

C E N T. and the other luminaries of the Reformation, had
 XVI. exhibited to the view of the European nations the
 SECT III. Christian religion restored, at least to a consider-
 PART I. able part of its native purity, and delivered from
 many of the superstitions under which it had
 lain so long disfigured. Among the most opu-
 lent states of *Europe*, several withdrew entirely
 from the jurisdiction of *Rome*; in others, certain
 provinces threw off the yoke of papal tyranny;
 and upon the whole, this defection produced a
 striking diminution both of the wealth and power
 of the Roman pontifs. It must also be observed,
 that even the kings, princes, and sovereign states,
 who adhered to the religion of *Rome*, yet changed
 their sentiments with respect to the claims and
 pretensions of its bishop. If they were not per-
 suaded by the writings of the protestants to re-
 nounce the superstitions of popery, yet they re-
 ceived most useful instructions from them in other
 matters of very great moment. They drew from
 these writings important discoveries of the ground-
 less claims and unlawful usurpations of the Roman
 pontifs, and came, at length, to perceive, that,
 if the jurisdiction and authority of *Rome* continued
 the same that it was before the rise of LUTHER,
 the rights of temporal princes, and the majesty of
 civil government would, sooner or later, be ab-
 sorbed in the gulph of papal avarice and ambition.
 Hence it was, that most of the sovereign states of
Europe, partly by secret and prudent measures,
 partly by public negotiations and remonstrances,
 set bounds to the daring ambition of *Rome*, which
 aimed at nothing less than universal dominion
 both in ecclesiastical and civil affairs; nor did the
 Roman pontif think it either safe or expedient to
 have recourse to the ancient arms of the church,
war and *excommunication*, in order to repel these
 attacks upon his authority. Even those very
 kingdoms, who acknowledged the Roman pontif

as the lawgiver of the church, and an infallible guide, confine, nevertheless, his power of enacting laws within narrow limits.

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
P A R T I.

V. In this declining state of their affairs, it was natural for the humbled pontifs to look about for some method of repairing their losses; and, for this purpose, they exerted much more zeal and industry, than had been shewn by their predecessors, in extending the limits of their spiritual dominion beyond *Europe*, and left no means unemploy'd of gaining profelytes and adherents in the *Indies*, both among the pagan nations and the Christian sects. The Jesuits, as we have already had occasion to observe, were the first missionaries that were sent for this purpose into these distant parts of the world; but able men, selected out of the other monastic orders, were afterwards employed in this arduous undertaking. If, however, we except the exploits of FRANCIS XAVIER, and his companions in *India*, *China*, and *Japan*, of which notice has been taken above, there were no great matters effected in this century; as, generally speaking, the persons who were set apart to execute this grand project, were not as yet endowed with that experience and dexterity that it necessarily required, and set about the work with more zeal than prudence and knowledge.

The methods employed by the Roman pontifs to repair their losses.

Missions.

The Portuguese had, in the preceding century, opened a passage into the country of the Abyssinians, who professed the doctrine, and observed the religious rites, of the *Monophyrites*; and this offered a favourable occasion of reducing this people under the papal yoke. Accordingly, JOHN BERMUDES was sent into *Ethiopia* for this purpose; and, that he might appear with a certain degree of dignity, he was clothed with the title of *Patriarch of the Abyssinians*. The same important commission was afterwards given to IGNA-TIUS LOYOLA, and the companions of his la-

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. IH.
PART I.

bours [g]; and, at their first setting out, several circumstances, and particularly a war with a neighbouring prince, which the Abyssinian monarch was desirous of terminating by the powerful succours of the Portuguese, seemed to promise them a successful and happy ministry. But the event did not answer this fond expectation; and, in some time, it appeared plainly, that the Abyssinians stood too firm in the faith of their ancestors, to be easily engaged to abandon and forsake it; so that, towards the conclusion of this century, the Jesuits had almost lost all hopes of succeeding in their attempts [b].

The Egyptians
and Armenians,

VI. The *Egyptians*, or *Copts*, who were closely connected with the Abyssinians in their religious sentiments, and also in their external forms of worship, became next the objects of Rome's ambitious zeal; and, in the year 1562, CHRISTOPHER RODERIC, a Jesuit of note, was sent, by the express order of pope Pius IV., to propagate the cause of popery among that people. This ecclesiastic, notwithstanding the rich presents and subtle arguments by which he attempted to change the sentiments, and shake the constancy of GABRIEL [i], who was at that time patriarch of *Alexandria*, returned to Rome with no other effect of his embassy than fair words, and a few

[g] It is certainly by mistake that Dr. MOSHEIM mentions LOYOLA as having made a voyage into *Abyssinia*. Jesuits were sent, at different periods, to that country, and with little success; but their founder was never there in person.

[b] See LUDOLFI *Histor. Æthiopica et Comm.*—GEDDES, *Church History of Ethiopia*, p. 120.—LE GRAND, *Dissertation de la Conversion des Abyssins*, which is to be found in the second volume of the *Voyage Historique d'Abyssinie* du R. P. JEROME LOBO, p. 13.—LA CROZE, *Histoire du Christianisme en Ethiopie*, livr. ii. p. 90.

[i] FRANC. SACHINI *Histor. Societat. Jesu*, part II: lib. v. EUSEB. RENAUD. *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrin.* p. 611.—*Hist. de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. iii. p. 314.

compli-

compliments [k]. It is however true, that, towards the conclusion of this century, and during the pontificate of CLEMENT VIII., an embassy from another patriarch of *Alexandria*, whose name was also GABRIEL, appeared at *Rome*, and was considered as a subject of triumph and boasting by the creatures of the pope [l]. But the more candid and sensible, even among the Roman-catholics, looked upon this embassy, and not without reason, as a stratagem of the Jesuits, to persuade the Abyssinians (who were so prone to follow the example of their brethren of *Alexandria*) to join themselves to the communion of *Rome*, and to submit to the authority and jurisdiction of its pontif [m]. It is at least certain, that, after this solemn embassy, we do not find in the records of history the smallest token of a propensity in the *Copts* to embrace the doctrine or discipline of *Rome*.

Many years before this period, a considerable sect of the Armenians had been accustomed to treat the Roman pontif with particular marks of

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

☞ [k] This patriarch offered to send one of his bishops to the council of *Trent*, in order to get rid of the importunity of these Jesuits; but he refused positively the sending any of his young students to be educated among their order, and declared plainly, that he owed no obedience nor submission to the bishop of *Rome*, who had no more dignity nor authority than any other bishop, except within the bounds of his own diocese. See *Histoire des Religieux de la Campagn. de Jesus*, tom. ii. p. 322. 324.

[l] The transactions of this embassy, adorned with an ample and pompous Preface, are subjoined to the sixth volume of the *Annal. Eccl.* of BARONIUS, p. 707 edit. *Antwerp*.

[m] RENAUDOT, in his *Hyst. Patriarch. Alexandrin.* p. 611, 612. endeavours to maintain the credit and importance of this embassy, of which BARONIUS has given such a pompous account. He is however much mistaken when he asserts, that Father SIMON, relying upon the fallacious testimony of GEORGE DOUZA, was the only person that ever considered this embassy as a stratagem; since it is evident, that THOMAS A JESU, in the sixth book of his treatise *De conversione omnium gentium procuranda*, has considered it in the same light, as well as several other writers. See GEDDES, *Church-History of Ethiopia*, p. 231, 232.

C E N T. ^{XVI.} **SECTION III.**
PART I.
 —————
 veneration and respect, without departing, however, from the religious doctrine, discipline, or worship of their ancestors. Of this a farther account shall be given in the History of the Eastern Churches; it may, nevertheless, be proper to observe here, that the attachment of this sect to the bishop of *Rome* was greatly increased, and the votaries of the pontif considerably multiplied, by the zeal of ZERAPION, an opulent man, who was entirely devoted to the court of *Rome*, and who, by engaging himself to discharge the debts under which the Armenians groaned, obtained, in the year 1593, the title and dignity of Patriarch, though there were already two patriarchs at the head of the Armenian church. He did not, however, enjoy this dignity long; for, soon after his promotion, he was sent into exile by the Persian monarch, at the desire of those Armenians who adhered to the ecclesiastical discipline of their ancestors; and thus the boasting and exultation of the Romans subsided all of a sudden, and their hopes vanished [*n*].

Nestorians
 and Indians,

VII. The ambitious views of the Roman pontiffs sowed the pestilential seeds of animosity and discord among all the eastern churches; and the Nestorian Christians, who are also known by the denomination of *Chaldeans*, felt early the effects of their imperious councils. In the year 1551, a warm dispute arose among that people about the creation of a new patriarch, SIMEON BARMAS being proposed by one party, and SULAKA earnestly desired by the other. The latter, to support his pretensions the more effectually, repaired to *Rome*, and was consecrated patriarch, in the year 1553, by pope JULIUS III., whose jurisdiction he had acknowledged, and to whose commands he had promised unlimited submission and obedience. JULIUS gave the name JOHN to

[*n*] See *Nouveaux Mémoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus dans le Levant*, tom. iii. p. 132, 133.

the

the new Chaldean patriarch, and, upon his return to his own country, sent with him several persons, skilled in the Syriac language, to assist him in establishing and extending the papal empire among the Nestorians. From this time that unhappy people were divided into two factions, and were often involved in the greatest dangers and difficulties by the jarring sentiments and perpetual quarrels of their patriarchs [o].

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

The Nestorians, or, as they are more commonly called, the *Christians of St. THOMAS*, who inhabited the maritime coasts of *India*, suffered much from the methods employed by the Portuguese to engage them to embrace the doctrine and discipline of the church of *Rome*, and to abandon the religion of their ancestors, which was much more simple, and infinitely less absurd [p]. The finishing stroke was put to the violence and brutality of these attempts by Don ALEXIS DE MENEZES, bishop of *Goa*, who, about the conclusion of this century, calling the Jesuits to his assistance, obliged this unhappy and reluctant people to embrace the religion of *Rome*, and to acknowledge the pope's supreme jurisdiction; against both of which acts they had always expressed the utmost abhorrence. These violent counsels and arrogant proceedings of MENEZES, and his associates, were condemned by some of the Roman-catholics as were most remarkable for their equity and wisdom [q].

[o] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNI *Bibliotheca Oriental. Clementino-Vaticana*, tom. iii. part II. p. 164.—See the *History of the Eastern Church*, in the following chapter of this history.

[p] For an account of the doctrines and worship of these, and the other eastern Christians, see the following Chapter:—As also two learned books of Monsieur LA CROZE, the one entitled, *Histoire du Christianisme des Indes*; and the other, *Histoire du Christianisme en Ethiopie*.

[q] See LA CROZE, *Histoire du Christianisme aux Indes*, livr. ii. p. 88. &c. in which there is an ample account of the *Christians of St. THOMAS*, and of the rough methods employed by MENEZES to gain them over to the church of *Rome*.

CENT.

XVI.

SECT. III.

PART I.

VIII. The greatest part of the first legates and missionaries of the court of *Rome* treated with much severity and injustice the Christians whom they were desirous of gaining over to their communion. For they did not only require that these Christians should renounce the particular opinions that separated them from the Greek and Latin churches, and that they should acknowledge the Roman pontif as CHRIST's sole *vicegerent* upon earth: their demands were still farther; they opposed many of the opinions of this people, some of which were at least worthy of toleration, and others highly agreeable to the dictates both of reason and scripture; they insisted upon the suppression and abolition of several customs, rites, and institutions, which had been handed down to them from their ancestors, and which were perfectly innocent in their nature and tendency; in a word, they would be satisfied with nothing less than an entire and minute conformity of the religious rites and opinions of this people, with the doctrine and worship of the church of *Rome*. The papal court, however, rendered wise by experience, perceived at length that this manner of proceeding was highly imprudent, and every way improper to extend the limits of the papal empire in the East. It was therefore determined to treat with more artifice and moderation a matter of such moment and importance, and the missionaries were, consequently, ordered to change the plan of their operations, and confine their views to the two following points: to wit, the subjection of these Christians to the jurisdiction of the Roman pontif, and their renouncing, or at least professing to renounce, the opinions that had been condemned in the general councils of the church. In all other matters, the Roman envoys were commanded to use a perfect toleration, and to let these people remain unmolested in following the sentiments,

sentiments, and observing the institutions, they had derived from their ancestors. To give the greater credit and plausibility to this new method of conversion, certain learned doctors of the church endeavoured to demonstrate, that the religious tenets of *Rome*, when explained according to the simplicity of truth, and not by the subtilties and definitions of the schools, differed very little from the opinions received in the Greek and the other eastern churches. But this demonstration was very far from being satisfactory, and it discovered less of an ingenuous spirit, than a disposition to gain proselytes by all sorts of means, and at all events. Be that as it may, the cause of *Rome* received much more advantage from this plan of moderation, than it had derived from the severity of its former counsels; though much less than the authors of this reconciling plan fondly expected.

IX. While the Roman pontiffs were using their utmost efforts to extend their dominion abroad, they did not neglect the means that were proper to strengthen and maintain it at home. On the contrary, from the dawn of the Reformation, they began to redouble their diligence in defending the internal form and constitution of the church of *Rome* against the dexterity and force of its adversaries. They could no more have recourse to the expedient of *crusades*, by which they had so often diminished the power and influence of their enemies. The revolutions that had happened in the affairs of *Rome*, and in the state of *Europe*, rendered any such method of subduing heretics visionary and impracticable. Other methods were, therefore, to be found out, and all the resources of prudence were to be exhausted in support of a declining church. Hence the laws and procedures of the *inquisition* were revised and corrected in those countries, where that formidable court is permitted to exert its dreadful power.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

The internal constitution of the church of *Rome* strengthened in various ways.

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III
P A R T I.

Colleges, and schools of learning, were erected in various places, in which the studious youth were trained up, by perpetual exercise, in the art of disputing, that thus they might wield, with more dexterity and success, the arms of controversy against the enemies of *Rome*. The circulation of such books as were supposed to have a pernicious tendency, was either entirely prevented, or at least much obstructed, by certain lists, or indexes, composed by men of learning and sagacity, and published by authority, in which these books were marked with a note of infamy, and their perusal prohibited, though with certain restrictions. The pursuit of knowledge was earnestly recommended to the clergy, and honourable marks of distinction, as well as ample rewards, were bestowed on those who made the most remarkable progress in the cultivation of letters. And, to enlarge no farther on this head, the youth, in general, were more carefully instructed in the principles and precepts of their religion, than they had formerly been. Thus it happens, that signal advantages are frequently derived from what are looked upon as the greatest evils, and much wisdom and improvement are daily acquired in the school of opposition and adversity. It is more than probable, that the church of *Rome* would never have been enriched with the acquisitions we have now been mentioning, had it continued in that state of uninterrupted ease and undisputed authority that nourish a spirit of indolence and luxury; and had not the pretended heretics attacked its territories, trampled upon its jurisdiction, and eclipsed a great part of its ancient majesty and splendour.

Ignatius
Loyola the
founder of
the order
called Je-
suits.

X. The Monastic orders and religious societies have been always considered by the Roman pontiffs as the principal support of their authority and dominion. It is chiefly by them that they rule the church,

church, maintain their influence on the minds of the people, and augment the number of their votaries. And, indeed, various causes contribute to render the connexion between the pontif and these religious communities much more intimate, than that which subsists between him and the other clergy, of whatever rank or order we may suppose them to be. It was therefore judged necessary, when the success of LUTHER, and the progress of the Reformation, had effaced such a considerable part of the majesty of *Rome*, to found some new religious fraternity, that should, in a particular manner, be devoted to the interests of the Roman pontif, and the very express end of whose institution should be to renew the vigour of a declining hierarchy, to heal the deep wound it had received, to preserve those parts of the papal dominions that remained yet entire, and to augment them by new accessions. This was so much the more necessary, as the two famous *Mendicant* societies [r], by whose ministry the popes had chiefly governed during many ages, and that with the greatest success and glory, had now lost, on several accounts, a considerable part of their influence and authority, and were thereby less capable of serving the church with efficacy and vigour than they had formerly been. What the pontif sought for, in this declining state of his affairs, was found in that famous and most powerful society, which, deriving its title from the name of JESUS, were commonly called *Jesuits*, while they were stiled by their enemies *Loyalites*, and sometimes *Inqubists* [s], from the Spanish name of their founder [t]. This

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

[r] These two orders were the Franciscans and the Dominicans.

[s] The Spanish name of the founder of the order of Jesuits was DON INICO DE GUIPUSCOA.

[t] The writers who have given the most particular and circumstantial accounts of the order of the Jesuits, are enumerated by CHRISTOPH. AUG. SALIN. in his *Historia August. Confessionis*, tom. ii. p. 73.

founder

C E N T. founder was IGNATIUS LOYOLA, a Spanish knight,
 XVI. who, from an illiterate soldier, became an unpa-
 S E C T. III. ralleled fanatic; a fanatic, indeed, of a fertile
 P A R T I. and enterprising genius [u], who, after having
 passed through various scenes of life, came to
Rome, and, being there directed by the prudent
 counsels of persons much wiser than himself, was
 rendered capable of instituting such an order as
 the state of the church at that time essentially re-
 quired [w].

The nature
 of the order
 and institu-
 tion of the
 Jesuits,

* XI. The Jesuits hold a middle rank between
 the *monks* and the *secular clerks*, and, with respect
 to the nature of their institute, approach nearer
 to the *regular canons* than to any other order. For
 though

[u] Many Jesuits have written the life of this extraordinary
 man; but the greatest part of these biographers seem more
 intent on advancing the glory of their founder, than solicitous
 about the truth and fidelity of their relations; and hence the
 most common events, and the most trivial actions that concern
 IGNATIUS, are converted into prodigies and miracles. The
 history of this enterprising fanatic has been composed with
 equal truth and ingenuity, though seasoned with a very large
 portion of wit and pleasantry, by a French writer, who calls
 himself HERCULES RASIEL DE SELVE*. This work, which
 is divided into two volumes, is entitled, *Histoire de l'admirable
 Don Inigo de Guypuscoa, Chevalier de la Vierge, et fondateur de
 la Monarchie des Imagistes*, and it has passed already through
 two editions at the *Hague*.

[w] Not only the protestants, but also a great number of
 the more learned and judicious *Roman-catholics*, have unani-
 mously denied, that IGNATIUS LOYOLA had either learning
 sufficient to compose the writings of which he is said to be the
 author, or genius enough to form the society of which he is
 considered as the founder. They maintain, on the contrary,
 that he was no more than a flexible instrument, in the hands
 of able and ingenious men, who made use of his fortitude and
 fanaticism to answer their purposes; and that persons much
 more learned than he were employed to compose the writings
 which bear his name. See GEDDES, *Miscellaneous Tracts*,
 vol. iii. p. 429.—The greatest part of his works are supposed
 to have proceeded from the pen of his secretary JOHN DE

* This is a feigned name. The real author was Monsieur LE VIER,
 an ingenious bookseller, who lived formerly at the *Hague*.

PALANCO;

though they resemble the monks in this, that they live separate from the multitude, and are bound by certain religious vows, yet they are exempt from stated hours of worship, and other numerous and burthensome services, that lie heavy upon the Monastic orders, that they may have more time to employ in the education of youth, in directing the consciences of the faithful, in edifying the church by their pious and learned productions, and in transacting other matters that relate to the prosperity of the papal hierarchy. Their whole order is divided into three classes. The first comprehends the *professed members*, who live in what are called the *professed houses*; the second contains the *scholars*, who instruct the youth in the *colleges*; and to the third belong the *novices*, who live in the *houses of probation* [x]. The *professed members*, besides the three ordinary vows of *poverty*, *chastity*, and *obedience*, that are common to all the Monastic tribes, are obliged to take a fourth, by which they solemnly bind themselves *to go, without deliberation or delay, wherever the pope shall think fit to send them*; they are also a kind of *Mendicants*, being without any fixed subsistence, and living upon the liberality of pious and well-disposed people. The other *Jesuits*, and more particu-

PALANCO; see LA CROZE, *Histoire du Christianisme en Ethiopie*, p. 55. 271. The Benedictines affirm, that his book of *Spiritual Exercises* is copied from the work of a Spanish Benedictine monk, whose name was CISNEROS (see *La Vie de M. de la Croze, par JORDAN*), and the *Constitutions of the Society* were probably the work of LAINEZ and SALMERON, two learned men, who were among its first members. See *Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. i. p. 115.

(x) Other writers add a fourth class, consisting of the *Spiritual and Temporal Co-adjutors*, who assist the professed members, and perform the same functions, without being bound by any more than the three *simple vows*; though, after a long and approved exercise of their employment, the *Spiritual Co-adjutors* are admitted to the *fourth vow*, and thus become *professed members*.

larly

C E N T. XVI. S E C T. III. P A R T I.
 larly the *scholars*, are possessed of large revenues, and are obliged, in case of urgent necessity, to contribute to the support of the *professed members*. These latter, who are few in number (considering the multitudes that belong to the other classes), are, generally speaking, men of prudence and learning, deeply skilled in the affairs of the world, and dexterous in transacting all kinds of business from long experience, added to their natural penetration and sagacity; in a word, they are the *true* and *perfect* Jesuits. The rest have, indeed, the title, but are rather the companions and assistants of the *Jesuits*, than real members of that mysterious order; and it is only in a very vague and general sense, that the denomination of Jesuits can be applied to them. But, what is still more remarkable, the secrets of the society are not revealed even to all the *professed members*. It is only a small number of this class, whom old age has enriched with thorough experience, and long trial declared worthy of such an important trust, that are instructed in the mysteries of the order.

The zeal of the Jesuits for the interests of the Roman pontiff.

XII. The church and court of *Rome*, since the remarkable period when so many kingdoms and provinces withdrew from their jurisdiction, have derived more influence and support from the labours of this single order, than from all their other emissaries and ministers, and all the various exertions of their power and opulence. It was this famous company, which, spreading itself with an astonishing rapidity through the greatest part of the habitable world, confirmed the wavering nations in the faith of *Rome*, restrained the progress of the rising sects, gained over a prodigious number of Pagans in the most barbarous and remote parts of the globe to the profession of popery, and attacked the pretended heretics of all denominations; appearing almost alone in the field of controversy, sustaining with fortitude and resolution

resolution the whole burthen of this religious war, and surpassing, by far, the champions of antiquity, both in the subtilty of their reasonings and the eloquence of their discourses. Nor is this all; for by the affected softness and complying spirit that reigns in their conversation and manners, by their consummate skill and prudence in civil transactions, by their acquaintance with the arts and sciences, and a variety of other qualities and accomplishments, they insinuated themselves into the peculiar favour and protection of statesmen, persons of the first distinction, and even of crowned heads. Nor did any thing contribute more to give them that ascendancy they have universally acquired, than the cunning and dexterity with which they relaxed and modified their system of morality, accommodating it artfully to the propensities of mankind, and depriving it, on certain occasions, of that severity, that rendered it burthenfome to the sensual and voluptuous. By this they supplanted, in the palaces of the great, and in the courts of princes, the Dominicans and other rigid doctors, who had formerly held there the tribunal of confession and the direction of consciences, and engrossed to themselves an exclusive and irresistible influence in those retreats of royal grandeur, from whence issue the counsels that govern mankind [y]. An order of this nature could not but be highly adapted to promote the interests of the court of *Rome*; and this, indeed, was its great end, and the leading purpose which it never lost sight of; employ-

[y] Before the order of Jesuits was instituted, the Dominicans alone directed the consciences of all the European kings and princes. And it was by the Jesuits that the Dominicans were deprived of a privilege so precious to spiritual ambition. See PEYRAT, *Antiquités de la Chapelle de France*, livr. i. p. 322.

CENT, ing every where its utmost vigilance and art to
 XVI. support the authority of the Roman pontifs, and
 SECT. III. to save them from the contempt, of which they
 PART I. must have been naturally apprehensive, in conse-
 quence of a revolution that opened the eyes of a
 great part of mankind.

All these circumstances placed the order of Jesuits in a conspicuous point of light. Their capacity, their influence, and their zeal for the papacy, had a very advantageous retrospect upon themselves, as it swelled the sources of their opulence, and procured to their society an uncommon, and indeed an excessive degree of veneration and respect. But it is also true, that these signal honours and advantages exposed them, at the same time, to the envy of other religious orders; that their enemies multiplied from day to day; and that they were often involved in the greatest perplexities and perils. Monks, courtiers, civil magistrates, public schools, united their efforts to crush this rising fabric of ambition and policy; and a prodigious number of books were published to prove, that nothing could be more detrimental to the interests of religion, and the well-being of society, than the institution of the Jesuits. In *France, Poland*, and other countries, they were declared public enemies of their country, traitors and parricides, and were even banished with ignominy [z]. But the prudence, or rather the cunning and artifice, of the disciples of *Loyola*, calmed this storm of opposition, and, by gentle and imperceptible methods, restored the credit and authority of their order, delivered it from the perils with which it had been threatened, and even

[z] See the *Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. iii. passim.—BOULAY, *Hist. Academ. Paris.* tom. vi. p. 559—648, et passim.—As well as almost all the writers who have given accounts of the sixteenth century.

put it in a state of defence against the future attempts of its adversaries [a].

XIII. The pontiffs of this century that ruled the church after the decease of ALEXANDER VI., were PIUS III., JULIUS II. [b], LEO X.,

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

Roman
pontiffs.

[a] The character and spirit of the Jesuits were admirably described, and their transactions and fate foretold, with a sagacity almost prophetic, so early as the year 1551, in a sermon preached in *Christ-Church, Dublin*, by Dr. GEORGE BROWN, bishop of that see; a copy of which was given to Sir JAMES WARE, and may be found in the *Harleian Miscellany* (vol. v. p. 566.). The remarkable passage that relates to the Jesuits is as follows: "But there are a new fraternity of late sprung up, who call themselves *Jesuits*, which will deceive many, who are much after the Scribes and Pharisees' manner. Amongst the *Jews* they shall strive to abolish the truth, and shall come very near to do it. For these sorts will turn themselves into several forms; with the Heathens a Heathenist, with the Atheists an Atheist, with the Jews a Jew, with the Reformers a Reformade, purposely to know your intentions, your minds, your hearts, and your inclinations, and thereby bring you at last to be like the fool that said, *in his heart, there was no God*. These shall spread over the whole world, shall be admitted into the councils of princes, and they never the wiser; charming of them, yea, making your princes reveal their hearts and the secrets therein, and yet they not perceive it, which will happen from falling from the law of God, by neglect of fulfilling the law of God, and by winking at their sins; yet, in the end, God, to justify his law, shall suddenly cut off this society, even by the hands of those who have most succoured them, and made use of them; so that, at the end, they shall become odious to all nations. They shall be worse than *Jews*, having no resting-place upon earth, and then shall a Jew have more favour than a *Jesuit*."—This singular passage, I had almost said prediction, seems to be accomplished in part, by the present suppression of the Jesuits in France (*I write this note in the year 1762*); and by the universal indignation which the perfidious stratagems, iniquitous avarice, and ambitious views of that society, have excited among all the orders of the French nation, from the throne to the cottage.

[b] It was from a foolish ambition of resembling CÆSAR (a very singular model for a Christian pontif), that this pope, whose name was ROVERE, assumed the denomination of JULIUS II. It may be indeed said, that CÆSAR was sovereign pontif (*pontifex maximus*), and that the pope of Rome enjoyed the same dignity, though with some change in the title.

ADRIAN

C E N T. ADRIAN VI., whose characters and transactions
 XVI. have been already taken notice of; CLEMENT VII.,
 SECT. III. of the house of MEDICIS,—PAUL III., of the
 PART I. illustrious family of FARNESE [c], JULIUS III. [d],
 whose name was JOHN MARIA GIOCCI,—MARCELLUS II.,—PAUL IV. [e], whose name, before
 his

[c] The sentiments and character of PAUL III. have given rise to much debate, even in our time, especially between the late Cardinal QUIRINI, and KEISLING, SCHELHORN, and some other writers. The cardinal has used his utmost efforts to defend the probity and merit of this pontif; while the two learned men above-mentioned represent him as a perfidious politician, whose predominant qualities were dissimulation and fraud. See QUIRINUS, *De gestis PAULI III., Farnesi Brixia*, 1745, in 4to. Among the *res gestæ* of PAUL III. were two bastards, whose offspring, FARNESE and SFORZA, were made cardinals in their infancy. See KEISLINGII *Epist. de gestis PAULI III.* SCHELHORN. *Amœnitates Hist. Eccles. et Liter.* But the licentious exploits of this pope do not end here. He was reproached, in a book published before his death under the name of OCHINO, with having poisoned his mother and his nephew, with having ravished a young virgin at Ancona, with an incestuous and adulterous commerce with his daughter CONSTANTIA, who died of poison administered by the pope, to prevent any interruption in his odious amours. It is said, in the same book, that being caught in bed with his niece LAURA FARNESE, who was the wife of NIC. QUERCEI, he received from this incensed husband a stab of a dagger, of which he bore the marks to his death. See SKEIDAN, *Comment. de Statu Relig. et Republicæ, Carolo Quinto Cæsare*, lib. xxi. p. 667. edit. Argentor.

[d] This was the worthy pontif, who was scarcely seated in the papal chair, when he bestowed the cardinal's hat on the keeper of his monkeys, a boy chosen from among the lowest of the populace, and who was also the infamous object of his unnatural pleasures. See THUAN. lib. vi. & xv.—HOFFING. *Hist. Eccl.* tom. v. p. 572.—and more especially SLEIDAN, *Histor.* lib. xxi. *Folio*, m. 609.—When JULIUS was reproached by the cardinals for introducing such an unworthy member into the sacred college, a person who had neither learning, nor virtue, nor merit of any kind, he impudently replied by asking them, *What virtue or merit they had found in him, that could induce them to place him (JULIUS) in the papal chair?*

[e] Nothing could exceed the arrogance and ambition of this violent and impetuous pontif, as appears from his treatment

his elevation to the pontificate, was JOHN PETER CARAFFA,—Pius IV., who was ambitious of being looked upon as a branch of the house of MEDICIS, and who had been known, before his promotion, by the name of JOHN ANGELI DE MEDICIS,—Pius V., a Dominican, called MICHAEL GHISLERI, a man of an austere and melancholy turn of mind, by which, and other similar qualities, he obtained a place in the Kalendar,—GREGORY XIII., who was known previously by the name of HUGO BUONCOMPAGNO [*f*], —SIXTUS V., otherwise named FELIX PERETTI DI MONTALTO, who, in pride, magnificence, intrepidity, and strength of mind, and in other great virtues and vices, surpassed by far all his predecessors,—URBAN VIII. GREGORY XIV., INNOCENT IX., the shortness of whose reigns prevented them from acquiring reputation, or falling into reproach.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

Among these pontiffs there were better and worse [*g*]; but they were all men of exemplary characters,

treatment of Queen ELIZABETH. See BURNET'S *History of the Reformation*.—It was he, who by a bull, pretended to raise Ireland to the privilege and quality of an independent kingdom; and it was he also who first instituted the *Index of prohibited books*, mentioned above § IX.

[*f*] See Jo. PETR. MAFFEI *Annales Gregorii XIII.*, Rom. 742, in 4to.

[*g*] PIUS V. and SIXTUS V. made a much greater figure in the Annals of Fame, than the other pontiffs here mentioned; the former on account of his excessive severity against heretics, and the famous bull *In Cana Domini*, which is read publicly at Rome every year on the Festival of the Holy Sacrament; and the latter, in consequence of many services rendered to the church, and numberless attempts, carried on with spirit, fortitude, generosity, and perseverance, to promote its glory and maintain its authority.—Several modern writers employed their pens in describing the life and actions of PIUS V., so soon as they saw him canonised, in the year 1712, by CLEMENT XI. Of his bull, entitled, *In Cana Domini*, and the tumults it occasioned, there is an ample account in GIAN-NORE'S *Histoire Civile de Naples*, tom. iv. p. 248. The life of SIXTUS V. has been written by GREGORY LETI, and

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

characters, when compared with the greatest part of those who governed the church before the Reformation. The number of adversaries, both foreign and domestic, that arose to set limits to the despotism of *Rome*, and to call in question the authority and jurisdiction of its pontif, rendered the college of cardinals, and the Roman nobility, more cautious and circumspect in the choice of a spiritual ruler; nor did they almost dare, in these critical circumstances of opposition and danger, to entrust such an important dignity to any ecclesiastic, whose bare-faced licentiousness, frontless arrogance, or inconsiderate youth, might render him peculiarly obnoxious to reproach, and furnish thereby new matter of censure to their adversaries. It is also worthy of observation, that from this period of opposition, occasioned by the ministry of the reformers, the Roman pontifs have never pretended to such an exclusive authority, as they had formerly usurped; nor could they, indeed, make good such pretensions, were they so extravagant as to avow them. They claim, therefore, no longer a power of deciding, by their single authority, matters of the highest moment and importance; but, for the most part, pronounce according to the sentiments that prevail in the college of cardinals, and in the different congregations, which are intrusted with their respective parts in the government of the church. Nor do they any more venture to foment divisions in sovereign states, to arm subjects against their rulers, or to level the thunder of their excommunications at the heads of princes. All such proceedings, which were formerly so frequent at the court of *Rome*, have been prudently suspended since the

translated into several languages; it is however a very indifferent work, and the relations it contains are, in many places, inaccurate and unfaithful.

gradual decline of that ignorance and superstition that prescribed a blind obedience to the pontif, and the new degrees of power and authority that monarchs and other civil rulers have gained by the revolutions that have shaken the papal throne.

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

The State of
the clergy.

XIV. That part of the body of the clergy, that is more peculiarly devoted to the Roman pontifs, seemed to have undergone no visible change during this century. As to the bishops, it is certain that they made several zealous attempts, and some even in the council of *Trent*, for the recovery of the ancient rights and privileges, of which they had been forcibly deprived by the popes. They were even persuaded that the pope might be lawfully obliged to acknowledge, that the episcopal dignity was of divine original, and that the bishops received their authority immediately from CHRIST himself [b]. But all these attempts were successfully opposed by the artifice and dexterity of the court of *Rome*, which never ceases to propagate and enforce this despotic maxim: "That the bishops are no more than the legates or ministers of Christ's vicar; and that the authority they exercise is entirely derived from the munificence and *favour of the apostolic see*:" a maxim, however, that several bishops, and more especially those of *France*, treat with little respect. Some advantages, however, and those not inconsiderable, were obtained for the clergy at the expence of the pontifs; for those *reservations, provisions, exemptions, and expectatives* (as they are termed by the Roman lawyers), which before the Reformation had excited such heavy and bitter complaints throughout all *Europe*, and exhibited the clearest proofs of papal avarice and tyranny, were now almost totally suppressed.

[b] See PAOLO SARPI's *History of the Council of Trent*.

CENT.

XVI.

SECT. III.

PART I.

The lives
and morals
of the clergy.

XV. Among the subjects of deliberation in the council of *Trent*, the reformation of the lives and manners of the clergy, and the suppression of the scandalous vices that had too long reigned in that order, were not forgot; nay, several wise and prudent laws were enacted with a view to that important object. But those who had the cause of virtue at heart, complained (and the reason of these complaints still subsists) that these laws were no more than feeble precepts, without any avenging arm to maintain their authority; and that they were transgressed, with impunity, by the clergy of all ranks, and particularly by those who filled the highest stations and dignities of the church. In reality, if we cast our eyes upon the Romish clergy, even in the present time, these complaints will appear as well founded now, as they were in the sixteenth century. In *Germany*, as is notorious to daily observation, the bishops, if we except their habit, their title, and a few ceremonies that distinguish them, have nothing in their manner of living that is, in the least, adapted to point out the nature of their sacred office. In other countries, a great part of the episcopal order, unmolested by the remonstrances or reproofs of the Roman pontif, pass their days amidst the pleasures and cabals of courts, and appear rather the slaves of temporal princes, than the servants of Him *whose kingdom is not of this world*. They court glory; they aspire after riches, while very few employ their time and labours in edifying their people, or in promoting among them the vital spirit of practical religion and substantial virtue. Nay, what is still more deplorable, those bishops, who, sensible of the sanctity of their character and the duties of their office, distinguish themselves by their zeal in the cause of virtue and good morals, are frequently exposed to the malicious efforts of envy, often loaded

loaded with false accusations, and involved in perplexities of various kinds. It may, indeed, be partly owing to the examples they have received, and still too often receive, from the heads of the church, that so many of the bishops live dissolved in the arms of luxury, or toiling in the service of ambition. Many of them, perhaps, would have been more attentive to their vocation, and more exemplary in their manners, had they not been corrupted by the models exhibited to them by the bishops of *Rome*, and had constantly before their eyes a splendid succession of popes and cardinals, remarkable only for their luxury and avarice, their arrogance and vindictive spirit, their voluptuousness and vanity.

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

That part of the clergy that go under the denomination of *canons*, continue, almost every where, their ancient course of life, and consume, in a manner far remote from piety and virtue, the treasures which the religious zeal, and liberality of their ancestors, had consecrated to the uses of the church, and the relief of the poor.

It must not, however, be imagined, that all the other orders of the clergy are at liberty to follow such corrupt models, or, indeed, that their inclinations and reigning habits tend towards such a loose and voluptuous manner of living. For it is certain, that the Reformation had a manifest influence even upon the Roman-catholic clergy, by rendering them, at least, more circumspect and cautious in their external conduct, that they might be thus less obnoxious to the censures of their adversaries; and it is accordingly well known, that since that period the clergy of the inferior orders have been more attentive to the rules of outward decency, and have given less offence by open and scandalous vices and excesses, than they had formerly done.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I

Monks—
The ancient
orders re-
formed.

XVI. The same observation holds good with respect to the Monastic orders. There are, indeed, several things, worthy of the severest animadversion, chargeable upon many of the heads and rulers of these societies; nor are these societies themselves entirely exempt from that laziness, intemperance, ignorance, artifice, discord, and voluptuousness, that were formerly the common and reigning vices in the Monastic retreats. It would be, nevertheless, an instance of great partiality and injustice to deny, that in many countries the manner of living, among these religious orders, has been considerably reformed, severe rules employed to restrain licentiousness, and much pains taken to conceal, at least, any vestiges of ancient corruption and irregularity that may yet remain. In some places, the austerity of the ancient rules of discipline, which had been so shamefully relaxed, was restored by several zealous patrons of Monastic devotion; while others, animated with the same zeal, instituted new communities, in order to promote, as they proudly imagined, a spirit of religion, and thus to contribute to the well-being of the church.

Of this latter number was MATTHEW DE BASSI, a native of *Italy*, the extent of whose capacity was much inferior to the goodness of his intentions, and who was a Franciscan of the more rigid class [*i*], who were zealous in *observing* rigorously the primitive rules of their institution. This honest enthusiast seriously persuaded himself, that

§ [*i*] The dispute that arose among the Franciscans by INNOCENT IV.'s relaxing so far their *institute* as to allow of *property* and *possessions* in their community, produced a division of the order into two classes, of which the most considerable, who adopted the papal relaxation, were denominated *Conventuals*, and the other, who rejected it, *Brethren of the Observance*. The latter professed to *observe* and follow rigorously the primitive laws and institute of their founder.

he

he was divinely inspired with the zeal that impelled him to restore the original and genuine rules of the Franciscan order to their primitive austerity; and, looking upon this violent and irresistible impulse as a celestial commission, attended with sufficient authority, he set himself to this work of Monastic reformation with the most devout assiduity and ardour [k]. His enterprize was honoured, in the year 1525, with the solemn approbation of CLEMENT VII.; and this was the origin of the order of *Capuchins*. The vows of this order implied the greatest contempt of the world and its enjoyments, and the most profound humility, accompanied with the most austere and fullen gravity of external aspect [l]; and its reputation and success excited, in the other Franciscans, the most bitter feelings of indignation and envy [m]. The *Capuchins* were so called from the sharp-pointed *Capuche*, or Cowl [n], which they added to the ordinary Franciscan habit, and

☞ [k] The *Brethren of the Observance*, mentioned in the preceding note, had degenerated, in process of time, from their primitive self-denial; and hence the reforming spirit, that animated BASSI.

[l] See LUC. WADDINGI *Annales Ordinis Minorum*, tom. xvi. p. 207. 257. edit. *Roman.*—HLLYOT, *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques*, tom. vii. ch. xxiv. p. 264.—And, above all, ZACH. BOVERII *Annales Capuchinorum*.

☞ [m] One of the circumstances that exasperated most the Franciscans, was the innovation made in their habit by the *Capuchins*. Whatever was the cause of their choler, true it is, that their provincial persecuted the new monks, and obliged them to fly from place to place, until they at last took refuge in the palace of the duke of *Camerino*, by whose credit they were received under the obedience of the *Conventuals*, in the quality of *bermits minors*, in the year 1527. The next year the pope approved this union, and confirmed to them the privilege of wearing the square *capuche*; and thus the order was established in 1528.

☞ [n] I know not on what authority the learned MICHAEL GEDDES attributes the erection and denomination of this order to one FRANCIS PUCHINE.

CENT. XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I. which is supposed to have been used by St. FRANCIS himself, as a covering for his head [o].

Another branch of the Franciscan order formed a new community, under the denomination of *Recollets* in France, *Reformed Franciscans* in Italy, and *Bare-footed Franciscans* in Spain, and were erected into a separate order, with their respective laws and rules of discipline, in the year 1532, by the authority of CLEMENT VII. They differ from the other Franciscans in this only, that they profess to follow, with greater zeal and exactness, the austere institute of their common founder and chief; and hence also they were called *Friars Minors of the strict observance* [p].

St. THERESA, a Spanish lady of an illustrious family, undertook the difficult task of reforming the Carmelite order [q], which had departed much from its primitive sanctity, and of restoring its neglected and violated laws to their original credit and authority. Her associate, in this arduous attempt, was JOHANNES DE SANTA CRUSA, and her enterprize was not wholly destitute of success, notwithstanding the opposition she met with from the greatest part of the *Carmelites*. Hence the order was, during the space of ten years, divided into two branches, of which one followed a milder rule of discipline, while the other embraced an institute of the most severe and self-denying kind [r]. But, as these different rules of life among the members of the same community were a perpetual source of animosity and discord,

[o] See DU FRESNE *Glossarium Latinitat. mediæ ævi*, tom. ii. p. 298. edit. *Benedict.*

[p] See WADDINGI *Annales*, tom. xvi. p. 167.—HELYOT, *Histoire des Ordres Monast.* tom. vii. ch. xviii. p. 129.

[q] Otherwise called the *White Fryars*.

[r] The former, who were the *Carmelites of the ancient observance*, were called the *moderate* or *mitigated*; while the latter, who were of the *strict observance*, were distinguished by the denomination of *bare-footed Carmelites*,

the more austere, or *bare-footed* Carmelites, were separated from the others, and formed into a distinct body, in the year 1580, by GREGORY XIII., at the particular desire of PHILIP II., king of Spain. This separation was confirmed, in the year 1587, by SIXTUS V., and completed, in 1593, by CLEMENT VIII., who allowed the *bare-footed Carmelites* to have their own chief, or *general*. But, after having withdrawn themselves from the others, these austere friars quarrelled among themselves, and in a few years their dissensions grew to an intolerable height; hence they were divided anew, by the pontif last mentioned, into two communities, each of which were governed by their respect *general* [s].

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

XVII. The most eminent of all the new orders that were instituted in this century, was, beyond all doubt, that of the *Jesuits*, which we have already had occasion to mention, in speaking of the chief pillars of the church of Rome, and the principal supports of the declining authority of its pontifs. Compared with this aspiring and formidable society, all the other religious orders appear inconsiderable and obscure. The Reformation, among the other changes which it occasioned, even in the Roman church, by exciting the circumspection and emulation of those who still remained addicted to popery, gave rise to various communities, which were all comprehended under the general denomination of *Regular Clerks*. And as all these communities were, according to their own solemn declarations, formed with a design of imitating that sanctity of manners, and reviving that spirit of piety and virtue, that had distinguished the sacred order in the primitive times; this was a plain, though tacit confession of the present corruption of the clergy, and consequent-

New Mon-
nastic or-
ders.

[s] HELYOT, *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. i. ch. xlvii. p. 340.

CENT. ly of the indispensable necessity of the Reforma-
 XVI. tion.
 SECT. III.
 PART I.

The first society of these regular clerks was formed in the year 1524, under the denomination of *Theatins*, which they derived from their principal founder JOHN PETER CARAFFA (then bishop of *Theate*, or *Chieti*, in the kingdom of *Naples*, and afterwards pope, under the title of PAUL IV.), who was assisted in this pious undertaking by CAJETAN, or GAETAN, and other devout associates. These monks, being by their vows destitute of all possessions and revenues, and even secluded from the resource of begging, subsist entirely upon the voluntary liberality of pious persons. They are called by their profession and institute to revive a spirit of devotion, to purify and reform the eloquence of the pulpit, to assist the sick and the dying by their spiritual instructions and counsels, and to combat heretics of all denominations with zeal and assiduity [1]. There are also some female convents established under the rule and title of this order.

The establishment of the *Theatins* was followed by that of the *Regular Clerks of St. Paul*, so called from their having chosen that apostle for their patron; though they are more commonly known under the denomination of *Barnabites*, from the church of *St. Barnabas*, at *Milan*, which was bestowed upon them in the year 1545. This order, which was approved by CLEMENT VII., and confirmed about three years after by PAUL III., was originally founded by ANTONIO MARIA ZACHARIAS of *Crcmona*, and BARTHOLOMEW FERRARI, and JACOB. ANT. MORIGIA, noblemen of *Milan*. Its members were at first obliged to live after the manner of the *Theatins*, renouncing all worldly goods and possessions, and depending upon the

[1] HELYOT, *ibid.* tom. iv. ch. xii. p. 71.

spontaneous.

spontaneous donations of the liberal for their daily subsistence. But they grew soon weary of this precarious method of living from hand to mouth, and therefore took the liberty, in process of time, of securing to their community certain possessions and stated revenues. Their principal function is to go from place to place, like the apostles, in order to convert sinners, and bring back transgressors into the paths of repentance and obedience [u].

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

The *Regular Clerks of St. Maieul*, who are also called *the fathers of Somasquo*, from the place where their community was first established, and which was also the residence of their founder, were erected into a distinct society by JEROME ÆMILIANI, a noble Venetian, and were afterwards successively confirmed, in the years 1540 and 1563, by the Roman pontiffs PAUL III. and PIUS IV. [w]. Their chief occupation was to instruct the ignorant, and particularly young persons, in the principles and precepts of the Christian religion, and to procure assistance for those that were reduced to the unhappy condition of orphans. The same important ministry was committed to the *Fathers of the Christian doctrine in France and Italy*. The order that bore this title in *France* was instituted by CÆSAR DE BUS, and confirmed, in the year 1597, by CLEMENT VIII.; while that which is known in *Italy* under the same denomination, derives its origin from MARK CUSANI, a Milanese knight, and was established by the approbation and authority of PIUS V. and GREGORY XIII.

[u] HELYOT, *loc. cit.* tom. iv. ch. xvi. p. 100.—In the same part of this incomparable work, this learned author gives a most accurate, ample, and interesting account of the other religious orders, which are here, for brevity's sake, but barely mentioned.

[w] *Acta Sanctor. Februar.* tom. ii. p. 217.

XVIII. It

CENT.

XVI.

SECT. III.

PART I.

Other new
religious
communi-
ties,

XVIII, It would be an endless, and, indeed, an unprofitable labour to enumerate particularly that prodigious multitude of less considerable orders and religious associations, that were instituted in *Germany* and other countries, from an apprehension of the pretended heretics, who disturbed by their innovations the peace, or rather the lethargy, of the church. For certainly no age produced such a swarm of monks, and such a number of convents, as that in which LUTHER and the other reformers opposed the divine light and power of the gospel to ignorance, superstition, and papal tyranny. We therefore pass over in silence these less important establishments, of which many have been long buried in oblivion, because they were erected on unstable foundations, while numbers have been suppressed by the wisdom of certain pontiffs, who have considered the multitude of these communities rather as prejudicial than advantageous to the church. Nor can we take particular notice of the female convents, or nunneries, among which the *Ursulines* shine forth with a superior lustre both in point of number and dignity. The *Priests of the Oratory*, founded in *Italy* by PHILIP NERI, a native of *Florence*, and publicly honoured with the protection of GREGORY XIII., in the year 1577, must, however, be excepted from this general silence, on account of the eminent figure they have made in the republic of letters. It was this community that produced BARONIUS, RAYNALDUS, and LADERCHIUS, who hold so high a rank among the ecclesiastical historians of the sixteenth and following centuries; and there are still to be found in it men of considerable erudition and capacity. The name of this religious society was derived from an apartment, accommodated in the form of an *Oratory*,

ry [x], or cabinet for devotion, which St. PHILIP C E N T.
NERI built at *Florence* for himself, and in which, XVL.
for many years, he held spiritual conferences with SECT. III.
his more intimate companions [y]. PART 4

XIX. It is too evident to admit of the least dispute, that all kinds of erudition, whether sacred or profane, were held in much higher esteem in the western world since the time of LUTHER, than they had been before that auspicious period. The Jesuits, more especially, boast, and perhaps not without reason, that their society contributed more, at least in this century, to the culture of the languages, the improvement of the arts, and the advancement of true science, than all the rest of the religious orders. It is certain, that the schools and academies, either through indolence or design, persisted obstinately in their ancient method of teaching, though that method was intricate and disagreeable in many respects; nor would they suffer themselves to be better informed, or permit the least change in their uncouth and disgusting systems. The monks were not more remarkable for their docility than the schools; nor did they seem at all disposed to admit into the retreats of their gloomy cloisters, a more solid and elegant method of instruction than they had been formerly accustomed to. These facts furnish a rational account of the surprising variety that appears in the *style* and *manner* of the writers of this age, of whom several express their sentiments with elegance, perspicuity, and order, while the diction of a great part of their contem-

The state of
learning.

[x] HELYOT, *Hist. des Ordres*, &c. tom. viii. ch. iv. p. 12.

[y] He was peculiarly assisted in these conferences by BARONIUS, author of the *Ecclesiastical Annals*, who also succeeded him as general of the order, and whose *Annals*, on account of his imperfect knowledge of the Greek language, are so remarkably full of gross faults, misrepresentations, and blunders.

C E N T. poraries is barbarous, perplexed, obscure, and
XVI. insipid.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

CÆSAR BARONIUS, already mentioned, undertook to throw light on the history of religion by his annals of the Christian church; but this pretended light was scarcely any thing better than perplexity and darkness [z]. His example, however, excited many to enterprizes of the same nature. The attempts of the persons they called heretics, rendered indeed such enterprizes necessary: for these heretics, with the learned FLACKIUS and CHEMNITZ at their head [a], demonstrated with the utmost evidence, that not only the declarations of holy scripture, but also the testimony of ancient history, and the records of the primitive church, were in direct opposition both to the doctrines and pretensions of the church of *Rome*. This was wounding popery with its own arms, and attacking it in its pretended strong holds. It was, therefore, incumbent upon the friends of *Rome* to employ, while it was time, their most zealous efforts in maintaining the credit of those ancient fables, on which the greatest part of the papal authority reposed, as its only foundation and support.

The state of
philosophy.

XX. Several men of genius in *France* and *Italy*, who have been already mentioned with the esteem that is due to their valuable labours [b], used

[z] The learned ISAAC CASAUBON undertook a refutation of the *Annals* of BARONIUS, in an excellent work, entitled, *Exercitationes*, &c. and though he carried it no farther down than the 34th year of the Christian æra, yet he pointed out a prodigious number of palpable, and (many of them) shameful errors, into which the Romish annalist has fallen during that short space. Even the Roman-catholic *literati* acknowledge the inaccuracies and faults of BARONIUS; hence many learned men, such as PAGI, NORIS, and TILLEMONT, have been employed to correct them. And accordingly, a few years ago, a new edition of these *Annals* was published at *Lucca*, with the corrections of these reviewers at the foot of each page.

[a] The former in the *Centurie Magdeburgenses*; the latter in his *Examen Concilii Tridentini*.

[b] See above, Sect. II. VIII. and IX.

their

their most zealous endeavours to reform the barbarous philosophy of the times. But the excessive attachment of the scholastic doctors to the Aristotelian philosophy on the one hand, and, on the other, the timorous prudence of many weak minds, who were apprehensive that the liberty of striking out new discoveries and ways of thinking might be prejudicial to the church, and open a new source of division and discord, crushed all these generous endeavours, and rendered them ineffectual. The throne of the subtle Stagirite remained therefore unshaken; and his philosophy, whose very obscurity afforded a certain gloomy kind of pleasure, and flattered the pride of those who were implicitly supposed to understand it, reigned unrivalled in the schools and monasteries. It even acquired new credit and authority from the Jesuits, who taught it in their colleges, and made use of it in their writings and disputes. By this, however, these artful ecclesiastics shewed evidently, that the captious jargon and subtilties of that intricate philosophy were much more adapted to puzzle heretics, and to give the popish doctors at least the appearance of carrying on the controversy with success, than the plain and obvious method of disputing, which is pointed out by the genuine and unbiassed dictates of right reason.

XXI. The church of *Rome* produced, in this century, a prodigious number of theological writers. The most eminent of these, both in point of reputation and merit, are as follow: THOMAS DE VIO, otherwise named Cardinal CAJETAN,—ECKIUS,—COCHLÆUS,—EMSER,—SURIUS,—HOSIUS,—FABER,—SADOLET,—PIGHIOUS,—VATABLE,—CANUS,—D'ESPENCE,—CARANZA—MALDONAT,—TURRIANUS,—ARIAS MONTANUS,—CATHARINUS,—REGINALD POLE,—SIXTUS SE-

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

Theological
writers of
the Romish
persuasion.

NENSIS,—

CENT. NENSIS, — CASSANDER, — PAPA D'ANDRADA,
 XVI. BAIUS, — PAMELIUS, and others [c].
 SECT. III. XXII. The religion of *Rome*, which the pon-
 PART I. tiffs are so desirous of imposing upon the faith of

The principles of the
 Roman-catholic faith.

all that bear the Christian name, is derived, according to the unanimous accounts of its doctors, from two sources, the *written word of God*, and the *unwritten*; or, in other words, from *scripture and tradition*. But as the most eminent divines of that church are far from being agreed concerning the person or persons who are authorised to interpret the declarations of these two oracles, and to determine their sense; so it may be asserted with truth, that there is, as yet, no possibility of knowing with certainty what are the real doctrines of the church of *Rome*, nor where, in that communion, the judge of religious controversies is to be found. It is true, in the court of *Rome*, and all those who favour the despotic pretensions of its pontif, maintain that he alone, who governs the church as CHRIST'S vicegerent, is entitled to explain and determine the sense of *scripture and tradition* in matters pertaining to salvation, and that, of consequence, a devout and unlimited obedience is due to his decisions. To give weight to this opinion, PIUS IV. formed the plan of a council, which was afterwards instituted and confirmed by SIXTUS V., and called the *Congregation for interpreting the decrees of the council of Trent*. This congregation was authorised to examine and decide, in the name of the pope, all matters of small moment relating to ecclesiastical discipline, while every debate of any consequence, and particularly all disquisitions concerning points of faith and doctrine, were left to the decision of the pontif

[c] For an ample account of the literary character, rank, and writings of these learned men, and of several others whose names are here omitted, see LOUIS ELL. DU PIN, *Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, tom. xiv and xvi.

alone,

alone, as the great oracle of the church [d]. But notwithstanding all this, it was impossible to persuade the wiser part of the Roman-catholic body to acknowledge this exclusive authority in their head. And accordingly, the greatest part of the Gallican church, and a considerable number of very learned men of the popish religion in other countries, think very differently from the court of *Rome* on this subject. They maintain, that all bishops and doctors have a right to consult the sacred fountains of *scripture* and *tradition*, and to draw from thence the rules of faith and manners for themselves and their flock; and that all difficult points and debates of consequence are to be referred to the cognizance and decision of general councils. Such is the difference of opinion (with respect to the determination of doctrine and controversies) that still divides the church of *Rome*; and as no judge has been, nor perhaps can be, found to compose it, we may therefore reasonably despair of seeing the religion of *Rome* acquire a permanent, stable, and determined form.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

XXIII. The council of *Trent* was assembled, as was pretended, to correct, illustrate, and fix with perspicuity, the doctrine of the church, to restore the vigour of its discipline, and to reform the lives of its ministers. But in the opinion of those who examine things with impartiality, this assembly, instead of reforming ancient abuses, rather gave rise to new enormities; and many transactions of this council have excited the just complaints of the wisest men in both communions.

The council
of Trent.

[d] See AYMOR, *Tableau de la Cour de Rome*. part V. ch. iv. p. 282. Hence it was, that the approbation of INNOCENT XI. was refused to the artful and insidious work of ROSSET, bishop of Meaux, entitled, *An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church*, until the author had suppressed entirely the first edition of that work, and made corrections and alterations in the second.

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

They complain that many of the opinions of the scholastic doctors on intricate points (that had formerly been left undecided, and had been wisely permitted as subjects of free debate) were, by this council, absurdly adopted as articles of faith, and recommended as such, nay imposed, with violence, upon the consciences of the people, under pain of excommunication. They complain of the ambiguity that reigns in the decrees and declarations of that council, by which the disputes and dissensions that had formerly rent the church, instead of being removed by clear definitions and wise and charitable decisions, were rendered, on the contrary, more perplexed and intricate, and were, in reality, propagated and multiplied instead of being suppressed or diminished. Nor were these the only reasons of complaint; for it must have been afflicting to those that had the cause of true religion and Christian liberty at heart, to see all things decided, in that assembly, according to the despotic will of the Roman pontif, without any regard to the dictates of truth, or the authority of scripture, its genuine and authentic source, and to see the assembled fathers reduced to silence by the Roman legates, and deprived, by these insolent representatives of the papacy, of that influence and credit, that might have rendered them capable of healing the wounds of the church. It was moreover a grievance justly to be complained of, that the few wise and pious regulations, that were made in that council, were never supported by the authority of the church, but were suffered to degenerate into a mere lifeless form or shadow of law, which was treated with indifference, and transgressed with impunity. To sum up all in one word, the most candid and impartial observers of things consider the council of *Trent* as an assembly that was more attentive to what might maintain the despotic authority of the pontif, than

than solicitous about entering into the measures that were necessary to promote the good of the church. It will not therefore appear surprising, that there are certain doctors of the Romish church, who, instead of submitting to the decisions of the council of *Trent* as an ultimate rule of faith, maintain, on the contrary, that these decisions are to be explained by the dictates of *scripture* and the language of *tradition*. Nor, when all these things were duly considered, shall we have reason to wonder, that this council has not throughout the same degree of credit and authority, even in those countries that profess the Roman-catholic religion [e].

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

Some countries, indeed, such as *Germany*, *Polland*, and *Italy*, have adopted *implicitly* and *absolutely* the decrees of this council, without the smallest restriction of any kind. But in other places it has been received and acknowledged on certain conditions, which modify not a little its pretended authority. Among these latter we may reckon the Spanish dominions, which disputed, during many years, the authority of this council, and acknowledged it at length only so far as it could be adopted *without any prejudice to the rights and prerogatives of the kings of Spain* [f]. In other countries, such as *France* [g] and *Hungary* [h], it never has been *solemnly* received, or

[e] The translator has here inserted in the text the note [b] of the original, and has thrown the citations it contains into different notes.

[f] See GIANNONE, *Histoire Civile du Royaume de Naples*, tom. iv. p. 235.

[g] See HECT. GODOFR. MASII *Diff. de Conemptu Concilii Tridentini in Gallia*, which is published among his other dissertations collected into one volume. See also the excellent discourse which Dr. COURRAYER has subjoined to the second volume of his French translation of PAUL SARPI's *History of the Council of Trent*, entitled, *Discours sur la Reception du Concile de Trente, particulierement en France*, p. 775. 789.

[h] See LORANDI SAMUELOF, *Vita Andr. Dudubii*, p. 56.

CENT. XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I. publicly acknowledged. It is true indeed, that, in the former of these kingdoms, those decrees of *Trent* that relate to points of religious doctrine, have, *tacitly* and *imperceptibly*, through the power of custom, acquired the force and authority of a rule of faith; but those which regard external discipline, spiritual power, and ecclesiastical government, have been constantly rejected, both in a public and private manner, as inconsistent with the authority and prerogatives of the throne, and prejudicial to the rights and liberties of the Gallican church [i].

The principal heads of the Roman-catholic religion.

XXIV. Notwithstanding all this, such as are desirous of forming some notion of the religion of *Rome*, will do well to consult the decrees of the council of *Trent*, together with the compendious *confession of faith*, which was drawn up by the order of Pius IV. Those, however, who expect to derive, from these sources, a clear, complete, and perfect knowledge of the Romish faith, will be greatly disappointed. To evince the truth of this assertion, it might be observed, as has been already hinted, that both in the decrees of *Trent* and in this papal confession, many things are expressed in a vague and ambiguous manner, and that designedly, on account of the intestine divisions and warm debates that then reigned in the church. This other singular circumstance might also be added, that several tenets are omitted in both, which no Roman-catholic is allowed to deny, or even to call in question. But, waving both these considerations, let it only be observed, that in these *decrees* and in this *confession* several doctrines and rules of worship are inculcated in a

[i] See LON. ELL. DU PIN, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, tom. xv. p. 380.

For what relates to the Literary History of the Council of *Trent*, the historians who have transmitted accounts of it, and other circumstances of that nature, see JO. CHR. KOCHER, *Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolica*, p. 325. 377. as also SALIG'S *History of the Council of Trent* (in German), p. 190—320.

much more rational and decent manner, than that in which they appear in the daily service of the church, and in the public practice of its members [k]. Hence we may conclude, that the justest notion of the doctrine of *Rome* is not to be derived so much from the *terms* made use of in the decrees of the council of *Trent*, as from the *real signification* of these terms, which must be drawn from the customs, institutions, and observances, that are, every where, in use in the Romish church. Add to all this, another consideration, which is, that in the bulls issued out from the papal throne in these latter times, certain doctrines, which were obscurely proposed in the council of *Trent*, have been explained with sufficient perspicuity, and avowed without either hesitation or reserve. Of this CLEMENT XI. gave a notorious example, in the famous *bull* called UNIGENITUS, which was an enterprize as audacious as it proved unsuccessful.

C F N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

XXV. As soon as the popes perceived the remarkable detriment their authority had suffered from the accurate interpretations of the holy scriptures that had been given by the learned, and the perusal of these divine oracles, which was now grown more common among the people, they left no methods unemployed that might discourage the culture of this most important branch of sacred erudition. While the tide of resentment ran high, they forgot themselves in the most unaccountable manner. They permitted their cham-

The state of
exegetic
theology, or
scripture-
knowledge.

[k] This is true, in a more especial manner, with respect to the canons of the council of *Trent*, relating to the doctrine of purgatory, the invocation of saints, the worship of images and relics. The terms employed in these canons are artfully chosen, so as to avoid the imputation of idolatry, in the philosophical sense of that word; for in the scripture sense they cannot avoid it, as all use of images in religious worship is expressly forbidden in the sacred writings in many places. But this circumspection does not appear in the worship of the Roman-catholics, which is notoriously idolatrous in both the senses of that word.

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

pions to indulge themselves openly in reflections injurious to the dignity of the sacred writings, and, by an excess of blasphemy almost incredible (if the passions of men did not render them capable of the greatest enormities), to declare publicly, that the edicts of the pontiffs, and the records of oral tradition, were superior, in point of authority, to the express language of the holy scriptures. But as it was impossible to bring the sacred writings wholly into disrepute, they took the most effectual methods in their power to render them obscure and useless. For this purpose the ancient Latin translation of the Bible, commonly called the *Vulgate*, though it abounds with innumerable gross errors, and, in a great number of places, exhibits the most shocking barbarity of style, and the most impenetrable obscurity with respect to the sense of the inspired writers, was declared, by a solemn decree of the council of *Trent*, an *authentic*, i. e. a *faithful, accurate, and perfect* [i] translation, and was consequently recommended as a

☞ [i] If we consult the canons of the council of *Trent*, we shall find that the word *authentic* is there explained in terms less positive and offensive than those used by Dr. MOSHEIM. Nor is it strictly true, that the *Vulgate* was declared by this council as a production *beyond the reach of criticism or censure*; since, as we learn from FRA-PAOLO, it was determined that this Version should be corrected, and a new edition of it published by persons appointed for that purpose *. There was, indeed, something highly ridiculous in the proceedings of the council in relation to this point; for, if the natural order of things had been observed, the revival and correction of the *Vulgate* would have preceded the pompous approbation with which the council honoured, and, as it were, consecrated that ancient Version. For how, with any shadow of good sense, could the assembled fathers set the seal of their approbation to a work which they acknowledged to stand in need of correction, and that before they knew whether or not the correction would answer their views, and merit their approbation?

* See FRA. PAOLO SARTI's *History of the Council of Trent*, book II. par. LIII. and Dr. COURRAYER's French translation of this *History*, vol. i. p. 284, note (29).

production

production beyond the reach of criticism or censure. It was easy to foresee that such a declaration was every way adapted to keep the people in ignorance, and to veil from their understandings the true meaning of the sacred writings. In the same council, farther steps were taken to execute, with success, the designs of *Rome*. A severe and intolerable law was enacted, with respect to all interpreters and expositors of the scriptures, by which they were forbidden to explain the sense of these divine books, *in matters relating to faith and practice*, in such a manner as to make them speak a different language from that of the church and the ancient doctors [*m*]. The same law farther declared, that the church alone (*i. e.* its ruler, the Roman pontif) had the right of determining the true meaning and signification of scripture. To fill up the measure of these tyrannical and iniquitous proceedings, the church of *Rome* persisted obstinately in affirming, though not always with the same impudence and plainness of speech, that the holy scriptures were not composed for the use of the multitude, but only for that of their spiritual teachers; and, of consequence, ordered these divine records to be taken from the people in all places where it was allowed to execute its imperious commands [*n*].

XXVI. These circumstances had a visible influence upon the spirit and productions of the commentators and expositors of scripture, which the example of LUTHER and his followers had

Commentators and expositors of the holy scriptures.

☞ [*m*] It is remarkable, that this prohibition extends even to such interpretations as were not designed for public view. *Etiamsi hujusmodi interpretationes nullo unquam tempore in lucem edendæ forent.* SESSIO 4ta, tit. cap. ii.

[*n*] The pontifs were not allowed to execute this despotic order in all countries that acknowledged the jurisdiction of the church of *Rome*. The French and some other nations have the Bible in their mother-tongue, in which they peruse it, though much against the will of the creatures of the pope.

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

rendered, through emulation, extremely numerous. The popish doctors, who vied with the protestants in this branch of sacred erudition, were insipid, timorous, servilely attached to the glory and interests of the court of *Rome*, and discovered, in their explications, all the marks of slavish dependance and constraint. They seem to have been in constant terror lest any expression should escape from their pen that favoured of opinions different from what were commonly received; they appeal, every moment, to the declarations and authority of the holy *fathers*, as they usually stile them; nor do they appear to have so much consulted the real doctrines taught by the sacred writers, as the language and sentiments which the church of *Rome* has taken the liberty to put into their mouths. Several of these commentators rack their imaginations in order to force out of each passage of scripture the four kinds of significations, called *Literal*, *Allegorical*, *Tropological*, and *Anagogical*, which ignorance and superstition had first invented, and afterwards held so sacred, in the explication of the inspired writings. Nor was their attachment to this manner of interpretation so ill-managed, since, it enabled them to make the sacred writers speak the language that was favourable to the views of the church, and to draw out of the Bible, with the help of a little subtilty, whatever doctrine they had a mind to impose upon the credulity of the multitude.

It must, however, be acknowledged, that, besides these miserable commentators that dishonour the church of *Rome*, there were some in its communion, who had wisdom enough to despise these senseless methods of interpretation, and who, avoiding all mysterious significations and fancies, followed the plain, natural, and literal sense of the expressions used in the holy scriptures. In this
class

class the most eminent were ERASMUS of *Rotterdam*, who translated into Latin, with an elegant and faithful simplicity, the books of the New Testament, and explained them with judgment in a paraphrase which is deservedly esteemed; Cardinal CAJETAN, who disputed with LUTHER at *Augsburg*, and who gave a brief, but judicious exposition of almost all the books of the Old and New Testament; FRANCIS TITELMAN, ISIDORUS CLARIUS, JOHN MALDONAT, BENEDICT JUSTINIAN, who acquired no mean reputation by their commentaries on the Epistles of St. *Paul*. To these may be added GAIGNY, DE'ESPENCE, and other Expositors [o]. But these eminent men, whose example was so adapted to excite emulation, had almost no followers; and, in a short space of time, their influence was gone, and their labours were forgot. For, towards the conclusion of this century, EDMUND RICHER, that strenuous opposer of the encroachments made by the pontiffs on the liberties of the Gallican church, was the only doctor in the university of *Paris* who followed the literal sense and the plain and natural signification of the words of scripture; while all the other commentators and interpreters, imitating the pernicious example of several ancient expositors, were always racking their brains for mysterious and sublime significations, where none such were, nor could be, designed by the sacred writers [p].

XXVII. The seminaries of learning were filled, before the Reformation, with that subtle kind of theological doctors, commonly known under the denomination of *schoolmen*; so that even at *Paris*, which was considered as the principal seat of sacred erudition, no doctors were to be found who were capable of disputing with the protestant divines in

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I,

The state of
didactic
theology.

[o] See SIMON, *Hist. Critique du Vieux et de Nouv. Testament*.

[p] See BAILLET, *Vie d'Edmund Richer*, p. 9, 10.

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

the method they generally pursued, which was that of proving the doctrines they maintained by arguments drawn from the Holy Scriptures and the writings of the fathers. 'This uncommon scarcity of *didactic* and *scriptural* divines produced much confusion and perplexity, on many occasions, even in the council of *Trent*; where the scholastic doctors fatigued some, and almost turned the heads of others, by examining and explaining the doctrines that were there proposed, according to the intricate and ambiguous rules of their captious philosophy. Hence it became absolutely necessary to reform the methods of proceeding in theological disquisitions, and to restore to its former credit that which drew the truths of religion more from the dictates of the sacred writings, and from the sentiments of the ancient doctors, than from the uncertain suggestions of human reason, and the ingenious conjectures of philosophy [q]. It was, however,

[q] See DU BOULAY's account of the Reformation of the Theological Faculty, or College at *Paris*, in his *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. vi. p. 790. In this reform, the Batchelors of Divinity, called *Sententiarum* and *Biblici*, are particularly distinguished; and (what is extremely remarkable) the *Augustine* monks, who were LUTHER's fraternity, are ordered to furnish the college of divinity once a-year with a *scriptural Batchelor* (*Baccalaureum Biblicum præsentare*); from whence we may conclude, that the monks of the Augustine order, to which LUTHER belonged, were much more conversant in the study of the Holy Scriptures than the other Monastic societies. But this academical law deserves to be quoted here at length, and that so much the more, as DU BOULAY's History is in few hands. It is as follows; *Augustinenses quolibet anno Biblicum præsentabunt, secundum statum fol. 21. quod sequitur: Quilibet ordo Mendicantium et Collegium S. Bernardi habeat quolibet anno Biblicum qui legat ordinarie, alioqui præventur Baccalaureo sententiarum.* It appears by this law, that each of the Mendicant orders was, by a decree of the Theological Faculty, obliged to furnish, yearly, a *scriptural Batchelor* (such was LUTHER); and yet we see, that in the *Reformation* already mentioned, this obligation is imposed upon none but the Augustine monks; from which it is natural to conclude, that the Dominicans, Franciscans,

however, impossible to deprive entirely the scholastic divines of the ascendant they had acquired in the seminaries of learning, and had so long maintained almost without opposition. Nay, after having been threatened with a diminution of their authority, they seemed to resume new vigour from the time that the Jesuits adopted their philosophy, and made use of their subtle dialectic, as a more effectual armour against the attacks of the heretics, than either the language of scripture, or the authority of the fathers. And, indeed, this intricate jargon of the schools was every way proper to answer the purposes of a set of men, who found it necessary to puzzle and perplex, where they could neither refute with perspicuity, nor prove with evidence. Thus they artfully concealed their defeat, and retreated, in the dazzled eyes of the multitude, with the appearance of victory [r].

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

The Mystics lost almost all their credit in the church of *Rome* after the Reformation; and that, partly on account of the favourable reception they found among the protestants, and partly in consequence of their pacific system, which, giving them an aversion to controversy in general, rendered them little disposed to defend the papal cause against its numerous and formidable adversaries. These enthusiasts however were, in some measure, tolerated in the church of *Rome*, and allowed to indulge themselves in their philosophical speculations, on certain conditions, which obliged them to abstain from censuring either the laws or the corruptions of the church, and from declaiming,

Franciscans, and the other Mendicants, had entirely neglected the study of the Scriptures, and consequently had among them no *scriptural Bachelors*; and that the Augustine monks alone were in a condition to satisfy the demands of the Theological Faculty.

[r] The translator has added the two last sentences of this paragraph, to illustrate more fully the sense of the author.

with

CENT. with their usual freedom and vehemence, against
 XVI. the vanity of external worship, and the dissensions
 SECT. III. of jarring and contentious doctors.
 PART I.

The state of
 morality
 and practi-
 cal religion.

XXVIII. There was no successful attempt made, in this century, to correct or improve the practical or moral system of doctrine that was followed in the church of *Rome*; nor, indeed, could any make such an attempt without drawing upon him the displeasure, and perhaps the fury, of the papal hierarchy. For, in reality, such a project of reformation seemed in no wise conducive to the *interests* of the church, as these interests were understood by its ambitious and rapacious rulers. And it is undoubtedly certain, that many doctrines and regulations, on which the power, opulence, and grandeur of that church essentially depended, would have run the risk of falling into discredit and contempt, if the pure and rational system of morality, contained in the gospel, had been exhibited in its native beauty and simplicity, to the view and perusal of all Christians without distinction. Little or no zeal was therefore exerted in amending or improving the doctrines that immediately relate to practice. On the contrary, many persons of eminent piety and integrity, in the communion of *Rome*, have grievously complained (with what justice shall be shewn in its proper place [s]), that, as soon as the Jesuits had gained an ascendant in the courts of princes and in the schools of learning, the cause of virtue began visibly to decline. It has been alleged, more particularly, that this artful order employed all the force of their subtle distinctions to sap the foundations of morality, and, in process of time, opened a door to all sorts of licentiousness and iniquity, by the loose and dissolute rules of conduct they propagated as far as their influence

☞ [s] See Cent. XVII. Sect. II. Part I. Chap. I. § XXXIV. extended.

extended. This poisonous doctrine spread, indeed, its contagion, in a latent manner, during the sixteenth century; but, in the following age, its abettors ventured to expose some specimens of its turpitude to public view, and thus gave occasion to great commotions in several parts of *Europe*.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

All the moral writers of the Romish church, in this century, may be distinguished into three classes, the *Schoolmen*, the *Dogmatists* [†], and the *Mystics*. The first explained, or rather obscured, the virtues and duties of the Christian life, by knotty distinctions, and unintelligible forms of speech, and buried them under an enormous load of arguments and demonstrations. The second illustrated them from the declarations of scripture, and the opinions of the ancient doctors. While the third placed the whole of morality in the tranquillity of a mind withdrawn from all sensible objects, and habitually employed in the contemplation of the divine nature.

XXIX. The number of combatants that the pontiffs brought into the field of controversy, during this century, was prodigious, and their glaring defects are abundantly known. It may be said, with truth, of the most of them, that, like many warriors of another class, they generally lost sight of all considerations, except those of victory and plunder. The disputants, which the order of Jesuits sent forth in great number against the adversaries of the church of *Rome*, surpassed all the rest in subtilty, impudence, and invective. But the chief leader and champion of the polemic tribe was ROBERT BELLARMINE, a Jesuit, and one of the college of cardinals, who treated, in several bulky volumes, of all the controversies that sub-

The state of
religious
controversy.

† [†] The reader will easily perceive, by the short account of these three classes that is given by Dr. MOSHEIM, that the word *Dogmatist* must not be taken in that *magisterial* sense, which it bears in modern language.

C E N T. XVI. S E C T. III. P A R T I. fisted between the protestants and the church of *Rome*, and whose merit as a writer consisted, principally, in clearness of style, and a certain copiousness of argument, which shewed a rich and fruitful imagination. This eminent defender of the church of *Rome* arose about the conclusion of this century, and, on his first appearance, all the force and attacks of the most illustrious protestant doctors were turned against him alone. His candor and plain-dealing exposed him, however, to the censures of several divines of his own communion; for he collected, with diligence, the reasons and objections of his adversaries, and proposed them, for the most part, in their full force, with integrity and exactness. Had he been less remarkable on account of his fidelity and industry; had he taken care to select the weakest arguments of his antagonists, and to render them still weaker, by proposing them in an imperfect and unfaithful light, his fame would have been much greater among the friends of *Rome*, than it actually is [u].

The controversies that divide the church of *Rome*.

XXX. If we turn our view to the internal state of the church of *Rome*, and consider the respective sentiments, opinions, and manners of its different members, we shall find that, notwithstanding its boasted unity of faith, and its ostentatious pretensions to harmony and concord, it was, in this century, and is, at this day, divided and distracted with dissensions and contests of various kinds. The Franciscans and the Dominicans contend with vehemence about several points of doctrine and discipline. The Scotists and Thomists are at eternal war. The bishops have never ceased disputing with the pontif (and the congregations that he has instituted to maintain his pretensions) concerning

[u] See JO. FRID. MAYERI *Ecloga de fide Baronii et Bel-larmini ipsius pontificis dubia*, published at *Amsterdam* in 8vo, in 1698.

the origin and limits of his authority and jurisdiction. The French and Flemings, together with other countries, openly oppose the Roman pontiff on many occasions, and refuse to acknowledge his supreme and unlimited dominion in the church; while, on the other hand, he still continues to encroach upon their privileges, sometimes with violence and resolution, when he can do so with impunity, at other times with circumspection and prudence, when vigorous measures appear dangerous or unnecessary. The Jesuits, who, from their first rise, had formed the project of diminishing the credit and influence of all the other religious orders, used their warmest endeavours to share with the Benedictines and other monasteries, which were richly endowed, a part of their opulence; and their endeavours were crowned with success. Thus they drew upon their society the indignation and vengeance of the other religious communities, and armed against it the monks of every other denomination; and, in a more especial manner, the Benedictines and Dominicans, who surpassed all its enemies in the keenness and bitterness of their resentment. The rage of the Benedictines is animated by a painful reflection on the possessions of which they had been deprived; while the Dominicans contend for the honour of their order, the privileges annexed to it, and the religious tenets by which it is distinguished. Nor are the theological colleges and seminaries of learning more exempt from the flame of controversy than the clerical and monastic orders; on the contrary, debates concerning almost all the doctrines of Christianity are multiplied in them beyond number, and conducted with little moderation. It is true indeed, that all these contests are tempered and managed, by the prudence and authority of the Roman pontiff, in such a manner as to prevent their being carried to

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

an excessive height, to a length that might prove fatal to the church, by destroying that phantom of external unity that is the source of its consistence as an ecclesiastical body. I say *tempered* and *managed*; for to heal entirely these divisions, and calm these animosities, however it may be judged an undertaking worthy of one who calls himself the *Vicar of Christ*, is, nevertheless, a work beyond the power, and contrary to the intention, of the Roman pontif.

The more
momentous
controversies
that
have divided
the church
of Rome.

XXXI. Besides these debates of inferior moment, which made only a slight breach in the tranquillity and union of the church of *Rome*, there arose, after the period in which the council of *Trent* was assembled, controversies of much greater importance, which deservedly attracted the attention of Christians of all denominations. These controversies were set on foot by the Jesuits, and from small beginnings have increased gradually, and gathered strength; so that the flame they produced has been transmitted even to our times, and continues, at this very day, to divide the members of the Romish church in a manner that does not a little endanger its stability. While the Roman pontifs foment, perhaps, instead of endeavouring to extinguish, the less momentous disputes mentioned above, they observe a different conduct with respect to those now under consideration. The most zealous efforts of artifice and authority are constantly employed to calm the contending parties (since it appears impossible to unite and reconcile them), and to diminish the violence of commotion, which they can scarcely ever hope entirely to suppress. Their efforts however have hitherto been, and still continue to be, ineffectual. They have not been able to calm the agitation and vehemence with which these debates are carried on, nor to inspire any sentiments of moderation and mutual forbearance into minds,
which

which are less animated by the love of truth, than by the spirit of faction.

XXXII. Whoever looks with attention and impartiality into these controversies will easily perceive, that there are two parties in the Roman church, whose notions with respect both to doctrine and discipline are extremely different. The Jesuits, in general, considered as a body [w], maintain, with the greatest zeal and obstinacy, the ancient system of doctrine and manners, which was universally adopted in the church before the rise of LUTHER, and which, though absurd and ill-digested, has, nevertheless, been considered as highly favourable to the views of *Rome*, and the grandeur of its pontifs. These sagacious ecclesiastics, whose peculiar office it is to watch for the security and defence of the papal throne, are fully persuaded that the authority of the pontifs, as well as the opulence, pomp, and grandeur of the clergy, depend entirely upon the preservation of the ancient forms of doctrine; and that every project that tends either to remove these forms, or even to correct them, must be, in the highest degree, detrimental to what they call the interests of the church, and gradually bring on its ruin. On the other hand, there are within the pale of the Roman church, especially since the dawn of the Reformation, many pious and well-meaning men, whose eyes have been opened, by the perusal of the inspired and primitive writers, upon the corruptions and defects of the received forms of doctrine and discipline. Comparing the dictates of primitive Christianity with the vulgar system of popery, they have found the latter full of enormities, and have always been desirous of a Reforma-

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

Two general
classes of
doctors in
the church
of Rome.

[w] The Jesuits are here taken in the general and collective sense of that denomination; because there are several individuals of that order, whose sentiments differ from those that generally prevail in their community.

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

The main
controver-
sies that di-
vide the
church of
Rome re-
duced to fix
heads.
First subject
of debate.

tion (though indeed a partial one, according to their particular fancies), that thus the church might be purified from those unhappy abuses that have given rise to such fatal divisions, and still draw upon it the censures and reproaches of the heretics.

From these opposite ways of thinking, arose naturally the warmest contentions and debates between the Jesuits and several doctors of the church of *Rome*. These debates may be reduced under the *six* following heads ;

The *first* subject of debate concerns the *limits and extent of the power and jurisdiction of the Roman pontif*. The Jesuits, with their numerous tribe of followers and dependents, all maintain, that the pope is *infallible* ;—that he is the only visible source of that universal and unlimited power which CHRIST has granted to the church ;—that all bishops and subordinate rulers derive from him alone the authority and jurisdiction with which they are invested ;—that he is not bound by any laws of the church, nor by any decrees of the councils that compose it ;—and that he alone is the supreme lawgiver of that sacred community, a lawgiver whose edicts and commands it is in the highest degree criminal to oppose or disobey. Such are the strange sentiments of the Jesuits ; but they are very far from being universally adopted. For other doctors of the church of *Rome* hold, on the contrary, that the pope is liable to error ;—that his authority is inferior to that of a general council ;—that he is bound to obey the commands of the church, and its laws, as they are enacted in the councils that represent it ;—that these councils have a right to depose him from the papal chair, when he abuses, in a flagrant manner, the dignity and prerogatives with which he is intrusted ;—and that, in consequence of these principles, the bishops and other inferior rulers

rulers and doctors derive the authority that is annexed to their respective dignities, not from the Roman pontif, but from CHRIST himself.

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

XXXIII. The *extent and prerogatives of the church* form the *second* subject of debate. The Jesuits and their adherents stretch out its borders far and wide. They comprehend within its large circuit, not only many who live separate from the communion of *Rome* [x], but even extend the inheritance of eternal salvation to nations that have not the least knowledge of the Christian religion, or of its divine author, and consider as true members of the church open transgressors which profess its doctrines. But the adversaries of the Jesuits reduce within narrower limits the kingdom of CHRIST, and not only exclude from all hope of salvation those who are not within the pale of the church of *Rome*, but also those who, though they live within its external communion, yet dishonour their profession by a vicious and profligate course of life. The Jesuits, moreover, not to mention other differences of less moment, assert, that the church can never pronounce an erroneous or unjust decision, either relating to *matters of fact*, or *points of doctrine* [y]; while the adverse party

Second sub-
ject of de-
bate.

☞ [x] They were accused at *Spoleto*, in the year 1653, of having maintained, in their public instructions there, the probability of the salvation of many heretics. See LE CLERC, *Biblioth. Univers. et Historique*, tom. xiv. p. 320.

☞ [y] This distinction, with respect to the *objects* of infallibility, was chiefly owing to the following historical circumstance: Pope INNOCENT X. condemned *five propositions*, drawn from the famous book of JANSENIUS, entitled, *Augustinus*. This condemnation occasioned the two following questions: 1st, Whether or no these propositions were erroneous? This was the question *de jure*, i. e. as the translator has rendered it, the question *relating to doctrine*. 2^d, Whether or no these propositions were really taught by JANSENIUS? This was the question *de facto*, i. e. relating to the matter of fact. The church was supposed, by some, infallible only in deciding questions of the former kind.

Q 2

declare,

C E N T. declare, that, in judging of matters of fact, it is
 XVI. not secured against all possibility of erring.

S E C T. III.
 P A R T I.

The third
 subject of
 debate.

XXXIV. The *third* class of controversies, that divides the church of *Rome*, comprehends the debates relating to the *nature*, *efficacy*, and *necessity* of *divine grace*, together with those that concern *original sin*, the *natural power* of man to obey the laws of God, and the *nature* and *foundation* of those *eternal decrees* that have for their object the salvation of men. The Dominicans, Augustins, and Jansenists, with several other doctors of the church, adopt the following propositions: That the *impulse* of divine grace cannot be *opposed* or *resisted*;—that there are no *remains* of *purity* or *goodness* in human nature since its fall;—that the *eternal decrees* of God, relating to the salvation of men, are neither founded upon, nor attended with, any condition whatsoever;—that God wills the salvation of all mankind; and several other tenets that are connected with these. The Jesuits maintain, on the contrary, that the *natural dominion* of sin in the human mind, and the hidden corruption it has produced in our internal frame, are less *universal* and *dreadful* than they are represented by the doctors now mentioned;—that *human nature* is far from being deprived of *all power* of doing good;—that the *succours* of *grace* are administered to *all mankind* in a measure *sufficient* to lead them to eternal life and salvation;—that the *operations* of grace offer no violence to the faculties and powers of nature, and therefore may be *resisted*;—and that God from all eternity has appointed everlasting rewards and punishments, as the portion of men in a future world, not by an *absolute*, *arbitrary*, and *unconditional* decree, but in consequence of that divine and unlimited *prescience*, by which he foresaw the *actions*, *merits*, and *characters* of every individual.

XXXV. The

XXXV. The *fourth* head, in this division of the controversies that destroy the pretended unity of the church of *Rome*, contains various subjects of debate, relative to *doctrines of morality and rules of practice*, which it would be both tedious and foreign from our purpose to enumerate in a circumstantial manner; though it may not be improper to touch lightly the first principles of this endless controversy [z].

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

The fourth
subject of
debate.

The Jesuits and their followers have inculcated a very strange doctrine with respect to the motives that determine the moral conduct and actions of men. They represent it as a matter of perfect indifference from what motives men obey the laws of God, provided these laws are really obeyed; and maintain, that the service of those who obey from the fear of punishment is as agreeable to the Deity, as those actions which proceed from a principle of love to him and to his laws. This decision excites the horror of the greatest part of the doctors of the Roman church, who affirm, that no

[z] No author has given a more accurate, precise, and clear enumeration of the objections that have been made to the moral doctrine of the Jesuits, and the reproaches that have been cast on their rules of life; and none at the same time has defended their cause with more art and dexterity, than the eloquent and ingenious GABRIEL DANIEL (a famous member of their order), in a piece, entitled, *Entretiens de Cleandre et d'Eudoxe*. This dialogue is to be found in the first volume of his *Opuscles*, p. 351. and was designed as an answer to the celebrated *Provincial Letters* of PASCAL, which did more real prejudice to the society of the Jesuits, than can be well imagined, and exposed their loose and perfidious system of morals with the greatest fidelity and perspicuity, embellished by the most exquisite strokes of humour and irony. Father DANIEL, in the piece above mentioned, treats with great acuteness the famous doctrine of *probability*, p. 351; the method of *direſſing our intentions*, p. 556; *equivocation and mental reservation*, p. 562; *sins of ignorance and oblivion*, p. 719; and it must be acknowledged, that, if the cause of the Jesuits were susceptible of defence or plausibility, it has found in this writer an able and dexterous champion.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

acts of obedience, that do not proceed from the love of God, can be acceptable to that pure and holy Being. Nor is the doctrine of the Jesuits only chargeable with the corrupt tenets already mentioned. They maintain farther, that a man never sins, properly speaking, but when he transgresseth a divine law, which is *fully known* to him, which is *present to his mind* while he acts, and of which he *understands the true meaning* and intent. And they conclude from hence, that, in strict justice, the conduct of that transgressor cannot be looked upon as criminal, who is either ignorant of the law, or is in doubt about its true signification, or loses sight of it, through forgetfulness, at the time that he violates it. From these propositions they deduce the famous doctrines of *probability* and *philosophical sin*, that have cast an eternal reproach upon the schools of the Jesuits [a]. Their adversaries behold these pernicious tenets with the utmost abhorrence, and assert that neither ignorance, nor forgetfulness of the law, nor the doubts that may be entertained with respect to its signification, will be admitted as sufficient to justify transgressors before the tribunal of God. This contest, about the main and fundamental points of morality, has given rise to a great variety of debates concerning the duties we owe to God, our

☞ [a] The doctrine of *probability* consists in this: *That an opinion or precept may be followed with a good conscience, when it is inculcated by four, or three, or two, nay even by one doctor of any considerable reputation, even though it be contrary to the judgment of him that follows it, and even of him that recommends it.* This doctrine rendered the Jesuits capable of accommodating themselves to all the different passions of men, and to persons of all tempers and characters, from the most austere to the most licentious. *Philosophical sin*, according to the Jesuits doctrine, is an *action, or course of actions, that is repugnant to the dictates of reason, and yet not offensive to the Deity.* See a fuller account of these two odious doctrines in the following part of this work, Cent. XVII. Sect. II. Part I. Chap. I. § XXXV. and in the author's and translator's notes.

neighbour,

neighbour, and ourselves; and produced two sects of moral doctors, whose animosities and divisions have miserably rent the church of *Rome* in all parts of the world, and involved it in the greatest perplexities.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

XXXVI. The administration of the sacraments, especially those of *penance* and the *eucharist*, forms the *fifth* subject of controversy in the church of *Rome*. The Jesuits and many other doctors are of opinion, that the salutary effects of the sacraments are produced by their *intrinsic virtue* and *immediate operation* [b] upon the mind at the time they are administered, and that consequently it requires but little preparation to receive them to edification and comfort; nor do they think that God requires a mind adorned with inward purity, and a heart animated with divine love, in order to the obtaining of the ends and purposes of these religious institutions. And hence it is, that according to their doctrine, the priests are empowered to give immediate absolution to all such as confess their transgressions and crimes, and afterwards to admit them to the use of the sacraments. But such sentiments are rejected with indignation by all those of the Romish communion who have the progress of vital and practical religion truly at

The fifth
subject of
debate.

[b] This is the only expression that occurred to the translator, as proper to render the true sense of that phrase of the scholastic divines, who say, that the sacraments produce their effect *opera operato*. The Jesuits and Dominicans maintain, that the sacraments have in themselves an *instrumental* and *efficient* power, by virtue of which they work in the soul (independently on its previous preparation or propensities) a disposition to receive the divine grace; and this is what is commonly called the *opus operatum* of the sacraments. Thus, according to their doctrine, neither knowledge, wisdom, humility, faith, nor devotion, are necessary to the efficacy of the sacraments, whose victorious energy nothing but a *mortal sin* can resist. See Dr. COURRAYER's *Translation* of PAUL SARPI's *History of the Council of Trent*, tom. i. livr. ii. p. 423, 424. edit. *Amsterdam*.

CENT. XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

heart, These look upon it as the duty of the clergy to use the greatest diligence and assiduity in examining the characters, tempers, and actions of those who demand absolution and the use of the sacraments, before they grant their requests; since, in their sense of things, the real benefits of these institutions can extend to those only whose hearts are carefully purged from the corruptions of iniquity, and filled with that divine love *that casteth out fear*. Hence arose that famous dispute in the church of *Rome*, concerning a *frequent approach to the holy communion*, which was carried on with such warmth in the last century, between the Jesuits and the Jansenists, with ARNAULD [c] at the head of the latter, and has been renewed in our times by the Jesuit PICHON, who thereby incurred the indignation of the greatest part of the French bishops [d]. The frequent celebration of the Lord's supper is one of the main duties, which the Jesuits recommended with peculiar earnestness to those who are under their spiritual direction, representing it as the most certain and infallible method of appeasing the Deity, and obtaining from him the entire remission of their sins and transgressions. This manner of proceeding the Jansenists censure with their usual severity; and it is also condemned by many other learned and pious doctors of the Romish communion, who reject that *intrinsic virtue and efficient operation* that is attributed to the sacraments, and wisely maintain, that the receiving the sacrament of the Lord's supper can be profitable to those only whose minds are prepared, by faith, repentance, and the love of God, for that solemn service.

[c] ARNAULD published, on this occasion, his famous book concerning the *Practice of communicating frequently*. The French title is, *Traité de la fréquente Communion*.

[d] See *Journal Univerſel*, tom. xiii. p. 148. tom. xv. p. 363. tom. xvi. p. 124.

XXXVII. The

XXXVII. The *sixth* and last controversy turns upon the proper method of instructing Christians in the truths and precepts of religion. One part of the Romish doctors, who have the progress of religion truly at heart, look upon it as expedient, and even necessary, to sow the seeds of divine truth in the mind, in the tender and flexible state of infancy, when it is most susceptible of good impressions, and to give it by degrees, according to the measure of its capacity, a full and accurate knowledge of the doctrines and duties of religion. Others, who have a greater zeal for the interests of the church than the improvement of its members, recommend a devout ignorance to such as submit to their direction, and think a Christian sufficiently instructed when he has learned to yield a blind and unlimited obedience to the orders of the church. The former are of opinion, that nothing can be so profitable and instructive to Christians as the study of the Holy Scriptures, and consequently judge it highly expedient that they should be translated into the vulgar tongue of each country. The latter exclude the people from the satisfaction of consulting the sacred oracles of truth, and look upon all vernacular translations of the Bible as dangerous, and even of a pernicious tendency. They accordingly maintain, that it ought only to be published in a learned language, to prevent its instructions from becoming familiar to the multitude. The former compose pious and instructive books to nourish a spirit of devotion in the minds of Christians, to enlighten their ignorance, and dispel their errors; they illustrate and explain the public prayers and the solemn acts of religion in the language of the people, and exhort all, who attend to their instructions, to peruse constantly these pious productions, in order to improve their knowledge, purify their affections, and

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

The six h
subj & of
debate.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

The disputes
carried on
with Baius
concerning
grace, &c.

and to learn the method of worshipping the Deity in a rational and acceptable manner. All this, however, is highly displeasing to the latter kind of doctors, who are always apprehensive, that the blind obedience and implicit submission of the people will diminish in proportion as their views are enlarged, and their knowledge increased [e].

XXXVIII. All the controversies that have been here mentioned did not break out at the same time. The disputes concerning divine grace, the natural power of man to perform good actions, original sin, and predestination, which

[e] The account here given of the more momentous controversies that divide the church of *Rome*, may be confirmed, illustrated, and enlarged, by consulting a multitude of books published in the last and present centuries, especially in *France* and *Flanders*, by Jansenists, Dominicans, Jesuits, and others. All the productions, in which the doctrine and precepts of the Jesuits, and the other creatures of the Roman pontif, are opposed and refuted, are enumerated by DOMINICK COLONIA, a French Jesuit, in a work published, in 1735, under the following title; *Bibliothèque Janseniste, ou Catalogue Alphabetique des principaux livres Jansenistes, ou suspects de Jansenisme, avec des notes critiques*. This writer is led into many absurdities by his extravagant attachment to the Roman pontif, and to the cause and tenets of his order. His book, however, is of use in pointing out the various controversies that perplex and divide the church of *Rome*. It was condemned by the late pope BENEDICT XIV.; but was, nevertheless, republished in a new form, with some change in the title, and additions, that swelled it from one octavo volume to four of the same size. This new edition appeared at *Antwerp* in the year 1752, under the following title; *Dictionnaire des livres Jansenistes, ou qui favorisent le Jansenisme, à Anvers chez J. B. Verdussen*. And it must be acknowledged, that it is extremely useful, in shewing the intestine divisions of the church, the particular contests that divide its doctors, the religious tenets of the Jesuits, and the numerous productions that relate to the six heads of controversy here mentioned. It must be observed, at the same time, that this work abounds with the most malignant invectives against many persons of eminent learning and piety, and with the most notorious instances of partiality and injustice*.

* See a particular account of this learned and scandalous work in the first and second volumes of the *Bibliothèque des Sciences et des Beaux Arts*, printed at the *Hague*.

have

have been ranged under the third class, were publicly carried on in the century of which we are now writing. The others were conducted with more secrecy and reserve, and did not come forth to public view before the following age. Nor will this appear at all surprising to those who consider that the controversies concerning *grace* and *free-will*, which had been set in motion by LUTHER, were neither accurately examined, nor peremptorily decided, in the church of *Rome*, but were rather artfully suspended and hushed into silence. The sentiments of LUTHER were indeed condemned; but no fixed and perspicuous rule of faith, with respect to these disputed points, was substituted in their place. The decisions of St. AUGUSTIN were solemnly approved; but the difference between these decisions and the sentiments of LUTHER were never clearly explained. The first rise of this fatal controversy was owing to the zeal of MICHAEL BAIUS, a doctor in the university of *Louvain*, equally remarkable on account of the warmth of his piety and the extent of his learning. This eminent divine, like the other followers of AUGUSTIN, had an invincible aversion to that contentious, subtle, and intricate manner of teaching theology, that had long prevailed in the *schools*; and under the auspicious name of that famous prelate, who was his darling guide, he had the courage or temerity to condemn and censure, in an open and public manner, the tenets commonly received in the church of *Rome*, in relation to the *natural powers of man*, and the *merit of good works*. This bold step drew upon BAIUS the indignation of some of his academical colleagues, and the heavy censures of several Franciscan monks. Whether the Jesuits immediately joined in this opposition, and may be reckoned among the first accusers of BAIUS, is a matter unknown, or, at most, uncertain; but it

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

C E N T. is unquestionably evident and certain, that, even
 XVI. at the rise of this controversy, they abhorred the
 SECT. III. principal tenets of BAIUS, which he had taken
 PART I. from AUGUSTIN, and adopted as his own. In the
 year 1567, this doctor was accused at the court
 of *Rome*, and *seventy-six propositions*, drawn from
 his writings, were condemned by pope PIUS V.,
 in a circular letter expressly composed for that
 purpose. This condemnation, however, was
 issued out in an artful and insidious manner, without
 any mention being made of the name of the au-
 thor; for the fatal consequences that had arisen
 from the rash and inconsiderate measures em-
 ployed by the court of *Rome* against LUTHER,
 were too fresh in the remembrance of the prudent
 pontif to permit his falling into new blunders of
 the same nature. The thunder of excommunication
 was therefore suppressed by the dictates of
 prudence, and the person and functions of BAIUS
 were spared, while his tenets were censured.
 About thirteen years after this transaction, GREGORY XIII. complied so far with the importunate
 solicitations of a Jesuit, named TOLET, as to re-
 inforce the sentence of PIUS V., by a new con-
 demnation of the opinions of the Flemish doctor.
 BAIUS submitted to this new sentence, either from
 an apprehension that it would be followed by
 severer proceedings in case of resistance, or,
 which is more probable, on account of the ambi-
 guity that reigned in the papal edict, and the
 vague and confused manner in which the ob-
 noxious propositions were therein expressed. But
 his example, in this respect, was not followed by
 the other doctors who had formed their theologi-
 cal system upon that of AUGUSTIN [f]; and,
 even,

[f] See, for an account of the disputes relating to BAIUS, the work of that author, published in 4to at *Cologne*, in 1696, particularly the second part, or appendix, entitled, *Baiana*,
feu

even, at this day, many divines of the Romish communion, and particularly the Janfenists, declare openly that BAIUS was unjustly treated, and that the two edicts of PIUS and GREGORY, mentioned above, are absolutely destitute of all authority, and have never been received as laws of the church [g].

XXXIX. Be that as it may, it is at least certain, that the doctrine of AUGUSTIN, with respect to the nature and operations of divine grace, lost none of its credit in consequence of these edicts, but was embraced and propagated, with the same zeal as formerly, throughout all the Belgic provinces, and more especially in the two flourishing universities of *Louvain* and *Douay*. This appeared very soon after, when two Jesuits, named LESSIUS and HAMEDIUS, ventured to represent the doctrine of predestination in a manner different from that in which it appears in the writings of AUGUSTIN: For the sentiments of these Jesuits were publicly condemned by the doctors of *Louvain* in the year 1587, and by those of *Douay* the year following. The bishops of the Low-Countries were disposed to follow the example of these two universities, and had already deliberated about assembling a provincial council for this purpose, when the Roman pontif SIXTUS V., suspended their proceedings by the interposition of his authority, and declared, that the cognizance and decision of religious controversies belonged only to the vicar of CHRIST, residing at *Rome*. But this cunning

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I

Contests
with the
Jesuits, Lessi-
us, and
Hamedius.

ſeu Scripta, quæ controversias ſpectant occasione ſententiarum Baii exortas.—BAYLE's *Diction.* at the articles BAIUS, in which there is an ample and circumstantial account of these disputes, DU PIN, *Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, tom. xvi. p. 144.—*Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. iii. p. 161.

[g] This is demonstrated fully by an anonymous writer, in a piece, entitled, *Dissertation sur les Bulles contre Baius, ou l'on montre qu'elles ne sont pas reçues par l'Eglise*, and published in two volumes 8vo, at *Utrecht*, in the year 1737.

vicar,

CENT. XVI. vicar, whose sagacity, prudence, and knowledge
 SECT. III. of men and things, never failed him in transactions
 PART I. of this nature, wisely avoided making use of the
 privilege he claimed with such confidence, that he
 might not inflame the divisions and animosities
 that were already subsisting. And accordingly,
 in the year 1588, this contest was finished, and
 the storm laid in such a manner, as that the con-
 tending parties were left in the quiet possession of
 their respective opinions, and solemnly prohibited
 from disputing, either in public or in private;
 upon the intricate points that had excited their
 divisions. Had the succeeding pontiffs, instead
 of assuming the character of judges in this ambi-
 guous and difficult controversy, imitated the
 prudence of SIXTUS V., and imposed silence on
 the litigious doctors, who renewed afterwards the
 debates concerning divine grace, the tranquillity
 and unity of the church of *Rome* would not have
 been interrupted by such violent divisions as rage
 at present in its bosom [b].

The contro-
 versies with
 the Mol-
 nists.

XL. The Roman church had scarcely perceived
 the fruits of that calm, which the prudence of
 SIXTUS had restored, by suppressing, instead of
 deciding, the late controversies, when new com-
 motions, of the same nature, but of a much more
 terrible aspect, arose to disturb its tranquillity.
 These were occasioned by LEWIS MOLINA [i], a
 Spanish

[b] See *Apologie Historique des deux Censures de Louvain et de Douay*, par M. GERY, 1688, in 8vo. The famous PASQUER QUENEL was the author of this apology, if we may give credit to the writer of a book, entitled, *Catechisme Historique et Dogmatique sur les Contestations de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 104.— See an account of this controversy in a piece, entitled, *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Controverses dans l'Eglise Romaine sur la Predestination et sur la Grace*; this curious piece is to be found in the fourteenth tome of LE CLERC's *Bibliothèque Universelle Historique*.

[i] From this Spanish doctor's name proceeded the well-known denomination of *Molinists*, by which those Roman-catholics

Spanish Jesuit, professor of divinity in the university of *Ebora* in *Portugal*, who, in the year 1588, published a book to shew that the *operations of divine grace* were entirely consistent with the *freedom of human will* [k], and who introduced a new kind of hypothesis, to remove the difficulties attending the doctrines of *predestination* and *liberty*, and to reconcile the jarring opinions of *Augustinians*, *Thomists*, *Semi-Pelagians*, and other contentious divines [l]. This attempt of the subtle Spanish doctor was so offensive to the Dominicans, who followed St. THOMAS as their theological guide, that they sounded, throughout the whole kingdom of *Spain*, the alarm of heresy, and accused the Jesuits of endeavouring to renew the errors of PELAGIUS. This alarm was followed by great commotions, and all things seemed to prognosticate a general flame, when CLEMENT VIII., in

tholics are distinguished, who seem to incline to the doctrines of *grace* and *free-will*, that are maintained in opposition to those of AUGUSTINE. Many, however, who differ widely from the sentiments of MOLINA, are unjustly ranked in the class of Molinists.

[k] The title of this famous book is as follows: *Liberi Arbitrii Concordia cum Gratiae donis, divinae praesentia, providentia, praedestinatione, et reprobatione, auctore Lud. Molina*. This book was first published at *Leipsen*, in folio, in the year 1588. Afterwards, with additions, and in 4to, at *Antwerp*, *Lyons*, *Venice*, and other places, in 1595.—A third edition, still further augmented, was published at *Antwerp* in 1609.

[l] MOLINA affirmed, that the *Decree* of predestination to eternal glory was founded upon a previous knowledge and consideration of the merits of the elect; that the grace, from whose operation these merits are derived, is not efficacious by its own intrinsic power only, but also by the consent of our own will, and because it is administered in those circumstances in which the Deity, by that branch of his knowledge, which is called *Scientia Media*, foresees that it will be efficacious. The kind of prescience, denominated in the school *Scientia Media*, is that foreknowledge of future contingents, that arises from an acquaintance with the nature and faculties of rational beings, of the circumstances in which they shall be placed, of the objects that shall be presented to them, and of the influence that these circumstances and objects must have on their actions.

the

C E N T. the year 1594, imposed silence on the contending
 XVI. parties, promising that he himself would examine
 SECT. III. with care and diligence every thing relating to
 PART I. this new debate, in order to decide it in such a
 manner as might tend to promote the cause of
 truth, and the peace of the church.

The congrega-
 tion of
 aids.

XLI. The pontif was persuaded that these gentle remedies would soon remove the disease, and that, through length of time, these heats and animosities would undoubtedly subside. But the event was far from being answerable to such pleasing hopes. The Dominicans, who had long fostered a deep-rooted and invincible hatred against the Jesuits, having now a favourable opportunity of venting their indignation, exhausted their furious zeal against the doctrine of MOLINA, notwithstanding the pacific orders of the papal edict. They fatigued incessantly the Spanish monarch, PHILIP II., and the Roman pontif, CLEMENT VIII., with their importunate clamours, until at length the latter found himself under a necessity of assembling at *Rome* a sort of council for the decision of this controversy. And thus commenced, about the beginning of the year 1598, those famous deliberations concerning the contests of the Jesuits and Dominicans, which were held in what was called the congregation *de auxiliis*, or of aids. This congregation was so denominated on account of the principal point in debate, which was the efficacy of the aids and succours of divine grace, and its consultations were directed by LEWIS MADRUSI, bishop of *Trent*, and one of the college of cardinals, who sat as president in this assembly, which was composed besides of three bishops and seven divines chosen out of so many different orders. The remaining part of this century was wholly employed by these spiritual judges in hearing and weighing the arguments alleged in favour of their respective opinions,

opinions by the contending parties [m]. The Dominicans maintained, with the greatest obstinacy, the doctrine of their patron St. THOMAS, as alone conformable to truth. The Jesuits, on the other hand, though they did not adopt the religious tenets of MOLINA, thought the honour of their order concerned in this controversy, on account of the opposition so publicly made to one of its members, and consequently used their utmost endeavours to have the Spanish doctor acquitted of the charge of Pelagianism, and declared free from any errors of moment. In this they acted according to the true Monastic spirit, which

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

[m] The history and transactions of this *Congregation* are related and illustrated by several writers of different complexions, by Jesuits, Dominicans, and Janсениsts. HYACINTH SERPI, a Dominican, published, under the feigned name of AUGUSTINIE BLANC, in the year 1700, at *Louvain*, a work entitled, *Histoire Congregationum de auxilio Gratiæ divinæ*; which was answered by another history of these debates composed by LIV. DE MEYER, a Jesuit, who assumed the name of THEOD. ERFUTHRIUS, in order to lie concealed from public view, and whose book is entitled, *Historia Controversiarum de Gratiæ divinæ auxilio*. The Dominicans also published the *Acta congregationum et disputationum, quæ coram CLEMENTE VIII., et PAULO V., de auxilio divinæ Gratiæ, sunt celebratæ*, a work composed by THOMAS DE LEMOS, a subtle monk of their order, who, in this very congregation, had defended with great applause the glory of St. THOMAS against the Jesuits.—Amidst these jarring accounts, a man must be endowed with a supernatural sagacity to come at the truth. For acts are opposed to acts, testimony to testimony, and narration to narration. It is therefore as yet a matter of doubt, which the court of *Rome* favoured most on this occasion, the Jesuits or the Dominicans, and which of these two parties defended their cause with the most dexterity and success.—There is also a history of these debates written in French, which was published, in 8vo, at *Louvain*, in the year 1702, under the following title; *Histoire de Congregations de auxilio, par un Docteur de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris*. This historian, though he be neither destitute of learning nor elegance, being nevertheless a flaming Janсениst, discovers throughout his enmity against the Jesuits, and relates all things in a manner that favours the cause of the Dominicans.

C E N T. leads each order to resent the affronts that are offered to any of its members, as if they had been cast
XVI.
SECT. III. upon the whole community, and to maintain, at
P A R T I. all adventures, the cause of every individual monk,
 as if the interests of the society were involved in it.

Rites and
ceremonies.

XLII. Notwithstanding the zealous attempts that were made, by several persons of eminent piety, to restore the institutions of public worship to their primitive simplicity, the multitude of vain and useless ceremonies still remained in the church; nor did the pontifs judge it proper to diminish that pomp and show, that gave the ministers of religion a great, though ill-acquired, influence on the minds of the people. Besides these ceremonies, many popular customs and inventions, which were multiplied by the clergy, and were either entirely absurd or grossly superstitious, called loudly for redress; and, indeed, the council of *Trent* seemed disposed to correct these abuses, and prevent their farther growth. But this good design was never carried into execution; it was abandoned, either through the corrupt prudence of the pope and clergy, who looked upon every check given to superstition as an attempt to diminish their authority, or through their criminal negligence about every thing that tended to promote the true interests of religion. Hence it happens, that in those countries where there are few protestants, and consequently where the church of *Rome* is in no danger of losing its credit and influence from the proximity and attempts of these pretended heretics, superstition reigns with unlimited extravagance and absurdity. Such is the case in *Italy*, *Spain*, and *Portugal*, where the feeble glimmerings of Christianity, that yet remain, are overwhelmed and obscured by an enormous multitude of ridiculous ceremonies, and absurd, fantastical, and unaccountable, rites; so that

that a person who arrives in any of these countries, after having passed through other nations even of the Romish communion, is immediately struck with the change, and thinks himself transported into the thickest darkness, into the most gloomy retreats, of superstition [n]. Nor, indeed, are even those countries, whom the neighbourhood of the protestants, and a more free and liberal turn of mind have rendered somewhat less absurd, entirely exempt from the dominion of superstition, and the solemn fooleries that always attend it; for the religion of *Rome*, in its best form, and in those places where its external worship is the least shocking, is certainly loaded with rites and observances that are highly offensive to sound reason. If, from this general view of things, we descend to a more circumstantial consideration of the innumerable abuses that are established in the discipline of that church; if we attend to the pious, or rather impious, frauds which are imposed, with impunity, upon the deluded multitude, in many places; if we pass in review the corruption of the clergy, the ignorance of the people, the devout farces that are acted in the ceremonies of public worship, and the insipid jargon and trifling rhetoric that prevail in the discourses of the Roman-catholic preachers; if we weigh all these things maturely, we shall find, that they have

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

[n] It is well known that the French, who travel into *Italy*, employ the whole force of their wit and raillery in rendering ridiculous the monstrous superstition of the Italians. The Italians, in their turn, look upon the French that visit their country as totally destitute of all principles of religion. This is evidently the case, as we learn from the testimony of many writers, and particularly from that of Father *LAMART*, in his *Voyages en Italie et en Espagne*. This agreeable Dominican lets no opportunity escape of censuring and exposing the superstition of the Spaniards and Italians; nor does he pretend to deny that his countrymen, and even he himself, passed for impious libertines in the opinion of these bigots.

C E N T. little regard to impartiality and truth, who pretend
 XVI. that, since the council of *Trent*, the religion and
 SECT. III. worship of the Roman church have been every
 PART I. where corrected and amended.

C H A P. II.

The History of the Greek and Eastern Churches.

The eastern
 church may
 be divided
 into three
 branches.

I. **T**HE society of Christians, that goes under the general denomination of the eastern church, is dispersed throughout *Europe*, *Asia*, and *Africa*, and may be divided into three distinct communities. The *first* is, that of the Greek Christians, who agree, in all points of doctrine and worship, with the patriarch residing at *Constantinople*, and reject the pretended supremacy of the Roman pontif. The *second* comprehends those Christians, who differ equally from the Roman pontif and the Grecian patriarch in their religious opinions and institutions, and who live under the government of their own bishops and rulers. The *third* is composed of those who are subject to the see of *Rome*.

The Greek
 church,
 properly
 speaking,

II. That society of Christians, that lives in religious communion with the patriarch of *Constantinople*, is, properly speaking, the Greek, though it assumes likewise the title of the eastern, church. This society is subdivided into two branches, of which the one acknowledges the supreme authority and jurisdiction of the bishop of *Constantinople*; while the other, though joined in communion of doctrine and worship with that prelate, yet obstinately refuses to receive his legates, or to obey his edicts, and is governed by its own laws and institutions, under the jurisdiction of spiritual rulers, who are independent on all foreign authority.

III. That

III. That part of the Greek church which acknowledges the jurisdiction of the bishop of *Constantinople*, is divided, as in the early ages of Christianity, into four large districts or provinces, *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Jerusalem*, over every one of which a bishop presides with the title of Patriarch, whom the inferior bishops and monastic orders unanimously respect as their common Father. But the supreme chief of all these patriarchs, bishops, and abbots, and, generally speaking, of the whole church, is the patriarch of *Constantinople*. This prelate has the privilege of nominating the other patriarchs, though that dignity still continues elective, and of approving the election that is made; nor is there any thing of moment undertaken or transacted in the church without his express permission, or his especial order. It is true indeed, that, in the present decayed state of the Greek churches, whose revenues are so small, and whose former opulence is reduced almost to nothing, their spiritual rulers enjoy little more than the splendid title of *Patriarchs*, without being in a condition to extend their fame, or promote their cause, by any undertaking of signal importance.

IV. The spiritual jurisdiction and dominion of the patriarch of *Constantinople* are very extensive, comprehending a considerable part of *Greece*, the *Grecian Isles*, *Wallachia*, *Moldavia*, and several of the European and Asiatic provinces that are subject to the *Turk*. The patriarch of *Alexandria* resides generally at *Cairo*, and exercises his spiritual authority in *Egypt*, *Nubia*, *Lybia*, and part of *Arabia* [o]. *DAMASCUS* is the principal residence of

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

is for the
most part
subject to
the patri-
arch of *Con-
stantinople*,

and is di-
vided into
four pro-
vinces or
districts
here de-
scribed.

[o] For an account of the patriarchate of *Alexandria*, and the various prelates who have filled that see, it will be proper to consult SOLLERII *Commentar. de Patriarchis Alexandrinis*, which is prefixed to the fifth volume of the *Acta Sanctorum*,

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

of the patriarch of *Antioch*, whose jurisdiction extends to *Mesopotamia*, *Syria*, *Cilicia*, and other provinces [p], while the patriarch of *Jerusalem* comprehends, within the bounds of his pontificate, *Palestine*, *Syria* [q], *Arabia*, the country beyond *Jordan*, *Cana in Galilee*, and mount *Sion* [r].

Menfis Junii; as also the *Oriens Christianus* of LE QUIEN, tom. ii. p. 329. The nature of their office, the extent of their authority, and the manner of their creation, are accurately described by EUS. RENAUDOT, in his *Dissertatio de Patriarcha Alexandrino*, which is published in the first volume of his *Liturgie Orientales*, p. 365.—The Grecian patriarch has, at this day, no bishops under his jurisdiction; the *chorepiscopi* or rural bishops alone are subject to his authority. All the bishops acknowledge as their chief the patriarch of the *Monophysites*, who is, in effect, the patriarch of *Alexandria*.

[p] The Jesuits have prefixed a particular and learned account of the patriarchs of *Antioch* to the fifth volume of the *Acta SS. Menfis Julii*, in which, however, there are some omissions and defects. Add to this the account that is given of the district or diocese of the patriarch of *Antioch* by MICH. LE QUIEN, in his *Oriens Christianus*, tom. ii. p. 670. and by BLASIIUS TERTIUS, in his *Syria Sacra, ò Descrizione Historico-Geographica delle due Chiese Patriarchali, Antiocha, et Gerusalemme*, published in folio at *Rome*, in the year 1695. There are three bishops in *Syria* which claim the title and dignity of patriarch of *Antioch*. The first is the bishop of the *Melchites*, a name given to the Christians in *Syria*, who follow the doctrine, institutions, and worship, of the Greek church; the second is the spiritual guide of the Syrian *Monophysites*; and the third is the chief of the *Maronites*, who hold communion with the church of *Rome*. This last bishop pretends to be the true and lawful patriarch of *Antioch*, and is acknowledged as such, or at least receives this denomination from the Roman pontif. And yet it is certain, that the pope creates at *Rome*, a patriarch of *Antioch* of his own choice. So that the see of *Antioch* has, at this day, four patriarchs, one from the Greeks, two from the Syrians, and one created at *Rome*, who is patriarch *in partibus*, i. e. titular patriarch, according to the signification of that usual phrase.

[q] *Syria* is here erroneously placed in the patriarchate of *Jerusalem*, as it evidently belongs to that of *Antioch*, in which also Dr. MOSHEIM places it in the preceding sentence.

[r] BLAS. TERTII *Syria Sacra*, lib. ii. p. 165.—D. PAPERCHII *Comment. de Patriarch. Hierosolym.* tom. iii. *Agor. Sanct. Mens. Mar.*—LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christ.* tom. iii. p. 102.

The

The episcopal dominions of these three patriarchs are indeed extremely poor and inconsiderable; for the Monophysites have long since assumed the patriarchal seats of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, and have deprived the Greek churches of the greatest part of their members in all those places where they gained an ascendant. And as *Jerusalem* is the resort of Christians of every sect, who have their respective bishops and rulers, the jurisdiction of the Grecian patriarch is consequently confined there within narrow limits.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

V. The right of electing the patriarch of *Constantinople* is, at this day, vested in the twelve bishops who reside nearest that famous capital; but the right of confirming this election, and of enabling the new-chosen patriarch to exercise his spiritual functions, belongs only to the Turkish emperor. This institution, however, if it is not entirely overturned, is nevertheless, on many occasions, prostituted in a shameful manner by the corruption and avarice of the reigning ministers. Thus it happens, that many bishops, inflamed with the ambitious lust of power and pre-eminence, purchase by money what they cannot obtain by merit; and seeing themselves excluded from the patriarchal dignity by the suffrages of their brethren, find an open and ready way to it by the mercenary services of men in power. Nay, what is yet more deplorable has frequently happened; even that prelates, who have been chosen in the lawful way to this eminent office, have been deposed, in order to make way for others, whose only pretensions were ambition and bribery. And indeed, generally speaking, he is looked upon by the Turkish vizirs as the most qualified for the office of patriarch, who surpasses his competitors in the number and value of the presents he employs on that occasion. It is true, some accounts worthy of credit represent the present state of the

The patriarch of Constantinople.

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

Greek church as advantageously changed in this respect; and it is reported, that, as the Turkish manners have gradually assumed a milder and more humane cast, the patriarchs live under their dominion with more security and repose than they did some ages ago [s].

The power of the patriarch among a people dispirited by oppression, and sunk, through their extreme ignorance, into the greatest superstition, must undoubtedly be very considerable and extensive; and such, indeed, it is. Its extent, however, is not entirely owing to the causes now mentioned, but to others that give no small weight and lustre to the patriarchal dignity. For this prelate does not only call councils by his own authority, in order to decide, by their assistance, the controversies that arise, and to make use of their prudent advice and wise deliberations in directing the affairs of the church; his prerogatives go yet farther, and, by the special permission of the emperor, he administers justice and takes cognizance of civil causes among the members of his communion. His influence is maintained, on the one hand, by the authority of the Turkish monarch, and, on the other, by his right of excommunicating the disobedient members of the Greek church. This right gives the patriarch a singular degree of influence and authority, as nothing has a more terrifying aspect to that people than a sentence of excommunication, which they reckon among the greatest and most tremendous evils. The revenue of this prelate is drawn particularly from the churches that are subject to his jurisdiction; and its produce varies according to the state and circumstances of the

[s] LL QUIEN, *ibid.* tom. i. p. 145.—ELSNER, *Beschreibung der Griechischen Christen in der Turkey*, p. 54.

Greek Christians, whose condition is exposed to many vicissitudes [1].

VI. The holy scriptures and the decrees of the first seven *general* councils are acknowledged by the Greeks as the rule of their faith. It is received, however, as a maxim established by long custom, that no private person has a right to explain, for himself or others, either the declarations of scripture, or the decisions of these councils; and that the patriarch, with his brethren, are alone authorized to consult these oracles, and to declare their meaning. And, accordingly, the declarations of this prelate are looked upon as sacred and infallible directions, whose authority is supreme, and which can neither be transgressed nor disregarded without the utmost impiety. The substance of the doctrine of the Greek church is contained in a treatise, entitled, *The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church*, which was drawn up by PLIER MOGISLAUS, bishop of Kiow, in a provincial council assembled in that city. This confession was translated into Greek [u], and publicly approved and adopted, in the year 1643, by PARTHENIUS of *Constantinople*, and all the other Grecian patriarchs. It was afterwards published in Greek and Latin at the expence of PANAGIOTA, the Turkish emperor's interpreter, a man of great opulence and liberality, who ordered it to be distributed *gratis* among the Greek Christians;

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

The doctrine of the Greek church.

[1] CUPER, a Jesuit, has given a *History of the Patriarchs of Constantinople*, in the *Acta Sanctorum Mensis Augusti*, tom. i. p. 1—257. There is also a very ample account both of the see of *Constantinople* and its patriarchs, in the first volume of the *Oriens Christianus* of MICH. LE QUIEN, who treats moreover of the Latin patriarchs of that city, in the third volume of the same work, p. 786. See also a brief account of the power and revenues of the present patriarch, and of the names of the several sees under his spiritual jurisdiction, in SMITH, *De Ecclesiæ Græcæ Hodierno Statu*, p. 48—59.

[u] It was originally composed in the Russian language.

and

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

and it was also enriched with a recommendatory letter composed by NECTARIUS, patriarch of Jerusalem [w]. It appears evidently from this confession, that the Greeks differ widely from the votaries of the Roman pontif, whose doctrines they reject and treat with indignation in several places; but it appears, at the same time, that their religious tenets are equally remote from those of other Christian societies. So that whoever peruses this treatise with attention, will be fully convinced, how much certain writers are mistaken, who imagine that the obstacles which prevent the union of the Greeks with this or the other Christian community, are but small and inconsiderable [x].

[w] This *confessio* was published in 8vo, at *Leipfic*, with a Latin translation, by LAUR. NORMANNUS, in the year 1695. In the preface we are informed, that it had been composed by NECTARIUS. but this assertion is refuted by NECTARIUS himself, in a letter which follows immediately the preface. It is also affirmed, both in the Preface and Title-page, that this is the first public edition that has been given of the Greek confession. But this assertion is also false; since it is well known that it was published in *Holland*, in the year 1662, at the expence of PANAGIOTA. The German translation of this confession was published at *Francfort* and *Leipfic*, in 4to, in 1727. The learned JO. CHRIS. KOCHERUS has given, with his usual accuracy and erudition, an ample account both of this and the other confessions received among the Greeks, in his *Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbol.* p. 45 & 53. and the laborious Dr. HOFFMAN, principal Professor of Divinity at *Witttemberg*, published at *Breslaw*, in 1751, a new edition of the *Orthodox Confession*, with an historical account of it. Those who are desirous of a circumstantial account of the famous PANAGIOTA, to whom this confession is indebted for a considerable part of its credit, and who has rendered to the Greek church in general the most eminent services, will find it in CANTEMIR'S *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, tom. iii. p. 149.

[x] The learned FABRICIUS has given, in the tenth volume of his *Bibliotheca Græca*, p. 441 an exact and ample list of the writers, whom it is proper to consult, in order to the forming a just notion of the state, circumstances, and doctrines, of the Greek church.

VII. The

VII. The votaries of *Rome* have found this to be true on many occasions. And the Lutherans made an experiment of the same kind, when they presented a fruitless invitation to the Greek churches to embrace their doctrine and discipline, and live with them in religious communion. The first steps in this laudable attempt were taken by MELANCTHON, who sent to the patriarch of *Constantinople* a copy of the confession of *Augsbург*, translated into Greek by PAUL DOLSCIUS. This present was accompanied with a letter, in which the learned and humane professor of *Wittemberg* represented the protestant doctrine with the utmost simplicity and faithfulness, hoping that the artless charms of truth might touch the heart of the Grecian prelate. But his hopes were disappointed; for the patriarch did not even deign to send him an answer [y]. After this, the divines of *Tubingen* renewed, with his successor JEREMIAH [z], the correspondence which had been begun by MELANCTHON. They wrote frequently, during the course of several years [a], to the new patriarch, sent him another copy of the *confession* of *Augsbург*, together with a *Compend of Theology*, composed by HEERBRAND, and translated into Greek by MARTIN CRUSIUS; nor did they leave unemployed any means, which a pious and well-conducted zeal could suggest as proper to gain over this prelate to their communion. The fruits, however, of this correspondence were very inconsiderable, and wholly consisted in a few letters from the Greek patriarch, written, indeed, with an amiable

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

The design
of uniting
the Greeks
with the
protestants
miscarries.

[y] LEO ALLATIUS, *De perpetua Consensione Ecclesiæ Orient. et Occident.* lib. iii. cap. viii. § ii. p. 1005.

[z] The name of the former patriarch was JOSEPH. In the year 1559, he had sent his Deacon DEMETRIUS to *Wittemberg* to inform himself upon the spot of the genius and doctrines of the protestant religion.

[a] This correspondence commenced in the year 1576, and ended in 1581.

spirit

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

spirit of benevolence and cordiality; but at the same time in terms which shewed the impossibility of the union so much desired by the protestants. The whole strain of these letters discovered in the Greeks an inviolable attachment to the opinions and institutions of their ancestors, and was sufficient to demonstrate the vanity of attempting to dissolve it in the present situation and circumstances of that people [b].

The miserable state of the Greeks,

VIII. Nothing, indeed, more deplorable can be conceived than the state of the greatest part of the Greeks, since their subjection to the oppressive yoke of the Turkish emperors. Since that fatal period, almost all learning and science, human and divine, had been extinguished among them. They have neither schools, colleges, nor any of those literary establishments that ennoble human nature, by sowing in the mind the immortal seeds of knowledge and virtue. Those few that surpass the vulgar herd in intellectual acquirements, have derived this advantage from the schools of learning in *Sicily* or *Italy*, where the studious Greeks usually repair in quest of knowledge, or from a perusal of the writings of the ancient doctors, and more especially of the theology of St. THOMAS, which they have translated into their native language [c].

Such, at least, is the notion of the learning of the modern Greeks, that is entertained by all the

[b] All the *Acts* and *Papers*, relating to this correspondence, were published in one volume at *Wittenberg*, in the year 1584. See CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFII *Liber de Actis et Scriptis publicis Ecclesiæ Wittenbergicæ*, p. 50.—See also JO. ALB. FABRICII *Biblioth. Græcæ*, vol. x. p. 517.—EMMAN. A SCHELSTRATE, *Acta Ecclesiæ Orientalis contra Lutheri hæresin*, published at *Rome* in the year 1739.—LAMI *Deliciæ Eruditorum*, tom. viii. p. 176.

[c] The translator has inserted the note [k] of the original into the following paragraph of the English text, which begins thus: *Such, at least, &c.*

European Christians, as well Roman-catholics as protestants, and it is built upon the clearest evidence, and supported by testimonies of every kind. Many of the Greeks deny with obstinacy this inglorious charge, and not only defend their countrymen against the imputation of such gross ignorance, but even go so far as to maintain, that all the liberal arts and sciences are in as flourishing a state in modern *Greece*, as they were in any period of the history of that nation. Among the writers that exalt the learning of the modern Greeks in such an extraordinary manner, the first place is due to an eminent historian [d], who has taken much pains to demonstrate the error of those who are of a different opinion. For this purpose he has not only composed a list of the learned men that adorned that country in the last century, but also makes mention of an academy founded at *Constantinople* by a certain Greek, whose name was MANOLAX, in which all the branches of philosophy, as well as the liberal arts and sciences, are taught with the utmost success and applause, after the manner of the ancient sages of *Greece*. But all this, though matter of fact, does by no means amount to a satisfactory proof of the point in question. It only proves, what was never doubted by any thinking person, that the populous nation of the Greeks, in which there is such a considerable number of ancient, noble, and opulent, families, is not entirely destitute of men of learning and genius. But it does not at all demonstrate, that this nation, considered in general, is at present enriched with science either sacred or profane, or makes any shining figure in the republic of letters. In a nation which, generally speaking, is sunk in the most barbarous igno-

[d] See DEM. CANTEMIR, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, tom. ii. p. 38.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

rance, some men of genius and learning may arise, and shine like meteors in a gloomy firmament. With respect to the academy founded at *Constantinople*, it may be observed, that a literary establishment, so necessary and yet so recent, confirms the judgment that has been almost universally formed concerning the erudition of the Greeks.

This ignorance, that reigns among the Greeks, has the most pernicious influence upon their morals. Licentiousness and impiety not only abound among the people, but also dishonour their leaders; and the calamities that arise from this corruption of manners, are deplorably augmented by their endless contentions and divisions. Their religion is a motley collection of ceremonies, the greatest part of which are either ridiculously trifling, or shockingly absurd. Yet they are much more zealous in retaining and observing these senseless rites, than in maintaining the doctrine, or obeying the precepts, of the religion they profess. Their misery would be extreme, were it not for the support they derive from the Greeks, who perform the functions of physicians and interpreters at the emperor's court; and who, by their opulence and credit, frequently interpose to reconcile the differences, or to ward off the dangers, that so often portend the destruction of their church.

The Greek
church in-
dependent
on foreign
jurisdiction.

IX. The *Russians*, *Georgians*, and *Mingrelians*, adopt the doctrines and ceremonies of the Greek church; though they are entirely free from the jurisdiction and authority of the patriarch of *Constantinople*. It is true, indeed, that this prelate had formerly enjoyed the privilege of a spiritual supremacy over the Russians, to whom he sent a bishop whenever a vacancy happened. But, towards the conclusion of this century, this privilege ceased by the following incident. JEREMIAH,
patriarch

patriarch of *Constantinople*, undertook a journey into *Moscow*, to levy pecuniary succours, against his rival METROPHANES, and to drive him, by the force of money, from the patriarchal throne. On this occasion, the Moscovite monks, in compliance, no doubt, with the secret orders of the Grand Duke THEODORE, the son of JOHN BASILIDES, employed all the influence both of threatenings and supplications to engage JEREMIAH to place at the head of the Moscovite nation an independent patriarch. The patriarch of *Constantinople*, unable to resist such powerful sollicitations, was forced to yield; and accordingly, in a council assembled at *Moscow* in the year 1589, nominated and proclaimed JOB, archbishop of *Roslow*, the first patriarch of the Moscovites. This extraordinary step was, however, taken on condition that every new patriarch of the Russians should demand the consent and suffrage of the patriarch of *Constantinople*, and pay, at certain periods fixed for that purpose, five hundred gold ducats. The transactions of this Moscovite council were afterwards ratified in one assembled by JEREMIAH at *Constantinople* in the year 1593, to which ratification the Turkish emperor gave his solemn consent [e]. But the privileges and immunities of the patriarch of *Moscow* were still farther extended about the middle of the following age, when the four eastern patriarchs, under the pontificate of DIONYSIUS II., patriarch of *Constantinople*, exempted him, at the renewed sollicitation of the Grand Duke of *Moscow*, from the double obligation of paying tribute, and of depending, for the

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

[e] See ANTON. POSSEVINI *Moscoria*—MICH. LE QUIN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 1292.—See also a relation of this transaction, which is published in the *Catalogus Codic. MSS. Biblioth. Taurinens.* p. 433—469.

confirmation

CENT. XVI. confirmation of his election and installation, on a foreign jurisdiction [f].

SECT. III.

PART I.

The Georgians and Mingrelians.

X. The *Georgians* and *Mingrelians*, or, as they were anciently called, the *Iberians* and *Colchians*, have declined so remarkably since the Mahometan dominion has been established in these countries, that they can scarcely be ranked in the number of Christians. Such, in a more especial manner, is the depraved state of the latter, who wander about in the woods and mountains, and lead a savage and undisciplined life; for among the *Georgians*, or *Iberians*, there are yet some remains of religion, morals, and humanity. These nations have a pontif at their head, whom they call *The Catholic*; they have also their bishops and priests; but these spiritual rulers are a dishonour to Christianity, by their ignorance, avarice, and profligacy; they surpass almost the populace in the corruption of their manners, and, grossly ignorant themselves of the truths and principles of religion, they never entertain the least thought of instructing the people. If therefore it be affirmed, that the *Georgians* and *Mingrelians*, at this day, are neither attached to the opinions of the *Monophysites*, nor to those of the *Nestorians*, but embrace the doctrine of the Greek church, this must be affirmed rather in consequence of probable conjecture, than of certain knowledge; since it is impossible almost to know, with any degree of precision, what are the sentiments of a people who seem to lie in the thickest darkness. Any remains of religion that are observable among them, are entirely comprehended in certain sacred festivals and external ceremonies, of which the former are celebrated, and the latter are performed, without

[f] LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christian.* tom. i. p. 155.—NIC. BERGIUS, *De Ecclesia Muscovitica*, par. I. sect. I. c. xviii. p. 164.

the least appearance of decency; so that the priests administer the sacraments of baptism and of the Lord's supper with as little respect and devotion, as if they were partaking of an ordinary repast [g].

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

XI. The eastern Christians, who renounce the communion of the Greek church, and differ from it both in doctrine and worship, may be comprehended under two distinct classes. To the former belong the *Monophysites*, or *Jacobites*, so called from JACOB ALBARDAI [b], who declare it as their opinion, that in the Saviour of the world there is only *one nature*; while the latter comprehends the followers of NESTORIUS, frequently called *Chaldeans*, from the country where they principally reside, and who suppose that there are two distinct *persons* or *natures* in the Son of God. The *Monophysites* are subdivided into two sects or

Of the eastern churches that separate from the communion of the Greeks and Latins.

[g] CLEMENT. GALLANUS, *Conciliatio Ecclesiæ Armenicæ cum Romanæ*, tom. i. p. 156.—CHARDIN, *Voyage en Perse*, &c. tom. i. p. 67. where the reader will find JOS. MAR. ZAMPI's *Relation de la Colchide et Mingrelie*.—LAMBERTI *Relation de la Colchide ou Mingrelie*, in the *Recueil des Voyages au Nord*, tom. vii. p. 160. LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 1333, 1339.—See also RICH. SIMON, *Histoire Critique des dogmes et ceremonies des Chrétiens Orientaux*, ch. v & vi. p. 71. in which the learned author endeavours to remove, at least, a part of the reproach under which the *Georgians* and *Mingrelians*: labour on account of their supposed ignorance and corruption. The *catholics* or pontiffs of *Georgia* and *Mingrelia* are, at this day, independent on any foreign jurisdiction; they are, however, obliged to pay a certain tribute to the patriarch of *Constantinople*.

[b] This JACOB ALBARDAI, or BARADEUS as he is called by others, restored, in the sixth century, the sect of the *Monophysites*, which was almost expiring, to its former vigour, and modelled it anew; hence they were called *Jacobites*. This denomination is commonly used in an extensive sense, as comprehending all the *Monophysites*, excepting those of *Armenia*; it however more strictly and properly belongs only to those Asiatic *Monophysites*, of which JACOB ALBARDAI was the restorer and the chief. See SIMON, *Histoire de Chrétiens Orientaux*, ch. ix. p. 118. a work, nevertheless, that often wants correction.

VOL. IV.

S

parties,

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

parties, the one African, the other Asiatic. At the head of the *Asiatics* is the patriarch of *Antioch*, who resides, for the most part, in the monastery of St. ANANIAS, which is situated near the city of *Merdin*, and sometimes at *Merdin*, his episcopal seat, as also at *Amida*, *Aleppo*, and other *Syrian* cities [i]. The government of this prelate is too extensive, and the churches over which he presides too numerous, to admit of his performing, himself, all the duties of his high office; and therefore a part of the administration of the pontificate is given to a kind of colleague, who is called the *maphrian* or *primate* of the East, and whose doctrine and discipline are said to be adopted by the eastern churches beyond the *Tigris*. This primate used formerly to reside at *Tauris*, a city on the frontiers of *Armenia*; but his present habitation is the monastery of St. MATTHEW, which is in the neighbourhood of *Mousul*, a city of *Mesopotamia*. It is farther observable, that all the patriarchs of the *Jacobites* assume the denomination of IG-NATIUS [k].

The Copts
and Abyssinians.

XII. The African *Monophysites* are under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of *Alexandria*, who generally resides at *Grand Cairo*, and they are subdivided into *Copts* and *Abyssinians*. The denomination of *Copts* comprehends all those Christians who dwell in *Egypt*, *Nubia*, and the countries adjacent, and whose condition is truly deplorable. Oppressed by the insatiable avarice and tyranny of the Turks, they draw out their wretched days in misery and want, and are unable to support either their patriarch or their bishops. These are not, however, left entirely destitute; since they are,

[i] ASSEMANNI *Dissert. de Monophys.* tom. ii.—*Biblioth. Orient. Clem. Vatican.* § viii.—FAUST. NAIRON, *Euoplia fidei Catholicæ ex Syrorum Monument.* par. I. p. 40.—LE QUIEN *Oriens Christ.* tom. ii. p. 1343.

[k] ASSEMANNI *Dissertat. de Monophysitis*, § viii.

in a manner, maintained by the liberality of those CENT. XVI. SECT. III. PART I.
Copts, who, on account of their capacity in household affairs, and their dexterity in the exercise of several manual arts, highly useful, though entirely unknown to the Turks, have gained admittance into the principal Mahometan families [7]. As to the *Abyssinians*, they surpass considerably the *Copts* both in their numbers, their power, and their opulence; nor will this appear surprising, when it is considered, that they live under the dominion of a Christian emperor; they, nevertheless, consider the Alexandrian pontif as their spiritual parent and chief, and consequently, instead of chusing their own bishop, receive from that prelate a *primate*, whom they call *abduua*, and whom they acknowledge as their ghostly ruler [m].

XIII. These Monophysites differ from other Christian societies, whether of the Greek or Latin communion, in several points both of doctrine and worship; though the principal reason of their separation lies in the opinion they entertain concerning the *nature* and *person* of JESUS CHRIST. The religious doctrines and rites of the Monophysites.

[7] RENAUDOT published at *Paris*, in 4to, in the year 1713, a very learned work, relative to the History of the Eastern Patriarchs, under the title of *Historia Alexandrinorum Patriarcharum Jacobitarum*, &c. He also published the Office used in the ordination of the Jacobite Patriarch, with remarks, in the first volume of his *Liturgiæ Orient.* p. 467.—The internal state of the *Alexandrian* or *Coptic* church, both with respect to doctrine and worship, is described by WANSLEY, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise d'Alexandrie, que nous appellons celle de Jacobites*, published at *Paris* in 1667. Add to this another work of the same author, entituled, *Relation d'un Voyage en Egypte*, p. 293. in which there is a particular account of the *Coptic* monasteries and religious orders. See also *Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus dans le Levant*, tom. ii. p. 9.—MALLET, *Description de l'Egypte*, tom. ii. p. 64.

[m] JOB LUDOLF, *Comment. in Histor. Æthiop.* p. 451. 461. 466.—LOBO, *Voyage d'Abissinia*, tom. ii. p. 36.—*Nouveaux Memoires des Missions dans le Levant*, tom. iv. p. 277.—MICH. LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christian.* tom. ii. p. 641.

CENT. XVI. Following the doctrine of DIOSCORUS, BARSUMA,
 SECT. III. XENAIAS, FULLO, and others, whom they con-
 PART I. sider as the heads or chief ornaments of their sect,
 they maintain that in CHRIST the *divine* and *human*
nature were reduced into *one*, and consequently
 reject both the decrees of the council of *Chalcedon*,
 and the famous letter of LEO the Great. That,
 however, they may not seem to have the least in-
 clination towards the doctrine of EUTYCHES,
 which they profess to reject with the most ardent
 zeal, they propose their own system with the ut-
 most caution and circumspection, and hold the
 following obscure principles: That the *two natures*
 are *united* in CHRIST without either *confusion* or
mixture; so that though the nature of our Saviour
 be really *one*, yet it is at the same time *twofold*
 and *compound* [n]. By this declaration it appears,
 that those learned men, who look upon the differ-
 ence between the *Monophysites* and the Greek and
 Latin churches, rather as a dispute about *words*
 than *things*, are not so far mistaken as some have
 imagined [o]. Be that as it may, both the Asiatic

[n] ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 25, 26, 29, 34, 117, 133, 135, 277, 297, &c.—See, in the same work, ABULPHARAGE'S *Subtile Vindication of the Doctrine of his Sect*, vol. ii. p. 288. There is a complete and circumstantial account of the religion of the Abyssinians, in the *Theologia Æthiopica* of GREGORY the Abyssinian, published by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux evangelii toti orbi exorientis*, p. 716, where there is also a list of all the writers who have given accounts of the Abyssinians.

[o] See LA CROZE, *Hist. du Christianisme des Indes*, p. 23. ASSEMANNI *loc. citat.* tom. ii. p. 291, 297.—RICH. SIMON, *Histoire des Chrétiens Orientaux*, p. 119.—JO. JOACH. SCHROEDER *Thesaurus Linguae Armenicae*, p. 276. ☞ The truth of the matter is, that the terms used by the Monophysites are something more than equivocal; they are contradictory. It may also be farther observed, that those who pretend to hold a middle path between the doctrines of Nestorius and Eutyches, were greatly embarrassed, as it was almost impossible to oppose the one, without adopting, or at least appearing to adopt, the other.

and

and African Monophysites of the present times are, generally speaking, so deeply sunk in ignorance, that their attachment to the doctrine by which they are distinguished from other Christian societies, is rather founded on their own obstinacy, and on the authority of their ancestors, than on any other circumstance; nor do they even pretend to appeal, in its behalf, to reason and argument [p].

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

XIV. The Armenians [q], though they agree with the other *Monophysites* in the main doctrine of that sect relating to the *unity* of the divine and human nature in CHRIST, differ from them, nevertheless, in many points of faith, discipline, and worship; and hence it comes to pass, that they hold no communion with that branch of the *Monophysites*, who are *Jacobites* in the more limited sense of that term. The Armenian church is governed by three patriarchs [r]. The chief of

The Armenians.

[p] The liturgies of the Copts, the Syrian Jacobites, and the Abyssinians, have been published, with learned observations, by RENAUDOT, in the first and second volumes of his *Liturgiæ Orientales*.

[q] The first writer, who gave a circumstantial account of the religion and history of the Armenians, was CLEMENT GALANI, an Italian of the order of the *Theatins*, whose *Conciliatio Ecclesiæ Armenicæ cum Romana*, was published at Rome, in three volumes in folio, in the year 1650. The other authors, who have treated of this branch of Ecclesiastical History, are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toti orbi exorients*, ch. xxxviii. p. 640.; to which must be added, LE QUIEN *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 1362.—The *History of Christianity in Armenia*, which the learned LA CROZE has subjoined to his account of the progress of the Christian religion in *Abyssinia*, and which was published at the Hague in 1739, is by no means answerable to the importance and copiousness of the subject; which must be attributed to the age and infirmities of that author. For an account of the particular institutions and rites of the Armenians, see GEMELLI CARERI *Voyage du tour du monde*, tom. ii. p. 146.

[r] Sir PAUL RICAUT mentions four; but his authority, were it more respectable than it really is, cannot be compared with that of the excellent sources from whence Dr. MOSHEIM draws his materials.

CENT. XVI.
SECT. III,
PART I.

these, whose diocese comprehends the *Greater Armenia*, beholds forty-two archbishops subjected to his jurisdiction, and resides in a monastery at a place called *Echmiazin*. The revenues of this spiritual ruler are such as would enable him to live in the most splendid and magnificent manner [1]; but there is no mark of pomp or opulence in his external appearance, nor in his domestic œconomy. His table is frugal, his habit plain; nor is he distinguished from the monks, with whom he lives, by any other circumstance than his superior power and authority. He is, for the most part, elected to his patriarchal dignity by the suffrages of the bishops assembled at *Echmiazin*, and his election is confirmed by the solemn approbation of the Persian monarch. The second patriarch of the Armenians, who is called *The Catholic*, resides at *Cis*, a city of *Cilicia*, rules over the churches established in *Cappadocia*, *Cilicia*, *Cyprus*, and *Syria*, and hath twelve archbishops under his jurisdiction. He also at present acknowledges his subordination to the patriarch of *Echmiazin*. The third and last in rank of the patriarchs above mentioned, who has no more than eight or nine bishops under his dominion, resides in the island of *Aghtamar*, which is in the midst of the Great Lake of *Varaspuracan*, and is looked upon by the other Armenians as the enemy of their church.

Besides these prelates, who are patriarchs in the true sense of that term, the Armenians have other spiritual leaders, who are honoured with

[1] R. SIMON has subjoined to his *Histoire de Chrétiens Orient.* p. 217. an account of all the Armenian churches that are subjected to the jurisdiction of this grand patriarch. But this account, though taken from USCANUS, an Armenian bishop, is nevertheless defective in many respects. For an account of the residence and manner of life of the patriarch of ECHMIAZIN, see PAUL LUCAS *Voyage au Levant*, tom. ii. p. 247, and GEMELLI CARRERI *Voyage du tour du monde*, tom. ii. p. 4—10.

the title of Patriarchs; but this, indeed, is no more than an empty title, unattended with the authority and prerogatives of the patriarchal dignity. Thus the archbishop of the Armenians, who lives at *Constantinople*, and whose authority is respected by the churches established in those provinces that form the connexion between *Europe* and *Asia*, enjoys the title of Patriarch. The same denomination is given to the Armenian bishop who resides at *Jerusalem*; and to the prelate of the same nation, who has his episcopal seat at *Caminec* in *Poland*, and governs the Armenian churches that are established in *Russia*, *Poland*, and the adjacent countries. These bishops assume the title of Patriarchs, on account of some peculiar privileges conferred on them by the Great Patriarch of *Echmiazin*. For by an authority derived from this supreme head of the Armenian church, they are allowed to consecrate bishops, and to make, every third year, and distribute among their congregations, the holy *chrism* or ointment, which, according to a constant custom among the eastern Christians, is the privilege of the patriarchs alone [1].

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

XV. The *Nestorians*, who are also known by the denomination of *Chaldeans*, have fixed their habitations chiefly in *Mesopotamia* and the adjacent countries. They have several doctrines, as well as some religious ceremonies and institutions, that are peculiar to themselves. But the main points, that distinguish them from all other Christian societies, are, their persuasion that *NESTORIUS* was

The Nesto-
rians, or
Chaldeans.

[1] See the *Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. iii. p. 1—218. where there is an ample and circumstantial account both of the civil and religious state of the Armenians. This account has been highly applauded by M. DE LA CROZE, for the fidelity, accuracy, and industry, with which it is drawn up, and no man was more conversant in subjects of this nature than that learned author.—See LA CROZE, *Histoire du Christianisme d’Ethiopie*, p. 345.

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

unjustly condemned by the council of *Ephesus*, and their firm attachment to the doctrine of that prelate, who maintained that there were not only two *natures*, but also two distinct *persons* in the Son of God. In the earlier ages of the church, this error was looked upon as of the most momentous and pernicious kind; but in our times it is esteemed of less consequence, by persons of the greatest weight and authority in theological matters, even among the Roman-catholic doctors. They consider this whole controversy as a dispute about words, and the opinion of NESTORIUS as a nominal, rather than a real, heresy; that is, as an error arising rather from the words he employed, than from his intention in the use of them. It is true indeed, that the Chaldeans attribute to CHRIST two *natures*, and even two *persons*; but they correct what may seem rash in this expression, by adding, that these *natures* and *persons* are so closely and intimately united, that they have only one *aspect*. Now the word *barsopa*, by which they express this aspect, is precisely of the same signification with the Greek word *προσωπον*, which signifies a *person* [*u*]; and from hence it is evident, that they attached to the word *aspect* the same idea that we attach to the word *person*, and that they understood by the word *person*, precisely what we understand by the term *nature*. However that be, we must observe here, to the lasting honour of the Nestorians, that, of all the Christian societies established in the East, they have been the most careful and successful in avoiding a multitude of superstitious

[*u*] It is in this manner that the sentiments of the Nestorians are explained in the inscriptions which adorn the tombs of their patriarchs in the city of *Mosul*.—See ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. iii. par. II. p. 210.—R. SIMON, *Histoire de la Créance des Chrétiens Orientaux*, ch. vii. p. 94.—Petrus STROZZA, *De dogmatibus Chaldeorum*, published, in 8vo, at *Rome*, in the year 1617.

opinions

opinions and practices that have infected the Greek and Latin churches [x].

XVI. In the earlier ages of Nestorianism the various branches of that numerous and powerful sect were under the spiritual jurisdiction of the same pontif, or *catholic*, who resided first at *Bagdat*, and afterwards at *Mousul*. But in this century the Nestorians were divided into two sects. They had chosen, in the year 1552, as has been already observed, two bishops at the same time, SIMEON BARMANA and JOHN SULAKA, otherwise named SIUD. The latter, to strengthen his interest, and to triumph over his competitor, went directly to *Rome*, and acknowledged the jurisdiction, that he might be supported by the credit of the Roman pontif. In the year 1555, SIMEON DENHA, archbishop of *Gelu*, adopted the party of the fugitive patriarch, who had embraced the communion of the Latin church; and, being afterwards chosen patriarch himself, fixed his residence in the city of *Ormia*, in the mountainous parts of *Persia*, where his successors still continue, and are all distinguished by the name of SIMEON. So far down as the last century, these patriarchs persevered in their communion with the church of *Rome*, but seem at present to have withdrawn themselves from it [y]. The great Nestorian pontifs, who form the opposite party, and look with an hostile eye on this little patriarch, have, since the year 1559, been distinguished by the general denomination of ELIAS, and reside con-

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.
→
Their pa-
triarchs,

[x] See the learned dissertation of ARSEMANNI *de Syris Nestorianis*, which occupies entirely the fourth volume of his *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* and which seems to have been much consulted, and partly copied, by MICH. LE QUIEN, in the eleventh volume of his *Oricus Christianus*, p. 1078.

[y] See JOS. SIM. ARSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 538. & tom. ii. p. 456.

CENT. constantly in the city of *Mouful* [z]. Their spiritual
 XVI. dominion is very extensive, takes in a great part
 SECT. III of *Asia*, and comprehends also within its circuit
 PART I. of the Arabian Nestorians; as also the CHRISTIANS
 of *St. THOMAS*, who dwell along the coast of
Malabar [a].

The re-
 mains of
 ancient
 sects.

XVII. Beside the Christian societies now mentioned, who still retained some faint shadow at least of that system of religion delivered by CHRIST and his Apostles, there were other sects dispersed through a great part of *Asia*, whose principles and doctrines were highly pernicious. These sects derived their origin from the Ebionites, Valentinians, Manicheans, Basilidians, and other separatists, who, in the early ages of Christianity, excited schisms and factions in the church. Equally abhorred by Turks and Christians, and thus suffering oppression from all quarters, they declined from day to day, and fell at length into such barbarous superstition and ignorance, as extinguished among them every spark of true religion. Thus were they reduced to the wretched and ignominious figure they at present make, having fallen from the privileges, and almost forfeited the very name, of Christians. The sect, who pass in the East under the denomination of *Sabians*, who call themselves *Mendai*, *Ijabi*, or the disciples of JOHN, and whom the Europeans entitle the *Christians of St. JOHN*, because they yet retain some knowledge of the gospel, is probably of Jewish origin, and seems to have been derived from the ancient *Hemerobaptists*, of whom the

[z] A list of the Nestorian pontifs is given by ASSEMANNI, in his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom. iii. par. I. p. 711. which is corrected, however, in the same volume, par. II. p. cml.—See also LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. ii. p. 1078.

[a] The reader will find an ample account of the *Christians of St. THOMAS* in LA CROZE, *Histoire du Christianisme des Indes*.—See also ASSEMANNI *loc. citat.* tom. iii. par. II. cap. ix. p. cccciii.

writers of ecclesiastical history make frequent mention [a]. This at least is certain, that that JOHN, whom they consider as the founder of their sect, bears no sort of similitude to JOHN the Baptist, but rather resembles the person of that name whom the ancient writers represent as the chief of the Jewish *Hemerobaptists* [b]. These ambiguous Christians, whatever their origin be, dwell in *Persia* and *Arabia*, and principally at *Bassora*; and their religion consists in bodily washings, performed frequently and with great solemnity [c], and attended with certain ceremonies which the priests mingle with this superstitious service [d].

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

XVIII. The

[a] The sect of *Hemerobaptists* among the Jews were so called from their washing themselves every day, and their performing this custom with the greatest solemnity, as a religious rite necessary to salvation. The account of this sect given by EPIPHANIUS in the introduction to his book of Heresies, has been treated as a fiction, in consequence of the suspicions of inaccuracy and want of veracity under which that author too justly labours. Nay, the existence of the *Hemerobaptists* has been denied, but without reason; since they are mentioned by JUSTIN MARTYR, EUSEBIUS, and many other ancient writers, every way worthy of credit. That the *Christians* of St. JOHN were descended from this sect, is rendered probable by many reasons, of which the principal and the most satisfactory may be seen in a very learned and ingenious work of Dr. MOSHEIM, entitled, *MOSHEIM De Rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum Magnum Commentarij*, p. 44.

[b] See the preceding note.

[c] The *Mendæans* at present perform these ablutions only once in a year. See MOSHEIM, *De Rebus Christian. ante Const. Mag. Comment.* p. 45.

[d] See the work of a learned Carmelite, named IGNATIUS A JESU, published at Rome, in 8vo, in the year 1652, under the following title: *Narratio originis rituum et errorum Christianorum S. Johannis: cui adjungitur discursus, per modum Dialogi, in quo confutantur XXXIV errores ejusdem nationis.*—ENGELB. KÄEMFERI *Amamitates Exoticæ*, Fascic. II. Relat. XI. p. 35.—SALE'S Preface to his *English Translation of the Koran*, p. 15.—ASSELMANNI *Biblioth. Oriental.* tom. iii. par. II. p. 609.—THEVENOT, *Voyages*, tom. iv. p. 584.—HERBELOT, *Biblioth. Orient.*

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

The Jaf-
dians, or
Jezdæans.

XVIII. The *Jafdians*, or *Jezdæans*, of whose religion and manners many reports of a very doubtful nature are given by voyage-writers, are an unsettled wandering tribe, who frequent the *Gordian* mountains, and the deserts of *Curdistan*, a province of *Persia*; the character of whose inhabitants has something in it peculiarly fierce and intractable. The *Jezdæans* are divided into *black* and *white* members. The former are the priests and rulers of the sect, who go arrayed in sable garments; while the latter, who compose the multitude, are cloathed in white. Their system of religion is certainly very singular, and

p. 725.—The very learned BAYER had composed an historical account of these *Mendæans*, which contained a variety of curious and interesting facts, and of which he designed that I should be the editor, but a sudden death prevented his executing his intention. He was of opinion (as appears from the *Thesaurus Epistolicus Crozianus*, tom. i. p. 21.) that these *Mendæans*, or *disciples of St. JOHN*, were a branch of the ancient Manicheans; which opinion LA CROZE himself seems to have adopted, as may be seen in the work now cited, tom. iii. p. 31. 52. But there is really nothing, either in the doctrines or manners of this sect, that resembles the opinions and practice of the Manicheans. Hence several learned men conjecture, that they derive their origin from the ancient idolators who worshipped a plurality of gods, and more especially from those who payed religious adoration to the stars of heaven, and who were called, by the Arabians, *Sabians* or *Sabeans* (*Sabini*). This opinion has been maintained with much erudition by the famous FOURMONT, in a *Dissertation* inserted in the eighteenth volume of the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres*, p. 23. But it is absolutely groundless, and has not even a shadow of probability, if we except the name which the Mahometans usually give to this sect. The *Mendæans*, themselves, acknowledge that they are of Jewish origin, and that they were translated out of *Palæstine* into the country they at present inhabit. They have sacred books of a very remote antiquity; among others, one which they attribute to ADAM, and another composed by JOHN, whom they revere as the founder of their sect. As these books have been some years ago added to the library of the king of *France*, it is to be hoped, that they may contribute to give us a more authentic account of this people than we have hitherto received,

is not hitherto sufficiently known; though it be evidently composed of some Christian doctrines, and a motley mixture of fictions drawn from a different source. They are distinguished from the other corrupt sects, that have dishonoured Christianity, by the peculiar impiety of their opinion concerning the evil genius. This malignant principle they call *Karubin* or *Cherubim*, i: e. one of the great ministers of the Supreme Being. And if they do not directly address religious worship to this evil minister, they treat him at least with the utmost respect, and not only abstain, themselves, from offering him any marks of hatred or contempt, but moreover will not suffer any contumelious treatment to be given him by others. Nay, they are said to carry this reverence and circumspection to such an excessive height, that no efforts of persecution, no torments, not even death itself, can engage them to conceive or express an abhorrence of this evil genius; and that they will make no scruple to put to death such persons as express, in their presence, an aversion to him [e].

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

XIX. The

[e] See HYDE, *Historia Relig. Veter. Persarum in Append.* p. 549 — ORTIER, *Voyage en Turquie et en Perse*, tom. i. p. 121. tom. ii. p. 249. In the last century, MICHAËL NABU, a learned Jesuit, undertook to instruct this profane sect, and to give them juster notions of religion (see D'APVILLY, *Mémoires ou Voyages*, tom. vi. p. 362. 377.) and after him another Jesuit, whose name was MONIER, embarked in the same dangerous enterprise (see *Mémoire. des Missions des Jésuites*, tom. iii. p. 291.), but how they were received, and what success attended their ministry, is hitherto unknown. RHENFERDIUS, as appears from the letters of the learned GISEBERT CUPEP, published by BAYER (see p. 30) considered the *Jésuites* as the descendants of the ancient *Sabians*. But this opinion is no less improbable than that which makes them a branch of the Manicheans; which is sufficiently refuted by their sentiments concerning the *Evil Genius*. LEAUSOBRE, in his *Histoire de Manichéisme*, tom. ii. p. 613. conjectures that the denomination of this sect is derived from the name of JESUS; but it seems rather to be borrowed from the word *Jaxid*, or *Jaxdan*, which,

CENT.

XVI.

SECT. III.

PART I.

Duruzians,
or Durfians.

XIX. The *Duruzians*, or *Durfians*, a fierce and warlike people that inhabit the craggy rocks and inhospitable wilds of mount *Libanus*, give themselves out for descendants of the Franks, who, from the eleventh century, carried on the Holy war with the Mahometans in *Palestine*; though this pretended origin is a matter of the greatest uncertainty. What the doctrine and discipline of this nation are at present, is extremely difficult to know, as they are at the greatest pains imaginable to conceal their religious sentiments and principles. We find, however, both in their opinions and practice, the plainest proofs of their acquaintance with Christianity. Several learned men have imagined, that both they and the *Curdi* of *Persia* had formerly embraced the sentiments of the Manicheans, and perhaps still persevere in their pernicious errors [f].

The *Chamfi*, or *Solares*, who reside in a certain district of *Mesopotamia*, are supposed, by curious inquirers into these matters, to be a branch of the *Samseans* mentioned by EPIPHANIUS [g].

There are many other Semi-christian sects of these kinds in the east [h], whose principles, tenets,

which, in the Persian language, signifies the Good God, and is opposed to *Abrimne*, or *Armanius*, the Evil Principle (see HERBELOT, *Biblioth. Orientale*, p. 484.—CHAREFEDDIN ALY, *Hist. de Timurbec*, tom. iii. p. 81.), so that the term *Jazidians* points out that sect as the worshippers of the good or true God. Notwithstanding the plausibility of this account of the matter, it is not impossible that the city *Jezd*, of which OTTER speaks in his *Voyage en Turquie et en Perse*, tom. i. p. 283. may have given rise to the title of *Jasidians*, or *Jezdeans*.

[f] See LUCAS, *Voyages en Grèce et Asie Mineure*, tom. ii. p. 36.—HYDE, *Histor. Relig. Veter. Persar.* p. 491. 554.—Sir PAUL RICAUT's *History of the Ottoman Empire*, vol. i. p. 313.

[g] HYDE, *Histor. Relig. Veter. Persar.* p. 555.

[h] See the work of the Jesuit DIUSSE, entitled, *Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses des Missions Etrangères*, tom. i. p. 63.

This

tenets, and institutions, are far from being unworthy of the curiosity of the learned. And those who would be at the pains to turn their researches this way, and more especially to have the religious books of these sects conveyed into *Europe*, would undoubtedly render eminent service to the cause of sacred literature, and obtain applause from all who have a taste for the study of Christian antiquities; for the accounts which have hitherto been given of these nations and sects are full of uncertainty and contradiction.

XX. The missionaries of *Rome* have never ceased to display in these parts of the world their dexterity in making profelytes, and accordingly have founded, though with great difficulty and expence, among the greatest part of the sects now mentioned, congregations that adopt the doctrine, and acknowledge the jurisdiction, of the Roman pontif. It is abundantly known, that, among the Greeks, who live under the empire of the Turk, and also among those who are subject to the dominion of the Venetians, the emperor of the Romans, and other Christian princes, there are several who have adopted the faith and discipline of the Latin church, and are governed by their own clergy and bishops, who receive their confirmation and authority from *Rome*. In this latter city there is a college, expressly founded with a view to multiply these apostatizing societies, and to increase and strengthen the credit and authority of the Roman pontif among the Greeks. In these colleges a certain number of Grecian students, who have given early marks of genius and capacity, are instructed in the arts and sciences, and are more especially prepossessed with the deepest

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

Of the
Greeks who
embraced
the Roman
communion.

This author tells us, that in the mountains, which separate *Persia* from *India*, there lives a sect of Christians, who imprint the sign of the cross on their bodies with a red-hot iron.

sentiments

C E N T. sentiments of veneration and zeal for the authority
XVI. of the pope. Such an institution, accompanied
SECT. III. with the efforts and labours of the missionaries,
PART I. could not fail, one would think, to gain an immense number of proselytes to *Rome*, considering the unhappy state of the Grecian churches. But the case is quite otherwise; for the most respectable writers, even of the Roman-catholic persuasion, acknowledge fairly, that the proselytes they have drawn from the Greek churches make a wretched and despicable figure, in point of number, opulence, and dignity, when compared with those, to whom the religion, government, nay, the very name of *Rome*, are disgusting and odious. They observe farther, that the sincerity of a great part of these proselytes is of the Grecian stamp; so that, when a favourable occasion is offered them of renouncing, with advantage, their pretended conversion, they seldom fail, not only to return to the bosom of their own church, but even to recompence the good offices they received from the Romans with the most injurious treatment. The same writers mention another circumstance, much less surprising, indeed, than those now mentioned, but much more dishonourable to the church of *Rome*; and that circumstance is, that even those of the Greek students who are educated at *Rome* with such care, as might naturally attach them to its religion and government, are, nevertheless, so disgusted and shocked at the corruptions of its church, clergy, and people, that they forget, more notoriously than others, the obligations with which they have been loaded, and exert themselves with peculiar obstinacy and bitterness in opposing the credit and authority of the Latin church [i].

XXI. In

[i] See, among other authors who have treated this point of history, *URB. CERRI, Etat present d'Eglise Romaine*, p. 82. in which,

XXI. In their efforts to extend the papal empire over the Greek churches, the designing pontiffs did not forget the church of *Russia*, the chief bulwark and ornament of the Grecian faith. On the contrary, frequent deliberations were held at *Rome*, about the proper methods of uniting, or rather subjecting, this church to the papal hierarchy. In this century JOHN BASILIDES, Grand Duke of the Russians, seemed to discover a propensity towards this union, by sending, in the year 1580, a solemn embassy to GREGORY XIII., to exhort that pontiff to resume the negotiations relative to this important matter, that so they might be brought to a happy and speedy conclusion. Accordingly, the year following, ANTONY POSSEVIN, a learned and artful Jesuit, was charged with this commission by the Roman pontiff, and sent into *Muscovy* to bring it into execution. But this dexterous missionary, though he spared no pains to obtain the purposes of his ambitious court, found by experience that all his efforts were unequal to the task he had undertaken; nor did the Russian ambassadors, who arrived at *Rome* soon after, bring any thing to the ardent wishes of the pontiff, but empty promises, conceived in dubious and general terms, on which little dependence could be made [k]. And, indeed, the event abundantly shewed,

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

A junction
between the
Russian and
Roman
churches at-
tempted in
vain.

which, speaking of the Greeks, he expresses himself in the following manner: *Ilz deviennent les plus violens ennemis des Catholiques lorsqu'ils ont appris nos sciences, et qu'ils ont connoissance de nos IMPERFECTIONS: i. e.* in plain English, *They (the Greeks) become the bitterest enemies of us Roman-catholics, when they have been instructed in our sciences, and have acquired the knowledge of our IMPERFECTIONS.* Other testimonies of a like nature shall be given hereafter.—MICH. LE QUIEN has given us an enumeration, although a defective one, of the Greek bishops that follow the rites of the Roman church, in his *Oriens Christ.* tom. iii. p. 860.

[k] See the conferences between POSSEVIN and the duke of *Muscovy*, together with the other writings of this Jesuit, relate
Vol. IV. T tive

C E N T. shewed, that BASILIDES had no other view, in all
 XVI. these negotiations, than to flatter the pope, and
 SECT. III. obtain his assistance, in order to bring to an ad-
 PART I. vantageous conclusion the unsuccessful war, which
 he had carried on against *Poland*.

The ministry of POSSEVIN and his associates was, however, attended with more fruit among that part of the Russians who reside in the Polish dominions, many of whom embraced the doctrine and rites of the Roman church, in consequence of an association agreed on in the year 1596, in a meeting at *Bresky*, the capital of the Palatinate of *Cujavia*. Those that thus submitted to the communion of *Rome* were called the *United*, while the adverse party, who adhered to the doctrine and jurisdiction of the patriarch of *Constantinople*, were distinguished by the title of the *Non-united* [1]. It is likewise farther worthy of observation here, that there has been established at *Kiowia*, since the fourteenth century, a congregation of Russians, subject to the jurisdiction of the Roman pontif, and ruled by its own *Metropolitans*, who are entirely distinct from the Russian bishops that reside in that city [m].

The votaries of *Rome* still less numerous among the Monophysites, Nestorians, and Armenians.

XII. The Roman missionaries made scarcely any spiritual conquests worthy of mention among either the Asiatic or African *Monophysites*. About the middle of the preceding century, a little insignificant church, that acknowledged the jurisdiction of the Roman pontif, was erected among the Nestorians, whose patriarchs, successively

tive to the negociation in question, that are subjoined to his work, called *Moscowia*—See also *La Vie du P. Possevin*, par JEAN DORIGNY, livr. v. p. 351.

[1] ADR. REGENVOLSCHII *Histor. Ecclesiar. Slavonicar.* lib. iv. cap. ii. p. 465.

[m] See MICH. LE QUIFN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 1274. and tom. iii. p. 1126.—*Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. *Februar.* p. 693.

named

named JOSEPH [n], reside in the city of *Diarbek*. Some of the Armenian provinces embraced the doctrines and discipline of *Rome* so early as the fourteenth century, under the pontificate of JOHN XXII., who, in the year 1318, sent them a Dominican monk to govern their church, with the title and authority of an archbishop. The episcopal seat of this spiritual ruler was first fixed at *Adorbigana*, in the district of *Soldania* [o]; but was afterwards transferred to *Naxivan*, where it still remains in the hands of the Dominicans, who alone are admitted to that ghostly dignity [p]. The Armenian churches in *Poland*, who have embraced the faith of *Rome*, have also their bishop, who resides at *Lemberg* [q]. The Georgians and Mingrelians, who were visited by some monks of the Theatin and Capuchin orders, disgusted these missionaries by their ferocity and ignorance, remained inattentive to their counsels, and unmoved by their admonitions; so that their ministry and labours were scarcely attended with any visible fruit [r].

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

XXIII. The pompous accounts which the papal missionaries have given of the vast success of their labours among all these Grecian sects, are equally destitute of candour and truth. It is evident, from testimonies of the best and most respectable authority, that, in some of these countries, they do nothing more than administer clandestine baptism to sick infants who are committed to their care, as they appear in the ficti-

The labours
of the Ro-
man mis-
sionaries a-
mong all
these sects
produce
little fruit.

[n] See ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. par. I. p. 615. — LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. ii. p. 1084.

[o] ODOR. RAYNALD. *Annal.* tom. xv. ad A. 1318. § iv.

[p] LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. iii. p. 1362 and 1403. CLEMENS GALANUS, *Conciliatione Ecclesiæ Armenia cum Romana*, tom. i. p. 527.

[q] *Mémoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jésus*, tom. iii. p. 54.

[r] URB. CERRI *Etat présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 162.

C. E N T. tious character of physicians [s]; and that, in
 XVI. other places, the whole success of their ministry
 SECT. III. is confined to the gathering together some
 PART I. wretched tribes of indigent converts, whose poverty is the only bond of their attachment to the church of *Rome*, and who, when the papal largesses are suspended or withdrawn, fall from their pretended allegiance to *Rome*, and return to the religion of their ancestors [t]. It happens also, from time to time, that a person of distinction among the Greeks or Orientals embraces the doctrine of the Latin church, and promises obedience to its pontif, nay, carries matters so far as to repair to *Rome* to testify his respectful submission to the apostolic see. But in these obsequious steps the noble converts are almost always moved by avarice or ambition; and accordingly, when the face of their affairs changes, when they have obtained their purposes, and have nothing more to expect, then they, generally speaking, either suddenly abandon the church of *Rome*, or express their attachment to it in such ambiguous terms, as are only calculated to deceive. Those who, like the Nestorian bishop of *Diarbek* [u], continue steadfast in the profession of the Roman faith, and even transmit it with an appearance of zeal to

[s] URB. CERRI *Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 164.—
 GABR. DE CHINON, *Relations nouvelles du Levant*, par. I. c. vi. p. 174. This Capuchin monk delivers his opinions on many subjects with frankness and candour.

[t] See CHARDIN'S *Voyages en Perse*, tom. i. p. 486. tom. ii. p. 53. 75. 206. 271. 349. and principally tom. iii. p. 433. of the last edition published in *Holland*, in 4to; for in the former editions all the scandalous transactions of the Roman missionaries among the Armenians, Colchians, Iberians, and Persians, are entirely wanting.—See also CHINON, *Relations du Levant*, par. II. p. 308. which regards the Armenians; and MAILLET, *Description d'Egypte*, tom. iii. p. 65. which is relative to the *Copts*.

[u] Otherwise named *Amidad* and *Caramit*.

their

their posterity, are excited to this perseverance by no other motive than the uninterrupted liberality of the Roman pontif.

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T I.

On the other hand, the bishops of *Rome* are extremely attentive and assiduous in employing all the methods in their power to maintain and extend their dominion among the Christians of the East. For this purpose, they treat, with the greatest lenity and indulgence, the proselytes they have made in these parts of the world, that their yoke may not appear intolerable. Nay, they carry this indulgence so far, as to shew evidently, that they are actuated more by a love of power, than by an attachment to their own doctrines and institutions. For they do not only allow the Greek and other eastern proselytes the liberty of retaining, in their public worship, the rites and ceremonies of their ancestors (though in direct opposition with the religious service of the church of *Rome*), and of living in a manner repugnant to the customs and practice of the Latin world; but, what is much more surprising, they suffer the peculiar doctrines, that distinguish the Greeks and Orientals from all other Christian societies, to remain in the public religious books of the proselytes already mentioned, and even to be reprinted at *Rome* in those that are sent abroad for their use [w]. The truth of the matter seems to

[w] ASSEMANNI complains in many passages of his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* that even the very books that were printed at *Rome* for the use of the Nestorians, Jacobites, and Armenians, were not corrected, nor purged, from the errors peculiar to these sects; and he looks upon this negligence, as the reason of the defection of many Roman converts, and of their return to the bosom of the eastern and Greek churches, to which they originally belonged.—See, on the other hand, the *Lettres Choissies du R. Simon*, tom. ii. let. xxiii. p. 156. in which this author pretends to defend this conduct of the Romans, which some attribute to indolence and neglect, others to artifice and prudence.

C. E. N. T. be briefly this: That at *Rome*, a Greek, an Ar-
 XVI. menian, or a Copt, is looked upon as an obedient
 SECT. III. child, and a worthy member of the church, if he
 PART II. acknowledges the supreme and unlimited power
 of the Roman pontif over all the Christian world.

The Maro-
 nites.

XXIV. The *Maronites*, who inhabit the mounts
Libanus and *Antilibanus*, date their subjection to
 the spiritual jurisdiction of the Roman pontif
 from the time that the Latins carried their hostile
 arms into *Palestine*, with a view to make them-
 selves masters of the Holy land [x]. This sub-
 jection

[x] The *Maronite* doctors, and more especially those that
 reside at *Rome*, maintain, with the greatest effort of zeal and
 argument, that the religion of *Rome* has always been preserved
 among them in its purity and exempt from any mixture of
 heresy or error. The proof of this assertion has been attempted,
 with great labour and industry, by FAUST. NAIRON, in his
Dissertatio de origine, nomine, ac religione, Maronitarum, pub-
 lished in 8vo at *Rome*, in the year 1679. It was from this
 treatise, and some other Maronite writers, that DE LA ROQUE
 drew the materials of his discourse concerning the origin of the
 Maronites, together with the abridgment of their history,
 which is inserted in the second volume of his *Voyage de Syrie et
 du Mont Liban*, p. 28, &c. But neither this hypothesis, nor
 the authorities by which it is supported, have any weight with
 the most learned men of the Roman church; who maintain,
 that the Maronites derived their origin from the *Monophysites*,
 and adhered to the doctrine of the *Monothelites* *, until the
 twelfth century, when they embraced the communion of *Rome*.
 See R. SIMON, *Histoire Critique des Chrétiens Orientaux*,
 ch. xiii. p. 146.—EUSEB. RENAUDOT, *Hist. Patriarch.
 Alexand.* in *Præfat.* iii. 2. in *Hist.* p. 49. The very learned
 ASSEMANI, who was himself a Maronite, steers a middle way
 between these two opposite accounts, in his *Biblioth. Orient.
 Vatic.* tom. i. p. 496. while the matter in debate is left unde-
 cided by MICH. LE QUIEN, in his *Oriens Christianus*, tom. iii.
 p. 1. where he gives an account of the Maronite church and
 its spiritual rulers.—For my own part, I am persuaded, that
 those who consider, that all the Maronites have not as yet em-
 braced the faith, or acknowledged the jurisdiction, of *Rome*,
 will be little disposed to receive with credulity the assertions of

* Those who maintained, that, notwithstanding the two natures in
 CHRIST, viz the human and the divine, there was, nevertheless, but one
 will, which was the divine.

jection however was agreed to, with this express condition, that neither the popes nor their emissaries should pretend to change or abolish any thing that related to the ancient rites, moral precepts, or religious opinions, of this people. So that, in reality, there is nothing to be found among the Maronites that favours of popery, if we except their attachment to the Roman pontif [y], who is obliged to pay very dear for their friendship. For, as the Maronites live in the utmost distress of poverty, under the tyrannical yoke of the Mahometans, the bishop of Rome is under a necessity of furnishing them with such

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART I.

certain Maronite priests, who are, after the manner of the Syrians, much addicted to boasting and exaggeration. Certain it is, that there are Maronites in Syria, who still behold the church of Rome with the greatest aversion and abhorrence; nay, what is still more remarkable, great numbers of that nation residing in Italy, even under the eye of the pontif, opposed his authority during the last century, and threw the court of Rome into great perplexity. One body of these non-conforming Maronites retired into the vallies of Piedmont, where they joined the Waldenses; another, above six hundred in number, with a bishop and several ecclesiastics at their head, fled into Corsica, and implored the protection of the republic of Genoa against the violence of the Inquisitors. See URB. CERRI *Etat. présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 121, 122.—Now, may it not be asked here, What could have excited the Maronites in Italy to this public and vigorous opposition to the Roman pontif, if it be true, that their opinions were in all respects conformable to the doctrines and decrees of the church of Rome? This opposition could not have been owing to any thing, but a difference in point of doctrine and belief; since the church of Rome allowed, and still allows, the Maronites, under its jurisdiction, to retain and perform the religious rites and institutions that have been handed down to them from their ancestors, and to follow the precepts and rules of life to which they have always been accustomed. Compare with the authors above-cited, *Lefaur. Epistol. Crozian.* tom. i. p. 11.

[y] The reader will do well to consult principally, on this subject, the observations subjoined by RICH. SIMON, to his French translation of the Italian Jesuit DANDINI's *Voyage to Mount Libanus*, published in 12mo at Paris, in 1685.—See also EUSEB. RENAUDOT, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandr.* p. 548.

C E N T. subsidies as may appease the voracity of their op-
XVI. pressors, procure a subsistence for their bishop and
SECT III. clergy, provide all things that are requisite for
PART I the support of their churches and the uninterrupted exercise of public worship, and contribute in general to lessen their misery. Besides, the college erected at *Rome* by GREGORY XIII., with a design to instruct the young men, frequently sent from *Syria*, in the various branches of useful science and sacred erudition, and to prepossess them with an early veneration and attachment for the Roman pontif, is attended with a very considerable expence. The patriarch of the Maronites performs his spiritual functions at *Canobin*, a convent of the monks of St. ANTHONY, on mount *Libanus*, which is his constant residence. He claims the title of *Patriarch of Antioch*, and always assumes the name of PETER, as if he seemed desirous of being considered as the successor of that apostle [2].

[2] See PETITQUEUX, *Voyage à Canobin dans le Mont Liban*, in the *Nouveaux Mémoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. iv. p. 252. & tom. viii. p. 355.—LA ROQUE, *Voyage de Syrie*, tom. ii. p. 10.—LAUR. D'ARVIEUX, *Mémoires, ou Voyages*, tom. ii. p. 418.

THE
SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

P A R T II.

The HISTORY of the MODERN CHURCHES.

C H A P. I.

The HISTORY of the LUTHERAN CHURCH.

I. **T**HE rise and progress of the *Evangelical*, or *Lutheran*, church, have been already related, so far as they belong to the history of the Reformation. The former of these titles was assumed by that church in consequence of the original design of its founders, which was to restore to its native lustre the *Gospel* of CHRIST, that had so long been covered with the darkness of superstition, or, in other words, to place in its proper and true light that important doctrine, which represents salvation as attainable by the merits of CHRIST alone. Nor did the church, now under consideration, discover any reluctance against adopting the name of the great man, whom Providence employed as the honoured instrument of its foundation and establishment. A natural sentiment of gratitude to him, by whose ministry the clouds of superstition had been chiefly dispelled, who had destroyed the claims of pride and self-sufficiency, exposed the vanity of confidence in the intercession of saints and martyrs, and pointed out the Son of God as the only proper object of trust

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T II.

The commencement
of the Lutheran
church.

C E N T. XVI. trust to miserable mortals, excited his followers
 S E C T. III. to assume his name, and to call their community
 P A R T II. the *Lutheran Church*.

The rise of this church must be dated from that remarkable period, when the pontif LEO X. drove MARTIN LUTHER, with his friends and followers, from the bosom of the Roman hierarchy, by a solemn and violent sentence of excommunication. It began to acquire a regular form, and a considerable degree of stability and consistence, from the year 1530, when the system of doctrine and morality it had adopted, was drawn up and presented to the diet of *Augsburg*. And it was raised to the dignity of a lawful and complete hierarchy, totally independent on the laws and jurisdiction of the Roman pontif, in consequence of the treaty concluded at *Passau*, in the year 1552, between CHARLES V. and MAURICE elector of *Saxony*, relating to the religious affairs of the empire.

The form
 and substance of its
 religious
 doctrine.

II. The great and leading principle of the Lutheran church, is, that the Holy Scriptures are the only source from whence we are to draw our religious sentiments, whether they relate to faith or practice; and that these inspired writings are, in all matters that are essential to salvation, so plain, and so easy to be thoroughly understood, that their signification may be learned, without the aid of an expositor, by every person of common sense, who has a competent knowledge of the language in which they are composed. There are, indeed, certain *formularies* adopted by this church, which contain the principal points of its doctrine, ranged, for the sake of method and perspicuity, in their natural order. But these books have no authority but what they derive from the scriptures of truth, whose sense and meaning they are designed to convey; nor are the Lutheran doctors permitted to interpret or explain these books

books so as to draw from them any propositions that are inconsistent with the express declarations of the word of God. The chief and the most respectable of these human productions is the *Confession of Augsburg*, with the annexed *Defence* of it against the objections of the Roman-catholic doctors [a]. In the next rank may be placed the

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

Articles

[a] When the confession of *Augsburg* had been presented to the diet of that city, the Roman-catholic doctors were employed to refute the doctrines it contained; and this pretended refutation was also read to that assembly. A reply was immediately drawn up by MELANCTHON, and presented to the emperor; who, under the pretext of a pious spirit, refused to receive it. This reply was published afterwards, under the title of *Apologia Confessionis Augustanae* and is the defence of that confession, mentioned by Dr. MOSHEIM as annexed to it. To speak plain, MELANCTHON's love of peace and concord seems to have carried him beyond what he owed to the truth, in composing this *Defence* of the confession of *Augsburg*. In the edition of that defence that some Lutherans (and CHYTRÆUS among others) look upon as the most genuine and authentic, MELANCTHON makes several strange concessions to the church of *Rome*; whether through servile fear, excessive charity, or hesitation of mind, I will not pretend to determine. He speaks of the presence of CHRIST's body in the eucharist in the very strongest terms that the Roman-catholics use to express the monstrous doctrine of *transubstantiation*; and adopts those remarkable words of THIOPHYLACT, that *the bread was not a figure only, but was truly changed into flesh*. He approves of that canon of the mass, in which the priest prays that *the bread may be changed into the body of Christ*. It is true that in some subsequent editions of the *defence* or *apology* now under consideration, these obnoxious passages were left out, and the phraseology, that had given such just offence, was considerably mitigated. There is an ample account of this whole matter, together with a history of the dissensions of the Lutheran church, in the valuable and learned work of HOSPINIAN, entitled *Historia Sacramentariae Fars posterior*, p. 199, & seq.—These expressions, in MELANCTHON's *Apologia*, will appear still more surprising, when we recollect that, in the course of the debates concerning the manner of Christ's presence in the eucharist, he, at length, seemed to lean visibly towards the opinions of BUCER and CALVIN; and that, after his death, his followers were censured and persecuted in *Saxony* on this account, under the denomination

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

Articles of Smalcald [b], as they are commonly called, together with the shorter and larger *Catechisms* of LUTHER, designed for the instruction of youth, and the improvement of persons of riper years. To these standard-books most churches add the *Form of Concord*; which, though it be not universally received, has not, on that account, occasioned any animosity or disunion; as the few points that prevent its being adopted by some churches are of an indifferent nature [c], and do
not,

denomination of *Philippists*. This shews either, that the great man now under consideration changed his opinions, or that he had formerly been seeking union and concord at the expence of truth.

§ [b] The *Articles*, here mentioned, were drawn up at *Smalcald* by LUTHER, on occasion of a meeting of the protestant electors, princes, and states, at that place. They were principally designed to shew how far the *Lutherans* were disposed to go in order to avoid a final rupture, and in what sense they were willing to adopt the doctrine of Christ's presence in the eucharist. And though the terms in which these *articles* are expressed be somewhat dubious, yet they are much less harsh and disgusting than those used in the *Confession*, the *Apology*, and the *Form of Concord*.

§ [c] Dr. MOSHEIM, like an artful painter, shades those objects in the history of Lutheranism, which it is impossible to expose with advantage to a full view. Of this nature was the conduct of the Lutheran doctors in the deliberations relating to the famous *Form of Concord* here mentioned; a conduct that discovered such an imperious and uncharitable spirit, as would have been more consistent with the genius of the court of Rome than with the principles of a protestant church. The reader, who is desirous of an ample demonstration of the truth and justice of this censure, has only to consult the learned work of ROD. HOSPINIAN, entitled. *Concordia Discors, seu de Origine et Progressu Formulæ Concordiæ Burgenfis*. The history of this remarkable production is more amply related in the thirty-ninth and following paragraphs of this first chapter, and in the notes, which the translator has taken the liberty to add there, in order to cast a proper light upon some things that are too interesting to be viewed superficially. In the mean time I shall only observe, that the points in the *Form of Concord*, that prevented its being universally received, are not of such an indifferent nature as Dr. MOSHEIM seems

not, in any degree, affect the grand and fundamental principles of true religion [*d*].

III. The form of public worship, and the rites and ceremonies that were proper to be admitted as a part of it, gave rise to disputes in several places, during the infancy of the Lutheran church. Some were inclined to retain a greater number of the ceremonies and customs that had been so excessively multiplied in the church of *Rome*, than seemed either lawful or expedient to others. The latter, after the example of the Helvetic reformers, had their views entirely turned towards that simplicity and gravity that characterised the Christian worship in the primitive times; while the former were of opinion, that some indulgence was to be shewn to the weakness of the multitude, and some regard paid to institutions that had acquired a certain degree of weight through long established custom. But as these contending parties were both persuaded that the ceremonial part of religion was, generally speaking, a matter of human institution, and that consequently a diversity of external rites might be admitted among different churches professing the same religion, without any prejudice to the bonds of charity and fraternal union, these disputes could not be of any long duration. In the mean time, all those ceremonies and observances of the church of

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T II.

The ceremonies and public worship of the Lutheran church.

to imagine. To maintain the *ubiquity*, or omnipresence, of CHRIST's body, together with its *real* and peculiar presence, in the eucharist, and to exclude from their communion the protestants, who denied these palpable absurdities, was the plan of the Lutheran doctors in composing and recommending the *Form of Concord*; and this plan can neither be looked upon as a matter of pure indifference, nor as a mark of Christian charity. But for a farther proof of this, see § xxxix. already referred to.

[*d*] See, for an account of the Lutheran confessions of faith, CHRIST. KOCHER *Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ*, P. 114.

Rome,

CENT. XVI.
SECT III
PART II.

Rome, whether of a public or private nature, that carried palpable marks of error and superstition, were every where rejected without hesitation; and wise precautions were used to regulate the forms of public worship in such a manner, that the genuine fruits of piety should not be choked by a multitude of insignificant rites. Besides, every church was allowed the privilege of retaining so much of the ancient form of worship as might be still observed without giving offence, and as seemed suited to the character of the people, the genius of the government, and the nature and circumstances of the place where it was founded. Hence it has happened, that, even so far down as the present times, the Lutheran churches differ considerably one from the other, with respect both to the number and nature of their religious ceremonies; a circumstance so far from tending to their dishonour, that it is, on the contrary, a very striking proof of their wisdom and moderation [e].

Concerning
the visible
head, and
the form of
government
of the Lu-
theran
church.

IV. The supreme civil rulers of every Lutheran state are clothed also with the dignity, and perform the functions of supremacy in the church. The very essence of civil government seems manifestly to point out the necessity of investing the sovereign with this spiritual supremacy [f], and the tacit consent of the Lutheran churches has confirmed the dictates of wise policy in this respect. It must not, however, be imagined, that the an-

[e] See BALTH. MEISNERUS, *Lib. de Legibus*, lib. iv. art. iv. quest. iv. p. 662—666.—JO. ADAM SCHÜRZERUS, *Breviar. Hulsmani. Encl.* p. 1313—1321.

[f] Since nothing is more inconsistent with that subordination and concord, which are among the great ends of civil government, than *imperium in imperio*, i. e. two independent sovereignties in the same body politic: Hence the genius of government, as well as the spirit of genuine Christianity, proclaims the equity of that constitution, that makes the supreme head of the state, the supreme visible ruler of the church.

cient rights and privileges of the people in ecclesiastical affairs have been totally abolished by this constitution of things; since it is certain, that the vestiges of the authority exercised by them in the primitive times, though more striking in one place than in another, are yet more or less visible every where. Besides, it must be carefully remembered, that all civil rulers of the Lutheran persuasion are effectually restrained, by the fundamental principles of the doctrine they profess, from any attempts to change or destroy the established rule of faith and manners, to make any alteration in the essential doctrines of their religion, or in any thing that is intimately connected with them, or to impose their particular opinions upon their subjects in a despotic and arbitrary manner.

The councils, or societies, appointed by the sovereign to watch over the interests of the church, and to govern and direct its affairs, are composed of persons versed in the knowledge both of civil and ecclesiastical law, and, according to a very ancient denomination, are called *Consistories*. The internal government of the Lutheran church seems equally removed from *episcopacy* on the one hand, and from *presbyterianism* on the other, if we except the kingdoms of *Sweden* and *Denmark*, who retain the form of ecclesiastical government that preceded the reformation, purged, indeed, from the superstitions and abuses that rendered it so odious [g]. This constitution of the Lutheran hierarchy will not seem surprising, when the sen-

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

✂ [g] In these two kingdoms the church is ruled by *bishops* and *superintendants*, under the inspection and authority of the sovereign. The Archbishop of *Upsal* is primate of *Sweden*, and the only archbishop among the Lutherans. The luxury and licentiousness, that too commonly flow from the opulence of the Roman-catholic clergy, are unknown in these two northern states; since the revenues of the prelate now mentioned do not amount to more than 400 pounds yearly, while those of the bishops are proportionably small.

CENT. XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

timents of that people, with respect to ecclesiastical polity, are duly considered. On the one hand, they are persuaded that there is no law, of divine authority, which points out a distinction between the ministers of the gospel, with respect to rank, dignity, or prerogatives; and therefore they recede from *episcopacy*. But, on the other hand, they are of opinion, that a certain subordination, a diversity in point of rank and privileges among the clergy, are not only highly useful, but also necessary to the perfection of church communion, by connecting, in consequence of a mutual dependence, more closely together the members of the same body; and thus they avoid the uniformity of the *presbyterian* government. They are not, however, agreed with respect to the extent of this subordination, and the degrees of superiority and precedence that ought to distinguish their doctors; for in some places this is regulated with much more regard to the ancient rules of church-government, than is discovered in others. As the divine law is silent on this head, different opinions may be entertained, and different forms of ecclesiastical polity adopted, without a breach of Christian charity and fraternal union.

The Lutheran liturgies, their public worship, and their method of instructing.

V. Every country has its own *Liturgies*, which are the rules of proceeding in every thing that relates to external worship and the public exercise of religion. These rules, however, are not of an immutable nature, like those institutions which bear the stamp of a divine authority, but may be augmented, corrected, or illustrated, by the order of the sovereign, when such changes appear evidently to be necessary or expedient. The liturgies used in the different countries that have embraced the system of LUTHER, agree perfectly in all the essential branches of religion, in all matters that can be looked upon as of real moment and importance; but they differ widely in many things
of

of an indifferent nature, concerning which the Holy Scriptures are silent, and which compose that part of the public religion that derives its authority from the wisdom and appointment of men. Assemblies for the celebration of divine worship meet every where at stated times. Here the Holy Scriptures are read publicly, prayers and hymns are addressed to the Deity, the sacraments are administered, and the people are instructed in the knowledge of religion, and excited to the practice of virtue by the discourses of their ministers. The wisest methods are used for the religious education of youth, who are not only carefully instructed in the elements of Christianity in the public schools, but are also examined, by the pastors of the churches to which they belong, in a public manner, in order to the farther improvement of their knowledge, and the more vigorous exertion of their faculties in the study of divine truth. Hence, in almost every province, *Catechisms*, which contain the essential truths of religion and the main precepts of morality, are published and recommended by the authority of the sovereign, as rules to be followed by the masters of schools, and by the ministers of the church, both in their private and public instructions. But as LUTHER left behind him an accurate and judicious production of this kind, in which the fundamental principles of religion and morality are explained and confirmed with the greatest perspicuity and force both of evidence and expression, this compendious *Catechism* of that eminent reformer is universally adopted as the first introduction to religious knowledge, and is one of the *standard-books* of the church which bears his name. And, indeed, all the provincial catechisms are no more than illustrations and enlargements on this excellent abridgment of faith and practice.

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

The holi-
days, and
ecclesiastical
discipline of
the Luther-
an church.

VI. Among the days that are held sacred in the Lutheran church (besides that which is celebrated, every week, in memory of CHRIST'S resurrection from the dead), we may reckon a'l such as were signalized by those glorious and important events that proclaim the celestial mission of the Saviour, and the divine authority of his holy religion [b]. These sacred festivals, the grateful and well-grounded piety of ancient times had always held in the highest veneration. But the Lutheran church has gone yet farther; and, to avoid giving offence to weak brethren, has retained several which seem to have derived the respect that is paid to them, rather from the suggestions of superstition than from the dictates of true religion. There are some churches, who carry the desire of multiplying festivals so far, as to observe religiously the days that were formerly set apart for celebrating the memory of the *Twelve Apostles*.

It is well known that the power of *excommunication*, i. e. of banishing from its bosom obstinate and scandalous transgressors, was a privilege enjoyed and exercised by the church from the remotest antiquity; and it is no less certain, that this privilege was perverted often to the most iniquitous and odious purposes. The founders, therefore, of the Lutheran church undertook to remove the abuses and corruptions under which this branch of ecclesiastical discipline laboured, and to restore it to its primitive purity and vigour. At first their attempt seemed to be crowned with success; since it is plain, that, during the sixteenth century, no opposition of any moment was made to the wise and moderate exercise of this spiritual authority. But in process of time this privilege fell imperceptibly into contempt; the terror of excommu-

[b] Such (for example) are the *nativity, death, resurrection* and *ascension* of the Son of God; the descent of the holy Spirit upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost, &c.

nication lost its force; and ecclesiastical discipline was reduced to such a shadow, that, in most places, there are scarcely any remains, any traces of it to be seen at this day. This change may be attributed partly to the corrupt propensities of mankind, who are naturally desirous of destroying the influence of every institution that is designed to curb their licentious passions. It must, however, be acknowledged, that this relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline was not owing to this cause alone; other circumstances concurred to diminish the respect and submission that had been paid to the spiritual tribunal. On the one hand, the clergy abused this important privilege in various ways; some misapplying the severity of excommunication through ignorance or imprudence, while others, still more impiously, perverted an institution, in itself extremely useful, to satisfy their private resentments, and to avenge themselves of those who had dared to offend them. On the other hand, the counsels of certain persons in power, who considered the privilege of excommunicating in the hands of the clergy as derogatory from the majesty of the sovereign, and detrimental to the interests of civil society, had no small influence in bringing this branch of ghostly jurisdiction into disrepute. It is however certain, that whatever causes may have contributed to produce this effect, the effect itself was much to be lamented; as it removed one of the most powerful restraints upon iniquity. Nor will it appear surprising, when this is duly considered, that the manners of the Lutherans are so remarkably depraved, and that in a church that is deprived almost of all authority and discipline, multitudes affront the public by their audacious irregularities, and transgress, with a frontless impudence, through the prospect of impunity.

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T II.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

Of the prosperous and calamitous events that have happened to the Lutheran church,

VII. The prosperous and unfavourable events that belong to the history of the Lutheran church, since the happy establishment of its liberty and independence, are neither numerous nor remarkable, and may consequently be mentioned in a few words. The rise and progress of this church, before its final and permanent establishment, have been already related; but that very religious peace, which was the instrument of its stability and independence, set bounds, at the same time, to its progress in the empire, and prevented it effectually from extending its limits [i]. Towards the conclusion of this century, GEBHARD, archbishop of *Cologn*, discovered a propensity to enter into its communion, and, having contracted the bonds of matrimony, formed the design of introducing the reformation into his dominions. But this arduous attempt, which was in direct contradiction with the famous *Ecclesiastical Reservation* [k] stipulated in the articles of the peace of religion concluded at *Augsburg*, proved abortive, and the prelate was obliged to resign his dignity, and to abandon his country [l]. On the other hand, it is certain, that the adversaries of the Lutheran church were not permitted to disturb its

[i] The reason of this will be seen in the following note.

[k] In the diet of *Augsburg*, which was assembled in the year 1555, in order to execute the treaty of *Passau*, the several states, that had already embraced the Lutheran religion, were confirmed in the full enjoyment of their religious liberty. To prevent, however, as far as was possible, the farther progress of the reformation, CHARLES V. stipulated for the catholics the famous *Ecclesiastical Reservation*; by which it was decreed, that if any archbishop, prelate, bishop, or other ecclesiastic, should, in time to come, renounce the faith of *Rome*, his dignity and benefice should be forfeited, and his place be filled by the chapter or college, possessed of the power of election.

[l] See JO. DAV. KOLER *Dissertatio de Gebhardo Truchessio*. — JO. PET. à LUDEWIG *Reliquiæ MStorum omnis ævi*, tom. v. p. 383. — See also a German work, entitled, *Unschuldige Nachrichten*. A. 1748, p. 484.

tranquillity,

tranquillity, or to hurt, in any essential point, its liberty, prosperity, and independence. Their intentions, indeed, were malignant enough; and it appeared evident, from many striking circumstances, that they were secretly projecting a new attack upon the protestants, with a view to annul the treaty of *Passau*, which had been confirmed at *Augsburg*, and to have them declared public enemies to the empire. Such was undoubtedly the unjust and seditious design of FRANCIS BURCKHARD, in composing the famous book *De Autonomia*, which was published in the year 1586; and also of PISTORIUS, in drawing up the *Reasons*, which the marquis of BADE alleged in vindication of his returning back from Lutheranism into the bosom of popery [m]. These writers, and others of the same stamp, treat the *Religious Peace*, negotiated at *Passau*, and ratified at *Augsburg*, as unjust, because obtained by force of arms, and as null, because concluded without the knowledge and consent of the Roman pontif. They pretend also to prove, that by the changes and interpositions, which they affirm to have been made by MELANCTHON, in the confession of *Augsburg*, after it had been presented to the diet, the protestants forfeited all the privileges and advantages that they derived from the treaty now mentioned. This latter accusation gave rise to long and warm debates during this and the following century. Many learned and ingenious productions were published on that occasion, in which the Lutheran divines proved, with the utmost perspicuity and force of argument, that the Confession of *Augsburg* was preserved in their church in its first state, uncorrupted by any mixture, and that none of their brethren had ever departed in any instance from

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

[m] See CHR. AUG. SALIG, *Histor. August. Confession.* tom. i. lib. iv. cap. iii. p. 767.

CENT. XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

the doctrines it contains [n]. They that felt most sensibly the bitter and implacable hatred of the papists against the doctrine and worship of the Lutheran church (which they disdainfully called the *new religion*), were the members of that church who lived in the territories of Roman-catholic princes. This is more especially true of the protestant subjects of the house of *Austria* [o], who have experienced, in the most affecting manner, the dire effects of bigotry and superstition seated on a throne, and who lost the greatest part of their liberty before the conclusion of this century.

The state of
learning a-
mong the
Lutherans.

VIII. While the votaries of *Rome* were thus meditating the ruin of the Lutheran church, and exerting, for this purpose, all the powers of secret artifice and open violence, the followers of LUTHER were assiduously bent on defeating their efforts, and left no means unemployed, that seemed proper to maintain their own doctrine, and to strengthen their cause. The calamities they had suffered were fresh in their remembrance; and hence they were admonished to use all possible precautions to prevent their falling again into the like unhappy circumstances. Add to this, the zeal of princes

[n] See SALIG, *Hist. August. Confessions*, tom. i.—It cannot indeed be denied, that MELANTHON corrected and altered some passages of the Confession of *Augsburg*. Nay, more; it is certain, that, in the year 1555, he made use of the extraordinary credit and influence he then had, to introduce among the Saxon churches an edition of that Confession, which was not only corrected in several places, but was, moreover, upon the whole, very different from the original one. But his conduct in this step, which was extremely audacious, or at least highly imprudent, never received the approbation of the Lutheran church, nor was the *Augsburg* Confession, in this new shape, ever admitted as one of the standard-books of its faith and doctrine.

[o] See the *Austri Evangelica* of the learned RAUPACHIUS, tom. i. p. 152. tom. ii. p. 237. This work is composed in the German language.

and

and men in power for the advancement of true religion, which, it must be acknowledged, was much greater in this century, than it is in the times in which we live. Hence the original confederacy that had been formed among the German princes for the maintenance of Lutheranism, and of which the elector of *Saxony* was the chief, gained new strength from day to day, and foreign sovereigns, particularly those of *Sweden* and *Denmark*, were invited to enter into this grand alliance. And as it was universally agreed, that the stability and lustre of the rising church depended much on the learning of its ministers, and the progress of the sciences among those in general who professed its doctrines, so the greatest part of the confederate princes promoted, with the greatest zeal, the culture of letters, and banished, wherever their salutary influence could extend, that baneful ignorance that is the mother of superstition. The academies founded by the Lutherans at *Jena*, *Helmstadt*, and *Altorf*, and by the Calvinists at *Franker*, *Leyden*, and other places; the ancient universities reformed and accommodated to the constitution and exigences of a purer church than that under whose influence they had been at first established; the great number of schools that were opened in every city; the ample rewards, together with the distinguished honours and privileges, that were bestowed on men of learning and genius; all these circumstances bear honourable testimony to the generous zeal of the German princes for the advancement of useful knowledge. These noble establishments were undoubtedly expensive, and required large funds for their support. These were principally drawn from the revenues and possessions, which the piety or superstition of ancient times had consecrated to the multiplication of convents, the erection or

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

CENT.

XVI.

SECT. III.

PART II.

The Study
of Belles
Lettres and
languages
promoted.

embellishment of churches, and other religious uses. .

IX. These generous and zealous efforts in the cause of learning were attended with remarkable success. Almost all the liberal arts and sciences were cultivated with emulation, and brought to greater degrees of perfection. All those, whose views were turned to the service of the church, were obliged to apply themselves, with diligence and assiduity, to the study of Greek, Hebrew, and Latin literature, in order to qualify them for forming, with dignity and success, the duties of the sacred function; and it is well known, that in these branches of erudition several Lutheran doctors excelled in such a manner, as to acquire a deathless name in the republic of letters. MELANCTHON, CARIO, CHYTRÆUS, REINECCIUS, and others, were eminent for their knowledge of history. More particularly FLACIUS, one of the authors of the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses* * (that immortal work, which restored to the light of evidence and truth the facts relating to the rise and progress of the Christian church, which had been covered with thick darkness, and corrupted by innumerable fables), may be deservedly considered as the parent of ecclesiastical history. Nor should we omit mentioning the learned MARTIN CHEMNITZ, to whose *Examination of the Decrees of the Council of Trent*, the history of religion is more indebted, than many, at this day, are apt to imagine. While so many branches of learning were cultivated with zeal, some, it must be confessed, were

* The joint authors of this famous work (besides FLACIUS ILIYRICUS) were NICOLAUS GALLUS, JOHANNES WIGANDU, and MATTHIAS JUDEX, all ministers of *Magd. burg*; and they were assisted by CASPAR NIDPRUCKIUS an Imperial counsellor, JOHANNES BAPTISTA BLINCELIUS an Augustinian, BASIL FABER, and others.

too little pursued. Among these we may place the history of literature and philosophy; the important science of criticism; the study of antiquities; and other objects of erudition that stand in connexion with them. It is, however, to be observed, that notwithstanding the neglect with which these branches of science seemed, too generally, to have been treated, the foundations of their culture and improvement in future ages were really laid in this century. On the other hand, it is remarkable that Latin eloquence and poetry were carried to a very high degree of improvement, and exhibited orators and poets of the first order; from which circumstance alone it may be fairly concluded, that, if all the branches of literature and philosophy were not brought to that pitch of perfection of which they were susceptible, this was not owing to the want of industry or genius, but rather to the restraints laid upon genius by the infelicity of the times. All the votaries of science, whom a noble emulation excited to the pursuit of literary fame, were greatly animated by the example, the influence, and the instructions of MELANCTHON, who was deservedly considered as the great and leading doctor of the Lutheran church, and whose sentiments, relating both to sacred and profane erudition, were so universally respected, that scarcely any had the courage to oppose them. In the next rank to this eminent reformer may be mentioned JOACHIM CAMERARIUS of *Leipsic*, a shining ornament to the republic of letters in this century, who, by his zeal and application contributed much to promote the cause of universal learning, and more especially the study of elegant literature.

X. The revolutions of philosophy among the Lutheran doctors were many and various. LUTHER and MELANCTHON seemed to set out with a resolution to banish every species of philosophy

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T II.

The various fate of philosophy among the Lutherans.

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. II.
P A R T II.

sophy [p] from the church; and though it is impossible to justify entirely this part of their conduct, yet they are less to be blamed than those scholastic doctors, whose barbarous method of teaching philosophy was inexpressively disgusting, and who, by a miserable abuse of the subtle precepts of ARISTOTLE, had perverted the dictates of common sense, and introduced the greatest obscurity and confusion both in philosophy and religion. But though these abuses led the two great men now mentioned too far, and were carrying them into the opposite extreme; yet their own recollection suspended their precipitation, and they both perceived, before it was too late, that true philosophy was necessary to restrain the licentious flights of mere genius and fancy, and to guard the sanctuary of religion against the inroads of superstition and enthusiasm [q]. It was in consequence of this persuasion that MELANTHON composed, in a plain and familiar style, abridgments of almost all the various branches of philosophy, which, during many years, were explained publicly to the studious youth in all the Lutheran academies and schools of learning. This celebrated reformer may not improperly be considered as an *eclectic*; for though in many points he followed ARISTOTLE, and retained some degree of

[p] See CHRIST. AUG. HEUMANNI *Acta philosophor.* art. ii. part X. p. 579.—JO. HERM. AB ELSWICH, *Dissertat. de varia Aristotelis fortuna in Scholis Protestantium*, which LAUNOY has prefixed to his book *De fortuna Aristotelis in Academia Parisiensis*, § viii. p. 15. § xiii. p. 36.

[q] Some writers, either through malignity or for want of better information, have pretended that LUTHER rejected the scholastic philosophy through a total ignorance of its nature and precepts. Those that have ventured upon such an assertion must have been themselves grossly ignorant of the History of Literature in general, as well as of the industry and erudition of LUTHER in particular. For a demonstrative proof of this, see BRUCKERI *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*, tom. iv. part I. p. 94, 95, 96, &c.

propensity

propensity to the ancient philosophy of the schools, yet he drew many things from the fecundity of his own genius, and had often recourse also to the doctrines of the Platonics and Stoics.

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A G E 11.

XI. This method of teaching philosophy, however recommendable on account of its simplicity and perspicuity, did not long enjoy alone and unrivalled, the great credit and authority it had obtained. Certain acute and subtle doctors, having perceived that MELANCTHON, in composing his *Abridgments*, had discovered a peculiar and predominant attachment to the philosophy of ARISTOTLE, thought it was better to go to the source, than to drink at the stream; and therefore read and explained to their disciples the works of the Stagirite. On the other hand, it was observed, that the Jesuits, and other votaries of *Rome*, artfully made use of the ambiguous terms and the intricate sophistry of the ancient schoolmen, in order to puzzle the protestants, and to reduce them to silence, when they wanted such arguments as were adapted to produce conviction. And, therefore, many protestant doctors thought it might be advantageous to their cause to have the studious youth instructed in the mysteries of the Aristotelian philosophy, as it was taught in the schools, that thus they might be qualified to defend themselves with the same weapons with which they were attacked. Hence there arose, towards the conclusion of this century, three philosophical sects, the *Melancthonian*, the *Aristotelian*, and the *Scholastic*. The first declined gradually, and soon disappeared; while the other two imperceptibly grew into one, and acquired new vigour by this coalition, increased daily in reputation and influence, and were adopted in all the schools of learning. It is true, the followers of RAMUS made violent inroads, in several places, upon the territories of these combined sects, and sometimes

Philosophi-
cal sects—
Aristoteli-
an and
Ramæans.

with

attempted to illustrate, the philosophy of PARACEL-
 CELSUS, in a great number of treatises, which, even in our times, are not entirely destitute of
 readers and admirers. The same philosophy got
 a certain footing in *France*, had several votaries
 in that kingdom, and was propagated with zeal
 at *Paris*, by a person whose name was RIVIER, in
 opposition to the sentiments and efforts of the
 university of that city [u]. Its cause was in-
 dustriously promoted in *Denmark* by SEVERI-
 NUS [w]; in *Germany* by KUNRATH, an eminent
 physician at *Dresden*, who died in the year 1605 [x];
 and in other countries by a considerable number
 of warm votaries, who were by no means unsuc-
 cessful in augmenting its reputation, and multi-
 plying its followers. As all these heralds of the
 new philosophy accompanied their instructions
 with a striking air of piety and devotion, and
 seemed, in propagating their strange system, to
 propose to themselves no other end than the ad-
 vancement of the divine glory, and the restoration
 of peace and concord in a divided church; a
 motive, in appearance, so generous and noble
 could not fail to procure them friends and pro-
 tectors. Accordingly we find that, towards the
 conclusion of this century, several persons, emi-
 nent for their piety and distinguished by their zeal
 for the advancement of true religion, joined them-
 selves to this sect. Of this number were the Lu-
 theran doctors WIGELIUS, ARNDIUS, and others,

of magic, but a famous physician born in the year 1574, at
Milgate in *Kent*, and very remarkable for his attachment to
 the alchymists. See ANT. WOOD, *Athenar. Oxoniens.* vol. i.
 p. 610. & *Hyst. et Antiq. Acad. Oxoniens.* lib. ii. p. 390.—
 P. GASSENDI *Examen Philosoph. Fluddanæ*, tom. iii. opp.
 p. 259.

[u] BOULAY, *Hystor. Acad. Paris.* tom. vi. p. 327, & passim.

[w] JO. MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. i. p. 623.

[x] JO. MOLLERI, *ibid.* tom. ii. p. 440.

who

C E N T. who were led into the snare by their ill-grounded
 XVI. notions of human reason, and who apprehended
 S E C T. III. that controversy and argumentation might lead
 P A R T II. men to substitute anew the pompous and intricate
 jargon of the schools. in the place of solid and
 sincere piety.

The contro-
 versy be-
 tween Hof-
 mann and
 his col-
 leagues.

XIII. Among those that discovered a propen-
 sity towards the system of the Paracelsists, or
 Theosophists, was the celebrated DANIEL HOF-
 MANN, Professor of Divinity in the university of
Helmstadt, who, from the year 1598, had declared
 open war against philosophy, and who continued
 to oppose it with the greatest obitnacy and vio-
 lence. Laying hold of some particular opinions
 of LUTHER, and certain passages in the writings
 of that great man, he extravagantly maintained
 that philosophy was the mortal enemy of religion ;
 that *truth* was divisible into two branches, the one
philosophical and the other *theological* ; and that
 what was *true* in philosophy, was *false* in theology.
 These absurd and pernicious tenets naturally
 alarmed the judicious doctors of the university,
 and excited a warm controversy between HOFMANN
 and his colleagues OWEN GUNTHERUS, CORNE-
 LIUS MARTIN, JOHN CASELIUS, and DUNCAN
 LIDDEL ; a controversy also of too much conse-
 quence to be confined within such narrow bounds,
 and which, accordingly, was carried on in other
 countries with the same fervour. The tumults it
 excited in *Germany* were appeased by the interpo-
 sition of HENRY JULIUS, duke of *Brunswick*, who,
 having made a careful inquiry into the nature of
 this debate, and consulted the professors of the
 academy of *Rostoc* on that subject, commanded
 HOFMANN to retract publicly the invectives he
 had thrown out against philosophy in his writings
 and in his academical lectures, and to acknow-
 ledge, in the most open manner, the harmony and
 union

union of sound philosophy with true and genuine theology [y].

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

The science
of theology
corrected
and im-
proved.

XIV. The theological system, that now prevails in the Lutheran academies, is not of the same tenor or spirit with that which was adopted in the infancy of the Reformation. As time and experience are necessary to bring all things to perfection, so the doctrine of the Lutheran church changed, imperceptibly and by degrees, its original form, and was improved and perfected in many respects. This will appear both evident and striking to those who are acquainted with the history of the doctrines relating to the interpretation of scripture, free-will, predestination, and other points, and who compare the Lutheran systems of divinity of an earlier date with those that have been composed in modern times. The case could not well be otherwise. The glorious defenders of religious liberty, to whom we owe the various blessings of the Reformation, as they were conducted only by the suggestions of their natural sagacity, whose advances in the pursuit of knowledge are gradual and progressive, could not, at once, behold the truth in all its lustre, and in all its extent, but, as usually happens to persons that have been long accustomed to the darkness of ignorance, their approaches towards knowledge were but slow, and their views of things but imperfect. The Lutherans were greatly assisted both in correcting and illustrating the articles of their faith, partly by the controversies they were obliged to carry on with the Roman-catholic

[y] There is an accurate account of this controversy, with an enumeration of the writings published on both sides of the question, in the *Life of Owen Guntherus*, which is inserted by MOLLERUS, in his *Cimbria Literata*, tom. i. p. 225.—See also JO. HERM. AB ELSWICH, *De fatis Aristotelis in Scholis Protestant.* § xxvii. p. 76.—And a German work, entitled, GOTTER. ARNOLD, *Kirchen and Kitzer-Historie*, p. 947.

C E N T. doctors, and the disciples of ZUINGLE and CALVIN,
XVI. and partly by the intestine divisions that reigned
S E C T. III. among themselves, of which an account shall be
P A R T II. given in this chapter. They have been absurdly
 reproached, on account of this variation in their
 doctrine, by BOSSUET and other papal writers, who
 did not consider that the founders of the Lutheran
 church never pretended to divine inspiration; and
 that it is by discovering first the errors of others,
 that the wise generally prepare themselves for the
 investigation of truth.

The state
 of exegetic
 theology.

XV. The first and principal object that drew the attention and employed the industry of the reformers, was the exposition and illustration of the sacred writings, which, according to the doctrine of the Lutheran church, contain all the treasures of celestial wisdom; all things that relate to faith and practice. Hence it happened, that the number of commentators and expositors among the Lutherans was equal to that of the eminent and learned doctors that adorned that communion. At the head of them all, LUTHER and MELANCTHON are undoubtedly to be placed; the former, on account of the sagacity and learning, discovered in his explications of several portions of scripture, and particularly of the Books of MOSES, and the latter, in consequence of his commentaries on the Epistles of St. PAUL, and other learned labours of that kind which are abundantly known. A second class of expositors, of the same communion, obtained also great applause in the learned world, by their successful application to the study of the Holy Scriptures, in which we may rank MATTHIAS FLACIUS, whose *Glossary and Key to the sacred writings* [z] is extremely useful in unfolding the meaning of the inspired penmen; JOHN BUGENHAGIUS, JUSTUS JONAS, ANDREW OSIAN-

[z] The Latin titles are *Glossa Scripturæ Sacrae*, and *Clavis Scripturæ Sacrae*.

DER, and MARTIN CHEMNITZ, whose *Harmonies of the Evangelists* are not void of merit. To these we may add VICTOR STRIGELIUS and JOACHIM CAMERARIUS, of whom the latter, in his *Commentary on the New Testament*, expounds the scriptures in a grammatical and critical manner only; and laying aside all debated points of doctrine and religious controversy, unfolds the sense of each term, and the spirit of each phrase, by the rules of criticism and the genius of the ancient languages, in which he was a very uncommon proficient.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

XVI. All these expositors and commentators abandoned the method of the ancient interpreters, who, neglecting the plain and evident purport of the words of scripture, were perpetually torturing their imaginations, in order to find out a mysterious sense in each word or sentence, or were hunting after insipid allusions and chimerical applications of scripture-passages, to objects which never entered into the views of the inspired writers. On the contrary, their principal zeal and industry were employed in investigating the natural force and signification of each expression, in consequence of that golden rule of interpretation inculcated by LUTHER, *That there is no more than one sense annexed to the words of scripture throughout all the Books of the Old and New Testament* [a]. It must, however, be acknowledged, that the examples exhibited by these judicious expositors were far from being universally followed. Many, labouring under the old and inveterate disease of an irregular fancy and a scanty judgment, were still seeking for hidden significations and double meanings in the expressions of Holy writ. They were perpetually busied in twisting all the prophe-

The respective merits of the sacred interpreters.

☞ [a] This *golden rule* will be found often defective and false, unless several prophetic, parabolical, and figurative expressions be excepted in its application.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

cies of the Old Testament into an intimate connexion with the life, sufferings, and transactions of JESUS CHRIST; and were over-sagacious in finding out, in the history of the patriarchal and Jewish churches, the types and figures of the events that have happened in modern, and that may yet happen in future times. In all this they discovered more imagination than judgment; more wit than wisdom. Be that as it may, all the expositors of this age may be divided, methinks with propriety enough, into two classes, with LUTHER at the head of the one, and MELANCTHON presiding in the other. Some commentators followed the example of the former, who, after a plain and familiar explication of the sense of scripture, applied its decisions to the fixing of controverted points, and to the illustration of the doctrines and duties of religion. Others discovered a greater propensity to the method of the latter, who first divided the discourses of the sacred writers into several parts, explained them according to the rules of rhetoric, and afterwards proceeded to a more strict and almost a literal exposition of each part, taken separately, applying the result, as rarely as was possible, to points of doctrine or matters of controversy.

Concerning
the didactic
theology or
doctrine of
the Lutheran
church.

XVII. Complete systems of theology were far from being numerous in this century. MELANCTHON, the most eminent of all the Lutheran doctors, collected and digested the doctrines of the church, which he so eminently adorned, into a body of divinity, under the vague title of *Loci Communes*, i. e. *A Common Place Book of Theology*. This compilation, which was afterwards, at different times, reviewed, corrected, and enlarged by its author, was in such high repute during this century, and even in succeeding times, that it was considered as an universal model of doctrine for all those, who either instructed the people by
their

their public discourses, or promoted the knowledge of religion by their writings [b]. The title, prefixed to this performance, indicates sufficiently the method, or rather the irregularity, that reigns in the arrangement of its materials; and shews that it was not the design of MELANCTHON to place the various truths of religion in that systematical concatenation, and that scientific order and connexion, that are observed by the philosophers in their demonstrations and discourses, but to propose them with freedom and simplicity, as they presented themselves to his view. Accordingly, in the first editions of the book under consideration, the method observed, both in delineating and illustrating these important truths, is extremely plain, and is neither loaded with the terms, the definitions, nor the distinctions, that abound in the writings of the philosophers. Thus did the Lutheran doctors, in the first period of the rising church, renounce and avoid, in imitation of the great reformer whose name they bear, all the abstruse reasoning and subtle discussions of the scholastic doctors. But the sophistry of their adversaries, and their perpetual debates with the artful champions of the church of *Rome*, engaged them by degrees, as has been already observed, to change their language and their methods of reasoning; so that, in process of time, the simplicity that had reigned in their theological systems, and in their manner of explaining the truths of religion, almost totally disappeared. Even MELANCTHON himself fell imperceptibly into the new method, or rather into the old method revived, and enlarged the subsequent editions of his *Loci Communes*, by the addition of several philosophical illustrations, designed to expose the

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

[b] See JO. FRANC. BUDDEUS, *Isagoge ad Theologiam*, lib. ii. cap. i. § xiii. tom. i. p. 381.

C E N T. fallacious reasonings of the Roman-catholic
 XVI. doctors. As yet, however, the discussions of
 SECT. III. philosophy were but sparingly used, and the un-
 PART II. intelligible jargon of the schoolmen was kept
 at a certain distance, and seldom borrowed. But
 when the founders of the Lutheran church were
 removed by death, and the Jesuits attacked the
 principles of the Reformation with redoubled ani-
 mosity, armed with the intricate and perplexing
 dialectic of the schools; then, indeed, the scene
 changed, and theology assumed another aspect.
 The stratagem employed by the Jesuits corrupted
 our doctors, induced them to revive that intricate
 and abstruse manner of defending and illustrating
 religious truth that LUTHER and his associates
 had rejected, and to introduce, into the plain and
 artless paths of theology, all the thorns and
 thistles, all the dark and devious labyrinths of the
 scholastic philosophy. This unhappy change was
 deeply lamented by several divines of eminent
 piety and learning about the commencement of
 the seventeenth century, who regretted the loss
 of that amiable simplicity that is the attendant on
 divine truth; but they could not prevail upon the
 professors, in the different universities, to sacrifice
 the jargon of the schools to the dictates of com-
 mon sense, nor to return to the plain, serious, and
 unaffected method of teaching theology that had
 been introduced by LUTHER. These obstinate
 doctors pleaded necessity in behalf of their scho-
 lastic divinity, and looked upon this pretended
 necessity as superior to all authorities, and all ex-
 amples, however respectable.

The state of
 morality a-
 mong the
 Lutherans.

XVIII. Those who are sensible of the intimate
 connexion that there is between faith and prac-
 tice, between the truths and duties of religion,
 will easily perceive the necessity that there was of
 reforming the corrupt morality, as well as the su-
 perstitious doctrines, of the church of *Rome*. It
 is

is therefore natural, that the same persons, who had spirit enough to do the one, should think themselves obliged to attempt the other. This they accordingly attempted, and not without a certain degree of success; for it may be affirmed, with truth, that there is more genuine piety and more excellent rules of conduct in the few practical productions of LUTHER, MELANCTHON, WEL-
 LER, and RIVIVS, to mention no more, than are to be found in the innumerable volumes of all the ancient *Casuits* and *Moralisers* [c], as they are called in the barbarous language of these remote periods. It is not, however, meant even to insinuate, that the notions of these great men concerning the important science of morality were either sufficiently accurate or extensive. It appears, on the contrary, from the various debates that were carried on during this century, concerning the duties and obligations of Christians, and from the answers that were given by famous casuists to persons perplexed with religious scruples, that the true *principles* of morality were not as yet fixed with perspicuity and precision, the agreement or difference between the laws of nature and the precepts of Christianity sufficiently examined and determined, nor the proper distinctions made between those parts of the gospel-dispensation, which are agreeable to right reason, and those that are beyond its reach and comprehension. Had not the number of adversaries, with whom the Lutheran doctors were obliged to contend, given them perpetual employment in the field of controversy, and robbed them of that precious leisure which they might have consecrated to the advancement of real piety and vir-

CENT.
 XVI.
 SECT. III.
 PART II.

[c] The moral writers of this century were called *Moralisantes*, a barbarous term, of which the English word *Moralisers* bears some resemblance.

C E N T. tue, they would certainly have been free from the
 XVI. defects now mentioned, and would, perhaps, have
 SECT. III. equalled the best moral writers of modern times.
 PART II.

This consideration will also diminish our wonder at a circumstance, which otherwise might seem surprising, that none of the famous Lutheran doctors attempted to give a regular system of morality. MELANCTHON himself, whose exquisite judgment rendered him peculiarly capable of reducing into a compendious system the elements of every science, never seems to have thought of treating morals in this manner; but has inserted, on the contrary, all his practical rules and instructions under the theological articles that relate to the *law, sin, free-will, justification, hope, and charity*.

Polemical or
 controversial
 theology.

XIX. All the divines of this century were educated in the school of controversy, and so trained up to spiritual war, that an eminent theologian, and a bold and vehement disputant, were considered as synonymous terms. It could scarcely, indeed, be otherwise, in an age when foreign quarrels and intestine divisions of a religious nature threw all the countries of *Europe* into a state of agitation, and obliged the doctors of the contending churches to be perpetually in action, or at least in a posture of defence. These champions of the Reformation were not, however, all animated with the same spirit, nor did they attack and defend with the same arms. Such of them as were contemporary with LUTHER, or lived near his time, were remarkable for the simplicity of their reasoning, and attacked their adversaries with no other arguments than those which they drew from the declarations of the inspired writers, and the decisions of the ancient fathers. Towards the latter end of the century this method was considerably changed, and we see those doctors, who were its chief ornaments, reinforcing their cause with the succours of the Aristotelian philosophy,

sophy, and thus losing, in point of perspicuity
 and evidence, what they gained in point of sub-
 tility and imagined science. It is true, as has
 been already observed more than once, that they
 were too naturally, though inconsiderately, led to
 adopt this method of disputing by the example of
 their adversaries the Roman catholics. The lat-
 ter having learnt, by a disagreeable and dis-
 couraging experience, that their cause was unable
 to support that plain and perspicuous method of
 reasoning, that is the proper test of religious and
 moral truth, had recourse to stratagem when
 evidence failed, and involved both their argu-
 ments and their opinions in the dark and intricate
 mazes of the scholastic philosophy; and it was
 this that engaged the protestant doctors to change
 their weapons, and to employ methods of defence
 unworthy of the glorious cause in which they had
 embarked.

The spirit of zeal that animated the Lutheran
 divines was, generally speaking, very far from
 being tempered by a spirit of charity. If we ex-
 cept MLLANTHON, in whom a predominant
 mildness and sweetness of natural temper triumphed
 over the contagious ferocity of the times, all the
 disputants of this century discovered too much
 bitterness and animosity in their transactions and
 in their writings. LUTHER himself appears at the
 head of this sanguine tribe, who he far surpassed
 in invectives and abuse, treating his adversaries
 with the most brutal asperity, and sparing neither
 rank nor condition, however elevated or respect-
 able they might be. It must indeed be con-
 fessed, that the criminal nature of this asperity
 and vehemence will be much alleviated, when
 they are considered in one point of view with the
 genius of these barbarous times, and the odious
 cruelty and injustice of the virulent enemies,
 whom the oppressed reformers were called to en-

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

counter. When the impartial inquirer considers the abominable calumnies that were lavished on the authors and instruments of the Reformation; when he reflects upon the horrors of fire and sword employed, by blood-thirsty and bigotted tyrants, to extirpate and destroy those good men whom they wanted arguments to persuade and convince; will not his heart burn with a generous indignation? and will he not think it in some measure just, that such horrid proceedings should be represented in their proper colours, and be stigmatized by such expressions as are suited to their demerit?

Three periods must be distinguished in the history of the Lutheran church.

XX. In order to form a just idea of the internal state of the Lutheran church, and of the revolutions and changes that have happened in it, with their true springs and real causes, it is necessary to consider the history of that church under three distinct periods. The *first* of these extends from the commencement of the Reformation to the death of LUTHER, which happened in the year 1546. The *second* takes in the space of time elapsed between the death of LUTHER and that of MELANCTHON, and consequently terminates in the year 1560; while the remainder of the century is comprehended in the third period.

The FIRST PERIOD.

DURING the *First* period, all things were transacted in the Lutheran church in a manner conformable to the sentiments, counsels, and orders of LUTHER. This eminent reformer, whose undaunted resolution, and amazing credit and authority, rendered him equal to the most arduous attempts, easily suppressed the commotions and dissensions that arose from time to time in the church, and did not suffer the sects, that several had attempted to form in its bosom, to gather

gather strength, or to arrive at any considerable degree of consistence and maturity. The natural consequence of this was, that, during the life of that great man, the internal state of the Lutheran church was a state of tolerable tranquillity and repose; and all such as attempted to foment divisions, or to introduce any essential changes, were either speedily reduced to silence, or obliged to retire from the new community.

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

XXI. The infancy of this church was troubled by an impetuous rabble of wrong headed Fanatics, who introduced the utmost confusion wherever they had occasion to spread their pestilential errors, and who pretended that they had received a divine inspiration, authorising them to erect a new kingdom of CHRIST, in which sin and corruption were to have no place. The leaders of this turbulent and riotous sect were MUNZER, STORCHIUS, STUBNER, and others, partly Swiss, and partly Germans, who kindled the flame of discord and rebellion in several parts of *Europe*, and chiefly in *Germany*, and excited among the ignorant multitude tumults and commotions, which, though less violent in some places than in others, were, nevertheless, formidable wherever they appeared [d]. The history of this seditious band is full of obscurity and confusion. A regular, full, and accurate account of it neither has, nor could well be, committed to writing; since, on the one hand, the opinions and actions of these Fanatics were a motley chaos of inconsistencies and contradictions, and, on the other, the age, in which they lived, produced few writers who had either the leisure or the capacity to observe with dili-

Debates between Luther and the Fanatics that troubled the church during the first period.

[d]. JO. BAPTISTA OTTIUS, in his *Annales Anabaptist.* p. 8. has collected a considerable number of facts relating to these fanatical commotions, which are also mentioned by all the writers of the History of the Reformation.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

gence, or to relate with accuracy, commotions and tumults of this extraordinary kind. It is however certain, that, from the most profligate and abandoned part of this enthusiastical multitude, those seditious armies were formed, which kindled in *Germany* the *War of the Peasants*, and afterwards seized upon the city of *Münster*, involving the whole province of *Westphalia* in the most dreadful calamities. It is also well known, that the better part of this motley tribe, terrified by the unhappy and deserved fate of their unworthy associates, whom they saw extirpated and massacred with the most unrelenting severity, saved themselves from the ruin of their sect, and, at length, embraced the communion of those who are called *Mennonites* [e]. The zeal, vigilance, and resolution of LUTHER happily prevented the divisions, which the odious disciples of MUNZER attempted to excite in the church he had founded, and preserved the giddy and credulous multitude from their seductions. And it may be safely affirmed, that, had it not been for the vigour and fortitude of this active and undaunted reformer, the Lutheran church would, in its infancy, have fallen a miserable prey to the enthusiastic fury of these detestable fanatics [f].

Carlostadt.

. XXII. Fanatics and enthusiasts of the kind now described, while they met with the warmest opposition from LUTHER, found, on the contrary, in

☞ [e] The tumults of the anabaptists in *Germany*, and the junction of the better part of them with MENNON, have already been mentioned in a cursory manner, Sect. I. chap. ii. § xxi. For an ample account of the origin, doctrine, and progress of the Mennonites, see the third chapter of the second part of this third section. Cent. xvi.

☞ [f] The danger, that threatened the Lutheran church in these tumults of the German anabaptists, was so much the greater on account of the inclination, which MUNZER and STORCK discovered, at first, for the sentiments of LUTHER, and the favourable disposition, which CARLOSTADT seemed, for some time, to entertain with respect to these fanatics.

CARO-

CARLOSTADT, his colleague, such a credulous attention to their seductions, as naturally flattered them with the hopes of his patronage and favour. This divine, who was a native of *Franconia*, was neither destitute of learning nor merit; but imprudence and precipitation were the distinguished lines of his warm and violent character. Of these he gave the most evident marks, in the year 1522, when, during the absence of LUTHER, he excited no small tumult at *Wittemberg*, by ordering the images to be taken out of the churches, and other enterprises of a rash and dangerous nature [g]. This tumult was appeased by the sudden return of LUTHER, whose presence and exhortations calmed the troubled spirits of the people; and here must we look for the origin of the rupture between him and CARLOSTADT. For the latter immediately retired from *Wittemberg* to *Orlamund*, where he not only opposed the sentiments of

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

[g] The reader may perhaps imagine, from Dr. MOSHEIM's account of this matter, that CARLOSTADT introduced these changes merely by his own authority; but this was far from being the case; the suppression of private masses, the removal of images out of the churches, the abolition of the law which imposed celibacy upon the clergy, which are the changes hinted at by our historian as *rash* and *perilous*, were effected by CARLOSTADT in conjunction with BUGENHAGIUS, MELANCTHON, JONAS AM-DORFF, and others, and were confirmed by the authority of the elector of *Saxony*. So that there is some reason to apprehend, that one of the principal causes of LUTHER's displeasure at these changes, was their being introduced in his absence; unless we suppose that he had not so far got rid of the fetters of superstition, as to be sensible of the absurdity and of the pernicious consequences of the use of images, &c. As to the abolition of the law that imposed celibacy on the clergy, it is well known, that it was the object of his warmest approbation. This appears from the following expressions in his letter to AMSDORFF: CARLOSTADII nuptiæ mure placent: novi puellam: confortet eum Dominus in bonum exemplum inhibendæ et minuendæ Papiſticæ libidinis. He confirmed soon afterwards this approbation by his own example,

LUTHER

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

LUTHER concerning the Eucharist [b], but also discovered, in several instances, a fanatical turn of mind [i]. He was therefore commanded to leave the electorate of Saxony, which he did accordingly, and repaired to Switzerland, where he propagated his doctrines, and taught with success, first at Zurich, and afterwards at Basil, retaining still, however, as long as he lived, a favourable disposition towards the sect of the anabaptists, and, in

✎ [b] This difference of opinion between CARLOSTADT and LUTHER concerning the eucharist, was the true cause of the violent rupture between those two eminent men, and it was very little to the honour of the latter. For, however the explication, which the former gave of the words of the institution of the Lord's supper, may appear forced, yet the sentiments he entertained of that ordinance as a commemoration of CHRIST's death, and not as a celebration of his bodily presence, in consequence of a *consubstantiation* with the bread and wine, are infinitely more rational than the doctrine of LUTHER, which is loaded with some of the most palpable absurdities of *transubstantiation*. And if it be supposed that CARLOSTADT strained the rule of interpretation too far, when he alleged, that CHRIST pronounced the pronoun *this* (in the words *This is my body*) pointing to his *body*, and not to the *bread*, what shall we think of LUTHER's explaining the non-sensical doctrine of *consubstantiation* by the similitude of a red-hot iron, in which two elements are united, as the body of CHRIST is with the bread in the eucharist? But of this more in its proper place.

✎ [i] This censure is with too much truth applicable to CARLOSTADT.—Though he did not adopt the impious and abominable doctrines of MUNZER and his band (as Dr. MOSHEIM permits the uninstructed reader to imagine by mentioning, *in general*, as being a friend to these fanatics), yet he certainly was chargeable with some extravagancies, that were observable in the tenets of that wrong-headed tribe. He was for abolishing the *civil law*, with the municipal laws and constitutions of the German empire, and proposed substituting the law of MOSES in their place. He distinguished himself by railing at the academies, declaiming against human learning, and other follies.

Great wits to madness nearly are allied.

See VAL. ERN. LOSCHERI *Historia motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformat.* part 1. cap. i.—DAN. GERDES, *Vita Carolostadii*, in *Miscell. Gronovij.* novis, tom. i.

general, to all enthusiastic teachers, who pretended to a divine inspiration [k]. Thus then did LUTHER, in a short space of time, lay this new storm that the precipitation of CAROLOSTADT had raised in the church.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

XXIII. The reforming spirit of CAROLOSTADT, with respect to the doctrine of CHRIST's presence in the eucharist, was not extinguished by his exile, in the Lutheran church. It was revived, on the contrary, by a man of much the same turn of mind, a Silesian knight, and counsellor to the duke of *Lignitz*, whose name was GASPAR SCHWENCKFELDT. This nobleman, seconded by VALENTINE CRAUTWALD, a man of eminent

Schwenckfeldt.

[k] This affirmation of Dr MOSHEIM wants much to be modified. In the original it stands thus, *Dum vixit vero anabaptistarum, et hominum divina visa jactantium partibus amicum sese ostendit*, i. e. *as long as he lived, he shewed himself a friend to the anabaptists, and other enthusiasts who pretended to divine inspiration*. But how could our historian assert this without restriction, since it is well known that CAROLOSTADT, after his banishment from *Saxony*, composed a treatise against enthusiasm in general, and against the extravagant tenets and the violent proceedings of the anabaptists in particular? Nay more; this treatise was addressed to LUTHER, who was so affected by it, that, repenting of the unworthy treatment he had given to CAROLOSTADT, he pleaded his cause, and obtained from the elector a permission for him to return into *Saxony*. See GERDES, *Vita Carolostadi*, in *Miscell. Groningens.* After this reconciliation with LUTHER, he composed a treatise on the eucharist, which breathes the most amiable spirit of moderation and humility; and, having perused the writings of ZUINGLE, where he saw his own sentiments on that subject maintained with the greatest perspicuity and force of evidence, he repaired, a second time, to *Zurich*, and from thence to *Basil*, where he was admitted to the offices of pastor and professor of divinity, and where, after having lived in the exemplary and constant practice of every Christian virtue, he died, amidst the warmest effusions of piety and resignation, on the 25th of December, 1541. All this is testified solemnly in a letter of the learned and pious GRYNÆUS of *Basil*, to PITISCVS, chaplain to the elector Palatine, and shews how little credit ought to be given to the assertions of the ignorant MORERI, or to the insinuations of the insidious BOSSERT.

learning,

CENT. XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

learning, who lived at the court of the prince now mentioned, took notice of many things, which he looked upon as erroneous and defective, in the opinions and rites established by LUTHER; and, had not the latter been extremely vigilant, as well as vigorously supported by his friends and adherents, would have undoubtedly brought about a considerable schism in the church. Every circumstance in SCHWENCKFELDT's conduct and appearance was adapted to give him credit and influence. His morals were pure, and his life, in all respects, exemplary. His exhortations in favour of true and solid piety were warm and persuasive, and his principal zeal was employed in promoting it among the people. By this means he gained the esteem and friendship of many learned and pious men both in the Lutheran and Helvetic churches, who favoured his sentiments, and undertook to defend him against all his adversaries [1]. Notwithstanding all this he was banished by his sovereign both from the court and from his country, in the year 1528, only because ZUINGLE had approved of his opinions concerning the eucharist, and declared that they did not differ essentially from his own. From that time the persecuted knight wandered from place to place, under various turns of fortune, until death put an end to his trials in the year 1561 [m]. He had founded a small congregation in *Silesia*, which were perfe-

[1] See JO. CONR. FUESLINI *Centuria I. Epistolar à Reformatioribus Helveticis Scriptar.* 169. 175. 225. *Museum Helvetic.* tom. iv. p. 445.

[m] JO. WIGANDI *Schwenckfeldianismus*, Lips. 1586, in 4to. — CONR. SCHLUSSELBURGI *Catalogi Hæreticor.* lib. x. published at *Frankfort* in the year 1599, in 8vo. — The most accurate accounts of this nobleman have been given by CHR. AUG. SALIG. in his *Histor. Augst. Confessionis*, tom. iii. lib. xi. p. 951. and by GODF. ARNOLD, in a German work, entitled, *Kirchen und Ketzer Historie*, p. 720. both which authors have pleaded the cause of SCHWENCKFELDT.

cuted and ejected in our times by the popish possessors of that country ; but have been restored to their former habitations and privileges, civil and religious, since the year 1742, by the present king of *Prussia* [n].

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T II.

XXIV. The upright intentions of SCHWENCKFELDT, and his zeal for the advancement of true piety, deserve, no doubt, the highest commendation ; but the same thing cannot be said of his prudence and judgment. The good man had a natural propensity towards fanaticism, and fondly imagined that he had received a divine commission to propagate his opinions. He differed from LUTHER, and the other friends of the Reformation, in three points, which it is proper to select from others of less consequence : The *first* of these points related to the doctrine concerning the eucharist. SCHWENCKFELDT inverted the following words of CHRIST : *This is my body*, and insisted on their being thus understood : “ *My body is* “ *THIS, i. e.* such as this bread which is broken “ and consumed : a true and real food, which “ nourisheth, satisfieth, and delighteth the soul. “ *My blood is THIS*, that is, such in its effects as “ the wine, which strengthens and refresheth the “ heart.” The poor man imagined that this *wonderful* doctrine had been revealed to him from heaven ; which circumstance alone is a sufficient demonstration of his folly.

The doctrine of
Schwenck-
feldt.

The *second* point in which he differed from LUTHER, was in his hypothesis relating to the efficacy of the divine word. He denied, for example, that the *external word*, which is committed to writing in the Holy Scriptures, was endowed with the power of *healing, illuminating, and renewing* the mind ; and he ascribed this power to

[n] See an account of SCHWENCKFELDT's *Confession of Faith*, in JO. CHR. KOCHER's *Bibliotheca Theologica Symbolica*, p. 457.

C E N T. the *internal word*, which, according to his notion,
 XVI. was CHRIST himself. His discourses, however,
 SECT. III. concerning this *internal word* were, as usually
 PART II. happens to persons of his turn, so full of confusion, obscurity, and contradiction, that it was difficult to find out what his doctrine really was, and whether or not it resembled that of the Mystics and Quakers, or was borrowed from a different source.

His doctrine concerning the *human nature* of CHRIST, formed the *third* subject of debate between him and the Lutherans. He would not allow CHRIST's human nature, in its exalted state, to be called a *creature*, or a created substance, as such denomination appeared to him infinitely below its majestic dignity, united as it is, in that glorious state, with the divine essence. This notion of SCHWENCKFELDT bears a remarkable affinity to the doctrine of EUTYCHES, which, however, he professed to reject; and, in his turn, accused those of Nestorianism, who gave the denomination of a *creature* to the human nature of CHRIST.

The Anti-
 ROMANS,

XXV. An intemperate zeal, by straining too far certain truths, turns them into falsehood, or, at least, often renders them the occasion of the most pernicious abuses. A striking instance of this happened during the ministry of LUTHER. For, while he was insisting upon the necessity of imprinting deeply in the minds of the people that doctrine of the gospel, which represents CHRIST's merits as the source of man's salvation, and while he was eagerly employed in censuring and refuting the popish doctors, who mixed the *law* and *gospel* together, and represented eternal happiness as the fruit of legal obedience, a fanatic arose, who abused his doctrine by over-straining it, and thus opened a field for the most dangerous errors. This new teacher was JOHN AGRICOLA, a native
 of

of *Aisleben*, and an eminent doctor of the Lutheran church, though chargeable with vanity, presumption, and artifice. He first began to make a noise in the year 1538, when from the doctrine of LUTHER, now mentioned, he took occasion to declaim against the *law*, maintaining that it was neither fit to be proposed to the people as a rule of manners, nor to be used in the church as a means of instruction; and that the *gospel* alone was to be inculcated and explained both in the churches and in the schools of learning. The followers of AGRICOLA were called *Antinomians*, i. e. *enemies of the law*. But the fortitude, vigilance, and credit of LUTHER suppressed this sect in its very infancy; and AGRICOLA, intimidated by the opposition of such a respectable adversary, acknowledged and renounced his pernicious system. But this recantation does not seem to have been sincere; since it is said, that, when his fears were dispelled by the death of LUTHER, he returned to his errors, and gained proselytes to his extravagant doctrine [o].

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART III.

XXVI. The tenets of the *Antinomians*, if their adversaries are to be believed, were of the most noxious nature and tendency; for they are supposed to have taught the loosest and most dissolute doctrine in point of morals, and to have maintained, that it was allowable to follow the impulse of every passion, and to transgress, without reluctance, the divine law, provided the transgressor *laid, bold on CHRIST*, and embraced his merits by a lively faith. Such, at least, is the representation that is generally given of their doctrine; but it ought not to be received with too much credulity. For whoever looks into this

The doctrine of AGRICOLA examined.

[o] See CASPAR. SAGITTARIUS *Introduct. ad Histor. Ecclesiast.* tom. i. p. 838. — BAYLE *Dictionnaire*, tom. ii. at the article ISLEBIUS — CONR. SCHLIESSELBURGH *Catalog. Harv.* lib. iv. — G. ARNOLD. *Kirchen und Keiser Historie*, p. 813.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

matter with attention and impartiality, will soon be persuaded, that such an absurd and impious doctrine is unjustly laid to the charge of AGRICOLA, and that the principal fault of this presumptuous man lay in some harsh and inaccurate expressions, that were susceptible of dangerous and pernicious interpretations. By the term *law* he understood the *Ten Commandments*, promulgated under the Mosaic dispensation; and he considered this law as enacted for the Jews, and not for Christians. He explained, at the same time, the term *Gospel* (which he considered as substituted in the place of the law) in its true and extensive sense, as comprehending not only the doctrine of the merits of CHRIST rendered salutary by faith, but also the sublime precepts of holiness and virtue, delivered by the divine Saviour as rules of obedience. If, therefore, we follow the intention of AGRICOLA, without interpreting, in a rigorous manner, the uncouth phrases and improper expressions he so frequently and so injudiciously employed, his doctrine will plainly amount to this: "That the *Ten Commandments*, published during the ministry of MOSES, were chiefly designed for the Jews, and on that account might be lawfully neglected and laid aside by Christians: and that it was sufficient to explain with perspicuity, and to enforce with zeal, what CHRIST and his apostles had taught in the New Testament, both with respect to the means of grace and salvation, and the obligations of repentance and virtue." The greatest part of the doctors of this century are chargeable with a want of precision and consistency in expressing their sentiments; hence their real sentiments have been misunderstood, and opinions have been imputed to them which they never entertained.

*The SECOND PERIOD.*CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.Debates
that arose
during the
second pe-
riod of the
Lutheran
church, be-
tween the
death of
Luther and
that of Me-
lancthon.

XXVII. AFTER the death of LUTHER, which happened in the year 1546, PHILIP MELANCTHON was placed at the head of the Lutheran doctors. The merit, genius, and talents of this new chief were, undoubtedly, great and illustrious; though it must, at the same time, be confessed, that he was inferior to LUTHER in many respects [*p*], and more especially in courage, steadfastness, and personal authority. His natural temper was soft and flexible; his love of peace almost excessive; and his apprehensions of the displeasure and resentment of men in power were such as betrayed a pusillanimous spirit. He was ambitious of the esteem and friendship of all with whom he had any intercourse, and was absolutely incapable of employing the force of threatenings, or the restraints of fear, to suppress the efforts of religious faction, to keep within due bounds the irregular love of novelty and change, and to secure to the church the obedience of its members. It is also to be observed, that MELANCTHON's sentiments, on some points of no inconsiderable moment, were entirely different from those of LUTHER; and it may not be improper to point out the principal subjects on which they adopted different ways of thinking.

In the *first* place, MELANCTHON was of opinion, that, for the sake of peace and concord, many

✂ [*p*] It would certainly be very difficult to point out the *many respects* in which Dr. MOSHEIM affirms that LUTHER was superior to MELANCTHON. For if the single article of courage and firmness of mind be excepted, I know no other respect in which MELANCTHON is not superior, or at least equal, to LUTHER. He was certainly his equal in piety and virtue, and much his superior in learning, judgment, meekness, and humanity.

CENT. XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

things might be connived at and tolerated in the church of *Rome*, which LUTHER considered as absolutely insupportable. The former carried so far the spirit of toleration and indulgence, as to discover no reluctance against retaining the ancient form of ecclesiastical government, and submitting to the dominion of the Roman pontiff, on certain conditions, and in such a manner, as might be without prejudice to the obligation and authority of all those truths that are clearly revealed in the Holy Scriptures.

A second occasion of a diversity of sentiments between these two great men was furnished by the tenets which LUTHER maintained in opposition to the doctrines of the church of *Rome*. Such were his ideas concerning faith, as the *only* cause of salvation, concerning the necessity of good works to our final happiness, and man's natural incapacity of promoting his own conversion. In avoiding the corrupt notions which were embraced by the Roman-catholic doctors on these important points of theology, LUTHER seemed, in the judgment of MELANCTHON, to lean too much towards the opposite extreme [q]. Hence the latter inclined to think, that the sentiments and expressions of his colleague required to be somewhat mitigated, lest they should give a handle to dangerous abuses, and be perverted to the propagation of pernicious errors.

It may be observed, *thirdly*, that though MELANCTHON adopted the sentiments of LUTHER in

[q] It is certain, that LUTHER carried the doctrine of *Justification by Faith* to such an excessive length, as seemed, though perhaps contrary to his intention, to derogate not only from the necessity of good works, but even from their obligation and importance. He would not allow them to be considered either as the *conditions* or *means* of salvation, nor even as a preparation for receiving it.

relation

relation to the eucharist [r], yet he did not consider their controversy with the divines of *Switzerland* on that subject, as a matter of sufficient moment to occasion a breach of church-communion and fraternal concord between the contending parties. He thought that this happy concord might be easily preserved, by expressing the doctrine of the eucharist, and CHRIST's presence in that ordinance, in general and ambiguous terms, which the two churches might explain according to their respective systems.

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

Such were the sentiments of MELANCTHON, which, though he did not entirely conceal during the life of LUTHER, he delivered, nevertheless, with great circumspection and modesty, yielding always to the authority of his colleague, for whom he had a sincere friendship, and of whom also he stood in awe. But no sooner were the eyes of LUTHER closed, than he inculcated with the greatest plainness and freedom, what he had before only hinted at with timorousness and cau-

§ [r] It is somewhat surprising to hear Dr. MOSHEIM affirming that MELANCTHON *adopted the sentiments of LUTHER in relation to the eucharist*, when the contrary is well known. It is true, in the writings of MELANCTHON, which were published before the year 1529, or 1530, there are passages, which shew that he had not, as yet, thoroughly examined the controversy relating to the nature of CHRIST's presence in the eucharist. It is also true, that during the disputes carried on between WESTPHAL and CALVIN, after the death of LUTHER, concerning the *real presence*, he did not declare himself in an open manner for either side (which, however, is a presumptive proof of his leaning to that of CALVIN), but expressed his sorrow at these divisions, and the spirit of animosity by which they were inflamed. But whoever will be at the pains to read the letters of MELANCTHON to CALVIN upon this subject, or those extracts of them that are collected by HOSPINIAN, in the second volume of his *Histoire Sacramentaria*, p. 428. will be persuaded, that he looked upon the doctrine of *Consubstantiation* not only as erroneous, but even as idolatrous; and that nothing but the fear of inflaming the present divisions, and of not being seconded, prevented him from declaring his sentiments openly. See also *Dictionnaire de BAYLE*, art. MELANCTHON, note L.

CENT. tion. The eminent rank MELANCTHON held
 XVI. among the Lutheran doctors rendered this bold
 SECT. III. manner of proceeding extremely disagreeable to
 PART II. many. His doctrine accordingly was censured and
 opposed; and thus the church was deprived of the
 tranquillity it had enjoyed under LUTHER, and ex-
 hibited an unhappy scene of animosity, contention,
 and discord.

The adia-
 phoristic
 controver-
 sy, or the
 dispute con-
 cerning
 matters of
 an indif-
 ferent nature.

XXVIII. The rise of these unhappy divi-
 sions must be dated from the year 1548, when
 CHARLES V. attempted to impose upon the
 Germans the famous edict, called the *Interim*.
 MAURICE, the new elector of *Saxony*, desirous to
 know how far such an edict ought to be respected
 in his dominions, assembled the doctors of *Wit-
 temberg* and *Leipsic* in the last mentioned city, and
 proposed this nice and critical subject to their
 serious examination. Upon this occasion MELAN-
 CTHON, complying with the suggestions of that
 lenity and moderation that were the great and
 leading principles in the whole course of his con-
 duct and actions, declared it as his opinion, that,
 in matters of an *indifferent* nature, compliance
 was due to the imperial edicts [5]. But in the
 class of matters indifferent, this great man and
 his associates placed many things which had ap-
 peared of the highest importance to LUTHER, and
 could not, of consequence, be considered as in-
 different by his true disciples [1]. For he regarded
 as

[5] The piece in which MELANCTHON and his associates
 delivered their sentiments relating to things *indifferent*, is com-
 monly called, in the German language, *Das Leipziger Interim*,
 and was republished at *Leipsic* in 1721, by BIEKJUS, in a
 work, entitled, *Das dreyfache Interim*.

[1] If they only are the *true disciples* of LUTHER, who
 submit to his judgment, and adopt his sentiments in theological
 matters, many doctors of that communion, and our historian
 among the rest, must certainly be supposed to have forfeited
 that title, as will abundantly appear hereafter. Be that as it
 may, MELANCTHON can scarcely, if at all, be justified in
 placing

as such, the doctrine of *justification by faith alone*; the necessity of good works to eternal salvation; the number of the sacraments; the jurisdiction claimed by the pope and the bishops; extreme unction; the observation of certain religious festivals, and several superstitious rites and ceremonies. Hence arose that violent scene of contention and discord, that was commonly called the *Adiaphoristic* [u] controversy, which divided the church during many years, and proved highly detrimental to the progress of the Reformation. The defenders of the primitive doctrines of Lutheranism, with FLACIUS at their head, attacked with incredible bitterness and fury the doctors of *Wittenberg* and *Leipsc*, and particularly MELANCTHON, by whose counsel and influence every thing relating to the *Interim* had been conducted, and accused them of apostacy from the true religion. MELANCTHON, on the other hand, seconded by the zeal of his friends and disciples, justified his conduct with the utmost spirit and vigour [w]. In this unlucky debate the two following questions were principally discussed: First, *whether the matter that seemed indifferent to MELANCTHON were so in reality*? This his adversaries obstinately denied [x]. Secondly, *whether, in things of an indifferent nature, and in which the interests of religion*

placing in the class of things indifferent the doctrines relating to *faith and good works*, which are the fundamental points of the Christian religion, and, if I may use such an expression, the very hinges on which the gospel turns.

[u] This controversy was called *Adiaphoristic*; and MELANCTHON and his followers *Adiaphorists*, from the Greek word *ἀδιαφοροί*, which signifies *indifferent*.

[w] SCHLUSSENBURGI *Catalog. Hereticor.* lib. xiii.—ARNOLD's German work, entitled, *Kirchen und Ketzer* 1711, *erie*, lib. xvi. cap. xxvi. p. 816.—SALIG. *Hist. r. Aug. Confess.* vol. i. p. 611.—The German work entitled, *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A. 1702, p. 339. 393.—LUC. OSIANDRI *Építome Histor. Eccles. Centur.* xvi. p. 502.

[x] See above, note [r].

CENT. XVI. *are not essentially concerned, it be lawful to yield to the enemies of the truth?*

Sect. III.
PART II.

A contro-
versy set on
foot by
George
Major, con-
cerning the
necessity of
good works.

XXIX. This debate concerning things *indifferent* became, as might well have been expected, a fruitful source of other controversies, which were equally detrimental to the tranquillity of the church, and to the cause of the Reformation. The first to which it gave rise, was the warm dispute concerning the *necessity of good works*, that was carried on with such spirit against the rigid Lutherans, by GEORGE MAJOR, an eminent teacher of theology at *Wittenberg*. MELANCTHON had long been of opinion, that the *necessity of good works*, in order to the attainment of everlasting salvation, might be asserted and taught, as conformable to the truths revealed in the gospel; and both he and his colleagues declared this to be their opinion, when they were assembled at *Leipsic*, in the year 1548; to examine the famous edict already mentioned [y]. This declaration was severely censured by the rigid disciples of LUTHER, as contrary to the doctrine and sentiments of their chief, and as conformable both to the tenets and interests of the church of *Rome*; but it found an able defender in MAJOR, who, in the year 1552, maintained the *necessity of good works* against the extravagant assertions of AMSDORF. Hence arose a new controversy between the *rigid* and *moderate* Lutherans, which was carried on with that keenness and animosity, that were peculiar to all debates of a religious nature during this century. In the course of this warm debate, AMSDORF was so far transported and infatuated by his excessive zeal for the doctrine of LUTHER, as to maintain, that *good works were an impediment to salvation*; from which imprudent and odious expression the flame of controversy received new fuel, and broke

[y] The *Interim* of CHARLES V.

forth

forth with redoubled fury. On the other hand, MAJOR complained of the malice or ignorance of his adversaries, who explained his doctrine in a manner quite different from that in which he intended it should be understood; and, at length, he renounced it entirely, that he might not appear fond of wrangling, or be looked upon as a disturber of the peace of the church. This step did not, however, put an end to the debate, which was still carried on, until it was terminated at last by the *Form of concord* [z].

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

XXX. From the same source that produced the dispute concerning the necessity of good works, arose the *synergistical* controversy. The *Synergists* [a], whose doctrine was almost the same with that of the Semi-pelagians, denied that God was the *only* agent in the conversion of sinful man; and affirmed, that man *co-operated* with divine grace in the accomplishment of this salutary purpose. Here also MELANCTHON renounced the doctrine of LUTHER; at least, the terms he employs, in expressing his sentiments concerning this intricate subject, are such as LUTHER would have rejected with horror; for in the conference at *Leipsic*, already mentioned, the former of these great men did not scruple to affirm, that *God drew to himself, and converted, adult persons in such a manner, that the powerful impression of his grace was accompanied with a certain correspondent action of their will.* The friends and disciples of MELANCTHON adopted this manner of speaking, and used the expressions

The synergistical controversy.

[z] SCHLUSSENBURG, lib. vii. *Catal. Hæreticor.*—ARNOLDI *Hist. Ecclesiæ*, lib. xvi. cap. xxvii. p. 822.—JO. MUSEI *Prælection. in Form. Concord.* p. 181.—ARN. GREVII *Memoria JOH. WESTPHALI*, p. 166.

[a] As this controversy turned upon the *co-operation* of the human will with the divine grace, the persons, who maintained this joint-agency, were called *Synergists*, from a Greek word (*συνεργία*), which signifies *co-operation*.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

of their master to describe the nature of the divine agency in man's conversion. But this representation of the matter was far from being agreeable to the rigid Lutherans. They looked upon it as subversive of the true and genuine doctrine of LUTHER, relating to the *absolute servitude* of the human will [b], and the total *inability* of man to do any good action, or to bear any part in his own conversion; and hence they opposed the *Synergists*, or Semi-pelagians, with the utmost animosity and bitterness. The principal champions in this theological conflict were SIRIGELIUS, who defended the sentiments of MLLANTHON with singular dexterity and perspicuity, and FLACIUS, who maintained the ancient doctrine of LUTHER: of these doctors, as also the subject of their debate, a farther account will be given presently [c].

Flacius, by his intemperate zeal, excited many divisions in the church.

XXXI. During these dissensions, a new academy was founded at *Jena* by the dukes of *Saxe-Weimar*, the sons of the famous JOHN FREDERICK, whose unsuccessful wars with the emperor CHARLES V. had involved him in so many calamities, and deprived him of his electoral dominions. The noble founders of this academy, having designed it for the bulwark of the protestant religion, as it was taught and inculcated by LUTHER, were particularly careful in choosing such professors and divines as were remarkable for their attachment

☞ [b] The doctrines of *absolute predestination*, *irresistible grace*, and *human impotence*, were never carried to a more excessive length, nor maintained with a more virulent obstinacy, by any divine, than they were by LUTHER. But in these times he has very few followers in this respect, even among those that bear his name. But of this more hereafter.

[c] See SCHLUSSENBURG *Catal. Hæreticor.* lib. v.—G. ARNOLD. *Hystor. Eccles.* lib. xvi. cap. xxviii. p. 826.—BAYLE *Dictionnaire*, at the article SYNERGISTES.—SALIG. *Hystor. Augst. Confess.* vol. iii. p. 474. 587. 880. —MUSÆI *Prælat. in Formulam Concordiæ*, p. 88.

to the genuine doctrine of that great reformer, and their aversion to the sentiments of those moderate Lutherans, who had attempted, by certain modifications and corrections, to render it less harsh and disgusting. And as none of the Lutheran doctors were so eminent, on account of their uncharitable and intemperate zeal for this ancient doctrine, as MATTHEW FLACIUS, the virulent enemy of MELANCTHON, and all the *Philippists*, he was appointed, in the year 1557, professor of divinity at *Jena*. The consequences of this nomination were, indeed, deplorable. For this turbulent and impetuous man, whom nature had formed with an uncommon propensity to foment divisions and propagate discord, did not only revive all the ancient controversies that had distracted the church, but also excited new debates; and sowed, with such avidity and success, the seeds of contention between the divines of *Weimar* and those of the electorate of *Saxony*, that a fatal schism in the Lutheran church was apprehended by many of its wisest members [*d*]. And, indeed, this schism would have been inevitable, if the machinations and intrigues of FLACIUS had produced the desired effect. For, in the year 1559, he persuaded the dukes of *Saxe-Weimar*, to order a *refutation* of the errors that had crept into the Lutheran church, and particularly of those that were imputed to the followers of MELANCTHON, to be drawn up with care, to be promulgated by authority, and to be placed among the other religious edicts and articles of faith that were in force in their dominions. But this pernicious design of dividing the church proved abortive; for the other Lutheran princes, who acted from the true

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

[*d*] See the famous letter of AUGUSTUS, elector of *Saxony*, concerning FLACIUS and his malignant attempts, which is published by ARN. GREVIUS, in his *Memoria Joh. Westphali*, p. 393.

and

CENT. XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

The contest between
Flacius and
Strigelius.

and genuine principles of the Reformation, disapproved of this seditious book, from a just apprehension of its tendency to increase the present troubles, and to augment, instead of diminishing, the calamities of the church [e].

XXXII. This theological incendiary kindled the flame of discord and persecution even in the church of *Saxe-Weimar*, and in the university of *Jena*, to which he belonged, by venting his fury against STRIGELIUS [f], the friend and disciple of MELANCTHON. This moderate divine adopted, in many things, the sentiments of his master, and maintained, particularly, in his public lectures, that the *human will*, when under the influence of the *divine grace* leading it to repentance, was not totally *unactive*, but bore a certain part in the salutary work of its conversion. In consequence of this doctrine, he was accused by FLACIUS of *Synergism*, at the court of *Saxe-Weimar*; and by the order of the prince was cast into prison, where he was treated with severity and rigour. He was at length delivered from this confinement in the year 1562, and allowed to resume his former vocation, in consequence of a declaration of his real sentiments, which, as he alleged, had been greatly misrepresented. This declaration, however, did not either decide or terminate the controversy; since STRIGELIUS seemed rather to conceal his erroneous sentiments [g] under ambiguous expressions, than to renounce them entirely. And indeed he was so conscious of this himself, that, to avoid being involved in new calamities and

[e] SALIG, *Historia Augst. Confess.* vol. iii. p. 476.

[f] See the writers cited in the preceding notes; and also BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article STRIGELIUS.

[g] The sentiments of STRIGELIUS were not, I have reason to believe, very *erroneous* in the judgment of Dr. MOSHEIM, nor are they such in the estimation of the greatest part of the Lutheran doctors at this day.

persecutions, he retired from *Jena* to *Leipsc*, and from *Leipsc* to *Heidelberg*, where he spent the remainder of his days; and appeared so unsettled in his religious opinions, that it is really doubtful whether he is to be placed among the followers of LUTHER or CALVIN.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. II.
PART II.

XXXIII. The issue, however, of this controversy, which FLACIUS had kindled with such an intemperate zeal, proved highly detrimental to his own reputation and influence in particular, as well as to the interests of the Lutheran church in general. For while this vehement disputant was assailing his adversary with an inconsiderate ardour, he exaggerated so excessively the sentiments, which he looked upon as orthodox, as to maintain an opinion of the most monstrous and detestable kind; an opinion which made him appear, even in the judgment of his warmest friends, an odious *heretic*, and a corrupter of the true religion. In the year 1560, a public dispute was held at *Weimar*, between him and STRIGELIUS, concerning the natural powers and faculties of the human mind, and their influence in the conversion and conduct of the true Christian. In this conference the latter seemed to attribute to unassisted nature too much, and the former too little. The one looked upon the fall of man as an event that extinguished, in the human mind, every virtuous tendency, every noble faculty, and left nothing behind it but universal darkness and corruption. The other maintained, that this degradation of the powers of nature was by no means universal or entire; that the will retained still some propensity to worthy pursuits, and a certain degree of activity that rendered it capable of attainments in virtue. STRIGELIUS, who was well acquainted with the wiles of a captious philosophy, proposed to defeat his adversary by puzzling him, and addressed to him, with that view, the following question:

Some particulars of the dispute carried on by Flacius at *Saxe-Weimar*.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

question: *Whether original sin, or the corrupt habit which the human soul contracted by the fall, is to be placed in the class of SUBSTANCES or ACCIDENTS?*

FLACIUS answered with unparalleled imprudence and temerity, that it belonged to the former; and maintained, to his dying hour, this most extravagant and dangerous proposition, that *original sin is the very substance of human nature*. Nay, so invincible was the obstinacy with which he persevered in this strange doctrine, that he chose to renounce all worldly honours and advantages rather than depart from it. It was condemned by the greatest and soundest part of the Lutheran church, as a doctrine that bore no small affinity to that of the Monachæans. But, on the other hand, the merit, erudition, and credit of FLACIUS procured him many respectable patrons and able defenders among the most learned doctors of the church, who embraced his sentiments, and maintained his cause with the greatest spirit and zeal, of whom the most eminent were CYRIAC SPANGENBERG, CHRISTOPHER IRENÆUS, and CÆLESTINE [b].

The consequences that arose from the imprudence of FLACIUS,

XXXIV. It is scarcely possible to imagine how much the Lutheran church suffered from this new dispute in all those places where its contagion had reached, and how detrimental it was to the progress of Lutheranism among those who still adhered to the religion of *Rome*. For the flame of discord spread far and wide; it was communicated even to those churches which were erected

[b] SCHLUSSENBURG. *Catalog. Harcthor.* lib. ii.—*The Life of FLACIUS*, written in German by RITTER, and published in 8vo at *Frankfort*, in the year 1725.—SALIG. *Histor. Aug. Confession*, vol. iii. p. 593.—ARNOLDI *Histor. Ecclesiast.* lib. xvi. cap. xxix. p. 829.—MUSÆI *Prælect. in Formul. Concordiæ*, p. 29.—JO. GEORGI LEUCKFELDI *Historia Spangenbergensis*.—For a particular account of the dispute, that was held publicly at *Wimar*, see the German work entitled, *Unschuld Nachricht*, p. 383.

in popish countries, and particularly in the Austrian territories,* under the gloomy shade of a dubious toleration; and it so animated the Lutheran pastors, though surrounded on all sides by their cruel adversaries, that they could neither be restrained by the dictates of prudence, nor by the sense of danger [1]. Many are of opinion, that an ignorance of philosophical distinctions and definitions threw FLACIUS inconsiderately into the extravagant hypothesis he maintained with such obstinacy, and that his greatest heresy was no more than a foolish attachment to an unusual term. But FLACIUS seems to have fully refuted this plea in his behalf, by declaring boldly, in several parts of his writings, that he knew perfectly well the philosophical signification and the whole energy of the word *substance*, and was by no means ignorant of the consequences that would be drawn from the doctrine he had embraced [2]. Be that as it may, we cannot but wonder at the senseless and excessive obstinacy of this turbulent man, who chose rather to sacrifice his fortune, and disturb the tranquillity of the church, than to abandon a word, which was entirely foreign to the subject in debate, and renounce an hypothesis, that was composed of the most palpable contradictions.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

[1] See a German work of BERN. RAUPACH, entitled, *Zweifache Zugabe zu dem Evangelisch. Operrich.* p. 25. 27. 32. 34. 43. 64. The same author speaks of the friends of FLACIUS in *Austria*; and particularly of IRENAUS, in his *Pföfsterl. Aupriace*, p. 69.—For an account of CÆLISTINE, see the German work mentioned at the end of the preceding note.

[2] This will appear evident to such as will be at the pains to consult the letters which WESTPHAL wrote to his friend FLACIUS, in order to persuade him to abstain from the use of the word *substance*, with the answers of the latter. These *Letters and Answers* are published by ARNOLD GREVIUS, in his *Memoria JO. WESTPHALI*, p. 186.

CENT.
XVI.
Sect. III.
PART II.

The disputes kindled by Osiander.

XXXV. The last controversy that we shall mention, of those that were occasioned by the excessive lenity of MELANCTHON, was set on foot by OSIANDER, in the year 1549, and produced much discord and animosity in the church. Had its first founder been yet alive, his influence and authority would have suppressed in their birth these wretched disputes; nor would OSIANDER, who despised the moderation of MELANCTHON, have dared either to publish or defend his crude and chimerical opinions within the reach of LUTHER. Arrogance and singularity were the principal lines in OSIANDER's character; he loved to strike out new notions; but his views seemed always involved in an intricate obscurity. The disputes that arose concerning the *Interim*, induced him to retire from *Nuremberg*, where he had exercised the pastoral charge, to *Königsberg*, where he was chosen professor of divinity. In this new station he began his academical functions, by propagating notions concerning the *Divine Image*, and the nature of *Repentance*, very different from the doctrine that LUTHER had taught on these interesting subjects; and, not contented with this deviation from the common track, he thought proper, in the year 1550, to introduce considerable alterations and corrections into the doctrine that had been generally received in the Lutheran church, with respect to the means of our *justification* before God. When we examine his discussion of this important point, we shall find it much more easy to perceive the opinions he rejected, than to understand the system he had invented or adopted; for, as was but too usual in this age, he not only expressed his notions in an obscure manner, but seemed moreover perpetually in contradiction with himself. His doctrine, however, when carefully examined, will appear to amount to the following propositions: "CHRIST, considered

“ considered in his *human nature only*, could not,
 “ by his obedience to the divine law, obtain
 “ *justification* and pardon for sinners; neither can
 “ we be *justified* before God by embracing and
 “ applying to ourselves, through faith, the
 “ *righteousness* and obedience of the *man* CHRIST.
 “ It is only through that eternal and *essential*
 “ *righteousness*, which dwells in CHRIST *considered*
 “ *as God*, and which resides in his divine nature,
 “ that is united to the human, that mankind can
 “ obtain complete *justification*. Man becomes a
 “ partaker of this *divine righteousness* by faith;
 “ since it is in consequence of this uniting prin-
 “ ciple that CHRIST dwells in the heart of man,
 “ with his divine righteousness; now wherever
 “ this divine righteousness dwells, *there* God can
 “ behold no sin, and therefore, when it is present
 “ with CHRIST in the hearts of the *regenerate*,
 “ they are, on its account, considered by the
 “ Deity as *righteous*, although they be sinners,
 “ Moreover, this *divine* and *justifying righteousness*
 “ of CHRIST excites the faithful to the pursuit of
 “ holiness, and to the practice of virtue.” This
 doctrine was zealously opposed by the most emi-
 nent doctors of the Lutheran church, and, in a
 more especial manner, by MELANCTHON and his
 colleagues. On the other hand, OSIANDER and
 his sentiments were supported by persons of con-
 siderable weight. But, upon the death of this
 rigid and fanciful divine, the flame of contro-
 versy was cooled, and dwindled by degrees into
 nothing [1].

C E N T.
 XVI.
 SECT. III.
 PART II.

XXXVI. The

[1] See SCHLUSSELBURGH *Catalogus Hæreticor.* lib. vi.—
 ARNOLDI *Hystor. Eccles.* lib. xvi. cap. xxiv. p. 804.—CHRIST,
 HARTKNOCH. *Preußische Kirchen-Historie*, p. 309.—SALIG.
Historia Augst. Confession. tom. ii. p. 922. The judgment
 that was formed of this controversy, by the divines of *Witten-
 berg*, may be seen in the German work, entitled, *Unschuldige
 Vol.* IV. Z *Nachrichten*,

CENT.

XVI.

SECT. III.

PART II.

The debates
excited by
Stancarus.

XXXVI. The doctrine of OSIANDER, concerning the method of being justified before God, appeared so absurd to STANCARUS, professor of Hebrew at *Königsberg*, that he undertook to refute it. But while this turbulent and impetuous doctor was exerting all the vehemence of his zeal against the opinion of his colleague, he was hurried, by his violence, into the opposite extreme, and fell into an hypothesis, that appeared equally groundless, and not less dangerous in its tendency and consequences. OSIANDER had maintained, that the man CHRIST, in his character of moral agent, was obliged to obey, for *himself*, the divine law, and therefore could not, by the imputation of this obedience, obtain *righteousness* or justification for *others*. From hence he concluded, that the Saviour of the world had been empowered, not by his character as *man*, but by his nature as *God*, to make expiation for our sins, and reconcile us to the favour of an offended Deity. STANCARUS, on the other hand, excluded entirely CHRIST's divine nature from all concern in the *satisfaction* he made, and in the *redemption* he procured for offending mortals, and maintained, that the sacred office of a mediator between God and man belonged to JESUS, considered in his human nature alone. Having perceived, however, that this doctrine exposed him to the enmity of many divines, and even rendered him the object of popular resentment and indignation, he retired from *Königsberg* into *Germany*, and from thence into

Nachrichten, p. 141. and that of the doctors of *Copenhagen*, in *der Dänischen Bibliothec*. part vii. p. 150. where there is an ample list of the writings published on this subject.—To form a just idea of the insolence and arrogance of OSIANDER, those who understand the German language will do well to consult HIRSCH, *Nuremberg Interims-Historie*, p. 44. 59, 60, &c.

Poland,

Poland, where he excited no small commotions [m], and where also he concluded his days in the year 1574 [n].

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

XXXVII. All those who had the 'cause of virtue, and the advancement of the Reformation really at heart, looked with an impatient ardour for an end to these bitter and uncharitable contentions; and their desires of peace and concord in the church were still increased by their perceiving the industrious assiduity with which *Rome* turned these unhappy divisions to the advancement of her interests. But during the life of MELANCTHON, who was principally concerned in these warm debates, no effectual method could be found to bring them to a conclusion. The death of this great man, which happened in the year 1560, changed, indeed, the face of things, and enabled those who were disposed to terminate the present contests, to act with more resolu-

The methods that were employed to heal these divisions.

[m] See a German work of CHR. HARTKNOCH, entitled, *Preussische Kirchen geschichte*, p. 340.—SCHLUSSELBURGII *Catalog. Hæreticor.* lib. ix.—*Dictionnaire du BAYLE*, at the article STANCARUS.—Before the arrival of STANCARUS at *Königsberg*, in the year 1548, he had lived for some time in *Switzerland*, where also he had occasioned religious disputes; for he adopted several doctrines of LUTHER, particularly that concerning the virtue and efficacy of the sacraments, which were rejected by the Swiss and Grisons. See the *Museum Helveticum*, tom. v. p. 484. 490, 491. For an account of the disturbances he occasioned in *Poland* in 1556, see BULLINGER, in Jo. CONR. FUESLINI *Centuria I. Epistolar. à Reformator. Helvetic. scriptar.* p. 371. 459.

[n] The main argument alleged by STANCARUS, in favour of his hypothesis, was this, that, if CHRIST was mediator by his divine nature only, then it followed evidently, that even considered as God, he was inferior to the Father; and thus, according to him, the doctrine of his adversary OSIANDER led directly to the Unitarian system. This difficulty, which was presented with great subtilty, engaged many to strike into a middle road, and to maintain that both the divine and human natures of CHRIST were immediately concerned in the work of Redemption.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

tion, and a surer prospect of success, than had accompanied their former efforts. Hence it was, that, after several vain attempts, AUGUSTUS, elector of *Saxony*, and JOHN WILLIAM, duke of *Saxe Weimar*, summoned the most eminent doctors of both the contending parties to meet at *Altenburg* in the year 1568, and there to propose, in an amicable manner, and with a charitable spirit, their respective opinions, that thus it might be seen how far a reconciliation was possible, and what was the most probable method of bringing it about. But the intemperate zeal and warmth of the disputants, with other unlucky circumstances, blasted the fruits that were expected from this conference [o]. Another method of restoring tranquillity and union among the members of the Lutheran church was therefore proposed; and this was, that a certain number of wise and moderate divines should be employed in composing a *Form* of doctrine, in which all the controversies, that divided the church, should be terminated and decided; and that this new compilation, as soon as it was approved of by the Lutheran princes and consistories, should be clothed with ecclesiastical authority, and added to the *symbolical* [p] our standard-books of the Lutheran church. JAMES ANDREÆ, professor at *Tubingen*, whose theological abilities had procured him the most eminent and shining reputation, had been employed so early as the year 1569, in this critical and difficult undertaking, by the special command of the dukes of *Wittemberg* and *Brunswick*. The elector of *Saxony* [q], with several persons of distinction, embarked with these two princes in the project

[o] CASP. SAGITTARIJ *Introductio ad Hist. Ecclesiasticam*, part II. p. 1542.

[p] The Lutherans call *symbolical* (from a Greek word that signifies *collection* or *compilation*) the books which contain their articles of faith and rules of discipline.

[q] AUGUSTUS.

they had formed; so that ANDRÆ, under the shade of such a powerful protection and patronage, exerted all his zeal, travelled through different parts of *Germany*, negociated alternately with courts and synods, and took all the measures which prudence could suggest, in order to render the *Form*, that he was composing, universally acceptable.

C E N T.
XVI.
S E C T. III.
P A R T II.

XXXVIII. The persons embarked in this new and critical design, were persuaded that no time ought to be lost in bringing it into execution, when they perceived the imprudence and temerity of the disciples of MELANCTHON, and the changes they were attempting to introduce into the doctrine of the church. For his son-in-law PEUCER [r], who was a physician and professor of natural philosophy at *Wittemberg*, together with the divines of *Wittemberg* and *Leipsick*, encouraged by the approbation, and relying on the credit, of CRACOVIVS chancellor of *Dresden*, and of several ecclesiastics and persons of distinction at the Saxon court, aimed at nothing less than abolishing the doctrine of LUTHER concerning the eucharist and the person of CHRIST, with a design to substitute the sentiments of CALVIN in its place. This new

The Saxon
Crypto-
Calvinists,
or, secret
favourers
of Cal-
vinism.

☞ [r] This PEUCER, whom Dr. MOSHEIM mentions without any mark of distinction, was one of the wisest, most amiable, and most learned men that adorned the annals of German literature during this century, as the well-known history of his life, and the considerable number of his medical, mathematical, moral, and theological writings, abundantly testify. Nor was he more remarkable for his merit, than for his sufferings. After his genius and virtues had rendered him the favourite of the elector of *Saxony*, and placed him at the head of the university of *Wittemberg*, he felt, in a terrible manner, the effects of the bigotry and barbarity of the rigid Lutherans, who, on account of his denying the corporal presence of CHRIST in the eucharist, united, with success, their efforts to deprive him of the favour of his sovereign, and procured his imprisonment. His confinement, which lasted ten years, was accompanied with all possible circumstances of severity. See MELCHIOR. ADAM, *Vit. Medicor. Germanor.*

CENT. XVI. reformation was attempted in *Saxony* in the year
 SECT. III. 1570, and a great variety of clandestine arts and
 PART II. stratagems were employed in order to bring it to
 a happy and successful issue. What the sentiments of MELANCTHON concerning the eucharist were, towards the conclusion of his days, appears to be extremely doubtful. It is however certain, that he had a strong inclination to form a coalition between the Saxons and Calvinists, though he was prevented, by the irresolution and timidity of his natural character, from attempting openly this much desired union. PEUCER, and the other disciples of MELANCTHON already mentioned, made a public profession of the doctrine of CALVIN; and though they had much more spirit and courage than their soft and yielding master, yet they wanted *his* circumspection and prudence, which were not less necessary to the accomplishment of their designs. Accordingly, in the year 1571, they published in the German language a work, entitled, *Stereoma* [*s*], and other writings, in which they openly declared their dissent from the doctrine of LUTHER concerning the *Eucharist* and the *Person of CHRIST* [*t*]; and that

☞ [*s*] A term which signifies *foundation*.

☞ [*t*] The learned historian seems to deviate here from his usual accuracy. The authors of the book, entitled, *Stereoma*, did not declare their dissent from the doctrine of LUTHER, but from the extravagant inventions of some of his successors. This great man, in his controversy with ZUINGLE, had, indeed, thrown out some unguarded expressions, that seemed to imply a belief of the *omnipresence* of the body of CHRIST; but he became sensible, afterwards, that this opinion was attended with great difficulties, and particularly that it ought not to be made use of as a *proof* of CHRIST's *corporal presence* in the eucharist*. But this absurd hypothesis was renewed, after the death of LUTHER, by TINMAN and WESTPHAL, and was dressed up, in a still more specious and plausible

* See LUTHERI opp. tom. viii. p. 275. Edit. Jenaens.

form,

that they might execute their purposes with greater facility, introduced into the schools a Catechism, compiled by PEZELIUS, which was favourable to the sentiments of CALVIN. As this bold step excited great commotions and debates in the church, AUGUSTUS held at *Dresden*, in the year 1571, a solemn convocation of the Saxon divines, and of all other persons concerned in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, and commanded them to adopt *his* opinion in relation to the eucharist [*u*]. The assembled doctors complied with this order in appearance; but their

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT III.
PART II.

form, by BRENTIUS, CHEMNITZ, and ANDREÆ, who maintained, *the communication of the properties of CHRIST's divinity to his human nature*, in the manner that it was afterwards adopted by the Lutheran church. This strange system gave occasion to the book, entitled *Stereoma*, in which the doctrine of LUTHER was respected, and the inventions alone of his successors renounced, and in which the authors declared plainly, that they did not adopt the sentiments of ZUINGLE or CALVIN; nay, that they admitted the real and substantial presence of CHRIST's body and blood in the eucharist.

[*u*] In this passage, compared with what follows, Dr. MOSHEIM seems to maintain, that the *opinion* of AUGUSTUS, which he imposed upon the assembled divines, was in favour of the adversaries of MELANCTHON, and in direct opposition to the authors of the *Stereoma*. But here he has committed a palpable oversight. The convocation of *Dresden*, in the year 1571, instead of approving or maintaining the doctrine of the rigid Lutherans, drew up, on the contrary, a *form of agreement (formula consensu)*, in which the *omnipresence* or *ubiquity* of CHRIST's body was denied, and which was, indeed, an abridgment of the book, entitled, *Stereoma*. So that the transactions at *Dresden* were entirely favourable to the moderate Lutherans, who embraced openly and sincerely (and not by a *feigned* consent (*subdole*) as our historian remarks) the sentiment of the elector AUGUSTUS, who at that time patronized the disciples of MELANCTHON. This prince, it is true, seduced by the crafty and artful insinuations of the *Ubiquitarians*, or rigid Lutherans, who made him believe that the ancient doctrines of the church were in danger, changed sides soon after, and was pushed on to the most violent and persecuting measures, of which the convocation of *Torgaw* was the first step, and the *Form of Concord* the unhappy issue.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

compliance was feigned [w]; for, on their return to the places of their abode; they resumed their original design, pursued it with assiduity and zeal, and by their writings, as also by their public and private instructions, endeavoured to abolish the ancient doctrine of the Saxons, relating to the presence of CHRIST's body in that holy sacrament. The elector, informed of these proceedings, convened anew the Saxon doctors, and held, in the year 1574, the famous convocation of *Torgaw* [x], where, after a strict enquiry into the doctrines of those who, from their secret attachment to the sentiments of the Swiss divines, were called *Crypto-Calvinists* [y], he committed some of them to prison, sent others into banishment, and engaged a certain number by the force of the secular arm to change their sentiments. PEUCER, who had been principally concerned in moderating the rigour of some of LUTHER's doctrines, felt, in a more especial manner, the dreadful effects of the elector's severity. For he was confined to a hard prison, where he lay in the most affecting circumstances of distress until the year 1585, when, having obtained his liberty, through the intercession of the prince of *Anhalt*, who had given his daughter in marriage to AUGUSTUS, he

☞ [w] The compliance was sincere, but the order was very different from that mentioned by our author; as appears from the preceding note.

☞ [x] It is to be observed, that there were but *fifteen* of the Saxon doctors convened at *Torgaw* by the summons of the elector; a small number this, to give law to the Lutheran church. For an account of the declaration drawn up by this assembly, on the points relating to the *presence of CHRIST's body in the eucharist, the omnipresence of that body, and the oral manducation of the flesh and blood of the divine Saviour*; see HOSPINIANI *Concordia Discors*, p. 39.

☞ [y] i. e. Hidden or disguised Calvinists.

retired to *Zerbſt*, where he ended his days in peace [z].

XXXIX. The schemes of the *Crypto-Calvinists*, or secret abettors of Calvinism, being thus disconcerted, the elector of *Saxony*, and the other princes who had entered into his views, redoubled their zeal and diligence in promoting the *Form of Concord* that has been already mentioned. Accordingly, various conferences were held preparatory to this important undertaking; and, in the year 1576, while the Saxon divines were convened at *Torgaw* by the order of AUGUSTUS, a treatise was composed by JAMES ANDREÆ, with a design to heal the divisions of the Lutheran church, and as a preservative against the opinions of the *Reformed* doctors [a]. This production, which received the denomination of the *Book of Torgaw*, from the place where it was composed, having been carefully examined, reviewed, and corrected, by the greatest part of the Lutheran doctors in *Germany*, the matter was again proposed to the deliberations of a select number of divines, who met at *Berg*, a Benedictine monastery in the neighbourhood of *Magdeburg* [b]. Here all things relating to the intended

CENT.
XVI.
SECT III.
PART II.
The Form
of Concord.

✎ [z] See SCHLUSSEIBURGII *Theologia Calvinistica*, lib. ii. p. 207. lib. iii. *Præf.* & p. 1—22. 52—57. 69. lib. iv. p. 246.—HUTTERI *Concordia Concors*, cap. i—viii.—ARNOUDI *Histor. Ecclesiast.* lib. xvi. cap. xviii. p. 389—395.—LOSCHERI *Historia motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformat.* part II. p. 176. part III. p. 1.—All these are writers favourable to the rigid Lutherans; see therefore, on the other side, CASP. PUCERI *Historia Carcerum et Liberationis Divinæ*, which was published in 8vo. at *Zurich*, in the year 1605, by PEZLIUS.

✎ [a] The term *Reformed* was used to distinguish the other Protestants of various denominations from the Lutherans; and it is equally applied to the friends of episcopacy and presbytery. See the following chapter.

✎ [b] The book that was composed by ANDREÆ and his associates at *Torgaw*, was sent, by the elector of *Saxony*, to almost all the Lutheran princes, with a view of its being examined, approved, and received by them. It was, however, rejected

CENT. XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

intended project were accurately weighed, the opinions of the assembled doctors carefully discussed, and the result of all was the famous *Form of Concord*, which has made so much noise in the world. The persons who assisted ANDRÆ in the composition of this celebrated work, or at least in the last perusal of it at *Berg*, were MARTIN CHEMNITZ, NICOLAS SELNECCER, ANDREW MUSCULUS, CHRISTOPHER CORNERUS, and DAVID CHYTRÆUS [c]. This new confession of the Lutheran faith was adopted first by the Saxons, in consequence of the strict order of AUGUSTUS; and their example was afterwards followed by the greatest part of the Lutheran churches, by some sooner, by others later [d]. The authority of this confession,

rejected by several princes, and censured and refuted by several doctors. These censures engaged the compilers to review and correct it; and it was from this book, thus changed and new modelled, that the *Form of Concord*, published at *Berg*, was entirely drawn.

[c] The *Form of Concord*, composed at *Torgau*, and reviewed at *Berg*, consists of two Parts. In the *first* is contained a system of doctrine drawn up according to the fancy of the *six doctors* here mentioned. In the *second* is exhibited one of the strongest instances of that persecuting and tyrannical spirit, which the protestants complained of in the church of *Rome*, even a formal CONDEMNATION of all those who differed from these *six doctors*, particularly in their strange opinions concerning the *majesty* and *omnipresence* of CHRIST's body, and the *real manducation* of his flesh and blood in the eucharist. This *condemnation* branded with the denomination of heretics, and excluded from the communion of the church, all Christians, of all nations, who refused to subscribe these doctrines. More particularly, in *Germany*, the terrors of the sword were solicited against these pretended heretics, as may be seen in the famous Testament of BRENTIUS. For a full account of the *Confession* of *Torgau* and *Berg*, see HOSPINIUS's *Concordia Discors*; where the reader will find large extracts out of this confession, with an ample account of the censures it underwent, the opposition that was made to it, and the arguments that were used by its learned adversaries.

[d] A list of the writers who have treated concerning the *Form of Concord*, may be found in JO. GEORG. WALCHII *Introduction*.

confession, as is sufficiently known, was employed for the two following purposes, *first*, to terminate the controversies, which divided the Lutheran church, more especially after the death of its founder; and *secondly*, to preserve that church against the opinions of the *Reformed*, in relation to the eucharist.

C E N T.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

XL. It so fell out, however, that this very *Form*, which was designed to restore peace and concord in the church, and had actually produced this effect in several places, became nevertheless a source of new tumults, and furnished matter for the most violent dissensions and contests. It immediately met with a warm opposition from the *Reformed*, and also from all those who were either secretly attached to their doctrine, or who, at least, were desirous of living in concord and communion with them, from a laudable zeal for the common interests of the protestant cause. Nor was their opposition at all unaccountable, since they plainly perceived, that this *Form* removed all the flattering hopes they had entertained, of seeing the divisions that reigned among the friends of religious liberty happily healed, and entirely excluded the *Reformed* from the communion of the Lutheran church. Hence they were filled with indignation against the authors of this new *Con-*

The Form of Concord produces much disturbance,—

is opposed by the *Reformed* or Calvinists,

roduet. in Libros Symbolicos, lib. i. cap. vii. p. 707. & KOECHER Biblioth. Theol. Symbolica, p. 188. There are also several Documents in MSS. relative to this famous confession, of which there is an account in the German work, entitled, Unschuld Nachricht. A. 1753, p. 322.—The principal writers who have given the history of the Form of Concord, and the transactions relating to it, are HOSPINIAR, an eminent divine of Zurich, in his Concordia Discors; and LEON. HUTTER, in his Concordia Concors. These two historians have written on opposite sides; and whoever will be at the pains of comparing their accounts with attention and impartiality, will easily perceive where the truth lies, and receive satisfactory information with respect to the true state of these controversies, and the motives that animated the contending parties.

fession

CENT. XVI. *cession of Faith*, and exposed their uncharitable proceedings in writings full of spirit and vehemence. The Swiss doctors, with HOSPINIAN at their head, the Belgic divines [*e*], those of the Palatinate [*f*], together with the principalities of Anhalt and Bade, declared war against the *Form of Concord*. And accordingly from this period the Lutheran, and more especially the Saxon doctors, were charged with the disagreeable task of defending this new Creed and its compilers, in many laborious productions [*g*].

and even by
the Luther-
ans them-
selves.

XLI. Nor were the followers of ZUINGLE and CALVIN the only opposers of this *Form of Concord*; it found adversaries, even in the very bosom of Lutheranism, and several of the most eminent churches of that communion rejected it with such firmness and resolution, that no arguments nor entreaties could engage them to admit it as a rule of faith, or even as a mean of instruction. It was rejected by the churches of HESSIA, POMERANIA, NUREMBERG, HOLSTEIN, SILESLIA, DENMARK, BRUNSWICK, and others [*h*]. But though they all united in opposing

[*e*] See PIETRII VILERII *Epistola Apologetica Reformatarum in Belgio Ecclesiarum ad et contra Auctores Libri Bergenfis dicti "Concordiæ."*—This work was published a second time with the Annotations of LUD. GERHARD à RENESSE, by the learned Dr. GERDES of Groningen, in his *Scriinium Antiquarium seu Miscellan. Groningens. Nov.* tom. i. p. 121. Add to these the *Unschuld. Nachricht.* A. 1747, p. 957.

[*f*] JOHN CASIMIR, Prince Palatine, convoked an assembly of the Reformed Divines at Francfort, in the year 1577, in order to annul and reject this *Form of Concord*. See HEN. ALTINGII *Hist. Eccles. Palatin.* § clxxix. p. 143.

[*g*] See JO. GEORG. WALCHII *Introd. in Libros Symbolicos Lutheranor.* lib. i. cap. vii. p. 734.

[*h*] For an account of the ill success the *Form of Concord* met with in the dutchy of Holstein, see the German work entitled, *Die Danische Bibliothec.* vol. iv. p. 212. vol. v. p. 355. vol. viii. p. 333—461. vol. ix. p. 1.—MUEHLII *Dissert. Hist. Theol. Diss. I. de Reformat. Holsat.* p. 108.—ARN. GREVII *Memoria PAULI ab EITZEN.* The transactions in Denmark in relation

opposing it, their opposition was nevertheless founded on different reasons, nor did they all act in this affair from the same motives and the same principles. A warm and affectionate veneration for the memory of MELANCTHON was, with some, the only, or at least the predominant, motive that induced them to declare against the *Form* in question; they could not behold, without the utmost abhorrence, a production in which the sentiments of this great and excellent man were so rudely treated. In this class we may rank the Lutherans of *Holstein*. Others were not only animated in their opposition by a regard for MELANCTHON, but also by a persuasion, that the opinions, condemned in the new Creed, were more conformable to truth, than those that were substituted in their place. A secret attachment to the sentiments of the Helvetic doctors prevented some from approving of the *Form* under consideration; the hopes of uniting the *Reformed* and *Lutheran* churches engaged many to declare against it; and a considerable number refused their assent to it from an apprehension, whether real or pretended, that adding a new *Creed* to the ancient confessions of faith would be really a source of disturbance and discord in the Lutheran church.

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

relation to this *Form*, and the particular reasons for which it was rejected there, may be seen in the *Danish Library* above quoted, vol. iv. p. 222—282. and also in PONTOPPIDAN'S *Annal. Eccles. Danicæ Diplomaticæ*, tom. iii. p. 456. This latter author evidently proves (p. 476.) a fact, which ILLERMAN ab ELSWICH, and other authors, have endeavoured to represent as dubious, viz. that FREDERICK II. king of *Denmark*, as soon as he received a copy of the *Form* in question, threw it into the fire, and saw it consumed before his eyes.—The opposition that was made by the Hessians to the same *Form*, may be seen in TIELEMANNI *Vitæ Theologor. Marpurgens.* p. 99.—*Danischen Bibliothec.* vol. vii. p. 273—364. tom. ix. p. 1—87.—The ill fate of this famous Confession, in the principalities of *Lignitz* and *Brieg*, is amply related in the German work, entitled, *Unschuld. Nachricht.* A. 1745. p. 173.

CENT. XVI. It would be endless to enumerate the different
 SECT. III. reasons alleged by the different individuals or
 PART II. communities, who declared their dissent from the

Form of Concord.

The conduct of Julius, duke of Brunswick, in this matter,

XLII. This *Form* was patronized in a more especial manner by JULIUS, duke of *Brunswick*, to whom, in a great measure, it owed its existence, who had employed both his authority and munificence in order to encourage those who had undertaken to compose it, and had commanded all the ecclesiastics, within his dominions, to receive and subscribe it as a rule of faith. But scarcely was it published, when the zealous prince changed his mind, suffered the *Form* to be publicly opposed by HESLIUS, and other divines of his university of *Helmstadt*, and to be excluded from the number of the Creeds and confessions that were received by his subjects. The reasons alleged by the Lutherans of *Brunswick*, in behalf of this step, were, 1st, That the *Form of Concord*, when printed, differed in several places from the manuscript copy to which they had given their approbation: 2^{dly}, That the doctrine relating to the *freedom of the human will* was expressed in it without a sufficient degree of accuracy and precision, and was also inculcated in the harsh and improper terms that LUTHER had employed in treating that subject: 3^{dly}, That the *ubiquity*, or universal and *indefinite presence* of CHRIST's human nature, was therein positively maintained, notwithstanding that the Lutheran church had never adopted any such doctrine. Besides these reasons for rejecting the *Form of Concord*, which were publicly avowed, others perhaps of a secret nature contributed to the remarkable change, which was visible in the sentiments and proceedings of the duke of *Brunswick*. Various methods and negotiations were employed to remove the dislike which this prince, and the divines that lived in his territories, had conceived

conceived against the Creed of *Berg*. Particularly in the year 1583, a convocation of divines from *Saxony*, *Brandenburg*, *Brunswick*, and the Palatinate, was held at *Quedlinburg* for this purpose. But JULIUS persisted steadfastly in his opposition, and proposed that the *Form of Concord* should be examined, and its authority discussed by a general assembly or synod of the Lutheran church [i].

XLIII. This *Form* was not only opposed from abroad, but had likewise adversaries in the very country which gave it birth. For even in *Saxony* many, who had been obliged to subscribe it, beheld it with aversion, in consequence of their attachment to the doctrine of MELANCTHON. During the life of AUGUSTUS, they were forced to suppress their sentiments; but as soon as he had paid the last tribute to nature, and was succeeded by CHRISTIAN I., the moderate Lutherans and the secret Calvinists resumed their courage. The new elector had been accustomed, from his tender years, to the moderate sentiments of MELANCTHON, and is also said to have discovered a propensity to the doctrine of the Helvetic church. Under his government, therefore, a fair opportunity was offered to the persons abovementioned, of declaring their sentiments and executing their designs. Nor was this opportunity neglected. The attempts to abolish the *Form of Concord*, that had in time past proved unsuccessful, seemed again to be renewed, and that with a design to

CENT.
XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

The Cry-
to Calvi-
nists make
new at-
tempts to
spread their
doctrine

[i] See LEON. HUTTERI *Concordia Concors*, cap. xlv. p. 1051.—PHIL. JUL. RICHTMEYER *Braunschweig Kirchen Historie*, part III. cap. viii. p. 483.—See also the authors mentioned by CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFUS, in his *Acta et Scripta Ecclesiæ Wurtemberg*. p. 62. & *Histor. Literar. Theologiæ*, part II. p. 423.—For an account of the Convocation of *Quedlinburg*, and the *Acta* that passed in that assembly, see the German work, entitled, *Dansche Bibliothec*. part VIII. p. 595.