

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

open a door for the entrance of Calvinism into Saxony. The persons who had embarked in this design, were greatly encouraged by the protection they received from several noblemen of the first rank at the Saxon court, and, particularly, from CRELLIUS, the first minister of CHRISTIAN. Under the auspicious influence of such patrons it was natural to expect success; yet they conducted their affairs with circumspection and prudence. Certain laws were previously enacted, in order to prepare the minds of the people for the intended revolution in the doctrine of the church; and some time after [k] the form of *exorcism* was omitted in the administration of baptism [l]. These measures were followed by others still more alarming to the rigid Lutherans; for not only a new German Catechism, favourable to the purpose of the secret Calvinists, was industriously distributed among the people, but also a new edition of the Bible in the same language, enriched with the observations of HENRY SALMUTH, which were artfully accommodated to this purpose, was, in the year 1591, published at *Dresden*. The consequences of these vigorous measures were violent tumults and seditions among the people, which the magistrates endeavoured to suppress, by punishing with severity such of the clergy as distinguished themselves by their oppo-

[k] In the year 1591.

[l] The custom of *exorcising*, or casting out *evil spirits*, was used in the fourth century at the admission of *Catechumens*, and was afterwards absurdly applied in the baptism of infants. This application of it was retained by the greatest part of the Lutheran churches. It was indeed abolished by the elector CHRISTIAN I., but was restored after his death; and the opposition that had been made to it by CRELLIUS was the chief reason of his unhappy end. See JUSTI. H. ROEHMERI *Jus Ecclesiast. Protestant.* tom. iii. p. 843. *Ed. Secund. Halle 1727.*—As also a German work of MELCHIOR KRAFT, entitled, *Geschichte des Exorcismi*, p. 401.

sition

sition to the views of the court. But the whole plan of this religious revolution was, all of a sudden, overturned by the unexpected death of CHRISTIAN, which happened in the year 1591. Then the face of affairs changed again, and assumed its former aspect. The doctors, who had been principally concerned in the execution of this unsuccessful project, were committed to prison, or sent into banishment, after the death of the elector; and its chief encourager and patron CRELLIUS suffered death in the year 1601, as the fruit of his temerity [m].

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

XLIV. Towards the conclusion of this century, a new controversy was imprudently set on foot at *Wittemberg*, by SAMUEL HUBER, a native of *Switzerland*, and professor of divinity in that university. The Calvinistical doctrine of absolute predestination and unconditional decrees was extremely offensive to this adventurous doctor, and even excited his warmest indignation. Accordingly, he affirmed, and taught publicly, that all mankind were elected from eternity by the Supreme Being to everlasting salvation, and accused his colleagues in particular, and the Lutheran divines in general, of a propensity to the doctrine of CALVIN, on account of their asserting, that the divine election was confined to those, whose *Faith, foreseen* by an omniscient God, rendered them the proper objects of his redeeming mercy. The opinion of HUBER, as is now acknowledged by many learned men, differed more in *words* than in *reality*, from the doctrine of the Lutheran church; for he did no more than explain in a new method, and with a different turn of phrase,

The dispute  
set on foot  
by Huber.

[m] See the German work of GODF. ARNOLD, entitled, *Kirchen-und Ketzer Historie*, part II. book XVI. cap. xxxvii. p. 863. As also the authors mentioned by HERM. ASCAN. ENGELKEN, in his *Dissertat. de Nic. Crellio, ejusque Supplicio*, *Rostochii*, 1724, edit.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

what that church had always taught concerning the unlimited extent of the love of God, as embracing the whole human race, and excluding none by an *absolute* decree from everlasting salvation. However, as a disagreeable experience and repeated examples had abundantly shewn, that new methods of explaining or proving even received doctrines were as much adapted to excite divisions and contests, as the introduction of new errors, HUBER was exhorted to adhere to the ancient method of proposing the doctrine of *Election*, and instead of his own peculiar forms of expression, to make use of those that were received and authorized by the church. This compliance, nevertheless, he refused to submit to, alleging, that it was contrary to the dictates of his conscience; while his patrons and disciples, in many places, gave several indications of a turbulent and seditious zeal for his cause. These considerations engaged the magistrates of *Wittenberg* to depose him from his office, and to send him into banishment [n].

The judgment that ought to be formed concerning all these controversies.

XLV. The controversies, of which a succinct account has now been given, and others of inferior moment, which it is needless to mention, were highly detrimental to the true interests of the Lutheran church, as is abundantly known by all who are acquainted with the history of this century. It must also be acknowledged, that the manner of conducting and deciding these debates, the spirit of the disputants, and the proceedings of the judges, if we form our estimate of them by the sentiments that prevail among the wiser sort of men in modern times, must be considered as inconsistent with equity, moderation, and charity. It betrays, nevertheless, a want both of

[n] For an account of the writers that appeared in this controversy, see CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFII *Introductio in Histor. Liter. Theolog. part II. lib. iii. p. 431.*

candour and justice to inveigh indiscriminately against the authors of these misfortunes, and to represent them as totally destitute of rational sentiments and virtuous principles. And it is yet more unjust to throw the whole blame upon the triumphant party, while the suffering side are all fondly represented as men of unblemished virtue, and worthy of a better fate. It ought not certainly to be a matter of surprise, that persons long accustomed to a state of darkness, and suddenly transported from thence into the blaze of day, did not, at first, behold the objects that were presented to their view with that distinctness and precision that are natural to those who have long enjoyed the light. And such, really, was the case of the first protestant doctors, who were delivered from the gloom of papal superstition and tyranny. Besides, there was something gross and indelicate in the reigning spirit of this age, which made the people not only tolerate, but even applaud, many things relating both to the conduct of life and the management of controversy, which the more polished manners of modern times cannot relish, and which, indeed, are by no means worthy of imitation. As to the particular motives or intentions that ruled each individual in this troubled scene of controversy, whether they acted from the suggestions of malice and resentment, or from an upright and sincere attachment to what they looked upon to be the truth, or how far these two springs of action were jointly concerned in their conduct, all this must be left to the decision of Him alone, whose privilege it is to search the heart, and to discern its most hidden intentions, and its most secret motives.

XLVI. The Lutheran church furnished, during this century, a long list of considerable doctors, who illustrated, in their writings, the various branches of theological science. After LUTHER

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

The principal doctors and writers of this century.

C E N T. and MELANCTHON, who stand foremost in this  
 XVI list, on account of their superior genius and eru-  
 SECT. III. dition, we may select the following writers, as  
 PART II the most eminent, and as persons whose names  
 are worthy to be preserved in the annals of litera-  
 ture; viz. WELLER, CHEMNITZ, BRENTIUS, FLA-  
 CIUS, REGIUS, MAJOR, AMSDORF, SARCERIUS,  
 MATHESIUS, WIGANDUS, LAMBERTUS, ANDRÆ,  
 CHYTRÆUS, SALNECCER, BUCER, FAGIUS, CRU-  
 CIGER, STRIGELIUS, SPANGENBERG, JUDEX,  
 HESHUSIUS, WESTPHAL, ÆPINUS, OSIANDER,  
 and others [o].

## C H A P. II.

### The HISTORY of the Reformed [p] Church.

The consti-  
 tution of the  
 Reformed  
 church.

I. THE nature and constitution of the *Re-  
 formed Church*, which was formerly de-  
 nominated by its adversaries after its founders

[o] For an ample account of these Lutheran doctors, see MELCHIOR. ADAMI *Vitæ Theologorum*, and LOUIS ELIS DUPIN *Bibliothèque des Auteurs séparés de la Communion de l'Eglise Romaine au XVII Siècle*. The lives of several of these divines have been also separately composed by different authors of the present times; as for example, that of WELLER by LÆMELIUS, that of FLACIUS by RITTER, those of HESHUSIUS and SPANGENBERG by LEUCKFELDT, that of FAGIUS by FEVERLIN, that of CHYTRÆUS by SCHUTZ, that of BUCER by VERPORTENIUS, those of WESTPHAL and ÆPINUS by ARN. GREVIUS, &c.

[p] It has already been observed that the denomination of REFORMED was given to those protestant churches which did not embrace the doctrine and discipline of LUTHER. The title was first assumed by the French protestants, and afterwards became the common denomination of all the Calvinistical churches on the continent. I say, on the continent; since in England the term *Reformed* is generally used as standing in opposition to popery alone. Be that as it may, this part of Dr. MOSHEIM's work would have been perhaps, with more propriety, entitled, *The History of the Reformed Churches*, than *The History of the Reformed Church*. This will appear still more evident from the following Note.

ZUINGLE

ZUINGLE and CALVIN, is entirely different from that of all other ecclesiastical communities. Every other Christian church hath some common centre of union, and its members are connected together by some common bond of doctrine and discipline. But this is far from being the case of the *Reformed* church [q], whose several branches are neither

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

[q] This and the following observations are designed to give the *Lutheran* church an air of *unity*, which is not to be found in the *Reformed*. But there is a real fallacy in this specious representation of things. The *Reformed* church, when considered in the true extent of the term *Reformed*, comprehends all those religious communities that separated themselves from the church of *Rome*; and, in this sense, includes the *Lutheran* church, as well as the others. And even when this epithet is used in opposition to the community founded by LUTHER, it represents, not a single church, as the *Episcopal*, *Presbyterian*, or *Independent*, but rather a collection of churches; which, though they be *invisibly* united by a belief and profession of the *fundamental* doctrines of Christianity, yet frequent *separate* places of worship, and have, each, a *visible* centre of *external* union peculiar to themselves, which is formed by certain *peculiarities* in their respective rules of public worship and ecclesiastical government. \* An attentive examination of the discipline, polity, and worship of the churches of *England*, *Scotland*, *Holland*, and *Switzerland*, will set this matter in the clearest light. The first of these churches, being governed by *bishops*, and not admitting of the validity of *presbyterian* ordination, differs from the other three, more than any of these differ from each other. There are, however, peculiarities of government and worship, that distinguish the church of *Holland* from that of *Scotland*. The institution of deacons, the use of forms for the celebration of the sacraments, an ordinary form of prayer, the observation of the festivals of Christmas, Easter, Ascension-day, and Whitsuntide, are established in the Dutch church; and it is well known, that the church of *Scotland* differs from it extremely in these respects. —But, after all, to what does the pretended uniformity among the Lutherans amount? are not some of the *Lutheran* churches governed by *bishops*, while others are ruled by *elders*? It shall moreover be shewn, in its proper place, that, even in point of doctrine, the *Lutheran* churches are not so very remarkable for their uniformity.

\* See the general sketch of the state of the church in the eighteenth century, in the sixth volume, paragraph XXI. and note [y].

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

---

united by the same system of doctrine, nor by the same mode of worship, nor yet by the same form of government. It is farther to be observed, that this church does not require from its ministers, either uniformity in their private sentiments, or in their public doctrine, but permits them to explain, in different ways, several doctrines of no small moment, provided that the great and fundamental principles of Christianity, and the practical precepts of that divine religion, be maintained in their original purity. This great community, therefore, may be properly considered as an ecclesiastical body composed of several churches, that vary, more or less, from each other in their form and constitution; but which are preserved, however, from anarchy and schisms, by a general spirit of equity and toleration, that runs through the whole system, and renders variety of opinion consistent with fraternal union.

The causes  
that pro-  
duced this  
state of  
things.

II. This indeed was not the original state and constitution of the Reformed church, but was the result of a certain combination of events and circumstances, that threw it, by a sort of necessity, into this ambiguous form. The doctors of *Switzerland*, from whom it derived its origin, and CALVIN, who was one of its principal founders, employed all their credit, and exerted their most vigorous efforts, in order to reduce all the churches, which embraced their sentiments, under one rule of faith, and the same form of ecclesiastical government. And although they considered the Lutherans as their brethren, yet they shewed no marks of indulgence to those who openly favoured the opinions of LUTHER, concerning the *Eucharist*, the *Person of CHRIST*, *Predestination*, and other matters that were connected with these doctrines; nor would they permit the other protestant churches, that embraced their communion, to deviate from their example in this respect.

spect. A new scene, however, which was exhibited in *Britain*, contributed much to enlarge this narrow and contracted system of church communion. For when the violent contest concerning the form of ecclesiastical government, and the nature and number of those rites and ceremonies that were proper to be admitted into the public worship, arose between the abettors of *Episcopacy* and the *Puritans* [r], it was judged necessary to extend the borders of the Reformed church, and rank in the class of its true members, even those who departed, in some respects, from the ecclesiastical polity and doctrines established at Geneva. This spirit of toleration and indulgence grew still more forbearing and comprehensive after the famous synod of *Dort*. For though the sentiments and doctrines of the *Arminians* were rejected and condemned in that numerous assembly, yet they gained ground privately, and insinuated themselves into the minds of many. The church of *England*, under the reign of CHARLES I., publicly renounced the opinions of CALVIN relating to the *Divine Decrees*, and made several attempts to model its doctrine and institutions after the laws, tenets, and customs, that were observed by the primitive Christians [s]. On the other hand, several Lutheran congregations in *Germany* entertained a strong propensity to the

☞ [r] The *Puritans*, who inclined to the presbyterian form of church-government, of which KNOX was one of the earliest abettors in *Britain*, derived this denomination, from their pretending to a purer method of worship than that which had been established by EDWARD VI., and Queen ELIZABETH.

☞ [s] This assertion is equivocal. Many members of the church of *England*, with archbishop LAUD at their head, did, indeed, propagate the doctrines of ARMINIUS, both in their pulpits and in their writings. But it is not accurate to say that the Church of *England* renounced publicly, in that reign, the opinions of CALVIN. See this matter farther discussed, in the note [x], Cent. XVII. Sect. II. P. II. ch. II. paragraph xx.



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

---

doctrines and discipline of the church of *Geneva*; though they were restrained from declaring themselves fully and openly on this head, by their apprehensions of forfeiting the privileges they derived from their adherence to the confession of *Augsburg*. The French refugees also, who had long been accustomed to a moderate way of thinking in religious matters, and whose national turn led them to a certain freedom of inquiry, being dispersed abroad in all parts of the protestant world, rendered themselves so agreeable, by their wit and eloquence, that their example excited a kind of emulation in favour of religious liberty. All these circumstances, accompanied with others, whose influence was less palpable, though equally real, instilled, by degrees, such a spirit of lenity and forbearance into the minds of protestants, that at this day, all Christians, if we except *Roman-catholics, Socinians, Quakers, and Anabaptists*, may claim a place among the members of the Reformed church. It is true, great reluctance was discovered by many against this comprehensive scheme of church-communion; and, even in the times in which we live, the ancient and less charitable manner of proceeding hath several patrons, who would be glad to see the doctrines and institutions of CALVIN universally adopted and rigorously observed. The number, however, of these rigid doctors is not very great, nor is their influence considerable. And it may be affirmed with truth, that, both in point of number and authority, they are much inferior to the friends of moderation, who reduce within a narrow compass the fundamental doctrines of Christianity on the belief of which salvation depends, exercise forbearance and fraternal charity towards those who explain certain doctrines in a manner peculiar to themselves, and desire to see the enclosure (if I may use that expression) of the Reformed church rendered

rendered as large and comprehensive as is possible [s].

III. The founder of the Reformed church was **ULRICK ZUINGLE**, a native of *Switzerland*, and a man of uncommon penetration and acuteness, accompanied with an ardent zeal for truth. This great man was for removing out of the churches, and abolishing in the ceremonies and appendages of public worship, many things which **LUTHER** was disposed to treat with toleration and indulgence, such as images, altars, wax-tapers, the form of *exorcism*, and private confession. He aimed at nothing so much as establishing, in his country, a method and form of divine worship remarkable for its simplicity, and as far remote as could be from every thing that might have the smallest tendency to nourish a spirit of superstition [t]. Nor were these the only circumstances in

CENT  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

The foundation of the Reformed church laid by Zuingle.

[s] The annals of theology have not as yet been enriched with a full and accurate *History of the Reformed Church*. This task was indeed undertaken by **SCULTET**, and even carried down so far as his own time, in his *Annales Evangelii Renovati*; but the greatest part of this work is lost. **THEOD. HASÆUS**, who proposed to give the *Annals of the Reformed Church*, was prevented by death from fulfilling his purpose. The famous work of **JAMES BASNAGE**, published in two volumes 4to at *Rotterdam*, in the year 1725, under the title of *Histoire de la Religion des Eglises Reformées*, instead of giving a regular History of the Reformed Church, is only designed to shew, that its peculiar and distinguishing doctrines are not new inventions, but were taught and embraced in the earliest ages of the church.—**MAIMBOURG**'s *Histoire du Calvinisme*, is remarkable for nothing, but the partiality of its author, and the wilful errors with which it abounds.

[t] The design of **ZUINGLE** was certainly excellent; but in the execution of it perhaps he went too far, and consulted rather the dictates of reason than the real exigencies of human nature in its present state. The present union between soul and body, which operate together in the actions of moral agents, even in those that appear the most abstracted and refined, renders it necessary to consult the *external senses*, as well as the *intellectual powers*, in the institution of public worship.

Besides,

CENT. in which he differed from the Saxon reformer ;  
 XVI. for his sentiments concerning several points of  
 SECT. III. theology, and more especially his opinions relat-  
 PART II. ing to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, varied  
 widely from those of LUTHER. The greatest part  
 of these sentiments and opinions were adopted in  
*Switzerland*, by those who had joined themselves  
 to ZUINGLE in promoting the cause of the Re-  
 formation, and were by them transmitted to all  
 the Helvetic churches, that threw off the yoke of  
*Rome*. From *Switzerland* these opinions were  
 propagated among the neighbouring nations, by  
 the ministerial labours and the theological writings  
 of the friends and disciples of ZUINGLE ; and thus  
 the primitive Reformed church, that was founded  
 by this eminent ecclesiastic, and whose extent at  
 first was not very considerable, gathered strength  
 by degrees, and made daily new acquisitions.

The contro-  
 versy be-  
 tween the  
 Lutherans  
 and Re-  
 formed  
 concerning  
 the eucha-  
 rist.

IV. The separation between the Lutheran and  
 Swiss churches was chiefly occasioned by the  
 doctrine of ZUINGLE, concerning the sacrament  
 of the Lord's supper. LUTHER maintained, that  
 the *body* and *blood* of CHRIST were *really*, though  
 in a manner far beyond human comprehension,  
*present* in the eucharist, and were exhibited to-  
 gether with the *bread* and *wine*. On the contrary,  
 the Swiss reformer looked upon the *bread* and  
*wine* in no other light, than as the *signs* and *symbols*  
 of the *absent* body and blood of CHRIST ; and,

Besides, between a worship purely and philosophically rational,  
 and a service grossly and palpably superstitious, there are many  
 intermediate steps and circumstances, by which a rational ser-  
 vice may be rendered more affecting and awakening, without  
 becoming superstitious. A noble edifice, a solemn music, a  
 well-ordered set of external gestures, though they do not, in  
 themselves, render our prayers one whit more acceptable to  
 the Deity, than if they were offered up without any of these  
 circumstances, produce, nevertheless, a good effect. They  
 elevate the mind, they give it a composed and solemn frame,  
 and thus contribute to the fervour of its devotion.

from

from the year 1524, propagated this doctrine in a public manner by his writings, after having entertained and taught it privately before that period [u]. In a little time after this [w], his example was followed by OECOLAMPADIUS, a divine of *Basil*, and one of the most learned men of that century [x]. But they were both opposed with obstinacy and spirit by LUTHER and his associates, particularly those of the circle of *Suabia*. In the mean time, PHILIP, landgrave of *Hesse*, apprehending the pernicious effects that these debates might have upon the affairs of the *protestants*, which were, as yet, in that fluctuating and unsettled state that marks the infancy of all great revolutions, was desirous of putting an end to these differences, and appointed, for that purpose, a conference at *Marpurg*, between ZUINGLE, LUTHER, and other doctors of both parties [y]. This meeting, however, only covered the flame, instead of extinguishing it; and the pacific prince, seeing it impossible to bring about a definitive treaty of peace and concord between these jarring divines, was obliged to rest satisfied with having engaged them to consent to a truce. LUTHER and ZUINGLE came to an agreement about several points; but the principal matter in debate,

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

[u] ZUINGLE certainly taught this doctrine in private before the year 1524, as appears from GERDES, *Historia Renovat. Evangelii*, tom. i. *Append.* p. 228.

[v] In the year 1525.

[x] JO. CONR. FUESLINI *Centuria I. Epistol. Theolog. Reformat.* p. 31. 35. 44. 49. — OECOLAMPADIUS was not less remarkable for his extraordinary modesty, his charitable, forbearing, and pacific spirit, and his zeal for the progress of vital and *practical* religion, than for his profound erudition, which he seemed rather studious to conceal than to display.

[y] ZUINGLE was accompanied by OECOLAMPADIUS, BUCER, and HEDION. LUTHER had with him MELANTHON and JUSTUS JONAS from *Saxony*, together with OSIANDER, BRENTIUS, and AGRICOLA.

even

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

The progress of these disputes so far down as the death of Luther.

even that which regarded CHRIST's presence in the eucharist, was left undecided; each party appealing to the Fountain of wisdom to terminate this controversy, and expressing their hopes that time and impartial reflexion might discover and confirm the truth [z].

V. The Reformed church had scarcely been founded in *Switzerland* by ZUINGLE, when this Christian hero fell in a battle that was fought, in the year 1530, between the protestants of *Zurich*, and their Roman-catholic compatriots, who drew the sword in defence of popery. It was not indeed to perform the sanguinary office of a soldier that ZUINGLE was present at this engagement, but with a view to encourage and animate, by his counsels and exhortations, the valiant defenders of the protestant cause [a]. After his death,

[z] RUCHAT, *Histoire de la Reformation de la Suisse*, vol. i. passim. vol. ii. livr. vi. p. 463 — HOTTINGER, *Helvetische Kirchen-Geschichte*, part III. p. 27. 51. 483. — VAL. ERN. LOSCHER *Historia Helvetiarum*, part I. cap. ii. iii. p. 55. cap. vi. p. 143. — FUISLIN, *Beytrage zur Schweizer Reformation*, tom. iv. p. 120.

[a] The Lutherans, who consider this unhappy fate of ZUINGLE as a reproach upon that great man in particular, and upon the Reformed church in general, discover a gross ignorance of the genius and manners of the Swiss nation in this century. For as all the inhabitants of that country are at present trained to arms, and obliged to take the field when the defence of their country requires it, so in the time of ZUINGLE this obligation was so universal, that neither the ministers of the gospel, nor the professors of theology, were exempted from this military service. Accordingly in the same battle in which ZUINGLE fell, JEROME POTANUS, one of the theological doctors of *Basil*, also lost his life. See FUESLIN *Centuria I. Epistolar. Theol. Reformat.* p. 84. ERASMUS also spoke in a very unfriendly manner of the death of ZUINGLE and his friend OECOLAMPADIUS. See JORTIN'S *Life of ERASMUS*, vol. i. p. 522. It is not therefore surprising to find the bigoted Sir THOMAS MORE insulting (with the barbarity that superstition seldom fails to produce in a narrow and peevish mind) the memory of these two eminent Reformers, in a letter to the furious and turbulent COCHLAEUS ;  
of

death, several Lutheran doctors of the more moderate sort, and particularly MARTIN BUCER, used their utmost endeavours to bring about some kind of reconciliation between the contending parties. For this purpose they exhorted the jarring theologians to concord, interpreted the points in dispute with a prudent regard to the prejudices of both sides, admonished them of the pernicious consequences that must attend the prolongation of these unhappy contests, and even went so far as to express the respective sentiments of the contending doctors in terms of considerable ambiguity and latitude, that thus the desired union might be the more easily effected. There is no doubt, but that the intentions and designs of these zealous intercessors were pious and upright [b]; but it will be difficult to decide, whether or no the means they employed were adapted to promote the end they had in view. Be that as it may, these pacific counsels of BUCER excited divisions in *Switzerland*; for some persevered obstinately in the doctrine of ZUINGLE, while others adopted the explications and modifications of his doctrine that were offered by BUCER [c]. But these divisions and commotions had not the least effect on that reconciliation with LUTHER, that was earnestly desired by the pious and moderate

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

of which the following words shew the spirit of the writer :  
 “ *Postrema ea fuit, quam de ZUINGLIO & OECOLAMPADIO*  
 “ *scriptam misisti, quorum nunciata mors mihi Lætitiam*  
 “ *attulit.*—Sublatos e medio esse tam immanes *Fidei Christianæ*  
 “ *hostes, tam intentos ubique in omnem perimendæ pietatis*  
 “ *occasionem, jure gaudere possum.*” JORTIN, *ibid.* vol. ii.  
 p. 702. App. No. xvi. N.

[b] See ALB. MENON. VERPOORTEN. *Comment. de Mart. Bucero et ejus Sententia de Cæna Domini*, § ix. p. 23. published in 8vo at *Coburg*, in the year 1709.—LOSCHER *Hist. Motuum*, part I. lib. ii. cap. i. p. 131. & part II. lib. iii. cap. ii. p. 15.

[c] FUESLINI *Centur. I. Epistolar. Theolog.* p. 162. 170. 181, 182. 190, &c.

doctors

CENT. XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

doctors on both sides. The efforts of BUCER were more successful out of *Switzerland*, and particularly among those divines in the upper parts of *Germany*, who inclined to the sentiments of the Helvetic church; for they retired from the communion of that church, and joined themselves to LUTHER by a public act, which was sent to *Wittenberg*, in the year 1536, by a solemn deputation appointed for that purpose [d]. The Swiss divines could not be brought to so great a length. There was, however, still some prospect of effecting a reconciliation between them and the Lutherans. But this fair prospect entirely disappeared in the year 1544, when LUTHER published his *Confession* of faith in relation to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, which was directly opposite to the doctrine of ZUINGLIUS and his followers, on that head. The doctors of *Zurich* pleaded their cause publicly against the Saxon reformer the year following; and thus the purposes of the peace-makers were totally defeated [e].

The transactions that succeeded the death of Luther.

VI. The death of LUTHER, which happened in the year 1546, was an event that seemed adapted to calm these commotions, and to revive, in the breasts of the moderate and pacific, the hopes of a reconciliation between the contending parties. For this union, between the Lutherans and Zuinglians, was so ardently desired by MELANCTHON, and his followers, that this great man left no means unemployed to bring it about, and seemed resolved rather to submit to a dubious and forced peace, than to see those flaming discords perpetuated, which reflected such dishonour on the protestant cause. On the other hand, this salutary work seemed to be facilitated by the theolo-

[d] LOSCHERUS, *loc. cit.* cap. ii. p. 205.—RUCHAT, *Histoire de la Reform. de la Suisse*, tom. v. p. 535.—HOTTINGER *Hystor. Eccles. Helvet.* tom. iii. lib. vi. p. 702.

[e] LOSCHERUS, *loc. cit.* part i. lib. ii. cap. iv. p. 341.

gical system that was adopted by JOHN CALVIN, a native of *Noyon* in *France*, who was pastor and professor of divinity at *Geneva*, and whose genius, learning, eloquence, and talents rendered him respectable even in the eyes of his enemies. This great man, whose particular friendship for MELANCTHON was an incidental circumstance highly favourable to the intended reconciliation, proposed an explication of the point in debate, that modified the crude hypothesis of ZUINGLE, and made use of all his credit and authority among the Swiss, and more particularly at *Zurich*, where he was held in the highest veneration, in order to obtain their assent to it [*f*]. The explication he proposed was not, indeed, favourable to the doctrine of CHRIST's bodily presence in the eucharist, which he persisted in denying; he supposed, however, that a certain *divine virtue* or *efficacy* was communicated by CHRIST with the *bread* and *wine*, to those who approached this holy sacrament with a lively faith, and with upright hearts; and to render this notion still more satisfactory, he expressed it in almost the same terms which the Lutherans employed in inculcating their doctrine of CHRIST's real presence in the eucharist [*g*]. For the great and common error of all those, who, from a desire of peace, assumed the character of arbitrators in this controversy, lay in this, that they aimed rather at a uniformity of *terms*, than of *sentiments*; and seemed satisfied when they had engaged the contending parties to

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

[*f*] CHRIST. AUG. SALIG. *Historia Aug. Confession.* tom. ii. lib. vii. cap. iii. p. 1075.

[*g*] CALVIN went certainly too far in this matter; and, in his explication of the benefits that arise from a worthy commemoration of CHRIST's death in the eucharist, he dwelt too grossly upon the *allegorical* expressions of scripture, which the papists had so egregiously abused, and talked of *really eating by faith the body*, and drinking the blood of CHRIST.



C E N T. use the same *words* and phrases, though their real  
 XVI. difference in opinion remained the same, and each  
 SECT. III. explained these ambiguous or figurative terms in  
 PART II. a manner agreeable to their respective systems.

The concord, so much desired, did not, however, seem to advance much. MELANCTHON, who stood foremost in the rank of those who longed impatiently for it, had not courage enough to embark openly in the execution of such a perilous project. Besides, after the death of LUTHER, his enemies attacked him with redoubled fury, and gave him so much disagreeable occupation, that he had neither that leisure, nor that tranquillity of mind, that were necessary to prepare his measures properly for such an arduous undertaking. A new obstacle to the execution of this pacific project was also presented, by the intemperate zeal of JOACHIM WESTPHAL, pastor at *Hamburg*, who, in the year 1552, renewed, with greater vehemence than ever, this deplorable controversy, which had been for some time suspended, and who, after FLACIUS, was the most obstinate defender of the opinion of LUTHER. This violent theologian attacked with that spirit of acrimony and vehemence, that was too remarkable in the polemic writings of LUTHER, the *act of uniformity*, by which the churches of *Geneva* and *Zurich* declared their *agreement concerning the doctrine of the eucharist*. In the book which he published with this view [b], he censured with the utmost severity, the variety of sentiments concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper that was observable in the Reformed church, and maintained, with his usual warmth and ob-

[b] This book, which abounds with senseless and extravagant tenets that LUTHER never so much as thought of, and breathes the most virulent spirit of persecution, is entitled, *Farrago confusaneorum et inter se dissidentium de S: Cæna opinionum ex Sacramentariorum Libris congesta*.

stinacy,

stinacy, the opinion of LUTHER on that subject. This engaged CALVIN to enter the lists with WESTPHAL, whom he treated with as little lenity and forbearance, as the rigid Lutheran had shewed towards the Helvetic churches. The consequences of this debate were, that CALVIN and WESTPHAL had each their zealous defenders and patrons; hence the breach widened, the spirits were heated, and the flame of controversy was kindled anew with such violence and fury, that, to extinguish it entirely, seemed to be a task beyond the reach of human wisdom or human power [1].

VII. These disputes were unhappily augmented, in process of time, by that famous controversy concerning the *decrees of God*, with respect to the eternal condition of men, which was set on foot by CALVIN, and became an inexhaustible source of intricate researches, and abstruse, subtle, and inexplicable questions. The most ancient Helvetic doctors were far from adopting the doctrine of those, who represent the Deity as allotting, from all eternity, by an *absolute, arbitrary, and unconditional* decree, to some everlasting happiness, and to others endless misery, without any *previous* regard to the moral characters and circumstances of either. Their sentiments seemed to differ but very little from those of the Pelagians; nor did they hesitate in declaring, after the example of ZUINGLE, that the kingdom of heaven was open to all who lived according to the dictates of right reason [2]. CALVIN had adopted a quite different

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

The controversy concerning predestination.

[1] LOSCHERI *Historia Metuum*, part II. lib. iii. cap. viii. p. 83 — MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 642. ARN. GREVIJ *Memoira* JOAC. WESTPHALI, p. 62. 106.

[2] For the proof of this assertion, see DALLEI *Apologia pro duabus Ecclesiis Gallicis. Synodus adversus Frid. Spanheim.* part IV. p. 946. — JO. ALPHONS. TURRETINI *Epistol. ad Antistes Cantuarienses*, which is inserted in the *Bibliothèque Germanic*, tom. xiii. p. 92. — SIMON, *Bibliothèque Critique*, published under the fictitious name of SAINIOR, Vol. IV. B b tom.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

different system with respect to the divine decrees. He maintained, that the everlasting condition of mankind in a future world, was determined from all eternity by the *unchangeable order* of the Deity, and that this *absolute* determination of his *will* and *good pleasure* was the *only* source of happiness or misery to every individual. This opinion was, in a very short time, propagated through all the Reformed churches, by the writings of CALVIN, and by the ministry of his disciples, and in some places was inserted in the national creeds and confessions; and thus made a public article of faith. The unhappy controversy, which took its rise from this doctrine, was opened at *Straßburg*, in the year 1560, by JEROME ZANCHIUS, an Italian ecclesiastic, who was particularly attached to the sentiments of CALVIN; and was afterwards carried on by others with such zeal and assiduity, that it drew, in an extraordinary manner, the attention of the public, and tended as much to exasperate the passions, and foment the discord of the contending parties, as the dispute about the eucharist had already done [1].

The discord  
is carried to  
the greatest  
height.

VIII. The Helvetic doctors had no prospect left of calming the troubled spirits, and tempering, at least, the vehemence of these deplorable feuds, but the moderation of the Saxon divines, who were the disciples of MELANCTHON, and who,

tom. iii. ch. xxviii. p. 292. 298. and also the author of a book, entitled, *Observationes Gallicæ in Formul. Consensus Helveticum*, p. 52. The very learned Dr. GERDES, instead of being persuaded by these testimonies, maintains, on the contrary, in his *Miscellan. Groningens.* tom. ii. p. 476, 477. that the sentiments of CALVIN were the same with those of the ancient Swiss doctors. But this excellent author may be refuted, even from his own account of the tumults that were occasioned in *Switzerland* by the opinion that CALVIN had propagated in relation to the divine decrees.

[1] LOSCHER: *Historia Motuum*, part III. lib. v. cap. ii. p. 27. S. c. x. p. 227.—SALIG, *Historia Augst. Confession.* tom. i. lib. ii. cap. xiii. p. 441.

breathing

breathing the pacific spirit of their master, seemed, after his death, to have nothing so much at heart as the restoration of concord and union in the protestant church. Their designs, however, were not carried on with that caution and circumspection, with that prudent foresight, or that wise attention to the nature of the times, which distinguished always the transactions of MELANCTHON, and which the critical nature of the cause they were engaged in, indispensably required. And hence they had already taken a step, which was adapted to render ineffectual all the remedies they could apply to the healing of the present disorders. For, by dispersing every where artful and insidious writings, with a design to seduce the ministers of the church, and the studious youth, into the sentiments of the Swiss divines, or, at least, to engage them to treat these sentiments with toleration and forbearance, they drew upon themselves the indignation of their adversaries, and ruined the pacific cause in which they had embarked. It was this conduct of theirs that gave occasion to the composition of that famous *Form of Concord*, which condemned the sentiments of the Reformed churches in relation to the *person* of CHRIST, and the *sacrament* of the Lord's supper. And as this *Form* is received by the greatest part of the Lutherans, as one of the articles of their religion; hence arises an insuperable obstacle to all schemes of reconciliation and concord.

IX. So much did it seem necessary to premise concerning the causes, rise, and progress of the controversy, which formed that separation that still subsists between the Lutheran and Reformed churches. From thence it will be proper to proceed to an account of the internal state of the latter, and to the history of its progress and revolutions. The history of the Reformed church, during this century, comprehends two distinct periods.

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

What those things are, that are most worthy of observation in the rise and progress of the Reformed church.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

periods. The first commences with the year 1519; when ZUINGLE withdrew from the communion of *Rome*, and began to form a Christian church beyond the bounds of the pope's jurisdiction; and it extends to the time of CALVIN's settlement at *Geneva*, where he acquired the greatest reputation and authority. The second period takes in the rest of this century.

During the first of these periods, the Helvetic church, which assumed the title of *Reformed*, after the example of the French protestants in their neighbourhood, who had chosen this denomination in order to distinguish themselves from the Roman-catholics, was very inconsiderable in its extent, and was confined to the cantons of *Switzerland*. It was indeed augmented by the accession of some small states in *Suabia* and *Alsace*, such as the city of *Straßbourg*, and some little republics. But, in the year 1536, these petty states changed sides, through the suggestions and influence of BUCER, returned to the communion of the Saxon church, and thus made their peace with LUTHER. The other religious communities, which abandoned the church of *Rome*, either openly embraced the doctrine of LUTHER, or consisted of persons, who were not agreed in their theological opinions, and who really seemed to stand in a kind of neutrality between the contending parties. All things being duly considered, it appears probable enough that the church, founded by ZUINGLE, would have remained still confined to the narrow limits which bounded it at first, had not CALVIN arisen, to augment its extent, authority, and lustre. For the natural and political character of the Swiss, which is neither bent towards the lust of conquest, nor the grasping views of ambition, discovered itself in their religious transactions. And, as a spirit of contentment with what they had, prevented their  
aiming

aiming at an augmentation of their territory, so did a similar spirit hinder them from being extremely solicitous about enlarging the borders of their church.

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

X. In this infant state of the *Reformed* church, the only point that prevented its union with the followers of LUTHER, was the doctrine they taught with respect to the *sacrament of the Lord's supper*. This first controversy, indeed, soon produced a second, relating to the *person of JESUS CHRIST*, which, nevertheless, concerned only a part of the Lutheran church [*m*]. The Lutheran divines of *Suabia*, in the course of their debates with those of *Switzerland*, drew an argument in favour of the *real* presence of CHRIST's body and blood in the eucharist, from the following proposition; that *all the PROPERTIES of the divine nature, and consequently its OMNIPRESENCE, were communicated to the human nature of CHRIST by the hypostatic union*. The Swiss doctors, in order to destroy the force of this argument, denied this *communication of the divine attributes to CHRIST's human nature*, and denied, more especially, the *ubiquity or omnipresence of the man JESUS*. And hence arose that most intricate and abstruse controversy concerning *ubiquity* and the *communication of properties*, that produced so many learned and unintelligible treatises, so many subtle disputes, and occasioned that multitude of invectives and accusations, that the contending parties threw out against each other with such liberality and profusion.

The religious points that first excited divisions between the Swiss and the Lutherans.

¶ [*m*] It was only a certain number of those Lutherans, that were much more rigid in their doctrine than LUTHER himself, that believed the *Ubiquity or Omnipresence* of CHRIST's person, considered as a *Man*. By this we may see, that the *Lutherans* have their divisions, as well as the *Reformed*, of which several instances may be yet given in the course of this history.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

It is proper to observe, that, at this time, the Helvetic church universally embraced the doctrine of ZUINGLE concerning the eucharist. This doctrine, which differed considerably from that of CALVIN, amounted to the following propositions: "That the *bread* and *wine* were no more than a representation of the *body* and *blood* of CHRIST; or, in other words, the *signs* appointed to denote the benefits that were conferred upon mankind in consequence of the death of CHRIST: that, therefore, Christians derived no other fruit from the participation of the Lord's supper, than a mere commemoration and remembrance of the merits of CHRIST, which, according to an expression common in the mouths of the abettors of this doctrine, was the *only thing that was properly meant by the Lord's supper* [n]." BUCER, whose leading principle was the desire of peace and concord, endeavoured to correct and modify this doctrine in such a manner, as to give it a certain degree of conformity to the hypothesis of LUTHER; but the memory of ZUINGLE was too fresh in the minds of the Swiss to permit their accepting of these corrections and modifications, or to suffer them to depart, in any respect, from the doctrine of that eminent man, who had founded their church, and been the instrument of their deliverance from the tyranny and superstition of Rome.

John Calvin  
the principal  
founder  
of the Re-  
formed  
church.

XI. In the year 1541, JOHN CALVIN, who surpassed almost all the doctors of this age in la-

[n] *Nil esse in Cæna, quam memoriam Christi.* That this was the real opinion of ZUINGLE, appears evidently from various testimonies, which may be seen in the *Museum Helveticum*, tom. i. p. 485. 490. tom. iii. p. 631.—This is also confirmed by the following sentence in ZUINGLE's book concerning *Baptism*: (tom. ii. opp. p. 85.) *Cæna Dominica non aliud, quam Commemorationis nomen meretur.* Compare with all this FUESLINI *Centur. I. Epistolar. Theologor. Reformator.* p. 255. 262, &c,  
borious

borious application, constancy of mind, force of  
 eloquence, and extent of genius, returned to *Ge-*  
*neva*, from whence the opposition of his enemies  
 had obliged him to retire. On his settlement in  
 that city, the affairs of the new church were  
 committed to his direction [o], and he acquired  
 also a high degree of influence in the political  
 administration of that republic. This event  
 changed entirely the face of affairs, and gave a  
 new aspect to the Reformed church. The views  
 and projects of this great man were grand and ex-  
 tensive. For he not only undertook to give  
 strength and vigour to the rising church, by  
 framing the wisest laws and the most salutary in-  
 stitutions for the maintenance of order and the  
 advancement of true piety, but even proposed to  
 render *Geneva* the mother, the seminary, of all  
 the *Reformed* churches, as *Wittemberg* was of all  
 the *Lutheran* communities. He laid a scheme  
 for sending forth from this little republic, the  
 succours and ministers that were to promote and  
 propagate the protestant cause through the most  
 distant nations, and aimed at nothing less than  
 rendering the government, discipline, and doc-  
 trine of *Geneva* the model and rule of imitation to  
 the Reformed churches throughout the world.  
 The undertaking was certainly great, and worthy  
 of the extensive genius and capacity of this emi-  
 nent man; and, great and arduous as it was, it  
 was executed in part, nay, carried on to a very

CENT.  
 XVI.  
 SECT. III.  
 PART II.

[o] CALVIN, in reality, enjoyed the power and authority  
 of a bishop at *Geneva*; for, as long as he lived, he presided in  
 the assembly of the clergy, and in the *Consistory* or ecclesiastical  
 judicatory. But when he was at the point of death, he advised  
 the clergy not to give him a successor, and proved to them evi-  
 dently the dangerous consequences of entrusting with any one  
 man, during life, a place of such high authority. After him,  
 therefore, the place of president ceased to be perpetual. See  
 SPON, *Histoire de Geneve*, tom. .i. p. 111.



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

---

considerable length, by his indefatigable assiduity and inextinguishable zeal. It was with this view, that, by the same of his learning, as well as by his epistolary solicitations and encouragements of various kinds, he engaged many persons of rank and fortune, in *France*, *Italy*, and other countries, to leave the places of their nativity, and to settle at *Geneva*; while others repaired thither merely out of a curiosity to see a man, whose talents and exploits had rendered him so famous, and to hear the discourses which he delivered in public. Another circumstance, that contributed much to the success of his designs, was the establishment of an academy at *Geneva*, which the senate of that city founded at his request; and in which he himself, with his colleague *THEODORE BLAZ*, and other divines of eminent learning and abilities, taught the sciences with the greatest reputation. In effect, the lustre which these great men reflected upon this infant seminary of learning, spread its fame through the distant nations with such amazing rapidity, that all who were ambitious of a distinguished progress in either sacred or profane erudition, repaired to *Geneva*, and that *England*, *Scotland*, *France*, *Italy*, and *Germany*, seemed to vie with each other in the numbers of their studious youth, that were incessantly repairing to the new academy. By these means, and by the ministry of these his disciples, *CALVIN* enlarged considerably the borders of the *Reformed* church, propagated his doctrine, and gained profelytes and patrons to his theological system, in several countries of *Europe*. In the midst of this glorious career he ended his days, in the year 1564; but the salutary institutions and wise regulations, of which he had been the author, were both respected and maintained after his death. In a more especial manner the academy of *Geneva* flourished

flourished as much under BEZA, as it had done during the life of its founder [p].

XII. The plan of doctrine and discipline, that had been formed by ZUINGLE, was altered and corrected by CALVIN; and that more especially in three points, of which it will not be improper to give a particular account.

1<sup>st</sup>, ZUINGLE, in his form of ecclesiastical government, had given an absolute and unbounded power, in religious matters, to the civil magistrate, to whom he had placed the clergy in a degree of subjection that was displeasing to many. But at the same time he allowed of a certain subordination and difference of rank among the ministers of the church, and even thought it expedient to place at their head a perpetual president, or superintendent, with a certain degree of inspection and authority over the whole body. CALVIN, on the contrary, reduced the power of the magistrate, in religious matters, within narrow bounds. He declared the church a separate and independent body, endowed with the power of legislation for itself. He maintained, that it was to be governed, like the primitive church, only by *presbyteries* and *synods*, that is, by assemblies of *elders*, composed both of the clergy and laity; and he left to the civil magistrate little else than the privilege of protecting and defending the church, and providing for what related to its external exigencies and concerns. Thus this eminent Reformer introduced

C E N T.

XVI.

S E C T. III.

P A R T II.

The form  
of doctrine  
and eccle-  
siastical  
government  
drawn up  
by this  
Reformer.

[p] The various projects and plans that were formed, conducted, and executed with equal prudence and resolution by CALVIN, in behalf both of the republic and church of Geneva, are related by the learned person, who, in the year 1730, gave a new edition (enriched with interesting historical notes, and authentic documents) of SPON's *Histoire de Genève*. The particular accounts of CALVIN's transactions, given by this anonymous editor, in his notes, are drawn from several curious manuscripts of undoubted credit. See SPON, *Histoire de Genève*, tom. ii. p. 87. 100, &c.

into

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

into the republic of *Geneva*, and, endeavoured to introduce into all the Reformed churches throughout *Europe*, that Form of ecclesiastical government, which is called *Presbyterian*, from its neither admitting of the institution of bishops, nor of any subordination among the clergy; and which is founded on this principle, that all ministers of the gospel are, by the law of God, declared to be equal in rank and authority. In consequence of this principle, he established at *Geneva* a *consistory*, composed of *ruling elders*, partly *pastors*, and partly *laymen*, and invested this ecclesiastical body with a high degree of power and authority. He also convened synods, composed of the ruling elders of different churches, and in these consistories and synods had laws enacted for the regulation of all matters of a religious nature; and among other things, restored to its former vigour the ancient practice of *excommunication*. All these things were done with the consent of the greatest part of the senate of *Geneva*.

2dly, The system that ZUINGLE had adopted with respect to the eucharist, was by no means agreeable to CALVIN, who, in order to facilitate the desired union with the Lutheran church, substituted in its place another, which appeared more conformable to the doctrine of that church, and, in reality, differed but little from it. For while the doctrine of ZUINGLE supposed only a *symbolical*, or figurative, *presence* of the body and blood of CHRIST in the eucharist, and represented a pious remembrance of CHRIST's death, and of the benefits it procured to mankind, as the only fruits that arose from the celebration of the Lord's supper, CALVIN explained this critical point in a quite different manner. He acknowledged a *real*, though *spiritual*, *presence* of CHRIST in this sacrament; or, in other words, he maintained, that true Christians, who approached this holy ordinance

nance with a lively faith, were, in a certain manner, united to the man CHRIST; and that from this union the spiritual life derived new vigour in the soul, and was still carried on, in a progressive motion, to greater degrees of purity and perfection. This kind of language had been used in the forms of doctrine drawn up by LUTHER; and as CALVIN observed, among other things, that the *divine grace* was *conferred* upon sinners, and *sealed* to them by the celebration of the Lord's supper, this induced many to suppose that he adopted the sentiment implied in the barbarous term *impanation* [q], and differed but little from the doctrine of the Lutheran church on this im-

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

☞ [q] The term *Impanation* (which signifies here the *presence* of CHRIST's body in the eucharist, *in or with the bread*, that is there exhibited) amounts to what is called *Consubstantiation*. It was a modification of the monstrous doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, first invented by some of the disciples of BERENGER, who had not a mind to break all measures with the church of Rome, and was afterwards adopted by LUTHER and his followers, who, in reality, made sad work of it. For, in order to give it some faint air of possibility, and to maintain it as well as they could, they fell into a wretched scholastic jargon about the nature of *substances*, *subsistences*, *attributes*, *properties*, and *accidents*, that did infinite mischief to the true and sublime science of gospel theology, whose beautiful simplicity it was adapted to destroy. The very same perplexity and darkness, the same quibbling, sophistical and unintelligible logic, that reigned in the attempts of the Roman-catholics to defend the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, were visible in the controversial writings of the Lutherans in behalf of *Consubstantiation*, or *Impanation*. The latter had, indeed, one absurdity less to maintain; but being obliged to assert, in opposition to intuitive evidence and unchangeable truth, that the *same* body can be in *many* places at the same time, they were consequently obliged to have recourse to the darkest and most intricate jargon of the schools, to hide the nonsense of this unaccountable doctrine. The modern Lutherans are grown somewhat wiser in this respect; at least, they seem less zealous than their ancestors about the tenet in question.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

portant subject [r]. Be that as it may, his sentiments differed considerably from those of ZUINGLE; for while the latter asserted, that all Christians, without distinction, whether *regenerate* or *unregenerate*, might be partakers of the body and blood of CHRIST; CALVIN confined this privilege to the pious and *regenerate* believer alone.

3dly, the *absolute decree* of God, with respect to the future and everlasting condition of the human race, which made no part of the theology of ZUINGLE, was an essential tenet in the creed of CALVIN, who inculcated with zeal the following doctrine: *That God, in predestinating, from all eternity, one part of mankind to everlasting happiness, and another to endless misery, was led to make this distinction by no other motive than his own GOOD PLEASURE and FREE WILL.*

These changes made by Calvin are not approved of, nor received by all the Reformed churches.

XIII. The first of the three points now mentioned, was of such a nature, that great as the credit and influence of CALVIN were, he could

[r] See PUESLINI *Certur. I. Epistol. Theolog. Reformat.* tom. i. p. 255. 266. 262, 263.—*Lettres de Calvin a Mont. Jac. de Falaise*, p. 84, 85.—We learn in PUESLIN, p. 263. that CALVIN wrote to BUCER a letter, intimating that he approved of his sentiments. It is possible, that he may have derived from BUCER the opinion he entertained with respect to the eucharist.—See BOSSUET, *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*, tom. ii. p. 8. 14. 19.—COURAYER, *Examen des Defauts des Theologiens*, tom. ii. p. 72. These two writers pretend, that the sentiments of CALVIN, with respect to the eucharist, were almost the same with those of the Roman-catholics\*. The truth of this matter is, that the obscurity and inconsistency with which this great man expressed himself upon that subject, render it extremely difficult to give a clear and accurate account of his doctrine.

\* How it could come into the heads of such men as BOSSUET and doctor COURAYER to say, that the *sentiments* of CALVIN concerning the eucharist were almost the same with those of the Roman-catholics, is, indeed, strange enough. The doctrine of Transubstantiation was to CALVIN an invincible obstacle to any sort of conformity between him and Rome on that subject. For however obscure and figurative his expressions with respect to CHRIST's spiritual presence in the eucharist may have been, he never once dreamed of any thing like a *corporal* presence in that Holy Sacrament.

not

not procure a universal reception for it in the Reformed churches. The English and Germans rejected it, and even the Swiss refused to adopt it. It was, however, received by the Reformed churches in *France, Holland, and Scotland*. The Swiss remained firm in their opposition: they would not suffer the form of ecclesiastical government, that had once been established under the inspection of ZUINGLE, to be changed in any respect, nor the power of the civil magistrate, in religious matters, to receive the smallest prejudice. The other two points were long debated, even in *Switzerland*, with the greatest warmth. Several churches, more especially those of *Zurich* and *Bern*, maintained obstinately the doctrine of ZUINGLE in relation to the eucharist [s]; neither could they be easily persuaded to admit, as an article of faith, the doctrine of *predestination*, as it had been taught by CALVIN [t]. The prudence, however, of this great man, seconded by his resolute perseverance and his extraordinary credit, triumphed at length so far, as to bring about an union between the Swiss churches and that of *Geneva*, first in relation to the doctrine of the eucharist [u], and afterwards also on the subject of *predestination* [w]. The followers of CALVIN extended still farther the triumphs of their chief, and improved with such success the footing he had gained, that, in process of time, almost all the Reformed churches adopted his theological

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

[s] See FUESLINI *Centur. Epistol.* p. 264.—*Museum Helvet.* tom. i. p. 490. tom. v. p. 479. 483. 490. tom. ii. p. 79.

[t] Besides RUCHAT and HOTTINGER, see *Museum Helveticum*, tom. ii. p. 105. 107. 117.—GFRDES, *Miscellan. Groningenf. Nova*, tom. ii. p. 476, 477.

[u] The agreement between the churches of *Switzerland* and that of *Geneva* was concluded in 1549 and 1554.

[w] See the *Consensus Genev. et Tigurinor.* in CALVINI *Opusculis*, p. 754.

system.

CENT. XVI. system, to which, no doubt, his learned writings contributed a good deal [x].

SECT. III.  
PART II.

The progress of  
Calvin's  
system in  
Germany;

XIV. It will not be improper to pass in review the different countries in which the doctrine and discipline of the Reformed church, as modelled by CALVIN, were established in a fixed and permanent manner. Among its chief patrons in Germany we may reckon FREDERICK III., elector Palatine, who, in the year 1560, removed from their pastoral functions the Lutheran doctors, and filled their places with Calvinists; and, at the same time, obliged his subjects to embrace the tenets, rites, and institutions, of the church of Geneva [y]. This order was indeed abrogated, in the year 1576, by his son and successor LEWIS, who restored Lutheranism to its former credit and authority. The effects of this revolution were, however, but transitory; for, in the year 1583, under the government of the elector JOHN CASIMIR, who had followed the example of his brother FREDERICK in embracing the discipline of the Reformed church, the face of things was again changed in favour of Calvinism, which resumed what it had lost, and became triumphant [z]. From this period the church of the Palatinate obtained the second place among the Reformed

[x] The learned DAN. ERN. JABLONSKY, in his *Letters to Leibnitz*, published by KAPPIUS, maintains (p. 24, 25, 41.), that the opinion of ZUINGLE has no longer any patrons among the Reformed. But this is a palpable mistake. For its patrons and defenders are, on the contrary, extremely numerous; and at this very time the doctrine of ZUINGLE is revived in England, Switzerland, and other countries, and seems to acquire new degrees of credit from day to day.

[y] HEN. ALTINGII *Hist. Eccl. Palat.* in LUD. CHR. MIEGII *Monum. Palat.* tom. i. p. 223.—LOSCHERI *Historia Motuum*, part II. lib. iv. cap. iv. p. 125.—SALIG, *Hist. Confession. Aug.* tom. iii. lib. ix. cap. v. p. 433.

[z] ALTING. *loc. cit.*—LOSCHERUS, *ibid.* part III. lib. vi. p. 234.—See also a German work, entitled, GOTTH. STRUVIUS, *Pfäelzische Kirchen Historie*, p. 110.

churches; and its influence and reputation were so considerable, that the *Form of instruction*, which was composed for its use by URSINUS, and which is known under the title of the *Catechism of Heidelberg*, was almost universally adopted by the Calvinists [a]. The republic of *Bremen* embraced, also, the doctrine and institutions of the Reformed. ALBERT HARDENBERG, the intimate friend of MELANCTHON, was the first who attempted to introduce there the doctrine of CALVIN concerning the eucharist. This attempt he made so early as the year 1556; and, though a powerful opposition rendered it unsuccessful, and procured the expulsion of its author out of the city of *Bremen*, yet the latent seeds of Calvinism took root, and, towards the conclusion of this century, acquired such strength, that no measures either of prudence or force were sufficient to prevent the church of *Bremen* from modelling its faith, worship, and government, after that of *Geneva* [b]. The various motives that engaged other German states to adopt, by degrees, the same sentiments, and the incidents and circumstances that favoured the progress of Calvinism in the empire, must be sought in those writers, who have undertaken to give a full, complete, and ample history of the Christian church.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

XV. Those among the French, who first re-nounced the jurisdiction and doctrine of the church of *Rome*, are commonly called Lutherans by the writers of these early times. This denomination, joined to other circumstances, has engaged some to imagine, that these French converts to the

and in  
*France*

[a] For an account of the catechism of *Heidelberg*, see KOCHER *Bibliotheca Theologica Symbolica*, p. 593 and 308.

[b] SALIG, *loc. cit.* part III. lib. x. cap. v. p. 715. & cap. vi. p. 776.—LOSCHERUS, *loc. cit.* part II. lib. iv. cap. v. p. 134. & part III. lib. vi. cap. vii. p. 276.—GERDES, *Historia Renovati Evangelii*, tom. iii. p. 157.



CENT. protestant cause were attached to the tenets of the  
 XVI. Lutheran church, and averse to those of the Swiss  
 SECT. III. doctors [c]. But this is by no means a just repre-  
 PART II. sentation of the matter. It appears much more  
 probable, that the first French protestants were  
 uniform in nothing but their antipathy to the  
 church of *Rome*, and that, this point being  
 excepted, there was a great variety in their reli-  
 gious sentiments. It is, however, to be observed,  
 that the vicinity of *Geneva*, *Lausanne*, and other  
 cities which had adopted the doctrine of CALVIN,  
 together with the incredible zeal of this eminent  
 man, and his two colleagues FAREL and BEZA, in  
 nourishing the opposition to the church of *Rome*,  
 and augmenting both the indignation and number  
 of its enemies, produced a very remarkable effect  
 upon the French churches; for, about the middle  
 of this century, they all, without exception, en-  
 tered into the bonds of fraternal communion with  
 the church of *Geneva*. The French protestants  
 were called, by their enemies, *Huguenots*, by way  
 of derision and contempt; the origin, however,  
 of this denomination is extremely uncertain [d].  
 Their

[c] LOSCHERI *Historia Motuum*, part II. cap. vi. p. 46.—  
 SALIG, *Hist. Aug. Confession*. tom. ii. lb. v. cap. vi. p. 190.

[d] Some etymologists suppose this term derived from  
 HUGUON, a word used in *Touraine*, to signify *persons that*  
*walk at night in the streets*. And as the first protestants, like  
 the first Christians, may have chosen that season for their reli-  
 gious assemblies through the fear of persecution, the nick-  
 name of *Huguenot* may, naturally enough, have been applied  
 to them by their enemies. Others are of opinion, that it was  
 derived from a French and faulty pronunciation of the Ger-  
 man word *Eidgnossen*, which signifies *confederates*, and had  
 been originally the name of that valiant part of the city of  
*Geneva*, which entered into an alliance with the Swiss Can-  
 tons, in order to maintain their liberties against the tyrannical  
 attempts of CHARLES III., duke of *Savoy*. These confede-  
 rates were called *Eignots*, and from thence, very probably,  
 was derived the word *Huguenots* now under consideration. The  
 Count

Their fate was severe; the storms of persecution assailed them with unparalleled fury; and, though many princes of the royal blood, and a great number of the flower of the nobility, adopted their sentiments, and stood forth in their cause [e], yet it may nevertheless be affirmed, that no other part of the Reformed church suffered so grievously as they did for the sake of religion. Even the peace, which they obtained from Henry III. in the year 1576, was the source of that civil war, in which the powerful and ambitious house of *Guise*, instigated by the sanguinary suggestions of the Roman pontiffs, aimed at nothing less than the extirpation of the royal family, and the utter ruin of the protestant religion; while the Huguenots, on the other hand, headed by leaders of the most heroic valour and the most illustrious rank, combated for their religion and for their sovereigns with various success. These dreadful commotions, in which both the contending parties committed such deeds as are yet, and always will be, remembered with horror, were, at length, calmed by the fortitude and prudence of HENRY IV. This monarch, indeed, sacrificed the dictates of conscience to the suggestions of policy; and imagining, that his government could have no stable nor solid foundation, as long as he persisted in disowning the authority and jurisdiction of *Rome*,

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

Count VILLARS, in a letter written to the king of *France*, from the province of *Languedoc*, where he was lieutenant-general, and dated the 11th of November, 1560, calls the riotous Calvinists of the *Cevennes*, *Huguenots*, and this is the first time that this term is found, in the registers of that province, applied to the protestants.

[e] See the *Histoire Eccles. des Eglises Reformées au Royaume de France*, published at *Antwerp*, in three volumes 8vo. in the year 1580, and supposed by many to have been written by BEZA. The writers that have given the best accounts of the French reformed churches, their confession of faith, and their forms of worship and discipline, are enumerated by KOCHERUS, in his *Bibliotheca Theolog. Symbolicæ*, p. 299.

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

he renounced the Reformed religion, and made a solemn and public profession of popery. Perceiving, however, on the other hand, that it was not possible either to extirpate or suppress entirely the protestant religion, he granted to its professors, by the famous edict drawn up at *Nantes* in the year 1598, the liberty of serving God according to their consciences [*f*]; and a full security for the enjoyment of their civil rights and privileges, without persecution or molestation from any quarter [*g*].

In England  
and Scot-  
land,

XVI. The church of *Scotland* acknowledges as its founder JOHN KNOX, the disciple of CALVIN; and, accordingly, from its first reformation, it adopted the doctrine, rites, and form of ecclesiastical government established at *Geneva*. There it has always adhered to with the utmost uniformity, and maintained with the greatest jealousy and zeal; so that even in the last century the designs of those who attempted to introduce certain changes into its discipline and worship, were publicly opposed by the force of arms [*h*].

A quite different constitution of things is observable in the church of *England*, which could

[*f*] This edict restored and confirmed, in the fullest terms, all the favours that had ever been granted to the protestants by other princes, and particularly by HENRY III. To these privileges others were also added, which had never been granted, nor even demanded, before: such as a free admission to all employments of trust, honour, and profit; the establishing courts and chambers in which the professors of the two religions were equal in number; and the permitting the children of protestants to be educated, without any molestation or constraint, in the public Universities.

[*g*] BENOIT, *Histoire de l'Edit. de Nantes*, tom. i. lib. v. p. 200.—DANIEL, *Hist. de France*, tom. ix. p. 409.—BOULAY, *Hist. Académ. Paris*, tom. i.

[*h*] SALIG. *Hist. Aug. Confession*, part II. lib. vi. cap. i. p. 403.—[*i*] Dr. MOSHEIM alludes, in this passage, to the attempt made under the reign of CHARLES II., to introduce episcopacy into *Scotland*.

never be brought to an entire compliance with the ecclesiastical laws of *Geneva*, and which retained, but for a short time, even those which it adopted. It is well known, that the greatest part of those English, who first threw off the yoke of *Rome*, seemed much more inclined to the sentiments of LUTHER concerning the eucharist, the form of public worship, and ecclesiastical government, than to those of the Swiss churches. But the scene changed after the death of HENRY VIII., when, by the industrious zeal of CALVIN, and his disciples, more especially PETER MARTYR, the cause of Lutheranism lost ground considerably; and the universities, schools, and churches became the oracles of Calvinism, which also acquired new votaries among the people from day to day [1]. Hence it happened, that when it was proposed, under the reign of EDWARD VI., to give a fixed and stable form to the doctrine and discipline of the church, *Geneva* was acknowledged as a sister church; and the theological system, there established by CALVIN, was adopted, and rendered the public rule of faith in *England*. This, however, was done without any change of the form of episcopal government, which had already taken place, and was entirely different from that of *Geneva*; nor was this step attended with any alteration of several religious rites and ceremonies, which were looked upon as superstitious by the greatest part of the Reformed. This difference, however, between the two churches, though it appeared at first of little consequence, and, in the judgment even of CALVIN, was esteemed an object of toleration and indulgence, was, nevertheless, in after-ages, a source of many calamities and dissensions, that were highly de-

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

[1] LOSCHERI *Hist. Motuum*, part II. lib. iii. cap. vii. p. 67.  
—SALIG. *Hist. Ang. Confession*, tom. ii. lib. vi. cap. iii. p. 317.

CENT. trimental both to the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of *Great Britain*.

XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

The rise of  
the Puri-  
tans.

XVII. The origin of these unhappy dissensions, which it has not as yet been possible entirely to heal, must be sought for in the conduct of those persecuted fugitives, who, to save their lives, their families, and their fortunes, from the bloody rage and inhuman tyranny of queen MARY, left the places of their nativity in the year 1554, and took refuge in *Germany* [k]. Of these fugitive

[k] I cannot help mentioning the uncharitableness of the Lutherans, upon this occasion, who hated these unhappy exiles, because they were *Sacramentarians* (for so the Lutherans called those who denied CHRIST'S bodily presence in the eucharist), and expelled from their cities such of the English protestants as repaired to them, as a refuge from popish superstition and persecution. Such as sought for shelter in *France*, *Geneva*, and those parts of *Switzerland* and *Germany* where the Reformation had taken place, and where Lutheranism was not professed, were received with great humanity, and allowed places of public worship. But it was at *Frankfort* that the exiles were most numerous; and there began the contest and division which gave rise to that separation from the church of *England* which continues to this day. It is, however, a piece of justice due to the memory of the excellent MELANCTHON, to observe, that he warmly condemned this uncharitable treatment, and more especially the indecent reproaches, which the Lutherans cast upon the English Martyrs who had sealed the Reformation with their blood, calling them the *Devil's Martyrs*. *Vociferantur quidam* (says this amiable Reformer) *Martyris Anglicos esse Martyres Diaboli. Nolim hac contumelia afficere sanctum spiritum in Latimero, qui annum octogesimum egressus fuit, et in alius sanctus viris, quos novi.* These are the words of this truly Christian Reformer, in one of his letters to CAMERARIUS, *Epist.* lib. iv. p. 959. and in another of his letters, speaking of the burning of BURGIVS at *Paris*, he thus severely censures WESTPHAL'S intolerant principles: *Tales viros ait Westphalus esse Diaboli Martyres. Hanc judicii perversitatem quis non detestetur?* *Ep.* lib. ii. p. 387. Such were the humane and liberal sentiments of MELANCTHON, which have rendered his name so precious to the lovers of piety, probity, and moderation; while the zealots of his own church have treated his memory with obloquy, and composed dissertations *de Indifferentismo Melancthonis*. N.

congregations

congregations *some* performed divine worship with the rites that had been authorized by EDWARD VI.; while *others* preferred the Swiss method of worship as more recommendable on account of its purity and simplicity. The former were called *Conformists*, on account of their compliance with the ecclesiastical laws enacted by the prince now mentioned; and the denominations of *Non-conformists* and *Puritans* were given to the latter, from their insisting upon a form of worship, more exempt from superstition, and of a more pure kind, than the liturgy of EDWARD seemed to them to be. These denominations became permanent marks of distinction, which still continue to denote those different religious communities which divide the British nation. The controversy concerning the ceremonial part of divine worship, that had divided the exiles abroad, changed scenes, and was removed with them to *England*; when the auspicious succession of queen ELIZABETH to the throne permitted them to return to their native country. The hopes of enjoying liberty, and of promoting each their respective systems, increased their contests instead of diminishing them; and the breach widened to such a degree, that the most sagacious and provident observers of things seemed to despair of seeing it healed. The wise queen, in her design to accomplish the reformation of the church, was fully resolved not to confine herself to the model exhibited by the protestants of *Geneva*, and their adherents to the *Puritans*; and, therefore, she recommended to the attention and imitation of the doctors, that were employed in this weighty and important matter, the practice and institutions of the primitive ages [1]. When her plan was put

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

[1] Dr. MOSHEIM seems disposed, by this ambiguous expression of the *primitive ages*, to insinuate that queen ELI-

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

put in execution, and the face of the church was changed and reformed by new rules of discipline, and purer forms of public worship, the famous *Act of Uniformity* was issued forth, by which all her subjects were commanded to observe these rules, and to submit to the reformation of the church on the footing on which it was now placed by the queen, as its supreme visible head upon earth. The *Puritans* refused their assent to these proceedings; pleaded the dictates of their consciences in behalf of this refusal, and complained heavily, that the gross superstitions of popery, which they had looked upon as abrogated and abolished, were now revived, and even imposed by authority. They were not, indeed, all equally exasperated against the new constitution of the church; nor did they in effect carry their opposition to equal degrees of excess. The more violent demanded the total abrogation of all that had been done towards the establishment of a national religion, and required nothing less than that the church of *England* should be exactly modelled after that of *Geneva*. The milder and more mo-

*MARY* had formed a pure, rational, and evangelical plan of religious discipline and worship. It is, however, certain, that, instead of being willing to strip religion of the ceremonies which remained in it, she was rather inclined to bring the public worship still nearer the Romish ritual, and had a great propensity to several usages in the church of *Rome*, which were justly looked upon as superstitious. She thanked publicly one of her chaplains, who had preached in defence of the *real presence*; she was fond of images, and retained some in her private chapel †; and would undoubtedly have forbid the marriage of the clergy, if *CECIL*, her secretary, had not interposed ‡. Having appointed a committee of divines to review *King EDWARD's* Liturgy, she gave them an order to strike out all offensive passages against the pope, and to make people easy about the corporal presence of *CHRIST* in the sacrament §.

\* *HEYLIN*, p. 124.

*Life of Parker*, p. 107. 108, 109.  
of *the Puritans*, vol. 1. p. 138.

† *Id. ibid.*

‡ *STRYPE's*  
*NEAL's Hist.*

derate *Puritans* were much more equitable in their demands, and only desired liberty of conscience, with the privilege of celebrating divine worship in their own way. The queen did not judge it proper to grant to either the object of their requests, but rather intent upon the suppression of this troublesome sect (as she was used to call it), permitted its enemies to employ for that purpose all the resources of artifice, and all the severity of the laws. Thus was that form of religion established in *Britain*, which separated the *English* equally from the church of *Rome* on the one hand, and from the other churches which had renounced popery, on the other; but which, at the same time, laid a perpetual foundation for dissension and feuds, in that otherwise happy and prosperous nation [m].

XVIII. The incident that gave rise to these unhappy divisions, which were productive of so many and such dreadful calamities, was a matter of very small moment, and which did not seem to affect, in any way, the interests of true religion and virtue. The chief leaders among the *Puritans* entertained a strong aversion to the vestments worn by the English clergy in the cele-

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

The sentiments and doctrine of the Puritans.

[m] No writer has treated this part of the Ecclesiastical History of *Britain* in a more ample and elegant manner than DANIEL NEAL, in his *History of the Puritans, or Protestant Non-conformists*, in four volumes 8vo. The first part of this laborious work was published at *London*, in the year 1732, and the latter part in 1738. The author, who was himself a *Non-conformist*, has not indeed been able to impose silence so far on the warm and impetuous spirit of party, as not to discover a certain degree of partiality in favour of his brethren. For while he relates, in the most circumstantial manner, all the injuries the *Puritans* received from the bishops, and those of the established religion, he, in many places, diminishes, excuses, or suppresses, the faults and failings of these separatists. See also for an account of the religious history of these times, STRYPE's *Lives of the archbishops of Canterbury* under queen ELIZABETH, viz. PARKER, GRINDAL, and WHITGIFT.



CENT. XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

bration of divine worship. As these habits had been made use of in the times of popery, and seemed to renew the impressions that had been made upon the people by the Romish priests, they appeared to the *Puritans* in no other light than as the *ensigns of Antichrist*. The spirit of opposition, being once set on foot, proceeded, in its remonstrances, to matters of superior moment. The form of ecclesiastical government, established in *England*, was one of the first and main grievances of which the *Puritans* complained. They looked upon this form as quite different from that which had been instituted by CHRIST, the great law-giver of the church, and, in conformity with the sentiments of CALVIN, maintained, that, by the divine law, all the ministers of the gospel were absolutely equal in point of rank and authority. They did not indeed think it unlawful that a person, distinguished by the title of a *bishop*, or *superintendent*, should preside in the assembly of the clergy, for the sake of maintaining order and decency in their method of proceeding; but they thought it incongruous and absurd, that the persons invested with this character should be ranked, as the bishops had hitherto been, among the nobility of the kingdom, employed in civil and political affairs, and distinguished so eminently by their wordly opulence and power. This controversy was not carried on, however, with excessive animosity and zeal, as long as the English bishops pretended to derive their dignity and authority from no other source than the laws of their country, and pleaded a right, purely human, to the rank they held in church and state. But the flame broke out with redoubled fury in the year 1583, when BANCROFT, afterwards archbishop of *Canterbury*, ventured to assert, that the order of bishops was superior to the body of presbyters, not in consequence of any human institution, but by

by the exprefs appointment of God himfelf [n]. This doctrine was readily adopted by many, and the confequences that feemed naturally to flow from it in favour of epifcopal ordination, happened in effect, and gave new fuel to the flame of controverfy. For they who embraced the fentiments of BANCROFT, confidered all minifters of the Gofpel, who had not received ordination from a bifhop, as irregularly invefted with the f acred character; and alfo maintained, that the clergy, in thofe countries where there were no bifhops, were deftitute of the gifts and qualifications that were neceffary to the exercife of the pastoral office, and were to be looked upon as inferior to the Roman-catholic priefts.

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

XIX. All thefe things exafperated the *Puritans*, whofe complaints, however, were not confined to the objects already mentioned. There were many circumftances that entered into their plan of reformation. They had a fingular antipathy againft *cathedral* churches, and demanded the abolition of the *archdeacons*, *deans*, *canons*, and other *officials*, that are fupported by their lands and revenues. They difapproved of the pompous manner of worfhip that is generally obferved in thefe churches, and looked, particularly, upon inftrumental mufic, as improperly employed in the fervice of God. The feverity of their zeal was alfo very great; for they were of opinion, that, not open profligates, but even perfons whofe piety was dubious, deferved to be excluded

[n] See STRYPE's *Life and Acts of John Whitgift*, archbifhop of *Canterbury*, p. 121. The firft Englifh Reformers admitted but two orders of church-officers to be of *divine appointment*, viz. *bifhops* and *deacons*; a prefbyter and a bifhop, according to them, being but two names for the fame office; but Dr. BANCROFT, in a fermen, preached at *Paul's Crofs*, January 12, 1588, maintained, that the bifhops of *England* were a diftinct order from *priefts*, and had fuperiority over them *jure divino*.

CENT. from the communion of the church [o]; and  
 XVI. they endeavoured to justify the rigour of this de-  
 SECT. III. cision, by observing that the church, being the  
 PART II. congregation of the faithful, nothing was more  
 incumbent on its ministers and rulers, than to  
 watch against its being defiled by the presence of  
 persons destitute of true faith and piety. They  
 found, moreover, much subject of affliction and  
 complaint in the rites and ceremonies that were  
 imposed by the order of the queen, and the autho-  
 rity of her council [p]; among these were the  
*festivals*

☞ [o] The Puritans justified themselves in relation to this point, in a letter, addressed, from their prison, to queen ELIZABETH, in the year 1592, by observing, that their sentiments concerning *the persons subject to excommunication*, and also concerning *the effects and extent of that act of church-discipline*, were conformable to those of all the Reformed churches, and to the doctrine and practice of the church of England in particular. They declared more especially, that according to their sense of things, the censure of excommunication deprived only of spiritual privileges and comforts, *without taking away either liberty, goods, lands, government private or public, or any other civil or earthly commodity of this life*, and thus they distinguished themselves from those furious and fanatical anabaptists, who had committed such disorders in Germany, and some of whom were now making a noise in England.

☞ [p] By this council our author means, the *High Commission Court*, of which it is proper to give here some account, as its proceedings essentially belong to the Ecclesiastical History of England. This court took its rise from a remarkable clause in the *act of supremacy*, by which the queen and her successors were empowered to choose persons “to exercise, under her, all manner of jurisdiction, privileges, and pre-eminences, touching any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the realms of England and Ireland, as also to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend all errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, contempts, offences, enormities whatsoever. Provided that they have no power to determine any thing to be heresy, but what has been adjudged to be so by the authority of the canonical scripture, or by the first four general councils, or any of them; or by any other general council, wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of canonical scripture, or such as shall hereafter be declared to be heresy by the High Court of Parliament, with the as-  
 “sent

*festivals or holidays* that were celebrated in honour of the saints, the use of the *sign of the cross* more especially in the sacrament of baptism, the nominating godfathers and godmothers as sureties for the education of children whose parents were still living [q], and the doctrine relating to the validity of lay-baptism [r]. They disliked the reading

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

“sent of the clergy in convocation.” Upon the authority of this clause, the queen appointed a certain number of *commissioners* for ecclesiastical causes, who, in many instances, abused their power. The court, they composed, was called the *Court of High Commission*, because it claimed a more extensive jurisdiction, and higher powers, than the ordinary *Courts of the Bishops*. Its jurisdiction reached over the whole kingdom, and was much the same with that which had been lodged in the single person of Lord CROMWELL, vicargeneral of HENRY VIII. These *Commissioners* were empowered to make enquiry, not only by the legal methods of juries and witnesses, but by all other ways and means which they could devise, that is, by rack, torture, inquisition, and imprisonment. They were vested with a right to examine such persons as they suspected, by administering to them an oath (not allowed of in their commission, and therefore called *ex officio*) by which they were obliged to answer all questions, and thereby might be obliged to accuse themselves, or their most intimate friends. The *finer* they imposed were merely discretionary; the imprisonment to which they condemned was limited by no rule but their own pleasure; they imposed, when they thought proper, new articles of faith on the clergy, and practised all the iniquities and cruelties of a real *Inquisition*. See RAPIN’S and HUME’S *Histories of England*, under the reign of ELIZABETH, and NEAL’S *History of the Puritans*, passim.

[q] Other rites and customs displeasing to the Puritans, and omitted by our author, were, *kneeling at the sacrament of the Lord’s supper*, *bowing at the name of Jesus*, *giving the ring in marriage*, the prohibition of marriage during certain times of the year, and the licensing it for money, as also the *confirmation of children* by *episcopal imposition of hands*.

[r] The words of the original are, *nec sacris Christianis pueros recens natos ab aliis, quam sacerdotibus, initiari patiebantur*. The Roman-catholics, who look upon the external rite of baptism as *absolutely necessary* to salvation, allow, consequently, of its being performed by a lay-man, or a midwife, where a clergyman is not at hand, nay (if such a ridiculous thing may be mentioned) by a surgeon, where a still birth is apprehended,

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

ing of the *apocryphal* books in the church; and, with respect to set forms of prayer, although they did not go so far as to insist upon their being entirely abolished, yet they pleaded for a right to every minister, of modifying, correcting, and using them in such a manner, as might tend most to the advancement of true piety, and of addressing the Deity in such terms as were suggested by their inward feelings, instead of those that were dictated by others. In a word, they were of opinion, that the government and discipline of the church of *England* ought to have been modelled after the ecclesiastical laws and institutions of *Geneva*, and that no indulgence was to be shewn to those ceremonies or practices, which bore the smallest resemblance of the discipline or worship of the church of *Rome*.

The principles on which the Puritans maintained their sentiments concerning ecclesiastical government and divine worship,

XX. These sentiments, considered in themselves, seemed neither susceptible of a satisfactory defence, nor of a complete refutation. Their solidity or falsehood depended upon the principles from whence they were derived; and no regular controversy could be carried on upon these matters, until the contending parties adopted some common and evident principles, by which they might corroborate their respective systems. It is only by an examination of these, that it can be known on what side truth lies, and what degree of utility or importance can be attributed to a contest of this nature. The principles laid down by the *queen's commissioners* on the one hand, and

apprehended. The church of *England*, though it teacheth in general, that none ought to baptise but men dedicated to the service of God, yet doth not esteem null baptism performed by laicks or women, because it makes a difference between what is *essential* to a sacrament, and what is requisite to the *regular* way of using it. The Puritans, that they might neither prescribe nor even connive at a practice that seemed to be founded on the absolute necessity of infant baptism, would allow that sacred rite to be performed by the clergy alone.

the

the *Puritans* on the other, were indeed very different.

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

For in the *first place*, The former maintained, that the right of reformation, that is, the privilege of removing the corruptions and of correcting the errors that may have been introduced into the doctrine, discipline, or worship of the church, is lodged in the *sovereign*, or civil magistrate alone; while the latter denied, that the power of the magistrate extended so far, and maintained, that it was rather the business of the clergy to restore religion to its native dignity and lustre. This was the opinion of CALVIN, as has been already observed.

*Secondly*, The queen's commissioners maintained, that the rule of proceeding, in reforming the doctrine or discipline of the church, was not to be derived from the sacred writings *alone*, but also from the writings and decisions of the fathers in the primitive ages. The *Puritans*, on the contrary, affirmed, that the inspired word of God being the pure and *only* fountain of wisdom and truth, it was from *thence alone* that the rules and directions were to be drawn, which were to guide the measures of those who undertook to purify the faith, or to rectify the discipline and worship, of the church; and that the ecclesiastical institutions of the early ages, as also the writings of the ancient doctors, were absolutely destitute of all sort of authority.

*Thirdly*, The queen's commissioners ventured to assert, that the church of *Rome* was a true church, though corrupt and erroneous in many points of doctrine and government; that the Roman pontif, though chargeable with temerity and arrogance in assuming to himself the title and jurisdiction of head of the whole church, was, nevertheless, to be esteemed a true and lawful bishop; and, consequently, that the ministers  
ordained

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

ordained by him were qualified for performing the pastoral duties. This was a point which the English bishops thought it absolutely necessary to maintain, since they could not otherwise claim the honour of deriving their dignities, in an uninterrupted line of succession, from the apostles. But the *Puritans* entertained very different notions of this matter; they considered the Romish hierarchy as a system of political and spiritual tyranny, that had justly forfeited the title and privileges of a true church; they looked upon its pontif as *Antichrist*, and its discipline as vain, superstitious, idolatrous, and diametrically opposite to the injunctions of the gospel; and in consequence of this they renounced its communion, and regarded all approaches to its discipline and worship as highly dangerous to the cause of true religion.

*Fourthly*, The court commissioners considered as the best and most perfect form of ecclesiastical government, that which took place during the first four or five centuries; they even preferred it to that which had been instituted by the apostles, because, as they alleged, our Saviour and his apostles had accommodated the Form, mentioned in Scripture, to the feeble and infant state of the church, and left it to the wisdom and discretion of future ages to modify it in such a manner as might be suitable to the triumphant progress of Christianity, the grandeur of a national establishment, and also to the ends of civil policy. The *Puritans* asserted, in opposition to this, that the rules of church government were clearly laid down in the Holy Scriptures, the only standard of spiritual discipline.[s]; and that the apostles, in establishing

☞ [s] By this they meant at least, that nothing should be imposed as necessary, but what was expressly contained in the Holy Scriptures, or deduced from them by necessary consequence.

establishing the first Christian church on the Aristocratical plan that was then observed in the Jewish Sanhedrim, designed it as an unchangeable model, to be followed in all times, and in all places.

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

*Lastly*, The court reformers were of opinion, that things *indifferent*, which are neither commanded nor forbidden by the authority of Scripture, such as the external rites of public worship, the kind of vestments that are to be used by the clergy, religious festivals, and the like, might be ordered, determined, and rendered a matter of obligation by the authority of the civil magistrate; and that, in such a case, the violation of his commands would be no less criminal than an act of rebellion against the laws of the state. The *Puritans* alleged, in answer to this assertion, that it was an indecent prostitution of power to impose, as *necessary* and *indispensable*, those things which CHRIST had left in the class of matters *indifferent*; since this was a manifest incroachment upon that *liberty, with which* the Divine Saviour *had made us free*. To this they added, that such rites and ceremonies as had been abused to idolatrous purposes, and had a manifest tendency to revive the impressions of superstition and popery in the minds of men, could by no means be considered as *indifferent*, but deserved to be rejected without hesitation, as impious and profane. Such, in their estimation, were the religious ceremonies of ancient times, whose abrogation was refused by the queen and her council [*t*].

XXI. This

quence. They maintained still farther, that supposing it proved, that all things necessary to the good government of the church could not be deduced from Holy Scripture, yet that the discretionary power of supplying this defect was not vested in the civil magistrate, but in the spiritual officers of the church.

[*t*] Dr. MOSHEIM, in these five articles, has followed the account of this controversy given by Mr. NEAL, in his *History*



CENT.

XVI.

SECT. III.

PART II.

The Brown-  
ists, a sect  
of the Pu-  
ritans.

XXI. This contest between the commissioners of the court, and their opponents, who desired a more complete reformation than had yet taken place, would have been much more dangerous in its consequences, had that party, that was distinguished by the general denomination of *Puritans*, been united in their sentiments, views, and measures. But the case was quite otherwise. For this large body, composed of persons of different ranks, characters, opinions, and intentions, and unanimous in nothing but their antipathy against the forms of doctrine and discipline that were established by law, was, all of a sudden, divided into a variety of sects; of which some spread abroad the delusions of enthusiasm, which had turned their own brains; while others displayed their folly in inventing new and whimsical plans of church-government. The most famous of all these sects was that which was formed, about the year 1581, by ROBERT BROWN, an insinuating man, but very unsettled and inconsistent in his views and notions of things. This innovator did not differ, in point of doctrine, either from the church of *England*, or from the rest of the *Puritans*; but he had formed new and singular notions concerning the nature of the church, and the rules

*History of the Puritans.* This latter adds a sixth article, not of debate, but of union, “Both parties (says he) agreed too well in asserting the necessity of an uniformity of public worship, and of calling in the sword of the magistrate for the support and defence of their several principles, which they made an ill use of in their turns, as they could grasp the power into their hands. The standard of uniformity, according to the bishops, was the *queen’s supremacy*, and the *laws of the land*; according to the Puritans, the *decrees of provincial and national synods*, allowed and enforced by the civil magistrate: But neither party were for admitting that liberty of conscience, and freedom of profession, which is every man’s right, as far as is consistent with the peace of the government under which he lives.”

of

of ecclesiastical government. He was for dividing the whole body of the faithful into separate societies or congregations, not larger than those which were formed by the apostles in the infancy of Christianity; and maintained, that such a number of persons, as could be contained in an ordinary place of worship, ought to be considered as a *church*, and enjoy all the rights and privileges that are competent to an ecclesiastical community. These small societies he pronounced *independent*, *jure divino*, and entirely exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishops, in whose hands the court placed the reins of spiritual government; and also from that of *synods*, which the Puritans regarded as the supreme visible sources of ecclesiastical authority. He also maintained, that the power of governing each congregation, and providing for its welfare, resided in the people; and that each member had an equal share in this direction, and an equal right to order matters for the good of the whole society [u]. Hence all points both of doctrine and discipline were submitted to the discussion of the whole congregation, and whatever was supported by a majority of votes passed into a law. It was the congregation also that elected certain of the brethren to the office of pastors, to perform the duty of public instruction, and the several branches of divine worship, reserving, however, to themselves the power of dismissing

[u] It is farther to be observed, that, according to this system, one church was not entitled to exercise jurisdiction over another; but each might give the other counsel or admonition, if they walked in a disorderly manner, or abandoned the capital truths of religion; and if the offending church did not receive the admonition, the others were to withdraw, and publicly disown them as a church of CHRIST. On the other hand, the powers of their church officers were confined within the narrow limits of their own society. The pastor of a church might not administer the sacrament of baptism, or the Lord's supper, to any but those of his own communion.

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

---

these ministers, and reducing them to the condition of private members, whenever they should think such a change conducive to the spiritual advantage of the community. For these pastors were not esteemed superior, either in sanctity or rank, to the rest of their brethren, nor distinguished from them by any other circumstance than the liberty of preaching and praying, which they derived from the free will and consent of the congregation. It is, besides, to be observed, that their right of preaching was, by no means, of an exclusive nature, or peculiar to them alone; since any member, that thought proper to exhort or instruct the Brethren, was abundantly indulged in the liberty of *prophecy* to the whole assembly. Accordingly, when the ordinary teacher or pastor had finished his discourse, all the other Brethren were permitted to communicate in public their sentiments and illustrations upon any useful or edifying subject, on which they supposed they could throw new light. In a word, BROWN aimed at nothing less than modelling the form of the church after that infant community that was founded by the apostles, without once considering the important changes both in the religious and civil state of the world since that time, the influence that these changes must necessarily have upon all ecclesiastical establishments, and the particular circumstances of the Christian church, in consequence of its former corruptions and its late reformation. And, if his notions were crude and chimerical, the zeal with which he and his associates maintained and propagated them was intemperate and extravagant in the highest degree. For he affirmed, that all communion was to be broken off with those religious societies that were founded upon a different plan from his, and treated, more especially the church of *England*, as a spurious church, whose ministers

were

were unlawfully ordained, whose discipline was popish and antichristian, and whose sacraments and institutions were destitute of all efficacy and virtue. The sect of this hot-headed innovator, not being able to endure the severe treatment which their opposition to the established forms of religious government and worship had drawn upon them, from an administration that was not distinguished by its mildness and indulgence, retired into the Netherlands, and founded churches at *Middleburg* in *Zealand*, and at *Amsterdam* and *Leyden* in the province of *Holland*, but their establishments were neither solid nor durable [x]. Their founder returned into *England*, and, having renounced his principles of separation, took orders in the established church, and obtained a benefice [y]. The Puritan exiles, whom he thus abandoned, disagreed among themselves, split into parties, and their affairs declined from day to day [z]. This engaged the wiser part of them to mitigate the severity of their founder's plan, and to soften the rigour of his uncharitable decisions; and hence arose the community of the *Independents*, or *Congregational Brethren*, which still subsists, and of

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

☞ [x] The British churches at *Amsterdam* and *Middleburg* are incorporated into the national Dutch church, and their pastors are members of the Dutch synod, which is sufficient to shew that there are at this time no traces of *Brownism* or *Independency* in these churches. The church at *Leyden*, where ROBINSON had fixed the standard of *independency* about the year 1595, was dispersed; and it is very remarkable, that a part of this church, transplanting themselves into *America*, laid the foundation of the colony of *New-England*.

☞ [y] BROWN, in his new preferment, forgot not only the rigour of his principles, but also the gravity of his former morals; for he led a very idle and dissolute life. See NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 376.

[z] NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. chap. vi.—HOORNBECKII *Summa Controvers.* lib. x. p. 738.—FULLER'S *Ecclesiastical History of Britain*, book x. p. 168.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

The state of  
the Reformed church in  
the Netherlands;

which an account shall be given in the history of the following century.

XXII. In the Belgic provinces, the friends of the Reformation seemed for a long time uncertain, whether they should embrace the communion of the Swiss, or of the Lutheran church. Each of these had zealous friends and powerful patrons [a]. The matter was, nevertheless, decided in the year 1571, and the religious system of CALVIN was publicly adopted. For the Belgic confession of faith, which then appeared [b], was drawn up in the spirit, and almost in the terms, of that which was received in the Reformed churches in *France*, and differed considerably, in several respects, from the confession of *Augsburg*, but more especially in the article relating to CHRIST's presence in the eucharist [c]. This will not appear surprising to those who consider the vicinity of the French to the Low-countries; the number of French protestants that were constantly passing or sojourning there; the extraordinary reputation of CALVIN, and of the academy of *Geneva*; as also, the indefatigable zeal of his disciples in extending the limits of their church, and propagating, throughout all *Europe*, their system of doctrine, discipline, and government. Be that as it may, from this period, the Dutch, who had before been denominated *Lutherans*, assumed universally the title of *Reformed*, in which also they imitated the French, by whom this title had been first invented and adopted. It is true, indeed, that, as long as they were subject to the Spanish yoke, the fear of exposing themselves to the displeasure

[a] LOSCHER *Hist. Motuum*, part III. lib. v. cap. iv. p. 74.

[b] KOCHER *Biblioth. Theolog. Symbolicæ*, p. 216.

[c] See BRANDT's *History of the Reformation of the Netherlands* (written in Dutch), vol. i. book v. p. 253.

of that sovereign induced them to avoid the title of *Reformed*, and to call themselves *Associates of the Brethren of the Confession of Augsburg*. For the Lutherans were esteemed, by the Spanish court, much better subjects than the disciples of CALVIN, who, on account of the tumults that had lately prevailed in *France*, were supposed to have a greater propensity to mutiny and sedition [*d*].

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

XXIII. The light of the Reformation was first brought from *Saxony* into *Poland* by the disciples of LUTHER. Some time after this happy period, the *Bohemian Brethren*, whom the Romish clergy had expelled from their country, as also several Helvetic doctors, propagated their sentiments among the Poles. Some congregations were also founded in that Republic by the *Anabaptists*, *Anti-Trinitarians*, and other sectaries [*e*]. Hence it was, that three distinct communities, each of which adopted the main principles of the Reformation, were to be found in *Poland*, viz. the *Bohemian Brethren*, the *Lutherans*, and *Swiss*. These communities, in order to defend themselves with the greater vigour against their common enemies, formed among themselves a kind of confederacy, in a synod held at *Sandomir* in the year 1570, upon certain conditions, which were comprehended in the *Confession of Faith*, that derives its

and in *Poland*.

[*d*] Dr. MOSHEIM advances this on the authority of a passage in BRANDT's *History of the Reformation of the Netherlands*, (p. 254, 255.) which is written in Dutch, and is, indeed, a most curious and valuable work, notwithstanding the author's partiality towards the cause of Arminianism, of which he was one of the most respectable patrons.

[*e*] LOSCHER *Hist. Motuum*, part III. lib. v. cap. iii. p. 36.—SALIG. *Hist. Aug. Confession* tom. II. 'b. vi. cap. iii. iv, v. p. 516.—REGNVOLESCII *Hist. Ecluf. Slavonicar.* lib. i. cap. xvi. p. 71.—SALIGNAC, *Hist. de Pologne*, tom. v. p. 40.—KAUTZ, *Præcipua Relig. Evangel. in Polonia Fata*, published in 4to, at *Hamburg*, in the year 1738.

CENT. XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

title from the city now mentioned [f]. But as this association seemed rather adapted to accelerate the conclusion of a peace, than to promote the cause of truth, the points in debate between the *Lutherans* and the *Reformed* being expressed in this reconciling confession in vague and ambiguous terms, it was soon after this warmly opposed by many of the former, and was entirely annulled in the following century. Many attempts have, indeed, been made to revive it; but they have not answered the expectations of those who have employed their dexterity and zeal in this matter. In *Prussia*, the *Reformed* gained ground after the death of LUTHER and MELANCTHON, and founded the flourishing churches that still subsist in that country [g].

The Bohemian Brethren.

XXIV. The *Bohemian*, or, as they are otherwise called, the *Moravian Brethren*, who descended from the better sort of Hussites, and were distinguished by several religious institutions of a singular nature, and well adapted to guard their community against the reigning vices and corruptions of the times, had no sooner heard of LUTHER'S design of reforming the church, than they sent deputies, in the year 1522, to recommend themselves to his friendship and good offices. In succeeding times, they continued to discover the same zealous attachment to the Lutheran churches in *Saxony*, and also to those that were founded in other countries. These offers could not be well accepted without a previous examination of their religious sentiments and principles. And, indeed,

[f] See DAN. ERNEST. [ABIONSKY, *Historia Consensus Soudorurensis*, published at Berlin in 4to, in the year 1731; as also the *Epistola Apologetica* of the same author, in defence of the work now mentioned, against the objections of an anonymous author.

[g] LOSCHERI *Historia Motuum*, part III. lib. vi. cap. i. p. 216.

this examination turned to their advantage; for neither LUTHER nor his disciples found any thing, either in their doctrine or discipline, that was, in any great measure, liable to censure; and though he could not approve, in every particular, of their *Confession of Faith*, which they submitted to his judgment, yet he looked upon it as an object of toleration and indulgence [*b*]. Nevertheless, the death of LUTHER, and the expulsion of these *Brethren* from their country in the year 1547, gave a new turn to their religious connexions; and great numbers of them, more especially of those who retired into *Poland*, embraced the religious sentiments and discipline of the *Reformed*. The attachment of the Bohemians to the *Lutherans* seemed, indeed, to be revived by the *Convention of Sendomir*, already mentioned; but as the articles of union, that were drawn up in that assembly, lost all their force and authority in a little time, the Bohemians, by degrees, entered one and all into the communion of the Swiss church [*i*]. This union was, at first, formed on the express condition, that the two churches should continue to be governed by their respective laws and institutions, and should have separate places of public worship; but, in the following century, all remains of dissension were removed in the synods held at *Astrog* in the years 1620 and 1627, and the two congregations were formed into one, under the title of *The Church of the*

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

[*b*] See a German work of CARPZOVIVS, entitled, *Nachricht von den Bohmischen Brudern*, p. 46. as also JO. CHR. KOCHLERI *Bibliotheca Theologica Symbolica*, p. 76.

[*i*] Besides COMENIVS, CAMER. RIUS, and LASITIUS, who have written professedly the History of the Bohemian Brethren, see LOSCHERI *Historia Motuum*, part III. lib. v. cap. vi. p. 99.—SALIG. *Hist. Confession. Aug.* tom. ii. lib. vi. cap. iii. p. 520.—AD. REGENVOLSCII *Hist. Eccles. Slavonica*, lib. i. cap. xiii, xiv, xv.



CENT. XVI. *United Brethren.* In this coalition the reconciled parties shewed to each other reciprocal marks of toleration and indulgence; for the external form of the church was modelled after the discipline of the *Bohemian Brethren*, and the articles of faith were taken from the creed of the *Calvinists* [k].

The Waldenses, Hungarian, and Transylvanians.

XXV. The descendants of the *Waldenses*, who lived shut up in the vallies of *Piedmont*, were naturally led, by their situation in the neighbourhood of the French, and of the Republic of *Geneva*, to embrace the doctrines and rites of the *Reformed* church. So far down, however, as the year 1630, they retained a considerable part of their ancient discipline and tenets; but the plague, that broke out that year, having destroyed the greatest part of this unhappy people, and among the rest a considerable number of their pastors and clergy, they addressed themselves to the French churches for spiritual succour; and the new doctors, sent from thence, made several changes in the discipline and doctrine of the *Waldenses*, and rendered them conformable, in every respect, with those of the protestant churches in *France* [l].

The Hungarians and Transylvanians were engaged to renounce the errors and superstitions of the church of *Rome* by the writings of *LUTHER*, and the ministry of his disciples. But some time after *MARTHIAS DEVAY*, and other doctors, began to introduce, in a secret manner, among these nations, the doctrines of the Swiss churches in relation to the eucharist, as also their principles of ecclesiastical government. This doctrine, and these principles, were propagated in a more open

[k] *REGENVOLSCIUS*, *loc. citat.* lib. i. cap. xiv. p. 120.

[l] *LÉGER*, *Histoire Generale des Eglises Vaudoises*, livr. i. chap. xxxiii. p. 205, 206.—*ABR. SCULETTI Annales Renovati Evangelii*, p. 294.—*DAN. GERDES, Hist. Renovati Evangelii*, tom. II. p. 401.

and public manner towards the year 1550, by SZEGEDIN and other Calvinist teachers, whose ministry was attended with remarkable success. This change was followed by the same dissensions that had broke out in other countries on like occasions; and these dissensions grew into an open schism among the friends of the Reformation in these provinces, which the lapse of time has rather confirmed than diminished [m].

XAVI After the solemn publication of the famous *Form of Concord*, of which an account has been already given, many German churches, of the Lutheran communion, dissolved their original bonds, and embraced the doctrine and discipline of CALVIN. Among these we may place the churches of *Nassau*, *Hmau*, and *Ifenburg*, with several others of less note. In the year 1595, the princes of *Anhalt*, influenced by the counsels of WOLFGANG AMLINGIUS, renounced also the profession of Lutheranism, and introduced into their dominions the religious tenets and rites of *Geneva*; this revolution, however, produced a long and warm controversy between the Lutherans and the inhabitants of the principality [n]. The doctrines

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

Of the Lu-  
theran  
churches  
but em-  
braced Cal-  
vinism.

[m] PAULI DEBREZANI *Historia Eccles. Reform. in Hungar. et Transylvan.* lib. ii. p. 64. 72. 98. *Unseluld. Nachr.* A. 1738, p. 1076. GEORG. HANERI *Historia Eccles. Transylv.* published at *Frankfort* in 12mo, in the year 1694.

[n] See for an account of this matter the German work of BECHMAN, which is thus entitled *Histoire des Harje Anhalt*, vol. ii. p. 133. and that of KRAFT, which bears the title of *Ausserliche Historie von dem Exorcismo*, p. 428. 497. 177 Though the princes professed Calvinism, and introduced Calvinist ministers in all the churches, where they had the right of patronage, yet the people were left free in their choices; and the noblemen and their vassals, that were attached to Lutheranism, had secured to them the unrestrained exercise of their religion. By virtue of a convention made in 1679, the Lutherans were permitted to erect new churches. The *Zerbst* line, with the greatest part of its subjects, profess Lutheranism; but the three other lines, with their respective territories, are Calvinists.

of

CENT. XVI. SECT. III. PART II. of the Calvinist or Reformed church, more especially those that relate to the eucharist, were also introduced into *Denmark*, towards the conclusion of this century; for, in this kingdom, the disciples and votaries of MLLANTHON, who had always discovered a strong propensity to a union between the protestant churches, were extremely numerous, and they had at their head NICHOLAS HEMMINGIUS, a man eminent for his piety and learning. But the views of this divine, and the schemes of his party, being discovered much sooner than they expected, by the vigilant defenders of the Lutheran cause, their plans were disconcerted [o], and the progress of Calvinism was successfully opposed by the Lutheran ministers, seconded by the countenance and authority of the sovereign [p].

The diversity that reigned among the various branches of the Reformed church.

XXVII. It must not however be imagined, that the different nations that embraced the communion of the Calvinist church, adopted, at the same time, without exception, all its tenets, rites, and institutions. This universal conformity was, indeed, ardently desired by the Helvetic doctors; but their desires, in this respect, were far from being accomplished. The English, as is sufficiently known, rejected the forms of ecclesiastical government and religious worship that were adopted by the other Reformed churches, and could not be persuaded to receive, as public and national articles of faith, the doctrines that were propagated in *Switzerland*, in relation to the

[o] ERICI PONTOPPIDANI *Annals Ecclesiæ Danicæ Diplomatici*, tom. iii. p. 57.

[p] That is (for our author consistently with truth can mean no more) the designs, that were formed to render Calvinism the national and established religion, proved abortive. It is certain however, that Calvinism made a very considerable progress in *Denmark*, and has still a great number of votaries in that kingdom.

sacrament

sacrament of the Lord's supper and the Divine decrees [q]. The protestants in *Holland, Bremen, Poland, Hungary*, and the Palatinate, followed, indeed, the French and Helvetic churches in their sentiments concerning the eucharist, in the simplicity of their worship, and in their principles of ecclesiastical polity, but not in their notions of *predestination*, which intricate doctrine they left undefined, and submitted to the free examination and private judgment of every individual [r]. It may farther be affirmed, that, be-

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

[q] It is true indeed, that the doctrine of ZUINGLE, who represented the bread and wine as bearing more than the external signs of the death of CHRIST, was not adopted by the church of *England*, but the doctrine of CALVIN was embraced by that church, and is plainly taught in the xxviii<sup>th</sup> article of its faith. As to what relates to the doctrine of the Divine Decrees, Dr MOSHEIM is equally mistaken. The xviii<sup>th</sup> article of the church of *England*, as Bishop BURNET candidly acknowledges, stands according to St. AUGUSTIN's doctrine, which he only differs it ill from that of CALVIN, and, though it be expressed with a certain latitude that renders it susceptible of a mitigated interpretation, yet it is very probable, that those who penned it were patrons of the doctrine of Absolute Decrees. The very cautions, that are subjoined to this article, intimate that *Calvinism* was what it was meant to establish. It is certain, that the Calvinistical doctrine of predestination prevailed among the first English Reformers, the greatest part of whom were, at least, *Calvinists*; in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH this doctrine was predominant, but after that period it lost ground imperceptibly, and was renounced by the church of *England* in the reign of King CHARLES I. Some members of that church still adhered, nevertheless, to the tenets of CALVIN, and maintained, not only that the thirty nine articles were Calvinistical, but also affirmed, that they were not susceptible of being interpreted in that latitude for which the *Arminians* contended. These episcopal votaries of Calvinism were called *Doctrinal Puritans*. See BURNET's *Explication of the Seventeenth Article*, &c. and NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. 1. p. 579.

[r] See GROTIJ *Apologet. coram, qui Hollandiæ ante mutationem*, A. 1618, præfuerunt, cap. iii. p. 54. Ed. Paris. 1640, in 12mo.

fore

CENT. fore the synod of *Dort* [s], no Reformed church had  
 XVI. obliged its members, by any special law, or article  
 SECT. II. of faith, to adhere to the doctrine of the church  
 PART II. of *Geneva* relating to the primary causes of the sal-  
 vation of the elect, or the ruin of the reprobate. It  
 is true indeed, that in the places now mentioned,  
 the greatest part of the *Reformed* doctors fell by  
 degrees, of their own accord, into the Calvinistical  
 opinion concerning these intricate points; and  
 this was principally owing, no doubt, to the great  
 reputation of the academy of *Geneva*, which was  
 generally frequented, in this century, by those  
 among the Reformed who were candidates for the  
 ministry.

The doc-  
 trine adopt-  
 ed by the  
 Reformed  
 churches.

XXVIII. The books of the Old and New  
 Testament are regarded by the *Reformed* churches  
 as the only sources of Divine Truth; it must how-  
 ever be observed, that, to their authority, the  
 church of *England* adds that of the writings of the  
 Fathers during the first five centuries [t]. The  
*Reformed* and the *Lutherans* agree in maintaining  
 that the Holy Scriptures are infallible in all  
 things; that, in matters of which the knowledge  
 is necessary to salvation, they are clear, full, and  
 complete; and also that they are to be explained

☞ [s] It was in this famous synod, that was assembled in  
 the year 1618, and of which we shall have occasion to give a  
 more ample account in the history of the following century, that  
 the doctrine of CALVIN was fixed as the national and established  
 religion of the Seven United Provinces.

☞ [t] There is nothing in the thirty-nine articles of the  
 church of *England*, which implies its considering the writings of  
 the Fathers of the first five centuries, as an authoritative crite-  
 rion of religious truth. There is, indeed, a clause in the *Act of*  
*Uniformity*, passed in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH, declar-  
 ing, that her delegates, in ecclesiastical matters, should not de-  
 termine any thing to be heresy, but what was adjudged so by the  
 authority of scripture, or by the first four general councils; and this  
 has perhaps misled Dr. MOSHEIM in the passage to which this  
 note refers. Much respect indeed, and perhaps too much, has  
 been paid to the Fathers; but that has been always a matter  
 of choice, and not of obligation.

by

by themselves, and not either by the dictates of human reason, or the decisions of the ancient Fathers. Several of the doctors among the former have indeed employed too freely the sagacity of their natural understanding, in explaining those divine mysteries that are contained in the Gospel; and this circumstance has induced many to imagine, that the *Reformed* adopted two sources of religion, two criterions of divine truth, *viz.* the *Holy Scripture* and *Human Reason*. But perhaps it will be found, that, in this respect, doctors of *both* communions have sometimes gone too far, being led on by the spirit of controversy, and animated with the desire of victory. For, if we except the singular tenets of some individuals, it may be affirmed with truth, that the *Lutherans* and the *Reformed* are unanimous in the matter now under consideration. They both maintain, that *contradictory propositions cannot be the objects of faith*; and consequently that all *doctrines* that contain *ideas* and *notions* that are *repugnant to*, and *mutually destroy each other*, must be *false* and *incredible*. It is true indeed, that the *Reformed* sometimes use this principle in a contentious manner, to overturn certain points of the *Lutheran* system, which they have thought proper to reject [u].

XXIX. The *Reformed*, if by this denomination we understand those who embrace the sentiments of CALVIN, differ entirely from the *Lutherans* in the following points:

1<sup>st</sup>, In their notions of the sacrament of the Lord's supper. The *Lutherans* affirm that the

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

The points  
in which  
the Re-  
formed and  
Lutherans  
differ.

[u] Our author has here undoubtedly in view the *Lutheran* doctrine of *Consubstantiation*, which supposes the same *extended body* to be *totally present* in different places at one and the same time. To call this a gross and glaring contradiction, seems rather the dictate of common sense, than the suggestion of a contentious spirit.

body

C E N T. body and blood of CHRIST are *materially present*  
 XVI. in this sacrament, though in an incomprehensible  
 SECT. III. manner; and that they are *really* exhibited both  
 PART II. to the righteous and the wicked, to the worthy  
 and to the unworthy, receiver. The *Reformed*  
 hold, on the contrary, that the man CHRIST is  
 only present in this ordinance by the external signs  
 of bread and wine; though it must, at the same  
 time, be observed, that this matter is differently  
 explained and represented in the writings of their  
 doctors.

2dly, In their doctrine of the *eternal decrees of God, respecting man's salvation*. The *Lutherans* maintain, that the *divine decrees* respecting the salvation or misery of men are founded upon a *previous knowledge* of their sentiments and characters; or, in other words, that God, foreseeing from all eternity the faith or incredulity of different persons, had reserved eternal happiness for the faithful, and eternal misery for the unbelieving and disobedient. The *Reformed* entertain different sentiments concerning this intricate point. They consider the divine decrees as *free* and *unconditional*, and as founded on the *will of God*, which is limited by no superior order, and which is above all laws.

3dly, Concerning *some religious rites and institutions*, which the *Reformed* consider as bordering upon superstition, or tending, at least, to promote it; while the *Lutherans* view them in another light, and represent all of them as *tolerable*, and some of them as *useful*. Such are the use of images in the churches, the distinguishing vestments of the clergy, the private confession of sins, the use of wafers in the administration of the Lord's supper, the form of *exorcism* in the celebration of baptism, and other ceremonies of like moment. The *Reformed* doctors insist on the abolition of all these rites and institutions; and  
 that

that upon this general principle, that the discipline and worship of the Christian church ought to be restored to their primitive simplicity, and freed from the human inventions and additions that were employed by superstition in the times of ignorance, to render them more striking to the deluded multitude.

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

---

XXX. The few heads of difference, between the two communions, which have been now briefly pointed out, have furnished an inexhaustible fund of controversy to the contending parties, and been drawn out into a multitude of intricate questions, and subjects of debate, that, by consequences fairly or injudiciously deduced, have widened the scene of contention, and extended to almost all the important truths of religion. Thus the debate concerning the *manner in which the body and blood of CHRIST are present in the Eucharist*, opened to the disputants a large field of inquiry, in which the nature and fruits of the institutions called *Sacraments*, the majesty and glory of CHRIST's *humanity*, together with the *communication* of the divine perfections to it, and that inward frame of spirit that is required in the worship that is addressed to the divine Saviour, were carefully examined. In like manner, the controversy, which had for its object *the divine decrees*, led the doctors, by whom it was carried on, into the most subtle and profound researches concerning the nature of the divine attributes, particularly those of *justice* and *goodness*, the doctrines of *fate* or *necessity*, the connexion between *human liberty* and *divine prescience*, the extent of God's love to mankind, and of the benefits that arise from the merits of CHRIST as mediator, the operations of that divine spirit or power that rectifies the wills and sanctifies the affections of men, the perseverance of the *elect* in their covenant with God, and in a state of salvation, and other

The moment and importance of these differences.



CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

other points of great moment and importance. The subject of debate, that was drawn from the use of certain external rites and ceremonies in religious worship, was also productive of several questions and enquiries. For besides the researches into the origin and antiquity of certain institutions, to which it gave occasion, it naturally led to a discussion of the following important questions: viz. *What are the special marks that characterize things INDIFFERENT?—How far is it lawful to comply with the demands of an adversary, whose opposition is only directed against things esteemed indifferent in their own nature?—What is the extent of Christian liberty?—Whether or no it be lawful to retain, in condescension to the prejudices of the people, or with a view to their benefit, certain ancient rites and institutions, which, although they carry a superstitious aspect, may nevertheless be susceptible of a favourable and rational interpretation?*

To whom  
the right of  
governing  
the church  
belongs.

XXXI. It has always been a question much debated among protestants, and more especially in England and Holland, where it has excited great commotions and tumults, *to whom the right of governing the church, and the power of deciding in religious matters, properly belong?* This controversy has been determined in favour of those who maintain, that the power of deciding, in matters of religious doctrine, discipline, and government, is, by the appointment of CHRIST himself, vested in the church, and therefore ought by no means to be intrusted with, or exercised by the civil magistrate; while, at the same time, they grant, that it is the business of the latter to assist the church with his protection and advice, to convoke and preside in its synods and councils, to take care that the clergy do not attempt to carry on any thing that may be prejudicial to the interests of the state, and, by his authority, to confirm the validity, and secure the execution, of the ecclesiastical

ecclesiastical laws enacted by the church under his inspection, It is true, that from the time of HENRY VIII., the kings of *England* consider themselves as *supreme heads of the church*, and that in relation to *its spiritual, as well as its temporal concerns*; and it is plain enough, that, on the strength of this important title, both HENRY VIII. and his son EDWARD assumed an extensive authority and jurisdiction in the church, and looked upon their spiritual power, as equal to that which had been unworthily enjoyed by the Roman pontif [w]. But Queen ELIZABETH receded considerably from these high pretensions, and diminished the spiritual power of her successors, by declaring that the jurisdiction of the kings of *England* extended only to the ministers of religion, and not to religion itself; to the rulers of the church, and not to the church itself; or, in other words, that the persons of the clergy were alone subject to their civil authority [x]. Accordingly, we see that the constitution of the church of *England* resembles perfectly that of the state, and that there is a striking analogy between the civil and ecclesiastical government established in that country. The clergy, consisting of the upper and lower houses of convocation, are immediately assembled by the archbishop of *Canterbury*, in consequence of an order from the sovereign, and propose in these meetings, by common consent, such measures as seem necessary to the well-being of the church; these measures are laid before the king and parliament, and derive from their ap-

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

[w] See NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol i. p. 11.

[x] See COURAYE, *Supplement aux deux Ouvrages pour la Défense de la validité des Ordinations Anglicanes*, chap. xv. p. 486.

☞ This must be understood with many restrictions, if it can be at all admitted. The whole tenor of Queen ELIZABETH's reign shewed plainly that she did not pretend to less power in religious matters than any of her predecessors.

CENT. XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

probation and authority the force of laws [y]. But it must be acknowledged, that this matter has given occasion to much altercation and debate; nor has it been found easy to fix the extent of the jurisdiction and prerogatives of these great bodies in a manner conformable to their respective pretensions, since the king and his council explain them in one way, and the clergy, more especially those who are zealous for the spiritual supremacy and independency of the church, understand them in another. The truth of the matter is plainly this, that the ecclesiastical polity in *England* has never acquired a stable and consistent form, nor been reduced to clear and certain principles. It has rather been carried on and administered by ancient custom and precedent, than defined and fixed by any regular system of laws and institutions.

The form  
of ecclesiastical  
government  
among the  
Reformed.

XXXII. If it was not an easy matter to determine in what hands the power of deciding affairs of a religious nature was to be lodged, it was no less difficult to fix the form of ecclesiastical government in which this power was to be administered. Many vehement disputes were kindled on this subject, which neither the lapse of time, nor the efforts of human wisdom, have been able to bring to an amicable issue. The Republic of *Geneva*, in consequence of the counsels of CALVIN, judged it proper that the particular affairs of each church should be directed by a body of elders, or *presbyters*, all invested with an equal degree of power and authority; that matters of a more public and important nature were to be sub-

[y] Jo. COSINUS, *De Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Religione et Disciplina*, in the learned THOMAS SMITH'S *Vita Eruditiff. Virorum*, published at London in 4to in the year 1707.—See also DAV. WILKINS, *De Veteri et Moderna Synodi Anglic. Constitutione*, tom. i. *Concil. Magn. Britann.* p. vii.—NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 2, 3. 15. 132.

mitted

mitted to the judgment of an assembly, or synod, composed of elders chosen as deputies by the churches of a whole province or district; and that all affairs of such extensive influence and high moment, as concerned the welfare of the sacred community in general, should be examined and decided, as in times of old, by a general assembly of the whole church. This form of ecclesiastical government the church of *Geneva* adopted for itself [z], and left no intreaties or methods of persuasion unemployed, that might recommend it to the other Reformed churches with which they lived in fraternal communion. But it was obsti-

CEN T.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

[z] The account Dr. MOSHEIM gives here and above (§ XII. of this chapter) of the form of Ecclesiastical Government established by CALVIN at *Geneva*, is far from being accurate. There are but two ecclesiastical bodies in that Republick, viz. the *Venerable Company* of the pastors and professors, and the *Consistory*; for a just description of which, see the judicious Mr. KEATE's *Short Account of the Ancient History, present Government and Laws of the Republic of Geneva*, printed for Dodsley in the year 1761, p. 110. 112. 121. 124.—I would only remark, that what this sensible author observes, with respect to the *Consistory*, p. 124. of his interesting performance, belongs principally, if not wholly, to the *Venerable Company*.—Dr. MOSHEIM seems to have been led into this mistake, by imagining that the ecclesiastical form of Government established in *Scotland*, where indeed all church affairs are managed by consistorial, provincial, and national assemblies, or, in other words, by *presbyteries*, *synods*, and *general synods*, was a direct transcript of the hierarchy of *Geneva*. It is also probable, that he may have been deceived by reading in NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, that the Scottish reformers approved of the discipline of the Reformed churches of *Geneva* and *Switzerland*, and followed their plan of Ecclesiastical Government. But he ought to have observed, that this approbation and imitation related only to the *democratical* form of the church of *Geneva*, and the parity of its ministers. Be that as it may, the plan of government, which our historian here supposes to have place at *Geneva*, is in reality that which is observed in *Scotland*, and of which no more than the first and fundamental principles were taken from the discipline of CALVIN. The small territory of *Geneva* would not admit of such a form of ecclesiastical polity as Dr. MOSHEIM here describes:

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

---

nately rejected by the English clergy, who regarded as sacred and immutable that ancient form of spiritual government, according to which a certain district or *diocese* is committed to the care and inspection of one ruler or bishop, to whom the *presbyters* of each church are subject, as also the *deacons* are to the *presbyters*; while those affairs that concerned the general interests of the church are treated in an assembly of bishops, and of such ecclesiastics as are next to them in rank and dignity. This form of episcopal polity was, with some small exceptions, adopted by the Bohemian and Moravian brethren [a], who were become one of the Reformed churches; but it was highly displeasing to those among the protestants, who had embraced the sentiments and discipline of CALVIN. The dissensions, occasioned by these different schemes of ecclesiastical polity, were every way adapted to produce a violent schism in the church; and that so much the more, as each of the contending parties pretended to derive their respective plan from the injunctions of CHRIST and the practice of his disciples. And, in effect, it divided the English nation into two parties, who, during a long time, treated each other with great animosity and bitterness, and whose feuds, on many occasions, proved detrimental to the civil interests and prosperity of the nation. This schism, however, which did such mischief in *England*, was, by the prudence and piety of a few great and excellent divines, confined to that country, and prevented from either becoming universal, or interrupting the fraternal union that prevailed between the church of *England* and the Reformed churches abroad. The worthy men, that thus set bounds to the influ-

[a] See *Epist. de Ordin. et Successione Episcop. in unitate Fratrum Bohem. conservata*, in CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFII *Institution. Juris Eccles.* p. 410.

ence of these unhappy divisions, found great opposition made, by the suggestions of bigotry, to their charitable purpose. To maintain, however, the bonds of union between the episcopal church of *England* and the presbyterian churches in foreign countries, they laid down the following maxim, which, though it be not universally adopted, tends nevertheless to the preservation of external concord among the *Reformed*, viz. "That JESUS CHRIST has left upon record no express injunctions with respect to the external form of government, that is to be observed in his church; and consequently, that every nation hath a right to establish such a Form, as seemeth conducive to the interests, and suitable to the peculiar state, circumstances, and exigences of the community, provided that such an establishment be in no respect prejudicial to truth, or favourable to the revival of superstition [b]."

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

XXXIII. It was the opinion of CALVIN, not only that flagitious and profligate members were to be cut off from the sacred society, and excluded from the communion of the church, but also that men of dissolute and licentious lives were punishable by the laws of the state, and the arm of the civil magistrate. In this he differed entirely from ZUINGLE, who, supposing that all authority, of every kind, was lodged in the hands of the magistrate alone, would not allow to the ministers of the church the power of excluding flagitious offenders from its communion, or withholding from them the participation of its sacra-

The state of  
church dis-  
cipline.

[b] See SPANHEMII Opera, tom. ii. lib. viii. ix. p. 1055. This was the general opinion of the British divines that lived in the earliest period of the Reformation, and was first abandoned by archbishop WHITGIFT. See NEAL'S History of the Puritans, tom. iii. p. 140.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

ments [c]. But the credit and influence of CALVIN were so great at Geneva, that he accomplished his purpose, even in the face of a formidable opposition from various quarters. He established the severest rules of discipline to correct the licentious manners of the times, by which he exposed himself to innumerable perils from the malignity and resentment of the dissolute, and to perpetual contests with the patrons of voluptuousness and immorality. He executed, moreover, these rules of discipline with the utmost rigour, had them strengthened and supported by the authority of the state, excluded obstinate offenders from the communion of the church, by the judicial sentence of the *Consistory*, and even went so far as to procure their banishment from the city; not to mention other kinds of punishment, of no mild nature, which, at his desire, were inflicted upon men of loose principles and irregular lives [d].  
The

[c] See a remarkable letter of RUD. GUALTIERI, in FUESLIN's *Centuria I. Epistolarum à Reformatöribus Helveticis scriptarum*, p. 478. where he expresses himself thus: *Excommunicationem neque Zuinglius . . . neque Bullingerus unquam probaverunt, et . . . obstitērunt iis qui eam aliquando voluerunt introducere . . . Basileæ quidem Oecolampadius, multum dissuadente Zuinglio, instituerat . . . sed adeo non durabilis fuit illa constitutio, ut Oecolampadius illam abrogavit, &c.* See also p. 90.

[d] Of all the undertakings of CALVIN, there was none that involved him in so much trouble, or exposed him to such imminent danger, as the plan he had formed, with such resolution and fortitude, of purging the church by the exclusion of obstinate and scandalous offenders, and inflicting severe punishments on all such as violated the laws, enacted by the church, or by the *Consistory*, which was its representative. See *The Life of Calvin*, composed by BEZA, and prefixed to his letters.—SPON's *Histoire de Genève*, and particularly the *Notes*, tom. ii. p. 45. 65.—CALVIN's *Letters*, and more especially those addressed to *Jaques de Bourgogne*, published at Amsterdam, in 8vo, in the year 1744, p. 126. 127. 132. 153. 157.—The party at Geneva, which CALVIN called the sect of *Liber-tines* (because they defended the licentious customs of ancient times, the erection of stews, and such like matters, not only by their discourse and their actions, but even by force of arms),

was

The clergy in *Switzerland* were highly pleased with the form of church-government that had been established at *Geneva*, and ardently desirous of a greater degree of power to restrain the influence of obstinate sinners, and a larger share of authority in the church, than they were intrusted with by the ecclesiastical constitution of ZUINGLE. They devoutly wished that the discipline of CALVIN might be followed in their *Cantons*, and even made some attempts for that purpose. But their desires and their endeavours were equally vain; for the Cantons of *Bern*, *Zurich*, and *Basil*, distinguished themselves among the others in opposing this change, and would by no means permit the bounds, that ZUINGLE had set to the jurisdiction of the church, to be removed, nor its power and authority to be augmented, in any respect [e].

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

XXXIV. All the various branches of learning, whether sacred or profane, flourished among the Reformed during this century, as appears evidently by the great number of excellent productions which have been transmitted to our times. ZUINGLE, indeed, seemed disposed to exclude philosophy from the pale of the church [f]; but in this inconsiderate purpose he had few followers, and the succeeding doctors of the Helvetic church

The state of  
learning among the  
Reformed.

was both numerous and powerful. But the courage and resolution of this great reformer gained the ascendant, and triumphed over the opposition of his enemies.

[e] See the account of the tumults and commotions of LAUSANNE, in the *Museum Helveticum*, tom. ii. p. 119.—The disputes, that were carried on, upon this occasion, in the Palatinate, which adopted the ecclesiastical discipline of *Geneva*, are recorded by ALTINGIUS, in his *Hist. Eccles. Palat.* and by STRUVIUS, in his *Hist. Eccles. Palat. German.* p. 212.

[f] ZUINGLE, in the Dedication of his book, *De verâ et falsa Religione*, to FRANCIS I. king of France, expresses himself in the following terms: *Philosophiæ interdictum est à Christi Scholis: at ipsi (Saxoniæ) fecerunt eam catholici verbi magistram.*



CEN. T.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

were soon persuaded of the necessity of philosophical knowledge, more especially in controversies and researches of a theological kind. Hence it was, that, in the year 1588, an academy was founded at *Geneva* by CALVIN, whose first care was to place in this new seminary a professor of philosophy for the instruction of youth in the principles of reasoning. It is true, indeed, that this professor had a very limited province assigned him, being obliged to confine his instructions to a mere interpretation of the precepts of ARISTOTLE, who at this time was the oracle of all the public schools [g], and whose philosophical principles and method were exclusively adopted by all the other Reformed academies; though it is certain, that the philosophy of RAMUS was, for some time, preferred by many of the doctors of *Basil* to that of the Stagirite [h].

The interpreters and commentators of scripture,

XXXV. The *Reformed* church, from its very infancy, produced a great number of expositors of scripture, whose learned and excellent commentaries deserve a memorable place [i] in the history of theological science. The exposition that ZUINGLE has given of the greatest part of the books of the New Testament is far from being

[g] BEZA, in his *Epistolæ Theologicæ*, (ep. xxxvi. p. 156.) speaks thus: *Certam nobis ac constitutum est, et in ipsis tradendis logicis et in ceteris explicandis disciplinis ab Aristotelis sententia ne tantillum quidem deflectere.*

[h] See CASP. BRANDTII *Vita Jacobi Arminii*, p. 12, 13, 22.

[i] Dr. MOSHEIM pays a tribute to these great men of the Reformed church, that seems to be extorted by justice, with a kind of effort, from the spirit of party. He says, that ZUINGLE's labours are not contemptible; that CALVIN attempted an illustration of the sacred writings; that the New Testament of BEZA has not, even at this day, entirely lost the reputation it formerly enjoyed. This is faint praise; and therefore the translator has, without departing from the tenor of the author's phraseology, animated a little the coldness of his panegyric.

destitute

defitute of merit [k]. He was succeeded by BULLINGER, OECOLAMPADIUS, and MUSCULUS, and also by others, who, though inferior to these great men in erudition and genius, deserve nevertheless a certain degree of approbation and esteem. But the two divines who shone with a superior and unrivalled lustre in this learned list of sacred expositors, were JOHN CALVIN, and THEODORE BEZA. The former composed an excellent commentary on almost all the books of Holy Writ; and the latter published a Latin Version of the *New Testament*, enriched with theological and critical observations, which has passed through many editions, and enjoys, at this day, a considerable part of the reputation and applause with which it is crowned at its first appearance. It must be acknowledged, to the honour of the greatest part of these commentators, that, wisely neglecting those allegorical significations and mystical meanings that the irregular fancies of former expositors had attributed to the terms of Holy Writ, they employed their whole diligence and industry in investigating the literal sense, the full energy of the words of scripture, in order to find out the true intention of the sacred writer. It must, however, be observed, on the other hand, that some of these interpreters, and more especially CALVIN, have been sharply censured for applying to the temporal state and circumstances of the Jews, several prophecies that point to the Messiah, and to the Christian dispensation in the most evident and palpable manner, and thus removing some of

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

[k] It was not only on the books of the *New Testament* that ZUINGLE employed his very learned and excellent labours. He expounded the Book of *Genesis*, together with the twenty-four first chapters of *Exodus*, and gave new Versions of the *Book of Psalms*, of the Prophecies of *Isaiab* and *Jeremiab*.

the

GEN T. the most striking arguments in favour of the divi-  
 XVI. nity of the Gospel [1].

SECT. III.

PART II.

The theolo-  
 gical doc-  
 trine of the  
 Reformed  
 Church.

XXXVI. The state of theology, and the revolutions it underwent among the Helvetic and the other Reformed churches, were pretty much the same with what it met with among the Lutherans. ZUINGLE was one of the first Reformed doctors who reduced that sacred science into a certain sort of order, in his book *Concerning true and false Religion*, which contained a brief exposition of the principal doctrines of Christianity. This production was followed by one much more comprehensive in its contents, and perfect in its kind, composed by CALVIN, and entitled, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, which held in the Reformed churches the same rank, authority, and credit, that the *Loci Communes* of MELANTHON obtained among us [m]. The example of CALVIN animated the doctors of his communion, and produced a great number of writers of *Common Place Divinity*, some more, others less voluminous, among which MUSCULUS, PETER MARTYR, and PISCATOR particularly excelled. The most ancient of these writers are, generally speaking, the best, on account of their simplicity and clearness, being untainted with that affectation of subtilty, and that scholastic spirit, that have eclipsed the merit of many a good genius. CALVIN was a model in this respect, more especially in his *Institutes*; a work remarkable for the finest elegance of style, and the greatest ease and perspicuity of expression, together with the most perfect simplicity of method, and clearness of argument. But this simplicity was soon effaced by the intricate science of

[1] See ÆGIDII HUNNII *Calvinus Judaizans*, published at Wittenberg, in 8vo. in the year 1595, which was refuted by DAVID PAREUS, in a book published the same year under the title of *Calvinus Orthodoxus*.

[m] The reader must not forget that the learned author of this History is a Lutheran.

the schools. The philosophy of ARISTOTLE, which was taught in almost all the seminaries of learning, and suffered much from falling into bad hands, insinuated itself into the regions of theology, and rendered them barren, thorny, intricate, and gloomy, by the enormous multitude of barbarous terms, captious questions, minute distinctions, and useless subtilties, that followed in its train [n].

CEN. T.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

XXXVII. The

[n] It must however be acknowledged, that the *scholastic* method of teaching theology seems to have first infected our [the Lutheran] church, though the contagion spread itself, soon after, among the reformed doctors. It was certainly very recent in *Holland* at the time of the famous synod of *Dort*. In this assembly MACCOVIUS, professor at *Franker*, a man deeply versed in all the mysteries of the scholastic philosophy, was accused of heresy by his colleague SIBRAND LUBBERT. When the matter was examined, the synod gave it as their opinion, that MACCOVIUS was unjustly accused of heresy; but that, in his divinity lectures, he had not followed that simplicity of method, and clearness of expression, that are commendable in a public teacher of Christianity; and that he rather followed the subtle manner of the scholastic doctors, than the plain and unaffected phraseology of the inspired writers. The decision of the synod is expressed by WALTER BALCANQUAL (in the acts of that ecclesiastical assembly that are subjoined to his letters to Sir DUDLEY CARLETON) in the following words: *Maccovium . . . nullius hæreseos reum teneri . . . peccasse eum, quod quibusdam ambiguis et obscuris scholasticis phrasibus usus sit: QUOD SCHOLASTICUM DOCENDI MODUM CONETUR IN BELGICIS ACADEMIIS INTRODUCERE . . . Monendum esse eum, ut cum spiritu sancto loquatur, non cum Bellarmino aut Suarezio* \*. These admonitions produced but little effect on MACCOVIUS, as appears by his theological writings, which are richly seasoned with scholastic wit and intricate speculations. He therefore appears to have been the first who introduced the subtilties of philosophy into the theological system of the Reformed churches in *Holland*. He was not, however, alone in this attempt, but was seconded by the acute Mr. WILLIAM AMES, minister of the English church at the *Hague*, and several others of the same scholastic turn. This method of teaching theology must have been in use among almost all the Reformed doctors before the synod of *Dort*, if we give credit to EPISCOPUS, who, in the last discourse he

\* See the *Acta Synodi Dort.* in HALT's *Golden Remains*. p. 161.—See PNEUMATI LOMBORCHII *Epistolar. Ecclesiasticar. Collect.* p. 374.

addressed

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

The state of  
practical  
divinity or  
morality.

XXXVII. The Reformed doctors of this century generally concluded their treatises of didactic theology with a delineation of the moral duties that are incumbent upon Christians, and the rules of practice that are prescribed in the Gospel. This method was observed by CALVIN, and was followed, out of respect for his example, by almost all the divines of his communion, who looked upon him as their model and their guide. This eminent man, towards the conclusion of his *Institutes*, speaks of the power of the magistrate, and the ends of civil government; and in the last chapter gives the portraiture of the *life and manners of a true Christian*, but in a much more concise manner than the copiousness, dignity, and importance of the subject seemed to require. The progress of morality among the Reformed, was obstructed by the very same means that retarded its improvement among the Lutherans. It was neglected amidst the tumult of controversy; and while every pen was drawn to maintain certain *systems of doctrine*, few were employed in cultivating or promoting that noblest of all sciences, which has *virtue, life, and manners* for its objects.

addressed to his disciples at *Leyden*, tells them that he had carefully avoided this scholastic divinity; and that this was the principal cause that had drawn on him the vehement hatred and opposition of all the other professors and teachers of theology. His words are as follow: *Videbam veritatem multarum et maximarum rerum in ipsa scriptura sacra, laboratis humana industria phasibus, ingeniosis vocularum fictionibus, locorum communium, artificiosis texturis, exquisitis terminorum ac formularum inventionibus adeo involutam, perplexam et intricatam redditam esse, ut Oedipo sæpe opus esset ad Sphingem illam theologican enodandam. Ita est, ut hinc primæ lacrymæ—Reducendam itaque terminorum apostolicorum et curvis obviorum simplicitatem semper sequendam putavi, et sequestrandas, quas academicæ et scholæ tanquam proprias sibi vendicant, logicas, philosophicasque speculationes et dictiones.* See PHILIPPI LIMBORCHII *Vita Episcopii*, p. 123, 124.

This

This master-science, which CALVIN and his associates had left in a rude and imperfect state, was first reduced into some kind of form, and explained with a certain degree of accuracy and precision, by WILLIAM PERKINS [o], an English divine, as the Reformed doctors universally allow. He was seconded in this laudable undertaking by TELINGIUS, a native of *Holland*, whose writings were composed in the Dutch language. It was by a worthy and pious spirit of emulation, excited by the example of these two doctors, that WILLIAM AMES, a native of *Scotland*, and professor of divinity at *Franker* [p], was engaged to compose a complete Body of Christian Morality [q]. These writers

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

[o] Mr. WILLIAM PERKINS was born at *Marston* in *Warwickshire*, in the first year of Queen ELIZABETH, and educated in *Christ's College, Cambridge*, of which he was Fellow. He was one of the most famous practical writers and preachers of his age. His puritanical and non-conforming principles exposed him to the cognizance of the *High Commission Court*; but his peaceable behaviour, and eminent reputation, in the learned world, procured him an exemption from the persecutions that fell upon his brethren. His works, which were printed in three volumes, folio, afford abundant proofs of his piety and industry, especially when it is considered that he died in the 44th year of his age.

[p] Dr. WILLIAM AMES, educated at *Cambridge*, under Mr. PERKINS, fled from the persecution of Archbishop BANCROFT, and was invited by the states of *Friesland* to the divinity chair in the University of *Franker*, which he filled with great reputation during the space of twelve years, after which he removed to *Rotterdam*, at the invitation of an *English* church there, and became their pastor. He was at the synod of *Dort*, and informed King JAMES's ambassador at the *Hague*, from time to time, of the debates of that assembly. Besides his controversial writings against the Arminians, he published the following: *Medulla Theologiæ* (the work here referred to by Dr. MOSHEIM); *Manuductio Logica*;—*Cases of Conscience*; *Analysis on the Book of Psalms*;—*Notes on the First and Second Epistles of St. Peter*, &c. These productions are not void of merit, considering the times in which they were written.

[q] In the Dedication and Preface of his famous book *De Conscientia et ejus jure*, Dr. AMES observes (*Præfat. p. 3.*).  
that

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

The con-  
tests of Cal-  
vin with the  
Spiritual  
Libertines.

writers were succeeded by others, who still threw farther light on this important science.

XXXVIII. The Reformed church was less disturbed, during this century, by sects, divisions, and theological disputes, than the Lutheran, which was often a prey to the most unhappy dissensions. This circumstance is looked upon by the former as a matter of triumph, though it may be very easily accounted for by all such as are acquainted with the History of the Reformed Church [r]. We have, however, in the writings of CALVIN, an account, and also a refutation, of a most pernicious sect that sprung up in that church, and produced troubles of a more deplorable kind than any that happened in our community [s]. This odious sect, which assumed the denominations of *Libertines* and *Spiritual Brethren and Sisters*, arose in *Flanders*, was headed by POKESIUS, RUFFUS, and QUINTIN, got a certain footing in *France* through the favour and protection of MARGARLT, queen of *Navarre*, and sister to FRANCIS I., and found patrons in several of the

that an excessive zeal for doctrine had produced an unhappy neglect of morality, *Quod hæc pars prophetiæ (i. e. morality) bacterius minus facit exulta, hoc inde fuit, quod primipales nostri perpetuo in acie adversus hostes pugnare, fidem propugnare, et anciam ecclesiæ purgare, necessitate quadam cogebantur, ita ut agros et vineas plantare et rigare non potuerint ex voto, sicut belli fervente usu venire solent.* The address to the students of *Franker*, which is subjoined to this book, under the title of *Parænesis ad Studiosos*, &c. deserves to be perused, as it confirms farther what has been already observed with respect to the neglect of the science of morality. *Theologi*, says he, *præclare se instructos putant ad omnes officii sui partes, si dogmata tantum intelligant, — Neque tamen omnia dogmata scrutantur, sed illa sola, quæ præcipue solent agitari et in controversiam vocari.*

[r] Dr. MOSHEIM ought to have given us a hint of his manner of accounting for this, to avoid the suspicion of having been somewhat at a loss for a favourable solution.

[s] Why all these comparisons? Our author seems, on some occasions, to tinge his historical relation with the spirit of party.

Reformed churches [1]. Their doctrine, as far as it can be known by the writings of CALVIN and its other antagonists (for these fanatics published no account of their tenets that is come to my knowledge), amounted to the following propositions: "That the Deity was the sole *operating cause* in the mind of man, and the immediate *author* of all human actions; that, consequently, the distinctions of *good* and *evil*, that had been established with respect to these actions, were false and groundless, and that men could not, properly speaking, commit sin; that religion consisted in the union of the spirit, or rational soul, with the Supreme Being; that all those who had attained this happy union, by sublime contemplation and elevation of mind, were then allowed to indulge, without exception or restraint, their appetites and passions; that all their actions and pursuits were then perfectly innocent; and that, after the death of the body, they were to be united to the Deity." These extravagant tenets resemble, in such a striking manner, the opinions of the *Beghards*, or *Brethren of the Free Spirit*, that it appears to me, beyond all doubt, that the *Libertines*, or *Spirituals*, now under consideration, were no more than a remnant of that ancient sect. The place of their origin confirms this hypothesis; since it is well known, that, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, *Flanders* almost swarmed with licentious fanatics of this kind.

XXXIX. We must not confound, as is frequently done, with these fanatics, another kind of *Libertines*, whom CALVIN had to combat, and who gave him much trouble and perplexity during the whole course of his life and ministry, I mean

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

And with  
the Libertines of Geneva.

[1] See CALVINI *Instructio adversus fanaticum et furiosam sectam Libertinorum, qui se spirituales vocant, in Tractatibus ejus Theologicis.*



CENT. XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

the *Libertines of Geneva*. These were rather a cabal of rakes than a sect of fanatics. For they made no pretences to any religious system, but pleaded only for the liberty of leading voluptuous and immoral lives. This cabal was composed of a certain number of licentious citizens, who could not bear the severe discipline of CALVIN, who punished with rigour not only dissolute manners, but also whatever carried the aspect of irreligion and impiety. This irregular troop stood forth in defence of the licentiousness and dissipation that had reigned in their city before the Reformation, pleaded for the continuance of those brothels, banquetings, and other entertainments of a sensual kind, which the regulations of CALVIN were designed to abolish, and employed all the bitterness of reproach and invective, all the resources of fraud and violence, all the powers of faction, to accomplish their purpose [u]. In this turbulent cabal there were several persons, who were not only notorious for their dissolute and scandalous manner of living, but also for their atheistical impiety and contempt of all religion. Of this odious class was GRUET, who attacked CALVIN with the utmost animosity and fury, calling him bishop *Asculanensis*, the new pope, and branding him with other contumelious denominations of a like nature. This GRUET denied the divinity of the Christian religion, the immortality of the soul, the difference between moral good and evil, and rejected, with disdain, the doctrines that are held the most sacred among Christians; for which impieties he was at last brought before the civil tribunals, in the year 1550, and was condemned to death [w]

[u] SPON'S *Histoire de Geneve*, tom. ii. p. 44. in the Notes of the editor, in the edition in 12mo published at Geneva in 1730.

[w] Id. tom. ii. p. 47. in the Notes.

XL. The opposition that was made to CALVIN did not end here. He had contests of another kind to sustain against those who could not relish his theological system, and, more especially, his melancholy and discouraging doctrine in relation to *eternal* and *absolute Decrees*. These adversaries felt, by a disagreeable experience, the warmth and violence of his haughty temper, and that impatience of contradiction that arose from an over-jealous concern for his honour, or rather for his unrivalled supremacy. He would not suffer them to remain at *Geneva*; nay, in the heat of the controversy, being carried away by the impetuosity of his passions, he accused them of crimes, from which they have been fully absolved by the impartial judgment of unprejudiced posterity [x]. Among these victims of CALVIN's unlimited power and excessive zeal, we may reckon SEBASTIAN CASTALIO, master of the public school at *Geneva*, who, though not exempt from failings [y], was nevertheless a man of probity, and was also remarkable for the extent of his learning, and the elegance of his taste. As this learned man could not approve of all the measures that were followed, nor indeed of all the opinions that were entertained by CALVIN and his colleagues, and particularly that of absolute and unconditional predestination, he was deposed from his office in the

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

Calvin's  
disputes  
with  
Castalio ;

[x] At this day, we may venture to speak thus freely of the rash decisions of CALVIN, since even the Doctors of *Geneva*, as well as those of the other Reformed churches, ingenuously acknowledge, that the eminent talents and excellent qualities of that great man were accompanied with great defects, for which, however, they plead indulgence, in consideration of his services and virtues. See the *Notes* to SPON's *Histoire de Geneve*, tom. ii. p. 110. as also the *Preface* to CALVIN's *Letters to Jacques de Bourgogne*, p. 19.

[y] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article CASTALIO, in which the merit and demerit of that learned man seem to be impartially and accurately examined.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

with Bol-  
sec,

year 1544, and banished the city. The magistrates of *Basil* received, nevertheless, this ingenious exile, and gave him the Greek professorship in their university [z].

XLI. A like fate happened to JEROM BOLSEC, a French monk of the Carmelite order, who, though much inferior to CASTALIO in genius and learning, was nevertheless judged worthy of esteem, on account of the motive that brought him to *Geneva*; for it was a conviction of the excellence of the protestant religion that engaged him to abandon the monastic retreats of superstition, and to repair to this city, where he followed the profession of physic. His imprudence, however, was great, and was the principal cause of the misfortunes that befel him. It led him, in the year 1551, to lift up his voice in the full congregation, after the conclusion of divine worship, and to declaim, in the most indecent manner, against the doctrine of *absolute Decrees*; for which he was cast into prison, and, soon after, sent into banishment. He then returned to the place of his nativity, and to the communion of *Rome*, and published the most bitter and slanderous libels, in which the reputation, conduct, and morals of CALVIN and BEZA were cruelly attacked [a]. From this treatment of BOLSEC arose the misunderstanding between CALVIN and JACQUES DE BOURGOGNE, a man illustrious by his descent from the dukes of *Burgundy*, who was CALVIN's great patron and intimate friend, and who had settled at *Geneva* with no other view than to enjoy the

[z] See UYTENBOGARD'S *Ecclesiastical History* written in Dutch, part I. p. 70—73. where that author endeavours to defend the innocence of CASTALIO. See also COLOMESII *Italia Orientalis*, p. 99.—BAYLE'S *Diction.* tom. i. p. 792.

[a] See BAYLE'S *Diction.* at the article BOLSEC.—SPON'S *Hyst. de Geneve*, tom. ii. p. 55. in the *Notes*.—*Biblioth. Raisonnée*, tom. xxxii. p. 446. tom. xxxiv. p. 409.

pleasure of conversing with him. JACQUES DE BOURGOGNE had employed BOLSEC as his physician, and was so well satisfied with his services, that he endeavoured to support him, and to prevent his being ruined by the enmity and authority of CALVIN. This incensed the latter to such a degree, that he turned the force of his resentment against this illustrious nobleman, who, to avoid his vengeance, removed from *Geneva*, and passed the remainder of his days in a rural retreat [b].

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

XLII. BERNARDIN OCHINUS, a native of *Siena*, and, before his conversion, general of the order of Capuchins, was, in the year 1543, banished from *Switzerland*, in consequence of a sentence passed upon him by the Helvetic church. This proselyte, who was a man of a fertile imagination, and a lively and subtle turn of mind, had been invited to *Zurich* as pastor of the Italian church established in that city. But the freedom, or rather the licentiousness, of his sentiments, exposed him justly to the displeasure of those who had been his patrons and protectors. For, among many other opinions very different from those that were commonly received, he maintained that the law, which confined a husband to one wife, was susceptible of exceptions in certain cases. In his writings also he propagated several notions, that were repugnant to the theological system of the Helvetic doctors, and pushed his inquiries into many subjects of importance, with a boldness and freedom that were by no means suitable to the genius and spirit of the age in which he lived. Some have, however, undertaken his defence, and have alleged in his behalf, that the errors he maintained at the time of his banishment (when,

and with  
Ochinus,

[b] See *Lettres de CALVIN à Jaques de Bourgogne*, Preface, p. 8.—*La Bibliothèque Raisonnée*, tom. xxxiv. p. 444. tom. xxxiv. p. 406.

C E N T. worn out with age, and oppressed with poverty, he  
 XVI. was rather an object of compassion, than of resent-  
 S E C T. III. ment), were not of such a heinous nature as to jus-  
 P A R T II. tify so severe a punishment. However that may  
 have been, this unfortunate exile retired into *Po-*  
*land*, where he embraced the communion of the  
 Anti-trinitarians and Anabaptists [c], and ended  
 his days in the year 1564 [d].

The con-  
 troversy be-  
 tween the  
 church of  
 England  
 and the  
 Puritans.

XLIII. It is remarkable enough, that those very  
 doctors, who animadverted with such severity  
 upon all those who dared to dissent from any part  
 of their theological system, thought proper, never-  
 theless, to behave with the greatest circum-  
 spection, and the most pacific spirit of mildness,  
 in the long controversy that was carried on with  
 such animosity between the *Puritans*, and the  
 abettors of *episcopacy* in *England*. For if, on the

[c] BOVERII *Annales Capucinatorum*.—Together with a book,  
 entitled, *La guerre Seraphique, ou Histoire des perils qu'a couru la*  
*barbe des Capucins*, livr. ii. p. 147. livr. iii. p. 190. 230.—  
*Observationes Helenæ Latinæ*, tom. iv. *Observ.* xx. p. 406.  
 tom. v. *Observ.* i. p. 3.—BAYLE'S *Diction.* at the article  
 OCHIN.—CHRIST. SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trinuar.* p. 4.  
 NICERON, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire des hommes illustres*,  
 tom. xix. p. 166.

[d] OCHINUS did not leave the accusations of his ad-  
 versaries without a reply; he published, in Italian, *Five Books*  
*of Apology* for his character and conduct, which were printed,  
 together with a Latin translation of them, by SEB. CASTALIO,  
 without the date of the year. The *Geneva* edition of this  
 apology bears date 1554, and is in 8vo. There is a German  
 edition in 4to, published (according to VOGTIUS, *Catal. Lib-*  
*rar.* p. 430.) in the year 1556. That copy in the *Jena* library  
 bears date 1559. See MYLIUS'S *Memor. Acad. Jenens.* C. 6.  
 p. 432. BEZA, in his letter to DUDITHIUS, insults the me-  
 mory of OCHINUS, and pretends to justify the severity with  
 which he was treated, in such a taunting and uncharitable  
 manner, as does him little credit. See his *Epist. Theolog. Ge-*  
*nevæ*, 1575, in 12mo. *Epist.* i. p. 10. & *Ep.* 81. What the  
 writers of the Romish church have laid to the charge of OCHI-  
 NUS, may be seen in the life of Cardinal COMMENDONI,  
 written by GRATIANI bishop of *Amelia* (and published in a  
 French translation by the eloquent FLECHIER bishop of  
*Nîmes*), B. 2. C. 9. p. 138—149. N.

one hand, they could not but stand well affected to the *Puritans*, who were stedfast defenders of the discipline and sentiments of the Helvetic church; so, on the other, they were connected with the episcopal doctors by the bonds of Christian communion and fraternal love. In this critical situation, their whole thoughts were turned towards reconciliation and peace; and they exhorted their brethren, the *Puritans*, to put on a spirit of meekness and forbearance towards the episcopal church, and not to break the bonds of charity and communion with its rulers or its members. Such was the gentle spirit of the doctors in *Switzerland* towards the church of *England*, notwithstanding the severe treatment the greatest part of the *Reformed* had received from that church, which constantly insisted on the divine origin of its government and discipline, and scarcely allowed the other reformed communities the privileges, or even the denomination, of a true church. This moderation of the Helvetic doctors was the dictate of prudence. They did not think it expedient to contend with a generous and flourishing people, nor to incur the displeasure of a mighty queen, whose authority seemed to extend not only to her own dominions, but even to the United Provinces, which were placed in her neighbourhood, and, in some measure, under her protection. Nor did the apprehensions of a general schism in the Reformed church contribute a little to render them meek, moderate, and pacific. It is one thing to punish and communicate a handful of weak and unsupported individuals, who attempt to disturb the tranquillity of the state by the introduction of opinions, which, though neither highly absurd, nor of dangerous consequence, have yet the demerit of novelty; and another to irritate, or promote divisions in a flourishing church, which, though weakened

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

Many persons of eminent genius and learning among the Reformed.

more or less by intestine feuds, is yet both powerful and respectable in a high degree. Besides, the dispute between the church of *England* and the other Reformed churches did not, as yet, turn upon points of doctrine, but only on the rites of external worship and the form of ecclesiastical government. It is, however, to be observed, that in process of time, nay soon after the period now under consideration, certain religious doctrines were introduced into the debate between the two churches, that contributed much to widen the breach, and to cast the prospect of reconciliation at a distance [d].

XLIV. That the Reformed church abounded, during this century, with great and eminent men, justly celebrated for their illustrious talents and universal learning, is too well known to stand in need of any proof. Besides CALVIN, ZUINGLE, and BEZA, who exhibited to the Republic of Letters very striking instances of genius and erudition, we may place in the list of those who have gained an immortal name by their writings, OECOLAMPADIUS, BULLINGER, FAREL, VIRET, MARTYR, BIBLIANDER, MUSCULUS, PELLICAN, LAVATER, HOSPINIAN, URSINUS, CRANMER archbishop of *Canterbury*, SZEGEDINUS, and many

☞ [d] All the protestant divines of the *Reformed* church, whether Puritans or others, seemed indeed, hitherto, of one mind about the *Doctrines of Faith*. But, towards the latter end of queen ELIZABETH's reign, there arose a party, which were first for softening, and then for overthrowing, the received opinions concerning *Predestination*, *Persistence*, *Free-will*, *Effectual Grace*, and the *Extent of Christ's Redemption*. These are the doctrines to which Dr. MOSHEIM alludes in this passage. The clergy of the episcopal church began to lean towards the notions concerning these intricate points, which ARMINIUS propagated some time after this; while, on the other hand, the Puritans adhered rigorously to the system of CALVIN. Several episcopal doctors remained attached to the same system, and all these abettors of Calvinism, whether episcopal or presbyterian, were called *Doctrinal Puritans*.

others,

others, whose names and merits are recorded by the writers of philological history, and particularly by MELCHIOR ADAM, ANTHONY WOOD, and DANIEL NEAL, the learned and industrious author of the *History of the Puritans*.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

## C H A P. III.

*The History of the ANABAPTISTS or MENNONITES.*

I. **T**HE true origin of that sect which acquired the denomination of the *Anabaptists* [e] by their administering anew the rite of baptism

The origin  
of the Ana-  
baptists  
obscure.

[e] The modern *Mennonites* reject the denomination of *Anabaptists*, and also disavow the custom of repeating the ceremony of baptism, from whence this denomination is derived. They acknowledge that the ancient *Anabaptists* practised the repetition of baptism to those who joined them from other Christian churches; but they maintain, at the same time, that this custom is at present abolished by, far the greatest part of their community. (See HERM. SCHYN, *Historiæ Mennonitarum plenior Deductio*, cap. ii. p. 32.). But here, if I am not much mistaken, these good men forget that ingenuous candour and simplicity, of which, on other occasions, they make such ostentation, and have recourse to artifice in order to disguise the true cause and origin of the denomination in question. They pretend, for instance, that the *Anabaptists*, their ancestors, were so called from their baptizing a second time all adult persons, who left other churches to enter into their communion. But it is certain, that the denomination in question was given them not only on this account, but also, and indeed principally, from the following consideration; that they did not look upon those who had been baptised in a state of infancy, or at a tender age, as rendered, by the administration of this sacrament, true members of the Christian church; and therefore insisted upon their being re-baptised in order to their being received into the communion of the *Anabaptists*. It is likewise certain, that all the churches of that communion, however they may vary in other respects, and differ from each other in their tenets and practices, agree nevertheless in this opinion, and, as yet, persevere obstinately in it. In a more especial manner are the ancient *Flemish Anabaptists* entitled to this



C E N T. baptism to those who came over to their commu-  
 XVI. nion, and derived that of *Mennonites*, from the  
 SECT. III. famous  
 PART II.

---

this denomination. For they not only re-baptise the children that have been already baptised in other churches, but even observe the same method with respect to persons that are come to the years of reason and discretion. Nay, what is still more remarkable, the different sects of *Anabaptists* deal in the same manner one with another; each sect re-baptise the persons that enter into its communion, although they have already received that sacrament in another sect of the same denomination; and the reason of this conduct is, that each sect considers its *baptism alone* as pure and valid. It is indeed to be observed, that there is another class of *Anabaptists*, called *Waterlansians*, who are more moderate in their principles, and wiser in all respects than those now mentioned, and who do not pretend to re-baptise *adult* persons, who have already been baptised in other Christian churches, or in other sects of their own denomination. This moderate class are, however, with propriety, termed *Anabaptists*, on account of their re-baptising such as had received the Baptismal Rite in a state of infancy or childhood. The patrons of this sect seem, indeed, very studious to conceal a practice, which they cannot deny to take place among them; and their eagerness to conceal it, arises from an apprehension of reviving the hatred and severities which formerly pursued them. They are afraid, lest, by acknowledging the truth, the modern *Mennonites* should be considered as the descendants of those malicious and fanatical *Anabaptists* of *Munster*, whose enormities rendered their very name odious to all true Christians. All this appears evident from the following passage in SCHYR's *Historia Mennonitarum plenior Deductio*, tom. ii. p. 32. where that author pretends to prove, that his brethren are unjustly *stigmatized* with the odious denomination of *Anabaptists*. His words are: *Anabaptismus ille plane obsolevit et a multis retro annis neminem cujusunque sectæ Christianæ fidei, JUXTA MANDATUM CHRISTI baptizatum, dum ad nostras Ecclesias transire cupit, re-baptizaverunt, i. e. That species of Anabaptism, with which we are charged, exists no longer, nor has it happened, during the space of many years past, that any person professing Christianity, of whatever church or sect he may have been, and who had been previously baptised according to the COMMANDMENT OF CHRIST, has been re-baptised upon his entering into our communion.* This passage would, at first sight, induce an inattentive reader to imagine, that there is no such thing among the modern *Mennonites*, as the custom of re-baptising those who enter into their community. But the words which we have marked in capitals (*JUXTA MANDATUM CHRISTI*,

famous man, to whom they owe the greatest part of their present felicity, is hid in the remote depths of antiquity, and is, of consequence, extremely difficult to be ascertained [f]. This  
uncer-

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

CHRISTI, i. e. ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENT OF CHRIST) discovers sufficiently the artifice and fraud that lie hid in this apology; for the Anabaptists maintain, that there is *no commandment of Christ* in favour of infant baptism. Moreover, we see the whole fallacy exposed by what the author adds to the sentence already quoted: *Sed illum etiam ADULTORUM baptismum ut sufficientem agnoscunt.* Nevertheless, this author, as if he had perfectly proved his point, concludes, with an air of triumph, that the odious name of *Anabaptists* cannot be given, with any propriety, to the *Mennonites* at this day; *Quare*, says he, *verissimum est, illud odiosum nomen Anabaptistarum illis non convenire.* In this, however, he is certainly mistaken; and the name in question is just as applicable to the modern *Mennonites*, as it was to the sect from which they descend, since the best and wisest of the *Mennonites* maintain, in conformity with the principles of the ancient Anabaptists, that the baptism of infants is destitute of validity, and consequently are very careful in re-baptising their proselytes, notwithstanding their having been baptized, in their tender years, in other Christian churches. Many circumstances persuade me, that the *declarations* and representations of things given by the modern *Mennonites*, are not always worthy of credit. Unhappily instructed by the miseries and calamities in which their ancestors were involved, they are anxiously careful to conceal entirely those tenets and laws that are the distinguishing characteristics of their sect; while they embellish what they cannot totally conceal, and disguise with the greatest art such of their institutions, as otherwise might appear of a pernicious tendency, and might expose them to censure.

[f] The writers for and against the *Anabaptists* are amply enumerated by CASPER SAGITTARIUS, in his *Introductio ad Histor. Eccles.* tom. i. p. 826. & CHRIST. M. PFAFFIUS, in his *Introduct. in Histor. Literar. Theologiæ*, part II. p. 349.—Add to these a modern writer, and a Mennonite preacher, HERMAN SCHYIN, who published at *Amsterdam* in 8vo, in the year 1729, his *Historia Mennonitarum*; and, in 1729, his *Plenior Deductio Histor. Mennonit.* These two books, though they do not deserve the title of a *History of the Mennonites*, are nevertheless useful, in order to come at a thorough knowledge of the affairs of this sect; for this author is much more intent upon defending his brethren against the accusations and reproaches with which they have been loaded, than careful in tracing out the

CENT. XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

uncertainty will not appear surprising, when it is considered, that this sect started up, all of a sudden, in several countries, at the same point of time, under leaders of different talents and different intentions, and at the very period when the first contests of the Reformers with the Roman pontiffs drew the attention of the world, and employed the pens of the learned, in such a manner, as to render all other objects and incidents almost matters of indifference. The modern *Mennonites* not only consider themselves as the descendants of the *Waldenses*, who were so grievously oppressed and persecuted by the despotic heads of the Roman church, but pretend, moreover, to be the purest offspring of these respectable sufferers, being equally averse to all principles of rebellion, on the one hand, and all suggestions of fanaticism on the other [g]. Their adversaries, on the contrary, represent them as the descendants of those turbulent and furious *Anabaptists*, who, in the sixteenth century, involved *Germany*, *Holland*, *Switzerland*, and more especially the province of *Westphalia*, in such scenes of blood, perplexity, and distress; and allege, that, terrified by the dreadful fate of their associates, and also influenced by the moderate counsels and wise injunctions of *MENNON*, they abandoned the ferocity of their primitive enthusiasm, and were gradually brought to a better mind. After having examined these

the origin, progress, and revolutions of their sect. And, indeed, after all, the *Mennonites* have not much reason to boast, either of the extraordinary learning or dexterity of this their patron; nay, it is even to be imagined, that they may easily find a more able defender. For an accurate account of the *Mennonite* historians, and their confessions of faith, see *JO. CHRIST. KOECHER* *Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolica*, p. 461.

[g] See *HERM. SCHYN*, *Plenor Deductio Histor. Mennon.* cap. i. p. 2. as also a Dutch work, intitled, *GAIENUS ABRAHAMZON*, *Verdediging der Christenen, die Doopsgezinde genaamd worden*, p. 29.

two different accounts of the origin of the *Anabaptists* with the utmost attention and impartiality, I have found that neither of them are exactly conformable to truth.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

II. It may be observed, in the first place, that the Mennonites are not entirely mistaken when they boast of their descent from the Waldenses, Petrobrussians, and other ancient sects, who are usually considered as *witnesses of the truth*, in the times of universal darkness and superstition. Before the rise of LUTHER and CALVIN, there lay concealed, in almost all the countries of *Europe*, particularly in *Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland, and Germany*, many persons, who adhered tenaciously to the following doctrine, which the Waldenses, Wickliffites, and Hussites had maintained, some in a more disguised, and others in a more open and public manner, viz. *That the kingdom of CHRIST, or the visible church he had established upon earth, was an assembly of true and real saints, and ought therefore to be inaccessible to the wicked and unrighteous, and also exempt from all those institutions, which human prudence suggests, to oppose the progress of iniquity, or to correct and reform transgressors.* This maxim is the true source of all the peculiarities that are to be found in the religious doctrine and discipline of the *Mennonites*; and it is most certain, that the greatest part of these peculiarities were approved of by many of those, who, before the dawn of the Reformation, entertained the notion already mentioned, relating to the visible church of CHRIST [b]. There were, however,

The most probable account of the origin of the Anabaptists.

[b] See for an account of the religious sentiments of the *Waldenses*, LIMBORCH's excellent *History of the Inquisition*, translated into English by the learned Dr. SAMUEL CHANDLER, book I. chap. viii.—It appears from undoubted testimonies, that the *Wickliffites* and *Hussites* did not differ extremely from the *Waldenses*, concerning the point under consideration. See also LYDII *Waldensia*, and ALLIX's *Ancient churches of Piedmont*, ch. 22—26. p. 211—28c. N.

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

---

different ways of thinking among the different members of this sect, with respect to the methods of attaining to such a perfect church-establishment as they had in view. Some, who were of a fanatical complexion on the one hand, and were persuaded, on the other, that such a visible church, as they had modelled out in fancy, could not be realised by the power of man, entertained the pleasing hope, that God, in his own good time, would erect to himself an holy church, exempt from every degree of blemish and impurity, and would set apart, for the execution of this grand design, a certain number of chosen instruments, divinely assisted and prepared for this work by the extraordinary succours of his Holy Spirit. Others, of a more prudent and rational turn of mind, entertained different views of this matter. They neither expected stupendous miracles nor extraordinary revelations; since they were persuaded, that it was possible, by human wisdom, industry, and vigilance, to purify the church from the contagion of the wicked, and to restore it to the simplicity of its original constitution, provided that the manners and spirit of the primitive Christians could but recover their lost dignity and lustre.

III. The drooping spirits of these people, who had been dispersed through many countries, and persecuted every where with the greatest severity, were revived when they were informed that LUTHER, seconded by several persons of eminent piety, had successfully attempted the reformation of the church. Then they spoke with openness and freedom, and the enthusiasm of the fanatical, as well as the prudence of the wise, discovered themselves in their natural colours. Some of them imagined, that the time was now come in which God himself was to dwell with his servants in an extraordinary manner, by celestial succours, and to establish upon earth a kingdom truly spiritual

tual and divine. Others, less sanguine and chimerical in their expectations, flattered themselves, nevertheless, with the fond hopes of the approach of that happy period, in which the restoration of the church, which had been so long expected in vain, was to be accomplished, under the divine protection, by the labours and counsels of pious and eminent men. This sect was soon joined by great numbers, and (as usually happens in sudden revolutions of this nature) by many persons, whose characters and capacities were very different, though their views seemed to turn upon the same object. Their progress was rapid; for, in a very short space of time, their discourses, visions, and predictions excited commotions in a great part of *Europe*, and drew into their communion a prodigious multitude, whose ignorance rendered them easy victims to the illusions of enthusiasm. It is, however, to be observed, that as the leaders of this sect had fallen into that erroneous and chimerical notion, that the new kingdom of CHRIST, which they expected, was to be exempt from every kind of vice, and from the smallest degree of imperfection and corruption, they were not satisfied with the plan of reformation proposed by LUTHER. They looked upon it as much beneath the sublimity of their views, and, consequently, undertook a more perfect reformation, or, to express more properly their visionary enterprise, they proposed to found a new church, entirely spiritual, and truly divine.

IV. It is difficult to determine, with certainty, the particular spot that gave birth to that seditious and pestilential sect of Anabaptists, whose tumultuous and desperate attempts were equally pernicious to the cause of religion, and the civil interests of mankind. Whether they first arose in *Switzerland*, *Germany*, or the *Netherlands*, is, as yet, a matter of debate, whose decision is of no great importance.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

The first  
motions of  
the Ana-  
baptists.

C E N T. importance [1]. It is most probable, that several  
 XVI. persons of this odious class made their appearance,  
 SECT. III. at the same time, in different countries; and we  
 PART II. may fix this period soon after the dawn of the Re-  
 formation in *Germany*, when LUTHER arose to set  
 bounds to the ambition of *Rome*. This appears  
 from a variety of circumstances, and especially  
 from this striking one, that the first *Anabaptist*  
 doctors of any eminence, were, almost all, heads  
 and leaders of particular and separate sects. For  
 it must be carefully observed, that though all  
 these projectors of a new, unspotted, and perfect  
 church, were comprehended under the general  
 denomination of *Anabaptists*, on account of their  
 opposing the baptism of infants, and their rebap-  
 tizing such as had received that sacrament in a  
 state of childhood in other churches, yet they  
 were, from their very origin, subdivided into va-  
 rious sects, which differed from each other in  
 points of no small moment. The most pernicious  
 faction of all those that composed this motley  
 multitude, was that which pretended that the  
 founders of the new and *perfect church*, already  
 mentioned, were under the direction of a divine  
 impulse, and were aimed against all opposition  
 by the power of working miracles. It was this  
 detestable faction that, in the year 1521, began  
 their fanatical work, under the guidance of MUN-  
 ZER, STUBNER, STORCK, and other leaders of the  
 same furious complexion, and excited the most  
 unhappy tumults and commotions in *Saxony* and  
 the adjacent countries. They employed at first  
 the various arts of persuasion, in order to propa-  
 gate their doctrine. They preached, exhorted,

[1] FUESLIN has attempted to examine, whether the Ana-  
 baptists first arose in *Germany* or *Schweizeland*, in a German  
 work, entitled, *Beitrage zur Schweizerisch Reformat. Geschichte*,  
 tom. i. p. 190. tom. ii. p. 64, 65. 265. 327, 328. tom. iii.  
 p. 323. but without success.

admonished,

admonished, and reasoned in a manner that seemed proper to gain the multitude, and related a great number of visions and revelations with which they pretended to have been favoured from above. But when they saw that these methods of making profelytes were not attended with such a rapid success as they fondly expected, and that the ministry of LUTHER, and other eminent reformers, was detrimental to their cause, they then had recourse to more expeditious measures, and madly attempted to propagate their fanatical doctrine by force of arms. MUNZER and his associates assembled, in the year 1525; a numerous army, composed, for the most part, of the peasants of *Suabia, Thuringia, Franconia, and Saxony*, and, at the head of this credulous and deluded rabble, declared war against all laws, government and magistrates of every kind, under the chimerical pretext, that CHRIST was now to take the reins of civil and ecclesiastical government into his own hands, and to rule alone over the nations. But this seditious crowd was routed and dispersed, without much difficulty, by the elector of *Saxony* and other princes; MUNZER, their ringleader, ignominiously put to death, and his factious counsellors scattered abroad in different places [k].

V. This bloody defeat of one part of these seditious and turbulent fanatics, did not produce that effect upon the rest that might naturally have been expected; it rendered them, indeed, more timorous, but it did not open their eyes upon this delusion. It is certain, that, even after this period, numbers of them, who were infected with the same odious principles that occasioned the de-

The progress of this sect.

[k] See SECKENDORF, *Histor. Lutheranismi*, lib. i. p. 192, 304. lib. ii. p. 13.—SLEIDAN, *Commentar.* lib. v. p. 47.—JOACH. CAMERARIJ *Vita Melancthonis*, p. 44.



CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

struction of MÜNZER, wandered about in *Germany, Switzerland, and Holland*, and excited the people to rebellion by their seditious discourses. They gathered together congregations in several places, foretold, in consequence of a divine commission, the approaching abolition of magistracy, and the downfall of civil rulers and governors; and, while they pretended to be ambassadors of the Most High, insulted, on many occasions, the Majesty of Heaven by the most flagitious crimes. Those who distinguished themselves by the enormity of their conduct in this infamous sect, were LEWIS HETZER, BALTHAZAR HUBMEYER, FELIX MLNTZ, CONRAD GREBEL, MELCHIOR HOFFMAN, and GEORGE JACOB, who, if their power had seconded their designs, would have involved all *Switzerland, Holland, and Germany*, in tumult and bloodshed [1]. A great part of this rabble seemed really delirious; and nothing more extravagant or more incredible can be imagined than the dreams and visions that were constantly arising in their disordered brains. Such of them as had some sparks of reason left, and had reflection enough to reduce their notions into a certain form, maintained, among others, the following points of doctrine: That *the church of CHRIST ought to be exempt from all sin—that all things ought to be in common among the faithful—that all usury, tythes, and tribute, ought to be entirely abolished—that the baptism of infants was an invention of the devil—that every Christian was invested with a*

[1] See JO. BAPT OTTII *Annales Anabaptist.* p. 21.—JO. HORNBECKII *Summa controvers.* lib. v. p. 332.—ANTON. MATTHÆI *Analect. veteris ævi*, tom. iv. p. 629. 677. 679.—BERNARD. RAUPACHII *Austriæ Evangel.* tom. ii. p. 41.—JO. GEORG. SCHFLHORN, in *Actis ad Histor. Eccles. pertinentibus*, tom. i. p. 100.—GODOFR. ARNOLDI *Historia Hæretica*, lib. xvi. cap. xxi. p. 727.—As also the German work of FUESLIN, entitled, *Beyträgen zu der Schweizer Reform. Geschichte.*

*power to preach the Gospel—and consequently, that the church stood in no need of ministers or pastors—that in the kingdom of CHRIST civil magistrates were absolutely useless—and that God still continued to reveal his will to chosen persons by dreams and visions [m].*

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

It would betray, however, a strange ignorance, or an unjustifiable partiality, to maintain, that even all those that professed, in general, this absurd doctrine, were chargeable with that furious and brutal extravagance which has been mentioned as the character of too great a part of their sect. This was by no means the case, several of these enthusiasts discovered a milder and more pacific spirit, and were free from any other reproach, than that which resulted from the errors they maintained, and their too ardent desire of spreading them among the multitude. It may still further be affirmed with truth, that many of those who followed the wiser class of *Anabaptists*, nay, some who adhered to the most extravagant factions of that sect, were men of upright intentions and sincere piety, who were seduced into this mystery of fanaticism and iniquity, by their ignorance and simplicity on the one hand, and by a laudable desire of reforming the corrupt state of religion on the other.

VI. The progress of this turbulent sect in almost all the countries of *Europe*, alarmed all that had any concern for the public good. Kings, princes, and sovereign states, exerted themselves to check these rebellious enthusiasts in their career, by issuing out, first, severe edicts to restrain their violence, and employing, at length, capital punishments to conquer their obstinacy [n]. But here

Severe punishments  
inflicted on  
the Ana-  
baptists.

[m] This account of the doctrine of the Anabaptists is principally taken from the learned FUSLIN already quoted.

[n] It was in *Saxony*, if I am not mistaken, and also in the year 1525, that penal laws were first enacted against this fanatical

C E N T. here a maxim, already verified by repeated experi-  
 XVI.  
 SECT. III. ence, received a new degree of confirmation; for the  
 PART II. conduct of the *Anabaptists*, under the pressures of  
 persecution, plainly shewed the extreme difficulty  
 of correcting or influencing, by the prospect of  
 suffering, or even by the terrors of death, minds  
 that are either deeply tainted with the poison of  
 fanaticism, or firmly bound by the ties of reli-  
 gion. In almost all the countries of *Europe*, an  
 unspeakable number of these unhappy wretches  
 preferred death, in its worst forms, to a retrac-  
 tation of their errors. Neither the view of the  
 flames that were kindled to consume them, nor  
 the ignominy of the gibbet, nor the terrors of the  
 sword, could shake their invincible, but ill-placed  
 constancy, or make them abandon tenets, that  
 appeared dearer to them than life and all its en-  
 joyments. The *Mennonites* have preserved volu-  
 minous records of the lives, actions, and unhap-  
 py fate of those of their sect, who suffered death  
 for the crimes of rebellion or heresy, which were  
 imputed to them[*o*]. Certain it is, that they  
 were treated with severity; but it is much to be  
 lamented that so little distinction was made be-  
 tween the members of this sect, when the sword of  
 justice was unsheathed against them. Why were

tical tribe. These laws were renewed frequently in the years  
 1527, 1528, 1534. See a German work of the learned KAP-  
 PIUS, entitled, *Nachlasse von Reformationen Urkunden*, part I.  
 p. 176.) — CHARLES V., incensed at the increasing impudence  
 and iniquity of these enthusiasts, issued out against them se-  
 vere edicts, in the years 1527 and 1529. (See OZRII *Annales*  
*Analept.* p. 45.) — The magistrates of *Switzerland* treated, at  
 first, with remarkable lenity and indulgence, the *Anabaptists*  
 that lived under their government; but when it was found  
 that this lenity rendered them still more enterprising and in-  
 solent, it was judged proper to have recourse to a different  
 manner of proceeding. Accordingly the magistrates of *Zu-  
 rich* denounced capital punishment against this riotous sect in  
 the year 1525.

[*o*] See JOACH. CHRIST. JEHRING, *Præfat. ad Historiam*  
*Mennonitarum*, p. 3.

the

the innocent and the guilty involved in the same fate? why were doctrines purely theological, or, at worst, fanatical, punished with the same rigour that was shewn to crimes inconsistent with the peace and welfare of civil society? Those who had no other marks of peculiarity than their administering baptism to adult persons only, and their excluding the unrighteous from the external communion of the church, ought undoubtedly to have met with milder treatment than what was given to those seditious incendiaries, who were for unhinging all government and destroying all civil authority. Many suffered for errors they had embraced with the most upright intentions, seduced by the eloquence and fervour of their doctors, and persuading themselves that they were contributing to the advancement of true religion. But, as the greatest part of these enthusiasts had communicated to the multitude their visionary notions concerning the new spiritual kingdom that was soon to be erected, and the abolition of magistracy and civil government that was to be the immediate effect of this great revolution, this rendered the very name of *Anabaptist* unspeakably odious, and made it always excite the idea of a seditious incendiary, a pest to human society. It is true, indeed, that many Anabaptists suffered death, not on account of their being considered as rebellious subjects, but merely because they were judged to be *incurable Heretics*; for in this century the error of limiting the administration of baptism to adult persons only, and the practice of rebaptising such as had received that sacrament in a state of infancy, were looked upon as most flagitious and intolerable heresies. It is, nevertheless, certain, that the greatest part of these wretched sufferers owed their unhappy fate to their rebellious principles and tumultuous proceedings, and that many also were punished for their te-

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

The Ana-  
baptists of  
*Munster*.

merity and imprudence, which led them to the commission of various crimes.

VII. There stands upon record a most shocking instance of this, in the dreadful commotions that were excited at *Munster*, in the year 1533, by certain Dutch Anabaptists, that chose that city as the scene of their horrid operations, and committed in it such deeds, as would surpass all credibility, were they not attested in a manner that excludes every degree of doubt and uncertainty. A handful of madmen, who had got into their heads the visionary notion of a new and spiritual kingdom, soon to be established in an extraordinary manner, formed themselves into a society, under the guidance of a few illiterate leaders chosen out of the populace. And they persuaded, not only the ignorant multitude, but even several among the learned, that *Munster* was to be the seat of this new and heavenly *Jerusalem*, whose ghostly dominion was to be propagated from thence to all the ends of the earth. The ringleaders of this furious tribe were JOHN MATTHISON, JOHN BOCKHOLD, a taylor of *Leyden*, one GERHARD, with some others, whom the blind rage of enthusiasm, or the still more culpable principles of sedition, had embarked in this extravagant and desperate cause. They made themselves masters of the city of *Munster*, deposed the magistrates, and committed all the enormous crimes, and ridiculous follies, which the most perverse and infernal imagination could suggest [p]. JOHN BOCKHOLD was proclaimed king and legislator of this new Hierarchy; but his reign was transitory, and his

☞ [p] BOCKHOLDT, or BOCKELSON, alias JOHN of *Leyden*, who headed them at *Munster*, ran stark naked in the streets, married eleven wives, at the same time, to shew his approbation of polygamy, and entitled himself king of *Sion*; all which was but a very small part of the pernicious follies of this mock monarch.

end

end deplorable. For the city of *Munster* was, in the year 1536, retaken, after a long siege, by its bishop and sovereign, Count WALDECK, the *New Jerusalem* of the Anabaptists destroyed, and its mock monarch punished with a most painful and ignominious death [q]. The disorders occasioned by the Anabaptists at this period, not only in *Westphalia*, but also in other places [r], shewed too

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

[q] See ANTON. CORVINI *Narratio de miseriabili Monaster. Anabapt. excido*, published first at *Wittenburg* in the year 1536.—CASP. SAGITTAR. *Introduc. in Histor. El. el. first. tom. 1. p. 537 & 835.*—HERM. HAMMANN. *Historia Renati E. angelus in Urbe Monaster. in Operib. Genealog. & Histor. p. 1203.*—The elegant Latin Poem of BOLANDUS in Elegiac verse, entitled, JO. FABRICII BOLANDI *Motus Monasteriens. Libri Decem. Colon. 1546*, in 8vo.—HERM. KERSSINBROCK, *Histor. Belli Monaster.*—DAN. GERDIS, *Miscellan. Gronovens. No. 1. tom. ii. p. 377.* This latter author speaks also of BERNARD ROTHMAN, an ecclesiastic of *Munster*, who had introduced the Reformation into that city, but afterwards was infected with the enthusiasm of the Anabaptists; and though, in other respects he had shewn himself to be neither destitute of learning nor virtue, yet enrolled himself in this fanatical tribe, and had a share in their most turbulent and furious proceedings.

[r] The scenes of violence, tumult, and sedition, that were exhibited in *Holland* by this odious tribe, were also terrible. They formed the design of reducing the city of *Leyden* to ashes, but were happily prevented, and severely punished. JOHN of *Leyden*, the anabaptist king of *Munster*, had taken it into his head that God had made him a present of the cities of *Amsterdam*, *Deventer*, and *Utrecht*; in consequence thereof, he sent bishops to these three places, to preach his gospel of sedition and carnage. About the beginning of the year 1535, twelve Anabaptists, of whom five were women, assembled at midnight in a private house at *Amsterdam*. One of them, who was a taylor by profession, fell into a trance, and after having preached and prayed during the space of four hours, stripped himself naked, threw his cloaths into the fire, and commanded all the assembly to do the same, in which he was obeyed without the least reluctance. He then ordered them to follow him through the streets in this state of nature, which they accordingly did, howling and bawling out, *Woe! woe! the wrath of God! the wrath of God! woe to Babylon!* When, after being seized and brought before the magistrates,

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

---

Menno  
Simon.

too plainly to what horrid lengths the pernicious doctrines of this wrong-headed sect were adapted to lead the inconsiderate and unwary; and therefore it is not at all to be wondered, that the secular arm employed rigorous measures to extirpate a faction, which was the occasion, nay the source, of unspeakable calamities in so many countries [s].

VIII. While the terrors of death, in the most dreadful forms, were presented to the view of this miserable sect, and numbers of them were executed every day, without a proper distinction being made between the innocent and the guilty, those that escaped the severity of justice, were in the most discouraging situation that can well be imagined. On the one hand, they beheld, with sorrow, all their hopes blasted by the total defeat of their brethren at *Munster*; and, on the other, they were filled with the most anxious apprehensions of the perils that threatened them on all sides. In this critical situation they derived much

clothes were offered them to cover their indecency, they refused them obstinately, and cried aloud, *We are the naked truth*. When they were brought to the scaffold, they sung and danced, and discovered all the marks of enthusiastic frenzy.—These tumults were followed by a regular and deep-laid conspiracy, formed by VAN GEELEN (an envoy of the mock-king of *Munster*, who had made a very considerable number of profelytes) against the magistrates of *Amsterdam*, with a design to wrest the government of that city out of their hands. This incendiary marched his fanatical troop to the town house on the day appointed, drums beating, and colours flying, and fixed there his head quarters. He was attacked by the burghers, assisted by some regular troops, and headed by several of the burgomasters of the city. After an obstinate resistance he was surrounded, with his whole troop, who were put to death in the severest and most dreadful manner, to serve as examples to the other branches of the sect, who were exciting commotions of a like nature in *Friesland*, *Groningen*, and other provinces and cities in the *Netherlands*.

[s] GER. BRANDT, *Histor. Reform. Belgicæ*, tom. i. lib. ii. p. 119.

comfort

comfort and assistance from the counsels and zeal of *MENNO SIMON*, a native of *Friesland*, who had formerly been a popish priest, and, as he himself confesses, a notorious profligate. This man went over to the Anabaptists, at first, in a clandestine manner, and frequented their assemblies with the utmost secrecy; but, in the year 1536, he threw off the mask, resigned his rank and office in the Romish church, and publicly embraced their communion. About a year after this, he was earnestly solicited by many of the sect to assume, among them, the rank and functions of a public teacher; and as he looked upon the persons, from whom this proposal came, to be exempt from the fanatical frenzy of their brethren at *Munster* (though, according to other accounts, they were originally of the same stamp, only rendered somewhat wiser by their sufferings), he yielded to their entreaties. From this period to the end of his days, that is, during the space of twenty-five years, he travelled from one country to another, with his wife and children, exercising his ministry under pressures and calamities of various kinds that succeeded each other without interruption, and constantly exposed to the danger of falling a victim to the severity of the laws. *East and West Friesland*, together with the province of *Groningen*, were first visited by this zealous apostle of the Anabaptists; from thence he directed his course into *Holland*, *Gelderland*, *Brabant*, and *Westphalia*, continued it through the German provinces that lie on the coasts of the *Baltick* sea, and penetrated so far as *Livonia*. In all these places his ministerial labours were attended with remarkable success, and added to his sect a prodigious number of proselytes. Hence he is deservedly looked upon as the common chief of almost all the Anabaptists, and the parent of the sect that still subsists under that denomination. The success of

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



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

---

this missionary will not appear very surprising to those who are acquainted with his character, spirit, and talents, and who have a just notion of the state of the Anabaptists at the period of time now under consideration. MENNO was a man of genius; though, as his writings shew, his genius was not under the direction of a very sound judgment. He had the inestimable advantage of a natural and persuasive eloquence, and his learning was sufficient to make him pass for an oracle in the eyes of the multitude. He appears, moreover, to have been a man of probity, of a meek and tractable spirit, gentle in his manners, pliable and obsequious in his commerce with persons of all ranks and characters, and extremely zealous in promoting practical religion and virtue, which he recommended by his example, as well as by his precepts. A man of such talents and dispositions could not fail to attract the admiration of the people, and to gain a great number of adherents wherever he exercised his ministry. But no where could he expect a more plentiful harvest than among the *Anabaptists*, whose ignorance and simplicity rendered them peculiarly susceptible of new impressions, and who, having been long accustomed to leaders that resembled frenetic Bacchanals more than Christian ministers, and often deluded by odious impostors, who involved them in endless perils and calamities, were rejoiced to find at length a teacher, whose doctrine and manners seemed to promise them more prosperous days [1].-

#### IX. MENNO

[1] MENNO was born at *Witmarsum*, a village in the neighbourhood of *Bolswert* in *Friesland*, in the year 1505, and not in 1496, as most writers tell us. After a life of toil, peril, and agitation, he departed in peace in the year 1561, in the duchy of *Holstein*, at the country-seat of a certain nobleman, not far from the city of *Oidesloe*, who, moved with compassion at a view of the perils to which MENNO was exposed, and the

IX. MENNO drew up a plan of doctrine and discipline of a much more mild and moderate nature than that of the furious and fanatical Anabaptists already mentioned, but somewhat more severe, though more clear and consistent, than the doctrine of some of the wiser branches of that sect, who aimed at nothing more than restoration of the Christian church to its primitive purity. Accordingly, he condemned the plan of ecclesiastical discipline, that was founded on the prospect of a new kingdom, to be miraculously established by JESUS CHRIST on the ruins of civil government, and the destruction of human rulers, and which had been the fatal and pestilential source of such dreadful commotions, such execrable rebellions, and such enormous crimes. He declared, publicly, his dislike of that doctrine, which pointed out the approach of a marvellous reformation in the church by the means of a new and *extraordinary* effusion of the Holy Spirit. He expressed his abhorrence of the licentious tenets, which several of the Anabaptists had maintained, with respect to the lawfulness of polygamy and divorce, and, finally, considered, as unworthy of toleration, those fanatics who were of opinion that the Holy Ghost continued to descend into the minds of many chosen believers, in as extraordinary a manner as he did at the first establishment

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

His doctrine.

the snares that were daily laid for his ruin, took him, together with certain of his associates, into his protection, and gave him an asylum. We have a particular account of this famous Anabaptist in the *Cimbria Literata* of MOLLERUS, tom. ii. p. 835. See also HERM. SCHYN, *Plenior Descriptio Histor. Mennon* cap. vi. p. 116.—The writings of MENNO, which are almost all composed in the Dutch language, were published in *folio*, at *Amsterdam*, in the year 1651. An excessively diffuse and rambling style, frequent and unnecessary repetitions, an irregular and confused method, with other defects of equal moment, render the perusal of these productions highly disagreeable.

of

C E N T. of the Christian church ; and that he testified this  
 XVI. peculiar presence to several of the faithful, by  
 S E C T. III. miracles, predictions, dreams, and visions of va-  
 P A R T II. rious kinds. He retained, indeed, the doctrines  
 commonly received among the Anabaptists in re-  
 lation to the baptism of infants, the *Millenium*, or  
 thousand years reign of CHRIST upon earth, the  
 exclusion of magistrates from the Christian church,  
 the abolition of war, and the prohibition of oaths  
 enjoined by our Saviour, and the vanity, as well  
 as the pernicious effects, of human science. But  
 while MENNO retained these doctrines in a general  
 sense, he explained and modified them in such a  
 manner, as made them resemble the religious  
 tenets that were universally received in the pro-  
 testant churches ; and this rendered them agree-  
 able to many, and made them appear inoffensive  
 even to numbers who had no inclination to em-  
 brace them. It however so happened, that the  
 nature of the doctrines considered in themselves,  
 the eloquence of MENNO, which set them off to  
 such advantage, and the circumstances of the  
 times, gave a high degree of credit to the religious  
 system of this famous teacher among the Ana-  
 baptists, so that it made a rapid progress in that  
 sect. And thus it was in consequence of the mi-  
 nistry of MENNO, that the different sorts of Ana-  
 baptists agreed together in excluding from their  
 communion the fanatics that dishonoured it, and  
 in renouncing all tenets that were detrimental to  
 the authority of civil government, and, by an un-  
 expected coalition, formed themselves into one  
 community [u].

X. To

[u] These facts shew us plainly how the famous question concerning the origin of the modern Anabaptists may be re- solved. The Mennonites oppose, with all their might, the account of their descent from the ancient Anabaptists, which we find in so many writers, and would willingly give the

X. To preserve a spirit of union and concord  
in a body composed of such a motley multitude  
of

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

the modern Anabaptists a more honourable origin. (See SCHYEN, *Hystor. Mennitar.* cap. viii. ix. xxi. p. 223.) The reason of their zeal in this matter is evident. Their situation has rendered them timorous. They live, as it were, in the midst of their enemies, and are constantly filled with an uneasy apprehension, that some day or other, malevolent zealots may take occasion, from their supposed origin, to renew against them the penal laws, by which the seditious Anabaptists of ancient times suffered in such a dreadful manner. At least, they imagine that the *odium*, under which they lie, will be greatly diminished, if they can prove, to the satisfaction of the public, the falsehood of that generally received opinion, that the *Mennonites* are the descendants of the *Anabaptists*, or, to speak more properly, the same individual sect, purged from the fanaticism that formerly disgraced it, and rendered wiser than their ancestors, by reflection and suffering.

The origin  
of the sects  
that have  
started up  
among the  
Anabap-  
tists.

After comparing diligently and impartially together what has been alleged by the Mennonites and their adversaries in relation to this matter, I cannot see what it is, properly, that forms the subject of their controversy; and, if the merits of the cause be stated with accuracy and perspicuity, I do not see how there can be any dispute at all about the matter now under consideration: For, in the

First place, if the Mennonites mean nothing more than this: that MENNO, whom they considered as their parent and their chief, was not infected with those odious opinions which drew the just severity of the laws upon the Anabaptists of *Münster*; that he neither looked for a new and spotless kingdom that was to be miraculously erected on earth, nor excited the multitude to depose magistrates, and abolish civil government; that he neither deceived himself, nor imposed upon others, by fanatical pretensions to dreams and visions of a supernatural kind; if (I say) this be all that the Mennonites mean, when they speak of their chief, no person, acquainted with the history of their sect, will pretend to contradict them. Nay, even those who maintain that there was an immediate and intimate connexion between the ancient and modern Anabaptists, will readily allow to be true all that has been here said of MENNO. — *zaly*. If the Anabaptists maintain, that such of their churches as received their doctrine and discipline from MENNO, have not only discovered, without interruption, a pacific spirit and an unlimited submission to civil government (abstaining from every thing that carried the remotest aspect of sedition, and shewing the utmost abhorrence of wars and bloodshed);

C E N T. of dissonant members, required more than human  
 XVI. power; and MENNO neither had, nor pretended  
 SECT. III. to  
 PART II.

---

shed), but have even banished from their *confessions* of faith, and their religious instructions, all those tenets and principles that led on the ancient Anabaptists to disobedience, violence, and rebellion; all this, again, will be readily granted.—And if they allege, in the third place, that even the Anabaptists, who lived before MENNO, were not *all* so delirious as MUNZER, nor so outrageous as the fanatical part of that sect, that rendered their memory eternally odious by the enormities they committed at *Munster*; that, on the contrary, many of these ancient Anabaptists abstained religiously from all acts of violence and sedition, followed the pious examples of the ancient Waldenses, Henricians, Petrobrussians, Hussites, and Wickliffites, and adopted the doctrine and discipline of MENNO, as soon as that new parent arose to reform and patronize the sect; all this will be allowed without hesitation.

But, on the other hand, the Mennonites may assert many things in defence of the purity of their origin, which cannot be admitted by any person who is free from prejudice, and well acquainted with their history. If they maintain, 1<sup>st</sup>, that none of their sect descended, by birth, from those Anabaptists, who involved *Germany* and other countries in the most dreadful calamities, or that none of these furious fanatics adopted the doctrine and discipline of MENNO, they may be easily refuted by a great number of facts and testimonies, and particularly by the declarations of MENNO himself, who glories in his having conquered the ferocity, and reformed the lives and errors of several members of this pestilential sect. Nothing can be more certain than this fact, *viz.* that the first Mennonite congregations were composed of the different sorts of Anabaptists already mentioned, of those who had been always inoffensive and upright, and of those who, before their conversion by the ministry of MENNO, had been seditious fanatics. Nor can the acknowledgment of this incontestible fact be a just matter of reproach to the Mennonites, or be more dishonourable to them, than it is to us, that our ancestors were warmly attached to the idolatrous and extravagant worship of paganism or popery.—Again; it will not be possible for us to agree with the *Mennonites*, if they maintain, 2<sup>dly</sup>, that their sect does not retain, at this day, any of those tenets, or even any remains of those opinions and doctrines, which led the seditious and turbulent Anabaptists of old to the commission of so many and of such enormous crimes. For, not to mention MENNO's calling the Anabaptists of *Munster* his *Brethren* (a denomination indeed somewhat softened by the epithet of *erring*, which he joined to it), it is undoubtedly true, that the doctrine concerning the  
 nature

to have, supernatural succours. Accordingly, the seeds of dissension were, in a little time, sown among this people. About the middle of this century, a warm contest, concerning *Excommunication*, was excited by several Anabaptists, headed by LEONARD BOWENSON and THEODORE PHILIP; and its fruits are yet visible in that divided sect. These men carried the discipline of excommunication to an enormous degree of severity and rigour. They not only maintained, that open transgressors, even those who sincerely deplored and lamented their faults, should, without any previous warning or admonition, be expelled from the communion of the church; but were also audacious enough to pretend to exclude the persons, thus excommunicated, from all intercourse with their wives, husbands, brothers, sisters, children, and relations. The same persons, as might naturally be expected from this sample of their severity, were harsh and rigid in their manners, and were for imposing upon their brethren a course of moral discipline, which was difficult and austere in the highest degree. Many of the Anabaptists protested against this, as unreasonable and unne-

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

---

nature of *Christ's kingdom*, or the *Church of the New Testament*, which led, by degrees, the ancient Anabaptists to those furious acts of rebellion that have rendered them so odious, is by no means effaced in the minds of the modern Mennonites. It is, indeed, weakened and modified in such a manner as to have lost its noxious qualities, and to be no longer pernicious in its influence; but it is not totally renounced nor abolished.—I shall not now enquire how far even the reformed and milder sect of MENNO has been, in time past, exempt from tumults and commotions of a grievous kind, nor shall I examine what passes at this day among the Anabaptists in general, or in particular branches of that sect; since it is certain, that the more eminent communities of that denomination, particularly those that flourish in *North Holland*, and the places adjacent, behold fanatics with the utmost aversion, as appears evidently from this circumstance, among others, that they will not suffer the people called *Quakers* to enter into their communion.

cessary;

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

---

cessary; and thus the community was, all of a sudden, divided into two sects; of which the one treated transgressors with lenity and moderation, while the other proceeded against them with the utmost rigour. Nor was this the only difference that was observable in the conduct and manners of these two parties; since the latter was remarkable for the sordid austerity that reigned in their rules of life and practice; while the former, considering more wisely the present state of human nature, were less severe in their injunctions, and were not altogether regardless of what is called decent, agreeable, and ornamental in life and manners. MENNO employed his most vigorous efforts to heal these divisions, and to restore peace and concord in the community, but when he perceived that his attempts were vain, he conducted himself in such a manner as he thought the most proper to maintain his credit and influence among both parties. For this purpose he declared himself for neither side, but was constantly trimming between the two, as long as he lived; at one time, discovering an inclination towards the austere Anabaptists; and, at another, seeming to prefer the milder discipline and manners of the more moderate brethren. But in this he acted in opposition to the plainest dictates of prudence; and accordingly the high degree of authority he enjoyed, rendered his inconsistency and irresolution not only disagreeable to both parties, but also the means of inflaming, instead of healing, their divisions [w].

XI. These two sects are, to this very day, distinguished by the denominations of *fine* and

The mild  
and moderate  
Anabaptists.

[w] See the *Historia Bellorum et Certaminum quæ, ab A. 1615, inter Mennonitas contigerunt*, which was published by an anonymous Mennonite. See also a German work, entitled, SIM. FRED. RUIS, *Nachrichten von dem Zustande der Mennoniten*, published in 8vo at Jena, in the year 1743.

*grofs,*

*grofs* [x], or, to express the distinction in more intelligible terms, into *rigid* and *moderate* Anabaptists. The former observe, with the most religious accuracy, veneration, and precision, the ancient doctrine, discipline, and precepts of the purer sort of Anabaptists; the latter depart much more from the primitive sentiments, manners, and institutions of their sect, and approach nearer to those of the protestant churches. The *grofs* or *moderate* Anabaptists consisted, at first, of the inhabitants of a district in *North Holland*, called *Waterland*, and hence their whole sect was distinguished by the denomination of *Waterlandians* [y]. The *fine* or *rigid* part of that community were, for the most part, natives of *Flanders*; and hence their sect acquired the denomination of *Flemingians*, or *Flandrians*. But new dissensions and contests arose among these *rigid* Anabaptists, not, indeed,

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

§ [x] The terms *fine* and *grofs* are a literal translation of *groben* and *feinen*, which are the German denominations used to distinguish these two sects. The same terms have been introduced among the Protestants in *Holland*; the *fine* denoting a set of people, whose extraordinary, and sometimes fanatical, devotion, resembles that of the English Methodists; while the *grofs* is applied to the generality of Christians, who make no extraordinary pretensions to uncommon degrees of sanctity and devotion.

[y] See FRID. SPANHEM *Elenchus Controvers. Theol. Opp.* tom. iii. p. 772. The *Waterlandians* were also called *Johannites*, from JOHN DE RIES, who was of great use to them in many respects, and who, assisted by LUBERT GERARD, composed their confession of faith in the year 1580. This confession (which far surpasses both in point of simplicity and wisdom all the other confessions of the Mennonites) has passed through several editions, and has been lately republished by HERMAN SCHYN, in his *Hist. Mennon.* cap. vii. p. 172. It was also illustrated in an ample Commentary, in the year 1686, by PETER JOANNIS, a native of *Holland*, and pastor among the *Waterlandians*. It is, however, been alleged, that this famous production is by no means the general confession of the *Waterlandians*, but the private one only of that particular congregation, of which its author was the pastor. See RUES, *Nachrichten*, p. 93, 94.

concerning



C E N T. concerning any point of doctrine, but about the  
 XVI. manner of treating persons that were to be excom-  
 SECT. III. municated, and other matters of inferior mo-  
 PART II. ment. Hence a new schism arose, and they were  
 subdivided into new sects, distinguished by the  
 appellations of *Flandrians* and *Frieslanders*, who  
 differed from each other in their manners and  
 discipline. To these were added a third, who  
 took the name of their country, like the two for-  
 mer, and were called *Germans*; for the Anabaptists  
 of *Germany* passed in shoals into *Holland* and the  
*Netherlands*. But, in process of time, the greatest  
 part of these three sects came over, by degrees,  
 to the moderate community of the *Waterlandians*,  
 with whom they lived in the strictest bonds of  
 peace and union. Those among the rigid Ana-  
 baptists, who refused to follow this example of  
 moderation, are still known by the denomination  
 of the *Old Flemings*, or *Flandrians*, but are few  
 in number, when compared with the united con-  
 gregations of the milder sects now mentioned.

The source  
 from which  
 the Menno-  
 nites drew  
 their doc-  
 trine.

XII. No sooner had the ferment of enthusiasm  
 subsided among the Mennonites, than all the dif-  
 ferent sects, into which they had been divided,  
 unanimously agreed to draw the whole system of  
 their religious doctrine from the Holy Scriptures  
 alone. To give a satisfactory proof of the sincer-  
 ity of their resolution in this respect, they took  
 care to have *Confessions* drawn up, in which their  
 sentiments concerning the Deity, and the manner  
 of serving him, were expressed in the terms and  
 phrases of Holy Writ. The most ancient, and  
 also the most respectable of these *Confessions*, is that  
 which we find among the *Waterlandians*. Several  
 others, of later date, were also composed, some  
 for the use of large communities, for the people  
 of a whole district, and which were consequently  
 submitted to the inspection of the magistrate;  
 others designed only for the benefit of private so-  
 cieties.

cieties [x]. It might not, perhaps, be amiss to enquire, whether all the tenets received among the Mennonites are faithfully exhibited and plainly expressed in these *Confessions*, or whether several points be not there omitted which relate to the internal constitution of this sect, and would give us a complete idea of its nature and tendency. One thing is certain, that whoever peruses these *Confessions* with an ordinary degree of attention, will easily perceive, that those tenets which appear detrimental to the interests of civil society, particularly those that relate to the prerogatives of magistracy, and the administration of oaths, are expressed with the utmost caution, and embellished with the greatest art, to prevent their bearing an alarming aspect. At the same time, the more discerning observer will see, that these embellishments are intended to disguise the truth, and that the doctrine of the Anabaptists, concerning the critical points above mentioned, are not represented, in their public *Confessions*, in their real colours.

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

XIII. The ancient Anabaptists, who trusted in an extraordinary direction of the Holy Spirit, were (under the pretended influence of so infalli-

Their religion was late reduced into a system.

[x] See an account of these *Confessions* in SCHYN's *Plenior Deduct. Hist. Mennon.* cap. iv. p. 78. 115. where he maintains, that *these Confessions prove as great a uniformity among the Mennonites, in relation to the great and fundamental doctrines of religion, as can be pretended to by any other Christian community.* But should the good man even succeed in persuading us of this boasted uniformity, he will yet never be able to make his assertion go down with many of his own brethren, who are, to this day, quarrelling about several points of religion, and who look upon matters, which appear to him of little consequence, as of high moment and importance to the cause of true piety. And, indeed, how could any of the Mennonites, before this present century, believe what SCHYN here affirms, since it is well known, that they disputed about matters which he treats with contempt, as if they had been immediately connected with their eternal interests?

CENT. ble a guide) little solicitous about composing a  
 XVI. system of religion, and never once thought of in-  
 SECT. III. stilling into the minds of the people just senti-  
 PART II. ments of the Deity. Hence the warm dissensions  
 that arose among them, concerning matters of  
 the highest consequence, such as the *Divinity of*  
 CHRIST, *Polygamy*, and *Divorce*. MENNO and  
 his disciples made some attempts to supply  
 this defect. But nevertheless we find, after his  
 time, that the Mennonites, more especially those  
 of the *rigid* class, carried the freedom of their re-  
 ligious speculations to such an excessive height, as  
 bordered upon extravagance. This circumstance  
 alone, were there no other, proves that the heads  
 of this sect employed the smallest part of their  
 zeal to prevent the introduction and propagation  
 of error; and that they looked upon sanctity of  
 life and manners alone as the essence of true re-  
 ligion. The *Waterlandians*, indeed, and after them  
 the other Anabaptists, were obliged, at length,  
 to draw up a summary of their doctrine, and to lay  
 it before the public, in order to remove the *odium*  
 that was cast upon them, on account of their bold  
 tenets, and their extravagant disputes, which were  
 likely to involve them in the greatest calamities.  
 But these *Confessions* of the *Mennonites* were, in  
 reality, little more than a method of defence, to  
 which they were reduced by the opposition they  
 met with, and must therefore be rather considered  
 as an expedient to avert the indignation of their  
 enemies, than as articles of doctrine, which all  
 of them, without exception, were obliged to be-  
 lieve. For we do not find among the Men-  
 nonites (a part of the modern *Waterlandians* ex-  
 cepted) any injunction, which expressly prohibits  
 individuals from entertaining or propagating re-  
 ligious opinions different from the public creed of  
 the community. And, indeed, when we look  
 attentively into the nature and constitution of this  
 sect,

sect, it will appear to have been, in some measure, founded upon this principle, that practical piety is the essence of religion, and that the surest and most infallible mark of the *true church* is the sanctity of its members; it is at least certain, that this *principle* was always universally adopted by the Anabaptists.

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

XIV. If we are to form our judgment of the religion of the *Mennonites* from their public creeds and confessions, we shall find, that though it varies widely from the doctrine of the Lutherans, yet in most things it differs but little from that of the Reformed church. They consider the sacraments in no other light, than as *signs* or symbols of the spiritual blessings administered in the Gospel; and their ecclesiastical discipline seems to be almost entirely the same with that of the *Presbyterians*. There are, however, peculiar tenets, by which they are distinguished from all other religious communities, and these may be reduced under three heads. For it is observable, that there are certain doctrines, which are held in common by all the various sects of the *Mennonites*: others, which are only received in some of the more eminent and numerous sects of that community (such were the sentiments of *MEKNO*, which hindered him from being universally acceptable to the Anabaptists); and others, again, which are only to be found among the more obscure and inconsiderable societies of that denomination. These last, indeed, appear and vanish, alternately, with the transitory sects that adopt them, and therefore do not deserve to employ our attention any farther in this place.

The religion of the Mennonites.

XV. The opinions that are held in common by the *Mennonites* seem to be all derived from this leading and fundamental principle, that *the kingdom which CHRIST established upon earth is a visible church, or community, into which the holy and the*

The great principle on which the general doctrine of the Mennonites is founded.

CENT. XVI. just are alone to be admitted, and which is consequently exempt from all those institutions and rules of discipline, that have been invented by human wisdom, PART II. for the correction and reformation of the wicked.

This fanatical principle was frankly avowed by the ancient Mennonites: their more immediate descendants, however, began to be less ingenuous; and in their public *Confessions of Faith*, they either disguised it under ambiguous phrases, or expressed themselves as if they meant to renounce it entirely. To renounce it entirely was impossible, without falling into the greatest inconsistency, and undermining the very foundation of those doctrines that distinguished them from all other Christian societies [a]. And yet it is certain that the present Mennonites, as they have, in many other respects, departed from the principles and maxims of their ancestors; so have they given a

[a] That they did not renounce it entirely, is evident from their own *Credo's and Confessions*, even from those in which the greatest caution has been employed to conceal the principles that rendered their ancestors odious, and to disguise whatever might render themselves liable to suspicion. For example, they speak in the most pompous terms concerning the dignity, excellence, utility, and divine origin, of civil magistrates; and I am willing to suppose that they speak their real sentiments in this matter. But when they proceed to give reasons that prevent their admitting magistrates into their communion, they discover unwarily the very principles which they are otherwise so studious to conceal. Thus, in the thirtieth article of the Waterlandian Confession, they declare, that *Jesus Christ has not comprehended the institution of civil magistracy in his spiritual kingdom, in the church of the New Testament, nor has he added it to the offices of his church*. The Latin words are: *Potestatem hanc politicam Dominus Jesus in regno suo spirituali, ecclesia Novi Testamenti, non instituit, neque hanc officium ecclesiæ suæ adjunxit*. Hence it appears, that the Mennonites look upon the church of the New Testament as a holy republic, inaccessible to the wicked, and, consequently, exempt from those institutions and laws that are necessary to oppose the progress of iniquity. Why then do they not speak plainly, when they deliver their doctrine concerning the nature of the church, instead of affecting ambiguity and evasions?

striking

striking instance of defection in the case now before us, and have almost wholly renounced this fundamental doctrine of their sect, relating to the nature of the Christian church. A dismal experience has convinced them of the absurdity of this chimerical principle, which the dictates of reason, and the declarations of scripture, had demonstrated sufficiently, but without effect. Now, that the Mennonites have opened their eyes, they seem to be pretty generally agreed about the following tenets: *First*, that there is an *invisible* church, which is universal in its extent, and is composed of members from all the sects and communities that bear the Christian name: *Secondly*, that the mark of the true church is not, as their former doctrine supposed, to be sought for in the unspotted sanctity of all its members (since they acknowledge that the visible church is promiscuously composed of the righteous and the wicked), but in the knowledge of the truth, as it was delivered by CHRIST, and in the agreement of all the members of the church in professing and defending it.

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

XVI. Notwithstanding all this, it is manifest, beyond all possibility of contradiction, that the religious opinions which still distinguish the Mennonites from all other Christian communities, flow directly from the ancient doctrine of the Anabaptists concerning the nature of the church. It is in consequence of this doctrine, that *they admit none to the sacrament of baptism but persons that are come to the full use of their reason*; because infants are incapable of binding themselves by a solemn vow to a holy life, and it is altogether uncertain whether or no, in mature years, they will be saints or sinners: It is in consequence of the same doctrine, that *they neither admit civil rulers into their communion, nor allow any of their members to perform the functions of magistracy*; for where there

Their peculiar tenets or doctrines,

C E N T. are no malefactors, magistrates are useless. Hence  
 XVI. do they pretend also to *deny the lawfulness of repel-*  
 SECT. III. *ling force by force, and consider war, in all its shapes,*  
 PART II. *as unchristian and unjust*; for as those who are  
*perfectly holy*, can neither be provoked by injuries,  
 nor commit them, they do not stand in need of  
 the force of arms, either for the purposes of re-  
 sentment or defence. It is still the same principle  
 that excites in them *the utmost aversion to the execu-*  
*tion of justice, and more especially to capital punish-*  
*ments*; since, according to this principle, there  
 are no transgressions nor crimes in the kingdom of  
 CHRIST, and consequently no occasion for the arm  
 of the judge. Nor can it be imagined, that *they*  
*should refuse to confirm their testimony by an oath* upon  
 any other foundation than this, that *the perfect*  
*members of a holy church* can neither *dissemble* nor  
*deceive*. It was certainly then the ancient doctrine  
 of the Anabaptists, concerning the sanctity of the  
 church, that gave rise to the tenets now men-  
 tioned, and that was the source of that rigid and  
 severe discipline, which excited such tumults and  
 divisions among the members of that community.

Their sys-  
 tem of mo-  
 rality.

XVII. The rules of moral discipline, that were  
 formerly observed by the Mennonites, were rigo-  
 rous and austere in the highest degree, and thus  
 every way conformable to the fundamental prin-  
 ciple, which has been already mentioned as the  
 source of all their peculiar tenets. It is somewhat  
 doubtful whether these rules still subsist and are re-  
 spected among them; but it is certain, that in the  
 times of old their moral precepts were very severe.  
 And indeed it could not well be otherwise; for,  
 when these people had once got it into their heads,  
 that *sanctity of manners* was the *only* genuine mark  
 of the true church, it may well be imagined, that  
 they would spare no pains to obtain this honour-  
 able character for their sect; and that, for this  
 purpose, they would use the strictest precautions

to guard their brethren against disgracing their profession by immoral practices. Hence it was, that they unanimously, and no doubt justly, exalted the rules of the Gospel, on account of their transcendent purity. They alleged, that CHRIST had promulgated a new law of life, far more perfect than that which had been delivered by MOSES and the Prophets; and they excluded from their communion all such as deviated, in the least, from the most rigorous rules of simplicity and gravity in their looks, their gestures, their clothing, and their table: all whose desires surpassed the dictates of mere necessity: nay, even all who observed a certain decorum in their manners, and paid a decent regard to the innocent customs of the world. But this primitive austerity is greatly diminished in the more considerable sects of the Mennonites, and more especially among the Waterlandians and Germans. The opulence they have acquired, by their industry and commerce, has relaxed their severity, softened their manners, and rendered them less insensible of the sweets of life; so that at this day the Mennonite congregations furnish their pastors with as much matter of censure and admonition as any other Christian community [b]. There are, however, still some remains of the abstinence and severity of manners that prevailed formerly among the Anabaptists; but these are only to be found among some of the smaller sects of that persuasion, and more particularly among those who live remote from great and populous cities.

XVIII. The particular sentiments and opinions that divided the more considerable societies of the

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

The singular tenet of some sects.

[b] It is certain, that the Mennonites in *Holland*, at this day, are, in their tables, their equipages, and their country seats, the most luxurious part of the Dutch nation. This is more especially true of the Mennonites of *Amsterdam*, who are very numerous and extremely opulent.



CEN T. Mennonites, were those that 'follow: I. MENNO  
 XVI.  
 SECT. III. denied that CHRIST derived from his mother the  
 PART II. body he assumed; and thought, on the contrary,  
 that it was produced out of nothing, in the womb  
 of that blessed virgin, by the *creating* power of  
 the Holy Ghost [c]. This opinion is yet firmly  
 maintained by the *ancient Flemings*, or *rigid*  
 Anabaptists; but has, long since, been renounced

[c] This is the account that is given of the opinion of  
 MENNO by HERMAN SCHYN, in his *Pluim Dedu? Hist. Men-*  
*nonit.* p. 164, 165. which other writers represent in a different  
 manner. After an attentive perusal of several passages in the  
 writings of MENNO, where he professedly handles this very  
 subject, it appears to me more than probable, that he inclined  
 to the opinion attributed to him in the text, and that it was  
 in this sense only, that he supposed CHRIST to be clothed with  
 a *divine* and *celestial* body. For that may, without any im-  
 propriety, be called *celestial* and *divine*, which is produced  
 immediately, in consequence of a *creating* act, by the Holy  
 Ghost. It must however be acknowledged, that MENNO does  
 not seem to have been unchangeably wedded to this opinion.  
 For in several places he expresses himself ambiguously on this  
 head, and even sometimes falls into inconsistencies. From  
 hence, perhaps, it might not be unreasonable to conclude,  
 that he renounced, indeed, the common opinion concerning  
 the origin of CHRIST's human nature; but was pretty much  
 undetermined with respect to the hypothesis, which, among  
 many that were proposed, it was proper to substitute in its  
 place. See FULSIINI *Centuria I. Epistolar. a Reformatore.*  
*Helveticis scriptar.* p. 383.—Be that as it may, MENNO is ge-  
 nerally considered as the author of this opinion concerning the  
 origin of CHRIST's body, which is still embraced by the more  
 rigid part of his followers. It appears probable, nevertheless,  
 that this opinion was much older than his time, and was only  
 adopted by him with the other tenets of the Anabaptists. As  
 a proof of this, it may be observed, that BOLANDUS, in his  
 Poem, entitled, *Motus Monasterienses*, lib. x. v. 49. plainly  
 declares, that many of the Anabaptists of Munster (who cer-  
 tainly had not been instructed by MENNO) held this very  
 doctrine in relation to CHRIST's incarnation:

*Esse (Christum) Deum statuant alii, sed corpore carnem,*  
*Humanam sumto sustinuisse negant:*  
*At Diam mentem, tenuis quasi sauce canalıs,*  
*Per MARIE corpus virginis isse ferunt.*

by all the other sects of that denomination [d].

II. The more austere Mennonites, like their forefathers, not only animadvert, with the most unrelenting severity, upon actions manifestly criminal, and evidently repugnant to the divine laws, but also treat, in the same manner, the smallest marks of an internal propensity to the pleasures of sense, or of a disposition to comply with the customs of the world. They condemn, for example, elegant dress, rich furniture, every thing, in a word, that looks like ornament, or surpasses the bounds of absolute necessity. Their conduct also to offenders is truly merciless; for they expel them from the church without previous admonition, and never temper the rigour of their judgments by an equitable consideration of the infirmities of nature in this imperfect state. The other Mennonites are by no means chargeable with this severity towards their offending brethren; they exclude none from their communion but the obstinate contemners of the divine laws; nor do they proceed to this extremity even with regard to such, until repeated admonitions have proved ineffectual to reform them.—III. The more rigid Mennonites look upon those that are excommunicated as the pests of society, who are to be avoided upon all occasions, and to be banished from all the comforts of social intercourse. Neither the voice of Nature, nor the ties of blood, are allowed to plead in their behalf, or to procure

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

---

[d] Many writers are of opinion, that the *Waterlandians*, of all the other Anabaptists, shewed the strongest propensity to adopt the doctrine of MENNO, relating to the origin of CHRIST's body. See *Histoire des Anabaptistes*, p. 223.—*Ceremonies et Coutumes de tous les Peuples du Monde*, tom. iv. p. 200. But that these writers are mistaken, is abundantly manifest from the public *Confession of Faith* of the *Waterlandians*, composed by RIES. See also, for a further refutation of this mistake, HERM. SCHYN, *Deductio Plenior Histor. Mennonit.* p. 165.

them

**C E N T.** them the smallest degree of indulgence. In such  
**XVI.** a case the exchange of good offices, the sweets of  
**S E C T. III.** friendly conversation, and the mutual effusions of  
**P A R T II.** tenderness and love, are cruelly suspended, even  
 between parents and children, husbands and wives,  
 and also in all the other endearing relations of  
 human life.—But the more moderate branches of  
 this community have wisely rejected this unnatural  
 discipline, and look upon the honour and sanctity  
 of the church to be sufficiently vindicated, when  
 its members avoid a close and particular intimacy  
 with those who have been expelled from its com-  
 munion. **IV.** The rigid Anabaptists enjoin it as  
 an obligation upon their disciples, and the mem-  
 bers of their community, to wash the feet of their  
 guests as a token of brotherly love and affection,  
 and in obedience to the example of **CHRIST**, which  
 they suppose, in this case, to have the force of a  
 positive command; and hence they are sometimes  
 called *Podoniptæ*. But the other *Mennonites* deny  
 that **CHRIST** meant, in this instance of his good-  
 ness and condescension, to recommend this custom  
 to the imitation of his followers, or to give his ex-  
 ample, in this case, the authority of a positive  
 precept.

The state of  
 learning  
 and philo-  
 sophy among the  
 Anabap-  
 tists,

**XIX.** The Anabaptists, however divided on  
 other subjects, were agreed in their notions of  
 learning and philosophy, which, in former times,  
 they unanimously considered as the pests of the  
 Christian church, and as highly detrimental to the  
 progress of true religion and virtue. Hence it  
 happened, that among a considerable number of  
 writers who, in this century, employed their pens  
 in the defence of that sect, there is none whose  
 labours bear any inviting marks of learning or  
 genius. The rigid *Mennonites* persevere still in  
 the barbarous system of their ancestors, and,  
 neglecting totally the improvement of the mind  
 and the culture of the sciences, devote themselves  
 entirely

entirely to trade, manual industry, and the mechanic arts. The *Waterlandians*, indeed, are honourably distinguished from all the other Anabaptists in this, as well as in many other respects. For they permit several members of their community to frequent the public universities, and there to apply themselves to the study of languages, history, antiquities, and more especially of physic, whose usefulness and importance they do not pretend to deny; and hence it happens, that in our times, so many pastors among the Mennonites assume the title and profession of physicians. Nay more; it is not unusual to see Anabaptists of this more humane and moderate class engaged even in philosophical researches, on the excellence and utility of which their eyes are, at length, so far opened, as to make them acknowledge their importance to the well-being of society. It was, no doubt, in consequence of this change of sentiment that they have erected, not long ago, a public seminary of learning at *Amsterdam*, in which there is always a person of eminent abilities chosen as professor of philosophy. But, though these moderate Anabaptists acknowledge the benefit which may be derived to civil society from the culture of philosophy and the sciences, yet they still persevere so far in their ancient prejudices, as to consider theology as a system that has no connexion with them; and, consequently, they are of opinion, that, in order to preserve it pure and untainted, the utmost caution must be used not to blend the dictates of philosophy with the doctrines of religion. It is farther to be observed, that, in the present times, even the *Flemish*, or rigid Anabaptists begin gradually to divest themselves of their antipathy to learning, and allow their brethren to apply themselves to the study of languages, history, and the other sciences.

XX. That

CENT.

XVI.

SECT. III.

PART II.

Their division into a multitude of sects.

XX. That simplicity and ignorance, of which the ancient Anabaptists boasted, as the guardians of their piety and the sources of their felicity, contributed principally to those divisions and schisms that reigned among them, from even their first rise, in a degree unknown and unexperienced in any other Christian community. This will appear evident to such as enquire, with the smallest attention, into the more immediate causes of their dissensions. For it is observable, that their most vehement contests had not for their object any difference in opinion concerning the doctrines or mysteries of religion, but generally turned upon matters relating to the conduct of life, on what was *lawful, decent, just, and pious* in actions and manners, and what, on the contrary, was to be considered as *criminal or unseemly*. These disputes were a natural consequence of their favourite principle, that *holiness* of life, and *purity* of manners, were the authentic *marks* of the true church. But the misfortune lay here, that, being ignorant themselves, and under the guidance of persons whose knowledge was little superior to theirs, they were unacquainted with the true method of determining, in a multitude of cases, what was *pious, laudable, and lawful*, and what was *impious, unbecoming, and criminal*. The criterion they employed for this purpose was neither the decision of right reason, nor the authority of the divine laws, accurately interpreted; since their ignorance rendered them incapable of using these means of arriving at the truth. They judged, therefore, of these matters by the suggestions of fancy, and the opinions of others. But as this method of discerning between right and wrong, decent and indecent, was extremely uncertain and precarious, and could not but produce a variety of decisions, according to the different feelings, fancies, tempers, and capacities of different persons, hence naturally

naturally arose diversity of sentiments, debates, and contests of various kinds. These debates produced schisms and divisions, which are never more easily excited, nor more obstinately fomented and perpetuated, than where ignorance, the true source of bigotry, prevails.

XXI. The Mennonites, after having been long in an uncertain and precarious situation, obtained a fixed and unmolested settlement in the United Provinces, under the shade of a legal toleration procured for them by WILLIAM, prince of *Orange*, the glorious founder of Belgic liberty. This illustrious chief, who acted from principle in allowing liberty of conscience and worship to Christians of different denominations, was moreover engaged, by gratitude, to favour the Mennonites, who had assisted him, in the year 1572, with a considerable sum of money, when his coffers were almost exhausted [e]. The fruits, however, of this toleration, were not immediately enjoyed by all the Anabaptists that were dispersed through the different provinces of the rising republic; for, in several places, both the civil magistrates and the clergy made a long and obstinate opposition to the will of the prince in this matter; particularly in the province of *Zealand* and the city of *Amsterdam*, where the remembrance of the plots the Anabaptists had laid, and the tumults they had excited, was still fresh in the minds of the people [f]. This opposition, indeed, was in a great measure conquered before the conclusion of this century, partly by the resolution and influence of WILLIAM the First, and his son MAURICE, and partly by the exemplary conduct of

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

The first solid settlement of the Mennonites in the United Provinces.

[e] See BRANDT, *Historie der Reformatie in de Nederlande*, vol. i. p. 525, 526.—*Ceremonies et Coutumes de tous les Peuples du Monde*, tom. iv. p. 201.

[f] BRANDT, *loc. cit.* book xi. p. 555, 586, 587. 609, 610. book xiv. p. 780. book xvi. p. 811.

the

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

the Mennonites, who manifested their zealous attachment to the republic on several occasions, and redoubled, instead of diminishing, the precautions that might remove all grounds of suspicion to their advantage, and take from their adversaries every pretext, which could render their opposition justifiable. But it was not before the following century, that their liberty and tranquillity were fixed upon solid foundations, when, by a *Confession of Faith*, published in the year 1626, they cleared themselves from the imputation of those pernicious and detestable errors that had been laid to their charge [g].

The Eng-  
lish Ana-  
baptists.

XXII. The sect, in *England*, which rejects the custom of baptizing infants, are not distinguished by the title of *Anabaptists*, but by that of *Baptists*. It is, however, probable, that they derive their origin from the German and Dutch Mennonites; and that, in former times, they adopted their doctrine in all its points. That, indeed, is by no means the case at present; for the English Baptists differ, in many things, both from the ancient and modern Mennonites. They are divided into two sects. One of which is distinguished by the denomination of *General* or *Arminian Baptists*, on account of their opposition to the doctrine of absolute and unconditional decrees; and the other by that of *Particular* or *Calvinistical Baptists*, from the striking resemblance of their religious system to that of the Presbyterians, who have CALVIN for their chief [b]. The Baptists of this latter sect settled chiefly at *London*, and in the towns and villages adjacent; and they have departed so far from the tenets of their ancestors, that, at this

[g] See HERM. SCHYN, *Plemer Deductio Hister. Mennonit.* cap. iv. p. 79.

[b] See WHISTON'S *Memoirs of his Life and Writings*, vol. ii. p. 461.

day,

day, they retain no more of the peculiar doctrines and institutions of the Mennonites, than the administration of baptism by immersion, and the refusal of that sacrament to infants, and those of tender years. And consequently they have none of those scruples relating to oaths, war, and the functions of magistracy, that still remain among even the most rational part of the modern Mennonites. They observe in their congregations the same rules of government, and the same method of worship, that are followed by the Presbyterians, and their community is under the direction of men eminent for their piety and learning [i]. From their Confession of Faith, that was published in the year 1643, it appears plainly, that their religious sentiments were the same then that they are at this day [k].

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

XXIII. The *General Baptists*, or, as they are called by some, the *Antipædobaptists*, are dispersed in great numbers through several counties of *England*, and are, for the most part, persons of mean condition, and almost totally destitute of learning and knowledge. This latter circumstance will appear less surprising, when it is considered, that, like the ancient Mennonites, they profess a contempt of erudition and science. There is much latitude in their system of religious doctrine, which consists in such vague and general principles, as render their communion accessible to Christians of almost all denominations. And, accordingly, they tolerate, in fact, and receive among them, persons of every sect, even Socinians and Arians; nor do they reject any from their communion who profess themselves Christians, and receive the Holy Scriptures as the source of

The opinions of the General and Particular Anabaptists in England.

[i] See a German work, composed by ANT. WILLIAM BOHM, under the title of the *History of the Reformation in England*, p. 151. 473. 536. 1152.

[k] *Bibliothèque Britannique*, tom. vi. p. 2.



CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

truth, and the rule of faith [1]. They agree with the *Particular Baptists* in this circumstance, that they admit to baptism adult persons only, and administer that sacrament by dipping or total immersion; but they differ from them in another respect, even in their repeating the administration of baptism to those who had received it, either in a state of infancy, or by aspersion, instead of dipping; for if the common accounts may be believed, the *Particular Baptists* do not carry matters so far. The following sentiments, rites, and tenets, are also peculiar to the former:

- I. After the manner of the ancient Mennonites, they look upon their sect as the only true Christian church, and consequently shun, with the most scrupulous caution, the communion of all other religious societies.
- II. They dip only once, and not three times, as is practised elsewhere, the candidates for baptism, and consider it as a matter of indifference, whether that sacrament be administered in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or in that of CHRIST alone.
- III. They adopt the doctrine of MENNO with respect to the *Millenium*, or thousand years reign of

[1] This appears evidently from their *Confession of Faith*, which appeared first in the year 1660, was republished by Mr. WHISTON, in the *Memoirs of his Life*, vol. ii. p. 561. and is drawn up with such latitude, that, with the removal and alteration of a few points\*, it may be adopted by Christians of all denominations†. Mr. WHISTON, though an Arian, became a member of this Baptist community, which, as he thought, came nearest to the simplicity of the primitive and apostolic age. The famous Mr. EMLYN, who was persecuted on account of his Socinian principles, joined himself also to this society, and died in their communion.

\* *Viz.* those relating to *Universal Redemption*, the *Persistence of the Saints*, *Election* and *Reprobation*, which are illustrated entirely on Arminian principles, and consequently cannot be embraced by rigid Calvinists; not to mention the points relating to Baptism, which are the distinctive marks of this sect.

† Our author does not certainly mean to include Roman-catholics in this large class, for then his assertion would not be true.

the saints with CHRIST upon earth: And iv. many of them embrace his particular opinion concerning the origin of Christ's body [m]. v. They look upon the precept of the apostles, prohibiting the use of blood, and *things strangled* [n], as a law that was designed to be in force in all ages and periods of the church. vi. They believe that the soul, from the moment that the body dies until its resurrection at the last day, remains in a state of perfect insensibility. vii. They use the ceremony of extreme unction. And to omit matters of a more trifling nature, viii. several of them observe the Jewish as well as the Christian sabbath [o]. These Baptists have three different classes of ecclesiastical governors, *bishops*, *elders*, and *deacons*; the first of these, among whom there have been several learned men [p], they modestly call *messengers* [q], as St. JOHN is known to have styled that Order, in the book of the *Revelations*.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

XXIV. Before we conclude the History of the Anabaptists, it may not be improper to mention a very singular and ridiculous sect that was founded by DAVID GEORGE, a native of *Delft*, and a member of that community. This enthusiast, after having laid the foundation of the sect of the *Davidists*, or *David-Georgians*, deserted the Anabaptists, and removed to *Basil* in *Switzerland*, in the year 1544, where he changed his name, and by the liberality and splendor that attended his

The Davidists, or David-Georgians.

[m] To wit, that the body of Jesus was not derived from the substance of the blessed Virgin, but *created* in her womb by an omnipotent act of the holy Spirit.

[n] ACTS, xv. 29.

[o] These accounts of the doctrine of the Baptists are taken from WALL's *History of Infant-Baptism* and from the second volume of WHISTON's *Memoirs of his Life*, p. 465, &c.

[p] See WHISTON's *Memoirs of his Life*, tom. ii. p. 466. as also CROSBY's *History of the English Baptists*, published in four volumes 8vo, in the year 1728.

[q] St. JOHN calls them the *angels of the churches*; the word *angel* (in Greek ἀγγέλων) signifies properly an *envoy* or *messenger*.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

opulence, joined to his probity and purity of manners, acquired a very high degree of esteem, which he preserved till his death. The lustre of his reputation was, however, but transitory; for, soon after his decease, which happened in the year 1556, his son-in-law, NICHOLAS BLES DYCK, charged him with having maintained the most blasphemous and pestilential errors. The senate of *Basil*, before whom this accusation was brought, being satisfied with the evidence by which it was supported, pronounced sentence against the deceased heretic, and ordered his body to be dug up and to be publicly burnt. And, indeed, nothing more horridly impious and extravagant can possibly be conceived, than the sentiments and tenets of this fanatic, if they were really such as they have been represented, either by his accusers or his historians. For he is said to have given himself out for the Son of God, the Fountain of divine wisdom, to have denied the existence of angels, good and evil, of heaven and hell, and to have rejected the doctrine of a future judgment; and he is also charged with having trampled upon all the rules of decency and modesty with the utmost contempt [r]. In all this, however, it is very possible, that there may be much exaggeration. The enthusiast in question, though a man of some natural genius, was, nevertheless, totally destitute of learning of every kind, and had something obscure, harsh, and illiberal in his manner of expression, that gave too much

[r] See NIC. BLES DYCKII *Historia Davidis Georgii à JACOBO REVIO edita* as also the life of the same Fanatic, written in the German language, by SIOETERFORTH. Among the modern writers, see ARNOLD's *Kirchen-und Ketzer Historie*, tom. i. p. 750. tom. ii. p. 534 & 1183. in which there are several things that tend to clear the character of DAVID. See also HENR. MORI *Enthusiasmus Triumphatus*, sect. xxxiii. p. 23. — And the documents I have published in relation to this matter, in the *History of Servetus*, p. 425.

occasion to an unfavourable interpretation of his religious tenets. That he had both more sense and more virtue than is generally imagined, appears manifestly, not only from his numerous writings, but also from the simplicity and candour that were visible in the temper and spirit of the disciples he left behind him, of whom several are yet to be found in *Holstein, Friesland*, and other countries [s]. He deplored the decline of vital and practical religion, and endeavoured to restore it among his followers; and in this he seemed to imitate the example of the more moderate Anabaptists. But the excessive warmth of an irregular imagination threw him into illusions of the most dangerous and pernicious kind, and seduced him into a persuasion that he was honoured with the gift of divine inspiration, and had celestial visions constantly presented to his mind. Thus was he led to such a high degree of fanaticism, that, rejecting as mean and useless the external services of piety, he reduced religion to contemplation, silence, and a certain frame or habit of soul, which it is equally difficult to define and to understand. The soaring *Mystics* and the visionary *Quakers* may, therefore, if they please, give DAVID GEORGE a distinguished rank in their enthusiastical community.

XXV. HENRY NICHOLAS, a *Westphalian*, one of the intimate companions of this fanatic, though somewhat different from him in the nature of his enthusiasm, and also in point of genius and character, founded a sect in *Holland*, in the year 1555, which he called the *Family of Love*. The principles of this sect were afterwards propagated in *England*, and produced no small confusion in both nations. The judgment that has been formed with respect to DAVID GEORGE may be applied with truth, at least in a great measure, to his as-

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

The Family  
of Love  
founded  
by  
Henry Ni-  
cholas.

[s] See Jo. MOLLERI *Introduct. in Histor. Chersones. Cimbrica*, P. II. p. 116. & *Cimbrica Literata*, tom. i. p. 422.

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

---

sociate NICHOLAS, who, perhaps, would have prevented a considerable part of the heavy reproaches with which he has been loaded, had he been endowed with a degree of genius, discernment, and knowledge, sufficient to enable him to express his sentiments with perspicuity and elegance. Be that as it may, the character, temper, and views of this man may be learned from the spirit that reigned in his flock [1]. As to his pretensions, they were, indeed, visionary and chimerical; for he maintained, that he had a commission from heaven, to teach men that the essence of religion consisted in the feelings of *divine love*; that all other theological tenets, whether they related to objects of faith, or modes of worship, were of no sort of moment; and consequently, that it was a matter of the most perfect indifference, what opinions christians entertained concerning the divine nature, provided their hearts burned with the pure and sacred flame of piety and love. To this, his main doctrine, NICHOLAS may have probably added other odd fancies, as always is the case with those innovators, who are endued with a warm and fruitful imagination; to come, however, at a true notion of the opinions of this enthusiast, it will be much wiser to consult his own writings, than to depend entirely upon the accounts and refutations of his adversaries [2].

[1] See JO. HORNBECK, *Summa Controvers.* lib. vi. p. 393. — ARNOLD, *Kirchen-und Ketzer Historie*, p. 746. — BOHM'S *History of the Reformation in England* (written in German), book iv. ch. v. p. 541.

[2] The most learned of all the authors who wrote against the *Family of Love*, was Dr. HENRY MORE, in his *Grand Explanation of the Mystery of Godliness*, &c. book vi. chap. 12—18. GEORGE FOX, the founder of the sect of Quakers, inveighed also severely against this seraphic *Family*, and called them a motley tribe of Fanatics, because they took oaths, danced, sung, and made merry. See SHEWELL'S *History of the Quakers*, book iii. p. 88, 89. 344.

## C H A P. IV.

*The History of the SOCINIANS.*

I **T**HE *Socinians* are said to have derived this denomination from the illustrious family of the *Sozzini*, which flourished a long time at *Sienna* in *Tuscany*, and produced several great and eminent men, and among others *LÆLIUS* and *FAUSTUS SOZINUS*, who are commonly supposed to have been the founders of this sect. The former was the son of *MARIANUS*, a famous lawyer, and was himself a man of uncommon genius and learning; to which he added, as his very enemies are obliged to acknowledge, the lustre of a virtuous life, and of unblemished manners. Being forced to leave his country, in the year 1547, on account of the disgust he had conceived against popery, he travelled through *France*, *England*, *Holland*, *Germany*, and *Poland*, in order to examine the religious sentiments of those who had thrown off the yoke of *Rome*, and thus at length to come at the truth. After this he settled at *Zurich*, where he died in the year 1562, before he had arrived at the fortieth year of his age [*w*]. His mild and gentle disposition rendered him averse from whatever had the air of contention and discord. He adopted the Helvetic confession of faith, and professed himself a member of the church of *Switzerland*; but this did not engage him to conceal entirely the doubts he had formed in relation to certain points of religion, and which he communicated, in effect, by letter, to some learned men, whose judgment he respected, and

C E N T.

XVI.

S E C T. III.

P A R T II.

---

 The deno-  
 mination  
 and origin  
 of this sect.

[*w*] CLOPPENBURG, *Dissertatio de origine et progressu Sociniani/mu.*—JO. HORNBECK, *Summa Controversiarum*, p. 563.—JO. HENR. HOTTINGER, *Hist. Eccles.* tom. ix. p. 417.

CENT. XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

in whose friendship he could confide [\*]. His sentiments were indeed propagated, in a more public manner, after his death; since FAUSTUS, his nephew and his heir, is supposed to have drawn, from the papers he left behind him, that religious system upon which the sect of the Socinians was founded.

The term Socinian bears different significations.

II. It is, however, to be observed, that this denomination does not always convey the same ideas, since it is susceptible of different significations, and is, in effect, used sometimes in a more strict and proper, and at others in a more improper and extensive sense. For, according to the usual manner of speaking, all are termed *Socinians*, whose sentiments bear a certain affinity to the system of SOCINUS; and they are more especially ranked in that class, who either boldly deny, or artfully explain away, the doctrines that assert the *Divine Nature* of CHRIST, and a *Trinity* of persons in the Godhead. But, in a strict and proper sense, they only are deemed the members of this sect, who embrace wholly, or with a few exceptions, the form of theological doctrine, which FAUSTUS SOCINUS either drew up himself or received from his uncle, and delivered to the *Unitarian* brethren, or Socinians, in *Poland* and *Transylvania* [y].

The origin of Socinianism.

III. The origin of *Socinianism* may be traced to the earliest period of the Reformation. For scarcely

[A] ZANCHIUS, *Præf. ad Libr. de tribus Flôrib.*—BELZA, *Epist. Volum.* ep. lxxx. p. 167. Certain writings are attributed to him by SANDIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Antitrinitar.* p. 18. but it is very doubtful whether he was the real author of them, or not.

[y] We have, hitherto, no complete or accurate history either of the sect called Socinians, or of LÆLIUS and FAUSTUS SOCINUS its founders; nor any satisfactory account of those who laboured principally with them, and, after them, in giving a permanent and stable form to this community. For the accounts

ly had that happy revolution in the state of religion taken place, when a set of men, fond of extremes, and consequently disposed to look upon as erroneous whatever had hitherto been taught and professed in the church of *Rome*, began to undermine the doctrine of CHRIST'S *Divinity*, and the other truths that are connected with it, and proposed reducing the whole of religion to practical piety and virtue. The efforts of these men were opposed with united zeal and vigilance by the Romish, Reformed, and Lutheran churches; and their designs were so far disconcerted, as to prevent their forming themselves and their followers into a regular and permanent sect. So early as the year 1524, the *divinity* of CHRIST was openly denied by LEWIS HERZER, one of the wandering and fanatical *Anabaptists*, who, about three years afterwards, was put to death at *Constance* [z]. There were not wanting among the first Anabaptists, several persons who entertained the opinions of HERZER; though it would be manifestly un-

accounts we have of the Socinians, and their principal doctors, from HORNE (1), CROZIVUS (2), CLOPPENBURG (3), SANDIUS (4), LUBJINSKIUS (5), and LAUBERBACH (6), are far from being proper to satisfy the curiosity of those, who desire something more than a vague and superficial knowledge of this matter. The History of Socinianism, that was published at *Paris* by LAMI in the year 1723, is a wretched compilation from the most common-place writers on that subject; it is also full of errors, and is loaded with a variety of matters that have no sort of relation to the history of SocINUS, or to the doctrine he taught. The very learned and laborious LA CROZE promised in his *Dissertations Historiques*, tom. i. p. 142. a complete History of Socinianism, from its origin to the present times, but did not fulfil this interesting engagement.

[z] SANDII *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitaria*.—JO. EAPT. OTTIUS, *Annal. Anabaptist.* p. 50.—BREITINGERI *Mis. in Helvetiam*, tom. v. p. 391. tom. vi. p. 100. 479.

(1) In his *Socinianism Confutatus* vol. i.—(2) In his *Opera Anti-Sociniani*.—(3) In his *Essai sur l'origine et le progrès du Socinianisme*, 1677 11 opp.—(4) In his *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitaria* tom. i.—(5) In his *Historia Reformationis Polonica*.—(6) In his *Ateneo Sociniano*, published in German at *Frankfort* in the year 1725.



CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

fair to lay these opinions to the charge of the whole community. But it was not only from that quarter that erroneous opinions were propagated in relation to the points already mentioned; others seemed to have been seized with the contagion, and it manifested itself from day to day in several countries. JOHN CAMPANUS, a native of *Juliers*, disseminated at *Wittemberg* and other places, various tenets of an heretical aspect; and taught, among other things, that the *Son was inferior to the Father*, and that the *Holy Ghost* was not the title of a *divine person*, but a *denomination* used to denote the *nature* of the *Father* and of the *Son*; and thus did this innovator revive, in a great measure, the errors of the ancient Arians [a]. A doctrine of a similar kind was propagated, in the year 1530, in *Switzerland*, *Augsburch*, and among the *Grisons*, by a person, whose name was CLAUDIUS, who, by his opposition to the doctrine of CHRIST'S divinity, excited no small commotions in these countries [b]. But none of these new teachers were so far encouraged by the number of their followers, or the indulgence of their adversaries, as to be in a condition to form a regular sect.

Michael  
Serveus,

IV. The attempts of MICHAEL SERVEDE [c], or SERVEUS, a Spanish physician, were much

[a] See the Dissertation *de Joh. Campano, Anti-Trinitario*, in the *Amœnitates Literariæ* of the very learned SCHELHORNIIUS, tom. xi. p. 1—92.

• [b] See SCHELHORNII *Dissert. Epistol. de Mino Celso Senensi Claudio item Allobrago, homine Fanatico et SS. Trinitatis hoste*, Ulmæ 1748, in 4to.—JAC. BREITINGERI *Museum Helvetic.* tom. vii. p. 667.—JO. HALLERUS, *Epistol.* in JO. CONRAD. FUESLIN, *Centuria Epistol. Viror. Eruditor.* p. 140.

[c] By taking away the last syllable of this name (I mean the Spanish termination *de*) there remains *Serve*, which, by placing differently the letters that compose it, makes *Reves*. SERVEUS assumed this latter name in the title-pages of all his books. He also called himself sometimes *Michael Villanovanus*, or *Villanovanus* alone, after the place of his nativity, omitting the name of his family.

more alarming to those who had the cause of true religion at heart, than the feeble and impotent efforts of the innovators now mentioned. This man, who has made such a noise in the world, was born at *Villa Nueva*, in the kingdom of *Arragon*, distinguished himself by the superiority of his genius, and had made a considerable progress in various branches of science. In the years 1531 and 1532, he published, in Latin, his *Seven books concerning the errors that are contained in the doctrine of the Trinity*, and his *Two Dialogues* on the same subject, in which he attacked, in the most audacious manner, the sentiments adopted by far the greatest part of the Christian church, in relation to the *Divine Nature*, and a *Trinity* of persons in the *Godhead*. Some years after this he travelled into *France*, and, after a variety of adventures, settled at *Vienne* in *Dauphiné*, where he applied himself, with success, to the practice of physic. It was here, that, letting loose the reins of his warm and irregular imagination, he invented that strange system of theology, which was printed, in a clandestine manner, in the year 1553, under the title of *Christianity restored*. The man seemed to be seized with a passion for reforming (in his way), and many things concurred to favour his designs, such as the fire of his genius, the extent of his learning, the power of his eloquence, the strength of his resolution, the obstinacy of his temper, and an external appearance, at least, of piety, that rendered all the rest doubly engaging. Add to all this, the protection and friendship of many persons of weight, in *France*, *Germany*, and *Italy*, which *SERVETUS* had obtained by his talents and abilities both natural and acquired; and it will appear that few innovators have set out with a better prospect of success. But, notwithstanding these signal advantages, all his views were totally disappointed by the vigilance and severity of

CALVIN,

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

---

CALVIN, who, when SERVETUS had escaped from his prison at *Vienne*, and was passing through *Switzerland*, in order to seek refuge in *Italy*, caused him to be apprehended at *Geneva*, in the year 1553, and had an accusation of blasphemy brought against him before the council [d]. The issue of this accusation was fatal to SERVETUS, who, adhering resolutely to the opinions he had embraced, was, by a public sentence of the court, declared an obstinate heretic, and, in consequence thereof, condemned to the flames. For it is observable, that, at this time, the ancient laws that had been enacted against heretics by the emperor *FREDERIC II.*, and had been so frequently renewed after his reign, were still in vigour at *Geneva*. It must, however, be acknowledged, that this learned and ingenious sufferer was worthy of a better fate; though it is certain, on the other hand, that his faults were neither few nor trivial; since it is well known, that his excessive arrogance was accompanied with a malignant and contentious spirit, an invincible obstinacy of temper, and a considerable portion of fanaticism [e].

## V. The

[d] This accusation was brought against SERVETUS by a person, who lived in CALVIN's family as a servant; and this circumstance displeased many.

[e] Dr. MOSHEIM refers the reader here, in a note, to an ample and curious history of SERVETUS, composed by him in the German language, of which the first edition was published at *Helmstadt*, in 4to, in the year 1748, and the second, with considerable additions, at the same place, the year following. Those who are not acquainted with the German language, will find a full account of this singular man, and of his extraordinary history, in a Latin dissertation, composed under the inspection of Dr. MOSHEIM, and published at *Helmstadt* under the following title: *Historia Michachis Serveti, quam, Præfide Jo. Laur. Mosheimæ, Abbate, &c. placido Doctorum examini publicè exponit HENRICUS AB ALLWAERDEN*. There is an accurate history of this unhappy man in the first volume of the work, entitled, *Memoirs of Literature, containing a Weekly Account of the State of Learning, both at home and abroad*,

V. The religious system that SERVETUS had struck out, of a wild and irregular fancy, was, indeed, singular in the highest degree. The greatest part of it was a necessary consequence of his peculiar notions concerning the *universe*, the *nature of God*, and the *nature of things*, which were equally strange and chimerical. Thus it is difficult to unfold, in a few words, the doctrine of this unhappy man; nor, indeed, would any detail render it intelligible in all its branches. He took it into his head that the true and genuine doctrine of CHRIST had been entirely lost, even before the council of *Nice*; and he was, moreover, of opinion, that it had never been delivered with a sufficient degree of precision and perspicuity in any period of the church. To these extravagant assertions he added another still more so, even that he himself had received a commission from above to reveal anew this divine doctrine, and to explain it to mankind. His notions with respect to the Supreme Being, and a Trinity of persons in the Godhead, were obscure and chimerical beyond all measure, and amounted in general to the follow-

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

The doctrine of  
Servetus.

abroad. This was composed by Monsieur DE LA ROCHE, and was afterwards augmented by him, and translated into French in his *Bibliothèque Angloise*, tom. ii. part I. article vii. p. 76.—There is also an account of SERVETUS given by MACKENZIE, in the first volume of his *Lives and Characters of the most eminent Writers of the Scots nation*, which was published at Edinburgh in the year 1708. To these we may add *An Impartial History of SERVETUS*, &c. written by an anonymous author, and published at London in 1724.

It is impossible to justify the conduct of CALVIN in the case of SERVETUS, whose death will be an indelible reproach upon the character of that great and eminent Reformer. The only thing that can be alleged, not to efface, but to diminish his crime, is, that it was no easy matter for him to divest himself at once of that persecuting spirit, which had been so long nourished and strengthened by the popish religion in which he was educated. It was a remaining portion of the spirit of popery in the breast of CALVIN that kindled his unchristian zeal against the wretched SERVETUS.

ing

C E N T. ing propositions: "That the *Deity*, before the crea-  
 XVI. "tion of the world, had produced within himself  
 SECT. III. "two *personal representations*, or *manners of exist-*  
 PART II. "ence [*f*], which were to be the *medium* of inter-  
 "course between him and mortals, and by whom,  
 "consequently, he was to reveal his will, and to  
 "display his mercy and beneficence to the children  
 "of men; that these two representatives were the  
 "Word and the *Holy Ghost*; that the former was  
 "united to the man CHRIST, who was born of  
 "the Virgin MARY by an omnipotent act of the  
 "divine will; and that, on this account, CHRIST  
 "might be properly called *God*; that the *Holy*  
 "*Spirit* directed the course, and animated the  
 "whole system of nature; and more especially  
 "produced in the minds of men wise councils,  
 "virtuous propensities, and divine feelings; and,  
 "finally, that these two *Representations* were to  
 "cease after the destruction of this terrestrial  
 "globe, and to be absorbed into the *substance* of  
 "the *Deity*, from whence they had been formed."  
 This is, at least, a general sketch of the doctrine  
 of SERVETUS, who, however, did not always ex-  
 plain his system in the same manner, nor take any  
 pains to avoid inconsistencies and contradictions;  
 and who frequently expressed himself in such am-  
 biguous terms, that it is extremely difficult to learn  
 from them his true sentiments. His system of  
 morality agreed in many circumstances with that  
 of the *Anabaptists*; whom he also imitated in cen-  
 suring, with the utmost severity, the custom of  
*Infant-Baptism*.

Other An-  
 ti-Trinita-  
 rians.

VI. The pompous plans of Reformation, that  
 had been formed by SERVETUS, were not only dis-  
 concerted, but even fell into oblivion, after the

¶ [*f*] These *representations*, or *manners of existence*, SER-  
 VETUS also called *œconomies*, *dispensations*, *dispositions*, &c. for  
 he often changed his terms in unfolding his visionary system.

death

death of their author. He was, indeed, according to vulgar report, supposed to have left behind him a considerable number of disciples; and we find in the writings of the doctors of this century, many complaints and apprehensions that seem to confirm this supposition, and would persuade us, that SERVETUS had really founded a sect; yet, when this matter is attentively examined, there will appear just reason to doubt, whether this man left behind him any one person that might properly be called his true disciple. For those who were denominated *Servetians* by the theological writers of this century, not only differed from SERVETUS in many points of doctrine, but also varied widely from him in his doctrine of the Trinity, which was the peculiar and distinguishing point of his theological system. VALENTINE GENTILIS, a Neapolitan, who suffered death at Bern, in the year 1566, adopted the Arian hypothesis, and not that of SERVETUS, as many writers have imagined; for his only error consisted in this, that he considered the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*, as subordinate to the *Father* [g]. Nearly allied to this, was the doctrine of MATTHEW GRIBALDI, a lawyer, whom a timely death, in the year 1566, saved from the severity of an ecclesiastical tribunal, that was ready to pronounce sentence against him on account of his errors; for he supposed the *divine nature* divided into *three eternal spirits*, which were distinguished from each other, not only by *number*, but also by *subordination* [b]. It is not so easy to determine the par-

SENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

[g] See BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the article GENTILIS.—SPON. *Hist. de Geneve*, livr. iii. tom. ii. p. 80.—SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 26.—LAMY, *Histoire du Socinianisme*, part II. ch. vi. p. 251.—FUESL. *Reformatio Beytrage*, tom. v. p. 381.

[b] SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 17.—LAMY, *loc. cit.* part II. ch. vii. p. 257.—SPON, *loc. cit.* tom. ii. p. 85. not.—HALERUS, in *Museo Figurino*, tom. ii. p. 114.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

ticular charge that was brought against ALCIAT, a native of *Piedmont*, and SYLVESTER TELLIIUS, who were banished from the city and territory of *Geneva*, in the year 1559; nor do we know, with any degree of certainty, the errors that were embraced by PARUTA, LEONARDI, and others [i], who were ranked among the followers of SERVETUS. It is, however, more than probable, that none of the persons now mentioned were the disciples of SERVETUS, or adopted the hypothesis of that visionary innovator. The same thing may be affirmed with respect to GONESIUS, who is said to have embraced the doctrine of that unhappy man, and to have introduced it into *Poland* [k]; for, though he maintained some opinions that really resembled it in some of its points; yet his manner of explaining the mystery of the Trinity was totally different from that of SERVETUS.

Erroneous  
accounts of  
the origin  
of Socini-  
anism.

VII. It is evident that none of the persons, now mentioned, professed that form or system of theo-

[i] For an account of these, and other persons of the same class, see SANDIUS, LAMY, and also LUBIENIECIUS, his *Historia Reformat. Poloniæ*, lib. ii. cap. v. p. 96.—There is a particular and ample account of ALCIAT given by BAYLE, in the first volume of his *Dictionary*; see also SPON, *loc. cit.* tom. ii. p. 85, 86.

[k] This is affirmed upon the authority of WISSOWATIUS and LUBIENIECIUS; but the very words of the latter will be sufficient to shew us upon what grounds. These words (*Hist. Reformat. Polon.* cap. vi. p. 111.) are as follows: *Is Servetus sententiam de præ-eminencia patris in patriam attulit, eamque non dissimulavit, i. e. GONESIUS introduced into Poland the opinion embraced by SERVETUS in relation to the pre-eminence of the Father, and was by no means studious to conceal it.* Who now does not see, that, if it was the pre-eminence of the Father that GONESIUS maintained, he must have differed considerably from SERVETUS, whose doctrine removed all real distinction in the divine nature? The reader will do well to consult SANDIUS (*loc. cit.* p. 40.) concerning the sentiments of GONESIUS; since it is from this writer, that LAMY has borrowed the greatest part of what he has advanced in his *Histoire de Socinisme*, tom. ii. chap. x. p. 278.

logical

logical doctrine, that is properly called *Socinianism*, the origin of which is, by the writers of that sect, dated from the year 1546, and placed in *Italy*. These writers tell us, that, in this very year, above forty persons eminently distinguished by their learning and genius, and still more by their generous zeal for truth, held secret assemblies, at different times, in the territory of *Venice*, and particularly at *Vicenza*, in which they deliberated concerning a general reformation of the received systems of religion, and, in a more especial manner, undertook to refute the peculiar doctrines that were afterwards publicly rejected by the Socinians. They tell us further, that the principal members of this clandestine society, were LÆLIUS, SOCINUS, ALCIAT, OCHINUS, PARUTA, and GENTILIS; that their design was divulged, and their meetings discovered, by the temerity and imprudence of some of their associates; that two of them were apprehended and put to death; while the rest, being dispersed, sought a refuge in *Switzerland*, *Germany*, *Moravia*, and other countries, and that SOCINUS, after having wandered up and down in several parts of *Europe*, went into *Poland*, first in the year 1551, and afterwards in 1558, and there sowed the seeds of his doctrine, which, in process of time, grew apace, and produced a rich and abundant harvest [1]. Such is

[1] See the *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinit.* p. 18 & 75. of SANDIUS, who mentions some writings that are supposed to have been published by the clandestine society of pretended Reformers at *Venice* and *Vicenza*; though the truth of this supposition is extremely dubious;—ANDR. WISSOWATII *Narratio quomodo in Polonia Reformati ab Unitariis separati sunt*, which is subjoined to the *Biblioth.* of SANDIUS, p. 209, 210.—The reader may likewise consult LUBIENIECIUS, *Hystor. Reformat. Polon.* lib. ii. cap. i. p. 38. who intimates, that he took this account of the origin of Socinianism from the manuscript *Commentaria* of BUDZINUS, and his *Life* of LÆLIUS SOCINUS. See also SAM. PRZISCOVIUS, in *Vita Socini*.



CENT. the account of the origin of Socinianism, that is  
 XVI. generally given by the writers of that sect. To  
 SECT. III. assert that it is, in every circumstance, fictitious  
 PART II. and false, would perhaps be going too far; but,  
 on the other hand, it is easy to demonstrate that  
 the system of religion, commonly called *Socinianism*,  
 was neither invented nor drawn up in those meet-  
 ings at *Venice* and *Vicenza* that have now been  
 mentioned [m].

## VIII. While,

[m] See GUSTAV. GEORG. ZELTNERI *Historia Crypto-Socinianismi Altorfmi*, cap. ii. § xli. p. 321. note.—This writer seems to think that the inquiries that have hitherto been made into this affair are by no means satisfactory; and he therefore wishes that some men of learning, equal to the task, would examine the subject anew.—This, indeed, were much to be wished. In the mean time, I shall venture to offer a few observations, which may perhaps contribute to cast some light upon this matter. That there was, in reality, such a society as is mentioned in the text, is far from being improbable. Many circumstances and relations prove sufficiently, that immediately after the Reformation had taken place in *Germany*, secret assemblies were held, and measures proposed, in several provinces that were still under the jurisdiction of *Rome*, with a view to combat the errors and superstition of the times. It is also, in a more especial manner, probable, that the territory of *Venice* was the scene of these deliberations; since it is well known, that a great number of the Venetians at this time, though they had no personal attachment to LUTHER, approved, nevertheless, of his design of reforming the corrupt state of religion, and wished well to every attempt that was made to restore Christianity to its native and primitive simplicity. It is farther highly credible, that these assemblies were interrupted and dispersed by the vigilance of the papal emissaries, that some of their members were apprehended and put to death, and that the rest saved themselves by flight. All this is probable enough; but it is extremely improbable, nay utterly incredible, that all the persons, who are said to have been present at these assemblies, were really so. And I therefore adopt willingly the opinion of those who affirm, that many persons, who, in after-times, distinguished themselves from the multitude by opposing the doctrine of *Trinity in Unity*, were considered as members of the Venetian society, by ignorant writers, who looked upon that society as the source and nursery of the whole *Unitarian* sect. It is certain, for instance, that OCHINUS is erroneously placed among the mem-  
 bers.

VIII. While, therefore, we reject this inaccurate account of the matter under consideration,\* it

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

bers of the famous society now mentioned; for, not to insist upon the circumstance, that it is not sufficiently clear whether he was really a Socinian or not, it appears undeniably, from the *Annales Capucinatorum* of BOVERIUS, as well as from other unquestionable testimonies, that he left *Italy* so early as the year 1543, and went from thence to *Geneva*. See a singular book, entitled, *La Guerre Sinaphique, ou l'Histoire des perils qu'a courus la Barbe des Capuchins*, livr. iii. p. 191. 216.—What I have said of OCHINUS may be confidently affirmed with respect to LÆLIUS SOCINUS, who, though reported to have been at the head of the society now under consideration, was certainly never present at any of its meetings. For how can we suppose that a young man, only one-and-twenty years old, would leave the place of his nativity, repair to *Venice* or *Vicenza*, and that without any other view than the pleasure of disputing freely on certain points of religion\*? Or how could it happen, that a youth of such unexperienced years should acquire such a high degree of influence and authority, as to obtain the first rank, and the principal direction, in an assembly composed of so many eminently learned and ingenious men? Besides, from the *Life of Lælius*, which is still extant, and from other testimonies of good authority, it is easy to shew, that it was the desire of improvement, and the hope of being aided, in his inquiries after truth, by the conversation of learned men in foreign nations, that induced him to leave *Italy*, and not the apprehension of persecution and death, as some have imagined. It is also certain, that he returned into his native country afterwards, and, in the year 1551, remained some time at *Sienna*, while his father lived at *Bologna*. See his letter to BULLINGER, in the *Museum Helveticum*, tom. v. p. 489. Now surely it cannot easily be imagined, that a man in his senses would return to a country from whence, but a few years before, he had been obliged to fly, in order to avoid the terrors of a barbarous inquisition and a violent death.

The real origin of Socinianism.

But, waving this question for a moment, let us suppose all the accounts, we have from the Socinians, concerning this famous assembly of *Venice* and *Vicenza*, and the members of which it was composed, to be true and exact; yet it remains to be proved, that the Socinian system of doctrine was invented and drawn up in that assembly. This the Socinian writers maintain; and this, as the case appears to me, may be safely

\* Is such a supposition really so absurd? Is not a spirit of enthusiasm, or even an uncommon degree of zeal, adequate to the production of such an effect?

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

is incumbent upon us to substitute a better in its place; and, indeed, the origin and progress of the Socinian doctrine seem easy to be traced out by such as are acquainted with the history of the church during this century. There were certain sects and doctors, against whom the zeal, vigilance, and severity of Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists, were united, and, in opposing whose settlement and progress, these three communions, forgetting their dissensions, joined their most vigorous counsels and endeavours. The objects of

denied. For the Socinian doctrine is undoubtedly of much later date than this assembly; it also passed through different hands, and was, during many years, reviewed and corrected by men of learning and genius, and thus underwent various changes and improvements before it was formed into a regular, permanent, and connected system. To be convinced of this, it will be sufficient to cast an eye upon the opinions, doctrines, and reasonings, of several of the members of the famous society, so often mentioned; which vary in such a striking manner, as shew manifestly that this society had no fixed views, nor had ever agreed upon any consistent form of doctrine. We learn, moreover, from many circumstances in the life and transactions of LÆLIUS SOCIANUS, that this man had not, when he left *Italy*, laid the plan of a regular system of religion; and it is well known, that, for many years afterwards, his time was spent in doubting, inquiring, and disputing; and that his ideas of religious matters were extremely fluctuating and unsettled. So that it seems probable to me, that the man died in this state of hesitation and uncertainty, before he had reduced his notions to any consistent form. As to GRIBALDI and ALCIAT, who have been already mentioned, it is manifest that they inclined towards the Arian system, and did not entertain such low ideas of the person and dignity of JESUS CHRIST, as those that are adopted among the Socinians. From all this it appears abundantly evident, that these Italian Reformers, if their famous society ever existed in reality (which I admit here as a probable supposition rather than as a fact sufficiently attested) were dispersed and obliged to seek their safety in a voluntary exile, before they had agreed about any regular system of religious doctrine. So that this account of the origin of Socinianism is rather imaginary than real, though it has been inconsiderately adopted by many writers. FUESLIN has alleged several arguments against it in his German work, entitled *Reformationen Beytragen*, tom. iii. p. 327.

their common aversion, were the *Anabaptists*, and those who denied the *Divinity* of CHRIST, and a *Trinity* of Persons in the Godhead. To avoid the unhappy consequences of such a formidable opposition, great numbers of both classes retired into *Poland*, from this persuasion, that in a country whose inhabitants were passionately fond of freedom, religious liberty could not fail to find a refuge. However, on their first arrival, they proceeded with circumspection and prudence, and explained their sentiments with much caution and a certain mixture of disguise, not knowing surely what might happen, nor how far their opinions would be treated with indulgence. Thus they lived in peace and quiet during several years, mixed with the Lutherans and Calvinists, who had already obtained a solid settlement in *Poland*, and who admitted them into their communion, and even into the assemblies where their public deliberations were held. They were not, however, long satisfied with this state of constraint, notwithstanding the privileges with which it was attended; but, having insinuated themselves into the friendship of several noble and opulent families, they began to act with more spirit, and even to declare, in an open manner, their opposition to certain doctrines that were generally received among Christians. Hence arose violent contests between them and the Swiss, or Reformed churches, with which they had been principally connected. These dissensions drew the attention of the government, and occasioned, in the year 1565, a resolution of the diet of *Petrikow*, ordering the innovators to separate themselves from the churches already mentioned, and to form a distinct congregation or sect [n]. These founders

of

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

[n] LAMY, *Histoire du Socinianisme*, part I. chap. vi. &c.  
p. 16.—STOINII *Epitome Originis Unitariorum in Polonia*, apud  
K k 2 SANDIUM,

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

of the Socinian church were commonly called *Pinczovians*, from the town in which the heads of their sect resided. Hitherto, indeed, they had not carried matters so far as they did afterwards; for they professed chiefly the Arian doctrine concerning the divine nature, maintaining that the *Son* and the *Holy Ghost* were two distinct natures, begotten by *God the Father*, and subordinate to him [o].

The progress of Socinianism.

IX. The *Unitarians*, being thus separated from the other religious societies in *Poland*, had many difficulties to encounter, both of an internal and external kind. From without, they were threatened with a formidable prospect arising from the united efforts of Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists, to crush their infant sect. From within, they dreaded the effects of intestine discord, which portended the ruin of their community before it could arrive at any measure of stability or consistence. This latter apprehension was too well grounded; for, as yet, they had agreed upon no regular system of principles, which might serve as a centre and bond of union. Some of them chose to persevere in the doctrine of the Arians,

SANDIUM, p. 183.—GEORG. SCHOMANNI *Testamentum*, apud eundem, p. 194.—ANDR. WISSOWARIUS *de Separatione Unitar. a Reformatis*, ibid. p. 211, 212.—LUBIENIECIUS, *Hist. Reformat. Poloniæ*, lib. ii. cap. vi. p. 111. cap. viii. p. 144. lib. iii. cap. i. p. 158.

[o] This will appear abundantly evident to all such as consult, with a proper degree of attention, the writers mentioned in the preceding note. It is unquestionably certain, that all those, who then called themselves *Unitarian Brethren*, did not entertain the same sentiments concerning the Divine Nature. Some of the most eminent doctors of that sect adopted the notions relating to the *person* and *dignity* of CHRIST, that were, in after-times, peculiar to the Socinians; the greatest part of them, however, embraced the Arian system, and affirmed, that our blessed Saviour was created before the formation of the world, by *God the Father*, to whom he was much inferior, nevertheless, in dignity and perfection.

# CHAP. IV. *The History of the Socinians.*

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

and to proceed no further; and these were called *Farnovians* [p]. Others, more adventurous, went much greater lengths, and attributed to CHRIST almost no other rank or dignity than those of a divine messenger, and of a true prophet. A third class, distinguished by the denomination of *Budneians* [q], went still further; declaring that JESUS CHRIST was born in an ordinary way, according to the general law of nature, and that, consequently, he was no proper object of divine worship or adoration [r]. There were also among these people several fanatics, who were desirous of introducing into the society the discipline of the enthusiastic Anabaptists; such as a community of goods, an equality of ranks, and other absurdities of the same nature [s]. Such were the disagreeable and perilous circumstances in which the *Unitarians* were placed, during the infancy of their sect, and which, no doubt, rendered their situation extremely critical and perplexing. But they were happily extricated out of these difficulties by the dexterity and resolution of certain of their doctors, whose efforts were crowned with singular success, on account of the credit and influence they had obtained in *Poland*. These Unitarian doctors suppressed, in a little time, the factions that threatened the ruin of their community, erected flourishing congregations at *Cracow*, *Lublin*, *Pinczow*, *Luck*, *Smila* [t] (a town belong-

[p] For a more particular account of the *Farnovians*, see § xxii. of this chapter.

[q] See the part of this chapter referred to in the preceding vote.

[r] *Vita Andr. Wyszowatu* in SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trin.* p. 226.—As also SANDIUS in *Simo. Budnac*, p. 54.

[s] LUBIENIECII *Hist. Reform. Polon.* lib. iii. cap. xii. p. 240.

[t] MART. ADALT, *Hystoria Arianismi Smigghensis*, Ged. 1741, in 8vo.

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

---

ing to the famous DUDITH [*u*],) and in several other places both in *Poland* and *Lithuania*, and obtained the privilege of printing their productions, and those of their brethren, without molestation or restraint [*w*]. All these advantages were crowned by a signal mark of liberality and munificence, they received from JO. SIENIENIUS, palatine of *Padolia*, who gave them a settlement in the city of *Racow*, which he had himself built, in the

¶ [*u*] This DUDITH, who was certainly one of the most learned and eminent men of the sixteenth century, was born at *P. da*, in the year 1533; and after having studied in the most famous universities, and travelled through almost all the countries of *Europe*, was named to the bishoprick of *Tina* by the Emperor FERDINAND, and made privy counsellor to that prince. He had, by the force of his genius, and the study of the ancient orators, acquired such a masterly and irresistible eloquence, that in all public deliberations he carried every thing before him. In the council, where he was sent in the name of the emperor and of the Hungarian clergy, he spoke with such energy against several abuses of the church of *Rome*, and particularly against the celibacy of the clergy, that the pope, being informed thereof by his legates, solicited the emperor to recal him. FERDINAND complied; but, having heard DUDITH's report of what passed in that famous council, he approved of his conduct, and rewarded him with the bishoprick of *Cbenat*. He afterwards married a maid of honour of the queen of *Hungary*, and resigned his bishoprick; the emperor, however, still continued his friend and protector. The papal excommunication was levelled at his head, but he treated it with contempt. Tired of the fopperies and superstitions of the church of *Rome*, he retired to *Cracow*, where he embraced the protestant religion publicly, after having been for a good while its secret friend. It is said, that he shewed some inclination towards the Socinian system. Some of his friends deny this; others confess it, but maintain that he afterwards changed his sentiments in that respect. He was well acquainted with several branches of philosophy and the mathematics, with the sciences of physic, history, theology, and the civil law. He was such an enthusiastical admirer of CICERO, that he copied over three times, with his own hand, the whole works of that immortal author. He had something majestic in his figure, and in the air of his countenance. His life was regular and virtuous, his manners elegant and easy, and his benevolence warm and extensive.

[*w*] SANDII *Bibliotheca Anti-Trin.* p. 201.

year 1569, in the district of *Sandomir* [x]. This extraordinary favour was peculiarly adapted to better the state of the Unitarians, who were, hitherto, dispersed far and wide in the midst of their enemies. And accordingly they now looked upon their religious establishment as permanent and stable, and presumed so far upon their good fortune, as to declare *Racow* the centre of their community, where their distant and dispersed members might unite their counsels, and hold their deliberations.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

X. When they saw their affairs in this promising situation, the first thing that employed the attention and zeal of their doctors and spiritual rulers, was a translation of the Bible into the Polish language, which was accordingly published in the year 1572. They had, indeed, before this, a Polish version of the sacred writings, which they had composed, jointly with the Helvetic doctors, in the year 1565, while they lived in communion with that church. But after the breach of that communion, and the order they had received to separate themselves from the Reformed church, this Version lost its credit among them, as it did not seem proper to answer their views [y]. After they had finished their new Version, they drew up a summary of their religious doctrine, which was published at *Cracow*, in the year 1574, under the title of *Catechism*, or *Confession of the Unitarians* [z]. The system of religion

A summary  
view of the  
religion  
they pro-  
fessed.

[x] SANDIUS, *loc. citat.* p. 201.—LUBIENIECIUS, *loc. cit.* p. 239.

[y] See a German work of RINGELTAUBE, entitled, *Von den Polnischen Eibeln*, p. 90. 113. 142. in which there is a further account of the Polish interpretations of the Bible composed by Socinian authors.

[z] From this little performance, and indeed from it alone, we may learn with certainty the true state of the Unitarian religion before FAUSTUS SOCINUS; and, nevertheless, I do



C E N T. ligious that is contained in this Catechism, is re-  
 XVI. markable for its simplicity, and is neither loaded  
 SECT. III. with  
 PART II.

not find that it has been so much as once quoted, or even mentioned, by any of the Socinian writers, by any historians who have given an account of their sect, nor yet by any of the divines that have drawn the pen of controversy against their religious system. I am almost inclined to believe, that the Socinians (when, in process of time, they had gained ground, acquired more dexterity in the management of their affairs, and drawn up a new, specious, and artful summary of their doctrine) were prudent enough to desire that this primitive Catechism should disappear, that it might not furnish their adversaries with an occasion of accusing them of inconsistency in abandoning the tenets of their ancestors, nor excite factions and divisions among themselves, by inducing any of their people to complain that they had deviated from the ancient simplicity of their first founder. These reasons, very probably, engaged the Socinian doctors to buy up all the copies they could find of this original *Confession* or Catechism, with a view to bury it in oblivion. It will not, therefore, be improper to give here some account of the form and matter of this first Socinian Creed, which contained the doctrine of that sect before the *Racovian Catechism* was composed. This account will throw new light upon a period and branch of Ecclesiastical History that are highly interesting. The original Catechism, now under consideration, which is extremely rare, has the following title prefixed to it: *Catechism or Confession of Faith of the Congregation assembled in Poland, in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, who was crucified and raised from the dead*—DEUTER. vi. Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one God—JOHN viii. 54. It is my Father—of whom ye say that he is your God. Printed by Alexander Turobinus, born in the year of Christ, the Son of God, 1574, in 12mo (1). We find, by a passage, at the end of the *Preface*, that this curious Catechism was printed at Cracow; for it is said to have been published in that city, in the year 1574, after the birth of Christ. Now it is known that the Unitarians had, at that time, a Printing-house at Cracow, which was, soon after, removed to Racow. Alexander Turobinus, who is said to have been the printer of this little production, is mentioned by SANDIUS (in his *Biblioth. Anti-Trin.* p. 51.) under the denomination of TUROBINCZYCK, which he

(1) The original title runs thus: *Catechesis et Confessio fidei cæterus per Poloniam congregati in nomine Jesu Christi, Domini nostri crucifixi et resuscitati.* Deut. vi. Audi, Israel, Dominus Deus noster Deus unus est. Johannis viii. dicit Jesus: Quem vos dicitis vestrum esse Deum, est pater meus. Typis Alexandri Turobinii, anno natæ Jesu Christi, filii Dei, 1574, in 12mo.

undoubtedly

with scholastic terms nor subtle discussions; but it nevertheless breathes, in several places, the spirit

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

undoubtedly derived from *Turobin*, a town in the Palatinate of *Chelm*, in *Little or Red Russia*, which was the place of his nativity. The author of this Catechism was the famous *GEORGE SCHOMAN*, as has been evidently proved from a piece, entitled, *Schomanni Testamentum* (2); and other circumstances, by *JO. ADAM MULLERUS*, in his Dissertation *De Unitariorum Catechisi et Confessione omnium* (3). The *Preface*, which is composed in the name of the whole Congregation, begins with the following salutation: *To all those who thirst after eternal salvation, the LITTLE and AFFLICTED FLOCK in Poland, which is baptized in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, sendeth greeting: praying most earnestly that grace and peace may be shed upon them by the one supreme God and Father, through his only begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, who was crucified* (4). After this general salutation, the *Præfators* give an account of the reasons that engaged them to compose and publish this Confession. The principal of these reasons was, the reproaches and aspersions that were cast upon the *Anabaptists*, in several places; from which we learn that, at this time, the denomination of *Anabaptists* was given to those who, in after times, were called *Socinians*. The rest of this *Preface* is employed in beseeching the reader to be firmly persuaded, that the designs of the *Congregation* are pious and upright, to read with attention, that he may judge with discernment, and, *abandoning the doctrine of Babylon, and the conduct and conversation of Sodom, to take refuge in the ark of Noah*, i. e. among the Unitarian Brethren.

In the beginning of the *Catechism* itself, the whole doctrine of Christianity is reduced to six points. The first relates to the *Nature of God*, and his Son *Jesus Christ*; the second to *Justification*; the third to *Discipline*; the fourth to *Prayer*; the fifth to *Baptism*; and the sixth to the *Lord's Supper*. These six points are explained at length, in the following manner: Each point is defined and unfolded, in general terms, in one question and answer, and is afterwards subdivided into its several branches in various questions and answers, in which its different parts are illustrated, and confirmed by texts of Scrip-

(2) This Testament is published by *SANDZUS*, in his *Bibliotheca Anti-Trin.* p. 52.

(3) The Dissertation of *MULLERUS* is to be found in a collection of pieces published by *BARTHOLOMÆUS* under the following title: *Fortschreiten neuerlichen Anmerkungen von allerhand Materien*, part xxi. p. 758.

(4) *Omnibus salutem eternam fratribus, gratiam ac pacem ab uno illo altissimo Deo patre, per unigenitum ejus filium, Dominum nostrum, Jesum Christum crucifixum, ex animo precatur CORIVS EXIGVVS ET AFFLICTVS per Poloniam, in nomine ejusdem Jesu Christi Nazareni baptizatus,*

CENT. spirit of Socinianism, and that even in those parts  
 XVI. of it which its authors look upon as most import-  
 SECT. III. ant  
 PART II.

ture. From this it appears, at first sight, that the primitive state of Socinianism was a state of real infancy and weakness, that its doctors were, by no means, distinguished by the depth or accuracy of their theological knowledge, and that they instructed their flock in a superficial manner, by giving them only some vague notions of certain leading doctrines and precepts of religion. In their definition of the *Nature of God*, with which this Catechism begins, the authors discover immediately their sentiments concerning JESUS CHRIST, by declaring that he, together with all other things, is *subject* to the supreme Creator of the universe. It may also be observed, as a proof of the ignorance or negligence of these authors, that, in illustrating the nature and perfections of the Deity, they make not the least mention of his *infinity*, his *omniscience*, his *immensity*, his *eternity*, his *omnipotence*, his *omnipresence*, his *spirituality*, nor of those other perfections of the divine nature that surpass the comprehension of finite minds. Instead of this, they characterize the Supreme Being only by his *wisdom*, his *immortality*, his *goodness*, and *unbounded dominion* and empire over the creatures. By this it would seem, that, even in this early period of Socinianism, the rulers of that sect had adopted it as a maxim, that nothing *uncomprehensible* or *mysterious* was to be admitted into their religious system.—Their erroneous notion concerning JESUS CHRIST is expressed in the following terms: *Our mediator before the throne of God is a man, who was formerly promised to our fathers by the prophets, and in these latter days was born of the seed of David, and whom God the Father, has made Lord and Christ, that is, the most perfect prophet, the most holy priest, and the most triumphant king, by whom he created the new world (5), by whom he has sent peace upon earth, restored all things, and reconciled them to himself; and by whom also he has bestowed eternal life upon his elect; to the end that, after the supreme God, we should believe in him, adore and invoke him, bear his voice, imitate his example, and find, in him, rest to our souls (6).* It is here worthy of note, that, al-

(5) This expression is remarkable; for these doctors maintained, that these declarations of Scripture, which represent the world as formed by Christ, do not relate to the visible world, but to the restoration of mankind to virtue and happiness by the Son of God. They invested this interpretation to prevent their being obliged to acknowledge the divine glory and creating power of Christ.

(6) *Est homo, mediator noster apud Deum patribus olim per prophetas promissus, et ultimus tandem temporibus ex Davidis semine natus, quem Deus pater fecit Dominum et Christum, hac e<sup>a</sup>, perfectissimum prophetam, sanctissimum sacerdotem, invictissimum regem, per quem mundum creavit, omnia restauravit, secum reconciliavit, pacificavit, et vitam eternam electis suis donavit: ut in illum, post Deum optissimum, credamus, illum adoremus, invocemus, audiamus, pro modulo nostro imitamus, et, in illo, requiem animabus nostris inveniamus.*

though

ant and fundamental. Nor will this appear surprising to those who consider, that the papers of  
 CENT. XVI.  
 SECT. III.  
 LÆLIUS PART II.

though they call CHRIST *a most holy priest*, and justify this title by citations from Scripture, yet they no where explain the nature of that *priesthood*, which they attribute to him.—With respect to the *Holy Ghost*, they plainly deny his being a *divine person*, and represent him as nothing more than a divine quality, or virtue, as appears from the following passage: *The Holy Ghost is the energy or perfection of God, whose fulness God the Father bestowed upon his only begotten Son, our Lord, that we, becoming his adopted children, might receive of his fulness* (7).—They express their sentiments concerning Justification in the ensuing terms: *Justification consists in the remission of all our past sins, through the mere grace and mercy of God, in and by our Lord Jesus Christ, without our merits and works, and in consequence of a lively faith, as also in the certain hope of life eternal, and the true and unfeigned amendment of our lives and conversations, through the assistance of the divine spirit, to the glory of God the Father, and the edification of our neighbours* (8). As by this inaccurate definition Justification comprehends in it amendment and obedience, so in the explication of this point our authors break in upon the following one which relates to *Discipline*, and lay down a short summary of moral doctrine, which is contained in a few precepts, and expressed, for the most part, in the language of scripture. There is this peculiarity in their moral injunctions, that they prohibit the *taking of oaths* and the *repelling of injuries*. As to what regards *Ecclesiastical Discipline*, they define it thus: *Ecclesiastical Discipline consists in calling frequently to the remembrance of every individual, the duties that are incumbent upon them in admonishing, first privately, and afterwards, if this be ineffectual, in a public manner before the whole congregation, such as have sinned openly against God, or offended their neighbour; and, lastly, in excluding from the communion of the church the obstinate and impenitent, that, being thus covered with shame, they may be led to repentance, or, if they remain unconverted, may be damned eternally* (9). By their further

(7) Spiritus sanctus est virtus Dei, cujus plenitudinem dedit Deus pater filio suo unigenito, Domino nostro, ut ex ejus plenitudine nos adoptivi acciperemus.

(8) Justificatio est ex mera gratia, per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, sine operibus et meritis nostris, omnium peccatorum nostrorum in viva fide remissa, vitæque æternæ indubitata expectatio et auxilio spiritus Dei vitæ nostræ non simulata, sed vera correctio, ad gloriam Dei patris nostri et edificationem proximorum nostrorum.

(9) Disciplina sacæstastica est effectus singulorum frequens commemoratio et peccatorum contra Deum vel proximum primum privato, deinde etiam publicæ, coram toto cœtu, commonefactio, denique pertinacium a communione sanctorum alienatio, ut pudore suffusi convertantur, aut, si id nolint, æternum damnentur.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

LÆLIUS SOCINUS, which he undoubtedly left behind him in *Poland*, were in the hands of many; and that, by the perusal of them, the Arians, who had formerly the upper hand in the community of the Unitarians, were engaged to change their sentiments concerning the nature and mediation of CHRIST.

explication of the point relating to *Ecclesiastical Discipline*, we see how imperfect and incomplete their notions of that matter were. For they treat, in the first place, concerning the government of the church and its ministers, whom they divide into *bishops, deacons, elders, and widows*. After this, they enumerate, at length, the duties of husbands and wives, old and young, parents and children, masters and servants, citizens and magistrates, poor and rich, and conclude with what relates to the admonishing of offenders, and their exclusion from the communion of the church, in case of obstinate impenitence. Their sentiments concerning *Prayer* are, generally speaking, sound and rational. But in their notion of *Baptism* they differ from other Christian churches in this, that they make it to consist in *immersion* or dipping, and *emersion* or rising again out of the water, and maintain that it ought not to be administered to any, but adult persons. *Baptism*, say they, *is the immersion into water, and the emersion of one who believes in the Gospel and is truly penitent, performed in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or in the name of Jesus Christ alone; by which solemn act the person baptized publicly acknowledges, that he is cleansed from all his sins, through the mercy of God the Father, by the blood of Christ, and the operation of the Holy Spirit; to the end that, being ingrafted into the body of Christ, he may mortify the old Adam, and be transformed into the image of the new and heavenly Adam, in the firm assurance of eternal life after the resurrection* (10). The last point handled in this performance is the *Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, of which the authors give an explication, that will be readily adopted by those who embrace the doctrine of ZWINGLE on that head. At the end of this curious Catechism there is a piece, entitled, *Oeconomia Christiana, seu Pastoratus Domesticus*, which contain a short instruction to heads of families, shewing them how they ought to proceed in order to maintain and increase, in their houses, a spirit of piety; in which also their

(10) *Baptismus est hominis Evangelio credentis et pœnitentiam agentis in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti, vel in nomine Jesu Christi in aquam immersio et emersio, quâ publice proficitur, se gratia Dei Patris, in sanguine Christi, opera Spiritus sancti, ab omnibus peccatis ablutum esse, ut, in corpus Christi inferens, transformatur in Adamum et transformetur in Adamum illum cœlestem, certus, se post resurrectionem consequatur esse vitam æternam.*

devotion

CHRIST [a]. It is true, indeed, that the denomination of *Socinian* was not as yet known. Those who were afterwards distinguished by this title, passed in *Poland*, at the time of which we now speak, under the name of *Anabaptists*, because they admitted to baptism adult persons only, and also rebaptized those that joined them from other Christian churches [b].

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

## XI. The

devotion is assisted by forms of prayer, composed for morning, evening, and other occasions.

The copy of this Catechism, which is now before me, was given, in the year 1680, by MARTIN CHELMIUS, one of the most eminent and zealous Socinian doctors, to Mr. CHRISTOPHER HEILIGMIER, as appears by a long inscription, written by the donor, at the end of the book. In this inscription CHELMIUS promises his friend other productions of the same kind, provided he receives the present one kindly, and concludes with these words of St. PAUL; *God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the strong.*

[a] This appears evidently from the following passage in SCHOMAN's *Testamentum* (published by SANDIUS, in his *Biblioth. Anti-Trin.*), p. 194, 195. *Sub id fere tempus (A. 1566.) ex Rufficis Læti Socini quidam fratres didicerunt, Dei filium non esse secundam Trinitatis personam, patri coessentialem et coæqualem, sed hominem Jesum Christum, ex Spiritu Sancto conceptum, ex Virgine Maria natum, crucifixum, et resuscitatum: a quibus nos commoti, sacras literas perferutari, persuasi sumus.* These words shew plainly, that the Unitarians, or *Pincovians*, as they were sometimes called, had, before their separation from the Reformed church in the year 1565, believed in a *Trinity* of some kind or other; and had not gone so far as totally to divest JESUS CHRIST of his divinity. SCHOMAN, now cited, was a doctor of great authority in this sect; and he tells us, himself, that, at the diet of *Petricow*, in the year 1565, he defended the *unity of God the Father* against the Reformed, who maintained the *existence of a threefold Deity*. We learn nevertheless from himself, that it was not till the year 1566, that a perusal of the papers of LÆLIUS SOCINUS had engaged him to change his sentiments, and to deny the *divine personality* of Christ. What then are we to conclude from hence? The conclusion is plainly this: that, before the year last mentioned, he and his *Pincovian* flock were not Socinians, but Arians only.

[b] This the Unitarians acknowledge, in the *Preface* of their *Catechism*, as we have observed above; and it is confirmed

CENT.

XVI.

SECT. III.

PART II.

The proceedings of  
Faustus Socinus.

XI. The dexterity and perseverance of FAUSTUS SOCINUS gave a new face to the sect of the Unitarians, of which he became the zealous and industrious patron. He was a man of true genius, but of little learning; firm in his purposes, and steady in his measures; much inferior in knowledge to his uncle LÆLIUS, while he surpassed him greatly in courage and resolution. This eminent sectary, after having wandered through several countries of *Europe*, settled, in the year 1579, among the *Unitarians* in *Poland*, and at his arrival there suffered many vexations and much opposition from a considerable number of persons, who looked upon some of his tenets as highly erroneous. And, indeed, it is evident, that the religious system of FAUSTUS SOCINUS, which he is said to have drawn from the papers of his uncle LÆLIUS, was much less remarkable for its simplicity than that of the *Unitarians*. He triumphed, however, at last, over all the difficulties that had been laid in his way, by the power of his eloquence, the spirit and address that reigned in his compositions, the elegance and gentleness of his manners, the favour and protection of the nobility, which he had acquired by his happy talents and accomplishments, and also by some lucky hits of fortune that favoured his enterprizes. By seizing the occasions when it was prudent to yield, and improving the moments that demanded bold resistance and firm resolution, he stemmed dexterously and courageously the torrent of opposition, and beheld the *Unitarians* submitting to his doc-

trine, confirmed by the writer of the *Epistola de Vita Andr. Wiffowatii*, which is subjoined to the *Bibliotheca Anti-Trin.* of SANDIUS. This writer tells us, that his sect were distinguished by the denominations of *Anabaptists* and *Arians*; but that all other Christian communities and individuals in *Poland* were promiscuously called *Chrześciani*, from the word *Chrześć*, which signifies *Baptism*.

trine,

trine, which they had before treated with indignation and contempt. They, in effect, laid aside all feuds and controversies, and formed themselves into one community under his superintendency and direction [c].

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

XII. Thus did SOCINUS introduce a considerable change into the ancient Unitarian system, which, before his time, was ill-digested, ill expressed, and chargeable in many places with ambiguity and incoherence. He disguised its inconsistencies, gave it an air of connexion, method, and elegance, and defended it with much more dexterity and art, than had ever been discovered by its former patrons [d]. And, accordingly, the

The Unitarian religion changed by Socinus.

[c] See BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the article SOCINUS, tom. iv. p. 2741.—SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trin.* p. 64.—SAM. PRZYPCOPII *Vita Socini*, which is prefixed to the works of SOCINUS.—LAMY, *Histoire de Socinianiſme*, part I. ch. xxiv. p. 101. part II. ch. xxii. p. 375, &c.

[d] Hence it appears, that the modern Unitarians are very properly called Socinians. For certainly the formation and establishment of that sect were entirely owing to the labours of LÆLIUS and FAUSTUS SOCINUS. The former, indeed, who was naturally timorous and irresolute, died at Zurich, in the year 1562, in the communion of the Reformed church, and seemed unwilling to expose himself to danger, or to sacrifice his repose, by founding a new sect, that is, by appearing professedly and openly in this enterprize. Besides, many circumstances concur to render it highly probable, that he did not finish the religious system of which he had formed the plan, but died, on the contrary, in a state of uncertainty and doubt with respect to several points of no small importance. But, notwithstanding all this, he contributed much to the institution of the sect now under consideration. For he collected the materials that FAUSTUS afterwards digested and employed with such dexterity and success. He secretly and imperceptibly excited doubts and scruples in the minds of many, concerning several doctrines generally received among Christians; and, by several arguments against the divinity of Christ, which he left behind him committed to writing, he so far seduced, even after his death, the Arians in Poland, that they embraced the communion and sentiments of those, who looked upon CHRIST as a mere man, created immediately, like ADAM,



CENT. the affairs of the *Unitarians* put on a new face.  
 XVI.  
 SECT. III. Under the auspicious protection of such a spirited  
 PART II. and insinuating chief; the little flock, that had been hitherto destitute of strength, resolution, and courage, grew apace, and, all of a sudden, arose to a high degree of credit and influence. Its number was augmented by profelytes of all ranks and orders. Of these some were distinguished by their nobility, others by their opulence, others by their address, and many by their learning and eloquence. All these contributed, in one way or another, to increase the lustre, and to advance the interests, of this rising community, and to support it against the multitude of adversaries, which its remarkable prosperity and success had raised up against it from all quarters; the rich maintained it by their liberality, the powerful by their patronage and protection, and the learned by their writings. But now the system of the *Unitarians*, being thus changed and new-modelled, required a new confession of faith to make known its principles, and give a clear and full account of its present state. The ancient *Catechism*, which was no more than a rude and incoherent sketch, was therefore laid aside, and a new form of doctrine was drawn up by Socinus himself. This form was corrected by some, augmented by others, and revised by all the Socinian doctors of any note; and, having thus acquired a competent degree of

ADAM, by God himself. What LÆLIUS had thus begun, FAUSTUS carried on with vigour, and finished with success. It is indeed difficult, nay scarcely possible, to determine precisely, what materials he received from his uncle, and what tenets he added himself; that he added several is plain enough. This difficulty arises from hence, that there are few writings of LÆLIUS extant, and of those that bear his name, some undoubtedly belong to other authors. We learn, however, from FAUSTUS himself, that the doctrine he propagated, with respect to the *person* of CHRIST, was, at least the greatest part of it, broached by his uncle LÆLIUS.

accuracy and perfection, was published\* under the title of the *Catechism of Racow*, and is still considered as the *Confession of Faith* of the whole sect. An unexpected circumstance crowned all the fortunate events that had happened to this sect, and seemed to leave them nothing further to desire; and this was the zealous protection of JACOBUS A SIENNO, to whom *Racow* belonged. This new patron, separating himself from the Reformed church, in the year 1600, embraced the doctrine and communion of the Socinians, and about two years after, erected in his own city, which he declared their metropolis, a public school, designed as a seminary for their church, to form its ministers and pastors [e].

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

XIII. From *Poland*, the doctrine of SOCINUS made its way into *Transylvania*, in the year 1563, and that, principally, by the credit and influence of GEORGE BLANDRATA, a celebrated physician, whom SIGISMUND, at that time sovereign of the country, had invited to his court, in order to the restoration of his health. BLANDRATA was a man of uncommon address, had a deep knowledge of men and things, and was particularly acquainted with the manners, transactions, and intrigues of courts. He had brought with him a Socinian minister, whose name was FRANCIS DAVID, who seconded his efforts with such zeal, that, by their united solicitations and labours, they engaged the prince, and the greatest part of the nobility, in their cause, infected almost the whole province with their errors, and obtained, for the ministers and members of their communion, the privilege of professing and propagating their doctrines in a public manner. The *Batori*, indeed, who were afterwards chosen dukes of *Transylvania*, were, by

The propagation of Socinianism in *Transylvania* and *Hungary*.

\* [e] See WISSOWATII *Narratio de Separatione Unitariorum a Reformatis*, p. 214.—LUBIENIECIUS, *Histor. Reformatorum, Polon.* lib. iii. c. xii. p. 240.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

---

no means, prejudiced in favour of the Socinians; but that sect was grown so powerful by its numbers, and its influence, that they could not, in prudence, attempt to suppress it [f]. Such also was the case with the successors of the *Batori*; they desired ardently to extirpate this society, but never could bring this desire into execution; so that to this day the Socinians profess their religion publicly in this province, and, indeed, in it alone; and, relying on the protection of the laws, and the faith of certain treaties that have been made with them, have their churches and seminaries of learning, and hold their ecclesiastical and religious assemblies, though exposed to perpetual dangers and snares from the vigilance of their adversaries [g]. About the same time the Socinians endeavoured to form settlements in *Hungary* [b] and *Austria* [i]; but these attempts were defeated by the united and zealous opposition both of the Roman-catholic and Reformed churches.

in Holland  
and England.

XIV. No sooner had the Socinians obtained a solid and happy settlement at *Racow*, but the dictates of zeal and ambition suggested to them views of a still more extensive nature. Encouraged by the protection of men in power, and the suffrages of men of learning and genius, they began to lay several plans for the enlargement of their community, and meditated nothing less than the

[f] See SANDII *Biblioth. Anti Trinit.* p. 28. & 55.—PAULI DEBREZENI *Historia Ecclesie Reformatæ in Hungaria*, p. 147.—MART. SCHMEIVELII *De Statu Eccles. Lutheranae in Transylvania*, p. 55.—LAMV, *Hist. du Socinianisme*, part I. ch. xiii. p. 46.—SALIG, *Histor. Aug. Confessions*, vol. ii. lib. vi. cap. vii. p. 847.

[g] GUSTAV. GEORG. ZELTNERI *Historia Crypto-Socinianismi Altorfni*, cap. ii. p. 357. 359.

[b] DEBREZENI *Histor. Eccles. Reform. in Hungaria*, p. 169.

[i] HENR. SPONDANI *Continuat. Annal. Baronii, ad A.* 1568, n. xxiv. p. 704.

propagation of their doctrine through all the states of *Europ*<sup>a</sup>. The first step they took towards the execution of this purpose, was the publication of a considerable number of books, of which some were designed to illustrate and defend their theological system, and others to explain, or rather to pervert, the sacred writings into a conformity with their peculiar tenets. These books, which were composed by the most subtle and artful doctors of the sect, were printed at *Racow*, and dispersed with the utmost industry and zeal through different countries [k]. They also sent missionaries to several places, towards the conclusion of this century, as appears evident from authentic records, in order to make profelytes, and to erect new congregations. These missionaries seemed every way qualified to gain credit to the cause in which they had embarked, as some of them were distinguished by the lustre of their birth, and others by the extent of their learning, and the power of their eloquence; and yet, notwithstanding these uncommon advantages, they failed, almost every where, in their attempts. A small congregation was founded at *Dantzic*, which subsisted, for some time, in a clandestine manner, and then gradually dwindled to nothing [l]. The first attempts to promote the cause of Socinianism in *Holland*, were made by a person whose name was ERASMUS JOHANNIS [m]. After him CHRIST-

[k] A considerable number of these books were republished together, in the year 1656, in one great collection, consisting of six volumes in *folio*, under the title of *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*. There are, indeed, in this collection many pieces wanting, which were composed by the most eminent leaders of the sect; but what is there published i. e. nevertheless, sufficient to give the attentive reader a clear idea of the doctrine of the Socinians, and of the nature of their institution as a religious community.

[l] GUSTAV. GEORG. ZELTNERI *Hist. Crypto-Socinismi Altorfmi*, p. 199.

[m] SANDIUS, *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinit.* p. 87.

C E N T. XVI. O P H E R O S T O R O D, and A N D R E W V O I D I O V I U S, who  
 S E C T. III. were the main pillars of the sect, used their ut-  
 P A R T II. most endeavours to gain disciples and followers in  
 that country; nor were their labours wholly un-  
 successful, though the zeal of the clergy, and the  
 vigilance of the magistrates, prevented their form-  
 ing any regular assemblies, and thus effectually  
 checked their progress [n], and hindered their  
 party from acquiring any considerable degree of  
 strength and stability [o]. Socinianism did not  
 meet with a better reception in *Britain* than in  
*Holland*. It was introduced into *Germany* by A D A M  
 N E U S E R, and other emissaries, who infected the  
 Palatinate with its errors, having entered into a  
 league with the Transylvanians, at the critical pe-  
 riod when the affairs of the Unitarians, in *Poland*,  
 carried a dubious and unpromising aspect. But  
 this pernicious league was soon detected, and the  
 schemes of its authors entirely blasted and discon-  
 certing; upon which N E U S E R went into *Turkey*,  
 and enlisted among the Janizaries [p].

The main  
 principle of  
 Socinian-  
 ism.

XV. Although the Socinians profess to believe  
 that all our knowledge of divine things is derived  
 solely from the Holy Scriptures; yet they main-  
 tain in reality, that the sense of scripture is to be  
 investigated and explained by the dictates of right

☞ [n] B R A N D T, in his History of the Reformation of the  
 Netherlands, tells us, that O S T O R O D and V O I D I O V I U S were  
 banished, and that their books were condemned to be burnt  
 publicly by the hands of the common hangman. Accordingly  
 the pile was raised, the executioner approached, and the mul-  
 titude was assembled, but the books did not appear. The ma-  
 gistrates, who were curious to peruse their contents, had  
 quietly divided them among themselves and their friends.

[o] Z E L T N E R U S, *Hist. Crypto-Socinismi*, &c. p. 31. & 178.

[p] B U R C H. G O R T. S T R U V I I *Hist. Eccles. Palat.* cap. viii.  
 § lvi. p. 214.—A L T I N G. *Hist. Eccles. Palat.* in M I E R I I *Monum.*  
*Palat.* p. 266—337.—L A C R O Z E, *Dissertations Historiques*,  
 tom. i. p. 101. 127. compared with B E R N. R A U P A C H I U S, his  
*Presbyterologia Austriaca*, p. 113. where there is an account of  
 J O H N M A T T H A U S, who was concerned in these troubles.

reason,

reason, to which, of consequence, they attribute a great influence in determining the nature, and unfolding the various doctrines of religion. When their writings are perused with attention, they will be found to attribute more to reason, in this matter, than most other Christian societies. For they frequently insinuate artfully, nay sometimes declare plainly, that the sacred penmen were guilty of several mistakes, from a defect of memory, as well as a want of capacity: that they expressed their sentiments without either perspicuity or precision, and rendered the plainest things obscure by their pompous and diffuse Asiatic style; and that it was therefore absolutely necessary to employ the lamp of human reason to cast a light upon their doctrine, and to explain it in a manner conformable to truth. It is easy to see what they had in view by maintaining propositions of this kind. They aimed at nothing less than the establishment of the following general rule, *viz.* that the history of the Jews and of JESUS CHRIST was indeed to be derived from the books of the *Old and New Testament*, and that it was not lawful to entertain the least doubt concerning the truth of this history, and the authenticity of these books in general; but that the particular doctrines which they contain, were, nevertheless, to be understood, and explained in such a manner as to render them conformable to the dictates of reason. According to this representation of things, it is not the Holy Scripture, which declares clearly and expressly what we are to believe concerning the nature, counsels, and perfections of the Deity; but it is human reason, which shews us the system of religion that we ought to seek in, and deduce from, the divine oracles.

XVI. This fundamental principle of Socinianism will appear more dangerous and pernicious, when we consider the sense in which the word

L 1 3

*Reason*

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

The dangerous consequence of this principle.

C E N T. *Reason* was understood by this sect. The pompous  
 XVI title of *Right Reason* was given, by the Socinians,  
 SECT. III. to that measure of intelligence and discernment,  
 PART II 

---

 or, in other words, to that faculty of comprehending and judging, which we derive from nature. According to this definition, the fundamental rule of the Socinians necessarily supposes, that no doctrine ought to be acknowledged as true in its nature, or divine in its origin, all whose parts are not level to the comprehension of the human understanding; and that, whatever the Holy Scriptures teach concerning the perfections of God, his counsels and decrees, and the way of salvation, must be modified, curtailed, and filed down, in such a manner, by the transforming power of art and argument, as to answer the extent of our limited faculties. Those who adopt this singular rule must, at the same time, grant that the number of religions must be nearly equal to that of individuals. For as there is a great variety in the talents and capacities of different persons, so what will appear difficult and abstruse to one, will seem evident and clear to another; and thus the more discerning and penetrating will adopt as divine truth, what the slow and superficial will look upon as unintelligible jargon. This consequence does not at all alarm the Socinians, who suffer their members to explain, in very different ways, many doctrines of the highest importance, and permit every one to follow his particular fancy in composing his theological system, provided they acknowledge, in general, the truth and authenticity of the history of CHRIST, and adhere to the precepts the Gospel lays down for the regulation of our lives and actions.

The sum  
 and substance of  
 Socinian-  
 ism.

XVII. In consequence of this leading maxim, the Socinians either reject without exception, or change and accommodate to their limited capacities, all those doctrines relating to the nature of God

God and of JESUS CHRIST, the plan of redemption, and the eternal rewards and punishments unfolded in the Gospel, which they either cannot comprehend, or consider as attended with considerable difficulties. The sum of their theology is as follows: "God, who is infinitely more perfect than man, though of a similar nature in some respects, exerted an act of that power by which he governs all things; in consequence of which an extraordinary person was born of the Virgin MARY. That person was JESUS CHRIST, whom God first translated to heaven by that portion of his divine power, which is called the *Holy Ghost*; and having instructed him fully there in the knowledge of his will, counsels, and designs, sent him again into this sublunary world, to promulgate to mankind a new rule of life, more excellent than that under which they had formerly lived, to propagate divine truth by his ministry, and to confirm it by his death.

"Those who obey the voice of this Divine Teacher (and this obedience is in the power of every one whose will and inclination leads that way), shall one day be clothed with new bodies, and inhabit eternally those blessed regions, where God himself immediately resides. Such, on the contrary, as are disobedient and rebellious, shall undergo most terrible and exquisite torments, which shall be succeeded by annihilation, or the total extinction of their being."

The whole system of Socinianism, when stripped of the embellishments and commentaries with which it has been loaded and disguised by its doctors, is really reducible to the few propositions now mentioned.

XVIII. The nature and genius of the Socinian theology has an immediate influence upon the

The moral doctrine of the Socinians.



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

---

moral system of that sect, and naturally leads its doctors to confine their rules of morality and virtue to the *external* actions and duties of life. On the one hand, they deny the influence of a divine spirit and power upon the minds of men; and, on the other, they acknowledge, that no mortal has such an empire over himself as to be able to suppress or extinguish his sinful propensities and corrupt desires. Hence they have no conclusion left, but one, and that is, to declare all such true and worthy Christians, whose *words* and *external actions* are conformable to the precepts of the Divine law. It is, at the same time, remarkable, that another branch of their doctrine leads directly to the utmost severity in what relates to life and manners, since they maintain, that the great end of CHRIST's mission upon earth was to exhibit to mortals a new law, distinguished from all others by its unblemished sanctity and perfection. Hence it is, that a great number of the Socinians have fallen into the fanatical rigour of the ancient Anabaptists, and judged it absolutely unlawful to retaliate injuries, to take oaths, to inflict capital punishments on malefactors, to oppose the despotic proceedings of tyrannical magistrates, to acquire wealth by honest industry, and other things of that nature. But, in this, there is something extremely singular, and they are here, indeed, inconsistent with themselves. For while, in matters of doctrine, they take the greatest liberty with the expressions of Scripture, and pervert them in a violent manner, to the defence of their peculiar tenets, they proceed quite otherwise, when they come to prescribe rules of conduct from the precepts of the Gospel; for then they understand these precepts literally, and apply them without the least distinction of times, persons, and circumstances.

XIX. It

XIX. It must carefully be observed, that the *Catechism of Racow*, which most people look upon as the great standard of Socinianism, and as an accurate summary of the doctrine of that sect, is, in reality, no more than a collection of the popular tenets of the Socinians, and by no means a just representation of the secret opinions and sentiments of their doctors [q]. The writings, therefore, of these learned men must be perused with attention, in order to our knowing the hidden reasons and true principles from whence the doctrines of the Catechism are derived. It is observable, besides, that, in this Catechism, many Socinian tenets and institutions, which might have contributed to render the sect still more odious, and to expose its internal constitution too much to public view, are entirely omitted; so that it seems to have been less composed for the use of the Socinians themselves, than to impose upon strangers, and to mitigate the indignation which the tenets of this community had excited in the minds of many [r]. Hence it never obtained, among the Socinians, the authority of a public confession or rule of faith; and hence the doctors of that sect were authorised to correct and contradict it, or to substitute another form of doctrine in its place. It is also observable, that the most eminent writers and patrons of the Socinians, give no clear or consistent account of the sentiments of that sect in

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II,  

---

The Cate-  
chism of  
Racow.

[q] We have an account of the authors of this famous *Catechism*, and of the various success it met with, in the *Commentatio de Catechesi Racovienfi*, published by JO. AND. SCHMIDTUS, in the year 1707. See also KOECHERI *Biblioth. Theolog. Symbolica*.—A new edition of the *Catechism* itself, with a solid refutation of the doctrine it contains, was published in 8vo at *Frankfort and Leipzig*, in the year 1739, by the learned GEORGE LEWIS OEDER.

[r] This appears evident enough from their presenting a Latin translation of this Catechism to JAMES I., king of *Great Britain*, and a German one to the academy of *Wittemberg*.

relation

C E N T. relation to ecclesiastical discipline and government,  
 LVI. and the form of public worship. All that we  
 SECT. III. know is, that they follow in these matters, gene-  
 PART II. rally speaking, the customs received in the pro-  
 testant churches [s].

The state of  
 learning ac-  
 mong the  
 Socinians.

XX. The first founders and patrons of this sect were eminently distinguished by their learning and genius. Their successors, however, did not follow their steps in this respect, nor keep up the reputation they had universally obtained. The Unitarians in Poland seem to have had little ambition of science. They gave no encouragement to learning or talents; and appeared little solicitous of having in their community subtle doctors and learned disputants. But, when they perceived, on the one hand, that the success of their community required as able defenders, as they had learned and ingenious adversaries; and were so lucky, on the other, as to obtain the privilege of erecting seminaries of learning at *Racow* and *Lublin*, they then changed their sentiments with respect to this matter, and became sensible of the necessity under which they lay, to encourage in their community a zeal for the sciences. This zeal increased greatly from the time that FAUSTUS SOCINUS undertook the restoration of their declining credit, and put himself at the head of their tottering sect. At that time many persons, distinguished by their birth, education, and talents,

[s] This is manifest from a work composed by PETER MORSCOVIVS, or MORSKOWSKY, under the following title: *Pelitia Ecclesiastica, quam vulgo Agenda vocant, sive forma Regiminis exterioris Ecclesiarum Christianarum in Polonia, quæ unum Deum Patrem, per filium ejus Unigenitum in Spiritu Sancto, confitentur*. This work, which is divided into three books, was composed in the year 1642, and published in 4to at *Nuremberg*, but a few years ago, by the learned GEORGE LEWIS OEDER. It is mentioned by SANDIUS, in his *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit*, p. 142. who says that it was drawn up for the use of the *Belgic churches*.

embraced

embraced its doctrine, and contributed to promote the love of science among its members. Then the youth were taught the rules of eloquence and rhetoric, and instructed in the important branches of Oriental, Greek, and Latin literature. Nay, even the secret paths of philosophy were opened, though their treasures were disclosed only to a few, who were selected, for that purpose, from the multitude. The Racovian doctors, in compliance with the spirit and taste of the age, chose ARISTOTLE as their guide in philosophy, as appears evidently from the *Ethics* of CRELLIUS, and other literary records of these times.

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

---

XXI. Notwithstanding this progress of philosophy among the Socinians, their doctors seemed to reject its succours in theology with obstinacy and disdain. They declare, in numberless places of their writings, that both in the interpretation of scripture, and in explaining and demonstrating the truths of religion in general, clearness and simplicity are alone to be consulted, and no regard paid to the subtilties of philosophy and logic. And, indeed, had their doctors and interpreters followed in practice, this rule that they have laid down with so much ostentation in theory, they would have saved their adversaries, and perhaps themselves, much trouble. But this is by no means the case. For, in the greatest part of their theological productions, their pretended simplicity is frequently accompanied with much subtilty, and with the most refined intricacies of scientific art. And, what is still more inexcusable, they reason with the greatest dexterity and acuteness concerning those subjects, which (as they surpass the reach of the human understanding) are generally received, among other Christians, as *facts* confirmed by the most respectable *testimony*, and consequently as matters of pure *faith*, while they discover little sagacity, or strength of judg-

Their method of proceeding in theology.

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

The divisions of the Socinians, and their intestine controversies.

Budnæans.

ment, in those discussions which are within the sphere of reason, and are properly amenable to its tribunal. They are acute where they ought to be silent, and they reason awkwardly where sagacity and argument are required. "These are certainly great inconsistencies; yet they proceed from one and the same principle, even the maxim universally received in this community, that all things *that surpass the limits of human comprehension are to be entirely banished from the Christian religion.*"

XXII. It has been already observed, that the Unitarians had no sooner separated themselves from the Reformed churches in Poland, than they became a prey to intestine divisions, and were split into several factions. The points of doctrine that gave rise to these divisions, related to the dignity of CHRIST's *nature and character*, the unlawfulness of *Infant-Baptism*, the *personality* of the *Holy Ghost*, to which were added several alterations, concerning the duties of life, and the rules of conduct that were obligatory on Christians. The sects, produced by these divisions, were not all equally obstinate. Some of them entertained pacific dispositions, and seemed inclined towards a reconciliation. But two, particularly, maintained tenaciously their sentiments, and persisted in their separation; these were the *Budnæans* and the *Farnovians*. The former were so called from their leader SIMON BUDNÆUS, a man of considerable acuteness and sagacity, who, more dexterous than the rest of his brethren in deducing consequences from their principles, and perceiving plainly the conclusions to which the peculiar principles of LÆLIUS SOCINUS naturally led, denied flatly all kinds of religious worship to JESUS CHRIST. Nor did BUDNÆUS stop here; in order to give a more specious colour to this capital error, and to maintain it upon consistent grounds, he asserted that CHRIST was not begotten by an extraordinary

extraordinary act of Divine power, but that he was born like other men, in a natural way. This hypothesis, however conformable to the fundamental principles of Socinianism, appeared intolerable and impious to the greatest part of that community. Hence BUDNÆUS, who had gained over to his doctrine a great number of proselytes in *Lithuania* and *Russian Poland*, was deposed from his ministerial functions, in the year 1584, and publicly excommunicated with all his disciples. It is said, however, that he afterwards abandoned his peculiar and offensive sentiments, and was again re-admitted to the communion of that sect [1].

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

XXIII. This heretical doctrine, which had created so much trouble to BUDNÆUS, was soon after adopted by FRANCIS DAVIDES, a Hungarian, who was the superintendant of the Socinian churches in *Transylvania*, and who opposed, with the greatest ardour and obstinacy, the custom of offering up prayers and divine worship to JESUS CHRIST. Several methods were used to reclaim him from this offensive error. BLANDRATA employed all the power of his eloquence for this purpose, and, to render his remonstrances still more effectual, sent for FAUSTUS SOCINUS, who went accordingly into *Transylvania*, in the year 1573, and seconded his arguments and exhortations with the utmost zeal and perseverance. But DAVIDES remained unmoved, and was, in consequence of this obstinate adherence to his error, thrown into

The sentiments of Budnæus embraced by Davides and Francis.

[1] See SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 34, 55.—*Epistola de Vita Wiffowatti*, p. 226.—RINGELTAUBE'S *German Dissertation on the Polish Bibles*, p. 144. 152.—SAMUEL CRELLIUS, the most learned Socinian of our times, looks upon ADAM NEUSER\*, who was banished on account of his erroneous sentiments, to have been the author of this doctrine, which is so derogatory from the dignity of JESUS CHRIST. See CRELLII *Theaur. Epistol. Cronian.* tom. i. p. 111.

\* See § xiv. of this chapter.

CENT. XVII.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.

prison by CHRISTOPHER BATHORY, prince of *Transylvania*; where he died, in the year 1579, in an advanced age [u]. This his unhappy fate did not, however, extinguish the controversy to which his doctrine had given rise. For he left behind him disciples and friends, who strenuously maintained his sentiments, stood firm against the opposition that was made to them, and created much uneasiness to SOCINUS and his followers in *Lithuania* and *Poland*. The most eminent of these were JACOB PALÆOLOGUS, of the isle of *Cbio*, who was burnt at *Rome*, in the year 1585; CHRISTIAN FRANCKEN, who had disputed in person with SOCINUS; and JOHN SUMMER [w], who was master of the academy of *Clausenburg* [x]. This little sect is branded by the Socinian writers, with the ignominious appellation of *Semi-Judaizers* [y].

XXIV. The

[u] SANDIUS, *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 55, 56.—FAUST. SOCIN. *Opes.* tom. i. p. 353. 395. tom. ii. p. 713. 771. where there is an account of his conference and dispute with FRANCIS DAVIDES.—STAN. LUBIENIECII *Hystor. Reform. Polonicæ*, lib. iii. c. xi. p. 228.

[w] See SANDIUS, *loc. cit.* p. 57, 58. The dispute between SOCINUS and FRANCKEN is related at large in the *Works* of the former, tom. ii. p. 667.

[x] *Clausenburg*, otherwise *Coloswar*, is a town in *Transylvania*, extremely populous and well fortified. The Socinians have here a public school and a printing-house; and their community in this place is very numerous. Till the year 1603, they were in possession of the cathedral, which was then taken from them and given to the Jesuits, whose college and church they had pulled down.

[y] FAUSTUS SOCINUS wrote a particular Treatise against the *Semi-Judaizers*, which is published in the second volume of his *Works*, p. 804. It is, however, worthy of observation, that the motive which engaged SOCINUS and his friends to employ so much pains and labour in the suppression of this faction, was not a persuasion of the pernicious tendency of its doctrines or peculiar notions. On the contrary, SOCINUS himself expressly acknowledges, that this controversy turns upon matters of very little importance, by declaring it, as his opinion, that praying or offering up divine worship to CHRIST,

XXIV. The *Farnovians* were treated by the Socinians with much more indulgence. They were neither excluded from the communion of the sect, nor obliged to renounce their peculiar tenets; they were only exhorted to conceal them prudently, and not to publish or propagate them in their discourses from the pulpit [z]. This particular branch of the Socinian community was so called

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. III.  
PART II.  
The Farnovian sect.

is not necessary to salvation. Thus, in his answer to *Wnieck*, (*Opp.* tom. ii. p. 538.) he expresses himself in the following manner: *The Christian, whose faith is so great, as to encourage him to make his addresses habitually and directly to the Supreme Being, and who standeth not in need of the comfort that flows from the invocation of CHRIST, his brother, who was tempted in all things like as he is, that a Christian is not obliged to call upon the name of Jesus, by prayer or supplication* \*. According therefore to the opinion of Socinus, those who lay aside all regard to CHRIST as an Intercessor, and address themselves directly to God alone, have a greater measure of faith than others. But, if this be so, why did he oppose with such vehemence and animosity the sentiment of DAVIDES, who, in effect, did no more than exhort all Christians to address themselves directly and immediately to the Father? Here there appears to be a striking inconsistency. We find also LUBIENECIUS, in his *Hystor. Reformat. Polonæ*, lib. iii. cap. xi. p. 228. speaking lightly enough of this controversy, and representing it as a matter of very little moment; whence he says, that in *Transylvania* there was much said about nothing †. From all this, then, it appears manifest, that SOCINUS and his followers were more artful than ingenuous in their proceedings with respect to DAVIDES. They persecuted him and his followers, lest by tolerating his doctrine, they should increase the odium under which they already lay, and draw upon themselves anew, the resentment of other Christian churches, while, in their private judgment, they looked upon this very doctrine, and its professors, as worthy of toleration and indulgence.

[z] *Epistola de Vita Wifowatus*, p. 226.—ERASMUS JOHANNIS (as we are informed by SANDIUS, *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 87.) was admitted Professor of Divinity in the Socinian academy at *Clausenburg*, on condition, that in his public discourses he should never say any thing of CHRIST's having existed before the Virgin MARY.

\* *Quod si quis tanta fide credens, ut ad Deum ipsum perpetuo recta accedere audeat, nec consolationem qua Christus inter nos per omnia seculi inuocacione proficiscitur, in se habere putabitur, ut CORNELIUS INNUCET.*

† *Fluctus in fine mundi.*

from



CENT. from STANISLAUS FARNOVIUS, or FARNESIUS, who was engaged by GONESIUS to prefer the Arian system to that of the Socinians, and consequently asserted, that CHRIST had been engendered, or produced, out of nothing, by the Supreme Being, before the creation of this terrestrial globe. It is not so easy to say, what his sentiments were concerning the *Holy Ghost*; all we know of that matter is, that he warned his disciples against paying the tribute of religious worship to that divine Spirit [a]. FARNOVIUS separated from the other Unitarians, in the year 1568, and was followed, in this schism, by several persons eminent on account of the extent of their learning, and the influence of their rank, such as MARTIN CZECHOVICIUS, NEIMOIOVIUS, STANISLAUS WISNOWIUS, JOHN FALCON, GEORGE SCHOMAN, and others. They did not, however, form themselves into a stable or permanent sect. The lenity and indulgence of the Socinians, together with the dexterity of their disputants, brought many of them back into the bosom of the community they had deserted, and considerable numbers were dispersed or regained by the prudence and address of FAUSTUS SOCINUS. So that, at length, the whole faction, being deprived of its chief, who died in the year 1615, was scattered abroad, and reduced to nothing [b].

[a] SANDIUS, *Biblioth.* p. 52. & passim.

[b] We omit here an enumeration of the more famous Socinian writers who flourished in this century, because the greatest part of them have already been mentioned in the course of this History. The rest may be easily collected from SANDIUS.

END OF THE FOURTH VOLUME.

श्रीय पुस्तकालय, का  
National Library, K

