christ he predestinates us to the adoption of children.*' (Eph. i, 5.)—(iii) When he is willing out of this abundant affection to impart to us some blessing, according to his gracious decree, it is through the intervention of the same Divine person. For in Christ as our Head, the Father has laid up all these treasures and blessings; and they do not descend to us, except through him, or rather by him as the Father's substitute, who administers them with authority, and distributes them according to his own pleasure.

2. But the communication which we have with God, is also made by the intervention of Christ.—It consists of three degrees,—access to God, cleaving to him, and the enjoyment of him. These three particulars become the objects of our present consideration, as it is possible for them to be brought into action in this state of human existence, and as they may execute their functions by means of faith, hope, and that charity which is the offspring of faith.

(1) Three things are necessary to this access;—(i) that God be in a place to which we may approach;—(ii) that the path by which we may come to him be a high-way and a safe one; and (iii) that liberty be granted to us and boldness of access.—All these facilities have been procured for us by the mediation of Christ. (i) For the Father dwelleth in light inaccessible, and sits at a distance beyond Christ on a throne of rigid justice, which is an object much too formidable in appearance for the gaze of sinners; yet he hath appointed Christ to be '*a propitiatory through faith in his blood;*' (Rom. iii, 25.) by whom the covering of the ark, and the accusing, convincing, and condemning power of the law which was contained in that ark, are taken away and removed as a kind of veil from before the eyes of the Divine Majesty; and a throne of grace has been established, on which God is seated, '*with whom in Christ we have to do.*' Thus has the Father in the Son been made ευπροσιτος, "easy of access to us."—(ii) It is the same Lord Jesus Christ who '*hath not only through his*

flesh consecrated for us a new and living way,' by which we may go to the Father, (Heb. x. 20.) but who is likewise '*himself the way*' which leads in a direct and unerring manner to the Father. (John xiv, 6.)—(iii) '*By the blood of Jesus*' we have liberty of access, nay we are permitted '*to enter into the holiest,*' and even '*within the veil whither Christ, as a High Priest presiding over the house of God and our fore-runner, is entered for us,*' (Heb. v. 20.) that '*we may draw near with a true heart, in the sacred and full assurance of faith,* (x, 22.) and may with great confidence of mind '*come boldly unto the throne of grace.*' (iv, 16.) Have we therefore prayers to offer to God? Christ is the High Priest who displays them before the Father: He is also the altar from which, after being placed on it, they will ascend as incense of a grateful odour to God our Father.—Are sacrifices of thanksgiving to be offered to God? They must be offered through Christ, otherwise '*God will not accept them at our hands.*' (Mal. i, 10.)—Are good works to be performed? We must do them through the Spirit of Christ, that they may obtain the recommendation of him as their author; and they must be sprinkled with his blood, that they may not be rejected by the Father on account of their deficiency.

(2) But it is not sufficient for us only to approach to God; it is likewise good for us *to cleave to him.*—To confirm this act of cleaving and to give it perpetuity, it ought to depend upon a communion of nature: But with God we have no such communion. Christ however possesses it, and we are made possessors of it with Christ, '*who partook of our flesh and blood.*' (Heb. ii, 14.) Being constituted our head, he imparts unto us of his Spirit, that we, (being constituted his members, and cleaving to him as '*flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones,*') may be one with him, and through him with the Father, and with both may become '*one Spirit.*'

(3) *The enjoyment* remains to be be considered:—It is a true, solid, and durable taste of the Divine goodness and sweetness in this life, not only perceived by the mind and understanding, but likewise by the heart, which is the seat of all the affections. Neither does this become ours, except in Christ, by whose Spirit dwelling in us that most divine testimony is pronounced in our hearts, that '*we are the children of God, and heirs of eternal life.*' (Rom. viii, 16.) On hearing this internal testimony, we conceive joy ineffable, '*possess our souls in* hope and *patience,*' and in all our straits and difficul-

ties we call upon God and cry, ABBA FATHER, with an earnest expectation of our final access to God, of the consummation of our abiding in him and our cleaving to him, (by which we shall have '*all in all*,') and of the most blessed fruition, which will consist of the clear and unclouded vision of God himself. But the third division of our present subject,* will be the proper place to treat more fully on these subjects.

SECONDLY. Having seen the subordination of both the objects of Christian Theology, let us in a few words advert to its NECESSITY. This derives its origin from the comparison of our contagion and vicious depravity, with the sanctity of God that is incapable of defilement, and with the inflexible rigour of his justice, which completely separates us from him by a gulf so great as to render it impossible for us to be united together while at such a vast distance, or for a passage to be made from us to him,—unless Christ had trodden the wine-press of the wrath of God, and by the streams of his most precious blood, plentifully flowing from the pressed, broken, and disparted veins of his body, had filled up that otherwise impassable gulf, '*and had purged our consciences, sprinkled with this his own blood, from all dead works*;' (Heb. ix, 14, 22.) that, being thus sanctified, we might approach to '*the living God and might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life.*' (Luke i, 75.)

But such is the great NECESSITY of this subordination, that, unless our faith be in Christ, it cannot be in God: The Apostle Peter says, '*By him we believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory; that your faith and hope might be in God.*' (1 Peter, i, 21.) On this account the faith also which we have in God, was prescribed, not by the law, but by the gospel of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is properly '*the word of faith*' and '*the word of promise.*'

The consideration of this necessity is of infinite utility, (i) both in producing confidence in the consciences of believers, trembling at the sight of their sins,—as appears most evidently from our preceding observations; (ii) and in establishing the necessity of the Christian Religion. I account it necessary to make a few remarks on this latter topic, because they are required by the nature of our present purpose and of the Christian Religion itself.

* See the third Oration.

I observe, therefore, that not only is the intervention of Christ necessary to obtain salvation from God, and to impart it unto men, but the faith of Christ is also necessary to qualify men for receiving this salvation at his hands:—not that faith in Christ by which he may be apprehended under the general notion of the wisdom, power, goodness and mercy of God, but that faith which was announced by the Apostles and recorded in their writings, and in such a Saviour as was preached by those primitive heralds of salvation.

I am not in the least influenced by the argument by which some persons profess themselves induced to adopt the opinion, "that a faith in Christ thus particular and restricted, which is required from all that become the subjects of salvation, agrees neither with the amplitude of God's mercy, nor with the conditions of his justice, since many thousands of men depart out of this life, before even the sound of the Gospel of Christ has reached their ears." For the reasons and terms of Divine Justice and Mercy are not to be determined by the limited and shallow measure of our capacities or feelings; but we must leave with God the free administration and just defence of these his own attributes. The result, however, will invariably prove to be the same, in what manner soever he may be pleased to administer those divine properties,—for, '*he will always overcome when he is judged.*' (Rom. iii, 4.) Out of his word we must acquire our wisdom and information. At the head of those things which are most indispensable, and of those which rank next to them in importance, this Divine word describes the NECESSITY of faith in Christ, according to the appointment of the just mercy and the merciful justice of God. '*He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.*' (John iii, 36.) This is not an account of the first kindling of the wrath of God against this wilful unbeliever; for he had then deserved the most severe expressions of that wrath by the sins which he had previously committed against the law; and this wrath '*abides upon him*' on account of his continued unbelief, because he had been favoured with the opportunity as well as the power of being delivered from it, through faith in the Son of God. Again: '*If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.*' (John viii, 24.) And, in another passage, Christ declares, '*This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.*' (John

xvii, 3.) The Apostle says, '*It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.*' That preaching thus described is the doctrine of the cross, '*to the Jews a stumbling-block and unto the Greeks foolishness: but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God:* (1 Cor. i, 21, 23, 24.) This wisdom and this power are not those attributes which God employed when he formed the world, for Christ is here plainly distinguished from them; but they are the wisdom and the power revealed in that gospel which is eminently '*the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.*' (Rom. i, 16.) Not only, therefore, is the cross of Christ necessary to solicit and procure redemption, but the faith of the cross is also necessary in order to obtain possession of it.

The necessity of faith in the cross does not arise from the circumstance of the doctrine of the cross being preached and propounded to men; but, since faith in Christ is necessary according to the decree of God, the doctrine of the cross is preached, that those who believe in it may be saved. Not only on account of the decree of God is faith in Christ necessary, but it is also necessary on account of the promise made unto Christ by the Father, and according to the covenant which was ratified between both of them. This is the word of that promise: '*Ask of me, and I will give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance.*' (Psalm ii, 8.) But the inheritance of Christ is the multitude of the faithful; '*the willing people that in the day of his power shall be spontaneously present with him in the beauties of holiness.*' (Psalm cx, 3.) '*In thee shall all nations be blessed; so then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.*' (Galat. iii, 8, 9.) In Isaiah it is likewise declared, '*When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed. He shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by the knowledge of himself* [which is *faith in him*] *shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.*' (Isa. liii, 10, 11.) Christ adduces the covenant which has been concluded with the Father, and founds a plea upon it when he says, '*Father, glorify thy Son; that thy Son also may glorify thee: as thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, &c, &c.* (John xvii, 1,2,3,4.)

Christ therefore by the decree, the promise and the covenant of the Father, has been constituted the Saviour of all that believe on him, according to the declaration of the Apostle:

'*And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation, to all them that obey him.*' (Heb. v, 9.) This is the reason why the Gentiles without Christ are said to be '*aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.*' Yet through faith '*those who some time were thus afar off and in darkness*' are said to be made nigh, and '*are now light in the Lord.*' (Eph. ii, 12, 13, and v, 8.) It is requisite therefore earnestly to contend for the NECESSITY of the CHRISTIAN RELIGION, as for the altar and the anchor of our salvation, lest, after we have suffered the Son to be taken away from us and from our faith, we should also be deprived of the Father: —'*For whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father.*' (1 John ii, 23.) But if we in the slightest degree connive at the diminution or limitation of this NECESSITY, Christ himself will be brought into contempt among Christians, his own professing people; and will at length be totally denied and universally renounced. For it is not an affair of difficulty to take away the merit of salvation, and the efficacy of saving, from HIM to whom we are not compelled by any necessity to offer our oaths of allegiance. Who believes, that it is not necessary to return thanks to him who has conferred a benefit? Nay, who will not openly and confidently profess, that he is not the Author of salvation whom it is not necessary to acknowledge in that capacity? The union, therefore, of both the objects, GOD and CHRIST, must be strongly urged and enforced in our Christian Theology; nor is it to be endured that under any pretext they be totally detached and removed from each other, unless we wish Christ himself to be separated and withdrawn from us, and for us to be deprived at once of him and of our own salvation.

The present subject would require us briefly to present before your eyes all and each of those parts of which the consideration of this object ought to consist, and the order in which they should be placed before our eyes; but I am unwilling to detain this most famous and crowded auditory by a more prolix oration.

Since, therefore, thus wonderfully great are the dignity, majesty, splendour, and plenitude of Theology, and especially of our Christian Theology, by reason of its double object which is GOD and CHRIST,—it is just and proper that all those who glory in the title of "men formed in the image of God," or in the far more august title of "Christians" and "men rege-

nerated after the image of God and Christ," should most seriously and with ardent desire apply themselves to the knowledge of this Theology; and that they should think no object more worthy, pleasant, or useful than this, to engage their laborious attention or to awaken their energies. For what is more worthy of man, who is the image of God, than to be perpetually reflecting itself on its great archetype? What can be more pleasant, than to be continually irradiated and enlightened by the salutary beams of his Divine Pattern? What is more useful than, by such illumination, to be assimilated yet more and more to the Heavenly Original? Indeed there is not any thing the knowledge of which can be more useful than this is, in the very search for it; or, when discovered, can be more profitable to the possessor. What employment is more becoming and honourable in a creature, a servant, and a son, than to spend whole days and nights in obtaining a knowledge of God his Creator, his Lord, and his Father? What can be more decorous and comely in those who are redeemed by the blood of Christ, and who are sanctified by his Spirit, than diligently and constantly to meditate upon Christ, and always to carry him about in their minds, and hearts, and also on their tongues?

I am fully aware that this animal life requires the discharge of various functions; that the superintendence of them must be entrusted to those persons who will execute each of them to the common advantage of the republic; and that the knowledge necessary for the right management of all such duties, can only be acquired by continued study and much labour. But if the very persons to whom the management of these concerns has been officially committed, will acknowledge the important principle,—that *in preference to all others, those things should be sought which appertain to the kingdom of God and his righteousness*, (Matt. vi, 33.) they will confess that their ease and leisure, their meditations and cares, should yield the precedence to this momentous study. Though David himself was the king of a numerous people, and intangled in various wars, yet he never ceased to cultivate and pursue this study in preference to all others. To the benefit which he had derived from such a judicious practice, he attributes the portion of wisdom which he had obtained, and which was '*greater than that of his enemies*;' (Psalm cxix, 98.) and by it also '*he had more understanding than all his teachers*.' (99.) The three most noble treatises which Solomon composed, are

to the present day read by the Church with admiration and thanksgiving; and they testify the great advantage which the royal author obtained from a knowledge of Divine things, while he was the chief magistrate of the same people on the throne of his Father. But since, according to the opinion of a Roman Emperor, "nothing is more difficult than to govern well," what just cause will any one be able to offer for the neglect of a study, to which even kings could devote their time and attention? Nor is it wonderful that they acted thus; for they addicted themselves to this profitable and pleasant study by the command of God; and the same Divine command has been imposed upon all and each of us, and is equally binding. It is one of Plato's observations, that "commonwealths would at length enjoy happiness and prosperity, either when their princes and ministers-of-state became philosophers, or when philosophers were chosen as ministers-of-state and conducted the affairs of government." We may transfer this sentiment with far greater justice to Theology, which is the true and only wisdom in relation to things Divine.

But these our admonitions more particularly concern you, most excellent and learned youths, who, by the wish of your parents or patrons, and at your own express desire, have been devoted, set apart, and consecrated to this study; not to cultivate it merely with diligence, for the sake of promoting your own salvation, but that you may at some future period be qualified to engage in the eligible occupation (which is most pleasing to God,) of teaching, instructing, and edifying the Church of the saints,—'*which is the body of Christ, and the fulness of him that filleth all in all.*' (Eph. i, 23.) Let the extent and the majesty of the object, which by a deserved right engages all our powers, be constantly placed before your eyes; and suffer nothing to be accounted more glorious, than to spend whole days and nights in acquiring a knowledge of God and his Christ, since true and allowable glorying consists in this Divine knowledge. Reflect what great concerns those must be into which ANGELS desire to look. Consider likewise, that you are now forming an entrance for yourselves into a communion, at least of name,* with these Heavenly Beings, and that God will in a little time call you to the employment for which you are preparing,—which is one great object of my hopes and wishes concerning you!

* In reference to the word *angelus*, which signifies both *an angel* and *a messenger*.

Propose to yourselves for imitation that chosen instrument of Christ, the Apostle Paul, whom you with the greatest willingness acknowledge as your teacher, and who professes himself to be inflamed with such an intense desire of knowing Christ, that he not only held every worldly thing in small estimation when put in competition with this knowledge, but also '*suffered the loss of all things, that he might win the knowledge of Christ.*' (Phil. iii, 8.) Look at Timothy his disciple, whom he felicitates on this account,—'*that from a child he had known the holy scriptures.*' (2 Tim. iii, 15.) You have already attained to a share in the same blessedness; and you will make further advances in it, if you determine to receive the admonitions, and to execute the charge, which that great teacher of the Gentiles addresses to his Timothy.—But this study requires not only diligence, but holiness, and a sincere desire to please God. For the object which you handle, into which you are looking, and which you wish to know, is sacred,—nay, it is the holy of holies. To pollute sacred things, is highly indecent; it is desirable that the persons by whom such things are administered, should communicate to them no taint of defilement. The ancient Gentiles when about to offer sacrifice were accustomed to exclaim,

"Far, far from hence let the profane depart!"

This caution should be re-iterated by you, for a more solid and lawful reason when you proceed to offer sacrifices to God Most High, and to his Christ, before whom also the holy choir of angels repeat aloud that thrice-hallowed song, '*Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty!*' While you are engaged in this study, do not suffer your minds to be enticed away by other pursuits and to different objects. Exercise yourselves, continue to exercise yourselves in this, with a mind intent upon what has been proposed to you according to the design of this discourse. If you do this, in the course of a short time you will not repent of your labour; but you will make such progress in the way of the knowledge of the Lord, as will render you useful to others. For '*the secret of the Lord is with them that fear him.*' (Psalm xxv, 14.) Nay, from the very circumstance of this unremitting attention, you will be enabled to declare, that you '*have chosen the good part which* alone *shall not be taken away from you,*' (Luke x, 42.) but which will daily receive fresh increase: Your minds will be so expanded by the knowledge of God and of his Christ, that they will hereafter become a most ample habitation for God and Christ through the Spirit.—I have finished.

ORATION II.

THE AUTHOR AND THE END OF THEOLOGY.

THEY who are conversant with the demonstrative species of oratory and choose for themselves any subject of praise or blame, must generally be engaged in removing from themselves, what very readily assails the minds of their auditors, a suspicion, that they are not impelled to speak by any immoderate feeling of love or hatred, but are more gently induced by an approved judgment of the mind; and that they have not followed the ardent flame of their will, but the clear light of their understanding which accords with the nature of the subject which they are discussing. But to me such a course is not necessary. For that which I have chosen for the subject of my commendation, easily removes from me all ground for such a suspicion.

I do not deny, that here indeed I yield to the feeling of love; but it is on a matter which if any one does not love, he hates himself, and perfidiously prostitutes the life of his soul. Sacred Theology is the subject whose excellence and dignity I now celebrate in this brief and unadorned Oration; and which, I am convinced, is to all of you an object of the greatest regard. Nevertheless, I wish to raise it, if possible, still higher in your esteem: This, indeed, its own merit demands; this, the nature of my office requires. Nor is it any part of my study to amplify its dignity by ornaments borrowed from other objects; for to the perfection of its beauty can be added nothing extraneous that would not tend to its degradation and the loss of its comeliness. I only display such ornaments as are, of themselves, its best recommendation. There are, its OBJECT, its AUTHOR, its END, and its CERTAINTY. Concerning the OBJECT, we have already declared whatever the Lord had imparted; and we will now speak of its AUTHOR and its END. God grant that I may follow the guidance of this Theology in all respects, and may advance nothing except what agrees

with its nature, is worthy of God and useful to you, to the glory of his name and to the uniting of all of us together in the Lord! I pray and beseech you also, my most excellent and courteous hearers, that you will listen to me, now when I am beginning to speak on the AUTHOR and the END of Theology, with the same degree of kindness and attention as that which you evinced when you heard my preceding discourse on its OBJECT.

Being about to treat of the AUTHOR, I will not collect together the lengthened reports of his well-merited praises, for with you this is unnecessary. I will only declare (1) *Who the Author is;* (2) *In what respects he is to be considered;* (3) *Which of his properties were employed by him in the revelation of Theology; and* (4) *In what manner he has made it known.*

I. We have considered the OBJECT of Theology in regard to two particulars: And that each part of our subject may properly and exactly answer to the other, we may also consider its Author in a two-fold respect,—that of LEGAL and of EVANGELICAL Theology: In both cases, the same person is the AUTHOR and the OBJECT, and the person who reveals the doctrine is likewise its matter and argument. This is a peculiarity that belongs to no other of the numerous sciences. For although all of them may boast of God, as their Author, because he is a *God of knowledge;* yet, as we have seen, they have some other object than God, which something is indeed derived from him and of his production. But they do not partake of God as their efficient cause, in an equal manner with this doctrine, which for a particular reason, and one entirely distinct from that of the other sciences, lays claim to God as its Author. God therefore is the Author of *legal* Theology; God and his Christ, or God in and through Christ, is the Author of that which is *evangelical.* For to this the scripture bears witness, and thus the very nature of the object requires, both of which we will separately demonstrate.

1. Scripture describes to us the Author of *legal* Theology before the fall, in these words: "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it:" (Gen. ii. 16, 17.) A threat was added in express words, in case the man should act deceitfully; and a promise, in the type of the tree of life, if he complied with the command. But there are two things, which, as they preceded this act of legislation, should have been pre-

viously known by man: (1) The nature of God, which is wise, good, just, and powerful; (2.) The authority by which he issues his commands, the right of which rests on the act of creation. Of both these man had a previous knowledge, from the manifestation of God, who familiarly conversed with him, and held communication with his own image through that Spirit by whose inspiration he said, "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh." (Gen. ii. 23.) The Apostle has attributed the knowledge of both these things to faith, and, therefore, to the manifestation of God. He speaks of *the former* in these words: "For he that cometh to God must have believed [so I read it,] that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." (Heb. xi. 6.) If a rewarder, therefore, he is a wise, good, just powerful, and provident guardian of human affairs. Of *the latter* he speaks thus: "Through faith we understand that the world was framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." (Heb. xi. 3.) And although that is not expressly and particularly stated of the moral law, in the primeval state of man; yet, when it is affirmed of the typical and ceremonial law, it must be also understood in reference to the moral law. For the typical and ceremonial law was an experiment of obedience to the moral law, that was to be tried on man, and the acknowledgment of his obligation to obey the moral law. This appears still more evidently in the repetition of the moral law by Moses after the fall, which was specially made known to the people of Israel in these words: "And God spake all these words:" (Exod. xx. 1.) and "What nation is there so great that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day?" (Deut. iv. 8.) But Moses set it before them according to the manifestation of God to him, and in obedience to his command,—as he says: "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law." (Deut. xxix, 29.) And, according to Paul, "That which may be known of God, is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them." (Rom. i, 19.)

2. The same thing is evinced by the nature of the object. For since God is the Author of the universe, (and that, not by a natural and internal operation, but by one that is voluntary and external, and that imparts to the work as much as he chooses of his own, and as much as the *nothing*, from which it

is produced, will permit,) his excellence and dignity must necessarily far exceed the capacity of the universe, and, for the same reason, that of man. On this account he is said in scripture, "to dwell in the light unto which no man can approach," (1 Tim. vi, 16.) which strains even the most acute sight of any creature, by a brightness so great and dazzling, that the eye is blunted and overpowered, and would soon be blinded unless God, by some admirable process of attempering that blaze of light, should offer himself to the view of his creatures: This is the very manifestation before which darkness is said to have fixed its habitation.

Nor is he himself alone inaccessible, but "as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are his ways higher than our ways, and his thoughts than our thoughts," (Isaiah lv, 9.) The actions of God are called "the ways of God," and the creation especially is called "the beginning of the way of God," (Prov. viii.) by which God began, as it were, to arise and to go forth from the throne of his majesty. Those actions therefore could not have been made known and understood, in the manner in which it is allowable to know and understand them, except by the revelation of God. This was also indicated before, in the term '*faith*' which the Apostle employed. But the thoughts of God, and his will, (both that will which he wishes to be done by us, and that which he has resolved to do concerning us,) are of free disposition, which is determined by the Divine power and liberty inherent in himself; and since he has, in all this, called in the aid of no counsellor, those thoughts and that will are of necessity "unsearchable and past finding out." (Rom. xi. 33.) Of these, Legal Theology consists; and as they could not be known before the revelation of them proceeded from God, it is evidently proved that God is its Author.

To this truth all nations and people assent. What compelled Rhadamanthus and Minos, those most equitable kings of Crete, to enter the dark cave of Jupiter and pretend that the laws, which they had promulgated among their subjects, were brought from that cave, at the inspiration of the Deity? It was because they knew those laws would not meet with general reception, unless they were believed to have been divinely communicated. Before Lycurgus began the work of legislation for his Lacedæmonians, imitating the example of those two kings, he went to Apollo at Delphos, that he might on his return confer on his laws the highest recommendation by means of the authority of

the Delphic Oracle. To induce the ferocious minds of the Roman people to submit to religion, Numa Pompilius feigned that he had nocturnal conferences with the goddess Ægeria. These were positive and evident testimonies of a notion which had pre-occupied the minds of men, "that no religion except one of divine origin and deriving its principles from heaven, deserved to be received." Such a truth they considered this, "that no one could know God, or any thing concerning God, except through God himself."

2. Let us now look at EVANGELICAL THEOLOGY. We have made the Author of it to be Christ and God, at the command of the same scriptures as those which establish the divine claims of Legal Theology, and because the nature of the object requires it with the greater justice, in proportion as that object is the more deeply hidden in the abyss of the divine wisdom, and as the human mind is the more closely surrounded and enveloped with the shades of ignorance.

(1) Exceedingly numerous are the passages of scripture which serve to aid and strengthen us in this opinion. We will enumerate a few of them: *First*, those which ascribe the manifestation of this doctrine to GOD THE FATHER; *Then*, those which ascribe it to CHRIST. "But we," says the Apostle, "speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory: But God hath revealed it unto us by his Spirit." (1 Cor. ii, 7, 10.) The same Apostle says,—"The gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God." (Rom. xvi, 25, 26.) When Peter made a correct and just confession of Christ, it was said to him by the Saviour, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven." (Matt. xvi, 17.) John the Baptist attributed the same to Christ, saying, "The only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared God to us." (John i, 18.) Christ also ascribed this manifestation to himself in these words, "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." (Matt. xi, 27.) And, in another place, "I have manifested thy name unto the men whom thou gavest me out of the world, and they have believed that thou didst send me." (John xvii, 6, 8.)

(2) Let us consider the necessity of this manifestation from the nature of its Object.

This is indicated by Christ when speaking of Evangelical Theology, in these words: "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son." (Matt. xi, 27.) Therefore no man can reveal the Father or the Son, and yet in the knowledge of them are comprised the glad tidings of the gospel. The Baptist is an assertor of the necessity of this manifestation when he declares, that "No man hath seen God at any time." (John i, 18.) It is *the wisdom* belonging to this Theology, which is said by the Apostle to be "hidden in a mystery, which none of the princes of this world knew, and which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man." (1 Cor. ii, 7, 8, 9.) It does not come within the cognizance of the understanding, and is not mixed up, as it were, with the first notions or ideas impressed on the mind at the period of its creation; it is not acquired in conversation or reasoning; but it is made known "in the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth." To this Theology belongs "that manifold wisdom of God which must be made known by the Church unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places," (Ephes. iii, 10.) otherwise it would remain unknown even to the angels themselves. What! Are the deep things of God "which no man knoweth but the Spirit of God which is in himself," explained by this doctrine? Does it also unfold "the length, and breadth, and depth, and height" of the wisdom of God? As the Apostle speaks in another passage, in a tone of the most impassioned admiration, and almost at a loss what words to employ in expressing the fulness of this Theology, in which are proposed, as objects of discovery, "the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, and the peace of God which passeth all understanding." (Ephes. iii, 18.) From these passages it most evidently appears, that the Object of Evangelical Theology must have been revealed by God and Christ, or it must otherwise have remained hidden and surrounded by perpetual darkness; or, (which is the same thing,) that Evangelical Theology would not have come within the range of our knowledge, and, on that account, as a necessary consequence, there could have been none at all.

If it be an agreeable occupation to any person, (and such it must always prove!) to look more methodically and distinctly through each part, let him cast the eyes of his mind on those

properties of the Divine Nature which this Theology displays, clothed in their own appropriate mode; let him consider those *actions* of God which this doctrine brings to light, and that *will* of God which he has revealed in his gospel: When he has done this, (and of much more than this the subject is worthy!) he will more distinctly understand the necessity of the Divine manifestation.

If any one would adopt a compendious method, let him only contemplate Christ; and when he has diligently observed that admirable union of the WORD and FLESH, his investiture into office and the manner in which its duties were executed; when he has at the same time reflected, that the whole of these arrangements and proceedings are in consequence of the voluntary economy, regulation, and free dispensation of God;—he cannot avoid professing openly, that the knowledge of all these things could not have been obtained except by means of the revelation of God and Christ.

But lest any one should take occasion, from the remarks which we have now made, to entertain an unjust suspicion or error, as though God the Father alone, to the exclusion of the Son, were the Author of the legal doctrine, and the Father through the Son were the Author of the Evangelical doctrine, —a few observations shall be added, that may serve to solve this difficulty, and further to illustrate the matter of our discourse. As God by his WORD, (which is his own Son,) and by his SPIRIT, created all things, and man according to the image of himself, so it is likewise certain, that no intercourse can take place between him and man, without the agency of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. How is this possible, since the *ad extra* works of the Deity are indivisible, and when the order of operation *ad extra* is the same as the order of procession *ad intra*? We do not, therefore, by any means exclude the Son as the Word of the Father, and the Holy Ghost who is "the Spirit of Prophecy," from efficiency in this revelation.

But there is another consideration in the manifestation of the gospel, not indeed with respect to the persons testifying, but in regard to the manner in which they come to be considered. For the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, have not only a natural relation among themselves, but another likewise which derives its origin from the will; yet the latter entirely agrees with the natural relation that subsists among them. There is an internal procession in the persons; and there is an external one, which is called in the scriptures and

in the writings of the Fathers, by the name of "Mission" or "sending." To the latter mode of procession, special regard must be had in this revelation. For the Father manifests the Gospel through his Son and Spirit.—(i.) He manifests it through the Son,—as to his being, sent for the purpose of performing the office of Mediator between God and sinful men; as to his being the WORD made flesh, and God manifest in the flesh; and as to his having died, and to his being raised again to life,—whether that was done in reality, or only in the decree and foreknowledge of God. (ii.) He also manifests it through his Spirit, as to his being the Spirit of Christ, whom he asked of his Father by his passion and his death, and whom he obtained when he was raised from the dead, and placed at the right hand of the Father.

I think you will understand the distinction which I imagine to be here employed: I will afford you an opportunity to examine and prove it, by adducing the clearest passages of scripture to aid us in confirming it. (i.) "All things," said Christ, "are delivered to me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son." (Matt. xi, 27.) They were *delivered* by the Father, to him as the Mediator, "in whom it was his pleasure that all fulness should dwell." (Col. i. 19. See also ii. 9.) In the same sense must be understood what Christ says in John: "I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me;" for it is subjoined, "and they have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me." (xvii. 8.) From hence it appears, that the Father had given those words to him as the Mediator: on which account he says, in another place, "He whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God." (John iii. 34.) With this the saying of the Baptist agrees, "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." (John i. 17.) But in reference to his being opposed to Moses, who accuses and condemns sinners, Christ is considered as the Mediator between God and sinners. The following passage tends to the same point: "No man hath seen God at any time: the only-begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father," [that is, "admitted," in his capacity of Mediator, to the intimate and confidential view and knowledge of his Father's secrets,] "he hath declared him:" (John i. 18.) "For the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand;" (John iii. 35.) and among the things thus given, was the doctrine of the

gospel, which he was to expound and declare to others, by the command of God the Father. And in every revelation which has been made to us through Christ, that expression which occurs in the beginning of the Apocalypse of St. John holds good and is of the greatest validity: "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants." God has therefore manifested Evangelical Theology through his Son, in reference to his being sent forth by the Father, to execute among men, and in his name, the office of Mediator.

(ii.) Of THE HOLY SPIRIT the same scripture testifies, that, as the Spirit of Christ the Mediator, who is the head of his church, he has revealed the Gospel. "Christ, by the Spirit," says Peter, "went and preached to the spirits in prison." (1 Peter iii. 19.) And what did he preach? Repentance. This therefore was done through his Spirit, in his capacity of Mediator, for, in this respect alone, the Spirit of God exhorts to repentance. This appears more clearly from the same Apostle: "Of which salvation the prophets have enquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified before hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." And this was the Spirit of Christ in his character of Mediator and head of the Church, which the very object of the testimony fore told by him sufficiently evinces. A succeeding passage exclu des all doubt; for the gospel is said in it "to be preached by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." (1 Pet. i. 12.) For he was *sent down* by Christ when he was elevated at the right hand of God, as it is mentioned in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles; which passage also makes for our purpose, and on that account deserves to have its just meaning here appreciated. This is its phraseology, "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." (Acts ii. 33.) For it was by the Spirit that the Apostles prophesied and spoke in divers languages. These passages might suffice; but I cannot omit that most noble sentence spoken by Christ to console the minds of his disciples, who were grieving on account of his departure, "If I go not away, the Comforter [or rather "the Advocate, who shall, in my place, discharge the vicarious office," as Tertullian expresses himself;] If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him

unto you. And when he is come he will reprove the world &c. (John xvi, 7, 8.)—He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you." (14.) Christ, therefore, as Mediator, "will send him," and he "will receive of that which belongs to Christ the Mediator. He shall glorify Christ" as constituted by God the Mediator and the Head of the Church; and he shall glorify him with that glory, which, according to the seventeenth chapter of St. John's Gospel, Christ thought it necessary to ask of his Father. That passage brings another to my recollection, which may be called its parallel in merit: John says, "The Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified." (vii, 39.) This remark was not to be understood of the person of the Spirit, but of his gifts, and especially that of prophecy. But Christ was glorified in quality of Mediator: and in that glorified capacity he sends the Holy Ghost: therefore, the Holy Spirit was sent by Christ as the Mediator. On this account also, the Spirit of Christ the Mediator is the Author of Evangelical Prophecy.—But the Holy Ghost was sent, even before the glorification of Christ, to reveal the Gospel. The existing state of the Church required it at that period, and the Holy Spirit was sent to meet that necessity. "Christ is likewise the same, yesterday, to-day, and for ever." (Heb. xiii. 8.) He was also "slain from the foundation of the world;" (Rev. xiii, 8.) and was therefore at that same time raised again and glorified; —but this was all in the decree and fore-knowledge of God. To make it evident, however, that God has never sent the Holy Spirit to the Church, except through the agency of Christ the Mediator, and in regard to him,—God deferred that plentiful and exuberant effusion of his most copious gifts, until Christ, after his exaltation to heaven, should send them down in a communication of the greatest abundance. Thus he testified by a clear and evident proof, that he had formerly poured out the gifts of the Spirit upon the Church, by the same person, as he by whom, (when through his ascension the dense and overcharged cloud of waters above the heavens had been disparted,) he poured down the most plentiful showers of his graces, inundating and overspreading the whole body of the Church.

III. But the revelation of Evangelical Theology is attributed to Christ in regard to his Mediatorship, and to the Holy Ghost in regard to his being the appointed substitute and Advocate of Christ the Mediator. This is done most consistently and

for a very just reason, both because Christ, as Mediator, is placed for the ground-work of this doctrine, and because in the duty of Mediation those actions were to be performed, those sufferings endured, and those blessings asked and obtained, which complete a goodly portion of the matters that are disclosed in the gospel of Christ. No wonder, therefore, that Christ in this respect (in which he is himself the object of the gospel,) should likewise be the revealer of it, and the person who asks and procures all evangelical graces, and who is at once the Lord of them and the communicator. And since the Spirit of Christ, our Mediator and our head, is the bond of our union with Christ, from which we also obtain communion with Christ, and a participation in all his blessings,—it is just and reasonable, that, in the respect which we have just mentioned, Christ should reveal to our minds, and seal upon our hearts, the evangelical charter and evidence of *that faith by which he dwelleth in our hearts!* The consideration of this matter exhibits to us (1.) the cause why it is possible for God to restrain himself with such great forbearance, patience, and long-suffering, until the gospel is obeyed by those to whom it is preached; and (2.) it affords great consolation to our ignorance and infirmities.

I think, my hearers, you perceive that this single view adds no small degree of dignity to our Evangelical Theology, besides that which it possesses from the common consideration of its Author. If we may be allowed further to consider what *wisdom*, *goodness*, and *power* God expended when he instituted and revealed this Theology, it will give great importance to our proposition. Indeed, all kinds of sciences have their origin in the wisdom of God, and are communicated to men by his goodness and power. But, if it be his right, (as it undoubtedly is,) to appoint gradations in the external exercise of his divine properties, we shall say, that all other sciences except this, have arisen from *an inferior wisdom of God*, and have been revealed by *a less degree of goodness and power*. It is proper to estimate this matter according to the excellence of its object. As the *wisdom* of God, by which he knows himself, is greater than that by which he knows other things; so the wisdom employed by him in the manifestation of himself is greater than that employed in the manifestation of other things. The *goodness* by which he permits himself to be known and acknowledged by man as his Chief Good, is greater than that by which he imparts the knowledge of other things. The *power* also, by which nature is raised to the knowledge of

supernatural things, is greater than that by which it is brought to investigate things that are of the same species and origin with itself. Therefore, although all the sciences may boast of God as their author, yet in these particulars, Theology, soaring above the whole, leaves them at an immense distance.

But as this consideration raises the dignity of Theology on the whole far above all other sciences, so it likewise demonstrates that *Evangelical* far surpasses *Legal* Theology; on which point we may be allowed, with your good leave, to dwell a little.—The wisdom, goodness, and power, by which God made man, after his own image, to consist of a rational soul and a body, are great, and constitute the claims to precedency on the part of Legal Theology. But the wisdom, goodness, and power, by which "the Word was made flesh," (John i, 14,) and "God was manifest in the flesh," (1 Tim. iii, 16,) and by which he "who was in the form of God took upon himself the form of a servant," (Phil. ii, 7,) are still greater, and they are the claims by which Evangelical Theology asserts its right to precedence.—The wisdom, and goodness, by the operation of which the power of God has been revealed to salvation, are great; but that by which is revealed "the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth," (Rom. ii, 16,) far exceeds it. Great indeed are the wisdom and goodness, by which "the righteousness of God by the law is made manifest," and by which the justification of the law was ascribed of debt to perfect obedience; but they are infinitely surpassed by the wisdom and goodness through which the righteousness of God by faith is manifested, and through which it is determined that the man is justified "that worketh not, but [being a sinner,] believeth on him who justifieth the ungodly," according to the most glorious riches of his grace.—Conspicuous and excellent were the wisdom and goodness which appointed the manner of union with God in legal righteousness, performed out of conformity to the image of God, after which man was created. But a solemn and substantial triumph is achieved through faith in Christ's blood by the wisdom and goodness, which, having devised and executed the wonderful method of qualifying justice and mercy, appoint the manner of union in Christ, and in his righteousness, "who is the brightness of his Father's glory and the express image of his person." (Heb. i. 3.)—Lastly, it is the wisdom, goodness and power, which out of the thickest darkness of ignorance brought forth the marvellous light of the gospel; which, from an infi-

nite multitude of sins, brought in everlasting righteousness; and which, from death and the depths of hell, "brought life and immortality to light:"—The wisdom, goodness, and power which have produced these effects, exceed those in which the light that is added to light, the righteousness that is rewarded by a due recompense, and the animal life that is regulated according to godliness by the command of the law, are each of them swallowed up and consummated in that which is spiritual and eternal.

A deeper consideration of this matter almost compels me to adopt a more confident daring, and to give to the wisdom, goodness, and power of God, which are unfolded in Legal Theology, the title of "NATURAL," and as in some sense the beginning of the going forth of God towards his image, which is man, and a commencement of Divine intercourse with him. The others, which are manifested in the Gospel, I fearlessly call "SUPERNATURAL wisdom, power, and goodness," and "the extreme point and the perfect completion of all revelation;" because in the manifestation of the latter, God appears to have excelled himself, and to have unfolded every one of his blessings. Admirable was the kindness of God, and most stupendous his condescension in admitting man to the most intimate communion with himself,—a privilege full of grace and mercy, after his sins had rendered him unworthy of having the establishment of such an intercourse. But this was required by the unhappy and miserable condition of man, who through his greater unworthinesss had become the more indigent, through his deeper blindness required illumination by a stronger light, through his more grievous wickedness demanded reformation by means of a more extensive goodness, and who, the weaker he had become, needed a stronger exertion of power for his restoration and establishment. It is also a happy circumstance, that no aberration of ours can be so great, as to prevent God from recalling us into the good way; no fall so deep, as to disable him from raising us up and causing us to stand erect; and no evil of ours can be of such magnitude, as to prove a difficult conquest to his goodness, provided it be his pleasure to put the whole of it in motion; and this he will actually do, provided we suffer our ignorance and infirmities to be corrected by his light and power, and our wickedness to be subdued by his goodness.

IV. We have seen that, (I) *God is the Author of Theology; and God and his Christ, that of Evangelical Theology.* We

have seen at the same time (II) *in what respect God and Christ are to be viewed in making known this revelation*, and (III) *according to what properties of the Divine Nature of both of them it has been perfected.*

We will now just glance at the MANNER.—The manner of the Divine manifestation appears to be *threefold*, according to the three instruments or organs of our capacity; (1) THE EXTERNAL SENSES, (2) THE INWARD FANCY OR IMAGINATION, and (3) THE MIND OR UNDERSTANDING. God sometimes reveals himself and his will by an image or representation offered to the external sight, or through an audible speech or discourse addressed to the ear. Sometimes he introduces himself by the same method to the imagination; and sometimes he addresses the mind in a manner ineffable, which is called INSPIRATION. Of all these modes scripture most clearly supplies us with luminous examples. But time will not permit me to be detained in enumerating them, lest I should appear to be yet more tedious to this most accomplished assembly.

THE END OF THEOLOGY.

We have been engaged in viewing the AUTHOR; let us now advert to the END. This is the more eminent and divine according to the greater excellence of that matter of which it is the end. In that light, therefore, this science is far more illustrious and transcendant than all others; because it alone has a relation to the life that is spiritual and supernatural, and has an END beyond the boundaries of the present life: while all other sciences have respect to this animal life, and each has an END proposed to itself, extending from the centre of this earthly life and included within its circumference. Of this science, then, that may be truly said which the poet declared concerning his wise friend, "For those things alone he feels any relish, the rest like shadows fly." I repeat it, "they fly away," unless they be referred to this science, and firmly fix their foot upon it and be at rest. But the same person who is the AUTHOR and OBJECT, is also the END of Theology. The very proportion and analogy of these things make such a connection requisite. For since the Author is the First and Chief Being, it is of necessity that he be the First and Chief Good: He is therefore the extreme End of all things. And since He, the Chief Being and the Chief Good, subjects, lowers, and spreads himself out, as an object to some power or faculty of a rational creature, that by its action or motion it may be employed and occupied concerning him, nay, that it may in a sense be united

with him,—it cannot possibly be, that the creature, after having performed its part respecting that object, should fly beyond it and extend itself further for the sake of acquiring a greater good. It is therefore of necessity that it restrain isself within him,—not only as within a boundary beyond which it is impossible for it to pass on account of the infinitude of the object and on account of its own importence,—but also as within its END and its GOOD, beyond which, because they are both the CHIEF in degree, it neither wishes nor is capable of desiring any thing; provided this object be united with it as far as the capacity of the creature will permit. God is therefore the END of our Theology, proposed by God himself in the acts prescribed in it; intended by man in the performance of those actions, and to be bestowed by God, after man shall have piously and religiously performed his duty. But because the chief Good was not placed in the promise of it, nor in the desire of obtaining it, but in actually receiving it, the end of Theology may with the utmost propriety be called, THE UNION OF GOD WITH MAN.

But it is not an ESSENTIAL union, as if two essences, (for instance, that of God and man,) were compacted together or joined into one, or as that by which man might himself be absorbed into God. The former of these modes of union is prohibited by the very nature of the things so united, and the latter is rejected by the nature of the union. Neither is it a *formal* union, as if God by that union might be made in the form of man, like a Spirit united to a body imparting to it life and motion, and acting upon it at pleasure, although, by dwelling in the body, it should confer on man the gift of life eternal.—But it is an *objective union*, by which God, through the agency of his pre-eminent and most excellent faculties and actions, (all of which he wholly occupies and completely fills,) gives such convincing proofs of himself to man, that God may then be said to be "all in all." (1 Cor. xv, 21.) This union is *immediate*, and without any bond that is different to the limits themselves. For God unites himself to the understanding and to the will of his creature, by means of himself alone, and without the intervention of image, species, or appearance: This is what the nature of this last and supreme union requires, as being that in which consists the Chief Good of a rational creature, which cannot find rest except in the greatest union of itself with God. But by this union, the understanding beholds in the clearest vision, and as if "face to face," God

himself, and all his goodness and incomparable beauty. And because a good of such magnitude and known by the clearest vision cannot fail of being loved on its own account,—from this very consideration the will embraces it with a more intense love, in proportion to the greater degree of knowledge of it which the mind has obtained.

But here a double difficulty presents itself, which must first be removed, in order that our feet may afterwards without stumbling run along a path that will then appear smooth and to have been for some time well trodden. (1) The one is, "How can it be that the eye of the human understanding does not become dim and beclouded when an object of such transcendent light is presented to it?" (2) The other is, "How can the same understanding, although its eye may not be dim and blinded, receive and contain that object in such great measure and proportion?" The cause of the first is, that the light exhibits itself to the understanding not in the infinity of its own nature, but in a form that is qualified and attempered. And to what is it thus accommodated? Is it not to the understanding? Undoubtedly, to the understanding; but not according to the capacity which it possessed before the union: otherwise it could not receive and contain as much as would suffice to fill it and make it happy. But it is attempered according to the measure of its extension and enlargement, to admit of which the understanding is exquisitely formed, if it be enlightened and irradiated by the gracious and glorious shining of the light accommodated to that expansion. If it be thus enlightened, the eye of the understanding will not be overpowered and become dim, and it will receive that object in such a vast proportion as will most abundantly suffice to make man completely happy. This is a solution for both these difficulties.—But an extension of the understanding will be followed by an enlargement of the will, either from a proper and adequate object offered to it, and accommodated to the same rule; or (which I prefer,) from the native agreement of the will and understanding, and the analogy implanted in both of them, according to which the understanding extends itself to acts of volition, in the very proportion of its understanding and knowledge. In this act of the mind and will,—in seeing a present God, in loving him, and therefore in the enjoyment of him,—the salvation of man and his perfect happiness consist. To which is added a conformation of our body itself to this glorious state of the soul, which, whether it be effected by the

immediate action of God on the body, or by means of an agency resulting from the action of the soul on the body,—it is neither necessary for us here to enquire, nor at this time to discover. From hence also arises and shines forth illustriously the chief and infinite glory of God, far surpassing all other glory, that he has displayed in every preceding function which he administered. For since that action is truly great and glorious which is good, and since goodness alone obtains the title of "greatness," according to that elegant saying, το ευ μεγα, * then indeed the best action of God is the greatest and the most glorious. But that is the best action by which he unites himself immediately to the creature, and affords himself to be seen, loved and enjoyed in such an abundant measure as agrees with the creature dilated and expanded to that degree which we have mentioned. This is therefore the most glorious of God's actions. Wherefore the end of Theology is *the union of God with man*, to the salvation of the one and the glory of the other;—and to the glory which he declares by his act, not that glory which man ascribes to God when he is united to him. Yet it cannot be otherwise, than that man should be incited to sing for ever the high praises of God, when he beholds and enjoys such large and overpowering goodness.

But the observations we have hitherto made on the END of Theology, were accommodated to the manner of that which is *legal*. We must now consider the same END as it is proposed to Evangelical Theology. The END of this is (1) God and Christ, (2) the union of man with both of them, and (3) the sight and fruition of both, to the glory of both Christ and God. On each of these particulars we have some remarks to make from the scriptures, and which most appropriately agree with, and are peculiar to, the Evangelical doctrine.

But before we enter upon these remarks, we must shew that the salvation of man, to the glory of Christ himself, consists also in the love, the sight, and the fruition of Christ. There is a passage in the fifteenth Chapter of the first Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians, which imposes this necessity upon us, because it appears to exclude Christ from this consideration. For in that place the Apostle says, "When Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, then the Son also himself shall be subject unto him, that God may be all in all." (1 Cor. xv, 24.) From this

* "That which is good is great."

passage three difficulties are raised, which must be removed by an appropriate explanation. They are these:—(1) "If Christ 'shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father,' he will no longer reign himself in person:" (2) "If he 'shall be subject to the Father,' he will no more preside over his Church:" and (3) "If 'God shall be all in all,' then our salvation is not placed in the union, sight, and fruition of him." I will proceed to give a separate answer to each of these objections. The kingdom of Christ embraces two objects:—The Mediatorial function of the regal office, and the Regal glory: The royal *function* will be laid aside, because there will then be no necessity or use for it, but the royal *glory* will remain, because it was obtained by the acts of the Mediator, and was conferred on him by the Father according to covenant. The same thing is declared by the expression "shall be subject," which here signifies nothing more than the laying aside of the super-eminent power which Christ had received from the Father, and which he had, as the Father's Vicegerent, administered at the pleasure of his own will: And yet, when he has laid down this power, he will remain, as we shall see, the head and the husband of his Church.—That sentence has a similar tendency in which it is said, "God shall be ALL IN ALL." For it takes away even the intermediate and deputed administration of the creatures which God is accustomed to use in the communication of his benefits; and it indicates that God will likewise immediately from himself communicate his own good, even himself, to his creatures. Therefore, on the authority of this passage, nothing is taken away from Christ which we have been wishful to attribute to him in this discourse according to the scriptures.

This we will now shew by some plain and apposite passages. Christ promises an union with himself in these words, "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." (John xiv, 23.) Here is a promise of good; therefore the good of the Church is likewise placed in union with Christ; and an *abode* is promised, not admitting of termination by the bounds of this life, but which will continue for ever, and shall at length, when this short life is ended, be consummated in heaven. In reference to this, the Apostle says, "I desire to depart and to be with Christ;" And Christ himself says, "I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am." (John xvii, 24.) John says, that the end of his gospel is, "that our fellowship may be with the Father and

the Son;" (1 John i, 3.) in which fellowship eternal life must necessarily consist, since in another place he explains the same end in these words, "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ; and that, believing, ye might have life through his name." (John xx, 31.) But from the meaning of the same Apostle, it appears, that this fellowship has an union antecedent to itself: These are his words, "If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father." (1 John ii, 24.) What! Shall the union between Christ and his Church cease at a period when he shall place before his glorious sight his spouse sanctified to himself by his own blood? Far be the idea from us! For the union, which had commenced here on earth, will then at length be consummated and perfected.

If any one entertain doubts concerning the vision of Christ, let him listen to Christ in this declaration:—"He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him." (John xiv, 21.) Will he thus disclose himself in this world only? Let us again hear Christ, when he intercedes with the Father for the faithful: "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." (John xvii, 24.) Christ, therefore, promises to his followers the sight of his glory, as something salutary to them; and his Father is entreated to grant this favour. The same truth is confirmed by John, when he says, "Then we shall see him as he is." (1 John iii, 2.) This passage may without any impropriety be understood of Christ, and yet not to the exclusion of God the Father. But what do we more distinctly desire than that Christ may become, what it is said he will be, "the light" that shall enlighten the celestial city, and in whose light "the nations shall walk?" (Rev. xxi. 23, 24.)

Although the fruition of Christ is sufficiently established by the same passages as those by which the sight of him is confirmed, yet we will ratify it by two or three others. Since eternal felicity is called by the name of "the supper of the Lamb," and is emphatically described by this term "the marriage of the Lamb," I think it is taught with adequate clearness in these expressions, that happiness consists in the fruition or enjoyment of the Lamb. But the Apostle, in his Apocalypse,

has ascribed both these epithets to Christ by saying, "Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him, for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready:" (Rev. xix, 7.) and a little afterwards he says, "Blessed are they which are called to the marriage-supper of the Lamb." (verse 9.) It remains for us to treat on the glory of Christ, which is inculcated in these numerous passages of scripture in which it is stated, that "he sits with the Father on his throne," and is adored and glorified both by Angels and by men in heaven.

Having finished the proof of those expressions the truth of which we engaged to demonstrate, we will now proceed to fulfil our promise of explanation, and to shew that all and each of these benefits descend to us in a peculiar and more excellent manner, from *Evangelical Theology*, than they could have done from that which is *Legal*, if by it we could really have been made alive.

2. And, that we may in the first place dispatch the subject of UNION, let the brief remarks respecting marriage which we have just made, be brought again to our remembrance. For that word more appropriately honours this union, and adorns it with a double and remarkable privilege; one part of which consists of a deeper combination, the other of a more glorious title. The scripture speaks thus of the deeper combination; "And they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church!" (Ephes. v. 31, 32.) It will therefore be a connubial tie that will unite Christ with the church. The espousals of the church on earth are contracted by the agency of the brides-men of Christ, who are the Prophets, the Apostles, and their successors, and particularly the Holy Ghost, who is in this affair a Mediator and Arbitrator. The consummation will then follow, when Christ will introduce his spouse into his bride-chamber. From such an union as this, there arises, not only a communion of blessings, but a previous communion of the persons themselves; from which the possession of blessings is likewise assigned, by a more glorious title, to her who is united in the bonds of marriage. The Church comes into a participation not only of the blessings of Christ, but also of his title. For, being the wife of the King, she enjoys it as a right due to her to be called QUEEN; which dignified appellation the scripture does not withhold from her. "Upon thy right hand stands the Queen in gold of Ophir:" (Psalm xlv. 9.) "There are three-score queens, and

four-score concubines, and virgins without number. My dove, my undefiled is but one; she is the only one of her mother, she is the choice one of her that bare her. The daughters saw her, and blessed her; yea, the queens and the concubines, and they praised her." (Sol. Song vi. 8, 9.) The Church could not have been eligible to the high honour of such an union, unless Christ had been made "her beloved, her brother, sucking the breasts of the same mother." (Cant. viii. 1.) But there would have been no necessity for this union, "if righteousness and salvation had come to us by the law." That was therefore a happy necessity, which, out of compassion to the emergency of our wretched condition, the Divine condescension improved to our benefit, and filled with such a plenitude of dignity! But the manner of this our union with Christ is no small addition to that union which is about to take place between us and God the Father. This will be evident to any one who considers what and how great is the bond of mutual union between Christ and the Father.

3. If we turn our attention to *sight* or *vision*, we shall meet with two remarkable characters which are peculiar to Evangelical Theology.

(1) In the first place, the glory of God, as if accumulated and concentrated together into one body, will be presented to our view in Christ Jesus; which glory would otherwise have been dispersed throughout the most spacious courts of "heaven immense;" much in the same manner as the light, which had been created on the first day and equally spread through the whole hemisphere, was on the fourth day collected, compacted together, and assembled into one body, and offered to the eyes as a most conspicuous and shining object. In reference to this, it is said in the Apocalypse, that the heavenly Jerusalem "had no need of the sun, neither of the moon; for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb will be the future light thereof," (Rev. xxi, 23.) as a vehicle by which this most delightful glory may diffuse itself into immensity.

(2) We shall then not only contemplate, in God himself, the most excellent properties of his nature, but shall also perceive that all of them have been employed in and devoted to the procuration of this good for us, which we now possess in hope, but which we shall in reality then possess by means of this union and open vision.

The excellence therefore of this vision far exceeds that which could have been by the law; and from this source arises

a fruition of greater abundance and more delicious sweetness. For as the light in the sun is brighter than that in the stars, so is the sight of the sun, when the human eye is capable of bearing it, more grateful and acceptable, and the enjoyment of it is far more pleasant, than a sight of the twinkling beams of "all the marshall'd host of night." From such a view of the Divine attributes, the most delicious sweetness of fruition will seem to be doubled. For the *first* delight will arise from the contemplation of properties so excellent; *the other* from the consideration of that immeasurable condescension, by which it has pleased God to unfold all those his properties, and the whole of those blessings which he possesses in the exhaustless and immeasurable treasury of his riches; and to give this explanation, that he may procure salvation for man and may impart it to his most miserable creature. This will then be seen in as strong a light, as if the whole of that which is essentially God appeared to exist for the sake of man alone, and for his sole benefit. There is also the addition of this peculiarity concerning it: "Jesus Christ shall change our vile body, [the body of our humiliation,] that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body: (Phil. iii. 21.) and as we have borne the image of the earthy [Adam], we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." (1 Cor. xv, 49.) Hence it is, that all things are said to be made new in Christ Jesus; (2 Cor. v. 17,) and we are described in the scriptures as "looking, according to his promise, for new heavens and a new earth, (2 Peter iii, 13,) and a new name written on a white stone, (Rev. ii, 17,) the new name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is the new Jerusalem, (Rev. iii, 12,) and they shall sing a new song to God and his Christ for ever." (Rev. v, 9.)

Who does not now see, how greatly the felicity prepared for us by Christ, and offered to us through Evangelical Theology excels that which would have come to us by "the righteousness of the law," if indeed it had been possible for us to fulfil it? We should in that case have been similar to the elect angels; but now we shall be their superiors, if I be permitted to make such a declaration, to the praise of Christ and our God, in this celebrated Hall, and before an assembly among whom we have some of those most blessed Spirits themselves as spectators.—They now enjoy union with God and Christ, and will probably be more closely united to both of them at the time of the "restitution of all things." But there will be nothing between the two parties similar to that CONJUGAL BOND

which unites us, and in which we may be permitted to glory. —They will behold God himself "face to face," and will contemplate the most eminent properties of his nature; but they will see some among those properties devoted to the purpose of man's salvation, which God has not unfolded for their benefit, because that was not necessary; and which he would not have unfolded, even if it had been necessary. These things they will see, but they will not be moved by envy; it will rather be a subject of admiration and wonder to them, that God, the Creator of both orders, conferred on man, (who was inferior to them in nature,) that dignity which he had of old denied to the spirits that partook with themselves of the same nature. They will behold Christ, that most brilliant and shining light of the city of the living God, of which they also are inhabitants: and, from this very circumstance their happiness will be rendered more illustrious through Christ. Christ "took not on him the nature of Angels, but the seed of Abraham;" (Heb. ii, 16.) to whom also, in that assumed nature, they will present adoration and honour, at the command of God, when he introduces his First-begotten into the world to come. Of that future world, and of its blessings, they also will be partakers: but "it is not put in subjection to them," (Heb. ii, 5,) but to CHRIST and his BRETHREN, who are partakers of the same nature, and are sanctified by himself. A malignant spirit, yet of the same order as the angels, had hurled against God the crimes of *falsehood* and *envy*. But we see how signally God in Christ has repelled both these accusations from himself, and from the salvation which he has procured. The *falsehood* intimated an unwillingness on the part of God that man should be reconciled to him, except by the intervention of the death of his Son. His *envy* was excited, because God had raised man, not only to the angelical happiness, (to which even that impure one would have attained had "he kept his first estate,") but to a state of blessedness far superior to that of Angels.

That I may not be yet more prolix, I leave it as a subject of reflexion to the devoted piety of your private meditations, most accomplished auditors, to estimate the vast and amazing greatness of the glory of God which has here manifested itself, and to calculate the glory due from us to him for such transcendant goodness.

In the mean time, let all of us, however great our number, consider with a devout and attentive mind, what duty is required of us by this doctrine, which having received its mani-

festation from God and Christ, plainly and fully announces to us such a great salvation, and to the participation of which we are most graciously invited. It requires to be received, understood, believed, and fulfilled, in deed and in reality. *It is worthy of all acceptation*, on account of its AUTHOR; and necessary to be received on account of its END.

1. Being delivered by so great an AUTHOR, it is worthy to be received with a humble and submissive mind; to have much diligence and care bestowed on a knowledge and perception of it; and not to be laid aside from the hand, the mind, or the understanding, until we shall have "obtained the END of it,—THE SALVATION OF OUR SOULS." Why should this be done? Shall the Holy God open his mouth, and our ears remain stopped? Shall our Heavenly Master be willing to communicate instruction, and we refuse to learn? Shall he desire to inspire our hearts with the knowledge of his Divine truth, and we, by closing the entrance to our hearts, exclude the most evident and mild breathings of his Spirit? Does Christ, who is the Father's WISDOM, announce to us that gospel which he has brought from the bosom of the Father, and shall we disdain to hide it in the inmost recesses of our heart? And shall we act thus, especially when we have received this binding command of the Father, which says, "Hear ye him!" (Matt. xvii. 5.) to which he has added a threat, that "if we hear him not, our souls shall be destroyed from among the people; (Acts iii. 23.) that is, from the commonwealth of Israel? Let none of us fall into the commission of such a heinous offence! "For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward; how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him?" (Heb. ii. 2, 3.)

2. To all the preceding considerations, let the END of this doctrine be added, and it will be of the greatest utility in enforcing this the work of persuasion on minds that are not prodigal of their own proper and Chief Good,—an employment in which its potency and excellence are most apparent. Let us reflect, for what cause God has brought us out of darkness into this marvellous light; has furnished us with a mind, understanding, and reason; and has adorned us with his image. Let this question be revolved in our minds,—"For what purpose or END has God restored the fallen to

their pristine state of integrity, reconciled sinners to himself, and received enemies into favour?"—and we shall plainly discover all this to have been done, that we might be made partakers of eternal salvation, and might sing praises to him for ever. But we shall not be able to aspire after this END, much less to attain it, except in the way which is pointed out by that Theological Doctrine which has been the topic of our discourse. If we wander from this END, our wanderings from it extend, not only beyond the whole earth and sea, but beyond heaven itself,—that city of which nevertheless it is essentially necessary for us to be made free-men, and to have our names enrolled among the living. This doctrine is "the gate of heaven," and the door of paradise; the ladder of Jacob, by which Christ descends to us, and we shall in turn ascend to him; and the golden chain, which connects heaven with earth. Let us enter into this gate; let us ascend this ladder; and let us cling to this chain. Ample and wide is the opening of the gate, and it will easily admit believers; the position of the ladder is immovable, and will not suffer those who ascend it to be shaken or moved; the joining which unites one link of the chain with another is indissoluble, and will not permit those to fall down who cling to it,—until we come to "him that liveth for ever and ever," and are raised to the throne of the Most High; till we be united to the living God, and Jesus Christ our Lord, "the Son of the Highest."

But on you, O chosen youths, this care is a duty peculiarly incumbent; for God has destined you to become "workers together with him," in the manifestation of the gospel, and instruments to administer to the salvation of others. Let the Majesty of the Holy AUTHOR of your studies, and the necessity of the END, be always placed before your eyes. (1.) On attentively viewing the Author, let the words of the Prophet Amos recur to your remembrance and rest on your mind: "The lion hath roared, who will not fear? The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy?" (Amos ii. 8.) But you cannot prophesy, unless you be instructed by the SPIRIT OF PROPHECY. In our days he addresses no one in that manner, except in the Scriptures; he inspires no one, except by means of the Scriptures, which are divinely inspired.—(2.) In contemplating the END, you will discover, that it is not possible to confer on any one, in his intercourse with mankind, an office of greater dignity and utility, or an office that is more salutary in its consequences, than this, by

which he may conduct them from error into the way of truth, from wickedness to righteousness, from the deepest misery to the highest felicity; and by which he may contribute much towards their everlasting salvation. But this truth is taught by Theology alone; there is nothing except this heavenly science that prescribes the true righteousness; and by it alone is this felicity disclosed, and our salvation made known and revealed. Let the sacred Scriptures therefore be your copies: make these divine

> "————models your delight!
> Night and day read them, read them day and night."
>
> COLMAN.

If you thus peruse them, "they will make you that you shall not be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ; (2 Peter i. 8.) but you will become good ministers of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine; (1 Tim. iv. 6.) and ready to every good work; (Titus iii. 1.) workmen who need not to be ashamed;" (2 Tim. ii. 15.) sowing the gospel with diligence and patience; and returning to your Lord with rejoicing, bringing with you an ample harvest, through the blessing of God and the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ: to whom be praise and glory from this time, even for evermore! Amen!

ORATION III.

THE CERTAINTY OF SACRED THEOLOGY.

ALTHOUGH the observations which I have already offered in explanation of the OBJECT, the AUTHOR, and the END of sacred Theology, and other remarks which might have been made, if they had fallen into the hands of a competent interpreter,—although all of them contain admirable commendations of this Theology, and convince us that it is altogether divine, since it is occupied concerning God, is derived from God, and leads to God; yet they will not be able to excite within the mind of any person a sincere desire of entering upon such a study, unless he be at the same time encouraged by the bright rays of an assured hope of arriving at a knowledge of the desirable OBJECT, and of obtaining the blessed END. For since the perfection of motion is rest, vain and useless will that motion be which is not able to attain to rest, the limit of its perfection. But no prudent person will desire to subject himself to vain and useless labour. All our hope, then, of attaining to this knowledge is placed in Divine revelation. For the anticipation of this very just conception has engaged the minds of men, "that God cannot be known except through himself, to whom also there can be no approach but through himself." On this account it becomes necessary to make it evident to man, that a revelation has been made by God; that the revelation which has been given is fortified and defended by such sure and approved arguments, as will cause it to be considered and acknowledged as divine; and that there is a method, by which a man may understand the meanings declared in the word, and may apprehend them by a firm and assured faith. To the elucidation of the last proposition this third part of our labour must be devoted. God grant that I may in this discourse again follow the guidance of his word as it is revealed in the scriptures, and may bring forth and offer to your notice such things as may contribute to establish our faith, and to promote the glory of God, to the gathering together of all of us in the Lord. I pray and

ch you also, my very famous and most accomplished rs, not to disdain to favour me with a benevolent and it hearing, while I deliver this feeble oration in your nce.

we are now entering upon a consideration of the CERTY of Sacred Theology, it is not necessary that we l contemplate it under the aspect of *Legal* and *Evange-* for in both of them there is the same measure of the , and therefore the manner of arriving at the knowledge ch is the same, and that is certainty. We will treat on ubject, then, in a general manner, without any particular nce or application.

t that our oration may proceed in an orderly course, it e requisite in the first place briefly to describe CERTAINTY ieral; and then to treat at greater length on the CERTY of THEOLOGY.

CERTAINTY, then, is a property of the mind or underng, and a mode of knowledge according to which the knows an object as it is, and is certain that it knows bject as it is. It is distinct from OPINION; because it is le for opinion to know a matter as it is, but its knowledge ompanied by a suspicion of the opposite falsity. Two therefore are required, to constitute certainty: (1) The of the thing itself, and (2) Such an apprehension of it in inds as we have just described. This very apprehension, ered as being formed from the truth of the thing itself, shioned according to such truth, is also called TRUTH, ount of the similitude; even as the thing itself is certain, ount of the action of the mind which apprehends it in ianner. Thus do those two things, [certainty and truth,] se of their admirable union, make a mutual transfer of iames, the one to the other.

truth may in reality be viewed in two aspects,—one , and the other *compound*: (1) The former, in relation iing as being in the number of entities; (2) The latter, rence to something inhering in a thing, being present : or one of its circumstantials,—or in reference to a thing ducing something else, or as being produced by some —and if there be any other affections and relations of among themselves. The process of truth in the mind : the same manner.—Its action is of two kinds: (1) On a being or entity which is called "a simple apprehension;" 2) on a complex being, which is termed "composition."

—The mode of truth is likewise, in reality, two-fold—*necessary* and *contingent*; according to which, a thing, whether it be simple or complex, is called "necessary" or "contingent." The necessity of a simple thing is the necessary existence of the thing itself, whether it obtain the place of a subject or that of an attribute. The necessity of a complex thing is the unavoidable and essential disposition and habitude that subsists between the subject and the attribute.

That *necessity* which, as we have just stated, is to be considered in *simple things*, exists in nothing except in God and in those things which, although they agree with him in their nature, are yet distinguished from him by our mode of considering them.—All other things, whatever may be their qualities, are contingent, from the circumstance of their being brought into action by power; neither are they contingent only by reason of their beginning, but also of their continued duration. Thus the existence of God, is a matter of necessity; his life, wisdom, goodness, justice, mercy, will, and power, likewise have a necessary existence. But the existence and preservation of the creatures are not of necessity. Thus also creation, preservation, government, and whatever other acts are attributed to God in respect of his creatures, are not of necessity. The foundation of necessity is the nature of God; the principle of contingency is the free-will of the Deity. The more durable it has pleased God to create any thing, the nearer is its approach to necessity, and the farther it recedes from contingency;—although it never pass beyond the boundaries of contingency, and never reach the inaccessible abode of necessity.

Complex necessity exists not only in God, but also in the things of his creation. It exists in God, partly on account of the foundation of his nature, and partly on account of the principle of his free-will: But its existence in the creatures is only from the free-will of God, who at once resolved that this should be the relation and habitude between two created objects. Thus "God lives, understands, and loves," is a necessary truth from his very nature as God. "God is the Creator," "Jesus Christ is the Saviour," "An angel is a created spirit endowed with intelligence and will," and, "A man is a rational creature," are all necessary truths from the free-will of God.

From this statement it appears, that degrees may be constituted in the necessity of a complex truth; that the highest may be attributed to that truth which rests upon the nature

of God as its foundation; that the rest, which proceed from the will of God, may be excelled by that which (by means of a greater affection of his will,) God has willed to invest with such right of precedence; and that it may be followed by that which God has willed by a less affection of his will.—The motion of the sun is necessary from the very nature of that luminary; but it is more necessary that the children of Israel be preserved and avenged on their enemies; the sun is therefore commanded to stand still in the midst of the heavens. (Joshua x, 13.) It is necessary that the sun be borne along from the East to the West, by the diurnal motion of the heavens: But it is more necessary that Hezekiah receive, by a sure sign, a confirmation of the prolongation of his life; the sun, therefore, when commanded, returns ten degrees backward; (Isai. xxviii, 8.) and thus it is proper, that the less necessity should yield to the greater,—and that from the free-will of God which has imposed a law on both of them. As this kind of necessity actually exists in things, the mind, by observing the same gradations, apprehends and knows it,—if such a mode of cognition can truly deserve the name of "knowledge."

But the *causes* of this CERTAINTY are three.—For it is produced on the mind, either by the senses, by reasoning and discourse, or by revelation. The first is called the certainty of *experience;* the second, that of *knowledge;* and the last, that of *faith.* The first is the certainty of particular objects which come within the range and under the observation of the senses; the second is that of general conclusions deduced from known principles; and the last is that of things remote from the cognizance both of the senses and reason.

II. Let these observations now be applied to our present purpose. The Object of our Theology is God, and Christ in reference to his being *God* and *Man.* God is a true Being, and the only necessary one, on account of the necessity of his nature. Christ is a true Being, existing by the will of God; and he is also a necessary Being, because he will endure to all eternity. The things which are attributed to God in our Theology, partly belong to his nature, and partly agree with it by his own free-will. By his *nature*, life, wisdom, goodness, justice, mercy, will, and power belong to him, by a natural and absolute necessity. By his *free-will*, all his volitions and actions concerning the creatures agree with his nature, and that immutably; because he willed at the same time, that they

should not be retracted or repealed. All those things which are attributed to Christ, belong to him by the *free-will of God*, —but on this condition, that "Christ be the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever," (Heb. xiii, 1.) entirely exempt from any future change, whether it be that of a subject or its attributes, or of the affection which exists between the two. All other things, which are found in the whole superior and inferior nature of things, (whether they be considered simply in themselves, or as they are mutually affected among themselves,) do not extend to any degree of this necessity. The truth and necessity of our Theology, therefore, far exceed the necessity of all other sciences, in as much as both these [the truth and necessity] are situated* in the things themselves: The certainty of the mind, while it is engaged in the act of apprehending and knowing things, cannot exceed the TRUTH and NECESSITY of the things themselves; on the contrary, it very often may, like a spent arrow, not reach them, [the truth and necessity,] through some defect in its capacity: For the eyes of our mind are in the same condition with respect to the pure truth of things, as are the eyes of owls with respect to the light of the Sun. On this account, therefore, it is of necessity, that the object of no science can be known with greater certainty than that of Theology; but it follows rather, that a knowledge of this object may be obtained with the greatest degree of certainty,—if it be presented in a qualified and proper manner to the inspection of the understanding according to its capacity. For this object is not of such a nature and condition as to be presented to the external senses; nor can its attributes, properties, affections, actions, and passions be known by means of the observation and experience of the external senses. It is too sublime for them; and the attributes, properties, affections, actions, and passions, which agree with it, are so high, that the mind, even when assisted by reason and discourse, can neither know it, investigate its attributes, nor demonstrate that they agree with the subject, whatever the principles may be which it has applied, and to whatever causes it may have had recourse, whether they be such as arise from the object itself, from its attributes, or from the agreement which subsists between them. The object is known to itself alone; and the whole *truth* and *necessity* are properly

* In the earliest impressions of this sheet, I stated a difficulty in the clause which stood thus in three editions of the Works of Arminius that I consulted: —*quatenus quidem utraque in rebus ipsis est sua*. In the edition of 1613, which I have since seen, the last word [*sua*] is *sita*, which makes the sentence intelligible.

and immediately known to HIM to whom they belong;—to God in the first place and in an adequate degree; to Christ, in the second place, through the communication of God: To itself, in an adequate manner, in reference to the knowledge which it has of itself; in an inferior degree to God, in reference to his knowledge of him [Christ].† Revelation is therefore necessary by which God may exhibit himself and his Christ as an object of sight and knowledge to our understanding; and this exhibition to be made in such a manner as to unfold at once all their attributes, properties, affections, actions, and passions, as far as it is permitted for them to be known, concerning God and his Christ, to our salvation and to their glory; and that God may thus disclose all and every portion of those theorems in which both the subjects themselves and all their attending attributes are comprehended. Revelation is necessary, if it be true that God and his Christ ought to be known, and both of them be worthy to receive Divine honours and worship. But both of them ought to be known and worshipped; the revelation, therefore, of both of them is necessary; and because it is thus necessary, it has been made by God. For if nature, as a partaker and communicator of a good that is only partial, is not deficient in the things that are necessary; how much less ought we even to suspect such a deficiency in God, the Author and Artificer of nature, who is also the Chief Good?

But to inspect this subject a little more deeply and particularly, will amply repay our trouble; for it is similar to the foundation on which must rest the weight of the structure,—the other doctrines which follow. For unless it should appear certain and evident, that *a revelation* has been made, it will be in vain to enquire and dispute about the *word* in which that revelation has been made and is contained. *In the first place*, then, the very nature of God most clearly evinces that a revelation has been made of himself and Christ. His nature is good, beneficent, and communicative of his blessedness, whether it be that which proceeds from it by creation, or that which is God himself. But there is no communication made of Divine good, unless God be made known to the understanding, and be desired by the affections and the will. But he

†The whole of this sentence stands thus: "Soli sibi notum est objectum: totaque veritas et necessitas proprie et immediate cognita est illi cui competit: Deo primo et adæquatè, Christo secundariò per communicationem Dei: Sibi adæquatè, quâ se cognoscit, inferius Deo, quâ cognoscit illum." This last clause is capable of being construed in a different manner, but with as much appearance of scholastic lore as it has in the present translation.

cannot become an object of knowledge except by revelation. A revelation therefore is made, as a necessary administrator of communication.

2. The necessity of this revelation may in various ways be inferred and taught from the nature and condition of man.—*First*, By nature, man possesses a mind and understanding. But it is just that the mind and understanding should be turned towards their Creator; this, however, cannot be done without a knowledge of the Creator, and such knowledge cannot be obtained except by revelation; a revelation has therefore been made.—*Secondly*. God himself formed the nature of man capable of Divine Good: But in vain would it have had such a capacity, if it might not at some time partake of this Divine Good; but of this the nature of man cannot be made a partaker except by the knowledge of it; the knowledge of this Divine Good has therefore been manifested.—*Thirdly*. It is not possible, that the desire which God has implanted within man should be vain and fruitless. That desire is for the enjoyment of an Infinite Good, which is God; but that Infinite Good cannot be enjoyed, except it be known; a revelation therefore has been made, by which it may be known.

3. Let that relation be brought forward which subsists between God and man, and the revelation that has been made will immediately become manifest. God, the Creator of man, has deserved it as his due, to receive worship and honour from the workmanship of his hands, on account of the benefit which he conferred by the act of creation. Religion and piety are due to God, from man his creature; and this obligation is co-eval with the very birth of man,—as the bond which contains this requisition was given on the very day in which he was created. But religion could not be a human invention. For it is the will of God to receive worship according to the rule and appointment of his own will. A revelation was therefore made, which exacts from man the religion due to God, and prescribes that worship which is in accordance with his pleasnre and his honour.

4. If we turn our attention towards Christ, it is amazing how great the necessity of a manifestation appears, and how many arguments immediately present themselves in behalf of a revelation being communicated. Wisdom wishes to be acknowledged as the deviser of the wonderful attempering and qualifying of justice and mercy. Goodness and gracious mercy, as the administrators of such an immense benefit, ought

to be worshipped and honoured. And power, as the administrator of such stupendous wisdom and goodness, and as the executrix of the decree made by both of them, deserved to receive adoration. But the different acts of service which were due to each of them, could not be rendered to them without revelation. The wisdom, mercy, and power of God, have therefore been revealed and displayed most copiously in Christ Jesus. He performed a multitude of most wonderful works, by which we might obtain the salvation that we had lost; he endured most horrid torments and inexpressible distress, which, when pleaded in our favour, served to obtain this salvation for us; and by the gift of the Father he was possessed of an abundance of graces, and, at the Divine command, he became the distributor of them. Having therefore sustained all these offices for us, it is his pleasure to receive those acknowledgments, and those acts of Divine honour and worship, which are due to him on account of his extraordinary merits. But in vain will he expect the performance of these acts from man, unless he be himself revealed. A revelation of Christ has therefore been made. Consult actual experience, and that will supply you with numberless instances of this manifestation The devil himself, who is the rival of Christ, has imitated these instances of gracious manifestation, has held converse with men under the name and semblance of the true God, has demanded acts of devotion from them, and prescribed to them a mode of religious worship.

We have, therefore, the *truth* and the *necessity* of our Theology agreeing together in the highest degree; we have an adequate notion of it in the mind of God and Christ, according to the word which is called ἔμφυτος '*engrafted.*' (James i, 21.) We have a revelation of this Theology made to men by the word preached; which revelation agrees both with the things themselves and with the notion which we have mentioned, but in a way that is attempered and suited to the human capacity. And as all these are preliminaries to the certainty which we entertain concerning this Theology, it was necessary to notice them in these introductory remarks.

Let us now consider this CERTAINTY itself. But since a revelation has been made in the word which has been published, and since the whole of it is contained in that word, (so that THIS WORD is itself our THEOLOGY,) we can determine nothing concerning the certainty of Theology in any other way

than by offering some explanation concerning our certain apprehension of that word. We will assume it as a fact which is allowed and confirmed, that this word is to be found in no other place than in the sacred books of the Old and New Testament; and we shall on this account confine this certain apprehension of our mind to that word. But in fulfilling this design three things demand our attentive consideration:—*First.* The CERTAINTY, and the kind of *certainty* which God requires from us, and by which it is his pleasure that this word should be received and apprehended by us as the Chief Certainty.—*Secondly.* The reasons and arguments by which the truth of that word, which is its divinity, may be proved.—*Thirdly.* How a persuasion of that divinity may be wrought in our minds, and this certainty may be impressed on our hearts.

I The CERTAINTY "with which God wishes this word to be received, is that of faith; and it therefore depends on the veracity of him who utters it." By this certainty "it is received," not only as true, but as divine: and it is not of that involved and mixed kind "of faith" by which any one, without understanding the meanings expressed by the word as by a sign, believes that those books which are contained in the Bible, are divine: for not only is a doubtful opinion opposed to faith, but an obscure and perplexed conception is equally inimical. Neither is it that species "of historical faith" which believes the word to be divine that it comprehends only by a theoretical understanding. But God demands that faith to be given to his word, by which the meanings expressed in this word may be understood, as far as it is necessary for the salvation of men and the glory of God; and may be so assuredly known to be divine, that they may be believed to embrace not only the CHIEF TRUTH, but also the CHIEF GOOD of man. This faith not only believes that God and Christ exist, it not only gives evidence to them when they make declarations of any kind, but it believes in God and Christ when they affirm such things concerning themselves, as, being apprehended by faith, create a belief in God as our Father, and in Christ as our Saviour. This we consider to be the office and employment of an understanding that is not merely theoretical, but of one that is practical. For this cause not only is ασφαλεια, (certainty) attributed in the Scriptures to true and living faith, but to it are likewise ascribed both πληροφορια (a full as-

surance, Heb. vi. 2.) and πεποιθησις; (trust or confidence, 2 Cor. iii. 4.) and it is God who requires and demands such a species of certainty and of faith.

II. We may now be permitted to proceed by degrees from this point, to a consideration of those arguments which prove to us the divinity of the word; and to the manner in which the required certainty and faith are produced in our minds. To constitute natural vision we know that, (beside an object capable of being seen,) not only is an external light necessary to shine upon it and to render it visible, but an internal strength of eye is also required, which may receive within itself the form and appearance of the object which has been illuminated by the external light, and may thus be enabled actually to behold it. The same accompaniments are necessary to constitute spiritual vision; for, beside this external light of arguments and reasoning,) an internal light of the mind and soul is necessary to perfect this vision of faith. But infinite is the number of arguments on which this word builds and establishes its divinity. We will select and briefly notice a few of those which are more usual, lest by too great a prolixity we become too troublesome and disagreeable to our auditory.

1. The Divinity of Scripture.

Let scripture itself come forward, and perform the chief part in asserting its own Divinity. Let us inspect its substance and its matter. It is all concerning God and his Christ, and is occupied in declaring the nature of both of them, in further explaining the love, the benevolence, and the benefits which have been conferred by both of them on the human race, or which have yet to be conferred; and prescribing, in return, the duties of men towards their Divine Benefactors. The scripture therefore is divine in its object.

(2.) But how is it occupied in treating on these subjects? It explains the *nature of God* in such a way as to attribute nothing extraneous to it, and nothing that does not perfectly agree with it.—It describes the *person of Christ* in such a manner, that the human mind, on beholding the description, ought to acknowledge, that "such a person could not have been invented or devised by any created intellect,"—and that it is described with such aptitude, suitableness, and sublimity, as far to exceed the largest capacity of a created understanding. —In the same manner the scripture is employed in relating the *love of God and Christ towards us*, and in giving an account

of *the benefits which we receive.* Thus the Apostle Paul, when he wrote to the Ephesians on these subjects, says, that from his former writings, the extent of "his knowledge of the mystery of Christ" might be manifest to them; (Ephes. iii. 4.) that is, it was divine, and derived solely from the revelation of God.—Let us contemplate the law in which is comprehended the duty of men towards God. What shall we find, in all the laws of every nation, that is at all similar to this, or (omitting all mention of "equality,") that may be placed in comparison with those ten short sentences? Yet even those commandments, most brief and comprehensive as they are, have been still further reduced to two chief heads,—the love of God, and the love of our neighbour. This law appears in reality to have been sketched and written by the right hand of God. That this was actually the case, Moses shews in these words, "What nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day?" (Deut. iv. 8.) Moses likewise says, that so great and manifest is the divinity which is inherent in this law, that it compelled the heathen nations, after they had heard it, to declare in ecstatic admiration of it,—"Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people!" (Deut. iv. 6.) The scripture, therefore, is completely divine, from the manner in which it treats on those matters which are its subjects.

(2) If we consider the END, it will as clearly point out to us the divinity of this doctrine. That End is entirely divine,—being nothing less than the glory of God and man's eternal salvation. What can be more equitable than that all things should be referred to him from whom they have derived their origin? What can be more consonant to the wisdom, goodness, and power of God, than that he should restore, to his original integrity, man who had been created by him, but who had by his own fault destroyed himself; and that he should make him a partaker of his own Divine blessedness? If by means of any word God had wished to manifest himself to man, what end of manifestation ought he to have proposed that would have been more honourable to himself and more salutary to man? That the word, therefore, was divinely revealed, could not be discerned by any mark which was better or more legible, than that of its showing to man the way of salvation, taking him as by the hand and leading him into that way, and not not ceasing to accompany him until it introduced him to the full enjoyment of salvation: In such a consummation as this,

the glory of God most abundantly shines forth and displays itself. He who may wish to contemplate what we are declaring concerning this End, in a small but noble part of this word, should place "the Lord's Prayer" before the eyes of his mind; he should look most intently upon it; and, as far as that is possible for human eyes, he should thoroughly investigate all its parts and beauties. After he has done this, unless he confess, that in it this double end is proposed in a manner that is at once so nervous, brief, and accurate, as to be above the strength and capacity of every created intelligence, —and unless he acknowledge, that this form of prayer is purely divine,—he must of necessity have a mind surrounded and inclosed by more than Egyptian darkness.

2. THE AGREEMENT OF THIS DOCTRINE IN ITS PARTS.

Let us compare the parts of this doctrine together, and we shall discover in all of them an agreement and harmony, even in points the most minute, that it is so great and evident as to cause us to believe that it could not be manifested by men, but ought to have implicit credence placed in it as having certainly proceeded from God.

Let the PREDICTIONS alone, that have been promulged concerning CHRIST in different ages, be compared together. For the consolation of the first parents of our race, God said to the serpent, "The seed of the woman shall bruise thy head." (Gen. iii, 15.) The same promise was repeated by God, and was specially made to Abraham: "In thy seed shall all the nations be blessed." (Gen. xxii, 18.) The patriarch Jacob, when at the point of death, foretold that this seed should come forth from the lineage and family of Judah, in these words: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." (Gen. xlix, 10.) Let the alien prophet also be brought forward, and to these predictions he will add that oracular declaration which he pronounced by the inspiration and at the command of the God of Israel, in these words: Balaam said, "There shall come a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth." (Num. xxiv, 17.) This blessed seed was afterwards promised to David, by Nathan, in these words: "I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom." (2 Sam. vii, 12.) On this account Isaiah says, 'There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of

Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots." (xi, 1.) And, by way of intimating that a virgin would be his mother, the same prophet says, "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name IMMANUEL!" (Isa. vii, 14.) It would be tedious to repeat every declaration that occurs in the Psalms and in the other Prophets, and that agrees most appropriately with this subject. When these prophecies are compared with those occurrences that have been described in the New Testament concerning their fulfilment, it will be evident from the complete harmony of the whole, that they were all spoken and written by the impulse of one Divine Spirit.—If some things in those sacred books seem to be contradictions, they are easily reconciled by means of a right interpretation. I add, that not only do all the parts of this doctrine agree among themselves, but they also harmonize with that Universal Truth which has been spread through the whole of Philosophy; so that nothing can be discovered in Philosophy, which does not correspond with this doctrine. If any thing appear not to possess such an exact correspondence, it may be clearly confuted by means of true Philosophy and right reason.

Let the STYLE and CHARACTER of the scriptures be produced, and, in that instant, a most brilliant and refulgent mirror of the majesty which is luminously reflected in it, will display itself to our view in a manner the most divine. It relates things that are placed at a great distance beyond the range of the human imagination,—things which far surpass the capacities of men. And it simply relates these things without employing any mode of argumentation, or the usual apparatus of persuasion: yet its obvious wish is to be understood and believed. But what confidence or reason has it for expecting to obtain the realization of this its desire? It possesses none at all, except that it depends purely upon its own unmixed authority, which is divine. It publishes its commands and its interdicts, its enactments and its prohibitions to all persons alike;—to kings and subjects, to nobles and plebeians, to the learned and the ignorant, to those that "require a sign" and those that "seek after wisdom," to the old and the young;—over all these, the rule which it bears, and the power which it exercises, are equal. It places its sole reliance, therefore, on its own potency, which is able in a manner the most efficacious to restrain and compel all those who are refractory, and to reward those who are obedient.

Let the REWARDS and PUNISHMENTS be examined, by which the precepts are sanctioned, and there are seen both a promise of life eternal and a denunciation of eternal punishments. He who makes such a commencement as this, may calculate upon his becoming an object of ridicule, except he possess an inward consciousness both of his own right and power; and except he know, that, to subdue the wills of mortals, is a matter equally easy of accomplishment with him, as to execute his menaces and to fulfil his promises.—To the scriptures themselves let him have recourse who may be desirous to prove with the greatest certainty its majesty, from the kind of diction which it adopts: Let him read the charming swan-like SONG OF MOSES described in the concluding chapters of the Book of Deuteronomy: Let him with his mental eyes diligently survey the beginning of Isaiah's prophecy: Let him in a devout spirit consider the Hundred-and-fourth Psalm. Then, with these, let him compare whatever choice specimens of poetry and eloquence the Greeks and the Romans can produce in the most eminent manner from their archives; and he will be convinced by the most demonstrative evidence, that the latter are productions of the human spirit, and that the former could proceed from none other than the Divine Spirit. Let a man of the greatest genius, and, in erudition, experience, and eloquence, the most accomplished of his race,—let such a well-instructed mortal enter the lists and attempt to finish a composition at all similar to these writings, and he will find himself at a loss and utterly disconcerted, and his attempt will terminate in discomfiture. That man will then confess, that what St. Paul declared concerning his own manner of speech, and that of his fellow-labourers, may be truly applied to the whole scripture:—"Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual." (1 Cor. ii, 13.)

3. THE PROPHECIES.

Let us next inspect the prophecies scattered through the whole body of the doctrine; some of which belong to the substance of the doctrine, and others contribute towards procuring authority to the doctrine and to its instruments. It should be particularly observed, with what eloquence and distinctness they foretel the greatest and most important matters, which are far removed from the scrutinizing research of every human and angelical mind, and which could not

possibly be performed except by power Divine: Let it be noticed at the same time with what precision the predictions are answered by the periods that intervene between them, and by all their concomitant circumstances;—and the whole world will be compelled to confess, that such things could not have been foreseen and foretold, except by an Omniscient Deity. I need not here adduce examples; for they are obvious to any one that opens the Divine Volume. I will produce one or two passages only, in which this precise agreement of the prediction and its fulfilment is described. When speaking of the children of Israel under the Egyptian bondage, and their deliverance from it according to the prediction which God had communicated to Abraham in a dream, Moses says, "And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the self-same day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the Land of Egypt:" (Exod. xii, 41.)—Ezra speaks thus concerning the liberation from the Babylonish captivity, which event, Jeremiah foretold, should occur within seventy years: "Now in the first year of Cyrus King of Persia, that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be fulfilled, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus, King of Persia," &c. (Ezra i, 1.) But God himself declares, by Isaiah, that the divinity of the scripture may be proved, and ought to be concluded, from this kind of prophecies. These are his words: "Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are Gods." (Isa. xli, 23.)

4. Miracles.

An illustrious evidence of the same Divinity is afforded in the miracles, which God has performed by the stewards of his word, his prophets and apostles,—and by Christ himself, for the confirmation of *his* doctrine and for the establishment of *their* authority. For these miracles are of such a description as infinitely to exceed the united powers of all the creatures and all the powers of nature itself, when their energies are combined. But the God of truth, burning with zeal for his own glory, could never have afforded such strong testimonies as these to false prophets and their false doctrine: nor could he have borne such witness to any doctrine even when it was true, provided it was not his, that is, provided it was not divine. Christ therefore said, "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not; but if I do, though you believe not me, believe the works." (John x, 37, 38.) It was the same cause

also, which induced the widow of Sarepta to say, on receiving from the hands of Elijah her son, who, after his death, had been raised to life by the prophet: "Now by this I know that thou art a man of God, and that the word of the Lord in thy mouth is truth." (1 Kings xvii, 24.) That expression of Nicodemus has the same bearing: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." (John iii, 2.) And it was for a similar reason that the Apostle said, "The signs of an Apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds." (2 Cor. xii, 12.) There are indeed miracles on record that were wrought among the Gentiles, and under the auspices of the Gods whom they invoked: It is also predicted concerning False Prophets, and Antichrist himself, that they will exhibit many signs and wonders: (Rev. xix, 20.) But neither in number, nor in magnitude, are they equal to those which the true God has wrought before all Israel, and in the view of the whole world. Neither were those feats of theirs real miracles, but only astonishing operations performed by the agency and power of Satan and his instruments, by means of natural causes, which are concealed from the human understanding, and escape the cognizance of men.—But to deny the existence of those great and admirable miracles which are related to have really happened, when they have also the testimony of both Jews and Gentiles, who were the enemies of the true doctrine,—is an evident token of bare-faced impudence and execrable stupidity.

5. The Antiquity of the doctrine.

Let the antiquity, the propagation, the preservation, and the truly admirable defence of this doctrine be added,—and they will afford a bright and perspicuous testimony of its divinity.—If "that which is of the highest antiquity possesses the greatest portion of truth," as Tertullian most wisely and justly observes,—then this doctrine is one of the greatest truth, because it can trace its origin to the highest antiquity. It is likewise Divine, because it was manifested at a time when it could not have been devised by any other mind; for it had its commencement at the very period when man was brought into existence. An apostate angel would not then have proposed any of his doctrines to man, unless God had previously revealed Himself to the intelligent creature whom he had recently formed: That is, God hindered the fallen angel,

and there was then no cause in existence by which he might be impelled to engage in such an enterprise. For God would not suffer man, who had been created after his own image, to be tempted by his enemy by means of false doctrine, until, after being abundantly instructed in that which was true, he was enabled to know that which was false and to reject it. Neither could any odious feeling of envy against man, have tormented Satan, except God had considered him worthy of the communication of his word, and had deigned, through that communication, to make him a partaker of eternal felicity, from which Satan had at that period unhappily fallen.

The PROPAGATION, PRESERVATION, and DEFENCE of this doctrine, most admirable when separately considered, will all be found divine, if, *in the first place*, we attentively fix our eyes upon those men among whom it is propagated; *then*, on the foes and adversaries of this doctrine; and, *lastly*, on the manner in which its propagation, preservation, and defence have hitherto been and still are conducted. (1) If we consider those men among whom this sacred doctrine flourishes, we shall discover that their nature, on account of its corruption, rejects this doctrine for a two-fold reason; (i) The *first* is, because in one of its parts it is so entirely contrary to human and worldly wisdom, as to subject itself to the accusation of FOLLY from men of corrupt minds. (ii) The *second* reason is, because in another of its parts it is decidedly hostile and inimical to worldly lusts and carnal desires. It is therefore rejected by the human understanding and refused by the will, which are the two chief faculties in man;—for it is according to their orders and commands that the other faculties are either put in motion or remain at rest. Yet, notwithstanding all this natural repugnance, it has been received and believed. The human mind, therefore, has been conquered, and the subdued will has been gained, by Him who is the Author of both.—(2) This doctrine has some most bitter and powerful enemies: Satan, the prince of this world, with all his angels, and the world his ally: These are foes with whom there can be no reconciliation. If the subtlety, the power, the malice, the audacity, the impudence, the perseverance, and the diligence of these enemies, be placed in opposition to the simplicity, the inexperience, the weakness, the fear, the inconstancy, and the slothfulness of the greater part of those who give their assent to this heavenly doctrine; then will the great-

est wonder be excited, how this doctrine, when attacked by so many enemies, and defended by such sorry champions, can stand and remain safe and unmoved. If this wonder and admiration be succeeded by a supernatural and divine investigation of its cause, then will God himself be discovered as the propagator, preserver, and defender of this doctrine.—(3) The manner also in which its propagation, preservation, and defence are conducted, indicates Divinity by many irrefragable tokens. This doctrine is carried into effect, without bow or sword,—without horses, chariots, or horsemen; yet it proceeds prosperously along, stands in an erect posture, and remains unconquered, in the name of the LORD OF HOSTS: While its adversaries, though supported by such apparently able auxiliaries and relying on such powerful aid, are overthrown, fall down together, and perish. It is accomplished, not by holding out alluring promises of riches, glory, and earthly pleasures, but by a previous statement of the dreaded cross, and by the prescription of such patience and forbearance as far exceed all human strength and ability.—"He is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel: for I will shew him HOW GREAT THINGS he must suffer for my name's sake." (Acts ix, 15, 16.) "Behold I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves." (Matt. x, 16.)

Its completion is not effected by the counsels of men, but in opposition to all human counsels,—whether they be those of the professors of this doctrine, or those of its adversaries. For it often happens, that the counsels and machinations which have been devised for the destruction of this doctrine, contribute greatly towards its propagation, while the princes of darkness fret and vex themselves in vain, and are astonished and confounded, at an issue so contrary to the expectations which they had formed from their most crafty and subtle counsels.

St. Luke says, "Saul made havock of the church, entering into every house, and, haling men and women, committed them to prison. Therefore they that were scattered abroad, went every where preaching the word." (Acts viii, 3, 4.) And by this means Samaria received the word of God. (14.) In reference to this subject St. Paul also says, "But I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things which happened unto me, have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel; so that my bonds are manifest in all the palace, and

in all other places." (Phil. i, 12, 13.) For the same cause that common observation has acquired all its just celebrity: "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church."—What shall we say to these things? "The stone which the builders refused, is become the head stone of the corner: This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes." (Psalm cxviii, 22, 23.)

Subjoin to these the tremendous judgments of God on the persecutors of this doctrine, and the miserable death of the tyrants. One of these, at the very moment when he was breathing out his polluted and unhappy spirit, was inwardly constrained publicly to proclaim, though in a frantic and outrageous tone, the divinity of this doctrine in these remarkable words: "THOU HAST CONQUERED, O GALILEAN!"

Who is there, now, that, with eyes freed from all prejudice, will look upon such clear proofs of the divinity of Scripture, and that will not instantly confess, the Apostle Paul had the best reasons for exclaiming?, "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost; in whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not; lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." (2 Cor. iv, 3, 4.) As if he had said, "This is not human darkness; neither is it drawn as a thick veil over the mind by man himself; but it is diabolical darkness, and spread by the devil, the prince of darkness, upon the mind of man, over whom, by the just judgment of God, he exercises at his pleasure the most absolute tyranny. If this were not the case, it would be impossible for this darkness to remain; but, how great soever its density might be, it would be dispersed by this light which shines with such overpowering brilliancy."

6. THE SANCTITY OF THOSE BY WHOM IT HAS BEEN ADMINISTERED.

The sanctity of those by whom the word was first announced to men, and by whom it was committed to writing, conduces to the same purpose,—to prove its Divinity. For since it appears, that those who were entrusted with the discharge of this duty, had divested themselves of the wisdom of the world, and of the feelings and affections of the flesh, entirely putting off the old man,—and that they were completely eaten up and consumed by their zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of men,—it is manifest that such great sanctity as this had been inspired and infused into them, by HIM alone who is the Holiest of the holy.

Let Moses be the first that is introduced: He was treated in a very injurious manner by a most ungrateful people, and was frequently marked out for destruction; yet was he prepared to purchase their salvation by his own banishment. He said, when pleading with God, "Yet now, if thou wilt, forgive their sin; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written." (Exod. xxxii, 32.) Behold his zeal for the salvation of the people entrusted to his charge,—a zeal for the glory of God! Would you see another reason for this wish to be devoted to destruction? Read what he had previously said: "Wherefore should the Egyptians speak and say?, —For mischief did the Lord bring them out to slay them in the mountains," (Exod. xxxii, 12.) "because he was not able to bring them out unto the land which he sware unto their Fathers." (Numb. xiv, 16.)—We observe the same zeal in Paul, when he wishes that himself "were accursed from Christ for his brethren the Jews, his kinsmen according to the flesh," (Rom ix.) from whom he had suffered many and great indignities.

David was not ashamed publicly to confess his heavy and enormous crimes, and to commit them to writing as an eternal memorial to posterity. Samuel did not shrink from marking in the records of perpetuity the detestable conduct of his sons; and Moses did not hesitate to bear a public testimony against the iniquity and the madness of his ancestors. If even the least desire of a little glory had possessed their minds, they might certainly have been able to indulge in taciturnity, and to conceal in silence these circumstances of disgrace.—Those of them who were engaged in describing the deeds and achievements of other people, were unacquainted with the art of offering adulation to great men and nobles, and of wrongfully attributing to their enemies any unworthy deed or motive. With a regard to truth alone, in promoting the glory of God, they placed all persons on an equality; and made no other distinction between them than that which God himself has commanded to be made between piety and wickedness. On receiving from the hand of God their appointment to this office, they at once and altogether bade farewell to all the world, and to all the desires which are in it.—"Each of them said unto his father and to his mother, I have not seen him; neither did he acknowledge his brethren; for they observed the word of God, and kept his covenant." (Deut. xxxiii, 9.)

7. THE CONSTANCY OF ITS PROFESSORS AND MARTYRS.

But what shall we say respecting the constancy of the professors and martyrs, which they displayed in the torments that

they endured for the truth of this doctrine? Indeed, if we subject this constancy to the view of the most inflexible enemies of the doctrine, we shall extort from unwilling judges a confession of its Divinity. But that the strength of this argument may be placed in a clearer light, the mind must be directed to four particulars: the *multitude* of the martyrs, and their *condition*; the *torments* which their enemies inflicted on them, and the *patience* which they evinced in enduring them.

(1) If we direct our enquiries to the *multitude* of them, it is innumerable, far exceeding thousands of thousands; on this account it is out of the power of any one to say, that, because it was the choice of but a few persons, it ought to be imputed to phrenzy or to weariness of a life that was full of trouble.

(2) If we enquire into their *condition*, we shall find nobles and peasants, those in authority and their subjects, the learned and the unlearned, the rich and the poor, the old and the young; persons of both sexes, men and women, the married and the unmarried, men of a hardy constitution and inured to dangers, and young ladies of tender habits who had been delicately educated, and whose feet had scarcely ever before stumbled against the smallest pebble that arose above the surface of their smooth and level path. Many of the early martyrs were honourable persons of this description,—that no one might think them to be inflamed by a desire of glory, or endeavouring to gain applause by the perseverance and magnanimity that they had evinced in the maintenance of the sentiments which they had embraced.

(3) Some of the *torments* inflicted on such a multitude of persons and of such various circumstances in life, were of a common sort and others unusual, some of them quick in their operation and others of them slow. Part of the unoffending victims were nailed to crosses and part of them were decapitated; some were drowned in rivers, whilst others were roasted before a slow fire. Several were ground to powder by the teeth of wild beasts, or were torn in pieces by their fangs; many were sawn asunder, while others were stoned; and not a few of them were subjected to punishments which cannot be expressed, but which are accounted most disgraceful and infamous, on account of their extreme turpitude and indelicacy. No species of savage cruelty was omitted which either the ingenuity of human malignity could invent, which rage the most conspicuous and furious could excite, or which even the infernal laboratory of the court of hell could supply.

(4) And yet, that we may come at once to the *patience* of these holy confessors,—they bore all these tortures with constancy and equanimity; nay, they endured them with such a glad heart and cheerful countenance, as to fatigue even the restless fury of their persecutors, which has often been compelled, when wearied out, to yield to the unconquerable strength of their patience, and to confess itself completely vanquished. And what was the cause of all this endurance? It consisted in their unwillingness to recede in the least point from that religion, the denial of which was the only circumstance that might enable them to escape danger, and, in many instances, to acquire glory. What then was the reason of the great patience which they shewed under their acute sufferings? It was because they believed, that when this short life was ended, and after the pains and distresses which they were called to endure on earth, they would obtain a blessed immortality. In this particular the combat which God has maintained with Satan, appears to have resembled a duel; and the result of it has been, that the Divinity of God's word has been raised as a superstructure out of the infamy and ruin of Satan.

8. THE TESTIMONY OF THE CHURCH.

The divine Omnipotence and Wisdom have principally employed these arguments, to prove the Divinity of this blessed word. But, that the Church might not defile herself by that basest vice, ingratitude of heart, and that she might perform a supplementary service in aid of God her Author and of Christ her Head,—she also by her testimony adds to the Divinity of this word. But it is only an addition; she does not impart Divinity to it; her province is merely an indication of the Divine nature of this word, but she does not communicate to it the impress of Divinity. For unless this word had been Divine when there was no Church in existence, it would not have been possible for her members "to be born of this word, as of incorruptible seed," (1 Pet. i, 23.) to become the sons of God, and, through faith in this word, "to be made partakers of the Divine Nature." (2 Pet. i, 4.) The very name of "authority" takes away from the Church the power of conferring Divinity on this doctrine. For AUTHORITY is derived from an AUTHOR: But the Church is not the AUTHOR, she is only the nurseling of this word, being posterior to it in cause, origin, and time. We never hear any person raise this objection: "The Church is of greater antiquity than the scripture, because at the time when that word had not been consigned to

writing, the Church had even then an existence." To trifle in a serious matter with such cavils as this, is highly unbecoming in Christians, unless they have changed their former godly manners and are transformed into Jesuits. The Church is not more ancient than this saying: "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head;" (Gen. iii, 15.) although she had an existence before this sentence was recorded by Moses in Scripture. For it was by the faith which they exercised on this saying, that Adam and Eve became the Church of God; since, prior to that, they were traitors, deserters, and the kingdom of Satan—that grand deserter and apostate. The Church indeed is "the pillar and ground of the truth;" (1 Tim. iii, 13.) but the truth is built upon it as a foundation; and thus this pillar bears up the truth and holds it out as an object of sight to be viewed by all mankind. In this way the Church performs the part of a director and a witness to this truth, and its guardian, herald, and interpreter. But in her acts of interpretation, the Church is confined to the sense of the word itself, and is tied down to the expressions of Scripture: for, according to the prohibition of St. Paul, it neither becomes her "to be wise above that which is written;" (1 Cor. iv, 6.) nor is it possible for her to be so, since she is hindered both by her own imbecility, and the depth of things divine.

But it will reward our labour, if in a few words we examine the efficacy of this testimony,—since such is the pleasure of the Papists, who constitute "the authority of the Church" the commencement and the termination of our certainty, when she bears witness to the scripture that it is the word of God.—In the first place, the efficacy of the testimony does not exceed the veracity of the witness. The veracity of the Church is the veracity of men: But the veracity of men is imperfect and inconstant, and is always such as to give occasion to this the remark of truth: "All men are liars." Neither is the veracity of him that speaks, sufficient to obtain credit to his testimony, unless the veracity of him who bears witness concerning the truth appear plain and evident to him to whom he makes the declaration. But in what manner will it be possible to make the veracity of the Church plain and evident? This must be done, either by a notion conceived a long time before, or by an impression recently made on the minds of the hearers. But men possess no such innate notion of the veracity of the Church as is tantamount to that which declares, "God is true and cannot lie." (Tit. i, 2.) It is necessary, therefore, that it be impressed by

some recent action; such impression being made either from within or from without. But the Church is not able to make any inward impression, for she bears her testimony by external instruments alone, and does not extend to the inmost parts of the soul. The impression therefore will be external; which can be no other than a display and indication of her knowledge and probity, as well as testimony,—often truly so called. But all these things can produce nothing more than an opinion in the minds of those to whom they are offered. Opinion, therefore, and not knowledge, is the supreme effect of this efficacy.

But the Papists retort, "that Christ himself established the authority of his Church by this saying, 'He that heareth you, heareth me.'" (Luke x, 16.) When these unhappy reasoners speak thus, they seem not to be aware, that they are establishing the authority of Scripture before that of the Church. For it is necessary that credence should be given to that expression as it was pronounced by Christ, before any authority can, on its account, be conceded to the Church. But the same reason will be as tenable in respect to the whole Scripture as to this expression. Let the Church then be content with that honour which Christ conferred on her when he made her the guardian of his word, and appointed her to be the director and witness to it, the herald and the interpreter.

III. Yet since the arguments arising from all those observations which we have hitherto adduced, and from any others which are calculated to prove the Divinity of the scriptures, can neither disclose to us a right understanding of the scriptures, nor seal on our minds those meanings which we have understood, (although the certainty of faith which God demands from us, and requires us to exercise in his word, consists of these meanings,)—it is a necessary consequence, that to all these things ought to be added something else, by the efficacy of which that certainty may be produced in our minds. And this is the very subject on which we are now prepared to treat in this the third part of our discourse.

9. The internal witness of the Holy Spirit.

We declare, therefore, and we continue to repeat the declaration till the gates of hell re-echo the sound,—"that the Holy Spirit, by whose inspiration holy men of God have spoken this word, and by whose impulse and guidance they have, as his amanuenses, consigned it to writing,—that this Holy Spirit is the Author of that light by the aid of which we obtain a perception and an understanding of the divine mean-

ings of the word, and is the Effector of that CERTAINTY by which we believe those meanings to be truly divine; and that He is *the necessary Author, the all-sufficient Effector.*" (1) Scripture demonstrates that He is the necessary Author, when it says, "The things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God: (1 Cor. ii, 11.) No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." (1 Cor. xii, 3.)—(2) But the Scripture introduces him as the sufficient and the more than sufficient Effector, when it declares, "The wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory, he hath revealed unto us by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." (1 Cor. ii, 7, 10.) The sufficiency therefore of the Spirit proceeds from the plenitude of his knowledge of the secrets of God, and from the very efficacious revelation which he makes of them. This sufficiency of the Spirit cannot be more highly extolled than it is in a subsequent passage, in which the same Apostle most amply commends it, by declaring, "He that is spiritual [a partaker of this revelation,] judgeth all things," (verse 15.) as having the mind of Christ through his Spirit, which he has received. Of the same sufficiency the Apostle St. John is the most illustrious herald. In his general Epistle he writes these words: "But the anointing which ye have received of Him, abideth in you; and ye need not that any man teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in Him." (1 John ii, 27.) "He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witness in himself." (1 John v, 10.) To the Thessalonians another Apostle writes thus: "Our Gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance." (1 Thess. i, 3.) In this passage he openly attributes to the power of the Holy Ghost the certainty by which the faithful receive the word of the gospel. The Papists reply, "Many persons boast of the revelation of the Spirit, who nevertheless are destitute of such a revelation: It is impossible therefore for the faithful safely to rest in it." Are these fair words? Away with such blasphemy! If the Jews glory in their Talmud and their Cabala, and the Mahometans in their Alcoran, and if both of these boast themselves that they are Churches,—cannot credence therefore be given with sufficient safety to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, when they affirm their Divine Origin? Will the true Church be any less a Church because the sons of the

stranger arrogate that title to themselves? This is the distinction between opinion and knowledge: It is their *opinion*, that they know that of which they are really ignorant. But they who do *know* it, have an assured perception of their knowledge. "It is the Spirit that beareth witness that the Spirit is truth;" (1 John v, 8.) that is, "the doctrine, and the meanings comprehended in that doctrine, are truth."

"But that attesting witness of the Spirit which is revealed in us, cannot convince others of the truth of the Divine word." —What then? It will convince them when it has also breathed on them: it will breath its Divine *afflatus* on them, if they be the sons of the church, all of whom "shall be (θεοδίδακτοι) taught of God: every man of them will hear and learn of the Father, and will come unto Christ." (John vi, 45.) Neither can the testimony of any Church convince all men of the truth and divinity of the sacred writings. The Papists, who arrogate to themselves exclusively the title of "the Church," experience the small degree of credit which is given to their testimonies, by those who have not received an *afflatus* from the spirit of the Roman See.

"But it is necessary that there should be a testimony in the Church of such a high character as to render it imperative on all men to pay it due deference."—True. It was the incumbent duty of the Jews to pay deference to the testimony of Christ when he was speaking to them; the Pharisees ought not to have contradicted Stephen in the midst of his discourse; and Jews and Gentiles, without any exception, were bound to yield credence to the preaching of the Apostles, confirmed as it was by so many and such astonishing miracles. But the duties here recited, were disregarded by all these parties. What was the reason of this their neglect? The voluntary hardening of their hearts, and that blindness of their minds which was introduced by the Devil.

If the Papists still contend, that "such a testimony as this ought to exist in the Church, against which no one shall actually offer any contradiction;" we deny the assertion: And experience testifies, that a testimony of this kind never yet had an existence, that it does not now exist, and (if we may form our judgment from the scriptures,) we certainly think that it never will exist.

"But perhaps the Holy Ghost, who is the Author and Effector of this testimony, has entered into an engagement with the Church, not to inspire and seal on the minds of men

this certainty, except through her, and by the intervention of her authority." The Holy Ghost does, undoubtedly, according to the good pleasure of his own will, make use of some organ or instrument in performing these his offices. But this instrument is the word of God, which is comprehended in the sacred books of scripture; an instrument produced and brought forward by Himself, and instructed in his truth. The Apostle to the Hebrews in a most excellent manner describes the efficacy which is impressed on this instrument by the Holy Spirit, in these words: "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." (Heb. iv, 12.) Its effect is called "Faith," by the Apostle: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." (Rom. x, 7.) If any act of the Church occurs in this place, it is that by which she is occupied in the sincere preaching of this word, and by which she sedulously exercises herself in promoting its publication. But even this is not so properly the occupation of the Church, as of "the Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, and Teachers," whom Christ has constituted his labourers "for the edifying of his body, which is the Church." (Ephes. iv, 11.) But we must in this place deduce an observation from the very nature of things in general, as well as of this thing in particular; it is, that the First Cause can extend much further by its own action, than it is possible for an instrumental cause to do; and that the Holy Ghost gives to the word all that force which he afterwards employs,—such being the great efficacy with which it is endued and applied, that whomsoever he only counsels by his word he himself persuades by imparting Divine meanings to the word, by enlightening the mind as with a lamp, and by inspiring and sealing it by his own immediate action. The Papists pretend, that certain acts are necessary to the production of true faith; and they say that those acts cannot be performed except by the judgment and testimony of the Church, —such as to believe that any book is the production of Matthew or Luke,—to discern between a Canonical and an Apocryphal verse, and to distinguish between this or that reading, according to the variation in different copies. But, since there is a controversy concerning the weight and necessity of those acts, and since the dispute is no less than *how far they may be performed by the Church*,—lest I should fatigue my most illustrious auditory by too great prolixity,—I will omit at

present any further mention of these topics; and will by Divine assistance explain them at some future opportunity.

My most illustrious and accomplished hearers, we have already perceived, that both the pages of our sacred Theology are full of GOD and CHRIST, and of the SPIRIT of both of them. If any enquiry be made for the OBJECT; *God and Christ by the* SPIRIT are pointed out to us.—If we search for the AUTHOR; *God and Christ by the operation of the* SPIRIT spontaneously occur.—If we consider the END proposed; *our union with God and Christ* offers itself,—an end not to be obtained except through the communication of the SPIRIT.—If we enquire concerning the TRUTH and CERTAINTY of the doctrine; *God in Christ*, by means of the efficacy of the HOLY GHOST, most clearly convinces our minds of the TRUTH, and in a very powerful manner seals the CERTAINTY on our hearts.

All the glory, therefore, of this revelation is deservedly due to God and Christ in the Holy Spirit: and most deservedly are thanks due from us to them, and must be given to them, through the Holy Ghost, for such an august and necessary benefit as this which they have conferred on us. But we can present to our God and Christ in the Holy Spirit no gratitude more grateful, and can ascribe no glory more glorious,—than this, the application of our minds to an assiduous contemplation and a devout meditation on the knowledge of such a noble object. But in our meditations upon it, (to prevent us from straying into the paths of error,) let us betake ourselves to the revelation which has been made of this doctrine. From the word of this revelation alone, let us learn the wisdom of endeavouring, by an ardent desire and in an unwearied course, to attain unto that ultimate design which ought to be our constant aim, —that most blessed end of our union with God and Christ. Let us never indulge in any doubts concerning the truth of this revelation; but, "the full assurance of faith" being impressed upon our minds and hearts by the inspiration and sealing of the Holy Spirit, let us adhere to this word, "till [at length] we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." (Ephes. iv, 13.) I most humbly supplicate and intreat God our merciful Father, that he would be pleased to grant this great blessing to us, through the Son of his love, and by the communication of his Holy Spirit.—And to him be ascribed all praise, and honour, and glory, for ever and ever! Amen.

ORATION IV.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

This charming Oration was delivered by Arminius on the eleventh of July, 1603, *—the day on which the dignity of Doctor of Divinity was publicly conferred on him, and immediately prior to the act of creation. At the close of the Oration will be found a beautiful form of prayer and thanksgiving which Arminius addressed to God, after receiving at the hands of Dr. Francis Gomarus the requisite literary honours: He also briefly returned thanks to Gomarus and the various orders of spectators, who were exceedingly numerous on that interesting occasion, not only on account of the just celebrity of the Professor elect, but because his was the first Doctor's degree which had been granted by the new Dutch University.*

As a preparatory exercise, he had on the preceding day maintained a public disputation, on THE NATURE OF GOD. *The substance of his profound and elaborate Theses on that subject was afterwards published, and stands in a subsequent part of this Work, as the fourth of his Public Lectures. His opponents were Bertius, Hommius, Crucius, and Grevinchovius, all of them celebrated for their great skill in scholastic learning. According to the duty which devolves on all opponents in the Schools, these learned men produced in a formal manner every objection to the positions of Arminius which they could devise; but he with the utmost skill and ingenuity answered the whole of their arguments, and, to the unbounded gratification of his auditory, proved himself a complete master of the art of reasoning and eminently qualified to engage in the instruction of others. On inspecting the fourth Lecture, those who are acquainted with the forms of scholastic disputation will perceive the arduous nature of such an undertaking, before an assembly of the greatest and most learned men in Holland. Some adequate conception of the difficulty of this task will likewise be formed, by those who are not personally familiar with the usages of the Schools, when they are informed, that all replies to objections must be* IMPROMPTU *and managed syllogistically; that the Respondent knows nothing of the objections of his opponents till they are actually propounded in public, when the tact of his talent discovers itself in furnishing a ready and appropriate answer to each of them as they arise; and that this disputation occupied several hours both in the morning and the afternoon: At the conclusion, Arminius received the applauses of his enlightened audience, for the consummate ability which he had displayed.—A few weeks afterwards, Arminius entered on the duties of his Professorship, in the execution of which he fully realized those high expectations that had been excited by the auspicious specimen which he then gave of his scholastic attainments.*

On the Nineteenth of June, three weeks prior to this public ceremony, Arminius had gone from Amsterdam to Leyden, and had subjected himself to a private examination: it being usual for all those who lay claim to a Doctor's degree, or any other literary distinction, to demonstrate to accredited persons in private that they possess the requisite qualifications, before they are permitted to tender similar unequivocal demonstrations in public. In a letter which he addressed to his

bosom-friend Uitenbogardt, two days afterwards, Arminius gives the following account of this preparatory examination: "On Tuesday last I was examined by Gomarus, in the presence of the honourable Grotius and Merula. He performed his duty with great diligence and fairness: I returned as good extempore answers to his questions as I was able. I gave complete satisfaction to him as well as to the two gentlemen who were present. His interrogatories consisted of those particulars which have a reference to the substance of Theology: and he conducted himself through the whole in such a manner as was highly becoming in him, and as well as I could possibly have desired."—Such was the creditable and frank testimony which this good man bore to the conduct of a divine, who had very recently opposed his call to the Professorship, and had united with others in an attempt to rob him of his good name and his character.

THE noble the Lord Rector,—the very famous, reverend, skilful, intelligent, and learned men, who are the fathers of this most celebrated University,—the rest of you, most worthy strangers of every degree,—and you, most noble and studious young men, who are the nursery of the Republic and the Church, and who are increasing every day in bloom and vigour:

If there be any order of men in whom it is utterly unbecoming to aspire after the honours of this world, especially after those honours which are accompanied by pomp and applause, that, without doubt, is the order ecclesiastical,—a body of men who ought to be entirely occupied with a zeal for God and for the attainment of that glory which is at his disposal. Yet, since, according to the laudable institutions of our ancestors, the usage has obtained in all well-regulated Universities, to admit no man to the office of instructor in them, who has not previously signalized himself by some public and solemn testimony of probity and scientific ability,—this sacred order of men have not refused a compliance with such public modes of decision, provided they be conducted in a way that is holy, decorous, and according to godliness. So far, indeed, are those who have been set apart to the pastoral office from being averse to public proceedings of this kind, that they exceedingly covet and desire them alone, because they conceive them to be of the first necessity to the Church of Christ: For they are mindful of this apostolical charge, "Lay hands suddenly on no man;" (1 Tim. v, 22.) and of the other, which directs that a Bishop and a Teacher of the Church be "apt to teach, holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers." (Titus i, 9.)—I do not therefore suppose one person, in this numerous assembly, can be so ignorant of the public ceremonies of this University, or can

hold them in such little estimation, as either to evince surprise at the undertaking in which we are now engaged, or wish to give it an unfavourable interpretation. But since it has always been a part of the custom of our ancestors, in academic festivities of this description, to choose some subject of discourse, the investigation of which in the fear of the Lord might promote the Divine glory and the profit of the hearers, and might excite them to pious and importunate supplication,—I also can perceive no cause why I ought not conscientiously to comply with this custom. And although at the sight of this very respectable, numerous, and learned assembly, I feel strongly affected with a sense of my defective eloquence and tremble not a little,—yet I have selected a certain theme for my discourse which agrees well with my profession, and is full of grandeur, sublimity, and adorable majesty. In making choice of it, I have not been overawed by the edict of Horace, which says,

Sumite materiam vestris, qui scribitis æquam &c.

"Select, all ye who write, a subject fit,
A subject not too mighty for your wit!
And ere you lay your shoulders to the wheel,
Weigh well their strength, and all their weakness feel!"

For this declaration is not applicable in the least to theological subjects, all of which by their dignity and importance exceed the capacity and mental energy of every human being and of angels themselves. A view of them so affected the Apostle Paul, (who, rapt into the third heaven, had heard words ineffable,) that they compelled him to break forth into this exclamation: "Who is sufficient for these things?" (2 Cor. ii, 16.) If therefore I be not permitted to disregard the provisions of this Horatian statute, I must either transgress the boundaries of my profession, or be content to remain silent. But I am permitted to disregard the terms of this statute; and to do so, is perfectly lawful.

For whatever things tend to the glory of God and to the salvation of men, ought to be celebrated in a devout spirit in the congregations of the saints, and to be proclaimed with a grateful voice. I therefore propose to speak on THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST: Not because I have persuaded myself of my capability to declare any thing concerning it, which is demanded either by the dignity of my subject, or by the respectability of this numerous assembly;—for it will be quite sufficient, and I

shall consider that I have abundantly discharged my duty, if according to the necessity of the case I shall utter something that will contribute to the general edification: But I choose this theme that I may obtain, in behalf of my oration, such grace and favour from the excellence of its matter, as I cannot possibly confer on it by any eloquence in the mode of my address. Since, however, it is impossible for us either to form in our minds just and holy conceptions about such a sublime mystery, or to give utterance to them with our lips, unless the power of God influence our mental faculties and our tongues, let us by prayer and supplication implore his present aid, in the name of Jesus Christ our great High-Priest.

"Do thou, therefore, O holy and merciful God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Fountain of all grace and truth, vouchsafe to grant thy favourable presence to us who are a great congregation assembled together in thy holy name. Sprinkle thou our spirits, souls, and bodies, with the most gracious dew of thy immeasurable holiness, that the converse of thy saints with each other may be pleasing to thee. Assist us by the grace of thy Holy Spirit, who may yet more and more illuminate our minds—imbued with the true knowledge of Thyself and thy Son; may He also inflame our hearts with a sincere zeal for thy glory; may He open my mouth and guide my tongue, that I may be enabled to declare concerning the Priesthood of thy Son those things which are true and just and holy, to the glory of thy name and to the gathering of all of us together in the Lord. Amen."

Having now in an appropriate manner offered up those vows which well become the commencement of our undertaking, we will, by the help of God, proceed to the subject proposed, after I have intreated all of you, who have been pleased to grace this solemn act of ours with your noble, learned, and most gratifying presence, to give me that undivided attention which the subject deserves, while I speak on a matter of the most serious importance, and, according to your accustomed kindness, to shew me that favour and benevolence which are to me of the greatest necessity. That I may not abuse your patience, I engage to consult brevity as much as our theme will allow. But the PRIESTHOOD is to be deduced from the very origin of the office, that from thence the discourse may appropriately be brought down to the PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST on which we profess to treat.

First.—The first of those relations which subsist between God and men, has respect to something given and something received. The latter requires another relation supplementary to itself,—a relation which taking its commencement from men, may terminate in God; and that is, an acknowledgment of a benefit received, to the honour of the munificent Donor. It is also a debt, due on account of a benefit already conferred, but which is not to be paid except on the demand and according to the regulation of the Giver; whose intention it has always been, that the will of a creature should not be the measure of his honour. His benignity likewise is so immense, that he never requires, from those who are under obligations to him, the grateful acknowledgment of the benefit communicated in the first instance, except when he has bound them to himself by the larger and far superior benefit of a mutual covenant. But the extreme trait in that goodness, is, that he has bound himself to bestow on the same persons favours of yet greater excellence by infinite degrees. This is the order which he adopts; he wishes himself first to be engaged to them, before they are considered to be engaged to Him. For every covenant that is concluded between God and men, consists of two parts:—(1) The preceding promise of God, by which he obliges himself to some duty and to acts correspondent with that duty:—and (2) The subsequent definition and appointment of the duty, which, it is stipulated, shall in return be required of men, and according to which a mutual correspondence subsists between men and God. He promises, that he will be to them a king and a God, and that he will discharge towards them all the offices of a good King; while he stipulates, as a counter obligation, that they become his people, that in this relation they live according to his commands, and that they ask and expect all blessings from his goodness.—These two acts [a life according to his commands, and an expectation of all blessings from his goodness,] comprise the duty of men towards God, according to the covenant into which he first entered with them.

On the whole, therefore, the duties of two functions are to be performed between God and men who have entered into covenant with him: First, *A regal one*, which is of supreme authority: Secondly, *A religious one*, of devoted submission.

(1) The use of the former is in the communication of every needful good, in the averting of evils, and in the imposing of laws or the act of legislation. Under it we likewise comprehend

the gift of prophecy, which is nothing more than the annunciation of the royal pleasure, whether it be communicated by God himself, or by some one of his deputies or ambassadors as a kind of internuncio to the covenant. That no one may think the prophetic office, of which the scriptures make such frequent mention, is a matter of little solicitude to us, we assign it the place of a substitute under the Chief Architect.

(2) But the further consideration of the *regal duty* being at present omitted, we will proceed to a nearer inspection of that which is *religious*. We have already deduced its origin from the act of covenanting; we have propounded it, in the exercise of the regal office, as something that is due; and we place its proper action in thanksgiving and entreaty. This action is required to be religiously performed, according to their common vocation, by every one of the great body of those who are in covenant; and to this end they have been sanctified by the word of the covenant, and have all been constituted priests to God, that they might offer gifts and prayers to THE MOST HIGH. But since God loves order, He who is himself the only instance of order in its perfection, willed, that, out of the number of those who were sanctified, some one should in a peculiar manner be separated to him; that he who was thus set apart should, by a special and extraordinary vocation, be qualified for the office of the priesthood; and that, approaching more intimately and with greater freedom to the throne of God, he should, in the place of his associates in the same covenant and religion, take the charge and management of whatever affairs were to be transacted before God on their account.

From this circumstance is to be traced the existence of the office of the priesthood, the duties of which were to be discharged before God in behalf of others,—an office undoubtedly of vast dignity and of special honour among mankind. Although the priest must be taken from among men, and must be appointed in their behalf, yet it does not appertain to men themselves to designate whom they will to sustain that office; neither does it belong to any one to arrogate that honour to himself. But as the office itself is an act of the divine pleasure, so likewise the choice of the person who must discharge its duties rests with God himself: And it was his will, that the office should be fulfilled by him who for some just reason held precedence among his kindred by consanguinity. This was the father and master of the family, and his successor was the first-born. We have examples of this in the holy patriarchs,

both before and after the deluge. We behold this expressly in Noah, Abraham, and Job. There are also those (not occupying the lowest seats in judgment,) who say that Cain and Abel brought their sacrifices to Adam their father, that he might offer them to the Lord; and they derive this opinion from the word הביא used in the same passage.—Though these examples are selected from the description of that period when sin had made its entrance into the world, yet a confirmation of their truth is obtained in this primitive institution of the human race, of which we are now treating. For it is peculiar to that period, that all the duties of the priesthood were confined within the act of offering only an eucharistic sacrifice and supplications. Having therefore in due form executed these functions, the priest, in the name of his compeers, was by the appeased Deity admitted to a familiar intercourse with Him, and obtained from Him a charge to execute among his kindred, in the name of God himself, and as "the messenger [or Angel] of the Lord of Hosts." For the Lord revealed to him the Divine will and pleasure; that, on returning from his intercourse with God, he might declare it to the people. This will of God consisted of two parts: (1) That which he required to be performed by his covenant people; and (2) That which it was his wish to perform for their benefit. In this charge, which was committed to the priest, to be executed by him, the administration of prophecy was also included; on which account it is said, "They should seek the LAW at the mouth of the priest, for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts." (Mal. ii, 7.) And since that second part of the Divine will was to be proclaimed from an assured trust and confidence in the truth of the Divine promises, and with a holy and affectionate feeling towards his own species,—in that view, he was invested with a commission to dispense benedictions. In this manner, discharging the duties of a double embassy, (that of men to God, and that of God to men,) he acted, on both sides, the part of a Mediator of the covenant into which the parties had mutually entered. Nevertheless, not content with having conferred this honour on him whom he had sanctified, our God all-bountiful elevated him likewise to the delegated or vicarious dignity of the regal office, that he, bearing the image of God among his brethren, might then be able to administer justice to them in HIS name, and might manage, for their common benefit, those affairs with which he was entrusted.

From this source arose what may be considered the native union of the PRIESTLY and the KINGLY offices, which also obtained among the holy patriarchs after the entrance of sin, and of which express mention is made in the person of Melchizedec. This was signified in a general manner by the Patriarch Jacob, when he declared Reuben, his first-born son, to be "the excellency of dignity and the excellency of power," which were his due on account of the right of primogeniture. For certain reasons, however, the kingly functions were afterwards separated from the priestly, by the will of God, who, dividing them into two parts among his people the children of Israel, transferred the Monarchy to Judah and the Priesthood to Levi.

But it was proper, that this approach to God, through the oblation of an eucharistic sacrifice and prayers, should be made with a pure mind, holy affections, and with hands, as well as the other members of the body, free from defilement. This was required, even before the first transgression. "Sanctify yourselves, and be ye holy; for I the Lord your God am holy." (Lev. xix, 2, &c.) "God heareth not sinners." (John ix, 31.) "Bring no more vain oblations, for your hands are full of blood." (Isa. i, 15.) The will of God respecting this is constant and perpetual. But Adam, who was the first man and the first priest, did not long administer his office in a becoming manner; for, refusing to obey God, he tasted the fruit of the forbidden tree; and, by that foul crime of disobedience and revolt, he at once defiled his soul which had been sanctified to God, and his body. By this wicked deed he both lost all right to the priesthood, and was in reality deprived of it by the Divine sentence, which was clearly signified by his expulsion from Paradise, where he had appeared before God in that which was a type of His own dwelling-place. This was in accordance with the invariable rule of Divine Justice:—"Be it far from me [that thou shouldest any longer discharge before me the duties of the priesthood:] for them that honour me, I will honour; and they that despise me, shall be lightly esteemed." (1 Sam. ii, 30.) But he did not fall alone: All whose persons he at that time represented and whose cause he pleaded, (although they had not then come into existence,) were with him cast down from the elevated summit of such a high dignity. Neither did they fall from the priesthood only, but likewise from the covenant, of which the priest was both the Mediator and the Internuncio; and God ceased to be the King and God

of men, and men were no longer recognized as his people. The existence of the priesthood itself was at an end; for there was no one capable of fulfilling its duties according to the design of that covenant. The eucharistic sacrifice, the invocation of the name of God, and the gracious communication between God and men, all ceased together.

Most miserable, and deserving of the deepest commiseration, was the condition of mankind in that state of their affairs,—if this declaration be a true one, "Happy is the people whose God is the Lord!" (Psalm cxliv, 15.) And this inevitable misery would have rested upon Adam and his race for ever, had not Jehovah, full of mercy and commiseration, deigned to receive them into favour, and resolved to enter into another covenant with the same parties; not according to that which they had transgressed, and which was then become obsolete and had been abolished; but into a new covenant of grace. But the Divine justice and truth could not permit this to be done, except through the agency of an umpire and a surety, who might undertake the part of a Mediator between the offended God and sinners. Such a Mediator could not then approach to God with an *eucharistic sacrifice* for benefits conferred upon the human race, or with prayers which might intreat only for a continuance and an increase of them: But he had to approach into the Divine presence to offer sacrifice for the act of hostility which they had committed against God by transgressing his commandment, and to offer prayers for obtaining the remission of their transgressions. Hence arose the necessity of an EXPIATORY SACRIFICE; and, on that account, a new priesthood was to be instituted, by the operation of which the sin that had been committed might be expiated, and access to the throne of God's grace might be granted to man though a sinner:—this is the priesthood which belongs to our Christ [the Anointed One] alone.

But God, who is the Supremely Wise Disposer of times and seasons, would not permit the discharge of the functions appertaining to this priesthood to commence immediately after the formation of the world and the introduction of sin. It was his pleasure, that the necessity of it should be first correctly understood and appreciated, by a conviction on men's consciences of the multitude, heinousness, and aggravated nature of their sins. It was also his will, that the minds of men should be affected with a serious and earnest desire for it, yet so that they might in the mean time be supported against despair,

arising from a consciousness of their sins, which could not be removed except by means of that Divine priesthood, the future commencement of which inspired them with hope and confidence. All these purposes God effected by the temporary institution of that typical priesthood, the duties of which infirm and sinful men "after the law of a carnal commandment" could perform, by the immolation of beasts sanctified for that service; which priesthood was at first established in different parts of the world, and afterwards among the Israelites, who were specially elected to be a sacerdotal nation. When the blood of beasts was shed, which contained the life of them, (Lev. xvii, 14.) the people contemplated, in the death of the animals, their own demerits, for the beasts had not sinned that they by death should be punished as victims for transgression. After investigating this subject with greater diligence, and deliberately weighing it in the equal balances of their judgment, they plainly perceived and understood that their sins could not possibly be expiated by those sacrifices, which were of a species different from their own, and more despicable and mean than human beings. From these premises they must of necessity have concluded, that, notwithstanding they offered those animals, they in such an act delivered to God nothing less than their own bond, sealing it in his presence with an acknowledgment of their personal sins, and confessing the debt which they had incurred. Yet, because these sacrifices were of Divine Institution, and because God received them at the hands of men as incense whose odour was fragrant and agreeable, from these circumstances the offenders conceived the hope of obtaining favour and pardon, reasoning thus within themselves, as did Sampson's mother: "If the Lord were pleased to kill us, he would not have received a burnt-offering and a meat-offering at our hands." (Judges xiii, 23.) With such a hope they strengthened their spirits that were ready to faint, and, confiding in the Divine promise, they expected in all the ardour of desire the dispensation of a priesthood which was prefigured under the typical one; "searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the SUFFERINGS of Christ, and the GLORY that should follow." (1 Pet. i, 11.) But, since the mind pants after the very delightful consideration of this priesthood, our oration hastens towards it; and, having some regard to the lateness of the hour, and wishing not to encroach on your comfort, we shall omit any further allusion to that

branch of the priesthood which has hitherto occupied our attention.

SECONDLY.—In discoursing on the PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST, we will confine our observations to three points; and,—on condition that you receive the succeeding part of my oration with that kindness and attention which you have hitherto manifested, and which I still hope and desire to receive,—we will describe: *First*, THE IMPOSING OF THE OFFICE.—*Secondly*, ITS EXECUTION AND ADMINISTRATION.—And *Thirdly*, THE FRUITS OF THE OFFICE THUS ADMINISTERED, AND THE UTILITY WHICH WE DERIVE FROM IT.

I. In respect to the IMPOSING OF THE OFFICE, the subject itself presents us with three topics to be discussed in order. (1) *The person who imposes it.*—(2) *The person on whom it is imposed, or to whom it is entrusted.*—And (3) *The manner of his appointment, and of his undertaking this charge.*

1. *The person imposing it* is GOD, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.—Since this act of imposing belongs to the economy and dispensation of our salvation, the persons who are comprised under this one Divine Monarchy are to be distinctly considered according to the rule of the scriptures, which ought to have the precedence in this enquiry, and according to the rules and guidance of the orthodox Fathers that agree with those scriptures. It is JEHOVAH who imposes this office, and who, while the princes of darkness fret themselves and rage in vain, says to his MESSIAH, "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." (Psalm ii, 8.) He it is who, when he commanded Messiah to sit at his right hand, repeated his holy and revered word with an oath, saying, "Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec." (Psalm cx, 4.) This is HE who imposes the office, and that by a right the most just and deserved. For "with him we have to do, who, dwelling in the light unto which no man can approach," remains continually in the seat of his Majesty. He preserves his own authority safe and unimpaired to himself, "without any abasement or lessening of his person," as the voice of antiquity expresses it; and retains entire, within himself, the right of demanding satisfaction from the sinner for the injuries which HE has sustained. From this right he has not thought fit to recede, or to resign any part of it, on account of the rigid inflexibility of his justice, according to

which he hates iniquity and does not permit a wicked person to dwell in his presence. This therefore is the Divine Person in whose hands rest both the *right* and the *power* of imposition; the fact of his having also the *will*, is decided by the very act of imposition.

But an enquiry must be made into the CAUSE of this imposition, which we shall not find, except, *First*, in the conflict between justice and gracious mercy; and, *Afterwards*, in their amicable agreement, or rather their junction by means of wisdom's conciliating assistance.

(1) JUSTICE demanded, on her part, the punishment due to her from a sinful creature; and this demand she the more rigidly enforced, by the greater equity with which she had threatened it, and the greater truth with which it had been openly foretold and declared.

Gracious MERCY, like a pious mother, moving with bowels of commiseration, desired to avert that punishment in which was placed the extreme misery of the creature. For she thought that, though the remission of that punishment was not due to the cause of it, yet such a favour ought to be granted to her by a right of the greatest equity; because it is one of her chief properties to "rejoice against judgment." (James ii, 13.)

JUSTICE, tenacious of her purpose, rejoined, that the throne of grace, she must confess, was sublimely elevated above the tribunal of justice; but she could not bear with patient indifference that no regard should be paid to her, and her suit not be admitted, while the authority of managing the whole affair was to be transferred to mercy. Since, however, it was a part of the oath administered to justice when she entered into office, "that she should render to every one his own," she would yield entirely to mercy, provided a method could be devised by which her own inflexibility could be declared, as well as the excess of her hatred to sin.

(2) But to find out that method, was not the province of MERCY.—It was necessary therefore to call in the aid of WISDOM to adjust the mighty difference, and to reconcile by an amicable union those two combatants that were, in God, the supreme protectresses of all equity and goodness. Being called upon, she came, and at once discovered a method, and affirmed that it was possible to render to each of them that which belonged to her; for if the punishment due to sin appeared desirable to Justice and odious to mercy, it might be transmuted into an expiatory sacrifice, the oblation of which,

on account of the voluntary suffering of death, (which is the punishment adjudged to sin,) might appease Justice, and open such a way for Mercy as she had desired.—Both of them instantly assented to this proposal, and made a decree according to the terms of agreement settled by Wisdom, their common arbitrator.

2. But, that we may come to the SECOND POINT, *a priest* was next to be sought, to offer the sacrifice: For that was a function of the priesthood. *A sacrifice* was likewise to be sought; and with this condition annexed to it, that the same person should be both priest and sacrifice. This was required by the plan of the true priesthood and sacrifice, from which the figurative and symbolical greatly differs.—But in the different orders of creatures neither sacrifice nor priest could be found.

It was not possible for an angel to become a priest; because "he was to be taken from among men and to be ordained from men in things pertaining to God." (Heb. v, 1.) Neither could an angel be a sacrifice; because it was not just that the death of an angel should be an expiation for a crime which a man had perpetrated: And if this had even been most proper, yet man could never have been induced to believe that the value of an angelical sacrifice had been expended by an angel upon him, or, if it had been so expended, that it was of the least avail.—Application was then to be made to men themselves. But, among them, not one could be found in whom it would have been a becoming act to execute the office of the priesthood, and who had either ability or inclination for the undertaking. For all men were sinners; all were terrified with a consciousness of their delinquency; and all were detained captive under the tyranny of sin and satan. It was not lawful for a sinner to approach to God, who is pure Light, for the purpose of offering sacrifice; because, being affrighted by his own internal perception of his crime, he could not support a sight of the countenance of an incensed God, before whom it was still necessary that he should appear. Being placed under the dominion of sin and satan, he was neither willing, nor had he the power to will, to execute an office the duties of which were to be discharged for the benefit of others, out of love to them. The same consideration likewise tends to the rejection of every human sacrifice. Yet the priest was to be taken from among men, and the oblation to God was to consist of a human victim.

In this state of affairs the assistance of WISDOM was again required in the Divine Council. She declared that a man must be born from among men, who might have a nature in common with the rest of his brethren, that, being in all things tempted as they were, he might be able to sympathize with others in their sufferings; and yet that he should neither be reckoned in the order of the rest, nor should be made man according to the law of the primitive creation and benediction; that he should not be under the dominion of sin; that he should be one in whom satan could find nothing worthy of condemnation, who should not be tormented by a consciousness of sin, and who should not even know sin, that is, one who should be "born in the likeness of sinful flesh, and yet without sin. For such a high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." (Heb. vii, 26.) But, that he might have a community of nature with men, he ought to be born of a human being; and, that he might have no participation in crime with them, but might be holy, he ought to be conceived by the Holy Ghost,—because sanctification is his proper work. By the Holy Spirit, the nativity which was above and yet according to nature, might, through the virtue of the mystery, restore nature, as it surpassed her in the transcendent excellence of the miracle. But the dignity of this priesthood was greater, and its functions more weighty and important, than man even in his pure state was competent to sustain or discharge. The benefits also to be obtained by it, infinitely exceeded the value of man when in his greatest state of purity. Therefore the Word of God, who from the beginning was with God, and by whom the worlds, and all things visible and invisible, were created, ought himself to be made flesh, to undertake the office of the priesthood, and to offer his own flesh to God as a sacrifice for the life of the world.

We now have the person who was entrusted with the priesthood, and to whom the province was assigned of atoning for the common offence: It is Jesus Christ, the Son of God and of man, a high priest of such great excellence, that the transgression whose demerits have obtained this mighty Redeemer, might almost seem to have been a happy circumstance.

3. Let us proceed to *the mode of its being imposed or undertaken.*—This mode is according to covenant, which on God's part received an oath for its confirmation. As it is according to covenant, it becomes a solemnity appointed by God, with whom rests the appointment to the priesthood. For the Levi-

tical priesthood was conferred on Levi *according to covenant*, as the Lord declares by the prophet Malachi: "My covenant was with him of life and peace." (ii, 5.) It is, however, peculiar to this priesthood of Christ, that the covenant on which it is founded, was *confirmed by an oath*.—Let us briefly consider each of them.

The covenant into which God entered with our High Priest, Jesus Christ, consisted, on the part of God, of the *demand* of an action to be performed, and of the *promise* of an immense remuneration. On the part of Christ, our High Priest, it consisted of an *accepting* of the PROMISE, and a *voluntary engagement* to PERFORM the ACTION.—*First*. God *required* of him, that he should lay down his soul as a victim in sacrifice for sin, (Isa. liii, 11.) that he should give his flesh for the life of the world, (John vi. 51.) and that he should pay the price of redemption for the sins and the captivity of the human race.—God "promised," that, if he performed all this, "he should see a seed whose days should be prolonged," (Isa. liii, 11.) and that he should be himself "an everlasting Priest after the order of Melchizedec," (Psalm cx, 4.) that is, he should, by the discharge of his *priestly* functions, be elevated to the *regal* dignity.—*Secondly*. Christ, our High Priest, accepted of these conditions, and permitted the province to be assigned to him of atoning for our transgressions, exclaiming, "Lo, I come that I may do thy will, O my God." (Ps. xl, 8.) But he accepted them under a stipulation, that, on completing his great undertaking, he should for ever enjoy the honour of a priesthood similar to that of Melchizedec, and that, being placed on his royal throne, he might, as KING of RIGHTEOUSNESS and PRINCE of PEACE, rule in righteousness the people subject to his sway, and might dispense peace to his people.—He, therefore, "for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame;" (Heb. xii, 2.) that, "being anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows," (Psalm xlv, 7.) he might sit for ever in the throne of equity at the right hand of the throne of God.

Great indeed was the condescension of the All-powerful God in being willing to treat with our High Priest rather in the way of covenant, than by a display of his authority. And strong were the pious affections of our High Priest, who did not refuse to take upon himself, on our account, the discharge of those difficult and arduous duties which were full of pain, trouble, and misery.—Most glorious act, performed by thee,

O Christ, who art infinite in Goodness! Thou Great High Priest, accept of the honours due to thy pious affection, and continue in that way to proceed to glory, to the complete consecration of our salvation!—For it was the will of God, that the duties of the office should be administered from a voluntary and disinterested zeal and affection for his glory and the salvation of sinners; and it was a deed worthy of his abundant benignity, to recompense with a large reward the voluntary promptitude which Christ exhibited.

God added an oath to the covenant, both for the purpose of confirming it, and as a demonstration of the dignity and unchangeable nature of that priesthood. Though the constant and unvarying veracity of God's nature might very properly set aside the necessity of an oath, yet as he had conformed to the customs of men in their method of solemnizing agreements, it was his pleasure by an oath to confirm his covenant; that our High Priest, relying in assured hope on the two-fold and immoveable anchor of the *promise* and of the *oath*, "might despise the shame and endure the cross."—The immutability and perpetuity of this priesthood have been pointed out by the oath which was added to the covenant. For whatever that be which God confirms by an oath, it is something eternal and immutable.

But it may be asked, "Are not all the words which God speaks, all the promises which he makes, and all the covenants into which he enters, of the same nature, even when they are unaccompanied by the sanctity of an oath?" Let me be permitted to describe the difference between the two cases here stated, and to prove it by an important example. There are two methods or plans by which it might be possible for man to arrive at a state of righteousness before God and to obtain life from him,—the one is according to righteousness through the law, by works and "of debt;" the other is according to mercy through the gospel, "by grace, and through faith:" These two methods are so constituted as not to allow both of them to be in a course of operation at the same time; but they proceed on the principle, that when the first of them is made void, a vacancy may be created for the second. In the beginning, therefore, it was the will of God to prescribe to man the first of these methods; which arrangement was required by his righteousness and the primitive institution of mankind. But it was not his pleasure to deal strictly with man according to the process of that legal covenant, and peremptorily to pro-

nounce a destructive sentence against him in conformity with the rigour of the law. Wherefore he did not subjoin an oath to that covenant, lest such an addition should have served to point out its immutability, a quality which God would not permit it to possess. The necessary consequence of this was, that when the first covenant was made void through sin, a vacancy was created by the good pleasure of God for another and a better covenant, in the manifestation of which he employed an oath, because it was to be the last and peremptory one respecting the method of obtaining righteousness and life. "By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, that in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." (Gen. xxii, 18.) —"As I live, saith the Lord, have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? and not that he should return from his ways and live?" (Ezek. xviii, 23.)—"So I sware in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest. And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief." (Heb. iii, 11, 18.) For the same reason it is said, "The wrath of God [from which it is possible for sinners to be liberated by faith in Christ,] abides on those who are unbelievers." (John iii, 36.) A similar process is observed in relation to the priesthood. For he did not confirm with an oath the Levitical priesthood, which had been "imposed until the time of reformation." (Heb. ix, 10.) But because it was his will that the priesthood of Christ should be everlasting, he ratified it by an oath. The Apostle to the Hebrews demonstrates the whole of this subject in the most nervous style, by quotations from the Hundred-and-tenth Psalm.—Blessed are we in whose behalf God was willing to swear! but most miserable shall we be, if we give no credit to him who swears. —The greatest dignity is likewise obtained to this priesthood and imparted to it, by the addition of an oath, which elevates it far above the honour to which that of Levi attained. "For the law of a carnal commandment maketh men priests who have infirmities, and are sinners, to offer both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him perfect who did the service, as pertaining to the conscience;" (Heb. ix, 9.) neither could they abolish sin, or procure heavenly blessings. "But the words of the oath, which was since the law, constituteth the Son a High Priest consecrated for evermore, who, after the power of an endless life and through the Eternal Spirit, offers himself without spot to God, and by that one offering he perfects for ever them that are sanctified, their consciences being purified to

serve the living God: by how much also it was a more excellent covenant, by so much the more ought it to be confirmed, since it was established upon better promises: (Heb. vii—x.) and that which God hath deigned to honour with the sanctity of an oath, should be viewed as an object of the most momentous importance.

II. We have spoken to the act of IMPOSING the Priesthood, as long as our circumscribed time will allow us. Let us now contemplate its EXECUTION, in which we have to consider *the duties to be performed*, and in them *the feeling and condition of him who performs them.* The functions to be executed were two: (1) The OBLATION of an expiatory sacrifice, and (2) PRAYER.

1. The OBLATION was preceded by a preparation through the deepest privation and abasement, the most devoted obedience, vehement supplications, and the most exquisitely painful experience of human infirmities, on each of which it is not now necessary to speak.—This oblation consists of two parts succeeding each other: The FIRST is the immolation or sacrifice of the body of Christ, by the shedding of his blood on the altar of the cross, which was succeeded by death,—thus paying the price of redemption for sins by suffering the punishment due to them. The OTHER PART consists of the offering of his body reanimated and sprinkled with the blood which he shed, —a symbol of the price which he has paid and of the redemption which he has obtained.—The FIRST PART of this oblation was to be performed without the Holy of Holies, that is, on earth, because no effusion of blood can take place in heaven, since it is necessarily succeeded by death. For death has no more sway in heaven, in the presence and sight of the Majesty of the True God, than sin itself has, which contains within it the deserts of death, and as death contains within itself the punishment of sin. For thus says the scripture: "The Son of man came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." (Matt. xx, 28.) "For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Matt. xxvi, 28.) "Christ Jesus gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." (1 Tim. ii, 6.)—But the SECOND PART of this offering was to be accomplished in heaven, in the Holy of Holies. For that body which had suffered the punishment of death and had been recalled to life, was entitled to appear before the Divine Majesty besprinkled with its own blood, that, remaining thus before God

as a continual memorial, it might also be a perpetual expiation for transgressions. On this subject the Apostle says: "Into the second tabernacle went the High Priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people. But Christ being come a High Priest of good things to come, not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the Holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us:" (Heb. ix, 11.) that is, by his own blood already poured out and sprinkled upon him, that he might appear with it in the presence of God. That act, being once performed, was never repeated; "for in that he died, he died unto sin once." But this is a perpetual act; "for in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." (Rom. vi, 10.)—"This man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood." (Heb. vii, 24.) The former was the act of the Lamb to be slain, the latter that of the Lamb already slain and raised again from death to life. The one was completed in a state of the deepest humiliation, the other in a state of glory; and both of them out of a consummate affection for the glory of God and the salvation of sinners. Sanctified by the anointing of the Spirit, he completed the former act; and the latter was likewise his work, when he had been further consecrated by his sufferings and sprinkled with his own blood. By the former, therefore, he sanctified himself, and made a kind of preparation on earth that he might be qualified to discharge the functions of the latter in heaven.

2. The SECOND of the two functions to be discharged, was the act of *prayer* and *intercession*, the latter of which depends upon the former. Prayer is that which Christ offers for himself, and intercession is what he offers for believers; each of which is most luminously described to us by John, in the Seventeenth Chapter of his Gospel, which contains a perpetual rule and exact canon of the prayers and intercessions which Christ offers in heaven to his Father. For although that prayer was recited by Christ while he remained upon earth, yet it properly belongs to his sublime state of exaltation in heaven: And it was his will, that it should be described in his word, that we on earth might derive from it perpetual consolation. Christ offers up a prayer to the Father for himself, according to the Father's command and promise combined, "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance." (Psalm ii, 8.) Christ had regard to this promise, when he said, "Father, glorify thy Son, that thy Son also

may glorify thee, as thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." This sort of entreaty must be distinguished from those "supplications which Christ in the days of his flesh offered up to the Father, with strong cries and tears;" (Heb. v, 7.) for by them he intreated to be delivered from anguish, while by the other he asks, "to see his seed whose days should be prolonged, and to behold the pleasure of the Lord which should prosper in his hands." (Isa. liii, 10.)—But, for the faithful, intercession is made, of which the apostle thus speaks, "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also MAKETH INTERCESSION FOR US." (Rom. viii, 34.) And, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, he says, "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing HE EVER LIVETH TO MAKE INTERCESSION FOR THEM." (vii, 25.) But Christ is said to intercede for believers, to the exclusion of the world, because, after he had offered a sacrifice sufficient to take away the sins of all mankind, he was consecrated a Great "High Priest to preside over the house of God," (Heb. x, 21.) "which house those are who hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." (iii, 6.) Christ discharges the whole of this part of his function in heaven, before the face of the Divine Majesty; for there also is the royal seat and the throne of God, to which, when we are about to pray, we are commanded to lift up our eyes and our minds. But he executes this part of his office, not in anguish of spirit, or in a posture of humble genuflection, as though fallen down before the knees of the Father, but in the confidence of the shedding of his own blood, which, sprinkled as it is on his sacred body, he continually presents as an object of sight before his Father, always turning it towards his sacred countenance. The entire efficacy of this function depends on the dignity and value of the blood effused and sprinkled over the body; for, by his blood-shedding, he opened a passage for himself "into the holiest within the veil." From which circumstance we may with the greatest certainty conclude, that his prayers will never be rejected, and that whatever we shall ask in his name, will, in virtue of that intercession, be both heard and answered.

The sacerdotal functions being thus executed, God the Father, mindful of his covenant and sacred oath, not only continued the priesthood with Christ for ever, but elevated

him likewise to the regal dignity, "all power being given unto him in heaven and in earth, (Matt. xxviii, 18.) also power over all flesh: (John xvii, 2.) a name being conferred on him which is far above all principality, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come, (Ephes. i, 21.) angels, and authorities, and powers being made subject unto him," (1 Pet. iii, 22.) that he might be the Christ and the Lord of his whole Israel, KING of Kings and LORD of Lords. By this admirable covenant, therefore, God hath united those two supreme functions in one, even in Christ Jesus, and has thus performed his promise, by which he had sworn that this Priest should "be for ever after the order of Melchizedec," who was at once a King and a Priest; and is to the present time "without beginning of days or end of life," because his genealogy is not described in the scriptures, which in this case are subservient to the figure. This conjunction of the sacerdotal and regal functions is the highest point and the extreme clause of all the Divine works, a never-fading token of the justice and the mercy of God attempered together for the economy of our salvation, a very luminous and clear evidence of the most excellent glory of God, and an immoveable foundation for the certainty of obtaining salvation through this royal priest. If man is properly styled "the extreme Colophon of the creation," "a microcosm" on account of the union of his body and soul, "an epitome of the whole world," and "the marriage of the Universe," what judgment shall we form of this conjunction, which consists of a most intimate and inseparable union of the whole church of believers and of God himself, "who dwells in the light unto which no man can approach?" and by what amplitude of title shall we point out its divinity? This union hath a name above every name that can be named. It is ineffable, inconceivable, and incomprehensible. If, chiefly in respect to this, I shall say, that Christ is styled "the brightness of the Father's glory," "the express image of his person," and "the image of the invisible God," I shall have expressed its excellency as fully as it is possible to do.

What can be a more illustrious instance of the admixture of justice with mercy than that even the Son of God, when he had "made himself of no reputation and assumed the form of a servant," could not be constituted a King except through a discharge of the sacerdotal functions; and that all those blessings which he had to bestow as a King on his subjects,

could not be asked except through the priesthood, and which, when obtained from God, could not (except through the intervention of this Royal Mediator,) be communicated by his vicarious distribution under God? What can be a stronger and a better proof of the certainty of obtaining salvation through Christ, than that he has, by the discharge of his sacerdotal functions in behalf of men, asked and procured it for men, and that, being constituted a King through the priesthood, he has received salvation from the Father to be dispensed to them? In these particulars consists the perfection of the Divine glory.

III. But this consideration, I perceive, introduces us, almost imperceptibly, to the THIRD and last portion of our subject, in which we have engaged to treat on THE FRUITS OF THE SACERDOTAL OFFICE in its administration by Christ. We will reduce all these fruits, though they are innumerable, to four chief particulars; and, since we hasten to the end of this discourse, we bind ourselves down to extreme brevity. These benefits are, (1) The concluding and the confirmation of a New Covenant;—(2) The asking, obtaining, and application of all the blessings necessary for the salvation of the human race; (3) The institution of a new priesthood, both eucharistic and rayal;—and (4) lastly, The extreme and final bringing to God of all his covenant people.

1. The FIRST UTILITY is *the contracting and the confirmation of a New Covenant*, in which the compendious advantage is directed to solid felicity.

We rejoice and glory, that this has been obtained by the priesthood of Christ. For since the first covenant had been made weak through sin and the flesh, and was not capable of bringing righteousness and life, it was necessary either to enter into another, or that we should be for ever expelled from God's presence. Such a covenant could not be contracted between a just God and sinful men, except in consequence of a reconciliation, which, it pleased God the offended party, should be perfected by the blood of our High Priest to be poured out on the altar of the cross. He who was at once the officiating priest and the Lamb for sacrifice, poured out his sacred blood, and thus asked and obtained for us a reconciliation with God. When this great offering was completed, it was possible for the reconciled parties to enter into an agreement. Hence, it pleased God, that the same High Priest who had acted as Mediator and Umpire in this reconciliation, should, with the very blood

by which he had effected their union, go between the two parties, as a middle-man, or, in the capacity of an ambassador, and as a herald to bear tidings of war or peace;—with the same blood as that by which the consciences of those who were included in the provisions of the covenant, being sprinkled, might be purged from dead works and sanctified;—with the very blood, which, sprinkled upon himself, might always appear in the sight of God;—and with the same blood as that by which all things in the heavens might be sprinkled and purified. Through the intervention, therefore, of this blood, another covenant was contracted, not one of works but of faith, not of the law but of grace, not an old but a new one,—and new, not because it was later than the first, but because it was never to be abrogated or repealed, and because its force and vigour should perpetually endure. "For that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away." (Heb. viii, 13.) If such a covenant as is described in this quotation should be again contracted, in the several ages which succeed each other, changes ought frequently to occur in it; and, all former covenants being rendered obsolete, others more recent ought to succeed. But it was necessary at length, that a pause should occur in one of them, and that such a covenant should at once be made as might endure for ever. It was also to be ratified with blood. But how was it possible to be confirmed with blood of greater value than that of the High Priest, who was the Son both of God and man? But the covenant of which we are now treating, was ratified with that blood; it was therefore a new one and never to be annulled. For the perpetual presence and sight of such a Great High Priest, sprinkled with his own blood, will not suffer the mind of his Father to be regardless of the covenant ratified by it, or his sacred breast to be moved with repentance. With what other blood will it be possible for the the consciences of those in covenant to be cleansed and sanctified to God, if, after having become parties to the covenant of grace, they pollute themselves with any crime? "There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, if any man have trodden underfoot this High Priest, and counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing." (Heb. x, 29.) The covenant therefore which has been concluded by the intervention of this blood and this High Priest, is a new one, and will endure for ever.

2. The SECOND FRUIT is *the asking, obtaining, and application of all the blessings necessary to those who are in covenant*

for the salvation both of soul and body. For since every covenant must be confirmed by certain promises, it was necessary that this also should have its blessings, by which it might be sanctioned and those in covenant rendered happy.

(1) Among those blessings, *the remission of sins* first offers itself, according to the tenour of the New Covenant, "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." (Heb. viii, 12.) But the scripture testifies, that Christ has asked this blessing by his blood, when it says, "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Matt. xxvi, 28.) The scripture also proves his having obtained such a blessing by the discharge of the same office, in these words: "By his own blood Christ entered in once into the holy place, HAVING OBTAINED eternal redemption for us." (Heb. ix, 12.) It adds its testimony to the application, saying, "In Christ WE HAVE REDEMPTION through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." (Ephes. i, 7.)

(2) This necessary blessing is succeeded by *adoption into sons* and by *a right to the heavenly inheritance:* And we owe it to the Priesthood of Christ, that this blessing was asked and obtained for us, as well as communicated to us, by the Priesthood of our Saviour Jesus Christ. For he being the proper and only begotten Son of the Father, and the sole heir of all his Father's blessings, was unwilling to enjoy such transcendent benefits alone, and desired to have co-heirs and partners, whom he might anoint with the oil of his gladness, and might receive into a participation of that inheritance. He made an offering, therefore, of his soul for sin, that, the travail of his soul being finished, he might see his seed prolonged in their days,—the seed of God which might come into a participation with him both of name and inheritance. "He was made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive THE ADOPTION OF SONS." (Gal. iv, 5.) According to the command of the Father, he asked, that the Heathen might be given to him for an inheritance. By these acts, therefore, which are peculiar to his priesthood, he asked for this right of adoption in behalf of his believing people, and obtained it for the purpose of its being communicated to them, nay, in fact, he himself became the donor. "For to as many as believed on his name Christ gave power to become the Sons of God." (John i, 12.) Through him and in regard to him, God has adopted us for sons, who are beloved in him the Son

of his love. He therefore is the sole heir, by whose death the inheritance comes to others; which circumstance was predicted by the perfidious husbandmen, (Mark xii, 7.) who, being Scribes and Pharisees, uttered at that time a remarkable truth, although they were ignorant of such a great mystery.

(3) But because it is impossible to obtain benefits of this magnitude except in union with the High Priest himself, it was expected of him that he should ask and obtain *the gift of the* HOLY SPIRIT, the bond of that union, and should pour him out on his own people. But since the Spirit of grace is the token as well as the testimony of the love of God towards us, and the earnest of our inheritance, Christ could not ask this great gift till a reconciliation had taken place, and to effect this was the duty of the priest. When, therefore, this reconciliation was effected, he asked of his Father another Comforter for his people, and his request was granted. Being elevated to the right hand of God, he obtained this Paraclete promised in the terms of the sacerdotal covenant; and, when he had procured this Spirit, he poured him out in a most copious manner on his followers, as the scripture says, "Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." (Acts ii, 33.)

That the asking, the obtaining, and the communication of all these blessings, have flowed from the functions of the priesthood, God has testified by a certain seal of the greatest sanctity, when he constituted Christ the Testator of these very blessings, which office embraces conjointly both the full possession of the good things divised as legacies in the Will, and absolute authority over their distribution.

3. The THIRD FRUIT of Christ's administration is *the institution of a new priesthood both eucharistic and regal*, and our sanctification for the purpose of performing its duties; for when a New Covenant was concluded, it was needful to institute a new eucharistic priesthood, (because the old one had fallen into disuse,) and to sanctify priests to fulfil its duties.

(1) Christ, by his own priesthood, completed such an institution; and he sanctified us by a discharge of its functions. This was the order in which he instituted it: FIRST, he constituted us his debtors, and as bound to thanksgiving on account of the immense benefits procured for us and bestowed upon us by his priesthood. THEN he instructed us how to offer sacrifices to God, our souls and bodies being sanctified

and consecrated by the sprinkling of his blood and by the unction of the Holy Spirit, that, if they were offered as sacrifices to God, they might meet with acceptance. It was also his care to have an altar erected in heaven before the throne of grace, which being sprinkled with his own blood he consecrated to God, that the sacrifices of his faithful people, being placed upon it, might continually appear before the face of the Majesty of heaven and in presence of his throne. LASTLY, he placed on that altar an eternal and never-ceasing fire,—the immeasurable favour of God, with which the sacrifices on that altar might be kindled and reduced to ashes.

(2) But it was also necessary that priests should be consecrated: the act of consecration, therefore, was performed by Christ, as the Great High Priest, by his own blood. St. John says, in the Apocalypse, "He hath loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father." (i, 6.)—"Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests." (v, 10.) Not content to have us joint-heirs in the participation of his inheritance, he willed that we should likewise partake of the same dignity as that which he enjoyed. But he made us partners with him of that dignity in such a manner, as in the mean time always to retain within himself the first place, "as Head of his body the Church, the first-born among many brethren and the Great High Priest who presides over the whole of the House of God." To Him, we, who are "born again," ought to deliver our sacrifices, that by him they may be further offered to God, sprinkled and perfumed with the grateful odour of his own expiatory sacrifice, and may thus through him be rendered acceptable to the Father. For this cause, the Apostle says, "By him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name." (Heb. xiii, 15.) We are indeed, by his favour, "a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices;" but those sacrifices are rendered "acceptable to God, only by Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. ii, 5.)—Not only was it his pleasure that we should be partakers of this sacerdotal dignity, but likewise of the eternity attached to it, that we also might execute the office of the priesthood after the order of Melchizedec, which by a sacred oath was consecrated to immortality. For though, at the close of these temporary ages, Christ will not any longer

perform the expiatory part of the priesthood, yet he will for ever discharge its eucharistic duties in our favour. These eucharistic duties we shall also execute in him and through him, unless, in the midst of the enjoyment of the benefits received by us from him, we should desire our memories no longer to retain the recollection, that through him we obtained those blessings, and through him we have been created priests to render due thanksgiving to God the chief Donor of all. But, since we are not able to offer to God, so long as we remain in this mortal body, the sacrifices due to him, except by the strenuous resistance which we offer to Satan, the world, sin, and our own flesh, and through the victory which we obtain over them, (both of which are royal acts,)—and since, after this life, we shall execute the sacerdotal office, being elevated with him on the throne of his Father, and having all our enemies subdued under us,—he hath therefore made us both kings and priests, yea "a royal priesthood" to our God, that nothing might be found in the typical priesthood of Melchizedec, in the enjoyment of which we should not equally participate.

4. The FOURTH and last FRUIT of the Priesthood of Christ, proposed to be noticed by us, is *the act of bringing to God all the church of the faithful*;—which is the end and completion of the three preceding effects. For with this intent the covenant was contracted between God and men; with this intent the remission of sins, the adoption of sons, and the Spirit of grace were conferred on the church; for this purpose the new eucharistic and royal priesthood was instituted;—that, being made priests and kings, all the covenant people might be brought to their God. In most expressive language the Apostle Peter ascribes this effect to the priesthood of Christ, in these words: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, THAT HE MIGHT BRING US TO GOD." (1 Pet. iii, 18.) The following are also the words of an Apostle concerning the same act of bringing them to God: "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father." (1 Cor. xv, 24.) In Isaiah's prophecy it is said, "Behold I and the children whom the Lord hath given me!" Let these words be considered as proceeding out of the mouth of Christ, when he is bringing his children and addressing the Father;—not that they may be "for signs and for wonders" to the people, but "a peculiar treasure to the Lord."

Christ will therefore bring all his CHURCH, whom he hath redeemed to himself by his own blood, that they may receive,

from the hands of the Father of infinite benignity, the heavenly inheritance which has been procured by his death, promised in his word, and sealed by the Holy Spirit, and may enjoy it for ever.—He will bring his PRIESTS, whom sprinkled with his blood, he hath sanctified unto God, that they may serve him for ever.—He will bring his KINGS, that they may with God possess the kingdom for ever and ever: for in them, by the virtue of his Holy Spirit, he has subdued and overcome Satan the Chief, and his auxiliaries—the world, sin, and their own flesh, yea, and "death itself, the last enemy that shall be destroyed."

Christ will bring, and God even the Father will receive:—He will receive the CHURCH of Christ, and will command her as "the bride, the Lamb's wife," on her introduction into the celestial bride-chamber, to celebrate a perpetual feast with the Lamb, that she may enjoy the most complete fruition of pleasure in the presence of the throne of his glory.—He will receive the PRIESTS, and will clothe them with the comely and beautiful garments of perfect holiness, that they may for ever and ever sing to God a new song of thanksgiving.—And then he will receive the KINGS, and place them on the throne of his Majesty, that they may with God and the Lamb obtain the kingdom and may rule and reign for ever.

These are the fruits and benefits which Christ, by the administration of his priesthood, hath asked and obtained for us, and communicated to us: Their dignity is undoubtedly great, and their utility immense. For what could occur of a more agreeable nature to those who are "alienated from the life of God, and strangers to the covenants of promise," (Ephes. ii, 12.) than to be received by God into the covenant of grace, and to be reckoned among his people? What could afford greater pleasure to the consciences which were oppressed with the intolerable burden of their sins, and fainting under the weight of the wrath of God, than the remission and pardon of all their transgressions? What could prove more acceptable to men, sons of the accursed earth, and to those who are devoted to hell, than to receive from God the adoption of sons, and to be written in heaven? What greater pleasure could those enjoy who lie under the dominion of Satan and the tyranny of sin, than a freedom from such a state of most horrid and miserable servitude, and a restoration to true liberty? What more glorious than to be admitted into a participation of the

Priesthood and of the Monarchy, to be consecrated priests and kings to God, even *royal priests* and *priestly kings*? And, lastly, what could be more desirable than to be brought to God, the Chief Good and the Fountain of all happiness, that, in a beatified and glorious state, we may spend with him a whole eternity?

This priesthood was imposed by God himself, "with whom we have to do," on Christ Jesus,—the Son of God and the Son of man, our first-born brother, formerly encompassed about with infirmities, tempted in all things, merciful, holy, faithful, undefiled, and separate from sinners; and its imposition was accompanied by a sacred oath, which it is not lawful to revoke. Let us therefore rely with assured faith on this priesthood of Christ, entertaining no doubt that God hath ratified and confirmed, is now ratifying and confirming, and will for ever ratify and confirm all those things which have been accomplished, are now accomplishing, and will continue even to the consummation of this dispensation to be accomplished, on our account, by a High Priest taken from among ourselves, and placed in the Divine presence, having received in our behalf an appointment from God, who himself chose him to that office.

Since the same Christ hath by the administration of his own priesthood obtained a perpetual expiation and purgation of our sins, and eternal redemption, and hath erected a throne of grace for us in heaven,—"let us draw near [to this throne of grace] with a true heart and in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience," (Heb. x, 22.) "and our conscience purged from dead works," (ix, 14.) assuredly concluding "that we shall obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." (iv, 16.)

Lastly. Since, by the administration of this priesthood, so many and such excellent benefits have been obtained and prepared for us, of which we have already received a part as "the first-fruits,"—and since we expect to reap in heaven the choicest part of these benefits, and the whole of them in the mass, and that most complete,—what shall we render to our God for such a transcendent dignity? what thanks shall we offer to Christ who is both our High Priest and the Lamb? "We will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord." We will offer to God "the calves of our lips," and will "present to him our bodies, souls, and spirits, a living sacrifice,

holy and acceptable." (Rom. xii, 1.) Even while remaining in these lower regions, we will sing, with the four-and-twenty elders that stand around the throne, this heavenly song to the God and Father of all: "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power: For thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." (Rev. iv, 11.) To Christ our High Priest and the Lamb, we will, with the same elders, chant the new song, saying, "Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: For thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: And we shall reign on the earth." (v, 10.) Unto both of them together we will unite with every creature in singing, "BLESSING, AND HONOUR, AND GLORY, AND MIGHT BE TO HIM WHO SITTETH UPON THE THRONE, AND UNTO THE LAMB FOR EVER AND EVER."—I have finished.

After the Academic Act of his promotion to a Doctor's degree was completed, Arminius, according to the custom at Leyden, which still obtains in many Universities, briefly addressed the same audience in the following manner:

Since the countenance necessary for the commencement of every prosperous action proceeds from God, it is proper that in him also every one of our actions should terminate. Since therefore his Divine clemency and benignity have hitherto regarded us in a favourable light, and have granted to this our act the desired success, let us render thanks to HIM for such a great display of his benevolence, and utter praise to his holy name.

"O thou Omnipotent and Merciful God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, we give thanks to thee for thine infinite benefits conferred upon us miserable sinners. But we would first praise thee for having willed that thy Son Jesus Christ should be the victim and the price of redemption for our sins; that thou hast out of the whole human race collected for thyself a church by thy word and Holy Spirit; that thou hast snatched us also from the kingdom of darkness and of Satan, and hast translated us into the kingdom of light and of thy Son; that thou hast called Holland, our pleasant and delightful country, to know and confess thy Son and to enjoy communion with him; that

thou hast hitherto preserved this our native land in safety against the machinations and assaults of a very powerful adversary; that thou hast instituted, in our renowned city, this university as a seminary of true wisdom, piety and righteousness; and that thou hast to this hour accompanied these scholastic exercises with thy favour. We intreat thee, O holy and indulgent God, that thou wouldst for ever continue to us these benefits; and do not suffer us, by our ingratitude, to deserve at thy hands, to be deprived of them. But be pleased rather to increase them, and to confirm the work which thou hast begun. Cause us always to reflect with retentive minds on these things, and to utter eternal praises to thy most holy name on account of them, through our Lord JESUS Christ. Amen!"

I thank you, Doctor Francis Gomarus, and am grateful to you, most illustrious man and very learned promoter, for this great privilege with which you have invested one who is undeserving of it. I promise at all times to acknowledge with a grateful mind this favour, and to strive that you may never have just cause to repent of having conferred this honour upon me.

To you also, most noble Lord Rector, and to the very honourable the Senate of the University, (unless I should desire to defile myself with the crime of an ungrateful spirit,) I owe greater thanks than I am able to express, for the honourable judgment which you have formed concerning me, and for your liberal testimony, which by no deed of mine have I ever deserved. But I promise and bind myself to exert my powers to the utmost, that I may not at any time be found to be entirely unworthy of it. If I thus exert myself, I know that you will accept it as a payment in full of all the debt of gratitnde which you have a right to demand.

I now address you, most noble, honourable, and famous men, to all and to each of whom I confess myself to be greatly indebted for your continued and liberal benevolence towards me, which you have abundantly demonstrated by your wish to honour this our act with your most noble, honourable, famous, and worthy presence. I would promise to make you a requital at some future period, did not the feebleness of my powers shrink from the magnitude of the undertaking implied in that expression, and did not the eminence of your stations repress the attempt.

In the duty of returning thanks which I am now discharging, I must not omit you, most noble and studious youths: For I owe this acknowledgment to your partial and kind inclination to me, of which you have given a sufficiently exuberant declaration in your honourable appearance and modest demeanour while you have been present at this our act. I give my promise and solemn undertaking, that if an occasion hereafter offer itself in which I can render myself serviceable to you, I will endeavour in every capacity to compensate you for this your kind partiality. The occurrence of such an opportunity is at once the object of my hopes and my wishes.

ORATION V.

ON RECONCILING RELIGIOUS DISSENSIONS AMONG CHRISTIANS.

This very judicious oration was pronounced on the 8th of February 1606, in the Hall of the University, when Arminius resigned the honourable annual office of RECTOR MAGNIFICUS, *which, at Leyden, answers in some respects to that of the head of one of our Colleges, and in others to that of Vice-Chancellor in an English University.—In this most admirable and spirited production, our author not only exhibits an accurate and profound acquaintance with the human heart and of the motives which bias it, but developes those sound principles of religious liberty which were espoused and defended by his successors, and on account of which the Dutch Remonstrants acquired the best portion of their just celebrity. Indeed, whatever was subsequently written by them on this interesting subject, is little more than an expansion of the sentiments here propounded in the nervous language of Arminius.*

At that period the great body of the Calvinistic Clergy of Holland were desirous of obtaining leave from the States General to hold a National Synod: They pressed the adoption of this measure the more earnestly, because, knowing themselves to be the stronger party, they hoped to obtain, in an assembly composed almost exclusively of Calvinists, a condemnation of the tenets of their opponents. Several of them suspected, that Arminius and Uytenbogardt secretly endeavoured to prevent the convening of the Synod. But their suspicions were groundless: for both these good men were decidedly in favour of that object, on condition that the Confession and Catechism were subjected to Synodical revision. In a Public Document, the States of Holland testify, that the most aged ministers who had appeared in the former national Synod, freely owned, that "it was usual at the beginning of such a Synod, to examine, first of all, in the fear of the Lord, the aforesaid Confession and Catechism, and to receive the remarks or objections of the brethren, and, after having weighed them, to proceed as the members determined." These however were terms which did not at all accord with the views of the Calvinists, many of whom were either so blinded by passion and prejudice, or cherished such low conceptions of the authority of the Word of God, as to assert, that those two formularies, the composition of erring mortals, were the only rules by which the scriptures of Eternal Truth ought to be interpreted.—Such being the state of public affairs at that period, Arminius with great modesty, clearness, and eloquence, delivers his opinion about the holding of a Synod and the principal objects which ought to engage the attention of its members. But (alas!) what a woeful difference is discernible between the Synod which was ultimately convened at Dort, and the heavenly Council which, in these pages, is depicted by the hand of a master. This difference will appear still more distinctly, by the copious notes appended to that part of the Oration.

In a letter which Arminius wrote to his young friend Narsius four days afterwards, he thus expresses himself: "According to the custom usually observed in this University, I resigned my office of Rector on the eighth

instant. My successor is Pavius. The oration which I pronounced was on RELIGIOUS DISSENSION; and I explained its nature and effects, its causes and remedies, with that freedom which the subject itself, and the state of the Church, require. Many people highly approve of what was said, while it is a copious source of blame and grief to others. I hope to be able to afford you a sight of this oration, the next time you come to Leyden; when you will confess, that it is not the production of a timid orator. For I perceive that the suspicions and calumnies of these men have the effect of imparting fresh courage to me, which is much strengthened by the Synod that is soon to be convened. If any one has any thing to allege against me or my sentiments, I challenge him to bring forward his allegations at the approaching Synod." *Such was the manner in which one of the most modest men wrote to an intimate friend! The injurious treatment of his adversaries had transformed his diffidence into courage, and had compelled him to speak plain things, to shew those persons their transgression, and all intolerant professors of Christianity their sins.*

NEVER since the first entrance of sin into the world, have there been any ages so happy as not to be disturbed by the occurrence of some evil or other; and, on the contrary, there has been no age so embittered with calamities, as not to have had a sweet admixture of some good, by the presence of the divine benevolence renewed towards mankind. The experience of all ages bears witness to the truth of this observation; and it is taught by the individual history of every nation. If, from a diligent consideration of these different histories and a comparison between them, any person should think fit to draw a parallel of the blessings and of the calamities which have either occurred at one and the same period, or which have succeeded each other,—he would in reality be enabled to contemplate, as in a mirror of the greatest clearness and brilliancy, how the BENIGNITY of God has at all times contended with his JUST SEVERITY, and what a conflict the GOODNESS OF THE DEITY has always maintained with the PERVERSITY OF MEN. Of this a fair specimen is afforded to us in the passing events of our own age, within that part of Christendom with which we are more immediately acquainted. To demonstrate this, I do not deem it necessary to recount all the EVILS which have rushed, like an overwhelming inundation, upon the century which has been just completed: for their infinity would render such an attempt difficult and almost impossible. Neither do I think it necessary, to enumerate, in a particular manner, the BLESSINGS by which those evils have been somewhat mitigated.

To confirm this truth, it will be abundantly sufficient to mention one very remarkable BLESSING, and one EVIL of great

magnitude and directly opposed to that blessing.—This BLESSING is, that the Divine clemency irradiates our part of the world by the illustrious light of his sacred truth, and enlightens it with the knowledge of true religion, or Christianity.—The EVIL opposed to it is, that either human ignorance or human perversity deteriorates and corrupts the clear light of this Divine truth, by aspersing and beclouding it with the blackest errors; creates separation and division among those who have devoted themselves exclusively to the service of religion; and severs them into parties, and even into shreds of parties, in direct contradiction to the nature and genius of Christianity, whose Author is called the "Prince of peace," its doctrine "the Gospel of peace," and its professors "the Sons of peace." The very foundation of it is an act of pacification concluded between God and men, and ratified by the blood of the Prince of peace. The precepts inculcated in each of its pages, are concerning peace and concord; its fruits are "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost;" and its end is peace and eternal tranquillity. But although the light from this torch of truth, which is diffused through the Christian world, affords no small refreshment to my mind; and although a view of that clearer light which shines among the Churches that profess to have been REFORMED FROM POPERY, is most exhilarating; yet I cannot dissemble the intense grief which I feel at my heart on account of that religious discord which has been festering like a gangrene, and pervading the whole of Christianity: Unhappily, its devastations have not terminated. In this unfeigned feeling of deep regret, I think, all those who love Christ and his Church, will partake with me; unless they possess hearts of greater hardness than Parian marble, and bowels secured from compassionate attacks by a rigidity stronger than that of the oak, and by defences more impregnable than those of triple brass.

This is the cause which has incited me to offer a few remarks on religious dissension in the Christian world; for according to that common proverb, "Whenever a man feel any pain, his hand is almost spontaneously moved to the part affected." This therefore is the subject which I propose to introduce to the notice of the present celebrated assembly, which the province has been awarded to me, of delivering an oration at this Academic Festival, according to an established and laudable custom. I shall confine myself to three p

culars: In the first place, I will give a dissertation on THIS DISCORD ITSELF and THE EVILS WHICH SPRING FROM IT. I will then shew ITS CAUSES; and, lastly, ITS REMEDIES.

The *first* particular includes within itself the NECESSITY of removing such a great evil; and the last prescribes the MANNER in which it may be removed,—to which the *middle* particular materially contributes. The union of the whole together explains and justifies the nature of the design which I have now undertaken.

I humbly pray and entreat the God of peace, that he will, by his Spirit of truth and peace, be present with me while engaged in speaking; and that he will govern my mind and direct my tongue, that I may utter such things as may be pleasing to him and salutary to the Church of Christ, for the glory of his name and our mutual instruction.

I likewise prefer a request to you, my very famous and accomplished hearers, that you will deign to grant me your favourable attention, while I glance at each of these particulars with much brevity, and discharge the office of a director to you rather than that of an orator, lest I trespass on your patience.

I. UNION is a great good: it is indeed the chief good and therefore the only one,—whether we separately consider each thing of which it is composed, or more of them contained together by a certain social tie or relation between themselves. For all things together, and each thing separately, are what they are by that very thing by which they are one; and, by this union, they are preserved in what they really are. And, if they have need and are capable of further perfection, they are, by the same union, still more strengthened, increased, and perfected, until they attain to the utmost boundary prescribed to them by nature or by grace, or by God the Author of both grace and nature. Of such certainty is this truth, that even the blessedness of God consists in that union by which He is ONE and always present with himself, and having all things belonging to him present together with him. Nothing, therefore, can be more agreeable or desirable than UNION, whether viewed in reference to single things or to the whole together; nothing can be more noxious and detestable than DISSENSION, by which all things begin at first to decline from their own condition, are afterwards diminished by degrees, and, at length, perish.—But as there are differences of GOOD, so are

there likewise of UNION. More excellent than another is that good which in its own nature obtains the pre-eminence above the other, on account of its being more general and durable, and on account of its approaching more nearly to the CHIEF GOOD. In like manner that union is also more excellent which consists of a thing of greater excellence, belongs to many, is more durable, and unites itself most intimately with the Deity. The union of true religion is, therefore, one of the greatest excellence.

But as those evil things which are opposed to the good things of greatest excellence, are the very worst of their kind,—so no discord is more shocking and hideous than that about religion. The truth of this remark is confirmed by the inward nature of this discord; and it is further manifested most clearly by the effects which proceed from it.

1. We shall see its NATURE (1) in the *object* of discord, (2) in the ready *inclination* for this object, which is evinced by the discordant partizans, (3) in its extensive *range*, and (4) its long *continuance*.

(1.) *The Christian Religion* is the OBJECT of this discord or dissension. When viewed with respect to its *form*, this religion contains the true knowledge of the true God and of Christ; and the right mode in which both of them may be worshipped. And when viewed with regard to its *end*, it is the only medium by which we can be bound and united to God and Christ, and by which on the other hand God and Christ can be bound and united to us. From this idea of connecting the parties together, [RELIGATIO] the name of *religion* is derived, in the opinion of Lactantius. In the term "RELIGION," therefore, are contained true wisdom and true virtue, and the union of both with God as the Chief Good,—in all of which is comprehended the supreme and the only happiness of this world and of that which is to come. And not only *in reality*, but *in the estimation* also of every one on whose mind a notion of religion has been impressed, (that is, on the whole of mankind,) men are distinguished from other animals, not by *reason*, but by a genuine character much more appropriate and indeed peculiar to them, and that is RELIGION, according to the authority of the same Lactantius.

(2.) But if bounds be imposed on the desire towards any thing by such an opinion of its value as is preconceived in the mind, an inclination or propensity towards religion is deserv-

edly entitled to the highest consideration, and holds the pre-eminence in the mind of a religious person. Nay, more than this, if, according to St. Bernard and to truth itself, "the measure to be observed in loving God, is to love him without measure,"—a propensity or inclination towards religion, (of which the chief and choicest part consists of love to God and Christ,) is itself without bounds: For it is at once illimitable and immeasurable. This is tantamount to the declaration of Christ, the AUTHOR of our religion, who said, "If any man come to me, and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." (Luke xiv, 26.) This strong affection for religion answers equally to that immeasurable love by which any one desires the union of himself with God, that is, desires the greatest happiness, because he knows that Religion is the strongest bond and the most adhesive cement of this union. Most serious therefore is religious discord when it is engaged in disputes about the altar itself.

(3.) Besides, it spreads and diffuses itself *most extensively*; for it involves within its vortex all the persons that have been initiated in the sacred rites of the Christian religion. No one is permitted to profess neutrality; nay, it is impossible for any man to remain neutral in the midst of religious dissension. For he who makes no advances towards the opposite sentiments of each of the dissidents, is induced thus to act from one of these four causes: (i) He either cherishes a third opinion in the Christian Religion, far removed from both the others: (ii) He thinks some other religion better than Christianity. (iii) He places Christianity and other systems of religion on an equality: Or, (iv) He entertains an equal disregard for the Christian system and all other modes of religion.—The *first* of these characters is not neutral, but becomes a third party among the disputants.—The *second* and the *third* dissent entirely from the Christian Religion, the axioms of which are, "that it is true, and that it alone is true:" for it is not so accommodating as Paganism,—it admits of no other system to be its associate. Besides, the *second* of these characters is an Atheist according to the Christian Religion, one of the statutes of which, is, that "whosoever denieth Christ the Son, the same hath not God the Father." (1 John ii, 23.) Against the *third* party this sentence is pronounced: "He that gathereth not with me, scattereth abroad." (Matt. xii, 30.) The *fourth*

is considered an Atheist by all mankind, and is deemed a second and adverse party in that most general kind of dissension which exists between true religion and its adversaries.

(4.) Lastly. This discord is very *long in its continuance* and almost incapable of reconciliation. For these traits in it, two causes may, I think, be assigned,—and both of them deducible from the very nature of religion.

The *first* is, that since religion is both in reality a matter that belongs to the Deity, and is so accounted by every one, being subject to his sole pleasure and management, and exempt from the jurisdiction of men; and since it has been bestowed, that it may exercise authority as a rule for the direction of life, and for prescribing some limits to liberty, and not that it may be slavishly subservient to the wills of men, like a *Lesbian rule*, which may be accommodated to every condition;—since these are some of the properties of religion, man is not permitted to stipulate concerning it, and scarcely any one has had the audacity to arrogate to himself such an assumption of authority.

The *other* cause is, that the parties individually think, if they concede even the smallest particle of the matter of discord, such a concession is nearly connected with the peril of their own salvation. But this is the genius of all separatists, not to enter into any treaties of concord with their adversaries, unless they be permitted to have life at least, and liberty, secured to them inviolate. But every one thinks, that his life, (that is, his spiritual life,) and the liberty which is proper for that life, are included in religion and its exercise.

To these a *third* cause may be added, which consists of the opinion, that each party supposes life and eternal salvation to be denied to them by their opponents, from this circumstance, —because those opponents disapprove of their religion, and when it is compared with their own, they treat it with the utmost contempt. This injury appears to be the most grievous and aggravating. But every act of pacification has its commencement in the oblivion of all injuries, and its foundation in the omission of those injuries which (to an eye that is jaundiced with such a prejudice as that which we have just stated,) seem to be continued and perpetual grievances.

When the nature and tendency of this species of discord have become quite apparent to worldly-minded Rulers, they have often employed it, or at least the semblance of it, for the

purpose of involving their subjects in enmities, dissensions, and wars, in which they had themselves engaged for other reasons. Having in this manner frequently implicated the people committed to his charge, a prince has become at pleasure prodigal of their property and their persons. These were readily sacrificed by the people to the defence of the ancient religion; but they were perverted by their rulers, to obtain the fulfilment of their desires, which they would never have procured, had they been deprived of such popular assistance. The *magnitude* of the dissension induces the willing parties cheerfully to make contributions of their property to their prince; the *multitude* of the Dissidents makes them wishful for the ability to contribute as much as may be sufficient; and the *obstinate spirit* which is indigenous to dissension, causes the parties never to grow weary of giving, while they retain the ability.

We have now in some sort delineated the nature of this discord or dissension, and have shewn that it is most important in its bearings, most extensive in its range, and most durable in its continuance.

2. Let us further see what have been, and what still are, the EFFECTS of an evil of such a magnitude, in this part of the Christian world. We may, I think, refer the infinitude of these effects to two chief kinds. The *first kind* is derived from *the force of the dissension* on the MINDS of men; and the *second kind* has its commencement in *the operation of the same dissension* on their HEARTS and affections.

FIRST.—From the force of this dissension on the MINDS of men, arises, (1) *a degree of doubtful uncertainty respecting religion.* When the people perceive that there is scarcely any article of Christian doctrine concerning which there are not different and even contradictory opinions; that one party calls that "horrid blasphemy" which another party has laid down as "a complete summary of the truth;" that those points which some professors consider the perfection of piety, receive from others the contumelious appellation of "cursed idolatry;" and that controversies of this description are objects of warm discussion between men of learning, respectability, experience and great renown. When all these things are perceived by the people, and when they do not observe any discrepancy in the life and manners of the opposite disputants, sufficiently great to induce them to believe that God vouchsafes assistance by "the Spirit of his truth," to one of these parties, in preference to the other, on account of any superior

sanctity,—they begin then to indulge in the imagination, that they may esteem the principles of religion alike obscure and uncertain. *

(2.) If an *intense desire to institute an enquiry into some subject* shall succeed this dubious uncertainty about religion, its warmth will abate and become cool, as soon as serious difficulties arise in the search, and an utter *despair of being able to discover the truth* will be the consequence. For what simple person can hope to discover the truth, when he understands that a dispute exists about its very principles,—whether they be contained in the scriptures alone, or in traditions not committed to writing? What hope can he entertain, when he sees that a question often arises concerning the translation of some passage of scripture, which can be solved only by a knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek languages? How can he hope to find out the truth, when he remarks, that the opinions of learned men, who have written on religious subjects, are not unfrequently quoted in the place of evidence,—while he is ignorant of all languages except that of the country in which he was born, is destitute of all other books, and possesses only a copy of the scriptures translated into the vernacular language? How can such a person be prevented from forming an opinion, that nothing like certainty respecting the chief doctrines of religion can be evident to any one, except that man

* This is an observation which ought to be deeply pondered by all projectors of fresh systems, seceders from the great body of the Christian Church, and the propagators of new doctrines. It is a consideration which pressed, with great weight, on the conscientious mind of Arminius, as may be seen in various parts of the preceding account of his life.

It is a most deplorable circumstance, that the very excellences and virtues of religious persons of different persuasions, (like many other of the best things in the world,) are thus capable of being perverted to the injurious purpose of inducing heedlessness and indifference about the divinely revealed doctrines of the scriptures; and that, as one of the stratagems of the devil, it should operate to the destruction of ignorant and unwary souls. But when we consider, that God has, even in this instance, '*chosen the foolish and weak things of the world to confound the wise and the mighty*,' we are encouraged to augur favourably about the circumstances of the poor and unpolished part of mankind, who are simple of heart, and sincere seekers of salvation. For we often meet with occurrences, in which proficients in the wisdom of this world find some stumbling-block or occasion of offence; and, in the midst of which, the comparative simpletons and weaklings of Christ's flock, recollecting his impressive words, (which are applicable to the disciples in every age,) *What is that to thee! Follow thou me!* proceed onward in their even course to Heaven, without turning aside to the right hand or to the left, and suffer "the letter'd proud and wise" to decide some insignificant point, and the greatest brawlers to deafen themselves with their own clamour. This is one of the wise provisions in the admirable economy of our salvation; and, with all his other plans, it is every way worthy of its Divine Author.

who is well skilled in the two sacred languages, has a perfect knowledge of all traditions, has perused with the closest attention the writings of all the great Doctors of the Church, and has thoroughly instructed himself in the sentiments which they held respecting each single principle of religion?

(3.) But what follows this despair? Either *a most perverse opinion concerning all religion, an entire rejection of every species of it, or Atheism:* These produce Epicurism, a still more pestilent fruit of that ill-fated tree. For when the mind of man is in despair about discovering the truth, and yet is unable to throw aside at the first impulse all care concerning religion and personal salvation, it is compelled to devise a cunning charm for appeasing conscience:—(i) The human mind in such a state will either conclude, that it is not only unnecessary for common people to understand the axioms of religion, and to be well assured of what they believe; but that the attainment of these objects is a duty incumbent on the clergy alone, to the faith of whom, as of "them that must give account" to God for the salvation of souls, (Heb. xiii, 17.) it is quite sufficient for the people to signify their assent by a blind concurrence in it. The clergy also themselves, with a view to their own advantage, not unfrequently discourage all attempts, on the part of the people, to gain such a knowledge of religion and such an assured belief.—(ii) Or the mind in such circumstances will persuade itself, that all worship paid to God, with the good intention of a devout mind, is pleasing to him; and therefore under every form of Religion, (provided such good intention be conscientiously observed,) a man may be saved, and all sects are to be considered as placed in a condition of equality. The men who have imbibed such notions as these, which point out an easy mode of pacifying the conscience, and one that in their opinion is neither troublesome nor dangerous,—these men not only desert all study of divine things themselves, but lay folly to the charge of that person who institutes a laborious enquiry and search for that which they imagine can never be discovered, as though he purposely sought something on which his insanity might riot.

But not less steep and precipitous is the descent from this state of despair to absolute *Atheism.* For since these persons despair of offering to the Deity the adoration of true religion, they think they may abstain from all acts of worship to him

without incurring any greater harm or punishment; because God considers no worship agreeable to him except that which he has prescribed,—and he bestows a reward on no other.—The efficacy of this despair is increased by *the irreligion* which seems to be interwoven with the natural dispositions of some men, and which, eagerly seizing on every excuse for sin, deceives itself, and veils its native profaneness and want of reverence for the Deity under the cloak of the grievous dissensions which have been introduced about religion.—But other two reasons may be adduced why Religious differences are, in the Christian world, the fruitful causes of *Atheism*. (i) *The first* is, that by this battering-ram of dissensions, the foundations of Divine Providence, which constitute the basis of all Religion, experience a violent concussion. When this thought enters the mind, that "it appears to be the first duty of providence, (if it actually have an existence) to place her dearest daughter RELIGION in such a luminous light, that she may stand manifest and apparent to the view of all who do not willingly drag their eyes out of their sockets."—(ii) *The other* is, that when men are not favoured with christian prophecy, which comprises religious instruction, and are destitute of the exercise of Divine worship, they first almost imperceptibly slide into ignorance and into the complete disuse of all worship, and afterwards prolapse into open impiety. But it has not unfrequently been the case, that men have suffered themselves to be deprived of these blessings, sometimes by the prohibition of their own consciences, and sometimes by those of others. (i) By the prohibition of their own consciences,—when they do not think it lawful for them to be present at the public sermons and other religious ordinances of a party that is adverse to them.—(ii) By that of the consciences of others—when the prevailing party forbid their weaker opponents to assemble together as a congregation, to hear what they account most excellent truths, and to perform their devotions with such rites and ceremonies as are agreeable to themselves. In this manner, therefore, even conscience, when resting on the foundation of religion, becomes the agent of impiety, where discord reigns in a religious community.—From Atheism, as a root, Epicurism buds forth, which dissolves all the ties of morality, is ruinous to it, and causes it to degenerate into licentiousness: All this, Epicurism effects, by previously breaking down the barriers of the fear of God, which alone restrain men within the bounds of their duty.

SECONDLY.—All these evils proceed from religious dissension when its operation is efficacious on the MIND. Most sincerely do I wish that it would remain there, content itself with displaying its insolence in the hall of the mind where discord has its proper abode, and would not attack the AFFECTIONS of the HEART. But, vain is my wish! For so extensively does it pervade the heart and subdue all its affections, that it abuses at pleasure the slaves that act as assistants.

1. For since all *similarity* in manners, studies, and opinions, possesses very great power in conciliating love and regard; and since any *want of resemblance* in these particulars is of great potency in engendering hatred, it often happens that from religious dissension arise ENMITIES more deadly than that hatred which Vatinius conceived against Cicero, and such exasperations of heart as are utterly irreconcileable. When religious discord makes its appearance, even amongst men the most illustrious in name and of the greatest celebrity, who had been previously bound together and united among themselves by a thousand tender ties of nature and affection, they instantly renounce, one against another, all tokens of friendship, and burst asunder the strictest bands of amity. This is signified by Christ, when he says, "I came not to send peace on earth, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household." (Matt. x, 34—36.) These words do not indicate the end and purpose of the coming of Christ, but an event which would succeed his coming; because he was then about to introduce into the world a religion which differed greatly from that which was publicly established, and concerning which many dissensions would afterwards arise, through the vicious corruption of mankind.

This dissimilarity was the origin of the rancour of the Jews against the Samaritans, which displayed itself in not allowing themselves to derive any benefit from the services of the Samaritans, even in matters that were necessary for their own convenience. It was the existence of this feeling which caused the woman of Samaria to wonder, concerning Jesus, "how he, who was a Jew, could ask drink of her, a Samaritan woman." (John iv, 9.) Indeed, it is the utmost stretch of hatred—to be unwilling to derive any advantage from another person that is an enemy.

2. Enmities and dissensions of the heart and affections branch out and become SCHISMS, factions, and secessions into different parties. For as love is an affection of union, so is hatred an affection of separation. Thus synagogues are erected, consecrated, and thronged with people, in opposition to other synagogues, churches against churches, and altars against altars,—when neither party wishes to have intercourse with the other. This also is the reason why we frequently hear expressions, entirely similar to those which were clamorously echoed through the assembled multitude of the Children of Israel when they were separating into parties,—"To your tents, O Israel! for our adversaries have no portion in God, nor any inheritance in his Son Christ Jesus." (1 Kings xii, 16.) For both factions equally appropriate to themselves the renowned name of "the true Israel," which they severally deny to their adversaries,* in such a peremp-

* This was generally the practice in former days, among men of little minds: But it was no small portion of the praise due to Arminius, (his enemies themselves being judges,) that he shewed to all religious disputants "a more excellent way," and taught them to propound their sentiments, with far more efficacy, by means of modesty and mildness. (See the preceding Appendix X.) An instance of the benevolence and urbanity of his disposition towards a bitter enemy, may be seen in Appendix F, page 74. Arminianism is distinguished, even in the present age, for the same liberality as that which was displayed by the pious founder of this Christian system. All true Arminians frankly acknowledge, that they can perceive nothing of a damning nature in the tenets of Calvinism, when held by persons of exemplary lives and holy conversation. But what thorough-paced Calvinist was ever known to have made a similar public declaration concerning the Arminian doctrines? It will readily be granted, that *ignorance of Arminianism* is one great cause of this unwilling recognition of the evangelical nature of its scriptural doctrines. But some persons think, perhaps uncharitably, that the more probable cause may be traced up to the policy of Calvinistic pastors in general, who, on making any such tolerant concession to their opponents, would expect to see a decline of ministerial influence among the people of their respective charges.

They have deterring instances of this description, which it is not uncommon for some of them to quote in private:—Thus, for instance, an Alderman of Bristol, who was a member of an Independent congregation, on being elected, in rotation, Mayor of that city; and while the affair was yet *in limine*, like a conscientious man and a good christian, he enquired of his pastor, if there would be any harm in his qualifying for office, by partaking of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in the Established Church? The minister declared without hesitation, that, for the purpose which he had in view, it would not be wrong to communicate once or twice in a steeple-house, or to attend in a public capacity the ministry of the word during the year of his office: He, at the same time, reminded him of the higher privileges enjoyed by the Independents, and hoped to have the pleasure, at the expiration of his Mayoralty, to behold him once more occupying his former place in the chapel. But, after all this necessary precaution, at the appointed period the ex-Mayor did not return according to expectation. Wondering at his remissness, the minister waited

tory manner as might induce one to imagine each of them exclusively endowed with a plenary power of passing judgment upon the other, and as though it had been previously concluded, that the name of ISRAEL, by which God accosts in a most gracious manner *the whole of his Church*, cannot encircle within its embrace those who differ in any point from the rest of their brethren.

3. But the irritation of inflamed hearts does not prescribe a boundary to itself in schism alone.—For if it happen, that one party considers itself the more powerful, it will not be afraid of instituting PERSECUTIONS against the party opposed to it, and of attempting its entire extermination:* In effecting

upon him one day, and expressed a degree of regret at not having seen him for so long a time at Chapel; when he very frankly replied,—'Sir, you told me, there would be no harm in communicating once or twice in the Established Church, and I had not long attended in my official costume the public services before I thought, that, if to do so *once or twice* was not wrong, I should not be culpable in repeating an act, which, in itself, you did not consider blame-worthy. I am therefore become a regular attendant at Church, where we are favoured with a most excellent and pious clergyman, whose conduct and doctrine give me complete satisfaction. And though I continue to entertain all possible respect for you, yet I decline to be any longer accounted a member of your community.'

This has been viewed as an unpleasant fruit of liberality; and similar incidents will naturally prove disastrous in their consequences to several of those poor Calvinistic teachers of the Independent persuasion who derive the whole of their maintenance from their congregations.—But more infectious and frequent would such examples of congregational defection become, if, in the exuberance of their liberality, these pastors were to declare the possibility of any christian being eternally saved who does not interpret scripture exactly according to the standard of the Genevan Clergy. On this account, it appears, they continue to arrogate to themselves the exclusive appellation of the TRUE ISRAEL, or EVANGELICAL DIVINES, while they stigmatize their brethren the pious Arminians as *dangerous heretics*.

* In all the Latin editions of this oration, the subjoined five sentences are printed *in the Italic character*, to distinguish them from the rest, on account of the striking similarity between many of the persecuting effects here described, and those which actually occurred, thirteen years afterwards, at the Synod of Dort. Arminius seems indeed, for some time prior to his death, to have felt a strong presentiment of the disastrous events which afterwards took place in Holland. Without pretending to any thing like inspiration, he perceived, from the manner in which his plain and scriptural doctrines were received when tendered with his characteristic modesty, that they would be nurtured and matured amidst all the storms and tempests which unsanctified hearts and hostile affections could raise; and that no weapon which the refined ingenuity of Calvinian intolerance could form against them, would be spared.

But the following curious extract, which is still more prophetic of the disgraceful occurrences of the year 1619, was written five years before the meeting of the Synod of Dort. Grotius had then recently published his masterly production, entituled, *Pietas Ordinum Hollandiæ*, in vindication of the pious and moderate counsels of the States of Holland with regard to religious matters. It was published in Latin, French, and Low Dutch, with the approba-

this, it spares no injury, which either human ingenuity can devise, the most notable fury can dictate, or even the office of

tion of the States; and it excited a great commotion among the Calvinistic clergy. Sibrandus Lubbertus, afterwards a very conspicuous member of the Synod of Dort, and Bogerman, who was chosen the ecclesiastical President of that Synod, attempted to answer the *Pietas Ordinum*. The book which Lubbertus wrote, was such a libellous performance as to draw down upon it the public interdict of the government, and its sale was consequently suppressed. Corvinus answered Bogerman's book, in a very satisfactory manner; but Gaspar Barlæus, at that time Vice-regent of the Theological College at Leyden, and one of the most able and elegant writers of the age, wrote a pamphlet against the principles avowed in Bogerman's preface. Having stated, that the spirit and temper exhibited by Bogerman and his party precluded all hopes of a Toleration, and that the only matter about which they appeared solicitous, was, "a decision of the controversy by a Synod," he proceeds thus:

"But, by what sort of a Synod? I will tell you: a Synod which the States must suffer to be called and holden where, when, and how the Clergy please, whose charges also the States must defray; to which they are to send only one or two persons as lookers-on, in order to take cognizance of what passes, lest the people might be induced to imagine that the debates of the Assembly related chiefly to the betraying of the nation into the hands of the Spaniards. In fine, a synod to whose decrees the States must affix their seal, to give them the sanction of laws, as soon as possible, against their adversaries. The rest of the synod will be composed of Divines: Those who make their appearance there, must be such as are deputed by the Classes or ecclesiastical powers; men, whose minds are formed for disputation, able to refute gainsayers, furnished with unexceptionable testimonials of their orthodoxy, and entirely free from all spots of suspicion; and men, who, by the constant exercise of their weapons in the discipline of the Church, have acquired great expertness in the use of them, and can skilfully employ them either in attack or defence. When these Fathers have taken their places, a President or Prolocutor will commence the business of the meeting, and will in a diffusive harangue recount the troubles and sufferings of the church which is militant in the midst of such monsters of error and heresy. He will then bless God, that the period is at last arrived when they find themselves at liberty, according to ancient custom, to devise remedies for these distempers, and, *once for all*, to condemn the heretical opinions of their adversaries. He will also proceed to exhort the brethren to moderate counsels, to a serious enquiry into the FIVE POINTS in order to form a pious and impartial judgment of these matters, and to ..... whatever else may serve to give the matter a specious appearance.

"After this introductory discourse, the Synod will cite the Remonstrants before them, and will accuse them of the propagation of false doctrines, and of having presumed, of their own accord and without consulting the Synod, to depart from those received formularies of doctrine, the Catechism and Netherland Confession, and to speak in disparagement of that excellent summary of sound words. If the accused attempt to make any reply, they will be required to deliver it briefly and by way of position,—that if there be any truth in what they have to allege, it may be approved by a synodical decision—and, if their counter allegations be accounted false, that they may submit to the spirits of the prophets and obey their decrees, unless they wish to be reputed Heathen men and Publicans.—It will next be warmly debated whether the Articles of the Remonstrants are opposed to the Holy Scripture and to the truth which is taught in the Church, and as it is taught there. One part of the Synod will maintain the negative, the other the affirmative.

"At last, after having commanded the Remonstrants to withdraw and suffered them for a season to cool their heels, the next subject of consideration

the infernal regions can supply. Rage is excited and cruelty exercised against the reputation, the property, and the persons of the living; against the ashes, the sepulchres, and the memory of the dead; and against the souls both of the living and the dead.† Those who differ from the stronger party are attacked with all kinds of weapons; with cruel mockings, calumnies, execrations, curses, excommunications, anathemas, degrading and scandalous libels, prisons and instruments of torture. They are banished to distant or uninhabited islands,

will be, 'What is to be done with them? But as the Fathers will not be unanimous in their opinions and judgments about this question, they will put it to the vote, and the majority will pass a decree to the following effect: *The Synod has judged and decreed, as it does hereby judge and decree, that the Five Articles of the Remonstrants are not orthodox, either in themselves or in respect to their consequences, but are contrary to the established doctrine of this church, and are therefore on no account to be tolerated in any pastor or teacher. However, all those amongst the Remonstrants who will consent to be entirely silent concerning the controverted points, and who will solemnly promise not to offer the least opposition to the orthodox doctrine, shall be spared, for the sake of their wives and children. But as for those who will pertinaciously defend the aforesaid articles, and will profess them by words and writing, let them be expelled from the Christian ministry and let others take their office. And if those who have hitherto by their writings opposed the Church and reviled her doctrines, do not recant what they have written, and, most humbly owning their fault, beg pardon of the Synod, they shall be smitten with the thunderbolt of excommunication.*

"This decree will be presented to the States, and they will be requested to ratify it,—not that there is any actual need of such a formality, but because their signature may be of some service. If the States approve of such a decree as this, they will be called, *the Fathers of their country, the nursing fathers of the Church, Constantines, Theodosiuses*, and *most Christian Princes:* They will be accounted the very men for gratifying the wishes of Bogerman, the expectations of Lubbertus, and the longings of many pious souls.—But if the States reject it, and declare that the cognizance of these matters belongs to none but them, and that they will abrogate the Synodical decree because it is full of nullities in many parts, the Fathers will then revert to their old course and former practices. No probability of peace or hope of christian forbearance will then remain, and the States will not obtain that epithet which they desire to receive, LOVERS OF TRUE RELIGION AND HATERS OF HERESY, but will rather be stigmatized as *the patrons and promoters of heretical opinions.*—This is a just portraiture of the Synod by whose righteous judgment Bogerman designs to terminate our differences."

From these quotations it is very evident, that the man who wrote this description was intimately acquainted with the materials of which that assembly would be composed, and knew full well the temper which the members of such a Synod might be expected to display.

† *Against the souls of the living*, by their malicious, cruel, and vexatious treatment; and, *against the souls of the dead*, by consigning them with much assurance to the place of eternal torment. In the latter case, however, it is generally some alleviation to the distress of surviving friends, to know, that such vile calumniators do not occupy the Supreme Seat of Judgment in the world to come; but that the eternal states of all men are decided according to the righteous equity of the Lord, '*who is a God of knowledge, and by whom the spirits as well as the actions of men are weighed.*' (Prov. xvi, 2.)

condemned to the mines, prohibited from having any communication with their fellow-creatures by land or sea, and excluded from a sight of either heaven or earth. They are tormented by water, fire, and the sword, on crosses and stakes, on wheels of torture and gibbets, and by the claws of wild beasts,—without any measure, bounds or end, until the party thus oppressed have been destroyed, or have submitted themselves to the pleasure of the more powerful, by rejecting with abjurations the sentiments which they formerly held, and by embracing with apparent devotion those of which they had previously disapproved; that is, by destroying themselves through the hypocritical profession which had been extorted from them by violence.* Call to mind how the Heathens persecuted the Christians; and the persecuting conduct of the Arians against the orthodox, of the worshippers of images against the destroyers of images, and *vice versâ*. That we may wander to no great distance, let us look at what has occurred within the period of our recollection and that of our fathers, in Spain, Portugal, France, England, and the Low Countries; and we shall confess with tears, that these remarks are lamentably too true.

4. But if it happen that the contending parties are nearly equal in power,—or that one of them has been long oppressed, wearied out by persecutions, and inflamed with a desire for liberty, after having had their patience converted into fury, (as it is called,) or rather into just indignation,—and if the oppressed party assume courage, summon all its strength, and collect its forces,—then most mighty WARS arise, grievances are repeated, after a flourish of trumpets the herald's hostile spear is sent forth in defiance, war is proclaimed, the opposing armies charge each other, and the struggle is conducted in a most bloody and barbarous manner. Both the belligerents observe a profound silence about entering into negotiations for peace, lest that party which first suggests such a course, should, from that very circumstance, create a prejudice against its own cause and make it appear the weaker of the two and the more unjust. Nay, the strife is carried on with such wilful obstinacy, that he can scarcely be endured who for a moment suspends their mutual animosities by a mention of peace,

* There was much of this tampering with consciences, and some consequent trimming and tergiversation, in the different classes, when a subscription to the decrees of the Synod of Dort, (that is, to common unmasked Calvinism,) was required of every ecclesiastical person.

unless he have placed a halter round his neck, and be prepared to be suspended by it on a gibbet, in case his discourse on this topic happens to displease. For such a lover of peace would be stigmatized as a deserter from the common cause, and considered guilty of heresy, a favourer of heretics, an apostate and a traitor.

Indeed, all these ENMITIES, SCHISMS, PERSECUTIONS, and WARS, are commenced, carried on, and conducted, with the greater animosity, on account of every one considering his adversary as the most infectious and pestilent fellow in the whole Christian world, a public incendiary, a murderer of souls, an enemy of God, and a servant of the devil,—as a person who deserves to be suddenly smitten and consumed by fire descending from heaven,—and as one, whom it is not only lawful to hate, to curse and to murder without incurring any guilt,—but whom it is also highly proper to treat in that manner, and to be entitled to no slight commendation for such a service,—because no other work appears in his eyes to be more acceptable to God, of greater utility in the salvation of man, more odious to satan, or more pernicious to his kingdom. Such a sanguinary zealot professes to be invited, instigated and constrained to deeds like these, by a zeal for the house of God, for the salvation of men, and for the Divine glory. This conduct of violent partizans is what was predicted by the Judge and the Master of our religion: "When they shall persecute you and kill you for my sake, they will think that they do God service." (John xvi, 2.) When the very conscience therefore arouses, assists and defends the affections, no obstacle can offer a successful resistance to their impetuosity. Thus we see, that Religion itself, through the vicious corruption of men, has been made a cause of dissension, and has become the field in which they may perpetually exercise themselves in cruel and bloody contests.

If, in addition to these things, some individual arrogate to himself, and, with the consent of a great multitude, usurp authority to prescribe laws with respect to religion, to strike with the thunder-bolt of excommunication whomsoever he pleases, to dethrone kings, to absolve subjects from their oaths of allegiance and fidelity, to arm them against their lawful rulers, to transfer the right over the dominions of one prince to others who are his sworn confederates, or to such as are prepared to seize upon them in the first instance, to pardon crimes however great their enormity may be, and whether

already perpetrated or to be hereafter committed, and to canonize ruffians and assassins,—the mere nod of such a man as is here described, must be instantly obeyed with blind submission, as if it were the command of God!—Blessed God! what a quantity of most inflammable matter is thus thrown upon the fire of enmities, persecutions, and wars! What an ILIAD of disasters is thus introduced into the Christian world! It is therefore not without just reason that a man may exclaim, "Is it possible, that RELIGION can have persuaded men to introduce this great mass of evils?"

But all the ills which we have enumerated do not only proceed from *real dissensions*, in which some fundamental truth is the subject of discussion, but also from those which are *imaginary*, when things affect the mind not as they are in reality, but according to their appearances. I call these *imaginary dissensions:* (i) Either, because they exist among parties that have only a *fabulous religion*, which is at as great a distance from the true one, as the heaven is distant from the earth, or as the followers of such a phantom are from God himself. Differences of this description are found among the Mahomedans, some parties of whom (as the Turks,) follow the interpretation of Omar; while others (as the Persians,) are proselytes to the commentaries of Ali.—(ii) Or, because the discordant parties believe these imaginary differences to be in the substance of the true doctrine, when they have in it no existence whatever. Of such a difference Victor, the Bishop of Rome, afforded an instance when he wished to excommunicate all the Eastern Churches, because they dissented from him in the proper time of celebrating the Christian festival of Easter.

But, to close this part of my discourse, the very summit and conclusion of all the evils which arise from religious discord, is, the destruction of that very religion about which all the controversy has been raised. Indeed, religion experiences almost the same fate, as the young lady mentioned by Plutarch, who was addressed by a number of suitors; and when each of them found that she could not become entirely his own, they divided her body into parts, and thus not one of them obtained possession of her whole person. This is the nature of discord, to disperse and destroy matters of the greatest consequence. Of this a very mournful example is exhibited to us in certain extensive dominions and large kingdoms, the inhabitants of which were formerly among the most flourishing professors of

the Christian Religion: but the present inhabitants of those countries have unchristianized themselves by embracing Mahomedanism,—a system which derived its origin, and had its chief means of increase, from the dissensions which arose between the *Jews* and the *Christians*, and from the disputes into which the Orthodox entered with the Sabellians, the Arians, the Nestorians, the Eutychians, and with the Monothelites.

II. Let us proceed to contemplate the CAUSES OF THIS DISSENSION.—Philosophers generally divide CAUSES, into those which directly and *of themselves* produce an effect, and into those which indirectly and *by accident* contribute to the same purpose. The consideration of each of these classes will facilitate our present enquiries.

1. The *accidental* cause of this dissension is (1) the very *nature of the Christian Religion*, which not only transcends the human mind and its affections or passions, but appears to be altogether contrary to both it and to them. (i) For the Christian Religion has its foundation in THE CROSS OF CHRIST; and it holds forth this humbling truth,—"JESUS, THE CRUCIFIED, IS THE SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD,"—as an axiom most worthy of all acceptation. For this reason also, the word of which this religion is composed, is termed "the doctrine of the cross." (1 Cor. i, 18.) But what can appear to the mind more absurd or foolish, than for *a crucified and dead person* to be accounted the SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD, and for men to believe that *salvation centres in the cross?* On this account the Apostle declares in the same passage, that *the doctrine of the cross*, [or, *the preaching of* CHRIST CRUCIFIED,] *is unto the Jews a stumbling-block and unto the Greeks foolishness.*—(ii) What is more opposed to the human affections than "for a man to hate and deny himself, to despise the world and the things that are in the world, and to mortify the flesh with the affections and lusts?" Yet this is another axiom of the Christian Religion, to which he who does not give a cheerful assent in mind, in will, and in deed, is excluded from the discipleship of Christ Jesus. This indispensable requisite is the cause why he who is alienated in mind from the Christian Religion, does not yield a ready compliance with these its demands; and why he who has enrolled his name with Christ, and who is too weak and pusillanimous to inflict every species of violence on his nature, invents certain fictions, by which he attempts to soften and mitigate a sentence, the exact fulfilment of which

fills him with horror. From these circumstances, after men have turned aside from purity of doctrine, dissensions are excited against religion and its firm and constant Professors.

(2.) In the scriptures, as in the only authentic document, the Christian Religion is at present registered and sealed; yet even they are seized upon as an occasion of error and dissension, when, as the Apostle Peter says, "the unlearned and unstable wrest them unto their own destruction," because they contain "some things hard to be understood." (2 Peter iii, 16.) The figurative expressions and ambiguous sentences, which occur in certain parts of the scriptures, are undesignedly forced to conduce to the adulteration of the truth among those persons "who have not their senses exercised" in them.

2. But omitting any further notice of these matters, let us take into our consideration the *proper causes of this dissension:*

(1.) In the front of these, Satan appears, that most bitter enemy of truth and peace, and the most wily disseminator of falsehood and dissension,—who acts as leader of the hostile band. Envying the glory of God and the salvation of man, and attentively looking out on all occasions, he marks every movement; and whenever an opportunity occurs, during the Lord's seed-time, he sows the tares of heresies and schisms among the wheat. From such a malignant and surreptitious mode of sowing *while men are sleeping*, (Matt. xiii, 23.) he often obtains a most abundant harvest.

(2.) MAN himself follows next in this destructive train, and is easily induced to perform any service for Satan, however pernicious its operation may prove to his own destruction; and that most subtle enemy, the serpent, finds in man several instruments most appropriately fitted for the completion of his purposes.

FIRST.—The *mind* of man is the first in subserviency to satan, both with regard to its blindness and its vanity.—First. *The* BLINDNESS *of the mind* is of two kinds, the one a *native blindness*, the other *accidental*.—The *former* of these grows up with us, even from the birth: our very origin is tainted with the infection of the primitive offence of *the Old Adam*, who turned away from God the Great Source of all his light. This blindness has so fascinated our eyes, as to make us appear like owls, that become dim-sighted when the light of truth is seen. Yet this truth is not hidden in a deep well; but though it is placed in the heavens, we cannot perceive it, even when its

beams are clearly shining upon us from above.—The *latter* is an *accidental and acquired blindness*, which man has chosen for himself, to obscure the few beams of light which remain to him. "The God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not; lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ should shine unto them." (2 Cor. iv, 4.) God himself, the just avenger of those who hate the truth, has inflicted on them this blindness, by giving efficacy to error. This is the cause why the veil that remains upon the mind, operates as a preventive, and obstructs the view of the gospel; (2 Cor. iii.) and why he on whom the truth has shone in vain, "believes a lie." (2 Thess. ii, 11.) But assent to a falsehood is a dissent and separation from those who are the assertors of truth.—Secondly. *The vanity of the mind* succeeds its blindness, and is prone to turn aside from the path of true religion, in which no one can continue to walk except by a firm and invariable purpose of heart. This vanity is also inclined to invent to itself such a Deity as may be most agreeable to its own vain nature, and to fabricate a mode of worship that may be thought to please that fictitious Deity. Each of these ways constitutes a departure from the unity of true religion, on deserting which men rush heedlessly into dissensions.

SECONDLY.—But the *affections* of the mind are, of all others, the most faithful and trusty in the assistance which they afford to satan, and conduct themselves like abject slaves devoted to his service;—although it must be acknowledged that they are frequently brought thus to act, under a false conception that they are by such deeds promoting their own welfare and rendering good service to God himself. LOVE and HATRED, the two chief affections, and the fruitful parents and instigators of all the rest, occupy the first, second, third, and indeed all the places, in this slavish employment. Each of them is of a *three-fold* character, that nothing might be wanting which could contribute to the perfection of their number.

The FORMER of them consists of the love of glory, of riches, and of pleasures,—which the disciple whom Jesus loved, thus designates,—"the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life." (1 John ii, 16.)—The LATTER consists of hatred to the truth, to peace, and to the professors of the truth.

(i.) PRIDE, then, that most prolific mother of dissensions in religion, produces its fetid offspring in three different ways:

For, FIRST, either it "exalteth itself against the knowledge of God," (2 Cor. x, 5.) and does not suffer itself to be brought into captivity by the truth to obey God, being impatient of the yoke which is imposed by Christ, though it is both easy and light. Pride says in reality, "Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us." (Psalm ii, 3.) From this baneful source arose the sedition of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, who arrogantly claimed for themselves a share in the priesthood, which God had given exclusively to Aaron. (Num. xvi.) Or, SECONDLY, *it loveth to have the pre-eminence* in the Church of God, and "to have dominion over another's faith;" the very crime of which St. John accuses Diotrephes, when he complains that "neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the Church." (3 John 9, 10.)—Or, LASTLY, Having usurped an impotent sovereignty over the *souls* of men by appointing and altering at its pleasure the laws concerning Religion, and over the *bodies* of men by employing menaces and force to bring into subjection to it the consciences of men,—it compels those Churches which cannot with a safe conscience bear this most iniquitous tyranny, to depart from the rest and to assume to themselves the management of their own affairs. The Greek Church declared itself to be influenced by this cause, in refusing to hold communion with the Latin Church, because the Roman Pontiff had, in opposition to all right and law, and in defiance of the rule of Christ and of the decrees of the Fathers, "arrogated to himself a plenitude of power." From the same fountain has flowed that immense schism which in this age distracts and divides all Europe: This has been ably manifested to the whole world by the just complaints and allegations of Protestant States and Protestant Princes.

But envy, anger, and an eager desire to know all things, are other three darts, which PRIDE hurls against concord in religion. For, *First*, if any one excels his fellows in the knowledge of Divine things, and in holiness of life, and if by these means he advances in favour and authority with the people,—pride immediately injects *envy* into the minds of some persons, which contaminates all that is fair and lovely; asperses and defiles whatever is pure; obscures, by vile calumnies, either his course of life or the doctrines which he professes; puts a wrong construction, by means of a malevolent interpretation, on what was well intended and correctly expressed by him; commences disputes with him who is thus high in public esti-

mation; and endeavours to lay the foundations of its own praise on the mass of ignominy which it heaps upon his name and reputation. † If by such actions as these it cannot obtain for itself a situation equal to its desires, it then invents new dogmas, and draws away the people after it; that it may enjoy such a dignity, among some individuals who have separated from the rest of the body, which it was impossible for it to obtain from the whole while they lived together in concord and harmony.—*Secondly.* Pride is also the parent *of anger*, which may stimulate any one to revenge, if he think himself injured even in the slightest degree by a professor of the truth. Such a person reckons scarcely any injury better suited to his purpose or more pernicious to the affairs of his adversary, than to speak contumeliously and in disparagement of his sentiments, and publicly to proclaim him a HERETIC,—than which no term can be more opprobrious or an object of greater hatred among mortals. Because, as this crime does not consist of *deeds*, but of *sentiments*, the aspersions cast upon them cannot be so completely washed away as to leave no stains adhering to them, or as to create a possibility at least for the calumniator to remove from himself by some evasive subterfuge the infamy which attaches itself to him who is an utterer of slanders.—*The Third weapon* which pride employs in this warfare, is *a passionate desire to explore and know all things.* This passion leaves no subject untouched, that its learning may be displayed to advantage; and, (not to lose the reward of its labour,) it obtrusively palms upon others as things necessary to be known, those matters which, by means of great exertion, it seems to have drawn out from behind the darkness of ignorance, and accompanies all its remarks by great boldness of assertion. From such a disposition and conduct as this, offences and schisms must arise in the Church.

(ii.) AVARICE, likewise, or, *the love of money*, which is termed by the Apostle "the root of all evil," (1 Tim. vi, 10.) brings its hostile standard into this embattled field. For, since the doctrine of truth is not a source of profit, when those who have faithfully taught it are succeeded by unbelieving teachers, "who are ravening wolves, and suppose gain to be godliness," the latter effect a great change in it,—(1) either by "binding heavy burdens, and grievous to be borne, and laying them on the shoulders of the disciples," (Matt. xxiii,

† It will be seen, by the preceding account of the life of our author, that he had reasons for speaking *feelingly* on this subject.

4.) for whose redemption votive offerings may be daily made; —(2.) by inventing profitable plans for expiating sins,—or, *lastly*, by preaching, in soft and complimentary language, such things as are agreeable to the ears of the people, for the purpose of gaining their favour, which, according to the expression of the Apostle, is a "corrupting of the word of God," or making a gain of it. (2 Cor. ii, 17.) From these causes dissensions have often arisen; (1) either when the faithful teachers that are in the church, or those whom God raises up for the salvation of his people, marshal themselves in opposition to the doctrine which is prepared for the sake of profit; or (2) when the people themselves, growing weary of impositions and rapine, become seceders from these pastors, by uniting themselves with such as are really better, or by receiving those as their substitutes who are in their estimation better. This was the torch of dissension between the Pharisees and Christ, who opposed their avarice, and came to loose all those grievous burdens. This was also the primary consideration by which Luther was excited to obstruct the sale of *Popish indulgences;* and from that small beginning, he gradually proceeded to reforms of greater importance.

(iii.) Not only that PLEASURE or "lust of the flesh," which specially comes under this denomination, and which denotes a *feeling or disposition for carnal things*, takes its part in the performance of this tragedy, but that also which in a general sense contains a *desire to commit sin* without any remorse of conscience: and both these kinds of pleasure most assiduously employ themselves in collecting inflammable materials for augmenting the flame of discord in religion.

For this passion or affection, having had some experience in the important "doctrine of the cross," desires, as the very summit of all its wishes, both to riot, while here, in the pleasures of voluptuousness, and yet to cherish some hopes of obtaining the happiness of heaven. With two such incompatible objects in view, this passion chooses teachers for itself, who may in an easy manner "place, under the arm-holes of their disciples, pillows sewed and filled with soft feathers," (Ezek. xiii, 18.) on which they may recline themselves and take sweet repose,—although their sins, like sharply-pointed thorns, continue to sting and molest them in every direction. They flatter them with the idea of easily obtaining pardon, provided they purchase the favour of the Deity, by means of certain exercises apparently of some importance, but possessing in

ality no consequence whatever, and by means of great dona-
ons with which they may fill his sanctuary. This is the
omplaint of the Apostle, who, when writing to Timothy, says,
"For the time will come when they will not endure sound
octrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to them-
elves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away
heir ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables."
To this is subjoined an admonition, that Timothy should
atch and discharge with fidelity the duties of his ministry:
(2 Tim. iv, 3,—5.) According to this quotation, a difference
ust of necessity exist between Timothy and those teachers.

But these three capital vices are serviceable to satan their
uthor in another way, and contribute under his direction to
ntroduce changes in religion, and, consequently, to excite
iscord among christians. In both sacred and profane history,
gregious examples are recorded of princes and private men,
who, being instigated by such a desire of power as partook at
nce of ambition and avarice, have invented new modes of
eligion, and accommodated them to the capacities, the
ishes, and the opinions of their people; by means of which
hey might either restrain their own subjects within the bounds
f their duty, or might subdue to their sway the people that
ere under the rule of other princes. Ambition and avarice
uggest to such aspiring persons the desire of inventing those
odes of religious worship; while an itching for novelty, a
ish to enjoy their pleasures, and the obvious agreement of
he new doctrine with their preconceived opinions, influence
he people to embrace the modish religion. With these inten-
ions, and under the impulse of these views, Jeroboam was
he first author of a change of religion in the Israelitish
hurch. He built altars in Dan and Bethel, and made golden
alves, that he might prevent the people from proceeding at
tated periods to Jerusalem, for the purpose of offering
acrifice, according to the command of God, and from return-
ng to the house of David, from which they had rent them-
elves. The same reasons also induced Mahomet to invent a
ew religion. By his frequent intercourse with Jews and
hristians, he had learned from both parties those things
hich were most agreeable to them; he therefore adopted the
ery crafty counsel of Sergius, the monk, and devised a new
ode of religion which was gratifying to the human senses,
nd which, as it was digested in his Alcoran, he persuded
any people to embrace. The few individuals with whom

he was able to prevail, were the foundation from which arose the immense Ottoman empire, and those extensive dominions which are to the present time in possession of the Turks.

2. We have now seen in what manner the *love of glory, of riches and pleasure*, performs its several parts in this theatre of religious dissensions. Let HATRED next appear and exhibit to us its actions, which, from the very nature of the cause, have a proper and direct tendency to excite discord.

(1) The first of its actors that appears upon the stage, is a hatred of the truth, and of true doctrine: This species of hatred is conceived, partly from an *anticipated notion of the mind*, which, since it cannot be reconciled to the doctrine of truth and yet is with difficulty drawn away from it, excites hatred against a sentiment that is opposed to itself: It is also partly conceived, because the true doctrine becomes the accuser of man, forbidding those things which are the objects of his desires, and commanding those things which he is most reluctant to perform: While it urges its precepts so rigidly, that every one who does not seriously regulate and conform his life to the conditions which they contain, is excluded from all hope of salvation.

(2) The next in order, is *the hatred of peace and concord*. For there are men of a certain description who cannot exist without having an enemy,—which Trogus Pompeius declares to have been a trait in the character of the ancient Spaniards. To such persons concord or amity is so offensive, that, out of pure hatred to it, they willingly expose themselves to the enmity of others. If this kind of litigious characters happen to obtain a station of some honour in the Church, it is amazing what scruples and difficulties they will not raise, what intricate sophisms they will not frame and contrive, and what accusations they will not institute,—that they may have an opportunity of raising a contest about the articles of religion, from which proceed private enmity and rancour that can never be appeased, and dissensions of a more deadly kind than the greatest of those which relate to the present life.

(3) The last which comes forward, is *a hatred against the professors of the true doctrine*, from which the descent is very rapid downwards to a dissent from that doctrine which those good men profess; because it is the anxious study of every one that hates another, not to have any thing in common with his adversary. Of this the Arabians afford an example: Out of hatred to Heraclius Cæsar, and to the stipendiary

Greek and Latin troops who served under him, they, who had long before departed from them in will and affection, effected a still more serious separation from them in religion; for, although they had previously been professors of Christianity, from that period they embraced the doctrines of the Alcoran and became followers of Mahomet.

But the professors of the true doctrine incur this species of hatred, either through *some fault of their own*, or through *the pure malice of men*.—(i) They incur this hatred *by their own fault*, if they do not administer the doctrine of the truth, with that prudence and gentleness which are appropriate to it; if they appear to have a greater regard for their own advantage, than for the advancement of religion, and, *lastly*, if their manner of life is in opposition to the doctrine. From all these circumstances a bad opinion is entertained of them, as though they scarcely believed the principles which they inculcate.—(ii) This hatred is also incurred by *the fault of another*, because the delicate and lascivious hearts of men cannot bear to have their ulcers sprinkled and purified by the sharp salt of truth, and because they with difficulty admit any censors on their life and manners. With a knowledge of this trait of the human heart, the Apostle enquires, "Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" (Galat. iv, 16.) For truth is almost invariably productive of hatred, while an obsequious complaisance obtains friends as its reward.

3. The preceding appear to be the procuring causes of dissensions in religion; and, as long as their efficacy endures, they tend to perpetuate those dissensions. There are other causes that we may justly class among those which perpetuate discord when once it has arisen, and which prevent the restoration of peace and unity.

(1) Among these perpetuating and preventing causes, the first place is claimed for the *various prejudices by which the minds of the Dissidents are occupied*, concerning *our adversaries and their opinions*, concerning *our parents and ancestors, and the Church to which we belong*, and, lastly, concerning *ourselves and our teachers*.

(i) *The prejudice against our adversaries* is, not that we think them under the influence of ERROR, but under that of *pure malice*, and because their minds have indulged their humour in thus dissenting. This cuts off all hope of leading them to adopt correct sentiments, and despair refuses to make the attempt.—(ii) *The prejudice against the opinions of our*

adversary is, that we condemn them ourselves not only for being false, but for having been already condemned by the public judgment of the church; we therefore consider them unworthy of being again brought into controversy, and subjected anew to examination.—(iii) But *the preconceived opinion which we have formed concerning our parents and ancestors, is also a preventive of reconciliation*,—both because we account them to have been possessed of such a great share of wisdom and piety, as rendered it improbable that they could ever have been guilty of error;—and because we conceive favourable hopes of their salvation, which is very properly an object of our most earnest wishes in their behalf: But these hopes we seem to call in question, if, in an opinion opposed to theirs, we acknowledge any portion of the truth appertaining to salvation, of which they have either been ignorant or have disapproved. It is on this principle that parents leave their posterity heirs both of their property and of their opinions and dissensions.—(iv) Besides, *the splendour of the Church*, to which we have bound ourselves by an oath, dazzles our eyes in such a manner that we cannot suffer any persuasion whatever to induce us to believe the possibility, in former times or at present, of that church having deviated in any point from the right way.—(v) *Lastly*. Our thoughts and sentiments *concerning ourselves and our teachers* are so exalted, that our minds can scarcely conceive it possible either for them to have been ignorant, or not to have had a sufficiently clear perception of things, or for us to err in judgment when we approve of their opinions. So prone is the human understanding to exempt from all suspicion of error itself and those whom it loves and esteems!

(2) It is no wonder if these prejudices produce *a pertinacity in eagerly defending a proposition once laid down*,—which is a most powerful impediment to reconciliation. Two kinds of fear render this pertinacity the more obstinate: (i) One is a *fear of that disgrace* which, we foolishly think, will be incurred if we acknowledge ourselves to have been at all in error. (ii) The other is a fear which causes us to think, that the whole doctrine is exposed to the utmost peril, if we discover it even in one point to be erroneous.

(3) In addition to these, *the mode of action commonly adopted both towards an adversary* and his *opinion*, is no small obstacle to reconciliation, although that mode may seem to have been chosen for conciliatory purposes.

(i) An adversary is treated in a perverse manner, when he is overwhelmed by curses and reproaches, assailed with detractions and calumnies, and when he is menaced with threats of violence. If he despises all these things, which is not an uncommon occurrence when "the testimony of his conscience" is in opposition to them, (2 Cor. i, 12.) they produce no effect whatever. But if his spirit broods over them, his mind becomes disturbed, and, like one stricken by the Furies, he is driven to madness, and is thus much worse qualified than before to acknowledge his error. In both these ways he is confirmed rather the more in his own opinion;—either because he perceives, that those who use arms of this kind openly betray the weakness as well as the injustice of their cause;—or, because he draws this conclusion in his own mind, that it is not very probable that those persons are instructed by *the Spirit of truth* who adopt such a course of conduct.

(ii) But contention is rashly instituted against the *opinion of an adversary*, *First*, when it is not proposed according to the mind and intention of him who is the assertor; *Secondly*, when it is discussed beyond all due bounds, and its deformity is unseasonably exaggerated; and, *Lastly*, when its refutation is attempted by arguments ill-calculated to produce that effect. —*The First* occurs when we do not attend to the words of an adversary, with a becoming tranquillity of mind and suitable patience; but immediately and at the mention of the first word, we are accustomed to guess at his meaning.—*The Second* arises from the circumstance of no one wishing it to appear as if he had begun to contend about a thing of trifling importance.—*The Last* proceeds from ignorance or from too great impetuosity, which, on being precipitously impelled into fury, augments its mischievous capabilities: It then seizes upon any thing for a weapon, and hurls it against the adversary. —When *the first mode* is adopted, the person whose meaning is misrepresented, understands that an opinion very different from his own is invented through calumny.—*The second course*, according to his judgment, has been pursued for the purpose of affixing an envious mark upon his opinion, and upon the dignity which it has acquired.—When *the last* is put in practice, he considers his opinion to be incapable of refutation, because he observes that it remains uninjured amidst all the arguments which have been directed against it. All and each of these add fuel to the flame of dissensions, and render the blazing fire inextinguishable.

III. We have now considered the NATURE, THE EFFECTS and THE CAUSES *of religious dissension.* It remains for us to inquire into the REMEDIES for such a great evil. While I attempt this in a brief manner, I beg that you will favour me with that degree of attention which you have already manifested.—The professors of medicine describe the nature of all *remedies* thus,—" they are never employed without benefit:" For if they be true remedies, they must prove beneficial; and, if they do not profit, they prove hurtful. This latter circumstance reminds me, that I ought first to remove certain corrupt remedies which have been devised by some persons and occasionally employed.

1. The first of these false remedies which obtrudes itself, is the fable of *the sufficiency of implicit faith,* by which people are called upon, without any knowledge of the matter, to believe that which is an object of belief with the Church and the Prelates. But the Scripture places righteousness " in the faith of the heart," and salvation " in the confession of the mouth;" (Rom. x, 10.) and says, " The just shall live by his faith," (Heb. ii, 4.) and " I believed and therefore have spoken." (2 Cor. iv, 13.) This monstrous absurdity is therefore exploded by the scripture. Not only does this fable take away all cause of religious dissension, but it also destroys religion itself, which, when it is destitute of KNOWLEDGE and FAITH, can have no existence.

2. The next figment is nearly allied to this; it concludes, that *every one may be saved in his own religion.* But while this remedy professes to cure one evil, it produces another much more hurtful and of greater magnitude; and that is, the certain destruction of those who are held in bondage by this error: Because this opinion renders the error incurable; since no one will give himself any trouble to lay it aside or to correct it. This was Mahomet's devise, for the purpose of establishing his Alcoran free from all liability of its becoming an object of dispute. The same doctrine obtained in Paganism, where the worship of demons flourished, as is evident from the title on a certain altar among the Athenians, the high stewards of Pagan wisdom. That altar bore the following inscription, 'TO THE GODS OF ASIA, EUROPE, AND AFRICA; TO THE UNKNOWN AND FOREIGN GODS:' which was after the manner of the Romans, at that period " the masters of the world," who were accustomed to invoke the tutelary deities of an enemy's city before they commenced

hostilities against it. In this manner has satan exerted himself, lest his "kingdom, being divided against itself, should fall."

3. The third false remedy is *a prohibition of all controversies respecting religion*, which lays down the most stupid ignorance for a foundation, and raises upon it the superstructure of religious concord: In Russia, where such an ordinance is in operation, this is obvious to every one that contemplates its effects. Yet it is hurtful, whether it be *true Religion* that flourishes, or it be *false:* In the first case, on account of the inconstancy of the human mind; and in the second case, because it stamps perpetuity on error,—unless the preceding fiction concerning the *equality of all religions* meet with approval, for on that foundation Mahomet raised this prohibition against religious controversies.

4. Next to this in absurdity is the advice, *not to explain the sacred scriptures but only to read them;* which is not only pernicious, on account of the omission of their particular application, and repugnant to the usage both of the ancient Jewish Church and of the primitive Church of Christ; but it is also of no avail in the cure of the evil, since any one might by reading discover the meaning for himself, according to his own fancy; and that reading which is instituted at the will of the reader, would act the part of an explanation, on account of the parallelism of similar and dissimilar passages.

But the Popish Church exhibits to us THREE REMEDIES.

FIRST, *that, for the sake of certainty, we may have recourse to the* CHURCH UNIVERSAL. However, since the whole of this church cannot meet together, the Court of Rome has appointed in its place a *representative* assembly consisting of the Pope, the Cardinals, the Bishops, and the rest of the prelates who are devoted to the Roman See and subject to the Pontiff. But, in addition to this, because it believes that it is possible for all the Cardinals, Bishops and Prelates to err, even when united together in one body, and because it considers the Pope alone to be placed beyond the possibility of error, it declares that we must apply to him for the sake of obtaining a decisive judgment concerning Religion. This remedy is not only vain and inefficient, but it is far more difficult to induce the rest of the Christian world to adopt it than any controverted article in the whole circle of religion: And since the Papists endeavour to prove this point from the scriptures, by that very circumstance they declare that the scriptures are the only sanctuary to which we can repair for religious information.

SECONDLY. Their next remedy is proposed, if I may be allowed the expression, merely for the sake of form, and lies in *the writings and agreement of the ancient Fathers.* But since the Christian Fathers have not all been authors, and few of those who have written have concerned themselves with controversies, (which takes away from us the *universal consent* of all of them together,) this remedy is also useless, because it is a fact to the truth of which the Papists themselves assent, that it was possible for each of these Fathers to err. From this circumstance, therefore, we conclude, that the consent of all of them is not free from the risk of error, even if each had separately declared his own individual opinion in his writings. Besides, this general agreement is no easy matter; nay, it is to be obtained with the greatest difficulty; because it is in the power of very few persons, (if of any man whatever,) to make themselves acquainted with such universal consent, both on account of the bulky and almost innumerable volumes in which the writings of the Fathers are contained, and because the dispute among different parties is no less concerning the meaning of those Fathers than concerning that of the Scriptures, the contents of which are comprised in a book of small size when compared with the dimensions of their massy tomes. We are thus sent forth on an endless excursion, that we may at length be compelled to return to the Sovereign Pontiff.

THIRDLY. The other remedy of the Papists is not much dissimilar to the preceding one. It is thus stated: *The decrees of former councils may be consulted; from which if it should appear that the controversy has been decided, the judgment then passed upon it must stand in the place of a definitive sentence; nor must any matter, the merits of which have been once decided, be brought again into judgment.*—But of what avail would this be, if a good cause had been badly defended, and had been overpowered and borne down, not by any defect in itself, but through the fault of those who were its defenders, and who were either awed into silence through fear, or betrayed their trust by an incompetent, foolish and injudicious defence? And of what consequence does such a remedy appear, if one and the same *spirit of error* have conducted on such an occasion both the attack and the defence? But let it be openly and justly proclaimed: Yet I declare, that THE CAUSE OF RELIGION, WHICH IS THE CAUSE OF GOD, IS NOT AN AFFAIR TO BE SUBMITTED TO HUMAN DECISION, or '*to be judged of man's judgment.*'

The Papists add a FOURTH remedy which, on account of its fierce and most violent efficacy, will not easily be forgotten by us as a people who have been called to endure some of its cruelties. It acts like the fulcrum of a lever for confirming all the preceding suggestions, and is the foundation of the whole composition. It is this, "Whosoever refuses to listen to the councils and writings of the fathers, and to receive them as explained by the Church of Rome,—whosoever refuses to listen to the Church, and especially to her husband, that High Priest and prophet, the vicar of Christ and the successor of St. Peter, let that soul be cut off from among his people: And he who is unwilling to yield to an authority so sacred, must be compelled, under the sword of the executioner, to express his consent, or he must be avoided," ["*devitetur*,"] which, in their language, signifies, that he must be deprived of life. To murder and utterly to destroy the adverse and gainsaying parties, is indeed a most compendious method of removing all dissensions! †

In the midst of these difficulties some persons have invented other remedies, which, since they are not within the power of man, ought, according to their views, to be asked of God in prayer.

1. One is, *that God would be pleased to raise some one from the dead, and send him to men:* From such a messenger they might then hope to know what is God's decisive judgment concerning the clashing opinions of the various dissidents. But this remedy is discountenanced by Christ when he says, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." (Luke xvi, 31.)

2. Another of these remedies is, *that God would by a miracle distinguish that party of whose sentiments he approves;* which appears to have been a practice in the times of Elijah. But, if no sect be entirely free from every particle of error, can it be expected that God will set the seal of his approval on any portion of falsity? But this wish is unnecessary, since the things which Christ did and spoke "are written that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that, believing, we might have life through his name." (John xx,

† Yet this co-ercive doctrine, of crushing with bloody rigour whatever opinions the prevailing party might declare to be rising heresies, was borrowed by the Calvinists of that age, and generally adopted in their ecclesiastical practice. Scarcely one early writer of that school can be found, who was not ready to defend this mode of producing Uniformity, as artfully as a y Popish author.

31.) But the remedy itself, if applied, would prove to be inefficacious. For even in the days of Christ and his Apostles, dissensions existed; and many of them were excited against the primitive heralds of the gospel, although they had acquired great renown by the benevolent exercise of the miraculous powers with which they were endued. To this remark I must add, that the approaching advent of ANTICHRIST is predicted to be "with all power, and signs, and lying wonders." (2 Thess. ii, 9.)

3. A third remedy, of a horrid description, remains to be noticed; which, nevertheless, is resorted to by some persons. It is *an adjuration of the devil*, to induce him by means of incantations and exorcisms to deliver an answer, from the bodies of *possessed persons*, concerning the truth of such doctrines as are at any period the existing subjects of controversy. This method is both a mark of the utmost desperation, and an execrable and insane love of demons.

But dismissing all these violent medicines, that are of a bad character and import, I proceed to notice such as are holy, true and saving; these I distribute into *preparatives*, and *aphæretics*, or *removers*, of this dissension.

1. To the class of *preparatives* belong, (1) in the first place, PRAYERS AND SUPPLICATIONS TO GOD, that we may obtain a knowledge of the truth, and that the peace of the Church may be preserved: and these religious acts are to be performed, at the special command of the magistrates, with fasting, and in dust and ashes, with seriousness, in faith, and with assiduity. These services, when thus performed, cannot fail of being efficacious; because they are done according to the ordinance of God, whose command it is, that "we pray for the peace of Jerusalem," (Psalm cxxii, 6.) and according to the promise of Christ, who has graciously engaged that "the Spirit of truth shall be given to those who ask him." (Luke xi, 13.) *

* How many Christians seem to forget this promise of the new covenant, as well as that other, quoted by our author in a succeeding paragraph: "If any man do the will of him who sent me, *he shall know of the doctrine*, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." (John vii, 17.) We have heard of some eminent Christians, ministers and others, who, after doubts had been injected into their minds concerning one or more of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, have betaken themselves to this course which the scriptures prescribe. They have in a methodical manner reviewed all the arguments urged either for or against the point, and, endeavouring to bring their minds to the scriptural docility of little children, have for hours together, on many successive days, pleaded with the Father of Lights for divine direction. Some of them, after earnest application to this Divine source, have received a speedy answer to their importunate and sincere petitions; and others, only at the

(2.) *Let a serious amendment of life, and a conscientious course of conduct be added:* For, without these, all our pray-

expiration of some years, have had all their scruples removed. On a principle very similar to that mentioned by St. Luke, (vii, 47.) these persons after experiencing such tokens of infinite condescension from God, and after having had much heavenly light communicated to them, '*loved much*' the souls of others, and in the economy of God's providence have become excellent master-builders in the christian church,—this salutary course of preparation eminently qualifying them for solving the doubts and meeting the objections of others tempted in like manner with themselves. If this were to become a settled practice, as it assuredly ought to be, with all who peruse the sacred volume and search for truth in the manner which it teaches, we should have fewer Socinians in the land, and the number of Free-thinkers and boasting sons of reason would be wonderfully diminished. This method is not calculated to encourage scepticism, but to remove it; and it most completely verifies the saying of our old grammarian, on another occasion,

Qui dubitat, qui sæpe rogat, mea dicta tenebit.

Very different from this is a sudden and hasty request about any affair, preferred, in the heat of a man's own spirit, '*to God who giveth wisdom to all men liberally*,' when they ask it of him, and are willing to receive it, in the spirit which he has commanded. However wrongfully the former mode may be stigmatized as ENTHUSIASM, this term is justly applied in its offensive meaning to the latter, because it is a tempting of God, either by asking of him something which he has not promised to bestow, or by asking a lawful thing in an improper spirit. A curious specimen of the latter mode occurs in the history of the life of Arminius:—

In the year 1605, Festus Hommius, a high Calvinist, who was one of the ministers of the Church of Leyden, busied himself greatly in injuring the reputation of Arminius by private slanders, and by circulating false and scandalous reports concerning his words and actions. Our author, who was not ignorant of this undermining and disingenuous conduct, so unbecoming in a Christian minister, resolved to discharge his duty by admonishing his calumniator with seriousness and courage: He therefore embraced a suitable opportunity, while his friend Uitenbogardt from the Hague was on a visit to him, and plainly told Hommius, in the presence of Uitenbogardt and Borrius, of the injustice that he had done him by the calumnies which he had invented and propagated. Having refuted all his infamous slanders, and answered every false imputation with which his character had been aspersed, he made poor Hommius so completely ashamed of himself as to be unable to offer a single word in self-vindication. The remaining part of this narrative shall be given in the the words of Arminius, who, in a letter to Uitenbogardt, dated the 20th of May, writes thus: 'I have just cause for expostulating with Festus Hommius, 'and with him of Amsterdam, respecting certain calumnies. I shall probably 'be compelled to have recourse to such a measure: If I be, my expostulations, 'while they are modest, shall not be wanting in courage; for I perceive, that 'the powers of these men are of no avail whatever, except against an absent 'person. They have within themselves such a consciousness of their criminality, that they dare scarcely lift up their eyes in the presence of the person 'calumniated, or even behold his countenance. When you and Borrius were 'here together, you recollect how I refuted all the charges and replied to the 'objections of Festus; and my discourse had such an effect as to extort from 'him a declaration, when he was taking leave of us, that *he was very desirous 'of enquiring after the truth*: But, from that time to the present, he has never 'come near me for the purpose of having another conference on those matters. '—The tale which he tells is this: On his retiring from that interview with 'me, he humbly supplicated and intreated God to open his eyes, and to mani-

ers are rendered ineffectual, because they are displeasing to God, on the ground, that "he who misemploys that portion of knowledge which he possesses, becomes by his own act unworthy of all further communications and increase of knowledge." This is in accordance with that saying of Christ: "Unto every one that hath, shall be given; and from him that hath not, even that which he hath shall be taken away from him." (Luke xix, 26.) But to all those who employ and improve the knowledge which is given to them, Christ promises *the Spirit of discernment* in these words: "If any man will do the will of my Father, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." (John vii, 17.)

2. But amongst the very first *removals*, let those causes be put away which, as we previously stated (page 391) have their origin in the affections, and which are not only the instigators of this dissension, but tend to perpetuate and keep it alive. Let humility overcome pride; let a mind contented with its condition become the successor of avarice; let the love of celestial delights expel all carnal pleasures; let good-will and benevolence occupy the place of envy; let patient forbearance subdue anger; let sobriety in acquiring wisdom prescribe bounds to the desire of knowledge, and let studious application take the place of learned ignorance. Let all hatred and bitterness be laid aside; and, on the contrary, "let us put on bowels of mercies" towards those who differ from us, and who appear either to wander about in the paths of error, or to scatter its noxious seeds among others. *

'fest the truth to him: After presenting this petition, such astonishing 'light and joy burst in upon his mind, that he formed a holy resolution to 'persevere steadfastly in those opinions which are generally received.——Are 'such men as this, suitable enquirers after truth? Can it be expected, that 'God will, in answer to a single petition, bestow his Holy Spirit in such a 'large measure, as to qualify the petitioner to form a right judgment of these 'high concerns without any possibility of error? The Lord imparts his Holy 'Spirit to his elect, after they have importunately cried to him *day and night*, 'and invoked his Divine Majesty for the communication of this gift. But 'when I hear these things about Festus, I relate the conversation which he 'and I had together in your presence; and I add, that I am prepared to de-'monstrate to him, from the word of God, that his sentiments can on no 'account be reconciled with the scriptures.'

Arminius knew, by painful experience, that a reflecting mind, aware of the important bearings of the great subjects to which he here refers, could not thus hastily come to a conclusion about them, when, as in the case of Hommius, it had not had time to understand the exact difference between them and the opinions which it had formerly imbibed.

* This paragraph, and the four considerations which follow it, are eminently characteristic of the mild and pacific disposition of Arminius. Those

These necessary concessions we shall obtain from our minds without much difficulty, if the following four considerations become the objects of our sedulous attention:

FIRST. *How extremely difficult it is to discover the truth on all subjects, and to avoid error.* On this topic St. Augustine most beautifully descants, when he thus addresses those worst of heretics, the Manichees: "Let those persons be enraged against you who are ignorant of the immense labour that is required for the discovery of truth, and how difficult it is to guard against error. Let those be enraged against you who know not how uncommon a circumstance and how arduous a toil it is to overcome carnal fantasies, when such a conquest is put in comparison with serenity of mind. Let those be enraged against you who are not aware of the great difficulty with which the eye of 'the inner man' is healed, so as to be able to look up to God as the sun of the system. Let those be enraged against you who are personally unconscious of the many sighs and groans which must be uttered before we are capable of understanding God in the slightest degree. And, lastly, let them be enraged against you who have never been deceived by an error of such a description as that under which they see you labouring. But how angry soever all these persons may be, I cannot be in the least enraged against you, whose weaknesses it is my duty to bear, as those who were near me at that period bore with mine; and I ought now to treat you with as much patience as that which was exercised towards me when, frantic and blind, I went astray in the errors of your doctrine."

SECONDLY. That those who hold erroneous opinions have been induced through *ignorance* to adopt them, is far more probable, than that *malice* has influenced them to contrive a method of consigning themselves and other people to eternal destruction.

THIRDLY. It is possible that they who entertain these mistaken sentiments, are of the number of the elect, whom God, it is true, may have permitted to fall, but only with this design,—that he may raise them up with the greater glory. How then can we indulge ourselves in any harsh or unmerciful resolutions against these persons, who have been destined

only who have attentively perused the preceding account of our author's life, and in particular his letters to his friends, can form an adequate conception of the propriety and aptitude of this christian advice to the Bulls of Bashan, which at that time surrounded him and obstructed his benevolent progress.

to possess the heavenly inheritance, who are our brethren, the members of Christ, and not only the servants but the sons of the Lord Most High? *

LASTLY. Let us place ourselves in the circumstances of an adversary, and let him in return assume the character which we sustain; since it is as possible for us, as it is for him, to hold wrong principles. When we have made this experiment, we may be brought to think, that the very person whom we had previously thought to be in error, and whose mistakes in our eyes had a destructive tendency, may perhaps have been given to us by God, that out of his mouth we may learn the truth which has hitherto been unknown to us.

To these four reflections, let there be added, *a consideration of all those articles of religion respecting which there exists on both sides a perfect agreement.* These will perhaps be found to be so numerous and of such great importance, that when a comparison is instituted between them, and the others which may properly be made the subjects of controversy, the latter will be found to be few in number and of small consequence. This is the very method which a certain famous prince in France † is reported to have adopted, when Cardinal Lorraine attempted to embroil the Lutherans, or those who adhered to the Augustan Confession, with the French Protestants, that he might interrupt and neutralize the salutary provisions of the Conference at Poissy, which had been instituted between the Protestants and the Papists.

But since it is customary after long and grievous wars, to enter into a truce, or a cessation from hostilities, prior to the conclusion of a treaty of peace and its final ratification; and, since, during the continuance of a truce, while every hostile attempt is laid aside, peaceful thoughts are naturally suggested, till at length a general solicitude is expressed with regard to the method in which a firm peace and lasting reconciliation may best be effected;—it is my special wish, that there may now be among us a similar cessation from the asperities of religious warfare, and that both parties would abstain from writings full of bitterness, from sermons remarkable only for the invectives which they contain, and from the unchristian

* This is truly *argumentum ad homines*, regarded as Calvinists. But it will be seen, by other parts of our author's writings, that he could make this supposition in perfect good faith, even according to his own opinions on the doctrine of Election.

† The King of Navarre.—See the preceding Appendix B, page 53.

practice of mutual anathematizing and execration. Instead of these, let the controversialists substitute *writings full of moderation*, in which the matters of controversy may, without respect of persons, be clearly explained and proved by cogent arguments: Let such sermons be preached as are calculated to excite the minds of the people to the love and study of truth, charity, mercy, long-suffering, and concord; which may inflame the minds both of Governors and people with a desire of concluding a pacification, and may make them willing to carry into effect such a remedy as is, of all others, the best accommodated to remove dissensions.

That remedy is, *an orderly and free convention of the parties that differ from each other:* In such an assembly, (called by the Greeks a SYNOD, and by the Latins a COUNCIL,) after the different sentiments have been compared together, and the various reasons of each have been weighed, in the fear of the Lord, and with calmness and accuracy, let the members deliberate, consult, and determine what the word of God declares concerning the matters in controversy, and afterwards let them by common consent promulge and declare the result to the Churches.

The Chief Magistrates, who profess the Christian religion, will summon and convene this Synod, in virtue of the Supreme official authority with which they are divinely invested,*

* The Letters of the States General, inviting the Protestant Divines of foreign countries to the National Synod, were issued on the 25th of June, 1618; and the members were summoned to meet together in the city of Dort, on the 1st of November in the same year. The Letters of Invitation, addressed to the Divines of the United Provinces, were dated 20th of September. The Synod of Dort was opened on the 13th of November. The Remonstrants had wished either to have their FIVE POINTS brought before a *Provincial Synod*, to prepare matters for a *National* one; or to have them brought at once before a *General Council* of Protestants, for decision. But the Calvinists would listen to neither of these equitable proposals.—If a Provincial Synod were held, especially in that Province which most needed such a remedy, they knew, from trial, how difficult it would be to combat the strong and popular arguments of the Arminians, when both parties were placed nearly on an equality in one assembly.—And if a General Council of Protestants were convened, they were certain, that the principles of Arminius would be recognized as integral parts of scripture verity, and consequently entitled not only to toleration, (which was all that the poor Arminians had desired,) but to the especial patronage of the civil authorities. This result was anticipated, from the immense preponderance which the Lutheran Divines, from all the small States in Germany, and other parts of the North of Europe, would have had in such a Council. The supreme contempt in which the Calvinists held the Lutherans may be seen, *passim*, in *the Acts of the Synod of Dort*, and in the narratives of cotemporary ecclesiastical historians: It was exceeded only by the rancorous hostility which they evinced towards the Arminians, and which arose from the more imminent danger to be apprehended from the proximity and the increase

and according to the practice that formerly prevailed in the Jewish Church, and that was afterwards adopted by the

of the latter.—Numerous state papers on these subjects were written by the public functionaries of the different provinces in the year 1617, among which those of the composition of the learned Grotius, who conducted the arguments in favour of a General Council, are very conspicuous for the superior abilities which they display. The best reasons employed by the Calvinists for their favourite project, are entitled to no better epithet than that of *special pleading*. Their chief argument against a General Protestant Council is thus expressed: "Never since the beginning of the Reformation have we been able to procure a General Council of Protestants, notwithstanding the troubles which have in various places infested the Church; as, amongst others, in the case of the quarrel in Germany about the UBIQUITY, which has been kept alive by the *Book of Concord*, unjustly so called."—Grotius answers it in these words: "Although there has not yet been a General Council of the Reformed Churches, it does not follow that such an assembly never can or will be convened. The differences in these Provinces are of such a nature as is sufficient to require the advice of our brethren of all the Reformed Churches; and this the more particularly, because they furnish the Lutherans with stronger pretences for refusing communion with us, than on any other account. Besides, the drawing up of a GENERAL CONFESSION, and the choice of the most proper means for uniting all Protestants, may be promoted on such an occasion. God Almighty seems likewise to have given us no small hopes of this, in having lately moved the hearts of the King of Great Britain, the Elector Palatine, and other Princes of Germany, to consent to it. That the Reformed Church of France has the same views, appears by the treatise which Du Moulin has published. True it is indeed, that the Pope and his party, being sensible of the great loss which they must thus sustain, will leave no means unattempted to hinder it: But this very circumstance ought to encourage us the more earnestly in our endeavours to effect it."—A NATIONAL SYNOD was therefore the sole remedy which the wisdom, or rather the *worldly prudence* of the Calvinists, could discover for removing the maladies under which the Church of Christ in Holland was at that time labouring. In shewing cause for their preference, they were placed in an awkward dilemma: For they perceived, that the strongest reasons to be adduced for the adoption of this measure, would extend too far, and might, in the hands of their able antagonists, be made to apply with greater cogency to the convening of a General Council. They tried to ward off these consequences by suggesting, that "as the design of a National Synod is only to restore the churches of the United Provinces to their former rest and tranquillity, all the useful purposes to which we can apply the presence of some Foreign Divines, is, *to be instructed* by them in the sentiments of their churches in reference to the points in controversy, and *to be directed* by their advice not only in the establishment of our peace, but also in cultivating a good correspondence with them." The Dutch Calvinists knew, that any assembly which did not bear some resemblance to a General Council, by being composed partly of foreigners, would not satisfy even the most moderate of their own persuasion. This is declared, after their own fashion, by the members of the Synod, in the preface to their ACTS; in which they say: "But since the Remonstrants did not appear to hold the judgment of the Belgic Churches in any great estimation, and since they had always endeavoured to persuade the people, that there was no difference between their sentiments and those of the Reformed Churches, it pleased their High Mightinesses to invite to this Synod *from all the Reformed Churches in the neighbouring Kingdoms, Principalities, and Republics*, some divines distinguished by their piety, learning, and prudence, that they might assist with their judgments and counsels the deputies of the Belgic Churches, and that these controversies, having been thus examined and

Christian Church and continued nearly to the nine hundredth year after the birth of Christ, until the Roman Pontiff began

determined [*communi quasi omnium Eccles. Reform. judicio,*] AS IF *by the common judgment of all the Reformed Churches*, might be composed with so much the greater certainty, happiness, and safety, and to more abundant profit." The whole of this paragraph was most craftily expressed: Those two convenient words, AS IF, are intended to excuse the non-attendance of deputies from the Protestant Churches of Prussia, Poland, Sweden, Denmark, and Norway, to which no invitation was transmitted;—to mention nothing of many of the minor German States, the Protestants in some of the native dominions of the House of Austria, several of the Hanse towns, and the Churches of France, England and Scotland, which were without ecclesiastical representatives in the Synod. To many of the NEIGHBOURING kingdoms invitations were certainly sent: But it was the ardent wish of the Calvinists, only to have the company of those choice spirits of other countries that would readily coalesce with themselves in devising measures to crush Arminianism. To obtain the presence of a few thus enlightened and unanimous, was the great object at which they aimed; and by this manœuvre they endeavoured to impart to their National Synod the dignified and imposing appearance of a General Council. In this object, however, they would have been defeated, had not King James of England entered into their views, and given that party his overpowering assistance.

James is said to have prided himself more on account of being an able casuist and theologian, than on any other personal qualification. It was in this capacity that his Majesty, in 1611, addressed a letter in French to the States of Holland, in which he talks largely about "God having honoured him with the title of DEFENDER OF THE FAITH," and that "he should be compelled not only to separate himself from such false and heretical churches" as countenanced Vorstius, "but to call upon all the other Reformed Churches to devise the best means of extinguishing, and sending back to hell, these cursed heresies that have newly broken forth."

This King was a real Don Quixote in religious matters. Isaac Walton, in his *Life of Sir Henry Wotton*, has related in his artless manner the offers, which, immediately after coming into possession of the English Crown, his Majesty made to Pope Clement the Eighth concerning the convention of a General Council for determining the differences between the Protestants and the Church of Rome, from which was to flow the future concord of Christendom. This refusal of his Holiness gave no small umbrage to the British Monarch. He also, in imitation of his great predecessor Elizabeth, took an uncommon interest in the ecclesiastical affairs of the Low Countries. In the year 1613, soon after the Delft Conference between three Ministers of the Remonstrant and three of the Calvinistic persuasion, his Majesty addressed a letter in French to their High Mightinesses, in which he observes: "We acquaint you with what experience has caused us to know, that questions of this kind are only terminated with great trouble, by means of disputes between Divines; but that it is more proper to suppress them by public authority, forbidding your ministers to bring such disputes into the pulpit or among the common people, and giving express commands to maintain peace by a mutual toleration of each other, in the difference of opinion which they severally hold on the points which have been mentioned; at least till such time as, after a full investigation of the whole affair by public authority, an ordinance to the contrary be issued by yourselves. We seem to have the stronger reasons, why we ought thus to persuade you, because, in a manuscript which your Ambassador, the Chevalier Carron, has presented to us, having seen very amply deduced the opinions of each of the parties and the reasons on which they are founded, we do not find either of them to be so absurd as to be inconsistent with the truth of the Christian faith or with the salvation of

through tyranny to arrogate this authority to himself. Such an arrangement is required by the public weal, which is never

souls." His Majesty's next adventure in this line was the expression of his high approval of the Resolution passed by the States of Holland and West Friezland, in January, 1614, tolerating both Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants, and prohibiting them from transgressing certain boundaries in doctrine which they very judiciously prescribed in that document. On this subject Isaac Casaubon, who was then high in the King's confidence, writes thus to Grotius: "I have accurately treated on the edict of the Illustrious States with his most Serene Majesty, his Grace the Archbishop, and with other prelates of consummate erudition; and both the King and all who read it, highly approved of it and praised the advice which it contains. For it is apparent, that in the framing of this edict an attempt has been made to warn people to avoid the two rocks equally dangerous in this doctrine—that of the Manichees and that of the Pelagians,—and to confirm them in that doctrine which, while it ascribes to God alone the whole of our salvation, in its commencement, its progress, and its completion, does not at the same time bring good works into contempt." This decree of the States of Holland was administered with such great public benefit, that our good king, about a year afterwards, invited the famous Peter Molinæus, or Du Moulin, to London, to assist in devising a method of uniting all the Protestant Churches in Europe together, and to reconcile all existing differences on doctrinal subjects, and to prevent them in future. This scheme, which was published in the year 1615, is a most admirable one; it was, however, too mild for that warm and agitated period. In one part of that document, it is justly stated, "All errors in religion have had their origin in the desire which men feel for *knowing too much* or *possessing too much*. *The last* of these evils has ruined the Church of Rome; and it is by *the former* of them that Satan labours hard to effect our ruin. Could we but prevail upon ourselves to remain ignorant of many things, and could be contented to know no more than what is necessary for salvation, and to tolerate those who err or who differ from us in opinions that are not necessary or fundamental, such a union would be more than half completed at the very commencement."—King James retained these favourite notions upwards of two years, and employed Mark Antony de Dominis, the Archbishop of Spalatro, at that time a recent convert from Popery, to write in support of them. In the beginning of 1617, his Majesty had a conversation with Bishop Overall on the existing theological differences in the Low Countries; when the Bishop repeated to his Majesty the remark of the Archbishop of Spalatro, "that those differences *did not appear to him to belong to the Catholic Faith, but to theological disputation*; that preachers therefore ought not to be allowed to enter into contests among themselves about these matters, in public and opposite sermons, to the distraction of the people; but that they ought rather to compose these differences by the private conferences of learned men, supported by clear testimonies from the scriptures and antiquity." The Bishop adds, that "his most Serene Majesty declared himself to be of the same opinion; and that it seemed to him a token of great rashness in men to enter into such scrupulous contests about questions of this kind relating to Divine Predestination, and to employ such rash assertions about them as though they had just descended from heaven after having assisted at the Divine Council-Board. This just and weighty sentiment of his Majesty excited the approbation of all the Bishops who were present." Yet this liberal speech was delivered only a few months before his Majesty transmitted orders to Sir Dudley Carleton, to employ all his influence at the Court of the Hague to oppress the Remonstrants.—In all the benevolent schemes into which this King entered, there is every appearance of a superior *understanding*; but in the vacillating policy which hindered their execution, a most lamentable want of *judgment* is displayed. This has always been considered, both by friends and foes, as the greatest defect in James the First; and these two witty lines may with

committed with greater safety to the custody of any one than to his whose private advantage is entirely unconnected with the issue.

almost as great propriety be applied to him, as to his profligate grandson, Charles the Second, to whom they were addressed:—

> He never *said* a *foolish* thing,
> And never *did* a *wise* one.

Of much the same complexion was his conduct respecting Popery, his transcendent hatred to which was proverbial; yet it was no small portion of his ambition, to have his son married to a daughter of the King of Spain. On this subject Balcanqual facetiously observes: "The talk of the *Spanish Match* hath of late been very fresh again in England, but this is certain, that, the other day at Theobald's, the King asking a gentleman of good note what the people talked of the *Spanish Navy*, received of him this answer: *Sir, the people is nothing so much afraid of the Spaniards'* POWDER *as of their* MATCH."

Were not the character of this Monarch well known, it would appear most wonderful, that he could lend himself to the measures of the Dutch Calvinists when they openly avowed, in their state-papers, the following sentiment, which was most abhorrent to his spirit: "The thing in question is not a civil or political matter, but ecclesiastical, and one which concerns only the unity, welfare, and edification of the Reformed Churches in these our Netherlands. Now the case of the Church of Christ *is of quite a different nature from that of the Civil Government*. For there has been a common band and alliance among the Reformed Churches of these provinces, even whilst they were all groaning under persecution, and *before the temporal union of the provinces was made:* And this common band never can or ought to be broken." The hint here given goes beyond the *collaterality* which Uitenbogardt described in his speech before the States of Holland, nearly ten years before: It amounts to an assumption of *supremacy* on the part of the ecclesiastics, and is very properly answered by Grotius in the following words: "The direction of ecclesiastical matters (in which is undoubtedly included the convening of a Synod by authority of the Civil Magistrates,) is one of the highest privileges of the sovereignty of the province of Holland; and when once this privilege is lost or resigned to others, it is usually attended with the ruin of all the rest. This, therefore, is a thing which cannot be called *merely ecclesiastical:* For it is likewise of a political nature; and they who would in this respect incroach upon the rights of the province, would not hesitate to attempt alterations in the State. We ought also seriously to study that Canon of the Primitive Church, in one of the General Councils, which gives us this direction, *Ut Ecclesia sequatur typos Politiæ*, 'Let the Church follow the pattern of the Civil Government.' This may be done, without the least infringement of the band of amity which ought to be maintained among all the Reformed."

The designs which Prince Maurice had long cherished against the ancient liberties and internal jurisdiction of the States, (each of which possessed by the act of Union the complete management of its own affairs,) were then in a course of execution. By the forcible and illegal removal of the old Burgomasters and Governors, and the appointment of new ones,—by the preponderance which these newly elected individuals gave to their own party by their election of persons to fill the higher offices of state in the various towns which had been ill-affected towards Calvinism and arbitrary power,—and by the untrue and scandalous reports which were invented and industriously propagated respecting the alleged secret intentions of Barnevelt and the Arminians to deliver up their country to the Spaniards,—the Prince was enabled to succeed in his ambitious enterprizes. To the party, therefore, that had forwarded his views he willingly gave all the weight of his influence, and that of the States General, the majority of whom, in virtue of the late unlawful

But men endued with wisdom will be summoned to this

changes effected in the Provinces, were favourable, not only to Calvinism, but to any measure which the Prince might think fit to propose.—It was in allusion to the revolution, thus craftily completed, that Bogerman, as president of the Synod of Dort, told Episcopius, in a sarcastic style, "You may remember what you told the Foreign Divines in your letter to them, that *there had of late been a great metamorphosis in the State.* You are no longer Judges and men in power, but persons under citation." (HALES'S LETTERS.)

In such a state of affairs, an ordinance of government was easily obtained for convening a National Synod, which was to consist of native Divines appointed by the different classes and presbyteries, of civil deputies chosen out of each province by the States, and of Foreign Divines deputed by such Churches as had adopted both the platform and the doctrine of Geneva. The temper and intolerant conduct of the various ecclesiastical meetings with whom rested the inland appointments, may be seen in the preceding life. And time had not mollified their intolerant principles: For, under the new order of things, and with the sanction of the fresh race of magistrates, they were emboldened to effect a schism in many of the chief towns, and forcibly to exclude the Arminian ministers from the churches which they occupied. In other towns, in which these bold practices could not be attempted with any probability of success, they employed the ecclesiastical arms of the *classes, provincial Synods,* and other packed vestry-meetings, the members of which (consisting generally of Calvinists,) summoned before them all the chief Arminian pastors in the various districts, accused them of holding heterodox opinions on the subject of Predestination, and suspended or expelled them from the ministry. This work of expulsion and suspension was carried on by the dominant party, even during the time in which the fate of Arminianism was in a course of determination by the Synod of Dort: So that, had that far-famed and reverend assembly decided in favour of a toleration of the Arminian Doctrines, the minor church-meetings had left few ministers of that persecuted denomination to profit from such a decision. The Calvinistic account of this summary and iniquitous process is thus given, in the Preface to the Acts of the National Synod: "And since there were several pastors in that province, [Guelderland] some of whom had been *suspected* of many other errors *beside the Five Points of the Remonstrants,*—others of them had illegally intruded into the office of the ministry,—while others were men of profligate habits; certain persons of this description being cited before the [provincial] Synod [of Guelderland and Zutphen, held at Arhheim, in July, 1618,] were suspended from the ministry for some of the before-mentioned reasons, and *by no means on account of the opinion contained in the Five Points of the Remonstrants,* which was reserved for the cognizance of the National Synod. The trial of the rest of these men being dismissed in the name of the Synod, was committed to a deputation from their body, to whom the States added certain of their own delegates. When they had fully investigated the cases of these men in their classes, they suspended some of them from the ministry, and entirely removed others." They were exceedingly desirous to induce a belief among their cotemporaries and to convey it to posterity, that not one of these persecuted ministers was molested on account of THE FIVE POINTS: In the compass of a page after this quotation, they repeat the same solemn asseveration in three different forms. The last of them is too remarkable to be omitted: Speaking of a Committee appointed by the Synod of South Holland, which met in Oct. 1618, they say, "But it was expressly enjoined upon this deputation, that they should not pass a censure upon any minister on account of any opinion contained in the FIVE POINTS of the Remonstrants, because the adjudication of those POINTS was to be reserved untouched for the National Synod. Although this deputation condemned a great number of ministers in general, even during the sitting of the National Synod, by suspending some of them from the office of pastors, and by entirely removing others from the

Synod, and will be admitted into it,—men who are well

ministry, for the before-mentioned most serious causes, [which were, *profane lives, turbulent conduct, Socinian errors, and illegal calls to the pastoral functions*,] yet they marked no man with any censure for his sentiments on the Five Points, as may be clearly shewn from the account of their transactions." From these very transactions it will be impossible for an unprejudiced person to draw any other conclusion than one,—which is, that had not the greater part of the sufferers been pious Remonstrants, unproved surmises would not in many of their cases have been accounted sufficient reasons for their suspension, nor would tainted evidence have been industriously sought against others that were expelled. That such men as the two Geerstangs were properly excluded from the ministry, cannot be denied; but the errors of those individuals, if they be correctly reported, had just as much to do with the distinguishing tenets of the Remonstrants as with those of the Manichees. They were men that would have been ejected from the bosom of any church that had a due regard to purity of doctrine, and they were not permitted by the Remonstrants to associate with them: But their cases were at that time brought prominently forwards, that they might serve as a veil to other darker and more malignant proceedings.—In the very able memorial which the Remonstrants, on their arrival at the Synod, presented to the foreign members, it is justly observed, respecting those who were accused of having taught, beside the Five Points, those doctrines which were contrary to the fundamentals of faith: "Such particular cases do not in any manner affect the common cause of the Remonstrants, but concern those alone who may be found guilty of them. Nor are we averse to the issuing of ecclesiastical censures against such persons, provided they be lawfully put upon their trials and fairly heard in defence of themselves against such charges."

Because the members of the regular provincial Synods could not be long absent from their respective congregations, such galloping commissions as these, endowed with ample powers, were appointed to traverse every province in which Arminianism had been planted; and they soon shewed to the world the most compendious method of rooting out reputed Heresies. Their track through the land resembled that of the Angel of destruction; it was marked by anguish, mourning, and desolation. Nor did the evil consequences of these unparalleled Calvinistic practices terminate with that generation; for their pernicious example served as a precedent to their brethren in England. When Calvinism, in the form of Presbyterianism and Independency, had attained the supremacy in this country during the Inter-regnum, the celebrated TRIERS and EJECTORS and the Committee for Scandalous Ministers, were constituted on the same plan, and became, for the time being, the extirpators of Arminianism.—After this detail, so well deduced and established from the Synodical documents, few words will suffice to point out the purely Calvinistic constitution of the Synod of Dort. When very few Remonstrant ministers remained in the land, except such as were ejected from the Church or under suspension, it was no difficult matter to procure an assemblage of men that were of one heart respecting the main object that was then sought to be accomplished.

On this subject Dr. Heylin has very pertinently remarked: "It is reported, that at the end of the Conference between the Protestants and Papists, in the first convocation of Queen Mary's reign, the Protestants were thought to have had the better, as being more dextrous in applying and enforcing some texts of scripture than the others were; and that, thereupon, they were dismissed by Weston the Prolocutor, with this short come-off: *You have the* WORD, *and we have the* SWORD. His meaning was, that what the Papists wanted in the strength of argument, they would make good by other ways,—as afterwards indeed they did by fire and faggot. The like is said to have been done by the Contra-Remonstrants, who, finding themselves at this Conference [held at the Hague, in 1611,] to have had the worst, and not to have thrived much better by their *pen*-comments than in that of the *tongue*, betook them-

qualified for a seat in it by the sanctity of their lives, and

selves to other courses; vexing and molesting their opposites in their Classes or Consistories, endeavouring to silence them from preaching in their several churches, or otherwise to bring them unto public censure." Having described the arbitrary conduct of the Prince of Orange, and the changes in the provincial governments which he effected, he adds: "This alteration being thus made, the Contra-Remonstrants thought it a high point of wisdom to keep their adversaries down, now they had them under, and to effect that by a National Council, which they could not hope to compass by their own authority: To which end the States General appointed a National Synod to be held at Dort, ... a synod much like that of Trent, in the motives to it, as also in the managing and conduct of it. For as neither of them was assembled till the sword was drawn, the terror whereof was able to effect more than all other arguments: So neither of them was concerned to confute but to condemn their opposites."

The *description* of Foreign Divines to be invited, completely excluded the Lutherans, and all those who had adopted the primitive Episcopal form of church-government. Nothing, therefore, except ulterior political objects, could have induced King James to act in a manner so perfectly anomalous, as to depute Episcopalian Divines to a Synod purposely composed of representatives from those Calvinistic Churches that had adopted the Presbyterian form of church-government. Dr. Heylin, who was chaplain to Charles his son and unfortunate successor, avows, more than once, these state-reasons as the sole motives of that monarch. In one part of his *Quinquarticular History*, he says, "So that King James, considering the present breach, as tending to the utter ruin of those States, and more particularly to the Prince of Orange, his most dear ally, thought it no small piece of king-craft, to contribute towards the suppression of the weaker party, [the Arminians,] not only by blasting them, in the said Declaration, with reproachful names, but sending such Divines to the assembly at Dort, as he was sure would be sufficiently active in their condemnation."

The respectable Divines deputed by the King, were entrusted with only a small part of these reasons of state; and some of them soon shewed, by their amiable simplicity, that they were not fit to be entrusted with many secrets of that kind. For good Bishop Hall, then Dean of Worcester, in the very first Latin sermon delivered before the reverend Synod, blabbed out with much artlessness a portion of the secret instructions which had been given; and, for this pardonable breach of the laws of diplomacy, received a caution, which he interpreted into a reprimand, from the King's Ambassador at the Hague. The worthy Dean, who met with many other circumstances which were painful to a conscientious mind, (and which he little expected to find when he penned the paragraphs quoted in the 70th page of the preceding LIFE,) soon quitted Dort under a plea of ill health, but evidently under a feeling of disgust at what he had both seen and felt in that early stage of the business. For Mr. Hales states, at the conclusion of one of his letters from Dort, "Mr. Dean went away to the Hague, *giving notice to no man*. I understood not till dinner that day of any intent he had to go. I wished him an ill journey for this discourtesy; but I hope he had a good one." His successor was Doctor Thomas Goad, who (as Bishop Hall would probably have done, had he remained longer at the Synod,) changed his sentiments on the subjects there debated; not immediately, but after having for some years revolved in his mind the arguments which each party had adduced. Hales was chaplain to the Ambassador, and though ostensibly invested with no official authority, was employed to report to his Excellency the progress of the Synodical business, and any secret intelligence which the Calvinistic conclave might not wish to be divulged, even to intimate friends who were not members of their body, but which a man of talents resident in such a place has generally, by one method or other, the power to elicit. He also received the germs of con-

their general experience,—men burning with zeal for God and

version from Calvinism during his abode at Dort, according to Mr. Anthony Farindon's letter, which the excellent Bishop Pearson prefixed to his edition of Hales's *Golden Remains*. "You may please to take notice," says Farindon, "that in his younger days he was a Calvinist, and even then when he was employed at that Synod; and, at the well pressing by Episcopius of the 16th verse in the Third Chapter of the gospel by St. John, *There I bid John Calvin good night!* as he has often told me." But, in his letters to Sir D. Carleton, there is no appearance of any sudden change of sentiment: It is most probable, that, like Dr. Goad and every man of sense that enjoyed such a fine opportunity, he then deserted the most glaring inconsistencies of Calvin's scheme; and, after some further reflection, adopted the tenets of Arminius.

Hales seems to have been succeeded in his confidential agency, by Walter Balcanqual, a Scotch Calvinist, who was deputed to the Synod, ostensibly, as a representative of the Church of Scotland; but in what relation he and the English Divines stood, will be learnt at the conclusion of this paragraph. He it was who gave the Ambassador secret information of the differences that existed among the British Divines respecting the second article of the Synod of Dort,—the extent of Christ's redemption. In his next letter, he writes thus to his excellency: "Though your Lordship's letters caused some anger here with the informer, *who was unknown to them*, yet, believe it, your Lordship hath done a work worthy of your honour," &c. In another letter he says: "Frequent admonitions and exhortations rather from your Lordship, or by your Lordship's means procured to the President, for prudence and wariness, and keeping the bond of peace, *may hinder much indiscretion in this Synod;* in which as I hope your Lordship will not be wanting, so, by God's grace, I shall not be wanting *to give your Lordship all convenient information.*" For these and other services of a similar nature, the Ambassador was very kind to him; as may be perceived by the following sentence in which he vindicated him, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, against a false charge of slovenliness: —"I do not find by what I hear from Dort, or what I observed here, [at the Hague,] that Mr. Balcanqual doth give any just subject for the report which is raised of *undecency in apparel;* but, on the contrary, that, *in all respects, he gives much satisfaction.*" In Balcanqual's very excellent abridgment of the concluding transactions of the Synod, after all the political purposes had been accomplished for which the British Deputies had been convened, they for the first time explained to the other members of the Synod, that they had come there, not as the representatives of the English and Scotch Churches, but only as the commissioners of their sovereign.—See the concluding note.

This was the developement of that notable "piece of king-craft" to which Heylin alludes. King James was himself not unfriendly to the doctrine of *conditional predestination:* He also knew the liberal construction of the public formularies of the Established Church, and that, as a proof of their excellence in this respect, both Arminians and Calvinists were accustomed to appeal to them, as we are at this day, in support of their several opinions. It was therefore one of his most particular charges to the Divines whom he deputed to the Synod, that they should not assist in deciding any thing that had been left undetermined by the Church of England; and that while they entered into the measures to be adopted by the Synod for humbling the Arminians, they should be particularly guarded in withholding their sanction from every doctrine which seemed repugnant to General Redemption. Much to their honour, the agents of their sovereign observed these directions; and his Majesty ordered matters so well, by means of his Ambassador, as to secure them from all liability to future ecclesiastical censure on their return to this country. The chief difficulty to be apprehended, was, their introduction to the Synod ostensibly as representatives of their different churches, when they were, in reality, only his Majesty's agents for accomplishing a particular

for the salvation of their human brethren, and inflamed with the love of truth and peace. * Into such a choice assembly

object. But Sir D. Carleton, by means of a state juggle, to which their High Mightinesses willingly became parties, smoothed their entrance into the Synod. The elder Brandt, without being aware of the true reason of this transaction, gives the following relation of it: "Then the foreign Divines were asked, Whether they had any credentials to produce to the Synod? But the lay-commissioners answered for them, that they had already presented them to the States General; and that some of them had likewise brought credentials to his Excellency, by which they had proved their deputation. This answer contented the Synod. The States themselves had also written to their Commissioners at Utrecht, to be careful in not suffering the English and Genevan Divines to be pressed to produce letters of credence to the Synod; their High Mightinesses having considered the presentation of those documents to themselves to be amply sufficient. These Divines therefore had no more questions addressed to them on this subject. But this circumstance appeared very strange to some persons, because on former occasions no ecclesiastical deputy would have been admitted to a Synod, if he brought with him no other commission than one from the civil powers, and if he even scrupled about producing that. But since the members of the Synod had received assurances, that these foreigners favoured the Contra Remonstrant party, they overlooked all minor considerations at this season. However, the deputies of Geneva produced their commission." Hales also gives the following account of Balcanqual's introduction, about five weeks after the opening of the Synod: "On Thursday in the morning, the Synod being met, the first thing done was the admission of the Scottish Deputy in this manner: He was brought to the Synod-house by the two scribes, and met at the door by two of the Deputies for the States, and by them conducted to his seat, which is a little seat made under the English seats, where he sits alone. When he was sate, the Præses welcomed him in the name of the Synod. *Then were the Letters from the States read*, which were to stand instead of Synodical letters: For, otherwise, the custom is here, that he that comes to be a member of the Synod, *brings Letters of credence from the Church that deputes him.*" Having thus surreptitiously, and contrary to all ecclesiastical usage, obtained an entrance into this assembly, they assisted, like regularly accredited members, in the predetermined condemnation of the Arminians, without prejudice to the tenets of the Churches of England and Scotland, that were not in the least implicated in their decisions. This artful and paltry trick, so worthy of that occasion, is generally either misunderstood or overlooked by those Calvinistic writers who treat on this subject. They wilfully or ignorantly consider all the opinions delivered by the English Divines at Dort, as the standard opinions of the Established Church, propounded according to its instructions by its own deputies: When the truth is, that the sentiments which they delivered, and their appearance at that Synod, received no more sanction from the Church of England than from the Church of Rome. In conclusion, it ought to be stated, in justice to the character of the British Divines, that they do not seem to have been aware of the informality of their introduction, or of the reasons for it: This affair was entirely under the management of the King's Ambassador, who furnished them with instructions on every emergency, according to the progress of the business and the agitation of particular questions.

* Lovers of truth and peace were the patrons, as well as the members, of the Synod of Dort,—but they were such only in a certain sense. For their love of *truth* (that is, of Unconditional Predestination,) was evinced, by the choice of the members convened to the Synod, all of whom, with two or three exceptions, were high Predestinarians: Their love of *peace* was manifested, by reducing to obedience and submission all those who ventured to utter a word in favour of General Redemption.

all those persons will be admitted who are acknowledged for any probable reason to possess the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit

The clergy of the principality of Anhalt were not invited to the Synod, because their opinions were understood to be similar to those of the Remonstrants, the ancient confession adopted by their churches being decided on the subject of conditional Predestination.

In the original order for holding the Synod, and in the list appended to it, as they were both passed by the States General, no mention was made of inviting any other Churches, except those of England, France, the Palatinate, Hesse and Switzerland; and it was a matter postponed for further deliberation, whether any invitation should be transmitted to the Churches of Bremen, Brandenburgh, Geneva and Nassau.

The divines of Bremen were viewed as men inclined too much to moderate counsels, and on that account improper representatives in an assembly that intended to carry every proposition with the unanimity of force. The manner in which their opinions were attempted to be prematurely drawn out of them, and the treatment which they received from a sanguinary bigot, may be seen in the 75th page of the preceding life. Yet, after some most severe dragooning by the brow-beating President, his fellow-traveller Gomarus, and other bitter Calvinists, Martinius became tolerably obsequious; and since the overwhelming majority were resolved to endure no opposers, he considered it the safest plan, to swim with the stream in silence, as his colleague Crocius had usually done from the commencement. The handsome manner in which the English and Scotch Divines interposed in favour of this persecuted individual, who was the common object of assault with all the supra-lapsarians then convened,—is every way worthy of the British character. Our Ambassador at the Hague also addressed a letter on the subject to Bogerman the President, who immediately after the receipt of it, with the Calvinistic sycophancy of that age, became all at once polite, mild, and obsequious. Martinius was a Divine of deep learning, and of as great moderation. His opinions on the *Five Points* were of a pacificatory cast, and may be said to have been nearly allied to those of our Richard Baxter. No man can peruse the confidential letters which he addressed to his friends about this period, without feeling much sympathy for such an exemplary and upright person, whose conscience the zealots of that day attempted to force, and whose sentiments, because they did not rise up as high as the standard of Calvinian orthodoxy, were unjustly represented as heretical.

The Divines of Brandenburgh were the last of those invited. Indeed no invitation was transmitted to them, till the state and temper of their churches had been ascertained with tolerable accuracy; and when it was generally thought that the Deputies from that Electorate were tractable and would follow in the train of the Contra-Remonstrants, it was determined to summon them to the Synod. Christopher Pelargus and John Bergius were chosen the Deputies of those Churches. But as Pelargus had become Calvinist and deserted the Lutherans, this powerful body opposed his mission. It would truly have appeared a most preposterous circumstance for a Lutheran community to sanction, by the presence of any of their body, the proceedings of an ecclesiastical Council that had been convened for the avowed purpose of crushing sentiments similar in some respects to their own. Towards the close of the Synod, the Marquis of Brandenburgh, eldest son of the Elector, addressed a letter of apology to the States General: It was read in the Synod of Dort on the 18th of March, 1619, and stated, as an excuse for the absence of the two Deputies, that "their journey had been prevented by the sickness of Pelargus, and other accidents. He begged that the decrees of the Synod might be forwarded to him as soon as they were finished. That they would be agreeable to the Confession of the Reformed Churches, he had no doubt; in which case, they might be subscribed by the clergy in the electoral dominions, and thus

of discernment between truth and falsehood, between good

serve to obviate the inconvenience occasioned by the absence of the deputies." Bergius was very glad, that he had not been deputed on this most ungracious business, as appears by the following letter which he addressed to Martin Fusselius, a Brandenburgh clergyman, on the 13th of February, 1619, while the Synod was still sitting:—"I rejoice that I am not present at the Dutch Synod; for I can see nothing transacted in that assembly which is worthy of such immense preparations, labour, and expence. Agricola has acquainted me by letter with almost all the particulars. I am not only certain that no benefit will accrue from the Synod, but that the flames of a greater evil will be excited by it; which, although now perhaps suppressed by the power of adversaries, lies hidden in the embers, and will burst forth in a short time with the greater impetuosity. And undoubtedly it is impossible for us to deny, that the Remonstrants have been treated with too much unfairness. What man will ever think of charging it against them as a crime, that they would not acknowledge for their presidents and judges, the Bogermans, the Gomars, the Sibrands, and others, whom they have always accounted their most bitter enemies? How can we [the Lutherans] bring such an accusation against them, when we refuse to have Pontiffs and Cardinals for our judges? But what act could be more ridiculous, after the Remonstrants were commanded to retire, than for their judges to occupy themselves for whole days afterwards in declaiming against them, and in boldly refuting their arguments? That is an occupation which does not appear to me of such great importance, as to induce one, for the sake of joining in it, to undertake a long and late journey in the very depth of winter. But this is the sort of proceedings of which those who attended have been witnesses. At our next autumnal fair, I expect to see exposed for sale the satirical remarks of the Papists, the protestations of the Remonstrants, and the refutations of the Synod.—May God have mercy upon his church! The only hope of safety which remained, was in the reverend fathers of the Synod shewing themselves desirous to reconcile parties and to unite discordant spirits: When I was disappointed in this, I entertained no expectations of any thing safe or beneficial."—Such were the very proper congratulations of Bergius on having happily escaped from the degrading drudgery of a Synodical Deputy!

It was for some time a matter of doubt with the leading men in Holland, whether they ought to invite the Divines of Geneva and Nassau, two of the greatest nurseries of Calvinism, to be present at the Synod. The cause of this demur was, to avoid the appearance of partiality, which they justly thought all the world would have imputed to them had they convened an assembly consisting only of Calvinistic Doctors. To keep up this semblance of moderation, the Synodical Summons was not transmitted to those Divines when they were sent to the churches of other states and countries. But when the schemes of secular aggrandisement and political power which are recounted in the preceding life, (*Appendix* P,) had succeeded beyond their utmost wishes, they no longer studied to '*avoid the appearance of evil*,' but boldly summoned all those Divines about whose presence at the Synod they had formerly hesitated. This was a most notable and certain method of procuring a strict Calvinian uniformity in the members. On this topic, Hales, in his letters from Dort to the English Ambassador at the Hague, says, "For a general confession of faith, at least so far as those churches stretch who have delegates here in the Synod, I think his project very possible, there being no point of faith in which they differ."

Great interest was made at the court of France, to procure the attendance of Deputies from the Reformed Churches of that country; but the king of France prohibited the Protestant clergy within his dominions from becoming members of the Synod, or assisting at its deliberations. For this refusal various reasons have been assigned: But those who are conversant with the history of the Low Countries at that remarkable crisis, will attribute it solely to state-

and evil, and those who promise to abide by the Scriptures,

policy. The King of France had by his Ambassador wisely recommended a plan of mutual toleration between the Calvinists and the Arminians,—a measure which the latter particularly desired. But this advice did not accord with the ambitious designs which Prince Maurice cherished against the liberties of his country, and in which he was encouraged by the most absolute monarch of the house of Stuart that ever swayed the British sceptre. Still less did that advice suit the exterminating views of the Dutch Calvinistic clergy, who, although they had formerly been thorns in the sides of Prince Maurice, were content to lay aside for a season their hot contests about worldly dominion, provided they could by this means establish the supremacy of Calvinism and suppress Arminianism. These circumstances very naturally caused the French to be viewed as favourers of the Arminians, and the English of the Calvinists. This view of the subject is established in a very striking manner, by a letter from the English Ambassador to the Archbishop of Canterbury, dated 14 Jan. 1619, which, at that early period, shews the drift of his instructions respecting the affairs of the Remonstrants, and the *predetermination* of Prince Maurice and his advisers about the punishment to be inflicted on the cited persons: "The same day I brought him [Dr. Goad] to his Excellency [Prince Maurice] and Count William, as I had formerly done the rest of the Divines. And there I took the boldness to read unto them, out of your Grace's letters, his Majesty's and your Grace's *judgments of the Remonstrants and their opinions;* which, being so clearly set down, his Excellency said, was *Bon François!*, and, if I be not deceived, *in conformity to what your Grace doth wish.* When the Synod hath done with the Remonstrants' opinions, this course will be taken with their persons: That the chief ring-leaders (as Uitenbogardt, Episcopius, Grevinchovius, and Vorstius, with some others,) will be branded with some note of infamy, and thrust out both of Church and State: Some others of the chief will have their entertainments [salaries] continued, but [will] be suspended in their functions: The rest, by reason of want *of fit men* to supply their charges, will be continued, in hope *the example of others* will keep them within their bounds. This course is like to be taken, *rebus sic stantibus*, [in the present posture of affairs.]—But if the French Ambassador's endeavours for *the delivery of our prisoners*, (about which they have now had two public audiences,) or if *their private practices in favour of the Arminian party* should take any place, *we must then expect a mutation.*"—By those persons whom the Ambassador here calls *our prisoners*, are to be understood Barneveldt, Grotius, and Hogerbeets, three of the most eminent men and upright statesmen of the Low Countries, who had always patronized the holy cause of Arminianism, and who, for their patriotic services to their native country, had, in defiance of all law, been arrested and imprisoned by the orders of Prince Maurice. Yet, after all the arbitrary measures which that Prince had adopted, affairs were not in a state of perfect security; for our Ambassador intimated, that, if French influence prevailed, "a mutation might be expected." The subjoined concluding extract shews still more plainly the political motives which were at work throughout the whole of those troubles: "And as they [the United Provinces] may go on, without *arriere-pense, in the course wherewith his Majesty hath so well and so constantly aided them by his countenance;* so my hope is, that his Majesty will in time *reap* more assuredly *the fruits of these mutations*, in that he is pleased *to use patience until they be better ripened.*"

Whosoever casts his eye over the list of the Foreign Divines that composed this last of Protestant Councils, will find scarcely one man who had not distinguished himself by his decided opposition to the doctrine of Conditional Predestination, and who was not consequently disqualified from acting the part of an impartial judge of the existing religious differences, or that of a peace-maker. This caused the famous Daniel Tilenus to observe, that "no persons were summoned to Dort who were not well known to be zealous pro-

that have been inspired by the same Holy Spirit.* Not only will ecclesiastics be admitted, but also laymen,—whether they be entitled to any superiority on account of the dignity of the office which they sustain, or whether they be persons in private stations. Not only will the representatives of one party, or of some parties, be admitted, but deputies from all the parties that disagree,—whether they have been defenders of the conflicting opinions that are at issue, or whether they have never publicly explained their own sentiments either in discourse or by writing.† But it is of the utmost consequence, that this sentence should, after the manner of Plato, be inscribed in letters of gold on the porch of the building in which this sacred meeting holds its sittings: "LET NO ONE THAT IS NOT DESIROUS OF PROMOTING THE INTERESTS OF TRUTH AND PEACE, ENTER THIS HALLOWED DOME!" It is my sincere and earnest wish, that God would "place his angel with a flaming two-edged sword at the entrance of this paradise," in which DIVINE TRUTH and the lovely CONCORD of the Church will be the subjects of discussion; and that he would by his Angel drive away all those who might be animated with a spirit averse to truth and concord, while the sacred guardian repeats, in tones terrific and a voice of thunder, the warning words used by the followers of Pythagoras and Orpheus preparatory to the commencement of their sacred rites:

Far, far from hence, ye multitude profane!

The situation and other circumstances of the town or city appointed for holding such a Council, must not be neglected.

moters of Calvin's predestination. In former ages, men were accustomed, *first* to go to the councils, and *then* to declare their sentiments: just the reverse of this is the practice in our days, for no one could be admitted into the Synod of Dort unless he had previously manifested the bearing of his opinions." The complexion of the inland or Dutch Divines, has been described in a preceding note.

* If the Calvinistic clergy of Holland had been desirous of "abiding by the divinely-inspired scriptures," a National Synod would have been held in the year 1608, and Arminianism would in that case have acquired a complete triumph. But the Calvinists, aware of the weakness of their cause on scriptural grounds, especially when opposed by such an adversary as Arminius, refused to be deprived of the aid afforded to them by some expressions in the Confession and Catechism, and would neither suffer those formularies to be subjected to the proposed revision, nor have the existing differences adjusted by the word of God alone. On this topic see the preceding Appendix V.

† Arminius in this passage very equitably proposes, that *the representatives of both parties* should be admitted into a Synod that was rightly constituted.

It should be so accommodated to the convenience of those who have to assemble in it, that neither the difficulty of approach-

But it will be perceived from the preceding notes, by what kind of ecclesiastical management the Remonstrants had been excluded from having any deputies in the Synod of Dort. So completely had the Calvinistic plan of exclusion succeeded, that three of the members from Utrecht were the only Remonstrants in that Synod. The reason of their being there at all, was, because that province was almost equally divided between Remonstrant and Calvinist Churches, and it had been agreed that three of each denomination should be summoned. But so obnoxious were the persons as well as the doctrines of the Remonstrants to their adversaries, that they would not allow even those three individuals to have a place in the seat of judgment: In the twenty-fourth session it was unanimously declared, that they could only be reputed as cited persons; however, as the Acts express it, "that this Synod might not be exposed to calumnies, *as if they wished to exclude them*, it was allowed them to sit among the judges" on five conditions, the chief of which were, "that while the affairs of the Remonstrants were under discussion, they should not disturb the proceedings of the Synod by *unseasonable interruptions*, and not acquaint their party with any thing done or said in the Synod, which concerned their cause." Two of them, after a day's deliberation, united themselves with their suffering brethren; and the third, who was a layman, had seen enough of the partial conduct of that venerable assembly to induce him to absent himself from their further deliberations.

As the Remonstrants formed no part of the members convened, it was debated, in the fourth session, how they ought to be summoned. It was proposed and resolved, that a letter should be composed and sent to the whole body, that they might depute three out of each province as deputies to the Synod. The president Bogerman then enquired, if all the Remonstrants were to be admitted: The president of the Lay Commissioners answered, that the ecclesiastical president and the secretaries should receive a private explanation from him respecting their numbers. In the interview which the two presidents and the secretaries had together, they concerted matters so well, that next day the preceding resolution for writing to the whole body was withdrawn for amendment; and it was finally agreed, that it should be left to the determination of the Lay Commissioners what persons, and how many, should be convened. These gentlemen selected thirteen of the Remonstrants, to each of whom they addressed a letter of citation, commanding them to appear before the Synod, "within fourteen days after the receipt of it without any tergiversation, excuse, or exception,—that in it they might freely propose, explain, and defend the before-mentioned Five Points as far as they were able and should deem to be necessary."—In the mean time the Remonstrants, without knowing the resolution of the Synod, had deputed three of their body from Leyden, to obtain leave for their appearance at the Synod, in a competent number and under safe-conduct, to defend their cause. On making their request known to the Lay Commissioners, they were informed of the resolution which had passed the Synod only the preceding day. To which they replied, that it was unreasonable to cite those to justify themselves who were both ready and willing to come of their own accord; and that if they persisted in proceeding with their plan of citation, they would by that act furnish just cause, not only to them, but to all good men, to entertain strange notions and suspicions of the Synodical proceedings. Not being permitted to choose those men from their own body whom they deemed the best qualified to state and defend their cause, they accounted it an additional hardship, that their enemies should assume that unlawful authority to themselves. But neither at that time nor afterwards, when they wished to add two of the most accomplished of the brethren to their number, were their representations of the least avail. The Commissioners indeed gave them a verbal promise, "that they might depend upon having the safe-conduct which they required; for none of them should be

ing it, nor the length of the journey to it, should operate as a hindrance on any of the members deputed. It should be a

detained by the Synod for an ecclesiastical matter." How ill this promise was kept, will be afterwards seen. As a specimen of the manner in which the clergy and Lay Commissioners played into each others' hands, we subjoin the following account from Hales's Letters: "The Remonstrants required especially these things—*First*, that all of their party throughout the Provinces might be allowed to make one body, and out of it to depute such as they thought good, whom they might send to the Synod to plead in their behalf. *Secondly*, that it might be lawful for them instead of some of those who were written unto, to substitute others. *Thirdly*, that Uitenbogardt and Grevinchovius might have safe-conduct and free access to the Synod. The delegates immediately sent for the Præses, the two Assessors, and the two Scribes, and required their opinion in this business. For the *first point*, the clergymen thought it not to be granted, as being feared would be prejudicial to the Belgic Churches. The deputies for the seculars answered, that they had given Episcopius this answer. For the *two latter*, the clergy thought that if it pleased the seculars it might be done. Reply was made by the seculars, that they were men infamous, tumultuous, on whom the church censure, for Grevinchovius had extended, and therefore they would permit them no place in the Synod. So was Episcopius and his company dismissed. This was a thing *done only in private:* the Synod had no notice of it, neither is it recorded in any public register. What more passed between the seculars and the Remonstrants at this meeting is not known, and the *Clergy know no more than it pleased the Seculars to impart*. Of this I heard nothing, till by reason of your Lordship's letters I enquired into it."

A few days before the arrival of these thirteen persons, that were cited as Heretics or criminals, and had to combat an assembly of Divines and others above ten times the number of themselves, the president Bogerman, after all his deep-laid schemes, had certain misgivings of mind concerning the result. On the second of December, according to Mr. Hales, he came privately "to my Lord Bishop, and under *benedicite* told him, that it was thought the Remonstrants would become suitors to the secular Deputies, for some greater respect in the Synod, than it is likely otherwise they should have: and that for this they would use the English as mediators. Then, that they would call in question the right of his presidentship, as being made only by the Provincials, without any respect had unto the Foreigners. To this my Lord Bishop replied, that for the *first*, since they were members of the Synod, they would not do any thing clancularly, without the consent and privity of the whole company. To the *second* he answered, that hitherto they [the English] had acknowledged him for their Præses, and so they would continue to do, notwithstanding any objection might be fancied; so that of them he might secure himself."

On the Sixth of December these valiant defenders of the truth arrived, and requested, by a deputation, to be allowed a few days to unpack their books, arrange their papers, &c. But they were commanded immediately to appear in a body before the Synod, and to prefer their own request. They were introduced by their brethren of Utrecht, and ordered to sit down at a long table placed in the middle of the Hall. Episcopius then, with the permission of the president, addressed an apostolic greeting to the Synod, and, having repeated the request previously made, he said, that "the cited Remonstrants appeared there to defend their good and righteous cause before that venerable assembly, by reasons and arguments drawn from the word of God,—or else to be confuted and better informed from the same word. In reference to the favour which they had asked, they left it to the discretion of the Commissioners of the States General, being ready on their parts, immediately and without delay, to engage in a conference, if that should be required." Then were they desired to withdraw into a chamber prepared for them adjoining the hall

place free from danger and violence, and secured against all surprise and ambuscades, in order that those who are sum-

of the Synod. After some time spent in deliberation, they were recalled, and informed by the president, that they would be expected at the Synod next morning at nine o'clock. He added, according to Hales, "that they came not to conference, neither did the Synod profess themselves an adverse party against them. Conferences had been heretofore held to no purpose. They ought to have heeded the words of the letters by which they were *cited*. They were called, not to conference, but to propose their opinions with their reasons, and leave it to the Synod to judge of them." Episcopius replied, that it was not necessary so nicely to criticize the word CONFERENCE, and that they had come there with no other view than to treat about the doctrines which were controverted, according to the summons which they had received.

This haughty reception furnished just reasons to the Remonstrants afterwards to complain, that "they had met with very unkind treatment at their first attendance in the Synod; many of the members would scarcely manifest common courtesy when they were introduced; the first greeting which they received was a reprimand for their late arrival; it was easy to gather, from the very looks of several of the members, their ill-will and partiality; the expressions addressed to many of them, were frequently as cutting as razors. When their adversaries were sure of having a majority of votes, and had the secular arm on their side, they refused to terminate the controversy in any other manner than by a Synodical decision; they cut off all hopes of enquiring after truth and detecting error by means of friendly debates and by a patient hearing of both parties: they compelled the Remonstrants to appear in an assembly in which their most violent enemies were the most numerous and powerful;—without treating them as equals, allowing them to sit with themselves, or admitting them (though such a small number) to an equal liberty of speaking,—but using them as criminals cited before the higher powers, by not allowing them to speak but when commanded, nor to answer but when asked, and then no further than they chose to permit, and by causing them to withdraw when they pleased to order and not to return till called.—And all this treatment after such a sudden and general revolution of affairs, both in Church and State, attended with such an increased hatred and contempt against them, as were sufficient to intimidate the stoutest hearts even in defending the best of causes, and entirely to incapacitate them from performing that necessary duty without the extraordinary aids of Divine Grace and the powerful assistance of God's Holy Spirit."

Such were the unavailing complaints of the Remonstrants, about the treatment which they at first received. But that was only the beginning of their sorrows.—On the first day of their appearance before the Synod, they waited upon several of the foreign members at their lodgings, and gave, as it became them, a christian salutation. They desired their good offices with the Lay Commissioners and the Synod to prevent their brethren and colleagues from being deprived of their ministry upon feigned pretences, by the deputies of the South Holland Synod, who were travelling through the country from church to church for that purpose. They likewise requested them, to contribute all in their power to mollify the rigour of the Contra-Remonstrants, and to bring matters to a fair and equitable hearing. They experienced a friendly reception from almost all the foreign divines; and finding them generally to be extremely ignorant of the late events in the United Provinces, they presented two able documents to each of them: One of these papers comprised the state of the existing differences and a defence of their doctrines; the other was a manuscript narrative of recent occurrences in the Low Countries.

The next day, Dec. 7th, the Remonstrants were called in, when after Episcopius had desired and obtained leave to speak, he uttered an oration, the delivery of which occupied nearly two hours, and which, on account of the noble sentiments contained in it, deserves to be recorded in letters of gold.

moned may come to it, remain in it, and return to their homes,

The gracefulness, force, and energy with which it was spoken, made such an impression on the auditory as drew tears from several of them, and even from some of the States' Deputies. This effect gave mighty umbrage to the choleric Bogerman, who, as president, according to Mr. Hales's account, "signified unto Episcopius, that, because there were in his speech many things considerable, he was therefore to deliver the copy of it. Episcopius replied, that he had none handsomely written: if the Synod would have patience, he would cause a fair transcript to be drawn for them. But this excuse would not serve; fair or foul, deliver it up he must, and so he did. The deputies for the politics signified, that since there were many things in it, which did as well concern the Seculars, as Ecclesiastics, they were to give it up subscribed with all their hands: which forthwith was done.—Then did the Præses tell them how much they were beholding to the Synod, that had so patiently heard them, notwithstanding that they had no leave granted them to speak, and that they ought to have expected the mandate of the Synod.—To this Episcopius replies, that he had required leave before he began to speak. 'True,' said the Præses, 'but you stayed not till leave was granted you. Besides,' said he, 'you are to know that no man may, no not of those that are the members of the Synod, offer to declaim without leave first had, and without manifesting the argument and drift of his speech.' "—The only answer which Episcopius gave to this remark, was, that he had been ignorant of the existence of such a law. Bogerman, however, continued his blustering speech, and declared how exceedingly unbecoming it was in them, to endeavour, at their first entrance into the Synod, to captivate and embitter the minds of the members with such a premeditated harangue, stuffed with false accusations against their brethren.—It is remarkable that Professor Barlæus, who wrote to a friend that evening an account of the discourse which passed between the President and Episcopius, agrees with Mr. Hales in stating the answer of Episcopius to be in substance, "that he had not another copy written out with sufficient neatness."

In the afternoon of that day, a trick was played off against Episcopius, which was every way unworthy of *honourable* men, much more of *Christians* and *Divines*: The Lay Commissioners sent for him, and asked him many questions, which with all the artlessness of an innocent and upright mind he answered. Their questions were apparently intended to elicit information, whether his speech, and the copy of it which he had given up to Bogerman, were nearly alike in sense and meaning. He said, they were the same, with the exception of a word or two; and added, that he had the first rough draft of it still by him, but it was so greatly interlined as scarcely to be intelligible to others. With his frank replies they seemed well satisfied; and, after exhorting him to labour for peace, they dismissed him in a friendly manner. Soon after, Heinsius, the Secretary of the Commissioners, came to the lodgings of Episcopius, and desired of him, in the name of one of the body, to have the perusal of the rough draft of which he had spoken. He delivered it up to Heinsius, under a promise that it should be speedily returned.—What use was made of it, will be seen in the proceedings of the 10th of December.

At the Session of that day, after some other business had been transacted, Bogerman intimated to the Synod, that the Remonstrants ought to be reminded of the purpose for which they had come, and required immediately to deliver in writing their sentiments on the Five Points. When they were called in, to be informed of this resolution, the President changed his tone, and thus violently accosted Episcopius: "You said lately, when you were commanded to deliver a copy of your speech, that you had no other. But it has since been discovered that you had another. I therefore exhort and admonish you, to manifest hereafter more sincerity towards the venerable Synod, and to speak with greater circumspection."—Episcopius said: "I gladly embrace this opportunity, to clear myself from the imputation of lying and insincerity, which has been cast upon me, and circulated through

in perfect safety. To secure these benefits, it will be neces-

the whole city. I never disowned having another copy in my possession: I only said that I had no other which was written out fairly enough. Why should I have denied it, when the contents of both the copies were the same, and when I delivered the minutes or rough draft the same day to secretary Heinsius, without being under any obligation so to do? How could I say, that I had no copy, when that which I am charged with denying, lay openly before me on the table, and might have been seen by every one when I was delivering my speech, because the greatest part of my auditors were seated on high benches, so as to overlook me and to see that I reached out another copy with an intention to deliver it?"—Edward Poppius also declared, that he and the rest of the cited Remonstrants who sate near him, and who were in the best situation for hearing what Episcopius said, were ready to testify to the truth of that expression.—Bogerman, however, insisted upon the truth of his own statement, and declared, that he did no injury to Episcopius, but simply related the matter of fact as he was sure it happened; and that all those who remembered it were able to testify the same.—Episcopius immediately desired, that the members who had such a remembrance of his expression, would immediately declare what they heard. But this promptitude of innocence to meet the foul charge, was quite unexpected, and created great confusion among the most violent men in the assembly. Some of the Lay Commissioners seem to have had a portion of honesty and fair-dealing about them; for when Bogerman in a fury was proceeding to interrogate several of the members on their recollection of the exact words which Episcopius had employed, the President of the Lay Commissioners was instructed to interpose his authority, and to order this frivolous discussion to cease.—But, on the second session afterwards, this attempt to impeach the veracity of Episcopius was renewed: and it is worthy of observation, that, *after the receipt of a docuwent from the Remonstrants, which created great uneasiness in the Synod, and retarded their operations*, the memories of several of the members were wonderfully strengthened. For, according to the Synodical Acts, "all of them declared, that they had *the sum and substance* of Episcopius's words quite fresh in their recollection. Some also said, that they had written with their pens *his formal expressions*, from which it was impossible to understand anything else except that *he had no other copy*; that, when he was urged immediately to exhibit it, he had replied, *It is not written with sufficient neatness, but is in a blotted state*, and that, after being commanded to deliver it up, whatever might be its condition, he had requested that the original might be restored to him, or an authentic transcript of it, *because it was but equitable, as he had none else, that he should retain a copy of his own oration.*—All those who could not recollect his formal expressions, testified, that *they had comprehended the meaning of Episcopius in the same manner as the President had done.*" In those Acts there is much more to the same effect; from which it plainly appears, that there were three varying accounts of this matter, which, worded as artfully as their secretaries could compose them, amounted to much uncertainty. Besides, at this distance of time, every impartial man will ask, "What benefit could Episcopius propose to himself by such an assertion?" He had given both copies up to his most inveterate enemies; and, in all their *weighty* deliberations about it, they never once mention, that any variation existed between them, or that any thing actually spoken was omitted in either of the copies. If any such discrepancy or omission had been discovered, these mighty men, who were adepts at magnifying trifles, would have recorded it in their Acts, for the instruction of generations then unborn. They, however, had a purpose to answer by it. In the absence of all real cause of blame, they invented this version of an unimportant fact, (which, by their own statement, rested on very doubtful authority,) that by the repetition of it they might injure the cause of the Remonstrants, and asperse their characters as persons altogether unworthy of credit. During

sary for a public pledge to be given to all the members and solemnly observed.

the ulterior proceedings of this grave Synod, the cited Remonstrants were often compelled to receive, with patience, this instance of imputed prevarication, and bad faith, from the lips of their persecutors.

In the same session, (Dec. 10.) after the President had ceased to speak about the two copies of the speech, he desired the Remonstrants to proceed with the chief affair—their explanation and defence of the Five Points. They requested leave to have a paper read by Episcopius. Bogerman would not consent to this; but the Lay President ordered another of the Remonstrants, Bernard Dwinglo, to read it. This very convincing document was addressed to the Synod, and consisted of two parts. It may be seen at full length in the Acts, and is in every respect worthy of the great men whose holy cause it defended. The FIRST PART declared, that the Remonstrants did not own the members of the Synod for lawful judges, because the great majority of them, with the exception of the foreign divines, were their professed enemies; and that most of the inland divines then assembled, as well as those whose representatives they were, had been guilty of the unhappy schism which was made in the churches of Holland, some of them having been the authors of it, while others had either actually fomented it, or consented to it by their silence, which could be interpreted into nothing less than tacit approbation. They subjoined several irrefragable arguments, expressed in manly and firm language, in support of this first part.—The SECOND PART contained the twelve qualifications, of which the Remonstrants thought a well-constituted Synod should consist. This part had been presented, some months before, to the States of Holland; and the observance of the stipulations proposed in it, they would gladly have obtained from the Synod,—averring that they were exceedingly equitable, and that the Protestants had offered similar conditions for the guidance of the Papists, and the Calvinists for the direction of the Lutherans. These twelve conditions were fortified by several testimonies from eminent Christian Divines,—from the grievances of the Protestants relative to the Council of Trent, the IRENICUM of Paræus, the ADMONITION of the Neustadt Divines composed by URSINUS, and from the writings of Gentiletus, Musculus, and Festus Hommius. The production of such a mass of evidence from writers of the Calvinistic persuasion, in favour of a toleration and moderate measures, and against the principle of *interested parties* usurping the place of *judges*,—gave dreadful offence to that powerful body in the Synod, and especially when they were charged with being at once plaintiff, judge, and jury. Hales says, it was "a long and tedious speech of two hours at the least," and such it would undoubtedly appear to a young and hot-headed Calvinist. At the close of it, the Remonstrants added: "Most reverend men, we do not propose these articles and conditions for the purpose of imperiously prescribing any thing to your reverences: we do it, that in a matter of such great importance we may free our consciences, as it becomes the pastors and faithful servants of Jesus Christ. If you deign to accede to them, we will betake ourselves with glad and cheerful minds to the matter in discussion.....But if this request be not granted to us, we shall console our spirits with the testimony of an approving conscience, and shall consider that we, in common with the most famous doctors of the Reformed Religion, have proposed most equitable conditions, and that your reverences have not entertained them. Our cotemporaries and posterity will agree with us in this our judgment."

No one can form an adequate conception of the scene which followed the reading of this document. Bogerman, the Remonstrants, the Lay President and the Commissioners, were warm interlocutors during that session and the succeeding one which was held in the afternoon of the same day. Some account of the discussion will be found at the close of this oration, immediately after the reprint of Bishop Womack's pamphlet. Bogerman laboured hard to

In this council the subjects of discussion will not be, the

shew, that, by denying the competency and impartial constitution of the tribunal before which they were summoned, they in reality were guilty of disaffection to the higher powers, who had appointed and convened the Synod; and that, by charging the majority of the members with being the authors of the schism, they had in effect accused the Prince of Orange and the States General, because those great personages had frequented the separate meetings. In reference to the latter circumstance, which exceedingly galled him and the inland divines, he said, "The proper time has not yet arrived for discussing it. But when it shall have been proved to the Synod, what kind of doctrine is sanctioned by the Church, those who have departed from it, and who are consequently guilty of the schism, will appear in their true colours. There are seasons in which it may be necessary for the people to separate from some of their pastors. If any heresy is publicly taught, it is the duty of a faithful ministry to give warning to the flock, that they may be upon their guard. But when the people have separated from such false teachers and begin to desire instruction and comfort, as was the case at the Hague, then it is the proper time to grant them a supply. And those who officiated to them ought not on that account to be divested of their privileges, or disqualified from judging of the doctrines in dispute." Charles Niellius, one of the Walloon ministers, answered in behalf of the Remonstrants, that though they acknowledged the authority of the States, and held the Synod in due estimation, yet it was as lawful for them to challenge this Synod, as for several of the Christian Fathers who challenged some of the ancient Councils, and their ancestors that of Trent. The laws themselves allowed men for certain reasons to challenge even sworn judges. But it was never known, that any law allowed parties to be judges. Nor was it equitable, that those who had previously separated from the Remonstrants, should sit in the Synod to try them, after they had by such separation prejudged their doctrine and entered into mutual engagements to procure its condemnation.—Episcopius then said, "Mr. President, if you were in our places and we in yours, would you submit to our judgment?" Bogerman replied, "If it had so happened, we must have endured it; and since government has ordered matters in a different way, it becomes you to bear it with patience." Episcopius rejoined, "It is one thing to acknowledge a person for a judge, and it is another to bear with patience the sentence which he may impose. We also will endure it; but our consciences cannot be persuaded to acknowledge you for the judges of our doctrines, since you are our *sworn* adversaries and have churches totally separated from ours."—The history of this separation will be found in Appendix P; and the confederacy to which both Niellius and Episcopius allude, will be seen in the long note appended to the conclusion of this oration.

This prolonged discussion, even as given in the highly-coloured and *ex parte* language of the Acts, was a most animated one, and is exceedingly interesting: In it the Remonstrants felt, that they had the mastery both in regard to temper and argument.—On the morning of the next day, the Remonstrants, after being called in, were urged by the Synod to present their ob[illegible]ions in writing against the Confession and Catechism. Before they [illegible]led to do that, they craved permission to read another document: [illegible] some demur, leave was granted, when Dwinglo read a paper which [illegible]nced thus: "The celebrated Paræus, in his *Irenicum*, prudently [illegible]s, that *he would advise no man to approach any Council in which the persons had to appear in the character of both adversaries and judges.*" [illegible] rest of the paper was occupied in wiping off the aspersions which had [illegible]n cast upon them in the four preceding sessions, and particularly the foul [illegible]harge of their want of respect for the constituted authorities of their country. They declared, that in case men of peaceable dispositions had been deputed to the Synod, (as the States General had intended,) and such men as had

jurisdictions, honours, and rights of precedence on the part of

never been concerned in making or promoting these unhappy divisions, they would have had little reason to offer exceptions against such a Synod. This document concluded with the following protest: "Wherefore, to argue no longer about this matter, all and each of us do by this express and solemn protest declare and make known to the whole of this Synod and to all Christendom, that, for the before-mentioned reasons, which are contained in a writing delivered by us and fortified by arguments, we do not own or account the present Synod, or the majority of it, for a lawful judge of our controversies, and that its decisions will possess no weight with us or our churches. Having thus previously made this protestation, we will now prepare ourselves for the business before us, on account of which we believe that we have been cited. We likewise request, that this writing, which contains our protest, may be inserted in the Synodical Acts."—On hearing this document read, and seeing the magnanimity of the Remonstrants under all the disadvantages which they encountered and the studied insults which they received, Professor Barlæus, who was among the spectators of this scene, exclaims in one of his letters, "When I heard these things, I admired the courage of the men. They were really intrepid, and spoke in the Synod, as equals with their equals. Their countenances were unruffled and serene, and they were prepared, as they confessed, to endure all extremities."

After the delivery of this protest, the Synod invented various methods to vex the cited Remonstrants and to impede the prosecution of their cause, the sum of which will be related in another part of these notes. Among those methods one of the most artful was, to ask them questions singly, and not in a body, with an evident design to entrap them in their answers. They had with the greatest injustice chosen those Remonstrants whom they thought proper, to be cited as guilty persons at the bar of the Synod, without the least regard to the useful or splendid qualifications of the individuals thus selected. Of the six prudent and accomplished men who had represented the Remonstrant party at the celebrated Hague Conference in 1611, only three were summoned to the present Synod; and though those who appeared on this occasion, were generally men of good natural talents and sound understandings, and well versed in the matters under discussion, yet they were not all endowed with the gift of rendering a ready and extempore reply in Latin to every question that might be suddenly asked; and if they had possessed such a gift in an eminent degree, it would still have been necessary that they should have had time for reflection, and for each to compare his own views and reasons with those of his brethren. This request, however, which cannot be viewed as a *favour* but as an *act of justice*, was almost without exception refused. In one of the discussions between them and the blustering President, Hales says, "Niellius excepted against this proceeding with them *capitatim*, [singly,] and required that they might consult in common what answer to give. For myself, saith he, I am a man of no ready speech and unfit for sudden disputation. Too great advantage is taken against men by this kind of proceeding. Many members of the Synod, were they thus singled out to give a sudden answer, might easily peradventure be put to some distress. *Nullam esse causam tam justam* &c. There is no cause so just, as not to be easily overcome, in case it be treated only at the option or according to the pleasure of the adverse party." Having presented to the Synod their opinions relative to the Five Points and their remarks on the Catechism and Confession, the Remonstrants wished to enter on *the proposing, explanation and defence of them, as far as they were able or should think necessary*, according to the very terms of the letters by which they had been cited; but the Synod, in opposition to the plain and obvious meaning which those expressions conveyed, decided that it was a *privilege belonging to themselves alone* to judge *how far* the Remonstrants might be permitted to enter into the explanation and defence of their doctrines. This was accounted an act of great injustice, by the Remonstrants, who also

princes,—the wealth, power, and privileges of Bishops,—the

alleged, that "they did not feel many scruples about the doctrine of Election, but that it was Reprobation in which the chief difficulty lay." They were very desirous, therefore, of having Reprobation discussed in the first instance: But their enemies, the Calvinists of those days, like the same race in this age, wished to keep UNCONDITIONAL REPROBATION enshrined in the dark *penetralia* of their temples, only to be produced, as opportunity might serve, for their own private purposes, either to terrify the careless among their hearers, or to quicken the occasionally sluggish current of congregational benevolence. This desecrating shrine of their God Moloch, who, (according to their preposterous statement,) created, nourished and brought up children, that they might pass through the fire to him and be doomed to eternal misery, *only because such was his pleasure*,—this desecrating shrine might not be touched by other hands than their own; and any man who was hardy enough to drag it forth to the light of day, was sure of being reckoned a heinous heretic. This studied suppression or concealment, is a strong argument, were there not others of still greater potency, either that Unconditional Reprobation is no part of the revealed verities of the Christian religion, all of which are commanded to be published to all men, and presented for universal acceptance; or, if it be one of those verities, that the Calvinist teachers who suppress it, are unfaithful stewards. It was not to be expected, therefore, that the Calvinists of the Synod would allow the Remonstrants to give Reprobation that prominence in their discussions to which it was justly entitled.—In one of the debates which these two questions produced, Bogerman again took advantage of the disingenuous trick which we have just exposed, and asked Pynakker, one of the cited ministers, "Do you imagine the Synod will suffer the Remonstrants to examine the doctrine of Reprobation?" Pynakker replied, "Yes, I do: Because, as this is the chief source of the troubles of the Church, it ought to be *first* discussed." Perceiving either that his meaning was not correctly understood or that he had expressed it in an imperfect manner, he immediately explained himself by adding, that by FIRST he meant CHIEFLY, (both of which significations the Latin word conveys,) and by acknowledging, that Election ought to have the precedence of discussion. When relating this occurrence, Poppius remarks, "This being received in a wrong sense, was imputed to all of us, as though we were unanimously of opinion, that the discussion of the doctrine of Reprobation ought to precede that of Election. Upon this question the Foreign Divines and others were desired by the President to deliver their sentiments. However, the expression imputed to us was employed by none of us, much less by all.—But this was their manner: If one of us, in the name of all, said any thing that proved advantageous to the rest, the President seemed to be much displeased at our unanimity: Then we were told, that *we were cited singly and personally*, and that *we did not compose a society or corporation*. But when any of us happened to employ a word that was capable of being wrested to our common injury and misconstrued, then what was said by one was certain to be imputed to all!!" After gaining a favourable opportunity like this, Bogerman always hastily dismissed the cited persons; and on this occasion he dwelt largely, in their absence, on Pynakker's expression, and persuaded the Foreign Divines that the proposal of the Remonstrants, to treat of Reprobation before Election, was a *sine qua non*, and that without it was granted to them they would not proceed. This alarmed all the Calvinistic brotherhood, who considering the honour of their craft concerned, rose *vi et armis*, delivered *seriatim* their objections to such a bold proceeding, and thought, with the Professor of Heidelberg, "that it was unreasonable for the Remonstrants to disturb the consciences of the ELECT on account of God's judgments against the Reprobated, and to plead the cause of the latter, as though they had been hired to undertake the defence of those who had by the just judgment of God been rejected; and that for these reasons the Synod neither could nor ought to grant the Remonstrant brethren

commencement of war against the Turks, or any other poli-

any further liberty, unless the members designed ..... to expose the *orthodox doctrine* of Predestination to be openly ridiculed." Finding this great aversion in the Synod to the precedence of Reprobation, the Remonstrants proposed, since they were forbidden to explain or defend their sentiments *viva voce*, "to explain their doctrines in writing, beginning with the article of Election, and proceeding to that of Reprobation; to defend their doctrines, and to refute the contrary opinions of the Contra-Remonstrants and of those whom they consider orthodox: But that, in case this explanation or defence seems to be defective, they would answer *in writing* the questions which the President might think proper to propose to them, or by *oral communications* by those of their body whom they might judge best qualified for that purpose. And that the liberty which they desired might not appear unlimited, they bound themselves to proceed in such a manner as should not savour in the least of an insolent licentiousness; and that their discussions might not be extended too far, the Lay Commissioners were empowered to curtail them at pleasure." But these very equitable terms, which were much worse than those which the unsophisticated and grammatical sense of the citatory letters held out to them, were rejected by the Synod, at the instigation and by the management of the President,—who, after having had recourse to his old trick of propounding questions to each of the cited persons, and after procuring against them three or four Synodical censures, had them at length (Jan. 14th) dismissed from the Synod, with every mark of contumely and scorn which he could invent.

Bogerman had previously busied himself in extracting the opinions of the Remonstrants from such writings of theirs as had been published long before, and in forming them into articles, to be separately discussed by the Synod. This passing of judgment on the Remonstrants from the testimony of their own writings, was an employment which Deodatus and his colleague from Geneva had at one of the earliest sessions mentioned as very desirable, and in which they appeared eager to engage. Any one who attentively reads the Acts of the Synod, and compares them with the private accounts both of Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants, will find that this had also been the intention of the President from the very commencement, and that all his shifting schemes and boisterous conduct was intended to irritate the Remonstrants, who possessed more patience than he had contemplated, and who were therefore to be removed from the Synod by a greater exercise of art and with greater difficulty. But one of the greatest injuries of which the Remonstrants had to complain, was, that the book from which their supposed opinions were chiefly collected, was the production of a declared enemy, who wrote a highly coloured account of a Conference respecting the Five Points, in which he pretended that the Calvinists had obtained a complete victory. A Remonstrant author had also written an able statement of the same Conference and had claimed a triumph for his party. The latter would therefore have certainly been the most proper authority from which to extract the real opinions of his own body. But misrepresentation, and not truth, was the grand object of the President and his inland associates,—as appears still more plainly by the falsification of the Theses of Episcopius, which will afterwards come more particularly under our notice.

But though dismissed from their further attendance on the Synod, the Remonstrants were not permitted to depart from Dort; the States' Commissioners having charged them not to quit the town, without their special permission. The President, in his speech dimissory, had said, that they would receive an intimation when the Synod had any further occasion for them. What occurred afterwards, will be the subject of another note. Sufficient evidence has been here adduced, to prove that the just proposal of Arminius, in the text, for "the admission of the deputies of all the parties at disagreement," was not complied with in this Synod; and that, in place of the noble

tical matters.* But its discussions will relate solely to those things which pertain to *Religion:* Of this description are the

inscription which he wished to see in front of the Synodical building, a more appropriate one would have been, "Let no one that is not desirous of promoting the interests of Calvin's UNCONDITIONAL ELECTION and REPROBATION, enter this grand Bear-garden!" With what justice it entitled itself to the latter appellation, will be seen in a subsequent part of this narrative. The noisy scenes which we have described, generally occurred when the Remonstrants were present, and were excited and kept up by the President, one or two of the States' Commissioners, and Heinsius; the latter of whom, though only secretary to the Lay Commission, was an adept at thumping the tables with both his fists, while he vociferated, with all the force of lungs which he possessed, against one or other of the Remonstrants, whose arguments vexed him, and whom he wished to silence. On such emergencies, his friend Bogerman usually gave him the aid of his Stentorian voice, and soon reduced the meek and yielding Remonstrants to the patience of taciturnity. This impertinence and assumption of authority on the part of Heinsius was endured by their Lordships the Commissioners, the majority of whom (as it might be expected in plodding Dutch traders,) were most deplorably ignorant of the Latin language; and when any of such worthies had to rule in the Synod in the capacity of Lay Presidents, which office each of them sustained in rotation, they occupied the seat of the learned with as much gravity and composure as an Eastern monarch, who, when he does not wish to be incommoded with answering an applicant, slightly beckons to a supple secretary, who immediately gives himself all the magisterial airs of his principal, and utters a reply framed either according to his own view of the case, or according to the degree of meaning which, by constant practice, he has learnt to collect from the unintelligible countenance of his ignorant and lazy superior. "Even thus did Heinsius act."—But, beside these, there were other scenes, of which the Remonstrants were not spectators, and in which some of the violent members of the Synod forgot the dignity of their characters as christians and the sacredness of their office as ministers.

* Arminius stipulates, in the preceding paragraph, for the faith of government to be pledged for the *safe conduct* of the different parties convened to the Synod. But the poor Remonstrants, having been cited to appear at that assembly rather as *criminals* than as *parties*, were ultimately excluded from the benefit of such a proper stipulation, although it had been originally promised to them by the Lay Commissioners. They were ordered not to leave the city of Dort on any account whatever, unless they obtained leave from the Commissioners; and when one of them, by leave of the acting Burgomaster of Dort, who was one of the Commissioners, had hastily gone to Utrecht, to visit one of his children that was expected soon to die, he was on his return called to an account for his conduct, and the former order repeated. In the course of their detention at Dort during eight months, they were as strictly watched as if they had been condemned malefactors. One of them, whose sister lay on her death-bed and earnestly desired to see him, could not obtain permission to visit her while she lived; and after her decease he was not allowed to attend her funeral. Another, whose wife was near the time of her *accouchement*, wished, like a good family-man, to be at home for a few days at that critical period; but his request was refused. When the uncle of another of them was at the point of death, he longed for the presence of his nephew, to receive his dying commands and to benefit him by his counsels and prayers; but the wishes of the good old man could not be gratified. After his death, the nephew was not allowed to look after the pressing concerns of his orphan cousins, although his uncle had appointed him their legal guardian. None of these favours, though asked with much humility, could be

doctrines which concern faith and manners, and ecclesiastical order.—(1) In these *doctrines*, there are two objects worthy of

obtained from the high Calvinistic personages, in whose hands, at that time, was vested the personal liberty of the persecuted and cited Remonstrants.

Towards the close of February, the magistrates of different towns deposed from the ministry three of the cited Remonstrant ministers who were present at the Synod, and sent regular notices to their families, speedily to quit the parsonage houses which they severally occupied. These three good men, being heartily tired of the strict durance in which they had been held since their arrival at Dort, represented to the States' Commissioners, that as they were not now in the ministry, they could no longer be considered amenable to the jurisdiction of the Synod: This was the very argument of the Commissioners, when, at the commencement of the Synod, the Remonstrants had wished to have associated with them the two recently deposed ministers, Grevinchovius and Goulart. Though, for very obvious reasons, at that early stage of the business, they would permit no Remonstrants to appear among the cited, "except such as were actually in the exercise of the ministry;" yet they would not listen to the same argument when it militated against their favourite purposes: and the three ministers were commanded to remain at Dort with their brethren. One of the three, however, whose wife then far advanced in pregnancy had been ordered to leave her house within eight days, ventured to return to Horn, and to assist her to remove from their former dwelling. But on his arrival, he found her already removed to another house; and his return to Dort was speedily required by the higher powers. To expedite his departure, two or three of the Calvinist Magistrates employed their official authority in a manner the most reprehensible: They placed him, like a criminal, in the town-waggon openly before his own door, though he had provided a carriage for himself on the outside of the town, to which he wished to have retired privately and without noise. A tumult ensued between the populace who were attached to their good pastor, and the soldiers whom the magistrates had placed before his house two hours before his departure. On his return to Dort, he was severely examined before the Commissioners respecting the unhappy commotion; but being convinced that he had not been at all to blame in that affair, they passed it over in silence.—At different times the Remonstrants wished to depute a few of their small body to the Hague, to make a proper representation of the manner in which they were treated by the Synod; but this indulgence was invariably refused. Their only resource then was, to write to their High Mightinesses an account of their proceedings, and to implore their interference and protection. But such an attempt, in that posture of their affairs, was unavailing; for their doom was already sealed.—Soon after their appearance at Dort, the magistrates of that city issued a proclamation, commanding the inhabitants, all of whom were celebrated for their attachment to Calvin, to refrain from insulting any of the foreign or native professors, divines, or other persons that were called to appear at the Synod, on pain of summary punishment to the offenders. This document was not required for the protection of the Calvinists; but the persecuted Remonstrants were such objects of hatred to the populace, as scarcely to be allowed to pass along the streets without being maltreated. This bad spirit was excited and encouraged by the violent sermons which were fulminated against them, from the different pulpits in the city.—Whenever these good men were required to be in attendance, (and they were liable to be summoned from their lodgings at a few minutes' notice,) they were not permitted to enter the large hall in which the Synodical sessions were held, but were ordered to wait the pleasure of that venerable body in an anti-chamber, the door of which was generally locked, and the passage leading to it guarded by two or three of the police, who hindered them from holding any communication with their friends, and kept them in as strict durance as if they had been convicted of some capital offence.—At the formal conclusion of the prin-

consideration, which are indeed of the greatest consequence: (i) *Their truth*, and (ii) *The degree of necessity which exists*

cipal business of the Synod, (May the 6th,) when the further attendance of the foreign Divines was declared to be no longer necessary, the Remonstrants were summoned from their lodgings and waited upon the Lay Commissioners, at six o'clock in the evening, when the resolution and censure of the Synod were read to them in Latin by Heinsius, the secretary; in which they were accused of "having corrupted the true religion, dissolved the unity of the Church, given grievous cause of scandal, and shewn themselves contumacious and disobedient: For these several reasons, the Synod prohibited them from the further exercise of their ministry, deprived them of their offices in the Church and University, and declared them incapable of performing any ecclesiastical function, till, by sincere repentance, they should have given the Church full satisfaction, and, being thus reconciled to her, should be readmitted into her communion." They were then required to wait at Dort till further orders from their High Mightinesses; and when they requested to have a copy of the Synodical censure and sentence against them, they were as usual refused.

On the 24th of May, the cited Remonstrants were summoned to appear before three new Commissioners whom the States General had deputed from their body, when each of them was called into the room and separately interrogated; after which, he who had been last called in was ordered into another room, and prevented from holding any communication with those who had not been ushered into the presence of the Commissioners. The proposal and questions addressed to each of them, were in substance the following: "Since you have been deprived by the Synod, the States General have directed us to ask you the following questions: Whether you are, notwithstanding this decision, resolved to act as ministers? Or whether you will be content in future to lead quiet and peaceable lives in obedience to the government, as private burghers, without any place or office, abstaining from all ecclesiastical ministrations in any meeting of the people of your sect, from all manner of teaching and preaching, exhorting, reading, administering the sacraments, visiting the sick, writing letters or transmitting papers?—It is the intention of their High Mightinesses to allow to those who shall conform to these requisitions such a competency as may enable them to live comfortably either in or out of these United Provinces, as their own choice may determine." In addition to these things, Episcopius was required to promise, "not to write either letters or books to confirm the people in the sentiments of the Remonstrants, or to seduce them from the doctrine of the Synod." All of them professed their willingness to obey their governors in all such matters as might be performed with a safe conscience, to live peaceably themselves and to exhort all others to the same practice. They also expressed their readiness to refrain from the exercise of their ecclesiastical functions in the public churches; but none of them, except Leo, could reconcile it to their consciences to abstain from feeding in smaller assemblies the flock of Christ over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers. The majority of them added, "Not only those who abuse or squander their talent will be punished, but those also who bury it in the earth, either through fear of trouble or hope of advantage. It is therefore our duty to place our lights on candlesticks, and not to hide or smother them under a bushel or an easy bed; and we hope your Lordships will neither hinder us nor be displeased with us for so doing." In a subsequent interview with the Commissioners, the Remonstrants proved, that their reasons for continuing the exercise of their ministry had formerly received the sanction of the States General themselves: For at the treaty of Cologne, in 1579, their High Mightinesses had insisted, "that subjects who professed any religion different from that which was established, could not satisfy their consciences by foregoing its exercise." But, after several unavailing conferences together, the Commissioners left them in a state of suspense and confinement, about 20 days longer. During that time, several

for knowing, believing and practising them.—(2) As to *Ecclesiastical order*,—because a good part of it is positive and only

reports were brought to them from various quarters, "that some great calamity was impending;" and they were seriously advised to avoid it by a timely flight. They were likewise informed of Barneveldt's execution, and of the perpetual imprisonment to which Grotius and Hogerbeets had been sentenced; and that several of their brethren in the ministry, who had lately attended a meeting at Rotterdam about their affairs in general, had been taken into custody and brought to the Hague, for that offence. They thought, however, that all these reports were only intended to create an artificial alarm, and to induce them to attempt an escape,—thus delivering their enemies from the hatred to which they would be exposed by their further rigorous proceedings. But their firmness on that trying occasion corresponded with all their previous conduct, and they refused to dishonour their good cause by flight or any other act of cowardice.

On the third of July, after having been summoned from Dort to the Hague, they appeared before the States General, and when they had been called in singly before their lordships, some time was spent to induce each of them to sign the *Act of Cessation* from the ministry. But to these renewed solicitations they separately returned the same modest answer as that which they had delivered at Dort. After allowing them two days for further deliberation, their Lordships on the fifth of the same month, having heard a repetition of their refusal, passed a resolution to banish them "out of the United Provinces and the jurisdiction thereof, without ever being allowed to return till the said States be fully satisfied that they are ready to subscribe the said Act [of Cessation,] and till they have obtained special leave from their High Mightinesses for that purpose,—on pain, in case of non-compliance, of being treated as disturbers of the public peace, for an example to others." Episcopius delivered a short speech, in which, among other matters, he reminded their High Mightinesses, "that they had been invited to a free Synod, and had received frequent verbal promises of a safe conduct." To this speech they did not deign a reply, but ordered the Remonstrants to be conducted into another room, and to have the door locked and bolted, while the Provost and his officers attended on the outside for purposes of intimidation. After being kept some time in this kind of imprisonment they were at length permitted to depute to their High Mightinesses two of their body, who requested that they might have leave to adjust their domestic affairs, to collect what was owing to them, and to pay their debts, that their wives and children might not be rendered miserable and turned naked into the streets. They offered to give unexceptionable security for their return at such a period and to such places as their Lordships might require. While they were preferring this request, the Heer Muis often interrupted them, and at last sarcastically told them "not to be so greatly concerned about their families; for if they had received an extraordinary call from God to serve his Church, He would undoubtedly support them after an extraordinary manner." But the only favour which the Remonstrants could obtain, was, the deferring of their departure till four o'clock the next morning, provided each of them would promise to retire to his lodgings without speaking to any body, and to be ready at the appointed hour next morning. Each of them had fifty Guilders allowed for his travelling expences, and a copy of the sentence of the States General. But it was between nine and ten o'clock the next day, before the magistrates removed them in nine waggons towards Walwick in Brabant, the place of banishment which they had desired, where they arrived after a journey of three days. *The Canons of Dort*, as the grand test of Calvinism, were then carried triumphantly by the Synodists throughout the land; and every clergyman, Professor and Schoolmaster, that refused to sign it, was deprived of his benefice and compelled to lay aside his functions. Several of them, in addition to their deprivation, were also banished out of the country, to various

requires to be accommodated to persons, places and seasons,—it will be easily despatched.

The end of such a holy convention will be the illustration, preservation, and propagation of the truth; the extirpation of existing errors, and the concord of the Church. The consequence of all which, will be the glory of God and the eternal salvation of men.*

parts on the continent.—This was the method in which the Dutch Government thought proper to keep their plighted faith about a *safe-conduct* to the Remonstrants! This act of cruelty, injustice and bad faith, has only one parallel in ecclesiastical history, and that is in the Council of Constance, at which John Huss and Jerome of Prague were murdered, in defiance of the sacredness of the imperial protection.

* The chief *illustration of the truth* which the Synod of Dort effected, was in some of their early sessions, before the Remonstrants were cited, when they occupied themselves in mutual consultations about a new translation of the Bible, the best method of catechizing, the propriety of preachers taking for a text a section of the Netherland Catechism instead of a portion of scripture, the degree of liberty to be allowed to Deacons or Candidates for holy orders, and the baptism of Children born of Heathen parents: It would have been really most edifying to hear these grave divines tendering mutual advice about such weighty points of discipline.—After much discussion about the new translation of the scriptures, it was determined to teach some of the rough Dutch preachers better manners than those to which they had been formerly accustomed, and politely to accost the Deity with You instead of THOU.—It was resolved, "that all ministers both in cities and villages should be required to preach from a portion of the Catechism every Sunday afternoon, on pain of the most rigorous censure of the Church."—They determined, that "it was not allowed to students of Divinity to perform the office of baptism; but in relation to preaching, that was left to the liberty and judgment of the different churches and classes."—About the baptism of children born of Heathen parents, Hales says, the Synodical "decision consisted of two parts. The first concerned the *Adulti*, and it was this: *That such as were of years and capacity should be diligently taught and Catechised, and then, if they did desire it, they should be Baptized.* The second concerned Infants, and it was, *That till they came to years of discretion, they should by no means be Baptized.* A strange decision, and such as, if my memory and reading fail me not, no Church either ancient or modern ever gave. When it was objected, What, if they were in danger of death? their answer was, 'that the want of Baptism would not prejudice them with God, except we would determine, as the Papists do, that Baptism is necessary to salvation.' Which is as much to undervalue the necessity of Baptism as the church of Rome doth overvalue it." Some amusing particulars are thus related by Mr. Hales in his letters to the Ambassador. "One of the deputies of Geldria, to shew the force of private catechizing, related, that amongst them there was a minister, who, when he first came to his living, found his church quite empty, because all his parishioners were Papists; and therefore if he would preach, he was to preach to the bare walls. But he takes so much pains as to go to every of his parish privately unto their houses, and there by familiar conversing with them, and expounding unto them the grounds of religion, he so far prevailed with them, that in the compass of a year he gained them all to come to church, and by this means hath scarce a Papist in his parish.—But doubtless the most effectual way of all the rest to bring young persons to learn their catechism, was that which was related by one of the Helvetian deputies. For he told us, that in his country the manner was, that all young persons that meant to marry, were to repair, both he and she, unto their minister, a little before they meant

The presidency of that assembly belongs to HIM ALONE who is the HEAD and the HUSBAND of the Church,—to Christ

to marry, and by him to be examined how well they had conned their catechism: If they had not done it perfectly to his mind, he had power to defer their marriage till they had better learnt their lessons.—I was much affected to this course when I heard it; and I thought that doubtless it was a speedy way to make all young persons, excepting myself and two or three more that mean not over hastily to marry, to be skilful in their catechism. The Synod shall be ill advised if they make no use of it." It was about this period, according to the same author, that the Duchess of Tremullio, a second Queen of Sheba, attended one of their sessions, and, like her great predecessor, "spake very well of the Synod, commending it both for piety and goodness." What a pity that "those pestilent fellows," the Remonstrants, should be brought forward to spoil such friendly discussions as these, and to destroy all the early blossoms of "piety and goodness!"

Among the anticipated consequences of such a holy convention, Arminius has enumerated "the extirpation of existing errors, and the concord of the churches." But these were not the results of the Synod of Dort; for it will be seen, that the blasphemous errors of Maccovius, and others of that tribe, were not then "extirpated." Nay, the concord of the Calvinistic Churches was far from being promoted by their decisions: For Bishop Womack, quoting Poelenburgh the successor of Episcopius and Curcellæus in the Divinity chair at Amsterdam, tells us of a "most bitter contention betwixt Voetius [Professor of Divinity in the University of Utrecht,] and Maresius [Professor at Bois-le-duc,], about the sense of that Synod. One of them maintains, that the Synod determined the decree of predestination and reprobation to antecede the consideration of the fall of Adam: To which assertion the other hath opposed an apology for the Synod. So that, though assembled on purpose to decide these controversies, and appease the broils that emerged and were inflamed upon them, yet (that they might seem to agree in something,) have they wrapped up their decrees and canons in so many clouds, and confounded them with so many intricacies, (if a man hath recourse to their suffrages for an interpretation,) that they are likely to fall into a new schism, before they come to a settled resolution what the meaning of that Synod is." The same good Bishop adds, "If these principles, which you call *Anti-Arminian*, were embraced as part of the faith of the Church of England, I might puzzle you perhaps by asking you, Which of them—the *Supralapsarian* or the *Sublapsarian* principles? If in any part of the Christian world these opinions [the Sublapsarian] be established as their doctrine, you will easily grant it is likeliest to be in the Belgic Churches; for the settling of whose distractions about these points, that Synod of Dort was assembled. But do you think these are propounded as articles of their creed there, or accounted current *pulpit* doctrine among them? You must not believe it: For now-a-days how many are there that dare tell them out of that place, [the pulpit] *God will not have all men to be saved*: Or, *The greater part of mankind are reprobated by God's absolute decree*: Or, that *Christ did not die for all men*: Or, that *God calls those whom he would not in any wise should come to him*: Or, that *the elect* (as they are called,) *cannot by any, no not the most grievous sins, be removed from their election!*" He then quotes the same Poelenburgh, thus, "You may very well conclude, the man is not sound in his brain, not well in his wits, that takes the boldness to maintain these points in his sermon. And if any person less discreet and provident, hath exposed the *arcana* or secrets of that his doctrine naked to the understanding of the people, there follows presently such a great commotion and disturbance in their minds, as looks like the Preface to a new schism."—In another passage the pious Bishop says, "I confess, they [the Synod] seem to allow the *Sublapsarian* doctrine as the most current and passable amongst the vulgar: But I do not find them cry down the *Supralapsarian*, no, nor the *Supra-creatarian*, neither, as dross or counterfeit. That these are no less

by his Holy Spirit. For He has promised to be present in a company that may consist only of two or three individuals

pure and orthodox than the other by that account, we have many presumptions to induce us to believe. For, (1) we know, kissing goes by favour: And we find, the men [who were] wedded to the most rigid of those opinions, were embraced and placed upon the bench,—while the Remonstrants, who detected the enormity, were brought unto the bar, not permitted duly and fully to implead them [those rigid opinions] or to justify themselves.—(2) What was, at least the pretended, business of their convention? 'That 'those opinions of Arminius and his followers might be accurately examined, 'and determined of by the rule of God's word only, the true doctrine established and the false rejected, and concord, peace, and tranquillity (by God's 'blessing) restored to the Churches of the Low Countries.' (Acta Syn. Dor. Sess. 140.) This was the end of their convention. But which opinions were they that gave the scandal to Arminius and his followers? Were they not those of the rigid Calvinists? And who were the authors of that disturbance, but those petulant parsons that would not endure the prescription of the wise physician, nor suffer their sores and ulcers to be lanced? It is true, the weakest must to the wall; and when it is put to the question, *Who are they that trouble Israel?*, to be sure, the oppressor will have the casting voice." —(WOMACK'S *Arcana Dog. Anti-Remon.*)

Doctor Jortin says. "To compel any one to swear, that he will never alter his opinions about controversial divinity, is a grievous imposition. It might have made some unstable men go over to Popery out of resentment, and say, *If I must surrender body, soul, sense, understanding, the Church of Rome shall have them, and not you.* Thus

Iliacos intra muros peccatur et extra;

whilst Christianity blushes, and grieves that she can say so little in behalf of her children.—I pass over the SYNOD OF DORT, in which the prevailing party oppressed, as they often do, the WISE and the LEARNED, and entailed *an irrational and uncharitable system* on their posterity."—(*Rem. on Eccles. Hist.*)

As an elucidation of Dr. Jortin's remark, the case of M. A. De Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro, may be added. It has already been seen what part this learned man took respecting the controversies in the Low Countries. At the period when the States of Venice were under the long interdict of the Pope's excommunication,—and when it was expected from the prudent management of Sir Henry Wotton, that the inhabitants would have embraced Protestantism,—this ecclesiastic quitted his high station in the Romish Church, and placed himself under the protection of James the First, King of England. A most impassioned letter, addressed to him by this monarch from Stirling, occurs in the *Præstant. ac Erudit. Vir. Epist.*; in which he intimates his willingness to have a work dedicated to him, that the Arch-bishop was then about to publish in reference to his abandonment of Popery, and the King very nobly adds: "We embrace the author with open arms; for he is undoubtedly worthy of our highest regards. Is not that man justly deserving of being accounted a fit object of the love of Christ his Lord, who has forsaken country, friends, and all that is commonly dear to the flesh, for the sake of Christ his master?" But, in a subsequent paragraph, his majesty suffers some of his theological vanity to escape, when he says, "We highly approve of your advice concerning the mode of dedication,—to place our name (since such is your pleasure,) in front of those copies which will remain for sale within our dominions,—but to omit it in such copies as will be transmitted to other regions. You have discovered the true reason for our wishes on this point: For you will procure to yourself a far greater portion of hatred from the despisers of the truth, on account of the appearance of our name prefixed to the volume, than on account of the truth of its contents. Such blessedness has our Saviour conferred upon us, that those persons who entertain no love for his truth, evince at the same time towards us the most

gathered together in his name: His assistance therefore will be earnestly implored at the beginning and end of each of their sessions. But, for the sake of order, moderation, and good government, and to avoid confusion, it will be necessary to have presidents subordinate to Christ Jesus. It is my sincere wish that the magistrates would themselves undertake that office in the Council; and this might be obtained from them as a favour. But in case of their reluctance, either some members deputed from their body, or some persons chosen by the whole Synod, ought to act in that capacity. The duties of these Presidents will consist in convening the assembly, proposing the subjects of deliberation, putting questions to the vote, collecting the suffrages of each member by means of accredited secretaries, and in directing the whole of the proceedings.*—The course of action to be adopted in the Synod

bitter hatred! Let not boasting be thought to lurk under the expression,—but there is not, we believe, either another king on the face of the earth, or even any private person of the lowest condition in society, who has borne for Christ as large a load of contradiction as we have been called to sustain!" The iniquity of the Synod of Dort, and the injurious and base treatment which the Remonstrants received, induced him, according to his own statement, to quit the Protestant communion and to return to that of the Papists. In a Latin letter (*De Pace Relig.*) which he afterwards addressed to Bishop Hall, he thus endeavours to justify his last change of sentiment: "I call upon you, Hall, and your colleagues at the Synod of Dort, to testify concerning that to which you gave your consent in the name of the Church of England. It certainly was not what that Church prescribes in her articles to be believed, but they were pure Calvinistic doctrines;—as though the Church of England professed such doctrines in common with the Contra-Remonstrants. Though you prudently withdrew from the Synod, yet you undoubtedly concurred in condemning, excommunicating, depriving, and turning the Remonstrants out of their churches, notwithstanding they neither believed nor maintained any tenet contrary to the articles of your church. They adhered to the ancient doctrine of the purest and most primitive church,—to that pious, holy, apostolical, most profitable and highly edifying doctrine, against which your church had nothing to object; and your own church has consequently been deeply wounded by yourself. The English, therefore, were extremely ill-advised when they interfered in this controversy, unless they had resolved to form their judgment of it according to the doctrine of their own church; because they ought at least to tolerate all catholic doctrines, which are not incompatible with the English Confession. This was the wholesome counsel, which, at that time, I likewise tendered to Dr. Goad, your successor: But that gentleman has given himself entirely up to the Calvinistic errors and severities. The Synod of Dort did not apply itself to examine into matters of of faith, but was governed by human views and designs, and its chief care was, that the party of Barneveldt should not be supported by the Remonstrants, nor prevail over the opposite faction. Away with such Synods and such synodical decrees!" This extract, in more than one point, is of considerable importance; because the writer of it was, at the commencement of that Synod, high in the confidence of King James, who derived no trifling gratification from having a reclaimed Archbishop for a boon companion, in his moments of learned repose.

* The States General appointed eighteen gentlemen as Lay Commissioners at the Synod; and gave it, as part of their instructions, "that they should

itself, is this: (1) a regular and accurate debate on the matters in controversy, (2) mature consultation concerning them,

regulate their conduct, with regard to sitting, voting, and presiding, according to the method established and observed in the meetings of their High Mightinesses; that each of them should preside a week by rotation; that, in the examination and inquiry into matters, they should have not only a deliberative but a decisive vote; and, [as a specimen of true Dutch thrift,] that all adjournments, recesses, or delays *may be for as short a time as possible, in order to prevent extraordinary charges to the States.*" The Remonstrants had very proper reasons for afterwards complaining:

1. That most of these honourable Commissioners, who had to represent the States General in that reverend assembly, were very deficient in the knowledge of Divinity, and were consequently totally unqualified to form a correct judgment of several of those matters which came under the cognizance of the Synod. But, by the opportune attentions of Bogerman, the ecclesiastical president, and his assessors, they were generally relieved from the burden of *thinking* and *determining for themselves*: After each session, Bogerman, or some of the leading inland ecclesiastics, usually had a private interview with them; when they concerted together about the proceedings to be adopted in the next session, and the President of the Commissioners was instructed in the answers which he must give, and had an appropriate speech prepared for the occasion. Nay, in some instances, we are told by one of their own party, this juggling was rather too apparent; for the Commissioners brought their decree written out at full length, before the matter to which it related had been discussed, and before the members of the Synod had expressed their determination. If the Foreign Divines occasionally raised scruples in the course of a debate, (and, though of the Calvinistic brotherhood, they were sometimes rather troublesome in this respect to the impetuous Bogerman,) the Commissioners were commonly appealed to for their decisive opinion; but, like prudent men who knew something about the snug management of such high matters, on these sudden emergencies they were accustomed to defer the delivery of their judgment till the next meeting;—and thus had an opportunity, in the mean time, of consulting their ecclesiastical advisers, for whose sake all these strange proceedings had been instituted. Indeed, the presence of these Commissioners and of the foreign Divines was indispensably necessary to the harsh measures which the Calvinists intended to adopt: For when any thing of an ungracious character was to be carried, in which the inland Divines did not wish to be seen, Bogerman's never-failing expedient, was to commit it to the Commissioners, or to the foreigners; the latter of whom frequently complained of the odium attached to this practice, while the former, as it became peaceable and patient men, carried the burden without repining.

2. Much skill in the Latin language was not requisite for men so strongly prejudiced against the Remonstrants as these Commissioners were; but, for the sake of their own characters, and to preserve at least the semblance of impartiality, they ought to have been competently qualified to understand the proceedings, which were conducted in Latin, and to express themselves with propriety. Instead of this, the members of the Synod and the spectators scarcely ever heard a word of what was said by some of them, (especially by the Commissioners of Holland, Utrecht and Over-Yssel, when it was their province to preside,) except by the mouth of their secretary Heinsius, who had on such occasions ample scope for the display of his classical acquirements and of his malignancy towards his old friends the Remonstrants. When the cited individuals answered any interrogatories, or when they presented a petition to the Commissioners, these incompetent Presidents could neither promptly return any answer themselves, nor suffer it to be done in their behalf, till the whole affair had been fully explained to them in good maternal Low Dutch. Commissioners Brederode, Nieuburg, Artsbergen,

and (3) complete liberty for every one to declare his opinion. The rule to be observed in all these transactions is the WORD

Hagen and Hemert, were bad Latinists; and, it is said, they would not have ventured to conclude a bargain in that language, if it had been only of the value of a hundred Guilders. Hartefeld, burgomaster of Amersfort, one of the Utrecht deputies, seems to have been the most ignorant of all; for when his friends asked him how he acquitted himself in the Synod, in which every thing was transacted in a language that he did not understand, he replied in perfect good-humour, "Why, I acquire knowledge by degrees: By practice and attention I begin to understand matters a little better; for I keep a Latin Dictionary in my hand, and sometimes look into it for a word or two." —Muis van Holy, the burgomaster of Dort, who was as hot and intolerant a being as Bogerman himself, and loved to splutter out his impure Latin against the Remonstrants, addressed them on one occasion in these words, before his brother commissioners, *Dixistis* VAS *velle respondere* [penultimâ brevi] *ad* SEXCENTOS *et millia interrogatoria:* He evinced the profundity of his literary attainments by his *chaste* pronunciation, and ready mode of construction.—Such, with a few creditable exceptions, were the men appointed by government to superintend the momentous proceedings of this Synod, with which they too seldom interfered, and to operate as a check upon the assembled ecclesiastics, whose creatures they willingly became.

3. But stronger grounds for complaints the Remonstrants had, when they subsequently alleged, that "the majority of these Commissioners were partial Calvinists." The States of Holland and Over-Yssel had long combated with the other States, by means of spirited Memorials, in favour of religious liberty and tolerant measures. Their noble stand against the incroachments of civil and ecclesiastical tyranny was described, for the instruction of all Europe, in the nervous language of Grotius, who published, in Latin, French and Low Dutch, his PIETAS ORDINUM HOLLANDIÆ, &c. three or four years prior to the convening of this Synod and his own imprisonment. But when Over-Yssel was compelled, from unexpected local circumstances, to withdraw from this honourable confederacy, and when a change was effected in the magistracy of the different large towns within the Province of Holland by the machinations and personal exertions of Prince Maurice, the States of Holland were forced to succumb to the Generality, which was then composed of other individuals than those who had been members in the days of Arminius. No wonder therefore will be excited at these Commissioners to the Synod being generally rigid Calvinists. On this subject, Smoutius, a turbulent divine, employs an exulting expression, that does not come with a good grace from a Christian minister, because it betokens his familiar acquaintance with games of chance: "The Contra-Remonstrants found no difficulty in winning the game, when all their cards were honours." Two or three of the Commissioners, who shewed themselves more impartial than the rest, became the objects of suspicion to the ruling party, and were falsely represented, in letters transmitted to the States General and to Prince Maurice at the Hague, as persons that favoured the Remonstrants, which was then considered tantamount to an offence against government: By such insinuations as these against them, they were in danger of being stripped of all their offices and employments. The circumstances, to which we have now briefly alluded, shew, that the Remonstrants had nothing to hope from these gentlemen, each of whom was appointed to hold in weekly rotation the office of Lay President of the Synod.

At the second session of the Synod, it was suggested by Fosbergen, a member of the Synod, "Whether it would not be most proper, to choose the Ecclesiastical President out of the members of those provinces in which there had been no disputes about the Five Points?" And, "Whether among the Assessors and Secretaries there ought not to be some of the Remonstrant party?" The Lay President, who was a violent Contra-Remonstrant, instantly replied, "that

OF GOD, recorded in the books of the Old and New Testament. The power and influence which the most ancient Councils

the elections were free, and that every man was at liberty to name whom he pleased;" which, constituted as he knew that assembly to be, imported, that they were at liberty to choose for their President what Calvinist they pleased. The inland members then proceeded to an election; and the majority of suffrages was declared to be in favour of John Bogerman, minister of Leuwarden, who was accordingly declared Ecclesiastical President. This is the man who, in 1600, when he was pastor of Sneek in Friesland, translated out of Latin into Low Dutch, Beza's sanguinary tract on *Punishing Heretics*; and considering Beza's sentiments not to be sufficiently warm and decided, he and his colleague Geldorp wrote a preface to it, in opposition to the Anabaptists. In that preface they maintained, "that God had made it a duty incumbent on the magistrates, to defend the *true* religion and to oppose the *false* with all their might.—It was a poisonous notion, that the government ought not to trouble itself about religion, but to leave the pastors to propagate it by themselves, as well as they could, by ecclesiastical methods. Yet pernicious as such an opinion was, it was very agreeable to many persons, who found their interest in 'a political peace,' (as they termed it,) but which was an unchristian and unlawful one. By such a peace, (according to the doctrine of those persons,) 'every man was to be allowed the free exercise of his religion,' to the end, forsooth, that 'no discord might arise between countrymen and fellow-citizens.' This is making peace with Satan."—They also declared, "that there ought to be only *one religion allowed*." As for the common objection, that "this would be lording it over men's consciences," they replied, "that this was the proper means to restore, according to the Divine command, the dominion of consciences to God, to whom alone it belonged; since they thus attempted only to execute the Divine commands by DIVINE METHODS."—In reply to the objection, that by the forcible restraint of what they called false doctrine and by the punishment of heretics, the Dutch would "suffer the loss of trade and manufactures, because those persons who were under accusation or suspicion would leave the country," they urged, "that this was the right way to obtain the Divine blessing on their trade. But though, in the execution of *such a noble design*, and in obedience to the commands of God, they might be in danger of losing all their trade; yet it would be preferable, to enjoy a small income with a good and tranquil conscience, than to possess with remorse of conscience provinces and towns prospering in commerce." The good sense of the unprejudiced reader will determine, whether the man, who had openly avowed such persecuting sentiments as these against his fellow Protestants, was a fit person to occupy the President's chair in an impartial Synod. The Remonstrants knew, that he had not abated in the least from his dogmatical rigour, and that in his view they and the Anabaptists appeared to be equally criminal and deserving of punishment. This might have been easily collected from his violent answer to the PIETAS ORDINUM of Grotius, mentioned page 384. Bogerman had also been an actor in the schism effected at the Hague, and had preached there, in opposition to the orders of government. His subsequent conduct in the chair completely verified the augury which the cited persons had formed of his character. Whether contemplated in his private capacity as a country pastor, or in his public station as the organ elect of the raving Calvinistic clergy at the Synod of Dort, he appears to have been in both respects an unamiable, plotting, and restless individual.

The following brief description of Bogerman was composed in nervous and elegant Latin by the great Episcopius: "Was not the President of the Synod a professed adversary, and a deadly enemy who entertained an almost mortal hatred against all those who had congregations of their own people in this country, and who at the same time held sentiments different from his, espe-

ascribed to this sacred rule, were pointed out by the significant action of placing a COPY OF THE GOSPELS in the first and most

cially on those subjects which relate to the Remonstrants? Is it not a matter of public notoriety, and particularly well known to the lowest of the rabble in Friezland where he resides, that he is a most violent patron and keen defender of that pestilential and destructive maxim about *killing Heretics*, which was condemned a long time since by no mean number even of the Contra-Remonstrants themselves? Is not this the man, who, (as we have been informed by persons worthy of credit,) like a Roman Dictator by his individual authority managed all matters apart and in private among only a few of his confederate brethren, and factious associates, contrary to the tenour of his instructions, and without consulting those with whom he had been deputed to the Synod, and by whose common and deliberate counsel, (as was well befitting,) he had been commanded to transact all things? Nay, has he not been accused and convicted of this offence in the Provincial Synod which has been lately held in Friezland? Is not this the man, O thou righteous Avenger of insolence and pride, who has been openly upbraided for his *artful tricks, fraudulent conduct, and palpable falsehoods*,—the very crimes which in these offensive terms he charged upon the harmless and innocent Remonstrants, when, at his own pleasure and without having received any directions to that effect, he dismissed them from the Synod, and loaded and oppressed them most unreasonably with such bitter and corroding expressions, as he afterwards judged proper to decry, and for which, being moved by repentance, he thought it best to ask their forgiveness? Were not his ambition and avarice publicly cast in his face as a reproach, because, after he had been allowed (who would believe it?) to chuckle over the sum of thirteen Guilders a day, he added to the account his allowance for 29 days of vacation, thus augmenting the amount by 377 Guilders? Such was the *holy* and *exemplary* character of that man who was chosen leader of the reverend choir and president of this Synod!"

In a letter which Episcopius addressed to Taurinus in 1641, he incidentally mentions a curious circumstance about the spiritual consolation which Bogerman administered to a sick man: "I recollect to have read in an account of a conversation which Bogerman held with Prince Maurice during his illness, that the sick Prince asked him, 'How can those passages of scripture which 'promise grace and pardon to penitents, apply to me, since I do not discover 'within myself any of that serious repentance or contrition?'—Bogerman replied, 'Do you not feel within yourself a willingness or wish to repent?'—When the Prince said, that he certainly had a feeling of that kind, Bogerman rejoined, 'This wish *to be able to repent*, is an infallible token of REGENERATION.' "—Such a soothing doctrine as this, was every way worthy of the President of the Synod of Dort, at which the Calvinistic axiom of "ONCE IN GRACE, ALWAYS IN GRACE" was completely established. The British Divines reasoned thus on the subject: "Our right or title to the kingdom of heaven and consequently to the vision of God, is not derived from any actions of our own, neither is it placed or built upon them; but it is placed in a free adoption, and in our union with Christ. Our right, therefore, to the kingdom is not taken away, unless that be removed upon which it is founded; *If sons, then heirs,—heirs of God, and co-heirs with Christ*. As long then as the believer's adoption and his grafting into Christ remain, though he may wander out of the way of the kingdom, *yet he cannot fall from his hereditary right to that kingdom*." (Acta Syn. Dor. 194, pt. 2.) While our pious countrymen were thus zealously contributing to spread this desecrating dogma, though they intended it for the comfort of the faithful, they could never have imagined the purpose to which it would be applied, a few years afterwards, by one of the greatest enemies of their church and order. Bishop Womack, in his "Result of False Principles," quoting from a pamphlet, entitled, "A Collection of Several Passages concerning his late Highness, OLIVER

honourable seat in the assembly. On this point the parties between whom the difference subsists, should be mutually

CROMWELL, in the Time of his Sickness," says, "This is that which supported the death-bed faith of his late Highness, O. C., who speaking then of the Covenant, is reported to say, 'Whatsoever sins thou hast, dost, or shalt 'commit, if thou lay hold upon free-grace, you are safe. But if you put 'yourself under a covenant of works, you bring yourself under the law, and 'so under the curse; then you are gone.'"

It has already been stated, (page 432) how equitable the conditions were which the Remonstrants proposed for the farther prosecution of their cause when they found that the Calvinists would not allow them to treat on Reprobation in the first instance. One of their propositions, was, "to defend their own doctrines, and to refute the opposite opinions of the Contra-Remonstrants and of *those whom they consider orthodox*." The allusion to it in this place, is only for the purpose of briefly elucidating the usual conduct of Bogerman. When he had read that part of their proposal, he paused, and exclaimed, "Pray, whom do you mean by *those who are considered orthodox?*" Episcopius answered for himself and brethren, "The present time is not the most proper for asking such a question; but we shall have no objection against naming those teachers, when we come to that part of the discussion." This judicious reply did not satisfy the President; who, how foolish soever the questions might be which he proposed, if they were not instantly answered, was accustomed to vent his Calvinian spleen and vengeance against those who refused, and to exhibit them to the deputies, and principally to the foreigners, as perverse and obstinate fellows who would not acknowledge the authority of the Synod, of which he was the proper mouth and organ. On this occasion, therefore, he insisted upon having the names of those *reputed orthodox teachers*. Seeing the snare which he had again dextrously laid for them, and that he intended to imbitter the foreign Divines against them, as men who would not hesitate to expose the most renowned Doctors of their different countries, the Remonstrants presented a continued refusal to his most pressing intreaties, and resolved that his remarks should be grounded on his own evil surmises and not on their expressions. Finding, therefore, that they were not to be coaxed into his trap, Bogerman opened out his characteristic fury, and in a great passion exclaimed: "If you will not name them, I will. They are Zuinglius, Bucer, Calvin, Beza, Marlorat, Martyr, Zanchius, Piscator, Perkins, and Whitaker! those venerable men, those brave heroes, those noble lights of the church, those happy souls whose memory is blessed both by God and man! These are the persons whom you intend to expose!" This speech was pronounced with so much warmth, and in such a thundering tone, that his countenance changed, his joints trembled, and his words seemed to possess no coherence. When Episcopius describes this scene, he says, "What eyes, and what a countenance did the man exhibit! The perturbation which he manifested I can compare to nothing better than that of a man the tender pupil of whose eye had been pricked by some sharp instrument, the pain of which caused him to writhe with agony."

Bogerman, however, like other skilful actors, had always some purpose to answer, by these exhibitions of outrageous conduct: his madness was, in this respect, never devoid of method or reason. On this occasion, when he seemed to have recovered from his passion, he perceived some members of the Synod to be shocked at his fury; he therefore ordered the Remonstrants to retire, and, in excuse for himself, threw all the blame on them, assuring the Synod, that it was the remembrance of those good and holy men which had transported him so much beyond himself. He then played upon the feelings of the members, and intimated, that the Remonstrants, who had thus with impure hands attacked such great men, endeavoured to overthrow the authority both of the Commissioners and the Synod, to pervert the received doctrines of

agreed. (1) The debates will not be conducted according to the rules of Rhetoric, but according to Dialectics: But a

the churches, and to procrastinate matters. Having made the requisite impression on all of them, especially in reference to the dreaded doctrine of reprobation, he desired the members to deliver their sentiments *seriatim* on this answer of the Remonstrants. The English declared themselves weary of their proceedings, and since they refused to own the authority of the Synod, their opinions might as well be gathered from their books in their absence. The counsel of all the foreigners, with the exception of Martinius of Bremen, was to the same effect, only that many of them mixed up their views of this matter with much invective against the cited persons and their doctrines. The inland Divines were of the same opinion as the other members. This ebullition of wrathful feeling shewed itself before the Remonstrants had presented to the Synod a single line in the way of *proposing*, *explaining*, *or defending those Five Points* which they had just given in to the Synod, as a sort of text on which to ground their further observations. It was in reference to this circumstance that Episcopius afterwards most appropriately observed: "If Bogerman had considered the dogmas of those men to be erroneous or horrible, and if he had shewn an aversion to please any party, mindful of his sacred oath, which prescribed *the word of God* as the sole rule of judgment, and being far removed from all affection and prejudice, he would not have accounted it a hardship to see those dogmas brought under examination; on the contrary, he would rather have taken them into consideration, and would have weighed in the balance of his judgment all those objections which the cited persons might have afterwards brought against them. The Synod also itself, which was bound in conscience to observe the sanctity of the same oath, ought to have passed no slight censure on its President, for having manifested such uncommon perturbation and such a strong attachment to a party, we will not say at the mere *mention*, but only on *the bare supposition*, of this matter. It was necessary to employ some dissimulation or pretence, and to cover up *those horrid secrets of the Contra-Remonstrant religion* with some specious disguise, that they might not give offence to the promiscuous multitude"

Episcopius has here pourtrayed the true cause of all this unfair dealing: For the Remonstrants had kept the members of the Synod in a feverish and fretful mood, during two or three previous sessions, by adducing their strong reasons for discussing Reprobation before Election. What sensible Calvinist would ever permit this to be done, if he could prevent it? The Synodical reasons of the different colleges for rejecting the priority of Reprobation, are among the most curious materials of those celebrated ACTS. Take a specimen, "Nature herself teaches us to begin with an affirmation, and not with a negation.—The example of all Theologians is decidedly in opposition to such a course.—Even if this were the easiest and most ready way, yet neither the Remonstrants nor ourselves are at liberty to walk in it: *They are not*, because they have been commanded *in the first place* to exhibit to the Synod their own sentiments, of which they approve and which they teach, not the opposite sentiments of which they disapprove: *Neither are we thus at liberty*, for we consider it great rashness and a dereliction of our duty to change *at our pleasure* that order which has been laid down by the higher powers.—The scriptures frequently descant on Election without any mention of Reprobation.—It is an act of profaneness, promiscuously to agitate curious questions on such a profound mystery.—This course of proceeding would be attended with peril to the Remonstrant brethren themselves, *since they will not be able to find either the Dutch brethren or the foreign Divines guilty* of those blasphemies with which they have heretofore with impunity loaded the orthodox doctrine.—If that opinion of theirs be correct which places *faith and perseverance foreseen* as the causes of election, they might be able to prove it sufficiently from proper principles, that is, from the sacred scriptures, *with-*

logical and concise mode of reasoning will be employed; and all precipitancy of speech and extempore effusions will be

out making any mention of the contrary sentiments.—Let them reflect on the judgment which all good, prudent, and wise men will form of them, when they hear, that the Remonstrants, having been summoned to deliver a profession of their own faith and not of other people's, chose to busy themselves with the discussion of the opinions of other men, rather than with the defence of their own.—Let them likewise consider, what the judgment of those churches which they serve will be, when they hear, that their pastors have been far more solicitous about the unbelieving goats than about the believing sheep; and that they preferred to depart from the care of the elect sheep, rather than to yield obedience to the magistracy and the Synod in a matter that was so very equitable."—These are only brief extracts from the reasons of two of the most moderate colleges. Those recondite, shrewd, and laboured arguments for the precedence of Election, and others to shew *the extreme equity* of interrogating each of the cited persons singly, and of allowing them to propose, explain, and defend their doctrines, *only so far as the Synod should think fit*, occupy no less than sixteen pages, in the quarto copy of *the Acts*, published by authority of the States General. But these extracts are ample enough to shew the utter reluctance which that grand body of Calvinists evinced to have the nakedness of their unscriptural doctrine of *absolute reprobation* discovered. One of the most futile arguments which they employ, is, "the injustice of thus disturbing the consciences of the Elect on account of God's judgments against the Reprobates." Does this import, that some *of the Elect* of that age were inclined (O heinous offence!) to '*put on bowels of compassion*' for the reputed reprobates, and thus to draw within their minds and from their own feelings some faint image or conception of the infinitely more expansive yearnings of the Divine Benevolence? Or does it mean, that "this disturbing of the consciences of the Elect" would be fatal to their personal salvation? If the former be the true signification of the expression, the more frequent the recurrence of such compunctious visitings and sympathetic feelings, the more humbling and salutary for the individuals themselves; for they will be induced to compare their internal sensations with those encouraging descriptions of God which are contained in his word, and they will soon learn to confess,

> "The Lord is merciful to ALL
> Our lost apostate race!"

But if the latter be the real import of the expression, does it not betoken, that Calvinistic Election is not eternal, but liable to be lost? Or, is it (as many of the profane have supposed) a mere imaginary matter, so that when a forward man chooses to put himself into the favourable scale of election, he is a saint, till he suffers himself to doubt, or till he begins to feel a "disturbing" concern for the welfare of others not so highly favoured as himself? It is undoubtedly true, that this inward and strong persuasion of being among the chosen few, is, of the many tokens of individual election, one in which almost every Calvinistic writer of any repute agrees, when he lays down what he conceives to be the proper *data* of such a felicitous state, however greatly several of his other *data* may differ from those of his brethren. To induce such bold warriors as Oliver Cromwell and Prince Maurice to account themselves elect ones, is an easy matter, even on such slight grounds as those adduced by their respective ghostly advisers. In the perilous circumstances in which they were both placed, Cromwell shewed himself to be by far the more courageous soldier: For he talks like an old veteran about "laying hold upon free-grace," and "putting yourself under a covenant of works," just as if either of these acts, however they may be *theoretically* contemplated in Calvin's scheme, were, in point of *actual practice*, purely a matter of personal

avoided. To each of the parties such an equal space of time will be allowed as may appear necessary for due meditation; and, to avoid many inconveniences and absurdities, every speech intended for delivery will be comprised in writing, and will be recited from the manuscript.* No one

option. But Calvinist teachers meet with few affairs of greater difficulty than that of persuading men of diffident and retiring spirits to reckon themselves among the chosen. The tenets of the Arminians are known to be much more evangelical than those of the Semi-Pelagians; yet even the latter have in this particular an advantage over the Calvinists. For they apply to all professors of religion that unerring test of our Lord, '*By their* FRUITS *ye shall know them*:' and they send all their adherents to prove their faith by their works, and to try themselves, their actions and their affections, by '*the law and the testimony*.'

Before we dismiss the doctors who thus skilfully screened the doctrine of unconditional Reprobation from the horrid doom to which it was destined, it may be proper to state, that the Hessian and Embden divines, in delivering their judgments on that *momentous* occasion, talked about the Remonstrants as "cited and guilty persons;" and among other matters informed them, "that it is not the province of cited and guilty persons to prescribe rules to judges." But before we conclude, we must quote this expression of the deputies from Geneva: "It is astonishing to us, that men, who are few in number *and only moderately endowed with other qualities*, should arrogate to themselves a Dictatorial power over the spirits, the doctrine and the judgments of men, who were beyond all exception greater than themselves;—and should in such an obstinate or fearful manner endeavour to avoid all judgment on the part of others, however legally it may have been instituted, unless it be in every respect favourable to them and accommodated to their conceptions!"

No one who has contemplated the effect produced by particular doctrines on the very countenances of some men, will consider a digression about *absolute Reprobation* to be misplaced in this note. Bogerman, the great defender of that frightful doctrine, seems to have had "NO PITY FOR REPROBATES" engraven on his formidable brow: The same observation applies to his compeer Gomarus, if the noble portraits, contained in the English translation of BRANDT'S *History of the Reformation in the Low Countries*, be faithful likenesses. But I am half inclined to believe, that either the celebrated GEORGE VERTUE who engraved those portraits, or the artist from whom he copied them, was a zealous Arminian: For on the clear and unruffled forehead of ARMINIUS he has impressed all the mildness and amplitude of "A MOST STRENUOUS DEFENDER OF THE DIVINE PHILANTHROPY," and has infused much sagacity and thoughtfulness into the general and striking benevolence of his aspect. The countenance of Arminius, in the engraving by Vertue, is more pleasing and majestic than that in the portrait which is prefixed to this translation of his works: The latter is copied from a Dutch engraving, that is represented to be a good likeness of what the noble Professor was, before he began to droop and decline.

* It is a subject of deep regret, that these excellent rules were not observed at the Synod of Dort. "Precipitancy of speech and extempore effusions" were but too frequent in that reverend assembly, not only in the treatment which the cited Remonstrants experienced, but in the conduct of some of the members towards each other. As one instance, among many, of this disregard of "Dialectics, and of a logical and concise mode of reasoning," take the following extract from HALES'S *Letters*.

"It hath been lately questioned, how Christ is said to be *Fundamentum Electionis*. The doctrine generally received by the Contra-Remonstrant in

shall be permitted to interrupt or to close a disputation, unless, in the opinion of the whole assembly, it appear that sufficient

this point is, 'That God, first of all, resolved upon the salvation of some singular persons; and, in the second place, upon Christ as a mean to bring this decree to pass.' So that, with them, God the Father alone is the author of our election, and Christ only the executioner.—Others on the contrary teach, 'that Christ is so to be held *Fundamentum Electionis*, as that he is not only the executioner of election, but the author and the procurer of it:' For proof of which they bring the words of the Apostle to the Ephesians, the first chapter, *Elegit nos in Christo, ante jacta mundi fundamenta*, ['He hath chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world.'] The exposition of this text was the especial thing discussed at this meeting [Session 65]: and some taught, that Christ was *Fundamentum Electionis*, because he was *primus Electorum* ['the first of the elect']; or because he is *Fundamentum Electorum*, but not *Electionis*, ['the foundation of the elect' but not of 'election,']; or because he is *Fundamentnm beneficiorum* ['the foundation of the benefits'], which descend upon us: others brooked none of those restraints. Dr. Gomarus stands for the former sentence, and in defence of it had said many things on Friday. This night Martinius of Breme, being required to speak his mind, signified to the Synod, that he made some scruple concerning the doctrine passant about the manner of Christ's being *Fundamentum Electionis*, and that he thought Christ, not only the Effector of our election, but also the Author and Procurer thereof. Gomarus, who owes the Synod a shrewd turn, (and then, I fear me, began to come out of debt,) presently, as soon as Martinius had spoken, starts up, and tells the Synod, *Ego hanc rem in me recipio*, ['I take this charge to myself,'] and therewithal casts his glove, and challenges Martinius with this proverb, *Ecce Rhodum, ecce saltum*, ['Here is your test: shew yourself courageous,'] and requires the Synod to grant them a duel,—adding that he knew Martinius could say nothing in refutation of that doctrine. Martinius, who goes in æquipace with Gomarus in learning, and *a little before him for his discretion*, easily digested this affront; and, after some few words of course, by the wisdom of the Præses matters seemed to be little pacified, and so, according to the custom, the Synod with prayer concluded. Zeal and devotion had not so well allayed the choler of Gomarus, but immediately after prayers he renewed his challenge and required combat with Martinius again; but they parted for that night without blows. Martinius, as it seems, is somewhat favourable to some tenets of the Remonstrants concerning *Reprobation, the latitude of Christ's merit, the salvation of infants, &c.*; and, to bring him to some conformity, was there a private meeting of the foreign Divines upon Wednesday morning, in my Lord Bishop's lodging; in which thus much was obtained, that, *though he would not leave his conclusions, yet he promised moderation and temper in such manner, that there should be no dissension in the Synod by reason of any opinion of his.*" On the same subject he writes thus in his next letter: "When Dr. Davenant had spoken, the auditory was commanded to depart. For having a purpose that others should speak at the same time, and fearing that some diversity of opinion might rise and occasion some dissension, it was thought fit that things should be transacted as privately as might be. Many more of the foreigners delivered themselves that night; and, amongst the rest, Martinius of Breme proposed again his former doubts unto the Synod, concerning the sense in which Christ is said to be *Fundamentum Electionis*, and requested to be resolved. But D. Gomarus at this time was somewhat better advised, and thought it best to hold his peace." And he briefly concludes his account of this matter in the following words: "My Lord Bishop of late hath taken some pains with Martinius of Breme, to bring him from his opinion of *Universal Grace*. By chance I came to see his letter written to Martinius, in which he expounded that place in the Third of John, '*So God loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son*,' &c.; which is the strongest ground upon which Martinius rests himself."

reasons have been advanced to satisfy the subject under discussion. (2) When a disputation is finished, a grave and mature deliberation will be instituted both concerning the controversies themselves and the arguments employed by both sides;* that, the limits of the matter under dispute being laid down with great strictness, and the amplitude of debate being contracted into a very narow compass, the question on which the assembly has to decide and pronounce may be perceived as at one glance with complete distinctness. (3) To these will succeed, in the proper course, a free declaration of opinion,—a right, the benefit of which will belong equally to all that are convened of each party, without excluding from it any of those who, though not invited, may have voluntarily come to the town or city in which the Synod is convened, and who may have been admitted into it by the consent of the members. †

* In a subsequent part of this narrative, it will be shewn, how ill several of these rules were observed at the Synod, and that, in consequence of its peculiar constitution and because it contained but one party, many of these excellent directions became nullities.

† The reader will, in Bishop Womack's pamphlet, perceive the manner in which this "free declaration of opinion" was often granted, even to the members themselves. In regard to the treatment of the Remonstrants, freedom of speech was scarcely ever granted to them, during the short intervals in which they were permitted to be present at some of the early sessions of the Synod. Thus, they complain, after one of them had put this close question to the President, "In case the Lutherans could prevail with the Elector of Saxony to convene a Synod, in which they alone might sit as judges, ought Dr. Pelargus, who had lately quitted their party and become Calvinist, for which the Lutherans have actually hindered him from sitting in this Synod to which he had been deputed,—ought he and those who are of his present persuasion, to submit to such a Lutheran Council?" (See page 419.) This was such an *argumentum ad hominem* as did not suit Bogerman, who accordingly made no reply; but, by a stretch of his authority, commanded silence, and ordered them to pass on to some other matter. "This," say the Remonstrants, "was the expedient which he practised whenever he found himself closely pressed and incapable of proceeding. He would then exclaim, 'Enough! Enough! Withdraw!' "—In the very next session, when Episcopius had begun to exculpate the cited Remonstrants from a false charge which had been preferred against them, he was interrupted, first by Heinsius, and afterwards by Bogerman; and thus injuriously compelled to abandon their necessary defence.

In the latter clause of the sentence in the text, Arminius does not appear to refer to common spectators, who, from the commencement, were allowed to be present at the different sessions, except when some affair of great importance was to be discussed: Thus, when the opinions of the deputies from different states and provinces were to be read in the Synod, (WOMACK'S *Brief Account* IV, 4,) it was ordered that all spectators, Contra-Remonstrants as well as Remonstrants, should be excluded from the Synod-house.—Hales has an entertaining extract on this subject. In the session of the 16th of Jan., he says, there was some discourse "concerning their auditory. For they questioned whether they should admit of hearers, or do all in private. Old Sibran-

And since nothing to the present period has proved to be a greater hindrance to the investigation of truth or to the con-

dus was very hot against the auditory, and thought it not fit that any care should be had of them, as being only *Mulierculæ, et pauculi juvenes incauti.* [weak women and a few listless young fellows]. There is some reason of this complaint of his, for many youths, yea and artificers, and I know not what rabble besides, thrust in, and trouble the place. As for women, whole toops of them have been seen there, and the best places for spectators reserved for them. Which thing must needs expose the Synod to the scorn of those, who lie in wait to take exception against it. But the Synod hath determined in favour of their auditory, that sessions consultatory and provisional shall be private, but Sessions wherein they discuss and conclude shall be public." Many of these spectators came from distant parts of the country, expecting to be amused or edified by a verbal conference between the Remonstrants and their adversaries. For though all of them could not be supposed to understand the language in which the discussions would be conducted, yet, by a slight attention to the temper of each of the speakers as displayed in his countenance and the tone of his voice, they might soon have framed a tolerably accurate graduated scale of the different degrees of Calvinian elevation to which they had attained,—from that of the English and Bremen divines, who declared themselves (on the second article) in favour of General Redemption, through the intermediate opinions of Walæus, Tossanus, Hommius, Lubbertus, and Voetius, up to those of the worshipfnl the President, who was the stern and strenuous defender of absolute Reprobation, and that determined Supralapsarian old Gomarus! But all hopes of an entertainment of this kind vanished, when, on the thirtieth session, it was announced to the Remonstrants by the Lay Commissioners, "that it never had been the intention of the States General that such a conference or disputation should be held, as is usual in the schools between two opponents; but that they [the Remonstrants] should propose, explain and defend their doctrines in writing, and then wait for the determination of the Synod." Many strangers who heard this decision, declared that they would not have come to Dort, if they had imagined that a mutual discussion would have been refused.—To remedy this public disappointment, the managers of the Synod endeavoured to be as accommodating as possible: For when, about the middle of February, the public sessions were less frequent than they had been, the people were promiscuously admitted into their private sessions, and allowed to remain till the prayers were ended, after which the members proceeded to business in committees or colleges, and the spectators withdrew. This arrangement was then said to have been made in consequence of the complaints of the innkeepers and excise-officers, who had suffered a great decline in business and revenue since the cessation of public sessions. To prevent a further defalcation, the reverend Synod in all humility of mind consented thus to become, during half an hour in each session, a sort of public show or spectacle.

But, on particular occasions, spectators of the Remonstrant persuasion were directed to be excluded; and the police officers, who had charge of the entrance, took good care to admit into the chamber none but well-known Calvinists. Thus, on the 7th of Jan., when the Synodical Acts of a few preceding sessions were to be repeated, John Narsius, the young man to whom Arminius addressed the letter quoted at the commencement of this oration, and who was on that day among the crowd of spectators, was called out hastily by one of the door-keepers, as though some one wished to speak to him, and was not suffered again to enter. John Grevius also, formerly Remonstrant pastor of Heusden, endeavoured on the same day to gain admission, but was prevented by one of the police, who informed him of the strict orders which they had received concerning persons of his denomination.—For three or four sessions after the dismission of the cited Remonstrants from the Synod, (on the fourteenth of Jan.,) while that sacred body of men were

clusion of an agreement, than this circumstance—that those who have been convened were so restricted and confined to

engaged in serious deliberations about their future course of proceedings, no spectators were admitted without leave personally obtained from the President, who would not concede such a favour to any one that was not acknowledged as one of the Contra-Remonstrant party. About that time, however, (on the 60th session,) Sylius, formerly Remonstrant minister of Utrecht, contrived to gain admittance with the throng; but his person being known to some of the members, he was soon discovered, and ordered to retire: The other spectators were also petulantly required at the same time to absent themselves. Such care did these skilful managers employ, to conceal from the cited persons every deliberation of any importance in relation to their affairs! On some of the sessions which were held on the dark winter evenings, they had a regular search instituted, under the vacant benches and tables, for any intruders that might be there concealed. Dr. Carleton, then Bishop of Landaff, was probably unacquainted with these excluding practices on the part of the President and his inland associates, or he would never have addressed the following sentence to the Archbishop of Canterbury: "In some things they erred greatly, for want of knowledge of what was done in the Synod, which seemed strange that of 400 or 500 persons which are spectators, not one would tell them what was done; seeing that might so easily be done, because they keep in a chamber that is hard by the door of the Synod House."

But these common spectators were not the persons to whom Arminius here refers: His observation applies rather to such men as those whom the President mentioned, as exceptions to the general exclusion when the different collegiate suffrages were to be read and considered: Hales says, the pleasure of the President, "with the advice of his assessors," was, that "the judgments should be read, no auditors being admitted, unless it were *some few choice ministers of good worth* who did here attend about the Synod." Of such *worthy* characters great numbers attended the public and private meetings of the Synod, and, though not recognized as members, were the familiars of the President, and rendered themselves useful to him in many secret negociations. Of these *choice ministers*, who were diligently employed in circulating *needful intelligence* on behalf of Calvinism, the famous Puritan, William Ames, was one, whose services were in high request. He is frequently mentioned in the English Letters from Dort. Hales, on one occasion, writes thus to his employer: "I suppose Mr. Amyes can better inform your honour of this last night's business: *He has been much with the Præses*, and, I imagine, *understands most of his intent*." Only a week before, Ames had been suddenly called to the Hague by the Ambassador, when Hales sent a letter by him, and says, "Mr. Amyes will inform your Lordship more largely, peradventure, in some farther circumstances." From these extracts it is evident, that Ames was more in the confidence of *the acting men* at Dort, than Hales or any other stranger could hope to be. Though an Englishman by birth, he had quitted his country on account of his Puritanic and levelling principles, and had, long before the convening of the Synod, distinguished himself by his virulent writings against Arminianism. He commenced his polemic career by holding oral disputations with the celebrated Grevinchovius at Rotterdam. Having been interrupted in that occupation, he discharged the remainder of his mental burden, by carrying on the controversy in letters, and by publishing his own objections and the replies of his antagonist. Grevinchovius, however, though then in great trouble, would not confide the statement of his good cause to the dubious fidelity of such a prejudiced adversary; but published another account of these disputes at Rotterdam, in 1615. Ames replied to his opponent's statement, in a pamphlet entitled *Rescriptio scholastica et brevis &c.* Soon after the Conference at the Hague, in 1611, Ames published a book, with this title, *Coronis ad Collationem Hagiensem*, in

received opinions as to bring from home with them the declaration which they were to make on every subject in the Synod;

which he tries to confute the answers which the Arminians gave to the Calvinists: This work is frequently quoted, to very good effect, by that consummate Divine, Bishop Womack, in his unanswerable dialogues, called *The Result of False Principles.* It was in reference to the confutation of several arguments in this work, that, when the Remonstrants were desired by the Lay Commissioners to be as brief as possible in their remarks on the fourth of the FIVE POINTS, they declared, "that their observations on that Point must appear prolix, on account of the many exceptions and subterfuges which the English Divine, Mr. Ames, had adopted."—To shew the influence and reputation which Ames enjoyed with the Synod, it will only be necessary to quote what is related concerning the 147th session, by Balcanqual, who, himself a high Calvinist, palliated the blasphemous and scandalous expressions of Maccovius. He says, "On the 27th of April, progress was made in requiring the votes and opinions of the members on the cause of Maccovius. Many persons wondered how he could possibly be accused of heresy on account of those theses; especially since one of the members for South Holland declared, that *they had formerly been seen by Mr. Ames, and had obtained his approbation; and that he was, even now, prepared to defend them.*" Because such a sound Calvinist as Mr. Ames could swallow and digest the blasphemies of Maccovius, the majority of the members ultimately agreed to receive the whole on the credit of his *taste* and *digestive powers*, and suffered the heretical Maccovius to escape with scarcely the semblance of a reprimand.

As early as 1610, Ames had written in favour of Puritanism and against Episcopacy: In the Preface to GREVINCHOVII *Dissertatio Theol.*, to which we have just alluded, that author gives, in Latin, the following account of Ames's production: Speaking of the English Puritans, he says, *Hi scilicet soli inter Anglos, &c.*, "They only, among all the English, are good, simple, and sound men; whom it is easy to know, by their avoiding all evil; and to whom the name of PURITANS has been given, on account of their aversion to theatrical amusements, oaths, balls, games of chance, and sumptuous entertainments. The rest of the nation are famous gamesters, hard drinkers, haters and neglecters of religious duties, experienced customers to the Papists, corrupted with a depraved ambition, profane swearers,—in short, vain, unjust and shameful men, all of them '*sons of Belial.*'.....This false and pretended order of BISHOPS must therefore be immediately abolished, or we must recall from the bottomless pit the system of the Papists." From this recapitulation it will plainly appear, that Ames was a fit instrument to be engaged in that disgraceful crusade against the gracious doctrines of Arminianism, which were then very imperfectly understood by the foreign Divines, and most grossly misrepresented by those of the United Provinces. To the shame of my native country, it was *the order of the day* with his Majesty's Ambassador in Holland, that the vilest detractors and the most worthless assailants of these doctrines, whether they happened to be Puritanic or Antinomian levellers, should be enlisted against the Remonstrants and encouraged to demolish their principles. But, like many other forward and busy fellows of his class, Ames sometimes forgot the character of the men in whose company he stood, and indulged his vanity at the expense of modesty and prudence. In one of Hales's letters, it is said: "My Lord Bishop is a little displeased with Mr. Amyes, for putting into his hand Grevinchovius's Book, in the Preface of which there are cited, out of a Writing of Mr. Amyes', certain words *very reproachful unto Bishops.*" Now in the preface to that book which, out of prejudice to Grevinchovius, he so eagerly gave into the hands of the Bishop, are contained the very gross and culpable sentiments which we have just quoted, and which Ames had neither modified nor retracted.

—it is therefore necessary that all the members assembled, should, prior to the commencement of any proceedings, take a

This circumstance, as well as many others, must have been very mortifying to the Bishop of Landaff, and to the rest of the English dignitaries. They were compelled to associate with a company of pastors, who, from their received notions of *the entire equality of their order*, had never been accustomed to manifest the least portion of that laudable courtesy, deference and christian respect to any spiritual superiors, which are among the many beneficial fruits of an episcopal regimen. The British divines must have felt themselves degraded by the unceremonious treatment, which, on more occasions than one, they received from the Presbyterian leaders of the Calvinistic party. But they had been expressly selected for this arduous service, by a man, whose greatest failings were his evident bias towards such pragmatical fellows as Ames and other theological innovators, and his strong attachment to the doctrines of Calvin. This was no less a personage than Dr. George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury; concerning whom the author of *the Worthies of England* long ago remarked, that if Laud had occupied the archi-episcopal chair at the time when Abbot had the supremacy, the lamentable schism which was subsequently effected, would never have occurred. For, the talents and the firmness of Laud, with the sound and holy materials which were then within the church itself, would have been more than equal to the suppression of the evil in its origin; and Abbot might afterwards, in the times of the First Charles, have indulged his native supineness by reclining on a bed of roses unmolested by a single thorn. In that case, the refined, dry and unedifying disquisitions which the Calvinistic clergy under Abbot's rule delivered from the pulpit, would not have paralyzed the salutary and mellowing influences of the Reformation from Popery;—to his successor would have been bequeathed something more substantial than "a church of shadowy forms," which, as a natural consequence of the unchecked prevalence of Calvinism, actually fell to the lot of Laud, and which he certainly endeavoured according to the best of his judgment to restore to its pristine elevation and purity,—though the doctrines recommended by him for that laudable purpose were not of such an evangelical and hallowing character as those of the renowned Arminius;—and Abbot himself would towards the close of life have been relieved from the trouble of writing in favour of the king's desire that *none should preach but in a religious form*, while no necessity would have existed for his good brother, the Bishop of Salisbury, to write *Animadversions on Thomson's Diatribe concerning the loss of justification and grace*, or the Saints' Apostacy. This brother was understood to possess great influence over the Archbishop: Balcanqual, who by degrees acquired the style of a real courtier, says, in a letter to the Ambassador, "This is like to be the difference, not in our college, but in the Synod about the second Article, [the extent of Christ's redemption,] and therefore desire his Grace to send us some good counsel for our carriage in it; for certainly most voices in the Synod will follow the received exposition of the reformed Doctors, confirmed much by my late Lord of Sarisbury his Grace's brother, who was thought to understand the meaning of our confession as well as any man." It is much to be regretted, that King James did not possess a more prudent adviser than Abbot in that great crisis of ecclesiastical affairs. The foolishness of the knight-errantry which sought adventures with theological adversaries in foreign countries, when such achievements tended only to aggrandize a greater enemy at home,—was made very apparent at this Synod. Had the elevated and scriptural doctrines of Arminianism, as taught by the great founder of that system, been allowed only to be placed in fair and honourable competition with the opposite doctrines, the Church of England would neither have had reason to lament that general inattention to christian duties, and that gradual decay of evangelical piety, which were induced by the lukewarm and Calvinistic principles industriously propagated from the pulpit and the press,

solemn oath, not to indulge in prevarication or calumny. By this oath they ought to promise that every thing shall be

under Abbot's administration, nor that foolish, and, unhappily too natural recurrence (under such circumstances) to principles as directly contrary as the opposite party could discover.

King James himself might have also derived much personal benefit from this grateful substitution: He would not then have become such an unjust and bigotted partizan as he shewed himself to be in 1611, when he addressed a theological manifesto to the States General, from which the following are extracts: "In the first place, therefore, we are persuaded, that you cannot possibly entertain a suspicion of our being induced by any worldly motives whatever to trouble you, especially with an affair of this description, unless we had been impelled to this service by a zeal for the glory of God, and by the warm desire which we feel, maturely to provide against and to cut off all matter of scandal which hangs over the Reformed Church. We wish you, then, to understand that we cannot sufficiently wonder that you have not only thought fit to call Vorstius (that frightful pestilence in a human form!) to such an elevated station, [as that of Professor of Divinity,] but have also permitted him to dedicate to you an apologetical pamphlet and to publish it under your auspices. This pamphlet undoubtedly contains nothing but an impudent defence of the disgusting and execrable blasphemies which he had vomited forth in his former book. These assertions we are now enabled to make from our individual knowledge: For, since we addressed our last letter to our ambassador, we have with our own eyes, more than once, perused both his publications, although not without the greatest grief and astonishment,—one of them being addressed to Maurice, Landgrave of Hesse, the other to yourselves. You might indeed have been abundantly warned to be in future on your guard against pests of this kind, when the same corrupting seed had been sown among you, some years ago, by ARMINIUS, *that enemy to God*, whose disciples and followers within your dominions have already become much too numerous and daring. At the instigation of these men, your subjects have now for some time been divided into parties and factions." But the most amusing part of this communication is thus delivered: "True indeed it is, *that we never heard a word about Arminius till after his death*, and till all the Reformed Churches in Germany began unanimously to complain of him. But no sooner were we made acquainted with the dissension between the minds of men, which, when Arminius died, he bequeathed to your Republic, than we immediately embraced the opportunity afforded to us by the presence of your Ambassadors extraordinary who were then at our Court,—and at that very instant we declared what appeared to us most conducive to the welfare and safety of your Republic, which, we have no doubt, they faithfully related. What reason is there, we beseech you, for doubting any more about the arrogance of the heretical or rather the atheistical sectaries who reside in your city of Leyden,—when one of them [Bertius] has not only dared lately to publish a blasphemous book on *the Apostacy of the Saints*, but has also proceeded to such a length of impudence, as to make a present of a copy to the Archbishop of Canterbury, accompanied by a letter, in which as well as in his book he is not ashamed of lying so roundly, as to affirm that the heresies expressed in his book do not differ from the profession of this our Church of England! What, if Vorstius, that miserable being, choose to deny the blasphemous heresies and proofs of Atheism which he has hitherto published, or to employ equivocations in softening them down! such a course will perhaps have the effect of prolonging his life, and prevent him from being burnt: On this subject I appeal to your *christian prudence*, and ask, Did there ever exist a heretic more deserving of this species of punishment?" From these extracts it appears, that two years after the death of Arminius, his Majesty had scarcely heard of the Professor's name; and he certainly had not seen one of his noble productions, or we

transacted in the fear of the Lord, and according to a good conscience; the latter of which consists,—in not asserting that

should have been favoured with some of his erudite remarks upon it. But he had recently seen two publications by men whom some people classed among the Arminians, but who did not belong to that body; and, from some of the ill-understood or disagreeable expressions in these two books, he is induced to pronounce a royal Philippic against them, and against the *manes* of ARMINIUS THE UNKNOWN! Grotius had been in England the preceding year respecting some affairs of the Dutch East India Company, and had on that occasion fully satisfied his Majesty's mind concerning the good intentions of the States of Holland in regard to the ecclesiastical differences which subsisted in their province, and had given him accurate information about the real situation of all their affairs. He had also several interviews with Bishop Overal, Isaac Casaubon, and other eminent and learned men of the Church of England; all of whom declared, that they would not themselves move one step beyond the bounds, which, in those controversies, the Remonstrants had wisely prescribed to themselves; and that the greatest men of their country held the same opinions as the Remonstrants. Grotius also at that period discovered, that Sir Ralph Winwood, the English Ambassador at the Hague, was in the habit of occasionally transmitting to the Archbishop of Canterbury such *ex-parte* accounts of ecclesiastical matters, as were highly prejudicial to the cause of the Remonstrants and favourable to the Calvinists, whose party was warmly patronized by his Grace. When the King had received ample information from Grotius, he was much exasperated at the erroneous statements which had been previously made to him: and he was in that state of mind for some time afterwards. But (alas!) this learned monarch was *never at one stay* with himself; and soon after Grotius had left England, Abbot, who had manifested his personal antipathy to that great man both before he came and during his abode in this country, persuaded his Majesty to buckle on his theological armour, and presented to him an enemy, worthy of a King, in the person of Vorstius, who was miscalled "a Remonstrant." An occupation more delightful to the mind of James could not have been devised; and he accordingly selected with critical exactitude all the objectionable positions contained in Vorstius's treatise on the Deity, and was much offended with the Dutch government for not instantly complying with his unchristian wishes respecting the punishment of the man who was then reputed an arch-heretic. But their affairs were at that time managed by men of integrity and prudence. Foiled in his attempt to have Vorstius brought to the stake, he was resolved that his kingly pains should not appear to be so trifling as to deserve no reward: And, since he could obtain nothing better, he accounted the heretical book a proper substitute for its author, and was content to have it ignominiously burnt in St. Paul's Church-Yard, and at both the Universities. It will however, be seen, in another part of this narrative, that the Synod of Dort gratified his Majesty's desires nearly to the full: and not a shadow of doubt is now entertained by any one, that the petty gratification of this monarch's insuperable vanity, in the stipulated condemnation and banishment of Vorstius, was one of the chief inducements held out to him, both by Abbot and the Contra-Remonstrants, to engage in the Synodical business, in opposition to the suggestions of his better understanding. Such petty enterprizes as these, in which James was artfully enlisted, were degrading to the royal character; and the impetuosity with which he prosecuted them, tended greatly, in that new age of thought, to alienate men's minds from the regal dignity and the established institutions, which have their best security in the manifestations of affection and respect on the part of those for whose benefit they are sustained and administered. Flattered as the great pacificator of nations by those that needed his aid, and boasting in private of his successful cunning and policy, which he was pleased to call "king-craft," his majesty imbibed very false ideas both of his own capabilities and of his royal power and prero-

which they consider to be false,—in not concealing that which they think to be the truth, (how much soever such truth may be opposed to them and their party,)—and in not pressing upon others for absolute certainties those points which seem, even to themselves, to be doubtful. By this oath they should also promise, that every thing shall be conducted according to the rule of the Word of God, without favour or affection, and without any partiality or respect of persons; * that the whole

gatives, and infused, into the minds of his children, the same unmanageable notions; which seemed to descend as by generation to the last of his unfortunate race. In forming a judgment concerning his immediate successor, we are too apt to contemplate Charles as an insulated personage; but if we consider the high veneration in which he held his royal father's published sentiments both on religion and politics, instead of viewing him as the self-tutored despot, we shall rather pity him as an obedient son, who, from mistaken yet conscientious motives, endeavoured to carry into practical effect those tyrannical principles about the truth of which neither his royal parent, nor any of those around his person, would ever suffer him to hesitate. But the decisive national crisis was far advanced at the very commencement of his reign, and had assumed a most portentous aspect, through the negligent supineness or the foreign trifling of those who had been entrusted with the supreme management of affairs civil and ecclesiastical. It was then too late for Charles to indulge in hopes of success, from the unrighteous experiment of applying arbitrary power as the sole remedy for existing abuses in the body politic; and for Archbishop Laud to expect any salutary results from the severe and objectionable manner in which he seconded his royal master's views with regard to ecclesiastical maladies, and suppressed the *unfruitful* peculiarities of Calvinism, the latter of which had under various devices been too much encouraged in the reign of his father.

* In many of the counsels which are tendered in this paragraph, every one who has perused the "Life of Arminius" will trace allusions to circumstances that had arisen in the Belgic churches, a little before the time when this oration was delivered.

In the form of the oath administered to each of the members of the Synod of Dort, several of these suggestions are adopted; especially that which specifies THE WORD OF GOD as "the only sure and infallible rule of faith," and which disavows the employment of "human writings" in deciding those controversies. With all their care and caution, however, the members occasionally betrayed a forgetfulness of the terms of their oath, in their dereliction of this Divine Rule of judgment. One instance of this may be seen in a preceding note, page 446: Another glaring instance of professed attachment to "human writings," was discovered at the second session. The history of this affair, and the gloss which the Synod put upon it, are thus related in their own ACTS: "In the letters of credence presented by the deputies of Over-Yssel, it was observed, that they were instructed to form their judgments not only according to the Word of God, but likewise *by the analogy of faith as it is contained in the Confession and Catechism of these churches.* Since by this expression it might seem, that the Confession itself and the Catechism, as a rule for judging of the truth of doctrine, were elevated to an equality in authority with the word of God, the deputies of Over-Yssel said in explanation, that they, and the brethren by whom they had been deputed, acknowledged the word of God for the sole rule by which to form a judgment about the truth of doctrine, and that they would themselves decide only according to it. But as additional mention was made, in their letters of credence, about *the Confession and Catechism*, they assured the Synod, that the brethren of Over-Yssel

of their attention in that assemby shall be solely directed to promote an enquiry after truth and to consolidate Christian concord; and that they will acquiesce in the sentence of the Synod on all those things of which they shall be convinced by the Word of God. On which account let them be absolved from all other oaths, either immediately or indirectly contrary to this, by which they have been bound either to Churches and their confessions, or to schools and their masters, or even to princes themselves, with an exception in favour of the right and jurisdiction which the latter have over their subjects.*

did not wish to intimate by this expression, that they placed those writings on an equal authority with the Holy Scriptures, but only accounted them orthodox compositions that agreed fully with the word of God, and forms of consent in orthodox doctrine; and that, if any controversy should arise respecting such consent, it was to be decided out of those formularies.—By this declaration they gave complete satisfaction to the Synod."—A most convenient method of varnishing over this business! But whoever is conversant with the ecclesiastical history of the Low Countries for some years previous to the holding of this Synod, will recollect that the authority of those two human documents was one of the main points on which the discussion of the doctrinal disputes hinged. On that subject see the remarks prefixed to this oration, page 370. In this view the open avowal of the Over-Yssel Deputies is entitled to the praise at least of frankness and honesty; since it is matter of fact, that a great number of the inland deputies, (though they were not themselves manly enough to confess it,) had been sticklers, during many years, in all the minor church-meetings, for the supremacy and almost the deification of those human compositions.

A third instance of this inattention to the obligations of their oath, may be seen, in Bishop Womack's pamphlet, (IV, 3,) quoted at length at the end of this oration. On that occasion the British Divines had strenuously insisted that several improper and indefensible expressions and phrases employed by various Calvinistic writers, and which had been adduced as a reproach by the Remonstrants, should be condemned by the Synod. This motion caused a long dispute, which was carried on through four successive sessions; during which, beside the usual tricks to which Bogerman always had recourse, "some of the members thought, it would not be for the advantage of the Synod to reject those harsh phrases, *because by such a course the reputation of some most excellent men would be wounded.*" This is part of what Balcanqual says on the subject: But in such a reason as this, can any trace be discovered of their professed *adherence to the word of God, as the sole rule by which to form their judgments?*—Alstedius, Professor of Herborn, and a member of the Synod, having accidentally met with two of the cited Remonstrants when this discussion was concluded, assured them, that the Synod would have condemned the opinions of Piscator and others, if some apprehension had not been entertained, lest the various Princes and States, under whose jurisdiction some of these offending individuals lived, would by such a course have been enraged against each other.—The whole of the proceedings on this subject resolved themselves into a measure of worldly prudence; and the violent Calvinists, who were the great majority in that choice assembly, shielded from deserved punishment the characters of several of their ablest champions.

* The exception contained in this last clause is a very just one; and proves that Arminius, though a divine, had very proper conceptions about political matters. At the commencement of this paragraph, he has stated one "great hindrance to the investigation of truth" to be this circumstance—"that those

Constituted after this manner, such a Synod will truly be a free assembly, most suitable and appropriate for the investigation of truth and the establishment of concord. This is an opinion which is countenanced by St. Augustine, who, expostulating with the Manichees, in continuation of the passage which we have just quoted, proceeds thus: "But that you may become milder and may be the more easily pacified, O Manicheans, and that you may no longer place yourselves in opposition to me, with a mind full of hostility which is most pernicious to yourselves, it is my duty to request of you, (whoever he may be that shall judge betwixt us,) that all arrogance be laid aside by both parties; and that none of us say, that he has discovered the truth: But rather let us seek it, as though it were unknown to each of us. For thus it will be possible for each of us to be engaged in a diligent and amicable search for it, if we have not by a premature and rash presumption believed that it is an object which we had previously discovered, and with which we are well acquainted."

From a Synod thus constructed and managed, those who rely on the promise of God may expect most abundant profit and the greatest advantages. For, though Christ be provoked to anger by our manifold trespasses and offences, yet the thought must not be once indulged,—that his church will be neglected by him; or, when his faithful servants and teachable disciples are, with simplicity of heart, engaged in a search after truth and peace, and are devoutly imploring the grace

who have been convened were so restricted and confined to received opinions as to bring from home the declaration which they were instructed to make on every subject in the Synod." The purpose which every man professes to have in view when he repairs to a General Council, is, to listen to conflicting arguments on different subjects at issue, and, after being convinced by the greater strength of some of those arguments, to determine in favour of such matters as they are brought to support. With such an intention as this, it is most preposterous for any deputy to be prevented by his secret instructions from yielding to the force of conviction, and to confine himself entirely to the preconceived opinions of those who have never listened to the conflicting arguments. As no man is compelled to appear at a General Council, those who cannot proceed to it without carrying the odious tokens of partiality and prejudice, ought never to enter the hall in which it is held. What kind of instructions the inland deputies to the Synod of Dort had received from their principals, may, after the preceding statement, be easily conceived: But it is known, that, several years before the convening of that assembly, they had not concealed their aversion to the suggestion of Arminius, when he wished them who met together ostensibly for the discovery of truth, "to be absolved from all other oaths, by which they had been bound either to Churches and their Confessions, or to schools and their masters." This was regarded with considerable apprehension, as a species of heresy, by those who wished to appear in support of the public formularies of the Dutch Churches; and it became at length a frequent matter of dispute in different meetings of their Presbyteries.

of his Holy Spirit,—that He will on any account suffer them to fall into such errors as are opposed to truths accounted fundamental, and to persevere in them when their tendency is thus injurious. From the decisions of a Synod that is influenced by such expectations, unanimity and agreement will be obtained on all the doctrines,* or at least on the principal part of them, and especially on those which are supported by clear testimonies from the Scriptures.

But if it should happen, that a mutual consent and agreement cannot be obtained on some articles, then, it appears to me, one of these two courses must be pursued:—FIRST. It must become a matter of deep consideration, whether a fraternal concord in Christ, cannot exist between the two parties, and whether one cannot acknowledge the other for partakers of the same faith and fellow-heirs of the same salvation, —although they may both hold different sentiments concerning the nature of faith and the manner of salvation. If either party refuse to extend to the other the right hand of fellowship, the party so offending shall, by the unanimous declaration of all the members, be commanded to prove from plain and obvious passages of scripture, that the importance attached to the controverted articles is so great as not to permit those who dissent from them to be one in Christ Jesus.†—

* The want of "unanimity and concord on all the doctrines" discussed in the Synod of Dort, is thus stated by a sterling writer of the old Arminian school, who was well qualified to give a decisive opinion on these subjects: "For to a man of an erect judgment, and whose spirit hath more of God and of a man in it than to suffer itself to be yoked with prejudice or base partiality, reading and weighing some passages in the records of this Synod, it cannot lightly but be a matter of some difficulty, to resolve himself clearly what the resolutions of this Synod were, touching the extent of the gracious intentions of God in the Redemption purchased by Christ, at least in case these resolutions of theirs be only estimated by their expressions..... But how that assertion of the men we speak of, wherein they grant that *Christ died antecedently for his enemies and unbelievers*, will find quarter at the hand of their own thesis, soon after subjoined, wherein they say that *Christ died adequately for all and only the elect*,—I leave to themselves and their friends to consider. I speak it with all simplicity of heart, and without the least touch or tincture either of prejudice or partiality, that, to the best of my memory and understanding, I never met with a piece of discourse from the hand of any judicious or learned man, *fuller of broad and pregnant inconsistencies, than the decisions of this Synod in the points cognizanced by them!* Only the writings and preachings of men interessed in the same principles with them, I find deeply baptized into the same spirit of self-digladiation."—(GOODWIN'S *Redemption Redeemed.*)

† Gomarus had offered an objection of this kind in the year 1608; respecting the doctrines of Arminius. (See page 74.) Ten years had elapsed when the Synod of Dort was called; during which long period his gloomy mind might have brooded over his celebrated assertion, and might have furnished itself with "plain and obvious passages of scripture" to prove that "those who dissented from him could not become one in Christ Jesus." But, after all the toil of himself and his associates, they were unable to produce any such strong

SECONDLY. After having made every effort towards producing a christian and fraternal union, if they find that this cannot be effected, in such a state of affairs the second plan must be adopted, which indeed the conscience of no man can under any pretext refuse: The right hand of friendship should be extended by both parties, and all of them should enter into a solemn engagement, by which they should bind themselves, as by oaths and under the most sacred obligations, to abstain in future from all bitterness, evil-speaking, and railing; to preach with gentleness and moderation, to the people entrusted to their care, that truth which they deem necessary; and to confute those falsities which they consider to be inimical to salvation and injurious to the glory of God,—and, while engaged in such a confutation of error, (however great their

reasons; and the chief resource on which they depended for the establishment of their tenets, seems to have been the arm of the civil magistrate, to whose paternal care they consigned at once their own lucubrations, and those *obstinate* persons who could not conscientiously receive them as the very quintessence of gospel verity.—It is remarkable, too, that, after Gomarus and his instigators had made all the world resound with the report of the deadly nature and destructive tendency of the innovations and errors of Arminius, and after they had employed much labour and time in examining his works, they were able to collect only nine, which, with the straining and stretching of the Synodists upon them, do not quite fill seven 12mo pages, at the close of Balcanqual's letters. They will be duly announced in their proper places, that the Christian Reader may be on his guard against them! In the mean time, he may form a true judgment of the whole, by these two specimens:

"6. On the EFFICACY OF GRACE.—We have the sentiments of Protestants on the efficacy of Grace, explained to us by Zanchius *(De Redemp. G. D.)* in these words: 'When the human will begins to be regenerated, although it 'has the power by its own nature to reject the grace which is efficaciously 'offered to it and sent into it, yet, on account of the efficacy of the Spirit and 'the firm will of God, it cannot resist that grace: and it is not so far capable of 'striving against God, when it is his will to regenerate, as to hinder regener-'ation.'—But the assertion of Arminius on this is, that 'it always remains 'in the power of free-will to reject the grace that is given and to refuse that 'which follows it; because grace is not an omnipotent act of God, which can-'not be resisted by the free-will of men.'

"9. On the BELIEVERS under the OLD TESTAMENT dispensation.—Arminius in his Apology, mentions it as a matter of some doubt, Whether the faithful under the Old Testament understood that the legal ceremonies were types of Christ. 'The passages,' he says, 'which seem to prove this, are so spe-'ciously removed by those who oppose that sentiment, that he who is not 'accustomed to yield his assent to any thing that is not well proved, may be 'easily induced to doubt whether the faithful under the Old Testament had 'any knowledge of that matter.'

"These are the errors of Arminius! from which many others necessarily rise as consectaries. Yet the Remonstrants call this man 'a pious and faithful servant of Jesus Christ!' "

Neither the reputation of Arminius, nor the soundness and evangelical tendency of his opinions, will be injured by this *Index Purgatorius*, even were it enriched with remarks that displayed more originality and theological acumen.

earnestness may be,) to let their zeal be under the direction of knowledge and attempered with kindness. On him who shall resolve to adopt a course of conduct different to this, let the imprecations of an incensed God and his Christ be invoked, and let the magistrates not only threaten him with deserved punishment, but let it be actually inflicted.*

But the Synod will not assume to itself the authority of obtruding upon others, by force, those resolutions which may have been passed by unanimous consent.† For this reflection

* This is the only part of the oration in which Arminius advises an appeal to the civil power; and the most zealous friend of religious freedom cannot wish to carry it beyond the bounds which our author prescribes. Observe, the obstinate party, that, after a Synod has decided against it, still holds out and cannot produce plain passages of scripture to prove the difference between it and the other to be insuperable; that refuses to offer to the other the right hand of friendship,—to desist from all bitterness, evil speaking and railing,—to preach with gentleness what it conceives to be the truth, and to confute opposing errors,—and that refuses to suffer its zeal to be under the direction of knowledge and attempered with kindness;—on such an obstinate party as this, Arminius thinks, deserved punishment should be actually inflicted. But he immediately qualifies this mode by such a number of merciful accompaniments, as will readily induce any one to believe, that he would himself have conquered the gainsayers by the arms of affectionate persuasion and kindness.

† Arminius dissuades from the practice of forcibly imposing upon others the resolutions of such a holy Synod. Happy would it have been for the inhabitants of the Low Countries, had those of Dort not been so obtruded! Many of the deprived and banished ministers of the Remonstrant persuasion returned into the United Provinces, and endeavoured to edify their disconsolate followers, by preaching to them whenever they could find an opportunity. In the performance of these pastoral duties, they travelled about in disguise, and held meetings in unfrequented places. An ordinance of government was issued, in 1619, prohibiting all such assemblies, and imposing punishment both by fine and imprisonment, not only on the officiating minister, but on every elder, deacon, or other ecclesiastical officer among the Remonstrants, and on every hearer. This punishment was augmented by succeeding enactments; and the cupidity of the military and the police, as well as that of common informers, was excited by the high fine imposed on the offenders, which was equally divided between the officer that apprehended them, and the spies who gave information. No man unacquainted with the history of the Low Countries at that period, can form any just idea of the of the havoc and devastation which ensued. Every province in the Union, and almost every large town in each province, had its own rights and ancient usages, which often differed much from the rest, and which, in executing the orders of the States General, it exercised according to its own discretion. Though this circumstance caused the greatest diversity to be observed in carrying into effect the proclamations of government, yet, as the ruling powers, from the Stadtholder down to the Burgomaster of the smallest town in those provinces, were alike enraged against the persons and the doctrines of the Remonstrants, they encouraged the most violent and rigorous proceedings against them, and, in many instances, accompanied the officers in the search for heretics and assisted in their apprehension. The outrageous proceedings in England which afterwards took place against the ejected Nonconformist ministers, when compared with the enormities which (with the connivance of the magistrates,) were perpetrated in the Low Countries against the Remonstrants, are to be considered as bearing fewer marks of

should always suggest itself,—"Though this Synod appears to have done all things conscientiously, it is possible, that,

malevolence and atrocity. The truce which had been concluded in 1608, with the Spaniards, for twelve years, expired in 1620; previous to which period, both the belligerent powers made extensive preparations for resuming hostilities, and every fortified town in the United Provinces was filled with troops, ready to take the field. Britons, happily for themselves, know only from the description of the sufferings of other nations, what a pest to peaceable citizens an unemployed soldiery frequently becomes: They may, however, easily conceive the great fury that would be displayed by Dutch or Allied troops, who, after having been pent up in a garrison some months, were taken into the open country or into a wood, and ordered to disperse a Remonstrant meeting. This command they contrived to execute in a summary and brutal manner, but generally with an eye to their own profit: For, after having fired among the assembled Remonstrants, they often commenced a system of plundering, by robbing all well-dressed individuals of their best garments, women of their rings and ornaments, and many persons of their money and other valuables. They maltreated all that offered the least resistance, and killed and wounded great numbers of valuable citizens. Some of the magistrates having found the Dutch soldiers acting in too lenient a manner against their offending countrymen, employed only Allied troops on this ungracious service. In some towns, in which the Remonstrants had ventured to hold meetings with great caution in private houses, the magistrates instituted an inquisitorial process, and, arresting persons upon suspicion of having been hearers, extorted from them or their dependents, by means the most unjustifiable, an account of some of those who *had voluntarily contributed their quotas toward the support of the banished or imprisoned ministers.* The latter was considered to be as great an offence as any of the others, and received its allotted portion of punishment.—But the ministers who dared to engage in these prohibited services, on being discovered, were most cruelly treated: Some of them were confined in prison many years, and only obtained their freedom after the death of Prince Maurice, and after his old friend King James had begun to manifest his decided predilection for the Spanish alliance. Others of them, who died in their native land, where it was unlawful for them to be seen either dead or alive, could not obtain Christian sepulture except by being committed to the earth under a fictitious name. After having recounted many of these particulars, Borrius declares in one of the Circular Letters, addressed to the Remonstrant Churches, in 1623: "They plague them [the Remonstrants] with extravagant fines, disfranchisements, prohibitions of trading, deprivation of all honourable or profitable situations, and by ruining them with exile. Some houses in which their meetings were held, have been pulled down: Others in which they sheltered themselves to avoid the fury and insults of the mob, on their return home from serving God, have been stormed and plundered; and all those persons who shewed them the least favour or kindness, have on that account been oppressed and trampled upon. And all this has been done in a country which took up arms in defence of their religious and civil rights! —Notwithstanding all these hardships, the Remonstrants are burdened with as many taxes as their fellow-subjects. It is true, they leave them their lives: But what is life to a good and pious man, when you at the same time rob him of all that is dear and valuable in life—the free and uninterrupted exercise of his religion?—The Remonstrants have sighed and groaned sufficiently, and have in a manner shed tears of blood for several years; and yet they are still oppressed.—All these things have befallen them, in addition to the shame, contempt, ridicule, insults, and bitter lampoons and ballads, to which they are obnoxious in all places. But the most mortifying circumstance of all, is, that such vile usage does not proceed from the stupid vulgar alone, but chiefly and more outrageously from those of the Court and

after all, it has committed an error in judgment." Such a diffidence and moderation of mind will possess greater power, and will have more influence, than any immoderate or excessive rigour can have, on the consciences both of the contumacious dissidents, and of the whole body of the faithful; because, according to Lactantius, "To recommend faith to others, we must make it the subject of persuasion and not of compulsion." Tertullian also says, "Nothing is less a religious business than to employ co-ercion about religion." For these disturbers will either then (1) desist from creating further trouble to the Church by the frequent, unseasonable and outrageous inculcation of their opinions, which, with all their powers of persuasion, they were not able to prevail with such a numerous assembly of impartial and moderate men to adopt.*

household of the Prince of Orange, who seize upon every opportunity to manifest their dislike and animosity!"

This note shall be closed with an anecdote of a more pleasant kind, related by the elder Brandt: "This business of subscribing was carried on either with violence or moderation, according to the regard paid, by the different magistrates, to the decrees of the National Synod. But the zealots, or most violent of the Contra-Remonstrant party, were not satisfied with compelling only the Schoolmasters to sign the act: They extended it even to Organists. This seemed very strange to some of those artists, since their pipes expressed nothing but inarticulate sounds, which could be offensive to neither party. In reference to this subject, I cannot refrain from relating a circumstance that occurs to my recollection, and which I heard many years ago, respecting a very ingenious Organist in one of the principal towns of Holland. This man, on being summoned to sign the Synodical formulary, earnestly requested the magistrates not to require his subscription; and said, 'My art has 'nothing peculiar to the one doctrine or the other. It is indeed my province 'to play in the Church, but not to preach there.'—But this ingenious excuse was of no avail; and as they continued to insist on obtaining his signature, he at length exclaimed, 'Gentlemen, I cannot possibly subscribe the Canons! 'But if you will be pleased to set them to music, I am at your service to play 'them for you in the Church on my organ. I am willing, with all my heart, 'to serve you in this manner. To play the Canons to any tune, is consistent 'enough with my profession; but to subscribe them, is contrary to my con-'science!' This bantering proposal was ill received, and excited greater displeasure than a positive refusal. Neither his musical attainments, therefore, nor the intercession of his friends, could prevent his expulsion from his situation. Other organists in several towns and cities, were also dismissed for refusing to sign the Canons."

* The Synod which Arminius has here depicted, consisted of "a numerous assembly of impartial and moderate men." The *impartiality* and *moderation* of the leading inland members of the Synod of Dort, will be best understood by a brief description of some of their characters. That of Bogerman has been already drawn at full length; and Gomarus is not unknown to the readers of this volume. Episcopius prefaces his short account of them, with these words: "If you wish to be well assured what kind of provincial divines were deputed to this Synod, consider the names of their chiefs and leaders, look over their virulent writings, which they published against the Remonstrants only a short time prior to the convening of the Synod, contemplate their behaviour towards the Remonstrants, which indicated something more

Or (2) being exposed to the just indignation of all these individuals, they will scarcely find a person willing to lend an ear

than common hostility, examine their bitter accusations, their harangues to the populace, their clandestine meetings, conspiracies, schisms, and rebellions,—their invectives, severe Philippics and reproaches, which were uttered every day, and low enough to have proceeded from a waggon-orator? Consider all these circumstances, and others like them, you may then collect materials from which to pronounce a true judgment of their personal qualities."—He then proceeds to describe them singly:

"Who is there that does not know how unfit GOMARUS was, to sit as a judge in the cause of Arminius and of those who are styled Arminians? For he was his colleague; and, being the very first man to evince tokens of all this hostility and discord, he became the herald who bore the hostile spear and declared war against Arminius and his followers.

"The more than feminine imbecility of the mind of SIBRANDUS LUBBERTUS displayed against the Remonstrants, his perpetual maliciousness and secret grudges against those of his colleagues who possessed greater moderation, his implacable hatred, his daily, vulgar and puerile invectives, and his paltry and insignificant letters against the Remonstrants, will all afford sufficient testimony of his total unfitness to become an arbitrator in our affairs."

This character of Lubbertus and Gomarus agrees well with a hasty sketch which Hales gave of them both, in one of his early letters to the Ambassador.—"Gomarus," he says, "is a man of great note; but *I never heard him speak with any strength of reason in the Synod till now.* What Sibrandus his opinion was concerning the point, I know not; for he doth so favour his voice that I can never tell what he saith: And I imagine *I have no great loss of it.*"—The elder Brandt also states the following circumstances concerning these two worthies, towards the close of January, 1619: "We find in a certain letter which one of the Remonstrants of Dort wrote to a friend about this time, that Gomarus gave sufficient proofs of his sour and uneasy temper in the different houses in which he lodged, having then changed the place of his abode no less than three times; that one of the persons in whose house he lodged had declared to a reputable man, that he would much rather have transactions with two or three Remonstrants than with one Gomarus; and that his landlord had become quite moderate, although he had previously been a very violent Contra-Remonstrant.—The same letter also mentions several other members of the Synod, who frequently removed from one lodging-house to another in a very unceremonious manner and to the great dissatisfaction of their landlords: It adds, that Sibrandus Lubbertus in particular was then traversing the whole city to provide a fresh lodging for himself." These two leaders of the Calvinistic phalanx were undoubtedly a most unlovely pair!

Episcopius thus continues his account of some others: "The shreds, patchwork, farrago, and collections of THYSIUS, of Harderwick, and the prefaces, as bitter as they are stupid, which he prefixed to those productions, prove him to be a manifest partizan and decided in his enmities. But what mortal man is there who applies the least degree of attention to this subject, and does not at once perceive the dissimulation and secret envy of POLYANDER towards the Remonstrants, when he has no manner of reason to adduce in support of his malignity:—the palpable schism and secession of WALÆUS;—the profane and scurrilous counsels in the city of Delft of HENRY ARNOLDSON, that most *worthy* president of the South Holland Synod, and his usuries that exceed those of mariners;—the exceedingly impudent and furious declamations of TRIGLANDIUS, out of his pulpit, against the Remonstrants;—the implacable hatred of MEHNIUS against all who dissent from him;—the Pharisaic and seditious Philippics of LYDIUS against the Remonstrants;—the secret and clandestine conspiracies of COLONIUS with the adversaries of the Remonstrants! What man is ignorant of the adverse dispositions and of the hostile deeds against the Remonstrants, on the part of these men and many others?"

to teachers of such a refractory and obstinate disposition. If this should not prove to be the result, then it must be con-

The two men who were chosen assessors to Bogerman, were James Rolandus, minister of Amsterdam, and Herman Faukelius of Middelburgh.—ROLANDUS could never mention the Remonstrants and their doctrines, in his sermons or private discourses, without being much agitated and trembling throughout his body. He could scarcely keep his countenance unchanged, if he met any noted Remonstrant in the street. In accordance with these feelings, he did not hesitate plainly to declare, that if Melancthon were then alive, and should come before them [the Synod] and maintain his notions about Conditional Predestination, they would not suffer him to divulge them.—FAUKELIUS, the second Assessor, had, long before, in conjunction with the other ministers of the Walcheren Class, assisted to prejudge and condemn the cause of the Remonstrants, in a letter which they wrote to the Divines in other countries, and had consented to the schism or separation. He was deputed to the Synod of Dort by men who had previously passed an unanimous resolution, "that the FIVE POINTS of the Remonstrants were *errors, contrary to the word of God and to the formularies of union.*"

The persons whom the Inland Divines chose for Registrars or Secretaries to the Synod, were SEBASTIAN DAMMAN, minister of Zutphen, and FESTUS HOMMIUS, of Leyden.

Damman had long before condemned the doctrine of the Remonstrants in several productions, and had united in extending the breach of Church-fellowship at Nimeguen and in other places by ejecting the Remonstrants. In publishing the Acts of the last provincial synod, held at Arnheim, under the title of "The Written Conferences of Guelderland," he had been guilty of bad faith, and had inserted many facts that were contrary to truth. His notorious tergiversation gave general offence. Having been himself an Arminian, he had formerly lived in a state of intimate friendship with Jacob Bruno, minister of Arnheim, who married the sister of Arminius. He had frequently extolled and recommended to others the opinions of the Remonstrants; and, after being received into the ministry by the class of Zutphen, whom he knew to hold the same sentiments, he openly declared, "Our Theology is no Theology: It is only mere *Calvinology* and *Bezology!*" By these expressions he intended to intimate, that many of the clergy did not derive their Divinity from the word of God, but from the works of Calvin and Beza.—The Remonstrants therefore had strong reasons for thinking, that he and his fellow-secretary were very improper persons to sustain that important office. It was in the power of these men to register in the acts of the Synod every thing at full length which militated against the cited persons, and to present whatever was favourable to them in a mutilated and garbled abridgment: This power they egregiously abused in numerous instances, and managed matters so well as to escape the reprehension which they richly deserved. For their usual practice was, to delay the public reading of the Acts of the preceding Sessions till several days afterwards; and then if any member stated his recollection to be different from the Synodical statement, if it happened to be respecting any matter of importance, his opinion was borne down by the *better* memories of the President and his associates. Brandt states in reference to this trick, in the course of his narrative: "On the 18th of December, the Acts of some of the preceding sessions were revised. The Remonstrants state, that the President, with his Assessors and Secretaries, composed a kind of little Synod among themselves; and, after regulating and adjusting most of the Acts according to their own minds, did not communicate them to the members at each succeeding session while the remembrance of the transactions was fresh in their minds, but deferred it occasionally for the space of a week or a fortnight: When, causing them [their version of the Acts,] to be suddenly produced, they took the members by surprize; and, reading them in great haste, while they were met together for other business, they found the members had either for-

cluded, that there are no remedies calculated to remove all evils; but those must be employed which have in them the

gotten them, or were then without the notes which they had made about each matter. To the Foreigners such proceedings appeared suspicious, and they could not avoid sometimes complaining of them. The cited persons also said, that when the Acts of the Synod were read in their presence, (which did not occur above twice or thrice,) they discovered in them several palpable mistakes and manifest untruths, which confirmed them still more in the jealousy which they had entertained of the partiality of the secretaries."—On the second of January, it is said: "The President briefly related the transactions with the Remonstrants for some days preceding, adding, that the Acts could not be read last week, because one of the secretaries who had attended the deputation from the Commissioners to the States-General at the Hague, had taken a great part of them with him, that he might be enabled to inform their High Mightinesses of all that had passed."—On the 7th of January, he gives a similar account: "The Acts of some of the preceding sessions were read and considered. The Remonstrants state, that the members were surprised at this; for they had expected to be employed in copying some of the President's questions concerning Reprobation. They complained therefore, that, in consequence of having received no notice, they had lately omitted to bring their notes with them, to compare them with the Acts of the Synod."

But Hommius was a worse character than even Damman. He was not a person of such a bold and passionate disposition as Bogerman or Gomarus; but he possessed all the cunning smoothness and cool malignity of a practised assassin. Engaged for many years in the vile arts of private slander and detraction against some of the best of his cotemporaries, he was at no time scrupulous respecting the means which he employed; and whenever he was detected in his infamous practices, and had them exposed to him in private, he was not at all abashed, but expressed his willingness to contradict them, and to pursue other courses. This man, and one or two of his friends, equally artful and plotting, were the prime movers in most of the important ecclesiastical disturbances which arose in the Low Countries previous to the convening of the Synod of Dort. The Remonstrants state, "that those among them, who conversed with him, and took great pains to induce him to embrace counsels tending to peace and forbearance, had frequently had experience of the curious methods which he employed to their detriment. Finding himself surrounded as if with a guard of mad and raging people, he could attempt any thing with impunity: and, under the protection of this shield, he earnestly strove to effect a breach of the peace with the Remonstrants. Though he affected outwardly to aim at peace, yet his constant endeavours in private, were, by vile artifices and without any regard to the prayers and entreaties of the best patriots, to cause the resolutions of the States to be rejected, and a schismatical banner to be publicly displayed at Leyden. For he knew that almost all the churches viewed that city as the polar star of Holland, on account of the influence which it possessed in ecclesiastical affairs, by means of its University and Divinity-College. But he screened himself under a fair outside and the zeal of the people: If that zeal had been restrained by him, he would have been defeated in all his projects." A man of this description must have been a very dangerous subject in that critical state of the Dutch Republic.

But the conduct of Hommius as a literary man and a Divine, will consign his name to perpetual execration. To his care was entrusted the publication of the second edition of the posthumous works of the two Professors, Trelcatius senior and junior; but he made very great alterations in them, without offering any apology or explanation. The first edition of those works had been published from authentic manuscripts. Egregious discrepancies therefore became apparent, when the two varying impressions were compared together; and it was soon ascertained, that several of the alterations of Hommius were in direct contradiction to the avowed sentiments of the deceased authors.

least peril. The mild and affectionate expostulation of Christ our Saviour, must also live in our recollections: He addressed

—His bad faith was displayed, in a still more reprehensible manner, when, early in 1618, he composed a Latin work, principally for the service and information of those foreigners who were invited to the National Synod, to be perused by them prior to their arrival. It was entituled, *Specimen Controversiarum Belgicarum*, and purported to contain exact quotations from the different writers whose sentiments were judged to be obnoxious to the Contra-Remonstrants. But those quotations were publicly proved to be, in many instances, false; and were obviously presented in that mutilated form, to excite a general prejudice against the cause of the Remonstrants. It was soon afterwards translated into Dutch for the use of the common people, under the title of *The Monster of the Low-Country Differences*. For this disgraceful publication, a few copies of which he presented to the States of Holland, their Lordships voted to the author a reward of two hundred Guilders. To point out the culpable perversions and falsifications in regard to his own words quoted in the *Specimen*, Episcopius wrote an able tract, called, *Optima Fides Festi Hommii*, and afterwards, on the same subject, *Brevis Responsio*. One of the misquotations of which Episcopius complained, is thus stated: "We deny, that the knowledge of God which is obtained from nature, is SAVING knowledge:" Hommius gives this sentence with the word "NATURAL" instead of SAVING, in order to find some pretence for affixing a charge of Socinianism on the author.—But this champion of Calvinism possessed "a front of brass;" and, so far from being abashed at these and similar exposures, he proceeded onward in his mad career, and proved to the learned world of what incorrigible materials his mind was composed.

To misreport the Theses of Episcopius, had been a favourite employment with Hommius from the year 1616, when he was summoned to two conferences with the learned professor, to substantiate his charges before the Curators of the University and the Burgomasters of Leyden; at both of which, with that monstrous flexibility of temper and principles which seemed natural to him, after being completely foiled in his disingenuous attempts, he professed himself to be completely satisfied with the explanations which Episcopius gave. Yet these salutary checks did not produce in him any signs of amendment, for he omitted no opportunity to vilify Episcopius and the Remonstrants. He distinguished himself particularly by his diligence in obtaining the different public and private disputations of Episcopius, as they were copied down by the Divinity students in the course of his lectures. But every one conversant with notes of this kind, knows how very inaccurately they are often taken, even by young men of the greatest acquirements. From these imperfect sources were the Theses of Episcopius derived which were criticised by the Divines of the Synod. Brandt relates, that on the second day of Jan., the President "exhorted the members of the Synod to prepare their scruples or objections on the subject of doctrine, to extract from the books of the Remonstrants whatever proceeded beyond the Five Points, and for that purpose carefully to observe the Theses or Disputations of the Professor Episcopius, which had lately been printed. Festus Hommius, who had published those Theses from a certain copy which he had procured, said, that now no man in the Synod had any reason to hesitate about this being the Professor's own work, and that they might fully rely on its authenticity. Yet Episcopius had ventured to assert, in a publication, only a few days before, that the appearance of that work had done him great injustice, whether it had been done intentionally or through negligence. Though Festus boasted, that he had acted *bonâ fide*, yet, the Remonstrants say, he could not be ignorant, that the copy from which he had the work printed, abounded with errors. There were in it whole sentences of which no good sense could be made; while, in others, many things were stated diametrically opposed to the sentiments of the author, and several that were false, or at least liable to much misconstruction."

his disciples and said, "Will ye also go away?" (John vi, 67.) We must use the same interrogation; and must rest at that point and cease from all ulterior measures.

On the 17th of Jan., Hommius and Faukelius were deputed to the Hague with two of the Lay Commissioners, to report progress to their High Mightinesses, one of whom, adverting to this deputation says, "Those deputies were not contented to make a simple report of matters, but even turned informers; they [the ecclesiastical deputies] were not only full of complaints about the obstinacy and rebellion of the Remonstrants, but likewise accused Episcopius of having communicated certain Theses or Positions to such of his disciples as he instructed in private, in which he had treated the Synod with contempt, and had even rejected the word of God: They added, that this would appear by the printed Theses themselves,—though, they believed, that it was not he, but some one else, that had published these Theses, and that he was totally unacquainted with the matter."

This is a slight sketch of the character and conduct of Festus Hommius, to whose care and that of Damman was confided the composition of the Acts and some other Synodical documents. He had made himself very conspicuous by the part which he had acted in all the disturbances in Holland, and was one of the Contra-Remonstrant deputies both at the Conference of the Hague and at that of Deft. His zeal and impudence gave him great importance in the eyes of all good Calvinists; and how well qualified he was thought to be for any confidential services, is very plain from the use which Sir D. Carleton made of him in his dextrous management of affairs at the Synod. Hales says, in his third letter, "Upon Saturday, the day after my coming to Dort, I went to Festus Hommius, and delivered him your honour's letters, upon perusal of which, he liberally promised me an index of all whatsoever had passed in the Synod until my coming to town."—The following account of his quarrel with old Lubbertus extracted from Balcanqual's notes, is highly illustrative of the spirit which animated the leaders of the Synod, and of the man's own cool and sedate method of managing an unpleasant affair. It is known that much address was displayed, by all the rigid Supra-lapsarians, to shield their good brother, Maccovius, from the well-merited and severe censure which was meditated against him by the moderate part of the Synod. Festus, who, for his Supra-lapsarian opinions, may be classed with Gomarus, fought hard for Maccovius; and, in that needful service, he spared none of those arts in which he was an adept. The period to which the extract from Balcanqual refers, was, when each of the members delivered his sentiments respecting the course to be pursued against Maccovius, whose blasphemous expressions had been first brought under the notice of the Synod by Sibrandus Lubbertus: "When Sibrandus had to deliver his opinion, he inveighed with great immodesty against Festus, upbraiding him with the height of his ingratitude to him. He also recited a new catalogue of the opinions of Maccovius, which were of the same class with the former. Festus, having obtained the President's permission to speak, answered Sibrandus in a modest manner, and stated, that those Theses had not been composed by Maccovius, but by a certain very learned young man of the name of Parker, who was removed far above the slightest suspicion of heterodoxy. He also said, though Sibrandus might now refuse to sustain the part of a public accuser, yet he had received information, from some persons in every respect entitled to credit, that Sibrandus had pillaged, from those Theses and from some other of his lectures, all the errors which had been objected against Maccovius.—When Sibrandus heard all this, he was agitated with a most violent passion, and *twice invoked* [*Deum vindicem,*] *the vengeance of God upon his soul, if there was any truth in those statements!* So that the President was compelled frequently to remind him of the sacred modesty and reverence which were due to the Synod."

My very famous, most polite and courteous hearers, these are the remarks which have been impressed on my mind, and

We will now proceed to give some account of the composition of the Acts. In the 73d session, among other matters, it was proposed, at the suggestion of the Commissioners, to compose from the Acts at large, an abstract of all the Synodical proceedings, to be transmitted to foreign princes for their information. This province was assigned to Altingius, Steinius, and the Assessors and Scribes; and Bogerman and Dr. Davenant were appointed the supervisors of such abridgment. But as that short narrative only embraced the occurrences up to that period, it was resolved, some time after the departure of the foreign divines, on the 28th of May, as Damman was then engaged in abridging the remainder of the Acts, which his fellow secretary had generally entered into the Journal, and as it was found to be impossible for him to finish his abstract before the conclusion of the Synod, on account of the many other occupations which demanded his attention, that he should, after the dissolution of the Synod, continue the labour of extracting at his leisure, and that when he had finished them, he should summon the supervisors, (Bogerman, Roland, Polyander, Mehnius, and a few others,) to confirm them in their reduced form. In consequence of this determination, Damman kept those documents in his possession till the month of November.

In December 1618, the States General had issued a proclamation prohibiting the printing, publication, importation, sale or vending of all or any of the proceedings of the National Synod, or of such papers as had been or might be drawn up or presented there, under the penalty of 200 Guilders for the first offence, loss of copies, &c. The requisitions of this proclamation were so rigorously observed, that the Remonstrants experienced the greatest difficulty in publishing any papers, however remote in subject from the Five Points or the other subjects of controversy. In May 1619, this proclamation was repeated by the States of Holland, with more severe penalties, a third part of which were awarded to the secretaries. It prohibited the Remonstrants from publishing any thing that related to the Synod, while their adversaries were allowed daily to print and circulate among the people all kinds of false and scandalous stories to their prejudice. A privilege was, at the same time, granted to the Synodical secretaries, empowering them to hinder every one from publishing, without their leave, any part of the proceedings of the Synod.

In October 1619, Damman having completed his task, the revisors met together, and, after a critical examination of the abridged Acts, gave them the sanction of their approbation and presented them to the States General, accompanied by a petition for their immediate publication. Their High Mightinesses appointed Commissioners from their own body to peruse this abridged "Historical Relation of the Acts of the National Synod;" who reported to the Generality, on the 28th Nov., that it would be proper, to have some harsh expressions in the Preface mollified, the letters of the Foreigners inserted, and the whole to be signed by the States General as well as by the Clergy. It was then resolved, that they should be again revised, and a deputy out of each province was commissioned for that purpose: After their emendations had been taken into consideration, on the 28th of Dec., their Lordships invited Heinsius and Hommius to attend them at the Hague, "in order to revise and consider of the abridged Canons of the Synod of Dort, and to put them into a better form or style." After all these deliberations and revisals, the Acts of the Synod were put to press; and, in March 1620, they made their first public appearance. The preface to them was supposed to be the production of Hommius; and from the very glaring mis-statement of facts which it exhibited, it was most probably of his composition. It is addressed to "the Reformed Churches of Christ," and contains an account of the Rise and Progress of the ecclesiastical differences in the United Provinces. The work itself is divided into three parts: *The First* gives an abridged

which I have accounted it my duty at this time to declare concerning the reconciliation of religious differences. The

statement of the occurrences of each session, and has the Canons of the Synod, the Belgic Confession, and a few other documents, embodied in it.—*The Second* consists entirely of the elaborate and highly-diversified judgments of the various colleges of Foreign Divines on the *Five Points*, and exhibits in reality the only criteria by which their consent and subscription to the Synodical Canons or Articles is to be interpreted.—*The Third Part* contains the judgments of the Provincial Divines on the same topics.—These celebrated Acts were printed both in Folio and Quarto, and very extensively circulated through Europe, either by gift or purchase. The Quarto copy is a thick volume of more than 1200 pages. Hommius was the man who had the honour to be deputed by the States General, to convey presentation-copies to King James, the Prince of Wales, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, by all of whom he was most graciously received. Such of the dignitaries and other divines of the English Church, as were attached to Calvinism, manifested towards Hommius every token of courtesy and regard; and when he left England, the King generously defrayed the expence of his voyage, and, according to current report, presented him with a gold cup and salver.

In the mean time, the cited Remonstrants were not idle. During their confinement at Dort, they attempted by every lawful means in their power to gain a sight of the Synodical Canons; but these were carefully concealed by the Contra-Remonstrant Divines, as part of their most valuable treasures. Their design in this studied secrecy, was, to prevent the Remonstrants from speaking or writing against those doctrinal decisions; and, by thus gaining time for completing their plans, to strengthen the infant interest of triumphant Calvinism.—After their banishment, the Remonstrant ministers wrote several small treatises for the edification of their churches and the information of strangers: Among these, the most famous were the two following by Episcopius: *Crudelis Iniquitas*, &c. "The Unjust Cruelties of the Synod of Dort;" and *Antidotum, continens pressiorem Declarationem*, &c. "The Antidote, containing a fuller declaration of the real and genuine opinions that were asserted and established at the Synod of Dort." Both of these works were published in the Latin, French, and Dutch languages; and were extensively circulated in despite of the severe enactments of the States General against all who printed any other account than that of the Synodical secretaries, and in breach of the exclusive privilege granted to the printer of the Acts, which prohibited *for seven years* the appearance of any other statements in the United Provinces. Zealous men were prepared to incur all hazards in smuggling and perusing these prohibited documents, which served to disperse those mists in which the Synodical misrepresentations had involved many transactions. The government adopted the strictest precautions, to prevent the distribution of such publications as these, and gave particular orders, in the spring of 1620, to every Dutch bookseller who was accustomed to attend the Frankfort Fair, not to import any copies of "the Synodical Acts of the Remonstrants, which, they were apprehensive, would then be offered for sale." But those "Acts" could not be prepared in sufficient time for that great book-mart; for banished men could not be expected to possess equal facilities for publication with those who were completely at ease in the bosom of their families, and who enjoyed the countenance of the government. However, in the course of the summer of 1620, these very interesting "Acts" were published in Latin, under this title, ACTA *et Scripta Synodalia Dordracena Ministrorum Remonstrantium in Fœderato Belgio.* This work consists of two parts: *The First* contains historical affairs, their several interviews with the Lay Commissioners and with the Synod, their Memorials, and Prefaces to the explanations of each article, &c. To this is subjoined a brief account of the circumstances under which each of their papers was written. *The Second Part* comprizes only those documents which relate to doctrinal matters, their

short time usually allotted to the delivery of an address on this occasion, and the defects of my own genius, have pre-

explanations and defences of their sentiments on the Five Points. The book was dedicated "to all Christian Universities and Churches." The Preface is a remarkably clever performance and every way worthy of the holy cause which Episcopius and his colleagues defended. One peculiarity in that great work will arrest the attention of every observant reader; it is the unanimity of the cited persons, and the consistency of their opinions, on all the points then in controversy. This is a characteristic feature of the system itself, which so signally defends the Divine Purity and Philanthropy, and offers some just and scriptural reasons why God has condescended to employ intreaty and persuasion with all who have erred and wandered from him, and why the whole process of the saving economy of his grace is carried on by exhorting men to acts of repentance, faith and holiness. The opinion which the Calvinists themselves entertained of the Synodical writings of the Remonstrants, may be gathered from this declaration, which Festus Hommius made in one of his excursions to the Hague, during the sitting of the Synod, "The last papers of the Remonstrants contain many new and unexpected matters, which far exceed what they offered at the Hague Conference, and the contents of their other writings." Voetius also, another Synodist, stated, "that the Remonstrants had then defended themselves with more ability than they had displayed at the Hague Conference."—This famous performance by the Remonstrants, which embraces a reply to every argument that had up to that period been employed against their principles, is exceedingly rare and very little known in this country. Fifty copies at least of the Calvinistic "Acts" may be met with in the Catalogues of the English booksellers, before one of the "Acts" of the Remonstrants can be found. Let the two books be compared together, and the excellences which we have pointed out in the latter will be instantly apparent; while in the former, the advocates of almost every varying theological opinion may find arguments severally in their favour. This was more particularly a fault with the Dutch Divines, who are thus correctly described by Balcanqual: "We begun to read the judgment of the College of the Belgic Professors, where at the very first, to our grief, we observed the BELGIC HUMOUR of *particular opinions*; for there are but five of that college, as we are of ours, and yet they are divided into three parts, and have given in three distinct and several judgments." Of these very discordant variations the synod seem to have been perfectly aware; and, in the preface to their "Acts," astutely turn it to the following good account: "It is not to be doubted, that *the prudent reader* will discover in these several JUDGMENTS the greatest and most admirable agreement. If to any one a certain diversity *in more minute matters* should seem to occur, even that circumstance will be a proof, that, while *a due liberty of prophesying* was permitted in this venerable assembly, all the members with accordant sentiments agreed fully in the doctrine expressed in the CANONS of this Synod, and all of them, without the least hesitation or exception, subscribed those Canons, for the sake of testifying this their consent." That Preface ought to have subjoined this additional information, that no member of an ecclesiastical Council signs such general articles or conclusions, except with a *salvo* in favour of his recorded judgment, which is accepted for the rule by which his consent must be interpreted.

The Calvinistic "Acts" of the Synod were not published without exciting the animadversions of the Remonstrants, who with the greatest justice remarked, "that the PREFACE to those Acts was untrue. and not composed with fairness,—since it made WHITE to be *black*, and was calculated to varnish over the most unchristian proceedings of the Contra-Remonstrants.—When the ACTS were composed, read, and approved, during the sessions of the Synod, the whole was transacted with great partiality. Those Acts were published only in an abridged form; this could not be done without retrench-

vented me from treating this subject according to its dignity and amplitude.

ing and omitting several things: They submitted it, therefore, to the judgment of men of understanding, what credit ought to attach to those Acts, especially in those parts which tended to the disadvantage of the Remonstrants. The partiality of the compilers was very perceptible: As a proof, it was only necessary to adduce the case of Maccovius, which was discussed with such uncommon warmth; yet his name was not once mentioned, but his affair was disguised under this phrase, *Causa particularis Frisica*, 'the particular case of the Friezlanders.' That affair, however, was of far greater importance than the falsehoods of which Episcopius was accused, and with which so many pages of the Acts were filled, or than the confession of the two brothers Geerstang, which appear to have obtained insertion for no purpose except that of stigmatizing the Remonstrants.—The accusation preferred by Acronius against the Remonstrant ministers of Campe is twice recorded, while no part of the two answers which their advocates delivered to the Synod is given, or even the letters which the magistrates and Consistory of that town presented in their defence.—The whole dispute with Martinius of Bremen, which arose to such a height as almost to induce the deputies of that city to leave the Synod, is glossed over with the following expressions: 'A 'discussion was held between the Dutch Professors and the Divines of Bre-'men, concerning various questions in explanation of the Third and Fourth 'Articles; also about the use and abuse of philosophical terms in theological 'controversies.'—All the proceedings of the Synod, after the departure of the foreigners, were [in that work] entirely suppressed; though it was only in those subsequent sessions that they composed the ecclesiastical Constitution, and the Formularies of Subscription, which they attempted to introduce in every place. All the papers which the Remonstrants, both before and after their expulsion, had delivered to the Synod, were, with the exception of one or two, omitted in those Acts: The explanation of the First Article which they had presented to the Synod, was passed over with no other notice than the mention of the Preface to it: There was likewise no mention made of the other large documents, which comprised the explanation and justification of their cause, though the reasons were as strong for their insertion as for that of the written judgment of Paræus or Du Moulin.—Most of the speeches and arguments of the inland and foreign Divines, respecting the opinions then in controversy, were passed over in complete silence; and nothing obtained such ample insertion, as a few sermons or harangues, which bore no actual relation to the chief matters that were under decision.—From all these circumstances it is easy to infer, that two faults were committed: (1) The studied concealment and falsification of the proceedings of the Synod; and (2) The wilful suppression of the truth by omitting the principal papers of the Remonstrants."

But, it may be asked, "For what holy purpose was all this labour undertaken, and all these grave deliberations instituted?" Episcopius shall answer the question: "The whole affair always at length returns to *the fatal and inevitable necessity of all things*, both present and future, good and evil, those which may conduce to the salvation of men or to their damnation: So that, according to this opinion, no mortal man will ever come into existence who will not be born to salvation or damnation, by the will and ordinance of God, and who will be able to do or to omit any thing more than he actually does or omits, to procure his own salvation or to promote his own damnation. —From this fountain and spring must necessarily flow, as streams, all those horrid and harsh sentiments which certain Divines have hitherto professed, not so much through want of consideration as through sheer impudence, and which they are not ashamed to disseminate among the vulgar. All candid judges of these matters must necessarily confess, that all those glosses, interpretations, and distinctions are nothing more than a mere pretence, and

May the God of truth and peace inspire the hearts of the magistrates, the people and the ministers of religion, with an ardent desire for truth and peace! May He exhibit before their eyes, in all its naked deformity, the execrable and polluting nature of dissension concerning religion; and may He affect their hearts with a serious sense of those evils which flow so copiously from it!; that they may unite all their prayers, counsels, endeavours, and desires, and may direct them to one point,—the removal of the causes of such a great evil, the adoption of a mild and sanatory process, and the application of gentle remedies for healing this dissension,—which are the only description of medicines of which the very weak and sickly condition of the body of the Church, and the nature of the malady, will admit. "The God of peace," who dignifies "the peace-makers" alone with the ample title of "children," (Matt. v, 9.) has called us to the practice of peace. Christ, "the Prince of peace," who by his precious blood, procured peace for us, has bequeathed and recommended it to us with a fraternal affection. (John xiv, 27.) It has also been sealed to us

a sort of charm invented for stultifying the people and driving them to fury,—and are fictitious colours, that are drawn over those foul and deformed dogmas, to impart to them a plausible semblance of truth.

"To produce a case in point, the reader is here presented with this dilemma: Whatever may be the number of men in the world, they are all either elected or reprobated from eternity, according to the opinion of the Synod.—(1) In reference to the ELECT, from the very moment in which God made his decree, without them and solely by his own Omnipotent force and might, he works and effects within them every saving good which they can either perform or possess; He keeps and preserves them in that good, by the same might, to the end; if they happen to fall into many grievous sins, they were forgiven to them before they had been committed, are not viewed in any other light than as *infirmities*, and cannot therefore by any means hinder their salvation; beside this, it is the will of God to effect repentance within them on account of those sins, even in the last moment of their lives, and thus at last to bestow upon them the destined salvation.

"With respect to the REPROBATES: It is the will of God to impute to them the sin of Adam, and therefore to punish them not only with death eternal, but likewise with such corruption and perversity as will cause them always to offend, and will not permit them to rise again from the sins into which they have fallen: He will not provide for them any saving grace, by which they may be converted. From these circumstances it necessarily arises, that, by the force of this innate corruption, they are continually falling into new sins, and when commanded to believe in Christ, they become unbelievers and such they remain: At last they impetuously rush into eternal condemnation both of soul and body.—Beside these two, no third class is presented.—It is this kind, therefore, of fatal and invincible necessity which is antecedent to all causes, and which necessitates all things that are done or that happen in the world, whether in reference to the salvation or the damnation of men,—it is this kind of necessity which is sanctioned, established and ratified by the venerable Synod: and in this manner, if such be the Divine Pleasure, it restores religion to its primitive splendour."

by the Holy Spirit, who is the bond of peace, and who has united all of us in one body by the closest ties of the new covenant. (Ephes. iv, 3.)

Let us be ashamed of contaminating such a splendid title as this by our petty contentions; let it rather be to us an object of pursuit, since God has called us to such a course. Let us not suffer that which has been purchased at such a great price to be consumed, and wasted away in the midst of our disputes and dissensions; but let us embrace it, because our Lord Christ has given it the sanction of his recommendation. Let us not permit a covenant of such great sanctity to be made void by our factious divisions; but, since it is sealed to us by the Holy Spirit, let us attend to all its requisitions and preserve the terms inviolate. Fabius, the Roman ambassador, told the Carthaginians, "that he carried to them in his bosom both WAR and PEACE, that they might choose either of them that was the object of their preference." Depending not on my own strength, but on the goodness of God, the promises of Christ, and on the gentle attestations of the Holy Spirit, I venture to imitate his expressions, (full of confidence although they be,) and to say, "Only let us choose peace, and God will perfect it for us." Then will the happy period arrive when with gladness we shall hear the voices of brethren mutually exhorting each other, and saying, "Let us go into the house of the Lord," that he may explain to us his will; that "our feet may joyfully stand within the gates of Jerusalem;" that, in an ecstacy of delight we may contemplate the Church of Christ, "as a city that is compact together, whither the tribes go up, the tribes of the Lord, unto the testimony of Israel to give thanks unto the name of the Lord:" that with thanksgiving we may admire "the thrones of judgment which are set there, the thrones of the house of David,"—the thrones of men of veracity, of princes who in imitation of David's example are peace-makers, and of magistrates who conform themselves to the similitude of the man after God's own heart.*

* The whole of this brief paraphrase and application of the pacific SONG OF DEGREES, is very beautiful, and eminently expressive of the enlarged views and benevolent feelings of the peaceful and pious Arminius. It will not suffer in comparison with the inflated discourse on the same Psalm, which was delivered by Schultetus, before the Synod, at the thirty-third session. It is worthy of observation in this place, and will always be a just cause of surprise, that the reverend members of that Council should be so exceedingly incautious as to indulge in public invectives against the Remonstrants, from the very commencement of their sittings, and even before their cause had been brought forward for adjudication. By such a partial course, they have in their own "Acts" furnished strong proofs, were there not a hundred others, of their preconceived hostility and undisguised maliciousness.

Thus shall we enjoy the felicity to accost each other in cheerful converse, and by way of encouragement sweetly to whisper in the ears of each other, "Pray for the peace of the Church Universal," and in our mutual prayers let us invoke "prosperity on them that love her;" that with unanimous voice, from the inmost recesses of our hearts, we may consecrate to her these votive intercessions and promises: "Peace be within thy walls, and prosperity within thy palaces: for our brethren and companions' sakes, we will now say, PEACE BE WITHIN THEE! Because of the house of the Lord our God we will seek thy good." (Psalm cxxii.) Thus at length shall it come to pass, that, being anointed with spiritual delights we shall sing together in jubilant strains, that most pleasant Song of Degrees, "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity," &c. And, from a sight of the orderly walk and peaceable conduct of the faithful in the house of God, filled with the hopes of consummating these acts of pacification in heaven, we may conclude in these words of the Apostle, "And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy upon the Israel of God!" (Gal. vi, 16.) Mercy, therefore, and peace, be upon the Israel of God!—I have concluded.*

* Having with all practical conciseness elucidated the amazing difference, which may be perceived, *in many essential particulars*, between THE HEAVENLY ASSEMBLY which Arminius pourtrays in this Oration, and THE SYNOD OF DORT, I consider it a part of my duty, to devote a few additional pages to counteract some late unprincipled attempts at misrepresentation on this very important subject. But before I proceed to the execution of this task, I present to the reader the following small tract by Bishop Womack, who has extracted it from the letters of Hales and Balcanqual.—The reader is particularly requested to consider the authority of those letters. They are an important part of the epistolary correspondence between Sir Dudley Carleton and two of his agents at the Synod, and were generally written on the very day when the occurrences happened, or in the course of two or three days afterwards, while the recollection of the facts and arguments was recent and vivid. The Calvinistic and highly prejudiced feelings of both the writers, and the exasperation of their spirits against the Remonstrants, are perceptible in all their communications to his Excellency. Yet these men, in the opinion both of their countrymen and of foreigners, have furnished the most valuable account of the Synod of Dort which has ever yet been given. Its value consists in the honest disclosure of many reprehensible practices to which the managers of that Synod had recourse, and in the frank confession of the outrageous dispositions of the Dutch Clergy, and the flimsy pretences under which they disguised several of their most objectionable proceedings,—and all this without the least abatement of their genuine hatred to Arminianism! The value of those letters is not at all diminished by a consideration of the celebrated editor of them, the excellent BISHOP PEARSON, '*whose praise is in all the Churches*' of Christendom for his luminous EXPOSITION OF THE CREED, and who imparted much interest to these instructive documents by his ingenious "under-scoring" of the most striking passages, which are consequently

printed in the *Italic* character. We have thus two unexceptionable witnesses in support of the statement given to the world by the injured Remonstrants. These letters were published in Latin by Mosheim, at Hamburgh, in 1724, with a Life of Hales prefixed to the translation. The principal part of them were also published by Limborch in *Epist. Præstant. Viror.*, and have been employed by every subsequent writer who made any pretensions to impartiality. That highly respectable and upright historian, the elder Brandt, has made great use of them; not because the temperate statements of the Remonstrants needed any such confirmation, for, as the good old man most properly observes, "the Contra-Remonstrants had sufficient opportunities to contradict their accounts, if they had contained any untruths: but this, as far as I know, they have never yet done." A short time, however, after making this declaration, Leydekker wrote against Brandt, and in vindication of the Synod. On this work, and that which it professes to censure, the learned Mosheim makes this remark: "After diligently comparing these two productions, I could see no enormous error in Brandt; for, in truth, *these two writers do not so much differ about facts, as they do in the reasoning which they deduce from them*, and in their accounts of the causes from which they proceeded. The reader will do well to consult the letters of the learned and worthy Mr. JOHN HALES, of Eton, who was an IMPARTIAL SPECTATOR of the proceedings of this famous Synod, and who relates with CANDOUR and SIMPLICITY what he saw and heard." With this excellent character of the compositions from which Bishop Womack compiled his "Brief Account," I introduce the reader to the work itself,—only requesting further to premise, that the elucidations which I have added to particular passages, are distinguished [thus] within brackets.

A

BRIEF ACCOUNT

OF THE

SYNOD OF DORT,

TAKEN OUT OF THE LETTERS OF MR. HALES AND MR. BALCANQUAL,

WRITTEN FROM DORT,

TO THE RT. HON. SIR D. CARLETON, LORD AMBASSADOR THEN AT THE HAGUE.

OUT OF WHICH THE READER MAY OBSERVE WITH ME,

I. THAT (generally speaking) *the Synod were an adverse party to the Remonstrants and their doctrine.* The evidences hereof are so many, I know not well where to begin my calculation: I will content myself with some few testimonies.

1. The President's jealousy, (which, without all question, proceeded from some guilt in himself,) That this was the sense of the Remonstrants, and made them so unwilling to submit their cause to so unequal a decision. The President's words are these: "Pretend you what you will, the true cause of "this your indisposition is this—that you take the Synod for the adverse part, "and account yourselves in equal place with them; this conceit hath mani-"fested itself in all your actions." (Letter of Jan. 5—15.)

2. The Dean of Worcester discovered no less in his Latin sermon in the Synod-house, wherein he came at last "to exhort them to stand to the former

determinations," which had hitherto most generally passed in the Reformed Churches in these points; and told them, "it was a special part of his Majesty's commission to exhort them *to keep unaltered the former Confessions.*" Here Mr. H. refers it to the Ambassador, saying, "How fit it was to open so much of their Commission, and *thus to* EXPRESS *themselves for a party against the Remonstrants*, your Honour can best judge." (Nov. 19—29.)

3. It is probable the Lord Ambassador gave them a check for this betraying their commission; for we find them standing more carefully upon their guard afterwards.—"It was proposed that there should be [amongst some others] *Scriptum Didacticum*, a plain and familiar writing drawn, wherein the doctrine of the Five Articles, according to the intent and meaning of the Synod, should be perspicuously expressed for the capacity of the common sort. But the English were altogether against it: Their reason was, Because it seemed incongruous that any writing concerning the doctrine of the Articles should be set forth, before the Synod had given sentence. And indeed, I must confess," saith Mr. Hales, "I see no great congruity in the proposal. Whilst matters are in controversy, judges walk suspensely, and are indifferent for either party; and, *whatsoever their intent be*, yet they make no overture of it till time of sentence come. All this business of citing, inquiring, examining, must needs seem only as *acted on a stage*, if the Synod *intempestively before-hand bewray a resolution.* But, notwithstanding any reason allegible against it, the thing is concluded." And a little after he relates, that the President advised those who were to undertake this, "That they should *have an eye to the inclination of the Synod, and beware, as much as might be, that they touched not there where any man was sore.* Whatsoever the pretence is," saith Mr. Hales, "the mentioning of these books before the determination of the Synod be formally set down, must needs be very unseasonable. It will make the world to think, they came resolved what to do; which, *though perchance they did*, yet it is no wisdom to confess it." (Feb. 7.)

I will add but one testimony more, which is this of Mr. Balcanqual, in his letters to the Lord Ambassador of Feb. 23. "Session 89, Feb. 22," saith he, "There were read 57 pages of the Remonstrants' book, which concerned their opinion of Reprobation, in which they did lay open the harsh opinions of many of our men, which unless the Synod do condemn, as well as the opinion of the Remonstrants, I see not how they can give the world satisfaction touching their indifferency." But the British Divines, &c., who urged it very vehemently, could not so much as get this opinion rejected, *Neminem posse &c.* ["a man can do no more good than he does."] Nor this, *Deum movere &c.* ["God moves the tongues of men to blaspheme."]

II. This leads me to my SECOND observation, viz. *That the Provincials were a passionate and factious (if not a malicious) party.*

For evidence hereof, (1) Consider the temper of some of them, and how they flew out into passion, beyond all measure, especially when any thing was spoken that seemed to favour the cause of the Remonstrants. Upon this account grew that great animosity of Gomarus against Martinius, mentioned in Hales's Letters of Jan. 15—25, [See page 449]; and more fully discovered in Mr. Balcanqual's Letters of Feb. 18, where he tells the Lord Ambassador, ["Notwithstanding that Polyander had delivered their collegiate sentence, yet Gomarus (Martinius his professed enemy,) asketh leave to speak, and so entereth into a confutation of that which they of Breme had delivered: So that he and Martinius fell foul in the Synod, *very much against the dignity of such an assembly!*] In truth I must needs say, that some of the Provincials do use Martinius very uncivilly, and all the foreign Divines do begin to take it evil at their hands.—[He is a man very learned and very honest, sound in all the Five Articles as any man in the Synod, except the second.....Notwithstanding of all this, *because he doth mislike many of the Contra-Remonstrants' broad speeches in many points*, (which, I think, *every learned and godly man will do*,)] they use him with so much discourtesy, as, I will assure your Lordship, he hath been very near leaving of the Synod, and his colleagues were half purposed to go with him. What a blow this would give to the credit

of the Synod, any man may easily perceive! The Provincials in this take not the right course. Though one be against the Remonstrants in all the Five Articles in substance; yet if he differ from them but in manner of speaking, they hold him as not sound." And in his next Letters, of Feb. 23, he relates of a plot laid *ex composito*, for disgracing of these Bremenses, and how the British Divines drew the indignation of those Provincials upon themselves, by interposing (though it was done by the Lord Bishop of Landaff with gravity and sweetness,) to allay their contentions. [The following extract from Balcanqual will shew the course of the plot, and will illustrate some of our former remarks, especially concerning the Presbyterian discourtesy, or rather the Republican equality, manifested both by Gomarus and Bogerman in their reply to the Bishop of Landaff: "D. Gomarus being he at whom the last disquisition of the third and fourth article ended, was entreated by the President to speak his mind of the said articles, but Sibrandus desireth the President first to give him leave to add some few things to that he had spoken the day before. Now what he added, was nothing but a renewing of that strife which was between him and Martinius in the last Session.—Whereas Martinius had alledged a place out of Pareus for the affirmative in *opere conversionis*, Sibrandus read a great many places out of Pareus tending to the contrary; and (no question it being plotted before) he entreateth that some of the Palatines (naming them all severally) who were Pareus his colleagues, would speak what they did know of Pareus his mind concerning the said Proposition.-Scultetus beginneth with a set Speech which he had inwrit lying before him;—but such a Speech it was, as I, and I think all the *Exteri* were exceedingly grieved, it should have come from a man of so good worth. The sum of it was this, that he did know upon his own knowledge that Pareus did hold the contrary of that which had been falsely fathered upon him in the Synod. Scultetus delivered his mind in exceeding bitter and disgraceful Words, and repeated his bitterest Sentences twice over.—He having ended, Martinius with great modesty answered, first, that he would read Pareus his own words, which he did; next, that for Sibrandus, he wondered that he would now in public bring these things up, since out of his love to peace, that very day he had sent his colleague Crocius to Sibrandus, with a large Explication of that sense in which he had delivered that proposition, with which Explication Sibrandus himself had sent him word that he was fully satisfied, and so he made account that that business had been peaceably transacted.—All this while Crocius spoke nothing.—Gomarus beginneth to go on in the Disquisition: but I think he delivered a Speech against the Bremenses, which none but a mad-man would have uttered. Next he falleth upon Crocius, and biddeth the Synod take heed of these Men that brought in these *monstra, portenta vocabulorum*, the Barbarisms of the Schools of the Jesuits, *determinare et non determinare voluntatem*,—with many such speeches, delivered with such sparkling of his eyes and fierceness of pronunciation, as every man wondered the President did not cut him off. At last he cut off himself, I think for want of breath; and the President giveth *Celeberrimo Doctori Gomaro*, many thanks for that his learned, grave and accurate speech: the *Exteri* wondered at it.—At last my Lord of Landaff, in good faith, in a very grave, short, sweet speech, spake to the President to this purpose, that this Synodical Disquisition was instituted for edification, not for any men to shew *studium contentionis*: and therefore did desire him to look that the knot of unity were not broken: In this his Lordship's Speech he named no man. The last word was hardly out of my Lord's lips, but furious Gomarus, knowing himself guilty, delivereth this wise speech, *Reverendissime D. Præsul, agendum est hic in Synodo non authoritate sed ratione*: that it was free for him to speak in his own place, which no man must think to abridge him of by their authority. My Lord replied nothing; but the President told my Lord, that *Celeberrimus D. Gomarus* had said nothing against men's persons, but their opinions, *and therefore that he had said nothing worthy of reprehension.* This gave every man just occasion to think the President was on the Plot. Martinius against this speech of Gomarus said nothing, but that he was sorry that he should have

this reward for his far journey.—The disquisition went on to Thysius, who very discreetly told the Synod he was sorry Martinius should be so exagitated, for a speech, which, according to Martinius his explication, was true.—Just as Thysius was thus speaking, Gomarus and Sibrandus, who sate next him, pull him by the sleeve, talk to him with a confused angry noise, in the hearing and seeing of all the Synod, chiding him that he would say so. Afterward Thysius, with great modesty, desired Martinius to give him satisfaction of one or two doubtful sentences he had delivered, which Martinius, thanking him for his courtesy, fully did. The President was certainly on this plot against Martinius; for at that same time he did read out of a Paper publicly a note of all the hard speeches Martinius had used."] Insomuch that (in his letters of March 25,) he tells the Lord Ambassador, that "Sibrandus and Gomarus keep their fits of madness by course. The last fit, before this, came to Gomarus's turn; and this day Sibrandus flew out, but with such raving and fierceness of countenance, such unheard bitterness against our College, as I desire no other revenge on him, than the very speaking of the words; which," saith he a little after, "if they had come from a wise man's lips, had been above the strength of patience." If these men flew out thus passionately against some of their own party, for their gentleness and moderation, (which was the only provocation of their choler,) in what temper may we expect to find them, in their proceedings towards their adversaries? This we may collect from Mr. Balcanqual's letters of Feb. 13, (misplaced among Mr. Hales's,) where he reports the matter thus: "For the Provincials, for anything I can see, they are so far set against the Remonstrants, (I wish not their persons as well as their opinions,) that I am afraid they will not like well of our moderation. For the dismission of the Remonstrants, since your Lordship is pleased to take notice of it, I hope I may without offence say, that it was such as certainly did the Synod much wrong. On Friday, when they [the Remonstrants] seemed to yield, then the *Exteri Theologi* could not be heard for the continuing of them in the Synod. Nay, the trick which was put upon them was a little too palpable, for the Delegates had their Decree of Dismission written, before they came into the Synod. Yet our voices were asked, hoping it should have been answerable to their decree; but, finding it was otherwise, without so much as laying their heads together for consultation, they published a decree which they brought written with them into the Synod!" This was resented so ill by some of the foreign Divines, that when (according to the custom,) repetition was made of the Act for the Remonstrants' dismission, Lud. Crocius of Breme (which perhaps began their indignation against these Divines,) signified, "That he perceived that Mr. Præses in that business had been *paulo commotior*, ['had evinced too much perturbation,'] and had let slip *verba quædam acerba*, ['certain acrimonious expressions,'] which might well have been spared; that in so great an act as that was, a little more advice and consideration might have been used. The Synod ought to have been consulted with, and a form of dimission conceived and approved of by all, which should, in the name of the Synod, have been pronounced and registered; whereas now the Synod stands indicted of all that *unnecessary roughness* which then was practised. It had stood better with the honour of the Synod to have held a more peaceable and passionless order. [The Præses replied, that, for dismissing the Remonstrants without a Synodical form, *it was from the secular lords, who willed him immediately to proceed.* What his apology was for his passionate speeches, I know not."] (Mr. Hales's Letters, Jan 6—16. See also the letters of Jan. 12—22.)

III. And this will not only lead our way to it, but also clear our THIRD observation, viz. *That this factious Provincial party swayed matters in this Synod as themselves listed.*

That they were able to do so, is evident, because they made up two parts of three, and so could out-vote the rest at their pleasure; and that they did so, appears, not only by what is alleged already, but also by Mr. Hales's letters of Jan. 6—16, where he saith, "The foreigners think themselves a little indirectly dealt withal, in that it being proposed to the whole Synod to

pass their judgment concerning the behaviour of the Remonstrants, *the Provincials were not at all required to speak;* and by these means the envy of the whole business was derived upon the foreigners. Whereas, on the contrary, when the like question was proposed formerly, and the foreigners had spoken very favourably in the Remonstrants' behalf, the Provincials struck in and established a rigid sentence against the foreigners' liking. So that there is little regard given to the judgment of the foreigners, *except they speak as the Provincials would have them.*"

IV. This will lead us to our FOURTH and last observation, viz. *How matters were carried by them;* which may easily be resolved by the former passages. But, for further satisfaction, the reader may take it in these instances following:

1. Mr. Balcanqual, in his Letters of March 25th, tells the Lord Ambassador, that "The President would take upon him more than ever any President did, to make Canons, and pass them by *placet* or *non placet;* and then he hath so many of the Provincials at command to pass what he will. I cannot, I confess, yet see how it can consist with the dignity of any, much more of some of the members of the Synod, that the President should dictate Canons, and the rest, especially a Bishop, write after him. So that he maketh the Canons, and the Synod are called *non ad consilium, sed tantum ad consentum,* ['not to give their advice, but only to express their consent.']" And, a little after, he saith, "The President and his Provincials have no care of the credit of strangers, nor of that account which we must yield, at our return, unto all men that shall be pleased to call for it. Their Canons they would have so full charged with catechetical speculations, as they will be ready to burst; and I perceive it plainly, that there is never a Contra-Remonstrant Minister in the Synod that hath delivered any doctrine which hath been excepted against by the Remonstrants, but they would have it in by head and shoulders in some Canon, that so they might have something to shew for that which they have said."—And yet he tells the Lord Ambassador, (March 16,) that "the Geldri were too rigid in many things; that the North Hollandi had many things, which we thought not only to be rigid but false; that the Drentani delivered many false and absurd propositions."—And, in his next letters (of March 17th,) he saith, "In good faith, some of the Provincials, especially the Geldri and the North-Hollandi, (who are, of all in the Synod, greatest in the President's books,) have delivered such propositions in that [second] Article, as I dare say never any Divine in the world dreamed of but themselves; for my own part, *I had rather lose mine hand than subscribe them.*"—And, in his letters of March 25th, he saith, "What trouble we have had in these last sessions, none can conceive but those who were present at them; and what strange carriage hath been in them, especially on the President's part, it is too palpable! He hath deceived all men's hopes of him very far. This matter of the personal censure, which was a thing of great consequence, we were never made acquainted with, before *the very instant in which it came to be read;* and because the Delegates must not be stayed from their going to the Hague, therefore all the Synod must say AMEN to it. Between the fore-noon and the after-noon session there was strange labouring with the Exteri for getting their consent to it, yet we meddled not with it. All I can say is, Me thinketh it is hard that every man should be deposed from his ministry, who will not hold every particular Canon; never did any Church of old, nor any Reformed Church, propose so many Articles to be held, *sub pœna excommunicationis,* ['on peril of excommunication.']" &c.

2. They misreported and perverted the sense and doctrine of the Remonstrants: For Mr. Balcanqual, in his letters of Feb. 9, informs the Lord Ambassador, "That one of the Transinsulani [Over-Yssel] took it evil, that we took the Remonstrants' meaning in their opinions, *where they spake best and soundest;* but he would have their meaning to be gathered out of all places in their books, *where they spake most absurdly,* which we thought was very far besides the rule of charity."—And, in his next letters, (of Feb. 15,) where he relates the reading some part of a huge volume, which had been presented to

the Synod by the Remonstrants, his words are these: "I must needs say, the Remonstrants had no favour; for I will assure your Lordship, that the President *picked out the worst part of it*. There were some five leaves read, which contained nothing but a bitter satire against Calvin, Beza, Pareus, Piscator, Whitaker, Perkins, Bogerman, Festus, and twenty more. But in truth, though unhappily, yet finely penned, me thought it was Episcopius's tongue."—And, in his letters of April 9—19, he informs [him] thus: "They are so eager to kill the Remonstrants, that *they would make their words have that sense which no grammar can find in them*. Upon Tuesday in the after-noon we had a session, in which were read the Canons of the first and second Article, and were approved, except the last of the second Article, which were never heard of till that hour, and the second Heterodox in that same Article. What they were, Dr. Davenant will inform your Lordship. The last was such, as I think no man of understanding would ever assent to."—Then, speaking of the last Heterodox, "Wherein," saith he, our College maintained dispute against the whole Synod. They condemned the thing itself as a thing most curious, and yet would have it retained *only to make the Remonstrants odious, though they find the very contrary of that they would father upon them in their writings!!*"

3. They would not (at the most earnest importunity of the British Divines and some others,) condemn any of the most horrible expressions and phrases, that had been used by the Calvinian Doctors, (as was noted above,) no nor so much as these two: "That God moves the tongues of men to blaspheme," and "That a man can do no more good than he does."—[This being an important test by which to try the professions of the Synod, it may be well to add the following account from Balcanqual's Latin notes. This subject had been mentioned in the preceding session, when the remark quoted in a former note (page 458) turned the discourse, and the President, as usual, begged to defer till the next day the consideration of "the hard sayings" of some of the Calvinists, that might seem to deserve Synodical reprehension. Accordingly, next day, (April 20,) the epilogue or CONCLUSION of the Canons was read; and in that part of it which endeavours to remove the calumnies with which the Remonstrants had loaded the received doctrine, (but for which it will be seen they had generally given both chapter and verse,) the British Divines wished to have added the two objectionable expressions which are quoted at the beginning of this paragraph, as well as some others of the same kind. The Hessian and Bremen Divines united with them in the same request; but Bogerman again had recourse to his tricks, and moved that the suffrages of the inland Divines should not be received till the next session, when the British very properly exposed the falsehood and duplicity of the President. Balcanqual says, "Before the President proceeded to receive the votes respecting the request urged in the morning, he desired the Synod to listen to the ideas that had been in the mean time entertained by himself and his assessors respecting the rejection of those harsh expressions. He requested the Synod well to consider these two observations: 'FIRST, That none of the 'Dutch Divines had ever written or taught any doctrines of that kind; they 'were not, therefore, at all applicable to this assembly, *which was only a 'Dutch Synod*.—SECONDLY, That the Doctors among whom those more rigid 'sayings might be found, had been and still are either English, French, or 'German Divines; and, since they had never been reprehended by their own 'Princes or Churches for those harsher forms of expression, it was very 'probable that those Princes and Foreign Churches would be displeased if 'this National Synod should pass a vote of censure on them for those sayings.' The form of the CONCLUSION had been entirely re-modelled, and in it were rejected a greater number of those improper phrases than had been in the first copy; but none of those additional expressions which the Foreign Divines had wished to embody in it. This form was then read, and the opinions of the Synodists were requested. The British Divines earnestly urged the addition of more harsh expressions to be classed among the rejections, and particularly those which they had mentioned in the forenoon session. To the

two reasons produced by the President, they gave the following reply: 'FIRST, 'That in the declarations which the Remonstrants had presented to the 'Synod, they had quoted many passages from the Contra-Remonstrants, '[the Dutch Calvinists,] and had referred to the very books and to the pages 'in which such expressions occur; therefore, unless the Synod should mani-'fest its disapprobation of those harsh writings, Dutchmen could by no 'means be liberated from those calumnies.—SECONDLY, That foreign Di-'vines undoubtedly ought not to be censured in the Synod; but, in case of 'their having spoken or written any thing that might lie as a reproach against 'the Reformed Church, it was in the power of the Synod to reject [such ob-'jectionable sayings or writings] by whomsoever employed, and the Synod 'ought to proceed to such rejection without delay. If, perchance, they 'might not prove to be Dutchmen who thus wrote or spoke, the reason for 'such persons being exempted would hold equally good in reference to So-'cinus, with whom the Synod on that principle would not be permitted to 'meddle, yet it had ventured more than once to condemn that man's dogmas 'in its Canons: Nor, on the same principle, ought the king of Great 'Britain to have passed any resolutions against Vorstius, who was not one 'of his subjects. It was their earnest wish to see a most extensive collection 'made of those expressions which were rejected; and they did not think that 'any Reformed Church would take offence, because they desired to have 'nothing rejected that had been approved by the consent of any Reformed 'Church. It was their particular wish to have this sentence classed among 'the rejections, *No man can possibly do more good than he actually does*, 'because, by rejecting it, no reproach would be cast on the memory of any 'deceased Reformed Doctor, since it was a sentiment conceived only yester-'day, which had scarcely attained to the seventh year of its age.'—The other foreign Divines, being desirous (as they declared) to sacrifice much to peace, agreed to the form of the CONCLUSION which had been previously read. Yet those of them who had in the morning produced reasons why several more of the harsh expressions should be numbered among the rejections, now repeated their wishes. All the inland Divines approved of the form as it had just been read; and the Dutch Professors of Divinity employed many arguments and contended, that the Synod ought not to mark with any censure the sayings of men, who had in other respects merited much at the hands of the Reformed Church! Yet Doctor Sibrandus said, it could not be denied, that *there were some persons in the United Provinces who taught much more rigid doctrines, than even those which the British Divines had enumerated* in the catalogue which they had formed of objectionable phrases.—Towards the close of the discussion, the President advised, as this was a matter not of doctrine alone but likewise of order, that the opinion of the Commissioners should be asked. Their Lordships were accordingly interrogated on this point, and promised to make it a subject of their deliberations till the session of next morning.

{"Session 133.—The President requested the Commissioners to be pleased to announce to the Synod their sentiments concerning the CONCLUSION which had been read in the preceding session. Their Lordships desired that it might again be read; it was read accordingly, when their Lordships expressed their approval of it, and entreated the Synod, if possible, to signify their acquiescence. They likewise beseeched the members, to hasten, with all practicable speed, to finish this affair of the FIVE POINTS; because they had received from the States General urgent orders, which were once more repeated, to press for the conclusion of that business. The suffrages of the Synod were then asked about the form of the EPILOGUE: The British insisted by all means on the addition of some further rejections, and principally of this,—*No man can possibly do any more good than he actually does!* But, in case this favour could not be obtained, that they might make a great sacrifice for the sake of peace, one of their number suggested, 'that the list of re-'jections should be enlarged by the addition of this sentence, ET QUÆ ALIA &c. '*And many more which are of the same kind;* so that when any horrible sen-

'tence was objected to them, as one which they had not rejected, they might 'excuse themselves by means of that parenthesis, and assert that all expres-'sions of this description had in that clause been rejected by the Synod.' To save time, therefore, and to preserve peace, the British signified their acquiescence."

[Thus, it appears, the notable expedient to blunt the force of any harsh Calvinistic sentiment, by asserting that *it is not countenanced by the body*, is no new invention, though it has in our days become a very common practice. The Calvinists of the Church of England who think they find grounds for their peculiar opinions in *the Articles and Homilies*, and the members of the Church of Scotland who derive their Calvinism from *the Assembly's Catechism*, one of its purest sources,—while they acknowledge themselves amenable to the doctrinal tribunals under which they respectively place themselves, have certainly some plausible excuse for disavowing every sentiment that is not contained in those ancient national formularies. But those persons who have adopted the Independent form of Church-government, and who are commonly the most successful propagators of Calvinism, possess no restraining documents of this kind, and are on that account qualified to ward off many imputations which attach to the others, and to make their own election of those writers whom they consider to be the prime and constitutional organs of Calvinism. On this principle it frequently happens, that while one Independent congregation in a town will not acknowledge Calvin, Beza, Gomarus, Crisp, Toplady, and Hawker, as the legitimate expounders of Calvinism,—another congregation in the immediate vicinity will regard those men as their soundest Divines, and reject the doctrine of such men as Davenant, Baxter, Bates, Howe, and Doddridge, because it is too mild for their taste. A flexible latitude of sentiment is therefore of considerable importance to a rising Independent teacher, since it enables him to accommodate himself to the exceedingly variable doctrinal barometers of different congregations to which he may be called. But, without any reference to such a latitude of opinion, a minister who is a man of peace and entirely dependent for support on the people of his charge, places himself under a manifest temptation to meet the views of those whose spiritual instructor he ought to be, and whose doctrinal views and christian characters it should be his labour to bring up to what *he* conceives to be the standard of the scriptures.]

4. When it was moved by Dr. Davenant, "That the Collegiate suffrages might be read publicly," (that the auditors might take notice of their ingenuity in condemning no more in the Remonstrants, and something in the Contra-Remonstrants too,) "because we know," saith Mr. Balcanqual, "the Provincials, in forming of the Canons, will carry us down by voices, and no words of ours that sound that way shall be expressed:" This was refused upon very trivial pretences; but the real ground was, that the auditors might not take notice of this their moderation and impartiality, which would have too much implied the want of them in others.—[One of the pretences of the President is thus expressed. "Because, though the suffrages of the Colleges do agree (as he perceived by reading of them,) in the thing itself; yet because there was some disagreement in phrases and forms of speaking, it was to be feared that the Remonstrants and other Jesuits and Dominicans present, would make great matter of these verbal differences, that they would cast abroad among the people strange reports of the dissensions of the Synod; and in another case, that the Remonstrants, no question, (as lately they had done) would put out in print the opinion of the Synod concerning the Articles, before the Canons were formed by the Synod, and in their pamphlet no doubt they would oppose sentence to sentence, wheresoever they might take hold of the least suspicion of difference."—It is then subjoined: "The President, in the mean time, sent Dammannus, one of the scribes, to entreat us to give way to the President's motion; and, no question, they laboured other Colleges as well as us; but certainly all the President's reasons above mentioned might easily have been answered; for my part, I think

his course was *tutior* ['the safer one'], but ours *honestior* ['the more honourable']." (Balcanqual's letters of March 9.)

5. The Canons were drawn up in private, and, as it were, dictated by the President, as was noted above, and complained of. (See Balcanqual's letters of March 25.)

V. All which passages duly considered, I shall upon the whole matter make a few queries, and so conclude the reader's trouble.

1. Whether (for all the Lord Ambassador's care to prevent it,) that were not a true prognostication of Mr. Balcanqual, in these words: "If your your Lordship's care do not now most of all shew itself for procuring of good counsel to be sent hither for the constitution of the Canons, we are like to make the Synod a thing to be laughed at in after ages." (March 25.)

2. Whether that observation of D. Tilenus hath not as much truth as acrimony in it, in his notes and animadversions upon the conclusion of the Canons of the Synod of Dort. His words are these: *Aristidem narrant historiæ in privata vita ita se gessisse, &c.* ["History informs us, that Aristides conducted himself with such propriety in private life, as to procure the surname of 'THE JUST;' and, that, at the same time, in administering the affairs of the Republic, he committed many acts that accorded neither with justice nor equity, while he accommodated his measures to the interests of his country, which, he said, 'required the aid of much injustice.' This piece of political sophistry has appeared to the Divines of Dort worthy of imitation: For, though with regard to other affairs, they may have considered it right to observe the rules of truth and justice; yet, in this, they perceive that their only hopes of victory are placed in the arts of fraud, injustice, and calumny, and in popular attempts of that description."] (Page 181.)

3. Whether Malderus had not too much cause to pass that censure upon the faith of the Synod, which he doth in these words: *Non abs re Synodus in præfatione sua testatur, &c.* ["It is not without good reason that the members of the Synod testify in their Preface, that they promised, at its commencement, by a solemn oath, to account the sacred scripture the sole rule by which to form their judgment; and that, in making themselves acquainted with this cause and in deciding upon it, they would proceed and act with a good and upright conscience. And with the greatest seriousness they endeavour to persuade the world, that it was by the particular grace of God that they performed this promise, with the greatest diligence, fidelity, and conscientiousness, and that the Synodical judgment was delivered with the unanimous consent of all and each of the members!—If all this had not been told, I scarcely think, that any man who has not been previously warped aside by party-prejudices, would attach the least credit to the declaration *that the Synod had acted with a good and untainted conscience in this* arena, *had pronounced on the* FIVE *controverted* POINTS *of doctrine a sentence which was at once true and agreeable to the Word of God, and had rejected whatever was false and contrary to the Holy Scriptures!*"] (MALDERI Anti-Synodica, cap. 16. 308.)

4. Whether these letters of Mr. Hales and Mr. Balcanqual do not sufficiently justify all the complaints of the Remonstrants, expressed in their Historical writings? See *Acta et Scripta Synodalia Remonstr. in Script. Histor.—Brevis Narratio, et Antidotum in Præfat.—D. Tileni. Not. in Can. Synod. Dordrac. in Epist. ad Lectorem.*

5. Whether the Remonstrants had not just cause to except against the incompetency of these judges, as they did? (Mr. Hales, Dec. 1—11.)

6. Whether, when the President dismissed them, after a most bitter speech, in these words: *Quamobrem vos &c.*, ["Wherefore, in the name of the delegates and of the Synod, I dismiss you. Begone!,"] Sapma had no reason to say, *Exeo ex ecclesia malignantium*, ["I depart out of the congregation of malignants"]? (Mr. Hales, Jan. 5—15.)

7. Whether that Synod be not null by Mr. Balcanqual's own confession, in his letter of Feb. 13, (amongst Mr. Hales's letters?) His words are these: "They [the Remonstrants] were called in and dismissed with such a pow-

dering speech, as I doubt not but your Lordship hath heard with grief enough: I protest I am much afflicted when I think of it. For if the Remonstrants should write, that the President pronounced a sentence which was not the sentence of the Synod, they should not lie. The civil lawyers and Canon of France, who write much about the formalities omitted in the Council of Trent, urge exceptions of less moment than these. So neither was there above a third part of the voices asked, *Ex quibus sententia ferri nequit:* ['from which judgment could not be given:'] Neither was the sentence conceived in writ, and approved by the Synod, and the bitter words in the sentence were not the words of any of the suffrages, unless that some of them were spoken by one man only."

8. Lastly, Whether it be not evident, that the Doctrine and Judgment of the Church of England are not at all concerned in the temerarious decisions of this Synod.

For (1) whereas it was declared in the conclusion, that *that was to be accounted the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, which was contained in those canons*, the British Divines moved to have it altered, professing, that they, being deputed by the King's Majesty, and not by the English and Scottish Churches, had no authority to explain the Confessions of their Churches; that they delivered their own private judgments only, which they thought were true; that they had concluded many things in their canons as true, of which the Confessions of their Churches had determined nothing," &c. (After Mr. Balcanqual's Letters.) [See a preceding note, page 417.]

(2) Whereas there was a difference amongst those of the British College about the sense of the words of our Confession (which relate to the second Article of the Remonstrants,) "That Christ died for the sins of all mankind; or, for the sins of the whole world:" The question was, "Whether these words were to be understood of *all particular men*, or only of *the Elect, who consist of all sorts of men.*" (Mr. Balcanqual's Letters, Febr. 9.) This Mr. Balcanqual thought a matter of so great consequence, that he propounded it to the Lord Ambassador, to procure them advice from England what course to follow. And what that advice was, we may collect from his letters of March 17, where he tells the Lord Ambassador; "I must needs say, that the Directions which your Lordship hath sent from Secretary Nanton, do seem to will us to be as favourable to the GENERAL PROPOSITIONS as may be, giving as little offence to the Lutherans as we can."

3. Had they differed about any other Article, and sent into England for advice, in all probability their instructions would have tied them to have had a very tender regard to the doctrine of the Lutherans in that also. This they understood well enough at last, and therefore, Sess. 137, (Mr. Balcanqual's Letters,) they vindicate the Lutherans to be part of the Reformed Churches; and because these Canons of Dort were not consonant to their Doctrine, therefore they object against their personal censure, wherein they declared, "their Synodical Articles were according to the judgment of all the Reformed Churches." [The better to understand this matter, the whole paragraph is here given from Balcanqual. The observations of Schultetus, Polyander and Bogerman, are true in regard to the fact stated, but not exactly true with respect to the cause assigned. "THE REFORMED" is actually made a party-appellation in several countries on the Continent: where it is impudently assumed by the Calvinists as the badge by which they choose to be distinguished, much in the same way as the majority of their vain brethren in Great Britain are pleased to style themselves "EVANGELICALS!" No surprise therefore can be excited at a moderate Lutheran declining the term which is employed to designate a Calvinist.—Balcanqual proceeds thus: "By which phrase, ('all the Reformed Churches,') it was insinuated, that the Lutheran Churches that profess other sentiments, are not to be numbered among the *Reformed*,—which appeared to them (the British) as a very harsh expression. —Schultetus and Polyander replied, 'that the Lutherans themselves deprecated the application of the term to them, and were accustomed to excite envy against our Churches by the use of the name REFORMED.'—The President also added, 'Our Churches in Holland are accustomed to be distinguished

'by the name of REFORMED, not only from the Papists, but likewise from the 'Lutherans.'—The British answered, 'In our Churches the Lutherans are accounted the REFORMED, since they first attempted to effect a Reformation in religion: We have it also in command from our King's most serene Majesty to employ as much circumspection as possible in giving no offence to the Lutheran Churches,"—then follows this clause,] *Itaque addita est ista vox*, NOSTRARUM, 'Therefore is that word [OURS] added,' as Mr. Balcanqual's notes report it. But I can find no such words as *nostrarum* added in the Edition of those Acta Syn. Nat. Dor. in folio 1620. But if the President could dictate Canons privately, or insert them, when they never had been heard of till that hour, wherein they were tendered for approbation, (as it appears by the former passages that he could,) he might take the liberty to expunge matters of greater weight and importance than was such a word as NOSTRARUM. And so, (as Mr. Hales did, upon occasion, by Mr. John Calvin,) I bid the Synod of Dort GOOD-NIGHT. LAURENCE WOMACK, D. D.

The circumstance mentioned at the close of Bishop Womack's pamphlet, respecting the omission of the word "OURS," is explained by what has been related, page 470, when, after several previous revisions and alterations, Heinsius and Hommius were invited by the States General further to revise and improve the synodical documents. If the word OUR, inserted for the satisfaction of the British Divines, had been permitted to remain, the clause in which it occurs would have read thus: "This saving doctrine which has been with the most scrupulous fidelity expressed according to the word of God and the consent of OUR Reformed Churches," which would then have meant "the Churches of the United Provinces." But this paltry expression did not accord with the enlarged ambition and the base motives of the Dutch Divines, who, by suppressing OUR, announced to the world, *that the doctrine established at that Synod was* "according to the consent of THE Reformed Churches:" And they left it to the information or the shrewdness of the reader, to interpret the meaning of "the Reformed Churches" after the Dutch and German fashion as "the Calvinistic Churches," or according to the more liberal signification given to the term by the British and other Divines as comprising "all the Churches that are Reformed from Popery." Either of these significations would have suited the expression employed by the Synodical revisors; but it is evident, from other circumstances, that their design was to induce the reader to adopt the latter, for which they manifested a marked predilection.

I. Instead of detailing any further particulars respecting the discussion which arose when the Remonstrants questioned the competency of the Synod, (page 428,) we will give a few extracts from the arguments of the Foreign Divines, in justification of the *equitable* constitution of that reverend tribunal. Those arguments fill 14 Quarto pages of the ACTS of the Synod: "Their objection, that *the Contra-Remonstrants are schismatics*, does not appear to us true or at all probable. For, if they be accounted schismatics, the whole of this Church and the Republic are involved in the same crime: This Synod also consists of persons that are marked by no ecclesiastical censure, or that have ever been convicted of schism or condemned by any legitimate tribunal: Because the Remonstrants, by receding from the doctrine generally received, have themselves been the beginning and the cause of this separation; for that is to be considered the truth which has from the commencement been delivered and received, while that is reputed an error which is afterwards introduced, till, after a lawful examination and judgment, the contrary be decided: Because it is professed by all foreign princes and republics that have deputed their divines to this assembly, that it is not a small council of schismatics, but a Synod of lawful pastors convoked together by the supreme authority of the Dutch Republic and Church. With regard to 'the chief part of the Synod consisting of their adversaries,' divines are not accustomed to be like a white sheet of paper in the business of religion, neither ought they to be: If therefore only those who preserve neutrality can become judges, they would always

be sought out of that Church in which the dissension had arisen, and no Church would be competent to settle its own disputes. Truth is the common treasure of the Church, and cannot on any account become the peculiar property of single persons: It is the public cause of God and the Church which is transacted in Synods, not the private cause of each individual. In external affairs the unjust sentence of a judge deprives another of property which he draws over to himself: But they who exercise a judiciary authority in the cause of faith, are neither able to rob other people of the truth nor to appropriate it to themselves.—They urge against us the words of Ursinus and Paræus, who advised people not to approach to those Councils in which the same parties are both accusers and judges. But in vain do they object against us the observations of these men, who wrote against the petty Councils of the *Papists* and the *Lutherans*, which differ as much from this Synod as the heavens are distant from the earth. For (1) in those Councils, the decrees of men (for instance those of the POPE and of LUTHER,) are heard; in this, the decrees of God. (2) In them, prejudices are brought to the Council and are carried away; in this, we think there is no member who is not so well affected as eagerly to embrace whatever the Remonstrants may be able to prove from the word of God. (3) In them, manifest adversaries were seated; in this, partners of the same Church. (4) In them, every thing was servile; in this, all things are free, both as it respects the profession of faith and its defence: With regard to the schism, he is not to be blamed who makes the secession, but he who forces the other to make it.—We thus approach to hear the cited brethren, and afterwards to consider whether they have produced or advised any thing that has not before claimed a due share of our consideration, and that may conduce to the illustration of Divine Truth and to the removal of the offences which oppress the Church of Christ; for we are prepared to yield to those who shall teach us any thing of greater truth and excellence.—An adverse party is either a private person, a multitude, or a public person: A private person cannot be at once both judge and party: but a multitude or a public person may: Thus according to the laws and statutes a magistrate is accustomed to sit as judge in his own cause.—Schism does not take away from the magistrate his own rights, nor from the chief ministers of the Churches whose cause is patronized by the magistrate.—What Paræus said was concerning the Councils of the Papists and the Ubiquitarians [Lutherans]. In this Synod the same persons will not sustain the double character of accuser and judge: For, let it be granted that the Contra-Remonstrants who have been deputed to this Synod, are an adverse party; yet the sole judge of these controversies will be the word of God, to which all have bound themselves before God by a solemn oath: If Doctor Paræus were present, they [the Remonstrants] would scarcely endure the sight of his countenance, and yet in his absence they venture to pluck his beard. We and our ancestors have had many transactions with the Ubiquitarians, Anabaptists, Libertines, the Jews and others; yet the ministers and elders of the Church were an adverse party to them." These and many similar arguments did the reverend foreigners produce, to persuade the hesitating Remonstrants to place themselves under the protection of such an *impartial* and *equitable* tribunal as that of the Dutch Synod.

II. Some account has been given (page 432,) of the dismission of the Remonstrants from all converse with the Synod, and their banishment. To complete the narrative, it will be necessary to state the manner in which they were occupied from Jan. 14th, to the 24th of May.—In the morning of the former day they had delivered their explanation of the First of their FIVE POINTS, and it was ordered to be copied out for the consideration of the different members. But that document, as well as the mere statement of the Five Points themselves, were not gratifying to the Calvinists. In his dimissory speech the President had complained, that "the Five Articles which they had presented, in the form of Theses, *were not drawn up in the manner prescribed to them by the Synod;* and that they were so exceedingly confused as to be rendered unserviceable." The Synod had particularly deprecated the Remonstrants' method of employing negatives, which impugned the doctrines of

Calvin and his followers; and many *kind* admonitions had they addressed to those refractory spirits, to alter their course, and to state only what they themselves believed, without interfering with the belief of other good people. Some of their strong reasons why the Remonstrants should suffer Reprobation to slumber in quiet, (though this was one of the chief Points in dispute,) are recounted in the 446th page. It cannot, therefore, be any cause of wonder, that such *contumacious beings* were dismissed with a most violent speech from the President.—On the 21st of Jan. they presented a Memorial to the Synod, in which they complained of many assertions in Bogerman's speech, and declared that they had not at the time made any reply, because they thought it best to follow the advice of the wise man, who said, '*Strive not with those who are in wrath.*'—Many of the foreign Divines expressed great dissatisfaction against the manner which the Synod had adopted, of refuting the opinions of the Remonstrants in their absence and while they were still detained in town, —especially when they had offered to explain their sentiments upon the points in dispute, provided due liberty were granted to them. The following reflections by Hales, shew the embarrassment which was felt on this subject: "The errors of public actions (if they be not very gross,) are with less inconvenience tolerated than amended. For the danger of alteration, of disgracing and disabling authority, makes that the fortune of such proceedings admits no regress, but being once howsoever well or ill done, they must for ever after be upheld. The most partial spectator of our Synodal Acts cannot but confess, that in the late dismission of the Remonstrants, with so much choler and heat, *there was a great oversight committed*,—and that whether we respect our common profession of Christianity, *Quæ nil nisi justum suadet et lene*, ['which persuades to nothing except what is just and lenient,'] or the quality of this people apt to mutine by reason of long liberty, and not having learnt to be imperiously commanded,—in which argument the clergy above all men ought not to have read their first lesson. The Synod therefore, to whom it is not now *in integro* to look back, and rectify what is amiss without disparagement, must now go forward and leave events to God, and for the countenance of their action do the best they may."

Desiring to satisfy the foreigners, and at the same time to maintain the dignity of the Synodical decisions, the Lay Commissioners sent for the Remonstrants on the 23rd of Jan., and informed them, "that, though by the resolution of the States General they were excluded from all further negociations with the Synod, and the Synod was impowered to proceed in the examination of their opinions as extracted from their former books and writings,—yet that they [the Commissioners] in order to remove all cause of complaint, had ventured of their own accord to allow them the liberty of drawing up in writing whatever they might wish to add in the way of explanation or vindication of their FIVE POINTS, and of delivering such writings to the President of the Commissioners within a fortnight, who would dispose of it in that manner which might be considered the most proper."—The Remonstrants expressed their gratification at this unexpected proposal, which, while it imposed on them no necessity to answer any questions, gave them liberty to defend their opinions beyond the limits which their adversaries had wished to prescribe. They thanked the Commissioners for their offer, but represented that the time specified was too early. In answer to this, it was said, "On these matters there has already been writing enough: You must therefore be concise, for there is no necessity to repeat what has been formerly adduced."—The Remonstrants said, "that, in an affair of such great importance, they ought to be permitted to make their defence in the most proper manner; that much had been written against them, which they were obliged to answer; but that, since they could no obtain a longer period, they would exert themselves to comply with the Commissioners' wishes, and though they believed they could not be prepared with all that had been proposed against the appointed day, yet they would then present to their Lordships a proof of their diligence."

On the 7th of Feb., therefore, they presented to the Commissioners, by Poppius and other four, a manuscript consisting of 204 sheets. The Preface to

it was subscribed by all the cited persons, and in it they stated, "that after their dismissal they would have been glad had they received permission to return home; but, since their lordships had forbidden them to move, they had submitted;—that the papers now presented contained 'A Defence of their Doctrine on the *First Point*, with a Refutation of that of the Contra-Remonstrants,'—'An Exposition of the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans,'—'An Explanation of the *Second Point*,' and 'An Index of the Evidences from which they had endeavoured to elicit the exact opinions of the Contra-Remonstrants, and of those whom they considered orthodox, on the Second Point:'—they requested to be allowed other five or six weeks to complete their other papers;—they thought, the Synod ought with great seriousness to consider this their last defence before they proceeded to pass sentence;—they complained, that, in their absence, the Synod had begun to refute their opinions as extracted from *the Hague Conference*, and that, according to the information which they received, had passed by some of their best arguments, had wrested them in a manner contrary to their obvious meaning, or had wished to appear ignorant of their own arguments having been answered by the Remonstrants: such proceedings they considered dishonourable and unjust. Since, therefore, the Synod would not permit them to appear again in the assembly, they thought it just and necessary that they [the Synod] should return an answer to this their defence. They also requested to have copies of those speeches by which some of the members had attempted to confute their opinions, and which would either afford them some instruction, or enable them to return such answers as might be convincing to those members. They also requested, that the Commissioners would allow them to visit for a short time their families and Churches, &c." After having received this document, their Lordships desired the Remonstrants to withdraw; and when they had spent some time in deliberation, the cited persons were called in and severely reprimanded: (1) Because they had presumed, in their Preface, to censure the proceedings of the Synod, which they were forbidden to do in future. (2) For not complying with the commands given to them, about bringing in the whole of their papers at the time appointed. (3) For speaking against the doctrines of the Contra-Remonstrants. (4) For having made their defence so long and tedious. When many words had passed between the parties, the Commissioners declared, that, as a matter of grace, they would grant the Remonstrants one week longer to despatch the whole of their business.—Accordingly on the 15th of Feb., they presented their explanation of the *Third, Fourth and Fifth Points;* but when the Commissioners found, that the manuscript, which consisted of sixty sheets, did not include their defence of those articles, they said they might employ themselves in preparing that defence, and their Lordships would afterwards inform them when they expected it to be ready. The Remonstrants, therefore, applied themselves with diligence to the completion of their labour. Episcopius composed all that was written on the *First* and *Second Points*, the defence of the *Third* and *Fourth*, and the explanation and defence of the *Fifth*. The Treatise on Reprobation was the work of Niellius. One of the Expositions on the Ninth of the Romans was by Borrius of Leyden, the other by Episcopius. Professor Barlæus wrote the Explanation of the *Third* and *Fourth Points*.

The next day (the 16th) the Remonstrants were informed, that they must have all their documents prepared within ten days, and that no longer time would be allowed. Accordingly on the 25th, they presented the Commissioners with their defence of the Second Point in eighty sheets of paper. Their Lordships, after having held a consultation with Bogerman, expressed their high displeasure at the extreme prolixity of all their documents, and at their not being delivered at the time prescribed. Much altercation ensued, when their Lordships declared, they would receive no more papers from them, and they were then dismissed. However, two days afterwards the Commissioners informed them, that they might finish their papers if they would engage to do so within a few days; but the Remonstrants required three or four weeks. This could not be granted, as the foreigners wished to depart before Easter:

but they were to be prepared in the course of ten days. On the 9th of March, they again waited on the Commissioners, and stated, that the very severe frost had prevented them from having their papers finished against the appointed day, but that they would complete them in another weeek, which period, it seems, was granted to them.

It was at this interview that the President of the Commissioners said, he had received fresh orders not to suffer any of the cited Remonstrants, not even those who were ejected from their benefices at Utrecht and Horn, to move from Dort. This detention of the Remonstrants excited various speculations: Some unprejudiced people viewed it as a great injury, particularly when their presence was no longer necessary and when little attention was paid to their new writings. Others, who betrayed greater partiality, thought there were good reasons for detaining them at Dort, since it was improper to suffer them to visit their churches, because they would then disclose all that they knew about the proceedings of the Synod, and prepossess the people too much against the Contra-Remonstrant party, which might have excited fresh disturbances.

On the 18th of March, the Remonstrants delivered up their defence of the *Fourth* and *Fifth Points*, which completed all that they wished to produce. At the close of the last paper, they thus expressed themselves: "Let that storm come upon us which has most unjustly deprived so many flourishing churches of their faithful pastors, even during the sessions of the Synod and whilst their cause was depending;—that storm which has caused many thousand souls to mourn and lament, and unceasingly to pour out their just complaints into the bosom of the Chief Shepherd. In the mean time we sincerely protest and declare, as in the presence of the Great Prince of pastors, before whose tribunal our adversaries and we must all appear to give an account of our actions, that it is purely from a humble fear of displeasing God that we reject those doctrines which we have opposed, because, being instructed by the Holy Scriptures, we firmly believe them to be *repugnant to the honour of God, destructive to piety, and a scandal to the Christian Religion!*" &c.

In a separate written address to the Commissioners, they say, among many other excellent things: "We have not prepared these Defences and Apologies, for the use of the Synod, with whom we have no further transactions, but only in obedience to the commands of your Lordships. The Synod never shewed the least regard to what we have done, either in the explanation or in the defence of our doctrines; but, on the contrary, without receiving our papers, or at least without properly perusing them, they have lately done nothing but utter harangues against us, which may well be viewed as a pre-condemnation of the whole body of our doctrines. To discover the sincerity of their hearts towards us and our cause, and to render us still more odious, they have lately produced an extract out of our papers, and openly by the President read it to the people, by which they have tried to insinuate as though we denied the true humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ.—When they happen to find any thing which has been transiently advanced by us, either to solve some argument of our adversaries or to corroborate one of our own solutions, they eagerly seize it, if it be in any degree calculated to excite the slightest suspicion of our orthodoxy, however false it may be, and they employ their men of learning in preparing a refutation of such arguments, and then make them the subject of an oration!"

When the Remonstrants had delivered these papers, the Commissioners deliberated a long time whether they ought to receive them or not; and they afterwards entered into a warm dispute with the cited persons about the time consumed in the composition of such writings. The majority of their Lordships, being commercial men, could not conceive that any extraordinary mental exertion was required; and they betrayed their great ignorance, by often telling the cited persons, that those documents had been prepared before their appearance at the Synod, though they contained the refutation of several arguments that had been employed against their doctrines in the Synod, and of which they had been incidentally informed. Balcanqual says, in refer-

ence to these last papers: "I forgot to tell your Lordship, that the President told me he had been glancing at this volume, and he finds it to be in many parts a confutation of the several discourses which have been had publicly in the Synod upon the Five Articles."—This was the last labour of the Remonstrants, who, from that period to the 6th of May, (page 435) were kept in a state of great uncertainty respecting the fate to which they would be doomed by their haughty adversaries.

III. The labours of the Calvinistic Synod must now be briefly recited. On the 16th of Jan., it was determined, "to enter upon an examination of the Five Points, every member being required to attend to the interrogatories and Theses dictated by the President, and each college or deputation to pursue this examination apart from the rest every forenoon: In the afternoon, a public assembly shall be held, at which the chief arguments of the Remonstrants shall be considered," &c. Sibrandus Lubbertus was the first man who had the honour to declaim in public against the reasons of the Remonstrants. On the 18th the States General expressed their approbation of the previous valiant achievements of the Synod. On the 22d, occurred that stormy discussion which is related, page 449. In carrying the Synodical plan into execution, great ignorance was displayed and much time wasted. Balcanqual says: "The confusion here in handling of business is very great; they do not know how to put any thing to Committees to agree of business, and then afterward to propound it to the Synod to be approved or disproved; which hath been the custom observed in all Councils and Synods: but nothing is known till it be propounded in the Synod, and then there are almost as many several voices as heads. If your Lordship would give your advice to some of the estates in this kind, it may be they would apprehend it, and we should bring business to some issue. The Palatine Divines and we have met now three times, and we have agreed on the same propositions, and have resolved to call one of every college of the Foreign Divines, and communicate the same with them; that so, if it be possible, all we strangers may set up, and throw down the same conclusions." On the evening of the 29th of Jan. the public discourses on the *First Point* were concluded by Altingius, who treated on Reprobation, and made some dreadful yet unsatisfactory remarks on that *dreaded* subject. Hales says, "I could have wished that the question of Reprobation had been yet further opened and stood upon, it being a point of large extent, and especially insisted upon by the Remonstrant."

In the course of a week afterwards, the examination in public of the *Five Points* was finished, on which Hales observes, "Our Synod goes on like a watch; the main wheels upon which the whole business turns, are least in sight: For all things of moment are acted in private sessions; what is done in public, is only for shew and entertainment."—On the 4th of Feb., it was proposed to compose several treatises for the use of the Dutch Churches: One of them is mentioned, page 470; and another, page 478, with Hales's remarks upon the proposition.—On the 11th, it was debated in a private session what course to adopt respecting the large defence which the Remonstrants had delivered to the Lay-Commissioners on the *First Point*. It was this Book which, Balcanqual says, page 482, was "finely penned." It was determined at last, "that Rolandus, Faukelius and Damman should examine it carefully and report to the Synod if they discovered any matters in it which had not been advanced in their former productions; and that the small part of it which contained the proofs of their doctrines should be read at one or two of their forenoon sessions, which was accordingly done,—though from their meagre notices of it, they were evidently shy about grappling with its arguments. The Synod was from the first resolved to have nothing to do with their new arguments, whether written or oral; and when, in the course of this debate, it was moved by one of the Synod, "that the explanation and defence of each of the Remonstrants' opinions should be read, considered and refuted, paragraph by paragraph,"—another of the members replied, "In that case the Synod may sit twelve years."—On the 18th, occurred that dispute between Martinius and Gomarus which is related page 478; and on the 19th, that in 479. For form's sake, on the 26th, the Synod began to read the Remonstrants'

defence of their *Second Point*. On the 27th, the President said, "that through God's grace they were now come to the conclusion of the discussion of the Five Points." On the 5th of March, the large treatise of Paræus on the *First* and *Second Points* was read; and the remainder of it in subsequent sessions. A letter of thanks was voted to him for this performance. On the 6 th, the collegiate suffrages began to be read in private: The earnest manner in which the English Divines opposed that mode of proceeding, may be seen, page 484, On the 8th, the judgments of all the Foreign Divines on the *First Point* were finished, and the Secretaries began to read those of the inland members. On the 11th, the Bishop of Landaff corrected an assertion which Gomarus had employed concerning the Articles of the Church of England, which he had represented as favouring the supra-lapsarian doctrines; after some tergiversation, the old man intimated that both Whitaker and Perkins had declared for Supra-lapsarianism, and he accounted them such good men as not to depart from the Confession of the Church of England.

At last, on the 21st of March, the judgments of all the Divines, both foreign and inland, on the other Four Points, were finished; when the President returned thanks to God for the great unanimity of all the deputies in matters of doctrine. He then informed them, "that he had prepared a list of certain Canons, which, after mature deliberation, might be adopted by the Synod. If any member wished for an alteration in them, he must inform the President, who would consult with his assessors on the subject. But in a subsequent session the Lay Commissioners thought it more conducive to the honour of the Synod, to appoint a few other Divines as associates to the President for drawing up the Canons. This proposition excited a warm debate, on which Balcanqual has remarked, (page 480,) that "Sibrandus and Gomarus kept their fits of madness by course," &c. At last, the Bishop of Landaff, Schultetus, Deodatus, Polyander, Walæus, and Triglandius were chosen to assist Bogerman. They were directed to prepare the Canons, and to give copies of them to the deputies of every country and province at the Synod, in order to obtain their opinions respecting any alterations. When they were received back, with the observations of the Deputies on them, they were to be copied out fairly and to be laid before the whole Synod for final approbation. Some of the members who had been always averse to the overbearing authority of the Ecclesiastical President were not satisfied with the appointment of his Canonical associates; for, they concluded, from what they knew of the easy temper of those individuals, that Bogerman would have far too great an influence over them, and would induce them to agree to whatever he pleased. It was then determined, that no more sessions should be held till the Canons were prepared, and returned with the remarks of each college of the Synodical Deputies. On this occasion, Balcanqual uttered the complaint which is recorded, page 481. In framing their observations on the Canons, Balcanqual says, "Some of our College have been earnest to have this proposition out, *Infideles damnabuntur &c.* 'Unbelievers will be damned, not only on account of their unbelief, but also on account of all their other sins, both original and actual.' Because they say, that from thence may be inferred, *that original sin is not remitted to all who are baptised*,—which opinion hath been by more than one Council condemned as heretical. They have therefore at their request put it out."—This remark, and another which Hales makes on the same subject, (page 437,) will be perused with no common interest, by all those who attribute to the ordinance of Baptism the same virtue as the primitive church has done, through its own legitimate interpreters,—the early Christian Fathers.

After having passed through the prescribed process of examination and amendment, at the end of three weeks, on the 16th of April, the Canons were produced before a full Synod, when the Canons which related to the First Point were read, and each member was personally asked, in the presence of of the Lay Commissioners, if he consented to them. Every one of the members publicly declared, that he approved of those Canons, which "contained such orthodox doctrine as was agreeable to the Word of God and the Confes-

sions of the Reformed Churches;" and that, on the other hand, he rejected those false and heterodox opinions which were at variance with them. When the Canons were read over and approved in full Synod, they were signed by all the members except the English, who delayed subscribing their names till the whole should be fairly copied. And it was not till the 23d of April, that they signed the original; and on the 26th, after the two secretaries, Damman and Festus, had made a solemn declaration before the Synod, *that they had compared several copies of the Canons with the originals, and had found them exactly agreeing*, they likewise signed the copies. The British had evidently begun to entertain no very exalted sentiments respecting the good faith of the President and his colleagues; for Balcanqual says, in his Latin notes, when the Canons on the *Second Point* were read in the Synod, "But in those Canons certain words had been changed and disposed in a different manner from what they were in the Canons which all the Synodists, except the British, had signed yesterday; the latter, therefore, declared the same sentiment with regard to their consent to those Canons, which they had done with regard to those on the *First* Point,—that they would delay their signatures till a fair copy was written." But from the filtering process through which these Canons were afterwards doomed to pass, (pages 470 and 486,) it will be seen, that all this laudable precaution on the part of our countrymen was unavailing; for the Dutchmen afterwards made what alterations they thought proper. On the same day occurred the transaction mentioned by Balcanqual, page 482, when the British "maintained dispute against the whole Synod."—In the afternoon session of that day, the Canons of the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Points were unanimously adopted by the members; after which the British Divines produced their black list of the harsh and very objectionable expressions of some of the Contra-Remonstrants, which they requested the Synod to insert among their rejections; but this favour was denied, (page 483,) and it was decided, in the language of the Acts, "by a majority of votes, that it was "best *to omit the rejection of those improper modes of expression;* lest the "adversaries should calumniously report, that, by such rejection of improper "phrases, the orthodox doctrine was likewise condemned, the true profession "of which was held by those persons, who, in the explanation of it, were seen "imprudently to adopt that harsh sort of phraseology: And particularly when "it was manifest, that *there were some of those modes of speaking which the* "*Holy Ghost had Himself employed;* (!!!) that several of them were such as had "been admitted in a sound sense by the Remonstrants themselves; and that "it was possible to explain by far the greater part of them in a proper and "inoffensive manner, provided a little charity were employed!" The last clause is an excellent rule of interpretation; but, unfortunately, the men who framed it, applied it only to the rash words uttered by the Antinomians and Supra-Lapsarians of their own school. A small portion of the same charity would have qualified them for explaining in a favourable sense many scriptural terms employed by the Remonstrants.

On the 23rd, all the Canons, with their various emendations were approved in full Synod, signed, and transmitted to the States General, who had long wished to have a sight of those documents, not particularly on account of the importance of their contents, but because they considered them as the harbingers of the dissolution of that reverend assembly, which, it was complained, drew too much money from their coffers.

"On the 24th of April, the President informed the Synod that the Committee appointed by them had confided it to one person [himself] to prepare the form of a personal censure, which the Synod might pass on the cited individuals, and upon as many others as rejected its doctrines. The form of it was then read, and the President desired the members to give their opinions of it. The British Divines unanimously declared, that the doctrine of the Dutch Churches as established in that Synod was their own, and therefore, when they were called upon, they had delivered their sentiments on it: But that the persons who maintained the contrary doctrine, were Dutch citizens; they would not therefore on any consideration pass a personal censure on the sub-

jects of other states, but left that matter entirely to the inland Divines, whose province it was to determine about their own ministers. All the Foreign Divines co-incided with this determination, except those of Geneva and Embden. Some of the inland Divines made remarks on certain parts of the form; one of which was, 'that it was not the province of an ecclesiastical tribunal to condemn them *as disturbers of their native country and of the peace of the Republic;* but that it belonged to the civil magistrate. A warm discussion then arose among the provincial Divines on this question, 'Whether any toleration was to be extended to those persons who, although they would not sign the synodical Canons, would yet engage to speak or teach nothing contrary to them either in public or private?' Some of the Provincials wished the Foreign Divines to deliver their sentiments on this topic; but it was answered by the President, [who was more in the secret than most of the others,] that all those particular cases ought to be left to the prudence of the provincial synods, and that he did not yet know what toleration the States General would allow.—In the succeeding session, the personal censure was again read, and the phrase *disturbers of their country, &c.* was omitted. The opinion of the Synod was then asked about it in this corrected form; but the British and the Hessians would neither express approbation nor disapprobation, for they were unwilling to meddle with such personal matters. The rest of the foreigners said, that having now more maturely considered the affair than they had done in the preceding session, they approved of it. All the Provincials likewise signified their approval. But Gomarus and some others begged, 'that the Synod would intercede with the States General for bestowing on those Remonstrants who were less obstinate *their salary for three months!!;* for they might probably in that time wish to converse with learned men and obtain satisfaction to their consciences on the Synodical Canons:' Yet it was his wish, 'that they should at the first opportunity be suspended from the exercise of their ministry.'—The President, [whose *tender mercies* were proverbial,] replied, 'that it did not at all comport with the dignity of such an AUGUST SYNOD to intercede with the States-General for *a trifling affair of salary;* but he did not doubt, that their High Mightinesses would exercise towards them *sufficient kindness and clemency!*'

This is Balcanqual's account, from which it is apparent, that many of the members of that Synod knew the hard fate which awaited the brave Remonstrants, and that the bare contemplation of it excited the latent compassion of Gomarus, who would *generously* have allowed the suspended parties *a quarter's salary!* The British were also acquainted with the impending calamity, and were most probably instructed in the course which they pursued on that occasion. This personal censure is mentioned, page 435; and was not signed as all the Canons had been, by every member of the Synod, but only by the three secretaries, Damman, Hommius, and Heinsius. This precaution was adopted, to prevent the world from knowing who were the dissidents that refused their sanction to that sweeping measure.—At the same session arose the discussion about the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, which is related, page 486. In the ACTS of the Synod, the Confessions of John and Peter Geerstang, as extorted from them by many insidious questions, are subjoined to the *Personal Censure* of the Remonstrants, apparently for the purpose of giving *a fair specimen* of Arminianism,—though the case of those two men had been long before decided by a provincial assembly, and their general doctrines were equally remote from those of the Remonstrants, and from those of the Church of England.

On the 25th of April, the petition of Maccovius was produced: His case we shall narrate in a subsequent article. On the 29th, the Preface to the Canons, after having received several corrections, was read and approved. In the intermediate sessions, various letters, from Peter Moulin and others, were read and discussed. The Lay Commissioners reported to the Synod, that the States General had ratified their Canons, and recommended to their immediate attention the Confession and Catechism, and the other affairs that had still to be considered. Accordingly, on the 30th, says Balcanqual, "the synodical

judgment on the Dutch Confession was required. The British Divines approved of all its doctrines, and thought that on the whole it contained nothing repugnant to the sacred writings. They had indeed observed in it some minute faults, which might easily be rectified, by a collation of copies, in the new and correct edition that was then in course of preparation. At the same time they added, that they gave no opinion respecting the three chapters which related to Church-government; yet they thought that the Government of their own Churches was of Apostolic institution. The Bishop of Landaff delivered a short speech against those three chapters, and maintained, that there had not been an equality among the pastors of the Church, either in the days of the Apostle or at any subsequent period." The rest of the members signified their acquiescence in the approbation declared by the British, and proceeded, on the First of May, to consider and revise the Heidelberg Catechism, which was approved and highly extolled in the afternoon-session of the same day. "But," says Balcanqual, "the British Divines vindicated the right of their own Church to interpret in a way different from that of others the article on *Christ's descending into Hell:* At last, in consequence of the great offence which they received from the scandalous neglect of the Lord's day in the city of Dort, they intreated and advised the Synod to prevail on the magistracy not to permit public buying and selling in the market, or shops to be opened for exposing goods to sale on that sacred day. One of the inland divines embraced that opportunity to move a resolution on *the Observance of the Sabbath;* which was not fully discussed, but referred to the provincial grievances that had to come under consideration after our matters were finished." This interference on the part of the British, is honourable to our country; for, whenever we lose that grand and Christian distinction, *the uniform and strict observance of the Sabbath,* we shall be shorn of our national strength and shall dwindle into a nation of men more contemptible than formalists and allied to unbelievers.

On the Second of May, the affair of Vorstius was brought before the Synod by the Lay-Commissioners; who, according to Balcanqual, "stated that their High Mightinesses had commanded a summary cognizance of his Theology to be taken, and that the deliberations of the members should be directed to this point, *Does the doctrine of Vorstius conduce to the edification of the Church?* and *Does a doctor of this description appear worthy to occupy the Divinity-chair?* Vorstius addressed letters to each of the colleges of Foreign Divines and to the Synod itself, which were all of the same tenour and were publicly read. In them he implored the equanimity and Christian charity of the Synod, intimated a wish personally to appear before the Synod, and intreated that, in case any thing had been discussed by him with too much freedom, it might be imputed to a desire of arriving at the truth, and that he might be convinced by reasons drawn from the word of God. He testified his willingness to enter into a conference with the Foreign Divines, and likewise to refute the Socinian heresy, provided that province were assigned to him. He could not possibly indulge the persuasion, that his books would be burnt, when certain writings by Piscator, containing sentiments far more horrid and offensive to good morals, had not been committed to the flames." Some of his old letters and his errors were then recounted.

The next day, says Balcanqual, "Each of the colleges, both foreign and provincial, declared in writing its judgment on Vorstius. After the British had read a synopsis which they had compiled of his principal blasphemies against the Divine Nature, they said, that, after having given such great cause of scandal, Vorstius had never in his subsequent explanations or defences acknowledged any of the errors that were propounded in his book *On the Attributes of the Deity,* but had attempted to disguise them under the most absurd distinctions and weak subterfuges, and to the best of his ability to undermine with consummate art the principal foundations of the orthodox doctrine. They therefore not only accounted him to be unworthy of the name and the office of an orthodox professor, but would likewise advise, that none of his books of that kind should be permitted to be sold in the shops of the

booksellers. In conclusion they begged, that, for an example and as a proof of a sacred zeal in the cause of God, the treatise of Vorstius *on the Deity* should, by order of government and by the decree of the Synod, be in a public and solemn manner burnt by fire. And, as a specimen of an infamous burnt-offering of this kind, the British read before the Synod an authentic decree, passed on the 21st Sept., 1611, and ratified with the seal of the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, by virtue of which and of the previous judgment of our most Serene King, the before mentioned book was publicly purified in the flames of vengeance. A copy of that Cambridge decree was then entered among the Acts of the Synod.

"The divines of the Palatinate declared, that they co-incided with the determinations of his most Serene Majesty and of the University of Cambridge, and related the fraudulent character of the recantation which Vorstius had made some years ago at Heidelberg.—The Hessian Divines stated, that the dedication of his treatise *on the Deity*, which had been inscribed to their most illustrious master the Landgrave, was so far from being pleasing to that pious prince, as to be exceedingly disagreeable to him: and that he had with singular prudence refused to admit Vorstius to a Professor's chair in that University, although he had been highly recommended. (See Page 455)—All the other members, both foreign and provincial, united in considering Vorstius worthy of being deprived of the Professorial dignity. With regard to the offer which he now made, of being a champion prepared to enter the lists against the Socinians, it was answered, [in the words of the Latin Poet,]

Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis
Tempus eget;

'The present times do not require such aid as this, or such defenders;' because Vorstius, in his heretical career, was himself much suspected of holding the errors of Socinianism. It was therefore thought, that he would not heartily engage in that enterprize: for he had done nothing at all respecting the matter which had been formerly committed to him for execution."

The next day when a certain Synodical decree respecting Vorstius was presented for approbation, "some insertions, omissions and explanations were moved by the British, who represented that certain errors on the subject of justification were ascribed to Vorstius, on which it was not yet sufficiently evident what his opinions were; and that other things were omitted or not condemned with suitable plainness, which yet were most blasphemous and had given very grievous offence to almost all the Catholic Church.—It was then debated at great length, that Vorstius denied *the resurrection of the same body*, or united with Socinus in completely taking away *the satisfaction of Christ*; and, in proof of this, some of his private letters were read which he had many years before addressed to Tossanus, and in which he makes an open profession of Socinianism.—But, in opposition to this, the British Divines were of opinion, that he ought to be found guilty out of books acknowledged and published by himself, and not from a private letter, concerning which there was no evidence that it had been written by him, or if there were evidence about any thing, it was, that it had been composed prior to the recantation which he published at Heidelberg. It was not the wish of the Synod to come to any determination about burning the book of Vorstius, but they referred that matter to the Supreme Magistrate.

"In the 152nd Session, held the same afternoon, the decree against Vorstius having undergone some slight alterations was again proposed. The British Divines wished to see inserted in it more of the Divine Attributes which had been attacked by Vorstius: They also wished his sentiments on *the satisfaction of Christ* and *man's justification* either to be entirely omitted in the Synodical Censure, or to be more fully explained to the Synod, that the members might be convinced of their being erroneous. Many long debates arose in the discussion of these and other dogmas that had been promulged by Vorstius. The members at length agreed to the adoption of that form of Censure

by which Vorstius is adjudged to be unworthy of occupying the Theological Chair, on account of his audacity and impiety in undermining the principal foundations of the Christian Faith: and in which the States-General are requested to prohibit the circulation of his Treatise *on the Deity* and other doctrines which are specified in that decree. Before the close of this session, which was protracted to a late hour in the night, the sentence against Maccovius was read."

Such is the account given by Balcanqual. In a few weeks afterwards, the States of Holland and West Friezland grounded ulterior proceedings upon the Synodical Censure, and discharged Vorstius from his office of Professor, requiring him to depart out of their territories in the space of six weeks, and never to return, upon pain of being punished at pleasure as a disturber of the public peace. In their mercy they allowed him *his salary for six months.*—This decree against him was confirmed a few weeks afterwards by the States General, who extended the prohibition to all the United Provinces, out of which Vorstius was in consequence banished.

On the Sixth of May, the principal business of the Synod having been terminated, there was a grand procession of the members to the Great Church at Dort, in which were recited from the pulpit the Canons or Articles of the Synod before an immense company of Spectators. Balcanqual's Latin description of it is very amusing: Among other circumstances, he relates, that "after the Preface to the Canons had been read, the President (Bogerman) admonished all the audience to manifest individually, according to custom, the joy which they felt on that day, and their gratitude to the Divine Majesty, by bestowing charitable donations on the poor. These largesses, which were collected by certain Deacons of the Church of Dort who had been appointed to that service, must undoubtedly have been very liberal: For no man could be observed who did not with a glad countenance stretch out his hand to bestow his bounty." After all the Articles had been recited, he adds, "When these had been finished, the subscription of each of the members was read, when every man at the mention of his own name testified his individual consent to the Canons by removing his hat from his head. [See the close of the Paragraph page 472.] The secretary then read the Personal Censure which the Synod passed on the Remonstrants: [See page 435.] But to that document the signature of each of the members was not added, because some of the Foreigners were unwilling to enter into any resolutions concerning the persons of those men, but only concerning their doctrines."

The next day, being the 9th of May, all the foreign Divines took their leave of the inland members, after they had all dined together and been entertained with music and other delights.—On the 10th of May, the States Commissioners waited upon each of the foreign divines at their respective lodgings, wished them a good journey, and presented each of them with a valuable gold medal, illustrative of the labours of the Synod. Beside the handsome daily allowance during their stay at Dort, they received a considerable sum to defray the expences of their journies to and from the Synod. Some of them who returned by the Hague, endeavoured to persuade the persons at whose houses they lodged to accompany them: intimating that they would there behold an uncommon sight, which proved to be the execution of that great man, the Advocate Olden Barneveldt, who was beheaded the fourth day after this formal conclusion of the main business of the Synod. It is reported of Diodati, the Genevan Deputy, that, not long before, he wrote a letter to M. Du Maurier, ambassador of France, in which he said, "The Church will never enjoy any quiet as long as the ring-leader of the Arminians is alive." On another occasion he had the audacity to say, before a large company with whom he was dining, "You must proceed to extremities before religion can be established on a solid foundation."—After the departure of the foreign Divines from Dort, the inland members held other twenty-six sessions, to finish those matters which had been referred to them, and with respect to which the former acts of the Synod were but the preliminaries. The 13th of May was the day on which

they held their first session, all spectators being excluded, and the business conducted in the Dutch language. That was the very day when the Advocate Olden Barneveldt was beheaded; and Bogerman the President, that day, offered public thanksgiving to God *for having delivered his Church from those men who had troubled her!* The members then proceeded to devise various forms of subscription to the Calvinism propounded by the Synod in their Canons, for the double purpose of *lawfully* discharging all Arminians from the ministry, and of preventing others of that persuasion from entering into it. They likewise enacted several other vexatious measures that had the same bearing. Yet some of their labours were of a description that seemed calculated to benefit their country,—such as their resolutions respecting the better observance of the Sabbath, the regulation of schools and universities, uniformity in the solemnization of marriages, &c, &c.

Vorstius, having heard nothing of the fate of his previous application to the Synod, addressed, on the 5th of May, another letter to the Bishop of Landaff and the other foreign Divines, from which the following are extracts: "I thought the attempt of humbly addressing your reverences deserved to be made, for this purpose,—that you will have the goodness not to disdain to perform for me in this affair an act of true charity, which is a service due to God and our neighbours, and that you will take upon you the part of honourable arbitrators between me, who am already overburdened with trouble from other quarters, and the provincial divines, of whom not a few have for a long time been highly exasperated against me, and whose interference in my affair is for this reason justly suspected. Your reverences are aware, that I have offered to the Synod a quiet and friendly discussion, either by word of mouth or by writing. If I can obtain neither of these favours, what will be the judgment of the Christian world and of posterity? For it is not sufficient to judge any man out of books, according to the votes of a majority, in matters that are the subjects of litigation, and especially in those of Theology; because books are both deaf and dumb, and can neither declare themselves beyond the expressions formed by the letters of which they are composed, nor can propose any reply to objections. This is still more unjust when the author of such books renders himself accessible, and offers himself as prepared equally for learning better doctrine than that which he already knows, or for communicating greater truths to those persons to whom they are unknown.—Yet, after all, if the majority of voices shall in this case prevail to form a judgment concerning me from my books alone, it will at least be equitable for your reverences to grant me this favour,—to mitigate and repress by your intercessions the too vehement zeal of others, that no severer sentence may be passed against me, than has yet been passed against Piscator and some others, who have hitherto been adversaries to my cause. Some of these men have long ago delivered certain harsh sentiments on the Predestination of God, and others of them on Justification and on similar articles of our faith;—although my sentiments being purely theoretical, may be manifestly erroneous, (a circumstance concerning them, that was never yet pointed out by your Synod,) and though they may not of themselves contribute any thing to the practice of piety,—yet when the opinions of those men are compared with them, mine will appear but as very slight excrescences or diminutive moles on the skin, in proportion to theirs which seem like deadly wounds or pestiferous ulcers. I submit it also to your reverences as a subject on which you ought seriously to reflect, that it is not possible to discover any thing in those doctrines principally objected against me which has at any period been publicly condemned as heretical by the ancient and purer church of Christ: On the contrary, nothing can be found in them which has not either been propounded by the ancient Church in a similar manner, or at least been tolerated by it as an indifferent matter. This fact is abundantly evident from my Apologetical Reply to the *Specimen* of Festus Hommius, which Reply I would hope your reverences have already both seen and perused,—to omit all mention of other writings of this kind, which were published by me long ago for the same purpose, and in which some expressions

that had perhaps been either too obscurely or too incautiously employed, will be found explained in a mild and candid manner and so as to bear a better signification."

What unaccountable mutations often occur in human friendships! Twelve years had not elapsed since Bogerman addressed a most loving letter to Vorstius as his dear friend, in which he gave a long account of the transactions of the Preparatory Convention which was held at the Hague in 1607, and of which both Bogerman and Arminius were members. The following are extracts from it. "Most famous man, reverend Sir, and my brother in Christ! —Arminius was present at our convention, and, with the exception of him and three others, we were all unanimous in our sentiments. But, because we had him opposed to us, we were forced to exhibit to the States-General our discordant judgments concerning those subjects on which the whole matter hinged. —It was the wish of Arminius, that the judges (that is, the ministers of all the Churches,) should, during the period of this search after truth, be liberated from those subscriptions and obligations by which they had bound themselves to the Catechism and the Confession: This is the course which according to his opinion ought to be pursued.—But it appeared to us a most absurd project. We confessed indeed, that sentence was to be pronounced according to the word of God; but that, since it is unbecoming both in a Christian and in a Minister to be without faith, it is impossible without it to enter into any investigation or to form a right judgment. We consider that to be the *true doctrine of faith* which those writings [the Catechism and Confession] have delivered from the word of God: Since a believer therefore is never liberated from the word of God, he is never free from *the doctrine delivered in it*, which *we believe to be contained in those writings*.—I judged it proper briefly to communicate to you these circumstances, that you might know the situation of our affairs ecclesiastical, and that you may pray to God for the peace and tranquillity of our Churches!" These extracts shew the estimation in which the reverend President of the Synod of Dort held those human formularies of union. In his opinion, they contained the very quintessence of the Gospel, and were the rule by which the doctrines of the scriptures ought to be judged.

For many years afterwards, poor Vorstius enjoyed the friendship of Bogerman, Acronius, Erpenius, Goclenius, Rosæus, and others of the Calvinistic brotherhood. In former days, he had also corresponded with Beza, Grynæus, Paræus, and other fathers of that school. But when he accepted of the Leyden professorship, and became the successor of Arminius, the hands of nearly all these men were raised against him; they compassed sea and land to effect his destruction; and they never refrained from their persecution of him, till they had hunted him out of the United Provinces. Whatever might have been the extent and complexion of his errors, he can be viewed by an impartial posterity in no other light than that of a martyr who was sacrificed to the malevolent passions of some persons, and to the despicable vanity of others. The following letter from Balcanqual to Mr. Secretary Nanton will pourtray the ideas which the British Divines entertained concerning the tyrannical act of condemning any man unheard! As Britons who had gradually imbibed a relish for the sweets of liberty, (though the portion of it that they possessed was not of that extensive and well-defined sort which we enjoy,) they seem to have had some indistinct recollection of St. Paul's question to the Centurion, "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned?" The former part of the letter will be explained by extracts from two of Balcanqual's Letters: "I think our President hath need of your Lordship's good counsel for carrying himself in making the Canons: I find every man murmuring already, *that he would make them, and doth but only dictate them to the rest.*" (March 22.) In his next, the observations occur which are quoted in page 481; after which, he again solicits his "Lordship's care and good counsel, (page 485,) and adds: "God's goodness towards his Church, and your Lordship's vigilant constancy in perfecting THIS GOOD COURSE, *which you were so careful*

to procure, I hope will teach us to overcome all these difficulties." This correspondence will prove, that Sir Dudley Carleton had nearly the supreme direction, behind the scenes, of every thing momentous. In this instance he transmitted his orders to the States Commissioners, who, notwithstanding their evident leaning towards Bogerman, were compelled to thwart his purposes.—I have not at hand a copy of this letter to Nanton in English, and am on that account compelled to translate it from the Latin of Hartsoeker. It is dated March 26th, 1619.

"WALTER BALCANQUAL TO MR. SECRETARY NANTON.

"Most illustrious man! The interruption in the series of the Synodical sessions has been the reason why I have not lately addressed any letters to you. From the time when I last wrote, the following is an account of the manner in which we have passed our time: An end was at length made of publicly reading the judgments of the different colleges on the Five Points. Thanks be to God, there was in them a greater harmony and agreement, than it seemed possible to expect in such a vast number of learned men, not one of whom knew the sentiments of others. The only difference of opinion occurred in the Second Article. The President, who is not accustomed to ask advice of the Synod, wished to frame the Canons himself in virtue of his office, and to dictate them to us. That plan seemed to us who had been deputed by his majesty, to detract greatly from the dignity of the Synod. Having therefore consulted with certain persons who approved of our advice, we considered it would be advantageous for some persons to be deputed by the Synod as associates to the President, so that whatever was transacted might be done by public authority. These measures greatly enraged the President, on whose side all the Provincial divines, some of the Foreigners, and particularly those of the Palatinate ranged themselves. Yet a public session was convoked on this account, when the President of the States Commissioners delivered a speech and required, that some persons should be deputed by the Synod, as associates to the President and his Assessors, to take an equal share in the formation of the Canons. When the votes on this proposition were collected, the greater part of the members declared, that this mode of proceeding was disagreeable to them, and that they conceded much to the authority of the President.—Schultetus, having expressed by many reasons his approbation of the acts of the President, rejected the advice which had been suggested by some individuals, but he charged no one by name as its author. Sibrandus Lubbertus also, when delivering his sentiments, broke out, like a mad-man, into furious invectives against those who had been the authors of this invention; and intimated, that it was not the province of the foreign divines to arrogate to themselves the right of determining about those things which would conduce to the welfare of these [the Dutch] churches; and that those members who had joined themselves to the foreigners, deserved to receive the severe stigma of an ecclesiastical censure. By this expression he wished to point out the South Holland members, to whom as well as to us the actions of the President were exceedingly displeasing. The fury of Sibrandus proceeded at last to such a length, that he was requested by both the Civil and the Ecclesiastical President, either to be silent or to speak those things which would not tend to disturb the peace of the Synod.

"Yet, because such was the pleasure of the States Commissioners, the whole Synod chose, as associates to the President and his Assessors, three of the foreign divines, (the Bishop of Landaff, Schultetus, and Diodati,) and three provincial divines, (Polyander, Walæus, and Triglandius,) who were diligently to occupy themselves in composing the Canons on each of the Five Points or Articles, and to transmit them (when composed,) to each of the colleges, [or societies of divines belonging to each province or nation,] that if they expressed a desire to have any thing in them added, withdrawn, or changed, they might make those alterations; till at length, after having been

often sent and remitted, they might receive full correction and be completely finished; and, being publicly confirmed as Canons, might be approved by the Synod. We are now sedulously engaged in giving the last polish to the Canons, which the Committee send to us.—The only part in which we meet with any difficulty, is on the Second Article. The majority of the Synod endeavour by the number of their votes to compel us to restrain, to the elect alone, those universal propositions concerning the death of Christ which occur in the sacred scriptures and in the Confessions of the Reformed Churches. On the contrary, we contend, that those propositions are neither to be explained nor restrained; and we are exceedingly glad, that the commands delivered to us in the king's name, by the Lord Ambassador, agree so exactly with our sentiments on the Second Article, which we have subscribed and tendered to the Synod. For we think, a solid and sufficient foundation is thus at length laid for the preaching of the Gospel to be announced to all men: We likewise avoid the greatest part of that offence which must otherwise of necessity be given to the Lutheran Churches: And, Thirdly, we retain the same phrases and forms of expression which the Ancient Fathers used, who disputed with the Pelagians about this very doctrine. If we agree together on this article, I hope the rest will be adjusted with sufficient moderation. Had not the moderation of the foreign divines operated as a preventive, the Canons which are framed would have been of such a kind as no mortal man was ever yet permitted to behold. For you can scarcely find a single provincial minister, who after having received a rebuke from the Remonstrants for some rigid sentiment which he has uttered, does not attempt to have it inserted in one Canon or another, that he may thus have it in his power to defend his own opinion. As soon as the Canons are decided, I will send them to you.

"The case of Vorstius succeeds to this labour. Some persons wish to mark his book with a censure, and not to cite him. The President, in the name of the States Commissioners, addressed a letter to our College, and enquired whether it appeared to us to be advantageous to have Vorstius present in the Synod, and what were our sovereign's wishes on this matter. We replied, that the Lord Ambassador must be consulted. But we think, to condemn any man unheard would be regarded as a hardship. In reply to the objection which they urge, 'that Vorstius would imitate the Remonstrants in protracting the Synod,' we say, Vorstius must not be allowed either to defend or to explain his blasphemous sentiments, but he must answer by YEA or NAY, and must be asked if he be prepared to abjure his heterodox opinions. In this way, without further waste of time, his cause may be decided. I think, therefore, that he ought to be cited to appear."

Balcanqual, like the rest of the Calvinists of the Synod, could not endure the idea of being detained one moment by any arguments which could be offered by *such a reputed heretic as* VORSTIUS. The orders which the British divines had received on this subject, seem to have been very peremptory; yet, as they were explained a few days before by Balcanqual, in a letter to Sir Dudley Carleton, they carry with them *a greater semblance of fairness*, than can be perceived in the course which the Synod ultimately pursued. Indeed, in the concluding Sessions, there was much apparent distance and ill-humour between the British and the Inland Divines The former had grieved the President and his friends, by refusing to sanction the Canons as they were first propounded, "full charged with Catechetical speculations," and by the interference of the English Ambassador with the States Commissioners, who had compelled those sturdy Predestinarians to relax a little in their doctrinal severity. It was when the case of Maccovius was under discussion, that this shyness ceased; and the two parties, like Pilate and Herod of old, "the same day were made friends together." On that memorable occasion, as the British Divines had previously shewn themselves the determined enemies of many harsh sentiments that had been published by various Supra-lapsarians, the remainder of the fraternity, having courageously fought for some expressions of the imprudent Piscator, Maccovius and others, whom they accounted the

best supporters of their cause, were afraid lest Maccovius, whose case was brought before them in a more tangible shape, should become the object of British vengeance. But, probably because they saw that their opposition would again be ineffectual, the British Divines devised an ingenious expedient. Among "the few choice ministers *of good worth* who did attend about the Synod," was one Master William Ames; and because he was acknowledged to be a man whose powers of deglutition were most capacious, (page 453,) they agreed to hold forth this Englishman as their proxy "in swallowing the camel of Maccovius." This prudent conduct gratified the President and the men of his party, who became once more very affable to the British, and treated them with marked respect during the few days of their abode in Dort.

According to Balcanqual's views, the conversion of Vorstius from *the error of his ways* would have proved nearly as grateful, as "his solemn excommunication," to the English monarch. His letter is dated the 20th of March, 1619; and the following is the concluding paragraph:

"There is some talk here about the citation of Vorstius; and Festus Hommius told me yesternight *he had some talk with your Lordship about it*. [Page 469.] If he be cited, *your Lordship's credit with the Prince of Orange and Count William must help us for discretion in dealing with him*, else he will keep the Synod as long as the Remonstrants did. Your Lordship, I hope, will give counsel to them, that if Vorstius should desire *to have time* to give in Apologies and Explications, for the hard speeches in his book *de Deo*, and should desire to be convinced with reason and satisfaction of his arguments, (all which would take up a long time,) *the Synod would talk of no such matter with him*, but in plain terms tell him, 'that all the members of the Synod 'had read his book, and found *many things* in it *very near unto open blasphe-'my*, and scandalous without all question to the Reformed Religion; that 'explications of things which are not once to be called in question, is no satis-'faction: and they therefore only desire to know whether he will make a plain 'recantation and denial of it, and publicly ask God forgiveness for it, and his 'Church likewise, there assembled, whom by that book he hath scandalized.' If he do this, we gain him; if not, then, without any more ado, *let the Synod censure him as they shall think fit*. I wish, that, to the terror of others, he might solemnly be excommunicated in the Synod. *In this and all other businesses we do and must rely upon your Lordship's care, for the handsome carriage of them*; which as your Lordship hath hitherto done, so, that your Lordship may still continue, to the good of God's Church, and your own immortal credit, it is no small part of the prayers of

Your Lordship's humble and faithful servant,
WALTER BALCANQUAL."

This extract alone, were there not other still more direct evidences of this fact, is sufficient to demonstrate the baneful influence which the indigested divinity of King James exercised over the proceedings and decisions of that Synod. The exercise of this influence seems to have been recognized, by the Dutch Government, on the principle, that *one good deed deserves another*; and too many instances of the operation of this principle may be traced in the account which has been given in the preceding notes. "But," says Heylin, "though the passions of the King, inflamed by holy indignation and kept unto the height, *to serve other men's turns rather than to advance his own*, had used some harsh expressions against Arminius; yet did his passions calm and subside at last, giving him leave to look about him and to discern the dangers which did seem to threaten him on the other side. Considering therefore with himself, or being informed by such of the Bishops and Divines as were then about him, how great an adversary was Calvinus to monarchical interest, [and] how contrary the predestinarian doctrines were to all rules of government, he found it necessary to devise or admit some course of the preventing of the mischief."

In a French letter, written in prison by that excellent man and suffering Remonstrant, Charles de Nielles, in 1625, to Episcopius, I find some quotations from a Pamphlet published by the Theological Faculty of Wirtemburgh in Germany; in which those Divines expose the hollow conduct and disingenuous tricks which the Calvinists had practised many years towards the Lutherans, in offering them the right hand of fellowship. It is entitled *A Faithful Warning to all the Lutheran Christians in Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, and other countries appertaining thereto, carefully to abstain from the Calvinistic Religion, which is both erroneous and highly pernicious;* and is one of the numerous manifestoes which passed between the belligerent parties, when the crown of Bohemia was a subject of contention between Ferdinand the Second, Emperor of Germany, and Frederic, the Elector Palatine. No man who is conversant with the history of Europe at that momentous period, can entertain even the shadow of a doubt, that *the intolerant conduct of the Synod of Dort was one of the chief causes why that crown was lost to Frederic.* His powerful competitor was a Papist, and would never have succeeded with the *Correspondents*, or Protestant Princes of Germany, had not many of them refused, *in the spirit of the subjoined extract*, to associate themselves with the destinies of such high Calvinists as Frederic and his party.

The secret history of this affair is a complete key to the politic arrangements of the Synod of Dort. Frederic was son-in-law to the English monarch, and nephew to Prince Maurice, the Dutch Generalissimo. He sent his Heidelberg Divines to Dort, to assist his uncle in the condemnation of the Remonstrant party, and to gratify his father-in-law in the ruin of Vorstius. In return, he naturally expected both his relatives to aid him in his grand enterprize, which certainly was commenced under the most promising auspices. Prince Maurice, though very willing to contribute his aid, did not possess means sufficiently ample to ensure his nephew's success; and King James, who possessed the means, was both dilatory and secretly unwilling. A witty historian has said, "The Elector Palatine might easily have foreseen, that his father-in-law would assist him no further than by some offers of mediation, by letters and Ambassadors: These are the only services that he ever rendered to any of his allies." But the summit of this monarch's ambition was never placed in an imitation *of the warlike and chivalrous fame* of David, King of Israel; it consisted rather in attaining to his son Solomon's celebrity for *pacific wisdom.* Frederic's rival was supported by the Court of Spain, he being a branch of that proud house; and James's mean and impolitic attachment to that Court, with which for many years he earnestly sought an alliance, prevented his affections from flowing in their natural current. When the Spaniards had treated our patient King with that superciliousness and *hauteur* which seem indigenous to their soil, and when the charm was broken which had fatally held him entranced, he wished to grant Frederic some effectual assistance; but his contemplated kindness came too late to be advantageous, and his son-in-law lost not only the crown of Bohemia, but was expelled from his hereditary dominions.—Now, this *negative act of preterition*, which James delighted to apply to other subjects than to politics, was one cause of that unhappy catastrophe.—Another and a greater cause may be found in the active hostility of the King of France, whose advice with regard to the Remonstrants had been slighted, (page 421) and who would not lend himself to the establishment of a Calvinistic monarch in Germany or any of its dependencies, but granted an asylum in his dominions to the banished Remonstrants, and assisted the Emperor Ferdinand to recover the lost crown of Bohemia.—But the most powerful and calamitous cause, was, *the alienation of the majority of the Protestant Princes of Germany*, who declared, that they would not encourage Calvinism so far, as to place on any throne a Prince who professed that intolerant religion. And, as poor Frederic was unfortunately almost the only one among the German Princes that was distinguished by a predilection for Calvinism,—and as he had, by the divines whom he deputed to the Dutch

Synod, acted a part that was in perfect accordance with the contracted principles which he had espoused,—the other German Princes of the Protestant persuasion, the majority of whom were Lutherans, perceived, in the consequences of his elevation to the regal dignity, many evils which they were resolved to avert, and they accordingly gave to his Imperial opponent, though a Papist by profession, their most hearty co-operation. Some of their reasons for this preference are contained in the following extract:

"The good to be expected from such brethren [as the Calvinists,] may be easily ascertained from the Synod of Dort and its proceedings. The Calvinists had several disputes with the Arminians, particularly about the Article of GRACE or ELECTION, in which the latter defended our [the Lutheran] opinion, and the former that of Calvin. In this controversy the Calvinists at length manifested such fury, that, by a hasty decree of their Synod, they condemned the Arminians and their doctrines, without permitting them to make any defence, deprived them of the exercise of their religion, and sent into perpetual exile from their native country the most eminent of their ministers. Was not that a very brotherly proceeding? If this was the treatment received at their hands by such as differed from them *in little more than one point*, (that of election or Predestination,) what must WE expect who differ from them in such a number of Articles? Men of sense may discover without the least difficulty the scope and tendency of their measures. They are now striving to gain possession of the secular arm, to draw the civil magistrate over to their party, and to introduce into the highest official stations those persons who entertain their opinions. Should their attempts succeed, we shall soon see a *General Synod* convened in Germany, over which men of the Calvinistic persuasion will preside, and, having the supreme direction of all affairs, will decide them according to their own pleasure, without once hearing us [the Lutherans,] or allowing us to sit with them in the same Synod: But they will imitate the practice at Dort, rashly censure our doctrine as erroneous, hinder the exercise of our profession, expel the Lutheran Ministers out of the country, and will, unless prevented by God, totally extirpate our religion. From all these circumstances we conclude, that their offers of fraternal communion are not sincere, but only designed to serve as pretences, till they can collect sufficient strength and courage to possess themselves of our churches. And, if a Prince of their persuasion should, in process of time, be exalted to the Imperial Dignity, [as Emperor of Germany,] such a spirit as that which they manifest will be sufficient to involve us in blood-shed and destruction, and we poor Lutherans shall be butchered like sheep by these *our worthy brethren*. For with them it is a principle of religion that *Heretics ought to be rooted out by force*, and that *no other religion than* THE TRUE ONE *should be tolerated in a well-governed state*, according to the doctrine propagated and defended by Calvin, Beza, and several other of their leaders. Their inference from these premises will be, that *the Lutherans are Heretics*, that is, Nestorians, Eutychians, Pelagians, &c.: which will be succeeded by this sanguinary decree, *The Lutherans must be extirpated with the sword!* Such will be the final decision of our Calvinistical brethren, and these are the advantages which we may expect from them! The fraternity which they offer to us, is that which Æsop describes,—the peace and amity which the wolf held out to the sheep, that he might with greater facility seize and devour his prey. Therefore let no man be imposed upon by the amicable name of BROTHERHOOD. For under this specious pretence do they seek our destruction. Whosoever unites himself with these Calvinists, becomes a partaker of all that deceit which they conceal, and of all those vile intrigues which they practise against the Lutheran Churches."

IV. We come now to the case of Maccovius, Professor of Divinity at Franeker in Friezland, who had maintained in his published writings, that "God propounds his word to Reprobates, for no other purpose than to render them inexcusable; that if the Gospel be considered with respect to God's intention —the proper end of it, (and not the accidental,) in reference to Reprobates, is their inexcusableness; that Christ knoweth all the hearts of Reprobates, and

that they neither can nor will open to him,—not that He may enter in, but partly that he may upbraid them for their impotency, and partly that He may increase their damnation; and that God has spoken to them, that, through their contempt and hatred of his only-begotten Son, their condemnation might be the more grievous." For these and similar erroneous doctrines he was accused before the States of Friezland, who desired the Lay Commissioners at the Synod of Dort to have his case decided by that Reverend Tribunal. But Sibrandus, who had been his original accuser, saw with grief and indignation the powerful phalanx which had been marshalled to cover the retreat of Maccovius, (page 502) and warily refused to be made a party in that affair, the pacific termination of which he clearly foresaw: Yet he took occasion, as it is related page 469, to vent his spleen against Festus Hommius, who, after being the bosom-friend of Sibrandus, had become the advocate of his enemy Maccovius.

Balcanqual gives the following history of this affair in his Latin notes: "25th April. The petition of John Maccovius was read: in which he heavily complained, that he had been accused of Heresy before the States of Friezland by Sibrandus Lubbertus; he therefore humbly intreated, that the Synod would take cognizance of the whole affair, that after Sibrandus had been heard he also might be permitted to speak in his own behalf, and that each of them might choose, out of the members of the Synod, arbitrators to examine diligently into the business and to report it to the Synod. The President desired Sibrandus to deliver his sentiments to the Synod respecting this dissension. Sibrandus denied, that he had at any time been the accuser of Maccovius; on the contrary, he proved, by the testimony of two of the Friezland brethren, that Maccovius had been accused by the Franeker Class, and that by orders of the States of Friezland and at the request of the assembly he had been at that time the sole mouth of the Class; and therefore, as he had not yet become a party in this controversy, he protested that he would on no account be considered one at present. The President stated the propriety of the Synod taking cognizance of this business, because such had been the particular desire of the States of Friezland in their letters to the States Commissioners, and because they had for this purpose transmitted attested copies of all the proceedings that had taken place in this dispute before them. It was then put to the votes of the members, since Sibrandus was not a party, Whether Maccovius ought first to be heard ?, or Whether cognizance should be taken of it, when he was not present, from the proceedings of the States of Friezland? The Synod decided that the proceedings should first be read, and, if necessary, that Maccovius should afterwards be openly heard.

"26th April: Another petition from Maccovius was read, in which he begged, that arbitrators may be chosen, and that his answer to the errors objected against him and his explanation may be read.—The proceedings in the case of Maccovius, which had been transmitted to the Synod by the States of Friezland, were read. The fifty errors with which Maccovius had been charged by the Franeker Class, were first read; with the exception of one or two, they seemed, even when first heard, not to be of such great consequence as to be grounds of accusation against a learned man before the Synod. The greatest part of them consisted of that generally-received distinction of an agent acting *physically* and *morally*,—a distinction that was imperfectly understood by his accuser.

"In the afternoon Session of the same day, was read the Answer of Maccovius to the errors which had been objected against him, and then another of greater brevity; in both of which he gave abundantly satisfactory answers to all the charges which had been brought against him, by denying some of them and explaining others. A letter from the Professors of Divinity at Heidelberg to the States of Friezland, was then read, in which that learned and reverend body exhorted their Lordships 'not to suffer such frivolous, metaphysical, 'obscure and false propositions to be disputed in their colleges, as had lately 'been done in the University of Franeker, under the direction of Maccovius,

'in the theses *on the traduction* (or drawing) *of man, as a sinner, to life.*'—The President enquired, Whether the larger explanation which Maccovius had offered to the Synod, ought to be read in the Synod?, and What method should be adopted in the management of this cause? Some of the foreign divines declared, that it was possible to reduce those fifty errors to four or five, and that no real charge of heresy as objected against him could be detected in them. All the foreigners were of opinion, that the affair ought to be consigned to a committee; and they desired, that two foreign divines and two Dutch Professors might be nominated, to whom might be added two ministers, and that this Committee should take cognizance of the whole matter and deliver their report to the Synod. The greatest part of them thought, that the prolix explanation of Maccovius ought not to be heard in the Synod, but should be referred to the Committee.—The Genevan Divines were the only persons that disapproved of this advice: Diodati wished this business to be left entirely to the inland members after the departure of the Foreign Divines: But Tronchinus [his colleague] in a most violent speech contended, that Maccovius ought by no means to be publicly heard, that no other mode of proceeding should be adopted in his case than had been pursued in that of the Remonstrants and Episcopius, and that he ought to be judged out of his writings.—Every one was astonished at such a conclusion as this against a man who was by no means suspected of heterodoxy."—Then followed the indecent quarrel between Hommius and Lubbertus, described page 469.

In the next Session, on the 27th of April, after the declaration of Ames had been stated, as recorded in page 453, Balcanqual says, "It was at last decided by a majority of votes, 'that the third of the papers of Maccovius should be 'publicly read in the Synod and that three foreign and three inland Divines 'should be chosen as a Committee, to take cognizance of the whole affair 'and report it to the Synod.' But as the President said, that the paper which had been mentioned contained many personal reflections, and particularly some that were aimed at Sibrandus, some of the foreign divines requested, for the sake of preserving peace, that the votes of the members on this point should be again taken, which was accordingly done; and the decision of the majority then was, that the paper should be read only in private before the Committee. The Committee chosen by the majority for hearing this affair, consisted of Schultetus, Sthenius and Breytingerus from the foreign Divines, and of Gomarus, Thysius and Mehnius from the Provincials. It excited the astonishment of the foreign members, that Schultetus should have been nominated by the inland members, and still more that he should have undertaken such a service, when the Theological Faculty of Heidelberg, of which he formed a part, had already condemned the theses under examination, as frivolous, metaphysical and false.

"On the 30th of April, was read the Report of the Synodical Committee on the case of Maccovius, the sum of which was, 'that Maccovius could not be 'considered guilty of any thing like Heathenism, Judaism, Pelagianism, 'Socinianism, or any other kind of heresy; and that he had been unjustly 'accused; but that his offence consisted in employing certain ambiguous and 'obscure scholastic phrases, in endeavouring to introduce into the Dutch Uni-'versities the scholastic mode of teaching, and in selecting those questions 'for disputation which were accounted the Pests of the Dutch Churches; 'that he ought therefore to be admonished, no longer to employ the expressions 'of Bellarmine and Suarez, but to speak in the language of the Holy Ghost; 'that these things ought to be considered as faults in him—his assertion that 'the *sufficiency* and the *efficacy* of the death of Christ is a foolish distinction,—'his denying that *the human race considered as fallen* was not the object of predestination,—and his maintaining, that *God has both willed and decreed* '*sins*, that *God has by no means willed the salvation of all men*, and *that there* '*are two elections*; and that, according to their judgment, the slight quarrel 'between him and Sibrandus ought to be terminated, and no person ought 'hereafter to prefer against him any more such accusations.'"

Such was the Report of the Synodical Committee on this affair. On the evening of the 4th of May, when the case of Vorstius was decided, judgment was also pronounced on Maccovius. It is thus related by Balcanqual: "Before the termination of this session, which continued to a late hour in the night, the Report of the Committee on the case of Maccovius was read, and approved by a majority of votes. For, according to their judgment, though he ought to be absolved from all charge of heresy, yet he ought to be admonished to adopt a more appropriate method of teaching Theology, and to employ such forms of speech as may be collected from the sacred scriptures. They also thought, that he had rendered himself justly reprehensible on account of certain propositions which he had crudely and rigidly defended."—Donia, an elder of the Church at Leuwarden, made some objections to this conclusion of the matter, and drew out of his bosom a form of the accusation which Sibrandus had been instructed to prefer, but which like a cautious man he had refused to undertake. But when this interruption to the unanimity of the Synod, had excited a great ferment and much discourse, "the political commissioners," says Balcanqual, "terminated the discussion by the sound of their hammer, which is the method employed by them to enforce silence on those who are noisy and obstreperous." This *argumentum baculinum* was found to be one of the most convenient and forcible weapons wielded by the Synod of Dort for convincing the gainsayers . and its efficacy, on more occasions than this, was rendered very apparent.

Bishop Womack, quoting from the ANTIDOTUM of the Remonstrants, gives the following account:

"When Maccovius, Professor of Franequer in Friezland, had not only asserted and disseminated by his writings the most horrid opinion, of all that ever had been written about Predestination by Zuinglius and Piscator; and moreover in the very Synod undertook, against his colleague Sibrandus Lubbertus, to maintain, *that God wills sin, that he ordains men to sin, as it is sin; that God in no wise would have all men to be saved*, and many things of the like import, declaring openly, that if these things were not maintained, they must forsake their chief doctors who had taught those things, and fall into the opinion of the Remonstrants. What said the Synod to this bold Supra-Creatarian? Did they sequester or displace him? No; but accounted him for a pure Orthodox Divine, guilty neither of heresy nor erroneous doctrine, as it was declared by the public testimony of the Synod; and so they dismissed him with a wholesome and friendly Caution, to forbear such forms of speech as might give offence to tender ears, and could not be digested by persons ignorant and uncapable of so great mysteries: and that he would not set light by those distinctions of divines, who had deserved well of the Church of Christ."

When the ingenuous reader has instituted a comparison between the treatment which Vorstius endured from the Synod, and that which Maccovius received, (narrated as both of them are in the words of a famous Synodist,) he will not feel any doubts respecting *the partiality* of that memorable assembly. Though Maccovius entertained many sentiments almost diametrically opposed to those of Vorstius, yet, on the common principle *that companionship in tribulation constitutes a strong bond of union*, these two heretics were on very friendly terms and consulted with each other, throughout the whole of the Synodical process in their respective cases. The subjoined letter will render a further explanation unnecessary:

"*In behalf of* JOHN MACCOVIUS, *Grace and Peace from God the Father and from our Lord Jesus Christ, are, in return, intreated by me*, CONRAD VORSTIUS.

"Most famous man and greatly honoured in the Lord! The information which you transmitted to me three days ago, was undoubtedly very agreeable to me, not only because you wished in it faithfully to declare to me the moderate and unbiassed opinion which Martinius entertains of me, but principally because you have been pleased once more familiarly to intimate, in the same communication, your own sentiments, which you have also openly

expressed to me in my own house, and which are connected with an apparently amicable feeling toward me.—But I wish you to be well assured, that to me nothing will prove more gratifying than to have truly Christian reasons tendered to me by the Synod, and particularly by the foreign divines, that through them may be procured and established a godly reconciliation of mind between those who consider themselves offended by my writings, and me, with some others, who, it may be hoped, have not hitherto been worthless objects of attention to the Reformed Church. I am prepared to do every thing which is decent and becoming in a good man, and which it will be possible for me to do with a good conscience and without injury to the truth. If God have bestowed on me any endowments, (and it is not my province ostentatiously to boast of such talents,) I am desirous of uniting with you in devoting them most willingly to the common edification of the Church and to the destruction of the kingdom of Antichrist. I wish you to direct your labours only to one point, in your intercourse with the rest of the divines who are now collected together at the Synod, and that is,—to obtain real and full liberty for me and others in similar circumstances to confer about the whole affair in a modest and peaceable manner and in the fear of God, with those persons who have competent skill in these controversies. In which case, I am confident, it will appear, that in many of these disputes I have (to say the least) been undeservedly traduced; and that in other differences which are merely scholastic, a moderate degree of liberty ought to be granted to each party. In this manner will a straight way for peace be formed: May our Lord Jesus now at length grant it to us and to all his Church! Amen.

"Salute for me in the most obliging manner Martinius and other old friends, to whom (I believe) you are now much better known. If you will have the goodness, the next time you write, to state the bearing of their judgment concerning me, as well as that of other persons who probably still retain a disadvantageous opinion of me, you will perform a most acceptable service. Farewell in the Lord, most famous man! and commend me in your prayers.—GOUDA, *January 3rd*, 1619: And I heartily pray, that it may please God to make this new year a prosperous and happy one to you and all good men —Forgive the imperfections of this letter, the bad writing in which is to be attributed to the infirm state of my health."

V. In a preceding note, (page 429,) reference has been made to the confederacy of the Contra-Remonstrant ministers against the followers of Arminius. Grotius has given a very particular account of the unchristian practices of those turbulent leaders of the people, in the Sixth and Ninth Books of his APOLOGY FOR THE STATES OF HOLLAND; and Episcopius, in his ANTIDOTUM, has presented us at greater length with the very terms in which their several agreements were expressed. The following extract from Grotius will exemplify the bad spirit which actuated the Calvinists of that period:

"Because such schisms did not spread fast enough for the wishes of those JEHUS, they composed and published a great number of books, in order to seduce the people. They held meetings, or sham Synods, in the years 1612, 13, 14, and 15; at which they made Canons, not only for excluding all civil magistrates from the superintendence of their churches, but also against permitting a Toleration; they likewise addressed letters to such persons as were disposed to an accommodation, to divert them from such a measure, and they publicly opposed the resolutions of the States in favour of Toleration. After this, in the month of January of the present year, (1617,) they held a secret assembly in Amsterdam, at which several pastors and schismatical elders, who were the chief promoters of such proceedings, passed the following decree, to animate and incite others by their example to effect a separation." Grotius then quotes the whole of this schismatical decree and some others; but for our purpose the subjoined extract will suffice: 'Finding 'moreover, that certain persons, calling themselves REMONSTRANTS, have 'greatly derogated from the doctrine of God and the merits of Jesus Christ, 'have brought into suspicion before the magistrates those men who adhere 'to pure doctrine, and have traduced them as refractory to the authority of

'the States, represented them as seditious, and, after imposing civil penal-
'ties, have attempted by every means in their power to prevent by the magis-
'trates the exercise of their religious worship, while they [the Remonstrants]
'in the mean time scatter their poison and find persons to patronize them,—
'we cannot avoid testifying by this instrument, that *the brethren who sepa-*
'*rate from such disturbers and tormentors of the Churches, act with perfect*
'*propriety* and in conformity with the words of the Apostle, Rom. xvi, 17 and
'2 John 10, 11. And as long as these Remonstrants place themselves in
'opposition to sound doctrine and ecclesiastical order, and study to defend
'the noxious FIVE POINTS and those ecclesiastical Canons which they allege
'as a pretence, *we consider ourselves bound in duty to acknowledge them as*
'*men with whom it is by no means lawful for us to hold any public connexion,*
'or to account them as members of our congregations, because they have
'a different design and doctrine to those which Christ, his Apostles, and the
'Reformed Churches have had, up to the present period: Finally, we separate
'from them until they desist from their doctrine, because they endeavour to
'lay another foundation; *nor will we ever suffer ourselves to be induced by*
'*the persuasions of any persons,* HOW HIGH SOEVER THEIR CONDITION MAY
'BE, *to recede from this our purpose and to be reconciled to those Remonstrants,*
'until a different resolution about this matter shall have been formed by a
'lawful Synod that judges according to the word of God; and we request our
'beloved brethren and fellow-labourers, who preserve the same doctrine and
'order with us, to testify by the signature of their names, that their senti-
'ments and ours are alike.'

From these expressions, and the acts which corresponded with them, the design of the Contra-Remonstrants was very evident; and they soon effected, in several of the Dutch Churches, that dreadful schism which ended in the convention of the Synod of Dort and in the disgraceful conduct of its managers.

Sufficient explanation has now been given respecting the circumstances and decisions of this famous Synod, to enable the reader to understand several of the remarks of Arminius in the preceding Oration and in the annexed *Declaration of his Sentiments before the States of Holland.* Those persons who wish for more ample information on the doctrinal topics decided by that reverend assembly in a manner perfectly *unique,* may consult Bishop Womack's *Arcana Dogmatum Anti-Remonstrantium, or* THE CALVINISTS' CABINET UNLOCKED: *In an Apology for Tilenus, against a pretended Vindication of the Synod of Dort, at the provocation of Master* R. BAXTER, *held forth in the Preface to his Grotian Religion:* &c. &c. This good old treatise contains not only the most complete exposure of the pernicious doctrines of the Synod, but also an able refutation of that specious and recently-fashionable modification of Calvinism, which, under the softened name of BAXTERIANISM, is espoused by all those who are ashamed of openly avowing their attachment to the rigid and unscriptural tenets of the Genevan Reformer. I shall in the course of a few weeks publish a new edition of the pious Bishop's treatise, and in the Introductory Remarks prefixed to it, shall endeavour to confute that egregious mass of slander, misrepresentation, and error which disfigures a late publication, entitled THE ARTICLES OF THE SYNOD OF DORT, &c., *with the History of Events which made way for that Synod.—Translated from the Latin, with Notes, Remarks, and References, by the Rev.* THOMAS SCOTT, *Rector of Aston Sandford, Bucks.*—This aged clergyman talks rather largely about "all his studies of modern controversy," and yet proves himself to have been ignorant of this circumstance,—that the abridgment of the Articles of the Synod of Dort which he reprehends in Dr. Heylin, was first given *in good English* by Bishop Womack, in his EXAMINATION OF TILENUS, (a new edition of which has been lately published,) several years prior to the publication of the celebrated HISTORIA QUINQUARTICULARIS. "The Examination of Tilenus" produced a most virulent reply from the famous Richard Baxter, in a pamphlet, entitled THE GROTIAN RELIGION DISCOVERED, &c. *With a Preface, vindicating the Synod of Dort from the calumnies of the New Tilenus,* &c.: In which with a degree of querulousness nearly equal to that of Mr. Scott's,

but with far greater ability, Mr. Baxter objected most strenuously against each of these abbreviated articles.—That was the period when the venerable Church of England lay in ruins, and when Republicanism and Independency were triumphant. Dr. Womack was one of those pious and learned individuals who, by the arbitrary measures of the persons then in power, were compelled to give place to such half-educated yet self-reputed competent pastors, as were judged worthy, from their hatred of Arminianism and Episcopacy, to be inducted into the vacant livings; and as he had, unhappily for himself, a great portion of leisure, he composed his ARCANA DOGMATUM ANTI-REMONSTRANTIUM, in answer to Baxter's objections, and, in all the meekness of wisdom which became such a great and good man, most signally discomfited that adversary, and repelled all his charges. Now, this is the very pamphlet which Dr. Heylin quotes as his authority for almost every important fact related in his *Historia Quinquarticularis* respecting the Synod of Dort and the ecclesiastical differences in the Low Countries. The admirers of Mr. Scott might therefore have spared many of those invectives with which they have with great injustice loaded the memory of Dr. Heylin, and tried to invalidate his testimony as a creditable historian. Though Arminius and those who imitated his moderation held some scriptural truths that were not received by Dr. Heylin, yet the character of the latter is safe from the shafts of Calvinistic calumny, which fall perfectly harmless at his feet when they are directed against his accuracy and faithfulness as a narrator of facts and occurrences in relation to the growth and rank produce of Unconditional Election and Reprobation.

1. But this allusion to persons who adhere to doctrines less gracious than those of Arminius, reminds me of one slanderous accusation against the Remonstrants which Mr. Scott has borrowed from Dr. Maclaine's note to Mosheim, (Vol. V. 442,) in which he says, "This toleration was offered them "in the Conference held at the Hague, in the year 1611, *provided they would* "*renounce the errors of Socinianism.*" The Doctor then refers to Triglandius, whose bad faith and base calumnies are not unknown to the admirers of Arminius. He also refers to Henry Brandt's *Relation of the Hague Conference*, which, as declared in page 432, is a vile *ex-parte* account,—a counter statement of the same conference having been published by Bertius on the part of the Remonstrants. Mr. Scott has not quoted either of these authorities, but has given the broad assertion without any qualification, much in the same manner as he artfully coupled Socinianism and Arminianism together in his *Force of Truth*, page 46. It is a fact well known to all who are conversant with the polemical tracts of the age in which Arminius flourished, that the chief expedient, to which the Calvinists had recourse for rendering his scriptural doctrines odious in the eyes of the people, was, to misrepresent them as Socinian. But this vile perversion of truth respecting him, was too palpable to be of any great avail or of long duration. In reference to him, therefore, it was soon abandoned, and applied with some colour of truth to one or two of his followers, who, after his decease, had incautiously adopted a few objectionable expressions, from which, by uncharitable and forced inferences, unscriptural dogmas might be deduced. But even in reference to these insulated individuals, this false charge was soon relinquished. For a proof of this, I refer Mr. Scott and his friends to *Responsio Remonst. ad Specimen Calumniarum &c.*; to *Verus Theologus Remonstrans*; and to *Vedelius Rhapsodus*, composed by Episcopius, to whom these charges particularly related. The Confession or Declaration of their Faith, published in 1621, contradicts this slanderous accusation in such a plain manner as to induce the [Calvinistic] Professors of Divinity at Leyden publicly to confess and affirm in *the Censure* [which they wrote against the Arminian doctrines,] that "the declarations of the Remonstrants in their Confession, with regard to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and the Divinity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, *were of such a kind as not to incur any just reprehension, and perfectly agreed with the analogy of faith.*"—The celebrated Vedelius also, one of the most inveterate enemies and bitter writers that the Remonstrants ever encountered, was compelled by the force and evidence of truth to declare,

in 1632, that *the Remonstrants were sound and orthodox on the doctrine of the Sacred Trinity.* The Calvinistic author of that scurrilous pamphlet, *the Real Remonstrant,* which was answered by Episcopius, states this fact with a sort of reluctant approbation, thus: "But it must first be made known, that this expression of Vedelius, in the second part of his first book, particularly declares, *that it was not his design to accuse the Remonstrants of openly professing these blasphemies.* 'For,' he says, 'in their writings, and especially 'in their letters and petitions in the year 1630, but most openly of all in their 'Confession of Faith, they testify, that *on the point of the Sacred Trinity they 'entertain one and the same opinion with us, as well as with the other Churches 'that adore God in Three Persons.*' Wherefore he [Vedelius] asserts plainly, '*that they profess the orthodox doctrine of the Sacred Trinity, even in those 'very articles which are attacked by Anti-Trinitarians,*'—under which title are distinguished the enemies of the Holy Trinity."

2. When reading the translation of *the Synodical Account* of the Conference of Delft, in 1613, which was convened for the purpose of promoting peace and union, I had expected to see a note, fraught with strong animadversions on the disingenuous conduct of the Calvinistic party, from such a zealous friend to religious liberty as Mr. Scott wishes occasionally to appear. For when it was granted, that all the disputes between the Arminians and Calvinists related only to the famous FIVE POINTS, the Calvinistic representatives in that Conference refused to return an answer to the Arminians *concerning their Toleration of those Points,* until they had extorted from the latter their sentiments on above *thirty Articles* which had been craftily drawn up, to render the Arminian tenets objects of popular odium and suspicion. The Arminian representatives, though averse to such palpable evasions, did not account this conduct of their adversaries a sufficient reason for refraining from all further intercourse with them, but, like honest men who cherished hopes of producing some practical scheme of toleration for their doctrines, desired to have time allowed for considering the new articles. The Calvinists with apparent frankness, told them to take six or eight weeks for this purpose, and promised in the mean time not to divulge those articles to any person: Yet that very day, they gave away copies to certain individuals, who, after circulating them in manuscript, soon had them printed, to the manifest prejudice of the Arminians. Festus Hommius was on this occasion one of the Calvinistic representatives, and had as early as 1605 drawn up certain questions in the Consistory of Leyden, which, he thought, ought to be subscribed by every minister; and in the year 1600, at the provincial Synod held at Haerlem, some of the ministers wished to propose *an annual subscription, on the part of every pastor, to the Confession and Catechism,* as a test to try whether any of them had changed their sentiments in the course of the twelve months preceding.—These facts prove, that such new impositions were at that period favourite expedients with the Calvinists:—On this subject what says *the Historical Preface* which is prefixed to the Acts, and which Mr. Scott has been at such immense pains to render into English and to elucidate?—It informs us, that Uitenbogardt by courtly cunning had a private audience before the States of Holland, and that, in the absence of Festus Hommius, who had been previously heard in behalf of the other party, "he traduced the actions of the rest of the pastors, and represented "them as men, who, by requiring a declaration [from the Arminians on "thirty articles,] attempted to introduce into the Churches *a new Inquisition* that was on no account to be endured. He also obtained an order "from the States, to interdict them [the Calvinistic pastors] from requiring "such a declaration from the Remonstrants."—This Historical Preface afterwards states, that, in complying with the requisition of the States, these Calvinists took an opportunity "to shew that the Theses, concerning which "they had required a declaration, were extant *in so many words* both in the "Confession and Catechism of the Dutch Churches; and that the Counter-"Theses to them had been delivered in different publications by many per-"sons with whom the Remonstrants had great intercourse in these provinces."

What are Mr. Scott's remarks on this novel method of proceeding? In a note he says, "Mosheim and many (indeed *most*) other writers on the sub-"ject, represent the Contra-Remonstrants as aiming to impose the creed of "Geneva, or of Calvin, on the Remonstrants in Belgium. Let the impartial "reader judge whether this was the real case." He does not utter one note of disapprobation, on the introduction of such a new inquisition into the Dutch Churches. This is the more wonderful, because some of his most intimate friends have heaped contumely and reproach on my Lord Bishop of Peterborough for proposing to the candidates for holy orders certain questions drawn up from the formularies of the Church of England. It is no part of my intention to become a party in this affair, or to offer an opinion respecting the usefulness or expediency of such questions; his Lordship is well qualified to understand his own measures, and to engage in their defence. I would only observe, that the Calvinistic innovators of 1613 required a categorical answer from *men who had been some time in the ministry*, and who (according to *the parity of the pastoral order* in Presbyterianism,) were perfectly on an equality with their turbulent and unconstitutional examinants. His Lordship is in very different circumstances, since he belongs to a church that, besides a truly Catholic amplitude of sentiment, acknowledges "a gradation of rank in the office ministerial," the highest order of which is that of Bishops, who have the oversight of all inferior pastors. One of the most important of Episcopal duties, according to the scriptures, is, *to prevent the introduction of improper persons into the pastoral office:* And it was in the exercise of this, one of his legitimate functions, that his Lordship devised a number of questions, which in an examination for ordination might act as a kind of touch stone to detect Antinomian candidates, and others of whom his Lordship did not approve. After knowing this test, to which the greatest degree of publicity has been given, no one is compelled to offer himself at Peterborough for ordination. But if a man have previously consulted his conscience respecting the answers which ought to be returned, and find that they do not accord with those which his Lordship may expect to find in candidates for holy orders, he is not left without remedy: A young man, who, on application for Deacon's orders in that particular diocese, may have been refused, has it still in his power to obtain ordination from other Bishops, unless he prove himself to be utterly devoid of the requisite qualifications for the sacred office.—This, therefore, is a case widely differing from that of *a factious company of presbyters endeavouring to impose an ever varying yet galling yoke on the neck of their worthy co-pastors*, many of whom had exercised the functions of the ministry much longer than the arrogant men that erected themselves into an arbitrary tribunal *to try the spirits* of their brethren. To each of these self-elected inquisitors might have been appropriately addressed the question once propounded to Moses, *Who made thee a ruler and a judge over us?* But no such interrogation can apply to his Lordship, who vexes *no man already inducted to a benefice*, or excludes him from his station in the church, but only makes the terms of communion straiter than they had been to a certain class of religionists in his diocese.—I compare these two modes of interrogation together in a few points, to shew that while the milder instance is made the subject of continued public reprehension, the more flagrant one obtains *something more than tacit approval.* Notwithstanding all its large professions to the contrary, therefore, modern Calvinism retains, in the hearts of some of its professors, all its native bigotry and intolerance; and that which is vehemently denounced when transacted at Peterborough, is accounted *perfectly lawful and praiseworthy* when emanating from Holland, that classic ground for Calvinism! For, the only misrepresentation concerning the narrative which Mr. Scott rectifies, is, that "the Contra-Remonstrants did not aim to impose the creed of Calvin," but only "the Confession and Catechism of the Belgic Churches; between which and the former," he acknowledges, "there was indeed some co-

incidence." But still not one word escapes him, in vituperation of the act itself or of the principles on which it proceeded.

3. The last extract from Mr. Scott, upon which I shall briefly animadvert, is one of his reflections at the close of his book, where he says: "*Had the* "*opponents of the Synod possessed the same authority, they would have acted* "*in like manner*, and so would the rulers of the other countries in Europe." —When Mr. Scott made this remark, he seems to have forgotten the very document which he undertook to elucidate. For it is very evident from the contents of the Historical Preface, that the intention of those who artfully composed it, was, to demonstrate, after their own manner, *the almost unbounded sway* which the patrons of Arminianism had obtained in the management of the public affairs of Holland, and particularly in ecclesiastical matters, from the year 1605 to 1617. Take one instance in Mr. Scott's translation of their account for 1812, when, after describing many of the effects that were singularly disastrous to Calvinism, as consequences of the increasing prevalence of Arminianism, they add, 'And, as in most of the cities they 'had the Magistrates more favourable to them, *and could do every thing through* '*J. Uitenbogardus with the Advocate of Holland*, they insolently exulted over 'the churches and their fellow ministers.' Yet during the whole of that period those patrons never attempted to collect together *a packed Synod after their own hearts;* which, let it be recollected, (if the statements of the Historical Preface be correct,) it would not have been difficult for them to effect, —since the terms according to which such national assemblies are usually convened, depend almost entirely upon the pleasure of the ruling powers in the State. Even in the Church of Rome, where we might expect to find some *uniformity of practice on this point*, General Councils have never been convened *according to one and the same pattern;* but have been varied according to the secular interests which they were severally designed to promote. In the preceding *Life of Arminius*, as well as in the annexed *Declaration*, will be seen the equitable terms on which he wished a National Synod to be convened, and the noble manner in which he yielded even to the greatest prejudices of the Calvinists, respecting the omission (in the proposed summons) of the litigated clause about *revising the Catechism and Confession.* In Appendix X are inserted several testimonies in favour of *the philanthropic and tolerant principles* of Arminius; and they have never in one instance, either in Holland or Great Britain, been abandoned by those who professed *to embrace his gracious doctrines in their original purity.* When, therefore, Mr. Scott intimates in an adjoining sentence, that "the measure adopted by "the rulers of Belgium, in respect of the Decisions of the Synod of Dort, "*ought not to be judged according to the generally-prevailing sentiments of* "*modern times*," he has forgotten to subjoin, that *the measures in question ought rather to be judged according to the enlightened and pacific sentiments of Arminius and his early followers.*

These three specimens of *ex-parte* statements and absurd reasoning, are by no means among the most objectionable parts of Mr. Scott's performance: Referring the reader once more to the republication of Bishop Womack's *Arcana Dogmatum Anti-Remonstrantium*, for a reply to many of these slanderous accusations and inconsequent arguments, I close the notes by the following quotation, which is *almost as applicable* to the Calvinistic professors of modern times as to those who enjoyed the supremacy *in matters ecclesiastic* under the Protectorate: "If we consider that the present Calvinists of all sorts, Creabilitarians, Supralapsarians, Sublapsarians, do all centre in this Synod, as the test of their Anti-Arminianism, (as Master Baxter calls it,) we must conclude that the design of that Synod was not to reduce all those several sects to one opinion, (that being impossible, their differences are so high and irreconcilable,) but their elaborate artifice, in contriving and daubing, varnishing and trimming up the decrees and canons thereof, was used on purpose to calculate them for the meridian of every

their judgments, and make them serve indifferently the interest of their several opinions. So that this Synod is to men of that persuasion what Manna was to the Israelites, (as some affirm,)—it affords them that relish to which every man's palate is most affected. One man discovers enough therein to encourage him to be a Supralapsarian; another man finds the contrary. To this man's sense they maintain Universal Redemption, to another's apprehension they deny it."

Such is the doctrinal latitude and variety which the Calvinism of the Dutch Synod claims for itself. The difference between the doctrines of Calvin and Arminius, in their practical application to the existing circumstances in which men are found by the gospel, is strongly displayed by the learned editor of *Dr. Thomas Jackson's Works*, in the following brief extract: "Let us take a Polemo, (a most shamelessly debauched ruffian,) upon this man we desire the work of the Lord by our ministry may be prosperous. We must either tell him, 'that there is something required of him in this present state, 'unconverted as he is,' and so set him a task; or 'that nothing at all is 'expected from him.' These two be points contradictory diametrally, there is no mean betwixt them. I say, that of this man something is required. The first *minimum quod sic*, is, reflecting upon his own actions, and the law writ in his conscience. Next, I would apply some of God's words spoken by the Prophets to some sinful people or person; as *Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings, cease to do evil, learn to do well.* (Isaiah i, 16.) Or that of St. James iv, 8, *Draw nigh to God.—Cleanse your hands, ye sinners, and purify your hearts, ye double minded.* [Or I would read to him Ezek. xviii.] And would affirm, that these words signify something, were not empty noises, but precepts; and if precepts, have some duty correspondent to be performed by him to whom I laid them; which is, *quod quærimus;* that I would have done.—My adversary must say, 'No-'thing is to be done; it is to no purpose for me to exhort, or him to 'try, nothing can be done to purpose.'—Now what will the poor patient say? Men are naturally inclined to believe them that most ease and please their natures best. The least consequent of this doctrine that he will or can make, (and that if he were a good natured man too,) will be this; 'Why, then, I will betake myself to a negative idleness, wrap my body in 'my arms, sit still, and wait the good hour when grace shall breathe upon 'me.'—A second will say, 'Go to then, I will eat my meat with joy, and 'take my portion of the things of this life, till tastes of a better drop into my 'mouth from heaven.'—A third may perhaps do worse; wend to a tavern, or worse place, and make work for grace, with a graceless desperate hope, that the more he sins, the more grace, when it comes, may abound; that *quò sceleratior eò gratiæ vicinior.*—If my adversary says, 'Nay; he must abstain 'from lewd courses;' we are half agreed: is not that part the same with Isaiah's, *Cease to do evil?* If he maintain his conclusion, I have no more to say, but to enter an appeal to God, and this protestation to man: That I disclaim all such dispositions, preparations, endeavours, as co-operating to the production of grace, after the manner that temperate behaviour concurreth to produce the habit of temperance; or that natural qualities do, to produce forms merely physical: And this will quit me from Pelagianism or Popery; but he shall never be able to free himself from the errors of the Stoic or Manichees that holds it indifferent, what works a man does before he be regenerate." (*Works*, page 3143.)

A DECLARATION

OF THE

SENTIMENTS OF ARMINIUS,

ON PREDESTINATION, DIVINE PROVIDENCE, THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL, THE GRACE OF GOD, THE DIVINITY OF THE SON OF GOD, AND THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN BEFORE GOD.

This DECLARATION *was delivered before the States of Holland, in a full assembly of their Lordships, on the 30th of Oct.* 1608, *in their Hall of Session at the Hague. The circumstances which preceded it, are briefly related by Arminius in the commencement of his speech; and as the occurrences there recounted form an important æra in his personal history, I shall add several notes in elucidation.*

Arminius pronounced this Oration in the Dutch Language, with such a happy admixture of freedom and modesty, as commanded admiration and applause from all his honourable auditors. It was afterwards translated into Latin, but not by the Author himself,—as is very evident from the striking difference in the style and in several of the epithets employed. But while some persons thought, THAT HE HAD SPOKEN NOTHING EXCEPT WHAT WAS NECESSARY TO HIS JUST DEFENCE, *others, who cannot be reckoned in the number of his friends, accused him of appearing too bold and confident,—such an injurious interpretation did the latter give to the fearlessness of innocence and integrity!—In a letter which Arminius addressed, on the 10th of December, the same year, to Doctor Sebastian Egberts, one of the principal magistrates of Amsterdam, he writes in the following terms concerning this* DECLARATION: "In my Oration before the States, I am said to have employed not only the *shield* but the *sword*, and the latter beyond all the bounds of moderation. The occasion required me to use the sword, because I had to give my opinion about certain dogmas, which I thought to be chargeable with error. I did give that opinion, and expressed my serious disapprobation of the dogma of Predestination, as it is at present taught among us; because while my conscience commands me *not to keep silence when that doctrine is made a topic of discussion*, it likewise dictates to me, *that it is worthy of reprehension*. But I observed great moderation; for I suppressed many things on which I might have dilated: And that most noble assembly, I am persuaded, will form a similar judgment respecting my oration. Is it any cause of wonder, if to those who wished me to be quite silent I seem to have been carried beyond the limits of moderation in my speech? But let these persons produce a single word uttered by me, which bears any mark of vehemence or the violation of temperance or discretion. It is necessary that they should do this; because as long as calumny chooses such great latitude for its excursions, it cannot be detected. The words of the man who sits in judgment, who forms an estimate, or who speaks concerning me, are these: 'He is a robber and a scoundrel,' 'He is a contumacious,

refractory, and heretical fellow!' But let the arguments be produced by which each of these charges may be proved, that every one who hears them may have an opportunity to judge of their truth. I made such a proposal as this to Helmichius of pious memory in our last conference together at Amsterdam; but he was silent about it in the presence of Uitenbogardt, who was amazed that nothing was produced in the form of proof, although it had been declared, that I laboured under a suspicion of heresy with many people, while I resided in that city. I understand, a certain person among you is of opinion, that I will not, according to the orders which I have received, deliver in writing what I spoke on a late occasion. That person, however, is mistaken; for I have already delivered it in a written form, and with such fidelity as will cause every one, though indulging the greatest malevolence against me, to desire nothing more ample and compendious. I have omitted no portion of what was then spoken; but have explained a few things a little more fully, upon which I was prevented from enlarging by the brevity of the time allotted to that purpose. I am not in the least afraid of any consequences that can ensue from this circumstance. Indeed there is no necessity for entertaining any such fear, which on my part would be very unbecoming: Because those who ambitiously aspire in our church to exercise dominion over the faith of others, are not able to kill even the body."—*Towards the close of the letter, he mentions the base slanders of some individuals, who had invented seven curious theological articles and circulated them in his name, and then alludes to the advice of his friends:*—"They think, such a fair occasion ought not to be neglected. Some people, it seems, act in this manner, that they may irritate me to write: But when I once break through that ice, a most extensive sea will be opened to me in which to pursue my course. Do not suppose, that, when speaking thus, I employ the language of impatience: Those who possess the most intimate knowledge of our affairs, wonder and are astonished at my rigid silence, when so many and such fair occasions have been offered and now daily present themselves for defending my own cause and that of truth. The only circumstance which prevents me from adopting their suggestions, is, the hope I cherish concerning THE REPENTANCE OF MY BRETHREN."—*What a noble and benevolent spirit is here displayed! Every reader of sensibility will admire the breathing of the same spirit of dignified forbearance in the contents of the subjoined pages; in which, with a manly eloquence, our author gives an exact and scriptural account of his creed, especially in those important points in reference to which it had been vainly attempted to accuse him of heterodoxy.*

TO THE NOBLE AND MOST POTENT THE STATES OF HOLLAND AND WEST FRIEZLAND, MY SUPREME GOVERNORS.

My most noble, potent, wise and prudent Lords,

AFTER the Conference which, by the command of your Mightinesses, was convened here at the Hague, between Gomarus and myself, had been held in the presence of four ministers and under the superintendence of their Lordships the Counsellors of the Supreme Court, the result of that meeting was reported to your Highnesses.* Some allusion

* This Conference between them was held on the 24th of May, 1608. Arminius and Uitenbogardt had been greatly traduced for the part which they

having been made in that report to the nature and importance of the controversy between us, it soon afterwards seemed good

had acted, and the advice which they had given, in the Preparatory Convention, which had been held on the 22d of May, in the year preceding. In consequence of this, they addressed a joint memorial to the States of Holland, beseeching them, to hear the relation of that whole affair from the mouth of those who had been present, and to grant the Dutch Churches a National Synod even on other terms than those which they had themselves before proposed to their Lordships. The States of Holland, as well as the States General, were at that period engaged in momentous negociations with foreign powers, and particularly with Spain on the subject of a truce for twelve years: they could not therefore attend to the prayer of that memorial. But Arminius soon afterwards addressed a petition on his own account to their Lordships, in which he represented the false reports concerning him which were industriously circulated, the very rigid manner in which those students who had been under his care were examined, and the disregard that was shewn (by some of the ecclesiastical assemblies,) to those *testimonials to character and ability* which, as Professor of Divinity and according to the practice of all Universities, he gave to the candidates for holy orders who had received from him their theological tuition and acquitted themselves with credit. He therefore earnestly besought their Lordships, whom he acknowledged as the supreme rulers of his country, to take regular cognizance of his cause, and in their wisdom to devise and appoint a method,—either that of *a Conference*, or of *an Ecclesiastical Convention* to be held under their auspices,—by which an early opportunity might be afforded to him of refuting all such calumnies, that all further inconvenience might be avoided, and that a mutual agreement might be established, such as ought ever to exist between those who profess the same religion.

The States of Holland and West Friezland, with the intention of preventing a greater evil, summoned Gomarus and Arminius to appear at the Hague, and to enter into a Conference together, attended by four of the ministers who had been present at the Preparatory Convention in 1607: These four ministers were Becius, Uitenbogardt, Helmichius, and Herman Gerards. The two Professors were to be heard before the Counsellors of the Supreme Court, whose instructions were, to see if by means of an amicable Conference on sacred subjects instituted between those two learned individuals, the dissension subsisting between them might be healed; and the right honourable Counsellors, who on this occasion acted as moderators, had to report the result to the States. But the deputies of the Churches adopted every method to thwart the design of their Mightinesses and to hinder the execution of this decree: Instead of the proposed Conference which was appointed to be held before the Supreme Court, they requested, that a Provincial Synod might be convened, in which this ecclesiastical cause might come under the cognizance and judgment of ecclesiastical persons who had been deputed by the Churches to form a decision upon it. The reply of the States was, that *the cognizance* of the cause was the only matter that had been committed to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, and that *the judgment* or decision to be formed upon it might afterwards be obtained either from a National or a Provincial Synod.

On the day appointed for this Conference, after the right honourable President of the Assembly had introduced the business by a few prefatory observations on the decree of the States and the design which their Lordships had in view by instituting this kind of proceeding, he commanded Gomarus to declare if any dissension existed between him and his colleague, and without any kind of evasion to explain its nature. Gomarus replied, 'that he was 'truly devoted to the service of the illustrious States, and confessed that the 'present assembly of the Supreme Court consisted of famous and prudent 'men, whose province nevertheless was not to decree judgment on sacred

to your Highnesses to cite each of us, with those four ministers, to appear openly before you in your honourable Assembly, and

'subjects, but on those only which were civil and secular; that this business 'did not belong to their jurisdiction, but to that of the Churches, and that 'the cognizance of it could not be commenced in that place without a mani-'fest prejudice both to his cause and to that of the Churches; that God must 'receive that which is God's, and to Cæsar must be rendered that which is 'Cæsar's; but that it was better to obey God than men.'—The President replied, 'that no doubt existed respecting *the religious nature* of the cause 'which was then about to be discussed, and that he and his honourable 'colleagues had by no means been wishful to arrogate to themselves the 'authority *to decide upon it*, the sole province assigned to them being that 'of *taking cognizance of it*.' They intreated Gomarus therefore, once more, 'that he would not refuse to engage in the explanation of his cause and to 'disclose it to them.'—Gomarus began to invent excuses, and artfully to postpone the consideration of the business, by contending at first, 'that it would 'be unjust in him to undertake the province of accuser against Arminius, 'with whom he had hitherto lived on terms of familiarity; that *he was like-'wise entirely ignorant of those things which had been written by his colleague, 'or which had been delivered in his public lectures or in his private classes*: 'But, as Arminius had himself occasionally introduced the mention of cer-'tain doubts and scruples which he felt, the preferable course would be—'for him now to produce those scruples. As it respected himself, he cherished 'no doubts concerning any of the articles of Christian doctrine as they 'were comprehended and explained in the Confession and Catechism, and 'he felt no desire to raise a controversy about any of them.' Being urged by the Court to deliver a more express reply, he was at length, after all these disingenuous subterfuges, reduced to the necessity of confessing, that there 'undoubtedly was some latent dissension between him and Arminius; but 'that it seemed to him very injudicious, and prejudicial to the liberty of the 'Churches, then and in that place to give an explanation of its nature and 'origin.'

Arminius, who had during the whole of the preceding discussion been silent, then declared, 'It was matter of astonishment to him, after various 'reports about his heterodoxy had been circulated among all the churches 'and after the conflagration which he had excited was stated to have 'flamed forth even above the roofs of the Church, that still such a 'great difficulty was here pretended to exist concerning the nature of this 'dissension and the doctrine which he had taught in contradiction to the 'formularies of consent. It was wrong to exact such a declaration from 'him, and in this manner to have the materials for his accusation procured 'from his own mouth. No person would produce what it was that he had 'taught privately or in public against the Confession and Catechism. It 'was scarcely equitable that he should declare the scruples which he enter-'tained, unless he received the commands of the Supreme Magistrate to that 'effect, who had already determined on having the Confession and Catechism 'reviewed in a National Synod.'—Gomarus immediately undertook to prove, that Armininius had taught such an opinion concerning a primary article of the Christian Faith, (the Justification of man before God,) as was at variance with the Holy Scriptures and with the Confession of the Dutch Churches. To sustain this charge, he produced the very words which Arminius had employed both in his propositions *on Justification*, and in a certain letter to a friend, (Hippolytus a Collibus, Ambassador from the Elector Palatine to the States General,) in which he had asserted, 'that in the *Justification of 'man before God* the righteousness of Christ is not imputed for righteousness; 'but that faith, or the act of believing, is, through the gracious acceptance '[or *act of acquittance*] of God, that righteousness of ours by which we 'are justified.'—After Gomarus had desired these expressions to be inserted

in that public manner to intimate to all of us whatever you then judged to be expedient. After we had appeared before

among the recorded transactions of that meeting, Arminius on the other hand dictated the following expressions for insertion in the same acts: 'For 'the purpose of declaring how abhorrent my mind is to every desire of un-'necessary contention or dispute, I here profess, that I esteem as true, 'pious, and holy, that doctrine of *Justification before God* which is made 'from faith to faith, or of the imputation of faith for righteousness, and 'which is contained in the Harmony of Confessions from all the Churches; 'that I do now approve and always have approved of it, and that I perfectly 'acquiesce in it. And in order to afford a more luminous testimony of this 'my intense desire for the general peace of the Reformed and Protestant 'Churches, I here sacredly affirm, that, if an occasion should present itself 'that would require a statement in writing of my opinion on this point, both 'with regard to the matter itself and to the phrases used and the manner of 'treating it, (which opinion I am prepared with firm arguments to defend 'against all objections,) I will with pleasure submit that written statement 'to the definitive sentence of all those Churches, so that, after a sufficiently 'legitimate cognizance of the cause has been taken according to the resolution 'of the Supreme Magistrates of my country, if those Churches shall consider '*that such an opinion and the author of it are not to be tolerated*, I will in-'stantly recede from that sentiment, on account of being better instructed, 'or I will desist from all further exercise of my functions.'—When Arminius had made this manly avowal, and when Gomarus still refused to acquiesce in it, and could not be induced to confess, that our author held the same sentiments on this subject as those of the Reformed Church, Arminius made another attempt to testify the peaceable spirit with which he was animated; and, to avoid all vain and useless disputes, he exclaimed, 'Behold, here are 'my sentiments concerning this doctrine, conveyed in the very expressions of 'the Heidelberg Catechism.' Then reciting the exact words of the Catechism, he immediately subjoined, 'I believe in my heart, and confess with my 'mouth, that I shall pass as a righteous man before God, only by faith in 'Jesus Christ: So that, though my conscience may accuse me, not only of 'having grievously sinned against all the commands of God, but also of not 'having observed one of them, and of being likewise inclined to all evil; 'yet, provided I embrace these benefits with real confidence of heart, the 'perfect satisfaction, righteousness, and holiness of Christ will be imputed 'to me and bestowed on me, without any merit of my own and purely from 'the mercy of God: Exactly as though I had never committed any sin, and 'as if no stain or taint had adhered to me; nay, more than this, as though 'I had perfectly performed that obedience which Christ has performed for me: 'Not because I can please God by the dignity of my faith, but because the 'sole satisfaction, righteousness, and holiness of Christ are made my right-'eousness before God: But I am not able to embrace this righteousness, 'and to apply it to myself, in any other manner than by faith.'

What form of words could be more sound and evangelical? Yet this scriptural confession did not satisfy Gomarus, who began to criticize the expressions of Arminius, by saying, 'that he had laid down faith as the 'object or matter of Justification, and yet had made the righteousness of 'Christ the meritorious cause of Justification.'—When Gomarus made this remark, he seemed to feel some complacency within himself as though he had performed some mighty achievement, or had unravelled a great secret. But to the great majority of the members of the Supreme Court, his objection wore a different aspect: For they thought, that it amounted to nothing better than a mere logomachy, a strife about words; because it was evident from the statements of both these learned Professors, "that neither of them placed *the cause* of man's justification by faith, in *the dignity of that work*, but in the grace of God."—When Gomarus seemed desirous to extort from

your Mightinesses, Gomarus affirmed, "that the controversy between him and me, was of such immense importance, that, with the opinions which I professed, he durst not appear in the presence of his Maker." He likewise asserted, "that, unless some mode of prevention were promptly devised, the consequence would be, that the various Provinces, Churches, and cities of our native land, and even the citizens themselves, would be placed in a state of mutual enmity and variance, and would rise up in arms against each other."—To all those allegations I then made no reply, except "that I certainly was not conscious of entertaining any such atrocious sentiments in Religion, as those of which he had spoken;* and I confidently

Arminius his sentiments on some other controverted points, it was the pleasure of the Supreme Court, who perceived the iniquity of such a course of proceeding, to command each of them to deliver to their Lordships, in the form of written propositions, his individual opinion on each of the principal articles, respecting which any controversy had ever been raised between them; and then for each to write his own animadversions and strictures on the written propositions of his antagonist. This equitable plan was pursued; and after Gomarus and Arminius had delivered to their Lordships these two documents with their mutual animadversions and strictures appended, the Conference was terminated. The members of the Supreme Court perused both these writings, and afterwards gave the following decision, as a just report of the whole matter, to the States of Holland: 'As far as we have been able 'to perceive from this Conference, we judge that the controversies which 'have arisen between these two Professors are not of very great importance; 'they relate principally to some disputes concerning Predestination, which 'are rather too subtle, and which may either be omitted, or may pass 'without animadversion by means of a mutual toleration.'

After receiving the Report, the States were pleased, on the same day to summon before them, in the great Hall of the public Sessions, both the Professors and the four attendant ministers; and the most honourable the Lord Advocate of Holland, addressing himself to these ecclesiastical personages, declared, among other things, his gratitude to God because *the controversy did not at all concern the chief points of the Christian Religion.* He then proceeded, in the name of that noble assembly, "to thank both of them for this renewed and faithful attempt to obtain a mutual good understanding, and enjoined them to secresy respecting the transactions of that meeting, to speak and publish nothing contrary to the Sacred Writings or to the Confession and Catechism, and to direct all their counsels and energies to procure the peace of the Churches and of the University." He also promised, "that the States would endeavour to have these controversies decided by a National Synod, or by a Provincial one provided the other could not be speedily convened."—What did Gomarus say, when he heard this conclusion of the whole matter? Thinking the Calvinistic view of the points in dispute to be of far greater importance than it had been estimated by the Supreme Court, he asked permission to speak, and in that full legislative assembly broke out into a rhapsody, to which Arminius briefly alludes in the text, and which has already been related, page 74. Every one must admire the mildness, the dignity, and the Christian forbearance which are so conspicuously united in the reply of Arminius.

* In this part of his answer, Arminius stated, 'that the points in contro-'versy between him and Gomarus were not so momentous as they had been

expressed a hope, that I should never afford either cause or occasion for schism and separation, in the Church of God or in our common country." In confirmation of which, I added, "that I was prepared to make an open and *bonâ fide* declaration of all my sentiments, views, and designs on every subject connected with Religion, whenever I might receive a summons to appear before this august assembly, and even prior to my retiring at that time from your presence."*—Your Highnesses

'represented; that he had always confined himself within the Confession of 'the Dutch Churches and was desirous still to adhere to it; that, when necessity required it, he had occasionally spoken against the peculiar opinions 'of some men, but had never uttered a single expression that was in 'opposition to the common sentiments of the Reformed Churches.'

* One of the shrewdest Calvinists of the present age has said, that "Arminianism is eminently *the religion of Common Sense;*" and in select companies, in which he might without a breach of Christian politeness explain himself a little more fully, he has not hesitated to declare, on the contrary, that "Calvinism is *the religion of revelation*, and to it belong all the sublime *mysteries* of the gospel." Denying the truth of such an unfair distinction as this, and reprobating the obviously sinister purpose which it was intended to serve, the followers of Arminius may derive some advantage from the hint; and while they declare in the words of Moses, "*The secret things* belong unto the Lord our God: But *those things which are revealed* belong unto us and to OUR CHILDREN for ever," they may also adopt, in the amplitude of its evangelical meaning, the exclamation of the Apostle, "Great is the *mystery* of godliness!"

A more striking instance, than the one recounted in the text, could not be selected for demonstrating, in its good acceptation, that "Arminianism is the religion of COMMON SENSE." From the preceding recital it will be seen, that as long as Gomarus was permitted to harangue the Supreme Court at pleasure, and to mix up his Calvinistic misapprehensions with a plentiful share of slander, (a practice lamentably too frequent in its occurrence both among ancient and modern Calvinists,) the noble members of that Court were *divided in opinion;* for it was only by a majority, though a great one, that their Lordships ordered the two Professors severally to deliver their opinions *in written propositions.* When that was done, and each of them had likewise endeavoured to refute in writing his opponent's propositions, their Lordships perused their productions, divested as they were of all extraneous matter, and became *unanimous in their decision*,—"that the points in controversy were not of any great importance."—Here, then, was decidedly the triumph of COMMON SENSE. And though Gomarus most insolently attempted to impugn and invalidate the judgment of some of the greatest men in the Republic, after their unanimous resolution had been publicly pronounced and while he still remained in their presence, yet his irregular and uncharitable discourse produced on his superiors none of those effects which he had expected. For they very properly viewed the officious preference of *his own judgment*, to that of others who had proved themselves to be unbiassed judges, as the spleen of a disappointed bigot or the ravings of a madman. The *ex-parte* statement in the Acts of the Synod represents the result of his speech thus: "But it was the pleasure of the Illustrious States, that the writings on both sides in this Conference, should, after having been mutually signed, be preserved in the Supreme Court until a National Synod was convened, and that they should not in the interim be communicated to any man living."

having since deliberated upon the proposal and offer which I then made, deem it proper now to summon me before you, for the purpose of redeeming, in this hall, the pledge which I had previously given. To fulfil that promise, I now appear in this place, and will with all due fidelity discharge my duty, whatever it be that is demanded of me in relation to this affair.

Yet since a sinister report, has for a long time been industriously and extensively circulated about me, not only among my own countrymen but also among foreigners,—in which report I am represented to have hitherto refused, after frequent solicitations, to make an open profession of my sentiments on the matter of Religion and my designs concerning it;*—and

The vile character of the *Historical Preface* to the Acts may be perceived from the garbled account which it gives of this Conference, which was most disgraceful to the cause of the Dutch Calvinists. No one who has perused the character of the man who was the principal author of that Preface, (page 468—470,) will express any surprise at its contents; and, on more occasions than the present, the reader will perceive the necessity of the information already tendered to him respecting the Synod of Dort. Indeed, without a tolerably extensive acquaintance with the constitution, proceedings, and consequences of that Synod, the personal history of Arminius and the benevolent direction of his labours would be imperfectly comprehended. For though that Calvinistic Council was a transaction subsequent to the death of Arminius, yet its decisions have been so disingenuously mixed up with his opinions and private character, as to render an accurate knowledge of various ecclesiastical occurrences a matter of expediency.

* Sibrandus Lubbertus was at that time made the chief organ of the Calvinistic faction in Holland, and maintained an extensive official (or rather *officious*) correspondence with the principal divines of that party throughout Europe. In the famous circular which he transmitted to them, in July 1607, (the mis-statements and unjust insinuations of which were ably refuted by Arminius and Uitenbogardt,) he gave an account of the Preparatory Convention, and in the following artful manner tried to prejudice the minds of the Foreign Divines against the holy and scriptural system of Arminius:

"On every side we hear these expressions, 'We and our children have been 'educated in this [Calvinistic] doctrine. On account of it, our parents have 'endured all the hardships of banishment, and we have ourselves maintained 'this cruel war of forty years' continuance. It is this very [Calvinistic] doc-'trine which was sealed with the blood of such a multitude of martyrs. And 'is this the only fruit of our labours and our miseries,—to behold the doctrine 'called in question, for the sake of which we have undergone all these toils 'and sufferings?'—Nor are these complaints destitute of reasonable foundation. For, as some persons suspect, the principal heads of doctrine will be rendered subjects of doubt,—such as relate to *original sin, the freedom of the will, faith, justification, sanctification, predestination, the sacraments, ecclesiastical discipline and presbyteries.* There are also some persons who whisper concerning *the person of Christ, redemption and satisfaction.* Others suppose, that they [Arminius and Uitenbogardt] are acting thus for the purpose of *exterminating out of the churches the present method of catechizing.* But I CANNOT AFFIRM ANYTHING WITH CERTAINTY respecting these suspicions and surmises. For we have diligently and seriously asked both of them to declare themselves and to shew what they desire; and we have told them,

since this unfounded rumour has already operated most injuriously against me,—I importunately intreat to be favoured with your gracious permission to make an ingenuous and open declaration of all the circumstances which relate to this business, before I proceed to the discussion of other topics.

1. *Account of a Conference proposed to me, but which I refused.*

On the 30th of June, in the year 1605, three Deputies of the Synod of South Holland came to me at Leyden; they were Francis Lansbergius, Libertus Fraxinus, and Daniel Dolegius of pious memory, each of them the minister of their respective churches at Rotterdam, the Hague, and Delft. Two members of the Synod of North Holland accompanied them, —John Bogardus, minister of the Church at Haerlem, and James Rolandus of the Church at Amsterdam. They told me,* "they had heard, that at the regular meetings of certain

that we will endeavour to give them satisfaction, provided that can by any means be done. But we have not been able to obtain any thing from them.—Their answer was, 'that they would propose nothing except in a Synod;' and added, 'that they were not obliged to make any propositions.'—And though we rejoined, 'that every Christian is bound *at all times to give an answer to every man that asketh him a reason* of his faith;' yet we could gain nothing more from them, except that they declared themselves 'unwilling to make disclosures in any other place than in a Synod.'"

What art and sophistry are here displayed! Yet worse specimens than even this of the Calvinistic misrepresentations of that age, may be easily produced. What wonder, therefore, that the foreign divines, to whom these circulars were addressed, and who were almost without exception of the Calvinian and Presbyterian school, should feel alarmed at this alleged inroad upon their dearest principles? Those of them who felt no great concern for the fate of the doctrine and the platform of Geneva, were really afraid, that the vital doctrines of Christianity were, as here stated, assailed by Arminius and his followers.—In a subsequent letter addressed to the Lord Advocate Olden Barneveldt, Sibrandus says, "I have with much diligence tried to discover the opinion of the foreign churches respecting the four controverted points, [on the subject of holding a National Synod.] They have unanimously replied, that on this subject their sentiments and ours are alike."

* The *Historical Preface* to the ACTS (which was not composed till ten years after Arminius had published his noble DECLARATION,) distorts, suppresses, curtails, or alters, at pleasure, many of the most important facts which the author relates, and which had till that period (1619) been considered as standing above all suspicion of misrepresentation or bad faith,—such was the high character of Arminius for honour and veracity, even among his inveterate adversaries! His mode of narrating occurrences is most admirable, and worthy of general imitation; for in every instance, in which his account can be compared with the contemporary communications of any of his adversaries, (as in the recently adduced case of the letter of Sibrandus,) he seems only to have consulted his natural modesty and forbearance, and not to have given such a representation of many circumstances as he might and ought to have done.

On these occurrences of 1605, the *Historical Preface* is judiciously brief: For it does not mention one half of the particulars: and those portions which it has selected receive, as might be naturally expected, a strong Calvinistic

of their classes, in the examination to which candidates for holy orders must submit prior to their admission into the Christian ministry, some of the students of the University of Leyden had returned such answers to the questions propounded to them as were of a novel description and contrary to the common and received doctrine of the Churches. Those novelties," it was said, "the young men affirmed to have been instilled into them while under my tuition."—In such a situation of affairs, they desired me "to engage in a friendly conference with them, by which they might have it in their power to perceive if there were any truth in this charge, and that they might afterwards be the better qualified to consult the interests of the Church."—To these suggestions I replied, "that I could by no means approve of the mode of proceeding which they recommended: For such a course would inevitably subject me to frequent and almost incessant applications for a friendly interview and conversation, if any one thought it needful to pester me in that manner whenever a student made use of a new or uncommon answer, and in excuse pretended to have learned it from me. The following therefore appeared to me a plan of greater wisdom and prudence:—As often as a student during his examination returned any answer, which, according to his affirmation, had been derived from my instructions, provided the brethren considered such answer to stand in opposition to the Confession and Catechism of the Belgic Churches, they should immediately confront that student with me; and, for the sake of investigating such an affair, I was ready to proceed at my own expence to any town, however distant, which it might please the Brethren to appoint for that purpose. The obvious consequence of this method would be, that, after it had been resorted to a few times, it would cause it clearly and evidently to appear whether the student's assertion were the truth or only a calumny.

But when Francis Lansbergius, in the name of the rest of his brethren, continued to urge and solicit a Conference I gave

tincture from the pen of Festus Hommius.—It may be necessary to add, that the interview between Arminius and the Deputies is said to have commenced thus: "They gave him an account of those reports which were in general circulation respecting himself and his doctrine;" and, in another passage, they advert to "the great solicitude which all the churches felt, lest,—after the complete integrity of the Reformed doctrine had been undermined, and after depraved sentiments had been instilled into the young men, who, as the hope of the Churches, were educated in that University, this matter should break out and display itself, to the great injury and disturbance of the Churches."

it as a further reason why I could not see the propriety of entering into a conference with them,—that they appeared before me in the character of Deputies, who had afterwards to render to the Synod an account of all their proceedings; and that I was not therefore at liberty to accede to their wishes, unless, not only with the knowledge and consent, but at the express command, of others who were my superiors, and whom I was equally with them bound to obey. Besides, it would be connected with no small risk and danger to me, if, in the relation of the event of our conference which they might hereafter give to the Synod, I should leave that relation entirely to their faithfulness and discretion. They had likewise no cause for demanding any thing of this kind from me, who was quite unconscious of having propounded a single doctrine, either at Leyden or Amsterdam, that was contrary to the Word of God or to the Confession and Catechism of the Churches in the Low Countries. For no such accusation had ever yet been brought against me by any person; and, I was confident, no attempt would be made to substantiate against me a charge of this description, if he who preferred such a charge were bound at the same time either to establish it by proofs, or, in failure of his proofs, to confess his uncharitable offence."

2. *An offer on my part, of a Conference with these Deputies, which they refused.*

I then told these five gentlemen, "that, notwithstanding all this, if they would consent to relinquish the title of DEPUTIES, and would each in his own private capacity enter into a conference with me, I was ready at that very moment to engage in it." The conditions which I proposed to be mutually observed by us, were these:—(i.) that they should explain their opinions on every single article and then I would explain mine; (ii.) they should adduce their proofs, and I would adduce mine; and (iii.) that they should at last attempt a refutation of my sentiments and reasons, and I would in return try to refute theirs. (iv.) If in this manner either party could afford complete satisfaction to the other, the result would be agreeable: But, if neither party could satisfy the other, then no mention of the subjects discussed in our private conference, or of its unfavourable termination, should be made in any place or company whatever, until the whole affair should be referred to a national Synod."

But when to this proposition they had given a direct refusal, we should have separated from each other without further dis-

course, had I not requested "that they would offer a conference in the same manner to Gomarus, as well as to Trelcatius of pious memory,—because it did not appear to me, that I had given them any cause for making such a demand upon me, rather than upon either of my two colleagues."—At the same time I enforced my concluding expressions with several arguments, which it would be too tedious now to repeat in the presence of your Mightinesses.—When I had finished, the deputies replied, "that they would comply with my request, and would wait on the two other Professors of Divinity and make them a similar offer:" And prior to their departure from Leyden, they called and assured me, that they had in this particular fulfilled their promise.

This then is the first of the many requests that have been preferred to me. It was the cause of much conversation at the time when it occurred: For many persons spoke about it. Some of them related it imperfectly, and in a manner very different from what were the real circumstances of the whole transaction; while others suppressed many essential particulars, and studiously concealed the counter-proposal which I had tendered to the deputies * and the strong reasons which I produced in its support.

3. *Another application is made to me.*

A few days afterwards, that is, on the 28th of July in the same year, 1605, a request of a similar character was likewise presented to me, in the name of the Presbytery of the Church of Leyden: but on this condition,—that if I approved of it, other persons, whom such a request equally concerned, should also be summoned before the same ecclesiastical tribunal: but if this offer did not receive my approbation, nothing further

* The account of this counter-proposal is thus related in the *Historical Preface:* "He said, If they would lay aside their quality as Deputies, he would not avoid a Conference on doctrine with them in the capacity of private pastors,—on this condition, that if it should happen that they did not agree together, they should not make any report of the matter to the Synod. This proposal the deputies considered to be unjust, since the anxiety of the Churches could not be removed by a conference of this description; and they departed from him without having accomplished their errand."—Their purpose was obviously the same as that of the other deputations and private persons who were instructed to wait upon him:—it was, that they might entrap him in his speech, and thus furnish themselves with matter for his accusation. We ought, therefore, to feel no surprize, when they represent his proposal as an *unjust one*, for it did not co-incide with their designs.—But, beside other considerable omissions, they do not state what was actually the fact,—that he was ready *on that condition* to enter into a conference with any one or more of their number, as well as with the whole body, in the relation of one private pastor conferring with another. See page 537.

should be attempted. But when I had intimated, that I did not clearly perceive, how this request could possibly obtain approval from me,—and when I had subjoined my reasons which were of the same description as those which I had employed on the preceding occasion,—my answer was perfectly satisfactory to Bronchovius the Burgomaster [of Leyden] and Merula of pious memory, both of whom had come to me in the name of that Church of which they were the Elders, and they determined to abandon all ulterior proceedings in that business.

4. *The Request of the Deputies of the Synod of South Holland to their Lordships, the Visitors of the University, and the Answer which they received.*

On the ninth of November, in the same year [1605], the deputies of the Synod of South Holland, Francis Lansbergius, Festus Hommius, and their associates, presented nine questions to their Lordships the Curators of the University of Leyden;* these were accompanied with a petition,—"that the Professors of Divinity might be commanded to answer them." But the Curators replied, "that they could on no account sanction by their consent the propounding of any questions to the Professors of Divinity; and if any one supposed that something was taught in the University contrary to truth and rectitude, that person had it in his power to refer the matter of his complaint to a National Synod, which, it was hoped, would at the earliest opportunity be convened, when it would come regularly under

* These nine questions with the answers to them and nine counter-questions, will be found at the close of this volume immediately after the Reply of Arminius to the *Thirty One Articles*. The origin of these questions was as follows: On the 30th of August, the Synod of South Holland met, when as the *Historical Preface* says, "Having heard from their own deputies the state of affairs in the University of Leyden, and what had been done with regard to Arminius and the other professors of Theology, they determined after mature deliberation, that this increasing evil must be seasonably counteracted, and that a remedy for it must not be deferred under the uncertain hope of a National Synod. The Synod therefore enjoined it on their deputies to make the most diligent inquiry concerning those articles which were the principal subjects of disputation among the divinity-students in the University of Leyden, and to desire the Lord Curators, to command the Theological Professors to give an open and sincere declaration of their sentiments concerning them, &c. The deputies, having instituted a diligent enquiry into this matter exhibited to the Curators nine questions relating to topics which, they had understood, were at that time principally discussed."—These nine questions, therefore, were manufactured by Hommius and his associates, after the most sedulous and secret investigation in the city of Leyden; and how ill-calculated they were to fasten the charge of heresy upon Arminius, the reader will perceive on inspection.

The allusion, at the beginning of this extract, to "what had been done with regard to Arminius and the other professors of Theology," will be understood by referring to page 39.

the cognizance of that assembly and receive the most ample discussion."—When this answer had been delivered, the Deputies of the Synod did not hesitate earnestly to ask it as a particular favour, "that, by the kind permission of their Lordships, they might themselves propose those nine questions to the Professors of Divinity, and might, without troubling their Lordships, personally inform themselves what answer, of his own accord and without reluctance, each of those three divines would return." But, after all their pleading, they were unable to obtain the permission which they so strenuously desired.—The whole of this unsuccessful negotiation was conducted in such a clandestine manner, and so carefully concealed from me, that I was totally ignorant even of the arrival of those reverend deputies in our city;* yet soon after their departure I became acquainted with their mission and its failure.

* Arminius knew nothing about their arrival or departure; but he was aware that these his restless enemies were entrusted with such a commission. In allusion to this, he says, in a letter which he addressed to his friend Uitenbogardt on the 27th of October, a fortnight prior to the arrival of the Synodical deputies: "You have undoubtedly, before this time, heard of the determination of the Synod; which was a circumstance that did not affect me so much as to induce me to think I ought to write to you about it. For they appear to have been suffering under a dearth of counsel respecting the method to be adopted in the further management of the affair which was at that time commenced, rather than to have derived any considerable profit from the business in which they were previously engaged." This refers to the attempt of the Dort Class, page 39.—He then proceeds: "What a difficult affair is this, which they have enjoined on their Deputies,—'to make an open enquiry 'about the actual state of our dissension, and to see what the necessity of the 'case may require!' But this they cannot determine, except by consent of the Curators. And among whom will that enquiry be made? It cannot be instituted among the Professors of Theology, who have already delivered to the Curators their opinion in writing. (Page 39.) The matter, therefore, will be transacted among the Divinity-students, who, on being interrogated, will either not venture to make any declaration, or, when ordered to produce proofs, will fail in the attempt. It is probable, that those to whom the domestic peace of the University is a subject of deep interest, will not account such a course as this advisable. Indeed, it scarcely seems possible for this enquiry to be instituted without exciting great tumult and contention; for the dispositions of young people are known to be warm above measure in favour of which party soever they espouse.—But I will exercise the grace of forbearance and will look upon all their proceedings with a calm and tranquil eye, resting in the testimony of my conscience and in my innocency."—The event proved the correctness of his prognostication; those who were most concerned for "the domestic peace of the University" hindered these pragmatical presbyters from inflaming the minds of the students by the needless inquisitorial process which they wished to institute.

In another part of the same letter he exclaims: "How difficult is it, in these unhappy days, to devote one's attention at once to the study of verity and of peace, when the minds of men are full of vehemence! Unless I received encouragement from the consciousness of my integrity, the favourable judgment of certain good men, and the open and manifest profit which I behold arising from my labours, it would often be scarcely possible for me to be in any other

5. *A Fourth Request of the same kind.*

After this, a whole year elapsed before I was again called to an account about such matters. But I must not omit to mention, that in the year 1607, a short time before the meeting of the Synod of South Holland at Delft, John Bernards minister of the Church at Delft, Festus Hommius minister of Leyden, and Dibbetius of Dort,* were deputed by the Synod to come to me and inquire what progress I had made in the refutation of of the Anabaptists.† When I had given them a suitable reply

than a state of great disquietude. But thanks be to God, who communicates strength and constancy to my spirit, and who has caused me to feel very little concern about these things, or the manner in which they may terminate."

* The reader who is acquainted with the history of the Synod of Dort, will perceive what a number of its members had occupied themselves almost as long as Arminius lived within their jurisdiction, in vexing his righteous soul and in devising plans for the ruin of his reputation and usefulness. To omit others of less note,—Festus Hommius, (467,) Dibbetius, Sibrandus Lubbertus, (465,) Gomarus, (74,) Henry Arnoldson, Henry Brandt, John Bogerman, (443,) James Rolandus, (466,) Faukelius, and Cornelius Hillenius, were among the number of those who lived long enough to sit in judgment upon some of the opinions of Arminius at the Synod of Dort,—a consummation after which they had long and ardently aspired while he lived, but in which their narrow spirits were not gratified till ten years after his decease, when the political circumstances of their country favoured their designs and enabled them to give vent to all those malicious passions to which they had previously allowed such large entertainment.

† This duty was imposed on Arminius by the unanimous vote of the brethren, in 1600, at the South Holland Synod, an annual Assembly, of which he had that year been chosen the President. The North Holland Synod also seconded the request, and Arminius promised to apply himself to its execution. On the part of some of his brethren, his invitation to undertake this refutation had been promoted, with intentions apparently not of the purest kind. They imagined, that in replying to the unscriptural arguments of that fanatical and litigious sect, he would be compelled to disclose all his sentiments on Predestination, which, it was known, did not accord with those of Calvin, and from which they were wishful to draw matter for his accusation. But though this seems to have been the feeling of some among his chief adversaries, the great majority of his co-pastors thought the charge had been committed into the hands of a competent person, whose performance would do honour to their choice. But, it will be seen, that he did not live to finish the treatise which he had commenced on this important subject.

In a letter to Uitenbogardt, dated 26 Jan. 1600, he says: "I have not yet determined any thing respecting the business which has been imposed on me by the Synod. Yet my mind, for certain reasons, is inclined to undertake the task, provided I could ascertain that it has been committed to me with a sincere intent; of which I am compelled to doubt by the perverse and erroneous judgments which some men have formed respecting me. But, whatever intention they may have had, I am of opinion that the labour will be useful to the Church of Christ: Not because these heresies have not been refuted in a learned and solid manner; but because new refutations find new readers. I have not in the course of my previous studies had an opportunity to learn the heresies of the Anabaptists, and their foundations, with so much accuracy as the profitable discussion of this matter requires: This is the

concerning that affair, which was the cause of much conversation among us on both sides, and when they were just on the point of taking their leave, they begged "that I would not hesitate to reveal to them whatever views and designs I had formed on the subject of Religion, for the purpose of their being communicated to the Synod, by the deputies, for the satisfaction of the brethren."—But I refused to comply with their intreaties, "because the desired explanation could not then be given either conveniently or to advantage: and I did not know any place in which it was possible to explain these matters with greater propriety, than in the National Synod; which, according to the resolution of their most noble and High Mightinesses the States General, was expected very shortly to assemble." I promised "that I would use every exertion that I might be enabled in that assembly openly to profess the whole of my sentiments; and that I would employ none of that alleged concealment or dissimulation about any thing of which they might then complain."—I concluded by saying, "that if I were to make my profession before them as deputies of the Synod of South Holland, I could not commit to their fidelity the relation of what might transpire, because, in matters of this description, every one was the most competent interpreter of his own meaning."—After these mutual explanations we parted from each other.

6. *The same Request is privately repeated to me, and my Answer to it.*

In addition to these different applications, I was privately desired, by certain ministers, "not to view it as a hardship to communicate my views and intentions to their colleagues the brethren assembled in Synod:" while others intreated me "to disclose my views to them, that they might have an opportunity of pondering and examining them by themselves, in the fear of the Lord," and they gave me an assurance, "that they would not divulge any portion of the desired communication." To the first of these two classes I gave in common my usual

only circumstance which slightly interrupts my progress. If any persons feel a persuasion on their minds, that this burden is imposed on me *with the sole view of discovering the thoughts of my heart on certain controverted points*, they will be frustrated in their wishes. For the necessity of the refutation will not require me to unfold all the views which I hold about Predestination and Free Will, which are, among others, the doctrines concerning which the dispute lies between us and the Anabaptists. But in this affair, I know, you will not fail to lend me your aid, both in furnishing me with books, (if you have any which treat on this subject,) and in giving me the benefit of your advice, as well as correcting my productions."

answer, "that they had no reason for demanding such an account from me, rather than from others."—But to one of these ministers, who was not among the last [of the two kinds of applicants,] I proposed a conference at three different times, concerning all the articles of our religion; in which we might consider and devise the best means that could possibly be adopted for establishing the truth on the most solid foundation, and for completely refuting every species of falsehood. It was also a part of my offer, that such conference should be held in the presence of certain of the principal men of our country; but he did not accept of this condition.*—To the rest of the enquirers I returned various answers; in some of which I plainly

* The person to whom Arminius here alludes was Werner Helmichius, one of his co-pastors at Amsterdam, whom their common friend Uitenbogardt had recommended to the service of that Church only a short time prior to the removal of Arminius to Leyden. He and Plancius were incited, by others who were concealed, to circulate rumours to the prejudice of our author, and to take an active part in discovering grounds of accusation against him. In September, 1604, Arminius writes thus concerning him, in a letter to Uitenbogardt: "I have also offered to Helmichius a Conference on all the articles of the Christian Religion, and on every theological doctrine, —that he may not suppose any thing to lurk in concealment.—But let these men take heed of themselves, if they be made wise: For, by proposing my own opinion, I might attempt to confute theirs. How easily may this be done by any man that has a correct perception of it! Nothing further will be necessary, than to propose the process, which, according to their supposition, obtains in the work of saving and damning men; by this, their whole doctrine will be confuted. For the excuses which they adduce for this process, are of such a description as not to be comprehended by any person: Nay, those who propound it, do not themselves understand it; this is apparent from the forms of speech which they employ. The *fate* of the Stoics and the *absolute necessity of things* are introduced; and (which is far worse than Manicheism,) *the cause of evil* is ascribed to the Good God. When the Manichees wished to avoid *this consequence*, and found it impossible on account of their unskilfulness, they invented *a second God*, the God of darkness;—which error of theirs was, in my judgment, far more deserving of toleration."

In a subsequent letter, immediately after the paragraph quoted page 405, Arminius adds, "Whenever an opportunity occurs, I relate to every person, that I have offered to Helmichius a peaceful Conference on all the heads of the Christian Religion, either in private or in public. I likewise make a similar offer to those who converse with me about it. I can do this with safety, because I can compel them to confess that they go beyond the terms of the Confession and Catechism; this they are compelled to allow, even now when not under any necessity to make the admission. But I think, not only that all the doctrines which I have ever proposed may be reconciled with the Confession and the Catechism, but that it is possible to defend them under the protection of those formularies:" This course, it will be found, Arminius has pursued in a subsequent part of the Declaration.

From these extracts it will be seen, that the two principal hindrances to Helmichius's acceptance of the repeated offers of Arminius, were, the unscriptural and indefensible nature of the dogmas on which he and other bigots insisted, and their own acknowledged personal transgressions against those two formularies of union. These circumstances rendered almost all the Supralapsarians in the United Provinces exceedingly shy about coming into close conversation with a man, whose powers of ratiocination ave been faintly described, in the preceding Life, page 55.

denied what they requested of me, and in others I made some disclosures to the enquirers: My sole rule in making such a distinction, was, the more intimate or distant degree of acquaintance which I had with the parties. In the mean time it frequently happened, that, a short time after I had thus revealed any thing in confidence to an individual, it was slanderously related to others,—how seriously soever he might have asserted in my presence, that what I had then imparted to him was, according to his judgment, agreeable to the truth, and although he had solemnly pledged his honour that he would on no account divulge it.

7. What occurred relative to the same Subject in the Preparatory Convention.

To these it is also necessary to add a report which has been spread abroad by means of letters, not only within these provinces, but far beyond their confines: It is, 'that, in the 'Preparatory Convention which was held at the Hague, in the 'month of June, 1607, by a company of the brethren, who 'were convened by a summons from their High Mightinesses 'the States-General,—after I had been asked in a manner the 'most friendly to consent to a disclosure, before the brethren 'then present, of my views on the subject of the Christian 'faith, I refused; and although they promised to endeavour, 'as far as it was possible, to give me satisfaction, I still declined 'to comply with their wishes.'*—But since I find by experience that this distorted version of the matter has procured for me not a few proofs of hatred and ill-will from many persons, who think that far more honourable deference ought to have been evinced by me towards that assembly, which was a convention of divines from each of the United Provinces, I perceive a necessity is thus imposed upon me to commence at the very origin of this transaction, when I am about to relate the manner in which it occurred:

Before my departure from Leyden for the convention at the Hague which has just been mentioned, five articles were put into my hands, said to have been transmitted to some of the provinces, to have been perused by certain ministers and Ecclesiastical assemblies, and considered by them as documents which embraced my sentiments on several points of Religion. Those points of which they pretended to exhibit a correct delineation, were Predestination, the Fall of Adam, Free-will,

* This is an extract from the letter of Sibrandus Lubbertus, which has just been quoted, page 523.

Original Sin, and the Eternal Salvation of Infants.* When I had read the whole of them, I thought that I plainly perceived, from the style in which they were written, who was the author of them; and as he was then present, (being one of the number summoned on that occasion,) I accosted him on this subject, and embraced that opportunity freely to intimate to him that I had good reasons for believing those articles to have been of his composition.—He did not make any attempt to deny the correctness of this supposition, and replied, 'that 'they had not been distributed precisely *as my articles*, but *as* '*those on which the students at Leyden had held disputations*.'—In answer to this remark I told him, 'Of one thing he must be 'very conscious, that, by the mere act of giving circulation to

* These form a part of the forged *Thirty One Articles*, an answer to which is subjoined to this Declaration. When the enemies of Arminius could find nothing tangible, on which their malevolence might fasten itself, they invented rumours and circulated suspicions against him in every possible form, both in print and manuscript. But the iniquity of the whole business lay in this,—that when they had many opportunities of knowing what he taught, they chose to attribute to him *such doctrines as they could have wished him to teach*, rather than those which he actually inculcated. The manufacture and circulation of forged Articles, therefore, were among the basest yet most successful expedients to which these men had recourse to blast the reputation of our author, and to hinder his usefulness. Finding these Five Articles to be serviceable to their cause, they soon augmented them by adding to them two others, concerning which Arminius thus writes to Dr. Sebastian Egberts, in Dec. 1608: "I have been twice informed by letter, that Seven Articles are circulated among you [at Amsterdam] in my name, and, I understand, they have also been seen by you. Will none of the ruling men among you perform this kind office for me,—to institute an enquiry into the truth of this matter, and concerning the author who fastens those articles on me, who am a foster-child of Amsterdam, and was a preacher (though an unworthy one!) fifteen whole years? I have no other reason for wishing this to be done, than a desire to obtain a just and moderate degree of protection. My relation Jacob Laurentson informs me by letter, that those articles were delivered to his wife by a certain person who said he had received them from an Elder of the Church. It may easily be asked, who that Elder is. But, *such people are not to be irritated!* I also exercise patience. But beware lest by your connivance and indulgence these stings increase so fast, as to cause you afterwards to utter vain lamentations about the punctures which they make and the pain they excite. Unless I had some time ago made a full determination in my mind, not to have recourse to public apologies except when pressed to adopt them by the most urgent necessity, I would now demonstrate what sufficient reasons are offered to me, in these articles, of animadverting upon the ignorance and maliciousness of some persons.—I have communicated this affair to those on whose judgment I place great dependence, and to whose kindness I am much indebted: They think, that I shall be acting with propriety if I request the Burgomasters to institute an enquiry into this matter. I therefore now desire you, to give this intimation in my name to your colleagues, who cannot, I think, for any just reason deny me this favour. I would write to them myself, did I not consider it more advisable to have the affair conducted with as little noise and exertion as possible. Yet if you think otherwise, I will write to the bench of magistrates."—Then follows the quotation which is inserted in page 517.

'such a document, he could not avoid creating a grievous and 'immediate prejudice against my innocence, and that the same 'articles would soon be ascribed to me, as if they had been my 'composition: when, in reality,' as I then openly affirmed, 'they had neither proceeded from me, nor accorded with my 'sentiments, and, as well as I could form a judgment, they 'appeared to me to be at variance with the word of God.'

After he and I had thus discoursed together in the presence of only two other persons, I deemed it advisable to make some mention of this affair in the Convention itself, at which certain persons attended who had read those very articles, and who had, according to their own confession, accounted them as mine. This plan I accordingly pursued; and just as the Convention was on the point of being dissolved, and after the account of our proceedings had been signed, and some individuals had received instructions to give their High Mightinesses the States General a statement of our transactions,—I requested the brethren 'not to consider it an inconvenience to remain a 'short time together, for I had something which I was desirous 'to communicate.' They assented to this proposal, and I told them 'that I had received the Five Articles which I held 'in my hand and the tenour of which I briefly read to them; 'that I discovered they had been transmitted, by a member of 'that convention, into different provinces; that I was positive 'concerning their distribution in Zealand and the diocese of 'Utrecht; and that they had been read by some ministers in 'their public meetings, and were considered to be documents 'which comprehended my sentiments.' Yet, notwithstanding, I protested to the whole of that assembly, with a good conscience and as in the presence of God, 'that those articles 'were not mine and did not contain my sentiments.'—Twice I repeated this solemn asseveration, and besought the brethren 'not so readily to attach credit to reports that were circulated 'concerning me, nor so easily to listen to any thing that was 'represented as proceeding from me or that had been rumoured 'abroad to my manifest injury.'

To these observations a member of that Convention answered, 'that it would be well for me, on this account, to signify to 'the brethren, what portion of those articles obtained my approbation, and what portion I disavowed, that they might thus 'have an opportunity of becoming acquainted in some degree 'with my sentiments.' Another member urged the same reasons; to which I replied, 'that the convention had not been

'appointed to meet for such a purpose, that we had already 'been long enough detained together, and that their High 'Mightinesses the States General were now waiting for our de-'termination.'—In that manner we separated from each other, no one attempting any longer to continue the conversation; neither did all the members of the Convention express a joint concurrence in that request, nor employ any kind of persuasion with me to prove that such an explanation was in their judgment quite equitable.* Besides, according to the most correct intelligence which I have since gained, some of those who were then present declared afterwards, 'that it was a 'part of the instructions which had been previously given to 'them, not to enter into any conference concerning doctrine; 'and that, if a discussion of that kind had arisen, they must 'have instantly retired from the Convention.'—These several circumstances therefore prove, that I was very far from being "solicited by the whole assembly" to engage in the desired explanation.

8. *My Reasons for refusing a Conference.*

Most noble and potent Lords, this is a true narration of those interviews and conferences which the brethren have solicited, and of my continued refusal: From the whole of which, every person may, in my opinion, clearly perceive, that there is no cause whatever for preferring an accusation against me on account of my behaviour throughout these transactions; especially when he considers their REQUEST with the MANNER in which it was delivered, and at the same time my REFUSAL with the REASONS for it,—but this is still more obvious from my counter-proposal.

1. Their REQUEST, which amounted to a demand upon me for a declaration on matters of faith, was not supported by any reasons, as far as I am enabled to form a judgment. For I never furnished a cause to any man why he should require such a declaration from me rather than from other people, by my having taught any thing contrary to the Word of God, or to the Confession and Catechism of the Belgic Churches: At no period have I ceased to make this avowal, and I repeat it on this occasion. I am likewise prepared to consent to an enquiry being instituted into this my profession, either by a

* The falsity of the statements of Sibrandus respecting this fact, (page 523,) has been ably proved by the answer of Uitenbogardt and Arminius. What credit therefore can be given to the *Historical Preface*, which, ten years afterwards, relates the same egregious falsehood with emendations, as though it had never been once refuted?

Provincial or a National Synod, that the truth of it may by that means be made yet more apparent;—if from such an examination it may be thought possible to derive any advantage.

2. The MANNER in which their request was delivered, proved of itself to be a sufficient obstacle, because it was openly made by a deputation. I was also much injured by the way in which the Synod prejudged my cause; for we may presume that it would not through its deputies invite any man to a Conference, unless he had given strong grounds for such an interview. For this reason I did not consider myself at liberty to consent to a Conference of this description, lest I should, by that very act, and apparently through a consciousness of guilt, have confessed that I had taught something that was wrong or unlawful.

3. The REASONS of my refusal were these:

FIRST. Because as I am not subject to the jurisdiction either of the North Holland Synod or that of South Holland, but have other superiors to whom I am bound to render an account of all my concerns, I could not consent to a conference with deputies, except by the advice of those superiors and at their express command; especially since a conference of this kind was not incumbent on me in consequence of the ordinary discharge of my duty. It was also not obscurely hinted by the deputies, that the conference [in 1605] would by no means be a private one; but this they discovered in a manner sufficiently intelligible, when they refused to enter into a conference with me, divested of their title of "deputies." I should therefore have failed in obedience to my superiors, if I had not rejected a conference which was in this manner proposed. I wish the brethren would remember this fact,—that although every one of our ministers is subject as a member to the jurisdiction of the particular Synod to which he belongs, yet not one of them has hitherto dared to engage in A CONFERENCE, without the advice and permission of the magistrates under whom he is placed; that no particular magistrates have ever allowed any minister within their jurisdiction to undertake a CONFERENCE *with the deputies of the Churches*, unless they had themselves previously granted their consent; and that it was frequently their wish, to be present at such conference, in the persons of their own deputies.* Let it be recollected what transpired

* This is a very important remark, as it shews the insubordination to the civil government of their country, which the Calvinistic Clergy of Holland were not at all disinclined to evince at every opportunity. (See page 118.) They never made any offer to him about having the presence of such impartial

at Leyden in the case of Coolhasius [Koolhaes,] at Gouda with Herman Herberts, at Horn in the case of Cornelius Wiggeri,

witnesses to their mutual transactions, as the magistrates might think fit to appoint,—a practice which Arminius here proves, by examples, to have been adopted in all similar preceding cases.

1. JASPAR KOOLHAES was a minister at Leyden. In the year 1578, he was engaged in a dispute with his co-pastor Peter Cornelison about the nomination and election of Elders and Deacons: The former contended, that, as soon as these church-officers had been nominated, they ought to be proposed for approval to the Civil powers, and then, after having obtained their concurrence, to be proposed to the congregation: Cornelison, on the contrary, maintained, that, after receiving their nomination from the Consistory, those church-officers ought to be presented to the congregation without the intervention of the magistrates.—This was the foundation of all the disputes and controversies which arose in the Low Countries respecting *the office and authority of a Christian Government* in matters ecclesiastic.—Many attempts were made by umpires and deputations to settle the boundaries of the two new and conflicting jurisdictions of Church and State. Several books were also published on the subject. Luke Hespe, one of the colleagues of Koolhaes, had maintained in the course of these disputes, "that all persons who accompanied him to the Lord's table must be of his opinion in all points; and that in case they were not, he would neither break the Lord's bread with them nor own them for brethren." In 1580 Koolhaes published two pamphlets, in the latter of which he combated Hespe's principles, and contended, "that we are bound to own all those for brethren who agree with us in fundamentals, and who are willing to live in peace with us, though they may not know as much as we do." In a subsequent publication, he said, "that as Christian ministers ought to allow every one to attend their sermons, so ought they to admit to the Lord's table all, who, after being baptised in the name of Christ, abstained from open and scandalous sins:" He also would not refuse to esteem as brethren those who might differ from the Reformed, solely on the point of Eternal Election. He added, "that, as for himself, he did not pretend to understand the manner of such election, and no one could have a right apprehension of it. And since the word of God did not subject men to the sentiments of Calvin, Zuinglius, Luther, and others, neither would he declare that any one was bound by them: Yet people ought to adhere to this article—that *God is by no means the cause of any man's damnation, nor is man the cause of his own salvation:* Whosoever is saved, therefore, is saved by grace; and whosoever is damned, it is through his own wickedness."—I am afraid it was this liberality of doctrinal sentiment, independent of the Calvinistic decree of *irrespective election*, that gained Koolhaes almost as many enemies among the Clergy, as did his ideas about the right of the Civil Powers.

The Magistrates published a very clever pamphlet in justification of their conduct, which soon elicited a reply from the Calvinistic ministers, who maintained in it, "that all other religious denominations, except their own, ought not to be tolerated, but were rather to be forbidden and suppressed by government, according to the example of the Kings of Judah." This is a fair specimen of the general illiberality of the Calvinists of that age: The reader who wishes to have another proof of it, may consult page 443.—The affair with the Magistrates was finally adjusted on the 29th of Oct. 1580, when the Civil Powers gained their point, and it was also stipulated, among other conditions, "that the magistrates should always be at liberty to depute two of their own body to superintend the proceedings of the Consistory; but without possessing a power to vote, and under a charge of secrecy."

But though the Magistrates obtained all their wishes from the clergy, they had to support and patronize Koolhaes, upon whose head the thunder-bolt of Calvinistic vengeance fell. At the National Synod of Middelburgh in 1581,

[Wiggertson,] and at Medenblick in the case of Tako [Sybrants].

his writings were declared to be "scandalous and contrary to pure doctrine;" and he was condemned to make a public acknowledgment of his offences,—which he refused to do.—At the Provincial Synod of Haerlem in 1582, he was publicly excommunicated, sentence having been pronounced against him from the pulpit, after a sermon had been delivered, before the congregation and the members of the Synod, from Rom. xvi, 17. But the classes of the Hague, of Gouda, and of Dort, protested against the passing of such a sentence.—At the National Synod of the Hague in 1585, by the mediation of some persons deputed by the Earl of Leicester, who had been appointed with Queen Elizabeth's consent Governor General of the United Provinces, an agreement was concluded between Koolhaes and his clerical brethren. Some of the conditions were, "He should declare, that the Belgic Confession was scriptural except in the matter of Reprobation in the 16th Article; he should consent to have his books suppressed; and he should remain silent in reference to what he did not yet fully understand concerning the doctrine contained in that Article, and should by no means maintain, *that the universal grace of God extended itself to all men and to every person in particular*. Having expressed his assent to these terms, he was subjected to many vexatious and malignant proceedings before he was again acknowledged as a minister of the gospel.—The last time of his being publicly traduced, was at the North Holland Synod held at Edam in 1604: when Festus Hommius moved a resolution, that a second excommunication should be published against Koolhaes; but, by the prudence of the States' Deputies in that assembly, the motion was quashed.

2. HERMAN HERBERTS was born at Grol, near Zutphen, in 1540. He became minister of the gospel at Wesel, and afterwards officiated for a short time at Antwerp. In 1577 he removed to Dort, where, in 1582, he was accused by some of his co-pastors, of having endeavoured to have one of the books of the Anabaptists reprinted. The government deputed four Commissioners to hear the charge and defence: On the 23d of March the accused and accusers appeared together before them, when his co-pastors, who had no proof of the charge against him, insisted that it was his duty to become his own accuser by acknowledging the truth of their allegation; but he refused. They urged this point in such a shameless manner, that one of the States-Commissioners said to his accusers, "Gentlemen, I have read *the History of the Spanish Inquisition*; but I was never yet in a place where I saw so lively a picture of it as I do here!"

Immediately after this he removed to Gouda, and became one of the pastors of that Church. He exercised his ministry without molestation for three years, when, in 1585, at the National Synod of the Hague, he entered into a discussion with some of the members, who had accused him of holding heterodox doctrine respecting *the Perfection of Christians in this life, the Letter and Spirit of the Scriptures, Justification and Predestination*. All the differences between him and the Synod appeared to be accommodated, after he had declared, among other things, "that those who are lost, are lost through their own fault and evil will, in rejecting the grace of God and Christ with all his benefits." As for the Confession, consisting of 37 Articles, "he received it as scriptural; and was willing to subscribe it, provided the 16th Article relating to Predestination might be interpreted in such a manner as *not to make God the Author of sin*." He likewise approved of the Catechism, "provided the exposition of the 114th answer, (which affirms, that *even the most holy men have only a small beginning or principle of obedience in this life,*) might be understood in reference to the most perfect holiness in the life to come. He owned, too, that he had treated his brethren with too much asperity, in his treatise entitled, *A Short Exposition*, &c. He promised more fully to explain some absurd and obscure passages in that book, and, for this purpose, to consult with the Professor Saravia and others of the Clergy. The only

The SECOND REASON by which I was dissuaded from a conference, is this: I perceived that there would be a great ine-

result of his consultations with these individuals was to aggravate the former differences; and it was seven years before they were settled. The exasperation of the Calvinists against him was unbounded, and when they were about to fulminate against him a *sentence of excommunication* similar to that against Koolhaes, the States of Holland prevented its execution, and appointed Uitenbogardt and Lansbergius as their Commissioners to compose the difference. These two good men allowed him to fulfil the agreement into which he had entered at the Synod of the Hague, because they accounted his concessions on the doctrine of Predestination to be amply sufficient. During all this storm Herberts continued in the highest repute with the magistrates of Gouda, on account of his edifying discourses and his exemplary conduct. When they perceived, that, after all his virtuous and honourable proposals to the Synod and its deputies, he could not with a good conscience satisfy their demands, they forbade him from entering into any further Conferences with his Calvinistic and persecuting brethren, many of whom wished to draw the terms of agreement much closer than had been originally done by the Synod itself. The Magistrates promised to protect him against all ecclesiastical censures and to allow his annual stipend. Through their favour and with the blessing of Heaven, he long survived these fiery trials. He died at Gouda in 1607, having constantly proclaimed from the pulpit in that town, during twenty-five years, the doctrine of Conditional Predestination.

3. CORNELIUS WIGGERTSON, minister of the gospel at Horn, was suspended by the North Holland Synod held at Alcmaer in 1587, for certain heterodox opinions with which he was charged, and which related principally to Original Sin, Election and Good Works. The Synod, held at Haerlem in the following year, petitioned the States to discharge him entirely from the ministry. After many fruitless negotiations between him and their deputies, the Synod held at Amsterdam in 1590, determined to proceed against him; but the States of Holland ordered them to desist, because they were themselves desirous to take cognizance of that affair. It was about this period that he begun to preach in a private house, and to absent himself from the public ordinances of the Church.

Martenson and Spruit, two of Wiggertson's colleagues at Horn, who were suspected of entertaining many of his sentiments, published a Confession of their opinions, in which they stated, "that, concerning the doctrine of Predestination, they adhered to the mild exposition of Bullinger; and that they were of the opinion of Albert Hardenberg, a learned minister at Embden, who in a Sermon on Romans IX, in which mention is made of Esau, said, 'I will rather sit down at the root of the tree, than hazard a dangerous 'fall from one of its branches, by climbing to the top of it.'" These two pastors experienced many proofs of ill-will from their clerical brethren, but the magistrates granted them countenance and support on account of their mild and peaceable demeanour.

Wiggertson, however, was a more determined spirit; and when the Synod of North Holland had complained to the States, "that he was laying the foundation of a new sect by holding a separate conventicle," Uitenbogardt, Bastingius and others held conferences with him, to induce him to accede to the terms which the Synod proposed, but without effect. In August, 1598, he was publicly excommunicated by his brethren: but the magistrates of Horn adopted no decisive measures for suppressing his separate congregations, which were continued for many years after that period.

Uitenbogardt, who was then but a young minister, has since confessed, that in the reports concerning this affair which he, Bastingius, and others delivered to the States, he had yielded too much to human feelings and had evinced too great complacency to the judgment of his associates. For without making themselves acquainted with Wiggertson's opinions, they had accused him

quality in the conference which was proposed, when, on the contrary, it is necessary that the greatest equality should exist between the parties who are about to confer together on any subject.—For, (1) they came to me armed with public authority; while, with respect to myself, every thing partook of a private character. And I am not so ignorant in these matters as not to perceive the powerful support which that man enjoys who transacts any business under the sanction of the PUBLIC AUTHORITY.—(2) They were themselves three in number, and had with them two deputies of the Synod of North Holland. On the other hand, I was alone, and destitute not only of all assistance, but also of persons who might act as witnesses of

of errors which could not be legitimately deduced from his various written declarations. Bastingius also made a similar confession.

4. TAKO SYBRANTS was a minister at Medenblick, and publicly taught the doctrine of a Conditional Predestination. His Calvinistic brethren, in a memorial to the States of Holland, complained of the unlawfulness of his call, and accused him of holding heterodox opinions. Uitenbogardt and Bastingius were employed by the States to mediate between the two parties, but did not succeed in their pacific endeavours. Sybrants then presented a counter-memorial to the States, in which he cleared himself from the charges which had been preferred against him by his enemies, and declared, "that he had offered to subscribe the Catechism and Confession, with this reservation, —*so far as they are conformable to the word of God.*"—The Magistrates of Medenblick at the same time transmitted an address to the States, in which, after bearing ample testimony to the exemplary character of Sybrants, and the purity of his doctrines, they stated, "that, perceiving the malice and perverseness of those factious people, they were resolved, not to suffer this matter to be any more agitated, and not to allow their minister Tako Sybrants to make or conclude any further declarations, promises, or engagements without their approbation." After the receipt of this letter, the States judged it right to allow this affair to rest, till that of Wiggertson had been decided: Accordingly in 1598, Uitenbogardt and John Matthisius were deputed by the States to negociate an accommodation between Sybrants and his Calvinistic brethren. By amicable Conferences with him, they prevailed upon him to write *a Confession of his Faith*, which was presented, in 1599, to the North Holland Synod held at Alcmaer, and approved by a majority of the members. Peter Plancius, the Amsterdam zealot, said much in opposition to it, and "maintained high dispute" with Uitenbogardt and Matthisius, who had been deputed by the States to give an account of their negotiation. Sybrants was never afterwards molested in the exercise of his ministry, but was permitted to propagate in peace the opinions of Melancthon about Predestination.

In each of these four cases, the magistrates of the different towns would not allow any conferences to be held between the contending parties, without their special permission. To prove this point, was the object of Arminius in referring to these cases. My object in this note, is, to shew that long before Arminius had uttered or written a word on the subject, some other Ministers had in various parts of the United Provinces taught the doctrine of Conditional Election and Reprobation. And though some of their opinions, on this subject and others connected with it, were not so correctly expressed or so well defined as those of Arminius, yet they entitled those who professed them to the veneration of their countrymen, for the noble manner in which they resisted the persecuting measures of the Calvinists.

the proceedings that were then to have commenced, and to whom they as well as myself might have safely entrusted our several causes.—(3.) They were not persons at their own disposal, but compelled to depend on the judgment of their superiors; and they were bound most pertinaciously to contend for those religious sentiments, which their superiors had within their own minds determined to maintain. To such a length was this principle extended, that they were not even left to their own discretion—to admit the validity of the arguments which I might have adduced, however cogent and forcible they might have found them to be, and even if they had been altogether unanswerable.—From these considerations I could not see by what means both parties could obtain that mutual advantage, which ought properly to accrue from such a conference. I might have gained some beneficial result from it; because I was completely at liberty, and, by employing my own conscience alone in forming a decision, I could, without prejudice to any one, have made those admissions which my conviction of the truth might have dictated to me as correct.—Of what great importance this last circumstance might be, your Lordships would have most fully discovered by experience, had any of you been present in the *Preparatory Convention*, as the representatives of your own august body.

My THIRD REASON is, that the account which they would have rendered to their superiors after the conference, could not but have operated in many ways to my injury,—whether I had been absent or present at the time when they delivered their report. (1.) *Had I been absent*, it might easily have happened either through the omission or the addition of certain words, or through the alteration of others in regard to their sense or order, that some fact or argument would be repeated in a manner very different from that in which it really occurred: Such an erroneous statement might also have been made, either through the inconsiderateness which arises from a defect in the intellect, through the weakness of an imperfect memory, or through a prejudice of the affections. (2.) And indeed *by my presence* I could with difficulty have avoided or corrected this inconvenience; because a greater degree of credit would have been given to their own deputies, than to me who was only a private individual.

LASTLY. By this means I should have conveyed to that assembly [the Provincial Synod] a right and some kind of prerogative over me; which, in reference to me, it does not

actually possess; and which, consistently with that office whose duties I discharge, it would not be possible for me to transfer to the Synod without manifest injustice towards those persons under whose jurisdiction it has been the pleasure of the General Magistracy of the land to place me.—Imperious NECESSITY, therefore, as well as EQUITY, demanded of me to reject the terms on which this conference was offered.

4. But however strong my sentiments might be on this subject, I gave those deputies an opportunity of gaining the information which they desired: If it had been their wish to accept the private conference which I proposed, they would have become possessed of my sentiments on every article of the Christian Faith. Besides, this conference would have been much better adapted to promote our mutual edification and instruction, than a public one could be; because it is customary in private conferences for each person to speak every thing with greater familiarity and freedom, than when all the formalities of deputations are observed,—if I may so express myself. Neither had they the least reason to manifest any reluctance on this point; because every one of them was at liberty, (if he chose) to enter into a private conference between him and me alone. But when I made this offer to all and to each of them, I added as one of my most particular stipulations, that, whatever the discussions might be which arose between us, they should remain within our bosoms, and no particle of them should be divulged to any person living. If on these terms they had consented to hold a conference with me, I entertain not the smallest doubt that we should either have given each other complete satisfaction: or we should at least have made it apparent, that, from our mutual controversy, no imminent danger could easily arise, to injure either that truth which is necessary to salvation, piety, or Christian peace and amity.

9. *The complaint concerning my Refusal to make a Declaration of my sentiments, does not agree with the rumours concerning me which are in general circulation.*

But omitting all further mention of those transactions, I am not able entirely to satisfy myself by what contrivance these two complaints appear consistent with each other: (1.) That I refuse to make a profession of my sentiments; and yet (2.) invectives are poured forth against me both in foreign countries and at home, as though I am attempting to introduce, into the Church and into the Christian religion, novel, impure and false

doctrines. *—If I do not openly profess my sentiments, from what can their injurious tendency be made evident? If I do not explain myself, by what method can I be introducing false doctrines? If they be mere groundless suspicions that are advanced against me, it is uncharitable to grant them entertainment, or at least to ascribe to them such great importance.

But it is cast upon me as a reproach, "that I do certainly disclose a few of my opinions, but not all of them; and that, from the few which I thus make known, the object at which I aim is no longer obscure, but becomes very evident." †

* The following extract of a letter to Dr. Sebastian Egberts, dated May 3, 1607, will afford a more complete reply to this objection: "They declare themselves to be quite ignorant of my proceedings, and err as much as possible in the judgment which they form about me and my studies and pursuits; because [my imputed crime] does not consist so much in giving currency to any novelty, as in denying certain novelties which they have themselves introduced into the Christian Church. This is a topic which we shall discuss in the National Synod, which will, I hope, be held either in this or the next year, if we be spared till that time and God vouchsafe us permission. —I can scarcely understand how it is, that some persons who are accounted as my followers can possibly render my cause an object of still greater odium, —when in fact I reckon no men my followers: For I do not make disciples for myself, but for Christ. They [who make such representations] do not deserve to obtain any credit from men of prudence, on account of their want of understanding, or their partiality,—especially since it is well known, that, on more occasions than one, manifest falsehoods have been propagated against me from that quarter. If they be good and honest men, they may learn from me what my sentiments are, or they ought to own that they have been deceived in their judgment.

"[But it is objected,] *I am unwilling to disclose myself:* Yet Helmichius will testify, that at two or three different times I made him an offer of a Conference on all the articles of our faith. [Page 532.] But I had very just reasons for my unwillingness to reply to the interrogatories of some deputies of the Synod: I know and confidently declare, that those reasons will afford pleasure to all prudent men; and that they are such as the very men who on that occasion accosted me, cannot possibly refute."—The strong reasons to which Arminius here alludes, are given in this page and the two immediately preceding; and the reader is left to decide whether they are not of a description that ought to have satisfied all men of sense and reason.

† Arminius in this passage glances at the grand mystery in all these dark insinuations against him, when, after inviting his sworn adversaries to mark his footsteps and to observe all his most secret movements, they could produce nothing against him, except a few uncharitable surmises,—"From the "few opinions which he does disclose, the object at which he aims is no "longer obscure!"—Very true! To the jaundiced eyes of prejudiced Calvinists it was quite evident, that the pious Arminius wished to inculcate (in opposition to the fashionable but unholy tenets of those times,) the scriptural doctrine, that "God our Saviour will have ALL MEN to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth;" and that "Christ Jesus gave himself for ALL." (1 Tim. ii, 4, 6.) He could say, in reference to all the doctrines which he taught, *These things were not done in a corner;* and, in imitation of his blessed Lord and Master, could accost his enemies, and manfully ask, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" But the interrogation produced nearly the same effect on their minds as on the Jews of old. (John viii, 46—48.)

In reference to this censure, the great consideration ought to be, "Can any of those sentiments which I am said to have disclosed, be proved to stand in contradiction either to the WORD OF GOD, or the CONFESSION of the Belgic Churches?" (1.) If it be decided, that they are *contrary to the Confession*,—then I have been engaged in teaching something in opposition to a document, "against which never to propound any doctrine," was the faithful promise which I made, when I signed it with my own hand: If, therefore, I be found thus criminal, I ought to be visited with merited punishment.—(2.) But if it can be proved, that any of those opinions are *contrary to the Word of God*,—then I ought to experience a greater degree of blame and to suffer a severer punishment, and compelled either to utter a recantation or to resign my office,—especially if those heads of doctrine which I have uttered, are of such a description as to be notoriously prejudicial to the honour of God and the salvation of mankind.—(3.) But if those few sentiments which I am accused of having advanced, are found neither to be at variance with *the Word of God*, nor with *the Confession* which I have just mentioned, then those consequences which are elicited from them, or seem dependent on them, cannot possibly be contradictory either to the Word of God or to the Belgic Confession. For, according to the rule of the schoolmen, "If the consectaries or consequences of any doctrine be false, it necessarily follows that the doctrine itself is also false, and *vice versâ*." The one of these two courses, therefore, ought to have been pursued towards me,—either to have instituted an action against me, or to have given no credit to those rumours. If I might have my own choice, *the latter*

I never read the subjoined extract from the same letter as that which was quoted in the preceding note, without being forcibly reminded of another expression which our Lord employed, *I sat daily with you teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me.* Arminius says to his friend: "It is objected, that *I lay down the foundations of my novelties, which foundations I afterwards either renounce or elude.* This is a wonderful story, which will not obtain credence, except from persons who are ignorant of all things and devoid of experience. I publicly teach before a crowded auditory; I hold frequent scholastic exercises [*disputations*,] in the presence of my colleagues [the other Professors]; I boldly speak whatever I think proper in reply to the objections urged, and employ no kind of tergiversation or subterfuge; and I have a private class composed of thirty students or upwards. *Is it not therefore astonishing, that not one of these various individuals has to this day produced* EVEN A SINGLE WORD *that I have spoken in opposition to the scriptures, to our Confession or to the Catechism?* My colleagues themselves, on being interrogated, and even instigated by a certain person, remain quiet,—in which state they would not continue long, through their zeal for *the purity of doctrine*, unless they knew that it is in vain and unprofitable to attempt any thing against me."

course is that which I should have desired; but of *the former* I am not at all afraid. For, how extensively soever and in all directions those THIRTY-ONE ARTICLES which concern me have been dispersed to my great injury and disparagement, and though they have been placed in the hands of several men of great eminence,—they afford sufficient internal testimony, from the want of sense and of other requisites visible in their very composition, that they are charged upon me through a total disregard to justice, honour, and conscience. Page 534.

10. *The principal Reasons why I durst not disclose to the Deputies my opinions on the subject of Religion.*

But some person will perhaps say: "For the sake of avoid-"ing these disturbances, and partly in order by such a "measure to give some satisfaction to a great number of "ministers, you might undoubtedly have made to your "brethren an open and simple declaration of your sentiments "on the whole subject of Religion, either for the purpose of "being yourself maturely instructed in more correct principles "or that they might have been able in an opportune manner to "prepare themselves for a mutual conference."

But I was deterred from adopting that method, on account of three inconveniences of which I was afraid:

FIRST.—I was afraid that if I had made a profession of my sentiments, the consequence would have been, that an enquiry would be instituted on the part of others, with regard to the manner in which an action might be framed against me from those premises.—SECONDLY. Another cause of my fear, was, that such a statement of my opinions would have furnished matter for discussion and refutation, in the pulpits of the Churches and the scholastic exercises of the Universities. —THIRDLY. I was also afraid, that my opinions would have been transmitted to foreign Universities and Churches, in hopes of obtaining from them a sentence of condemnation, and the means of oppressing me."—That I had very weighty reasons to fear every one of these consequences together, it would not be difficult for me clearly to demonstrate from the [Thirty One] ARTICLES, and from the writings of certain individuals.*

* These reasons, when properly understood, are of the greatest validity and fully justify the conduct of Arminius in not listening to the intreaties of every officious individual, or of every petty Synodical deputation, that chose to invite him to a private conference on the grand doctrines of Christianity. It is against all such private Conferences that he adduces these arguments.

Only a few days prior to the delivery of this DECLARATION before the States of Holland, he addressed the following observations in a letter to a friend: "But I wish your magistrates diligently to enquire of these zealots, 'What

With respect to "the personal instruction and edification" which I might have hoped to derive from such a disclosure, it

'is it that Arminius is agitating and that ought not to be moved?' I will engage, that they really answer nothing: Or, if they do, it will be of such a description as will readily convince every one, that it is not anything *immoveable*, but rather something the foundations of which are *scarcely yet laid down*: Or it will be evident, that it has not been moved by me. They appear to me to give a plain proof of this, by agitating with such great vehemence what they call *the concerns of immoveable truth!* But truth, which is always its own patron, will easily confute falsehood,—especially when the former is defended by those who occupy the highest stations. It would be a work of difficulty, and not at all adviseable, for me to compose propositions on those points about which they regard me as an object of suspicion. Indeed, it would be altogether fruitless; because the very plain Theses which I wrote [*against the Roman Pontiff*,] were not able to exonerate me from the calumnious charge of *attempting to promote the interests of the Papal kingdom.* How can I know on what points I am suspected, when no one openly explains them? It is scarcely possible for me to guess what they are; and by the very attempt to divine them, I shall render myself suspected among men of prudence. I have *Thirty One Articles* which are charged to my account, and which I have answered in a written *Apology* that I have delivered to those who first shewed me a copy. But those individuals, although men of the greatest prudence and of high authority, will not, I am persuaded, advise me to publish this *Apology*, lest, when calumny has been confuted in too open a manner, it should bring down disgrace upon the heads of its authors.

"If I have any topics to be discussed, I am resolved to propose them to my brethren in a free Synod, whether National or Provincial, and in the presence of Statesmen, to whom a knowledge of them is of the greatest importance: I will not state them in naked propositions, but will add such momentous reasons as will, in my opinion, tend to their complete establishment.

"In the mean time, I will act as I have hitherto done; I will possess my soul in patience, and place my reliance on God, who will defend my good cause, and who is wont to afford present aid to those who are unjustly oppressed,—though the persons that in his place are appointed the assertors of justice in the world, may overlook or connive at such oppression. This patience of mine, I freely declare, is the only thing which has made those zealots so audacious. Yet I am persuaded, by some who do not hold the lowest situation among the rulers of these Provinces, to continue the exercise of this patience: If to these gentlemen it should appear adviseable, for me publicly to declare what I hold, and if the circumstances of my country would permit it, my enemies would be compelled to devote the labour, which they have till now expended in calumny, to the defence of certain shameful and enormous dogmas,—one of which I will here produce: 'The creation [of man] in an 'upright state of original righteousness is the way of reprobation, by which 'God determined from all eternity to devote the greatest part of men to eternal 'destruction without any consideration of sin.'—This is a dogma which is neither laid down in the scriptures, in any Council whether General or Particular, nor by any of the Fathers who flourished during the first Six Hundred years after Christ: Nay, it is a proposition abhorrent to the common consent of Protestant Divines, and is not contained in any Confession of the Reformed Churches. Behold here one of their immoveable things!"

This is a very important extract: It evinces the intense desire which Arminius felt for a National Synod, in which to disclose and defend his sentiments. But this desire was repressed by Grotius, Olden Barneveldt, and other principal men in the Commonwealth, who generally intimated, when pressed on this point, that *the proper time had not yet arrived.* It appears, that Olden Barneveldt, who was one of the most experienced Statesmen in Europe, imagined he could by policy keep both parties quiet; but in the

is necessary to consider,—that not only I but many others, and even they themselves, have peculiar views which they have

course of a few years he found himself to be wofully mistaken, and, when it had become too late, he was ready to grant the convention of a National Synod, which he had actually refused more than once to Arminius and his friends.

It likewise very ably developes the hopelessness of the Calvinistic cabal: They had no heterodox materials out of which to fabricate a case of heresy and bring it before the Synod,—although the man whom they wished to accuse was (as stated page 545,) daily teaching among them, and taking his allotted part in the divinity exercises of the University. This was most galling to his enemies, who were simple enough to state the circumstance to several foreign Divines as a serious ground of accusation against our author. One of these foreigners (Peter du Moulin) shewed himself so much alarmed, at Arminius not yielding to the importunity of every petty deputation that wished to sound him, as to advise the Protestant Churches of France not to send any pupils to finish their education under him at Leyden.—This remained many years as a kind of unanswerable Calvinistic complaint. Arminius alludes to it in several of his letters, but more particularly in one addressed to Borrius in 1605, in which he says: "I understand, my enemies complain, 'that I do not unfold to them my sentiments and the arguments on which they are founded;' and they add this pretence to their lamentation, 'that it is my intention to rise in the National Synod and make a sudden and unexpected attack upon them, to obtrude on them unknown opinions, and to confirm them by arguments on the confutation of which they will not have had leisure previously to meditate.'—They think, that the business of this assembly will be transacted in the same manner as that of others has formerly been; and are ignorant, that I rely on the goodness of my conscience and my cause, and am not afraid to encounter any discussion or examination, how early soever it may be instituted, or however rigidly conducted."—It was this contemplated attack from Arminius, which was another source of grievous apprehension. Yet he would not take any undue advantage of their panic: But on the contrary when they thought, that, as the principal men in the State were favourable to the doctrines of General Redemption, the approaching National Synod would be one of complete Arminian prepouderance,—he nobly declares that it would not in this respect resemble those Synods which had preceded it and in which the Calvinists had held political pre-eminence, and that those who made such an assertion "were ignorant, that on the goodness of his conscience and of his cause," (next to Divine aid,) he placed his chief reliance.

He had tried the effect of personal conferences with Helmichius, Hommius, Plancius, and others; and he relates the effects, page 532. When he proposed to the different deputies, to enter either separately or in a body as *private pastors* into conference with him, he ascertained, by their refusal, what he had formerly known, that it was any thing rather than *their own individual satisfaction* which they sought in such a conference. Their refusal amounted to an avowal of their design,—they wished to engage him in conversation on the points in dispute between them, that they might have an opportunity of giving their own version of the arguments and expressions which transpired during the interview. What complexion that version would have carried to the Synod, every one may conjecture who has any knowledge of the metamorphosing powers of Festus Hommius. Well may a follower of Christ, when placed in such circumstances of difficulty, pray to his Heavenly Father for the wisdom of the serpent, though already possessed of the harmlessness of the dove! (Matt. x, 16.)

The FIRST of the Three Fears, therefore, which are mentioned in the text, was not groundless; for the Calvinists invented every artifice to draw from his own lips matter for his personal accusation.—The SECOND of those

formed on religious topics; and, therefore, that such instruction cannot be applied to any useful purpose, except in some place or other where we may all hereafter appear together, and where a definitive sentence, as it is called, both may and must be pronounced.—With respect to "the opportune and befitting preparation which my brethren ought in the mean time to be making for a conference,"—I declare that *it will at that time be most seasonable and proper when all shall have produced their views, and disclosed them before a whole assembly*, that thus an account may be taken of them all at once, and they may be considered together.

Since none of these Objections have any existence in this august Assembly, I proceed to the Declaration of my Sentiments.

Having in this manner refuted all those objections which have been made against me, I will now endeavour to fulfil my promise, and to execute those commands which your Lordships have been pleased to lay upon me. I entertain a confident persuasion, that no prejudice will be created against me or my sentiments from this act, however imperfectly I may perform it, because it has its origin in that obedience which is due from me to this noble assembly,—next to God, and according to the Divine pleasure.

I. On Predestination.

The first and most important article in Religion on which I have to offer my views, and which for many years past has

Fears was also a just one; for though he had not then given any such public statement of his opinions as he does in this Declaration, yet his enemies had been some years occupied in inventing them for him, and occasionally confuting them in sermons from the pulpit, or in the scholastic exercises of the University. What then would they not have done, had they been provided with a greater portion of food for their malevolence?—The Third Fear was also very proper; for he had lately realized it in his own experience. Sibrandus Lubbertus had transmitted to the Foreign Universities and Churches a highly-coloured and untrue *ex-parte* statement of the famous Preparatory Convention, and had imputed motives to Arminius and his friends which they had not felt and arguments which they never used. Indeed, in the accredited transactions of that meeting, which were signed by all the members, it was expressly stated, that each party was prepared to tender, to their High Mightinesses, the reasons for their different opinions on the three points about which they disagreed, whenever they might be required. For a sight of those reasons Sibrandus did not tarry, but shewed the fertility of his genius in devising them for his injured Arminian brethren, and in adding a plentiful sprinkling of infamous slanders on doctrinal subjects, that had not once come under discussion on that occasion. See page 523.—Arminius therefore had the most unexceptionable reasons for determining, in the language of a preceding extract, "to propose his sentiments to his brethren only in a free Synod, and *in the presence of Statesmen;* and not to state them in naked propositions, but to add such momentous reasons as would tend to establish them."

engaged my attention, is the PREDESTINATION OF GOD, that is, the *Election* of men to *salvation*, and the *Reprobation* of them to *destruction*. Commencing with this Article, I will FIRST explain what is taught concerning it, both in discourses and writings, by certain persons in our Churches, and in the University of Leyden. I will AFTERWARDS declare my own views and thoughts on the same subject, while I shew my opinion on what they advance.

On this article there is no uniform and simple opinion among the Teachers of our Churches; but there is some variation in certain parts of it in which they differ from each other.

1. *The first opinion, which I reject, but which is espoused by those* [*Supralapsarians*] *who assume the very highest ground of this Predestination.*

The opinion of those who ascend to the greatest height on this point, as it is generally contained in their writings, is to this effect:

"I. God by an eternal and immutable decree has predestinated, from among men, (whom he did not consider as being then *created*, much less as being *fallen*,) certain individuals to everlasting life, and others to eternal destruction, without any regard whatever to righteousness or sin, to obedience or disobedience, but purely of his own good pleasure, to demonstrate the glory of his justice and mercy;—or, (as others assert,) to demonstrate his saving grace, wisdom and free uncontrollable power.

"II. In addition to this decree, God has pre-ordained cer ain determinate means which pertain to its execution,—and this by an eternal and immutable decree. These means necessarily follow by virtue of the preceding decree, and necessarily bring him who has been predestinated, to the end which has been fore-ordained for him.—Some of these means belong in common both to the decree of Election and that of Rejection, and others of them are specially restricted to the one decree or to the other.

"III. The means common to both the decrees, are three: *The First* is, The creation of man in the upright [or *erect*] state of original righteousness, or after the image and likeness of God in righteousness and true holiness.—*The Second* is, The permission of the fall of Adam, or the ordination of God that man should sin, and become corrupt or vitiated.—*The Third* is, The loss or the removal of original righteousness and of the image of God, and a being concluded under sin and condemnation.

"IV. For unless God had created some men, he would not have had any upon whom he might either bestow eternal life, or superinduce everlasting death.—Unless he had created them in righteousness and true holiness, he would himself have been the author of sin, and would by this means have possessed no right either to punish them to the praise of his justice, or to save them to the praise of his mercy.—Unless they had themselves sinned, and by the demerit of sin had rendered themselves guilty of death, there would have been no room for the demonstration either of justice or of mercy.

"V. The means pre-ordained for the execution of the decree of election, are also these three: *The First* is, The pre-ordination or the giving of Jesus Christ as a Mediator and a Saviour, who might by his merit deserve, [or purchase,] for all the elect and for them only, the lost righteousness and life, and might communicate them by his own power [or virtue]. —*The Second* is, the call [or vocation] to faith outwardly by the word, but inwardly by his Spirit, in the mind, affections and will; by an operation of such efficacy that the elect person of necessity yields assent and obedience to the vocation, in so much that it is not possible for him to do otherwise than believe and be obedient to this vocation. From hence arise justification and sanctification through the blood of Christ and his Spirit, and from them the existence of all good works: And all that, manifestly by means of the same force and necessity. —*The Third* is that which keeps and preserves the elect in faith, holiness, and a zeal for good works; or, it is the gift of perseverance,—the virtue of which is such, that believing and elect persons not only do not sin with a full and entire will, or do not fall away totally from faith and grace, but it likewise is neither possible for them to sin with a full and perfect will, nor to fall away totally or finally from faith and grace.

"VI. The two last of these means [vocation and perseverance,] belong only to the elect who are of adult age. But God employs a shorter way to salvation, by which he conducts those children of believers and saints who depart out of this life before they arrive at years of maturity; that is, provided they belong to the number of the elect, (who are known to God alone,)—for God bestows on them Christ as their Saviour and gives them to Christ, to save them by his blood and Holy Spirit, without actual faith and perseverance in it [faith]; and this he does according to the promise of the covenant of grace, *I will be a God unto you, and unto your seed after you.*

"VII. The means pertaining to the execution of the decree of reprobation to eternal death, are partly such as peculiarly belong to all those who are rejected and reprobate, whether they ever arrive at years of maturity or die before that period, —and they are partly such as are proper only to some of them. —The mean that is common to all the reprobate, is *desertion in sin*, by denying to them that saving grace which is sufficient and necessary to the salvation of any one. This negation [or denial] consists of two parts:—For, *in the First Place*, God is not willing that Christ should die for them [the reprobate] or become their Saviour,—and this neither in reference to *the antecedent will of God* (as some persons call it,) nor in reference to *his sufficient will*, or the value of the price of reconciliation; because this price was not offered for reprobates, either with respect to the decree of God, or its virtue and efficacy. (2) But the other part of this negation [or denial] is, that God is unwilling to communicate the Spirit of Christ to reprobates, yet without such communication they can neither be made partakers of Christ nor of his benefits.

"VIII. The mean which belongs properly only to some of the reprobates, is obduration [or the act of hardening], which befals those of them who have attained to years of maturity, either because they have very frequently and enormously sinned against the law of God, or because they have rejected the grace of the Gospel.—(1.) To the execution of *the first species* of induration [or hardening] belong the illumination of their conscience by means of knowledge, and its conviction of the righteousness of the law: For it is impossible that this law should not necessarily detain them in unrighteousness, to render them inexcusable.—(2.) For the execution of the *second species* of induration, God employs a call by the preaching of his gospel, which call is inefficacious and insufficient both in respect to the decree of God, and to its issue or event. This calling is either only *an external one*, which it is neither in their desire nor in their power to obey. Or it is likewise *an internal one*, by which some of them may be excited in their understandings to accept and believe the things which they hear; but yet it is only with such a faith as that with which the devils are endowed when *they believe and tremble!* Others of them are excited and conducted still further, so as to desire in a certain measure *to taste the Heavenly gift.* But the latter are, of all others, the most unhappy, because they are raised up on high, that they may be brought down with a heavier fall: And this fate it is

impossible for them to escape, for they must of necessity return to their vomit, and depart or fall away from the faith.

"IX. From this decree of Divine election and reprobation, and from this administration of the means which pertain to the execution of both of them, it follows, that the elect are necessarily saved, it being impossible for them to perish,—and that the reprobate are necessarily damned, it being impossible for them to be saved; and all this from the absolute purpose [or determination] of God, which is altogether antecedent to all things, and to all those causes which are either in things themselves or can possibly result from them."

These opinions concerning Predestination are considered, by some of those who advocate them, to be the foundation of Christianity, salvation, and of its certainty. On these sentiments, they suppose, 'is founded the sure and undoubted 'consolation of all believers, which is capable of rendering 'their consciences tranquil; and on them also depends the 'praise of the grace of God, so that if any contradiction be 'offered to this doctrine, God is necessarily deprived of the 'glory of his grace, and then the merit of salvation is attri-'buted to the free-will of man and to his own powers and 'strength,—which ascription savours of Pelagianism.'*

These then are the causes which are offered why the advocates of these sentiments labour with uncommon anxiety to retain the purity of such a doctrine in their Churches, and why they oppose themselves to all those innovations which are at variance with them.

2. My Sentiments on the preceding scheme of Predestination.

But, for my own part,—to speak my sentiments with freedom, and yet with a *salvo* in favour of a better judgment,—I am of opinion, that this doctrine of theirs contains many things that are both false and impertinent, and at an utter disagreement with each other; all the instances of which, the present time will not permit me to recount, but I will subject it to an examination only in those parts which are

* This is a very accurate description of the plan pursued, by the rigid Predestinarians, towards all those who cannot discover in the Word of God any traces of Calvin's invention of Irrespective Election and Reprobation. Such calumnious reproaches appear most preposterously applied to the Arminians, whose tenets, from their very origin, have always had a tendency to exalt *the grace of God* to its scriptural elevation; while the doctrines of Calvin and his imitators have seized on a solitary apostolic expression, (*O wretched man that I am!*) to beat down the legitimate aspirings of Divine Grace after a holy conformity to God, and to controvert and explain away the positive commands of God our Saviour concerning personal sanctity.

most prominent and extensive. I shall therefore propose to myself four principal heads, which are of the greatest importance in this doctrine; and when I have in the first place explained of what kind they are, I will afterwards declare more fully the judgment and sentiments which I have formed concerning them. They are the following:

"I. That God has absolutely and precisely decreed to save certain particular men by his mercy or grace, but to condemn others by his justice: And to do all this without having any regard in such decree to righteousness or sin, obedience or disobedience, which could possibly exist on the part of one class of men or of the other.

"II. That, for the execution of the preceding decree, God determined to create Adam, and all men in him, in an upright state of original righteousness; beside which, he also ordained them to commit sin, that they might thus become guilty of eternal condemnation and be deprived of original righteousness.

"III. That those persons whom God has thus positively willed to save, he has decreed not only to salvation but also to the means which pertain to it; (that is, to conduct and bring them to faith in Christ Jesus, and to perseverance in that faith;) and that he also in reality leads them to these results by a grace and power that are irresistible, so that it is not possible for them to do otherwise than believe, persevere in faith, and be saved.

"IV. That to those whom, by his absolute will, God has fore-ordained to perdition, he has also decreed to deny that grace which is necessary and sufficient for salvation, and does not in reality confer it upon them; so that they are neither placed in a possible condition nor in any capacity of believing or of being saved."

After a diligent contemplation and examination of these four heads, in the fear of the Lord, I make the following declaration respecting this doctrine of Predestination.

3. *I reject this Predestination for the following reasons.*

I. *Because it is not the foundation of* CHRISTIANITY, *of* SALVATION, *or of its* CERTAINTY.

1. *It is not the foundation of* CHRISTIANITY:—(1) For this Predestination is not that decree of God by which Christ is appointed by God to be the Saviour, the Head, and the Foundation of those who will be made heirs of salvation: Yet that decree is the only foundation of Christianity.—

(2) For the doctrine of this Predestination is not that doctrine by which, through faith, we as lively stones are built up into Christ, the only Corner-stone, and are inserted into him as the members of the body are joined to their head.

2. *It is not the foundation of* SALVATION:—(1) For this Predestination is not that decree of the good-pleasure of God in Christ Jesus on which alone our salvation rests and depends. —(2) The doctrine of this Predestination is not the foundation of salvation: For it is not "the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth:" because through it "the righteousness of God" is not "revealed from faith to faith."

3. *Nor is it the foundation of the* CERTAINTY *of salvation:* For that is dependent upon this decree,—"They who believe, shall be saved:" I believe, therefore I shall be saved. But the doctrine of this Predestination embraces within itself neither the first nor the second member of the syllogism.

This is likewise confessed by some persons in these words: "We do not wish to state, that the knowledge of this [predestination] is the foundation of Christianity or of salvation, or that it is necessary to salvation in the same manner as the doctrine of the Gospel," &c.

II. *This doctrine of Predestination comprises within it neither the whole nor any part of the Gospel.*—For,—according to the tenour of the discourses delivered by John and Christ, as they are described to us by the Evangelists, and according to the doctrine of the Apostles and Christ after his ascension,—the Gospel consists partly of an injunction *to repent and believe*, and partly of a promise to bestow *forgiveness of sins, the Spirit of grace, and life eternal.* But this Predestination belongs neither to the injunction to repent and believe, nor to the annexed promise. Nay, this doctrine does not even teach what kind of men in general God has predestinated, which is properly the doctrine of the Gospel; but it embraces within itself a certain mystery,* which is known only to God who is

* Is this one of *the mysteries* to which the shrewd Calvinist alluded, (page 522,) when he claimed for his system all the secret things contained in the gospel? Yet Calvin's scheme is strangely at variance with itself, in this as in many other particulars: For, however great the mystery mentioned in the text may appear to the uninitiated, it must be a *manifest* and *perceptible* truth to those who feel themselves irresistibly drawn or driven to embrace the peculiarities of Calvin's scheme, and to derive from it some portion of comfort and security. But not only have they this personal perception of it within themselves, but they seem to possess a kind of intuitive power of discerning it in others. It is on the latter principle, I suppose, that, in the very outset of Calvinism, the followers of that ungracious system deemed themselves justified in visiting with reproaches and abuse all those who had not boldly joined *the little Predestinarian flock*, and in looking upon their despised Arminian brethren as Papists and modern Pelagians!

the Predestinator, and in which mystery are comprehended *what particular persons* and *how many* he has decreed to save and to condemn. From these premises I draw a further conclusion,—that this doctrine of Predestination is not necessary to salvation, either as an object of knowledge, belief, hope, or performance. A confession to this effect has been made by a certain learned man * in the theses which he has proposed for discussion on this subject, in the following words:—
"Wherefore the Gospel cannot be simply termed *the book or* "*the revelation of predestination*, but only in a relative sense: "Because it doth not absolutely denote either the matter of "the number or the form; that is, it neither declares how "many persons in particular, nor (with a few exceptions,) "who they are, but only the description of them in general, "whom God has predestinated."

III. *This doctrine was never admitted, decreed, or approved in any* COUNCIL, *either General or Particular, for the first* 600 *years after Christ.*—1. Not in the General Council of Nice, in which sentence was given against Arius and in favour of the the Deity and Consubstantiality of the Son of God:—Not in the first Council of Constantinople, in which a decree was passed against Macedonius, respecting the Deity of the Holy Spirit:—Not in the Council of Ephesus, which determined against Nestorius, and in favour of the Unity of the Person of the Son of God:—Not in that of Chalcedon, which condemned Eutyches, and determined, "that in one and the same person of our Lord Jesus Christ there were two distinct natures, which differ from each other in their essence:"—Not in the second Council of Constantinople, in which, Peter Bishop of Antioch, and Anthymus Bishop of Constantinople, with certain other persons, were condemned for having asserted, "that the Father had likewise suffered," [as well as the Son,]: —Nor in the third Council of Constantinople, in which the Monothelites were condemned for having asserted, "that there was only one will and operation in Jesus Christ."

2. But this doctrine was not discussed or confirmed in Particular Councils,—such as that of Jerusalem, Orange, or even that of Mela in Africa, which was held against Pelagius and his errors, as is apparent from the articles of doctrine which were then decreed both against his person and his false opinions.

* This is Gomarus, whose Theses on Predestination the reader will have an opportunity to peruse in *the Examination* of them which was instituted by Arminius.

But so far was Augustine's doctrine of Predestination from being received in those Councils, that when Celestinus the Bishop of Rome, who was his co-temporary, wrote to the Bishops of France and condemned the doctrines of the Pelagians, he concluded his epistle in these words: "But as we "dare not despise, so neither do we deem it necessary to de-"fend, the more profound and difficult parts of the questions "which occur [in this controversy], and which have been "treated to a very great extent by those who opposed the "heretics: Because we believe, that whatever the writings "according to the fore-mentioned rules of the Apostolic See "have taught us, is amply sufficient for confessing the grace "of God, from whose work, credit, and authority not a tittle "must be subtracted or withdrawn," &c. In reference to the RULES which were laid down by Celestinus in that epistle, and which had been decreed in the three preceding Particular Councils,—we shall experience no difficulty in agreeing together about them, especially in regard to those matters which are necessary to the establishment of grace in opposition to Pelagius and his errors.

IV. *None of those Doctors or Divines of the Church who held correct and orthodox sentiments for the first Six Hundred years after the birth of Christ, ever brought this doctrine forward or gave it their approval.* Neither was it professed and approved by a single individual of those who shewed themselves the principal and keenest defenders of grace, against Pelagius: Of this description, it is evident, were St. Jerome, Augustine, the author of the treatise entitled, *De Vocatione Gentium*, ["The calling of the Gentiles,"] Prosper of Aquitaine, Hilary, Fulgentius, and Orosius. This is very apparent from their writings.

V. *It neither agrees nor corresponds with the* HARMONY *of those* CONFESSIONS *which were printed and published together in one Volume at Geneva, in the name of the Reformed and Protestant Churches.*—If that Harmony of Confessions be faithfully consulted, it will appear, that many of them do not speak in the same manner concerning Predestination; that some of them only incidentally mention it; and that they evidently never once touch upon those heads of the doctrine * which are now in great repute and particularly urged in the preceding scheme of Predestination, and which I have already

* See these heads in the preceding page 550.

adduced. Nor does any single Confession deliver this doctrine in the same manner as it has just now been propounded by me. [See page 550] The Confessions of Bohemia, England, and Wirtemburg, and the first Helvetian [Swiss] Confession, and that of the four cities of Strasburgh, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau, make no mention of this Predestination. Those of Basle and Saxony only take a very cursory notice of it in three words. The Augustan Confession speaks of it in such a manner as to induce the Genevan editors to think, that some annotation was necessary on their part, to give us a previous warning. The last of the Helvetian [Swiss] Confessions, to which a great portion of the Reformed Churches have expressed their assent and which they have subscribed, likewise speaks of it in such a strain as makes me very desirous to see what method can possibly be adopted to give it any accordance with that doctrine of Predestination which I have just now advanced. Yet this [Swiss] Confession is that which has obtained the approbation of the Churches of Geneva and Savoy.

VI. Without the least contention or cavilling, it may very properly be made a question of doubt, *Whether this doctrine agrees with the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism*; as I shall briefly demonstrate.

1. In the 14th Article of the Dutch Confession, these expressions occur: "Man knowingly and willingly subjected "himself to sin, and, consequently, to death and cursing, "while he lent an ear to the deceiving words and impostures "of the Devil," &c. From this sentence I conclude, *that man did not sin on account of any necessity through a preceding decree of Predestination:* which inference is diametrically opposed to that doctrine of Predestination against which I now contend.—Then, in the 16th Article, which treats of *the eternal election of God*, these words are contained: "God shewed "himself MERCIFUL, by delivering from damnation, and by "saving, those persons whom, in his eternal and immutable "counsel and according to his gratuitous goodness, he chose "in Christ Jesus our Lord, without any regard to their "works: And He shewed himself JUST, in leaving others in "that their fall and perdition into which they had precipitated "themselves." It is not obvious to me, how these words are consistent with this doctrine of Predestination.

2. In the 20th question of the Heidelberg Catechism, we read: "Salvation through Christ is not given [restored] to all

"them who had perished in Adam, but to those only who are "ingrafted into Christ by true faith and who embrace his "benefits:" From this sentence I infer, *that God has not absolutely predestinated any men to salvation; but that he has in his decree considered* [*or looked upon*] *them as believers:* This deduction is at open conflict with the first and third points of this Predestination. [See page 554.]—In the 54th question of the same Catechism, it is said: "I believe that, from the "beginning to the end of the world, the Son of God out of "the entire race of mankind doth by his word and Spirit "gather or collect unto himself a company chosen unto eternal "life and agreeing together in the true faith." In this sentence "election to eternal life," and "agreement in the faith," stand in mutual juxta-position; and in such a manner, that the latter is not rendered subordinate to the former,—which, according to these [Supralapsarian] sentiments on Predestination ought to have been done. In that case the words should have been placed in the following order: "The Son of God "calls and gathers to himself, by his word and Spirit, a com-"pany chosen to eternal life, *that they may believe and agree* "*together in the true faith.*"

Since such are the statements of our Confession and Catechism, no reason whatever exists, why those who embrace and defend these [Supralapsarian] sentiments on Predestination, should either violently endeavour to obtrude them on their colleagues and on the Church of Christ; or why they should take it amiss, and put the worst construction upon it, when any thing is taught in the Church or University that is not exactly accordant with their doctrine, or that is opposed to it.

VII. I affirm, that *this doctrine is repugnant to the* NATURE OF GOD, *but particularly to those* ATTRIBUTES *of his nature by which he performs and manages all things,—his wisdom, justice, and goodness.*

1. It is repugnant to his WISDOM in three ways. (1) Because it represents God as decreeing something for a particular end [or purpose] which neither is nor can be good: Which is, that God created something for eternal perdition to the praise of his justice.—(2) Because it states, that the object which God proposed to himself by this Predestination, was, to demonstrate the glory of his mercy and justice: But this glory he cannot demonstrate, except by an act that is contrary at once to his mercy and his justice,—of which description is that decree of God in which he determined that man should sin and

be rendered miserable.—(3) Because it changes and inverts the order of the two-fold wisdom of God, as it is displayed to us in the Scriptures. For it asserts, that God has absolutely predetermined to save men by the mercy and wisdom that are comprehended in the doctrine of the cross of Christ, without having foreseen this circumstance,—that it was impossible for man (and that, truly, through his own fault,) to be saved by the wisdom which was revealed in the law and which was infused into him at the period of his creation:—When the scripture asserts, on the contrary, that "it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe;" that is, "by the doctrine of the cross, after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God." (1 Cor. i, 21.)

2. It is repugnant to the JUSTICE of God, not only in reference to that attribute denoting in God a love of righteousness and a hatred of iniquity, but also in reference to its being a perpetual and constant desire in Him to render to every one that which is his due.—(1) It is at variance with the *first* of these ideas of justice in the following manner: Because it affirms, that God has absolutely willed to save certain individual men, and has decreed their salvation without having the least regard to righteousness or obedience: The proper inference from which, is, that God loves such men far more than his own justice [or righteousness.]—(2) It is opposed to the *second* idea of his justice: Because it affirms, that God wishes to subject his creature to misery, (which cannot possibly have any existence except as the punishment of sin,) although, at the same time, he does not look upon [or consider] the creature as a sinner, and therefore as not obnoxious either to wrath or to punishment. This is the manner in which it lays down the position,—that God has willed to give to the creature not only something which does not belong to it, but which is connected with its greatest injury: Which is another act directly opposed to his justice. In accordance, therefore, with this doctrine, God, in the first place, detracts from himself that which is his own, [or his right,] and then imparts to the creature what does not belong to it, to its great misery and unhappiness.

3. It is also repugnant to the GOODNESS of God. Goodness is an affection [or disposition] in God to communicate his own good so far as his justice considers and admits to be fitting and proper. But in this doctrine the following act is attributed to God,—that, of himself, and induced to it by nothing

external, he wills the greatest evil to his creatures; and that from all eternity he has pre-ordained that evil for them, or pre-determined to impart it to them, even before he resolved to bestow upon them any portion of good. For this doctrine states, that God willed to damn; and, that he might be able to do this, he willed to create;—although creation is the first egress [or going forth] of God's goodness towards his creatures.—How vastly different are such statements as these from that expansive goodness of God by which he confers benefits not only on the unworthy, but also on the evil, the unjust, and on those who are deserving of punishment,—which trait of Divine Beneficence in OUR FATHER WHO IS IN HEAVEN, we are commanded to imitate. (Matt. v, 45.)

VIII. *Such a doctrine of Predestination is contrary to the nature of man*, in regard to his having been created after the Divine image in the knowledge of God and in righteousness, —in regard to his having been created with freedom of will, —and in regard to his having been created with a disposition and aptitude for the enjoyment of life eternal. These three circumstances respecting him, may be deduced from the following brief expressions: "Do this, and live:" (Rom. x, 5.) "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." (Gen. ii, 17.) If man be deprived of any of these qualifications, such admonitions as these cannot possibly be effective in exciting him to obedience.

1. This doctrine is inconsistent with *the Divine Image*, which consists of the knowledge of God and holiness. For according to this knowledge and righteousness man was qualified and impowered, he was also laid under an obligation to know God, to love, worship, and serve him. But by the intervention, or rather by *the prevention*, of this Predestination, it was pre-ordained that man should be formed vicious and should commit sin,—that is, that he should neither know God, love, worship, nor serve him; and that he should not perform that which, by *this image of God*, he was well qualified and impowered to do, and which he was bound to perform. This is tantamount to such a declaration as the following, which any one might make: "God did undoubtedly create man after his own image, in "righteousness and true holiness; but, notwithstanding this, "he fore-ordained and decreed, that man should become "impure and unrighteous, that is, should be made conform-"able to the image of Satan."

2. This doctrine is inconsistent with *the freedom of the will*, in which and with which man was created by God. For it prevents the exercise of this liberty, by binding or determining the will absolutely to one object,—that is, to do this thing precisely, or to do that. God, therefore, according to this statement, may be blamed for the one or the other of these two things, (with which let no man charge his Maker!,)—either for creating man with freedom of will,—or for hindering him in the use of his own liberty after he had formed him a free agent. In the former of these two cases, God is chargeable with *a want of consideration*, in the latter with *mutability*, —and, in both, with being injurious to man as well as to himself.

3. This predestination is prejudicial to man in regard to *the inclination and capacity for the eternal fruition of salvation*, with which he was endowed at the period of his creation. For, since by this predestination it has been pre-determined, that the greater part of mankind shall not be made partakers of salvation, but shall fall into everlasting condemnation,—and since this predetermination took place even before the decree had passed for creating man,—such persons are deprived of something, for the desire of which they have been endowed by God with a natural inclination. This great privation they suffer, not in consequence of any preceding sin or demerit of their own, but simply and solely through this sort of predestination.

IX. *This Predestination is diametrically opposed to* THE ACT OF CREATION.

1. For creation is a communication of good according to the intrinsic property of its nature. But a creation of this description,—whose intent or design is, to make a way through itself by which the reprobation that had been previously determined may obtain its object,—is not a communication of good: For we ought to form our estimate and judgment of every good, from the mind and intention of Him who is the Donor, and from the end to which or on account of which it is bestowed. In the present instance, the intention of the Donor would have been, to condemn,—which is an act that could not possibly affect any one except a creature; and the end or event of creation would have been the eternal perdition of the creature. In that case creation would not have been a communication of any good, but a preparation for the greatest evil both according to the very intention of the Creator and the actual

issue of the matter; and according to the words of Christ, '*It had been good for that man, if he had never been born!*' (Matt. xxvi, 24.)

2. Reprobation is an act of hatred, and from hatred derives its origin. But creation does not proceed from hatred; it is not therefore a way or means, which belongs to the execution of the decree of reprobation.

3. Creation is a perfect act of God, by which he has manifested his wisdom, goodness, and omnipotence: It is not therefore subordinate to the end of any other preceding work or action of God. But it is rather to be viewed as that act of God, which necessarily precedes and is antecedent to all other acts that he can possibly either decree or undertake. Unless God had formed a previous conception of the work of creation, he could not have decreed actually to undertake any other act; and until he had executed the work of creation, he could by no means have completed any other operation.

4. All the actions of God which tend to the condemnation of his creatures, are *strange work* or foreign to him; because God consents to them, for some other cause that is quite extraneous. But creation is not an action that is foreign to God, but it is proper to Him: It is eminently an action most appropriate to Him, and to which he could be moved by no other external cause, because it is the very first of the Divine acts, and, till it was done, nothing could have any actual existence, except God himself; for every thing else that has a being, came into existence through this action.

5. If creation be the way and means through which God willed the execution of the decree of his reprobation, he was more inclined to will the act of reprobation than that of creation; and he consequently derived greater satisfaction from the act of condemning certain of his innocent creatures, than in the act of their creation.

6. Lastly. Creation cannot be a way or means of reprobation according to the absolute purpose of God: because, after the creation was completed, it was in the power of man still to have remained obedient to the Divine commands, and not to commit sin; to render this possible, while God had on one part bestowed on him sufficient strength and power, He had also on the other placed sufficient impediments;—a circumstance most diametrically opposed to a predestination of this description.

X. *This doctrine is at open hostility with* THE NATURE OF ETERNAL LIFE, and the titles by which it is signally distinguished in the Scriptures. For it is called "the inheritance of the sons of God;" (Tit. iii, 7.) but those alone are the sons of God, according to the doctrine of the Gospel, "who believe in the name of Jesus Christ." (John i, 12.) It is also called, "the reward of obedience," (Matt. v, 12.) and of "the labour of love;" (Heb. vi, 10.) "the recompence of those who fight the good fight and who run well,—a crown of righteousness;" &c. (Rev. ii, 10.—2 Tim. iv, 7, 8.) God therefore has not, from his own absolute decree, without any consideration or regard whatever to faith and obedience, appointed to any man, or determined to appoint to him, life eternal.

XI. *This Predestination is also opposed to* THE NATURE OF ETERNAL DEATH, *and to those appellations by which it is described in Scripture.* For it is called "the wages of sin; (Rom. vi, 23.) the punishment of everlasting destruction, which shall be recompenced to them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; (2 Thess. i, 8, 9.) the everlasting fire prepared for the Devil and his angels, (Matt. xxv, 41.) a fire which shall devour the enemies and adversaries of God." (Heb. x, 27.) God, therefore, has not, by any absolute decree without respect to sin and disobedience, prepared eternal death for any person.

XII. *This Predestination is inconsistent with* THE NATURE AND PROPERTIES OF SIN, *in two ways*:—(1.) Because sin is called "disobedience" and "rebellion," neither of which terms can possibly apply to any person who by a preceding Divine decree is placed under an unavoidable necessity of sinning. (2.) Because sin is the meritorious cause of damnation. But the meritorious cause which moves the Divine will to reprobate, is according to justice; and it induces God, who holds sin in abhorrence, to will reprobation. Sin, therefore, which is a cause, cannot be placed among the means, by which God executes the *decree* or *will* of reprobation.

XIII. *This Doctrine is likewise repugnant to* THE NATURE OF DIVINE GRACE, *and, as far as its powers permit, it effects its destruction.* Under whatever specious pretences it may be asserted, that "this kind of predestination is most admirably adapted and quite necessary for the establishment of grace," yet it destroys it in .ee ways:

1. Because grace is so attempered and commingled with the nature of man, as not to destroy within him the liberty of his

will, but to give it a right direction, to correct its depravity, and to allow man to possess his own proper motions: While, on the contrary, this Predestination introduces such a species of grace, as takes away free-will and hinders its exercise.

2. Because the representations of grace which the Scriptures contain, are such as describe it capable of "being resisted, (Acts, vii, 51.) and received in vain;" (2 Cor. vi, 1.) and that it is possible for man to avoid yielding his assent to it; and to refuse all co-operation with it: (Heb. xii, 15.—Matt. xxiii, 37. —Luke vii, 30.) While, on the contrary, this predestination affirms, that grace is a certain irresistible force and operation.

3. Because, according to the primary intention and chief design of God, grace conduces to the good of those persons to whom it is offered and by whom it is received: While, on the contrary, this doctrine drags along with it the assertion, that grace is offered even to certain reprobates, and is so far communicated to them as to illuminate their understandings and to excite within them a taste for the heavenly gifts,—only for this end and purpose, that, in proportion to the height to which they are elevated, the abyss into which they are precipitated may be the deeper, and their fall the heavier; and that they may both merit and receive the greater perdition.

XIV. *The Doctrine of this Predestination is* INJURIOUS TO THE GLORY OF GOD, which does not consist of a declaration of liberty or authority, nor of a demonstration of anger and power,—except to such an extent as that declaration and demonstration may be consistent with justice, and with a perpetual reservation in behalf of the honour of God's goodness. But according to this doctrine it follows, that GOD IS THE AUTHOR OF SIN, which may be proved by four arguments:

1. One of its positions is, that God has absolutely decreed to demonstrate his glory by punitive justice and mercy, in the salvation of some men and in the damnation of others: which neither was done, nor could have possibly been done, unless sin had entered into the world.

2. This doctrine affirms, that, in order to obtain his object, God ordained that man should commit sin, and be rendered vitiated; and, from this Divine ordination or appointment, the fall of man necessarily followed.

3. It asserts that God has denied to man, or has withdrawn from him, such a portion of grace as is sufficient and necessary to enable him to avoid sin; and that this was done before man had sinned: Which is an act that amounts to the same as if

God had prescribed a law to man, which it would be utterly impossible for him to fulfil, when the nature in which he had been created was taken into consideration.

4. It ascribes to God certain operations with regard to man, both external and internal, both mediate (by means of the intervention of other creatures) and immediate,—which divine operations being once admitted, man ought necessarily to commit sin, by that necessity which the scholmen call "a consequential necessity antecedent to the thing itself," and which totally destroys the freedom of the will. Such an act does this doctrine attribute to God, and represents it to proceed from his primary and chief intention, without any foreknowledge of an inclination, will, or action on the part of man.

From these premises we deduce, as a further conclusion, that *God really sins.* Because, (according to this doctrine,) he moves to sin by an act that is unavoidable, and according to his own purpose and primary intention, without having received any previous inducement to such an act from any preceding sin or demerit in man.

From the same position we might also infer, that *God is the only sinner.* For man, who is impelled by an irresistible force to commit sin, (that is, to perpetrate some deed that has been prohibited,) cannot be said to sin himself.

As a legitimate consequence it also follows, *that sin is not sin,* since whatever that be which God does, it neither can be sin, nor ought any of his acts to receive that appellation.

Beside the instances which I have already recounted, there is another method by which this doctrine inflicts a deep wound on the honour of God,—but these, it is probable, will be considered at present to be amply sufficient.

XV. *This doctrine is highly* DISHONOURABLE TO JESUS CHRIST *our Saviour.* For, (1.) it entirely excludes him from that decree of predestination which predestinates the end: and it affirms, that men were predestinated to be saved, before Christ was predestinated to save them; and thus it argues, that *he is not the foundation of election.*† (2.) It denies, that Christ is the meritorious cause, that again obtained for us the salvation which we had lost, by placing him as *only a subordinate cause* of that salvation which had been already foreordained, and thus only a minister and instrument to apply that salvation unto us. This indeed is in evident congruity

† See page 449.

with the opinion which states, 'that God has absolutely willed 'the salvation of certain men, by the first and supreme decree 'which he passed, and on which all his other decrees depend 'and are consequent:' If this be true, it was therefore impossible for the salvation of such men to have been lost, and therefore unnecessary for it to be repaired and in some sort regained afresh, and discovered, by the merit of Christ, who was fore-ordained a Saviour for them alone.

XVI. *This doctrine is also* HURTFUL TO THE SALVATION OF MEN.

1. Because it prevents that saving and godly sorrow for sins that have been committed, which cannot exist in those who have no consciousness of sin. But it is obvious, that the man who has committed sin through the unavoidable necessity of the decree of God, cannot possibly have this kind of consciousness of sin. (2 Cor. vii, 10.)

2. Because it removes all pious solicitude about being converted from sin unto God. For he can feel no such concern who is entirely passive and conducts himself like a dead man, with respect not only to his discernment and perception of the grace of God that is exciting and assisting, but also to his assent and obedience to it; and who is converted by such an irresistible impulse, that he not only cannot avoid being sensible of the grace of God which knocks within him, but he must likewise of necessity yield his assent to it, and thus convert himself, or rather, be converted. Such a person, it is evident, cannot produce within his heart or conceive in his mind this solicitude, except he have previously felt the same irresistible motion. And if he should produce within his heart any such concern, it would be in vain and without the least advantage: For that cannot be a true solicitude, which is not produced in the heart by any other means except by an irresistible force according to the absolute purpose and intention of God to effect his salvation. (Rev. ii, 3; iii, 2.)

3. Because it restrains, in persons that are converted, all zeal and studious regard for good works, since it declares 'that 'the regenerate cannot perform either more or less good than 'they do:' For he that is actuated or impelled by saving grace, must work, and cannot discontinue his labour; but he that is not actuated by the same grace, can do nothing, and finds it necessary to cease from all attempts. (Tit. iii, 14.)

4. Because it extinguishes the zeal for prayer, which yet is an efficacious means instituted by God for asking and obtain-

ing all kinds of blessings from him, but principally the great one of salvation. (Luke xi, 1—13.) But from the circumstance of it having been before determined by an immutable and inevitable decree, that this description of men [the elect] should obtain salvation, prayer cannot on any account be a means for asking and obtaining that salvation. It can only be a mode of worshipping God; because according to the absolute decree of his predestination he has determined that such men shall be saved.

5. It takes away all that most salutary *fear and trembling with which we are commanded to work out our own salvation.* (Phil. ii, 12.) For it states, 'that he who is elected and 'believes, cannot sin with that full and entire willingness with 'which sin is committed by the ungodly; and that they cannot 'either totally or finally fall away from faith or grace.'

6. Because it produces within men a despair both of performing that which their duty requires and of obtaining that towards which their desires are directed. For when they are taught, that the grace of God (which is really necessary to the performance of the least portion of good,) is denied to the majority of mankind, according to an absolute and peremptory decree of God,—and that such grace is denied because, by a preceding decree equally absolute, God has determined not to confer salvation on them but damnation;—when they are thus taught, it is scarcely possible for any other result to ensue, than that the individual who cannot even with great difficulty work a persuasion within himself of his being elected, should soon consider himself included in the number of the reprobate. From such an apprehension as this, must arise a certain despair of performing righteousness and obtaining salvation.

XVII. *This doctrine* INVERTS THE ORDER OF THE GOSPEL *of Jesus Christ.*—For in the gospel God requires repentance and faith on the part of man, by promising to him life everlasting, if he consent to become a convert and a believer. (Mark i, 15; xvi, 16.) But it is stated in this [Supralapsarian] decree of Predestination, that it is God's absolute will, to bestow salvation on certain particular men, and that He willed at the same time absolutely to give those very individuals repentance and faith, by means of an irresistible force, because it was his will and pleasure to save them.—In the gospel, God denounces eternal death on the impenitent and unbelieving: (John iii, 36.) and those threats contribute to the purpose which he has in view,—that he may by such means deter them.

from unbelief and thus may save them. But by this decree of Predestination it is taught, that God wills not to confer on certain individual men that grace which is necessary for conversion and faith, because he has absolutely decreed their condemnation. —The gospel says, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that WHOSOEVER believeth in him should have everlasting life." (John iii, 10.) But this doctrine declares: "that God so loved those whom he had absolutely "elected to eternal life, as to give his Son to them alone, and "by an irresistible force to produce within them faith on him."— To embrace the whole in few words, the gospel says, "Fulfil "the command, and thou shalt obtain the promise; believe, "and thou shalt live." But this [Supralapsarian] doctrine says, "Since it is my will to give thee life, it is therefore my will "to give thee faith:" which is a real and most manifest inversion of the gospel.

XVIII. *This Predestination is in open hostility to* THE MINISTRY OF THE GOSPEL.

1. For if God by an irresistible power quicken him who is dead in trespasses and sins, no man can be a minister and "a labourer together with God," (1 Cor. iii, 9,) nor can the word preached by man be the instrument of grace and of the Spirit, —any more than a creature could have been an instrument of grace in the first creation* or a dispenser of that grace in the resurrection of the body from the dead.

2. Because by this Predestination the ministry of the gospel is made "the savour of death unto death" in the case of the majority of those who hear it, (2 Cor. ii, 14—16,) as well as an instrument of condemnation, according to the primary design and absolute intention of God, without any consideration of previous rebellion.

3. Because, according to this doctrine, Baptism, when administered to many reprobate children, (who yet are the offspring of parents that believe and are God's covenant-people,) is evidently a seal [or ratification] of nothing, and thus becomes entirely useless, in accordance with the primary and absolute intention of God, without any fault [or culpability] on the part of the infants themselves, to whom it is administered in obedience to the divine command.

4. Because it hinders public prayers from being offered to God in a becoming and suitable manner, that is, with faith,

* The act of creation, according to our author, was the first egress of God's goodness, or grace, towards his creatures.—Page 561.

and in confidence that they will be profitable to all the hearers of the word; when there are many among them, whom God is not only unwilling to save, but whom by his absolute, eternal, and immutable will, (which is antecedent to all things and causes whatever,) it is his will and pleasure to damn: In the mean time, when the Apostle commands PRAYERS and SUPPLICATIONS to be made FOR ALL MEN, he adds this reason, "for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; who will have ALL MEN to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." (1 Tim. ii, 1—4.)

5. The constitution of this doctrine is such, as very easily to render pastors and teachers slothful and negligent in the exercise of their ministry: Because, from this doctrine it appears to them as though it were impossible for all their diligence to be useful to any persons, except to those only whom God absolutely and precisely wills to save, and who cannot possibly perish; and as though all their negligence could be hurtful to none, except to those alone whom God abtolutely wills to destroy, who must of necessity perish, and to whom a contrary fate is impossible.

XIX. *This doctrine completely subverts* THE FOUNDATION OF RELIGION IN GENERAL, *and of the Christian Religion in particular.*

1. The foundation of RELIGION considered IN GENERAL, is *a two-fold love of God;* without which there neither is nor can be any Religion: *The First* of them is a love for righteousness [or justice] which gives existence to his hatred of sin: *The Second* is a love for the creature who is endowed with reason, and (in the matter now before us,) it is a love for man, according to the expression of the Apostle to the Hebrews: "For he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that HE IS A REWARDER of them that diligently seek him." (xi, 6.) GOD'S LOVE OF RIGHTEOUSNESS is manifested by this circumstance,—that it is not his will and pleasure to bestow eternal life on any except on "those who seek HIM." GOD'S LOVE OF MAN consists in his being willing to give him eternal life, if he seek HIM.

A mutual relation subsists between these two kinds of love, which is this: The latter species of love, which extends itself to the creatures, cannot come into exercise, except so far as it is permitted by the former, [the love of righteousness]: The former love, therefore, is by far the most excellent species; but in every direction there is abundant scope for the eman-

ations of the latter, [the love of the creature,]—except where the former [the love of righteousness] has placed some impediment in the range of its exercise.—The first of these consequences is most evidently proved from the circumstance of God's condemning man on account of sin, although he loves him in the relation in which he stands as his creature; which would by no means have been done, had HE loved man more than righteousness, [or justice,] and had he evinced a stronger aversion to the eternal misery of man than to his disobedience. —But the second consequence is proved by this argument, that God condemns no person, except on account of sin; and that he saves such a multitude of men who turn themselves away [or are converted] from sin;—which he could not do, unless it was his will to allow as abundant scope to *his love for the creatures*, as is permitted by *righteousness* [or justice] under the regulation of the Divine judgment.

But this [Supralapsarian] doctrine inverts this order and mutual relation in two ways: (1) The one is when it states, that God wills absolutely to save certain particular men, without having had in that his intention the least reference or regard to their obedience. This is the manner in which it places *the love of God to man* before his *love of righteousness*, and lays down the position,—that God loves men (as such) more than righteousness, and evinces a stronger aversion to their misery than to their sin and disobedience.—(2) The other is when it asserts, on the contrary, that God wills absolutely to damn certain particular men without manifesting in his decree any consideration of their disobedience. In this manner it detracts from *his love to the creature* that which belongs to it; while it teaches, that God hates the creature, without any cause or necessity derived from *his love of righteousness* and his hatred of iniquity: In which case, it is not true, " that sin is the primary object of God's hatred, and its only meritorious cause."

The great influence and potency which this consideration possesses in subverting the foundation of religion, may be appropriately described by the following simile:—Suppose a son to say, " My father is such a great lover of righteousness " and equity, that, notwithstanding I am his beloved son, he " would disinherit me if I were found disobedient to him: " Obedience, therefore, is a duty which I must sedulously " cultivate, and which is highly incumbent upon me, if I wish " to be his heir."—Suppose another son to say: " My father's

"love for me is so great, that he is absolutely resolved to "make me his heir: There is therefore no necessity for my "earnestly striving to yield him obedience; for, according to "his unchangeable will, I shall become his heir. Nay, he will "by an irresistible force draw me to obey him, rather than "not suffer me to be made his heir." But such reasoning as the latter is diametrically opposed to the doctrine contained in the following words of John the Baptist: "And think not to say within yourselves, WE HAVE ABRAHAM TO OUR FATHER: For I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." (Matt. iii, 9.)

2. But the CHRISTIAN RELIGION also has its superstructure built upon this two-fold love as a foundation. This love, however, is to be considered in a manner somewhat different, in consequence of the change in the condition of man, who, when he had been created after the image of God and in his favour, became by his own fault a sinner and an enemy to God. (1) GOD'S *love of righteousness* [or justice] on which the Christian Religion rests, is, *First*, that righteousness which he declared only once, which was in Christ; because it was his will that sin should not be expiated in any other way than *by the blood and death of his Son*, and that Christ should not be admitted before him as an Advocate, Deprecator, and Intercessor, *except when sprinkled by his own blood*.—But this love of righteouness is, *Secondly*, that which he daily manifests in the preaching of the gospel, in which he declares it to be his will to grant a communication of Christ and his benefits to no man, except to him who becomes converted and believes in Christ.—(2) GOD'S *love of miserable sinners*, on which likewise the Christian Religion is founded, is, *First*, that love by which He gave his Son for them, and constituted him a Saviour of those who obey Him.—But this love of sinners is, *Secondly*, that by which he hath required obedience, not according to the rigour and severity to which he was entitled by his own supreme right, but according to his grace and clemency, and with the addition of a promise of the remission of sins, provided fallen man repent.

The [Supralapsarian] doctrine of Predestination is, in two ways, opposed to this *two-fold foundation*: FIRST, By stating, 'that God has such a great love for certain sinners, that it 'was his will absolutely to save them before he had given 'satisfaction, through Christ Jesus, to his love of righteous-'ness, [or justice,] and that he thus willed their salvation even

'in his own fore-knowledge and according to his determinate 'purpose.' Besides, it totally and most completely overturns this foundation, by teaching it to be 'God's pleasure, 'that satisfaction should be paid to his justice, [or righteous-'ness,] because he willed absolutely to save such persons:' Which is nothing less, than to make *his love for justice*, manifested in Christ, subordinate to *his love for sinful man* whom it is his will absolutely to save.—SECONDLY, It opposes itself to this foundation, by teaching, 'that it is the will of 'God absolutely to damn certain sinners without any consider-'ation of their impenitency;'—when at the same time a most plenary and complete satisfaction had been rendered, in Christ Jesus, to God's *love of righteousness* [or justice] and to his hatred of sin: So that nothing now can hinder the possibility of his extending mercy to the sinner, whosoever he may be, except the condition of repentance: Unless some person should choose to assert, what is stated in this doctrine, 'that it has 'been God's will to act towards the greater part of mankind 'with the same severity as he exercised towards the devil and 'his angels, or even with greater,—since it was his pleasure 'that neither Christ nor his gospel should be productive of 'greater blessings to them than to the devils,—and since, 'according to the first offence, the door of grace is as much 'closed against them as it is against the evil angels.' Yet each of those angels sinned, by himself in his own proper person, through his individual maliciousness, and by his voluntary act; while men sinned, only in Adam their parent, before they had been brought into existence.

But, that we may more clearly understand the fact of *this two-fold love* being the foundation of all religion and the manner in which it is so, with the mutual correspondence that subsists between each other, as we have already described them,—it will be profitable for us to contemplate with greater attention the following words of the Apostle to the Hebrews: "He that cometh to God, must believe that HE is, and that HE is a rewarder of them that diligently seek HIM."—In these words two things are laid down as foundations to Religion, in opposition to two fiery darts of Satan, which are the most pernicious pests to it, and each of which is able by itself to overturn and extirpate all religion: One of them is Security, the other Despair.—SECURITY operates, when a man persuades himself, that, how inattentive soever he may be to the worship of God, he will not be damned, but will obtain salvation.—

DESPAIR is in operation, when a person entertains a persuasion, that, whatever degree of reverence he may evince towards God, he will not receive any remuneration. In what human mind soever either of these pests is fostered, it is impossible that any true and proper worship of God can there reside.—Now both of them are overturned by the words of the Apostle: For if a man firmly believes, "that God will bestow eternal "life on those alone who seek him, but that He will inflict on "the rest death eternal," he can on no account indulge himself in SECURITY. And if he likewise believes, that "God is "truly a rewarder of those who diligently seek Him," by applying himself to the search he will not be in danger of falling into DESPAIR.—The foundation of the former kind of faith by which a man firmly believes, "that God will bestow eternal life on none except on those who seek Him," is that love which God bears to his own righteousness, [or justice,] and which is greater than that which He entertains for man: And, by this alone, all cause of security is removed.—But the foundation of the latter kind of faith,—"that God will undoubtedly be a rewarder of those who diligently seek Him," —is that great love for man which neither will nor can prevent God from effecting salvation for him, except HE be hindered by his still greater love for righteousness or justice. Yet the latter kind of love is so far from operating as a hindrance to God from becoming a rewarder of those who diligently seek HIM, that, on the contrary, it promotes in every possible way the bestowment of that reward. Those persons, therefore, who seek God, can by no means indulge in a single doubt concerning his readiness to remunerate: And it is this which acts as a preservative against DESPAIR or distrust.—Since this is the actual state of the case, this two-fold love, and the mutual relation which each part of it bears to the other and which we have just unfolded, are the foundations of religion, without which no religion can possibly exist. That doctrine, therefore, which is in open hostility to this mutual love and to the relation that mutually subsists between them, is, at the same time, subversive of the foundation of all religion. *

* It is at this point that the author of the *Historical Preface* to the ACTS of the Synod of Dort, gives the following account of this Declaration: "When Arminius perceived, that the Churches thus pressed him to a declaration of his sentiments, he shewed to their Lordships the States, in one of their usual sessions, what were his views concerning Divine Predestination, the Grace of God and the Free Will of man, the Perseverance of Saints, the Certainty of Salvation, the Perfection of man in this life, the Deity of the Son of God,

XX. LASTLY. *This doctrine of Predestination* HAS BEEN REJECTED *both in former times and in our own days*, BY THE GREATER PART OF THE PROFESSORS OF CHRISTIANITY.

the Justification of Man before God, and concerning other Articles of doctrine. On the same occasion he endeavoured to persuade the Illustrious States, that a doctrine was delivered in these Reformed Churches concerning Divine Predestination, which was at variance with the nature of God,—his wisdom, justice, and goodness, with the nature of man and the freedom of his will, with the work of creation, the nature of life and death eternal and of sin; and which took away Divine Grace, was inimical to the glory of God and injurious to the salvation of men,—which made God the author of sin, hindered contrition for sin, removed all pious solicitude, diminished the desire of performing good works, extinguished the ardour for prayer, took away *the fear with which we ought to work out our salvation*, produced despair, inverted the gospel, obstructed the ministry of the word, and, lastly, not only overturned the foundation of the Christian Religion but of all religion whatever."

The Rev. Thomas Scott in his recent publication, (page 510,) sagely observes on this passage: 'It is probable, that in all the volumes which ever since that 'time have been written by Arminians, or Anti-Calvinists, in *Refutation of* '*Calvinism*, there is no objection of any plausibility urged against the doc-'trines designated by that term, which is not here briefly and fairly and em-'phatically stated, (as used by Arminius, before the States of Holland,) in 'this History written with the express purpose of sanctioning the decisions of 'the Synod of Dort. Perhaps, no where else can so compendious a list of 'these objections be found. The compilers [of *the Historical Preface*,] evi-'dently did not consider them as unanswerable or very formidable: Nor were 'they afraid of having the whole cause fairly tried and determined according 'to the WORD OF GOD.'—He then quotes the words of the Apostle, '*Who art thou that repliest against God?*;' which are generally thundered forth by Calvinists *in terrorem* to all those who presume to question *the horrid and unscriptural decree* of Reprobation which they have artfully invented, and which they audaciously attempt to ascribe to the GOD of *Justice* and *Mercy*;—one of these attributes being as much impugned as the other, if men be predestinated from all eternity to everlasting punishment *without any regard being had to their sins or unbelief!*

Now if this *compendious* mode of answering an adversary were always practised, the strange work of controversy would be reduced to an admirable system of despatch, which would soon obtain patrons. The powerful arguments which Arminius has here, with great force and elegance, diffused through SEVENTY CLOSELY-PRINTED Octavo PAGES, are by means of this "brief and emphatic" device, answered in TEN LINES, according to the complaisant computation of some people! What a pity that this ingenious contrivance had not been discovered when the present Bishop of Winchester (formerly of Lincoln) wrote his *Refutation of Calvinism*,—a term which seems to disturb Mr. Scott's quiet as much as the echo of a troublesome ghost,—the verbose and ponderous *Remarks* on that publication might then have been spared, or their essence might at least have been compressed into two duodecimo pages!

But while Mr. Scott talks about the reasons of Arminius "not being considered as *unanswerable* or very *formidable*," he has forgotten to inform his readers, that in this "compendious list of objections," the compilers have astutely kept out of sight the arguments which Arminius adduces for demonstrating, that the doctrine of Supralapsarian Predestination "was not comprised in the gospel,-was "never admitted or approved by any General or Particular Council, or by any "orthodox divine for the first 600 years after Christ,—was not in accordance "with *the Harmony of Confessions*, published in one volume at Geneva in "the name of the Reformed and Protestant Churches,—and, that it was con-"tradictory to the Dutch Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism." These

1. But, omitting all mention of the periods that occurred in former ages, facts themselves declare, that the Lutheran and

are five of the primary objections, which Arminius urges against Calvinistic Predestination, at great length and with great effect, and which he corroborates by appropriate quotations and references. But though these five are the most important with regard to the doctrine of the Dutch Churches, they are *very conveniently* omitted in the *Historical Preface*, because the mere enumeration of them might have endangered the favourite object of the crafty "Compilers," which was obviously *to adulterate existing documents and mystify preceding facts, that they might* MISLEAD FOREIGN CHURCHES. They commence their "list" therefore at the *seventh*, instead of the *first* of our author's objections against the single doctrine of Predestination: How then could Mr. Scott, or any man who has examined the subject, venture to say, that they were not only "briefly" but "FAIRLY stated" by those early followers of Calvin?

One of Mr. Scott's conclusions, is, "The compilers evidently did not consider them as *unanswerable* or very *formidable*:" Yet Mr. S. would himself be amused, if not edified, were I to present him with an extract from the jejune reply of Gomarus. Such a *formidable* aspect did these positions of Arminius wear, that the ablest Divines of the Synod of Dort never once adverted to them, in the course of their profound and multifarious reasonings. The inference from this fact must be, Either that they accounted his objections absolutely *unanswerable*, Or that they esteemed his successors to be men of greater talents, and the conquest over them to be consequently far more glorious than that which they could obtain over our author: Which of these inferences is the most correct, that reader will quickly determine who has perused this DECLARATION, and the honourable testimonies quoted in the preceding Appendix X. It is most amazing indeed, that in a Synod which was specially convened to suppress Arminianism, such very slight mention should be made of our author and the heresies of which he had been previously accused. The Theses of Episcopius, Grevinchovius against Ames, Arnoldson against Tilenus, the Answer of the Remonstrants to the Letter of the Walcheren Class, and their own (H. Brandt's) unjust version of the Hague Conference, furnish nearly all the materials for animadversion which engaged the critical attention of the Synodical divines. Those reverend gentlemen found it a much easier occupation to combat a few of the unguarded expressions which they found in the writings of the Disciples, than to grapple with the well-digested meditations and scriptural positions of the Master.

The highly disingenuous and inferential character of the ostentatious remarks of the Synodists on the productions of Arminius, prove him to have been in their eyes a "*very formidable*" adversary. Beside the two instances quoted page 461, I give the following extract as another proof of their unjust and forced method of implication. It occurs in the judgment of the Divines of the Palatinate, on *the Second Article* of the Remonstrants; and when it is stated that those divines were Schultetus, Tossanus and Altingius, (the two latter celebrated for their skill in Oriental learning,) it only furnishes an additional instance of the unwarranted lengths to which the passions even of respectable men will sometimes carry them, and shews how frequently reason is obscured by interest or affection. To prove, that the ransom paid by Jesus Christ to Divine Justice, "was not both *sufficient* and *efficacious* to expiate original sin and to bring the whole human race into the covenant of mercy," (a figment consisting in a great measure of their own inventions,) they mention, among other arguments, that "those two standard-bearers among "the Remonstrants, Arminius and Vorstius, promise some alleviation, "through the redemption or satisfaction of Christ, *to men who are damned in* "*the everlasting flames of hell*; which produces this effect—that God does not "impose [or *inflict*] damnation according to a strict rule, but according to a

Anabaptist churches, as well as that of Rome, account this to be an erroneous doctrine.

" strict rule, but according to one that is attempered with a certain degree of " clemency: To them, therefore, [*to men in the everlasting flames of Hell,*] " a certain small portion of that universal efficacy is allotted."

What authority did those learned men adduce for such an assertion? They refer the inquisitive reader to the 13th of the Public Disputations of Arminius, Thesis 5th,—most probably after calculating, that not one in five hundred, of those who perused their lucubrations, would give himself the trouble to verify quotations from two reputed heretics; but that they would receive, *as authentic information*, whatever was asserted by such *Calvinistically orthodox men* as the Divines of Heidelberg. The whole Thesis of Arminius is thus expressed: " They [the Law and the Gospel,] differ moreover *in the mode of* " *their remuneration.* For, *the reward was bestowed, of debt, to him that* " *worketh*, according to the law, (Rom. iv, 4.) and punishment was inflicted " on the transgressor according to the severity of strict justice. *But to him* " *that believeth, the reward is reckoned of grace;* while, to him that believeth " not, condemnation is due, according to THE JUSTICE WHICH IN CHRIST " JESUS IS ATTEMPERED WITH CLEMENCY. (John iii, 19; ix, 41; Gen. ii, 17.) " They differ *in the special consideration of their subjects.* For the law was " imposed on man while in a state of innocence, and at that time standing in " the favour of God: But the gospel was given to man as a sinner who had " to be brought back to the favour of God,—because it is the word of reconcili- " ation. (2 Cor. v, 19.)—They differ *in the peculiar reference of their ends.* For " by the Law are illustrated the wisdom, goodness and strict justice of God " But by the Gospel is afforded a far more illustrious proof of the wisdom of " God, of his goodness joined with gracious mercy, (1 Cor. i, 20—24; Eph. i, " 8.) and of his JUSTICE ATTEMPERED IN CHRIST JESUS. (Rom. iii, 24—26.)"

How could these holy sentiments have been expressed in terms more scriptural and judicious? The first reference which our author makes to this *attempered justice* of God, is in the sanction appended to the command which was delivered in Paradise, *In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.* Had not the blood of that *Lamb which was slain from the foundation of the world* been efficacious in attempering justice with clemency, the first offence of the first man would undoubtedly have been instantly visited with temporal death. Though Adam was immediately stricken with spiritual death and fell from the favour of God, yet, through the clemency of *Christ, the Second Adam*, his animal existence was prolonged, to afford him an opportunity, by penitence and the other appointed recuperative means of his dispensation, to regain the approbation of his Maker, which he had previously forfeited.—The second reference of Arminius is to this passage: *Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness* [or JUSTICE] *for the remission of sins that are past,* THROUGH THE FORBEARANCE OF GOD; *that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.* Unless this *forbearance of God*, through the redemption in Christ Jesus, were in constant and gracious operation, no man that ever lived would have had an opportunity of *being justified, by believing in Jesus.* For, except the justice of God had been attempered with clemency, the sentence against every transgression would now be, as it was in former days, *The soul that sinneth shall* [instantly] *die!* In this view of the subject, therefore, we are most appropriately exhorted by St. Peter, to "account that the LONG-SUFFERING of our Lord is salvation."

No one who reads the Thesis can for one moment mistake the meaning of Arminius; and the charge contained in the quotation from the Heidelberg divines, formed no part of the heresies alleged against him by his contemporaries. With as much propriety may such a charge be applied to the reasoning contained in page 572, in which our author thus describes *God's love of sinners:*

2. However highly LUTHER and MELANCTHON might at the very commencement of the Reformation have approved of this doctrine, they afterwards deserted it. This change in Melancthon is quite apparent from his latter writings: And those who style themselves "Luther's disciples," make the same statement respecting their master, while they contend that on this subject he made a more distinct and copious declaration of his sentiments, instead of entirely abandoning those which he formerly entertained.—But Philip Melancthon believed that this doctrine did not differ greatly from the Fate of the Stoics: This appears from many of his writings, but more particularly in a certain letter which he addressed to Gasper Peucer, and in which, among other things, he states: "Lælius writes to me and says, that the controversy respecting "the STOICAL FATE is agitated with such uncommon fervour "at Geneva, that one individual is cast into prison because "he happened to differ from Zeno. O unhappy times!, when "the doctrine of salvation is thus obscured by certain strange "disputes!"

3. All the Danish Churches embrace a doctrine quite opposed to this, as is obvious from the writings of NICHOLAS HEMMINGIUS in his Treatise ON UNIVERSAL GRACE, in which he declares, that the contest between him and his adversaries consisted in the determination of these two points: "Do the

"It is that [love] by which he hath required obedience, *not according to the "rigour and severity* to which he was entitled by his own supreme right, *but "according to his grace and clemency*, and with the addition of a promise of "the remission of sins, provided fallen man repent." The Calvinists of that age exhibited so much antipathy to this diffusive clemency, as to prove their own extreme selfishness. Since they were taught to consider themselves safe in the covenant of grace, they paid little regard to the helpless condition of others, but imbibed a portion of that churlish spirit which God reproved in the prophet Jonah, when he most pathetically said, '*Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for the which thou hast not laboured neither madest it to grow, which came up in a night and perished in a night:* AND SHOULD NOT I SPARE NINEVEH, THAT GREAT CITY, *wherein are more than six-score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand, and also much cattle?*'

But, to give some semblance of probability to their base and groundless insinuation, the Synodical calumniators added another reference to the 26th Thesis of the disputations of Vorstius *on the covenant*. By his own tenets, however, that persecuted individual is left to be judged; they do not concern the object of these remarks, as a subsequent note will evince. (See also page 78 and Appendix P.) The name of Vorstius at that period was undeservedly a sufficient passport to all in Divinity that was daring and unguarded: and it was evidently associated with that of the pious and circumspect Arminius, for no other purpose than the common one—to blast the fair reputation of the deceased Professor, and to injure the cause of the Remonstrants that was then in a course of adjudication. Where then is the FAIRNESS of which Mr. Scott has boasted? I confess, that I can find as little of it in his Synodical friends as in their admirer, defender, and commentator!

elect believe?" Or "Are believers the true elect?" * He considers "those persons who maintain the former position, to hold sentiments agreeable to the doctrine of the Manichees and Stoics; and those who maintain the latter point, are in obvious agreement with Moses and the Prophets, with Christ and his Apostles."

4. Besides, by many of the inhabitants of these our own provinces this doctrine is accounted a grievance of such a nature, as to cause several of them to affirm, that on account of it they neither can nor will have any communion with our Church: Others of them have united themselves with our Churches, but not without entering a protest, "that they cannot possibly give their consent to this doctrine." But, on account of this kind of Predestination, our Churches have been deserted by not a few individuals, who formerly held the same opinions as ourselves: Others also have threatened to depart from us, unless they be fully assured that the Church holds no opinion of this description.

5. There is likewise no point of doctrine which the Papists, Anabaptists, and Lutherans oppose with greater vehemence than this, and through whose sides they create a worse opinion of our Churches or procure for them a greater portion of hatred, and thus bring into disrepute all the doctrines which we profess. They likewise affirm, "that of all the blasphemies against God which the mind of man can conceive or his tongue can express, there is none so foul as not to be deduced by fair consequence from this opinion of our Doctors."

6. *Lastly.* Of all the difficulties and controversies which have arisen in these our Churches since the time of the Reformation, there is none that has not had its origin in this doctrine, or that has not at least been mixed with it. What I have here said will be found true, if we bring to our recollection the controversies which existed at Leyden in the affair of Koolhaes, at Gouda in that of Herman Herberts, at Horn with respect to Cornelius Wiggertson, and at Mendenblich in the affair of Tako Sybrants. † This consideration was not among the last of those motives which induced me to give my most diligent attention to this head of doctrine, and endeavour to prevent our Churches from suffering any detriment from it;

* Arminius states these two questions in another form in the margin, thus: "Do we believe, *because we have been elected?*" Or, "Are we elected, *because we believe?*"

† See the long note, page 538—541.

because, from it, the Papists have derived much of their increase. While all pious teachers ought most heartily to desire the destruction of Popery, as they would that of the kingdom of Antichrist, they ought with the greatest zeal to engage in the attempt, and, as far as it is within their power, to make the most efficient preparations for its overthrow. *

* In those days the enemies of Protestantism eyed with malignancy all the motions of its Professors; and the Jesuits had then recently published CREDO CALVINISEQUARUM, a very artful pamphlet, containing the Creed of Calvin's followers, arranged in a scholastic form, and consisting of quotations from their most admired authors. That pamphlet was very injurious to the Protestant Religion, by the attempt made in it to fasten those high Predestinarian peculiarities on the whole of the Reformed Churches. Vorstius, who was at that time Professor of Divinity at Steinfurt, wrote an able reply to this Jesuitical pamphlet. It was in 1607, two years before the death of Arminius, that the acquaintance between him and Vorstius seems to have commenced, when he presented our author with a copy of his reply, entitled APOLOGIA *pro Ecclesiis Orthodoxis contra Jesuitas*, and requested his friendly strictures: Arminius complied with his request, in a most charming letter, in which he instructed that great genius in some interesting points of doctrine, on which he appeared to have imbibed erroneous ideas.—In a subsequent letter, dated March 31, 1609, a few months prior to his own decease, he addressed to Vorstius the following remarks on Popery.

"I never said, that *Bellarmine's fourth Volume was incapable of being refuted:* But I have said,—and I adhere to the same declaration,—that, according to my judgment no solid refutation has yet been given to those arguments by which Bellarmine shews, that the following consequences flow from the writings of some of our divines,—*God is the author of sin, God really sins, God is the only sinner*, and *sin is no sin at all.*—I have read the arguments which you have given in your answer to the [Jesuitical] CREED OF THE CALVINISTS; but, requesting you to forgive my freedom, I observe that they do not appear to me to be good and sufficient excuses for our divines. Bellarmine has not tied the knot so tightly, as to prevent its being drawn more closely around them: This fact I consider it very easy to demonstrate. This is one reason why I think it a much safer course, to decline acknowledging the authority of those teachers among us, and openly to profess, *that the sentiments of individuals ought not to be charged upon our Churches.* It might probably be added as an extenuation of our men, that persons may be found, even among the schoolmen and other Popish divines, from whose writings it is possible to deduce the same consequences."

As this was one of the last letters which Arminius wrote, I cannot resist the inclination to present the reader with the liberal and pious sentiments with which it concludes: "With regard to the judgments which Divines may form about me and my doctrine, my only wish is, that they may partake of moderation and candour, and that all divines will consider me to lie under no stronger obligations to approve my opinions to them, than those by which they are bound to approve their opinions to me. For we live under an equal jurisdiction in the Christian Church: and it is the province of no man, to exercise dominion over the faith of another,—*because one is our Master, even Christ.*—Such is the hasty reply which I have thought proper to give to your letter. I beseech you, most learned man, to receive it in a favourable manner, and to admit as an excuse the infirm state of my health, which does not permit me to make further additions.—I pray the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, to inspire all of us with a serious and real love of truth, piety and peace. To this Almighty God I commend you and all your concerns, and myself to your prayers. May God shew compassion to his church, by delivering it from tyranny, and mercifully liberating his own word from the bonds of human traditions!"

The preceding views are, in brief, those which I hold respecting this novel doctrine of Predestination. I have propounded it with all good faith from the very expressions of the authors themselves, that I might not seem to invent and attribute to them any thing which I was not able clearly to prove from their writings.

2. A Second Kind of Predestination.

But some other of our doctors state the subject of God's Predestination in a manner somewhat different. We will cursorily touch upon the two modes which they employ.

Among some of them the following opinion is prevalent: *

1. God determined within himself, by an eternal and immutable decree, to make (according to his own good pleasure,) the smaller portion out of the general mass of mankind partakers of his grace and glory,—to the praise of his own glorious grace. But according to his pleasure he also passed by the greater portion of men, and left them in their own nature, which is incapable of every thing supernatural, [or beyond itself,] and did not communicate to them that saving and supernatural grace by which their nature, (if it still retained its integrity,) might be strengthened, or by which, if it were corrupted, it might be restored,—for a demonstration of his own liberty: Yet after God had made these men sinners and guilty of death, he punished them with death eternal—for a demonstration of his own justice.

2. Predestination is to be considered in respect to *its end* and to *the means which tend to it*. But these persons employ the word "Predestination" in its special acceptation for *election*, and oppose it to *reprobation*.—(1) In respect to *its end*, (which is salvation, and an illustration of the glorious grace of God,) man is considered in common and absolutely, such as he is in his own nature.—(2) But in respect to *the means*, man is considered as perishing from himself and in himself, and as guilty in Adam.

3. In the decree concerning *the end*, the following gradations are to be regarded: (1) *The prescience of God*, by which he foreknew those whom he had predestinated. Then (2) the Divine *prefinition*, [or *predetermination*,] by which he foreordained the salvation of those persons whom he had foreknown:

* In the animadversions on the preceding scheme of Predestination, I have often called it *Supra-lapsarian*; but it is more properly styled, in the language of that age, "the Creabilitarian opinion," and that which follows in the text, as the "second kind of Predestination," is a modified Supra-lapsarianism, and the "third kind" is Sub-lapsarianism.

—*First*, By electing them from all eternity: and, *Secondly*, By preparing for them *grace* in this life, and *glory* in the world to come.

4. *The means* which belong to the execution of this Predestination, are (1) Christ himself:—(2) An efficacious call to faith in Christ, from which Justification takes its origin:—(3) The gift of perseverance unto the end.

5. As far as we are capable of comprehending their scheme of REPROBATION, it consists of two acts,—that of *preterition* and that of *predamnation*. It is antecedent to all things, and to all causes which are either in the things themselves or which arise out of them;—that is, it has no regard whatever to any sin, and only views man in an absolute and general aspect.

6. Two means are fore-ordained for the execution of the act of PRETERITION: (1) *Dereliction* [or *abandoning*] in a state of nature, which by itself is incapable of every thing supernatural: And (2) *Non-communication* [or *a negation*] of supernatural grace, by which their nature (if in a state of integrity,) might be strengthened, and (if in a state of corruption,) might be restored.

7. PREDAMNATION is antecedent to all things, yet it does by no means exist without a fore-knowledge of the causes of damnation: It views man as a sinner, obnoxious to damnation in Adam, and as on this account perishing through the necessity of Divine Justice.

8. The means ordained for the execution of this predamnation, are (1) *Just Desertion*,—which is either that of *exploration*, [or *examination*,] in which God does not confer his grace,—or that of *punishment* when God takes away from a man all his saving gifts, and delivers him over to the power of Satan. (2) The Second means are *induration* or *hardening*, and those consequences which usually follow, even to the real damnation of the person reprobated.

3. A THIRD KIND OF PREDESTINATION.

But others among our doctors state their sentiments on this subject in the following manner:

1. Because God willed within himself from all eternity to make a decree by which he might elect certain men and reprobate the rest, He viewed and considered the human race not only *as created* but likewise *as fallen* or *corrupt*, and on that account obnoxious to cursing and malediction. Out of this lapsed and accursed state God determined to liberate certain individuals and freely to save them by his grace,—for

a declaration of his mercy; but He resolved in his own just judgment to leave the rest under the curse [or malediction] for a declaration of his justice: In both these cases God acts without the least consideration of *repentance* and *faith* in those whom he elects, or of *impenitence* and *unbelief* in those whom he reprobates.

2. The special means which relate particularly to the execution both of election and reprobation, are the very same as those which we have already expounded in the first of these kinds of Predestination,—with the exception of those means which are common both to Election and Reprobation; because this [third] opinion places the fall of man, not as a means fore-ordained for the execution of the preceding decree of Predestination, but as something that might furnish a fixed purpose [*proæresis*] or occasion for making this decree of Predestination.

4. MY JUDGMENT RESPECTING THE TWO LAST-DESCRIBED SCHEMES OF PREDESTINATION.

Both these opinions, as they outwardly pretend, differ from the First in this point,—that neither of them lays down *the creation* or *the fall* as a mediate cause fore-ordained by God for the execution of the preceding decree of Predestination. Yet, with regard to *the fall*, some diversity may be perceived in the two latter opinions: For *the Second kind of Predestination* places election, with regard to the end, *before the fall*; it also places before that event *preterition*, [or *passing by*,] which is the first part of Reprobation: While *the third kind* does not allow any part of election and reprobation to commence till *after the fall of man*. But, among the causes which seem to have induced the inventors of the two latter schemes to deliver the doctrine of Predestination in this manner, and not to ascend to such a great height as the inventors of the First scheme have done, this is not the least,—that they have been desirous of using the greatest precaution, lest it might be concluded from their doctrine, *that God is the author of sin*, with as much show of probability as, (according to the intimation of some of those who yield their assent to *both the latter kinds*,) it is deducible from the *First description* of Predestination. *

† See the conclusion of *Bavo's Summary*, in the preceding Appendix G, which exactly co-incides with these remarks of our author.

In the margin of this part of the *Declaration*, Arminius adds the following note: "The authors of these two opinions have endeavoured, not to suffer *the fall of Adam* to be laid down as a means subordinate and subservient to the decree of Predestination, and thus, at the same time, not to make God the author of sin."

Yet if we be willing to inspect *these two latter* opinions a little more closely, and in particular if we accurately examine the *Second and Third kind* and compare them with other sentiments of the same authors concerning some subjects of our religion, we shall discover, that the fall of Adam cannot possibly, according to their views, be considered in any other manner than as a necessary means for the execution of the preceding decree of Predestination.

1. In reference to the SECOND of the three, this is apparent from two reasons comprised in it:

The First of these reasons is that which states God to have determined by the decree of reprobation to deny to man that grace which was necessary for the confirmation and strengthening of his nature, that it might not be corrupted by sin; which amounts to this, that God decreed not to bestow that grace which was necessary to avoid sin; and from this must necessarily follow *the transgression of man*, as proceeding from a law imposed on him. The fall of man is therefore a means ordained for the execution of the decree of Reprobation.

The Second of these reasons is that which states the two parts of Reprobation to be *preterition* and *predamnation*. These two parts, according to that decree, are connected together by a necessary and mutual bond, and are equally extensive. For, all those whom God passed by in conferring Divine grace, are likewise damned: Indeed no others are *damned*, except those who are the subjects of this act of *preterition*. From this therefore it may be concluded, that "sin must necessarily follow from the decree of reprobation or preterition." Because, if it were otherwise, it might possibly happen, that a person who had been *passed by*, might not commit sin, and from that circumstance might not become liable to damnation; since sin is the sole meritorious cause of damnation: And thus certain of those individuals who had been *passed by*, might neither be saved nor damned,—which is a great absurdity.

This *Second opinion* on Predestination, therefore, falls into the same inconvenience as the *First*. For it not only does not avoid that [conclusion of *making God the author of sin*,] but while those who profess it make the attempt, they fall into a palpable and absurd self-contradiction,—while, in reference to this point, the *First* of these opinions is alike throughout and consistent with itself. *

* This is the boast of that clever man and celebrated Supra-lapsarian, Dr. Twisse, who on account of his eminent Calvinistic qualifications was appointed

2. *The Third* of these schemes of Predestination would escape this rock to much better effect, did not the patrons of

in 1643 Prolocutor or President of the famous *Assembly of Divines at Westminster*, part of whose labour it was, to attempt, like the framers of the Lambeth Articles, (page 90,) to make *the Articles of the Church of England* assume a regular and decided Calvinistic aspect: This circumstance is very galling to all the modern assertors of *the Calvinism of our Church*, and is never mentioned without evident tokens of regret. For it is thus proved, that her *reputed Calvinism* was not sufficiently explicit and strong for those great men who framed the Lambeth Articles, and for those who constituted *the Westminster Assembly*,--and to whom the high Predestinarian doctrines, in their foundations and bearings, were much better known than to any of the modern defenders of Calvinism. The *improvements* made by the latter Assembly upon the first Fifteen of our excellent Articles, may be safely recommended, as an interesting study, to all those rigid Predestinarian clergymen who glory in what they call the *Calvinism* of our Church.

Dr. Twisse wrote a reply to our author's *Examination of Perkins on Predestination*, and entitled it *A Vindication of the Grace, Power, and Providence of God, &c.*, in which he arrives at the very same conclusion as Arminius, respecting the equally objectionable nature of Sublapsarianism,—that, whatever subterfuges it may employ, it can repel to no better effect than Supralapsarianism does, the charge of *making God the author of sin*. He is particularly severe against Peter Molinæus, Du Moulin, who, in that vile production, *the Anatomy of Arminianism*, had endeavoured, like many theological pretenders in these days, to invent a Predestinarian scheme, in which *absolute Election* should claim for itself *all the necessity* that had formerly been divided between it and Reprobation. Du Moulin adopted the same plan with it, as the Arminians do both with it and Election,—he made it to proceed *from a foresight of sins actually committed, and of a final perseverance in them:* And to manifest the cruelty and injustice of *unconditional* Reprobation, he employs this appropriate interrogation: "Who does not "abominate a king that can talk in the following manner?: *I adjudge this* "*man to be hanged. But, in order that his sentence may be* JUST, *it is my* "*pleasure that he commit murder, or steal some of the national property!*"

He likewise reasons thus in another most orthodox passage: "It cannot "be denied, that the *reprobation* or *rejection* of a creature is the greatest "punishment which it is possible for God to inflict on a rational being, "because the necessary consequences of it are eternal torments. It is not "therefore the part of Infinite Goodness and Supreme Justice to desert his own "creature, not indeed because it had sinned but *because such desertion was* "*God's pleasure, and that he might obtain matter for glory from the desertion* "*of a poor spirit created by himself?* If a father knows that on him depends "the happiness of his son, can he, without incurring the charge of *cruelty* "and *want of affection*, desert that son,—innocent as the child is and not "convicted of any crime,—especially if by this desertion his son should fall "into eternal wretchedness, and, solely on account of it, become at once most "miserable and wicked?—Indeed if God should withdraw what he had "bestowed, and should reduce his creature to a non-entity, there would "exist no cause of complaining. But, to give *an infinite evil* to a creature on "whom he had bestowed *a finite good*,—and to create man for the sole purpose "of destroying him, that he may acquire glory to himself by such destruc-"tion,—how abhorrent is this from the benignity and the justice of God!"

For this amiable weakness, Moulin is reprehended by Dr. Twisse in eight long chapters. In the commencement of them, he says, "I undertake this "task with the greater cheerfulness, because, I see this divine [Moulin] who "is in other respects singularly learned, and who attempers his Philosophy "with his Theology in a manner sufficiently laudable and accurate,--I see him "committing shameful mistakes in the article of Reprobation, and thus

it, while declaring their sentiments on Predestination and Providence, employ certain expressions, from which *the neces-*

"importing into the Reformed Churches pure and unsophisticated Arminian-
"ism. This, alas, he has done without any tergiversation, in a manner at
"once too spirited and luminous. By this deed he not only professedly agrees
"in that particular with the Arminians, but, by a just consequence he entirely
"destroys all the arguments in favour of election, which he had previously
"urged against the Arminians." In commenting upon some of Moulin's arguments, the Doctor exclaims, "In these expressions Moulin delineates to
"us the spectres of reasons, rather than their true representations. These
"words are spoken much too improvidently. In this argument, therefore,
"he is chargeable with far more errors than Arminius.—This is to act the
"part of a Rhetorician, and not that of a Philosopher."

Several epithets, more rancorous than these, has this Supra-lapsarian Doctor bestowed on his offending brother.—What is the reason of all this bad humour towards Moulin and other Sublapsarians? Dr. Twisse shall give his own account of the matter: "Do you wish me freely to explain the only
"advantage which accrues from this moderate method of softening our opinion
"respecting the object of Predestination? I will declare what my thoughts
"are: The sole effect of it is, that we [our doctrine] may be freed from the
"fall of our first parents, by making the decree to be subject and subordinate
"to that act. It appears to me more than probable and very likely, that this
"was the only thing which engaged the foresight of those who asserted this
"middle and apparently temperate opinion,—lest otherwise it should be esta-
"blished, *that sin was committed in consequence of God's decree*, as a means
"accommodated to the purposes which had been previously prescribed to it by
"God in Predestination. It seems impossible, by any solid reason, to explain
"from these premises, how God may not be constituted the author of sin. Let
"it be granted, that the fall of our first parents is removed from the decree of
"Predestination. If, in the mean time, it must only be subjected to *a Divine*
"*decree* of another kind, what advantage do we ultimately gain from this our
"anxious desire to avoid that rock? We have in reality not avoided it; but
"while we have with sufficient solicitude wished, by one course, to shun this
"rock, we have, on steering another course, unhappily struck upon it. If this
"had been the order of things in the Divine intention,—that the first place
"should be occupied by the creation, the second by the permission of the fall,
"and the third by predestination to life and death.—then it would have been
"necessary, that in the act of execution the order of all of them should be
"reversed: The consequences of which would be, that God ought *first* to have
"saved some men and damned others, he ought *afterwards* to have permitted
"their fall, and, *last of all*, he ought to have produced them from nothing by
"means of creation. Such are the monstrous and portentous opinions with
"which this [Sublapsarian] scheme is charged, and which it produces,—
"opinions that are far more worthy to proceed from the schools of the Jesuits
"or the Arminians, than from ours!" (*Vind. Grat.* l. i, pt. 1. dig. iv. sec. 4.)
To understand the logic contained in the close of this quotation, it is necessary to state, that one grand argument on which as a foundation the Doctor's scheme rests, and which he considers to be his best weapon of defence, is this fallacious postulate, *Whatever is first in the Divine Intention, must be last in execution!* His own curious reasons for adopting it, are too diffuse to be here transcribed; they may be seen in his preface. Though the Calvinists generally knit their brows and thunder out *anathemas* against any man "who is so presumptuous as to pry into the Divine Counsels," yet, in every Predestinarian controversy which I have examined, the Fatalists have in this respect been themselves the first offenders, and their adversaries have been compelled either to follow them through all their labyrinths, or to sit down in bitterness of soul and hear the saving purposes and the glorious attributes of the Divine Being traduced and virtually blasphemed. In this instance, the Doctor and

sity of the fall might be deduced. Yet this necessity cannot possibly have any other origin than some decree of predestination.

(1) One of these explanatory expressions is their description of *the Divine Permission*, by which God permits sin. Some of them describe it thus: "Permission is the withdrawing of that "Divine Grace, by which, when God executes the decrees of "his will through rational creatures, he either does not reveal "to the creature that Divine will of his own by which He "wills that action to be performed, or does not bend the will "of the creature to yield obedience in that act to the Divine "will." To these expressions the following are immediately subjoined: "If this be a correct statement, the creature com-"mits sin through necessity, yet voluntarily and without

his Supralapsarian friends have invented a preposterous scheme for *the operation of the Divine Volitions*, for which they do not pretend to adduce any scriptural authority, but which ought, according to their ideas, to be as implicitly believed as if it were a part of Divine Revelation. It assumes, as stated page 550, that *before any thought of the creation of mankind entered into the Divine Intention, the damnation of some men and the salvation of others were decreed.* But as their invention, when completed, would not work, (because it did not account for *the mode in which God actually executes whatever he has previously purposed,*) the preceding most absurd postulate was their next device, to set the first in motion: And it was by this very postulate that the venerable Doctor endeavoured to make the Sublapsarians look ridiculous. That great man, Dr. Thomas Pierce, when adverting to this sophism, says: 'They apply it so as to infer, that because eternal punishment is last in 'execution (after sin), it was first in God's intention (before sin). And by the 'same logic, he that first intends to take ship at Dover and afterwards sail 'into France, must needs sail into France first, and after that take ship at 'Dover. Had I used that axiom *in such an ignorant manner* when I was a 'raw sophister, I had been hissed out of the schools. And how extremely 'weak is that cause which could betray so strong a disputant as Dr. Twisse 'into so strange an inconvenience?'

Sufficient evidence has been adduced to shew, that Dr. Twisse entertained the same ideas, as those of Arminius, respecting the tendency of the Sublapsarian scheme *to make God the author of sin*, and the horridly uniform consistency of Supra-lapsarianism. Every man who knows any thing of the matter, will admire the *honesty*, while he abhors the *cruelty and blasphemy*, of the Supra-lapsarians; and while *a regard for the Divine honour* or *the tenderness of their own dispositions*, as evinced by the Sublapsarians, excites his warm approval of their apparently moderate plan,—his applause will cease, or it will be transformed into censure and aversion, as soon as he discovers the thin disguise under which they veil consequences equally blasphemous and unscriptural with those of *their higher brethren*. Dr. Twisse insinuates in the following passage, that the Sublapsarian Divines are not governed by pure motives in their selection of a system: 'Several of our Divines seem induced by this 'speciousness to think, *that the Divine decree* (which concerns the raising of 'fallen men by grace and the gift of salvation through mercy) *presupposes the* '*corruption of mankind in Adam*. At this point, therefore, they stop, ascend 'to no greater elevation, and do not attempt to deduce reasons for the Divine 'Counsel in Predestination from any higher source than *the corrupt mass* of 'mankind; and they consider, that they have then had a sufficient regard to

"restraint."* If it be objected, that "this description does not comport with that permission by which God permitted the sin of Adam:" We also entertain the same opinion about it. Yet it follows as a consequence from this very description, that "other sins are committed through necessity."

(2) Of a similar tendency are the expressions which some of them use, when they contend, that the declaration of the glory of God which must necessarily be illustrated, is placed in "the demonstration of mercy and of punitive justice." But such a demonstration could not have been made, unless sin, and misery through sin, had entered into the world, to form at least a sort of the lowest desert of misery: And in this manner is sin also necessarily introduced, through the necessity of such a demonstration of the Divine glory Since *the fall of Adam* is already laid down to be necessary, and, on that account, to be a means for executing the preceding decree of predestination; *creation itself* is likewise at the same time laid down as a means subservient to the execution of the same decree. For *the fall* cannot be necessarily consequent upon *the creation*, except through the decree of predestination, which cannot be placed between the creation and the fall, but is prefixed before both of them, as having the precedence, and ordaining *creation* for *the fall*, and *both of them* for executing one and the same decree,—to demonstrate the justice of God in the punishment of sin, and his mercy in its remission. Because, if this were not the case, *that which must necessarily ensue* from the act of creation *had not been intended by God* when he created: Which is to suppose an impossibility.

'the safety or integrity of every man's faith, and have made good and special 'provision for the peace and tranquillity of the Church. But *our error* is not 'necessary to defend the Divine Majesty and to maintain his holy nature: God 'will provide for that himself. For he is able to vindicate his own cause; we 'will also by his grace engage in its vindication. *Men generally desire to 'regulate and temper the will of God to their own dispositions:* But our sole wish 'is, that he would be pleased of his mercy to grant us that piety by which we 'may daily form our dispositions yet more and more to obey him, that we may 'restrain our obstreperous affections which strive against his truth.' In this astute manner does the learned Doctor try to drill "the obstreperous affections" of the Sublapsarians into a bold and manly avowal of his unmerciful sentiments, which, how repugnant soever they might be to a merciful human disposition, he dignifies with the title of GOD'S TRUTH. But this is one of the most temperate of his censures on *that milder race of men*, among whom the reader will be surprised to find, according to the Doctor's own enumeration, all the Dutch Divines who signed the first Contra-Remonstrance, and Tilenus, Lubbertus, Kimedontius, Zanchius, Ursinus, Paræus, Polanus, Bucanus, Peter Martyr, Bishop Hutton, Bishop Abbot, Calvin, Piscator, &c. &c.

* See WOMACK'S *Examination of Tilenus*. Page 17, 8vo Edit. 1822.

But let it be granted, that *the necessity of the fall of Adam* cannot be deduced from either of the *two latter* opinions, yet all the preceding arguments which have been produced against *the First* opinion, are, after a trifling modification to suit the varied purpose, equally valid against the *two latter*. This would be very apparent, if, to demonstrate it, a conference were to be instituted.

5. My own Sentiments on Predestination.

I have hitherto been stating those opinions concerning the article of Predestination which are inculcated in our churches and in the University of Leyden, and of which I disapprove. I have at the same time produced my own reasons, why I form such an unfavourable judgment concerning them; and I will now declare my own opinions on this subject, which are of such a description as, according to my views, appear most conformable to the word of God.

I. The First absolute decree of God concerning the salvation of sinful man, is that by which he decreed to appoint his Son Jesus Christ for a Mediator, Redeemer, Saviour, Priest and King, who might destroy sin by his own death, might by his obedience obtain the salvation which had been lost, and might communicate it by his own virtue.

II. The second precise and absolute decree of God, is that in which he decreed to receive into favour *those who repent and believe*, and, in Christ, for his sake and through him, to effect the salvation of such penitents and believers as persevered to the end; but to leave in sin and under wrath *all impenitent persons and unbelievers*, and to damn them as aliens from Christ.

III. The Third Divine decree is that by which God decreed to administer *in a sufficient and efficacious manner* the means which were necessary for repentance and faith; and to have such administration instituted (1) according to the *Divine Wisdom*, by which God knows what is proper and becoming both to his mercy and his severity, and (2) according to *Divine Justice*, by which He is prepared to adopt whatever his wisdom may prescribe and to put it in execution.

IV. To these succeeds the Fourth decree, by which God decreed to save and damn certain particular persons. This decree has its foundation in the foreknowledge of God, by which he knew from all eternity those individuals who *would*, through his preventing grace, *believe*, and, through his subsequent grace *would persevere*,—according to the before-described administration of those means which are suitable and

proper for conversion and faith; and, by which foreknowledge, he likewise knew those who *would not believe and persevere.**

PREDESTINATION, when thus explained, is

1. The foundation of Christianity, and of salvation and its certainty.

2. It is the sum and the matter of the gospel; nay, it is the gospel itself, and on that account *necessary to be believed in order to salvation*, as far as the two first articles are concerned.

3. It has had no need of being examined or determined by any Council either General or Particular, since it is contained in the scriptures clearly and expressly in so many words; and no contradiction has ever yet been offered to it by any orthodox divine.

4. It has constantly been acknowledged and taught by all Christian teachers who held correct and orthodox sentiments.

5. It agrees with that *Harmony of all Confessions* which has been published by the Protestant Churches.

6. It likewise agrees most excellently with the Dutch Confession and Catechism. This concord is such, that if in the *Sixteenth Article* these two expressions [*eos quos*, et *alii*] "those persons whom" and "others," be explained by the words "believers" and "unbelievers," these opinions of mine on Predestination will be comprehended in that Article with the greatest clearness. This is the reason why I directed the thesis *to be composed in the very words of the Confession*, when, on one occasion, I had to hold a public disputation before my private class in the University. This kind of Predestination also agrees with the reasoning contained in the *twentieth* and the *fifty-fourth* question of the Catechism.

7. It is also in excellent accordance with the nature of God, —with his wisdom, goodness, and righteousness; because it contains the principal matter of all of them, and is the clearest demonstration of the Divine wisdom, goodness, and righteousness [or justice].

8. It is agreeable in every point with the nature of man,—in what form soever that nature may be contemplated,—whether in the primitive state of creation, in that of the fall, or in that of restoration.

9. It is in complete concert with the act of creation, by affirming that the creation itself is a real communication of good both from the intention of God and with regard to the

* The reader will perceive these particulars to be exact counter-parts to the preceding objections against Supra-lapsarianism, which commenced page 554.

very end or event; that it had its origin in the goodness of God; that whatever has a reference to its continuance and preservation proceeds from Divine Love; and that this act of creation is a perfect and appropriate work of God, in which He is at complaisance with himself, and by which he obtained all things necessary for an unsinning state.*

10. It agrees with the nature of life eternal, and with the honourable titles by which that life is designated in the Scriptures.

11. It also agrees with the nature of death eternal, and with the names by which that death is distinguished in Scripture.

12. It states sin to be a real disobedience and the meritorious cause of condemnation; and on this account it is in the most perfect agreement with the fall and with sin.

13. In every particular it harmonizes with the nature of grace, by ascribing to it all those things which agree with it, [or *are adapted to it*,] and by reconciling it most completely to the righteousness of God and to the nature and liberty of the human will.

14. It conduces most conspicuously to declare the glory of God,—his justice and his mercy. It also represents God as the cause of all good and of our salvation, and man as the cause of sin and of his own damnation.

15. It contributes to the honour of Jesus Christ, by placing him for the foundation of predestination and the meritorious as well as communicative cause of salvation.

16. It greatly promotes the salvation of men: It is also the power, and the very means which lead to salvation,—by exciting and creating within the mind of man sorrow on account of sin, a solicitude about his conversion, faith in Jesus Christ, a studious desire to perform good works, and zeal in prayer, —and by causing men to *work out their salvation with fear and trembling*. It likewise prevents despair, as far as such prevention is necessary.

17. It confirms and establishes that order according to which the gospel ought to be preached, (1) by requiring repentance and faith,—(2) and then by promising remission of sins, the grace of the Spirit, and life eternal.

18. It strengthens the ministry of the gospel, and renders it profitable with respect to preaching, the administration of the sacraments and public prayers.

* For an explanation of this clause, see page 563, sect. 3 and 4.

19. It is the foundation of the Christian religion; because in it the two-fold love of God may be united together,—God's love of righteousness [or justice], and his love of men, may with the greatest consistency be reconciled to each other.

20. *Lastly.—This doctrine of Predestination has always been approved by the great majority of professing Christians,* and even now, in these days, it enjoys the same extensive patronage.* It cannot afford any person just cause for expressing his aversion to it; nor can it give any pretext for contention in the Christian Church.

It is therefore much to be desired, that men would proceed no further in this matter, and would not attempt to investigate *the unsearchable judgments of God,*—at least that they would not proceed beyond the point at which those judgments have been clearly revealed in the scriptures.*

This, my most Potent Lords, is all that I intend now to declare to your Mightinesses, respecting the doctrine of PRE-

* This was then, and is now, an absolute fact: The moderate and pacific creed of the great Melancthon, (of which that of Arminius, on this point in particular, was an exact copy,) had infused itself into all the Reformed National Churches of Europe, except those who adopted the Presbyterian Platform of Geneva—such as the Churches of France and Scotland. Our own excellent Church imbibed much of this spirit; and has retained it in greater purity and with less interruption, than any even of the professed Lutheran Churches: This has often been satisfactorily proved; but in no work has the commanding evidence in its favour been stated so luminously as in Dr. Richard LAURENCE's most erudite *Bampton Lectures* for 1804, the reasoning of which is unanswerable. Omitting therefore, all allusion to the Christians of the Greek and Romish Churches, there would be no difficulty in proving, *that the great majority of modern Protestants approve and maintain the doctrine of* CONDITIONAL ELECTION AND REPROBATION.

* How mildly does Arminius deliver the reproof, which is too often and most unaptly employed by the Calvinists, *Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?* God has been pleased to reveal his truth in his word, and to declare, *The soul that sinneth shall die.—Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, &c.* Yet the Calvinists evade the force of the first of these passages, by teaching, that "an elect soul, though he fall *foully*, cannot fall *finally*." And they labour to wrest the plain and obvious meaning of the second, by intimating, that, by "the wicked and unrighteous man" there mentioned, is to be understood "a believer under a cloud," which is a commodious Calvinistic epithet for a man of that class of *believers* who, notwithstanding their profession of *faith*, live in the practice of *sin*.—God also declares, *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned.* What is the Calvinistic *improvement* upon these Divine expressions? It is, after the manner of Dr. Twisse and the other great masters of the *fatal* system, (page 586), that God first decreed who should "be saved;" and then, it was determined as a secondary arrangement, that *those who are thus decreed to salvation* should "believe and be baptized:" In this summary manner is removed that grand incentive to conversion held out by the scriptures, which makes *final salvation* to be dependent upon *faith and perseverance foreseen.*—On the other part, the Calvinists further aver, that God first decreed who they were that should "be damned," and afterwards passed another decree that *the persons thus destined to damnation* should "not

DESTINATION, about which there exists such a great controversy in the Church of Christ. If it would not prove too tedious to your Lordships, I have some other propositions which I could wish to state, because they contribute to a full declaration of my sentiments, and tend to the same purpose as that for which I have been ordered to attend in this place by your Mightinesses.

There are certain other articles of the Christian Religion, which possess a close affinity to the doctrine of Predestination, and which are in a great measure dependent on it: Of this description are *the Providence of God, the Free-will of man, the Perseverance of saints*, and *the Certainty of Salvation*. On these topics, if not disagreeable to your Mightinesses, I will in a brief manner relate my opinion.

II. THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD.

I consider *Divine Providence* to be "that solicitous, continued, and universally present inspection and oversight of "God, according to which he exercises a general care over the "whole world, but evinces a particular concern for all his [intel-"ligent] creatures without any exception, with the design of pre-"serving and governing them in their own essence, qualities, "actions, and passions, in a manner that is at once worthy of "Himself and suitable to them, to the praise of his name and "the salvation of believers."—In this definition of Divine Providence I by no means deprive it of any particle of those properties which agree with it or belong to it; but I declare, that it preserves, regulates, governs, and directs all things, and that nothing in the world happens fortuitously or by chance. Be-

believe." By this unsound doctrine (for a sanction to which the inventors blasphemously invoke the name of the Great and Merciful God), is undermined the force of all the threats and gracious expostulations contained in the scriptures, and *final damnation* is no longer chargeable to the personal negligence and obstinacy of the sinner, because it is not made, according to the scriptural plan, to be a lamentable consequence of *unbelief and disobedience foreseen*.

How necessary is it, on all occasions, to *hold fast the form of sound words*, and to propound the offers of the gospel in the expressive and gracious terms in which they have been indited by the Holy Spirit! I can assure the reader, that, in wading through some of the muddy productions of the early Divines of Calvin's school, I have met with numerous practical inversions of evangelical expressions. But I will now give one instance of a virtual *perversion*: St. Paul has said, *Let* GOD *be true, but every man a liar!* Omitting all irreverent mention of the Divine Name,—of which, or of the Divine Attributes, those aged teachers of Calvinism seem at times to have had very little recollection,—the point towards the establishment of which many of them bent all their mental energies, was obviously this—"Let Calvin's scheme of Predestination be true, although every other man that dissents from it be accounted a liar!"

side this, I place in subjection to Divine Providence both *the free-will* and even *the actions of a rational creature:* So that nothing can be done without the will of God, not even any of those things which are done in opposition to it;—only we must observe a distinction between good actions and evil ones, by saying, that "God both *wills* and *performs* good acts," but that "He only *freely permits* those which are evil." Still farther than this, I very readily grant, that even all actions whatever concerning evil that can possibly be devised or invented, may be attributed to Divine Providence,—employing solely one caution, "not to conclude from this concession *that God is the cause of sin.*" This I have testified with sufficient clearness, in a certain disputation concerning the *Righteousness and Efficacy of Divine Providence concerning things that are evil,* which was on two different occasions treated in Leyden as a divinity-act, at which I presided. In that disputation I endeavoured to ascribe to God whatever actions concerning sin I could possibly conclude from the scriptures to belong to him; and I proceeded to such a length in my attempt, that some persons thought proper on that account to charge me with having made *God the author of sin.* The same serious allegation has likewise been often produced against me, from the pulpit, in the city of Amsterdam, on account of those very theses; but with what show of justice such a charge was made, may be evident to any one, from the contents of my written answer to those *Thirty-one Articles* formerly mentioned, which have been falsely imputed to me, and of which this was one. *

* The reply of Arminius may be seen in *the twenty-third* of those Articles. The very judicious disputation to which it refers, constitutes *the Ninth and Tenth* of his Public Lectures, and was undertaken in consequence of some passionate words which escaped from the lips of Gomarus when he presided, as moderator, at a disputation on *Divine Providence,* and after some solid arguments had been urged, with great modesty and according to the practice of the University, against that learned Professor's theses, by A. C. Vlietius, who was a divinity-student under the joint tutelage and care of Arminius and his morose uncle Kuchlinus. This circumstance caused many reports to be circulated, respecting the erroneous opinions which Arminius was said to entertain on the same subject. He therefore determined immediately to prepare the Theses mentioned in the text: And though the disputation of Gomarus *on the general theme* had been maintained on the 30th of April 1605, our author held another, only four days afterwards, on *the particular question* of the effect of Divine Providence upon moral evil. In the interval between these two Academical Acts, our author addressed to his friend Uitenbogardt, on the 2nd of May, a letter, of which the following is a very interesting extract:

"The day before yesterday, in a Disputation *on the Providence of God,* Gomarus in answer to the objections of Vlietius, who had stated them with

III. The Free-Will of Man.

This is my opinion concerning the Free-will of man:—*In his primitive condition* as he came out of the hands of his Creator, man was endowed with such a portion of knowledge, holiness, and power, as enabled him to understand, esteem, consider, will, and to perform THE TRUE GOOD, according to the commandment delivered to him: Yet none of these acts could he do, *except through the assistance of Divine Grace.* —But in his *lapsed and sinful state*, man is not capable, of and by himself, either to think, to will, or to do that which is really good; but it is necessary for him to be regenerated and renewed in his intellect, affections or will, and in all his powers,

sufficient modesty, spoke in such a manner as betrayed the commotion of his mind to all the audience. He likewise uttered some expressions against me, as he supposed: But the person who made him acquainted with my words, had deceived him with a perverse and unfair narration. Without feeling any concern, I listened to him while he spoke with the greatest vehemence; and this is the practice which I will try to pursue, that I may be able to produce the whole of my forces when required by necessity.

"You cannot believe how imperfectly they [my enemies] are prepared to attack the opinions of other people and to defend their own: Or rather, you not only can believe this fact, but, being instructed by personal experience, it constitutes a part of your knowledge. These are the principal arguments which they employ: *Such have been the sentiments of all the Doctors of the Church! This is the unvarying opinion of the Reformed Church!* But in no quarter do I hear, THUS SAITH THE LORD!

"At present I am preparing some Theses *on the Righteousness and Efficacy of the Providence of God concerning evil;* and I intend to propose them in regular course within a few days, as subjects of public disputation. In the explanation of this matter I cannot give myself complete satisfaction. Yet I will attempt something, and will freely declare my sentiments: For I can do this, without clashing against either the Confession or the Catechism. I wish it were possible for me previously to explain my sentiments on this point before you and Borrius, and to submit them to your examination and judgment: In that case it is probable, nay it is very certain, the three united together would be able to accomplish what one cannot do by himself. My declaration will at least amount to this: I not only acknowledge Providence in general, but also its influence concerning evil. For I ascribe to it the following actions: Prohibition and Permission respecting the *beginning* of sin, Determination and Direction respecting its *progress*, and, respecting its *end*, Punishment, (in which part I shall treat on *the withdrawing of grace, the being given over to a reprobate mind*, &c.) I shall then discuss the topic of its being remitted or pardoned."

With what amiable diffidence and ingenuousness did this great man disclose his views and intentions to his intimate friends! It is a tolerably fair test of the orthodoxy of the sentiments briefly described in the preceding extract, when one party accuses the author of 'entertaining doubts concerning *Providence in general*,' and another charges him with 'carrying that doctrine to such a length, in regard to the permission of evil, as to *make God the author of sin*.' What a *profound genius* must Plancius the detractor have possessed, who could discover this frightful consequence in the Theses of Arminius, and who warned his Calvinistic audience at Amsterdam against its infectious nature!

by God in Christ through the Holy Spirit, that he may be qualified rightly to understand, esteem, consider, will, and perform whatever is truly good. When he is made a partaker of this regeneration or renovation, I consider that, since he is delivered from sin, he is capable of thinking, willing, and doing that which is good, but yet *not without the continued aids of Divine Grace.* *

* In the Book entitled *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*, which was principally composed by Archbishop Cranmer, examined and approved by a Convocation of the Clergy, (several of whom afterwards suffered as martyrs for the truth,) and which was published with the royal sanction in 1543, long before the birth of Arminius, it is said, "The commandments and threatenings of Almighty God in scripture, whereby man is called upon and put in remembrance what God would have him to do, most evidently do express and declare, *that man hath Free-will also now after the fall of our first father Adam.*—What undoubtedly should be said in vain, unless there were some faculty or power left in man, whereby he may, by the help and grace of God, (if he will receive it, when it is offered to him,) understand his commandments, and *freely* consent and obey unto them. Which thing, of the Catholic Fathers, is called *Free-will*, which if we will describe, we may call it conveniently in all men, A certain power of the will joined with reason, whereby a reasonable creature, without constraint, *in things of reason* discerneth and willeth good and evil; but it willeth not *that good which is acceptable to God*, except it be holpen with grace: but that which is ill, it willeth of itself.—Besides many other evils that came by that transgression [of our first parents], the high power of man's reason and freedom of will were wounded and corrupted, and all men thereby brought into such blindness and infirmity that they cannot eschew sin, except they be illuminated and made free by an especial grace, that is to say, by a supernatural help and working of the Holy Ghost, which although the goodness of God offereth to all men, yet they only enjoy it, who *by their free will* do accept and embrace the same. Nor they also that be holpen by the said grace, can accomplish and perform things that be for their wealth, *but with labour and endeavour:* so great is in our nature the corruption of the first sin, and the heavy burden bearing us down to evil.—Free-will, before it may will or think any godly thing, must be holpen by the grace of Christ, and by his Spirit be prevented and inspired, that it may be able thereto; and, being so made able, may from thenceforth *work together* with grace; and, by the same sustained, holpen and maintained, may do and accomplish good works and avoid sin, and persevere also and increase in grace. It is surely of the grace of God only, that first we be inspired and moved to any good thing: But, to resist temptations, and to persist in goodness and go forward, *it is both of the grace of God, and of our free-will and endeavour.*"

In the Nuremberg Catechism, a work containing above 500 pages, which was translated into English by Archbishop Cranmer, and published in 1547, it is said: "And therefore we say in this creed, *I believe in the Holy Ghost.* But it is necessary some things here to speak of the manner of sanctification, how and after what manner the Holy Ghost doth hallow us, that *we may so prepare ourselves*, or rather *give place* to the Holy Ghost, *which preventeth us*, that he with his light and Almighty strength and power may work his will in us.—Give your hearts to God, like wax, apt and meet to receive what thing soever it shall please him to print in you.—And take this for a sure conclusion, and doubt nothing thereof, that the Holy Ghost, as he hath begun these things in us, so he will finish the same in us, *if we obey him*, and continue in faith to the end of our lives. For he that continueth to the end, shall be saved.—We wretched sinners do not first *prevent* God, *and go before him* in the work of

IV. The Grace of God.

In reference to *Divine Grace*, I believe, (1) It is *a gratuitous affection* by which God is kindly affected towards a

our justification, but it is God that layeth the first foundation of our salvation. First, he sendeth unto us godly and faithful ministers, by whom we be baptized, and, *before we do any good work*, he *offereth* us his grace.—Forasmuch as we know by God's holy commandments what his will is, ['that *all men* be saved,'] it is our part to *conform our wills* to his will, and to desire *him to give us his grace and aid*.—He governeth by the Holy Word of his Gospel, and the power of the Holy Ghost, (whom he poureth plentifully upon all them that believe the gospel,) and by that comfortable word of the gospel he gently enticeth and draweth us unto him, that we should gladly *of our own free-will* obey him."

Melancthon also, in his *Common Places*, published in 1545, speaks thus on *the Freedom of the Will:* "But we must know, that the Holy Spirit is efficacious by the word of the gospel, when it is heard, or when it becomes an object of meditation: As it is written, (Gal. iii, 14.) '*that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith*.' It is a saying that has been often repeated, 'Those who meditate on God, ought to commence at the word of 'God, and not to search for God without his word.' When we thus commence at the word of God, three causes of a good action then concur together,—the word of God, the Holy Spirit, and *the human will, which does not resist God's word, but yields its assent*. For it [the will] might shake it off, as Saul was accustomed to do *of his own accord*. But when a listening and enduring mind *offers no resistance*, and does not cherish distrust, but when, by the assistance which the Holy Spirit also affords, it endeavours to yield assent,—in this contest, *the will is not idle*.

"The ancients have said, 'Good works are performed by grace preceding, 'and the will accompanying them.' Thus likewise St. Basil says, 'Only do 'thou exercise thy will, and God will be beforehand with it.' God prevents [or goes before], calls, moves and helps us; but let it be our care, to offer no resistance. For sin evidently derives its origin from us, and not from the will of God. St. Chrysostom says, 'He who draws, draws *a man that is willing*:' As it is likewise expressed in that passage of St. John's Gospel, (vi, 45.) '*Every man therefore that hears of the Father and learns, shall come unto me*.' He commands them to learn, that is, to hear the word,—not to resist the word of God, but to assent to it, and not to indulge in distrust.

"These things are evident, if we find by experience in real sorrows and in true invocation what kind of contest is maintained by the will: if it were to shew itself as a mere statue, there would not be in the saints any conflict, wrestling, or anguish. But since the contest is great and difficult, the will is not idle, but yields a languid assent; and unless at the intervals of invocation it were reminded and admonished by promises and examples, and were assisted by the Holy Spirit, it would fall into despair.

"I have seen many persons, who yet were not the disciples of Epicurus, but who, when they felt some sorrow on account of their lapses, have begun to dispute thus: 'How can I hope to be received when I do not perceive any new 'light or new virtues [strength] infused into me? Besides, *if Free-will does* '[*or effects,*] *nothing at all*, I will, in the mean time, indulge in distrust and 'other vicious affections, until I shall have felt that regeneration effected of 'which you speak.'—This Manichæan conceit is a most horrible falsehood: And from such an error their minds must be drawn away, and they must be taught—that *Free-will is of some avail*, [does effect something]. Pharaoh and Saul were not compelled to resist God; but they did it willingly and freely, although God had at several times manifested such illustrious proofs of his presence.

miserable sinner, and according to which he, in the first place, gives his Son, "that whosoever believeth in him might have

"If we have *only to wait for that infusion of qualities, without any effort of our own*, as the fictions of the Enthusiasts and the Manichees pretend, no necessity would exist for the ministry of the gospel, and there would be no contest in the minds of men. But God has instituted the ministry, that the word may be received, that the mind may meditate on the promise and embrace it, and that, while we manfully fight against distrust, the Holy Spirit may at the same time be efficacious in us.

"I return this answer, therefore, to such as excuse their loitering and slothfulness by supposing that *Free-will is of no avail*: 'Nay, O man, it is 'the eternal and immoveable command of God that you should obey the word 'of the gospel, that you should hear the Son of God, and should acknowledge 'the Mediator. How black and horrid are these sins;—this unwillingness to 'behold the Son of God, the Mediator bestowed on the human race! Thou 'wilt say, *I am not able*.—Nay, but thou art in some measure able: And 'when thou sustainest thyself by the word of the gospel, beseech God to grant 'thee his assistance; and know, that God is willing in this very manner to 'convert us,--when, being excited by the promise, we contend against ourselves, 'call upon him, and resist our distrust and other vicious affections. Some of 'the ancients, therefore, have spoken thus: *Free-will is a faculty in man of 'applying himself to grace;* that is, it hears the promise, strives to give its 'assent, and casts away the sins that are opposed to conscience. In devils no 'such [efforts] are made. Let the difference, therefore, between devils and 'mankind be taken into consideration. But these observations are rendered 'still clearer, when the promise is considered: Since the promise is universal, 'and since *there are not contrary wills in God*, it is necessary, that *there be 'in ourselves some cause of the difference why Saul is rejected and David 'received;* [1 Sam. xv, 26.] that is, it is necessary that there be *in these two men 'some action that is dissimilar*.'"

In many other passages he explains in what respect this dissimilarity consists. "Mercy and the merits of Christ are, in the will of God, the cause of Election, but [with these] it is necessary for our [act of] apprehension to concur. For, since the promise of grace is universal, as has already been shewn, and since it is necessary that we obey the promise, *some difference* between those who are elected and those rejected must be taken from our own wills, that is, those who resist [or oppose] the promise are rejected,—on the contrary, they who embrace the promise are accepted.—God has elected those whom he decreed to call to the knowledge of his Son; and it is his pleasure to make known his will and his benefits *to the human race*. He therefore approves and *elects those who obey his calling*.—Be not detained by this imagination, *that thou canst not effect conversion*. Nay, thou art able to effect it, by God's assistance; and he really wills to afford his aid, and does actually assist those who ask."

He then adds, as a conclusion to the former paragraph: "There is truth in these things when rightly understood; and the employment of them in the exercises of faith and in true consolation, when the mind rests on the Son of God as he is shewn in the promise, will illustrate this union of causes —the word of God, the Holy Spirit, and the human will."

In an *Exposition of the Nicene Creed*, which Melancthon sent to Cranmer in 1550, he thus expresses himself: "These fundamental principles must be maintained against the Manichees,—that *it is possible for all men to be converted to God*, that the will does not shew itself to be purely passive, *but in some measure active*, and that *it can comply with the drawings of God*."

Luther himself, in his tract *On the Servility of the* [*Human*] *Will*, says: "But let the same works be ascribed both to God and to men, what effect do these similitudes [quoted by his adversary] produce? None at all, except this, that *the creature co-operates with God when he operates*. But are we now disputing about this co-operation? Is not the contest, rather,

eternal life,"—and, afterwards, he justifies him in Christ Jesus and for his sake, and adopts him into the right of sons, unto salvation.—(2) It is *an infusion* (both into the human under-

respecting *the proper strength and operation of Free-will?*—But God does not work in us *without us*; for he has created and preserved us for this end—that he might work in us, and that *we might be co workers with him*, whether this be done beyond his kingdom by his general Omnipotence, or within his kingdom by the particular virtue [or energy] of his Spirit."—In reference to this passage, Erasmus, his opponent, says in reply: "I have attributed nothing to Free-will, except that it is obedient to grace when it knocks, that it is in co-operation when grace operates, and that *it can withdraw itself from grace in both these instances*: But I always except the particular will of God, who can by unknown causes forcibly transport it wheresoever he pleases. St. Augustine confesses the same things; and yet he allows the Freedom of the will, and ascribes to it a power of acting. The same confession is made by Luther."—In his preceding tract, entitled *Diatribe*, Erasmus had observed: "The mercy of God prevents [or *goes before*] our will, accompanies the will in its efforts, and gives [to those efforts] a happy issue: And yet, in the mean time, *we will, we run, and we obtain*."—In the Old English translation of his Paraphrase upon the Gospel, which was ordered by the king's injunction to be publicly kept in the Churches, he observes, on John vi, 45, "Things of this world are learned by men's endeavour and study. This celestial philosophy is not understood, unless the secret inspiration of the Father make men's hearts apt to be taught.—The gift is God's, *but the endeavour is yours*. A man heareth my words with bodily ears in vain, except he hear-before the secret voice of the Father, which must inspire the mind with an insensible grace of faith. Therefore *whosoever fashioneth himself to be apt to receive this inspiration*, the Father doth then draw them: And he only that is thus drawn, cometh finally to me."

In the article on *Free-will*, the Saxon Confession says: "Man cannot possibly by his natural powers liberate himself from sin and eternal death: But this liberation, and man's conversion to God, and newness of Spirit, are effected by the Son of God who vivifies us by his Holy Spirit, as it is declared, (Rom. viii, 9,) '*If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.*' After the Holy Spirit has been received, *the will is not idle or unemployed*. And we render thanks to God for this immense benefit, which he bestows upon us for the sake of his Son, through whom he also gives us his Holy Spirit, and governs us by his Spirit."

As this is a point for which Arminianism has been subjected to most undeserved obloquy, I considered it a duty to shew at some length what were the avowed opinions of Cranmer, the chief framer of the *Thirty-nine Articles* of our Church, Melancthon, Luther, and Erasmus, several years prior to the birth of our author. Let the impartial reader declare whether the individual declarations of those holy, wise, and learned men, or that of our author, be the most scriptural and moderate. The sentiments of Arminius on *Free-will* are expressed with as great caution and evangelical truth, as our own Tenth Article, and is far more explicit than the Eighteenth of the Augustan Confession.

The extracts from Cranmer and Melancthon are also of particular moment in relation to the next article, *the Grace of God*, which, in a Declaration of this kind, cannot be discussed without embracing a notice concerning its cognate, *the Freedom of the Will*: For these articles being two consistent branches of the same doctrine, are mutually illustrative. It will be perceived, that Melancthon's observations chiefly apply to the operations of Divine Grace, and the concurrence of the human will, in the matter of *conversion*; while those of Cranmer relate principally to the great work of the Holy Spirit in our *sanctification*.

standing and into the will and affections,) of all those gifts of the Holy Spirit which appertain to the regeneration and renewing of man,—such as *faith, hope, charity,* &c.; for, without these gracious gifts, man is not sufficient to think, will, or do any thing that is good.—(3.) It is that *perpetual assistance* and continued aid of the Holy Spirit, according to which He acts upon and excites to good the man who has been already renewed, by infusing into him salutary cogitations, and by inspiring him with good desires, that he may thus actually will whatever is good; and according to which God may then will and work together with man, that man may perform whatever he wills.

In this manner, I ascribe to grace THE COMMENCEMENT, THE CONTINUANCE AND THE CONSUMMATION OF ALL GOOD, —and to such an extent do I carry its influence, that a man, though already regenerate, can neither conceive, will nor do any good at all, nor resist any evil temptation, *without this preventing and exciting, this following and co-operating grace.*— From this statement it will clearly appear, that I am by no means injurious or unjust to grace, by attributing, as it is reported of me, too much to man's free-will: For the whole controversy reduces itself to the solution of this question, "Is the grace of God a certain irresistible force?" That is, the controversy does not relate to those actions or operations which may be ascribed to grace, (for I acknowledge and inculcate as many of these actions or operations as any man ever did,) but it relates solely to the mode of operation,—*whether it be irresistible or not:* With respect to which, I believe, according to the scriptures, that many persons resist the Holy Spirit and reject the grace that is offered.

V. THE PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS.

My sentiments respecting the Perseverance of the Saints are, That those persons who have been grafted into Christ by true faith, and have thus been made partakers of his life-giving Spirit, possess *sufficient powers* [or strength] to fight against Satan, sin, the world and their own flesh, and to gain the victory over these enemies,—yet not without the assistance of the grace of the same Holy Spirit.—Jesus Christ also by his Spirit assists them in all their temptations, and affords them the ready aid of his hand; and, provided they stand prepared for the battle, implore his help, and be not wanting to themselves, Christ preserves them from falling: So that it is not possible for them, by any of the cunning craftiness or power of Satan,

to be either seduced or dragged out of the hands of Christ. * But I think it is useful and will be quite necessary in our first

* Arminius spoke nearly the same modest words when interrogated on this subject in the last Conference which he had with Gomarus, before the States of Holland, on the 12th of Aug. 1609, only two months prior to his decease. The Rev. Thomas Scott says, in his notes to *the Historical Preface*, 'It is 'remarkable, that Arminius himself in this his last public Conference, and 'just before his death, should express himself so UNDECIDED on this grand 'point of *decided* and unqualified opposition to modern Arminians; and should 'make the concession, that he was not yet able to answer the scriptures 'which seemed to favour the doctrine of the final perseverance in all true 'believers. It is worthy the serious consideration of his disciples.'—Mr. Scott thinks this conduct *remarkable*. Such it might appear to be in a man of common mould, who, because he had somewhat against particular parts of a certain unscriptural system, would venture rashly to oppose other parts that deserved no marked reprehension. But to discover in Arminius a different and admirable trait, ought to excite no wonder; for, it will be seen, he was on every occasion careful to *let his moderation be known unto all men*. (Phil. iv, 5.)

This diffident mode of expressing himself on a topic about which he had not fully satisfied the scruples of his own mind, is indeed "worthy of consideration by his disciples;" and since it has elicited from Mr. Scott a high and deserved eulogium, we may hope that it will also be accounted worthy of very "serious consideration" by all the other disciples of Calvin. The common sense of mankind will in that case be no longer insulted with the silly verbiage and arrogant boasting, which distinguish the productions of those men who have sworn fealty to mere earthly teachers; and who seem to have forgotten, that, as a general characteristic, it may be confidently predicated of all humble and sincere Christians, 'ONE *is your Master, even* CHRIST; *and all ye are brethren*.' The followers of the Redeemer, who can embrace as their "brethren beloved" those "of the household of faith" that are *not rigid Predestinarians*, will then possess the assurance of which St. John speaks when he declares, '*We* KNOW *that we have passed from death unto life*, BECAUSE WE LOVE THE BRETHREN.'

Though the question propounded, and the answer returned, were not exactly those which the *Historical Preface* and Mr. Scott have stated, (as is shewn in Appendix W,) yet the leaning of our author's mind towards the negative of that question, is very evident from this part of his DECLARATION, and from his answer to the *Second* of the *Thirty-one Articles* with which he was unjustly charged. In the latter production he points out an important distinction that ought always to be observed when this doctrine is discussed, and the terms on which he was prepared to maintain, "that it is impossible for believers, *as long as they continue believers*, to decline [or fall away] from salvation;" and, on the contrary, "that it is impossible for believers, *if they fall away from the faith and become unbelievers*, to do otherwise than fall away from salvation,—that is, *if they remain unbelievers*."—The restrictions in these two passages are perfectly in unison with the rest of our author's system, which recognizes, *as believers*, those christian characters alone who continue to believe and *do not fall from their own steadfastness*. (2 Pet. iii, 17.) But it also accounts it possible for those very characters to imitate the change in conduct of *that faithful and wise steward*, described by our Lord (Luke xii, 42.) as saying in his heart, "*My Lord delayeth his coming!*; and who [in consequence] *began to beat the men-servants*, &c. The Lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the UNBELIEVERS!"—"Ye are the salt of the earth," says the same Supreme Authority, "but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for

convention, [or Synod] to institute a diligent enquiry from the Scriptures, Whether it is not possible for some individuals through negligence to desert the commencement of their existence in Christ, to cleave again to the present evil world, to decline from the sound doctrine which was once delivered to them, to lose a good conscience, and to cause Divine grace to be ineffectual.

nothing but to be cast out, and trodden under foot of men. Have salt in yourselves," &c.

In his pamphlet, entitled *Articuli nonnulli Perpendendi*, Arminius very justly observes concerning the *Perseverance of Saints*, 'The Church of Christ, 'from the days of the Apostles, down to the present time, has never reckoned 'that as an ORTHODOX opinion *which denies that it is either possible for true 'believers and regenerate persons to fall away from faith, or that they do in 'reality fall away from faith, totally and finally*. Neither has the Christian 'Church ever accounted that opinion HERETICAL, which maintains the con-'trary proposition, [that is, *the possibility and the actuality of believers falling 'totally and finally from the faith*.] Nay, the affirmative proposition [which 'maintains *the possibility of their fall*,] has always had more patrons among 'the followers of Christ, than the negative has obtained.'

Mr. Scott, therefore, is far from being correct when he wishes to prove, from a brief and garbled statement of an insulated occurrence, that Arminius was on this point opposed to his modern followers. The assertion is not true as it regards our author, who was far from being the rash and truce-breaking man that Mr. Scott has represented: Neither is it generally true, as it regards modern Arminians. For, by quotations from some of the greatest defenders of General Redemption that the Church of England has produced, I can easily demonstrate, that they maintained the doctrine of Final Perseverance with as much ability as any of Calvin's followers.

The great Melancthon's opinion concerning *the defectibility of the Saints*, is very express: "They are *the Sons of God* who are actuated by the Holy Spirit. But they who run headlong against conscience, eject and vex the Holy Spirit; and therefore they cease to be any longer *the Sons of God*.—I also affirm, that they who fall into such sins shake off the Holy Spirit, and are again made liable to eternal punishment. Some of them, as Aaron and David, return unto the Lord, are converted and received into favour: Many of them do not return, but fall into eternal punishment.—But these Stoical disputations which some men keep up are to be execrated, who contend, that *the elect always retain the Holy Spirit* even when they suffer falls the most atrocious."

Luther says: "Unless Ham had believed and prayed, and unless he had feared God, he could in no wise have been saved in the ark: Yet he was afterwards reprobated. Do you ask, what we shall infer from such examples? We shall only draw this inference, that these examples have been proposed for the purpose of instilling into us a godly fear, lest we should suppose, that, *after grace has been once received, it is impossible for us to fall again from it*."

The strong language of the Augsburgh and Saxon Confessions on this topic, are well known to all theological readers.

Seckendorf, the historian of Lutheranism, says: "Luther, Bugenhagen, and Melancthon declared, that they had in all the Churches unanimously taught a contrary doctrine, [to that of *the indefectibility of grace even in those who fall into open sin*,] that is, they had always taught, that if any saint and believer should willingly and purposely sin against God's commands, *he was no longer a saint, but had cast away* TRUE FAITH, and rejected the Holy Spirit."

Though I here openly and ingenuously affirm, I never taught that a *true believer can either totally or finally fall away from the faith, and perish*;* yet I will not conceal, that there are passages of Scripture which seem to me to wear this aspect; and those answers to them which I have been permitted to see, are not of such a kind as to approve themselves on all points to my understanding. On the other hand, certain passages are produced for the contrary doctrine [of Unconditional Perseverance] which are worthy of much consideration.

VI. THE ASSURANCE OF SALVATION.

With regard to the certainty [or assurance] of salvation, my opinion is, that it is possible for him who believes in Jesus Christ to be certain and persuaded, and, *if his heart condemn him not*, he is now in reality assured, *that he is a Son of God, and stands in the grace of Jesus Christ*. Such a certainty is wrought in the mind, as well by the action of the Holy Spirit inwardly actuating the believer and by the fruits of faith,—as from his own conscience, and the testimony of God's Spirit witnessing together with his conscience. I also believe, that it is possible for such a person, with an assured confidence in the grace of God and his mercy in Christ, to depart out of this life, and to appear before the throne of grace, without any anxious fear or terrific dread: and yet this person should constantly pray, '*O Lord, enter not into judgment with thy servant!*'†

* See the First and Second of the subjoined XXXI Articles.

† One of the most edifying as well as amusing ecclesiastical narratives that could be produced by a man of genius and piety, would be a correct history of the fluctuation of religious opinions among different sects and parties,—and the prominence which has at various periods been given, by one and the same sect, to some of the distinguishing doctrines of Christianity. "The Assurance of Salvation," which our author has described in the 333rd page as "the Internal Witness of the Holy Spirit," has been recognized under these and other names, and is one of those grand doctrines which cannot be separated from the gospel without undermining its very foundations. Long before the days of Arminius, the Christian Church had considered it a test of the personal interest which every individual believer felt in the saving merits of Christ applied to his soul. It was consequently inculcated as *a duty of universal obligation among Christ's flock*. But after our author had begun to shew the absurdity of several of Calvin's *additions to the gospel*, the rigid Predestinarians resolved to re-model this doctrine of Personal Assurance and to make it one of the strong bulwarks of their system. Instead of allowing it to remain the scriptural criterion of a believer's actual enjoyment in God, they overcharged it with their own inventions: They no longer applied it to *the present experience of the people of God*, as Arminius has done in the text, but to a very different and unhallowing purpose,—to the creation of a presumptuous confidence, that, "whether in the way to the kingdom, or by the way-side, they should never fall totally and finally from grace." In the spirit of their creed, they did not make it helpful in ascertaining the conscious growth of their Christian graces, the perceptible elevation of their religious

But, since "God is greater than our hearts, and knoweth all things," and since a man judges not his owu self,—yea, though

character, or their actual standing in the Divine Favour; but they employed it to work themselves up to a persuasion of their *individual* or *personal election*, (which according to their doctrine was determined at first in the Divine Mind, *without any regard to faith or holiness in the particular subjects of it*,) and consequently to *a complete certainty of their final perseverance*.—Arminius did not in his days greatly impugn this preposterous sentiment, (for his enemies gave him abundance of other employment,) indeed it had then scarcely attained to any degree of popularity. But it was boldly attacked by his successors, who shewed its absurdity.—When the Calvinists found it to be untenable in its more modern shape, they abandoned both the sound part of the doctrine and their own additions, in rather a curious manner; for they began to teach it, not as a *duty* incumbent on all believers, but as a *privilege* enjoyed by only a few even of the elect. In that condition it rests *generally* among them to this day. So that they are but a very slight remove beyond the Semi-Pelagians, many of whom acknowledge the existence of the doctrine and the enjoyment of it as a rare privilege, while others of them in their usual style deride it as "enthusiastic,"—a word of portentous sound among those *self-estimated men of reason*, and sufficient with them to induce the abandonment of any true but *unfashionable tenet* to which it is applied. These two discordant parties are not the only persons who discountenance this scriptural doctrine; it is discarded from the creed and practice of the Roman Catholic Church, because it will be seen by a subsequent extract, that it is very injurious to several parts of the Priests' office.

Limborch has well described the views of the moderate part of the Semi-Pelagians, when he treats in his "Body of Divinity" on the *Sealing*, the *Earnest* or the *Pledge* of the HOLY SPIRIT, by which terms were then understood nearly the same gifts as the *Witness of the Spirit*, or the *Assurance of Salvation*. He asks, "*Is it not granted to all true believers?*—Answer: It does not appear to be granted to all, neither is it necessary,—because it is conferred in order to give them a certainty of their salvation. But this certainty [or assurance] may likewise be drawn from the word of God, and from the clear promises which are contained in it, and which a believer may with certainty apply to himself. (2 Tim. iv, 6—8; 1 John iii, 21, 22.) And this kind of certainty seems ordinarily to be sufficient. In the mean time, such cases *may happen* as those in which, if sincere and ardent prayers be addressed to God, he may bestow his Spirit, to effect a stronger confirmation of that hope which has been conceived through his promises. I say, *if the Spirit be asked of him in prayer*,—because it is his pleasure, to be acknowledged as the author of such a saving gift. (Luke xi, 13; James i, 5.) For instance, when a man is oppressed with some heavy calamity or persecution, or is solicited by a grievous temptation, under which he would easily faint or fall, he prays to God, and God is accustomed to grant this gift, by which he confirms the man in the hope of life eternal, places before his eyes its magnitude and glory, and causes it to appear as if it were present. God is pleased to do this, that the man, being thus inflamed with the desire of that glory, may cheerfully proceed in a course of piety, and may reject and despise all the delights of this world and the desires of the present life, which might seduce and attract him from his Christian career. This is that *peace of God* (Phil. iv, 7,) with which when believers are armed, they not only *preserve an equanimity of mind* in adversities the most difficult, but they also rejoice and glory in them, even unto death. (Rom. v, 2, 3.) Examples of these effects are shewn in various martyrs, who, while enduring the most grievous torments and cruel deaths, employed themselves in singing psalms and hymns. But this kind of confirmation seems to be no other, than *sealing by the Holy Spirit*. But since God bestows on believers this gift of *sealing*, he will likewise preserve it in them to the end, *if they persevere in faith*. On this account it is said, (Ephes.

a man know nothing by himself, yet is he not thereby justified, but he who judgeth him is the Lord," (1 John iii, 19; 1 Cor. iv,

iv, 30,) *we are sealed by the Holy Spirit of God unto the day of redemption.*"—According to this mode of stating the doctrine, common Christians have little need of it, and the cases are very few in which such confirmation *may happen* to be necessary !!

The purpose to which Oliver Cromwell applied the Calvinistic perversion of this doctrine, may be seen in a preceding page, (444,) and in page 406 is shewn the still more preposterous use which Hommius made of it, when, *after one prayer*, " he formed a holy resolution to persevere steadfastly in those opinions which are generally received." A similar instance of this arrogance respecting *the Divine assurance of holding correct opinions*, (which is a doctrine greatly opposed to that inculcated page 404,) occurs in Fox's *Acts and Monuments*, concerning a person of the name of CARELESS, who was one of the holy sufferers in the bloody days of Queen Mary, and who thus puns upon his own name, in a letter to a friend : " I have cast my CARE upon the " Lord, which CARETH for me, and I will be CARELESS, according to my " name." In the course of his examination before a Popish Doctor, he said, " I am most sure and certain of my salvation by Jesus ; *so that my soul is* " *safe already*, whatsoever pains my body may suffer here for a little time." There is nothing very objectionable in this paragraph, except the confident boasting of *the safe state of his soul*, which is expressed according to the Calvinistic doctrine of *assured perseverance*, and which would not sound well with the scriptural and modest appendage of Arminius, '*O Lord, enter not into judgment with thy servant!*'—But CARELESS adds soon afterwards, " I am most certain, and even so am I sure, that his Holy Spirit " (wherewith I am sealed,) will so preserve me from all heresies and evil " opinions, that I shall die in none at all." When poor CARELESS spoke these words, he had either forgotten, or had *carelessly* perused the following quotation from the *Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*, or King's Book, published in 1543, which contained the only public formularies of faith that were then in force within these realms : " Whether there " be any *special, particular knowledge*, which man by faith hath certainly of " himself, whereby he may testify to himself, that he is of *the Predestinates* " *which shall to the end persevere in their calling*,—we have not spoken, nor " can in scripture nor doctors find, that *any such faith can be taught or* " *preached*." But we are not too rigorously to judge every expression of this kind. Great allowance must occasionally be made for the phraseology of a man of lively imagination ; and still greater allowance will be granted when we consider, that, through Divine condescension, a larger measure of the graces of the Holy Spirit, even according to Limborch's cool notions, might be imparted to the mind of one who was in immediate view of martyrdom. This example is quoted to shew the unwarranted length to which the early Calvinists were inclined to stretch the salutary doctrine of assurance, and the encouragement which their unguarded manner gave to subsequent enthusiasts, who rendered it subservient to any thing which suited their fancies. How different in every respect is the certainty inculcated by Arminius : " If a man's heart [a believer " in Jesus] condemn him not, he is certain and persuaded, that he is a Son of " God and stands in the grace of Jesus Christ. But—I dare not place *such an* " *assurance* on an equality with that by which we know *there is a God*, and that " *Christ is the Saviour of the world*." In accordance with the modesty of this declaration, Bishop Ridley, that noble martyr for the truth of God, thus expressed himself respecting the assurance which he felt in the very prospect of death : " How nigh the day of my dissolution and departure out of this world is at hand, I cannot tell. The Lord's will be fulfilled, how soon soever it shall come! I know, that the Lord's words must be verified in me, that I shall appear before the Incorrupt Judge, *and be countable to him for all my former life*. And although THE HOPE *of his mercy* is my SHEET-ANCHOR *of eternal*

3.) I dare not [on this account] place this assurance [or certainty] on an equality with that by which we know *there is a God*, and that

salvation, yet am I persuaded, that whosoever wittingly neglecteth and regardeth not to clear his conscience, he cannot have *peace with God*, nor a *lively faith* in his mercy."

On this subject the sentiments of the Lutherans were very correct. Like the amiable Arminius, they carefully guarded against the inroads of enthusiasm, by bringing the witness of the Spirit to sanction nothing, except what was expressly contained in the Holy Scriptures. (See the remarks of our author, page 336.)—On the one hand they had to encounter the Roman Catholics, who encouraged all Christians to entertain a personal distrust of their saving interest in Christ,—evidently with an intention to establish the necessity of auricular confession, and other *lucrative* parts of the priests' office, but especially the power of drawing souls out of Purgatory: So that the faith of the laity among the Papists did not *stand in the power of God*, but *in the wisdom of men*. (1 Cor. ii, 5.) On the other hand, the Lutherans were compelled to subvert the foundations of that carnal security in which the Anabaptists inveloped themselves by means of *the abuse* of this doctrine: Indeed, the Anabaptists, and their enemies the Calvinists, seemed for many years to vie with each other in sanctioning their several extravagances by an injurious appeal to *the evangelical confidence* which God bestows only on men of *humble and contrite spirits*.—The manner in which the Lutherans avoided both the Papistical and the Anabaptist rocks, was most admirable; while, with singular consistency, they maintained the scriptural doctrine in its purity. (See the *Augustan Confession*, passim.) It is pleasing to observe the steps by which Luther endeavoured to instil this Christian confidence into all the members of the Reformed Churches, beginning with the weaklings of the flock and proceeding upwards to those who had made greater advances in Divine Grace. In one passage he says: "The acquired or infused faith of these sophists talks thus about Christ, *I believe the Son of God suffered and rose again*: there it terminates. But true faith says, '*I also believe that the Son of God suffered* '*and was raised again*, and that *all this was done* FOR ME *and* FOR MY SINS. '*Of this I am certain*: Because he died for the sins of the whole world. But 'it is most certain, that I am some part of the world: Therefore it is most 'certain that he died also for my sins.'" See, in page 555, a similar brief and conclusive kind of reasoning on this subject by Arminius. In another passage Luther speaks thus: "I have shewn at great length, that a Christian man ought to be *perfectly assured* of his standing in the favour of God, and ought to *have in his heart the cry of the Holy Spirit*. I have done this, that we may be fully instructed to reject the most pestilential opinion of all the Papal kingdom, *that a man ought to be in a state of uncertainty respecting the grace of God towards him*. If this opinion be once established, Christ evidently profiteth nothing. Because he entertains doubts concerning the grace of God towards him, he must likewise necessarily doubt concerning *the Divine Promises*, and, consequently, about *the will of God, the benefits of Christ*,—that for us he suffered, died, rose again, &c.—Of this the Pope is ignorant, and therefore he fulminates his furious dogmas, *that no one knows, not even righteous and wise men, whether they be worthy of God's love*, &c. Nay, if they be righteous and wise men, they *know assuredly* that they are beloved by God,—otherwise they are not righteous and wise persons."—On another occasion he writes thus: "God says to thee, '*Behold, thou hast my Son; hear and accept of him*. If thou do this, thou art already *assured of thy faith and salvation*.'"

The same clear views are taught in various parts of the *Saxon Confession*, which the Lutheran Churches offered to the Council of Trent in 1551. The extract in a preceding page, (599,) respecting *Free-will*, is equally appropriate to this doctrine. It is remarkable, that in nearly every paragraph where the work of the Holy Spirit is mentioned, this clause is added, *The human*

Christ is the Saviour of the world. Yet it will be proper to make *the extent of the boundaries of this assurance*, a subject of enquiry in our convention.

will is not idle. In the following quotation may be perceived a particular allusion to the error of those who wished to render this doctrine of the Spirit of none effect, by appending to it an *irrespective* or *personal election*, which has in every age of the Church been injurious to the growth of piety, and a source of arrogance to the individuals who consider themselves thus to have been *elected without any reference to their future faith or perseverance.* "The Eternal Father and the Son vivify and renew the hearts [of men] by the Holy Spirit. In this consolation they [believers] are elevated by faith, as St. Paul says, (Gal. iii, 14,) *that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.*—We do not therefore speak about an *idle* knowledge: And those ignorant men labour under an egregious mistake who suppose, that *remission of sins* happens to idle persons without any motion of their minds, without contest, and without a perception of consolation in their real pains, at the age when the word of the doctrine can be understood, according to that passage, *Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.* And because we propose consolation to consciences in penitence, we do not add in this place any questions about predestination or election: But we lead all our readers to the word of God, and command them to learn the will of God from HIS OWN WORD, according to the precept of the Eternal Father, who hath declared in express terms, HEAR YE HIM! Let them not be inquisitive about other speculations."—In the Eighth Article on *Good Works*, after a grateful acknowledgment of the various blessings of salvation, among which "the governance of the minds and hearts of believers by God's Holy Spirit" holds a conspicuous place, it is added: "We know assuredly, that these benefits are procured for us, as it is most sweetly said by Zechariah, (xii, 10,) '*I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and supplication.*' He calls it *the Spirit of grace*, because in this consolation *the Son of God bears testimony by sealing us with the Holy Spirit*, that we are in grace and that we are delivered from the pains of the damned. He afterwards calls it *the Spirit of supplication*, because when we have acknowledged [the receipt of] the remission of sins, we do not avoid God, we do not rage against Him,—but we approach to him with true faith and hope, and ask of him and expect his assistance, we love him, and subject ourselves to him. In this manner is our obedience commenced. In the same way the Lord says: '*I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Comforter,—the Spirit of truth.*' The Holy Spirit kindles the light of truth in our minds, and excites within our hearts new emotions that are agreeable to the law of God; that we may acknowledge this great gift, may gratefully endeavour to retain it, and that we may constantly ask for assistance to be afforded to us in the greatest perils of life. Nor is the will idle, [or unemployed,] even after we have received the Holy Spirit."

Melancthon says, in his *Loci Præcip. Theolog.*, (1543,) "The Holy Spirit "is sent into the hearts of believers, that he may kindle new light, right-"eousness, and life eternal. Thus Zechariah calls him *the Spirit of grace* "*and of supplication*; that is, he WITNESSES [bears testimony] WITHIN US, "that we are received into favour, and he moves [inclines] the heart to come "to this belief and determination: He also incites us to the act of invocation, "because we believe that we are now heard."—In his *Answer to the 22 impious Articles of the Bavarian Inquisition*, (1559,) he says: "Let converted persons therefore retain their ASSURANCE, nor yield to doubts which produce profaneness or despair. Thus the Council of Trent passed a decree, that *men should always doubt.* When in the midst of real sorrows men of piety are elevated and excited by the word of the gospel, let them conclude with certainty, that they have then both the reconciliation, [atonement,] and the

VII. The Perfection of Believers in this life.

Beside those doctrines on which I have treated, there is now much discussion among us respecting *the perfection of believers*,

Holy Spirit as a pledge or earnest. Let them confide in the word, according to that saying, *My soul hath hoped in his word, My soul hath hoped in the Lord.* But if the will yielded to doubts, the Holy Spirit would be shaken off and discarded. The saints while in this life have always a strife about their own *unworthiness* and the *particularity* [of God's favour]. Let this unworthiness be combatted by the passages concerning gratuitous reconciliation on account of the Son of God, and concerning his intercession, who says, *O Father, love them with that love with which thou lovest me!*—Concerning election let them derive consolation from this passage, *Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord!*; nor let them enquire into the things into which God hath not commanded any enquiries to be instituted, as the Son of Syrach teaches, 'Piously meditate on those things which God hath commanded thee.' —The Papists destroy this consolation, when they command people to remain in a state of uncertainty: But the Enthusiasts transfer it from the word of God and from faith, unto feigned inspirations, [afflatus,] and order you to abide in doubt until you perceive yourself to be forcibly seized, and reluctantly compelled to believe. Against this imagination also let us support ourselves by the word of the gospel. The rule is firm and well-established, *War a good warfare, holding faith and a good conscience.* (1 Tim. i, 6.) But those who are converted have assistance which they ought not to slight or refuse, that is, the Holy Spirit, whom they should not grieve but excite, by meditating on the word of God and by ardent prayer, as St. Paul commands Timothy, *Stir up the* gift of God *which is in thee.* The Church has always been surrounded by the two hostile armies of the Pelagians and the Enthusiasts. Steuckfeldt has contended in many volumes, that God communicates himself to men without the ministry or even without their meditation on the doctrine.—Others do not wish to appear as if they took away the doctrine; yet they remove the consolation which has its commencement in the word, when they dispute that *the promise is particular*, and that *God has wills which are contradictory.* But I propose *the universal promise* to those who are in the congregation of the called and are troubled, and I do not state the existence of contradictory wills in God. I often reflect upon the mortal agony of a certain holy man, who at intervals before his decease employed this expression: *Thy word is a light to my feet!* Other persons beside me saw Luther himself in a certain severe agony, and heard him frequently repeating this sentence: *He hath concluded* all *under sin, that he might have mercy upon* all! I also remember a pious matron, who shewed herself to be elevated by true consolation, after having in the course of her agony often repeated these words: *Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.*"

Thus explicitly did the Lutherans speak concerning *the assurance of salvation*, which they represented as communicated by the Holy Spirit to every man that was in a state of Justification. To what a high and hallowing object do they make it conducive! Very different from this is the sinister use to which the Calvinists have rendered it subservient. One of the most vulnerable points in their system, was, in former days, the frequency of the unhappy lapses of those who made the greatest professions of this certainty, or assured confidence. Not anticipating any such flagrant consequences, Calvin had very inadequately provided against their occurrence; but the experience which his successors had gained by seeing the defects of his system when operating on a larger scale, and their own ingenuity, induced them to accommodate *the assurance of salvation* to these unchristian lapses. The unsanctifying principle, "Once in grace, always in grace," how speciously soever it may be disguised, is a necessary fruit of irrespective and

or regenerate persons, in this life; and it is reported, that I entertain sentiments on this subject, which are very improper,

personal election; and the one must be maintained with as much pertinacity as the other. When therefore any eminent professor fell from his Christian steadfastness, the early Calvinists did not imitate other religious denominations by bewailing his fall as a kind of apostacy from the faith, but virtually held out not merely a palliation but some encouragement for such offences by coolly observing, "He has only lost *the grace of assurance:* He has fallen *foully* indeed, but not *finally.*" Such subterfuges as these were also employed by men who styled themselves BAXTERIANS; and it must be owned, that the wary founder of that scheme cannot be cleared from the accusation. At the period when this perversion of assurance occurred, many of the halls and castles of the nobility had galleries or *verandas* which gradually projected from each story that overlooked the inner court,—much in the same way as several of our large inn-yards are at present garnished. The Calvinists had only to imagine *the grace of assurance* to elevate a man to the highest veranda; and if from that he happened unfortunately to fall, it was scarcely possible for him to descend further at once than to the next veranda,—for each of the galleries gradually projected, till the lowest overhung a greater portion of the yard, and could contain more spectators, than any of those above. Though fallen from the highest elevation, the unfortunate tumbler was still an occupant of one of the lower galleries, and was considered to be a legitimate inmate of the mansion. An unexpected and rapid descent from one platform to another, though contrary to the strict *decorum* of the house, was viewed in the Papistical light of *a venial offence.* The greatest praise to which such an invention entitles itself, is this,—*However unscriptural it may be, like many of the appendages to Calvinism, it seems vastly ingenious!* See (page 444,) what our own Divines said on this point at the Dutch Synod.

In one of the excellent letters of the learned Grotius, in which he offers some animadversions on one of Peter Moulin's productions, the following brief history of this doctrine is given: "I now come to *the assurance of salvation,* in which the statements of Moulin wonderfully attract my approbation. He says, (1) 'There are some degrees of real faith that may be 'overturned.—(2) Some of the elect may entertain doubts respecting their 'salvation.—(3) There is a degree peculiar to that faith which never fails. '—(4) *A full assurance of faith* must be importunately asked of God.' (Heb. x, 22.) From these premises I deduce the following conclusions:—(1) That the faith which is overturned, and that which is not, do not differ so much in essence as in degree,—which was likewise the opinion of Junius.—(2) That perseverance is obtained from God, and is promised by God on this condition, *that we must ask it by earnest and importunate prayers,* and therefore that it is not entirely absolute.

"But, not to be deceived by the ambiguity of words, we must observe, all the ancients have stated that faith which may be overturned to be so far true faith, as not to deny to it the effect of Justification. For they openly declare, that many persons to whom their former sins have been remitted, are damned on account of sins which they have subsequently committed. Nor are they less agreed on this point,—'justifying grace cannot exist at the same time with 'sins against conscience, such as murder, adultery, and similar offences.' Wherefore, since some of the elect fall into sins of that kind after having received the gift of faith, (as is proved by too many examples,) it follows, and is openly avowed by the Holy Fathers, 'that, after faith has been received, 'a period of time may arrive, in which an elect person may not be in a state 'of justification.' If it were needful, these their declarations might be proved by many authorities. With them agree those Protestant Confessions which condemn them who say, *Those who have once been justified do not lose the Holy Spirit;* (AUGSBURGH CON. xi.) or which teach, on the contrary, *After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given and fall*

and nearly allied to those of the Pelagians, viz. "that it is possible for the regenerate in this life perfectly to keep God's pre-

into sin: (ENGLISH ART. xvi.) *It is possible for some of those who have been born again, to shake off the Holy Spirit, and to become obnoxious to the wrath of God and to eternal punishment.* (SAXON CON. xi.)

"The ancient authors appear to me to acknowledge three modes of *being assured of salvation.*—(1) The FIRST of them is an extraordinary one by revelation, which, St. Augustine intimates, is given to some men, when he says: 'What man knows that he will persevere to the end in the exercise and 'progress of righteousness?, unless through some revelation he be assured 'by HIM who in his just and secret counsel does not instruct all men con-'cerning this matter, but deceives no one.' (*City of God*, xi, 12.)—(2) The ordinary methods are two: Of which the first derives its origin *from the time*, the other *from the degree of faith.—From the time* a man who believes is assured of his salvation, when death is at hand, and a continuance in life is hopeless. For when a believer knows these two points, which, from the sacred writings and with pious antiquity we defend against the Papists,—that is, when he knows that he believes, and that a believer is justified before God, and when these are the last moments of a believer, he knows, therefore, that he is dying in a state of grace and is thus assured of his salvation. In reference to this, when Prosper had declared *predestination to be uncertain with us*, he added, *while we are exercised with the perils of the present life.*—(3) The other ordinary mode of ASSURANCE is *from the degree of faith.* For the ancients constantly affirm, 'that the charity [or love] which never fails is perfect,'—speaking according to the perfection of the present life; because, as the saying of St. Augustine is, 'In this life the *most perfect* charity has no place.' This saying of St. Jerome is very remarkable, 'The charity [or love] which was but a herb in Peter before he denied 'Christ, and which in every man springs up before it arrives at maturity, 'is lost and recovered before it attains to its perfection.' This is that root which St. Augustine says, 'cannot possibly be dried up, even under a burning sun.' Nor does that Father seem to have had respect to any thing else, when he asks, 'Who among the multitude of believers may 'presume that he is in the number of those who are predestinated?' For, by mentioning *the multitude of believers*, he apparently excludes some few and select persons.

"Beside these three plenary modes of *assurance*, there are other inferior degrees. For, as St. Bernard himself acknowledges with all the ancients, 'God has not left his own elect in this life without a testimony of consolation: 'But this testimony is the more certain and assured, according to the greater 'and more numerous exercises of their piety. This is clearly demonstrated 'by the Holy Scriptures, when they command us to *make our calling and* '*election sure or certain, by faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience,* '*godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity.*' (1 Pet. i, 5—10.) On this account St. Augustine proclaims, with all antiquity, 'Fear is diminished exactly in proportion to the increase of charity.'"

St. Bernard's practical views of assurance accord well with those of the Lutherans; but the Calvinists were scandalized at what they called "the LEGALITY of sentiments which made the strong attestations of the Spirit dependent on the practice of piety." But they should have recollected, that such pious "exercises" are not performed, except by the aid of the Holy Spirit. The words of St. Paul, (Phil. ii, 12,) have also been urged against this doctrine: *Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.* But this exhortation must be consistent with another, and apparently a contradictory one, in the same epistle: *Rejoice in the Lord alway: Be careful for nothing.* (iv, 4.) Yet any youthful theological student, who by the aid of a Greek Concordance will examine the grammatical structure of the evangelical exhortations to *Conversion*, may easily reconcile these two passages

cepts." To this I reply, though these might have been my sentiments, yet I ought not on this account to be considered a

with each other, as well as with St. John's words, *Perfect love casteth out fear*. This objection was particularly urged by Waddingus, a Popish clergyman at Antwerp, in a disputation which he had in 1620 with the learned Professor Episcopius, during his exile from Holland. The close of it is thus stated. "At length Waddingus said, 'No man can be assured that he has a supernatural act.'—But I said, 'He can know whether he does or does not believe God who commands it, and therefore whether he performs that act which God requires: If otherwise, what could God require? And what could man do, if he were ignorant of what he should do? Then, for any man to be certain [or assured] that he believes, it is not requisite that he should know *the faith which he has, to be a supernatural act*,—provided he knows it to be an act that is commanded, and that it proceeds from a sincere heart.'"

From these extracts it will be seen, that none of the latter Dutch Remonstrants were so evangelical in their sentiments on this point as Arminius was. See pages 276, 294, 319, 333, and 362. In their anxiety to inculcate the performance of moral duties, a branch of divinity most culpably overlooked by the Fatalists their opponents, they neglected to take the high and sacred ground on which Arminius stood. To avoid all appearances of enthusiasm, they abandoned the doctrine as *a duty*, and imitated the Calvinists in representing it *only as a privilege*. Limborch says, "A believer cannot be otherwise than *well assured* of his being in a state of salvation, if he use his *reason* and *judgment*." This is quite correct as far as it goes: For the Apostle says, "This is our rejoicing, *the testimony of our conscience*, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, *not with fleshly wisdom*, but *by the grace of God*, we have had our conversation in the world." (2 Cor. i, 12.) This amounts to nothing more than *moral evidence*, as Waddingus the Papist well observed.

But the same Apostle has declared: "Ye have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear: But ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry ABBA! FATHER! THE SPIRIT ITSELF *beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God*." (Rom. viii, 15, 16.) The pious Melancthon, in a short comment on these words, says, "The Apostle in this passage makes a clear distinction between the Holy Spirit exciting and consoling us, and that consolation by which the heart is gladdened and quickened."—This is something divinely super-added to *the testimony of our conscience*, and to Limborch's "use of *reason* and *judgment*." It is one of those *good things* which HE who *is a sun and a shield* to his people, *will not withhold from them that walk uprightly*. When they cease to walk uprightly, they are excluded from the enjoyment of all such favours; and when the consciousness of Divine approval is withdrawn, the unhappy backsliders in heart are deprived at the same time of the attestations of their own approving conscience. Our Saviour has said, "How much more shall your Father which is in heaven give, to them that ask him, *good things!*; (Matt. viii, 2.) which, in the parallel passage of Luke, (xi, 13,) are comprised in the gift of THE HOLY SPIRIT.—There would be no difficulty in demonstrating from Limborch's own showing in the preceding extract, that this grace of ASSURANCE ought to be possessed by every Christian. For he allows, "The Spirit will be "bestowed, if it be asked of God in prayer, and it will effect a stronger "confirmation of that hope which has been conceived through his promises. "God is accustomed to grant to believers this gift, [which in the preceding "sentence he terms SAVING,] and he will also *preserve it in them to the end*, "IF THEY PERSEVERE IN FAITH." Are not all these desirable enjoyments? In the word of God none of those unsound limitations can be found which men have invented. Let us then no longer render ourselves liable to receive this reproof,—*Ye have not, because ye ask not, or because ye ask amiss*. But let us "ask and receive, that our joy may be full!"

Pelagian, either partly or entirely,—provided I had only added that "they could do this *by the grace of Christ*, and *by no*

The excellent Dr. ISAAC WATTS, a Calvinist of the moderate and pious school, has embodied, in the following fine verses, all the scriptural views which were entertained in common by the Lutherans, the early Calvinists, and the Arminians:

Why should the Children of a King
  Go mourning all their days?
GREAT COMFORTER! descend, and bring
  Some tokens of thy grace.

Dost thou not DWELL IN ALL THY SAINTS,
  And SEAL them heirs of Heaven?
When wilt thou banish my complaints,
  And shew my sins forgiven?

ASSURE MY CONSCIENCE of her part
  In the Redeemer's blood;
And BEAR THY WITNESS with *my heart*
  That I am born of God.

Thou art the EARNEST of his love,
  The PLEDGE of joys to come;
And thy soft wings, Celestial Dove,
  Will safe convey me home!

I dare not assert, "that if this heavenly doctrine had been always as cautiously and scripturally propounded by others as it was by Arminius, it would have obtained more general support from the professors of our holy religion." I cannot give credit to such an assertion, while I behold that pertinacious attachment to masters, fashions, and systems, which distinguishes many individuals, who shew a far greater solicitude to propagate their favourite notions than the great truths of the Bible. As long too as *the carnal mind is enmity against God*, we must expect some persons to smile at our "simplicity" when we express pious hopes, during a long drought in summer, of receiving from heaven an answer to the excellent *Form of Prayer* FOR RAIN, which our Church prescribes to be used on that occasion;—although we have scriptural authority for the success of our supplications in that very case, (James v, 17,) and are assured by an Apostle, that '*The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.*' The very same persons will laugh at the doctrine of *assurance*, or the *Witness of the Spirit*, when it is mentioned in their presence. But however they may ridicule such rational hopes and well-grounded expectations, the fact remains no less certain, after all their scorn and incredulousness, that many Christians have received special answers to their "fervent prayers" for rain on the earth, and to their earnest entreaties for the gracious dews of the Divine Influence,—so that while *they are in the* FEAR OF THE LORD *all the day long*, (Prov. xxiii, 17,) *they can* REJOICE *evermore*, PRAY *without ceasing*, *and in every thing* GIVE THANKS: *For*, adds the holy Apostle, *this is the* WILL OF GOD *in Christ Jesus concerning you.* (1 Thess. v, 16—18.)

From no human compositions has this doctrine received such unequivocal patronage as from the formularies of the Church of England, but particularly from the much-neglected *Book of Homilies*. No Divines in the world have written upon it with greater clearness and ability, than have several of the English Arminians of the old school. Let the following specimen suffice from Bishop PEARSON, one of the ablest expounders of the doctrines held by the Church Universal: "FIFTHLY. It is the office of the Holy Ghost to ASSURE us of the adoption of sons, to create in us a sense of the paternal love of God towards us, to give us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance,

means without it." But while I never asserted, that *a believer could perfectly keep the precepts of Christ in this life*, I never

The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost given unto us. (Rom. v, 5.) *And because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying,* ABBA, FATHER! (Gal. iv, 6.) *For we have not received the Spirit of bondage again unto fear; but we have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry,* ABBA, FATHER! *The Spirit itself bearing witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.* (Rom. viii, 15.) As therefore we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from him our regeneration, so we are also ASSURED by the same Spirit of our ADOPTION; and because, being sons, we are also heirs, *heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ*, by the same Spirit we have the PLEDGE, or rather the EARNEST, of our inheritance. *For he which establisheth us in Christ, and hath anointed us, is* GOD; *who hath also sealed us, and hath given the earnest of his Spirit in our hearts:* (2 Cor. i, 21.) So that *we are sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession.* (Ephes. i, 14.) The Spirit of God as given unto us in this life, though it have not the proper nature of a PLEDGE,—as in the gifts received here being no way equivalent to the promised reward, nor given in the stead of any thing already due,—yet is to be looked upon as an earnest, being part of that reward which is promised, and, upon the condition of performance of the covenant which God hath made with us, certainly to be received."

I conclude this note with an abridgment of the four preceding particulars, which the same excellent Bishop produces. The first of them is a good illustration of the doctrine inculcated in the note, page 404: "The external and GENERAL work of the Spirit, as to the whole Church of God, is the revelation of the will of God; by which so much in all ages has been propounded, as was sufficient to instruct men unto eternal life. The same Spirit which revealeth the Object of faith generally to the universal Church of God, (which Object is propounded externally by the Church to every particular believer,) doth also illuminate the understanding of such as believe, that they may receive the truth. For faith is the gift of God, not only in the object but also in the act: Christ is not only given unto us, in whom we believe, but *it is also given us in the behalf of Christ to believe on him;* (Phil. i, 29.) and this gift is a gift of the Holy Ghost working within us an assent unto that which by the word is propounded to us. Thus *by grace are we saved through faith; and that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God.* (Ephes. ii, 8.) As the increase and perfection, so the original or initiation of Faith is from the Spirit of God, not only by an external proposal in the word, but by an internal illumination in the soul; by which we are inclined to the obedience of faith, in assenting to those truths which unto a natural and carnal man are foolishness.—The SECOND Part of the office of the Holy Ghost in the sanctification of man, is the regeneration and renovation of him. For our natural corruption consisting in an aversation of our wills and a depravation of our affections, an inclination of them to the will of God is wrought within us by the Spirit of God.—The THIRD part of this office is to lead, direct, and govern us in our actions and conversations, that we may actually do and perform those things which are acceptable and well-pleasing in the sight of God. *If we live in the Spirit*, quickened by his renovation, *we must also walk in the Spirit*, following his direction, led by his manuduction. And *if we walk in the Spirit, we shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh.* (Gal. v, 16, 25.) For we are not only directed, but animated and acted in these operations by the Spirit of God, *who giveth both to will and to do;* and *as many as are* THUS *led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God.* (Rom. viii, 14.) Moreover, that this direction may prove more effectual, we are also guided in our prayers and acted in our devotions, by the same Spirit.—FOURTHLY. The office of the same Spirit is to join us unto Christ, and make

denied it, but always left it as a matter which has still to be decided. For I have contented myself with those sentiments which St. Augustine has expressed on this subject, whose words I have frequently quoted in the University, and have usually subjoined, that I had no addition to make to them.

Augustine says, "Four questions may claim our attention on "this topic. The *First* is, Was there ever yet a man without "sin,—one who from the beginning of life to its termination "never committed sin?—The *Second*, Has there ever been, is "there now, or can there possibly be, an individual who does "not sin, that is, who has attained to such a state of perfection "in this life as not to commit sin, but perfectly to fulfil the "law of God?—The *Third*, Is it possible for a man in this "life to exist without sin?—The *Fourth*, If it be possible for "a man to be without sin, why has such an individual never yet "been found?" St. Augustine says, "that such a person as "is described in the *First Question* never yet lived, or will "hereafter be brought into existence, with the exception of "Jesus Christ.—He does not think, that any man has attained "to such perfection in this life as is pourtrayed in the *Second* "*Question*.*—With regard to the *Third*, he thinks it possible

us members of that one body of which our Saviour is the Head.—What the Apostle wished to the Corinthians, ought to be the earnest petition of every Christian, that *the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with us all!* (2 Cor. xiii, 14.)—*That which is born of the Spirit, is spirit;* such is their felicity which have it! *That which is born of the flesh, is flesh;* such is their infelicity which want it! If we be *elected according to the fore-knowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit unto* OBEDIENCE, (1 Pet. i, 2.) if the office of the Spirit doth consist in this, and he be therefore called HOLY because he is to sanctify us, how should *we follow* PEACE *with all men*, and HOLINESS *without which no man shall see the Lord?* (Heb. xii, 14.) How should we endeavour to *cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit*, PERFECTING HOLINESS *in the fear of God?* (2 Cor. vii, 1.) *The temple of God is holy, which temple we are if the Spirit of God dwelleth in us;* (1 Cor. iii, 16.) for the inhabitation of God is a consecration; and that place must be a temple where his honour dwelleth."

* *The Perfection of Believers in this life*, is one of those Divine doctrines which meet with great opposition from worldly men, and from some professors of Christianity: But if we once admit that distinction concerning Perfection which Grotius has quoted in a preceding page (610,) from St. Augustine, much of the unjust clamour which has been raised against it will cease.

Let those who disparage this scriptural tenet, examine with care and attention, by the help of a Concordance, all the passages in which this obnoxious truth occurs,—let them reflect at the same time, that they are not the sayings of men weak and fallible, but the WORDS OF GOD,—and if they can explain away or evade "the strong, commanding evidence" which they display in favour of EVANGELICAL PERFECTION, they are beyond the teaching of the Holy Spirit, and have no need of that "wisdom which is from above," and which does not instruct its possessors to *lie against the truth*. (James

" for a man to be without sin, by means of the grace of Christ " and free-will.—In answer to the *Fourth*, Man does not do

iii, 14.) It may be proper to inform the English reader, that in very few texts of the New Testament is the word καταρτισμος employed by the Sacred Writers to express what our translators call " Perfection;" but that the Greek term principally used for that purpose, is τελειοτης with its adjuncts. There is in the latter word a simplicity which causes it to be intelligibly construed in all other languages. Its root is Τελος, " an end;" and " the perfection" of any thing consists in its fulfilling the *end, scope* or *purpose* of the dispensation, economy or institution for which it is designed, or in which it is placed. Thus St. James intimates (ii, 22,) that unless works be accompanied by faith, the latter would not *be made perfect*,—" would not fulfil the design for which it was instituted;" (i, 4.) and unless *patience had her perfect work*, " she would be defective," in " not answering the purpose for which she was given." St. Paul informs Timothy, " the END of the commandment is *charity* out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned;" this appears to be the meaning of his fine description of charity, (1 Cor. xiii,) which " never faileth:" When therefore " that which *is perfect* is come,"—when that charity is come which is *the end of the commandment*, " the bond of perfectness," (Col. iii, 14,) and which fulfils the purposes of its economy,—then prophecies, tongues, and knowledge " shall be done away."—" He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him: In this is our love made perfect;" (1 John iv, 17.)—in this union with God we " fulfil the design of our Christian calling, of our dispensation," one principal part of which is there specified, " to cast out fear that hath torment, that we may have BOLDNESS in the day of judgment."—" Go and sell that thou hast, if thou wilt be perfect;" (Matt. xix, 21.) if thou wilt *answer the end* of the commandment. The Apostles of our Lord " taught every man in all wisdom" the gracious DESIGNS of the Divine Economy in the Redemption of Mankind, that they might see them " standing perfect and complete *in all the will of God*,"—" perfect and entire, *wanting nothing*,"—and that they might at last " present every man perfect in Christ Jesus," which is similar to the expression of St. Jude, " to present them *faultless* before the presence of his glory." An Apostle prays, (Heb. xiii, 21,) in behalf of those who by *patient continuance in* WELL-DOING sought for glory, &c., " The God of peace make you PERFECT *in every good work* to do his will!" Now, though it is conceded, in the same verse, God " works in you that which is well-pleasing in his sight," yet this evangelical appendage, which is most consistently quoted by Arminians, does not abate the aversion which our dear brethren, the Calvinistic writers, have conceived against perfection, because it is connected with what they term *the legality of labour*. Such is their antipathy to this association, that they can scarcely endure the mention of PERFECTION *in the exercise of good works*, even when it proceeds from the lips of an inspired Apostle. But, fret themselves as they may, " what GOD hath joined together, no *man* may with impunity put asunder." There is an important passage, (2 Tim. iii, 16,) in which this view of perfection as *the scope of the Divine Economy*, is well displayed: " All scripture is given by inspiration of God,—that the man of God may be (αρτιος) *perfect*, [*adapted* or *equipped*,] and [εξηρτισμενος, the same word with an augmented signification,] *throughly furnished* unto [*completely fitted* for the performance of] all good works."

It appears that even " the Captain of our salvation was *made perfect* through sufferings;" (Heb. ii, 10.) as Mediator he fulfilled the purposes of the Divine Economy in the great work of human Redemption. " Though he were a Son, yet he learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and, *being made perfect*, he became the author of eternal salvation unto *all them that obey him*." The beloved disciple acquaints us with *the design* of the Mediatorial Institution: " *For this purpose* the Son of God was manifested, *that he might*

"what it is possible for him by the grace of Christ to perform, "either because that which is good escapes his observation, or

destroy the works of the devil;—and ye know, that he was manifested *to take away our sins.*" (1 John iii, 5, 8.) Pride is represented as the sin of "those angels which kept not their first estate;" it was also the grand offence of our First Parents, and the cause of their expulsion from Paradise. Among the very first lessons, therefore, which our Divine Instructor taught his disciples, was this, "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am *meek* and *lowly of heart:* And ye shall find rest unto your souls." "Blessed are *the poor in spirit, the meek,*" *&c.* To whatever height a Christian's other graces may rise, he never can forget that salutary HUMILITY which he learnt in the school of penitence. Indeed, his increase in holiness is declared to be in exact proportion to his humbling views of himself, according to the evangelical maxim: "Whosoever shall exalt himself, shall be abased; and he that shall *humble himself,* shall be *exalted.*" (Matt. xxiii, 12.) The foundation of all true piety is properly laid in HUMILITY: By it and the twin grace of CHARITY all the real disciples of Jesus are distinguished: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another:" (John xiii, 34.) To render this "brotherly love" perfect, it is necessary for Christians to exhibit that branch of genuine humility which consists of "one preferring another in honour." (Rom. xii, 10.) "Put on, as *the elect of God,* holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, *humbleness of mind,* meekness, long-suffering," &c. (Col. iii, 12.) "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who made himself of no reputation, *took upon him the form of a servant, humbled himself,* and became obedient unto death, &c. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him," &c. (Phil. ii, 5.) "*Be clothed with humility:* For God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble." (1 Pet. v, 5.) God resisteth the proud, because they resist Him and virtually declare, "We will not have Him to reign over us." With an apparent reference to this idea, St. James repeats the preceding passage; and then exhorts his countrymen to resist the devil rather than God: "Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." (James iv, 7.) In this manner does the Son of God fulfil "*the purpose* for which he was manifested:" Pride, that first "work of the devil," is destroyed; and Humility, that virtue of 'GOD *manifest in the flesh,*' is imparted by the Holy Spirit.

After having laid the foundations of Perfection thus deep in *humility,* we may invite our Calvinistic friends to erect upon it a fabric whose "excellency may mount up to the heavens, and whose head may reach unto the clouds." With such a lowly yet stable basis, it will not prove to be a second "Tower of Babel," but "a building fitly framed together," composed of the various Divine accessories of *faith, virtue, knowledge,* &c., till it finally communicates with that "building of God—the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Yet, when "the head-stone of it is brought forth with shoutings, crying, *Grace, grace unto it!*" at that moment of joy and exultation when "glory ends what grace begun," the *perfect* and *upright* man, —"whose end is peace," and who has ever acknowledged, that "God wrought in him what was well pleasing in his sight,"—will in complete consistency with his Creed exclaim, "I am an unprofitable servant! Enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord! Thou hast wrought all my works in me!" (Isai. xxvi, 12.) A Perfection of this description, "which ascribes to *the grace of God* the commencement, the continuance, and the consummation of all good," (page 600,) is like the ladder which Jacob beheld; though the bottom of it rest "on the earth, the top of it will reach to heaven, and on it the angels of God will be seen ascending and descending." Nay, such is the condescension of Him who formed all the Angelic Host, God himself vouchsafes to make the humble heart his home. "For thus saith the HIGH and LOFTY ONE that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is HOLY; I

"because in it he places no part of his delight."—From this quotation it is apparent, that St. Augustine, one of the most

dwell in the high and holy place, *with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit*, to revive the spirit of the humble," &c. (Isai. lvii, 15.) This will serve to explain the enigma of the humble Psalmist, when he said, "My soul shall make her BOAST in the Lord: The *humble* shall hear thereof and be glad." (Psalm xxxiv, 2.)

But there is a danger, in all attempts like this to exhibit to weak brethren A PERFECTION MADE EASY, lest by a species of generalization we should render it *too easy*, and impede its intended beneficial operation, by lowering its scriptural standard. For no Christian man fulfils the purposes of his dispensation, without *a persevering attempt to excel in all the virtues and graces of the Holy Spirit:* This seems to be what the Sacred Writers intend when they exhort Christians to "go on to *perfection*." I will therefore leave it where St. Augustine has left it in the text, and refer my readers to the numerous exhortations to piety, virtue, holiness, perfection, and progress in the Divine Life, which are contained in the scriptures. As long as Calvinism is the system which (after all its modifications and windings,) it has continued to be since its first invention, these exhortations must be in a great measure nugatory and of no avail to its votaries. For, instead of directing the chief attention of its followers to personal amendment of life through *repentance*, *faith*, and *holiness*, as the appointed MEANS of salvation through Christ, or to "the recompence of *reward*" as the END,—in complete concord with all other schemes of Fate, it seduces them from the pursuit of that practical piety which is the chief design of Christianity, and sets them, without adequate *data*, to trace *the actings of the Divine Mind upon itself*, when "long before the goings forth of God towards his creatures," he formed that incomprehensible plan which they impute to him of determining the end, and then making the means subservient to it, without any consideration of the future personal faith and holiness of those who shall be saved, or the final impenitence and unbelief of those who shall be damned. By this method they removed from man even the shadow of personal accountability, and completely destroyed his free agency. Doctor SUMNER has admirably shewn in his excellent Book, entitled *Apostolical Preaching*, the very slight and passing allusions of the Apostles of our Lord to the doctrine of election. Instead of giving it that prominence which Calvinistic pastors are accustomed to do in their discourses, those early propagators of Christianity never mentioned it thus incidentally but for a practical and sanctifying purpose, and with an evident recognition of its CONDITIONALITY,—its Dependence on *faith and obedience foreseen*. Thus, in one of the strongest of the favourite passages of the Calvinists, (1 Pet. i, 2,) the Apostle recognizes the *foresight of the Deity*, only as it is connected with those subjects of election who are *sanctified by the Spirit*, are *obedient*, and *sprinkled with the blood of Jesus Christ*. The same observation applies to the use of the word "predestination," in Rom. viii, 29, 30, and the other two passages in which it occurs: "Whom He did foreknow, he also did predestinate *conformed to the image of his Son*:" Here is a foreknowledge of the *actual* conformity of those who are predestinated. That Absolute Election and Reprobation were considered *untenable on scriptural grounds*, is abundantly manifest from the concessions made (page 555—6,) by Gomarus and other Fathers of that rigid system. They confess, "that the knowledge "of such a Predestination as theirs, is neither the foundation of Christianity "nor salvation; and that the Gospel cannot be simply termed *the book* or *the* "*revelation of predestination*, but only in a relative sense." How manly is this avowal from the lips of the first inventors! And what a contrast does it present to the quibbling and subterfuges of some modern "vain janglers who, desiring to be expounders of the Divine law, understand neither what they say of it, nor whereof they affirm," (1 Tim. i, 7,) when they bring it forward to confirm Irrespective Predestination!

strenuous adversaries of the Pelagian doctrine, retained this sentiment, that "it is possible for a man to live in this world "without sin."

When those austere yet consistent defenders of Supralapsarian Calvinism were charged with a practical inversion of the gospel by teaching people to neglect the MEANS in reference to the END of salvation, (to both of which the scriptures seem to draw *the whole attention* of man,) and by teaching them curious speculations about the unknown, because confessedly unrecorded and hidden, *predeterminations of the Deity*,—which they did when, like some whom they ought not to have imitated,

> In thoughts more elevate, they reason'd high
> Of Providence, Foreknowledge, Will and Fate,
> Fixt Fate, Free-will, Foreknowledge absolute,—

they never attempted to deny the charge, but said, no better method than this could be devised to prevent the growth of despair and to administer comfort; for amidst the mutability of every thing human, only on *the unchanging love of God to individuals* "is founded the sure and undoubted consolation of all believers, which is calculated to render their consciences tranquil." Though the scriptures are declared, (2 Tim. iii, 15,) "ABLE *to make men wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus*," yet these adepts at systematizing thought, that a knowledge of the Predestinarian syllogisms which they had invented was CAPABLE of rendering men *still wiser*. The people were therefore told, that, notwithstanding "the thunders of the law" against them, (by which term they thought proper to vilify "the salutary denunciations of the gospel,") and notwithstanding "their foul falls," they must derive *consolation* from the reflection, that the "foundation of God standeth sure," (2 Tim. ii, 9,) and that "the promise of God is sure to all the [elect] seed." (Rom. iv, 16.) In this way Christ was evidently made "the minister of sin," (Gal. ii, 17,) and men might with impunity "frustrate the grace of God," by "turning it into lasciviousness." (Jude 4.) For if the chief ground of a Christian's comfort, is, "that from all eternity the END concerning him was fixed," (which as a source of comfort *remains yet to be proved* out of the scriptures,) and if the prescribed scriptural means (faith and holiness) have no influence on that inevitable END,—which our British Divines maintained with great consistency in the Synod of Dort, when they said, "Though a believer may wander out of the way of the kingdom, yet he *cannot fall from his hereditary right* to that kingdom,"—then may the man who can believe such a soothing doctrine say to his soul, "Soul! thou hast much goods laid up *for ever*; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry!" The preacher who propounds the binding fatality of the END from all eternity, is very appropriately compared to the fanatic owner of a sloop, who, desirous of freighting her to a distant port, entrusts the management to two sailors, whom he binds (hand and foot) to the mast of the vessel, and thus addresses them: "You have no reason to express astonishment, for you will "have no need to employ these limbs in navigating the vessel. Rest assured, "that you will without exertion arrive in safety at the desired haven, as "certainly as if you toiled and cared with the utmost anxiety during the "whole of the passage."

In the interesting Dedication which the nine orphan children of Arminius prefixed to his *Dissertation on the true and genuine Sense of the Seventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans*, the following pertinent remarks occur concerning the futility of this ground of consolation to believers: "That partition or disposal of our religion does not appear to be well adapted to promote piety, by which all things are directed to *a self-consciousness of special mercy* as to the principal part of our *duty*, and to the *comfort* which is derived from it in contradiction to the DESPAIR which is its opposite; but by

Beside this, the same Christian Father says, " Let Pelagius " confess, *that it is possible for man to be without sin*, in no other

which they are not at all directed to the *necessary performance of obedience* in opposition to SECURITY. It has its origin in the conceit, that *there is greater reason to be afraid of despair than of security*,—when in fact the contrary is true. For in the whole history of the Old and New Testament, which embraces a period of so many thousand years, the only example of a man in despair occurs in the person of Judas, the perfidious betrayer of his proper Saviour,—the case of Cain is foreign to the purpose. On the other hand, the world is now, as it was formerly, quite full of men in a state of SECURITY and neglecters of the duty which is divinely imposed on them, who nevertheless in the mean time sweetly bless themselves, and promise themselves grace and peace from God in full measure."

Those who wish to see a specimen of the injurious theory of Calvinistic Election, may peruse what is related, page 449, respecting Christ holding only the subordinate place of *the Executioner of Election*; and its equally injurious effects in practice may be seen in page 444, where Bogerman, with all the Pontifical authority which he bore with such *meekness* at the Synod of Dort, informs a sick man, who stood in need of christian instruction before he was entitled to receive spiritual consolation, that a " WISH *to be able to repent* was an infallible token of regeneration." In what a contrary strain is the Church of Ephesus addressed: " Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come to thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent." (Rev. ii, 5.)

In the absolute and unconditional predestination of Calvin's scheme will be found the first deep lines of that aversion to the performance of good works, and to the consequent progress towards scriptural perfection, which to this day distinguishes the warmest of his followers. But great is the encouragement given to lukewarm and unfruitful professors by the low interpretation which the Calvinists give to the reasoning of St. Paul in the Seventh Chapter of his Epistle to the Romans. They assert, that when the Apostle says, '*The good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do*,' he is speaking in the character of a man regenerated by the grace of Christ! In the Dissertation contained in the first part of the Second Volume of these Works, Arminius most satisfactorily proves from scripture and antiquity, that the Apostle throughout this chapter is describing the condition and feelings of an unrenewed man under the law: If this be not the case, that chapter contains a decided contradiction to all the other evangelical expressions of scripture. The same Apostle had said in the preceding chapter, *Sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace*: This passage is a complete key to all that succeeds. It is also said, (Heb. viii, 19.) *For the* LAW *made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did;* and the whole of Romans vii, goes to prove that truth. But so wedded are the Calvinists to their own preposterous notions, that unless a christian can utter all the days of his life, *O wretched man that I am!*, he is in their eyes neither a believer, nor one of God's elect. It is very obvious, that if these pretended friends to the grace of God can conceive its operations to ascend no higher than to this point, *To will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not*, and to the similar imperfect experience of a carnal man there described, they are among the most injurious of its traducers; and the conclusion of that chapter, when interpreted after their manner, contains one of the greatest licences to the commission of sin that an ungodly libertine could desire: *So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but* WITH THE FLESH, THE LAW OF SIN!

Hear DIODATI's Calvinistic comment on the words just quoted. " *With the* " *mind*: namely, with that part which is regenerate and most excellent.— " *With the flesh*: namely, with that which remaineth of corruption." This

"way than *by the grace of Christ*, and we will be at peace with "each other."—The opinion of Pelagius appeared to St.

interpretation contradicts the saying of our Lord, Matt. vi, 24; for, according to it, a man CAN serve two masters, both God and Mammon!—a principle which it was his design to subvert. The Calvinistic accounts of the immediate blessed effects of regeneration upon the human mind, are in general very scriptural: They describe those who are renewed in the spirit of their mind, as "having put on the new man, which after God is created in *righteousness and true holiness*," and as "having put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is *corrupt* according to the deceitful lusts." (Ephes. iv, 22.) To a man who reads these descriptions it will be matter of amazement and horror, that the very men, who promulge them, and who ridiculously pride themselves on being the great assertors of the potency of Divine Grace, should allow that holy principle to be so inoperative and ineffectual in *the elect*, as to suffer them '*to serve the law of God*' only with one part, "with that which is regenerate,"—and *to serve the law of sin* with the other part, "with that which remaineth of corruption." According to this doctrine, the contest between the Divine principles of *regeneration* and the infernal principles of *corruption* issues in what is commonly termed "a drawn battle,"—God seizes upon "one part of a regenerate man," and calmly allows his sworn "adversary the devil" to retain possession of the other part, till DEATH, *the great Calvinistic Deliverer*, compels Satan to quit his hold! How much more consistently do the Arminians assert "the sovereign power of grace Divine," who declare, in the words of our Lord, "When a strong man armed [the Devil] keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace: But when a stronger than he [Jesus Christ,] shall come upon him and *overcome him*, he taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusted and divideth his spoils." (Luke xi, 21.) It would indeed be a small part of the glory of Christ, if he were able only to effect an uncertain victory in behalf of his redeemed ones: When they cry to him day and night, *Avenge us of our adversary*, "will not God avenge his own elect? I tell you," says our Lord, "that he will avenge them speedily. (Luke xviii, 8.) This is the love of God, *that we keep his commandments*; and his commandments are not grievous. For whatsoever is born of God, *overcometh the world*; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. (1 John v, 4.) After that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster, [the law,] for ye are all the children of God *by faith* in Christ Jesus. (Gal. iii, 26.) If ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law. They that are Christ's, have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." (v, 18, 24.)

To this small part of revealed truth, misinterpreted as it is by the Calvinists, they have thought proper to subject all that is said in the Bible respecting the experience of mature Christians. On reading their carnal strictures, our wonder will cease at their stern opposition to these and similar apostolic exhortations: *Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto* PERFECTION; *not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, &c.—We desire, that every one of you do shew the same diligence to the* FULL ASSURANCE OF HOPE *unto the end; that ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.* (Heb. vi, 12.) St. John in the second and third chapters of his first Epistle gives a fine description of three consecutive degrees of grace, in the persons of those whom he calls, *little children, young men, and fathers.* Let those degrees be severally compared with the characteristics deduced from Romans vii, and it will soon be apparent which of them appertain to the gospel dispensation and to the practical doctrine of our blessed Saviour Christ Jesus, and which of them belong to the imperfection of the legal institution. Yet on the latter, the Calvinists rested their palliative doctrine of pious imperfection and continued sinning. How uncomfortable must that religion be which can rise no higher than to this legal mark, *I am carnal, sold under sin!* Much greater consolation may be derived from a contemplation of the noble evangelical mark, "the perfecting

Augustine to be this,—" that man could fulfil the law of " God *by his own proper strength and ability;* but with still

of the saints," described thus, (Ephes. iv, 13,) " Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto *a perfect man*, unto the *measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ*, that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro.' &c." With a happy inconsistency, however, several rigid Predestinarians can sing, with Dr. Watts, the verses in page 612, and the following lines :

The sorrows of the mind
Be banished from this place !
Religion never was design'd
To make our pleasures less.

If then the experience of Christians must be circumscribed within the desecrating limits which these men have provided for it in the words of Romans vii, let them no longer boast of being friendly to the doctrines of grace. The most moderate of them call the Lutherans and Arminians SYNERGISTS or " co-workers with God," both in conversion and sanctification, because, (as it is seen by the preceding notes on the Freedom of the Will, page 598,) they encourage believers not to resist God's Holy Spirit, when, by his blessed motions upon their souls, " he works in them both to WILL and to DO of his good pleasure," but obediently to comply with his gracious excitations, and " to WORK OUT their own salvation with fear and trembling." (Phil. ii, 12.) Hear another salutary instance of self-contradiction in the Annotations which the famous Calvinist, John Diodati, wrote on the Italian version of the Bible in 1606, thirteen years prior to his appearance at the Synod of Dort as a deputy from the Church of Geneva, and one of the greatest Predestinarian champions in that assembly. In his Arminian comment on the above passage he says, " *Work out :* that is, bend all your endeavours and strength to attain to the " mark and accomplishing of your salvation. 2 Cor. vii, 1.—*With fear :* that " is, with holy reverence, humility and care; or with such a fear as may make " you careful and diligent, and *not one which contrarieth the assurance of your* " *salvation.—For God worketh in you :* He gives a reason why they should so " employ themselves, namely, because their labour shall not be in vain, but " God's grace shall ASSIST THEREUNTO, and powerfully CO-OPERATE WITH " THEM. See Romans vi, 13, 14. Or [he gives a reason] why they ought to do " it *with fear*, namely, because that being able to do nothing of themselves, " but *only through God's grace*, they ought not to make themselves uncapable " of it through carnal security, self-confidence or presumption, (Rom. xi. 20.) " but, contrariwise, be ready and obedient to all God's motions, whereof they " are but only the instruments." This extract is in the phraseology of Fusel's translation, 1648, and, in conjunction with the scriptural references which it embraces, is highly explanatory of the holy and elevating doctrines of Arminianism. Let the rigid Calvinists stigmatize the Arminians as " co-operators with the grace of God ;" the latter will always feel delighted with the distinction : and that delight will not be one whit diminished when they can thus associate with them some of the fathers of Calvin's system, who will unite in singing Doctor Watts's beautiful paraphrase of Psalm lxxxiv, 7 :

They go from STRENGTH to STRENGTH
Through this dark vale of tears,
Till each o'ercomes at length,
Till each in Heaven appears.
O glorious seat! Thou, God our King,
Shalt thither bring *Our willing feet !*

This is a real Arminian sentiment, and is all that is intended by " the perfection of believers in this life," provided that by the Doctor's phrase, *Till*

"greater facility *by means of the grace of Christ.*" I have already most abundantly stated the great distance at which I

each o'ercomes at length, be understood "death, the last enemy that shall be destroyed!" To cover the nakedness of their system, some of the Calvinists are apt to pervert this passage by substituting *sin* in the place of *death*, and thus to place death in the throne of the Saviour,—the first promise concerning whom was, that *he should bruise the head of the serpent*. "If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life, because of righteousness." (Rom. viii. 10.)

At the commencement of this long note I shewed the manner in which the foundation of scriptural perfection is laid in humility, and that "the Son of God was manifested for this purpose—to destroy *the works of the Devil*," and especially *pride*, that first diabolical work. After this grace had been imparted to the believer by the Holy Spirit, he was instructed to "exercise himself unto godliness." But it appears from those who advocate the dwarfish kind of christianity, (if "christianity" it may be called,) that there is another sort of *exercise* and *humiliation* for the *imperfect men* of the Calvinian school of legality; and since their humility is of a desecrating character, and is a fruit of *sin dwelling in the heart*, it is very properly ascribed by them to *infernal agency*, "for the devil sinneth from the beginning." In his Annotations on these words of the Apostle, (Rom. vii, 17.) "Now then it is no more I that do it, [*that which I would not*,] but it is sin that dwelleth in me,"—Diodati declares: "We must distinguish of these three things—the *kingdom* [or dominion,] the *indwelling*, and the *opposition of sin*. The *first* is annihilated and "brought to nothing in believers, the *other two* [the *indwelling* and the *oppo-* "*sition* of sin] remain for their EXERCISE and HUMILIATION!" This flimsy and unhallowed distinction continues to the present time, a standard argument in the rigid Predestinarian churches. It is not requisite now to prove, how much such a sentiment detracts from the grace of God as it is described in the scriptures: This will appear still more plainly, if we consider that these detractors falsely represent Divine Grace as *an irresistible principle*. Yet here, by their own showing, the Divine WISDOM, HOLINESS and POWER are traduced,—*the two former* in being under the necessity of effecting humiliation in believers by means of sin,—and *the latter* by being rendered so exceedingly weak and inefficient as not to be able to produce one of the fruits of the Spirit, without the strange expedient of calling in the supplementary aid of sins, those works of the devil "for the destruction of which the Son of God was manifested." Till the Calvinists have satisfactorily demonstrated, that "to destroy sin" means "to allow it to *dwell in the heart and oppose the motions of grace*," and that in the New Testament dispensation the All-wise God has employed such an unhallowing agency as this to fulfil his holy purposes, their additions to the gospel must stand charged with a most profane absurdity. The Divine principle, which they have egregiously misrepresented, appears from their statements to be irresistible in the work of CONVERSION, but not in that of SANCTIFICATION: For, in the latter, instead of achieving a complete victory, the grace of God is unjustly stated to stop in the career of its blessed triumphs, to accept of a truce from sin its sworn enemy, and to permit this subtle and dethroned rival to *dwell* in the heart of the believer and impudently to manifest a brazen front of *opposition* to all the Divine operations.

In the 22d Article of the Belgic Confession, which is highly Calvinistic, the following very pertinent quotation occurs: "For it is of necessity, either that "all things are not in Christ which are required for our salvation: or that, if "they be in him, the man who by faith possesses Jesus Christ, *has likewise at* "*the same time* PERFECT SALVATION. It is therefore altogether a horrid blas- "phemy against God to assert, that Christ is not sufficient, but that there is "also need of other things: For it would follow as a natural consequence, "that *Christ is only partly a Saviour*." What "horrid blasphemers," therefore, in the language of these old Calvinists, must those men be who can de-

stand from such a sentiment; in addition to which I now declare, that I account this sentiment of Pelagius to be hereti-

liberately teach and assert, "that *when a believer possesses Christ, he has not at the same time* PERFECT SALVATION:" and "that *Christ is not sufficient* to decide the mortal strife between the flesh and the Spirit and to give the latter an undoubted conquest; but that there is also need of other things,—such as SIN *for the exercise and humiliation of believers*, and DEATH *for finally destroying the indwelling and the opposition of sin.*" Well might those ancient worthies add, as a natural consequence, "that under such circumstances *Christ would shew himself to be a Saviour only in part!*"

It has been the perpetual study of the Calvinists to misrepresent Arminianism. But, after all their verbiage, as Arminius observes most appositely, "the whole controversy reduces itself to the solution of this question, *Is the "grace of God a certain irresistible force?* That is, the controversy does "not relate to those actions or operations which may be ascribed to grace, "(for I acknowledge and inculcate as many of these actions or operations as "any man ever did,) but it relates solely to the mode of operation,—*whether "it be irresistible or not.*" The Arminians believe, with this great man, "that many persons resist the Holy Spirit and reject the grace that is offered." Yet they can to the honour of Divine Grace most consistently and without equivocation declare, "Behold the Lamb of God, which *taketh away* the sin of the world! He hath appeared to *put away sin* by the sacrifice of himself. (Heb. ix, 26.) The blood of Jesus Christ his Son *cleanseth* us from *all sin.* He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to *cleanse us from all unrighteousness.* (1 John i, 9.) For the grace of God that *bringeth salvation*, hath appeared to *all men*, teaching us, that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, *that he might redeem us from* ALL INIQUITY, and *purify* unto himself a peculiar people, *zealous of good works.*" (Titus ii, 11.) We may therefore in a Christian spirit address these words of St. Paul to a poor deluded Calvinist, who has imbibed the fatal dogma, that as sin is (according to Diodati,) thus useful to believers, he may venture to *sin that grace may abound:* "Be not deceived: God is not mocked: For whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." (Gal. vi, 7.) Compare this solemn apostolic admonition with the Calvinistic comment of Diodati, recorded in a preceding page (619,) and it will soon be apparent, that Arminianism is the *Religion* of *Scripture* as well as of *Common Sense*, and that the Arminians seem more fully aware, than their revilers, of the import of our Lord's words, (John viii, 34,) "Whosoever committeth sin, is *the slave of sin*," and is therefore, at the time, under its dominion.

These views of the perfection which the Scriptures inculcate, might advantageously be illustrated by quotations from the formularies of our own Church and from Lutheran writers. I will, however, only give the following brief description of perfection from the pen of the pious Melancthon: "Since the kingdom of God is righteousness and life in the heart, therefore perfection consists of an increase in the fear of God, in confidence of the mercy promised in Christ, and in a diligent concern to be obedient to our calling: As St. Paul likewise describes perfection, *We are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.* (2 Cor. iii, 18.)"

The following extract of a letter contains many correct sentiments on this point, and is interesting on some other accounts. It was addressed, in 1616, by Poppius to Uitenbogardt, the latter of whom, after the death of Arminius, exercised a kind of general superintendence over the Remonstrant ministers. The former part of it will evince the extreme solicitude of Uitenbogardt, and of other eminent characters among the Remonstrants, for the preservation

cal, and diametrically opposed to these words of Christ, '*Without me ye can do nothing*:' (John xv, 5.) It is likewise very

of evangelical doctrine and the general inculcation of gracious principles; and it will serve to counteract and subvert those vile and reiterated statements, in the *Historical Preface* to the Acts of the Synod of Dort, respecting the unhallowing designs of the Arminians. Uitenbogardt was an aged minister, and had greater experience in ecclesiastical affairs than any man in the United Provinces; he therefore knew of the propensity in the human mind, while avoiding one extreme, to fly to another, and kindly cautioned Poppius against even the appearance of *bare morality* in his public discourses: The reply of Poppius will prove that venerable servant of Christ to have exercised with regard to him a groundless jealousy. But subsequent events shewed Uitenbogardt's apprehensions to have been correct respecting some others: For while several of the Remonstrants endeavoured to shun the practice of the Calvinistic preachers, (who most injudiciously propounded the grace of God *so as to make it a ground of carnal security*,) they resolved to say little about grace, and to supply the defects of their adversaries by inculcating the observance of Christian precepts and the strict performance of religious duties. This was a complete change of practice from that observed by Arminius and the early defenders of his system; for those able Divines avowed on all occasions, that "the preaching of the cross of Christ is, to all those who are called by the gospel, *the power of God and the wisdom of God*." (1 Cor. i, 24.) The effect of this change, though deplorable, must be recorded and ought to be generally known;—not a few of the subsequent Dutch Remonstrants, within thirty years after the Synod of Dort, by explaining away many scriptural peculiarities of this description, had made rapid advances towards Semi-Pelagianism, and gave the law in that species of lore to Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Doctors Heylin, Whitby, and others of our celebrated countrymen. But it must never be forgotten, that several Divines of the greatest talents, both in Holland and England, *held fast the form of sound words* as delivered by Arminius; and manfully demonstrated to the world, that the doctrines of General Redemption are of a more gracious description and of a more hallowing tendenty, than the unhumbling and restricted grace of the Genevan school and the absurd pleas of Calvinism for a stinted and *imperfect* Christianity.—Poppius begins thus to answer his aged friend: "Reverend man, and brother in Christ entitled to high honour,—With pleasure I understood from your letters, that my sermons appear to you *well calculated to promote piety*; for *that* was the sole object which I proposed to myself in their composition. I likewise place your censures in my list of benefits: Yet I think it well, to return an answer to some of them, that I may remove from your mind a few doubts, and that you may intimately know my views and intentions on certain subjects. Your reverence seems to make some of your observations in the persons of the hyper-critics, and you expressly attribute them to that class of judges. You say, (1) 'They 'will exclaim, *that we are desirous of instilling into the hearts of men a kind 'of Theology that is entirely moral*.' This, I believe, they will say: But while they blame it, what sort of Theology will they recommend? Must it be theoretical Divinity? St. Paul indeed knew of none, except *that which is after godliness*; (Titus i, 1.) and he wished this to be sedulously inculcated on men, according to the eighth verse of the third chapter of the same epistle. ['This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be CAREFUL *to maintain good works*: These things are good and profitable unto men.'] I will bear this accusation with a willing mind, being assured that the Lord Jesus will recompense such conduct with signal advantage, and that the charge can never be substantiated before those who have a right understanding of matters.—You say, (2) 'It will displease them to perceive, *that I have no sermon on confidence in the satisfaction of Christ, and on the peace of the con-*

destructive, and inflicts a most grievous wound on the glory of Christ.

sciences that repose on that satisfaction.' But I generally preach and declare confidence in Christ: And is not this a confidence in the satisfaction and merits of Christ? You will undoubtedly be of the same opinion with me, that we must pluck up by the roots, out of the hearts of our hearers, that confidence by which men are accustomed to repose on Christ's Satisfaction without yielding obedience to his commands,—which is a species of assurance that is at once contrary to the scriptures and detrimental to mankind."

After some excellent remarks, he says: "I proceed to other matters, which your reverence considers not to be devoid of difficulty. On PERFECTION: But I treat on this point at greater length in my discourses *on the new creature*, which are now printed off. Though in my former discourses I say several things which will not prove very agreeable to zealots, yet I do not see in what respect I contradict the doctrine of our Churches. I am well aware, that in the 114th question of the Catechism it is taught, that 'those who are converted to God are not able perfectly to keep the precepts of the law.' But it is urged by me, that the obedience which God requires of us in Christ not only *can be* perfectly performed by those Christians who are born again, but also *ought to be* performed PERFECTLY, that is, 'fully according 'to that mode without the performance of which God is not willing to admit 'us to a communion with him,—which is, *that no sin reign in us, and that 'we strive to overcome our infirmities.'* But such a condition does not seem to be at variance with my statements, since I deny that the requirements of God in Christ are of such a nature *as not to allow of any sin whatever being committed by us*,—that is to say, *they are not of such a nature as to cause eternal death to await us if we happen to commit sin, and consequently to remove us beyond the reach of grace:* Which are the terms in which they [the Calvinists] are accustomed to stigmatize the word PERFECTION. This doctrine therefore does not seem to possess any great difficulty, if a man teach the possibility of conquering the infirmities and rising from the falls which are discovered in persons that are born again, whilst the general tenor of their lives is framed according to the gracious rules and precepts of Christ and not according to the rigour of the law; especially if it be added, *this complete and actual victory over infirmities is not simply necessary to salvation.* I frankly confess, that THE MOST HOLY PERSONS ON EARTH ALWAYS NEED THE GRACE OF GOD AND THE REMISSION OF SINS. Even the zealots [for Christian imperfection] will themselves judge it necessary, I think, to soften by a convenient interpretation the terms which the Catechism employs in describing *the slight beginnings of obedience in the most holy persons.* The words of Ursinus in his Catechetical explanations, (page 827,) are these: 'The fulfilling of the law is made possible to those who are born again, with 'regard to the imputation of Christ's righteousness, or by the benefit of 'justification and regeneration, both of which we obtain through faith.' And Calvin says, (Instit. lib. IV, c. i, s. 20,) 'I confess, that we must not 'labour slowly or coldly in urging perfection, much less must we cease,' &c. But how can this be done, if the *impossibility* which the Catechism describes must be inculcated? On this subject the saying of St. Augustine is well known. [See, in the text, a long quotation from this Father.] This also must never be forgotten, that I generally speak concerning *the gracious requirement of God in Christ* and its performance, and that in the subsequent discourses I refute the opinion of those who are called PERFECTIONISTS.

"One fruit which I expect from my reply to your letter, is this,—that your reverence may have an opportunity of judging, that, if my book cannot be published with any advantage to our cause, it may at least not prove to be detrimental. And since our zealots [the Calvinists] impudently attempt to fix upon us by continued repetition the reproach of I-know-not what kind of impiety and a studied neglect or disregard of the Divine Honour and

I cannot see that any thing is contained in all I have hitherto produced respecting my sentiments, on account of which any

Worship, will it not be advantageous to us to roll away this infamy by the open assertion of true piety, and to do it with such effect that the States General may not hereafter listen to those who are favourers of Libertinism, when their High Mightinesses are the patrons of our cause? It was my desire to benefit the good cause, and not to injure it. I have not written indeed according to the wish of the hyper-critics; yet it does not appear to me, that I have spoken or written any thing which had not been previously spoken or written by other persons of our order. I explain the Seventh Chapter of the Romans by *a man under the law;* but, I think, it is already evident to many people, that this is an opinion which we have defended. When treating on the sacrifice of Christ, I remain *within the will of God;* but neither is this any novelty in our body. Arminius himself has written on PERFECTION, in his *Answer to the Thirty-one Articles:* [See the Twenty-ninth.] And the author of the epistolary dedication, which is prefixed to the *Dissertation of Arminius on the Seventh Chapter of the Romans,* has embraced in that composition not a few of those observations which relate to this matter. These are the words of our own Fifth Article: 'Those who are grafted by 'true faith into Christ, and are consequently made partakers of his vivifying 'Spirit, are abundantly endued [furnished] with strength, with which they 'may fight Satan, sin, the world, and their own flesh, and may thus obtain 'the victory over them.' Do not these expressions convey the same sentiments as those which I inculcate?—which are, 'that it is possible for those 'who are born again to yield that obedience which God has prescribed, so 'that no sin may have dominion over them, and that they may also conquer 'their infirmities.' Even Episcopius is not afraid of occasionally declaring the same truths to his auditors, of which fact I have certain information. I have perhaps expounded some scriptural testimonies not exactly according to the mind of other people: But what man is there who does not claim for himself this LIBERTY OF PROPHESYING?"—The concluding phrase in this extract will remind the learned reader of a liberal treatise which bears that title, and which was written by a good Bishop whose name occurs in this note, and whose eloquent and practical books on *Holy Living* and *Holy Dying* have been blessed by God to the edification of thousands that now compose a part of *the spirits of just men made* PERFECT, and never can be seriously perused by any man without spiritual advantage. Yet that great man was not ashamed of owning his obligations to the Remonstrants, both for the tolerant principles of his religion and of his politics.

This Remonstrant Letter teaches the same truth as that which St. Augustine has stated in one part of the text, "No man does that which it is possible for him by the grace of Christ to perform." The evangelical views therefore of the Arminians are summarily delivered by an inspired Apostle in the following important passage, "My little children, these things write I unto you, that YE SIN NOT. And if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous: And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for our's only, but also for the sins of the whole world.—Whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God PERFECTED." (1 John ii, 2.) According to this salutary doctrine, if a believer "be overtaken in a fault, they who are spiritual can restore such an one in the spirit of meekness;" they can direct him to the Advocate with the Father. It is not therefore that impracticable sort of plan, that angelic perfection, which it has been represented to be by its chief enemies, who have provided a substitute for it, and among whom must again be associated the great body of the rigid Predestinarians and Semi-Pelagians. But while it is earnest in its exhortations to believers, *to stir up the gift of God that is in them* and commands them *not to sin,* it points to the grand remedy provided for "believers overtaken in a fault"—the GREAT PROPITIATION *for our sins!*

person ought to be "afraid of appearing in the presence of God," * and from which it might be feared that any mischievous consequences can possibly arise. Yet because every day brings me fresh information about reports concerning me, "that I carry in my breast destructive sentiments and heresies," I cannot possibly conceive to what points those charges can relate, except perhaps they draw some such pretext from my opinion concerning *the Divinity of the Son of God*, and *the Justification of man before God*. Indeed, I have lately learnt, that there has been much public conversation, and many rumours have been circulated, respecting my opinion on both these points of doctrine, particularly since the last Conference [between Gomarus and myself] before the Counsellors of the Supreme Court ?† This is one reason why I think, that I shall not be acting unadvisedly if I disclose to your Mightinesses the real state of the whole matter.

VIII. THE DIVINITY OF THE SON OF GOD.

With regard to the Divinity of the Son of God and the word αυτοθεος, ['God in his own right,'] both of which have been discussed in our University in the regular form of scholastic disputations,—I cannot sufficiently wonder what the motive can be, which has created a wish in some persons to render me suspected to other men, or to make me an object of suspicion to themselves. This is still more wonderful, since this suspicion has not the least ground of probability on which to rest, and is at such an immense distance from all reason and truth, that, whatever reports have been spread abroad respecting this affair to the prejudice of my character, they can be called nothing better than "notorious calumnies."—At a disputation held one afternoon in the University, when the Thesis that had been proposed for disputation was *the Divinity of the Son of God*, one of the students happened to object, "that the Son of God was *autotheos*, ['God in his own right,'] and that he therefore had his essence from himself and not from the Father."—In reply to this I observed, "that the word *autotheos* was capable of two different acceptations, since it might signify either 'one who is truly God,' or 'one who is God of himself;' and that it was with great propriety and correctness attributed to the Son of God according to the former signification, but not according to the latter."—The student, in prosecution of his argument, violently contended, "that the word was justly

* See the assertion of Gomarus, page 521.
† See an account of this Conference, pp. 518—521.

applicable to the Son of God, principally according to *the second* of these significations: and that the essence of the Father could not be said to be communicated to the Son and to the Holy Spirit, in any other than in an improper sense; but that it was in perfect correctness and strict propriety common alike to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." He added "that he asserted this with the greater confidence because he had the younger Trelcatius of pious memory, [but who was then living,] as an authority in his favour on this point; for that learned Professor had written to the same purport in his *Common Places*."—To these observations I answered, "that this opinion was at variance with the word of God, and with the whole of the ancient Church, both Greek and Latin, which had always taught, that *the Son had his Deity from the Father by eternal generation*." To these remarks I subjoined, "that from such an opinion as this, necessarily followed the two mutually-conflicting errors, Tritheism and Sabellianism; that is, (1.) It would ensue as a necessary consequence, from these premises, that there are three Gods, who have together and collaterally the Divine Essence, independently of this circumstance—that one of them (being only personally distinguished from the rest,) has that essence from another of the persons. Yet *the proceeding of the origin of one person from another*, (that is, of the Father from the Son,) is the only foundation that has ever been used for defending the Unity of the Divine Essence in the Trinity of persons.—(2.) It would likewise follow as another consequence, that the Son would himself be the Father, because he would differ from the Father in nothing but in regard to name,—which was the opinion of Sabellius. For, since it is peculiar to the Father to derive his Deity from himself, or (to speak more correctly,) to derive it from no one, if, in the sense of being 'God of himself,' the Son be called *autotheos*, it follows that He is the Father."

Some account of this disputation was dispersed abroad in all directions, and it reached Amsterdam. A minister of that city, who now rests in the Lord, having interrogated me respecting the real state of this affair, I related the whole of it to him plainly, as I have now done: and I requested him to make Trelcatius of blessed memory acquainted with it as it had actually occurred, and to advise him in a friendly manner to amend his opinion, and to correct those inappropriate words in his *Common Places:* This request the minister from Amsterdam engaged to fulfil in his own way.

In all this proceeding I am far from being liable to any blame; for I have defended the truth and the sentiments of the Catholic and Orthodox Church. Trelcatius undoubtedly was the person most open to animadversion; for he adopted a mode of speaking which detracted somewhat from the truth of the matter.—But such has always been either my own infelicity or the zeal of certain individuals, that, as soon as any disagreement arises, all the blame is instantly cast upon me, as if it was impossible for me to display as much veracity [or orthodoxy] as any other person. Yet on this subject I have Gomarus himself consenting with me; for, soon after Trelcatius had published his *Common Places*, a disputation on *the Trinity* having been proposed in the University, Gomarus did in three several parts of his Theses express himself in such terms as were diametrically opposed to those of Trelcatius. The very obvious difference in opinion between those two Professors I pointed out to the Amsterdam minister, who acknowledged its existence. Yet, notwithstanding all these things, no one endeavoured to vindicate me from this calumny; while great exertion was employed to frame excuses for Trelcatius, by means of a qualified interpretation of his words,—though it was utterly impossible to reconcile their palliative explanations with the plain signification of his unperverted expressions. Such are the effects which the partiality of favour and the fervour of zeal can produce!

The milder and qualified interpretation put upon the words of Trelcatius, was the following: "The Son of God may be "styled *autothcos*, or may be said to have his Deity from "himself, in reference to *his being God*,—although he has his "Deity from the Father, in reference to *his being the Son*." For the sake of a larger explanation, it is said, "God, or the "Divine Essence, may be considered both *absolutely* and *rela-* "*tively*.—When regarded *absolutely*, the Son has his Divine "Essence from himself; but, when viewed *relatively*, He "derives it from the Father."—But these are new modes of speaking and novel opinions, and such as can by no means consist together. For the Son, both in regard to his *being the Son*, and to his *being God*, derives his Deity from the Father. When he is called God, it is then only not expressed that *he is from the Father*; which derivation is particularly noted when the word Son is employed. Indeed, the essence of God can in no manner come under our consideration, except it be said, "that the Divine Essence is communicated to the Son by the Father."

Nor can it possibly in any different respect whatever be said, that this Essence is both "communicated to him" and "not communicated;" because these expressions are contradictory, and can in no diverse respect be reconciled to each other. If the Son have the Divine Essence *from himself* in reference to its being *absolutely* considered, it *cannot be communicated to him:* If it be *communicated to him* in reference to its being *relatively* considered, he cannot *have it from himself* in reference to its being *absolutely* considered.

I shall probably be asked, "Do you not acknowledge, that, "*to be the Son of God*, and *to be God*, are two things entirely "distinct from each other?" I reply, Undoubtedly I subscribe to such distinction. But when those who make it proceed still further, and say, "Since *to be the Son of God* signifies that he "derives his essence from the Father, *to be God* in like manner "signifies nothing less than that he has his essence from him-"self or from no one;" I deny this assertion, and declare, at the same time, that it is a great and manifest error, not only in Sacred Theology, but likewise in Natural Philosophy. For, these two things, *to be the Son* and *to be God*, are at perfect agreement with each other; but *to derive his essence from the Father*, and, at the same time, *to derive it from no one*, are evidently contradictory, and mutually destructive the one of the other.

But, to make this fallacy still more apparent, it must be observed, how equal in force and import are certain double ternary and parallel propositions, when standing in the following juxta-position:

God is from *eternity*, possessing the Divine Essence from eternity.

The Father is from *no one*, having the Divine Essence from no one.

The Son is from *the Father*, having the Divine Essence from the Father.

The word "God" therefore signifies, that He has the true Divine Essence; but the word "Son" signifies, that He has the Divine Essence from the Father: On this account, he is correctly denominated both God and the Son of God. But since He cannot be styled the Father, he cannot possibly be said *to have the Divine Essence from himself or from no one.* Yet much labour is devoted to the purpose of excusing these expressions, by saying, "that when the Son of God in refer-"ence to his being God is said *to have his essence from himself*,

"that form of speech signifies nothing more, than that the "Divine Essence is not derived from any one." But if this be thought to be the most proper mode of action which should be adopted, there will be no depraved or erroneous sentiment which can be uttered that may not thus find a ready excuse. For though God and the Divine Essence do not differ substantially, yet whatever may be predicated of the Divine Essence can by no means be equally predicated of God; because they are distinguished from each other in our mode of framing conceptions, according to which mode all forms of speech ought to be examined, since they are employed only with a design that through them we should receive correct impressions. This is very obvious from the following examples, in which we speak with perfect correctness when we say, "*Deum mortuum esse*," and "The Essence of God is communicated;" but very incorrectly when we say, "God is communicated."—That man who understands the difference existing between *concrete* and *abstract*, about which there were such frequent disputes between us and the Lutherans, will easily perceive what a number of absurdities will ensue, if explanations of this description be once tolerated in the Church of God. Therefore, in no way whatever can this phrase, "The Son of God is *autotheon*," ['God of himself,' or 'in his own right,'] be excused as a correct one, or as having been happily expressed. Nor can that be called a *proper* form of speech which says, "The Essence of God is common to three persons;" but it is *improper*, since the Divine Essence is declared to be *communicated* by one of them to another.

The observations which I now make I wish to be particularly regarded, because it may appear from them how much we are capable of tolerating in a man whom we do not suspect of heresy; and, on the contrary, with what avidity we seize upon any trivial circumstance by which we may inculpate another man whom we hold under the ban of suspicion. Of such partiality this incident affords two manifest examples.

IX. The Justification of man before God.

I am not conscious to myself, of having taught or entertained any other sentiments concerning *the justification of man before God*, than those which are held unanimously by the Reformed and Protestant Churches, and which are in complete agreement with their expressed opinions.

There was lately a short controversy in relation to this subject, between John Piscator, Professor of Divinity in the

University of Herborn in Nassau, and the FRENCH CHURCHES. It consisted in the determination of these two Questions: (1.) "Is the obedience or righteousness of Christ, which is imputed "to believers and in which consists their righteousness before "God,—is this only the passive obedience of Christ?," which was Piscator's opinion. Or (2.) "Is it not, in addition to this, "that active righteousness of Christ which he exhibited to the "law of God in the whole course of his life, and that holiness "in which he was conceived?," which was the opinion of the French Churches.—But I never durst mingle myself with the dispute, or undertake to decide it; for I thought it possible for the professors of the same religion to hold different opinions on this point from others of their brethren, without any breach of christian peace or the unity of faith. Similar peaceful thoughts appear to have been indulged by both the adverse parties in this dispute; for they exercised a friendly toleration towards each other, and did not make that a reason for mutually renouncing their fraternal concord. But concerning such an amicable plan of adjusting differences, certain individuals in our own country are of a different judgment.*

* It is remarkable, that Piscator, who continued to be a very rigid Predestinarian and many of whose opinions were objects of abhorrence even to the English Deputies at the Synod of Dort, should express himself in a most decided manner against the desecrating tendency of the doctrine of the imputed [active] righteousness of Christ. We have a still more singular instance in the celebrated John Goodwin, who while yet a zealous Calvinist published one of the most masterly treatises on this subject, that was ever presented to the British Public. Yet he retained his Calvinism till several years afterwards, and did not hesitate to teach the doctrine of absolute reprobation as being applicable to children who die in their infancy. "As his judgment became more matured, like several of the greatest Divines in Europe, he abandoned those opinions concerning Predestination in which he had been educated;" and while his noble work REDEMPTION REDEEMED remains in the Christian Church, a most admirable defence of Arminianism, his TREATISE ON JUSTIFICATION stands an impregnable bulwark against the contrary doctrine.

On this topic Goodwin's very able biographer pertinently observes: "That any man professing to derive his creed from the Bible, should have imbibed the notion of the imputation of Christ's personal righteousness in the justification of a sinner, is a singular circumstance, and affords a striking proof of the liability of even good and upright minds to erroneous impressions. It is repeatedly said by the sacred writers, that faith is imputed for righteousness; but it is never said, that Christ's obedience to the moral law is imputed to any man. In the language of scripture, the terms justification, forgiveness of sin, the non-imputation of sin, and the imputation of righteousness, are manifestly employed to express substantially the same blessing; and that blessing is uniformly represented not as the fruit of Christ's obedience to the moral law, but of his meritorious death.

"It should also be observed, that there are several moral duties imposed upon mankind in their relative situations, as husbands and wives, parents, masters and servants: relations these in which Christ never stood, and the duties of which therefore cannot be placed to the account of any people as having

A question has been raised from these words of the Apostle Paul, " Faith is imputed for righteousness." (Rom. iv.) The

been performed by him in their stead. To say nothing of the violence offered to the apostolic term λογιζομαι, when understood as signifying any such imputation as that in question; and of the absurdity of supposing that when it is so peremptorily asserted, that '*by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified*' in the sight of God, (Rom. iii, 20,) in every instance men are actually justified by an imputation or transfer to them of those very 'deeds,' performed by the Lord Jesus Christ!" (JACKSON'S *Life of Goodwin*, p. 45.)

For a further account of the views of Arminius on this point, consult the note, page 520: Where he expresses his belief in the very words of the Heidelberg Catechism, questions 60 and 61.

The Letter of the French Synod, and the Answer of Piscator, are given at full length in *Præst. ac Erudit. Vir. Epist. Eccles.* As the Synodical Epistle professes to contain *exhortations* and no *arguments*, we present the reader with the following extract from the learned Professor's reply, which was written in 1604: " Reverend, Very Respectable, and Most Learned Men, and Brethren beloved in Christ,—I have understood from your letter, that you are grieved on account of some individuals among you who have disturbed your concord by teaching this doctrine,—'the perfect obedience which Christ 'performed to the law is not imputed to us, and his righteousness and purity 'are not given to us for the price of eternal salvation;' and that those persons announce me as the inventor of this opinion, and contend for it under my authority. I likewise learn, that you vehemently disapprove of this doctrine and condemn it, because you bestow upon it the epithets of *a contagion, an error, an unsound dogma, one that is at variance with the gospel*, and, lastly, *an opinion*. For these reasons you request of me, 'that I will not hereafter 'instil such lessons into tender minds.' I certainly desire in your behalf the existence of concord among yourselves,—but such a concord as is founded in every particular on the agreement of Heavenly Truth. But I assert, that I am not the author of the doctrine which those brethren have taught among you: And I regret, that they should contend for it under my authority; because their contention for it ought to be through the sole authority of the sacred scriptures, and they should not announce me as the inventor of that doctrine which I am very sorry to find is so fully disapproved and condemned by you who are pastors of the Church. But since I do not plead guilty to those crimes of which you accuse it, my conscience will not suffer me to comply with your request in rejecting a doctrine, which I consider to be orthodox and agreeable to the word of God. On the contrary, I account it my duty to institute before you an apology for it, and, according to the precept of the Apostle Peter, *to give you a reason of the hope that is in me, with meekness and fear*. Though this forms no part of your petition, yet the adoption of such a course is required for the glory of God and the edification of the Church,—both of which are concerned in this matter. You undoubtedly ought not only to have asked of me the reasons of this my doctrine, but from the word of God to have convicted me of the error, which, according to your views, is contained in this doctrine. You are not exonerated from the performance of this duty by what you say: 'that you were able, by means of 'testimonies and reasons drawn from the sacred scriptures, to confute those 'my tenets; but you thought that, as you were treating with a man of 'piety and learning, an admonition would be preferable to a disputation, 'and that the *intreaties* of your most respectable assembly would be of more 'avail with me, than the *arguments* of any person.' Nay, if I appear to you as a pious and learned man, you should have reflected, that *as such* I am provided with proofs and arguments for my doctrine, and that I have hitherto delivered it with a good conscience, to the glory of God and the edification of the church, in accordance with the nature of my office: I cannot therefore abandon it, in order to gratify any human being. Whatever your conduct

enquiry was, (1.) Whether those expressions ought to be *properly* understood, "so that faith itself, as an act performed

towards me may be, I will not neglect my duty; but, according to the grace which God has bestowed on me, I will render you a reason of my doctrine."

I have quoted this apologetical introduction at full length, for several reasons, but principally because whatever part of it may be considered available to Piscator the Calvinist, is equally potent in support of Arminius the able defender of General Redemption, against such requests as those of Bishop Hall quoted in a preceding page (70). After a brief dissertation "on the obedience of the *life* of Christ and his *death*," Piscator proceeds thus: "Since I have in this affair to treat with men of learning, I will propose my arguments in a syllogistic mode, that a judgment may be formed concerning them with the greater facility and correctness, and that their truth may be rendered the more apparent.—(1) God imputes righteousness to us for that very thing on account of which he forgives us our sins: But God forgives us our sins solely on account of the obedience of *the death* of Christ,—under which brief expression by a Metonymy I comprehend the rest of his sufferings: Therefore, He imputes righteousness to us, solely on account of the obedience of the death of Christ. I prove the proposition of this syllogism from the equal validity and force of these two phrases—*to forgive sins* and *to impute righteousness.* (Rom. iv, 6, 7.) But I prove the assumption of the syllogism from this circumstance,—the scriptures deliver no other thing, than the obedience of the death of Christ, by which our sins have been expiated and the pardon of them obtained.—(2) If our sins have been expiated by the obedience of *the life* of Christ, either a PERFECT expiation has been procured for *all of them*, or an IMPERFECT one for *only some of them.* But neither of these assertions can be made with truth. (i.) The *first* cannot be asserted, because it would then follow that *Christ has died in vain;* for as *he died* to expiate our sins, he would not have accounted it necessary to offer such an expiation for them if they had been already expiated by the obedience of his *life.* (ii.) And the *latter* assertion cannot be made, because Christ hath yielded PERFECT obedience to the law of God; wherefore if he have performed that for the expiation of our sins, he must necessarily through that obedience have expiated all of them PERFECTLY.—(3) If Christ by the obedience of his *life* had rendered satisfaction to God for our sins, it would follow as a consequence that *God is unjust*, who has made an additional demand to receive satisfaction through the obedience of *death*, and thus has wished to have the same debt twice paid. But God is not unjust: Therefore by the obedience of his life Christ has not rendered satisfaction to God for our sins. —(4) If Christ have given satisfaction for our sins by the obedience which he performed to the law, so that God may impute this obedience to us as though we had ourselves performed it, the consequence will be, that *we are delivered from yielding obedience to the law*, since, according to the hypothesis, Christ has performed it for us, or in our stead: As with great correctness we declare, with an Apostle, 'We are redeemed from the CURSE of the law, Christ having been made a curse *for us.* (Gal. iii, 13.) But we are not freed from obedience to the law, but are bound to perform it to God for ever. Therefore Christ has not rendered satisfaction for our sins, by the obedience which he performed to the law.—(5) If Christ by his obedience to the law has merited for us the forgiveness of sins, the consequence will be, that *the remission of sins was effected without the shedding of blood*, that is, 'without such a blood-shedding as was the cause of death.' In the law no one is commanded to allow his blood to be shed, or himself to be killed, for obtaining the remission of sins. But 'without shedding of blood no remission is effected.' (Heb. ix, 22.) Therefore Christ has not merited for us the remission of sins, by the obedience which he performed to the law."

I omit several of the lucid proofs adduced by Piscator, and hasten to present the reader with an extract from one of the letters of Arminius, another

"according to the command of the gospel, is imputed before "God *for* or *unto* righteousness,—and that of grace; since it

part of which has been quoted for a different purpose in Appendix Z: "Two things are worthy of observation in the Synodical Epistle to Piscator: (1) The *First* is this circumstance, which has been common to all ecclesiastical assemblies and churches from remote antiquity,—to consider their present state 'a perfect one, in which there is no deficiency of necessary truth, and in 'which no falsehood takes up its abode; and therefore the only thing for 'which they must make provision, is, *a firm perseverance in the received 'doctrine, and a combined contest in its favour in opposition to the adversaries.*' This is virtually the foundation on which the ministers, in Synod assembled, build their petition.—(2) The *other* is the request itself, a compliance with which they endeavour to obtain from Piscator. In it (i.) they animadvert upon Piscator's opinion with greater severity than propriety. (ii.) The arguments which they produce in support of their request, are unseemly in a Synod: For it is not by intreaties, but by firm demonstrations, that they must hope to obtain from a learned and pious man a change of such an opinion as he conceives to be true, and a cessation on his part from officially instilling it into others—(iii.) Highly exaggerating their own troubles, they appear either to be ignorant of the evils with which the Churches of other countries are afflicted, or to care very little about them, when they say, 'The Churches of Germany enjoy halcyon days.'

"The syllogism by which Piscator concludes his *first* argument is excellent, &c.—(2) His *second* argument will seem absurd, unless we pay attention to his hypothesis, by which he states *justification* to be *the remission of sins*, which remission is obtained by the expiation made for them through the death of Christ. This hypothesis being pre-supposed, it is impossible to reject his second argument. But his opponents deny, that justification consists solely of the remission of sins; for they declare, 'a performance of the law is likewise required.'—(3) In the *third* argument let the same hypothesis be observed, or else the adverse party will say, 'Christ has rendered satisfaction 'to the law, *not for our sins*, but *for us who were bound to perform the law*:' Which is true, provided we were bound to perform the law and Christ took the performance of it on himself.—(4) In the *fourth* argument we must attend to the same remark,—with the exception, that, when he says, 'Christ has performed the law *in our stead*,' he presses upon his adversary with too much strictness. For if Christ performed the law *in our stead*, we are no longer bound to its performance. But the subject of dispute on this point, is, Whether we are bound to obey the law or not;—that is, so far as the law demands such obedience *after a legal manner*. If this argument be properly urged, it tends to support Piscator's opinion; but it ought to be proposed in a different manner, thus: 'If Christ have performed obedience to the law in our stead, 'we are not bound to any further [legal] obedience, because we are not 'bound to the punishment which he has borne in our stead.'—(5) In the *fifth* argument let the same hypothesis be observed; because if it can be denied and that correctly, the reasoning of Piscator will be invalid. But he appears to think, that he has proved with sufficient firmness by his first argument, 'that the whole of justification consists solely of the remission of 'sins,'—if this be true, *that no obedience of Christ, not even that of his life, appertains to the procuration of justification, except so far as by such obedience Christ has obtained the remission of sins.* When the reasoning has been considered in this manner, we may form some judgment concerning the strength of Piscator's arguments. But I am surprised that he did not more manfully contend for his own opinion when he was writing to such a great assembly or to its deputies. Yet he has performed greater things than the Synod, who employ no argument in their letter to convince Piscator."

Arminius then states, in a most charming and methodical manner, his own just views of this great subject: As it would be an injury to the whole chain

"is not the righteousness of the law."—(2.) Whether they ought to be *figuratively* and *improperly* understood, "that the "righteousness of Christ, being apprehended by faith, is im-"puted to us for righteousness." Or (3.) Whether it is to be understood, "that the righteousness, for which or unto which "faith is imputed, is the instrumental operation of faith;" which is asserted by some persons.—In the Theses on JUSTIFICATION, which were disputed under me when I was moderator, I have adopted the former of these opinions not in a rigid manner, but simply, as I have likewise done in another passage which I wrote in a particular letter.*—It is on this ground that I am accounted to hold and to teach unsound opinions concerning the Justification of man before God. But how unfounded such a supposition is, will be very evident at a proper season and in a mutual conference: For the present, I will only briefly say, "I believe that sinners are accounted righteous "solely by the obedience of Christ; and that the righteousness "of Christ is the only meritorious cause on account of which "God pardons the sins of believers and reckons them as right-"eous as if they had perfectly fulfilled the law. But since "God imputes the righteousness of Christ to none except "believers, I conclude, that in this sense it may be well and "properly said, *To a man who believes Faith is imputed for* "*righteousness through grace*,—because God hath set forth his "Son Jesus Christ to be a propitiation, a throne of grace, "[or mercy-seat,] through faith in his blood."—Whatever interpretation may be put upon these expressions, none of our divines blames Calvin, or considers him to be heterodox on this point; yet my opinion is not so widely different from his as to prevent me from employing the signature of my own hand in subscribing to those things which he has delivered on this subject, in the Third Book of his *Institutes*; this I am prepared to do at any time, and to give them my full approval.

Most noble and potent Lords, these are the principal articles, respecting which I have judged it necessary to declare my opinion before this august meeting, in obedience to your commands.

of ratiocination to publish it in unconnected portions, and as this note is now sufficiently prolix, I shall reserve the remaining extract for a subsequent volume, in which Arminius resumes the subject.

* To Hippolytus a Collibus, Ambassador from the Elector Palatine to the States-General.

X. The Revision of the Dutch Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism.

But, beside these things, I had some annotations to make on *the Confession of the Dutch Churches* and on *the Heidelberg Catechism;* but they will be discussed most appropriately in our Synod, which at the first opportunity we hope to obtain through your consent, or rather by means of your summons. This is the sole request which I prefer to your Mightinesses,—that I may be permitted to offer a few brief remarks on a certain clause, subject to which their High Mightinesses the States General gave their consent to the convening of a National Synod in this province, [Holland,] and the substance of which was, that in such Synod *the Confession and Catechism of the Dutch Churches should be subjected to examination.*

This clause has given great umbrage to many persons, not only because they account it unnecessary, but likewise unjust, to subject the Confession and Catechism to examination. They also suppose, that I and a certain individual of great reputation, are the persons who prevailed with the States-General to have such a clause inserted. But it is by no means true, that the revision of the Confession and Catechism is unnecessary and unjust, or that we were the instigators of their High Mightinesses in this affair. With regard to the last of these two suppositions, so far were we from having any concern with the origin of that clause, that, eleven or twelve years ago, at the pressing importunity of the Churches that prayed for a National Synod, the States of South Holland and West Friezland at last judged it proper to consent to it by their decree, on no other condition than *that in such Synod the Confession of the Dutch Churches should be subjected to examination.* Yet we, at that time, neither endeavoured by our advice, nor by our influence, to promote any such measure. But if we had with all our might made the attempt, we should have been doing nothing but what was compatible with our official duties; because it is obviously *agreeable to reason* as well as to *equity,* and quite *necessary* in the present posture of affairs, that such a measure should be adopted:*

* The following extract from Brandt's *History,* will elucidate the fact to which Arminius alludes, and which had been falsely attributed to him and Uitenbogardt: "In the United Provinces, the clergy had formerly resolved to hold a National Synod every three years: for which purpose they now [1596] asked permission of the States General, who gave an absolute refusal to their request: For they had not then forgotten what had transpired in preceding Synods. After repeated solicitations, however, they at length returned this

FIRST. That it may openly appear to all the world that we render to *the word of God alone* such due and suitable honour, as to determine it to be *beyond* (or rather *above*) *all disputes*, too great to be the subject of any exception, and worthy of all acceptation.

SECONDLY. Because these pamphlets are *writings that proceed from men*, and may on that account contain within them *some portion of error*, it is therefore proper to institute a lawful enquiry, that is, in a national Synod, whether or not there be any thing in those productions which requires amendment.

1. The first enquiry may be, Whether these human writings are accordant in every part with the word of God, with regard to the words themselves, the construction of the sentences, and the correct meaning.

2. Whether they contain *whatever is necessary to be believed unto salvation*,—so that salvation is, according to this rule, not denied to those things to which it appertains.*

answer to the clergy, 'that as the Deputies of the States General had received 'no instructions on this subject, the Churches must present this their petition 'and the reasons on which it was founded, to the particular States of each 'province.' After the Clergy of Holland had received this communication, they made a regular application to the States of their province, who, on the 23d of December, acquiesced in the prayer of their petition, but with this proviso: *That the Belgic Confession shall be revised, in the fear of God, by the National Synod; and that the best mode of settling, maintaining and increasing peace and unity in the Churches of the Low Countries shall be an object of consideration, and in it the late troubles shall be composed.* For in several ecclesiastical disputes, the Clergy had reproached each other with opposing the National Confession: Some of them had declared, 'that they were 'bound by that Confession only so far as it was agreeable to the word of God, 'and that, as it contained some topics that were either equivocal or contradic-'tory, it could not be a fixed rule of doctrine.' The States of Holland therefore endeavoured to stifle those seeds of discord by means of a good revision; and their resolution was not opposed by any of the ministers at that period. But, because the rest of provinces continued to withhold their assent to the convening of a National Synod, although the clergy urged it with great importunity, and since the permission of Holland could extend no farther in this matter than to one vote among many, the meeting of a National Synod was for several succeeding years prevented, especially by the refusal of the province of Utrecht."

This refusal on the part of the States General, and the subsequent consent of the States of Holland with their appended proviso, occurred seven years prior to the elevation of Arminius to the Professorship at Leyden,—a period when, as a private and unostentatious pastor, he possessed no such influence as is here attributed to him.—Respecting *the troubles* which were *to be composed* at that National Synod, consult the note, page 538.

* In four editions of the works of Arminius, I find the last clause of this sentence substituted for the last of that which succeeds it, obviously to the injury of the consequences naturally to be deduced. But in the early edition of 1613, each of these clauses stands as in the present translation.

3. Whether it [the Rule of these Formularies] does not contain far too many particulars, and embrace several that are *not necessary to be believed unto salvation*,—so that salvation is consequently attributed to those things to which it does not belong.*

* Erasmus says, "Truth does not stand in need of many words; and that is best remembered which is related with the greatest conciseness. Never was the Christian faith more plain or pure, than when the world was contented with the single and concise symbol of the Apostles or of Apostolic men." In one of his letters, he advises his cotemporaries "only to enjoin those articles which are plainly expressed in the sacred scriptures, or those without which we cannot attain to salvation. For this purpose but few things are necessary; and the fewer and more simple they are, the more readily will they be admitted." Of this opinion were several eminent men beside Erasmus and our author. In answer to Cardinal Perron, Casaubon says, in the name of King James the First of England, "The articles of our faith, and whatever is necessary to be believed unto salvation, ought to be sought in the scriptures alone; and no dependence should be placed on human authority, however great it might be, but only on the word of God, in which he has revealed his will to us by the Holy Spirit. The Primitive Fathers and Churches, therefore, acted aright in drawing their creeds from the Holy Scriptures; but in relation to the framing of new articles, they had no authority."—Mark Antony de Dominis, the Archbishop of Spalatro, declares: "Those long and tedious Confessions which contain the decision of many theological controversies, can neither be proposed nor embraced as symbols, rules, and formularies of faith. For those which began to be published in nearly all the Reformed Churches in order to terminate the differences that had arisen in one or other particular Church, are, notwithstanding their intention, and always will be, the principal causes of schism. Who is so dull and stupid as to submit his judgment or conscience to the doctrines of particular teachers, from whom he can receive no certainty of faith?" This Archbishop owned, that the most pacific plan would be, to draw up a short Confession of fundamental and necessary matters, with the general concurrence of all the orthodox Eastern and Western Churches.—In the reasons given for their opinions at the famous Preparatory Convention, held at the Hague in 1607, Arminius, and the three members who voted with him, gave this advice: "Let there only be composed such a Confession as comprehends nothing except those simple points which are necessary to salvation, which have been already determined in General Councils, and which are conceived in plain and scriptural words and phrases,—and then we may rest assured no one would be hasty in opposing it or in making alterations."—The elder Du Moulin says, in his reply to Perron: "The sum of religion consists of two branches,—*to do well*, and *to believe aright*: We find the substance of the *first* in the law of God, and of the *second* in the *Symbol* or Apostles' Creed. Many persons have attained to salvation with even less knowledge than this: Jonah did not preach so much to the Ninevites, and yet the Lord Jesus bears testimony to their conversion."—David Paræus, in his *Irenicum*, divides the foundation of our faith and salvation into four principal parts: The *first* is, the Ten Commandments; the *second*, the Apostles' Creed; the *third*, the Lord's Prayer; and the *fourth*, the Sacraments. He then adds, "Those who receive and faithfully practise these things, will undoubtedly be saved, although they may never have heard of other matters about which Divines dispute."—Bishop Hall says, in his book on *Moderation*, "I know no book so necessary as that *De Paucitate Credendorum*, that is, *Of the small number of things we are obliged to believe*; and there is no article so necessary as that, *We need not believe more than the Symbol of the Apostles*."—The celebrated

4. Whether certain words and forms of speech are not employed in them, which are capable of being understood in different ways and furnishing occasion for litigation and dispute. Thus, for example, in the Fourteenth Article of the Confession, we read the following words, "Nothing is done

Junius, who was the predecessor of Arminius in the Divinity Chair at Leyden, says, "However, in this at least we all agree—*we allow the scriptures to be the word which proceeded from God:* Upon this common foundation we ought to do so much for the present and future good of Christendom, as to try whether by our agreement in this one fundamental point we might not proceed much further, and, by being charitably inclined towards each other, might not bear one with another in matters of ignorance and error, since we are all learners in the same school of Christ."—The younger Du Moulin, in his tract on *the Peace of the Soul*, says: "Instead of enquiring about the points on which we differ, we should act far better in considering those on which we agree, and in giving God thanks for them. If any one should bring us intelligence, that a great kingdom or country had been discovered in *Terra Australi Incognita*, and that the Holy Scriptures, the Apostles' Creed or the twelve Articles of our belief, and the Four First Councils were there received, —it would undoubtedly give us no small satisfaction; and those people would be very dear to us, though they might differ from us in several points of doctrine raised upon this common foundation. Why, therefore, should we not bear with our friends and neighbours, with our own countrymen, who are at agreement with us in such a number of fundamentals?"—Dr. Pierce says, in vindication of Bishop Davenant: "That reverend Bishop in his famous Epistle to Duræus, (which was one of the last, if not the *very last* thing he wrote, and that not long before his death,) affirmeth, that *nothing is fundamental which is not comprehended in the Apostles' Creed.* Amongst these he reckons *the redemption of mankind in general*, as really different from *God's peculiar people;* which he therefore does distinguish into two several articles. And this is one of those articles which he alledgeth as an expedient to reconcile the Protestant Churches. Which whosoever shall deny, is pronounced by the Bishop to deserve an excommunication, and to be a Christian only in name." He afterwards adds, "Bishop Davenant, in his Pacificatory to Duræus, saith, 'that nothing belongs to the catholic and fundamental faith 'in these points of Free-will and Predestination, but this one thing—*that all 'good is from God's grace, and all evil from ourselves.*' He saith too, that 'the word CALVINIST is rather a sign of a faction, than a badge of brotherly 'union;' and sets down theses of God's decrees, which are flatly contradictory to many Anti-Remonstrants, if not to all."

These are the opinions of many great men who were either the cotemporaries or the predecessors of Arminius, all of whom seem to have been heartily tired of the endless disputes which were fomented in those days respecting points that the various parties deemed fundamental, or necessary to be believed unto salvation. Some of them had been members of the Synod of Dort, and at the close of life evidently felt certain compunctious visitings of conscience for having assisted at the formation of such a multitude of new articles of belief. When the errors of Popery were discarded, each of the Protestant communities (with the exception of the immense body of the Lutherans,) drew up its own peculiar Confession of Faith; in consequence of which, there was soon a perplexing variety. Some of them, it is seen, (page 646,) were afterwards altered; and, among the rest, the Dutch Confession. The zealots, therefore, had not a shadow of reason for opposing the revision of the Confession and the Catechism, both of which, when compared with our own invaluable Catechism and Articles, appear capable of being much amended.

without God's ordination," [or appointment]: If by the word "ordination" is signified, "that God appoints things of any kind to be done," this mode of enunciation is erroneous, and it follows as a consequence from it, that *God is the author of sin.* But if it signify, that "whatever it be that is done, God ordains it to a good end," the terms in which it is conceived are in that case correct.

5. Whether things utterly repugnant to each other may not be discovered in them. For instance, A certain individual who is highly honoured in the Church, addressed a letter to John Piscator, Professor of Divinity in the University of Herborn in Nassau, and in it he exhorted him to confine himself within the opinion of the Heidelberg Catechism on the doctrine of Justification. For this purpose he cited three passages, which he considered to be at variance with Piscator's sentiments. But the learned Professor replied, that he confined himself completely within the doctrinal boundaries of the Catechism; and then quoted out of that formulary ten or eleven passages as proofs of his sentiments. But I solemnly declare, I do not perceive by what method these several passages can possibly be reconciled with each other.

6. Whether every thing in these writings is digested in that *due order* in which the scripture requires them to be placed.

7. Whether all things are disposed in a manner the most suitable and convenient for preserving peace and unity with the rest of the Reformed Churches.

THIRDLY. The Third Reason is, because a National Synod is held for the purpose of discovering whether all things in the Church are in a proper state or right condition. One of the chief duties which appertains to such an assembly, is, the examination of doctrine, whether it be that which is admitted by unanimous consent, or that for which particular divines contend.

FOURTHLY. The Fourth Reason is, because an examination of this description will obtain for these writings a greater degree of authority, when after a mature and rigid examination they shall be found to agree with the word of God, or shall be made conformable to it in a still greater measure. Such an examination will also excite within the minds of men a greater value for Christian ministers, when they perceive that these sacred functionaries hold in the highest estimation *that truth which is revealed in Scripture*, and that their attachment to it is so great as to induce them to spare no labour in order to render *their*

own doctrine more and more conformable to that revealed truth. *

* It is requisite for the reader to recollect, that although Arminius is speaking, in these concluding paragraphs, concerning the reasonableness and necessity of the *clause of revision* in the summons for a National Synod, yet he and those who voted with him at the Preparatory Convention in 1607, abstained from pressing for such insertion—on the proviso, to which the other party assented, that, *while the mention of it was omitted in the summons to be issued, the revision itself should actually take place.* Few people can form any adequate conception of the high authority ascribed by the zealots of those days to two formularies that had then been in existence about thirty years, and that were certainly not the most perfect of their kind. See pages 370, 422, 458, and 500. This undue attachment to the Confession and Catechism seems to have proceeded from the bearing which both of them had towards Calvinism, and from the consequent applicability of those Predestinarian doctrines to a people in opulent circumstances, whose former frugal habits had then begun to degenerate into luxury. Among a people in such circumstances, the secure and soothing doctrines of Personal Election and Final Perseverance will always find many votaries. But though these formularies bore a Calvinistic aspect, yet the rigid Predestinarian teachers in the United Provinces did not consider them sufficiently explicit, especially in countenancing Supra-lapsarianism, which was at that æra the most popular kind of Calvinism: And had not the Arminians honestly avowed their intention of submitting the Confession and Catechism to examination in the first National Synod that might be convened, the high Calvinists themselves, like their servile imitators *the Westminster Assembly of Divines*, (page 585,) would have attempted to raise to a greater height these national standards of Predestinarian Orthodoxy. This object they virtually accomplished in 1619, at the Synod of Dort, when they established new formularies of consent in their voluminous Canons or Articles, the subtle character of which is accurately described, page 514, by Bishop Womack. After having obtained their wishes in the establishment of stronger Calvinistic forms of union, and in the condemnation of the Remonstrants, it is not wonderful that the members of that Synod should answer in less than two days, *to their own great satisfaction*, the objections which the Remonstrants had made to some parts of the Confession and Catechism, and should express their high approval of their sacred and inviolable contents. Though in possession of other documents to their hearts' content, the Fathers of the Synod of Dort did not shew themselves ungrateful to the old formularies, but (page 437,) "required all ministers, on pain of the most rigorous censure of the Church, to preach from a portion of the Catechism every Sunday afternoon."—Several other interesting notices of this practice are given in Hales's letters, in one of which he states the following particulars concerning the Remonstrant deputies of Utrecht: "*Thirdly.* They would have a Catechism so made, that the answers might be nothing else but bare texts of Holy Scriptures. For they thought, that 'if scripture alone were taught and not any men's glosses, it 'would be a more immediate means to gain the Anabaptists and other 'schismatics to accept of the Catechism.'—*Fourthly.* They thought fit, that in the preface to these Catechisms there should be a note given to this purpose,—*that these kinds of writing by Catechisms, &c., were to be esteemed only as the Apocryphal Scriptures.*—To the Third point some little thing was answered to this purpose,—'that this was a mean utterly to extirpate all 'other forms of catechizings out of the Church, there never yet having been 'any form of Creed or Catechism so conceived.'" In a subsequent session, the same deputies, according to Hales, "misliked *the decree concerning the* NOT PREMISING *of a text of scripture before Catechetical sermons.* To this the Præses replied, 'to the point of premising a text of scripture before the cate-'chetical sermon, that the determination of the Synod was not to take that

FIFTHLY. The Fifth Reason why at this, if at any period, it is necessary to adopt the suggestion which we have mentioned,

'custom away there where it was in use; but only to prohibit the urging of 'it [a text of scripture] there where it had a long time been disused.' "

How necessary soever the toleration of such a practice might appear to be in the very infancy of Protestantism, when the people required to be called off from the foolish vagaries of Popery to an observance of the practical duties of Christianity, no such necessity existed at that period; and the Synodical requisition was accordingly abused by the Dutch preachers to the worst of purposes,—in defence of the unhallowing peculiarities of Calvinism. Most absurd must it have been for a teacher of evangelical truth to choose a text from the Catechism, and to corroborate the doctrines by quotations from the Synodical judgments of the various Colleges. But still greater absurdities are related in the subjoined letter, which was written, in 1659, by the learned Arnold Poelenburgh, who succeeded Curcellæus, the successor of Episcopius, in the Divinity Chair of the Remonstrants at Amsterdam. It is addressed to the Rev. C. Hartsoecker, an accomplished Remonstrant minister at Amsterdam, and its contents are of considerable importance.

"DEAR HARTSOECKER,—You write 'that our friend * * * * * has expressed 'some wonder *at our Divines formerly requiring with such pertinacity the 'revision, or rather the emendation, of the Heidelberg Catechism and the 'Dutch Confession:*' To me, however, it appears very amazing that he should manifest any degree of surprise. For, in the first place, since these writings were the productions of men, (and indeed of such men as might possibly be, and some of whom actually were, liable to error,) the demands of our people were extremely equitable when they desired to have those productions subjected to a trial on the touch-stone of the Holy Scriptures. Nay, they ought to have been brought for judgment to the bar of the scriptures, for this very reason—to prevent their authority from being placed in comparison or on an equality with the dignity of the Divine contents of the inspired Volume. For I see not only a great number of the people, but also some ministers, who *attribute almost Divine Authority to these two human productions:* To such a length has this prejudice proceeded, that I have known a person betray great amazement when I denied that the Heidelberg Catechism was written under Divine Inspiration. And this practice has now so far obtained, that the teachers of the Churches not only for themselves acknowledge these human writings for a standard of faith and a rule for manners and commend them as such to the people, but some bestow upon them the appellations of the LITTLE BIBLES and the MARROW OF SCRIPTURE. I omit other epithets of eulogy, with which they principally adorn their Catechism. In process of time, therefore, the matter has been brought to this condition,—that it is not now deemed sufficient to bring proofs of doctrine from the sacred scriptures, unless it be demonstrated that such doctrines also agree with the Confession and Catechism: Of which circumstance our Divines justly complained at the Hague Conference. Through this cause how much is detracted and is still withdrawing from scripture,—must be evident, I think, to every one, except to him whose judgment is either blinded by his prejudice or is in a state of abject bondage to these fallible compositions. Besides, they bring the Catechism into the pulpit as into a most spacious theatre, and out of it choose for themselves an argument for a text, just in the same way as they would select one from the scriptures. And when, to save appearances, they read a passage of scripture, the divisions of their subject, their mode of treating it, and the doctrines which they deduce from it, have all a reference to this *sacred Catechism*. It is really wonderful, that men who profess to be *reformed* should thus suddenly relapse into a new species of Popery. I have also understood, that it became a subject of deliberation at the Synod of Dort,—'Whether, in the Bibles which were then 'printed or had afterwards to be executed, the Confession and Catechism

is, (1.) Because there are several individuals in the ministry who have certain views and considerations respecting some

'ought not to have precedence of the Apocrypha?'—I am fearful lest this evil should descend still lower, and the question at length be thus stated, 'Ought not these two formularies to precede even the Canonical books of 'scripture?' For it would not be necessary to seek a pretext for such precedence, because the Confession and Catechism are said to contain *the marrow of scripture;* and we all know, that compends or digests frequently take precedence in rank of the complete volumes from which they have been extracted.

"But there was no necessity to elevate to such an amazing height these documents, which are of human invention and execution; especially when the very authors who first wrote and signed them, did by no means propose to themselves, that these documents should serve us for rules either of a primary or a secondary class: The truth of this remark, chiefly in reference to the Confession, is clearly proved by a certain letter from Professor Saravia. Besides, not only our Divines who flourished at the time when the Synod of Dort was held and those of them who lived prior to that period, but the Chief Magistrates of Holland and of some other of these Provinces, had long before judged it proper to have those documents once more submitted to examination: [See page 637.] For those prudent persons had observed, that under those formularies was springing up an immense produce of rank dissensions, and that men of piety and learning were generally attacking them in their discourses. For,—not to make any mention of Coornhert [59] and of my great grandfather Cornelius Wiggertson, [540,] both of whom shewed that the *desiderata* in those documents were not few in number,—Piscator himself, a Divine of great reputation among our adversaries, did not hold them in such high estimation as to consider them incapable of being polished with greater accuracy, and of being framed anew and to much better effect. I have in my possession some of Piscator's remarks on the Heidelberg Catechism: They are in the hand-writing of Uitenbogardt of pious memory; and in this letter I transcribe a copy, that you may shew them to our friend."

He then quotes Piscator's animadversions on Quest. 6, 10, 36, 37, 55, 73, 76, and 90, of the Catechism, which, as proceeding from a violent Calvinist, are singularly curious, and prove that its enunciation was in several particulars very unguarded and needed correction. After giving extracts from some of the Catechetical Explanations of Altingius, in answer to the objections of the Remonstrants at the Synod of Dort, Poelenburgh proceeds thus: "It is worthy of observation, that several of these animadversions of Piscator agree with those which were afterwards produced by our Divines.—I could easily append more instances in which it would plainly appear, that our Divines, Piscator, and others had passed a just censure upon the Catechism. But what I have already produced, is sufficient; because it was my wish to demonstrate, only by something in the form of a slight specimen, that our Divines were not the first persons who considered those writings entitled to emendation, and that others had either been their predecessors or their supporters with regard to the points which they deemed worthy of correction.

"But the scruple which has risen in our friend's mind respecting this matter, appears to derive its origin from these two circumstances—'that our 'Divines had themselves formerly subscribed those documents which were 'established by the public consent of a majority,—and that the terms in it 'which seem adverse to our sentiments, may easily be brought to bear our 'acceptation of them by employing an accommodated mode of interpretation.' I acknowledge the truth of both these facts; yet they will not bear out the consequences, which, according to your friend's thoughts, are deducible from them. For they subscribed,—either because, on account of a long-established custom, they had not then attained to a competent understanding of that which was exactly agreeable to the terms of their duty;—or because,

points contained in these writings, which they reserve in secret and reveal to no one, because they hope that such points will

since they were bound by a kind of necessity, they had not been able to withdraw themselves, and to oppose the immense host of those who yielded their full assent;—or they added the subscription of their names, that, when a favourable opportunity had offered itself, they might expel this idol of the Catechism out of the temple of God, and might solemnly drive and explode it out of the pulpit as out of a theatre: To effect this [latter] purpose, I know for a certainty that many of them sedulously kept a watchful and observant eye on all the junctures and periods that seemed best accommodated to their enterprize. This pure and well-designed scheme miscarried through want of success;—an unproductive sequel, that was to be accounted a part of their unhappiness, or was rather to be imputed to the baseness of other people. Yet, notwithstanding this failure, it was necessary at some time or other to make another attempt to accomplish that purpose from which, it was hoped, the christian commonwealth would obtain the greatest advantages. For though many expressions in the Confession and Catechism might without difficulty be bent and interpreted, so as to have a leaning towards our opinions, —yet our adversaries are accustomed to exclaim, 'that the words are forcibly 'wrested, and that they cannot be drawn and warped except by a twist of the 'neck, to be subservient to our cause.' But let us grant, that they [the Calvinists] vilely distort not a few expressions to obtain from those documents a patronage for their own opinions; yet it can never be permitted, if the thing can only by any means be prevented, that the faith and credence, which we owe to the sacred scriptures alone, should repose either in a primary or secondary sense on a writing that is composed by human beings, and that cannot be free from the danger of errors. Such a practice resolves itself into a contempt of God and a reproach on the scriptures, and is pernicious rather than beneficial in promoting the salvation of men and their personal piety,—because in this way not a few persons are drawn away and turned aside from a perusal of the sacred books and from a due veneration for their contents."

This letter, though more applicable to the subsequent Remonstrants, than to our author, offers many satisfactory reasons why men, who had become attached to the sanctifying doctrines of General Redemption *after their entrance into the ministry*, should wish to have the documents to which they had previously added the subscription of their names, revised and amended in some points,—which, as matters then stood, operated as real hindrances to their liberty of prophesying. Arminius proved himself to be one of the most conscientious of mortals; for, in his private correspondence with intimate friends, he frequently mentions the points on which he was prevented from enlarging, lest he should impugn one of the formularies to which he had sworn allegiance. His enemies were always vigilant, and listened in vain to hear some uncatechetical expressions escape from his lips. See, in page 519, the unsuccessful attempt of Gomarus, even when aided by the contents of a private letter; and, in page 545, may be seen the avowal of Arminius on this very topic. It was therefore very natural for him to desire an alteration: This feeling was not reprehensible in the infancy of the Dutch ecclesiastical establishment, when the opposite party were regularly in the habit of proposing changes, and were themselves desirous of rendering the formularies of union more perfect and less exceptionable.

Poelenbureh employs, in two different passages, the terms "primary" and "secondary;" which allude to certain words of Gomarus in the Preparatory Convention. That learned Professor declared, "he certainly regarded THE WORD OF GOD as *the primary or principal rule of faith*, and the CONFESSION and CATECHISM as *the secondary rule*." But the passionate Bogerman, who also was a member of that Convention, affirmed repeatedly on the same occasion, "that the sacred scriptures must b interpreted according to the Confession and Catechism!"

become subjects of discussion in a National Synod. Because such a convention has been promised, some of them have suffered themselves to be persuaded not to give the least publicity to any of the views or considerations which they have formed on these subjects.

(2.) Besides, this will be the design of a National Synod,—that their High Mightinesses the States General may be pleased to establish and arm with public authority certain ecclesiastical sanctions, according to which every one may be bound to conduct himself in the Church of God.* That this favour may be obtained from their High Mightinesses, and that they may execute such a measure with a good conscience, it is necessary that they be convinced in their own understandings, *that the doctrine contained in the formulary of union is agreeable to the word of God.* This is a reason which ought to induce us spontaneously to propose an examination of our Confession before their High Mightinesses, and to offer either to shew that it is in accordance with the Word of God, or to render it conformable to that Divine Standard.

SIXTHLY. The Sixth Reason is drawn from the example of those who are associated together under the Augustan Confession, and from the conduct of the Swiss and the French Churches, that have within two or three years enriched their Confessions with one entirely-new article. And the Dutch Confession has itself been subjected to examination since it was first published: some things having been taken away from

* Regular ecclesiastical sanctions were at that period greatly needed in the United Provinces. From the Republican nature of the government both in Church and State, considerable diversity prevailed both in the mode of celebrating the offices of the Church, and of electing the magistrates. Each province, and even some particular cities, were permitted by the Act of Union to retain their own customs and privileges; and these were often at veriance with some of the most useful and necessary regulations of the States General. A malady somewhat of the same kind may be perceived in the Republican States of North America; but with this difference,—that the same evil which was aggravated by being pent up in the dense population and the confined boundaries of the small Dutch States, is of a more diffusive and less noxious character in the ample and wide domains of the American Union. So that if a philosophical cosmopolite or a religious fanatic be discontented because he does not find every thing according to his humour in the laws and usages of one of the States, he has not an opportunity to communicate the contagion to a restless and mixed multitude; but thinking aloud to himself in the romantic forests and uncultivated wilds of that vast tract of country, he can traverse one State after another, till he has made a complete tour of the whole Seventeen, in search of something that may contribute towards his small stock of contentment. Fastidious indeed must that man be who cannot discover the object of his search, in such a diversity of institutions and of scenery!

it and others added, while some of the rest have undergone various alterations. *

Numerous other reasons might be produced, but I omit them; because I consider those already mentioned to be quite sufficient for proving, that *the clause concerning examination and revision*, as it is termed, was with the greatest justice and propriety inserted in *the instrument of consent* of which we have made previous mention.

I am not ignorant, that other reasons are adduced, in opposition to these; and one in particular, which is made a principal subject of public conversation, and is accounted of all others the most solid. To it, therefore, I consider it necessary to offer a brief reply. It is thus stated:

"By such an examination as this, the doctrine of the Church "will be called in question; which is neither an act of propriety "nor of duty.

"I. Because this doctrine has obtained the approbation and suffrages of many respectable and learned men; and has been strenuously defended against all those who have offered it any opposition.

"II. Because it has been sealed with the blood of many thousand martyrs.

"III. Because from such an examination will arise, within the Church, confusion, scandal, offences, and the destruction of consciences; and, out of the Church, ridicule, calumnies and accusations."

To all these I answer:

1. It would be much better, not to employ such odious forms of speech, as *to call in question*, and others of that class, when the conversation is only respecting *some human composition*,

* This was also the case with our own excellent Articles and Liturgy: For, (to make no mention of the "Articles devised by the King's Highness Majesty" in 1536, the "Bishop's Book" in 1537, or the "King's Book" in 1543,) certain judicious alterations were made in our present public formularies, between their first promulgation in 1553 and their final ratification in 1571.—See also, in a succeeding page, an account of the examinations to which the Dutch Confession itself was subjected.

In all these observations, the reader must bear in mind, that the formularies of the Dutch Churches were then only in their infancy; that the Heidelberg Catechism, which the Dutch Calvinists prized for its bias towards their doctrines, was, as its name imports, the work of a foreign Church and but a temporary expedient, much like that of the *Nuremberg Catechism* in England till our own was formed many years afterwards; and that none of the arguments employed by Arminius can by any ingenuity be made to apply to the alteration of our own existing formularies, which have bravely stood the test of experience during 250 years, and will maintain their venerable authority as long as scriptural verity and catholic charity, in this their happy combination, are relished by the Professors of our common Christianity.

which is liable to have error intermixed with its contents. For with what right can any writing be said *to be called in question or in doubt*, which was never of itself *unquestionable*, or ought to be considered as *indubitable?*

2. *The approbation of divines, the defence of a composition against its adversaries*, and *the sealing of it with the blood of Martyrs*, do not render any doctrine authentic or place it beyond the limits of doubt: Because it is possible both for divines and martyrs to err,—a circumstance which can admit of no denial in this argument.*

* These and the subsequent remarks of Arminius, concerning the Protestant martyrs, are very appropriate. Yet there were a few of our English Martyrs about the period of the Reformation, who considered themselves to be dying witnesses for a mild species of Irrespective Predestination, among other more important doctrines, in opposition to the equally evangelical tenets of some of their fellow-sufferers that were favourers of General Redemption. That very learned, acute and indefatigable Divine, Richard LAURENCE, LL.D. published, in 1819, a small treatise on this subject which possesses uncommon interest. As the reader will already have learnt, that my plan has been to collect, in this first volume of our Author's Works, as many notices as possible of the rise and increase among Protestants of those scriptural doctrines which are properly included under the distinguishing term of ARMINIANISM, I here give a few apposite quotations from the reverend Doctor's very able work, and recommend a perusal of the entire production to those who desire to obtain more ample information. It bears the title of "AUTHENTIC DOCUMENTS *relative to the Predestinarian Controversy, which took place among those who were imprisoned, for their adherence to the doctrines of the* REFORMATION, *by Queen Mary: Containing, &c. With an Introduction by Richard* LAURENCE, *LL.D., Canon of Christ Church, Regius Professor of Hebrew*," &c., [in the University of Oxford.]

In the Introduction, Dr. Laurence says:

"The two tracts, now for the first time published, relate to disputes upon the subject of Predestination, which arose among those, who were imprisoned for their adherence to the principles of the Reformation, and many of whom subsequently suffered martyrdom, in the short but sanguinary reign of Queen Mary. The first of the two, which is upon the Predestinarian side of the question, was written by John BRADFORD, (a name distinguished by Fox in his Martyrology,) who undertakes to answer in it a certain paper under the form of "*Enormities*," drawn up by the other party. The second tract under the form of a narrative was composed by John TREWE, an Anti-Predestinarian; and contains an account of the origin and progress of the whole dispute.

"It has been generally supposed, that every authentic document respecting differences of opinion, so singular under such circumstances and at such a juncture, has utterly perished.

"Notwithstanding however this strong and general persuasion, I some years since discovered, among the manuscripts of Bodley, in the public library at Oxford, one, which appears to contain the principal documents upon the subject on both sides. I have since taken the pains to transcribe what I conceived to be the most important parts of it, and have comprised them in the present publication.

"In my Bampton Lectures and tracts upon Baptism, I have adduced various documents to prove, that the great promoters of our Reformation, and authors of our church formularies, especially Archbishop CRANMER, the prime mover in all things, did not hold the doctrine of absolute Predestination. Had they indeed held it, still from their general character and conduct we might have

3. A distinction ought to be made between the different matters contained in the Confession. For while some of them

presumed that they would have been moderate upon the point in the formation of our public creed; but if they did not hold it, it is absurd to suppose that they could have been otherwise. The present publication I apprehend will shew, that among those who relinquished the faith of their ancestors for that of the Reformation, when first established, even the Predestinarian party itself proceeded not to the full extent of the Calvinistical system, while the Anti-Predestinarian party contemplated the whole of that system with unqualified abhorrence.

"Nor were the latter party insignificant in numbers or in talents. This appears not from the vain estimate of its own importance, but from the impartial testimony of its adversaries. In a memorial preserved by STRYPE, entitled, 'A Confession and Protestation of the Christian Faith written by me John 'CLEMENT, Anno Dom. 1556,' the writer remarks, 'I perceive, that there is a 'wonderful sort of the Pelagians sect *swarming every where*, which do main-'tain, teach, and defend, that all men, having faith or not, being regenerate 'or not regenerate, [*no very fair representation, by the way, of the opposite* '*opinion*,] have power, choice, and free-will to choose life and to keep the 'commandments of God in such wise, as the law of God requireth.' Again: 'I perceive that not only Papists, but *divers others, that be Professors of God's* '*Word*, being [rather] moved of an earnest zeal, than of any true knowledge 'of the Scriptures, do, *with words and writings*, impugn the most pure, hea-'venly, sweet, comfortable, and true doctrine of God's firm Predestination 'and free Election of us in Christ.'

"By the same industrious historian also is recorded another declaration of the like tendency in 'A Letter to the Congregation of Free-willers, by one that 'had been of that persuasion but come off, and now a prisoner for religion.' In this the new convert thus expresses himself: 'Truly, my dearly beloved in 'the Lord, so oft as I behold the misery and calamity of this realm of Eng-'land, it so much lamenteth my soul, that I cannot express it by tongue or 'pen. And I protest before God, and his elect angels, that it is the sins of 'us all, that have professed the gospel here in England of late. But I doubt 'not but that it shall be to our salvation, notwithstanding our fall. And *one* '*cause was, because we were not sound in the Predestination of God, but we* '*were rather enemies unto it*, God forgive us!'

"But by talents, as well as numbers, was the Anti-Predestinarian party said to be distinguished. I have previously alluded to a letter in the Bodley MSS. signed C. P. and addressed 'to the ministers with all that congregate in 'the name of Christ.' Touching upon the doctrine of predestination, the author of this letter makes the following applicable reflections: 'It is both to 'be much marvelled at, and likewise to be lamented, that this, being *one of* '*the principal points of our faith*, and *the very foundation of our salvation*, is 'so greatly obscured and insincerely handled in the writings, not only of a '*great number* of the mean sort, but also *of the most excellently learned*.'".

Part of a dialogue is then given between Dr. Martin a celebrated Popish examiner and CARELESS who has already been mentioned (page 605,) and who figures, towards the close of Trewe's Narrative, as the "Chief of the Predestinarian company:" After which, the Introduction thus proceeds:

"From this account recorded by Fox it appears, that, although Careless charged, unfairly I apprehend, the Free-willers of his day with making Predestination dependent on good works, as a meritorious cause, according to the principles of the Church of Rome, yet he did not accuse them, as some of his party had done, with teaching Anabaptistical extravagancies, or of maintaining the absurd opinion of *universal* Predestination. And it also appears, that Dr. Martin, his examiner, who seems to have been well informed of what had passed, represented the Predestinarian disputes, not as limited to the prison of

make a near approach to the foundation of salvation and are *fundamental articles of the Christian Religion*, others of them

the King's Bench, but as pervading the whole Reformed Church, which in consequence of its divisions he sneeringly denominated *the Congregation*. But, what the sentiments of Trewe and his party really were, the present publication will enable us more correctly to determine from their own declarations.

"When the controversy commenced, both parties clearly contemplated their respective opinions as perfectly conformable with the recently-established doctrines of the Reformed Church of England. Hence it happened, that, as the 17th Article of our Church was supposed only to contain a general doctrine common to both parties, neither party appealed to it as decisive of the question between them. Notwithstanding however this dilemma, the Predestinarians thought of an expedient to bear down their opponents by the weight of authority. Bradford drew up a treatise upon the subject in answer to certain allegations on the other side, (the same which is contained in No. 4, Bodley MS. now published,) and sent it to Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley, for their approbation, "as they might think good," stating that the prisoners under confinement in the same prison agreed with him in opinion, and were ready to signify that agreement, *if* those three Reformers themselves would set them an example.

"Signatures surely would never have been withholden from it, nor would it for a single moment have been kept back from the public, had not some apprehension been entertained, that the persons, whose approbation of it was solicited, might not contemplate in a favourable point of view, either its object or its argument, or both. That Cranmer and his associates had not in the formularies of the Reformed Church established the points in debate to the satisfaction of the Predestinarians, seems from this letter incontrovertible; for Bradford in the most solemn and earnest manner adjures them to do something *more*, than they had already done in this respect; so to express their sentiments upon the doctrine of Predestination, that posterity might receive and preserve the truth, *ut veritas doctrinæ maneat apud posteros*, precisely as they had acted in the extinction of Papal errors.

"The application then of Bradford to the 'Chief Captains of Christ's Church' clearly comprises two distinct requests; first, that they would bestow what approbation they thought meet upon *his* treatise, and secondly, that they would make some public declaration of *their own* opinions. But what was the answer which he received?

"Mildly, but unmoved, Ridley replied, that *he had made some brief remarks upon the texts of Scripture* relating to the subject, which had been suggested to him; but not one word is to be found *of a concurrence in opinion* with Bradford. Nay, to check the overweening confidence of his correspondent, and to exhibit his own good sense and moderation, he breaks out into the following grave and emphatical style of dignified rebuke: 'Sir, in these matters *I am* '*so fearful*, that *I dare not* speak farther, yea almost none otherwise, than '*the very text doth (as it were) lead me by the hand.*'"

After much conclusive reasoning and several elucidatory quotations, Dr. Laurence adds:

"It appears then from the whole of the correspondence, as it has come down to us, that Bradford received no answer whatsoever to his application from Cranmer and Latimer, and that those, which he did receive from Ridley, rather tended to silence than to encourage him.

"The doctrine, which seems to have been a principal point of controversy, between the Predestinarian and Anti-Predestinarian party, and to have proved most offensive to the latter, was that which is usually called *the indefectibility of grace*. This would naturally become an object of enquiry and solicitude to those, who daily expected to suffer martyrdom."

Trewe's very excellent narrative thus commences:

are built up as a superstructure on the foundation, and of themselves *are not absolutely necessary to salvation.* The doctrines

"JOHN TREWE, the unworthy marked servant of the Lord, being in bands for the testimony of Jesu, signifieth the cause of contention in the King's Bench, as concerning sects in religion, the 30th of January, A. D. 1555.

"Hitherto I have suffered much injury, and borne many a slanderous report of such, as were the beginners of this lamentable contention, rather than I would disclose their rash and uncharitable behaviour in writing, thinking ever, that they would have repented and amended it, and have come to an unity in the truth with us: which was like three or four times, but most likest at Christmas last, and yet it brake again by me, as they untruly report. For which cause I am now constrained briefly to write the beginning and continuing of this contention with the breaking of the unity, that now was begun, that it might be seen, who was in the fault thereof, that men might leave speaking evil of that they know not. God that seeth the secrets of all hearts, knoweth that I lie not. They [the Predestinarians] did give such occasion of evil and offence to the weak by their using of gaming, that we could do no less but gently admonish them to leave it, and to exhort them after the Scriptures to redeem the time, seeing the days are evil, and to leave such vain things, and to mourn with us, that did mourn for the great misery that is fallen on this land, and for the lamentable perplexity that many of our weak brethren (that were not able to bear the cross) were in, and to watch and pray continually, that God might mitigate his wrath, and strengthen us and our brethren in his truth to stand, that our lives and deaths might glorify his holy name.

"With the which they were not content, but defended it by the Scriptures, and because we would not give them place, but disproved them by the word, they were somewhat displeased with us; insomuch that in process of time they began to pick out matter against us, and because we did use abstinence and prayer, they reported us to be JUSTIFIERS OF OURSELVES, and such like: To the which we answered, *that our justification came by faith in Christ's death and bloodshedding;* but that we did, we did it that God might make us able to bear his cross, and that he would cease these sharp storms of persecution, the which (through this our sloth) was like to drive many one from God unto the devil, to their utter destruction both of body and soul. After other talk, in conclusion they did affirm, 'that none of them that God ordained 'to be saved, could be driven from him by persecution, nor yet by any other 'occasion or means. For all such as shall be saved,' say they, 'were elect 'and predestinate thereunto before the foundation of the world was laid, and 'none of them can be damned, *do what wickedness they can.*' And whereas we brought against them the Apostle Paul, which affirmeth that all were damned in Adam and destitute of the glory of God, and that the reward of sin is death, &c., that would not serve; for they most stiffly affirmed, without any authority of the holy Scriptures, that *if the Elect did commit never so great offence or sin, they should not finally perish.* Whereby they do not only make St. Paul a liar, but also they destroy the fear of God, which is the beginning and right science of wisdom; and, that being frustrate, *there is a great gate set open to carnal liberty;* unto the which we saw that many did fly to their utter destruction, by the means of the said false doctrine.

"Moreover we saw that it did put out of credit and unplace all those pithy places and sentences in the holy Scriptures, that at these troublesome days doth cause men to forsake evils, and to stand to the truth, as their own words did manifestly declare. For when we asked them what was meant by the sentences written in Joshua xxiv. e; 2 Chron. xv. a; Ezek. xxxiii. e; Matt. x, c; Mark xiii. d; Luke xi. d, xxi. g; Romans xi. c, xiv. d; 1 Cor. iii. d, g, x. d; 2 Cor. vi. a; Gal. iii. a; 1 Tim. iv. a; 2 Tim. ii; Heb. iii. a, iv. a, vi. e, x. e; 2 Pet. ii. a; Apoc. ii. a; and such like, which threateneth damnation unto God's Elect if they do wilfully sin against him,—some of them compared

of *the former class* are approved by the unanimous consent of all the Reformed, and are effectually defended against all gain-

them to the law, which now (as they said) is in no effect to condemn the Elect, because Christ hath fulfilled it. 'Therefore these sentences, 'said they, 'are written to put the Elect in fear to do evil, that their lives might 'glorify their Father which is in heaven, and not to put them in fear of damn-'ation.' By this in effect they affirmed those Scriptures to be written in vain, or to put men in fear where no fear is; affirming in effect, *that the words of the Holy Ghost doth no more good, than a man of clouts with a bow in his hand doth in a corn field*, which will keep away the vermin crows awhile, but when they know it what it is, they will fall down beside, and devour the corn without fear. And other some answered and affirmed, 'that the threat-'enings of those Scriptures should be no more certainly performed on the 'Elect of God, than this common proverb, which is,—*If the sky fall, we shall 'catch many larks.*' Indeed Christ hath taken away the curse of the law from all his very Elect that CONTINUE in his word, OR HAVE A MIND to do his his will, and GROWETH FORWARD in good works, although they be not come to that PERFECTION that is required of them: But such as have tasted of the good word of God, and were partakers of the Holy Ghost, &c., and do fall away as Saul, Asa, and Juda, and such like, and become persecutors of Christ in his members, Christ profiteth them nothing at all, but they shall receive according to the saying of the Holy Ghost in the foresaid sentences.

"This we saw the holy Scriptures did affirm, but they said, it doth not; therefore we could not believe them therein, for we saw it was great derogation to God's glory, and hurtful to his church; and yet they held and taught more odious things. 'All such,' say they, 'that were not predestinate to be the 'heirs of the kingdom of heaven before the foundation of the world was laid, 'were ordained and reprobated to do wickedly and to be damned,'—which saying is untrue. Because they affirm, contrary to the holy Scriptures, 'that 'there was but a remnant predestinate, (that is to say,) few ordained to be 'saved, and the whole multitude beside to do all manner of sin and wicked-'ness, and that at the end to be damned. *God made them for this evil 'purpose*,' say they, '*and there is no means in them to avoid it*, but that those 'miserable wretches, after their troublesome care here, must most wofully 'abide the terrible pains of eternal fire. To this loathsome end,' saith this sect, 'they were ordained before there was any motion of evil in them, nor yet 'cause in their behalf why they should be ordained to destruction more than 'the other were ordained to be saved; yet God ordained *them*,' say they, 'to be *damned* and the *other* to be *saved*.' These Scriptures and other do approve, that God ordained all men to be saved. [We omit his quotations.] But if God had done as they affirm, as he hath not, we saw not which ways to discharge him of *partiality*. For it seemed to us that they made him author of all the sin and abomination that is done and committed on the earth, clean discharging the devil and man thereof, in that they affirm, he made these sinful and miserable creatures only for that purpose and end.

"Moreover to maintain their error contrary to these scriptures, [omitting quotations,] they hold and affirm, that there is no more wit growing in man unregenerated to desire or wish any thing that should please God, that his free mercy and grace might extend to him to assist him to salvation, no more than is in a brute beast or dry post; whereby they give men occasion to hide and deny the same good gift, that God gave them in the creation, and not to be thankful to him therefore, but rather to curse him for that he hath ordained them to such a miserable estate and end, as they untruly affirm he hath.

"Moreover we saw in that they did hold and affirm, that none but great learned men could have the true understanding of the word of God; and in that they would not nor could not answer us how they approved their doctrine; and in forbidding us to ask how they could approve that, which they taught

saying adversaries. But those of *the latter class* become subjects of controversy between different parties: And some of these

and in the defacing, displacing, and washing away of the holy Scriptures, and such like, they do jointly agree with the Papists, that do the like to maintain their superstition, idolatry and blasphemy, and their wicked beastly living; and that if we should have consented with them, we could never more with any good consciences read the holy Scriptures, because we saw not how to place them, nor what profit it could be unto us, seeing that opinion affirmed, that *our salvation rested altogether on our fore-ordinance, and no part on God's assistance in our perseverance;* which opinion in our sight was and is so wicked and detestable against the holy Scriptures, that our consciences grounded upon God's most holy word will not suffer us to consent to them, except we should do against God's words and our own consciences, and so to despair and be damned.

"Moreover besides all these aforesaid detestable errors, enormities, and odious things laid to God's charge, to establish their false and wicked opinion, they affirm, that *Christ hath not died for all men.* Whereby *they make Christ inferior to Adam and grace to sin, and doth destroy faith, and the certainty of our election;* and it is enough to drive as many as believe it to despair, for lack of knowledge whether Christ died for them or not. For their own authors affirm, that if a man were ten years established in the truth, and live very godly five of them, he might be none of them that Christ died for, how doth this agree with that they so stoutly affirm without the Scriptures, they were so elect in Christ's blood before the foundation of the earth was laid, seeing there is *none of them certain* (if they believe their ancient writers,) *before their end, whether Christ died for* [*them*] *or not.* Thus we saw they did in effect destroy the thing they in words went about to build more strongly. They accused us of that thing we were free, and they guilty themselves. For we, that do hold and affirm the truth, that *Christ died for all men,* do by the holy Scriptures satisfy every man that doth repent and unfeignedly believe with a lively faith [*that he*] *is in the state of salvation, and one of God's elect children, and shall certainly be saved, if he do not with malice of heart, utterly forsake God,* and despise his word and ordinance, and become a persecutor of his children: until this time God will use his means with him, now his word, then his rod to raise him up again, if he do through negligence or weakness fall; and as long as he feeleth repentance and hope, and that he hath a will desirous to do God's will, he is under the promise of life made by God the Father in and through his Son Jesus Christ, which hath fulfilled that which was lacking in his part; so that [if] he through God's gift and assistance do continue to the end, he shall be saved, though all men in earth, and devils in hell, say and do what they can to the contrary. *This certainty of our Election is sure, and agreeable to the word, but that which they hold is not.* Therefore we durst not for our lives and souls forsake this undoubted truth, and grant to that, which they by the word cannot approve to be true.

"For these aforesaid causes and no other, they did evil us, rail on us, and call us heretics, cast dust in our faces, and *give sentence of damnation on us,* and excommunicated us, and would neither eat nor drink with us, nor yet bid us God speed; and did keep away such money as was given them in common to distribute amongst us, that did lie for the truth, and caused us to be locked up that we should speak to nobody by their minds, lest we should warn them of their false and erroneous opinion, that is to bad to the name of Predestination, *for that we hold, and also do affirm the certainty of Election in Christ's blood* in as ample manner as God's word doth teach and affirm. They being therewith not content, but did both in word and writing most shamefully slander us to be such hypocritish dissentious persons and notorious heretics, that we were not worthy to receive the benevolence that was due unto Christians; for no other cause, but that our consciences grounded on God's word would not suffer us to be of that sect."

are attacked by enemies, not without some semblance of truth and justice.

Trewe then adds *twenty-three enormities*, which from their marked coincidence with the objections of our author to the same system, page 555, prove Arminianism to be the Religion of Common Sense as well as of Revelation.

"Notwithstanding *this foul error of the Manichees sect, that containeth all these detestable enormities and odious things* against God, and hurtful to man, nor yet their revilings, slanderings, and misusing of us, which is so much to be resisted, we forgave them, and desired them to have their love, and promised to say the best of them, and to show as much familiar joy and love to them as to our own souls, so that they would not teach it (nor other things, that they did hold) to God's dishonour and hurt of his church. Our request herein they granted three or four times, but indeed they soon brake it. For, whereas they had concluded, that they should leave teaching of the false doctrine, which did breed doubt, brawling, and striving more than godly edifying, and none to speak evil by another, yet they ever brake it again, either by slandering of us or sending out writings against us, or maintaining this their folly, by racking the pure and holy word of God in their talk, and open lectures. As one time they fell out with us, and reported us to be abominable heretics, because we would not grant to them without approbations of the holy Scriptures, that our children might receive a lawful baptism in the church of Antichrist, in the which we did not stand against, lest we should therein allow and affirm Antichrist to be God's minister, &c.

"At another time we were like to come to an unity also, but then in an open lecture, contrary to all good judgments and their own promise, they taught and affirmed, that the voice of God, that said to Peter, 'Make not common or 'unclean that which God hath cleansed,' did affirm *play and pastimes to be clean to Christians;* of the which because we did gently shew them that these Scriptures were applied contrary to the mind of the Holy Ghost, to maintain sin rather than increase virtue, they were displeased, and stoutly defended it against all holy Scriptures, that did threaten punishment unto all such as did give themselves to fulfil the lust of the flesh in following the desire thereof in notorious sins and vanities, and such like; and after the old custom fell out with us, and would neither eat nor drink with us, nor yet bid us God speed, for nought else, but because we would not consent with them, that *play at bowls, dice and cards, was cleansed by the word and not sin, nor offence to all men;* the which if they would have granted it to have been so much offence as an idle word, and that it ought to be repented and grown from, we had been one with them therein: But they would not grant it to be so much, and yet there can no man use it without many idle words, beside mis-spending of the time, and giving offence to other, and such like. *They before confessed us to be of the true Church and no heretics*, and upon the same would have received us to the communion; but then because we would not with them affirm against these Scriptures, as partly is to be seen by these Scriptures, [omitting his quotations,] that *vain play may be used of such as be in bonds, and look every day to suffer for the truth*, they did not only fall out with us, and *after their accustomed manner call and report us heretics*, cast dust in our faces, and *give judgment of damnation on us*, and otherways ungodly handled us; but also threatened us, that *we were like to die for it, if the Gospel should reign again!*, affirming, that the true church might shed blood for believers' sake; of the which we brought to disprove them, Ezek. xxx, e. Matt. v, e; xiii, d; xv. b; xviii, c. Luke ix, c. John x, b. 2 Thess. iii; 2 Tim. iv, d; Tit. iii, d., but it would not serve, for they would not suffer the holy Scriptures to have place, but wash them away by comparisons and glosses of their own imaginations, without any good ground or authority of the word, as they did all other most pithy and effectual Scriptures, that we did bring against them to confute their other false opinions."

The blood of martyrs has sealed those of the former class, but by no means those of the latter. In reference to this affair, it ought to be diligently observed, what was proposed by the martyrs of our days, and on what account they shed their blood. If this be done, it will be found, that no man among them was even interrogated on that subject which I consider it equitable to make a prominent part in the deliberations of a Synod, and, therefore, that no martyr ever sealed it with his blood. I will produce an example:—When a question was raised about the meaning of the Seventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, one individual said, "that the passage was "quoted in the margin of the Confession exactly in the same "sense as he had embraced it, and that the martyrs had with "their own blood sealed this Confession."—But, in reply to this, it was stated, 'that if the strictest search be instituted 'throughout the entire large *History of the Martyrs*, as it is 'published by the French, it will be discovered, that no martyr 'has at any period been examined on that passage, or has shed 'his blood on that account.'

To sum up the whole: *The blood of the martyrs* tends to confirm this truth,—that they have made profession of their faith "in simplicity and sincerity of conscience." But it is by no means conclusive, that the Confession which they produced is free from every degree of reprehension or superior to all exception; unless they had been *led by Christ into all truth*, and therefore rendered incapable of erring.

4. If the Church be properly instructed in that difference which really does and always ought to exist between *the word of God* and *all human writings*,—and if the Church be also rightly informed concerning that liberty which she and all christians possess, and which they will always enjoy, to measure

I forbear to make further extracts from this edifying narrative; the doctrinal arguments of which, and not the facts, the opposite party attempted to refute. There is not, in all ecclesiastical history, a more striking instance than this of the different effects of the two systems upon the heart and conduct of professors. Which of the two parties conducted itself in the most exemplary and scriptural manner, when each individual was in the immediate view of martyrdom,—the most lax and indulgent of my readers will not be at a loss to determine. In the preceding quotations will be recognized many of the excellent doctrines on which Arminius has treated in this part of his Declaration; and it will not escape the notice of the reader, that those Protestants who maintained the doctrines of General Redemption, even prior to the birth of Arminius, were styled by their enemies "JUSTIFIERS OF THEMSELVES." After the perusal of this account, many useful reflections will arise in the mind of every lover of that happy consistency which ought always to exist between FAITH and PRACTICE; and he will not withhold from Arminianism the praise of such a scriptural combination.

all human compositions by the standard rule of God's word,* —she will neither distress herself on that account, nor will she

* That this was the practice of the compilers of the Dutch Confession, will be evident from the following extract of a letter, addressed to Uitenbogardt in 1612, by Adrian Saravia, or Sarrau, formerly Professor of Divinity at Leyden. On account of his attachment to the English interest, at the time when the Earl of Leicester held the appointment of Governor General of the Low Countries, he was compelled to quit Leyden, in 1588, and to retire into this country, where he was made Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and was held in the highest estimation among all good men for his virtues and learning. He seems to have entertained very just sentiments concerning the powers of the Civil Magistrate, and at the commencement of his letter, animadverts with much propriety on the tergiversation of the Dutch Clergy in this particular: "For they must be viewed in no other light than that of seditious persons, who do not own the supreme authority of the Chief Magistrate even in ecclesiastical causes, and who attribute to their own *Aristocracy* that authority in Church affairs which the Pope ascribes to his *Monarchy*. But look at the want of probity in the judgment which these men form! Oppressed by the tyranny of the Roman Papacy, we appealed to the authority and protection of the Civil Magistrate, whatever his personal character or religious profession might be, and demanded to obtain a hearing from him in a cause that was purely ecclesiastic. At that period, there was scarcely any power which we did not ascribe to the Civil Magistrate: A proof of this fact may be seen in the letter to the King of Spain and to the States General of the Dutch Provinces, which was formerly prefixed to the Confession of the Faith of the Churches,—and then revolve within your mind the kind of religion which those men professed, and yet what great power we ascribed to them in the matter of faith. I was at that time [1565] pastor of the French Church at Antwerp, and took upon myself the charge of presenting copies of that Confession to the Prince of Orange and the Count of Egmont. My wife's brother was then Chamberlain to Count Lodowick, [the Stadt-holder of Friezland,] he conducted me into the presence of his master, that I might become acquainted with him, and might give him some copies of the Confession which had been recently published, for the purpose of their being still further distributed among the nobles. At that time I was the first to collect a Church at Brussels, by the assistance of the Lord of Thoulouse who was the brother of the Lord of St. Aldegonde, [the famous Philip Marnixius,] and the members consisted of those persons who attended at the Court and of some citizens who spoke the French language.

"In the altercations at Leyden, this Confession of Faith and the Catechism, I perceive, are alleged and urged as though they were the very word of God. Bold and presumptuous men in a daring manner depreciate the Augustan Confession; and those of them who wish to be esteemed men of greater modesty, complain, that there are some things in it which they desire to see amended. But, as if their own Confession were a rule of faith, they will not permit it to be altered. I profess myself to have been one of the most early authors of that Confession; Herman Modet was also one of them: I do not know whether there are now any other survivors. It was first written in the French language, by that servant and martyr of Christ, Guido de Bres. But, prior to its publication, he communicated it to as many ministers of God's word as he could find; and if any thing in it displeased them, he offered to have it amended by means of additions or curtailments,—that it might not be accounted to be the work of a single individual. But not a man among those who affixed their signatures to it, ever thought of publishing a CANON OF RULE OF FAITH, but to prove his own faith by the Canonical scriptures. Yet in that Confession there is nothing which, in my opinion, is blame-worthy, or which I wish to alter. But if there be any persons who do not approve of all its parts, I think they ought to obtain a hearing, and

be offended on perceiving all human writings brought to be proved at the touch-stone of God's word. On the contrary,

to be taught out of the Word of God if they reprove any thing according to that Divine Word. No man is to be rashly numbered among the ungodly, who manifests a readiness to be instructed. The weight or importance of every article is not alike. There may be some articles, from which those who dissent may be tolerated, and are not on that account to be considered aliens from the Christian Church.

"I entertain a similar opinion concerning your Catechism, which I taught for some years both in the French and Dutch Churches. Yet I differ from it in the exposition of *Christ's descent into Hell.* After I had been banished by your countrymen and had returned to this country, I changed my opinion; because on this point I acquired better information from the sermons and writings both of the right reverend the Bishop of Winchester, [Dr. Launcelot Andrews,] and of other very learned men, who in no particular yield the palm of superiority either to Calvin or Beza."

These are the very laudable sentiments of a man who was one of the firmest pillars of the Reformation in the United Provinces, who acknowledges himself to be one of the first authors of the Dutch Confession, and who could find "nothing in it which was blame-worthy or needed alteration." That document continued to be signed merely as a formulary of union, by all who were admitted into the ministry, till the year 1605, when the Synod of South Holland passed a Resolution, "That the Confession should be signed, not "only to testify the UNITY of doctrine, but also the PURITY or soundness of it: "And if at any time a minister should incur the least suspicion respecting "his principles, the Synod earnestly exhorted the Class to which he belonged "to enquire into the affair, with the intent of being fully satisfied concerning "him."—The Dutch clergy made this alteration, in the purpose for which subscription was originally designed, that they might contravene a Resolution which had been recently passed by the States of Holland, *concerning the examination of the Confession in the next National Synod.* So that a man on entering into the Sacred Office, was no longer required to subscribe the Confession as containing a general form of excellent and sound doctrine, but was liable to be interrogated respecting the purity of every single article and expression in it, both *then* and *at any future period* when his co-pastors might think proper to entertain against him any unjust surmise. A minister, or a candidate for the ministry, was liable to be examined not only on *the express words* of the Confession, but likewise on *the Calvinistic inferences* which were deduced from those expressions by their predestinarian examiners. This must have been a practice particularly galling to the conscientious minds of Arminius and his friends, against whom it was principally directed; and it operated as an additional reason why those excellent men wished for a revision of the formularies of union, and for the adoption of "regular ecclesiastical sanctions" in all cases that had to be brought before the Classes and Provincial Synods, in which a curious diversity of practice then prevailed. Had not the States of Holland at various interesting junctures of this description interposed their authority and good offices between the parties, the Arminians, though possessing a greater number of friends among the chief men in the State, would have been early ferretted out of the Church, by means of these ecclesiastical bye-laws of their restless and disingenuous adversaries.

Those who wish to obtain a better acquaintance with Saravia, may consult Isaac Walton's instructive LIFE *of the venerable Richard Hooker*, whose studies, avocations, and disposition, were congenial with those of the learned and amiable Professor: "At his entrance into this place, [Bishop's Borne, three miles from Canterbury,] his friendship was much sought for by Dr. Hadrian Saravia, then or about that time made one of the Prebends of Canterbury; a German by birth, and some times a pastor both in Flanders and Holland, where he had studied and well considered the controverted points

she will rather feel far more abundant delight, when she sees, that God has bestowed on her in this country such pastors and teachers, as try at the chief touch-stone their own doctrine, in a manner at once suitable, proper, just, and worthy of perpetual observance; and that they do this, to be able exactly and by every possible means to express their agreement with the word of God, and their consent to it even in the most minute particulars.

5. But it is no less proper, that *the doctrine once received in the Church* should be subjected to examination, however great the fear may be "lest disturbances should ensue, and lest evil-disposed persons should make such revision an object of ridicule, calumny or accusation," or should even turn it to their own great advantage,—[by representing the matter so as to induce a persuasion,] "that those who propose this examination are not sufficiently confirmed in their own religion;" when, on the contrary, this is one of God's commands, '*Search and try the spirits whether they be of God.*' (1 John iv, 1.) If cogitations of that description had operated as hindrances on the minds of Luther, Zuinglius, and others, they would never have pried into the doctrine of the Papists, or have subjected it to a scru-

concerning episcopacy and sacrilege; and in England had a just occasion to declare his judgment concerning both unto his brethren ministers of the Low Countries, which was excepted against by Theodore Beza and others, against whose exceptions he rejoined, and thereby became the happy author of many learned tracts, writ in Latin, especially of three; one, of the *Degrees of Ministers*, and *of the Bishops' superiority above the Presbytery*; a second against *Sacrilege*; and a third, of *Christian Obedience to Princes*; the last being occasioned by Gretzerus the Jesuit. And it is observable, that when in a time of church tumults, Beza gave his reasons to the Chancellor of Scotland for the abrogation of Episcopacy in that nation, partly by letters, and more fully in a treatise of a three-fold Episcopacy (which he calls divine, human, and satanical,) this Dr. Saravia had, by the help of Bishop Whitgift made such an early discovery of their intentions, that he had almost as soon answered that treatise as it became public, and he therein discovered how Beza's opinion did contradict that of Calvin and his adherents, leaving them to interfere with themselves in point of Episcopacy: but of these tracts it will not concern me to say more, than that they were most of them dedicated to his and the Church of England's watchful patron, John Whitgift, the Archbishop, and printed about the time in which Mr. Hooker also appeared first to the world in the publication of his first four books of Ecclesiastical Polity.

"This friendship being sought for by this learned Doctor, you may believe was not denied by Mr. Hooker, who was by fortune so like him as to be engaged against Mr. Travers, Mr. Cartwright, and others of their judgment, in a controversy too like Dr. Saravia's; so that in this year of 1595, and in this place of Borne, these two excellent persons began a holy friendship, increasing daily to so high and mutual affections, that their two wills seemed to be but one and the same; and their designs, both for the glory of God and peace of the Church, still assisting and improving each other's virtues, and the desired comforts of a peaceable piety."

tinizing examination: Nor would those who adhere to the Augustan Confession have considered it proper to submit that formulary again to a new and complete revision, and to alter it in some particulars. This deed of theirs is an object of our praise and approval: And we conclude, that, when Luther towards the close of his life was advised by Philip Melancthon to bring the eucharistic controversy on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to some better state of concord, (as it is related in the writings of our own countrymen,) he acted very improperly in rejecting that counsel, and in casting it back as a reproach on Philip, for this reason, as they state his declaration, "lest by "such an attempt to effect an amicable conclusion, *the whole* "*doctrine should be called in question.*" Besides, if reasons of this kind ought to be admitted, the Papists with the best right and the greatest propriety formerly endeavoured to prevent the doctrine, which had for many preceding centuries been received in the Church, from being called in question or subjected again to examination.

But it has been suggested, in opposition to these reasons, "that if the doctrine of the Churches be submitted to an "entirely new revision, as often as a National Synod shall be "held, the Church would never have any thing to which it "might adhere or on which it might firmly depend, and it will "be possible to declare with great justice, concerning churches "thus circumstanced, that 'they have an anniversary faith,'— "*are tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doc-* "*trine.* (Ephes. iv, 14.)"

1. My First Answer to these remarks, is, the Church always has Moses and the Prophets, the Evangelists and the Apostles, —that is, the Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament; and these scriptures fully and clearly comprehend whatever is necessary to salvation. Upon them the Church will lay the foundation of her faith, and will rest upon them as on an immoveable basis,—principally because, how highly soever we may esteem Confessions and Catechisms, every decision on matters of faith and religion must obtain its final resolution in the scriptures.

2. Some points in the Confession are *certain and do not admit of a doubt:* These will never be called in question by any one, except by heretics. Yet there are other parts of its contents which are of such a kind, as may with the most obvious utility become frequent subjects of conference and discussion *between men of learning who fear God,*—for the purpose of recon-

ciling them with *those indubitable articles* as nearly as is practicable.

3. Let it be attempted to make the Confession contain *as few articles as possible*; and let it propose them in a very brief form, conceived entirely in the expressions of scripture. Let all the more ample explanations, proofs, digressions, redundancies, amplifications and exclamations, be omitted; and let nothing be delivered in it, except *those truths which are necessary to salvation.* * The consequences of this brevity will be, that the

* Many of the excellent sentiments contained in Casaubon's letter to Cardinal Perron, seem to be copied almost *verbatim* from our author. This was very possible, since this Declaration was delivered in 1608, and Casaubon's letter was not published till four years afterwards. In it he specifies this as the most compendious mode of attaining unity, "carefully to separate *necessary* things from those which are *unnecessary*, to adopt proper methods for agreeing in all needful points, and on other matters to allow a christian liberty. With regard to things *necessary*, which were but few, they were in some measure held equally by all those who desired to be accounted christians."

"To ascertain the point of necessity," Episcopius says, "three things are to be previously admitted: (1.) That whatever is necessary to be believed, must at all times and by all [christian] men have been accounted equally necessary.—(2.) That whatever is necessary to be believed, should be stated and maintained as of such necessity, that it may boldly and without scruple be declared, *that on it depend both salvation and damnation:* So that it may be asserted concerning every one, *He who does not believe this or that, can neither be God's servant nor be saved, if he live under the influence of his unbelief.*—(3.) That every thing which is necessarily to be believed, ought to be clearly, openly and easily understood by any man, even by the meanest and most simple persons:—Are we desirous to judge discreetly concerning those things which are necessary, pernicious and useful? One requisite it is needful for us previously to obtain, and that is, *a pious disposition of mind*, which lies between the two extremes of SELF-CONCEIT and SUPERSTITION—the two grand springs of all ecclesiastical divisions: The *former* of them will not permit itself to be taught by another; the *latter* either cannot or dares not receive such instruction. Both of them abound in jealousies and suspicions, and are afraid that poison lurks under every word and heresy under every proposition. But PIETY is the golden mean. She therefore easily resigns her own opinion for one that is better; and as she is willing to hear all things, so is she ready to try them and to hold fast that which seems best."

In the year 1610, Uitenbogardt was appointed Chaplain to a special embassy which the States General sent to the Court of France. During his stay at Paris, he had an interview with the famous Isaac Casaubon, who was then librarian to the King of France, but who soon afterwards repaired to England in company with Sir Henry Wotton, and was detained in this country by King James. After publishing several valuable works, he died here in 1614, and had a monument erected to his memory in Westminster Abbey.—The Conversation between him and Uitenbogardt was of a most interesting description: I quote only a part of it, for the sake of introducing his remarks, and those of Professor Poelenburgh, in commendation of the pacific plans of our author. It may be necessary to premise, that Casaubon was a warm admirer of the ancient Christian Fathers. Take the following quotation from one of his Letters as a specimen: 'Some among us may possibly ascribe too much to 'Antiquity. But there are far more of another kind, who attribute nothing 'to it, and imagine, that no such thing as *a true church* was in existence prior 'to the days of Luther and Calvin,—both of whom were undoubtedly very

Confession will be less liable to be filled with errors, not so obnoxious to obloquy, and less subject to examination. Let the

'great and incomparable persons. Of this description, my own dear country '[Geneva] at present contains a vast number.'

In his discourse with Uitenbogardt he said: 'But I must confess, Sir, 'there are other things which give me much disquietude when I reflect upon 'venerable antiquity. (1) With regard to our *Church Polity*, it does not 'appear to me to agree with that of the Ancients.'—Uitenbogardt replied, that he was of the same opinion.—Casaubon continued: 'M. Beza told me, that 'after M. Calvin had observed the abuses of the Church of Rome in that 'particular, [attachment to antiquity,] he quite eradicated it; but that M. 'Calvin was in reality the Bishop of Geneva: A short time before his decease, 'he offered that appointment to Beza, who refused to accept of it. On one 'occasion I told him, that [a particular occurrence] would not have happened, 'had we possessed the regimen of the ancient Church. When he had owned 'this, I asked him, Why then did you offer such resistance to that of the 'Church of England? But to my question Beza returned no answer.—'(2) We have not so much devotion. For, in the very act of celebrating the 'Lord's Supper, as we approached the table, a certain person enquired of me, '*Pray how is your Turkey-cock?*, and they call names.—(6) In regard to [the 'Genevan] Predestination, it is difficult to avoid drawing the conclusion from 'it, that GOD IS THE AUTHOR OF SIN.—(7) M. Calvin makes St. Augustine 'say that concerning *Free-will* which he never uttered.—(8) With respect to 'Good works, they ought to occupy a larger share of public attention, and to 'be more frequently inculcated from the pulpit. M. Perrot once declared at 'Geneva, *We have too long preached* JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ALONE, *it is now* '*high time for us to speak about* WORKS!—(9) On the subject of the Descent 'into Hell, M. Calvin has spoken far too crudely.—I know that he was a 'great personage; but his followers exaggerate matters. It [Calvinism] is a 'species of real Pharisaism. M. Goulart at one period attempted to compel 'people to swear to Calvin's Institutes.—I am in a state of the greatest uneasi-'ness; for I am not well received on either side: [that of the Papists, or 'that of the Calvinists:] Yet, by the favour of heaven, I am beloved by many 'of the learned.'

"To the whole of these remarks," Uitenbogardt says, "I replied, that they were worthy of serious consideration, and that I had also wished to see many things altered: In the matter of Predestination I did not see how some of the assertions of Calvin can possibly be cleared from the consequence of making *God the Author of sin*. Yet I wished no innovations to be made, lest the Churches should be still further divided than they formerly were.—Casaubon then enquired concerning Arminius, 'Whether he had not also some-'thing, about which he complained?' I replied, 'He had; but the principal 'object of his concern, was, to effect an union among Christians. The 'method which Arminius had devised for this purpose, was, to make a 'distinction between those doctrines which are *fundamental*, and those which 'are *not fundamental*, that we might be well assured of the former class, and 'might enjoy the liberty of freely prophesying on the latter.'—At the mention of these designs, Casaubon exclaimed, 'O SACRED COGITATIONS!'—I added, 'that Arminius had been desirous of submitting his proposals on this subject 'to a [National] Synod, on which account he had been compelled to endure 'many grievances.' I then related to him some circumstances about the approaching Synod; but Reygersbergius came in and interrupted our discourse."

In a letter which Professor Poelenburgh addressed, in 1659, to the Rev. C. Hartsoecker, he introduces the subjoined remarks: "This conference between them ought to be highly valued by us, for this reason—because it is a proof, that Casaubon, that illustrious and extraordinary man, was devoted to us, both in the defence of truth and in the desire for a mutual toleration.

practice of the Ancient Church be produced as an example, that comprehended, in as brief a form of words as was practicable, those articles which she judged *necessary to be believed.*

Although some of the expressions upon which he animadverted as novelties in Conrad Vorstius, ought to have excited a less portion of his animosity, because those expression have the example of the ancients, such as Tertullian and others, on which to rest,—and although he ought not on that account to have called Vorstius 'a Divine that employs new phrases,'—yet, in his *Exercitations on the Annals of Baronius*, he has afforded a sufficiently clear testimony of his sentiments concerning those points of faith which were then in a state of controversy, when he relates, that several persons had come out of France, his native country, who had sedulously opposed St. Augustine in those parts in which he advocates a different opinion. But in this manuscript which you now behold, with what a holy fervour does this famous man exclaim, O SACRED COGITATIONS!, when he contemplates that love of mutual concord which inflamed the heart of Arminius and with which he was entirely engrossed. But Uitenbogardt was unwilling 'to have any innovations made, lest the 'Churches should be more than formerly divided into schisms and parties.' Such appear to have been at that period the sentiments of Uitenbogardt, unless perhaps we do not properly apprehend what were his own intentions. But age, experience, and the outrageous domination of his adversaries, afterwards taught him this lesson,—'If you resist errors, against which it is 'occasionally necessary to offer some resistance, it is not possible for you 'always to preserve every thing in a state of tranquillity.' For in our regard for peace, our counsels must be such as to prevent the extinction of Divine Truth;—especially, if that [particular] truth be useful both in exciting piety and the hopes of eternal salvation, and in cherishing them after they are excited, so as to cause it to stand in the closest relation to doctrines of the first necessity;—and, principally, if the error, which is opposed to such truth, should appear to be entirely subversive of the glory of God's Justice, Mercy, and Truth, because for the Divine Glory we must earnestly contend."

Poelenburgh then offers some good observations on the celebrated maxim of Politicians, "that evil which has gained a firm foundation must not be rashly removed;" and on the equally ready ecclesiastical aphorism, "Unless the doctrine which is the object of contention be one that is *absolutely necessary to salvation*, or if it even be an error, it is better to leave it untouched, than to excite tumults in the Church on that account." In reference to the latter, Poelenburgh very appropriately asks, "Where is the person, who from *the votes of all men* will undertake to determine those doctrines which are wholly and solely necessary to salvation?, and if any such individual be in existence, he shall live in my estimation as the Great Apollo." In JACKSON'S *Life of Goodwin*, (Chap. ix,) is given a curious instance of the difficulty of this undertaking: The celebrated Richard Baxter, having been appointed a member of one of Cromwell's Committees for settling the terms of Republican toleration, compelled his reverend colleagues to reject this sentiment, which they had previously adopted as one of their FUNDAMENTALS,—"He that alloweth himself or others in any known sin, cannot be saved." "I told them," says Baxter, "that the Parliament [consisting principally of Presbyterians,] took the Independent way of separation to be a sin; and when this article came before them, they would say, 'By our brethrens' 'judgment [several of whom were Independents,] we are all damned men, if 'we allow the Independents, or any other Sectaries, in their sin.'"—Arminius alludes, in page 547, to the former Political Maxim, which was frequently employed against his prudent and pacific measures.

The conclusion of the learned Professor Poelenburgh's letter is in the following terms. "In this discourse between Casaubon and Uitenbogardt, the circumstance which affords me the chief pleasure, is, the opinion of Ca-

Some individuals form a distinction between *the Confession* and *the Catechism* with respect to revision; and, since *the*

saubon, that, in order to effect an union among the various sects of Christians, a discrimination must be made between the doctrines which are fundamental and those which are not; and his acknowledgment and commendation of the HOLY THOUGHTS OF ARMINIUS on that subject. For after I have looked round and observed all the plans and counsels which learned and pious men have devised and tendered, this expedient alone appears capable of affording a remedy to evils of such magnitude,—to schisms thus long continued, inveterate and confirmed. Because if this determination was once formed among all Christians, 'that it is unlawful to lacerate and disperse into parties the 'body of the Church of Christ, unless it be made plain and apparent from the 'Holy Scriptures of God, *that the error opposed is subversive of the very found-'ations of faith and piety;*'—if this point were once determined, (Immortal God!) how many grievous and widely dispersed schisms would it be possible, by this method, to bring into a state of union, and to recal and cement together into the same conjunction of one body! This then is the adhesive material, which must bind together in one the minds of all believers. How desirable that this course had been pursued by those men who attempted above all others to restore the Church, which had been greatly adulterated by Popish vices and errors, to her ancient integrity, soundness, and splendour! Had this been sedulously adopted by them, we should not have a Church so lacerated and rent asunder as it is at present.

"How desirable that Calvin, who was in other respects adorned with the great endowments of genius, erudition and eloquence, should not also have been entitled to an equally high degree of reputation and applause for his moderation! In that case, he would undoubtedly have obtained both from God and man a far greater portion of favour and regard, he would with more abundant effect have promoted the difficult work of Reformation, he would have left behind him disciples of a much better description than those who now bear his name, and he would have laid those solid foundations for concord on which the house of God being firmly fixed and established might have reposed and continued for ever. But it is a circumstance of congratulation, that the invincible force of truth sometimes extorted from him a true expression. In the Confession which he wrote for the Italian churches, and which was published in the year 1558, he declares, 'that the Confession of Faith which is 'comprised in the Apostles' Creed, ought to be sufficient for *all moderate 'Christians!*' In the First Book of his *Institutes*, (cap. xiii. § 5,) he extols St. Hilary, who in a passage of his *Book on Councils* calls the French bishops HAPPY MEN, 'because they had neither invented, received, nor had even 'known any other Confession, than the ancient and very simple one which 'from the time of the Apostles had been received by all churches.' Calvin had occasionally lucid intervals, but they were rare in their occurrence. This testimony in his favour has been deservedly bestowed by a very great man of the present age; and the truth of it is likewise apparent even in the affair of predestination.

"In the mean time, I consider it a cause of congratulation on our part, that as, after those fervid contests which were maintained by St. Augustine and others, a milder and more moderate opinion concerning Predestination immediately arose and increased in the minds of men in general; so now in this age, after that unbridled passion for contending has subsided which usually transports into opposition even the most excellent men, by degrees the great mass [of professing Christians] acquiesce in this opinion of ours, or in one equally moderate.—Another circumstance is likewise to be reckoned among the principal felicities of the present æra, that, in all religious sects, eminent men arise on every side, who devote the whole of their cares and thoughts chiefly to one object,—*to inflame men with as great a love for* PEACE *as for* TRUTH. But I consider the highest degree of gratitude to be due to the Divine Being on this

Confession is the peculiar property of the Dutch Churches, and is on that account found in the hands of comparatively few people, they conclude, "that it is possible without any difficulty to revise it in a Synod and subject it to examination." But since *the Catechism* belongs not only to us, but likewise and principally to the Churches of the Palatinate, and is therefore to be found in the hands of all men, the same persons consider the examination of it "to be connected with great peril."—But to this I reply, If we be desirous of constituting the Heidelberg Catechism *a formulary of concord among the teachers of the Churches*, and if they be obliged to subscribe it, it is still necessary to subject it to examination. For no Churches whatever ought to hold such a high station in our esteem, as to induce us to receive any writing of their composition without, at the same time, reserving to ourselves the liberty of submitting it to a nice scrutiny: And I account this to be the principal cause,* why the churches of different provinces, although

account,—because he has injected not only into the hearts of the Popish rulers, but in the first instance into those of the Reformed religion, the disposition to remove, destroy, and abolish generally throughout the world the cruel and bloody tribunal of the Inquisition, and every kind of tyranny over the consciences of men.—Since God, who is the Author and Defender of peace, has extinguished the horrid practices of burning human victims alive, and of murdering the innocent, may He yet more extensively diffuse this sacred flame of love and amity through the hearts of all who believe in Christ! With this wish I close my letter."

This communication requires no comment. The reader who wishes to know more concerning these HOLY THOUGHTS of our author, will find them in the fifth Oration of this volume.

* In a preceding note, page 656, Saravia gives an interesting account of the origin of the Dutch Confession. In 1563, it was first published in the German and Dutch languages; in 1566, it was altered and contracted, and re-published in French and Dutch; and in 1581, it was first translated into Latin and printed in that language. Professor Junius was appointed by a Synod of the Reformed Churches, which was held at Antwerp, in 1566, to revise it in its amended form: After which, he says, *he sent it to Geneva, to receive the approbation of the Pastors of that city*, who were accounted the Fathers of the rigid Predestinarian system. The elder Brandt tell us, that the reason why the compilers did not follow the Augsburgh Confession in composing this formulary, "was, *partly* because they had previously maintained in writing the doctrines of Calvin and of the French Churches; but *principally* on account of the affinity of language between the French and the Walloons, and between that of the latter and of the inhabitants of Flanders and Brabant. Yet the Dutch Reformed occasionally screened themselves behind the Augsburgh Confession, because it was not so disagreeable at the Court [of Spain] as that of France which was Calvin's, and because the Calvinists were considered as a people more addicted to public tumults and disorders than the Lutherans. Prior to this period, the Reformed in the Low Countries had adopted the London Catechisms, both the large and the small one, as far as they related to matters of faith; but they regulated their manners only by the rules of the Holy Scriptures." I am unable to divine what two productions intended by the *London Catechisms* here mentioned by the venerable histo-

at perfect agreement with each other on the fundamental points of Christian doctrine, have each composed for themselves their own Confessions.—But if *the Heidelberg Catechism* be not allowed to become a formulary of this kind,* and if a suitable

rian: Do they relate to our present Catechism and Articles, or to Archbishop Cranmer's translation of the Nuremberg Catechism, and the *Catechismus Brevis* which was approved by the London Synod in 1552?

But though the Confession was thus actually Calvinistic in its origin, having been submitted in its amended state to the Pastors of Geneva, yet it was the judgment of many eminent divines, that with regard to Predestination it resembled our own excellent Seventeenth Article, "in *not fully* expressing all that either the Arminian or the Calvinist would wish to say on the subject, but leaving it as a matter about which mutual charity and forbearance might be exercised." Some collateral points may be found in both the Dutch formularies, that are predicated in terms more objectionable to an Arminian than is this concerning Predestination. On this topic the opinion of Arminius himself is of some moment, and it is thus liberally stated in a letter to his friend Uitenbogardt, in 1606:—"This is one of those things which I have observed in them, [my enemies] that they hold their own private opinions for a standard, and suppose them to be in every respect agreeable to the Catechism and Confession. But the real state of the matter is far otherwise: For it appears to me that *the opinion of* NEITHER PARTY *concerning* PREDESTINATION *is in accordance with the Confession or the Catechism!*" In a subsequent passage he says: "I have spoken nothing that is opposed to the Confession or the Catechism. If I have taken away a passage of scripture from those who have up to this period used or rather abused it in establishing *their own private opinion*, I have only exercised my own right—a privilege which they also daily enjoy. But I have used this passage in establishing *a doctrine which is, as they themselves confess, the foundation of Christianity, of salvation, and of our individual assurance of our own salvation*: and I have their own testimony, though it is drawn from reluctant witnesses, *that the doctrine which I thus confirm, is of* FAR GREATER IMPORTANCE *than that which they wish to confirm, by the same passage of scripture.*"—See pages 554—556, and the note 617—618.

* The Calvinists in the United Provinces, who were undoubtedly the most violent of the race, not content with the power which a subscription to the Dutch Confession imparted, wished to associate with it, as a test, the Heidelberg Catechism. This document had been increasing in estimation and importance with the rigid Predestinarians, ever since the National Synod which was held at the Hague in 1585; when it was decreed, "that all the pastors of the Church should deliver an exposition on a portion of the Heidelberg Catechism every Sunday afternoon." In consequence of this high Synodical sanction, it was generally accounted of equal validity with the Confession, and in all ecclesiastical discussions the one formulary was scarcely ever named without the other. Thus in the South Holland Synod, held at Delft in 1607, several of the members had the following question propounded to them: "Do you allow, that whatsoever is contained in the Confession and Catechism, (both as to the sense, the expressions, the manner of speaking, and every thing else,) is agreeable to the Holy Scriptures?" In the same year, the Synod of Groningen passed a resolution, "that they could by no means consent to any revision in the Dutch Confession of Faith, or the Catechism, by a National Synod; because when they entered into holy orders, they had bound themselves under an oath to maintain those formularies."—The latter instance is one of those anomalies which we previously noted in the ecclesiastical regimen in the United Provinces. Some of the smaller Provinces and cities included both documents in the subscriptions required from ministerial candidates: and the violent Contra-Remonstrants openly avowed their intentions to have this double subscription enacted in the approaching National Synod and universally adopted. Nothing

liberty be conceded in the explanation of it, it will not then be necessary either to revise it or subject it to examination; provided, I repeat, that the obligatory burden of subscription be removed, and a moderate liberty be conceded in its explanation.*

Concluding Address.

This is all that I had to propose to your Mightinesses, as to my most noble, potent, wise and prudent masters. While I own myself bound to render an account of all my actions, to the members of this most noble and potent assembly, (next after God,) I at the same time present to them my humble and grateful acknowledgments, because they have not disdained to grant

therefore, was more frequently heard in their minor church-meetings, than this sentiment, "We are determined to live and die by the Confession and Catechism!"

Since "to make the Heidelberg Catechism a component part of the terms of subscription to candidates for holy orders and to others already in the ministry," had long been the prevalent determination of the Calvinists, (page 512) it was against this innovation that Arminius directs these strong and unanswerable arguments. He thought, that if men were thus required to subscribe or swear to more articles than formerly, those augmented articles should be rendered as little liable to exception as possible, and ought, on that account, and for other reasons which he assigns, to be revised in a National Synod. Thus, the persons who were the greatest innovators, endeavoured to fasten on Arminius, by means of false accusations and calumnious reports, the charge of novel schemes and unprecedented measures. What his moderate views and pacific intentions had always been in relation to this matter, may be seen in the following extract of a private letter, which he addressed to a friend a few months prior to his death:—"I have nothing to write about our General Synod, nor do I know whether it will be convened or not. There is far greater hope of our obtaining a Provincial Synod, that is, either one of Holland and West Friezland, or one of North and South Holland. But I am unacquainted with the subjects to be discussed in it, and the order which will be observed. If the matter were to be conducted according to my wishes, our Confession and Catechism should undergo a rigid examination in that assembly; but principally the Confession, which, as a formulary of agreement, has been hitherto subscribed by all our ministers. I shall not be urgent respecting the examination of the Catechism, *provided it be not obtruded on us as a similar formulary:* If it be so obtruded, I think it ought to be subjected to an equal scrutiny."

* When Arminius thus objects against "the obligatory burden of subscription," the connection of the sentence will shew, that it is only against the proposed subscription of the Heidelberg Catechism as an additional formulary of agreement. No man in that age had a clearer and more correct perception, than our author, of the necessity of subscription, as a means of defending the avenues of the Protestant Church against the approach or admission of Arians, Socinians, and other classes of virtual unbelievers and blasphemers. But the whole of the notes on this subject, as well as our author's own words in the text, will prove, that the formulary which required subscription should be of a gospel standard, and that, while it consisted of few articles, each of them should be stated in terms so clear and cogent, as to render them easy to be understood and generally acceptable.

A specimen of "the moderate liberty to be conceded in its explanation," may be seen in pages 559, and 641.

me a courteous and patient audience. I embrace this opportunity solemnly to declare, that I am sincerely prepared to institute an amicable and fraternal conference with my reverend brethren, (at whatever time or place and on whatever occasion this honourable assembly may judge proper to appoint,) on all the topics which I have now mentioned, and on any other concerning which it will be possible for a controversy to exist or at some future period to arise. I also make this additional promise, that I will in every conference conduct myself with equanimity, moderation and docility, and will shew myself not less actuated by *the desire of being taught*, than by that of *communicating to others some portion of instruction.** And, since in the discussion of every topic on which it will be possible to institute a conference, two points will become objects of attention,—FIRST, "*Whether that be true* which is the subject of the controversy," and, SECONDLY, "*Whether it be necessary to be believed unto salvation*,"—and since both these points ought to be discussed and proved out of the scriptures,—I here tender my sacred affirmation, and solemnly bind myself hereafter to observe it, that, however cogently I may have proved by the most solid [human] arguments any article to be agreeable to the word of God, I will not obtrude it for an article of belief on

* What a manly and charitable avowal is this! The magnitude of the loss sustained by the Dutch Churches in the death of this great man, before he was permitted to present to the christian world the results of this fair and scriptural mode of proceeding,—can be known by those alone who are well acquainted with the subsequent violent conduct of the Calvinists in those Provinces. From several of the pamphlets which they published at that period, it is very evident that one of the greatest fears which they entertained, was, *lest the rigid Predestinarian articles of their belief should come to be proved at the touch-stone of the Word of God.* To prevent such a dreaded experiment from being made, those men tried to put in motion all the powers of earth and hell, and proved by infallible tokens to all the world, that, notwithstanding their singular pretensions, they neither loved the truth *nor had the fear of God before their eyes.* With very good reason did Episcopius on one occasion declare: "Every one now rends the seamless garment of Christ and casts lots for his vesture. He who imagines that he has obtained a shred of it, lifts it up like a bloody ensign or standard, as a challenge to all others. One nation sets itself in array against another, in the very bosom of the church of Christ: And if a man were to examine into the reason, he would find it to be nothing less than *ambition and a desire to tyrannize over other people.* Many opinions are of such trifling importance, as not to render it necessary for us to depart even a hair's-breadth from each other on account of them, much less to separate to an immense distance. This is apparent from a single circumstance: Compel the members of every sect to prove, that the peculiar tenets which they propagate, are, in their very nature such, that, unless they are known and embraced, the sons of men can neither live holy lives nor die in a happy condition. Make this experiment, and you will find all of them disconcerted;—a certain token, *that this separation which is founded on such opinions, has been rashly formed and is scandalously perpetuated.*"

those of my brethren who may entertain a different opinion respecting it,—unless I have plainly proved it *from the word of God* and have with equal clearness established its truth, and *the necessity unto salvation* that every christian should entertain the same belief.

If my brethren will be prepared to act in this manner, as far as I know the complexion of my own opinions, there will not easily arise among us any schism or controversy. But, that I may on my part remove every cause of fear that can possibly invade this most noble assembly,—occupied and engaged as its honourable members now are with important concerns on which in a great measure depends the safety of our native country and of the Reformed Churches,*—I subjoin this remark, that "those things which I am unwilling to tolerate in my brethren, must amount to a GREAT NUMBER and be of VAST IMPORTANCE. For I am not of the congregation of those who wish *to have dominion over the faith of another man*, but am only a minister to believers, with the design of promoting in them an increase of knowledge, truth, piety, peace and joy in Jesus Christ our Lord.

But if my brethren cannot perceive how they can possibly tolerate me, or allow me a place among them, in reference to myself I indulge in no hope that a schism will on this account be formed. May God avert any such catastrophe !, since far too many schisms have already arisen and spread themselves abroad among Christians. It ought rather to be the earnest endeavour of every one, to diminish their number and destroy their influence. Yet, even under such circumstances, [when I shall be rejected from the communion of my brethren,] *in patience will I possess my soul ;* and though in that case I shall resign my office, yet I will continue to live for the benefit of our common Christianity as long as it may please God to lengthen out my days and prolong my existence: Never forgetting this sentiment, *Sat Ecclesiæ, sat Patriæ datum*, ENOUGH HAS BEEN DONE TO SATISFY THE CHURCH OF CHRIST AND MY COUNTRY !

* This is an allusion to the Truce for twelve years, which was soon afterwards concluded between the Dutch and Spaniards. It was promoted by Olden Barneveldt, but, as might be expected, was highly displeasing to that brave warrior and consummate general Prince Maurice. To this difference of opinion between them, may be traced the subsequent execution of Olden Barneveldt, and the condemnation of the Remonstrants at the Synod of Dort.

THE

APOLOGY OR DEFENCE

OF

JAMES ARMINIUS

AGAINST CERTAIN THEOLOGICAL ARTICLES EXTENSIVELY DISTRIBUTED, AND CURRENTLY CIRCULATED AT LEAST THROUGH THE HANDS OF SOME PERSONS IN THE LOW COUNTRIES AND BEYOND THEIR CONFINES; IN WHICH BOTH ARMINIUS, AND ADRIAN BORRIUS A MINISTER OF LEYDEN, ARE RENDERED SUSPECTED OF NOVELTY AND HETERODOXY, OF ERROR AND HERESY, ON THE SUBJECT OF RELIGION.

The origin of the THIRTY ONE ARTICLES *is fully described in two of the notes appended to the preceding* DECLARATION, *pages* 534 *and* 547. *In the latter of those notes, Arminius states, that he had answered those Articles in this* APOLOGY, *which he delivered to the individuals who first shewed him a copy: He thought, that, as "those whom he consulted were men of the greatest prudence and of high authority, they would not advise him to publish this Answer," for a very sound reason,—"lest, when calumny had been confuted in too open a manner, it should bring down disgrace upon the heads of its authors." The letter which contained this quotation was written on the* 10*th of Oct.*, 1608; *and on the* 30*th of the same month, he alluded twice in this* DECLARATION *to the Defamatory Articles, as to documents that were well known. Their advice therefore seems to have been pursued in suppressing this Apology for a season; and I have not been able to ascertain the exact period of its publication. From some collateral evidence, however, I am inclined to conclude, that it was published early in* 1609.

Though Arminius had been assailed for some years by restless adversaries, whose occupation and delight appeared to be the invention and circulation of the most senseless and unfounded slanders, yet he never spoke, wrote, or published any thing in the form of a defence till 1608, *the year in which he wrote this Answer, which was the Second of his apologetical pieces. His celebrated Letter to Hippolytus a Collibus, Ambassador from the Elector Palatine to the States General, was the First; and his Declaration was the Third and last: All the three were finished in* 1608, *the year prior to his lamented decease. Through the kindness and liberality of the Elector's Ambassador, he had become possessed of the defamatory Articles, which that practised and vile slanderer Sibrandus Lubbertus had transmitted to the aged Paræus of Heidelberg, as an exact epitome of the Arminian Creed. The atrocious*

nature of those perversions of truth will be learnt from this Apolgoy, in which are contained several of the inventions of Lubbertus and others. Arminius had long employed the shield of innocence, meekness, and patience, as his sole defence against the poisoned shafts of calumny. But when his enemies adduced the authority of St. Jerome, (as they did in the commencement of their scandalous Articles,) "that no man ought to remain patient under an imputation of heresy,"—they touched upon a string that roused his energies: He laid aside his accustomed reserve, and composed the following dignified and able Reply, which is at once a defence of his character, and an unvarnished exposition of the heavenly doctrines which he had espoused.—See the Introduction to the DECLARATION, *page* 517.

CERTAIN articles relating to the Christian Religion are now in a course of circulation. In a paper which was not long since delivered into my hands, the number of them is distinguished into two series, one consisting of *twenty* and the other of *eleven articles*. Some of them are attributed to me, others to Adrian Borrius, and several both to him and me. Those persons by whom they were first disseminated, attempt in them to render us suspected of having introduced, into the Church and the University of Leyden, novelties and heretical instructions, and to accuse us of error and heresy,—that both the students of Divinity and the common people may stand on their guard against us, who have this black mark imprinted on us, lest they become infected with the same envenomed disorder,—and that those persons who enjoy the supremacy both in Church and State, may seasonably interpose their authority, to prevent the evil from extending any further, or rather to extinguish it in its very commencement; which if they neglect to do, "they will be instrumental in producing the greatest detriment to Divine Truth, and to the Political and Ecclesiastical concord of these Provinces."

The dispersion of some of these articles is not a very recent circumstance: For, above two years ago, seventeen out of these thirty-one came into my hands, expressed exactly in the same words as those that occur in the writing which is the subject of my present remarks. But I was silent and concealed my regret; for I thought, that those articles would in their very infancy die a natural death,—since part of them were destitute of the truth of historical narration, by not being attributed to those who had been the authors of them; and part of them were void of all real theological sense, by the strange intermixture of truth and falsehood. But the issue did not answer my expectation: For they not only remained without diminution, but gained an increase, by the addition of other *fourteen* to the former *seventeen Articles*, and by a far wider dispersion of the

whole than had at first been made. This unexpected result had the effect of inducing me to think, that I ought to oppose their progress by a moderate answer, lest my continued silence should be interpreted as tantamount to a confession.* If this

* I estimate the general liberality of the present enlightened age so highly, as to believe it difficult for modern readers to form any tolerably accurate conception of the malevolence of our author's enemies. The Calvinistic leaders among the Dutch clergy seem to have thought, that the MEANS which they employed, (however base and scandalous they might be,) were sanctified by the END at which they pretended to aim, and which they avowed to be the GLORY OF GOD!

In the preceding Life, page 118, it has been shewn, that Arminius, during the last ten years of his residence at Amsterdam, had either outlived all calumny, or had by his prudent conduct and unimpeachable character overawed and abashed the impudence of slander. But after his honourable elevation to the Professorship at Leyden, his old enemy, Peter Plancius, emerged from the obscurity in which he had been enveloped while Arminius remained near him; and, instigated by wounded pride and personal envy, he commenced a series of most provoking attacks upon the doctrines and character of our author, not only among his private friends, but likewise in the pulpit. Indeed nearly all the malevolent reports concerning him, which were circulated through the United Provinces, might be traced to Amsterdam, and were "decked out in borrowed attire" by Plancius and his boisterous associates. I here present the reader with a few extracts from the private letters of Arminius, that some judgment may be formed of the mental persecution which he was condemned to endure: "I have to grapple with the worst of all the furies, the first-born vice of the devil, from which he also derives his title: [DIABOLUS, *the accuser of the brethren!*] I have resolved to subdue it by patience. God grant, that I may be sustained by the strength of his Spirit, and thus enabled to obtain a conquest! There is nothing, according to their own confession, which certain zealots leave unattempted here and elsewhere, both in our native country and abroad, in Germany and France, that they may cast me down from my seat, [Professor's *Chair*,] and may silence me who am an obscure individual. But their strenuous endeavours have hitherto been in vain: And the result has not been felicitous to themselves; because, by their calumnies they ennoble one whose chief desire it was to remain in a state of privacy, and who could not possibly have obtained celebrity for himself by his personal qualities! The main origin of this evil is in your city, where such circumstances are confidently related about me, as durst not even be whispered by any man in this city, where I am daily teaching in public and private, if that individual entertained a fear that his whispers would be afterwards disclosed to me. They accuse me of having invented novelties: Yet they listen to the greatest innovators throughout the world, in the persons of my adversaries, and suppose themselves to be safely shielded under the sole protection of the venerable scriptures; when I am at the same time prepared to confirm all my sentiments from those Divine writings alone, and in the very same expressions, if such be their pleasure." Then follow the two quotations inserted in pages 544, 545. In a subsequent passage, he adds: "I am acquainted with the other matters which are discussed in that place, [Amsterdam,] and I think you are ignorant of those which are transacted in other quarters: If you were acquainted with them, you would wonder at the impudent perverseness of the men. The only remedies which I oppose to all these evils, are INTEGRITY and PATIENCE; and I comfort myself with the hope of a happy termination, which will be granted to me by the JUST JUDGE, who knows the object which I wish to obtain, and the course of conduct which I pursue. To HIM, I am well assured, my studies and designs are pleasing; because they are entirely subservient to the confirmation of TRUTH, PIETY, and PEACE among Christians.

be the interpretation which on many occasions is given to silence, it is an easy matter thus to construe it respecting any doctrine

I am also much refreshed and enlivened by the much too favourable judgment which is formed concerning me and my labours, by the most distinguished individuals in our country. I know, that a distinction must be made in religion between one truth and another: If my enemies at Amsterdam, and in other places, would bestow the like reflection on this difference, I should no longer be subject to suspicion and assailed by calumny."

In an extract immediately succeeding that which is quoted in page 547, Arminius says: "Do you wish to hear ANOTHER of their *immoveable truths?* It is this, 'those who are born again can do no more good than they already do.'—Behold here a THIRD! 'As it was not decreed by God to save man by the law before the fall, neither was it so decreed after the fall.' Though these are great enormities, yet if he [Plancius] who is the principal man among you, had any intimation given to him, that I was preparing to attack these sayings, he would instantly undertake to defend them in public. I could easily produce more quotations of this kind, which were never heard in the Christian Church till within these last few years. For it is notorious, that certain dogmas of the Predestinarians which answer to these, were instantly rejected by the [ancient] Church."

At the commencement of the letter which is quoted in pages 517 and 534, our author says: "The conduct of men towards me, especially among your citizens, is of such a nature as to make them think, that they may invent falsehoods, detractions, and slanders against me, and all the while be committing no offence. If Prince Maurice had drunk a cup of poison, they would not be afraid of suspecting me as the author and adviser of such a criminal action. I durst not thus rashly attempt to criminate even the devil himself. A heretic let me be [accounted]; yet I am a man, whom God has formed after his own image, and for whom Christ has shed his blood; I have also devoted myself to the cause of his truth, I am its liege and well-approved servant, and by the aid of Christ I hope to be its fearless and undaunted defender unto death—how fretful and outrageous soever satan, and every antichristian thing in the world, may make themselves! But it is a most impious practice [on the part of my enemies], to transfer to my account those crimes of which they are themselves notoriously guilty. Whatever degree of dissension may exist in our churches, from them its origin is derived, as well as its circulation. Let them be silent, and cease from their clamorous harangues before the people in public, and from their secret whispers and private slanders, and the matter is instantly adjusted.—In my public theses against the Roman Pontiff, I have discussed such topics as ought to vindicate me from this calumny, [of attachment to Popery,] and if they are not able to set me completely free from all suspicion, I know not what I can do further to exonerate myself. I am acquainted with two remedies against calumny, and I employ both of them,—INNOCENCE and PATIENCE! May the Lord be pleased to bestow the latter upon me, since he has hitherto granted me the enjoyment of the former. I boldly declare, that I fear no tribunal whatever, not even one of the greatest severity." Then follow the quotations inserted in pages 517 and 534. At the close of the letter he says: "Besides, there is, I understand, a report in circulation at Amsterdam, that when the Prince of Orange was lately at Leyden, he entered into a religious conference with me, and stopped my mouth. And yet in your city may be found persons, among whom even this wonderful story obtains credence! *To believe it* cannot possibly be any thing less than a most palpable token either of ignorance or malice. But those who account me a heretic, must have formed great hopes: For if the Prince of Orange could thus easily confound me, what superior effects will not those persons produce who persuade themselves, (and with great justice,) that they undoubtedly have senses better exercised in the scriptures, than are those of his Highness?"

that is aspersed as a heresy, "under which imputation," it is said in a vaunting tone, "St. Jerome would have no man to remain patient."

In a subsequent letter, dated Dec. 10th 1608, he writes thus: "The matters which I discuss and controvert are of such a kind, as may be separated from the edifice of our Reformation; and though they have been inserted [into the noble building] by certain individuals, yet they may be removed without the least injury. I think I could easily demonstrate with what facility and safety this might be effected, provided those who are of a different opinion would give me their attention. I am attempting to remove nothing, *except in a legitimate manner, by the common consent of all the brethren:* For this reason, therefore, I am urgent for the convening of a Synod, and the appointment of a Conference. Of your personal good-will I entertain no doubt; but I wish your colleagues to reflect only upon this one thing—*that it is possible both* FOR ME TO SPEAK THE TRUTH, *and* FOR OTHER PEOPLE TO UTTER FALSEHOODS! If the concession of this fact could be obtained from them, they would, while lending one ear to the charges of my enemies, listen with the other to my statement. I shall with difficulty be induced to prepare writings [on this subject] for publication, though there are some among my adversaries who think such a measure is in my contemplation: That is, they are desirous for me to commit myself. But they are not aware, that it is in my power at once to refute slanders and not commit myself." This extract contains another strong proof of the liberality of our author's views. Though Arminianism was then understood to have the chief men in the country for its patrons, yet so far was Arminius or his friends from wishing to employ that high patronage to any base or low-born purpose, that he would have nothing altered in the unsettled formularies of the Church, "except in a legitimate manner, by the COMMON CONSENT OF ALL THE BRETHREN!" It cannot too frequently be repeated, that this trait is eminently characteristic not only of our author's *disposition* but likewise of his *system*. And what a contrast does it present to the plots and contrivances of the Calvinistic party, when their friends had fraudulently, and by a wound on the constitution, gained the supremacy!

Concerning the circumstance of "committing himself," to which allusion is made at the close of the letter, consult the preceding DECLARATION, pages 543—548.

The letters from which these extracts are given, were all addressed confidentially to one individual; and though in all such communications, great allowances must be made for the warmth of private feeling while thus *thinking aloud to a friend*, yet there is no necessity for it in the case of our author. He never maligned his enemies *even in Latin*, or bestowed such foul epithets as those which poor Castellio received in French from the Father of rigid Predestinarianism, such as "a blasphemous slanderer, a malignant, barking dog, full of ignorance and bestiality," &c. The biographer of Arminius, therefore, is not called to deliver in favour of his author any ungracious apology like the following, which is prefixed by Mr. John Allen to the last edition of CALVIN's *Institutes*, professedly a work of piety!!—'Almost all the writers of that age, 'writing chiefly in a dead language, were accustomed to speak of their adversa-'ries in terms which the polished manners of the modern times have discarded, 'and which would now be deemed illiberal and scurrilous. Where these cases 'occur, the translator has not thought himself bound to a literal rendering of 'every word, or at liberty to refine them entirely away, but has adopted 'such expressions as he apprehends will give a faithful representation of *the 'spirit of the author* to modern readers.' What an unhappy disposition must Calvin have possessed, to require such a clumsy excuse as this! For how is it possible to form a correct estimate of *the spirit of an author* unless we have his exact epithets?

The poets are not the only "irritable tribe of human beings;" every literary man, and Divines among the rest, will occasionally evince a portion of

In this reply I will use candour and conscience. Whatever I know to be true, I will confess and defend: On whatever subjects I may feel any hesitation, I will not conceal my ignorance: And whatever my mind dictates to be false, I will deny and refute.—May the God of truth and peace direct my mind and my hand by his Holy Spirit! Amen.

ARTICLES I & II.

I. *Faith, that is, justifying faith is not peculiar to the elect.*

II. *It is possible for believers finally to decline and fall away from faith and salvation.*

ANSWER.

The connection between these two articles is so intimate, that when the first of them is granted the second is necessarily inferred; and, in return, when the latter is granted the former is to be inferred, according to the intention of those persons who framed these articles. For if "faith be not peculiar to the elect," and if perseverance in faith and salvation belong to the elect alone, it follows, that believers not only can, but that some of them actually do, "fall away from faith and salvation:" And, on the contrary, if it be "possible for believers finally to fall away from faith and salvation," it follows that "faith is not

this sensitiveness, when the ennobling or pious designs which they have cherished and promoted are attempted to be destroyed by malevolence. Our author had much to endure on this account, and had laboured under an infirm state of health for two years preceding; yet, with all these and other circumstances, which might be alleged as pretexts for indulging in unhallowed feelings, he on no occasion betrayed any other disposition than that which befitted a man who feared God and wrought righteousness. The warmest expression that ever escaped from his lips or his pen, is recorded in this note: He does not call down the curses of heaven upon the heads of his adversaries, or pray for their confusion,—but says, "I durst not thus rashly criminate even the devil himself!" Yet this is in reality a phrase that breathes much Christian forbearance, and does not amount to the sentiment uttered by Michael the Archangel, who, "when contending with the devil, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, *The* LORD *rebuke thee!*" The meekness and piety of Arminius would sooner have prayed, in behalf of an adversary, "The Lord forgive thee!" I have often admired an ingenious and edifying turn which Mr. John Goodwin gave to the Archangel's form of malediction when one of his enemies had written it as "his hearty prayer:" The good old man replies, "I shall join issue with you in the words of your "prayer against me, and pray, *The Lord rebuke me*,—only with David's "addition,—*not in anger!*" (Psalm vi, 1.) What a difference is perceptible between this dignified and Christian feeling of forgiveness, and that diabolical display of violence and asperity which disgusts us in several of Calvin's productions! The subjoined brief character which Castellio has given of one of them, the poison of which was directed personally against him, is not inapplicable to some others: "But, concerning your Latin Pamphlet, what necessity is there to employ many words? Its title is, THE CALUMNIES OF A KNAVE. Its conclusion is, *The Lord rebuke thee, Satan!* And its intermediate contents are exactly of the same complexion."

peculiar to the elect," they being the individuals concerning whom the framers of these articles assert, that *it is impossible for them not to be saved.* The reason of the consequence, is, because the words FAITH and BELIEVERS, according to this hypothesis, have a wider signification than the words ELECTION and THE ELECT: The former comprehend some persons that are not elect, that is, "some who finally fall away from faith and salvation." No necessity therefore existed for composing both these articles; it was quite sufficient to have proposed one: And if the authors of them had sought for such amplification, as had no real existence, but consisted of mere words, it was possible to deduce the Second from the First in the form of a consectary. Thus it is evident, that *the multitude* of the articles, was the great object to be attempted, for the purpose of making it appear as if those persons ERRED IN VERY MANY POINTS, whom the too sedulous curiosity of the brethren is desirous, without cause, of rendering suspected of heresy.

I. But, to treat of each article singly, I declare, respecting THE FIRST, that I never said either in public or in private, "Faith is not peculiar to the Elect." This article therefore is not attributed to its proper author; and thus is committed a historical error.

I add, Even if I had made such a declaration as this, a defence of it would have been ready. For I omit the scriptures, from which a more prolix discussion of this subject might be formed; and since the Christian Fathers * have with great semblance of truth defended their sentiments from that Divine source, I might employ *the Consent of those Fathers* as a shield to ward off from myself the charge of NOVELTY; and *the Harmony of Confessions*, which are severally the composition of those Churches that have seceded from Popery and that come under the denomination of "Protestants" and "the Reformed," I might adopt for a polished breast-plate, to intercept or turn aside the dart of HERESY which is hurled against me. Neither should I be much afraid of this subject being placed for adjudication in the balances of *the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism.*

1. Let St. Augustine, Prosper, and the author of the Book entitled, *The Vocation of the Gentiles*, be brought forward to bear testimony respecting "the Consent of the Fathers."

* All the editions of our author's works, except that printed at Frankfort in 1635, have the word *Partibus*, instead of *Patribus*, in this passage, to the manifest injury of the meaning.

(1.) AUGUSTINE says, "It is wonderful, and indeed most wonderful, that God does not bestow perseverance on certain of his sons, whom He has regenerated in Christ, and to whom he has given faith, hope and love; while he pardons such great acts of wickedness in sons that are alienated from him, and, by imparting his grace, makes them his children." (*De Correpl. et Gratiâ, cap.* 8.)

(2.) PROSPER says, "It is a lamentable circumstance which is proved by many examples, that some of those persons who were regenerated in Christ Jesus, have relinquished the faith, and, ceasing to preserve their former sanctity of manners, have apostatized from God, and their ungodly course has been terminated under his displeasure and aversion." (*Ad Capita Gal. resp.* 7.)

(3.) The Author of *The Vocation of the Gentiles* says, "God bestows *the power of willing* to obey him, in such a manner as not to take away, even from those who will persevere, that mutability by which it is possible for them to be unwilling [to obey God]. If this were not the case, none of the believers would have departed from the faith." (*Lib.* ii, *c.* 9.)

2 The HARMONY OF CONFESSIONS might in the following manner contribute to my defence: This dogma states, that "faith is the peculiar property of the elect," and that "it is impossible for believers *finally* to decline from faith and salvation:"—Now, if this be a dogma *necessary to salvation*, then that Confession which does not contain it, or which asserts some thing contradictory to it, cannot be considered as harmonizing with the rest on the subject of religion. For wherever there is harmony, it is proper that there should be neither defect nor contradiction *in things pertaining to salvation*. But the Augustan [or Lutheran] Confession says, that "it condemns the Anabaptists, who deny that those persons who have once been justified can again lose the Holy Spirit." Besides, Philip Melancthon with his followers, and the greater portion of the Lutheran Churches, are of opinion, that "faith is bestowed even on the non-elect." Yet we are not afraid of acknowledging these Lutherans for brethren.

3. THE BELGIC CONFESSION does not contain this dogma [that "faith is peculiar to the elect"]; and without controversy it cannot be deduced from OUR CATECHISM. For when it is said, in the article on the Church, "I believe that I shall perpetually remain a member of the Church;" and, in the first question, "God keeps and preserves me in such a manner, as

to make all things necessarily subservient to my salvation;" those expressions are to be understood of a believer, in reference to his actual believing. For he who is *truly such a one*, answers to the character of a *christian:* But no man is such, except through faith: Faith is therefore presupposed in both the expressions.

II. With regard to the SECOND Article, I say, that a distinction ought to be made between *power* and *action*. For it is one thing to declare, that "*it is possible* for the faithful to fall away from faith and salvation," and it is another to say, that "*they do actually* fall away." This distinction is of such extensive observance, that even antiquity itself was not afraid of affirming, concerning the elect and those who were to be saved, "that it was possible for them *not to be saved;*" and that "the mutability by which it was possible for them *not to be willing to obey God*, was not taken away from them,"—although it was the opinion of the ancients, "that such persons never would in reality be damned."—On this very subject, too, the greater part of our own doctors lay down a difference: For they say, "that it is possible for such persons to fall away, if their nature, which is inclined to lapses and defection, and if the temptations of the world and Satan, be the only circumstances taken into consideration: but that they will not *finally* fall away, because God will bring back to himself his own elect before the end of life." If any one asserts, "that it is not possible for believers, in consideration of their being *elect persons*, finally to fall away from salvation, because God has decreed to save them," I answer, The decree concerning saving does not take away *the* POSSIBILITY *of damning*, but it removes *damnation itself*. For "to be actually saved," and "a possibility of not being saved," are two things not contrary to each other, but in perfect agreement.

I therefore add, that in this way I have hitherto discriminated these two cases: And at one time I certainly did say, with an explanation subjoined to it, "that it was possible for believers *finally* to decline or fall away from faith and salvation." But at no period have I asserted, "that believers do finally decline or fall away from faith or salvation." This article therefore is ascribed to one who is not its author; and it is another offence against historical veracity.

I subjoin, that there is a vast difference between the enunciation of these two sentences: (1.) "It is possible for believers to decline from the FAITH;" and (2.) "It is possible for be-

lievers to decline from SALVATION." For the latter, when rigidly and accurately examined, can scarcely be admitted;—it being impossible for believers, as long as they remain *believers*, to decline from salvation. Because, were this possible, that power of God would be conquered which he has determined to employ in saving believers. On the other hand, if believers fall away from the faith and become unbelievers, it is impossible for them to do otherwise than decline from salvation,—that is, provided they still continue unbelievers. Therefore, whether this hypothesis be granted or not, the enunciation cannot be accurately expressed: For if this hypothesis (their perseverance in faith) be granted, they cannot decline; but if it be not granted, they cannot do otherwise than decline. (2.) But that first enunciation includes no hypothesis; and therefore an answer may be given to it simply, either that it is possible, or that it is impossible. For this cause, the second article ought to be corrected in the following manner: "It is possible for believers finally to fall away or decline from the faith;" or rather, "Some believers finally fall away and decline from the faith." This being granted, the other can be necessarily inferred,—"therefore they also actually decline from salvation."

Respecting the truth of this [Second] article, I repeat the same observations which I made about the First. For the following expressions are reciprocal to each other, and regular consequences: "Faith is peculiar to the elect," and "Believers do not finally fall away from the faith." In like manner, "Faith is not peculiar to the elect," and "Some believers finally decline from the faith."

ARTICLE III.

It is a matter of doubt, whether the faith by which Abraham is said to be justified, was a faith in Jesus Christ who was still to come.—No proof can be adduced of his having understood the promises of God in any other manner, than that he should be the heir of the world.

ANSWER.

There are two members in this article, or rather, those members are two distinct articles, each of which presents itself to be separately considered by us,—after I have observed, that in this passage no *affirmation* or *negation*, each of which properly constitutes a heretic, is attributed to us, but *a mere doubt*

alone, that betokens a consciousness of ignorance and infirmity, which those who arrogate to themselves *the knowledge of all these things*, ought to endeavour to remove by a mild course of instruction, and not to make it a subject of reviling or provocation.

I. To the FIRST MEMBER I reply:

First.—I never uttered this expression; but have, on more occasions than one, taught both in public and private a contrary doctrine. Yet I remember, when a certain minister at Leyden had boasted of *the clearness* of this article, and was astonished how any persons could be found who entertained a different opinion about it, I told him, that the proof of it would not be a very easy occupation to him if he had to encounter a powerful adversary, and I challenged him to make a trial,—which challenge I now repeat. I wish him to prove this assertion by such plain arguments, as will not leave a man just reasons for doubting any longer about the matter. This is a point on which the labours of a divine will be more profitably expended, than on publishing and magnifying *the doubts of the infirm*, whose confidence in themselves is not equal to that which he manifests.

Secondly.—"Faith in Christ" may be received in two acceptations: Either *according to promise*, which was involved in the types, figures and shadows of words and things, and proposed in that manner: Or, *it is according to the gospel*, that is clearly manifested. The difference between these two is so great, that with regard to it the Jews are said "to have been detained or kept under the law before faith came, concluded or shut up unto that faith which should afterwards be revealed." (Gal. iii, 23.) And the Apostle says, "the children of Israel were prevented, by the veil placed over the countenance of Moses, from steadfastly looking to the end of that which is abolished," (2 Cor. iii, 13.) that is, to the end of the law, as is evident from the whole chapter, and from Romans x, 5, where Christ is said to be "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Let the whole description of the faith of Abraham, which the Apostle gives at great length in Romans iv, be attentively considered, and it will appear, that *no express mention of Jesus Christ is made in it*, but it is implied in such a way as it is not easy for any one to explain.

Let it be added that *faith in Jesus Christ* seems to some persons to be used by *metonymy*, for "that faith which is concerning the types and figures which adumbrate and prefigure Jesus

Christ,"—although it has not united with it an understanding of those types, unless it be a very obscure one, and such as appears suitable to the infant Church, according to the economy of the times and ages which God in his wisdom employs. Let a comparison be instituted between *that servitude* under which the heir, so long as he is a child, is said by the Apostle to be held, (Gal. iv, 1—3.) and *that bondage* from which the Spirit of the Lord is declared to liberate the man whose heart is converted to Him; (2 Cor. iii, 16—18.) and this doubting will then be considered ascribable to the proper fear of a trembling [scrupulous] conscience, rather than to a disposition that has a powerful propensity towards heresy.

II. To the SECOND MEMBER of this Article I answer:

First.—I never made such an assertion.

Secondly.—If even I had, it would not have called for any deserved reprehension, except from a man that was desirous by that very act to betray at once the weakness of his judgment and his want of experience. (1.) It is a sign of a *judgment not the most accurate*, to blame any man for saying that which, it is possible to prove, has been written by the Apostle himself in so many words. For if *the heir-ship of the world* was promised to Abraham in these words, '*Thou shalt be the father of many nations*,' what wonder is there if Abraham understood the promises in no other manner than as they had been divinely pronounced?—(2.) It is a mark of *great inexperience* in the men who framed these articles, to suppose that *the heir-ship of the world* which was promised to Abraham, appertained to *this animal life* and to *carnal benefits*; because *the world* of which mention is made in that passage, is *that future world* to which belongs the calling of the Gentiles, by which vocation Abraham was made *the father of many nations*. This is apparent from the consideration, that he is said to have been made the heir of the world by *the righteousness of faith*, of which St. Paul (Rom. iv, 13.) proves the Gentiles likewise to be partakers; and in Ephes. iii, 1—11, the Apostle treats on the vocation of the Gentiles, and says, it belongs to "the grace of the gospel, and to the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hidden in God and is now brought to light by Christ, by whom God created all things." I repeat it, that vocation does not belong to *the wisdom* by which God formed the world, but to that by which he constituted Christ *His Wisdom* and Power to salvation to them that believe; and by which he founded the Church, which will

endure for ever.—See 1 Cor. i, 21—23; ii, 6—8; Ephes. iii, 1—11.—If the forgers of this article say, "that they have likewise perceived this, but had supposed that my opinion was different;" I reply, It is not the part of a prudent man to frame a foolish adversary for himself.

ARTICLE IV.

Faith is not an effect of election, but is a necessary requisite foreseen by God in those who are to be elected: And the decree concerning the bestowing of faith precedes the decree of election.

ANSWER.

Of this article also there are two entire members:

I. In the FIRST of them, three assertions are included,—(1.) "Faith is not an effect of election."—(2.) "Faith is a necessary requisite in those who are to be elected or saved."—(3.) "This requisite is foreseen by God in the persons to be elected."—I confess, all these, when rightly understood and correctly explained, agree entirely with my opinion, on the subject. But the last of the members is proposed in terms too odious, since it makes no mention of God, whose benefit and gift I acknowledge faith to be.

I will now proceed to explain myself on each of these assertions:

1. With regard to the FIRST, the word "Election" is ambiguous. For it either signifies "the election by which God determines to justify believers, while those who are *unbelievers* or *workers* are rejected from righteousness and salvation:" Or it signifies "the election by which he determines to save *certain particular persons*, as such, and to bestow faith on them in order to their salvation,—other particular persons being also rejected, merely in reference to their being such particular individuals." Election is received according to this latter signification, by those who charge me with these articles. I take it in the former acceptation, according to Romans ix, 11: "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil,—that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth,—it was said unto her, *The elder shall serve the younger.*"—I will not now enter into a prolix disputation, Whether or not the sense in which I receive it, be the correct one: It is evident, at least, that there is some

decree of God by which he determines to justify believers;* and which, since it excludes unbelievers from righteousness and

* To understand the whole of our author's reasoning, it is necessary to give particular attention to the terms in which this article was expressed by his enemies. The topics which he briefly discusses in this Answer, will be found in an enlarged form in his Friendly Conference with Junius. To those persons who are not intimately acquainted with the peculiarities of our author's scheme of Predestination, as it is deduced from the scriptures of truth, it may be requisite to state in this place,—that it does not differ from that of Calvin's so widely as many people have supposed. Arminius objected against some of the most glaring, bold and desecrating errors which the Genevan Reformer had endeavoured to append to the gospel; but every particle about it that was scriptural, holy and elevating, he cherished and defended as warmly as any of Calvin's admirers. Not a few appearances of this description will be traced in the subjoined extract from a letter, which was addressed to Uitenbogardt, in 1603, by Arminius, prior to his removal to Leyden:

"The question respecting *the origin of this faith in man*, does not require a more ample explanation, [than it finds in the *Friendly Conference with Junius*,] it belongs entirely to another business. For, in Justification, we are not taught from whence faith arises; let it suffice, that it is there proved, *Believers, and they alone, are justified without the works of the law.* I have endeavoured to distinguish, or rather to disjoin, this decree by which God resolves *to justify and adopt believers*, from that by which He determines *to bestow faith on these or those* [*particular individuals*]: This distinction I have attempted to make, from the nature and necessity of the things themselves; expressly with this design—that people may learn that our controversy does not relate to every kind of Predestination, but to that only which is included in the last-named decree. Or, if any person wish to have both of them regarded as constituting one entire system, (in proving which he will experience some difficulty,) I wish to teach, that the controversy does not extend to the whole of Predestination, but to one part alone. I consider this method to contribute greatly towards diminishing controversies and disputes. For I never can approve of such general and indefinite accusations as this, 'He indulges himself in false opinions concerning Predestination!' The state of the controversy ought to be specially explained, and so contracted as to be readily grasped; after which it will probably appear, that the difference is not of such great importance, as, on account of it, to set a black mark of heresy on the person whose opinions vary from the doctrine which is generally received. It is certain, that the decree by which God resolves to justify the believers who work not, (Rom. iv. 5,) is of very great importance, and occupies the second part of the Apostolic doctrine, that is, of that doctrine which was peculiar to the Apostles as the administrators of the gospel of Christ.

"But such a number of considerations are required for explaining the other question, [respecting *the origin of faith*,] that I can scarcely attribute to myself the ability of performing the task. But *I am decidedly inclined to the* PART OF GRACE; and I wish to make no assertion that may either be injurious to it, or that may carry with it any probable appearance of such a hurtful tendency. I will refrain from this explanation at present, as one of two great prolixity. But let it even be granted, that the matter stands thus: 'That 'Faith is communicated to men, solely by the omnipotent act of God, which 'man has neither the power nor the will to resist; and that faith is not com-'municated to those who have it not, for this reason—because God is unwilling 'to act in man by such an irresistible action:' In this case, and for the reason here stated, will it still be useless to teach, *That God justifies none except those who believe?* A consideration of the only order which God has established, will require us thus to teach,—though in that action He perform the condition required by himself, which condition could not have been performed except through that [irresistible] action. Add to this, that, beside his own omnipo-

salvation, is appropriately called " the decree according to election" or " with election," as being that which does not include

tent and internal action, God is both able and willing to employ the following argument: ' God justifies no persons except such as believe: Believe there-' fore, that thou mayest be justified.' With respect, then, to this argument, FAITH will arise from *suasion;* but with respect to the omnipotent and internal act of God, FAITH will arise from *an irresistible efficacy.*—Should any one object, ' That it is impossible for faith thus to spring at the same time from ' a SUASION *which may be resisted,* and from AN EFFICACY *which is irresistible;*' I have nothing to offer that will be any great contradiction to this remark. But I have another observation to make, that is somewhat different; it is this, ' In his omnipotent act God employs [or uses] this argument; and by this ' argument, when rightly understood, He efficaciously produces [operates] ' faith.' If it were otherwise, the operation would be expended on a *stone* or a *lifeless body,* and not upon the INTELLECT of a MAN."

In another part of the letter, he says: " I do not deny, that faith is communicated to us through the Spirit of Christ, whom he has obtained from the Father, and of whom He is constituted the Donor and Dispenser by the Father. But we must observe, that the Spirit, considered absolutely *as the Author of faith,* precedes even the union of Christ with us: This conclusion may easily be drawn from the circumstance—that our union with Christ is perfected by the Spirit and faith.....There is nothing in that reasoning by Calvin of which I cannot heartily approve, if all things in it be rightly understood. For I confess, that the grace by which the Holy Spirit is bestowed, is not common to all men. I also acknowledge, that God's gratuitous [free] election may be said to be ' the fountain of faith;' but it is an election *to bestow faith,* and *not to communicate salvation.* For *a believer* is elected to a participation of SALVATION, but *a sinner* is elected to FAITH. But we must see which of the two elections is so frequently inculcated in scripture: ' He has elected ' [chosen] us to the adoption of sons: The purpose of God which is according ' to election: The election has obtained it: A remnant according to the ' election of grace are saved.'—Let this passage also be taken into consideration, (2 Thess. ii, 13,) ' Because God hath ELECTED you to *salvation* through ' sanctification of the Spirit and *belief* of the truth,' &c.; and this two-fold election will be apparent, Or at least, it will seem impossible to say, that ' election to *salvation* is an election to *faith;*' because the former is produced ' through *faith* [or belief] and sanctification of the Spirit.'

" I do not reject the doctrine of our Divines, but I wish to see them employ a more accurate distinction: And this is the sole cause why I am traduced. If it were lawful for me to devote myself entirely to these exercises, those persons who now indulge suspicions against me on account of my studies, would soon understand the great advantage which the doctrine of our Churches would derive from the mode of treating it which I practise.—The object at which I aim, is the same as theirs; but we probably do not proceed towards it with equal speed and along the same path. I wish a trial could be made, in some important article, whether I, or certain other persons, can point out in the plainest way the truth of our doctrine. Were such an experiment instituted on the doctrine of Predestination, (concerning which point, chiefly, I am suspected by some people,) it would be my desire to have you as an umpire; or I would permit the very men with whom I might hold the contest, to decide concerning the success of the experiment."

This letter, written to his dearest friend, requires no comment. From the whole of its contents it is evident, that he was " decidedly inclined to the PART OF GRACE," and that his chief concern was to secure and maintain the Divine Purity and Glory, which he saw to be dreadfully impugned by several of the Calvinistic appendages to the Gospel. In this sketch of his scheme of Predestination, he preserves that admirable union which may be perceived in the scriptures, which is discernible in the experience of all pious people, and

all men within its embrace. This decree I consider as *the foundation of Christianity, of man's salvation, and of his assurance of salvation;* and it is this of which the Apostle treats in the Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh chapters of his Epistle to the Romans, and in the First chapter to the Ephesians.

But I have not yet declared what my sentiments in general are about that decree by which God is said "to have determined absolutely to save certain particular persons, and to bestow faith upon them in order to their salvation, while others are reprobated from salvation and faith;" although I have confessed, that there is a certain decree of God, according to which he determines to administer the means to faith and salvation, as he knows them to be suitable and proper to his righteousness, mercy and severity. From these premises it is deduced as a most manifest consequence, that faith is not an effect of that election by which God determines to justify those who believe.

2. With regard to the SECOND assertion,—from the particulars thus explained it is concluded, that "*faith is a necessary requisite* in those who shall be partakers of salvation according to the election of God;" or, that "it is *a condition prescribed and required by God,* to be performed by those who shall obtain his salvation."—"This is the will of God, that whosoever believeth in the Son hath eternal life; he that believeth not, shall be condemned:" The propositions contained in this passage cannot be resolved into any other than this brief one, which is likewise used in the Scripture, "Believe, and thou shalt be saved:" In which the word "believe" has the force of a demand or requirement; and the phrase "thou shalt be saved" has that of a suasion, by means of a good that is promised. This truth is so clear and perspicuous, that the denial of it would be a proof of great perversity or of extreme unskilfulness.—If any one say, 'It is a *condition*, but yet an *evangelical* '*one*, which God may himself perform in us, or, (as it is better ' expressed,) which He may by his grace cause us to perform;' —the man who speaks thus, does not contradict this truth, but confirms it when he adds this explanation, 'of what description ' soever that condition may be.'

which really exists between the MORAL SUASION which God is pleased to employ in the communication of his gracious influences upon rational creatures, and the accompanying EFFICACIOUS WORKING of his Holy Spirit, both in Conversion and Sanctification.—See our Author's further explanation in the succeeding Eighth Article.

3. With regard to the THIRD, I say, that we must distinguish between the condition by which it is *required*, that by which it is *performed*, and that by which it is *seen* or *foreseen as performed*. This third member therefore is proposed in a manner much too confused. Yet when this confusion is corrected by the distinction which we have stated, nothing of absurdity will be apparent even in that member. Because *foreseeing* or *seeing*, in the very nature and order of things, follows the performance itself; the performance has its own causes into which it is to be resolved; and the efficiency of those causes is not necessary, unless faith be prescribed and required by the law of faith and the gospel. Since therefore faith is said "to be foreseen by God in those who are to be saved," those causes, without the intervention of which there could be no faith, are not removed but are rather appointed. Among those causes I consider the preventing, accompanying and succeeding [subsequent] grace of God, as the principal: And I say, with Fulgentius, "Those persons will be saved, or "they have been predestinated and elected, who, God foreknew, "would believe by the assistance of his preventing grace, (I add, "*and of his accompanying grace*,) and would persevere by the "aid of his subsequent grace."—In this First member, then, there is nothing except truth of the greatest purity.

II. The SECOND member is, "The decree concerning the gift of faith, precedes the decree of election;" in the explanation of which I employ the same distinction as in the former, and say, 'The decree of election, by which God determines to 'justify and save believers, precedes the decree concerning the 'bestowment of faith.' For faith is unnecessary, nay it is useless, without this previous decree: And the decree of election, by which God resolves to justify and save this or that particular person, is subsequent to that decree according to which He determines to administer the means necessary and efficacious to faith, that is, the decree concerning the gift of faith.

If any one says, 'God wills first absolutely to save some par-'ticular person; and, since he wills that, he also wills to bestow 'faith on him,—because without faith it is not possible for him 'to be saved:' I tell him, that he lays down contradictory propositions,—that 'God wills absolutely to save some one *without* '*regard to faith*;'—and yet that, 'according to the will of 'God, he cannot be saved *without faith*.' Through the will of God it has been revealed to us, *Without faith it is impossible for any man to please God*, or to be saved: There is therefore in God no other will, by which he wills any one *to be absolutely*

saved without consideration of faith. For contradictory wills cannot be attributed to God.

If any person replies, 'God wills the end, before he wills the 'means leading to the end; but salvation is the end, and faith 'the means leading to the end:'—I answer, *First*, Salvation is not the end of God; but salvation and faith are the gifts of God, bound and connected together in this order between themselves through the will of God,—that faith should precede salvation, both with regard to God the Donor of it; and in reality. *Secondly.* Faith is A CONDITION required by God to be performed by him who shall be saved, before it is A MEANS of obtaining that salvation. Since God will not bestow salvation on any one, except on him who believes, man is on this account incited to be willing to believe, because he knows that his chief good is placed in salvation. Man therefore tries, by faith as the means, to attain to salvation as the end; because he knows, that he cannot possibly obtain salvation except through that means: And this knowledge he does not acquire, except through the declaration of the Divine Will, by which God requires faith from those who wish to be saved, that is, by which he places faith as a CONDITION in the object, that is, in the person to be saved.

ARTICLE V.

Nought among things contingent can be said to be NECESSARILY *done in respect to the Divine decree.*

ANSWER.

My opinion concerning Necessity and Contingency is, 'that 'they can never be applicable at once to one and the same 'event:' But I speak of the necessity and contingency that are both of the same kind, not those which are different in their genus. The schoolmen state, that there is one *necessitas consequentis* [an absolute necessity,] and another *necessitas consequentiæ* [a hypothetical necessity]. The former is, when the necessity arises *from a cause antecedent to the thing itself:* But *necessitas consequentiæ* [a hypothetical necessity] arises from *certain premises* [*or principles*] *antecedent to the conclusion.**

* As the English reader would not understand the metaphysical distinctions of *a consequent necessity* and *the necessity of a consequence*, I have adopted, instead of them, those of "an *absolute*" and "a *hypothetical necessity*." For such a substitution I have the authority of that clever Lutheran Professor, honest Christopher Scheibler; who, in his excellent Treatise on METAPHYSICS, (Lib. i, c. 18.) says: "This distinction is nearly allied to that which has

A *consequent* [or absolute] *contingency* cannot consist with a *consequent* [or absolute] *necessity*, nor can they meet together in one event: In the same manner, one *conclusion* cannot be both necessary and contingent in regard to its consequence, [that is, it cannot have, at the same time, a necessity and a contingency that are *hypothetical*]. But the cause why one thing cannot be necessary and contingent at the same time, is this, 'that what is 'necessary, and what is contingent, divide the whole amplitude 'of being.' For every being is either necessary or contingent. But those things which divide the whole of being, cannot coincide or meet together in any single being: Otherwise they would not divide the whole range of being. What is contingent, and what is necessary, likewise differ in their entire

been previously given [concerning absolute and hypothetical necessity,] for *necessitas consequentiæ* is assumed from the supposition of something precedent to it, and is thus in a certain sense *hypothetical*." After detailing the derivation of both terms from a syllogistic distinction much employed by Logicians, Scheibler thus proceeds: "That necessity is called *necessitas consequentiæ* when any thing is said to be necessary by its subordination or *relation* to other things, and by its connection with them. But that necessity is styled *necessitas consequentis*, by which any thing is really necessary after the removal of such a connection as has been just described, and by a consideration of the thing *absolutely* in itself." His definition of the other species of necessity, to which he says "they are allied," is the following:

"An ABSOLUTE necessity, is that which is assumed *ab intrinseco* from within, by which any thing is immutable when such is *the requisition* of its own nature. On this account it is called *the necessity of nature and of definition*.—But a HYPOTHETICAL necessity is that according to which whatever is immutable, is so through the extrinsic position of some circumstance. Thus, it is an ABSOLUTE necessity, that *God is just*, and that *fire burns*.—But that is a HYPOTHETICAL necessity concerning which we say, *What is done, cannot be undone*: For in this case the necessity does not arise from *the nature of the thing*, which is called 'necessary;' but it arises *extrinsically*,—that is, from the hypothesis or supposition of time. Thus it is necessary, *that offences must come*,—that is, on the supposition of the condition of human beings, because man is inclined to every species of wickedness and crime. This kind of hypothetical necessity obtains likewise in hypothetical propositions, which derive their appellation from that circumstance: Thus, 'If an ass fly, it has wings.'

"St. Augustine says, in his CITY OF GOD, (lib. iv, c. 10,) 'That is one kind 'of necessity when we say, It is of necessity, that *God always lives and fore-'knows all things*.—It is another kind when we say, It is of necessity, that '*men die*.—And it is still different when we say, *Man now wills something '*by his free will*: Therefore it is of necessity that he wills it.'"

I must here again be permitted to state, in behalf of Arminius, that it would have been impossible for him, or any other man, to overturn the arguments of his adversaries, who had intrenched their errors within certain refined metaphysical distinctions, unless he had evinced the great superiority of his powers as a metaphysician. In this Article, and the two which succeed it, he proves himself to be a worthy disciple of Ramus and Zabarella; he unravels the complex yet ingenious scheme of his opponents, and shews the most admired of their positions to be untenable. In two of his private letters, he has treated the subject of *Necessity and Contingency* in a more ample manner, and illustrated it by a great number of familiar examples.

essences and in the whole of their definition. For that is *necessary* which *cannot* possibly not be or not be done, [or, in the old English way, *which cannot but be or be done*]: And that is *contingent* which *is possible* not to be or to be done. Thus contradictorily are they opposed to each other; and this opposition is infinite, and therefore always dividing truth from falsehood: As, "this thing is either *a man*, or it is *not a man*;" it is not possible for any thing to be both of these at once,—that is, it is impossible for any thing *of one essence*. Otherwise [in another sense,] "Christ is *a man*," as proceeding from his mother Mary; "he is *not a man*," in reference to his having been begotten of the Father from all eternity; but these are two things and two natures.

But they say, 'It is possible for one and the same event to 'be necessary and contingent in different respects—*necessary* 'with regard to the First Cause, which is God,—and *contin-* '*gent* in respect to second causes.' I answer,—FIRST. Those things which differ in their entire essences, do not co-incide in respects.—SECONDLY. The necessity or contingency of an event is to be estimated, not from one cause, but from all the causes united together. For after ten causes have been fixed,* from which a thing is produced, not *necessarily*, but *contingently*, if one be added from which the thing may be *necessarily* completed, the whole of that thing is said to have been done *not contingently* but *necessarily*. Because when all these causes were together appointed, it was impossible for that thing to hinder itself from being produced and from being brought into existence. That thing, I confess indeed, when distinctly compared by our mind with each of its causes, has a different relation to them respectively: But since none of those causes is *the total cause* of that event, and since all of them united together form *the total cause*, the thing ought itself to be accounted and declared to have been done from that total cause, either *necessarily* or *contingently*.

It is not only a rash saying, but a false and an ignorant one,—'that a thing which in regard to second causes is done *con-* '*tingently* is said to be done *necessarily* in regard to the Di- 'vine Decree.' For the Divine decree itself, being an internal action of God, is not immediately the cause of the thing; but, whatever effects it may produce, it performs them by power, according to the mode of which a thing will be said to

* The logical word *positis* often occurs in these three Articles, and by it the readers may understand any of the terms "laid down, fixed, or supposed."

be either *necessarily* or *contingently*. For if God resolve to use an irresistible power in the execution of his Decree, or if he determine to employ such a *quantum* of power as nothing can resist or can hinder it from completing his purpose, it will follow that the thing will *necessarily* be brought into existence: Thus, 'Wicked men, who persevere in their sins, will *necessarily* perish;' for God will by an irresistible force cast them down into the depths of hell.—But if he resolve to use a force that is not irresistible, but that can be resisted by the creature, then that thing is said to be done, *not necessarily*, but *contingently*,—although its actual occurrence was certainly foreknown by God, according to the infinity of his understanding, by which He knows all results whatever, that will arise from certain causes which are laid down, and whether those causes produce a thing necessarily or contingently. From whence the school-men say, that "all things are done by *a necessity of infallibility*;"* which phrase is used in a deter-

* The following quotation from *A Correct Copy of some Notes concerning God's Decrees*, by that profound Logician and Divine, Dr. Thomas PIERCE, will elucidate this remark, while it also serves to explain to the mere English reader some metaphysical terms which Arminius has here employed: "Many conclude that God's working upon the wills of his Elect, is by such a physical immediate immutation of their wills, as doth not only produce a *certain*, but a *necessary* effect: And being forgetful (rather than ignorant) to distinguish *necessity* from *certainty* of events, they call that *necessary* which is but *certain* and *infallible*, and so (through haste or inadvertency) they swallow down the error of Irresistible Grace; using the word *irresistible* instead of *efficacious*.

"*Infallible* properly is that 'which cannot err, or be deceived.' That is properly *necessary* 'which cannot but be.' The first relates to the perfection of the knowledge of God, but the second to the Almightiness of his will. The First is properly applied unto the object of God's foresight,—and though it is otherwise used, yet it is by such a Catachresis as I humbly conceive to be a stone of stumbling. But the Second [is applied] more precisely unto the object of his decree. The First is consistent with those contingent events to which the Second is diametrically opposed. For instance: *That I am now writing*, is but contingent, because I do it upon choice. Yet God's foreknowledge of this my writing from all eternity, did infer that this my writing would *infallibly* come to pass. This event is *contingent*, for I can choose; but yet *infallible*, for God cannot err. This contingent therefore doth infallibly come to pass; not by way of *a consequent*, but by way of *consequence*; my writing being not the *effect* but the *object* only of God's Omniscience, which is (in order) before the act. God foresees a contingent will contingently come to pass; and therefore we infer, it will infallibly come to pass, because HE foresees it who is infallible. So that his prescience is *a consequent* of the thing's coming to pass; and its infallibility of coming to pass is *inferred* from his prescience only by way of *consequence*. It is one thing, to follow as the effect of a cause, in order of *nature*; and quite another, to follow as the sequel of an antecedent, in way of *argumentation*. The short and plain upshot of all is this: The precious vessels of Election do very certainly and infallibly persevere unto the end, and that by reason of God's Omniscience which cannot be deceived; but not of necessity and irresistibly, by reason of his Omnipotence which cannot be frustrate nor defeated."

minate sense, although the words in which its enunciation is expressed are ill-chosen. For infallibility is not an affection of a being, which exists from causes; but it is an affection of a Mind that sees or that foresees from what causes it will transpire. But I readily endure a catachrestic Metalepsis, [an improper trope,] when it is evident concerning a thing,*—although it is my wish that our enunciations were always the best-accommodated to the natures of the things themselves.

But the inventors of these articles try to prove by the examples which they produce, that 'one and the same thing, 'which with respect to SECOND CAUSES is done *contingently*, 'is in respect to the DIVINE DECREE done *necessarily*.' They say, 'It was possible for the bones of Christ *to be broken*, or '*not to be broken*. It was possible for them *to be broken*, if 'any person considers the nature of bones; for they were 'undoubtedly fragile. But they *could not be broken*, if the 'decree of God be taken into the account.'—In answer to this, I deny, that *in respect of the* DIVINE DECREE *they could not be broken*. For God did not decree, that it was IMPOSSIBLE *for them to be broken*, but that they *should not be broken*. This is apparent from the manner in which the transaction was actually conducted. For God did not employ *an irresistible power* by which he might prevent the bones of Christ from being broken by those who approached to break them; but by a mild kind of suasion he caused that they should not will to break the bones of Christ, by an argument drawn from

* Arminius says, in one of his letters: "By a Metalepsis, therefore, that which belongs to the fore-knowing Mind is ascribed to the thing foreknown, —as though an event would *necessarily* happen because it was infallibly foreknown by the Divine Mind. But God knows as infallibly what things will happen contingently, as what will happen necessarily; for his foreknowledge does not depend upon an immutable CAUSE of the existence of the thing, but on the INFINITY of the Divine Knowledge. And what praise is due to the Divine Wisdom, if it therefore foreknow future things—because God resolves to produce them by such a power as the creatures cannot resist? As often therefore as it is said, 'that a thing will happen *infallibly* or *certainly*,' such an expression is Metaleptic. It is another instance of Metalepsis, when that which it is said will *infallibly* happen, is stated to be done *necessarily*."

In a subsequent letter, written in 1607, he says: "It follows therefore, that the Prescience of God is infallible on account of the Infinity of his Knowledge. This truth the human mind is capable of grasping; but the *mode* by which it is a truth, is known to God alone. But since we are not able *certainly* to foreknow any thing in any other manner than on account of it being dependent on an immutable cause,—from this mode of *our own* certain foreknowledge we form a conclusion respecting the mode of the DIVINE FOREKNOWLEDGE. But we act improperly in thus determining: Because unless this mode differ entirely from the mode of human prescience, and have nothing analogous to it, it is not Divine. Human knowledge, indeed, possesses something analogous to that which is Divine; but the *mode* of Divine Knowledge is decidedly transcendent."

its inutility.* For since Christ had already given up the ghost, before those who broke the legs had arrived at the cross, they were not at all inclined to undertake a vain and fruitless labour in breaking the legs of our Saviour. Because the breaking of legs, with a design to hasten death, was only done lest the bodies should remain suspended on the cross on a festival or sacred day, contrary to the Divine law.—Indeed if the Divine Wisdom knows how to effect that which it has decreed, by employing causes according to their nature and motion,—whether their nature and motion be contingent or free, —the praise due to such Wisdom is far greater than if it employ a power which no creature can possibly resist: Although God can employ such a power whensoever it may seem expedient to his Wisdom.† I am therefore of opinion, that I committed no offence when I said, "No contingent "thing,—that is, nothing which is done or has been done "CONTINGENTLY,—can be said to be or to have been done "NECESSARILY *with regard to the Divine decree.*"

ARTICLE VI.

All things are done contingently.

ANSWER.

This Article is expressed in such a stupid and senseless manner, that they who attribute it to me, declare by this very circumstance, that they do not perceive under how many falsities this expression labours; nay, they do not understand

* "But when the soldiers came to Jesus, and saw *that he was dead already*, they brake not his legs." (John xix, 31—36.)

† Another quotation from Dr. PIERCE may communicate to this assertion a larger elucidation: "God indeed (if it please him) can, by his absolute power over his creature, make him act this thing or take that thing, by ineluctable necessity, and whether he will or not: But then that acting is not volition, and that taking is not choice. For the very word CHOICE cannot be apprehended, but it must carry along with it a sound of freedom. *Optio* must be *optimorum*, and so *duorum* at least: 'It is of two things or more, that we choose the best,' whether in reality or in appearance. And this liberty of the will (by which we choose) being acknowledged on all sides, (as well by Mr. Perkins and Dr. Twisse, as by Bellarmine and Arminius, as every man knows that hath but read and compared them,) that famous ἐνέργεια of a two-fold necessity, the one of co-action, and the other of infallibility, (being built upon a manifest and gross mistake both of the word Necessity, and the word Infallibility,) seems to me to be serviceable to no other end, than to cover a wound, which it is impossible to cure.—Shall I declare my judgment then, (although in weakness, yet in sincerity,) how free-will is necessary to the choosing of good,—to which, without grace, it is altogether insufficient? My judgment is, that it is necessary, not as a *Cause* but as a *Condition;*

what is the meaning of the words which they employ. For if that is said to be done *contingently* which it is possible *not to do*, [or which *may not be done*,] after all the causes required for its being done have been fixed,—and, on the other hand, if that is said to be done *necessarily* which cannot be left undone, [which *cannot but be done*,] after all the causes required for its performance have been fixed,—and if I grant, that, after some causes have been fixed, it is impossible for any other event to ensue—than *that the thing should be done and exist*, —how then can I be of opinion, that "all things are done [or happen] contingently?" But they have deceived themselves by their own ignorance; from which it would be possible for them to be liberated, if they would bestow a becoming and proper attention on sentiments that are more correct, and would in a friendly manner obtain from the author a knowledge of his views and opinions.

I have both declared and taught, that "necessity, in reference to its being said *to be* or *to happen necessarily*,—is either absolute or relative." It is an *absolute* necessity, in relation to a thing being said simply "to be or to happen *necessarily*," without any regard being had to the supposition [or laying down] of any cause whatever. It is a *relative* necessity, when a thing is said "to be or to happen necessarily," after some cause had been laid down or fixed.—Thus, God exists by an *absolute* necessity; and by the same absolute necessity, he both understands and loves himself. But the world, and all things produced from it, are, according to an *absolute* consideration, *contingent*, and are produced contingently by God freely operating. But it being granted, that God wills to form the world by his Infinite Power, to which NOTHING ITSELF must be equal to *matter in the most perfect state of preparation*,—and it being likewise granted, that God actually employs this power,—it will then be said, 'It was impossible 'for the world to do otherwise than exist from this cause:' [or, 'From this cause *the world could not but exist*:'] And this is a *relative* necessity, which is so called from the hypothesis of an antecedent cause being laid down or fixed. *

not as that, *by virtue of which* we CAN DO any thing that is good; but as that, *without which* we CANNOT CHOOSE it. GOD'S GRACE alone is the CAUSE of the good, but MAN'S WILL is as really the INSTRUMENT of the choice. We can DO good, as God's *engines*, without a will; and so did Balaam's ass, without a reason. But we cannot CHOOSE good, without a free will; as that ass could not possibly understand what she spake without a ratiocination."

* The reasoning contained in this paragraph, will be explained in a manner somewhat different, by the subjoined extract from Dr. Pierce, who on all occasions gratefully acknowledges his vast obligations to Boetius:

I will explain my meaning in a different manner: Two things in this place come under our consideration,—the CAUSE and the EFFECT. If both of them be necessarily fixed, that is, if not only the effect be fixed necessarily when the cause is fixed, but if the cause also necessarily exist and be necessarily supposed to operate, the necessity of the effect is in that case *simple* and *absolute*. In this manner arises the *absolute* necessity of the Divine effect, by which God is said to know and love himself; for the Divine Understanding and the Divine Will cannot be inoperative, [cannot but operate]. This operation of God is not only an internal one, but it is also *ad intra*, [inwards,] tending towards an object, which is

"There is a twofold necessity, whereof one is *absolute*, and the other on *supposition*: The *absolute* is that by which a thing *must be moved* when something moves it: The *suppositive* is that by which a man *shall be damned* if he die *impenitent*. The latter necessity (though not the first) does extremely well consist both with the liberty of man's will and God's conditional decrees. For instance, I am now writing, and God foresaw that I am writing; yet it does not follow that I must needs write,—for I can choose. What God foresees, must necessarily come to pass; but it must come to pass *in the same manner that he foresees it*. He foresees, I will write not of necessity but choice; so that his fore-sight does not *make* an absolute and peremptory necessity, but *infers* a necessity upon supposition. (We must mark, in a parenthesis, how great a difference there is betwixt the MAKING, and the INFERRING of a necessity!) Whatsoever I do, there is an absolute necessity that God should foresee; yet God foreseeing my voluntary action, does not make it necessary, but on supposition that it is done. If all things are present to God, (as indeed they are,) his *foresight* must needs be all one with our *sight*. As, therefore, when I see a man dance as he pleases, it is necessary that he do what I see he does,—but yet my looking on does not make it necessary:—So God's foreseeing that man would sin, implied a *certainty* that so it would be, but did not make it an *absolutely necessary* or *involuntary thing*. For that a thing may be *certain* (in respect of its EVENT) and yet *not necessary* (in respect of its CAUSE) is no news at all to a considering person, who will but duly distinguish God's omniscience from his omnipotence, and his foresight from his decree, and *infallible* from *necessary*, and *spontaneous* from *voluntary*, and that which follows as a *consequence only* from that which follows as a *consequent*. From all that I have spoken upon this last subject, it seems inevitably to follow that a *suppositive necessity*, and none else, is very consistent with a free and contingent action. Whilst I see a man sitting, it is *necessary* that he sit, but *upon supposition* that I see him sitting: His *posture* is still a voluntary *contingent* thing; for he sat down when he would, and may arise when he pleaseth, but still with a proviso of God's permission. I desire to be taught what is, if this is not, exact speaking, viz. 'That God by his prohibition under penalty makes my 'disobedience become liable to punishment; and by his decree to *permit* or *not* 'hinder me, *he leaves me in the hand of mine own counsel*, and so in the state of 'peccability, that I may sin and perish, *if I will*. So that by his PRESCIENCE 'that *I will sin*, he hath no manner of INFLUENCE or CAUSALITY upon my sin; 'which infers my destruction to be entirely from myself.' I am a little confident, that whosoever shall but read Boethius, his fifth book,—and, reading, shall understand it,—and, understanding, shall have the modesty to retract an error,—he will not reverence the 4th section of the 23rd chapter of the 3rd book of INSTITUTIONS, because it is Mr. CALVIN's but will suspect Mr. Calvin because of that section."

himself. But whatever God may do *ad extra*, [externally,] that is, when acting on an object which is something beside himself, [or, something different from himself,]—whether this object be united to him in understanding and he tend towards it by *an internal act*, or whether it be in reality separated from him and towards which he tends by *an external act*,—the whole of this he does freely, and the whole of it is therefore said to be *absolutely contingent*. Thus God *freely* decreed to form the world, and did *freely* form it: And, in this sense, *all things are done contingently in respect to the Divine decree*; because no necessity exists why the decree of God should be appointed, since it proceeds from his own pure and free [or unconstrained] Will.

Or, to express it in another form: That is called the *simple* and *absolute* necessity of any effect, "when the cause necessarily exists, necessarily operates, and employs that power through which *it is impossible for the thing not to exist*," [or through which *it cannot but exist*]. In the nature of things, such an effect as this cannot be contemplated. For the Intellect of the Deity, by which he understands himself, proceeds from a Cause that necessarily exists and that necessarily understands itself; but it does not proceed from a Cause which employs a power of action for such an understanding.

Under this consideration, the *relative* necessity of any event is two-fold:—FIRST. When a cause that necessarily exists, but does not necessarily operate, uses a power of action that cannot be resisted. Thus, it being fixed, that "God, who is a *Necessary Being*, wills to create a world by his Omnipotence," a world must in that case necessarily come into existence.—SECONDLY. When a cause that does not necessarily exist and yet necessarily operates, acts with such efficacy as is impossible to be resisted by the matter or subject on which it operates. Thus, straw is said to be *necessarily* burnt [or consumed] by the fire, if it be cast into the flame: Because it is impossible either for the fire to restrain its power of burning so as not actually to burn, or for the straw to resist the fire. But because God can prevent the fire from burning any combustible matter that is brought near it or put into it,*—this kind of necessity is

* In one of his letters to Uitenbogardt, in 1604, this position is thus rendered more plain and evident: "But, that 'the necessity which subsists between '*fire* and *burning* is not ABSOLUTE,' is apparent from the history of *the Three Children* in the Babylonian furnace. By the decree of God a *necessary* relation subsists between the end and the means, when, notwithstanding, neither of them is ABSOLUTELY *necessary*. Thus, it is necessary for a man to believe on

called *partial* in respect to the cause, and only according to the nature of the things themselves and the mutual affection [or relation] between them.*

When these matters have been thus explained, I could wish to see what can possibly be said in opposition. I am desirous, that we should in preference contend for THE NECESSITY OF GOD ALONE,—that is, for his necessary existence and for the necessary production of his *ad intra* [internal] acts,—and that we should contend for the CONTINGENCY OF ALL OTHER THINGS AND EFFECTS.† Such a procedure on our part would conduce far more to the glory of God; to whom by this method would

Christ, if he wishes to obtain salvation; but it is not *absolutely* necessary, that he should either believe or be saved. 'But God has decreed to give him 'salvation and faith: Therefore he will necessarily have both.' We deny the consequence: For God decreed freely to bestow both of them, and by such actions as could not possibly be resisted by the man,—although he would not afterwards be found to have offered in reality any resistance, and although God knew that he would not resist. This is the kind of predestination which has St. Augustine for its patron, but concerning which I am not now treating: For I am only contending against that necessity which cannot exist except by a physical determination, which takes away human liberty, and on that account operates as an excuse for his sin that was made inevitable."

* In another of his letters to Uitenbogardt, Arminius says: "There are some persons who are much grieved at my assertions, that '*there is no absolute necessity in any thing* EXCEPT IN GOD. Nay, that even fire does not 'burn necessarily; but that the necessity which exists in things or events, is 'nothing more than the relation of CAUSE to EFFECT,—and this, even when the 'CAUSE cannot suspend its own action, and the OBJECT cannot hinder that 'cause from acting upon it according to the efficacy of such cause: Thus fire 'cannot suspend its burning, if materials be brought to feed it; nor can combustible materials resist the action of the fire. In the same manner does the 'relation subsist between the means and the end. *Thus it behoved Christ to* 'SUFFER, that he might *enter into his glory*, [Luke xxiv, 26, 46.] because 'God decreed, that he should not enter into glory except through sufferings.'" [Heb. ii. 9, 10, 17.]

† This was a favourite sentiment with our author; and it cannot be too frequently inculcated, in opposition to the desecrating consequences of the *inevitable necessity* and *binding fatality* of Calvin's system. In a letter to Uitenbogardt, dated August 17th, 1604, Arminius writes thus: "I have lately had the company of Helmichius, who discussed with me the topics of Necessity and Contingency, on which I had treated in my Lectures, and in the Disputation concerning *the First Sin of Man*. He maintained, that 'in a different respect several things were both *contingent* and *necessary*:' I denied this position; that is, I asserted, that they were not necessary *absolutely*, or *with respect to the antecedent cause*, which is called *Necessitas consequentis*, a consequent [or absolute] necessity. We did not agree together; but each of us parted from the other, severally persisting in our own opinions: Yet he confessed, that the discussion did not concern the necessity of faith, and that it was not possible for any heresy to lurk under the opposite sentiment. I insisted that it tends greatly to the GLORY OF GOD, to call nothing 'NECESSARY' except HIMSELF, and to declare that *he foreknows contingent things*, [qua talia] even in reference to their contingency, which He at the same time resolves to execute by *contingent* events, and *free* causes."

be attributed both the GLORY *of his necessary existence*, that is, *of his eternity*, according to which it is a pure act without [the exercise of] power,—and the GLORY *of his free creation of all other things*, by which also his Goodness becomes a supreme object of our commendation.

ARTICLE VII.

God has not by his eternal decree determined future and contingent things to the one part or the other.

ANSWER.

A calumny which lies concealed under ambiguous terms, is capable of inflicting a deep injury with the greatest security; but after such equivocal expressions are explained, the slander is exposed, and loses all its force among men of skill and experience.

The word "DETERMINED" is of this ambiguous description: For it signifies (1.) either 'the determination of God by which 'he resolves that something shall be done; and when such a 'determination is fixed, (by an action, motion and impulse of 'God, of whatever kind it mny be,) the second cause, both with 'regard to its power and the use of that power, remains *free* 'either *to act* or *not to act*,—so that, if it be the pleasure of 'this second cause, *it can suspend* [or defer] *its own action*.'— Or it signifies, (2.) 'such a determination, as, when once it is 'fixed, the second cause (at least in regard to the *use of its* '*power*,) remains no longer free so as to be able to suspend its 'own action, when God's action, motion and impulse have been 'fixed; but by this determination, it [the second cause] is 'necessarily bent or inclined to the one course or the other, all '*indifference to either part* being completely removed, before 'this determined act be produced by a free and unconstrained 'creature.'

1. If the word "DETERMINED," in the Article here proposed, be interpreted according to this first method, far be it from me to deny such a sort of Divine Determination. For I am aware that it is said, in the fourth chapter of the *Acts of the Apostles*, "Both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together against Jesus, to do whatsoever God's hand and counsel *determined before* (or previously appointed) to be done." But I also know, that Herod, Pontius Pilate, and the Jews, *freely* performed those very actions; and (notwithstanding this "fore-determination of

God," and though by his power every Divine action, motion and impulse which was necessary for the execution of this "fore-determination," were all fixed,) yet it was possible for this act (the crucifixion of Christ,) which had been "previously appointed" by God, not to be produced by those persons, and they might have remained free and indifferent to the performance of this action, up to the moment of time in which they perpetrated the deed. Let the narrative of the passion of our Lord be perused, and let it be observed how the whole matter was conducted,—by what arguments Herod, Pontius Pilate and the Jews were moved and induced,—and the kind of administration [or management] that was employed in the use of those arguments,—and it will then be evident, that it is the truth which I here assert.

2. But if the word "DETERMINED" be received according to the second acceptation, I confess, that I abominate and detest that axiom (as one that is FALSE, ABSURD, and preparing the way for MANY BLASPHEMIES,) which, declares that "God by his eternal decree has determined to the one part or to the other *future contingent things:*"—By this last phrase understand "those things which are performed by the free will of the creature."

(1.) I execrate it as A FALSEHOOD: Because God in the administration of his Providence conducts all things in such a manner that when he is pleased to employ his creatures in the execution of his decrees, he does not take away from them their nature, natural properties or the use of them, but allows them to perform and complete their own proper motions. Were it otherwise, Divine Providence, which ought to be accommodated to the creation, would be in direct opposition.

(2.) I detest it as AN ABSURDITY: Because it is contradictory in the adjunct, that "something is done *contingently*," that is, it is done in such a manner as makes *it* POSSIBLE *not to be done;*—and yet this same thing is determined to the one part or the other in such a manner, as makes *it* IMPOSSIBLE *to leave undone* that which has been determined to be done. What the patrons of such a doctrine advance about "that liberty not being taken away which belongs to the nature of the creature," is not sufficient to destroy this contradiction: Because it is not sufficient for the establishment of contingency and liberty, to have the presence of a power which can freely act according to nature; but it is requisite that the use and employment of that power and liberty should on no account be impeded. What

insanity therefore is it, [according to the scheme of these men,] to confer at the creation a power on the creature *of acting freely or of suspending its action*,—and yet to take away the use of such a power when the liberty comes at length to be employed: That is, to grant it when there is no use for it,—but, when it becomes both useful and necessary, then in the very act to prevent the exercise of its liberty. Let Tertullian against Marcion be examined, (lib. ii. c. 5, 6, 7,) where he discusses this matter in a most erudite and nervous manner: I yield my full assent to all that he advances.

(3.) I abhor it as CONDUCING TO MULTIPLIED BLASPHEMIES. For I consider it impossible for any art or sophistry to prevent this dogma concerning "such a previous determination" from producing the following consequences:—FIRST. It makes God to be the author of sin, and man to be exempt from blame.—SECONDLY. It constitutes God as the real, proper and only sinner: Because when there is a fixed law which forbids this act, and when there is such "a fore-determination" as makes it "impossible for this act not to be committed," it follows as a natural consequence, that it is God himself who transgresses the law, since he is the person who performs this deed against the law. For though this be immediately perpetrated by the creature, yet, with regard to it, the creature cannot have any consideration of sin; because this act was unavoidable on the part of man, after such "fore-determination" had been fixed.—THIRDLY. Because, according to this dogma, God needed sinful man and his sin, for the illustration of his Justice and Mercy.—FOURTHLY. And, from its terms, sin is no longer sin.

I never yet saw a refutation of those consequences which have been deduced from this dogma by some other persons. I wish such a refutation was prepared, at least that it would be seriously attempted: When it is completed, if I am not able to demonstrate, even then, that these objections of mine are not removed,—I will own myself to be vanquished, and will ask pardon for my offence. Although I am not accustomed to charge and oppress this sentiment [of theirs] with such consequences before other people, yet I usually confess this single circumstance, (and this, only when urged by necessity,) that "I cannot possibly free their opinion from those objections."

ARTICLE VIII.

Sufficient grace of the Holy Spirit is bestowed on those to whom the gospel is preached, whosoever they may be; so that, if they will, they may believe: Otherwise, God would only be mocking mankind.

ANSWER.

At no time, either in public or in private, have I delivered this proposition in these words, or in any expressions that were of equivalent force, or that conveyed a similar meaning. This assertion I confidently make, even though a great number of persons might bear a contrary testimony: Because, unless this Article receive a modified explanation, I neither approve of it at present, nor has it at any time obtained any portion of my approval. Of this fact it is in my power to afford evidence, from written conferences which I have had with other people on the same subject.

In this Article there are three topics concerning which I am desirous of giving a suitable explanation.

First. *Concerning the difference which subsists among the persons to whom the gospel is preached.* Frequent mention of this difference is made in the scriptures, and particularly in the following passages.—" I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things *from the wise and prudent*, and hast revealed them *unto babes*." (Matt. xi. 25.) The explanation of these words may be discovered in 1 Cor. i. and ii.—" Into whatsoever city or town ye shall enter, enquire who in it is worthy; and there abide till ye go thence. And when ye come into a house, salute it: And *if the house be worthy*, let your peace come upon it; but *if it be not worthy*, let your peace return to you." (Matt. x. 11—13.) The Jews of Berœa " were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind," &c. (Acts xvii. 11.) " Pray for us, that the word of the Lord may have free course, and be glorified, even as it is with you; and that we may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men: For all men have not faith. But the Lord is faithful," &c. (2 Thess. iii. 1, 2.)

Secondly. *Concerning the bestowing of sufficient grace,*—what is to be understood by such a gift? It is well known, that there is *habitual grace*, and [the grace of] *assistance*. Now the phraseology of the Article might be understood according to this acceptation,—as though some kind of *habitual grace*

were infused into all those to whom the gospel is preached, which would render them *apt* [or *inclined*] to give it credence. [or believe the gospel.] But this interpretation of the phrase is one of which I do not approve. But this SUFFICIENCY,* after all that is said about it, must, in my opinion, be ascribed to *the assistance of the Holy Spirit*, by which he assists the preaching of the gospel, as the organ [or instrument] by which He [the Holy Spirit] is accustomed to be efficacious in the hearts of the hearers. But it is possible to explain this operation of the assistance of the Holy Spirit, in a manner so modified and appropriate, and such *sufficiency* may be ascribed to it, as to keep at the greatest possible distance from Pelagianism.

THIRDLY. *Concerning the expression*, '*By this sufficient grace they may believe, if they will.*' These words, when delivered in such a crude and undigested form, are capable of

* Since in this sentence the two words "sufficient" and "efficacious" occur, it may be well for the reader to know the opinion of Arminius respecting them. In a letter, dated July 8th, 1606, he says: "St. Augustine invented the distinction of *sufficient* and *efficacious* grace, to establish at once both free-will and grace, as well as his own [scheme of] Predestination. But this distinction does not obtain the approbation of many of our divines, and it is entirely rejected by great numbers who assert that *there is no sufficient grace!* But I am of opinion, that the distinction ought to be admitted; otherwise, the freedom of the will and the justice of God cannot be defended. But it requires the exertion of the most consummate skill to explain, how this SUFFICIENCY is to be distinguished from EFFICACY: This has long been a frequent subject of my meditations; and the very question which you raise, has often occurred to my mind—'How can this be called SUFFICIENT GRACE which never effects that 'for which it is sufficient, and upon which even the EFFICACY of grace is 'dependent?'

"But I will not now attempt the resolution of this point, which would require too prolix a discussion. Of this, however, I am well persuaded, that sufficient grace belongs not only to the external vocation, but likewise to the internal gift: otherwise, it does not deserve to bear the name of SUFFICIENT. But if regeneration be peculiar to the elect alone, it is certain that regeneration is distinguished from *sufficient grace, which* St. Augustine deservedly makes to be common even to the reprobates: And therefore, either the grace which is called "sufficient" is not sufficient to produce this effect; or, if it be sufficient, regeneration is not necessary to it. If then you conclude it to be impossible for any good to be effected without regeneration, and if at the same time you make regeneration to be peculiar to the elect, you must of necessity deny sufficient grace. If you do not deny sufficient grace, you must necessarily own the one or the other of these consequences,—either that regeneration is not necessary to effect any good, or that it is not peculiar to the elect.

"If you enquire what my sentiments are on this point, I reply, that *I make the election of each individual to salvation to be subsequent to faith and regeneration:* And, that this may not excite your wonder, I will only desire you to distinguish between *election to salvation* and *election to faith and regeneration.* For it is one decree, by which God resolves *to save a* BELIEVER; and it is another, by which he determines *to administer the means that are necessary and efficacious to* FAITH. The former of these two decrees has the precedence, because there would be no necessity for the latter except the other were previously in existence."

being brought to bear a very bad interpretation, and a meaning not at all agreeable to the scriptures,—as though, after that power had been bestowed, the Holy Spirit and Divine Grace remain entirely quiescent,* waiting to see whether the man will properly use the power which he has received, and will believe the gospel: When, on the contrary, he who wishes to entertain and to utter correct sentiments on this subject, will account it necessary to ascribe to Grace its own province, which indeed is the principal one, in persuading the human will that it may be inclined to yield assent to those truths which are preached.

This exposition completely frees me from the slightest suspicion of heresy on the point here mentioned; and proves it to be a report not entitled to the least credit, *that I have employed such expressions*, as I am unwilling to admit, except with the addition of a sound and proper explanation.

In reference to the REASON which is appended to this Proposition,—that, *otherwise, God would only be mocking mankind*, —I confess it to be a remark which several adversaries employ against the opinion entertained by many of our Divines, to convict it of absurdity: And it is not used without just cause, which might easily have been demonstrated,—had it pleased the inventors of these Articles, (instead of ascribing them to me,) to occupy themselves in openly declaring on this subject their own sentiments, which they keep carefully concealed within their own bosoms.†

* It happens in this case, as in several others, that the consequences with which the Calvinists endeavoured to charge the sentiments of Arminius, appertained exclusively to their own: For it is seen in a preceding page, (622,) that "the Holy Spirit and Divine Grace remain in a state of quiescence;" and allow sin, "their subtle and dethroned rival, *to dwell* in the heart of a believer and *to oppose* all the Divine operations."

† In the ample notes at the beginning of the DECLARATION, and particularly at page 532, I have shewn that Arminius frequently disclosed his views to his Calvinistic brethren, when they applied to him in the capacity of private ministers and evinced any portion of sincerity. He had interviews at different times with Plancius, Helmichius and Festus Hommius; and on every occasion tried in all meekness and simplicity to satisfy their scruples and to remove their unfounded surmises. But whenever he wished to obtain from them, in return, an account of their views on the same subjects, that by them he might correct his own, they were uniformly mute, and would never comply with his equitable wishes. In process of time, therefore, he became rather more circumspect in his communications; for, according to his narrative, (page 533,) he found that they had other motives than their own satisfaction for such private conferences with him, and that they were the kind of brethren of whom St. Paul speaks, (Gal. ii, 4,) *they came in privily to spy out the liberty which he had in Christ Jesus, that they might bring him into bondage* with some of

ARTICLE IX.

The temporal afflictions of believers are not correctly termed "CHASTISEMENTS," *but are* PUNISHMENTS *for sins. For Christ has rendered satisfaction only for eternal punishments.*

ANSWER.

This Article is attributed to me by a double and most flagrant falsehood: The first of which will be found in *the Article itself*, and the Second in *the Reason appended.*

1. Concerning the FIRST. Those who are mere novices in Divinity know, that the afflictions and calamities of this animal life, are either *punishments, chastisements,* or *trials.* That is, in sending them, God either intends *punishment* for sins, in regard to their having been already committed, and without any other consideration ;—or He intends *chastisement*, that those who are the subjects of it may not afterwards fall into the commission of other or similar offences;—or, in sending afflictions and calamities, God purposes *to try* the faith, hope, charity, patience, and the like conspicuous virtues and

their Provincial Synods, or other intolerant ecclesiastical assemblies. In these XXXI Articles, the reader is presented with the fruits of the united labours of these three men, whose powers of reminiscence must have been lamentably enfeebled, or whose malevolence had furnished the artful materials for the employment of their falsifying talents : But, to the latter of these two causes, many persons will attribute the studied misrepresentations, garbled statements, and crafty verbiage, perceptible in every line of these forged Articles, which, it will be recollected, were not all composed at one period, but gathered increase in proportion to the opportunities that the compilers enjoyed of gaining fresh hints or of drawing new inferences.

These remarks will assist to illustrate the subjoined extract from one of our author's letters to Uitenbogardt, dated July 15th, 1604 :—" In my last letter, I informed you of the result of my interview with Plancius and Helmichius at Amsterdam. I have the same thoughts about Helmichius, [as about Plancius,] *that he will never be satisfied.* How is it possible ?, when his conceptions [notions] depend on foundations far different [to mine], and which he does not divulge that one may form some judgment concerning them. He always postpones the work of explanation, and refuses to propound his sentiments with the arguments on which they rest. The greatest portion of these men are afraid, that, if they reveal their own arguments, they may be found not sufficiently valid to abide a severe examination. The dogmas concerning Predestination which are taught at Amsterdam, give offence to many persons, are understood by very few, and are rejected by great numbers. Nor ought these results to be any cause of wonder, when the Divines themselves have not a sufficiently clear understanding of what they assert, and seem afraid lest their sayings should obtain credence; since, according to their own confession, they are contrary to COMMON SENSE and to the WORD OF GOD itself. This I have long known, and will not cease to give it yet greater publicity, as occasion may be afforded."

In the days of its infancy, therefore, Arminianism seems to have had its claims allowed, even by its adversaries, as *the religion of Scripture and of Common Sense.*—See page 522.

graces of his people. What man would be so silly as to say, when the Apostles were called before the Jewish Council and were beaten with rods, that "it was a PUNISHMENT!", although "they departed from the presence of the Council, REJOICING that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name." (Acts v, 41.) Is not the following expression of the Apostle familiar to every one? "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep. For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged: But when we are judged, παιδευομεθα, we are CHASTENED (reproved or instructed,) OF THE LORD, that we should not be condemned with the world." (1 Cor. xi, 30—32.) By not reflecting on these and similar passages of scripture, the persons who attributed these articles to me betrayed their *ignorance*, as well as their *audacity*. If they had bestowed the least reflection upon such texts, by what strange infatuation of of mind has it happened, that they ascribe to me a sentiment which is thus confuted by plain and obvious quotations from the word of God?

On one occasion, when the subject of discussion was—*the calamities inflicted on the house of David on account of his criminal conduct towards Uriah*,—and when the passages of scripture which were adduced tended with great semblance of truth to prove, that those *calamities* bore some relation to PUNISHMENT, I stated, that 'no necessity whatever existed for us 'to allow ourselves to be brought into such straits by our 'adversaries the Papists, from which we could with difficulty escape; since the words appear to make against 'the opinion which asserts that *they have by no means any* '*reference to punishment:* And because sin merits both an 'eternal punishment corresponding with its grievous enormity, 'and a temporal punishment, (if indeed God be pleased to 'inflict the latter, which is not always his practice even with 'respect to those who persevere in their transgressions, as 'may be seen in Psalm lxxiii, and Job xxi,) it might, not 'unseasonably, be said, that, after God has pardoned the 'guilt so far as it is meritorious of *eternal* punishment, he 'reserves or retains it in reference to *temporal* punishment.' And I shewed, that, "from these premises, no patronage could be obtained for the Popish dogma of a *Purgatory*," which was the subject of that discussion.

2. With regard to the REASON appended,—it is supported by the same criminal falsehood as the preceding part of the

Article, and with no less absurdity of object, as I will demonstrate.—For I affirm, in the first place, that this expression at no time escaped from my lips, and that such a thought never entered my imagination. My opinion on this subject is: 'Christ is our Redeemer and Saviour from sins, which 'merit both temporal and eternal death; and He delivers us 'not only from death *eternal*, but from death *temporal* which 'is the separation of the soul from the body.'—But it is amazing, that this opinion ["Christ has rendered satisfaction for *temporal* punishments alone,"] could possibly have been attributed to me by men of discretion, when the scriptures expressly declare, "Christ was also a partaker of flesh and blood, that, through death, he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." (Heb. ii, 14.) By the term DEATH in this place must be understood either "the death of the body alone," or "that in conjunction with eternal death." "The Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil:" (1 John iii, 8.) And among those *works* to be destroyed, we must reckon *death temporal:* For "by the envy of the devil, death entered into the world." In another passage it is said, "For since by man came death, by MAN came also the resurrection of the dead;" this man is Christ. (1 Cor. xv, 21.) "Christ shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." (Phil. iii, 21.) The greatest necessity exists for that man to become conversant with the scriptures, who denies, that "*by the death of Christ* we are redeemed from *temporal death*, and obtain a right and title to a happy resurrection."

The following is an affirmation which I have made: 'We are 'not actually delivered from temporal death, except by *the* '*resurrection from the dead*, through which our last enemy, death, 'will be destroyed. These two truths, therefore, are, in my 'judgment, to be considered and taught, (1.) Christ, by his 'death, immediately took away from death the authority or 'right which he had over us,—that of detaining us under his 'power, even as *it was not possible that Christ himself should be* '*holden by the bonds* [*pains*] *of death.* (Acts ii, 24.) But (2.) 'Christ will in his own time deliver us from its actual dominion, 'according to the administration [or appointment] of God, 'whose pleasure it is to concede to the soul an early period of 'liberation and to the body one that is later.' But, I confess,

that I cannot with an unwavering conscience assert, and therefore dare not do it as if it were an object of certain knowledge, that "temporal death, which is imposed or inflicted on the saints, *is not a punishment*, or has no regard to punishment," when it is styled "an ENEMY that is to be destroyed" by the Omnipotence of Christ.

The contrary opinion to this is not proved by the argument, that "our corporeal death is a passage into eternal life:" Because it is the passage of the *soul*, and not of the *body*; the latter of which, while it remains buried in the earth, is held under the dominion of death. Nor is it established by the remark, that "*the saints long for the death of the body*:" (Phil. i, 21—23,) For when they "have a desire to be dissolved [to depart] and be with Christ," that desire is according to the soul,—the body in the mean time remaining under the dominion of death its enemy, until it likewise (after being again united to its own soul,) be glorified with it. The address of Christ to Peter may also be stated in opposition: "*When thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not*: This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God." (John xxi, 19.)

The framers of these Articles, therefore, have imputed this opinion to me, not only without truth, but without a sufficient sanction from their own discretion. Of this weakness of their judgment I observe, in this Article, other two tokens:

FIRST. They do not distinguish between the magnitude of each error in a proper manner. For he falls into a far greater error who DENIES, that "Christ has rendered satisfaction for corporeal punishments," that is, *for the punishment of death temporal*;—than is his who ASSERTS, that "the death of the body has regard to punishment, since it is inflicted even on holy persons." But they have placed *the latter error* as the proposition; and *the former one* is brought, as a reason, for its confirmation: When they ought to have adopted an opposite mode of stating them, according to the relative estimate of each of these errors, thus,—"Christ has rendered satisfaction for eternal punishments alone: Therefore, the *temporal afflictions* of believers are not correctly called *chastisements*, but are *punishments* for sins."

SECONDLY. Because they make me employ an argument, which I cannot discover to be possessed of any force towards proving the proposition. For I grant, that Christ has rendered

satisfaction even for *temporal punishments;* and yet I say, "It may likewise be true, that *temporal death* has a reference to PUNISHMENT, even when it is inflicted on believers."

THIRDLY. From these considerations, a Third Mark of an inconstant and wavering judgment discovers itself. For when they employ this mode of argumentation,—"Christ has liberated us from temporal punishments: Therefore our death cannot have any respect to punishment,"—they do not perceive, that I might with equal facility draw from the same premises the following conclusion, "Therefore it is not equitable that the saints should die a temporal death."—My method of reasoning is [direct] *a re ad rem*, from subject to subject,—"Because Christ has borne the death of the body, it is not to be borne by us." Their method is [relative] *a re ad respectum rei*, from the subject to its relation, thus,—"Because Christ has borne the death of the body, it is indeed inflicted on us, but not so as to have any reference to punishment."

God will himself approve and verify this argument *a re ad rem*, from subject to subject, by the effect which He will give to it at some future period. But the argument will be prepared and stated in a legitimate form, thus,—"Christ has borne the death of the body; and (secondly) has taken it away, which fact is apparent from his resurrection: Therefore, God will take away death from us in his own good time."

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

James Nichols, Printer, 22, Warwick-Square, Paternoster-Row

JB-1/