

sons eminent for their piety, learning, and eloquence, and still maintains its reputation in this respect. Its members however have, on account of certain theological productions, been suspected of introducing new opinions; and this suspicion has not only been raised, but is also industriously fomented and propagated, by the Jesuits. The priests who enter into this society are not obliged to renounce their property or possessions, but only to refuse all ecclesiastical cures or offices to which any fixed revenues or honours are annexed, as long as they continue members of this fraternity, from which they are, however, at liberty to retire whenever they think proper [*d*]. While they continue in the Order, they are bound to perform, with the greatest fidelity and accuracy, all the priestly functions, and to turn the whole bent of their zeal and industry to one single point, even the preparing and qualifying themselves and others for discharging them daily with greater perfection, and more abundant fruits. If, therefore, we consider this Order in the original end of its institution, its convents may, not improperly, be called the schools of *sacerdotal divinity* [*e*]. It is nevertheless to be observed, that, in later times,

[*d*] The *Fathers* or *Priests* (as they are also called) of the oratory, are not, properly speaking, *religious* or monks, being bound by no *vows*, and their institute being purely ecclesiastical or sacerdotal.

[*e*] See HABERT DE CERISI, *Vie du Cardinal BERULLE, fondateur de l'Oratoire de Jesus*, published at Paris in 4to in the year 1646.—MORINI *Vita Antiqq.* prefixed to his *Orientalia*, p. 3, 4, 5. 110.—R. SIMON, *Lettres Choieses*, tom. ii. p. 60. et *Bibliothèque Critique* (published under the fictitious name of *Saint Jorre*), tom. iii. p. 303. 324. 330. For an account of the genius and capacity of BERULLE, see BAILLEE, *Vie de RICHER*, p. 220—342.—LE VASSOR, *Histoire de LOUIS XIII.*, tom. iii. p. 397.—HELYOT, *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. viii. chap. x. p. 53.—*Gallia Christiana Benedictinor.* tom. vii. p. 976.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

the Fathers of the Oratory have not confined themselves to this single object, but have imperceptibly extended their original plan, and applied themselves to the study of polite literature and theology, which they teach with reputation in their colleges [f].

After these *Fathers*, the next place is due to the *Priests of the Missions*, an Order founded by VINCENT DE PAUL (who has obtained, not long ago, the honours of sainthood), and formed into a regular congregation, in the year 1632, by Pope URBAN VIII. The rule prescribed to this society, by its founder, lays its members under the three following obligations: *First*, to purify themselves, and to aspire daily to higher degrees of sanctity and perfection, by prayer, meditation, the perusal of pious books, and other devout exercises: *Secondly*, to employ eight months of the year in the villages, and, in general, among the country-people, in order to instruct them in the principles of religion, form them to the practice of piety and virtue, accommodate their differences, and administer consolation and relief to the sick and indigent: *Thirdly*, to inspect and govern the seminaries in which persons designed for holy orders receive their education, and to instruct the candidates for the ministry in the sciences that relate to their respective vocations [g].

The *Priests of the missions* were also intrusted with the direction and government of a Female Order called *Virgins of Love*, or *Daughters of Charity*, whose office it was to administer assistance

☞ [f] *The Fathers of the Oratory* will now be obliged, in a more particular manner, to extend their plan; since, by the suppression of the Jesuits in France, the education of youth is committed to them.

[g] ABELY *Vie de VINCENT DE PAUL*, published in 4to at Paris in 1664.—HELYOT, *loc. cit.* tom. viii. chap. xi. p. 64.—*Gallia Christiana*, tom. vii. p. 998.

and relief to indigent persons, who were confined to their beds by sickness and infirmity. This Order was founded by a noble virgin, whose name was LOUISA LE GRAS, and received, in the year 1660, the approbation of Pope CLEMENT IX. [b].—*The Brethren and Sisters of the pious and Christian schools*, who are now commonly called *Pietists*, were formed into a society in the year 1678, by NICHOLAS BARRE, and obliged, by their engagements, to devote themselves to the education of poor children of both sexes [i]. It would be endless to mention all the religious societies which rose and fell, were formed by fits of zeal, and dissolved by external incidents, or by their own internal principles of instability and decay.

XXIX. If the *Company of Jesus*, so called, which may be considered as the soul of the papal hierarchy, and the main spring that directs its motions, had not been invincible, it must have sunk under the attacks of those formidable enemies that, during the course of this century, assailed it on all sides and from every quarter. When we consider the multitude of the adversaries the *Jesuits* had to encounter, the heinous crimes with which they were charged, the innumerable affronts they received, and the various calamities in which they were involved, it must appear astonishing that they yet subsist; and still more so, that they enjoy any degree of public esteem, and are not, on the contrary, sunk in oblivion, or covered with infamy. In *France*, *Holland*, *Poland*, and *Italy*, they experienced, from time to time, the bitter effects of a warm and

The society
of Jesuits.

[b] GOBILLON, *Vie de Madame DE GRAS, Fondatrice des Filles de la Charité*, published in 12mo at Paris, in the year 1676.

[i] HELYOT, *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. viii. chap. xxx. p. 233.

CEN. T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

vehement opposition, and were, both in public and private, accused of the greatest enormities, and charged with maintaining pestilential errors and maxims, that were equally destructive of the temporal and eternal interests of mankind, by their tendency to extinguish the spirit of true religion, and to trouble the order and peace of civil society. The Jansenists, and all who espoused their cause, distinguished themselves more especially in this opposition. They composed an innumerable multitude of books, in order to cover the sons of LOYOLA with eternal reproach, and to expose them to the hatred and scorn of the whole universe. Nor were these productions mere defamatory libels, dictated by malice alone, or pompous declamations, destitute of arguments and evidence. On the contrary, they were attended with the strongest demonstration, being drawn from undeniable facts, and confirmed by unexceptionable testimonies [k].

Yet

[k] An account of this opposition to, and of these contests with, the Jesuits, would furnish matter for many volumes; since there is scarcely any Roman Catholic country which has not been the theatre of violent divisions between the sons of LOYOLA, and the magistrates, monks; or doctors, of the Romish Church. In these contests, the Jesuits seemed almost always to be vanquished; and nevertheless, in the issue, they always came victorious from the field of controversy. A Jansenist writer proposed, some years ago, to collect into one relation the accounts of these contests that lie dispersed in a multitude of books, and to give a complete history of this famous Order. The first volume of his work accordingly appeared at *Utrecht*, in the year 1741, was accompanied with a curious *Preface*, and entitled *Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus*. If we may give credit to what this writer tells us of the voyages he undertook, the dangers and difficulties he encountered, and the number of years he spent in investigating the proceedings, and in detecting the frauds and artifices, of the Jesuits, we must certainly be persuaded, that no man could be better qualified for composing the history of this insidious Order. But this good man, returning imprudently into *France*, was discovered by his exasperated enemies the Jesuits, and is

Yet all this was far from overturning that fabric of profound and insidious policy which the Jesuits had raised, under the protection of the Roman pontifs, and the connivance of deluded princes and nations. It seemed, on the contrary, as if the opposition of such a multitude of enemies and accusers had strengthened their interest

said to have perished miserably by their hands. Hence not above a third part of his intended work was either published or finished for the press. ¶ Some things may be added, both by way of correction and illustration, to what Dr. MOSHEIM has here said concerning this history of the Jesuits and its author. In the *first place*, its author or compiler is still alive, resides at the *Hague*, passes by the name of BENARD, is supposed to be a Jansenist, and a relation of the famous Father QUENEL, whom the Jesuits persecuted with such violence in *France*. He is a native of *France*, and belonged to the oratory. It is also true, that he went thither from *Holland* several years ago; and it was believed, that he had fallen a victim to the resentment of the Jesuits, until his return to the *Hague* proved that report false. *Secondly*, This history is carried no further down than the year 1572, notwithstanding the express promises and engagements by which the author bound himself, four and twenty years ago (in the Preface to his first volume), to publish the whole in a very short time, declaring that it was ready for the press. This suspension is far from being honourable to Mr. BENARD, who is still living at the *Hague*, and consequently at full liberty to accomplish his promise. This has made some suspect, that, though Mr. BENARD is too much out of the Jesuits reach to be influenced by their threatenings, he is not, however, too far from them to be moved by the eloquence of their promises, or stedfast enough to stand out against the *weighty* remonstrances they may have employed to prevent the further publication of his history. It may be observed *thirdly*, that the character of a traveller, who has studied the manners and conduct of the Jesuits in the most remarkable scenes of their transactions in *Europe*, and the other parts of the globe, is here assumed by Mr. BENARD as the most pleasing manner of conveying the accounts which he compiled in his closet. These accounts don't appear to be false, though the character of a traveller, assumed by the compiler, be fictitious. It must be allowed, on the contrary, that Mr. BENARD has drawn his relations from good sources, though his style and manner cannot well be justified from the charge of acrimony and malignity.

C E N T.
XVII.
S E C T. II.
P A R T I.

instead of diminishing it, and added to their affluence and prosperity instead of bringing on their destruction. Amidst the storm that threatened them with a fatal shipwreck, they directed their course with the utmost dexterity, tranquillity, and prudence. Thus they got safe into the desired harbour, and arose to the very summit of spiritual authority in the church of *Rome*. Avoiding rather than repelling the assaults of their enemies, opposing for the most part patience and silence to their redoubled insults, they proceeded uniformly and stedfastly to their great purpose, and they seem to have attained it. For those very nations who formerly looked upon a Jesuit as a kind of monster, and as a public pest, commit, at this day, some through necessity, some through choice, and others through both, a great part of their interests and transactions to the direction of this most artful and powerful society [1].

XXX. All


[1] It may perhaps be affirmed with truth, that none of the Roman Catholic nations attacked the Jesuits with more vehemence and animosity than the French have done upon several occasions; and it is certain, that the Jesuits in that kingdom have been, more than once, involved in great difficulties and distress. To be convinced of this, the reader has only to consult DU BOULAY'S *Historia Academiae Parisiensis*, tom. vi. p. 559. 648. 676. 738. 742. 744. 763. 774. 874. 890. 898. 909. in which he will find an ample and accurate account of the resolutions and transactions of the Parliament and University of *Paris*, and also of the proceedings of the people in general, to the detriment of this artful and dangerous society. But what was the final issue of all these resolutions and transactions, and in what did all this opposition end? I answer, in the exaltation and grandeur of the Jesuits. They had been banished with ignominy out of the kingdom, and were recalled from their exile, and honourably restored to their former credit, in the year 1604, under the reign of HENRY IV., notwithstanding the remonstrances of many persons of the highest rank and dignity, who were shocked beyond expression at this unaccountably mean and ignoble step. See *Memoires de SULLY* (the modern edition published at *Geneva*), tom. 5. p. 82. 314.

After

XXX. All the different branches of literature received, during this century, in the more polished Roman-Catholic countries, a new degree of lustre and improvement. *France, Spain, Italy,* and the *Netherlands*, produced several men eminent for their genius, erudition, and acquaintance with the learned languages. This happy circumstance must not, however, be attributed to the labour of the schools, or to the methods and procedure of public education; for the old, dry, perplexing, inelegant, scholastic method of instruction prevailed then, and indeed still takes place in both the higher and lower seminaries of learning; and it is the peculiar tendency of this method to damp genius, to depress, instead of exciting and encouraging, the generous efforts of the mind towards the pursuit of truth, and to load the memory with a multitude of insignificant words and useless distinctions. It was beyond the borders of these pedantic seminaries, that genius was encouraged, and directed by great and eminent patrons of science, who opened new paths to the attainment of solid learning, and presented the sciences under a new and engaging aspect to the studious youth. It must be observed here, in justice to the French, that they bore a distinguished part in this literary reformation.—Excited by their native force of genius, and animated by the encouragement that learning and learned men received from the munificence of Lewis XIV., they cultivated with success almost all the various branches of literature, and, rejecting the barbarous jargon of the schools, exhibited

CEN. t.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

The state of
learning in
the church
of Rome.

After that period, they moved the main-springs of government both in church and state, and still continue to sit, though invisibly, at the helm of both.  The reader must again be advertised, that this note was written by Dr. MOSHEIM some years before the suppression of the society of the Jesuits in *France*.

CENT. XVII. learning under an elegant and alluring form, and
 SECT. II. thereby multiplied the number of its votaries and
 PART I. patrons [m]. It is well known how much the
 example and labours of this polite nation contributed to deliver other countries from the yoke of scholastic bondage.

The state of
 philosophy.

XXXI. The Aristotelians of this century were a set of intricate dialecticians, who had the name of the Stagirite always in their mouths, without the least portion of his genius, or any tolerable knowledge of his system; and they maintained their empire in the schools, notwithstanding the attempts that had been made to diminish their credit. It was long before the court of *Rome*, which beheld with terror whatever bore the smallest aspect of novelty, could think of consenting to the introduction of a more rational philosophy, or permit the modern discoveries in that noble science to be explained with freedom in the public seminaries of learning. This appears sufficiently from the fate of GALILEI, the famous mathematician of *Florence*, who was cast into prison by the court of *Inquisition*, for adopting the sentiments of COPERNICUS, in relation to the constitution of the solar system. It is true, indeed, that DES CARTES and GASSENDI [n], the one by his new philosophy, and the other by his admirable writings, gave a mortal wound to the Peripatetics, and excited a spirit of liberty and emulation that changed the face of science in *France*. It was under the auspicious influence of these adventurous guides, that several eminent men of that nation abandon-

[m] For an ample account of this matter, see VOLTAIRE'S *Siècle de LOUIS XIV.*, and more especially the *Chapters* in the second volume relative to the *Arts and Sciences*.

[n] See GASSENDI *Exercitationes Paradoxæ adversus Aristoteles, Operum*, tom. iii. This subtle and judicious work contributed, perhaps, more than any thing else, to hurt the cause, and ruin the credit, of the Peripatetics.

ed the perplexed and intricate wilds of the philosophy that was taught by the modern Aristotelians; and, throwing off the shackles of mere authority, dared to consult the dictates of reason and experience, in the study of nature, and in the investigation of truth. Among these converts to true philosophy, several *Jesuits*, and a still greater number of *Jansenists* and *Priests of the Oratory*, distinguished themselves; and, accordingly, we find in this list the respectable names of MALEBRANCHE, ARNAULD, LAMI, NICOLE, PASCAL, who acquired immortal fame by illustrating and improving the doctrine of DES CARTES, and accommodating it to the purposes of human life [a]. The modesty, circumspection, and self-diffidence of GASSENDI, who confessed the scanty measure of his knowledge, and pretended to no other merit than that of pointing out a rational method of arriving at truth, while others boasted that they had already found it out, rendered him disagreeable in *France*. The ardent curiosity, the fervor, precipitation, and impatience of that lively people, could not bear the slow and cautious method of proceeding that was recommended by the cool wisdom of this prudent inquirer. They wanted to get at the summit of philosophy, without climbing the steps that lead to it.

[a] These great men were, indeed, very ill treated by the Peripatetics, on account of their learned and excellent labours. They were accused by these exasperated scholastics of irreligion; and were even charged with Atheism, by Father HARDOUIN, who was really intoxicated with the large draughts he had taken from the muddy fountains of Peripatetic and Scholastic science. See his *Athei Detecti*, in his *Opp. Posthum.* p. 1. and 1259.—It is easy to perceive the reasons of all this resentment; since the Cartesian system, which aimed at restoring the authority of reason and the light of true philosophy, was by no means so proper to defend the pretensions of *Rome* and the cause of Popery, as the dark and intricate jargon of the Peripatetics.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART. I.

Towards the conclusion of this century, many eminent men, in *Italy* and in other countries, followed the example of the French, in throwing off the yoke of the Peripatetics, and venturing into the paths that were newly opened for the investigation of truth. This desertion of the old philosophy was at first attended with that timorousness and secrecy that arose from apprehensions of the displeasure and resentment of the court of *Rome*; but, as soon as it was known that the Roman pontiffs beheld with less indignation and jealousy the new discoveries in metaphysics, mathematics, and natural philosophy, than the deserters broke their chains with greater confidence, and proceeded with greater freedom and boldness in the pursuit of truth.

The respective merit of Jesuits, Benedictines, Priests of the Oratory, and Jansenists, in the cultivation of sacred and profane literature.

XXXII. After this general account of the state of learning in the Roman-Catholic countries, it will not be improper to point out, in a more particular manner, those of the Romish writers, who contributed most to the propagation and improvement both of sacred and profane erudition during the course of this century. The Jesuits were, for a long time, not only possessed of an undisputed pre-eminence in this respect, but were, moreover, considered as almost the sole fountains of universal knowledge, and the only religious Order that made any figure in the literary world. And it must be confessed by all, who are not misled by want of candour or of proper information, that this famous society was adorned by many persons of uncommon genius and learning. The names of PETAU, SIRMOND, POUSSINES, LABBE, and ABRAM, will live as long as letters shall be held in honour; and even that of HARDOUN, notwithstanding the singularity of his disordered fancy, and the extravagance of many of his opinions, will escape oblivion.

It

It is at the same time to be observed, that the literary glory of the Jesuits suffered a remarkable eclipse, during the course of this century, from the growing lustre of the *Benedictine* Order, and more especially of the *Congregation of St. Maur*. The Jesuits were perpetually boasting of the eminent merit and lustre of their *society* on the one hand, and exposing, on the other, to public contempt, the ignorance and stupidity of the *Benedictines*, who, indeed, formerly made a very different figure from what they do at present. Their view in this was to form a plausible pretext for invading the rights of the latter, and engrossing their ample revenues and possessions; but the *Benedictines* resolved to disconcert this insidious project, to wipe off the reproach of ignorance that had heretofore been cast upon them with too much justice, and to disappoint the rapacious avidity of their enemies, and rob them of their pretexts. For this purpose they not only erected schools in their monasteries, for the instruction of youth in the various branches of learning and science, but also employed such of their select members, as were distinguished by their erudition and genius, in composing a variety of learned productions, that were likely to survive the waste of time, adapted to vindicate the honour of the fraternity, and to reduce its enemies to silence. This important task has been executed with incredible ability and success by MABILLON, D'ACHERY, MASSUET, RUINART, BEAUGENDRE, GARNIER, DE LA RUE, MARTENE, MONTEAUCON, and other eminent men of that learned Order. It is to these *Benedictines* that we are indebted for the best editions of the Greek and Latin fathers; for the discovery of many curious records and ancient documents, that throw a new light upon the history of remote ages, and upon the antiquities of various countries; for the best accounts of

C. I. N. T. ancient transactions, whether ecclesiastical or po-
 XVII. litical, and of the manners and customs of the
 SECT. II. earliest times; for the improvement of chrono-
 PART I. logy, and the other branches of literature. In
 all these parts of philology and *Belles Lettres*, the
 religious Order, now under consideration, has
 shone with a distinguished lustre, and given spe-
 cimens of their knowledge, discernment, and in-
 dustry, that are worthy of being transmitted to
 the latest posterity. It would be perhaps diffi-
 cult to assign a reason for that visible decline of
 learning among the Jesuits, that commenced pre-
 cisely at that very period when the Benedictines
 began to make this eminent figure in the repub-
 lic of letters. The fact, however, is undeniable;
 and the Jesuits have long been at a loss to pro-
 duce any one or more of their members who are
 qualified to dispute the pre-eminence, or even to
 claim an equality, with the Benedictines. The
 latter still continue to shine in the various branches
 of philology, and, almost every year, enrich the
 literary world with productions that furnish abun-
 dant proofs of their learning and industry;
 whereas, if we except a single work, published by
 the Jesuits of *Antwerp*, many years have passed
 since the sons of LOYOLA have given any satisfac-
 tory proofs of their boasted learning, or added to
 the *mass* of literature any work worthy to be
 compared with the *labours* of the followers of BE-
 NEDICT.

These learned monks excited the emulation of
 the *Priests of the Oratory*, whose efforts to resemble
 them were far from being destitute of success.
 Several members of this latter Order distinguish-
 ed themselves by their remarkable proficiency in
 various branches both of sacred and profane lite-
 rature. This, to mention no more examples, ap-
 pears sufficiently from the writings of MORIN,
 THOMASSIN, and SIMON, and from that admirable
 work

work of CHARLES DE COINTE, entitled *The Ecclesiastical Annals of France*. The *Jansenists* also deserve a place in the list of those who cultivated letters with industry and success. Many of their productions abound with erudition, nay several of them excel both in elegance of style and precision of method; and it may be said, in general, that their writings were eminently serviceable in the instruction of youth, and also proper to contribute to the progress of learning among persons of riper years. The writings of those who composed the community of *Port-Royal* [p], the works of TILLEMONT, ARNAUD, NICOLE, PASCAL, and LANCELOT, with many other elegant and useful productions of persons of this class, were undoubtedly an ornament to French literature during this century. The other religious societies, the higher and lower orders of the clergy, had also among them men of learning and genius that reflected a lustre upon the respective classes to which they belonged. Nor ought this to be a matter of admiration; since nothing is more natural than that, in an immense multitude of monks and clergy, all possessed of abundant leisure for study, and of the best opportunities of improvement, there should be some who, unwilling to hide or throw away such a precious talent, would employ with success this leisure, and these opportunities, in the culture of the sciences. It is nevertheless certain, that the eminent men who were to be found beyond the limits of the four

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

[p] *Messieurs de Port-Royal* was a general denomination, which comprehended all the Jansenist writers, but was however applied, in a more confined and particular sense, to those Jansenists who passed their days in pious exercises and literary pursuits in the retreat of *Port-Royal*, a mansion situated at a little distance from *Paris*. It is well known, that several writers of superior genius, extensive learning, and uncommon eloquence, resided in this sanctuary of letters.

classes

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

The principal authors
of the Ro-
mish com-
munion.

classes already mentioned [9], were few in number, comparatively speaking, and scarcely exceeded the list that any of these classes was able to furnish.

XXXIII. Hence it comes, that the church of Rome can produce a long list of writers that have arisen in its bosom, and acquired a shining and permanent reputation, by their learned productions. At the head of the eminent authors which we find among the monastic orders and the regular clergy, must be placed the Cardinals BARONIUS and BELLARMINE, who have obtained an immortal name in their church, the one by his laborious *Annals*, and the other by his books of Controversy. The other writers that belong to this class, are—SERRARIUS—FEVARDENTIUS—POSSEVIN—GRETSER—COMBESIS—NATALIS ALEXANDER—BECAN—SIRMOND—PETAU—POUSSINES—CELLÓT—CAUSSIN—MORIN—RENAUD—FRAPAOLO—PALLAVICINI—LABBE—MAIMBURG—THOMASSIN—SFONDRAT—AGUIRRE—HENRY NORIS—D'ACHERY—MABILLON—HARDOUIN—SIMON—RUINART—MONTFAUCON—GALLONI—SCACCHI—CORNELIUS A LAPIDE—BONFRERE—MENARD—SEGUENOT—BERNARD—LAMY—BOLLAND—HENSCHEN—PAPEBROCH—and others.

The principal among the *secular clergy*, who are neither bound by vows, nor attached to any peculiar community and rules of discipline, were—PERRON—ESTIUS—LAUNOY—ALBASPINÆUS—PETRUS DE MARCA—RICHLIEU—HOLSTENIUS—BALUZE—BONA—HUET—BOSSUET—FENELON—GODEAU—TILLEMONT—THIERS—DU PIN—LEO ALLATIUS—ZACCAGNI—COTELIER—FILE-

[9] The Jesuits, Benedictines, Priests of the Oratory, and Jansenists.

SAC—VISCONTI—&c. [r]. This list might be considerably augmented by adding to it those writers among the laity who distinguished themselves by their theological or literary productions.

CEN. E.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART. I.

XXXIV. If we take an accurate view of the religious system of the Romish church during this century, both with respect to articles of faith and rules of practice, we shall find that, instead of being improved by being brought somewhat nearer to that perfect model of doctrine and morals that is exhibited to us in the Holy Scriptures, it had contracted new degrees of corruption and degeneracy in most places, partly by the negligence of the Roman pontiffs, and partly by the dangerous maxims and influence of the Jesuits. This is not only the observation of those who have renounced the Romish communion, and in the despotic style of that church are called *heretics*; it is the complaint of the wisest and worthiest part of that communion, of all its members who have a zeal for the advancement of true Christian knowledge and genuine piety.

The doctrine of the church of Rome still more corrupt than in the preceding ages.

As to the *doctrinal* part of the Romish religion, it is said, and not without foundation, to have suffered extremely in the hands of the Jesuits, who, under the connivance, nay sometimes by the immediate assistance of the Roman pontiffs, have perverted and corrupted such of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity as were left entire by the council of *Trent*. There are not wanting proofs sufficient to support this charge; inasmuch as these subtle and insidious fathers have manifestly endeavoured to diminish the authority and importance of the Holy Scriptures, have extolled the power of human nature, changed the sentiments

[r] For a particular account of the respective merit of the writers here mentioned, see, among other literary historians, Du Pin's *Histoire des Ecrivains Ecclesiastiques*, tom. xvii. xviii. xix.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

of many with respect to the necessity and efficacy of divine grace, represented the mediation and sufferings of CHRIST as less powerful and meritorious than they are said to be in the sacred writings, turned the Roman pontiff into a terrestrial Deity, and put him almost upon an equal footing with the Divine Saviour; and, finally, rendered, as far as in them lies, the truth of the Christian religion dubious, by their fallacious reasonings, and their subtle but pernicious sophistry. The testimonies brought to support these accusations by men of weight and merit, particularly among the Jansenists, are of very great authority, and it is extremely difficult to refuse our assent to them, when they are impartially examined; but, on the other hand, it may be easily proved, that the Jesuits, instead of inventing these pernicious doctrines, did no more, in reality, than propagate them as they found them in that ancient form of the Romish religion that preceded the Reformation, and was directly calculated to raise the authority of the Pope, and the power and prerogatives of the Romish church to the very highest pitch of despotic grandeur. To inculcate this form of doctrine was the direct vocation of the Jesuits, who were to derive all their credit, opulence, and influence, from their being considered as the main support of the papacy, and the peculiar favourites of the Roman pontiffs. If the ultimate end and purpose of these pontiffs were to render the church more pure and holy, and to bring it as near as possible to the resemblance of its Divine Founder, and if this were the commission they give to their favourite emissaries and doctors, then the Jesuits would be at liberty to preach a very different doctrine from what they now inculcate. But that liberty cannot be granted to them as long as their principal orders from the papal throne are, to use all their diligence and industry,

industry, to the end that the pontifs may hold what they have acquired, and recover what they have lost; and that the bishops and ministers of the Romish church may daily see their opulence increase, and the limits of their authority extended and enlarged. The chief crime then of the Jesuits is really this, that they have explained, with more openness and perspicuity, those points which the leading managers in the council of *Trent* had either entirely omitted, or slightly mentioned, that they might not shock the friends of true religion, who composed a part of that famous assembly. And here we see the true reason why the Roman pontifs, notwithstanding the ardent solicitations and remonstrances that have been employed to arm their just severity against the Jesuits, have always maintained that artful Order, and have been so deaf to the accusations of their adversaries, that no entreaties have been able to persuade them to condemn their religious principles and tenets, however erroneous in their nature, and pernicious in their effects. On the contrary, the court of *Rome* has always opposed, either in a public or clandestine manner, all the vigorous measures that have been used to procure the condemnation and suppression of the doctrine of the *Loyolites*; and the Roman pontifs have constantly treated all such attempts as the projects of rash and imprudent men, who, through involuntary ignorance or obstinate prejudice, were blind to the true interest of the church.

XXXV. In the sphere of morals, the Jesuits made still more dreadful and atrocious inroads than in that of religion. Did we affirm, that they have perverted and corrupted almost all the various branches and precepts of morality, we should not express sufficiently the pernicious tendency of their maxims. Were we to go still further, and maintain, that they have sapped and destroyed

C E N T.
XVII.
S E C T. II.
P A R T. I.

The foundations of morality sapped by the Jesuits.

its

CEN. T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

its very foundations, we should maintain no more than what innumerable writers of the Romish church abundantly testify, and what many of the most illustrious communities of that church publicly lament. Those who bring this dreadful charge against the sons of LOYOLA, have taken abundant precautions to vindicate themselves against the reproach of calumny in this matter. They have published several maxims, inconsistent with all regard for virtue and even decency, which they have drawn from the moral writings of that Order, and more especially from the numerous productions of its *Casuits*. They observe, more particularly, that the whole society adopts and inculcates the following maxims :

“ That persons *truly wicked*, and *void of the love of God*, may expect to obtain *eternal life* in heaven, provided that they be impressed with a fear of the Divine anger, and avoid all heinous and enormous crimes *through the dread of future punishment* :

“ That those persons may transgress *with safety*, who have a *probable reason* for transgressing, *i. e.* any plausible argument or authority in favour of the sin they are inclined to commit [*s*] :

[*s*] This is one of the most corrupt and most dangerous maxims of the Jesuits. On the one hand, they have among them doctors of different characters and different principles, that thus they may render their society recommendable in the eyes of all sorts of persons, the licentious as well as the austere. On the other, they maintain, that an *opinion* or *practice*, recommended by any one doctor, becomes thereby *probable*, as it is not to be supposed that a learned divine would adopt an opinion, or recommend a practice, in favour of which no considerable reason could be alleged.—But here lies the poison : this *probable* opinion or practice *may* be followed, say the Jesuits, even when the contrary is still *more probable*, nay, when it is *sure*, because, though the man err, he errs under the authority of an eminent doctor. Thus ESCOBAR affirms, that a judge may decide in favour of that side of a question that is the least probable, and even against his own opinion, if he be supported by any tolerable authority. See *Lettres Provinciales*, Letter viii.

“ That

“ That *actions intrinsically evil*, and directly
“ *contrary to the divine laws*, may be *innocently*
“ performed, by those who have so much power
“ over their own minds, as to join, even ideally,
“ a *good end* to this *wicked action*, or (to speak in
“ the stile of the Jesuits) who are capable of di-
“ *recting their attention aright* [t].

“ That *philosophical sin* is of a very light and
“ trivial nature, and does not deserve the pains of
“ hell:”—(By *philosophical sin* the Jesuits mean
an *action contrary to the dictates of nature and right*
reason, done by a person who is ignorant of the
written law of God, or doubtful [u] of its true
meaning.)

✂ [t] For example, an ecclesiastic who buys a benefice, in order to *direct his intention aright*, must, by a powerful act of abstraction, turn away his thoughts from the crime of *simony*, which he is committing, to some lawful purpose, such as that of acquiring an ample subsistence, or that of doing good by instructing the ignorant. Thus again, a man who runs his neighbour through the body in a duel, on account of a trivial affront, to render his action lawful, has only to turn his thoughts from the principle of vengeance to the more decent principle of honour; and the murder he commits will, by the magic power of Jesuitical morality, be converted into an innocent action. There is no crime, no enormity, to which this abominable maxim may not be extended. A famous Jesuit has declared, that a son may wish for the death of his father, and even rejoice at it when it arrives, provided that his wish does not arise from any personal hatred, but only from a desire of the *patri-mony* which his death will procure him. See GASPARD HURTADO, *De sub. peccat. diff.* 9. quoted by DIANA, p. 5. tr. 14. R. 99. and another has had the effrontery to maintain, that a monk or ecclesiastic may lawfully assassinate a calumniator, who threatens laying scandalous crimes to the charge of their community, when there is no other way of hindering him to execute his purpose. See the works of Father L'AMY, tom. v. disp. 36. n. 118.

[u] It would be perhaps more accurate to define the *philosophical sin* of the Jesuits to be an *action contrary to right reason*, which is done by a person who is either absolutely ignorant of God, or does not think of him during the time this action is committed.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

“ That the transgressions committed by a person blinded by the seduction of lust, agitated by the impulse of tumultuous passions, and destitute of all sense and impression of religion, however detestable and heinous they may be in themselves, are not imputable to the transgressor before the tribunal of God ; and that such transgressions may often be as involuntary as the actions of a madman :

“ That the person who takes an oath, or enters into a contract, may, to elude the force of the one, and the obligation of the other, add to the form of words that express them, certain mental additions and tacit reservations.”

These, and other enormities of a like nature [w], are said to make an essential part of the system

[w] The books that have been written to expose and refute the corrupt and enormous maxims of the Jesuits, would make an ample library, were they collected together. But nothing of this kind is equal to the learned, ingenious and humorous work of the famous PASCAL, entitled, *Le Provinciales, ou Lettres écrites par LOUIS DE MONTALTE à un Provincial de ses amis et aux Jésuites sur la Morale et la Politique de ces Pères*. This exquisite production is accompanied, in some editions of it, with the learned and judicious observations of NICOLE, who, under the fictitious name of GUILLAUME WENDEROCK, has fully demonstrated the truth of those facts which PASCAL had advanced, without quoting his authorities, and has placed in a full and striking light, several interesting circumstances which that great man had treated with, perhaps, too much brevity. These *Letters*, which did the Jesuits more real mischief than either the indignation of sovereign princes, or any other calamity that had heretofore fallen upon their Order, were translated into Latin by RACHELIUS. On the other hand, the sons of LOYOLA, sensibly affected and alarmed by this formidable attack upon their reputation, left no means unemployed to defend themselves against such a respectable adversary. They sent forth their ablest champions to defend their cause, or at least to cover them from shame ; among which champions the subtle and eloquent Father DANIEL, the celebrated author of the History of *France*, shone forth with a superior lustre ; and, as if they thought it unsafe to trust to the powers of argument and the force of evidence alone, they applied themselves

system of morality inculcated by the Jesuits. And they were complained of, in the strongest remonstrances,

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

themselves for help to the secular arm, and had credit enough to obtain a sentence against the *Provinciales*, by which they were condemned to be burnt publicly at *Paris*. See DANIEL'S *Opuscules*, vol. i. p. 363. This author, however, acknowledges, that the greatest part of the answers which the Jesuits opposed to the performance of PASCAL were weak and unsatisfactory. Certain it is, that (whether it was owing to the strength of argument, or to the elegant wit and humour that reigned in them) the *Provincial Letters* lost not the smallest portion of their credit and reputation by all the answers that were made to them, but continued to pass through a variety of editions, which could scarcely be printed off with rapidity sufficient to satisfy the desires of the public.

Another severe attack was made upon the Jesuits, in a book inferior to PASCAL'S in point of wit and genteel pleasantries, but superior to it in point of evidence, since it abounds with passages and testimonies, which are drawn from the most applauded writings of the Jesuits, and demonstrate fully the corruption and enormity of the moral rules and maxims inculcated by that famous Order. This book, which was published at *Mont*, in three volumes 8vo, in the year 1702, bears the following title: *La Morale des Jesuites, extraite fiddlement de leurs Livres, imprimée avec la permission et l'approbation des superieurs de leur Compagnie, par un Docteur de Sorbonne*. The author was PERRAULT (son of CHARLES PERRAULT, who began the famous controversy in *France* concerning the respective merit of the ancients and moderns), and his book met with the same fate with the *Provincials* of PASCAL; for it was burnt at *Paris* in the year 1670, at the request of the Jesuits. See the *Opuscules* du P. DANIEL, tom. i. p. 356. Nor indeed is it at all surprizing, that the Jesuits exerted all their zeal against this compilation, which exhibited, in one shocking point of view, all that had been complained of and censured in their maxims and institutions, and unfolded the whole mystery of their iniquity.

It has been also laid to the charge of the Jesuits, that they reduced their pernicious maxims to practice, especially in the remoter parts of the world. This the famous ARNAULD, together with some of his Jansenist brethren, have undertaken to prove, in that laborious and celebrated work, entitled, *La Morale Pratique des Jesuites*. In this important work, which consists of eight volumes in 8vo, and of which a second edition was published at *Amsterdam* in the year 1742, there is a multitude of authentic relations, documents, facts, and testimonies, employed to demonstrate the criminal conduct and practices

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

remonstrances, not only by the Dominicans and Janſeniſts, but alſo by the moſt eminent theological doctors of *Paris, Poitiers, Louvain*, and other academical cities, who expreſſed their abhorrence of them in ſuch a public and ſolemn manner, that the Roman pontif neither thought it ſafe nor honourable to keep ſilence on that head. Accordingly a part of theſe moral maxims were condemned, in the year 1659, by pope ALEXANDER VII., in a public edict; and, in the year 1690, the article relating to *philosophical ſin* met with the ſame fate, under the pontificate of ALEXANDER VIII. [*]. It was but natural to think, that, if the Order of Jeſuits did not expire under the terrible blows it received from ſuch a formidable liſt of adverſaries, yet their ſyſtem of morals muſt at leaſt have been ſuppreſſed and their peſtilential maxims baniſhed from the ſchools. This is the leaſt that could have been expected from the complaints and remonſtrances of the clerical and monaſtic Orders, and the damnatory bulls of the Roman pontifs. And yet, if we may credit the teſtimonies of

practices of the Jeſuits. For an ample account of the jeſuitical doctrine concerning *Philosophical Sin*, and the diſſentions and controverſies it occaſioned, ſee JACOBI HYACINTHI BERRY * *Addenda ad Hiſtor. Congregationum de Auxiliis*, p. 82; as alſo his *Auſarium*, p. 289.

[*] There is a concise and accurate account of the conteſts and diviſions, to which the morality of the Jeſuits gave riſe in *France* and in other places, in a work, entitled, *Catechiſme Hiſtorique et Dogmatique ſur les Conteſtations qui diviſent maintenant l'Egliſe*, published in the year 1730, ſee tom. ii. p. 26. —It is very remarkable, that the two papal bulls of ALEXANDER VII. and VIII., againſt the Jeſuits, are not to be found in the *Bullarium Pontificum*; but the Janſeniſts and Dominicans, who are careful in perpetuating whatever may tend to the diſhonour of the Jeſuits, have preſerved them induſtriouſly from oblivion.

* This is a ſeditious name; the true name of the author of the *Addenda* is AUGUSTIN LE BLANC.

many learned and pious men in the communion of *Rome*, even this effect was not produced; and the remonstrances of the monks, the complaints of the clergy, and the bulls of the popes, rather served to restrain, in a certain measure, the enormous licentiousness, that had reigned among the writers of this corrupt Order, than to purify the seminaries of instruction from the contagion of their dissolute maxims.—After what has been observed in relation to the moral system of the Jesuits, it will not be difficult to assign a reason for the remarkable propensity that is discovered by kings, princes, the nobility, and gentry of both sexes, and an innumerable multitude of persons of all ranks and conditions, to commit their consciences to the direction, and their souls to the care, of the brethren of this society. It is, no doubt, highly convenient for persons, who do not pretend to a rigid observance of the duties of religion and morality, to have spiritual guides, who diminish the guilt of transgression, disguise the deformity of vice, let loose the reins to all the passions, nay, even nourish them by their dissolute precepts, and render the way to heaven as easy, as agreeable, and smooth as is possible [y].

What has here been said concerning the erroneous maxims and corrupt practices of the Jesuits must, however, be understood with certain modifications and restrictions. It must not be imagined, that these maxims are adopted, or these practices justified, by all the sons of *LOVOLA*, without exception, or that they are publicly taught and inculcated in all their schools and seminaries; for this, in reality, is not the case. As this Order has produced men of learning and genius, so neither has it been destitute of men of probity and candour; nor would it be a difficult

☞ [y] The translator has here inserted into the text the note [z] of the original.

C E N T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

talk to compile from the writings of the Jesuits a much more just and proper representation of the duties of religion and the obligations of morality, than that hideous and unseemly exhibition of both, which PASCAL and his followers have drawn from the jesuitical *Casuists*, *Summists*, and *Moralists*. Those who censure the Jesuits in general, must, if their censures be well founded, have the following circumstances in view: *First*, That the rulers of that society not only suffer several of their members to propagate publicly impious opinions and corrupt maxims, but even go so far as to set the seal of their approbation to the books in which these opinions and maxims are contained [z]: *Secondly*, That the system of religion and morality that is taught in the greatest part of their seminaries is so loose, vague, and ill-digested, that it not only may be easily *perverted* to bad purposes and erroneous conclusions, but even seems peculiarly *susceptible* of such abuse: and lastly, that the select few, who are initiated into the *grand mysteries* of the society, and set apart to transact its affairs, to carry on its projects, to exert their political talents in the closet of the minister, or in the cabinet of the prince, commonly make use of the dangerous and pernicious maxims that are complained of, to augment the authority and opulence of their Order. The candor and impartiality that become an historian oblige us to acknowledge, at the same time, that, in demonstrating the turpitude and enormity of certain maxims and opinions of the Jesuits, their adversaries have gone too far, and permitted their eloquence and zeal to run into exaggeration. This

☞ [z] This is no doubt true. The Jesuits, as has been observed above, note [r], have doctors of all sorts and sizes; and this, indeed, is necessary, in order to the establishment of that universal empire at which they aim. See *Lettres Provinciales*, let. v. p. 62. dixième édit. de Cologne, 1689.

we might shew, with the fullest evidence, by examples deduced from the doctrines of *probability* and *mental reservation*, and the imputations that have been made to the Jesuits on these heads; but this would lead us too far from the thread of our history. We shall only observe, that what happens frequently in every kind of controversy, happened here in a singular manner; I mean, that the Jesuits were charged with tenets, which had been drawn *consequentially* from their doctrine, by their accusers, without their consent;—that their phrases and terms were not always interpreted according to the precise meaning they annexed to them;—and that the tendency of their system was represented in too partial and unequitable a light.

XXXVI. The Holy Scriptures did not acquire any new degrees of public respect and authority under the pontiffs of this century. It can be proved, on the contrary, by the most authentic records, that the votaries of *Rome*, and more especially the Jesuits, employed all their dexterity and art, either to prevent the word of God from falling into the hands of the people, or at least to have it explained in a manner consistent with the interest, grandeur, and pretensions of the church. In *France* and in the *Low Countries* there arose, indeed, several commentators and critics, who were very far from being destitute of knowledge and erudition; but it may nevertheless be said concerning them, that, instead of illustrating and explaining the divine oracles, they rendered them more obscure, by blending their own crude inventions with the dictates of celestial wisdom. This is chargeable even upon the Jansenists, who, though superior to the other Roman-catholic expositors in most respects, yet fell into that absurd method of disfiguring the pure word of God, by far-fetched allusions, mytic inter-

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

The state of
Exegetic
theology, or
the progress
made in the
interpretation
and exposition
of scripture.

C. E. N. T.
XVII.
S. A. C. T. II.
P. A. R. T. I.

Of Didac-
tic, Moral,
and Pole-
mic Theo-
logy.

pretations, and frigid allegories, computed from the reveries of the ancient fathers [a]. Here, nevertheless, an exception is to be made in favour of PASQUIER QUENEL, a priest of the oratory, whose edition of the *New Testament*, accompanied with pious meditations and remarks, made such a prodigious noise in the theological world [b], and even in our time has continued to furnish matter of warm and violent contest, and to split the Roman catholic doctors into parties and factions [c].

XXXVII. The greatest part of the public schools retained that dry, intricate, and captious method of teaching theology, that had prevailed in the ages of barbarism and darkness, and was

[a] The reader will find a striking example of this in the well-known *Bible* of ISAAC LE MAITRE, commonly called SACY, which contains all the crude and extravagant fancies and allegories, with which the ancient doctors obscured the beautiful simplicity of the Holy Scriptures, and rendered their clearest expressions intricate and mysterious.

[b] That is, in the Roman-catholic part of the theological world. Never perhaps did any thing shew, in a more striking manner, the blind zeal of faction than the hard treatment this book met with. RENAUDOT, a very learned French abbot, who resided some time at Rome during the pontificate of CLEMENT XI., went one day to visit that pontif, who was a patron of learned men, and found him reading QUENEL'S Bible. On the abbot's entering the chamber, the pope accosted him thus: *Here is an admirable book! We have nobody at Rome capable of writing in this manner, I would be glad if I could engage the author of it to reside here.*—The very same pope that pronounced this encomium on QUENEL'S book, condemned it publicly afterwards, and employed all his authority to suppress it. See VOLTAIRE, *Siècle de LOUIS XIV.*, vol. ii. p. 293. *Edit. de Dresde*, 1753.

[c] The first part of this work, which contains *Observations* on the four Gospels, was published in the year 1671; and as it was received with universal applause, this encouraged the author, not only to revise and augment it, but also to enlarge his plan, and compose *Observations* on the other books of the New Testament. See *Catéchisme Historique sur les Controverses de l'Eglise*, tom. ii. p. 150.—CH. EBERH. WEISMANNI *Hist. Eccl. Sac.* xvii. p. 588.

adapted

adapted to disgust all such as were endowed with a liberal turn of mind. There was no possibility of ordering matters so, as that *Didactic* or *Biblical* *theology*, which is supposed to arrange and illustrate the truths of religion by the dictates of Holy Scripture, should be placed upon the same footing, and held in the same honour, with *scholastic* *divinity*, which had its source in the metaphysical visions of the peripatetic philosophy. Even the edicts of the pontiffs were insufficient to bring this about. In the greatest part of the universities, the *scholastic* doctors domineered, and were constantly molesting and insulting the *Biblical* divines, who, generally speaking, were little skilled in the captious arts of sophistry and dialectical chicane. It is nevertheless to be observed, that many of the French doctors, and more especially the Jansenists, explained the principal doctrines and duties of Christianity in a style and manner that were at least recommendable on account of their elegance and perspicuity; and indeed it may be affirmed, that almost all the theological or moral treatises of this age, that were composed with any tolerable degree of simplicity and good sense, had the doctors of *Port-Royal* or the French priests of the oratory, for their authors. We have already taken notice of the changes that were introduced, during this century, into the method of carrying on theological controversy. The German, Belgic, and French divines, being at length convinced, by a disagreeable experience, that their captious, incoherent, and uncharitable manner of disputing, exasperated those who differed from them in their religious sentiments, and confirmed them in their respective systems, instead of converting them; and perceiving, moreover, that the arguments in which they had formerly placed their principal confidence, proved feeble and insufficient to make

SENT. XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

The contests that arose under the pontificate of Clement VIII. between the Jesuits and Dominicans concerning the Divine Grace.

the least impression, found it necessary to look out for new and more specious methods of attack and defence.

XXXVIII. The Romish church has, notwithstanding its boasted uniformity of doctrine, been always divided by a multitude of controversies. It would be endless to enumerate the disputes that have arisen between the seminaries of learning, and the contests that have divided the monastic Orders. The greatest part of these, as being of little moment, we shall pass over in silence; for they have been treated with indifference and neglect by the popes, who never took notice of them but when they grew violent and noisy, and then suppressed them with an imperious nod, that imposed silence upon the contending parties. Besides, these less momentous controversies, which it will never be impossible entirely to extinguish, are not of such a nature as to affect the church in its fundamental principles, to endanger its constitution, or to hurt its interests. It will, therefore, be sufficient to give a brief account of those debates, that, by their superior importance and their various connections and dependencies, may be said to have affected the church in general, and to have threatened it with alarming changes and revolutions.

And here the first place is naturally due to those famous debates that were carried on between the *Jesuits and Dominicans*, concerning the *nature and necessity of Divine Grace*; the decision of which important point had, towards the conclusion of the preceding century, been committed by CLEMENT VIII. to a select assembly of learned divines. These arbiters, after having employed several years in deliberating upon this nice and critical subject, and in examining the arguments of the contending parties, intimated, plainly enough, to the pontif, that the sentiments of the Dominicans,

nicans, concerning *Grace, Predestination, Human Liberty, and Original Sin*, were more conformable to the doctrine of scripture and the decisions of the ancient fathers than the opinions of MOLINA, which were patronised by the Jesuits. They observed, more especially, that the former leaned towards the tenets of AUGUSTINE; while the latter bore a striking resemblance of the Pelagian heresy. In consequence of this declaration, CLEMENT seemed resolved to pass condemnation on the Jesuits, and to determine the controversy in favour of the Dominicans. Things were in this state in the year 1601, when the Jesuits, alarmed at the dangers that threatened them, beset the old pontif night and day, and so importuned him with entreaties, menaces, arguments, and complaints, that, in the year 1602, he consented to re-examine this intricate controversy, and undertook himself the critical task of principal arbitrator therein. For this purpose, he chose a council [*d*] (composed of fifteen cardinals, nine professors of divinity, and five bishops), which, during the space of three years [*e*], assembled seventy-eight times, or, to speak in the style of *Rome*, held so many *congregations*. At these meetings, the pontif heard, at one time, the Jesuits and Dominicans disputing in favour of their respective systems; and ordered, at another, the assembled doctors to weigh their reasons, and examine the proofs that were offered on both sides of this difficult question. The result of this examination is not known with any degree of certainty; since the death of CLEMENT, which happened on the fourth day of March, in the year 1605, prevented his pronouncing a decisive sentence. The Do-

☞ [*d*] This council was called the Congregation *de Auxiliis*.

[*e*] From the 20th of March 1602, to the 22d of January 1605.

C E N T.
XVII.
S E C T. II.
P A R T I.

Continuation of this controversy under Paul V. and its issue.

minicans assure us, that the pope, had he lived, would have condemned MOLINA. The Jesuits, on the contrary, maintain, that he would have acquitted him publicly from all charge of heresy and error. They alone, who have seen the records of this council, and the journal of its proceedings, are qualified to determine which of the two we are to believe; but these records are kept with the utmost secrecy at Rome.

XXXIX. The proceedings of the *congregation* that had been assembled by CLEMENT were suspended, for some time, by the death of that pontiff; but they were resumed, in the year 1605, by the order of PAUL V., his successor. Their deliberations, which were continued from the month of *September*, till the month of *March* in the following year, did not turn so much upon the merits of the cause, which were already sufficiently examined, as upon the prudent and proper method of finishing the contest. The great question now was, whether the well-being of the church would admit of the decision of this controversy by a papal bull? and, if such a decision was found adviseable, it still remained to be considered, in what terms the bull should be drawn up. All these long and solemn deliberations resembled the delivery of the mountain in the fable, and ended in this resolution, that the whole controversy, instead of being *decided*, should be *suppressed*; and that each of the contending parties should have the liberty of following their respective opinions. The Dominicans assert, that the two pontiffs, together with the *congregation* of divines that they employed in the review of this important controversy, were entirely persuaded of the justice of *their* cause, and of the truth of *their* system; they moreover observe, that PAUL V. had expressly ordered a solemn condemnation of the doctrine of the Jesuits to be drawn up; but was prevented

prevented from finishing and publishing it to the world, by the unhappy war that was kindled about that time between him and the Venetians. The Jesuits, on the other hand, represent these accounts of the Dominicans as entirely fictitious, and affirm that neither the pontiff, nor the more judicious and respectable members of the congregation, found any thing in the sentiments of MOLINA that was worthy of censure, or stood in much need of correction. In a point which is rendered thus uncertain by contradictory testimonies and assertions, it is difficult to determine what we are to believe; it however appears extremely probable, that, whatever the private opinion of PAUL V. may have been, he was prevented from pronouncing a public determination of this famous controversy, by his apprehensions of offending either the king of *France*, who protected the Jesuits, or the king of *Spain*, who warmly maintained the cause of the Dominicans. It is farther probable, nay almost certain, that, had the pontiff been independent on all foreign influence, and at full liberty to decide this knotty point, he would have pronounced one of those ambiguous sentences, for which the oracle of *Rome* is so famous, and would have so conducted matters as to slock neither of the contending parties [f].

XL. The

[f] Besides the authors we have above recommended as proper to be consulted in relation to these contests, see LE CLERC, *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire des controverses dans l'Eglise Romaine sur la Predestination et sur la Grace*, in his *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique*, tom. xiv. p. 235.—The conduct, both of the Jesuits and Dominicans, after their controversy was hushed in silence, affords much reason to presume, that they had been both secretly exhorted by the Roman pontiff to mitigate somewhat their respective systems, and so to modify their doctrines or expressions, as to avoid the reproaches of heresy that had been cast upon them; for the Jesuits had been accused of Pelagianism, and the Dominicans of a propensity to the tenets of the Protestant churches. This

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

XL. The flame of controversy, which seemed thus extinguished, or at least covered, broke out again

The rise of
Jansenism,
and the
contests it
produced.

appears, in a more particular manner, from a letter written by CLAUDIUS AQUAVIVA, general of the Jesuits, in the year 1613, and addressed to all the members of his Order. In this letter the prudent general modifies with great dexterity and caution the sentiments of MOLINA, and enjoins it upon the brethren of the society to teach every where the doctrine which represents the Supreme Being, as *electing, freely, to eternal life, without any regard had to their merits, those whom he has been pleased to render partakers of that inestimable blessing*; but, at the same time, he exhorts them to inculcate this doctrine in such a manner, as not to give up the tenets, relating to Divine Grace, which they had maintained in their controversy with the Dominicans. Never, surely, was such a contradictory exhortation or order heard of; the good general thought, nevertheless, that he could reconcile abundantly these contradictions, by that branch of the divine knowledge which is called, by the schoolmen, *scientia media*. See the *Catéchisme Historique sur les dissensions de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 207.

On the other hand, the Dominicans, although their sentiments remain the same that they were before the commencement of this controversy, have learned, notwithstanding, to cast a kind of ambiguity and obscurity over their theological system, by using certain terms and expressions, that are manifestly borrowed from the schools of the Jesuits; and this they do to prevent the latter from reproaching them with a propensity to the doctrine of CALVIN. They are, moreover, much less remarkable, than formerly, for their zealous opposition to the Jesuits, which may be owing, perhaps, to prudent reflections on the dangers they have been involved in by this opposition, and the fruitless pains and labour it has cost them. The *Jansenists* reproach them severely with this change of conduct, and consider it as a manifest and notorious apostasy from divine truth. See the *Lettres Provinciales* of PASCAL, lett. ii. p. 27. *Edit. de Cologne*, &c. 1689.—We are not, however, to conclude, from this change of style and external conduct among the Dominicans, that they are reconciled to the Jesuits, and that there remain no traces of their ancient opposition to that perfidious Order. By no means; for besides that, many of them are shocked at the excessive timidity and prudence of a great part of their brethren, the whole body retains still some hidden sparks of the indignation with which they formerly beheld the Jesuits; and, when a convenient occasion of discovering this indignation is offered, they do not let it pass unimproved. The *Jansenists* are here embarked in the same cause with the Dominicans;

again with new violence, in the year 1640, and formed a kind of schism in the church of Rome, which involved it in great perplexity, and proved highly detrimental to it in various respects. The occasion of these new troubles was the publication of a book, intitled, AUGUSTINUS, composed by CORNELIUS JANSENIUS, bishop of Ypres, and published after the death of the author [g]. In this book, which even the Jesuits acknowledge to be the production of a man of learning and piety, the doctrine of AUGUSTINE, concerning man's *natural corruption*, and the *nature and efficacy* of that *Divine Grace*, which alone can efface this unhappy stain, is unfolded at large, and illustrated, for the most part, in AUGUSTINE's own words. For the end, which JANSENIUS proposed to himself in this

Dominicans; since the sentiments of St. THOMAS, concerning *Divine Grace*, differ but very little from those of St. AUGUSTINE. Cardinal HENRY NORIS, the most eminently learned among the followers of the latter, expresses his concern, that he is not at liberty to publish what passed in favour of AUGUSTINE, and to the disadvantage of MOLINA and the Jesuits, in the famous Congregation *de Auxiliis*, so often assembled by the Popes CLEMENT VIII. and PAUL V.; see his *Vindicia Augustiniane*, cap. vi. p. 1175. tom. i. opp.—*Quando*, says he, *recentiori Romano decreto id vetitum est, cum dispendio causæ, quam defendo, necessariam defensionem omitto.*

[g] For an account of this famous man, see BAYLE's *Dictionary*, tom. iii. at the article JANSENIUS.—LEYDECKER, *De vita et morte JANSENI*, lib. iii. which makes the first part of his *History of Jansenism*, published at Utrecht in 8vo in the year 1695.—*Dictionnaire des Livres Jansénistes*, tom. i. p. 120.—This celebrated work of JANSENIUS, which gave such a wound to the Romish church, as neither the power nor wisdom of its pontiffs will ever be able to heal, is divided into three parts. The *first* is historical, and contains a relation of the Pelagian controversy, which arose in the fifth century. In the *second*, we find an accurate account and illustration of the doctrine of AUGUSTINE, relating to the *Constitution and powers of the Human Nature, in its original, fallen, and renewed state.* The *third* contains the doctrine of the same great man, relating to the *Aids of sanctifying Grace procured by Christ, and to the eternal Predestination of men and angels.* The style of JANSENIUS is clear, but not sufficiently correct.

work,

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

work, was not to give his own private sentiments concerning these important points, but to shew in what manner they had been understood and explained by that celebrated father of the church, now mentioned, whose name and authority were universally revered in all parts of the Roman-catholic world [b]. No incident could be more unfavourable to the cause of the Jesuits, and the progress of their religious system, than the publication of this book; for as the doctrine of AUGUSTINE differed but very little from that of the Dominicans [i]; as it was held sacred, nay almost respected as divine, in the church of Rome, on account of the extraordinary merit and authority of that illustrious bishop, and, at the same time, was almost diametrically opposite to the sentiments generally received among the Jesuits; these latter could scarcely consider the book of JANSENIUS in any other light than as a tacit, but formidable, refutation of their opinions concerning *Human Liberty* and *Divine Grace*. And, accordingly, they not only drew their pens against this famous book, but also used their most zealous endeavours to obtain a public condemnation of it from Rome. Their endeavours were not unsuccessful. The Roman inquisitors began the opposition by prohibiting the perusal of it, in the year 1641; and the year following, URBAN VIII. condemned it by a solemn bull, as infected with

[b] Thus JANSENIUS expresses himself in his *Augustinus*, tom. ii. *Lib. Proœmial.* cap. xxix. p. 65.—*Non ego hic de aliqua nova sententia reperienda disputo . . . sed de antiqua Augustini.*—*Queritur, non quid de natura humanæ statibus et viribus, vel de Dei gratia et predestinatione sentiendum est, sed quid Augustinus olim ecclesiæ nomine et applausu tradiderit, predicaverit, scriptoque multipliciter consignaverit.*

[i] The Dominicans followed the sentiments of THOMAS AQUINAS, concerning the nature and efficacy of *Divine Grace*:

several

several errors, that had been long banished from the church.

C E N T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

XLI. There were nevertheless places, even within the bounds of the Romish church, where neither the decisions of the inquisitor, nor the bull of the pontif, were in the least respected. The doctors of *Louvain* in particular, and the followers of AUGUSTINE in general, who were very numerous in the *Netherlands*, opposed, with the utmost vigour, the proceedings of the Jesuits, and the condemnation of JANSENIUS; and hence arose a warm contest, which proved a source of much trouble to the Belgic provinces. But it was not confined within such narrow limits; it reached the neighbouring countries, and broke out, with peculiar vehemence, in *France*, where the abbot of *St. Cyran* [k], a man of an elegant genius, and equally distinguished by the extent of his learning, the lustre of his piety, and the sanctity of his manners, had procured AUGUSTINE many zealous followers, and the Jesuits as many bitter and implacable adversaries [l]. This respectable abbot

[k] The name of this abbot was JEAN DU VERGER DE HAURANE.

[l] This illustrious abbot is considered by the Jansenists as equal in merit and authority to JANSENIUS himself, whom he is supposed to have assisted in composing his *Augustinus*. The French, more especially (I mean such of them as adopt the doctrine of AUGUSTINE), revere him as an oracle, and even extol him beyond JANSENIUS. For an account of the life and transactions of this pious abbot, see LANCELOT's *Memoires touchant la vie de M. de S. Cyran*, which were published at *Cologne* *, in the year 1738, in two volumes 8vo.—Add to these *Recueil de plusieurs piéces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, p. 1,—150.—ARNAUD D'ANDILLY, *Memoires au sujet de l'Abbé de S. Cyran*, which are published in the first volume of his *Vies des Religieuses de Port-Royal*, p. 15—44.—BAYLE's *Dictionary*, vol. ii. at the article JANSENIUS,—*Dictionnaire des*

* Though they are said, in the title-page, to have been printed at *Cologne*; yet it is presumed, on good grounds, that they first saw the light at *Utrecht*.

C. E. N. T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

abbot was the intimate friend and relation of JAN-
SENIUS, and one of the most strenuous defenders
of his doctrine. On the other hand, the far
greatest part of the French theologists appeared
on the side of the Jesuits, whose religious tenets
seemed more honourable to human nature, or at
least more agreeable to its propensities, more suit-
able to the genius of the Romish religion, and
more adapted to promote and advance the inte-
rests of the Romish church, than the doctrine of
AUGUSTIN. The party of JANSENIUS had also its
patrons; and they were such as reflected honour
on the cause. In this respectable list we may rec-
kon several bishops eminent for their piety, and
some of the first and most elegant geniuses of the
French nation, such as ARNAUD, NICOLE, PAS-
CAL, and QUENEL, and the other famous and
learned men, who are known under the denomi-
nation of the *Authors of Port-Royal*. This party
was also considerably augmented by a multitude
of persons, who looked upon the usual practice of
piety in the Romish church (which consists in the
frequent use of the Sacraments, the confession of
sins, and the performance of certain external acts
of religion) as much inferior to what the Gospel
of CHRIST requires, and who considered Christian
piety as the vital and internal principle of a soul,
in which true faith and divine love have gained a
happy ascendant. Thus one of the contending
parties excelled in the number and power of its
votaries; the other in the learning, genius, and
piety of its adherents; and, things being thus ba-
lanced, it is not difficult to comprehend, how a
controversy, which began about a century ago,

Œuvres Jansénistes, tom. i. p. 133.—For an account of the
earlier studies of the abbot in question, see GABRIEL LIRON,
Singularités Historiques et Littéraires, tom. iv. p. 507.

should

should be still carried on with the most vehement contention and ardour [m].

XLII. Those who have taken an attentive view of this long, and indeed endless controversy, cannot but think it a matter both of curiosity and amusement to observe the contrivances, stratagems, arguments, and arts employed by both *Jesuits* and *Janfenists*; by the former in their methods of attack, and by the latter in their plans of defence. The *Jesuits* came forth into the field of controversy, armed with sophistical arguments, odious comparisons, papal bulls, royal edicts, and the protection of a great part of the nobility and bishops; and, as if all this had appeared to them insufficient, they had recourse to still more formidable auxiliaries, even the secular arm, and a competent number of dragoons. The *Janfenists*, far from being dismayed at the view of this warlike host, stood their ground with steadiness and intrepidity. They evaded the mortal

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

The methods and arguments employed by both parties in this controversy.

[m] The history of this contest is to be found in many authors, who have either given a relation of the whole, or treated apart some of its most interesting branches. The writers that ought to be principally consulted on this subject are those which follow: GERBERON, *Histoire Générale du Janfenisme*, published in 1700, at *Amsterdam*, in three volumes 8vo, and republished in five volumes 12mo, at *Lyons*, in 1708.—DU MAS, *Histoire des Cinq Propositions de JANSENIUS*, printed at *Lige* in 8vo in 1694. Of these two writers, the former maintains the cause of the *Janfenists*, while the latter favours that of the *Jesuits*.—Add to these, MELCH. LEYDECKER's *Historia Janfenismi*, printed at *Utrecht* in 8vo in 1695; and VOLTAIRE's *Siècle de LOUIS XIV.* tom. ii. p. 264. Several books, written on both sides, are enumerated in a work published in 8vo in 1735, under the following title: *Bibliothèque Janfeniste, ou Catalogue Alphabetique des principaux Livres Janfenistes*, the author of which is said to be DOMIN. COLONIA, a learned *Jesuit*. This book, as we have had before occasion to observe, has been republished at *Antwerp*, with considerable additions, in four volumes 8vo, under the title of, *Dictionnaire des Livres Janfenistes*.—See *Recueil des piéces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, p. 325.

C E N T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

blows that were levelled at them in the royal and papal mandates, by the help of nice interpretations, subtle distinctions, nay, by the very same sophistical refinements which they blamed in the Jesuits. To the threatenings and frowns of the nobles and bishops, who protected their adversaries, they opposed the favour and applause of the people; to sophisms they opposed sophisms, and invectives to invectives; and to human power they opposed the Divine Omnipotence, and boasted of the miracles by which heaven had declared itself in their favour. When they perceived that the strongest arguments and the most respectable authorities were insufficient to conquer the obstinacy of their adversaries, they endeavoured, by their religious exploits, and their application to the advancement of piety and learning, to obtain the favour of the pontiffs, and strengthen their interest with the people. Hence they declared war against the enemies of the Romish church; formed new stratagems to ensnare and ruin the Protestants; took extraordinary pains in instructing the youth in all the liberal arts and sciences; drew up a variety of useful, accurate, and elegant abridgments, containing the elements of philosophy and the learned languages; published a multitude of treatises on practical religion and morality, whose persuasive eloquence charmed all ranks and orders of men; introduced and cultivated an easy, correct, and agreeable manner of writing; and gave accurate and learned interpretations of several ancient authors. To all these various kinds of merit, the greatest part of which were real and solid, they added others that were at least visionary and chimerical; for they endeavoured to persuade, and did, in effect, persuade many, that the Supreme Being interposed particularly in support of their cause, and, by prodigies and miracles of a stupendous

pendous kind, confirmed the truth of the doctrine of AUGUSTINE, in a manner adapted to remove all doubt, and triumph over all opposition [n]. All

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

[n] It is well known that the *Jansenists*, or *Augustinians*, have long pretended to confirm their doctrine by miracles; and they even acknowledge, that these miracles have sometimes saved them, when their affairs have been reduced to a desperate situation. See *Memoires de Port Royal*, tom. i. p. 256. tom. ii. p. 107.—The first time we hear mention made of these miracles is in 1656, and the following years, when a pretended thorn of that derisive crown that was put upon our SAVIOUR's head by the Roman soldiers, is reported to have performed several marvellous cures in the convent of *Port-Royal*. See the *Recueil de plusieurs pieces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, p. 228. 448.—FONTAINE, *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, tom. ii. p. 131.—These were followed by other prodigies in the year 1661.—*Vies des Religieuses de Port-Royal*, tom. i. p. 192. and in the year 1664, *Memoires de Port-Royal*, tom. iii. p. 252.—The fame of these miracles was very great during the last century, and proved singularly advantageous to the cause of the *Jansenists*; but they are now fallen, even in *France*, into oblivion and discredit. The *Jansenists*, therefore, of the present age, being pressed by their adversaries, were obliged to have recourse to new prodigies, as the credit of the old ones was entirely worn out; and they seemed, indeed, to have had miracles at command, by the considerable number they pretended to perform. Thus (if we are credulous enough to believe their reports) in the year 1725, a woman, whose name was LE FOSSE, was suddenly cured of a bloody flux, by imploring the aid of the *Hoff*, when it was, one day, carried by a *Jansenist* priest. About two years after this, we are told, that the tomb of GERHARD ROUSSE, a canon of *Avignon*, was honoured with miracles of a stupendous kind; and, finally, we are informed, that the same honour was conferred, in the year 1731, on the bones of the Abbé DE PARIS, which were interred at *St. Medard*, where innumerable miracles are said to have been wrought. This last story has given rise to the warmest contests, between the superstitious or crafty *Jansenists* and their adversaries in all communions. Besides all this, QUESNELL, LEVIER, DESANGINS, and TOURNUS, the great ornaments of *Jansenism*, are said to have furnished extraordinary succours, on several occasions, to sick and infirm persons, who testified a lively confidence in their prayers and merits. See a famous *Jansenist* book composed in answer to the *Bull Unigenitus*, and entitled, *Jesus Christ sous l'Anathème et sous l'Excommunication*,

C. B. N. T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

Five propo-
sitions of
Janfenius
condemned
by Inno-
cent X.

All this rendered the Janfenifts extremely popular, and held the victory of the Jefuits for fome time dubious; nay, it is more than probable, that the former would have triumphed, had not the caufe of the latter been the caufe of the papacy, and had not the ftability and grandeur of the Romifh church depended, in a great meafure, upon the fuccefs of their religious maxims.

XLIII. It appears, from feveral circumftances, that URBAN VIII., and, after him, INNOCENT X., were really bent on appeafing thefe dangerous tumults, in the fame manner as the popes in former times had prudently fuppreffed the controverfies excited by BAIUS and the Dominicans. But the vivacity, inconfiftancy, and reftlefs fpirit of the French docters threw all into confufion, and difconcerted the meafures of the pontifs. The

art. xvii. p. 61. xviii. p. 66. *Edit. Utrecht.*—There is no doubt, but a great part of the Janfenifts defend thefe miracles from principle, and in confequence of a perfuafion of their truth and reality; for that party abounds with perfons, whofe piety is blended with a moft fuperftitious credulity, who look upon their religious fyftem as celeftial truth, and their caufe as the immediate caufe of heaven, and who are confequently difpofed to think that it cannot poffibly be neglected by the Deity, or left without extraordinary marks of his approbation and fupporting prefence. It is however amazing, nay almoft incredible, on the other hand, that the more judicious defenders of this caufe, thofe eminent Janfenifts, whofe fagacity, learning, and good fenfe, difcover themfelves fo abundantly in other matters, do not confider that the powers of nature, the efficacy of proper remedies, or the efforts of imagination, produce many important changes and effects, which impofture, or a blind attachment to fome particular caufe, lead many to attribute to the miraculous interpoftion of the Deity. We can eafily account for the delufions of weak enthufiafts, or the tricks of egregious impoftors; but when we fee men of piety and judgment appearing in defence of fuch miracles as thofe now under confideration, we muft conclude, that they look upon fraud as lawful in the fupport of a good caufe, and make no fcruple of deceiving the people, when they propofe, by this delufion, to confirm and propagate what they take to be the truth.

opposers

opposers of the doctrine of AUGUSTINE selected *five propositions* out of the work of JANSENIUS already mentioned, which appeared to them the most erroneous in their nature, and the most pernicious in their tendency; and, being set on by the instigation, and seconded by the influence of the Jesuits, employed their most zealous endeavours and their most importunate intreaties, at the court of *Rome*, to have these propositions condemned. On the other hand, a great part of the Gallican clergy used their utmost efforts to prevent this condemnation; and, for that purpose, they sent deputies to *Rome*, to entreat INNOCENT X. to suspend his final decision until the true sense of these propositions was deliberately examined, since the ambiguity of style, in which they were expressed, rendered them susceptible of a false interpretation. But these entreaties were ineffectual: the interest and importunities of the Jesuits prevailed; and the pontiff, without examining the merits of the cause with a suitable degree of impartiality and attention, condemned, by a public bull, on the 31st of May, 1653, the propositions of JANSENIUS. These propositions contained the following doctrines:

1. That *there are divine precepts, which good men, notwithstanding their desire to observe them, are, nevertheless, absolutely unable to obey; nor has God given them that measure of grace, that is essentially necessary to render them capable of such obedience:*

2. That *no person, in this corrupt state of nature, can resist the influence of divine grace, when it operates upon the mind:*

3. That, *in order to render human actions meritorious, it is not requisite that they be exempt from NECESSITY, but only that they be free from CONSTRAINT* [o].

4. That

[o] AUGUSTINE, LEIBNITZ, and a considerable number of modern philosophers, who maintain the doctrine of NE-

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

4. That the Semi-pelagians err grievously in maintaining, that the human will is endowed with the power of either receiving or resisting the aids and influences of preventing grace :

5. That whosoever affirms, that Jesus Christ made expiation, by his sufferings and death, for the sins of all mankind, is a Semi-pelagian.

Of these propositions the pontif declared the first four only *heretical* ; but he pronounced the fifth *rash, impious, and injurious* to the Supreme Being [p].

Alexander VII. publishes a bull against Janf. nius.

XLIV. This sentence of the supreme ecclesiastical judge was indeed painful to the Janfenists, and of consequence highly agreeable to their adversaries. It did not however either drive the former to despair, or satisfy the latter to the extent of their desires ; for while the doctrine was condemned, the man escaped. JANSENIUS was not named in the bull, nor did the pontif even declare that the *five propositions* were maintained in the book entitled AUGUSTINUS, in the sense in which he had condemned them. Hence the disciples of AUGUSTINE and JANSENIUS defended themselves by a distinction invented by the ingenious and subtle ANTHONY ARNAUD, in consequence of which they considered separately in this controversy the *matter of doctrine* and the *matter of fact* ; that is to say, they acknowledged themselves bound to believe, that the *five propositions* abovementioned were justly condemned by the

CESSITY, consider this necessity in *moral actions*, as consistent with true liberty, because it is consistent with *spontaneity* and *choice*. According to them, constraint alone and external force destroy merit and imputation.

[p] This Bull is still extant in the *Bullarum Romanarum*, tom. vi. p. 456. It has also been published, together with several other pieces relating to this controversy, by DU PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, in his *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 261.

Roman pontif [q]; but they maintained, that the pope had not declared, and consequently that they were not bound to believe, that these propositions were to be found in JANSENIUS's book, in the sense in which they had been condemned [r]. They did not however enjoy long the benefit of this artful distinction. The restless and invincible hatred of their enemies pursued them in every quarter where they looked for protection or repose; and at length engaged ALEXANDER VII., the successor of INNOCENT, to declare, by a solemn bull, issued out in the year 1656, that the *five propositions*, that had been condemned, were the tenets of JANSENIUS, and were contained in his book. The pontif did not stop here; but to this flagrant instance of imprudence added another still more shocking; for, in the year 1665, he sent into *France* the form of a declaration, that was to be subscribed by all those who aspired after any preferment in the church, and in which it was affirmed, that the *five propositions* were to be found in the book of JANSENIUS, in the same sense in which they had been condemned by the church [s]. This declaration, whose unexampled temerity and contentious tendency appeared in the most odious colours, not only to the Jansenists, but also to the wiser part of the French nation, produced the most deplorable divisions and tumults. It was immediately opposed with vigour by the Jansenists, who maintained, that in *matters of fact* the pope was *fallible*, especially when his decisions were merely personal, and not confirm-

☞ [q] This was what our author calls the *questio de juri*.

☞ [r] This is the *questio de facto*.

[s] This *Bull*, together with several other pieces, is also published by DU PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, in his *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. 281. 288. 306.—See the form of ALEXANDER's declaration, with the *Mandate* of LEWIS XIV. *ibid.* p. 314.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

ed by a general council; and, of consequence, that it was neither obligatory nor necessary to subscribe this papal declaration, which had only a matter of fact for its object. The Jesuits, on the contrary, audaciously asserted, even openly, in the city of *Paris*, and in the face of the Gallican church, that faith and confidence in the papal decisions relating to matter of *fact*, had no less the characters of a well-grounded and *divine faith*, than when these decisions related merely to matters of doctrine and opinion. It is to be remarked, on the other hand, that all the Jansenists were by no means so resolute and intrepid as those abovementioned. Some of them declared, that they would neither subscribe nor reject the *Form* in question, but shew their veneration for the authority of the pope, by observing a profound silence on that subject. Others professed themselves ready to subscribe it, not indeed without exception and reserve, but on condition of being allowed to explain, either verbally or in writing, the sense in which they understood it, or the distinctions and limitations with which they were willing to adopt it. Others employed a variety of methods and stratagems to elude the force of this tyrannical *declaration* [1]. But nothing of this kind was sufficient to satisfy the violent demands of the Jesuits; nothing less than the entire ruin of the Jansenists could appease their fury. Such, therefore, among the latter, as made the least opposition to the declaration in question, were cast into prison, or sent into exile, or involved in some other species of persecution; and it is well known, that this severity was a consequence of the suggestions of the Jesuits, and of their influence in cabinet-councils.

[1] See DU MAS, *Histoire des Cinq Propositions*, p. 158.—GERBERON, *Histoire Generale du Jansenisme*, p. ii. p. 516.

XIV. The lenity or prudence of CLEMENT IX. suspended, for a while, the calamities of those who had sacrificed their liberty and their fortunes to their zeal for the doctrine of AUGUSTINE, and gave them both time to breathe, and reason to hope for better days. This change, which happened in the year 1669, was occasioned by the fortitude and resolution of the bishops of *Angers*, *Beauvais*, *Pamiers*, and *Alet*, who obstinately and gloriously refused to subscribe, without the proper explications and distinctions, the oath or declaration that had produced such troubles and divisions in the church. They did not indeed stand alone in the breach; for when the court of *Rome* began to menace and level its thunder at their heads, nineteen bishops more arose with a noble intrepidity, and adopted their cause, in solemn remonstrances, addressed both to the king of *France* and the Roman pontif. These resolute protesters were joined by ANNE GENEVIEVE DE BOURBON, duchess of *Longueville*, a heroine of the first rank both in birth and magnanimity, who, having renounced the pleasures and vanities of the world, which had long employed her most serious thoughts, espoused, with a devout ardour, the doctrines and cause of the *Jansenists*, and most earnestly implored the clemency of the Roman pontif in their behalf. Moved by these entreaties, and also by other arguments and considerations of like moment, CLEMENT IX. became so indulgent as to accept of a conditional subscription to the famous declaration, and to permit doctors of scrupulous consciences to sign it according to the mental interpretation they thought proper to give it. This instance of papal condescension and lenity was no sooner made public, than the *Jansenists* began to come forth from their lurking-places, to return from their voluntary exile, and to enjoy their former tranquillity and freedom,

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

This persecution is suspended under the pontificate of Clement IX.—This suspension commonly called the Peace of Clement.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

freedom, being exempt from all uneasy apprehensions of any further persecution.

This remarkable event is commonly called the Peace of CLEMENT IX.; its duration, nevertheless, was but transitory [u]. It was violated in the year 1676, at the instigation of the Jesuits, by LEWIS XIV., who declared, in a public edict, that it had only been granted for a time, out of a condescending indulgence to the tender and scrupulous consciences of a certain number of persons; but it was totally abolished after the death of the duchess of LONGUEVILLE, which happened in the year 1679, and deprived the Jansenists of their principal support. From that

[u] The transactions relating to this event, which were carried on under the pontificate of CLEMENT IX., are circumstantially related by Cardinal ROSPIGNIOSI, in his *Commentarii*, which DU PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE has subjoined to his *Elementa Theologica*, published in 8vo at Paris, in the year 1716. See also this last-mentioned author's *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 336. in which the letters of CLEMENT IX. are inserted. Two Jansenists have written the History of the Clementine Peace. VARET, vicar to the archbishop of Sens, in an anonymous work entitled, *Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans l'affaire de la Paix de l'Eglise sous la Pape CLEMENT IX.*; and QUESNEL, in an anonymous production also, entitled, *La Paix de CLEMENT IX., ou Demonstration des deux faussetés capitales avancées dans l'Histoire des Cinq Propositions contre la foi des disciples de St. AUGUSTIN*. That VARET was the author of the former, is asserted in the *Catéchisme Historique sur les contestations de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 352; and that the latter came from the pen of QUESNEL, we learn from the writer of *Bibliothèque Janséniste*, p. 314.—There was another accurate and interesting account of this transaction published in the year 1706, in two volumes 8vo, under the following title: *Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans l'affaire de la paix de l'Eglise sous le Pape CLEMENT IX., avec les Lettres, Actes, Mémoires, et autres pièces qui y ont rapport*.—The important services that the duchess of Longueville rendered the Jansenists in this affair are related with elegance and spirit by VILLEFORT, in his *Vie d'Anne Genevieve de Bourbon, Duchesse de Longueville*, tom. ii. livr. vi. p. 89, of the edition of Amsterdam (1739), which is more complete and ample than the edition of Paris.

time their calamities were renewed, and they were pursued with the same malignity and rage that they had before experienced. Some of them avoided the rising storm by a voluntary exile; others sustained it with invincible fortitude and constancy of mind; others turned aside its fury, and escaped its violence, as well as they could, by dexterity and prudence. ANTHONY ARNAUD, who was the head and leader of the party, fled into *Holland* in the year 1679 [w]; and, in this retreat, he not only escaped the fury of his enemies, but had it in his power to hurt them considerably, and actually made the Jesuits feel the weight of his talents and the extent of his influence. For the admirable eloquence and sagacity of this great man gave him such an ascendant in the *Netherlands*, that the greatest part of the churches there embraced his opinions, and adopted his cause; the Romish congregations in *Holland* also were, by his influence, and the ministry of his intimate friends and adherents, JOHN NEERCASSEL and PETER CODDEUS, bishops of *Castorie* and *Sebasto* [x], entirely gained over to the Jansenist party. These latter still persevere with the utmost steadiness in the principles of Jansenism; and, secured under the protection of the Dutch government, defy the threats, and hold in derision, the resentment of the Roman pontiffs [y].

XLVI. It

[w] For an account of this great man, see BAYLE's *Dictionary*, vol. i. at the article ANTHONY ARNAUD; as also *Histoire abrégée de la vie et des ouvrages de M. ARNAUD*, published at *Cologne*, in 8vo.—The change introduced into the Romish churches in *Holland* is mentioned by LAFITAU, *Vie de CLEMENT XI.*, tom. i. p. 123. For an account of CODDEUS, NEERCASSEL, and VARET, and the other patrons of Jansenism among the Dutch, see the *Dictionnaire des Livres Jansenistes*, tom. i. p. 48, 21. 353. tom. ii. p. 406. tom. iv. p. 119.

[x] Bishops in *paribus infidelium*.

[y] It must however be observed, that, notwithstanding the

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. H.
PART I.

The austere
piety of the
Janfenists.

XLVI. It is not only on account of their embracing the doctrine of AUGUSTINE concerning Divine Grace (a doctrine which bears a striking resemblance with that of the Calvinists), that the Janfenists have incurred the displeasure and resentment of the Jesuits. They are charged with many other circumstances, which appear intolerable to the warm votaries of the church of *Rome*. And indeed it is certain, that the various controversies, which have been mentioned above, were excited in that church principally by the Janfenists, and have been propagated and handed down by them, even to our times, in a prodigious multitude of their books published both in *France* and in the *Netherlands* [z]. But that which offends most the Jesuits, and the other creatures of the Pontif, is the austerity of this party, and the severity that reigns in their system of moral discipline and practical religion. For the Janfenists cry out against the corruptions of the church of *Rome*, and complain that neither its doctrines nor morals retain any traces of their former purity. They reproach the clergy with an universal depravation of sentiments and manners, and entire forgetfulness of the dignity of their character and the duties of their vocation. They censure the licentiousness of the monastic Orders, and insist upon the necessity of reforming their discipline according to the rules of sanctity, abstinence, and self-denial, that were originally prescribed by their respective founders. They maintain also, that the people ought to be carefully instructed in all the doctrines and precepts

the ascendant the Janfenists have in *Holland*, the Jesuits, for some time past, have by artifice and disguise got a considerable footing among the Romish churches that are tolerated by the republic.

[z] See *Hist. Eccles. Rom.* SÆC. xvi. § xxxi.

of

of Christianity, and that, for this purpose, the Holy Scriptures and Public Liturgies should be offered to their perusal in their mother-tongue; and, finally, they look upon it as a matter of the highest moment to persuade all Christians that true piety does not consist in the observance of pompous rites, or in the performance of external acts of devotion, but in inward holiness and divine love.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

These sentiments of the Janfenists, on a general view, seem just and rational, and suitable to the spirit and genius of Christianity; but, when we examine the particular branches into which they extend these general principles, the consequences they deduce from them, and the manner in which they apply them, in their rules of discipline and practice, we shall find, that the piety of this famous party is deeply tinged both with superstition and fanaticism; that it more especially favours the harsh and enthusiastical opinion of the *Mytics*; and, of consequence, that the Janfenists are not undeservedly branded by their adversaries with the denomination of *Rigourists* [a]. This denomination

[a] They who desire to form a just notion of the dismal piety of the Janfenists (which carries the unseemly features of that gloomy devotion that was formerly practised by fanatical hermits in the deserts of *Syria*, *Lybia*, and *Egypt*, but is entirely foreign from the dictates of reason and the amiable spirit of Christianity), have only to peruse the epistles and other writings of the *Abbot of ST. CYRAN*, who is the great oracle of the party. This abbot was a well-meaning man; and his piety, such as it was, carried in it the marks of sincerity and fervor; he was also superior, perhaps, as a pastor, to the greatest part of the Roman catholic doctors; and his learning, more especially his knowledge of religious antiquity, was very considerable: but to propose this man as a complete and perfect model of *genuine piety*, and as a most accurate and accomplished teacher of *Christian virtue*, is an absurdity peculiar to the Janfenists, and can be adopted by no person who knows what *genuine piety* and *Christian virtue* are. That we may

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

denomination they merited, in a peculiar manner, by their doctrine concerning Repentance and Penance,

may not seem to detract rashly, and without reason, from the merit of this eminent man, it will not be improper to confirm what we have said by some instances. This good abbot, having undertaken to vanquish the *Heretics* (i. e. the Protestants) in a prolix and extensive work, was obliged to read, or at least to look into, the various writings published by that *impious tribe*; and this he did in company with his nephew MARTIN DE BARCOS, who resembled him entirely in his sentiments and manners. But before he would venture to open a book composed by a Protestant, he constantly marked it with the *sign of the cross*, to expel the *evil spirit*. What weakness and superstition did this ridiculous proceeding discover! for the good man was persuaded that *Satan* had fixed his residence in the books of the Protestants; but it was not so easy to determine where he imagined the wicked spirit lay, whether in the paper, in the letters, between the leaves, or in the doctrines of these *infernal productions*? Let us see the account that is given of this matter by LANCELOT, in his *Mémoires touchant la vie de M. l'Abbé de S. Cyran*, tom. i. p. 226. His words are as follows: *Il lisait ces livres avec tant de piété, qu'en les prenant il les empoisonnait toujours en faisant la signe de la Croix dessus, ne doutant point que le Démon n'y residât actuellement.* His attachment to AUGUSTINE was so excessive, that he looked upon as sacred and divine even those opinions of that great man, which the wiser part of the Romish doctors had rejected as erroneous and highly dangerous. Such, among others, was that extravagant and pernicious tenet, that *the saints are the only lawful proprietors of the world*; and that *the wicked have no right, by the divine law, to those things which they possess justly, in consequence of the decisions of human law.* To this purpose is the following assertion of our abbot, as we find it in FONTAINE's *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, tom. i. p. 201. *Jésus Christ n'est encore entré dans la possession de son Royaume temporel, et des biens du monde qui lui appartiennent, que par cette PETITE PORTION qu'en tient l'Eglise par les bénéfices de ses Clercs, qui ne sont que des fermiers et les dépositaires de Jésus Christ.* It, therefore, we are to give credit to this visionary man, the golden age is approaching, when JESUS CHRIST, having pulled down the mighty from their seats, and dethroned the kings and princes of the earth, shall reduce the whole world under his sole dominion, and give it over to the government of priests and monks, who are the *princes* of his church.—After we have seen such sentiments as these maintained by their oracle and chief, it is but natural to be surprised when we hear the *Janse-*

Penance, whose tendency, considered both in a civil and religious point of view, is singularly

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

nists boasting of their zeal in defending sovereign states, and in general the civil rights of mankind, against the stratagems and usurpations of the Roman pontiffs.

The notions of the abbot of ST. CYRAN concerning prayer, which breathe the fanatical spirit of mysticism, will further confirm what we have said of his propensity to enthusiasm. It is, for example, a favourite maxim with him, that the Christian who prays, ought never to recollect the good things he stands in need of in order to ask them of God, since true prayer does not consist in distinct notions and clear ideas of what we are doing in that solemn act, but in a certain *blind impulse* of divine love. Such is the account given of the abbot's sentiments on this head by LANCELOT, in his *Memoires touchant la vie de l'Abbé de S. Cyran*, tom. ii. p. 44.—*Il ne croyoit pas*, says that author, *que l'on pût faire quelque effort pour s'appliquer à quelque point, ou à quelque pensée particulière—parce que la véritable prière est plutôt un attrait de son amour, qui emporte notre cœur vers lui, et nous enleve comme hors de nous mêmes, que non pas une occupation de notre esprit, qui se remplit de l'idée de quelque objet quoique divin.* According to this hypothesis, the man prays best who neither *thinks* nor *asks* in that act of devotion. This is, indeed, a very extraordinary account of the matter, and contains an idea of prayer which seems to have been quite unknown to CHRIST and his *Apostles*; for the former has commanded us to address our prayers to God in a set form of words; and the latter frequently tell us the subjects of their petitions and supplications.

But of all the errors of this Arch-jansenist, none was so pernicious as the fanatical notion he entertained of his being the *residence* of the Deity, the *instrument* of the Godhead, by which the *divine nature* itself essentially operated. It was in consequence of this dangerous principle, that he recommends it as a duty incumbent on all pious men to follow, without consulting their judgment or any other guide, the *first motions* and *impulses* of their minds, as the dictates of heaven. And indeed the Jansenists, in general, are intimately persuaded, that God *operates* immediately upon the minds of those who have composed, or rather suppressed, all the motions of the *understanding* and of the *will*, and that to such he declares, from above, his intentions and commands; since whatever thoughts, designs, or inclinations arise within them, in this calm state of tranquillity and silence, are to be considered as the direct suggestions and oracles of the divine wisdom. See, for a further account of this pestilential doctrine, *Memoires de Port-Royal*, tom. iii. p. 246.

pernicious;

CEN. 4.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

pernicious. For they make repentance consist chiefly in those voluntary sufferings, which the transgressor inflicts upon himself, in proportion to the nature of his crimes and the degree of his guilt. As their notions of the extent of man's original corruption are greatly exaggerated, they prescribe remedies to it that are of the same nature. They look upon Christians as bound to expiate this original guilt by acts of mortification performed in solitude and silence, by torturing and macerating their bodies, by painful labour, excessive abstinence, continual prayer and contemplation; and they hold every person obliged to increase these voluntary pains and sufferings, in proportion to the degree of corruption they have derived from nature, or contracted by a vicious and licentious course of life. Nay, they carry these austerities to so high a pitch, that they do not scruple to call those *holy* self-tormentors, who have gradually put an end to their days by excessive abstinence or labour, the *sacred victims of repentance*, that have been *consumed* by the *fire of divine love*. Not satisfied with this *fanatical* language, they go still farther, and *superstitiously* maintain, that the conduct of these self-murderers is peculiarly meritorious in the eye of heaven; and that their sufferings, macerations, and labours, appease the anger of the Deity, and not only contribute to their own felicity, but draw down abundant blessings upon their friends and upon the church. We might confirm this account by various examples, and more especially by that of the famous Abbé DE PARIS, the great wonder-worker of the Jansenists, who put himself to a most painful death, in order to satisfy the justice of an incensed God [b]; such was the picture

[b] See MORINUS, *Com. de Penitentia*, *Præf.* p. 3. in which there is a tacit censure of the penance of the Jansenists.
—See,

picture he had formed of the Best of Beings in his disordered fancy.

XLVII. A striking example of this austere, forbidding, and extravagant species of devotion was exhibited in that celebrated female convent called *Port-Royal in the fields*, which was situated in a retired, deep, and gloomy vale, not far from *Paris*. The inspection and government of this austere society was given by HENRY IV., about the commencement of this century, to JACQUELINE, daughter of ANTHONY ARNAUD [c], who, after her conversion, assumed the name of MARIE ANGELIQUE DE LA ST. MADELAINE. This lady had at first led a very dissolute life [d], which was the general case of the cloistered fair in *France*, about this period; but a remarkable change happened in her sentiments and manners; in the year 1609, when she resolved no more to live like a nun, but to consecrate her future days to deep devotion and penitential exercises. This holy resolution was strengthened by her acquaintance with the famous FRANÇOIS DE SALES, and the abbot of ST. CYRAN. The last of these pious connexions she formed in the year 1623, and modelled both her own conduct and the manners of

CEN T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

The convent of
Port-Royal.

—See, on the other hand, the *Memoires de Port-Royal*, p. 483.

—The Jansenists, among all the meritorious actions of the abbot of ST. CYRAN, find none more worthy of admiration and applause than his restoring from oblivion the true system of penitential discipline; and they consider him as the second author or parent of the doctrine of penance. See *Memoires de Port-Royal*, tom. iii. p. 445, 504.—This very doctrine, however, of penance was one of the principal reasons of his being committed to prison by the order of Cardinal RICHELIEU. *Ibid.* tom. i. p. 233, 452.

[c] An eminent lawyer, and father to the famous ARNAUD, doctor in *Sorbonne*.

[d] The dissolute life imputed to this abbess by Dr. MOSHEIM is an egregious mistake, which seems to have proceeded from his misunderstanding a passage in BAYLE's *Dictionnaire*, vol. i. p. 338. note F, fourth edition in French.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

her convent after the doctrine and example of these devout men. Hence it happened, that, during the whole course of this century, the convent of *Port-Royal* excited the indignation of the Jesuits, the admiration of the Jansenists, and the attention of *Europe*. The holy virgins of this famous society observed, with the utmost rigour and exactness, that ancient rule of the Cistercians, which had been almost every where abrogated on account of its excessive and intolerable austerity; nay, they even went beyond its most cruel demands [*e*]. Such was the fame of this devout nunnery,

[*e*] There is a prodigious multitude of books still extant, in which the rise, progress, laws, and sanctity of this famous convent are described and extolled by eminent jansenists, who, at the same time, deplore its fate in the most doleful strains. Of this multitude we shall mention those only which are easy to be acquired, and which contain the most modern and circumstantial accounts of that celebrated establishment.—The Benedictines of *St. Maur* have given an exact though dry history of this convent in their *Gallia Christiana*, tom. vii. p. 910. A more elegant and agreeable account of it; but an account charged with imperfection and partiality, was composed by the famous poet RACINE, under the title of *Abrégé de l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, and was published, after having passed through many preceding editions, in the year 1750, at *Amsterdam*, among the works of his son LEWIS RACINE, tom. ii. p. 275—366. The external state and form of this convent are professedly described by MOLEON, in his *Voyages Liturgiques*, p. 234.—Add to these, NIC. FONTAINE, *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, published at *Cologne* (or rather at *Utrecht*) in two volumes 8vo, in the year 1738.—DU FOSSE, *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*.—*Recueil de plusieurs pieces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, published at *Utrecht*, in 8vo, in the year 1740.—The editor of this last compilation promises, in his Preface, further collections of pieces relative to the same subject, and seems to insinuate, that a complete history of *Port-Royal*, drawn from these and other valuable and authentic records, will sooner or later see the light. See, besides the authors abovementioned, LANCELOT, *Memoires touchant la Vie de l'Abbé de S. Cyran*. All these authors confine their relations to the external form and various revolutions of this famous convent. Its internal state, its rules of discipline,

nunnery, that multitudes of pious persons were ambitious to dwell in its neighbourhood, and that a great part of the *Jansenist-penitents*, or self-tormentors, of both sexes, built huts without its precincts; where they imitated the manners of those austere and gloomy fanatics, who, in the fourth and fifth centuries, retired into the wild and uncultivated places of *Syria* and *Egypt*, and were commonly called, *The Fathers of the Desert*. The end which these Penitents had in view was, by silence, hunger, thirst, prayer, bodily labour,

discipline, the manners of its virgins, and the incidents and transactions that have happened between them and the holy neighbourhood of Jansenists, are described and related by another set of writers; see *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal, et à la Vie de MARIE ANGELOU D'ARNAUD*, published at *Utrecht* in 5 vols. 8vo, in the year 1742.—*Vies interessantes et edifiantes des religieuses de Port-Royal, et de plusieurs personnes qui leur étoient attachées*. There are already four volumes of this work published, of which the first appeared at *Utrecht* in the year 1750, in 8vo, and it must be acknowledged, that they all contain several anecdotes and records that are interesting and curious.—For an account of the suppression and abolition of this convent, see the *Memoires sur la destruction de l'Abbaye de Port-Royal des Champs*, published in 8vo, in 1711. If we are not much mistaken, all these histories and relations have been much less serviceable to the reputation of this famous convent than the Jansenist party are willing to think. When we view ARNAUD, TILLEMONT, NICOLE, LE MAITRE, and the other authors of *Port-Royal*, in their learned productions, they then appear truly great; but, when we lay aside their works, and, taking up these histories of *Port-Royal*, see these great men in private life, in the constant practice of that austere discipline of which the Jansenists boast so foolishly, they indeed then shrink almost to nothing, appear in the contemptible light of fanatics, and seem totally unworthy of the fame they have acquired. When we read the *Discourses* that ISAAC LE MAITRE, commonly called SACY, pronounced at the bar, together with his other ingenious productions, we cannot refuse him the applause that is due to such an elegant and accomplished writer; but when we meet with this polite author at *Port-Royal*, mixed with labour and reapers, and with the spade or the sickle in his hand, he then certainly makes a comical figure, and can scarcely be looked upon as perfectly right in his head.

DE N. T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

watchings, sorrow, and other voluntary acts of self-denial, to efface the guilt, and remove the pollution the soul had derived from natural corruptions or evil habits [f]. They did not, however, all observe the same discipline, or follow the same kind of application and labour. The more learned consumed their strength in composing laborious productions filled with sacred and profane erudition, and some of these have, no doubt, deserved well of the republic of letters: others were employed in teaching youth the rudiments of language and the principles of science; but the far greatest part exhausted both the health of their bodies and the vigour of their minds in servile industry and rural labour; and thus pined away by a slow kind of death. What is singularly surprising is that many of these voluntary victims of an inhuman piety were persons illustrious both by their birth and stations, who after having distinguished themselves in civil or military employments, debased themselves so far in this penitential retreat, as to assume the character, offices, and labour of the lowest servants.

This celebrated retreat of the devout and austere Jansenists was subject to many vicissitudes during the whole course of this century: at one time it flourished in unrivalled glory; at another it seemed eclipsed, and on the brink of ruin. At length, however, the period of its total extinction approached. The nuns obstinately refused

[f] Among the first and most eminent of these penitents was ISAAC LE MAITRE, a celebrated lawyer at *Paris*, whose eloquence had procured him a shining reputation, and who, in the year 1637, retired to *Port-Royal* to make expiation for his sins. The retreat of this eminent man raised new enemies to the abbot of ST. CYRAN. See the *Memoires pour l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, tom. i. p. 28. The example of LE MAITRE was followed by a vast number of persons of all ranks, and, among these, by some persons of the highest distinction. See *Vies des Religieuses de Port-Royal*, tom. i. p. 141.

to subscribe the declaration of Pope ALEXANDER VII., that has been so often mentioned; on the other hand, their convent and rule of discipline was considered as detrimental to the interests of the kingdom, and a dishonour to some of the first families in *France*; hence LEWIS XIV., in the year 1709, set on by the violent counsels of the Jesuits, ordered the convent of *Port-Royal* to be demolished, the whole building to be levelled with the ground, and the nuns to be removed to *Paris*. And, lest there should still remain some secret fuel to nourish the flame of superstition in that place, he ordered the very carcases of the nuns and devout Jansenists to be dug up and buried elsewhere.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

XLVIII. The other controversies that disturbed the tranquillity of the church of *Rome*, were but light blasts when compared with this violent hurricane. The old debate between the Franciscans and Dominicans, concerning the *Immaculate Conception of the Virgin MARY*, which was maintained by the former, and denied by the latter, gave much trouble and perplexity to the Roman pontifs, and more especially to PAUL V., GREGORY XV., and ALEXANDER VII. The kingdom of *Spain* was thrown into such combustion, and so miserably divided into factions by this controversy, about the beginning of this century, that solemn embassies were sent to *Rome*, both by PHILIP III. and his successor, with a view to engage the Roman pontif to determine the question, or, at any rate, to put an end to the contest by a public bull. But, notwithstanding the weighty solicitations of these monarchs, the oracle of *Rome* pronounced nothing but ambiguous words, and its high priests prudently avoided coming to a plain and positive decision of the matter in question. For if they were awed, on the one hand, by the warm remonstrances of the Spanish court,

The controversy concerning the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin MARY.

C E N T.
XVII.
S E C T. II.
P A R T I.

court, which favoured the sentiment of the Franciscans, they were restrained, on the other, by the credit and influence of the Dominicans. So that, after the most earnest entreaties and importunities, all that could be obtained from the pontif, by the court of *Spain*, was a declaration, intimating, that the opinion of the Franciscans had a high degree of probability on its side, and forbidding the Dominicans to oppose it in a public manner; but this declaration was accompanied with another [g], by which the Franciscans were prohibited, in their turn, from treating as erroneous the doctrine of the Dominicans. This pacific accommodation of matters would have been highly laudable in a prince or civil magistrate, who, unacquainted with theological questions of such an abstruse nature, preferred the tranquillity of his people to the discussion of such an intricate and unimportant point; but whether it was ho-

[g] See FRID. ULR. CALIXTI *Historia Immaculate Conceptionis B. Virginis MARIE*, published at Helmstadt in 4to, in the year 1696.—HORNBECKII *Comm. ad Bullam URBANI VIII., de diebus Festis*, p. 250.—LAUNON *Præscriptiones de Conceptu Virginis MARIE*, tom. i. p. i. oper. p. 9.—Long after this period, CLEMENT XI. went a step further, and appointed, in the year 1708, a festival to be celebrated, in honour of the *Immaculate Conception of the Virgin MARY*, throughout the Romish church. See the *Memoires de Trevoux*, for the year 1709, art. xxxvii. p. 514. But the Dominicans obstinately deny that the obligation of this law extends to them, and persist in maintaining their ancient doctrine, though with more modesty and circumspection than they formerly discovered in this debate. And when we consider that this doctrine of theirs has never been expressly condemned by any pope, and that they are not in the least molested, nor even censured, for refusing to celebrate the festival abovementioned, it appears evidently, from all this, that the terms of the papal edict are to be understood with certain restrictions, and interpreted in a mild and indulgent manner; and that the spirit of this edict is not contrary to the tenor of the former declarations of the pontiffs on this head. See LAMINDUS PRITHIVIVS (a fictitious name assumed by the author MURATORI) *De ingeniorum moderatione in religionis negotio*, p. 254.

nourable

nourable to the Roman pontif, who boasts of a Divine right to decide all religious controversies, and pretends to a degree of inspiration that places him beyond the possibility of erring, we leave to the consideration of those who have his glory at heart.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

XLIX. The controversies with the Mystics were now renewed, and that sect, which in former times enjoyed such a high degree of reputation and authority, was treated with the greatest severity, and involved in the deepest distress towards the conclusion of this century. This unhappy change in their affairs was principally occasioned by the fanaticism and imprudence of MICHAEL DE MOLINOS, a Spanish priest, who resided at Rome, and the fame of whose ardent piety and devotion procured him a considerable number of disciples of both sexes. A book published at Rome, in the year 1681, by this ecclesiastic, under the title of the *Spiritual Guide*, alarmed the doctors of the church [b]. This book contained, besides the usual precepts and institutions of Mystical theology, several notions relating to a *spiritual* and *contemplative life*, that seemed to revive

Quietism,
or the con-
troverfies
occasioned
by the doc-
trine of
Molinos.

[b] This book, which was composed in Spanish, and published, for the first time, in the year 1675, was honoured with the approbation and encomiums of many eminent and respectable personages. It was published in Italian in several places, and at length at Rome, in 1681. It was afterwards translated into French, Dutch, and Latin, and passed through several editions in France, Italy, and Holland. The Latin translation, which bears the title of *Manuductio Spiritualis*, was published at Halle, in the year 1687, in 8vo, by FRANK. There is another work of MOLINOS, composed in the same spirit, *Concerning the daily celebration of the Communion*, which was also condemned. See the *Recueil de diverses pieces concernant le Quietisme et les Quietistes, ou MOLINOS ses sentimens et ses disciples*, published in 8vo at Amsterdam, in the year 1688, in which the reader will find a French translation of the *Spiritual Guide*, together with a collection of Letters on various subjects, written by MOLINOS.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

the pernicious and infernal errors of the *Beghards*, and open a door to all sorts of dissolution and licentiousness. The principles of MOLINOS, which have been very differently interpreted by his friends and enemies, amount to this: "That the whole of religion consists in the perfect calm and tranquillity of a mind removed from all external and finite things, and centered in God, and in such a pure love of the Supreme Being, as is independent on all prospect of interest or reward;" or, to express the doctrine of this Mystic in other words, "The soul, in the pursuit of the supreme good, must retire from the reports and gratifications of sense, and, in general, from all corporeal objects, and, imposing silence upon all the motions of the understanding and will, must be absorbed in the Deity." Hence the denomination of *Quietists* was given to the followers of MOLINOS; though that of *Mystics*, which was their vulgar title, was more applicable, and expressed with more propriety their fanatical system. For the doctrine of MOLINOS had no other circumstance of novelty attending it, than the singular and unusual terms he employed in unfolding his notions, and the ingenuity he discovered in digesting what the ancient Mystics had thrown out in the most confused and incoherent jargon, into something that looked like a system. The Jesuits, and other zealous votaries of Rome, soon perceived that the system of MOLINOS was a tacit censure of the Romish church, as having departed from the spirit of true religion, by placing the essence of piety in external works, and in the performance of a certain round of rites and ceremonies. But the warmest opponents MOLINOS met with was from the French ambassador [i] at Rome, who raised a

[i] Cardinal D'ETREES.

most violent persecution against him. This made many imagine, that it was not the theological system of MOLINOS alone that had inflamed the resentment of that minister, but that some considerations of a political nature had been blended with this famous controversy, and that the Spanish Mystic had opposed the designs and negotiations of the French monarch at the court of Rome. However that may have been, MOLINOS, unable to resist the storm, and abandoned by those from whom he chiefly expected succour, yielded to it, in the year 1685, when, notwithstanding the number, rank, and credit of his friends at Rome, and the particular marks of favour he had received from the Roman pontif [k], he was cast into prison. Two years after this, he was obliged to renounce, in a public manner, the errors of which he was accused, and this solemn recantation was followed by a sentence of perpetual imprisonment, from which he was, in an advanced age, delivered by death, in the year 1696 [l]. The candid and impartial will be obliged to acknowledge, that the opinions and expressions of this enthusiast were perfidiously misrepresented and perverted by the Jesuits and others, whose interest it was that he should be put out of the way, and excluded from every thing but contemplation and repose; and it is most certain, that this doctrine was charged with consequences

[k] INNOCENT XI.

[l] He was born in the diocese of Saragossa, in the year 1627; see *Biblioth. Janseniste*, p. 469.—For an account of this controversy, see the *Narrative of the Proceedings of the Controversy concerning Quietism*, which is subjoined to the German translation of BURNET's Travels.—As also ARNOLDI *Historia Eccles. et Heretic.* tom. iii. c. xvii. p. 176.—JAEGERI *Histor. Eccles. et Polit.* Sæculi xvii. Decenn. ix. p. 26.—PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 357, where may be seen the papal edicts relating to this controversy.

which

C E N T. XVII. which he neither approved nor even apprehended.
 S E C T. II. But, on the other hand, it must also be confessed,
 P A R T I. that the system of MOLINOS was chargeable with
 the greatest part of the reproaches that are justly
 thrown upon the Mystics, and favoured much the
 illusions and follies of those fanatics, who would
 make the crude visions of their disordered fancies
 pass for Divine revelations [m].

Followers
 of Molinos.

L. It would have been truly surprising had a system of piety, that was so adapted to seduce the indolent mind, to captivate the warm imagination, and to melt the tender heart, been destitute of votaries and followers. But this was by no means the case. In *Italy, Spain, France, and the Netherlands*, MOLINOS had a considerable number of disciples, and, besides the reasons we have now hinted, another circumstance must have contributed much to multiply his votaries; for, in all parts of the Romish dominion, there were numbers of persons, who had sense and knowledge enough to perceive, that the whole of religion could not consist in external rites and bodily mortifications, but too little to direct themselves in religious matters, or to substitute what was right in the place of what they knew to be wrong; and hence it was natural enough for them to follow the first plausible guide that was offered to them. But the church of *Rome*, apprehensive of the consequences of this Mystic theology, left no method unemployed that could contribute to stop its progress; and, by the force of promissings and threatenings, of severity and mildness properly applied, stifled in the birth the commotions and changes it seemed adapted to excite. The death of MOLINOS contributed also to dispel the anxiety

[m] All that can be alleged in defence of MOLINOS has been gathered together by WEISMANNUS, in his *Hystor. Eccles. sæcl. Sæc. xvii.* p. 555.

of the Romish doctors, since his disciples and followers seemed too inconsiderable to deserve any notice. Among these are generally reckoned Cardinal PETRUCCI, FRANCIS DE LA COMBE, a Barnabite friar, the spiritual director of *Madame GUYON* (who shall be mentioned more particularly), FRANCIS MALAVALLE, BERNIERE DE LOUVIGNI, and others of less note. These enthusiasts, as is common among the Mystics, differ from MOLINOS in several points, and are also divided among themselves; this diversity is, however, rather nominal than real; and, if we consider the true signification of the terms by which they express their respective notions, we shall find that they all set out from the same principles, and tend to the same conclusions [n].

LI. One of the principal patrons and propagators of *Quietism* in France was MARIE BOUVIERES DE LA MOTHE GUYON, a woman of fashion, remarkable for the goodness of her heart and the regularity of her manners, but of an inconstant and unsettled temper, and subject to be drawn away by the seduction of a warm and unbridled fancy. This female apostle of Mysticism derived all her ideas of religion from the feelings of her own heart [o], and described its nature to others according

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

The case of
Madame
Guyon and
Fenelon.

[n] The writings of these fanatics are enumerated and sharply criticised by COLONIA, in the *Bibliothèque Quietiste* (which he has subjoined to his *Bibliothèque Janseniste*), p. 455—488.—See also GOD. ARNOLDI *Historia et Descriptio Theologiae Mysticae*, p. 364, & POIRET's *Bibliotheca Mysticorum*, published at Amsterdam, in 8vo, in 1708.

[o] Madame GUYON wrote her own life and spiritual adventures in French, and published them in the year 1720. Her writings, which abound with childish allegories and mystic ejaculations, have been translated into German. Her principal production was *La Bible de Mad. GUYON, avec des explications et réflexions qui regardent la vie intérieure*. This Bible with Annotations relating to the hidden or internal life, was published in the year 1715, at Amsterdam, under the name of *Cologn*, in twenty volumes in 8vo, which abundantly discover the

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

according as she felt it herself; a manner of proceeding of all others the most uncertain and delusive. And accordingly, her religious sentiments made a great noise in the year 1687, and gave offence to many. Hence, after they had been accurately and attentively examined by several men of eminent piety and learning, they were, at length, pronounced erroneous and unsound, and, in the year 1697, were professedly confuted by the celebrated BOSSUET. This gave rise to a controversy of still greater moment, between the prelate last mentioned and FRANCIS SALIGNAC DE FENELON, archbishop of *Cambray*, whose sublime virtue and superior genius were beheld with veneration in all the countries of *Europe*. Of these two disputants, who, in point of eloquence, were avowedly without either superiors or equals in *France*, the latter seemed disposed to favour the religious system of Madame GUYON. For when BOSSUET desired his approbation of the book he had composed, in answer to the sentiments of that female Mystic, FENELON not only refused it, but openly declared that this pious woman had been treated with great partiality and injustice, and that the censures of her adversary were unmerited and groundless. Nor did the warm imagination of this amiable prelate permit him to stop here, where the dictates of prudence ought to have set bounds to his zeal; for, in the year 1697, he published a book [p], in which he adopted several of the tenets of Madame GUYON, and more especially that favourite doctrine of the Mystics, which teaches, that the love of the Supreme Being must be pure and disinterested; that

the fertile imagination and shallow judgment of this female mystic. See a further account of her in the *Letters of Mad. de MAINTENON*, tom. i. p. 249. tom. ii. p. 45, 47, 49, 51.

[p] This book was entitled, *Explication des Maxims des Saints pour la vie intérieure*. It has been translated into Latin.

is, exempt from all views of interest and all hope of reward [9]. This doctrine FENELON explained with a pathetic eloquence, and confirmed it by the authority of many of the most eminent and pious among the Romish doctors. BOSSUET, whose leading passion was ambition, and who beheld with anxiety the rising fame and eminent talents of FENELON as an obstacle to his glory, was highly exasperated by this opposition, and left no method unemployed which artifice and jealousy could suggest, to mortify a rival whose illustrious merit had rendered so formidable. For this purpose, he threw himself at the feet of LEWIS XIV., implored the succours of the Rôman pontif, and, by his importunities and stratagems, obtained, at length, the condemnation of FENELON's book. This condemnation was pronounced in the year 1699, by INNOCENT XII., who, in a public brief, declared that book unsound in general, and branded with more peculiar marks of disapprobation twenty-three propositions, specified by the *Congregation* that had been appointed to examine it. The book, however, was condemned alone, without any mention of the author; and the con-

☞ [9] This doctrine of the Mystics has thus far a foundation in reason and philosophy, that the moral perfections of the Deity are, in themselves, *intrinsically amiable*; and that their *excellence* is as much adapted to excite our esteem and love, as the experience of their *beneficent effects* in promoting our well being, is to enflame our gratitude. The error, therefore, of the Mystics lay in their drawing extravagant conclusions from a right principle, and in their requiring in their followers a perpetual abstraction and separation of ideas which are intimately connected, and, as it were, blended together, such as *felicity* and *perfection*; for though these two are inseparable in fact, yet the Mystics, from a fantastic pretension to disinterestedness, would separate them right or wrong, and turned their whole attention to the latter. In their views also of the supreme Being, they overlooked the important relations he bears to us as *benefactor* and *rewarder*; relations that give rise to noble sentiments and important duties, and confined their views to his supreme *beauty, excellence, and perfection*.

duct

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

duct of FENELON on this occasion was very remarkable. He declared publicly his entire acquiescence in the sentence by which his book had been condemned, and not only read that sentence to his people in the pulpit at *Cambray*, but exhorted them to respect and obey the papal decree [r]. This step was differently interpreted by different persons, according to their notions of this great man, or their respective ways of thinking. Some considered it as an instance of true magnanimity, as the mark of a meek and gentle spirit, that preferred the peace of the church to every private view of interest or glory. Others, less charitable, looked upon this submissive conduct as ignoble and pusillanimous, as denoting manifestly a want of integrity, inasmuch as it supposed, that the prelate in question condemned with his lips what in his heart he believed to be true. One thing indeed seems generally agreed on, and that is, that FENELON persisted, to the end of his days, in the sentiments which, in obedience to the order of the pope, he retracted and condemned in a public manner.

La Peyrere,
White,
Sfondrati,
and Borri.

LII. Besides these controversies, which derived their importance chiefly from the influence and reputation of the disputants, and thus became productive of great tumults and divisions in the church, there were others excited by several innovators, whose new and singular opinions were followed with troubles, though of a less momen-

[r] An ample and impartial account of this controversy has been given by TOUSSAINTS DU PLESSIS, a Benedictine, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise de MEAUX*, livr. v. tom. i. p. 485—523.—RAMSAY, in his *Life of FENELON*, written in French, and published at the *Hague* in the year 1723, is less impartial; but is nevertheless worthy of being consulted on this subject. See VOLTAIRE, *Siècle de LOUIS XIV.*, tom. ii. p. 301.—The public acts and edicts relating to this controversy have been collected by DU PLESSIS ARGENTRE, in his *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 402

tous and permanent nature. Such was the strange doctrine of ISAAC LA PEYRERE, who, in two small treatises, published in the year 1655, maintained, that it is the origin of the Jewish nation, and not of the human race, that we find recorded in the books of MOSES, and that our globe was inhabited by many nations before ADAM, whom he considered as the father of the Jews. Though PEYRERE was a protestant when he published this opinion, yet the doctors of the Romish church looked upon themselves as obliged to punish an error that seemed to strike at the foundation of all Revealed Religion; and therefore, in the year 1656, had him seized at *Brussels*, and cast into prison, where, to escape the flames, he publicly renounced his erroneous system, and, to make a full expiation for it, embraced the popish religion [s].

THOMAS WHITE, known at different times, and in different countries, by the names of ALBIUS, ANGLUS, CANDIDUS, BIANCHI [t], which he assumed successively, made a considerable figure, about the middle of this century, in *England, Portugal, France, and the Netherlands*, by the number and subtilty of his philosophical productions; but he also incurred the displeasure of many of the doctors of his communion, on account of the novelty and singularity of his opinions. He was undoubtedly a man of genius and penetration; but, being a passionate admirer

[s] BAYLE's *Dictionary* at the article PEYRERE.—ARNOLDI *Hist. Eccles. et Heret.* tom. iii. p. 70.—*Menagiana*, published by DE LA MONNOYE, tom. ii. p. 40.

[t] All these denominations were relative to his true name, which was WHITE. This man was a peculiar favourite of Sir KENELM DIGBY's, and mentions him with singular veneration in his philosophical writings. See more of this WHITE in WOOD's *Athenæ Oxon.* 2d edit. vol. ii. p. 665, and in the *Biograph. Brit.* Article GLANVIL, vol. iv. p. 2206.

C E N T. of the Peripatetic philosophy, he ventured to em-
XVII. employ it in the explication of some of the peculiar
SECT. II. doctrines of the Romish church. This bold at-
PART I. tempt led him imperceptibly out of the beaten
 road of popery, opened to him new views of
 things, and made him adopt notions that had
 never been heard of in the church of *Rome*; and
 hence his books were prohibited and condemned
 in several places, and particularly at *Rome* by the
Congregation of the Index. This innovator is said
 to have died in *England*, his native country, and
 to have left a sect behind him that embraced his
 doctrine, but, in process of time, fell into obli-
 vion [u].

His peculiarities, however, were nothing, in
 comparison with the romantic notions of JOSEPH
 FRANCIS BORRI, a Milanese knight, eminent for
 his knowledge of chymistry and physick; but who,
 at the same time, appears to have been rather a
 madman than a heretic. The fancies broached
 by this man, concerning the VIRGIN MARY, the
 HOLY GHOST, the erection of a new celestial
 kingdom, of which he himself was to be the
 founder, and the downfall of the Roman pontif,
 are so extravagant, childish, and absurd, that no
 sober person can view them in any other light
 than as the crude reveries of a disordered brain.
 Besides, the conduct of this fanatic, in several
 places, discovered the greatest vanity and levity,
 attended with that spirit of imposture that is
 usually visible in quacks and mountebanks; and,
 indeed, in the whole of his behaviour, he seemed
 destitute of sense, integrity, and prudence. The
 inquisitors had spread their snares for BORRI, but
 he luckily escaped them, and wandered up and
 down through a great part of *Europe*, giving him-

[u] See BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the Article *ANGELUS*.—
 BAILLET, *Vie de DES CARTES*, tom. ii. p. 245.

self out for another ESCULAPIUS, and pretending to be initiated into the most profound mysteries of chemical science. But in the year 1672, he imprudently fell into the clutches of the Roman pontif, who pronounced against him a sentence of perpetual imprisonment [w].

The last innovator we shall here mention is COELESTINE SPONDRATI, who, having formed the design of terminating the disputes concerning predestination, by new explications of that doctrine, wrote a book upon that knotty subject, which threw into combustion, in the year 1696, a considerable part of the Romish church; since it was, in some things, agreeable to none of the contending parties, and neither satisfied entirely the Jesuits nor their adversaries. Five French bishops, of great credit at the court of *Rome*, accused the author, notwithstanding the high rank of cardinal to which he had been raised on account of his extensive learning, of various errors, and more especially of having departed from the sentiments and doctrine of AUGUSTINE. This accusation was brought before INNOCENT XII., in the year 1696, but the contest it seemed adapted to excite was nipt in the bud. The pontif appeased, or rather put off, the French prelates, with a fair promise that he would appoint a congregation to examine the cardinal's doctrine, and then pronounce sentence accordingly; but he forgot his promise, imitated the prudent conduct of his predecessors on like occasions, and did not venture to give a final decision to this intricate and knotty controversy [x].

LIII. There

[w] There is a very interesting article in *BAYLE's Dictionary* relating to BORRI, in which all the extravagancies of that wrong-headed man are curiously related. See also *ARNOLD, loc. cit. p. iii. c. xviii. p. 193.*

[x] This book, which was published at *Rome* in 4to, in the year

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

Canoniza-
tions.

LIII. There was scarcely any change introduced into the ritual of the Romish church during this century, if we except an edict of URBAN VIII., for diminishing the number of holidays, which was issued out in the year 1643 [y]; we shall therefore conclude this account with a list of the saints added to the *Kalendæ* by the Roman pontiffs during the period now before us.

In the year 1601, CLEMENT VIII. raised to that spiritual dignity RAYMOND of PENNAFORT, the famous compiler of the *Decretals*; in 1608, FRANCES PONTIANI, a Benedictine nun; and, in 1610, the eminent and illustrious CHARLES BORROMEO, bishop of *Milan*, so justly celebrated for his exemplary piety, and almost unparalleled liberality and beneficence.

GREGORY XV. conferred, in the year 1622, the honour of sainthood on THERESIA, a native of *Avila* in *Spain*, and a nun of the Carmelite Order.

URBAN VIII., in the year 1623, conferred the same ghostly honours on PHILIP NERI, the founder

year 1696, is entitled, *Nodus Prædestinationis dissolutus*.—The Letters of the French bishops, with the answer of the Roman pontif, are to be found in DU PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE's *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 394. and NATALIS ALEXANDER's *Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis*, p. 877. The Letters of the bishops are remarkable in this respect, that they contain sharp animadversions against the Jesuits and their discipline. The prelates express, in the strongest terms, their abhorrence of the doctrine of *philosophical sin*, which has rendered the Jesuits so deservedly infamous, and their detestation of the methods of propagating Christianity employed by the missionaries of that Order in *China*. Nay, to express their aversion to the doctrine of SPONDRATI, they say, that his opinions are *still* more *erroneous* and *pernicious* than *even* those of the *Molinists*. The doctrine of this cardinal has been accurately represented and compared with that of AUGUSTIN by the learned BASNAGE, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise*, livr. xii. c. iii. § xi. p. 713.

[y] The bull issued out by URBAN VIII., for diminishing the number of the holidays celebrated in the church of *Rome*, may be seen in the *Novæ Bibliothecæ*, tom. xv p. 88.

of the Order entitled, *Fathers of the Oratory*, in Italy; on IGNATIUS LOYOLA, the parent of the Jesuits; and on his chief disciple FRANCIS XAVIER, the Jesuitical *Apostle of the Indians*.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

ALEXANDER VII. canonized, in the year 1658, THOMAS DE VILLANOVA, a Spanish monk, of the Order of *St. Augustin*; and, in 1665, FRANCIS DE SALES, bishop of *Geneva*.

CLEMENT X. added to this ghostly list, in the year 1670, PEDRO DE ALCANTARA, a Franciscan monk; and MARIA MAGDALENA PACTII, a Florentine nun of the Carmelite Order; and, in the year 1671, ROSE, an American Virgin, of the third Order of Dominic, and LEWIS BERTRAND, a Dominican monk.

Under the pontificate of INNOCENT XII., sainthood was conferred upon CAJETAN of *Vicenza*, a regular clerk of the Order of Theatins, for whom that honour had been designed twenty years before, by CLEMENT X., who died at the time the canonization was to have been performed; JOHN of *Leon*, a Hermit of *St. Augustin*; PASCHAL BAYLONIOS, a Franciscan monk of the kingdom of *Arragon*; and JOHN DE DIEU, a Portuguese, and one of the Order of the *Brethren of Hospitality*, all of whom had been marked for a place in the Calendar, by ALEXANDER VIII., were solemnly canonized, in the year 1691, by INNOCENT XII. [z].

[z] The *Diplomas* of the pontiffs, relative to all these canonizations, may be seen in JUSTUS FONTANINUS's *Codex Constitutionum, quas summi Pontifices ediderunt in solemnibus Canonizatione sanctorum*, p. 260. published in folio at Rome, in the year 1729. As they contain the particular reasons which occasioned the elevation of these persons to a place in the Calendar, and the peculiar kind of merit on which each of these ghostly promotions was founded, they offer abundant matter for reflection and censure to a judicious reader. Nor would it be labour ill employed to inquire, without prejudice or partiality, into the justice, piety, and truth of what the popes allege in these *Diplomas*, as the reasons inducing them to confer sainthood on the persons therein mentioned.

C H A P. II.

*The HISTORY of the GREEK and ORIENTAL
CHURCHES.*

C E N T. I.
XVII.
S E C T. II.
P A R T I.

The state of
the Greek
Church.

I. **T**HE history of the Greek and Eastern Christians, faithfully and accurately composed, would, no doubt, furnish us with a variety of entertaining and useful records; but the events that happen, and the transactions that are carried on in these distant regions, are very rarely transmitted to us genuine and uncorrupted. The spirit of religious party, and the pious frauds it often engenders, want of proper information, and undistinguishing credulity, have introduced a fabulous mixture into the accounts we have of the state of the Christian religion in the East; and this consideration has engaged us to treat in a more concise manner, than would otherwise have been expedient, this particular branch of ecclesiastical history.

The Greek church, whose wretched situation was mentioned in the history of the preceding century, continued, during the present one, in the same deplorable state of ignorance and decay, destitute of the means of acquiring or promoting solid and useful knowledge. This account is, however, to be considered as taken from a general view of that church; for several of its members may be alleged as exceptions from this general character of ignorance, superstition, and corruption. Among that multitude of Greeks who travel into *Sicily, Venice, Rome, England, Holland, and Germany*, or carry on trade in their own country, or fill honourable and important posts in the court of the Turkish emperor, there are undoubtedly several, who are exempt from this reproach of ignorance and stupidity, of superstition

perdition and profligacy, and who make a figure by their opulence and credit [a]. But nothing can be more rooted and invincible than the aversion the Greeks in general discover to the Latin or Romish church; an aversion which neither promises nor threatenings, artifice nor violence, have been able to conquer, or even to temper or diminish, and which has continued inflexible and unrelenting amidst the most zealous efforts of the Roman pontiffs, and the various means employed by their numerous missionaries to gain over this people to their communion and jurisdiction [b].
It

[a] I have been led to these remarks by the complaints of ALEXANDER HELLADIUS, and others, who see things in the light in which he has placed them. There is still extant a book published in Latin by this author, in the year 1714, entitled, *The present state of the Greek Church*, in which he throws out the bitterest reproaches upon several authors of eminent merit and learning, who have given accounts of that church, and maintains that his brethren of the Greek communion are much more pious, learned, wise, and opulent, than they are commonly supposed to be. Instead of envying the Greeks the merit and felicity which this panegyrist supposes them possessed of, we sincerely wish them much greater degrees of both. But we observe, at the same time, that, from the very accounts given by HELLADIUS, it would be easy to prove, that the state of the Greeks is not a whit better than it is generally supposed to be; though it may be granted, that the same ignorance, superstition, and immorality, do not abound alike in all places, nor among all persons. See what we have remarked on this subject in the accounts we have given of the Eastern church during the sixteenth century.

[b] The Jesuit TARILLON has given an ample relation of the numerous *Missions* in *Greece* and the other provinces of the Ottoman empire, and of the present state of these *Missions*, in his Letter to PONTCHARTRAINE, *Sur l'état présent des Missions des Pères Jésuites dans la Grece*, which is published in the *Nouveaux Mémoires des Missions de la Campagne de Jésus*, tom. i. p. 1125. For an account of the state of the Romish religion in the islands of the *Archipelago*, see the letter of the Jesuit XAVIER PORTIER, in the *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses écrites des Missions étrangères*, tom. x. p. 328. These accounts are, it is true; somewhat embellished, in order to advance the glory of the Jesuits: but the exaggerations of these missionaries may be easily corrected by the ac-

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

The story
of Cyrillus
Lucar.

The hopes
of an union
between
the Greek
and Latin
churches
entirely
dispelled.

It is true, indeed, that the Latin doctors have founded churches in some of the islands of the *Archipelago*; but these congregations are poor and inconsiderable; nor will either the Greeks or their masters, the Turks, permit the Romish missionaries to extend further their spiritual jurisdiction.

II. Under the pontificate of URBAN VIII., great hopes were entertained of softening the antipathy of the Greeks against the Latin church [c], and of engaging them, and the other Christians of the East, to embrace the communion of *Rome*, and acknowledge the supremacy and jurisdiction of its pontif. This was the chief object that excited the ambitious zeal and employed the assiduous labour and activity of URBAN, who called to his assistance such ecclesiastics as were most eminent for their acquaintance with Greek and Oriental learning, and with the tempers, manners, and characters of the Christians in those distant regions, that they might suggest the shortest and most effectual method of bringing them and their churches under the Roman yoke. The

counts of other writers, who, in our times, have treated this branch of ecclesiastical history. See, above all others, R. SIMON's (under the fictitious name of SANIOSE) *Bibliothèque Critique*, tom. i. c. xxiii. p. 340. and especially p. 346. where the author confirms a remarkable fact, which we have mentioned above upon the authority of URBAN CERRI, viz. that amidst the general dislike which the Greeks have of the Romish church, none carry this dislike to such a high degree of antipathy and aversion, as those very Greeks who have been educated at *Rome*, or in the other schools and seminaries belonging to its spiritual jurisdiction. *Ils sont* (says Father SIMON) *les premiers à crier contre et à médire du Pape et des Latins. Ces Pelerins Orientaux qui viennent chez nous fourbent et abusent de notre crédulité pour acheter un bénéfice et tourmenter les missionnaires Latins, &c.* We have still more recent and ample testimonies of the invincible hatred of the Greeks towards the Latins, in the *Preface* to COWELL's *Account of the present Greek Church*, printed at Cambridge, in the year 1723.

[c] See the Life of MORINUS, which is prefixed to his *Antiquitates Eccles. Orient.* p. 37.

wisest of these counsellors advised the pontif to lay it down for a preliminary in this difficult negotiation, that the Greek and Eastern Christians were to be indulged in almost every point that had hitherto been refused them by the Romish missionaries, and that no alteration was to be introduced either into their ritual or doctrine; that their ceremonies were to be tolerated, since they did not concern the essence of religion; and that their doctrine was to be explained and understood in such a manner, as might give it a near and striking resemblance of the doctrine and institutions of the church of *Rome*. In defence of this method of proceeding, it was judiciously observed, that the Greeks would be much more tractable and obsequious, were they told by the missionaries, that it was not meant to convert them; that they had always been Roman-catholics in reality, though not in profession; and that the popes had no intention of persuading them to abandon the doctrine of their ancestors, but only desired that they would understand it in its true and genuine sense. This plan gave rise to a variety of laborious productions, in which there was more learning than probity, and more dexterity than candour and good faith. Such were the treatises published by LEO ALLATIUS, MORINUS, CLEMENT GALANUS, LUCAS HOLSTENIUS, ABRAHAM ECHELLENSIS [d], and others, who pretended

[d] The book of LEO ALLATIUS, *De Concordia Ecclesie Orientalis & Occidentalis*, is well known, and deservedly looked upon, by the most learned men among the Protestants, as the work of a disingenuous and insidious writer. The *Grecia Orthodoxa* of the same author, which was published at *Rome* in the year 1652, in 4to, and contains a compilation from all the books of the Grecian doctors that were well affected to the Latin church, is still extant.—We have nothing of LUCAS HOLSTENIUS (who was superior to ALLATIUS in learning and sagacity) upon this subject, except two posthumous dissertations,

C E N T.
XVII.
S E C T. II.
P A R T I.

ed to demonstrate, that there was little or no difference between the religion of the Greeks, Armenians, and Nestorians, and that of the church of *Rome*, a few ceremonies excepted, together with some unusual phrases and terms that are peculiar to the Christians of the East.

This design of bringing, by artful compliances, the Greek and Eastern churches under the jurisdiction of *Rome* was opposed by many ; but by none with more resolution and zeal than by CYRILLUS LUCAR, patriarch of *Constantinople*, a man of extensive learning and knowledge of the world, who had travelled through a great part of *Europe*, and was well acquainted with the doctrine and discipline both of the Protestant and Romish churches. This prelate declared openly, and indeed with more courage than prudence, that he had a strong propensity to the religious sentiments of the English and Dutch churches, and had conceived the design of reforming the doctrine and ritual of the Greeks, and bringing them nearer to the purity and simplicity of the Gospel. This was sufficient to render the venerable patriarch odious to the friends of *Rome*. And accordingly the Jesuits, seconded

by dissertations, *De ministro et forma sacramenti confirmationis apud Græcos*, which were published at *Rome* in the year 1666.—The treatises of MORINUS, *De penitentia et ordinationibus*, are known to all the learned, and seem expressly composed to make the world believe, that there is a striking uniformity of sentiment between the Greek and Latin churches on these two important points, when, laying aside the difference that scholastic terms and peculiar modes of expression may appear to occasion, we attend to the meaning that is annexed to these terms by the members of the two communions.—GALANUS, in a long and laborious work, published at *Rome* in the year 1650, has endeavoured to prove, that the Armenians differ very little from the Latins in their religious opinions ; and ABRAHAM ECHLENSIS has attempted to convince us in several treatises (and more especially in his *Animadversiones ad Hebræi Jesu Catalogum librorum Chaldaicorum*), that all Christians throughout *Africa* and *Asia* have the same system of doctrine that is received among the Latins.

by

by the credit and influence of the French ambassador, and assisted by the treacherous stratagems of some perfidious Greeks, continued to perplex and persecute the good man in various ways, and at length accomplished his ruin; for, by the help of false witnesses, they obtained an accusation of treason against him; in consequence of which he was put to death, in the year 1638, by the order of the Emperor [e]. He was succeeded by CYRILLUS, Bishop of Berea, a man of a dark, malignant, and violent spirit, and the infamous instrument the Jesuits had chiefly employed in bringing him to an untimely end. As this new patriarch declared himself openly in favour of the Latins, the reconciliation of the Greeks with the church of Rome seemed more probable than ever, nay almost certain [f]; but the dismal fate of this

[e] The *Confession of Faith*, drawn up by CYRILLUS LUCAR, was published in Holland in the year 1645; and is also inserted by AYMON, in his *Monumens authentiques de la Religion des Grecs*, p. 237. By this confession, it appears evidently, that CYRILLUS had a stronger inclination towards the doctrine of the reformed churches, than to that which was commonly received among the Greeks. Nor was he, by any means, ill-affected towards the Lutherans, since he addressed several letters to the Swedish clergy about this time, and solicited their friendship, as appears from the learned ARKENHOLTZ's *Mémoires de la Reine CHRISTINE*, tom. i. p. 486. tom. ii. Append. p. 113.—AYMON has published, in the work already mentioned, p. 1—109. twenty-seven Letters of this Patriarch to the Clergy of Geneva, and to other Doctors of the Reformed Church, in which his religious sentiments are still more plainly discovered. His life, transactions, and deplorable fate, have been recorded by THOMAS SMITH, a learned divine of the English Church, in his *Narratio de Vita, Studiis, Gestis, et Martyrio CYRILLI LUCARIS*, which is the third article of his *Miscellanea*, published at London in 8vo; in the year 1686; as also by HOTTINGER, in his *Analeſt. Historico-Theolog. Appendic. differt. viii.* p. 550. and by other authors mentioned by FABRICIUS in his *Bibliotheca Græcæ*, vol. x. p. 499.

[f] See EDUARD VEGELII *Defensio Exerc. de Ecclesiâ Græcâ*, p. 300. where we find the letters of the Roman pontif URBAN VIII. to CYRILLUS of Berea, in which he loads with applause this

C. E. N. T. this unworthy prelate dispelled all of a sudden the
XVII. pleasing hopes and the anxious fears with which
SECT. II. *Rome* and its adversaries beheld the approach of
PART I. this important event. The same violent death
that had concluded the days of CYRILLUS LUCAR
pursued his successor, in whose place PARTHENIUS,
a zealous opposer of the doctrine and ambitious
pretensions of *Rome*, was raised to the patriarchal
dignity. After this period, the Roman pontifs
desisted from their attempts upon the Greek
church, no favourable opportunity being offered
either of deposing its patriarchs, or gaining them
over to the Romish communion.

Whether or
not the Ro-
mish doc-
trines and
mission-
aries con-
tributed to
the corrup-
tion of the
doctrine of
the Greek
church.

III. Notwithstanding these unsuccessful at-
tempts of the Roman pontifs to reduce the Greek
church under their dominion, many allege, and
more especially the reformed clergy complain,
that the doctrine of that church has been mani-
festly corrupted by the emissaries of *Rome*. It is
supposed, that, in later times, the munificence of
the French ambassadors at the *Port*, and the per-
suasive sophistry of the Jesuits, have made such
irresistible impressions on the avarice and igno-
rance of the Greek bishops, whose poverty is
great, that they have departed, in several points,
from the religious system of their ancestors, and
have adopted, among other errors of the Romish
church, the monstrous and unnatural doctrine of
Transubstantiation. This change is said to have
been more especially brought about in the fa-
mous council, which was assembled, in the year

this new patriarch, for having been so instrumental in banishing
from among the Greeks the pernicious errors of CYRILLUS
LUCAR, and warmly exhorts him to depose all the Greek pa-
triarchs and bishops that are not favourable to the Latin
Church. These exhortations are seconded by flattering pro-
mises, and, particularly, by an assurance of protection and suc-
cess from the King of *Spain*. CYRILLUS of *Berea* died in the
communion of the Romish Church. See HEN. HILLARI
Nat. ad Paul. Cypr. Chron. Ecclesie Græcæ, p. 470.

1672, at *Jerusalem*, by DOSITHEUS, the patriarch of that city [g]. Without entering into an examination of the truth and equity of this charge brought against the Greek bishops, we shall only observe, that it was the controversy between the Roman Catholics and Protestants in *France* that first gave rise to it. The latter, and more especially JOHN CLAUDE, so justly celebrated for his extensive learning and masterly eloquence, maintained, that many of the doctrines of the Romish church, and more particularly that of *Transubstantiation*, were of a modern date, and had never been heard of before the ninth century. The Roman Catholics, on the contrary, with ARNAUD at their head, affirmed, that the doctrine of *Rome* concerning the *Eucharist*, and the real conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of CHRIST in that holy ordinance, had been received by Christians in all ages of the church [h]. To strengthen their cause further by authorities, that they imagined would have no small influence upon their adversaries, they ventured to assert, that this doctrine was adopted by all the Eastern Christians, and particularly by the Greek churches [i].

[g] See, for an account of this council, AYMON, *Memoires Authentiques de la Religion des Grecs*, tom. i. p. 263.—GILBERTI CUPERI *Epistole*, p. 404. 407.—See, more especially, the judicious and learned observations of BASNAGE on the transactions of this council, in his *Histoire de la Religion des Eglises Reformées*, period iv. p. 1. c. xxxii. p. 452. and COWELL's *Account of the Present State of the Greek Church*, book i. ch. v. p. 136.

[h] It was to prove this most groundless assertion, that the famous NICOLLE, published his artful book, *De la Perpétuité de la Foi*, in the year 1664, which was answered, with a victorious force of evidence, by the learned CLAUDE.

[i] The names and productions of the principal writers that appeared in this controversy, may be found in the *Bibliotheca Græca* of FABRICIUS, vol. x. p. 444. and in the learned PSAFF's *Dissertatio contr. LUDOV. ROGERII Opus Eucharisticum*, published at *Tubingen* in the year 1718.

This

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

This bold assertion required striking and authentic testimonies to give it any degree of credit. Accordingly the ambassador of *France*, residing at *Constantinople*, received orders from his court to concert with the *Jesuits*, and to leave no methods unemployed in procuring certificates from the *Greek clergy* to confirm this assertion. On the other hand, the English and Dutch ambassadors, persuaded that no such doctrine was really professed in the *Greek church*, procured also the testimonies of several ecclesiastics, in order to take from the *Roman Catholic* disputants this pretext; which, after all, was of no great consequence, as it did not affect the merits of the cause. The result, however, of this scrutiny was favourable to the *Romish* doctors, whose agents in foreign parts procured a more numerous list of testimonies than their adversaries could produce. The Protestants invalidated these testimonies, by proving fully, that many of them were obtained by bribery from the indigent *Greeks*, whose deplorable poverty made them sacrifice truth to lucre; and that a great number of them were drawn by artifice from ignorant priests, whom the *Jesuits* deceived, by disguising the doctrines of *Rome* in such a manner as to give them a *Grecian* air, and make them resemble the religious system of the *Eastern churches* [1]. Granting all this to be true, it may nevertheless be justly questioned, whether the admission of certain doctrines in the *Greek church*, that resembled the errors of *Popery*, is to be dated from the period now before us; and

[1] Here, above all other histories, the reader will do well to consult *COWELL's Account of the Present State of the Greek Church*, Pref. p. 2. and also book i. ch. v. p. 136. as this author was actually at *Constantinople* when this scene of fraud and bribery was carried on, and was an eye-witness of the insidious arts and perfidious practices employed by the *Jesuits* to obtain from the *Greek priests* and monks testimonies in favour of the doctrine of the *Latin or Romish church*.

whoever examines this controversy with a spirit of impartiality, accompanied with a competent knowledge of the history of the religious doctrine of the Greek churches, will perhaps find, that a certain vague and obscure notion, similar to the Romish doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, has been received during many ages by several of these churches; though, in these latter times, they may have learnt, from the Romish missionaries, the Popish manner of expressing this monstrous and unaccountable tenet [1].

IV. Of those independent Greek churches, which are governed by their own laws, and are not subject to the jurisdiction of the patriarch of *Constantinople*, there is none but the church established in *Russia* that can furnish any matter for an ecclesiastical historian; the rest are sunk in the most deplorable ignorance and barbarity that can possibly be imagined. About the year 1666, a certain sect, which assumed the name of *Ishraniki*, i. e. *the Multitude of the Elect*, but were called by their adversaries, *Roskolsnika*, or the *seditionary Faction*, arose in *Russia*, and excited considerable tumults and commotions in that kingdom [m]. The reasons that this sect alleges in defence of its separation from the Russian church, are not as yet known with any degree of certainty; nor have we any satisfactory or accurate account of its doctrines and institutions [n]; we only know, in general,

The Russian church.

[1] The learned LA CROZE, who cannot be suspected of any propensity to favour the cause of *Rome* in general, or that of the Jesuits in particular, was of opinion, that the Greeks had been long in possession of the foolish doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. See GISEBERTI CUPERI *Epistol.* p. 37. 44. 48. 51. 65.

[m] These, perhaps, are the same persons of whom the learned GMELIN speaks, under the denomination of STEROVERZI, in the account of his *Voyage into Siberia*, tom. iv. p. 404.

[n] This sect is called by other authors the sect of the *Roskolniki*. According to the account of VOLTAIRE, who pretends

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

neral, that its members affect an extraordinary air of piety and devotion, and complain of the corruptions introduced into the ancient religion of the Russians, partly by the negligence, and partly by the ambition, of the Episcopal Order [o]. On the other hand, great pains were taken to conquer the obstinacy of this factious sect; arguments, promises, threatenings, dragoonings, the authority of synods and councils, seconded by racks and gibbets; in a word, all the methods

pretends to have drawn the materials of his *History of the Russian Empire under PETER I.*, from authentic records furnished by the court of *Peterburg*, this sect made its first appearance in the twelfth century. The members of it allege, in defence of their separation, the corruptions, both in doctrine and discipline, that have been introduced into the Russian Church. They profess a rigorous zeal for the *Letter of Holy Scripture*, which they do not understand; and the transposition of a single word in a new edition of the Russian Bible, though this transposition was made to correct an uncouth phrase in the translation commonly received, threw them into the greatest combustion and tumult. They will not allow a priest to administer baptism after having tasted spirituous liquor; and in this, perhaps, they do not amiss, since it is well known, that the Russian priests seldom touch the flask without drinking deep. They hold, that there is no subordination of rank, no superior or inferior, among the faithful; that a Christian may kill himself for the love of CHRIST; that *Hallelujah* must be but twice pronounced; and that it is a great sin to repeat it thrice; and that a priest must never give a blessing but with three fingers. They are regular, even to austerity, in their manners; but as they have always refused to admit Christians of other denominations into their religious assemblies, they have been suspected of committing in them various abominations, which ought not to be believed without the strongest and most demonstrative proof. They are accused, for example, of killing a child in these assemblies, and of drinking its blood, and of lascivious commerce in its most irregular forms.

[o] See BÉRGIVS, *De Statu Ecclesie Religionis Muscovitice*, sect. xii. cap. vii. p. 69. sect. ii. cap. xvi. p. 218.—*Append.* 270.—HARACCIVS's *Account of the Greek Church*, written in German, p. 30.—HAVEN's *Iter Russicum*.—Some doctors conjecture, that these *Ismniki*, or *Raskolniki*, are a branch descended from the ancient Bogomilians, of whom we have already given some account, cent. xii. part ii. chap. v. § ii.

that

that artifice or barbarity could suggest were practised to bring back these seditious heretics into the bosom of the church. But the effect of these violent measures by no means answered the expectations of the Russian government; they exasperated, instead of reclaiming, these schismatics, who retired into the woods and deserts, and, as it often happens, were rendered more fierce and desperate by the calamities and sufferings in which they were involved. From the time that PETER the Great ascended the throne of *Russia*, and made such remarkable changes in the form and administration both of its civil and ecclesiastical government, this faction has been treated with more humanity and mildness; but it is alleged, that these mild proceedings have by no means healed the schism; and that, on the contrary, the ROSKOLNIKI have gained strength, and are become still more obstinate since the period now mentioned.

C. E. N. T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

V. It will not be improper here to give some account of this reformation of the church of *Russia*, that was owing to the active zeal and wisdom of PETER I.; for though this interesting event belongs to the history of the following century, yet the scheme, by which it was brought about, was laid towards the conclusion of that now before us. This great prince made no change in the articles of faith received among the Russians, and which contain the doctrine of the Greek church. But he took the utmost pains to have this doctrine explained in a manner conformable to the dictates of right reason and the spirit of the Gospel; and he used the most effectual methods to destroy, on the one hand, the influence of that hideous superstition that sat brooding over the whole nation; and, on the other, to dispel the ignorance of the clergy, which was incredible, and that of the people, which would have surpassed it, had that

The change introduced into the Russian church by Peter I.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

been possible. These were great and arduous undertakings; and the reformation, to which they pointed, was such as seemed to require whole ages to accomplish and bring to any tolerable degree of perfection. To accelerate the execution of this glorious plan, PETER I. became a zealous protector and patron of arts and sciences. He encouraged, by various instances of munificence, men of learning and genius to settle in his dominions. He reformed the schools that were sunk in ignorance and barbarism, and erected new seminaries of learning. He endeavoured to excite in his subjects a desire of emerging from their ignorance and brutality, and a taste for knowledge and the useful arts. And, to crown all these noble attempts, he extinguished the infernal spirit of persecution; abolished the penal laws against those that differed merely in religious opinion from the established church; and granted to Christians of all denominations liberty of conscience, and the privilege of performing divine worship in the manner prescribed by their respective liturgies and institutions. This liberty, however, was modified in such a prudent manner, as to restrain and defeat any attempts that might be made by the Latins to promote the interests of Popery in *Russia*, or to extend the jurisdiction of the Roman pontif beyond the chapels of that communion that were tolerated by law. For though Roman Catholics were allowed places for the celebration of divine worship, yet the Jesuits were not permitted to exercise the functions of missionaries or public teachers in *Russia*; and a particular charge was given to the council, to which belonged the cognizance of ecclesiastical affairs, to use their utmost care and vigilance to prevent the propagation of Romish tenets among the people.

Besides

Besides all this, a notable change was now introduced into the manner of governing the church. The splendid dignity of patriarch, which approached too near the lustre and prerogatives of majesty, not to be offensive to the emperor and burthensome to the people, was suppressed, or rather assumed, by this spirited prince, who declared himself the supreme pontif and head of the Russian church [p]. The functions of this high and important office were intrusted with a council assembled at *Petersburg*, which was called the *Holy Synod*, and in which one of the *archbishops*, the most distinguished by his integrity and prudence, was appointed as president. This honourable office was filled by the famous STEPHEN JAVORSKI, who composed a laborious work, in the Russian language, against heresy [q]. The other orders of the clergy continued in their respective rank and offices; but both their revenues and their authority were considerably diminished. It was resolved at first, in this general reformation, to abolish all monasteries and convents, as prejudicial to the community, and unfriendly to population; but this resolution was not put in execu-

[p] This account is not perhaps entirely accurate. Dr. MOSHEIM seems to insinuate, that PETER assumed not only the authority, but also the office and title of patriarch or supreme pontif, and head of the church. This, however, was not the case; he retained the power without the title, as may be seen by the oath that every member of the synod he had established was obliged to take, when he was appointed to that office. It was in consequence of his authority, as emperor, that he claimed an absolute authority in the church, and not from any ghostly character or denomination. The oath now mentioned ran thus: *I swear and promise to be a faithful and obedient subject and servant to my true and natural sovereign, and to the august successors it shall please him to appoint, in consequence of the indisputable power he has to regulate the succession to the crown. I acknowledge him as the supreme judge of this spiritual college, &c.* See VOLTAIRE's *Histoire de l'Empire de Russie sous Pierre le Grand*, tom. i. p. 174.

[q] LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 1295.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

The state of
the Mono-
phy sites,

tion; on the contrary, the emperor himself erect-
ed a magnificent monastery in honour of ALEX-
ANDER NEWSKY, whom the Russians place in the
list of their heroes [r].

VI. A small body of the *Monophysites* in *Asia* abandoned, for some time, the doctrine and institutions of their ancestors, and embraced the communion of *Rome*. This step was entirely owing to the suggestions and intrigues of a person named ANDREW ACHIGIAN, who had been educated at *Rome*, where he imbibed the principles of Popery, and, having obtained the title and dignity of patriarch from the Roman pontif, assumed the denomination of IGNATIUS XXIV. [s]. After the death of this pretended patriarch, another usurper, whose name was PETER, aspired after the same dignity, and, taking the title of IGNATIUS XXV., placed himself in the patriarchal chair; but the lawful patriarch of the sect had credit enough with the Turks to procure the deposition and banishment of this pretender; and thus the small congregation which acknowledged his jurisdiction was entirely dispersed [t]. The African Monophysites, and more especially the *Copts*, notwithstanding that poverty and ignorance which exposed them to the seductions of sophistry

[r] Those who are acquainted with either the Danish or German languages, will find several interesting anecdotes relating to these changes in HAVEN's *Iter Russicum*.

[s] From the fifteenth century downwards, all the patriarchs of the *Monophysites* have taken the name of IGNATIUS, and that for no other reason than to shew that they are the lineal successors of IGNATIUS, who was bishop of *Antioch* in the first century, and of consequence the lawful patriarchs of *Antioch*. A like reason induces the religious chief of the Maronites, who also lays claim to the same dignity, to assume the name of PETER; for St. PETER is said to have governed the church of *Antioch* before IGNATIUS.

[t] JO. SIMON. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Orientalis, Clementine-Vaticana*. tom. ii. p. 482. and his *Dissert. de Monophysitis*, § iii. p. 6. 7.

and

and gain, stood firm in their principles, and made an obstinate resistance to the promises, presents, and attempts, employed by the papal missionaries to bring them under the Roman yoke.—With respect to the *Abyssinians*, we have mentioned already, in its proper place, the revolution by which they delivered themselves from that tyrannical yoke, and resumed the liberty they had so imprudently renounced. It is proper, however, to take notice here of the zeal discovered by the Lutherans, in their attempts to dispel the ignorance and superstition of this people, and to bring them to the knowledge of a purer religion, and a more rational worship. It was with this pious design that the learned HEYLING, of *Lubeck*, undertook a voyage into *Ethiopia* in the year 1634, where he resided many years, and acquired such a distinguished place in the favour and esteem of the emperor, that he was honoured with the high and important office of prime minister of that mighty empire. In this eminent station, he gave many instances of his zeal both for the interests of religion and the public good; after which he set out for *Europe*, but never arrived there, nor is it known in what manner, or by what accident, he ended his days [u].

Several years after this, ERNEST, Duke of *Saxe-Gotha*, surnamed the *Pious*, on account of his eminent sanctity and virtue, formed the resolution of making a new attempt to spread the knowledge of the Gospel, in its purity and simplicity, among the ignorant and superstitious *Abyssinians*. This design was formed by the counsels and suggestions of the famous LUDOLPH, and was to have been executed by the ministry of Abbot GREGORY, an

[u] A very curious life of HEYLING was published in German by Dr. MICHAELIS at *Hall*, in 1724.—See also MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. i. p. 253.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. H.
PART I.

Abyssinian, who had resided for some time in *Europe* [w]. The unhappy fate of this missionary, who perished in a shipwreck in the year 1657, did not totally discourage the prince from pursuing his purpose; for, in the year 1663, he entrusted the same pious and important commission with JOHN MICHAEL WANSLEB, a native of *Erfurt*, to whom he gave the wisest orders, and whom he charged particularly to leave no means unemployed that might contribute to give the Abyssinian nation a favourable opinion of the Germans, as it was upon this basis alone that the success of the present enterprize could be built. WANSLEB, however, whose virtue was by no means equal to his abilities, instead of continuing his journey to *Abyssinia*, remained several years in *Egypt*. On his return from thence into *Europe*, he began to entertain uneasy apprehensions of the account that would naturally be demanded both of his conduct, and of the manner in which he had employed the sums of money he received for his Abyssinian expedition. These apprehensions rendered him desperate, because they were attended with a consciousness of guilt. Hence, instead of returning into *Germany*, he went directly to *Rome*, where, in the year 1667, he embraced, at least in outward profession, the doctrine of that church, and entered into the Dominican Order [x]. Thus the pious designs of the best of princes failed in the execution. To them, however, we are indebted for the great light that has been thrown by the learned and laborious LUDOLPH on the history,

[w] See LUDOLPHI *Proœmium ad Comm. in Hist. Æthiop.* p. 31.—JUNCKERI *Vita JOBI LUDOLPHI*, p. 68.

[x] For an account of this inconstant and worthless, but learned man, see LOBO, *Voyage d'Abyss.* tom. i. p. 198. 227. 233. 248.—CYPRIAN. *Catalog. MSS. Biblioth. Gotobæ,* p. 64. EUS. RENAUDOT, *Pres. ad Histor. Patriarch. Alexand.* ECHARD and QUÉTIF, *Scriptor. Ordin. Predic.* tom. ii. p. 693. See the same authors, *Historia Ecclesiæ Alexandrinæ.*

doctrine.

doctrine, literature, and manners, of the Abyssinians, which, before this period, were but very superficially known in *Europe*.

C E N T
XVII.
S E C T. II
P A R T. I.

The state of
the Armen-
ians.

VII. The state of the Christians in *Armenia* underwent a considerable change soon after the commencement of this century, in consequence of the incursions of *ABBAS the Great*, King of *Persia*, into that province. This prince laid waste all that part of *Armenia* that lay contiguous to his dominions, and ordered the inhabitants to retire into *Persia*. These devastations were designed to prevent the Turks from approaching to his frontier; for the Eastern monarchs, instead of erecting fortified towns on the borders of their respective kingdoms, as is done by the European princes, laid waste their borders upon the approach of the enemy, that, by thus cutting off the means of their subsistence, their progress might be either entirely stopped, or considerably retarded. In this general emigration, the more opulent and better sort of the Armenians removed to *Ispahan*, the capital of *Persia*, where the generous monarch granted them a beautiful suburb for their residence, with the free exercise of their religion, under the jurisdiction of a bishop or patriarch. Under the reign of this magnanimous prince, who cherished his people with a paternal tenderness, these happy exiles enjoyed the sweets of liberty and abundance; but after his death the scene changed, and they were involved in calamities of various kinds [y]. The storm of persecution that arose upon them shook their constancy; many of them apostatised to the Mahometan religion, so that it was justly to be feared that this branch of the Armenian church would gradually perish. On the other hand, the state of religion

[y] See CHARDIN, *Voyages en Perse*, tom. ii. p. 106.—GABRIEL DU CHINON, *Nouvelles Relations du Levant*, p. 206.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

in that church derived considerable advantages from the settlement of a prodigious number of Armenians in different parts of *Europe* for the purposes of commerce. These merchants, who had fixed their residence, during this century, at *London*, *Amsterdam*, *Marseilles*, and *Venice* [z], were not unmindful of the interests of religion in their native country. And their situation furnished them with favourable opportunities of exerting their zeal in this good cause, and particularly of supplying their Asiatic brethren with Armenian translations of the Holy Scriptures, and of other theological books, from the European presses, especially from those of *England* and *Holland*. These pious and instructive productions being dispersed among the Armenians, who lived under the Persian and Turkish governments, contributed, no doubt, to preserve that illiterate and superstitious people from falling into the most consummate and deplorable ignorance.

The state of
the Nesto-
rians.

VIII. The divisions that reigned among the Nestorians in the preceding century still subsisted; and all the methods that had been employed to heal them proved hitherto ineffectual. Some of the Nestorian bishops discovered a propensity to accommodate matters with the church of *Rome*. ELIAS II., bishop of *Mosul*, sent two private embassies to the Pope, in the year 1607 and 1610, to solicit his friendship; and, in the letter he addressed upon that occasion to PAUL IV., declared

[z] For an account of the Armenians who settled at *Marseilles*, and of the books they took care to have printed in that city for the use of their brethren in foreign parts, see RICH. SIMON's *Lettres Choiesies*, tom. ii. p. 137.—The same author (tom. iv. p. 160.), and the learned JOHN JOACHIM SCHRODER, in a *Dissertation* prefixed to his *Thesaurus Lingua Armenica*, give an account of the Armenian Bible that was printed in *Holland*. The latter also takes notice of the other Armenian books that were published at *Venice*, *Lyons*, and *Amsterdam*, *loc. cit.* cap. ii. § xxv. p. 38.

his desire to bring about a reconciliation between the Nestorians and the Latin church [a]. ELIAS III., though at first extremely averse to the doctrine and institution of that church, changed his sentiments in this respect; and, in the year 1657, addressed a letter to the congregation *De propagandâ Fide*, in which he intimated his readiness to join with the church of *Rome*, on condition that the Pope would allow the Nestorians a place of public worship in that city, and would abstain from all attempts to alter the doctrine or discipline of that sect [b]. The Romish doctors could not but perceive that a reconciliation, founded on such conditions as these, would be attended with no advantage to their church, and promised nothing that could flatter the ambition of their pontif. And accordingly we do not find that the proposal above mentioned was accepted. It does not appear that the Nestorians were received, at this time, into the communion of the Romish Church, or that the bishops of *Mosul* were, after this period, at all solicitous about the friendship or good-will of the Roman pontif. The Nestorian bishops of *Ormus*, who successively assume the name of SIMEON, proposed also, more than once [c], plans of reconciliation with the church of *Rome*; and, with that view, sent the Roman pontif a confession of their faith, that gave a clear idea of their religious tenets and institutions. But these proposals were little attended to by the court of *Rome*, which was either owing to its dislike of the doctrine of these Nestorians [d], or to that contempt which their poverty and want of influence

[a] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 543. tom. ii. p. 457. tom. iii. p. i. p. 650.

[b] ASSEMANNI *loc. cit.* tom. iii. p. 2.

[c] In the years 1619 and 1653.

[d] ASSEMANNI *loc. cit.* tom. i. p. 531. tom. ii. p. 457. tom. iii. p. i. p. 622.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART I.

excited in the pontiffs, whose ambition and avidity aimed at acquisitions of more consequence; for it is well known, that, since the year 1617, the bishops of *Ormuz* have been in a low and declining state, both in point of opulence and credit, and are no longer in a condition to excite the envy of their brethren at *Mosul* [e]. The Romish missionaries gained over, nevertheless, to their communion, a handful of Nestorians, whom they formed into a congregation or church, about the middle of this century. The bishops or patriarchs of this little flock reside in the city of *Amida*, or *Diarbeker*, and all assume the denomination of JOSEPH [f]. The Nestorians, who inhabit the coasts of *Malabar*, and are called the Christians of St. THOMAS, suffered innumerable vexations, and the most grievous persecution, from the Romish priests, and more especially the Jesuits, while these settlements were in the hands of the Portuguese; but neither artifice nor violence could engage them to embrace the communion of *Rome* [g]. But when *Cochin* was taken by the Dutch, in the year 1663, and the Portuguese were driven out of these quarters, the persecuted Nestorians resumed their primitive liberty, and were reinstated in the privilege of serving God without molestation, according to their consciences. These blessings they still continue to enjoy; nor are such of them as entered into the communion of *Rome* disturbed by the Dutch, who are used to treat with toleration and indulgence all sects who live peaceably with those who differ from them in religious opinions and ceremonies.

[e] PET. STROZZA, *Pref. ad librum de Chaldaeorum dogmatibus*.

[f] See LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. ii. p. 1078.

[g] LE CROZE *Histoire du Christianisme des Indes*, livr. v. p. 344.

[h] SCHOUTEN *Voyage aux Indes Orient.* tom. i. p. 319.

SECTION II.

PART II.

The HISTORY of the MODERN CHURCHES.

CHAP. I.

The HISTORY of the LUTHERAN CHURCH.

I. **W**E have already seen [a] the calamities and vexations the Lutheran church suffered from the persecuting spirit of the Roman pontiffs, and the intemperate zeal of the house of *Austria*, which, on many occasions, shewed too great a propensity to second their ambitious and despotic measures; we shall therefore, at present, confine our view to the losses it sustained from other quarters. The cause of Lutheranism suffered considerably by the desertion of MAURICE, Landgrave of *Hesse*, a prince of uncommon genius and learning, who not only embraced the doctrine and discipline of the *Reformed* church [b], but also, in the year 1604, removed the Lutheran professors from their places in the University of *Marpurg*, and the doctors of that communion from the churches they had in his dominions. MAURICE, after taking this vigorous step, on account of the obstinacy with which the Lutheran clergy opposed

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

The Lutheran church
lost its ground
in some
places.—The
Hussians
embrace
Calvinism.

[a] In the *History of the Romish Church*.—See above.

[b] The reader must always remember, that the writers of the continent generally use the denomination of *Reformed* in a limited sense, to distinguish the church of *England* and the Calvinistical churches from those of the Lutheran persuasion.

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

his design, took particular care to have his subjects instructed in the doctrine of the Helvetic church, and introduced into the Hessian churches the form of public worship that was observed at Geneva. This plan was not executed without some difficulty; but it acquired a complete degree of stability and consistence in the year 1619, when deputies were sent by this prince to the synod of *Dort*, in *Holland*, with express orders to consent, in the name of the Hessian churches, to all the acts that should be passed in that assembly. The doctors of the Reformed church, who lived at this period, defended strenuously the measures followed by MAURICE, and maintained, that in all these transactions he observed the strictest principles of equity, and discovered an uncommon spirit of moderation. Perhaps the doctors of modern days may view this matter in a different point of light. They will acknowledge, perhaps, without hesitation, that if this illustrious prince had been more influenced by the sentiments of the wisest of the Reformed doctors, concerning the conduct we ought to observe towards those who differ from us in religious matters, and less by his own will and humour, he would have ordered many things otherwise than he actually did [c].

The new reformation takes place in *Brandenburg*.

II. The example of the Landgrave of *Hesse* was followed, in the year 1614, by JOHN SIGISMUND,

[c] The reader will find a more ample account of this matter in the controversial writings of the divines of *Cassel* and *Dernstadt*, published at *Cassel*, *Marpurg*, and *Gießen*, in the years 1632, 1636, 1647; and of which SALIG speaks largely in his *Hist. Aug. Confess.* tom. i. lib. iv. cap. ii. p. 756. Those who understand the German language, may also consult GARTH's *Historischer Bericht von dem Religions Wesen in Furthenthum Hessen*, 1706, in 4to.—CYPRIAN's *Unterricht von Kirchlicher Vereinigung der Protestanten*, p. 263. & *Appendix*, p. 101.—As also the *Act* published in the *Unschuldigen Nachrichten*, A. 1749. p. 25.

elector.

elector of *Brandenburg*, who also renounced Lutheranism, and embraced the communion of the *Reformed* churches, though with certain restrictions, and without employing any acts of mere authority to engage his subjects in the same measure. For it is observable, that this prince did not adopt all the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism. He introduced, indeed, into his dominions the form of public worship that was established at *Geneva*, and he embraced the sentiments of the *Reformed* churches concerning the *Person* of CHRIST, and the manner in which *he is present* in the eucharist, as they appeared to him much more conformable to reason and scripture than the doctrine of the Lutherans relating to these points. But, on the other hand, he refused to admit the Calvinistical doctrine of *Divine Grace*, and *Absolute Decrees*; and, on this account, neither sent deputies to the synod of *Dort*, nor adopted the decisions of that famous assembly on these intricate subjects. This way of thinking was so exactly followed by the successors of SIGISMUND, that they never would allow the opinion of CALVIN, concerning the *Divine Decrees*, to be considered as the public and received doctrine of the *Reformed* churches in their dominions. It must be particularly mentioned, to the honour of this wise prince, that he granted to his subjects an entire liberty in religious matters, and left it to their unrestrained and free choice, whether they would remain in the profession of Lutheranism, or follow the example of their sovereign; nor did he exclude from civil honours and employments, or from the usual marks of his protection and favour, those who continued in the faith of their ancestors. This lenity and moderation, which seemed so adapted to prevent jealousy and envy, and to satisfy both parties, did not however produce this natural and salutary effect; nor were they sufficient

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

cient to restrain within the bounds of decency and charity several warm and inconsiderate votaries of Lutheranism. These over-zealous persons, who breathed the violent spirit of an age in which matters of consequence were usually carried on with vehemence and rigour, looked upon it as intolerable and highly provoking,—that the Lutherans and Calvinists should enjoy the same honours and prerogatives,—that all injurious terms and odious comparisons should be banished from religious debates—that the controverted points in theology should either be entirely omitted in the sermons and public discourses of the clergy, or explained with a spirit of modesty and Christian charity,—that certain rites which displeased the Calvinists should be totally abolished,—and that they who differed in opinions, should be obliged to live in peace, concord, and the mutual exchange of good offices. If it was unreasonable in them to be offended at injunctions of this nature, it was still more so to discover their indignation, in a manner that excited not only sharp and uncharitable debates, but also civil commotions and violent tumults, that disturbed considerably the tranquillity of the state, and nourished a spirit of sedition and revolt, which the labour of years was employed to extinguish in vain. In this troubled state of things, the divines of *Saxony*, and more especially those of *Wittenberg*, undertook to defend the Lutheran cause; but if it be acknowledged, on the one hand, that their views were good, and their intentions upright; it must be owned, on the other, that their style was keen even to a degree of licentiousness, and their zeal warm beyond all measure. And indeed, as it generally happens, their want of moderation hurt, instead of promoting, the cause in which they had embarked; for it was in consequence of their violent proceedings, that the *Form of Concord* was suppressed

pressed in the territories of *Brandenburg*, and the subjects of that electorate prohibited, by a solemn edict, from studying divinity in the academy of *Wittenberg* [d].

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

III. It was deplorable to see two churches, which had discovered an equal degree of pious zeal and fortitude in throwing off the despotic yoke of *Rome*, divided among themselves, and living in discords that were highly detrimental to the interests of religion, and the well-being of society. Hence several eminent divines and leading men, both among the Lutherans and Calvinists, sought anxiously after some method of uniting the two churches, though divided in their opinions, in the bonds of Christian charity and ecclesiastical communion. A competent knowledge of human nature and human passions was sufficient to persuade these wise and pacific mediators, that a perfect uniformity in religious opi-

Attempts made towards a union between the Lutheran and Reformed churches.

[d] The edicts of SIGISMUND and his successors, relating to this change in the state of religion in *Brandenburg*, have been several times republished in one collection. Besides these there are many books, treatises, and pamphlets, which give an account of this remarkable transaction, and of which the reader will find a complete list in the German work entitled, *Unschuldigen Nachrichten*, An. 1745, p. 34. A. 1746, p. 326. compared with JO. CAROL. KOCHER *Bibliotheca Theologiae Symbolica*, p. 312.—The reader who desires to attain to a perfect acquaintance with this controversy, and to be able to weigh the merits of the cause, by having a true state of the case before him, will do well to consult ARNOLDI *Histor. Eccles. et Heret.* p. ii. lib. xvii. c. vii. p. 965.—CYPRIAN'S *Unterricht von der Vereinigung der Protestanten*, p. 75. and in *Append. Monum.* p. 225.—*Unschuldigen Nachrichten*, A. 1729, p. 1067, et A. 1732, p. 715.—They who affirm that the elector's ultimate end, in changing the face of religion in his dominions, was not the prospect of augmenting and extending his authority, found their opinion rather on conjecture than on demonstration; nor do they confirm this assertion by testimonies that are sufficient to bring full conviction. It must, however, be acknowledged, on the other hand, that their conjectures have neither an absurd nor an improbable aspect.

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

nions was not practicable, and that it would be entirely extravagant to imagine that any of these communities could ever be brought to embrace univervally, and without limitation, the doctrines of the other. They made it, therefore, their principal business to persuade those, whose spirits were inflamed with the heat of controversy,—that the points in debate between the two churches were not essential to true religion;—that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity were received and professed in both communions;—and that the difference of opinion between the contending parties, turned either upon points of an abstruse and incomprehensible nature, or upon matters of indifference, which neither tended to render mankind wiser nor better, and in which the interests of genuine piety were in no wise concerned. Those who viewed things in this point of light, were obliged to acknowledge, that the diversity of opinions between the two churches was by no means a sufficient reason for their separation; and that of consequence they were called, by the dictates of that Gospel which they both professed, to live not only in the mutual exercise of Christian charity, but also to enter into the fraternal bonds of church communion. The greatest part of the *Reformed* doctors seemed disposed to acknowledge, that the errors of the Lutherans were not of a momentous nature, nor of a pernicious tendency; and that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity had not undergone any remarkable alteration in that communion; and thus on their side an important step was made towards peace and union between the two churches. But the greatest part of the Lutheran doctors declared, that they could not form a like judgment with respect to the doctrine of the *Reformed* churches; they maintained tenaciously the importance of the points which divided the two communions, and affirmed, that

a con-

a considerable part of the controversy turned upon the fundamental principles of all religion and virtue. It is not at all surprizing, that this steadiness and constancy of the Lutherans was branded by the opposite party with the epithets of morose obstinacy, supercilious arrogance, and such like odious denominations. The Lutherans were not behind-hand with their adversaries in acrimony of style; they recriminated with vehemence, and charged their accusers with instances of misconduct, different in kind, but equally condemnable. They reproached them with having dealt disingenuously, by disguising, under ambiguous expressions, the real doctrine of the Reformed churches; they observed further, that their adversaries, notwithstanding their consummate prudence and circumspection, gave plain proofs, on many occasions, that their propensity to a reconciliation between the two churches arose from views of private interest, rather than from a zeal for the public good.

IV. Among the public transactions relative to the project of a union between the *Reformed* and *Lutheran* churches, we must not omit mentioning the attempt made by JAMES I., king of *Great Britain*, to accomplish this salutary purpose, in the year 1615. The person employed for this end by the British monarch, was PETER DU MOULIN, the most eminent among the Protestant doctors in *France* [e]; but this design was neither carried on with spirit, nor attended with success [f].

Declaration
of the synod
of Charenton.

[e] See LA VASSOR, *Hist. de Louis XIII.* tom. ii. p. ii. p. 21.

[f] King James, who would have abandoned the most important and noble design, at any time, to discuss a point of grammar or theology, or to gain a point of interest for himself or his minions, neglected this union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, which he had begun to promote with such an appearance of piety and zeal.

CEN T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

Another attempt of the same pacific nature was made in the year 1631, in the synod of *Charenton*, in which an act was passed by the Reformed doctors of that respectable assembly, declaring the Lutheran system of religion conformable with the spirit of true piety, and free from pernicious and fundamental errors. By this act, a fair opportunity was offered to the Lutherans of joining with the Reformed church upon honourable terms, and of entering into the bonds both of civil and religious communion with their Calvinistical brethren [g]. But this candid and charitable proceeding was attended with very little fruit, since few of the Lutherans were disposed to embrace the occasion that was here so freely offered them, of terminating the dissensions that separated the two churches. The same year a conference was held at *Leipsic* between the Saxon doctors, HOE, LYSER, and HOPFNER, on the one side, and some of the most eminent divines of *Hesse-Cassel* and *Brandenburg*, on the other; to the end that, by exposing with fidelity and precision their respective doctrines, it might be more easily seen, what the real obstacles were that stood in the way of the union projected between the two churches. This conference was conducted with decency and moderation, and the deliberations were neither disturbed by intemperate zeal, nor by a proud spirit of contention and dispute; but that openness of heart, that mutual trust and confidence, which are so essential to the success of all kinds of pacification, were wanting here. For though the doctors of the Reformed party exposed, with the utmost precision and fairness, the tenets of their church, and made, moreover, many concessions, which the Lutherans

[g] BENOIT, *Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes*, tom. ii. p. 544.—*AYMON*, *Attes des Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformees, de France*, tom. ii. p. 500.—ITTIGH *Dissert. de Synodi Carentonensis indulgentia erga Lutheranos*, Lips. 1705, 4to.

themselves could scarcely expect; yet the latter, suspicious and fearful, and always apprehensive of schemes, formed by artifice under the mask of candour, to betray and ensnare them, did not dare to acknowledge, that they were satisfied with these explications and offers; and thus the conference broke up without having contributed in any respect to promote the salutary work of peace [b]. To form a true idea of these pacific deliberations, of the reasons that gave rise to them, and of the principles by which they were conducted, it will be necessary to study the civil history of this interesting period with attention and care.

CEN T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

V. ULADISLAUS IV., king of *Poland*, formed a still more extensive plan of religious union than those hitherto mentioned; he proposed a reconciliation not only between the Reformed and Lutheran churches, but also between these two communions and that of *Rome*. For this purpose, he ordered a conference to be held at *Thorn*, in the year 1645, the issue of which, as might naturally have been expected, was far from being favourable to the projected union; for the persons employed by the three churches to heal their divisions, or at least to calm their animosities, returned from this conference with a greater measure of party-zeal, and a smaller portion of Christian charity, than they had brought to it.

The conferences at
Thorn and
Cassel.

The conference held at *Cassel* in the year 1661, by the order of WILLIAM VI., Landgrave of *Hesse*, between MUSÆUS and HENICHIUS, professors at *Rintelen*, on the side of the Lutherans, and

[b] TIMANNI GASSELLI *Historia Sacra et Ecclesiastica*, p. ii. in *addendis*, p. 597—613. in which the *Acts* of this conference are published.—JO. WOLFG. JAEGERI *Historia Seculi xvii.* Decenn. iv. p. 497. ⤴ This testimony of Dr. MOSHEIM, who was himself a Lutheran, is singularly honourable to the Reformed doctors.

C E N T. CURTIUS and HEINSIUS, of the university of Mar-
 XVII.
 S E C T. II. *purg*, on that of the Reformed, was attended with
 P A R T II. much more success; and, if it did not bring
 about a perfect uniformity of opinion, it produce
 what was much better, a spirit of Christian charity and forbearance. For these candid doctors, after having diligently examined the nature, and weighed the importance, of the controversies that divided the two churches, embraced each other with reciprocal marks of affection and esteem, and mutually declared that their respective doctrines were less different from each other than was generally imagined; and that this difference was not of sufficient moment to prevent their fraternal union and concord. But it happened unluckily, that these moderate doctors of *Rintelen* could not infuse the same spirit of peace and charity that animated *them*, into their Lutheran brethren, nor persuade them to view the difference of opinion, that divided the Protestant churches, in the same indulgent point of light in which they had considered them in the conference at *Cassel*. On the contrary, this their moderation drew upon them the hatred of almost all the Lutherans; and they were loaded with bitter reproaches in a multitude of pamphlets [i], that were composed expressly to refute their sentiments, and to censure their conduct. The pains that were taken after

[i] The writers who have given accounts of the conferences of *Thorn* and *Cassel*, are enumerated by SAGITTARIUS, in his *Introd. ad Hist. Ecclesiast.* tom. ii. p. 1604.—See also JÆGERI *Historia Sæculi xvii. Decenn. v.* p. 689. and *Decenn. vii.* p. 160. where the *Acts* of the conferences of *Cassel* and *Thorn* are extant.—Add to these, JOSEPHUS. TURRETINI *Nubes Testium pro moderato in rebus Theologicis judicio*, p. 178.—There is an ample account of the conference of *Cassel* in the *Life of MUSEUS* given by MOLLERUS in his *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 566. The reader will find in the same work, an accurate *Index* of the *Accounts* of this conference published on both sides.

this period by the princes of the house of *Brandenburg*, and more especially by *FREDERIC WILLIAM* and his son *FREDERIC*, in order to compose the dissensions and animosity that divide the Protestants, and particularly to promote a fraternal union between the Reformed and Lutheran churches in the Prussian territories, and in the rest of their dominions, are well known : and it is also equally notorious, that innumerable difficulties were formed against the execution of this salutary design.

VI. Besides these public conferences, held by the authority of princes, in order to promote union and concord among Protestants, a multitude of individuals, animated by a spirit of true Christian charity, embarked in this pious cause on their own private authority, and offered their mediation and good offices to reconcile the two churches. It is true, indeed, that these peace-makers were, generally speaking, of the Reformed church ; and that those among the Lutherans, who appeared in this amiable character, were but few, in comparison with the great number of Calvinists that favoured this benevolent but arduous design. The most eminent of the Calvinistical peace-makers was *JOHN DUREUS*, a native of *Scotland*, and a man justly celebrated on account of his universal benevolence, solid piety, and extensive learning ; but, at the same time, more remarkable for genius and memory, than for nicety of discernment and accuracy of judgment, as might be evinced by several proofs and testimonies, were this the proper place for discussions of that nature. Be that as it will, never, perhaps, was there such an example of zeal and perseverance as that exhibited by *DUREUS*, who, during the space of forty years [A], suffered vexations,

The pacific exploits of *John Dureus*.

[A] From the year 1631 to 1674.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

and underwent labours, which required the firmest resolution, and the most inexhaustible patience; wrote, exhorted, admonished, intreated, and disputed; in a word, tried every method that human wisdom could suggest, to put an end to the dissensions and animosities that reigned among the Protestant churches. For it was not merely by the persuasive eloquence of his pen, or by forming plans in the silence of the closet, that this worthy divine performed the task which his benevolence and zeal engaged him to undertake; his activity and industry were equal to his zeal; he travelled through all the countries in *Europe* where the Protestant religion had obtained any footing; he formed connexions with the doctors of both parties; he addressed himself to kings, princes, magistrates, and ministers; and by representing, in lively and striking colours, the utility and importance of the plan he had formed, hoped to engage them more or less in this good cause, or at least to derive some succour from their influence and protection. But here his views were considerably disappointed; for though his undertaking was generally applauded; and though he met with a favourable and civil reception from the greatest part of those to whom he addressed himself, yet he found very few who were seriously disposed to alleviate his labours, by lending him their assistance, and seconding his attempts by their influence and counsels. Nay some, suspecting that the fervent and extraordinary zeal of DUREUS arose from mysterious and sinister motives, and apprehending that he had secretly formed a design of drawing the Lutherans into a snare, attacked him in their writings with animosity and bitterness, and loaded him with the sharpest invectives and reproaches. So that this well-meaning man, neglected at length by those of his own communion, opposed and rejected by the
followers

followers of LUTHER, involved in various perplexities and distress, exhausted by unsuccessful labour, and oppressed and dejected by injurious treatment, perceived, by a painful experience, that he had undertaken a task which was beyond the power of a private person, and spent the remainder of his days in repose and obscurity at *Cassel* [1].

It may not be improper to observe here, that DUREUS, who, notwithstanding the uprightness of his intentions in general, was sometimes deficient in frankness and ingenuity, had annexed to his plan of reconciliation certain doctrines which, were they susceptible of proof, would serve as a foundation for the union not only of the Lutherans and Calvinists, but also of all the different sects that bear the Christian name. For, among other things, he maintained, that the *Apostles*

[1] See COLERI *Historia* JOH. DURÆI, published in 4to at *Wittenberg* in 1716, to which, however, many important additions might be made from public records, and also from documents that have not as yet seen the light. Some records and documents, of the kind here referred to, have been published by HASÆUS, in his *Bibliotheca Bremens. Theologico-Pbiologica*, tom. i. p. 911. and tom. iv. p. 683. A still greater number are given by GESSELIUS, in the *Addenda Irenica*, that are subjoined to his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, tom. ii. p. 614. The transactions of DURÆUS at *Marpurg* are mentioned by SCHENK, in his *Vite Professorum Theologie Marburg*, p. 202.—His attempts in *Holstein* may be learned from the letters of LACKMAN and LOSSIUS, which are joined together in the same volume. His exploits in *Prussia* and *Poland* are recorded by JABLONSKY, in his *Historia Consensus Sandomiriensis*, p. 127. and his labours in *Denmark*, the *Palatinate*, and *Switzerland*, are mentioned respectively by ELSWICH, in his *Fasciculus Epistol. Theolog.* p. 147.—SEELÉN'S *Delicie Epistol.* p. 353. and in the *Museum Helvet.* tom. iii. iv. v.—See also JÆGERI *Historia Seculi xvii. Decenn.* vii. p. 171.—BOHMIUS, *Englische Reformations Historie*, and more especially an account of DURÆUS, published under my direction at *Helmstadt*, in the year 1744, by BENZELIUS, and entitled, *Dissertatio de JOHAN. DURÆO, maxime de Abusu ejus Suecanis*. This Dissertation contains a variety of anecdotes drawn from records not yet made public.

C E N T. XVII. *Creed* was a complete body of divinity; the *Ten*
 S E C T. II. *Commandments* a perfect system of morals; and the
 P A R T II. *Lord's Prayer* a comprehensive series of petitions
 for all the blessings contained in the divine promises. Now if this notion, that these sacred compositions contain all that is essential to faith, obedience, and devotion, had been universally entertained, or evidently demonstrated, it would not have been a chimerical project to aim at a reconciliation of all Christian churches upon this basis, and to render these compositions the foundation of their coalition and the bond of their union. But it would have been highly chimerical to expect, that the Christian sects would universally adopt this notion, or be pleased to see the doctrines of Christianity reduced to such general principles. It is further to be observed, with respect to DUREUS, that he shewed a peculiar propensity towards the sentiments of the *Mystics* and *Quakers*, on account of their tendency to favour his conciliatory and pacific project. Like them he placed the essence of religion in the *ascent* of the soul to God, in calling forth the *hidden word*, in fanning the *divine spark* that resides in the recesses of the human mind, and, in consequence of this system, was intimately persuaded, that differences merely in theological opinions did not at all concern the essence of true piety.

Matthiæ
and Calixtus.

VII. Those among the Lutherans that appeared the most zealous in this pacific cause, were JOHN MATTHIÆ [m], bishop of *Strängnes* in *Sweden*, and GEORGE CALIXTUS, professor of divinity at *Helmstadt*, whom DUREUS had animated with a

† [m] MATTHIÆ had been chaplain to GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS, and was afterwards appointed, by that prince, preceptor to his daughter CHRISTINA, so famous in history, on account of the whimsical peculiarities of her character, her taste for learning, and her desertion of the Swedish throne and the Protestant religion.

portion

portion of his charitable and indulgent spirit. The former was a man of capacity and merit, the latter was eminently distinguished among the doctors of this century, by his learning, genius, probity, and candour; but they both failed in the arduous undertaking in which they had engaged, and suffered considerably in their attempts to promote the cause of unity and concord. The *Olive-branches* [n] of MATTHIÆ, who entitled thus his pacific productions, were, by a royal edict, publicly condemned and suppressed in Sweden; and their author, in order to appease the fury of his enemies, was obliged to resign his bishopric, and pass the rest of his days in retirement [o]. The zeal of CALIXTUS, in calming the tumultuous and violent spirit of the contending parties, drew upon him the bitterest reproaches, and the warmest animosity and resentment from those who were more bent on maintaining their peculiar opinions, than in promoting that charity which is the end of the commandment; and while he was labouring to remove all sects and divisions, he appeared to many of his brethren in the light of a new sectary, who was founding the most pernicious of all sects, even that of the *Syncretists*, who were supposed to promote peace and concord at the expence of truth. We shall, before we finish this chapter, endeavour to give a more particular and circumstantial account of the sentiments and trials of this great man, to whose charge many other things were laid, besides the *crime* of endeavouring to unite the disciples of the same master in the amiable bonds of charity, concord, and mutual forbearance; and whose opinions and designs excited warm contests in the Lutheran church.

[n] *Rami Olive Septentrionalis.*

[o] See SCHEFFERI *Succia Litterata*, p. 123. and JOH. MOLLER ad eam *Hypomnemata*, p. 317.—ARKENHOLTZ, *Memoires de la Reine CHRISTINE*, tom. i. p. 320. 505. tom. ii. p. 63.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

The prosperous
events that
happened
to the Lutheran
church.

VIII. The external state of the Lutheran church at this period was attended with various circumstances of prosperity, among which we may reckon its standing firm against the assaults of *Rome*, whose artifice and violence were in vain employed to bring on its destruction. It is well known, that a very considerable number of Lutherans resided in those provinces where the public exercise of their religion was prohibited. It has more especially been shewn by the late memorable emigration of the *Saltzburgers* [p], that still greater numbers of them lay concealed in that land of despotism and bigotry, where the smallest dissent from popery, with whatever secrecy and circumspection it may be disguised, is considered as an enormous and capital crime; and that they preserved their religious sentiments and doctrines pure and uncorrupted amidst the contagion of Romish superstition, which they always beheld with aversion and horror. In those countries which are inhabited by persons of different communions, and whose sovereigns are members of the Romish church, we have numberless instances of the cruelty and injustice practised by the papists against those that dissent from them; and these cruelties are exercised under a pretext suggested by the most malevolent bigotry, which represents these dissenters as seditious subjects, and consequently as worthy of the most rigorous treatment. And yet it is certain, that, amidst all these vexations, the Lutheran church has stood its ground; nor has either the craft or fury of its

[p] For an account of the persecuted Lutherans in the archbishopric of *Saltzburg*, see *BURNET's Travels*. See more especially a famous Latin discourse, published at *Tubingen*, in the year 1732, under the following title: *Commentariolus Theologicus de non tolerandis in Religione Dissidentibus, quam Præfide CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFIO defendet WOLF. LUD. LETSCHING.*

enemies

enemies been able, any where, to deprive it entirely of its rights and privileges. It may further be observed, that the doctrine of LUTHER was carried into *Asia*, *Africa*, and *America*, by several persons who fixed their habitations in those distant regions, and was also introduced into some parts of *Europe*, where it had hitherto been unknown.

IX. When we turn our view to the internal state of the Lutheran church during this century, we shall find it improved in various respects; though several blemishes yet remained that clouded its lustre. It must be acknowledged, to the honour of the Lutherans, that they cultivated all the various branches of literature, both sacred and profane, with uncommon industry and success, and made several improvements in the sciences, which are too well known to stand in need of a particular mention; and of which a circumstantial enumeration would be inconsistent with the brevity we propose to observe in this history. But if it cannot be denied, on the one hand, that the cause of religion gained by these improvements in learning, it must be owned, on the other, that some branches of science were perverted by injudicious or ill-designing men, to corrupt the pure simplicity of genuine Christianity, and to render its doctrines abstruse and intricate. Thus it too often happens in life, that the best things are the most egregiously abused.

About the commencement of this century, the sciences chiefly cultivated in the schools were logic and metaphysics; though the manner of treating them was almost entirely destitute of elegance, simplicity, and precision. But, in process of time, the scene changed in the seminaries of learning; and the more entertaining and agreeable branches of literature, that polish wit, excite taste, exercise judgment, and enrich memory, such as civil and natural history, philology, antiquities, criticism,

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

The progress of learning among the Lutherans.

C E N T. cism, and eloquence, gained the ascendant. Both
 XVII. these kinds of knowledge acquired also a more
 S E C T. II. graceful, consistent, and regular form than that
 PART II. under which they had hitherto appeared. But it
 happened most unluckily, that while the boundaries of science were extended from day to day, and new discoveries and improvements were constantly enriching the republic of letters, the credit of learning began sensibly to decrease, and learned men seemed gradually to lose those peculiar marks of veneration and distinction that the novelty of their character, as well as the excellence and importance of their labours, had hitherto drawn from the public. Among the various circumstances that contributed to this decline of literary glory, we may particularly reckon the multitude of those who, without natural capacity, taste, or inclination, were led, by authority or a desire of applause, to literary pursuits; and by their ignorance or their pedantry, cast a reproach upon the republic of letters.

The state of
 philosophy.

The Aristoteli-
 ans triumph.

X. The only kind of philosophy that was taught in the Lutheran schools, during the greatest part of this century, was that of ARISTOTLE, dressed up in that scholastic form that increased its native intricacy and subtilty. And such was the devout and excessive veneration entertained by many for this abstruse system, that any attempt to reject the Grecian oracle, or to correct its decisions, was looked upon as of the most dangerous consequence to the interests of the church, and as equally criminal with a like attempt upon the sacred writings. Those who distinguished themselves in the most extraordinary manner by their zealous and invincible attachment to the Peripatetic philosophy, were the divines of *Leipsic*, *Tubingen*, *Helmstadt*, and *Altorf*. The enchantment, however, was not universal; and there were many who, withdrawing their private judgment from the yoke

yoke of authority, were bold enough to see with their own eyes; and of consequence discerned the blemishes that were indeed sufficiently visible in the pretended wisdom of the Grecian sage. The first attempt to reduce his authority within narrow bounds was made by certain pious and prudent divines, who though they did not pretend to discourage all philosophical inquiries, yet were desirous of confining them to a few select subjects; and complained, that the pompous denomination of philosophy was too frequently prostituted [q], by being applied to unintelligible distinctions, and words, or rather sounds, destitute of sense. These were succeeded in their dislike of the Peripatetic philosophy by the disciples of RAMUS, who had credit enough to banish it from several seminaries of learning, and to substitute in its place the system of their master, which was of a more practical kind, and better adapted to the purposes of life [r]. But if the philosophy of ARISTOTLE met with adversaries who opposed it upon solid and rational principles, it had also enemies of a very different character, who imprudently declaimed against philosophy in general, as highly detrimental to the cause of religion and the interests of society. Such was the fanatical extravagance of DANIEL HOFFMAN, professor at *Helmstadt*, who discovered, in this controversy, an equal degree of ignorance and animosity; and such also were the followers of ROBERT FLUDD, JACOB BEHMEN, and the Rosacruzians, who boasted of having struck out, by the assistance of *fire* and *divine illumination*, a new, won-

[q] Such, among others, was WENSESLAS SCHILLINGIUS, of whom a particular account is given by ARNOLD, in his *Histor. Eccles. et Hæret.* p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. vi.

[r] See JO. HERMAN AB ELSWICK, *De varia Aristotelis fortuna*, § xxi. p. 54. and WALCHIUS, *Historia Logices*, lib. ii. cap. ii. sect. iii. § v. in *Parergis ejus Academicis*, p. 613.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

The freedom of philosophical inquiry gains ground.

derful, and celestial system of philosophy, of which mention has been already made [r]. These adversaries of the Stagirite were divided among themselves, and this diminished the strength and vigour of their opposition to the common enemy. But had they been ever so closely united in their sentiments and measures, they would not have been able to overturn the empire of ARISTOTLE, which was deeply rooted in the schools through long possession, and had a powerful support in the multitude of its votaries and defenders.

XI. The Peripatetic system had still more formidable adversaries to encounter in DES CARTES and GASSENDI, whose writings were composed with that perspicuity and precision that rendered them singularly agreeable to many of the Lutheran doctors of this century, and made them look with contempt on that obsolete and barren philosophy of the schools, which was expressed in uncouth terms and barbarous phrases, without taste, elegance, or accuracy. The votaries of ARISTOTLE beheld with envy these new philosophers, used their most zealous endeavours to bring them into discredit, and, for this purpose, represented their researches and principles as highly detrimental to the interests of religion and the growth of true piety. But when they found, by experience, that these methods of attack proved unsuccessful, they changed their manner of proceeding, and (like a prudent general, who, besieged by a superior force, abandons his outworks and retires into the citadel) they relinquished much of their jargon, and defended only the main and essential principles of their system. To render these principles more palatable, they began to adorn them with the graces of elocution, and to mingle with their philosophical tenets the charms of polite li-

[r] See above, in the *General History of the Church*, § xxxi.
terature.

terature. They even went so far as to confess, that ARISTOTLE, though the prince of philosophers, was chargeable with errors and defects, which it was both lawful and expedient to correct. But these concessions only served to render their adversaries more confident and enterprising, since they were interpreted as resulting from a consciousness of their weakness, and were looked upon as a manifest acknowledgment of their defeat. In consequence of this, the enemies of the Stagirite renewed their attacks with redoubled impetuosity, and with a full assurance of victory; nor did they confine them to those branches of the Peripatetic philosophy which were allowed by its votaries to stand in need of correction, but levelled them, without distinction, at the whole system, and aimed at nothing less than its total dissolution. GROTIUS, indeed, who marched at the head of these philosophical reformers, proceeded with a certain degree of prudence and moderation. PURFENDORF, in treating of the law of nature and of the duties of morality, threw off, with more boldness and freedom, the Peripatetic yoke, and pursued a method entirely different from that which had been hitherto observed in the schools. This freedom drew upon him a multitude of enemies, who loaded him with the bitterest reproaches; his example was nevertheless followed by THOMASius, professor of law in the academy of *Leip-sic*, and afterwards at *Hall*, who attacked the Peripatetics with new degrees of vehemence and zeal. This eminent man, though honourably distinguished by the excellence of his genius and the strength of his resolution, was not, perhaps, the properest person that could be pitched upon to manage the interests of philosophy. His views, nevertheless, were vast; he aimed at the reformation of philosophy in general, and of the Peripatetic system in particular; and he assidu-

ously

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

ously employed both the power of exhortation and the influence of example, in order to persuade the Saxons to reject the Aristotelian system, which he had never read, and which most certainly he did not understand. The scheme of philosophy, that he substituted in its place, was received with little applause, and soon sunk into oblivion; but his attempt to overturn the system of the Peripatetics, and to restore the freedom of philosophical inquiry, was attended with remarkable success, made, in a little time, the most rapid progress, and produced such admirable effects, that THOMASIVS is justly looked upon, to this day, as the chief of those bold spirits who pulled down philosophical tyranny from its throne in Germany, and gave a mortal blow to what was called the *Sectarian Philosophy* [t] in that country. The first seminary of learning that adopted the measures of THOMASIVS was that of *Hall* in Saxony, where he was professor; they were afterwards followed by the rest of the German schools, by some sooner, and by others later; and from thence a spirit of philosophical liberty began to spread itself into other countries, where the Lutheran religion was established. So that, towards the conclusion of this century, the Lutherans enjoyed a perfect liberty of conducting their philosophical researches in the manner they judged the most conformable with truth and reason, of departing from the mere dictates of authority in matters of science, and of proposing publicly every one his respective opinions. This liberty was not the consequence of any positive decree of the state, nor was it inculcated by any law of the church; it seemed to

☞ [t] By the *Sectarian Philosophers* were meant, those who followed implicitly some one of the ancient philosophical sects, without daring to use the dictates of their private judgment, to correct or modify the doctrines or expressions of these hoary guides.

result from that invisible disposal of things, which we call accident, and certainly proceeded from the efforts of a few great men, seconding and exciting that natural propensity towards free inquiry, that can never be totally extinguished in the human mind. Many employed this liberty in extracting, after the manner of the ancient *Eclectics*, what they thought most conformable to reason, and most susceptible of demonstration, from the productions of the different schools, and connecting these extracts in such a manner as to constitute a complete body of philosophy. But some made a yet more noble use of this inestimable privilege, by employing, with indefatigable zeal and industry, their *own* faculties in the investigation of truth, and building upon solid and unchangeable principles a new and sublime system of philosophy. At the head of these we may place LEIBNITZ, whose genius and labours have deservedly rendered his name immortal [u].

In this conflict between the reformers of philosophy and the votaries of ARISTOTLE, the latter lost ground from day to day, and his system, in consequence of the extremes that reformers often fall into, grew so disgusting and odious, that condemnation was passed on every part of it. Hence the science of *Metaphysics*, which the Grecian sage had considered as the master-science, as the original fountain of all true philosophy, was spoiled of its honours, and fell into contempt; nor was the authority and influence even of DES CARTES (who also set out, in his enquiries, upon metaphysical principles) sufficient to support it against the prejudices of the times. However, when the first heat of opposition began to cool, and the

[u] The curious reader will find an accurate and ample account of this revolution in philosophy, in the learned BRUCKER'S *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

The virtues
and defects
of the Lu-
theran doc-
tors.

rage of party to subside, this degraded science was not only recalled from its exile, by the interposition and credit of LEIBNITZ, but was also reinstated in its former dignity and lustre.

XII. The defects and vices of the Lutheran clergy have been circumstantially exposed, and even exaggerated by many writers, who seem to require in the ministers of the Gospel a degree of perfection, which ought indeed always to be aimed at, but which no wise observer of human nature can ever hope to see generally reduced to practice. These censurers represent the leading men of the Lutheran church as arrogant, contentious, despotic, and uncharitable; as destitute of Christian simplicity and candour; fond of quibbling and dispute; judging of all things by the narrow spirit of party; and treating with the utmost antipathy and aversion those that differ from them ever so little in religious matters. The less considerable among the Lutheran doctors were charged with ignorance, with a neglect of the sacred duties of their station, and with a want of talent in their character as public teachers. And the whole body were accused of avarice, laziness, want of piety, and corruption of manners.

It will be acknowledged, without difficulty, by those who have studied with attention and impartiality the genius, manners, and history of this century, that the Lutheran clergy are not wholly irreproachable with respect to the matters that are here laid to their charge, and that many Lutheran churches were under the direction of pastors who were highly deficient, some in zeal, others in abilities, many in both, and consequently ill qualified for propagating the truths of Christianity with wisdom and success. But this reproach is not peculiarly applicable to the seventeenth century; it is a general charge that, with

too much truth, may be brought against all the ages of the church. On the other hand, it must be acknowledged, by all such as are not blinded by ignorance or partiality, that the whole of the Lutheran clergy did not consist of these unworthy pastors, and that many of the Lutheran doctors of this century were distinguished by their learning, piety, gravity and wisdom. Nay, perhaps it might be difficult to decide, whether in our times, in which some pretend that the sanctity of the primitive doctors is revived in several places, there be not as many that do little honour to the pastoral character as in the times of our ancestors? It must further be observed, that many of the defects which are invidiously charged upon the doctors of this age, were in a great measure owing to the infelicity of the times. They were the unhappy effects of those public calamities which a dreadful war, of thirty years duration, produced in *Germany*; they derived strength from the influence of a corrupt education, and were sometimes encouraged by the protection and countenance of vitious and profligate magistrates.

XIII. That the vices of the Lutheran clergy were partly owing to the infelicity of the times, will appear evident from some particular instances. It must be acknowledged that, during the greatest part of this century, neither the discourses of the pulpit nor the instructions of the schools were adapted to promote among the people, just ideas of religion, or to give them a competent knowledge of the doctrines and precepts of the Gospel. The eloquence of the pulpit, as some ludicrously and too justly represent it, was reduced, in many places, to the noisy art of bawling (during a certain space of time measured by a sand-glass) upon various points of theology, which the orators understood but very little, and which the people did not understand at all; and when the import-

CEN. T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

The vices of the Lutheran clergy partly owing to the times in which they lived.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

ant doctrines and precepts of Christianity were introduced in these public discourses, they were frequently disfigured by tawdry and puerile ornaments, wholly inconsistent with the spirit and genius of the divine wisdom that shines forth in the Gospel, and were thus, in a great measure, deprived of their native beauty, efficacy, and power. All this must be confessed; but perhaps it may not appear surprising, when all things are duly considered. The ministers of the Gospel had their heads full of sonorous and empty words, of trivial distinctions and metaphysical subtilties, and very ill furnished with that kind of knowledge that is adapted to touch the heart and to reform the life; they had also few models of true eloquence before their eyes; and therefore it is not much to be wondered, if they dressed out their discourses with foreign and tasteless ornaments.

The charge brought against the universities, that they spent more time in subtle and contentious controversy, than in explaining the holy Scriptures, teaching the duties of morality, and promoting a spirit of piety and virtue, though too just, yet may also be alleviated by considering the nature and circumstances of the times. The Lutherans were surrounded with a multitude of adversaries, who obliged them to be perpetually in a posture of defence; and the Roman-catholics, who threatened their destruction, contributed, in a more particular manner, to excite in their doctors that polemic spirit, which unfortunately became a habit, and had an unhappy influence on the exercise both of their academical and pastoral functions. In time of war, the military art not only becomes singularly respectable, but is preferred, without hesitation, before all others, on account of its tendency to maintain the inestimable blessings of liberty and independence; and thus, in the midst of theological com-

motions,

motions, the spirit of controversy, by becoming necessary, gains an ascendant, which, even when the danger is over, it is unwilling to lose. It were indeed ardently to be wished, that the Lutherans had treated with more mildness and charity those who differed from them in religious opinions, and had discovered more indulgence and forbearance towards such, more especially, as by ignorance, fanaticism, or excessive curiosity, were led into error, without pretending, nevertheless, to disturb the public tranquillity by propagating their particular systems. But they had unhappily imbibed a spirit of persecution in their early education; this was too much the spirit of the times, and it was even a leading maxim with our ancestors, that it was both lawful and expedient to use severity and force against those whom they looked upon as heretics. This maxim was derived from *Rome*; and even those who separated from that church did not find it easy to throw off, all of a sudden, that despotic and uncharitable spirit that had so long been the main-spring of its government, and the general characteristic of its members. Nay, in their narrow views of things, their very piety seemed to suppress the generous movements of fraternal love and forbearance; and the more they felt themselves animated with a zeal for the divine glory, the more difficult did they find it to renounce that ancient and favourite maxim, which had so often been ill interpreted and ill applied, that *whosoever is found to be an enemy to God, ought also to be declared an enemy to his country.* [*w.*]

[*w.*] It were to be wished that the Lutherans had not, in many places, persevered in these severe and despotic principles longer than other Protestant churches. Until this very day, the Lutherans of *Frankfort* on the *Maine* have always refused to permit the *Reformed* to celebrate public worship within the bounds, or even in the suburbs, of that city. Many attempts have been made to conquer their obstinacy in this respect, but hitherto without success.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

The eccle-
siastical
laws and
polity of
the Luth-
erans.

XIV. There were few or no changes introduced, during this century, into the form of government, the method of worship, and the external rites and ceremonies of the Lutheran church. Many alterations would indeed have been made in all these, had the princes and states of that communion judged it expedient to put in execution the plans that had been laid by THOMASIVS, and other eminent men, for reforming its ecclesiastical polity. These plans were built upon a new principle, which supposed, that the majesty and supreme authority of the sovereign was the only source of church-power. On this fundamental principle, which these great men took all imaginable pains to prove, by solid and striking arguments, they raised a voluminous system of laws, which, in the judgment of many, evidently tended to this conclusion: that the same sovereign who presides in the state ought to rule in the church; that prince and pontif are inseparable characters; and that the ministers of the Gospel are not the ambassadors of the Deity, but the deputies or vicegerents of the civil magistrate. These reformers of Lutheranism did not stop here; they reduced within narrower bounds the few privileges and advantages that the clergy yet retained; and treated many of the rites, institutions, and customs of our church, as the remains of popish superstition. Hence an abundant source of contention was opened, and a long and tedious controversy was carried on with warmth and animosity between the clergy and civilians. We leave others to determine with what views these debates were commenced and fomented, and with what success they were respectively carried on by the contending parties. We shall only observe, that their effects and consequences were unhappy, as, in many places, they proved,

proved, in the issue, detrimental to the reputation of the clergy, to the dignity and authority of religion, and to the peace and prosperity of the Lutheran church [x]. The present state of that church verifies too plainly this observation. It is now its fate to see few entering into its public service; who are adapted to restore the reputation it has lost, or to maintain that which it yet retains. Those who are distinguished by illustrious birth, uncommon genius, and a liberal and ingenuous turn of mind, look upon the study of theology, which has so little external honours and advantages to recommend it, as below their ambition; and hence the number of wise, learned, and eminent ministers grows less considerable from day to day. This circumstance is deeply lamented by those among us who consider with attention the dangerous and declining state of the Lutheran church; and it is to be feared, that our descendants will have reason to lament it still more bitterly.

XV. The eminent writers that adorned the Lutheran church through the course of this century, were many in number. We shall only mention those whom it is most necessary for a student of ecclesiastical history to be more particularly acquainted with; such are ÆGIDIUS and NICHOLAS HUNNIUS—LEONARD HUTTER—JOSEPH and JOHN ERNESTI GERHARD—GEORGE

The most
eminent
Lutheran
writers.

☞ [x] It has been the ill hap even of well-designing men to fall into pernicious extremes, in the controversies relating to the foundation, power, and privileges of the church. Too few have steered the middle way, and laid their plans with such equity and wisdom as to maintain the sovereignty and authority of the *state*, without reducing the *church* to a mere creature of civil policy. The reader will find a most interesting view of this nice and important subject, in the learned and ingenious bishop of Gloucester's *Alliance between Church and State*, and in his *Dedication* of the second volume of his *Divine Legation of Moses*, to my Lord MANSFIELD.

C E N T. XVII. and FREDERICK ULRIC CALIXTUS—the MENT-
 S E C T. II. ZERS—the OLEARIUS'S—FREDERIC BALDWIN—
 PART II. ALBERT GRAWER—MATTHIAS HOE—the CARP-
 ZOVIVS—JOHN and PAUL TARNOVIUS—JOHN
 AFFELMAN—EILHART LUBER—the LYSERS—
 MICHAEL WALTHER—JOACHIM HILDEBRAND
 —JOHN VALENTINE ANDREAS—SOLOMON GLAS-
 SIUS—ABRAHAM CALOVIUS—THEODORE HACK-
 SPAN—JOHN HULSEMAN—JACOB WELLER—PE-
 TER and JOHN MAUSÆUS, brothers—JOHN CON-
 RAD DANHAVER—JOHN GEORGE DORSCHÆUS—
 JOHN ARNDT—MARTIN GEYER—JOHN ADAM
 SCHARTZER—BALTHAZAR and JOHN MEISNER—
 AUGUSTUS PFEIFFER—HENRY and JOHN MUL-
 LER—JUSTUS CHRISTOPHER SCHOMER—SEBAS-
 TIAN SCHMIDT—CHRISTOPHER HORSHOLT—the
 OSIANDERS—PHILIP JACOB SPENER—GEB.
 THEODORE MEYER—FRIDEM. BECHMAN—and
 others [y].

An histori-
 cal view of
 the religi-
 ous doctrine
 of the Lu-
 therans.

XVI. The doctrine of the Lutheran church remained entire during this century; its funda- mental principles received no alteration, nor could any doctor of that church, who should have presumed to renounce or invalidate any of those theological points that are contained in the *sym- bological books* of the Lutherans, have met with toleration and indulgence. It is, however, to be observed, that, in later times, various circum- stances contributed to diminish, in many places, the authority of these *symbolical* oracles, which had so long been considered as an almost infallible rule of faith and practice. Hence arose that un- bounded liberty which is at this day enjoyed by all who are not invested with the character of

[y] For an account of the lives and writings of these au- thors, see WITTE'S *Memorie Theologorum*, and his *Diarium Biographicum*; as also PIPPINGIUS, GOESIVS, and other writers of literary history.

public

public teachers, of dissenting from the decisions of these *symbols* or creeds, and of declaring this dissent in the manner they judge the most expedient. The case was very different in former times : whoever ventured to oppose any of the received doctrines of the church, or to spread new religious opinions among the people, was called before the higher powers to give an account of his conduct, and very rarely escaped without suffering in his fortune or reputation, unless he renounced his innovations. But the teachers of novel doctrines had nothing to apprehend, when, towards the conclusion of this century, the Lutheran churches adopted that leading maxim of the Arminians, that *Christians were accountable to God alone for their religious sentiments ; and that no individual could be justly punished by the magistrate for his erroneous opinions, while he conducted himself like a virtuous and obedient subject, and made no attempts to disturb the peace and order of civil society.* It were to be wished, that this religious liberty, which the dictates of equity must approve, but of which the virtuous mind alone can make a wise and proper use, had never degenerated into that unbridled licentiousness that holds nothing sacred, but with an audacious insolence transpires under foot the solemn truths of religion, and is constantly endeavouring to throw contempt upon the respectable profession of its ministers.

XVII. The various branches of sacred erudition were cultivated with uninterrupted zeal and assiduity among the Lutherans, who, at no period of time, were without able commentators, and learned and faithful guides for the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. It is natural to mention here TARNOVIVS, GERHARD, HACSPAN, CALIXTUS, ERASMUS, SCHMIDT, to whom might be added a numerous list of learned and judicious ex-

Sacred philology cultivated among the Lutherans.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

positors of the sacred oracles. But what appears more peculiarly worthy of observation is, that the very period which some look upon as the most barren of learned productions, and the most remarkable for a general inattention to the branch of erudition now under consideration, produced that inestimable and immortal work of SOLOMON GLASSIUS, which he published under the title of *Sacred Philology*, and than which none can be more useful for the interpretation of Scripture, as it throws an uncommon degree of light upon the language and phraseology of the inspired writers. It must, at the same time, be candidly acknowledged, that a considerable part of this century was more employed, by the professors of the different universities, in defending, with subtilty and art, the peculiar doctrines of the Lutheran church, than in illustrating and explaining the Holy Scripture, which is the only genuine source of divine truth. Whatever was worthy of censure in this manner of proceeding, was abundantly repaired by the more modern divines of the Lutheran communion: for no sooner did the rage of controversy begin to subside, than the greatest part of them turned their principal studies towards the exposition and illustration of the Sacred Writings; and they were particularly animated in the execution of this laborious task, by observing the indefatigable industry of those among the Dutch divines, who, in their interpretations of Scripture, followed the sentiments and method of COCCÆIUS. At the head of these modern commentators we may place, with justice, SEBASTIAN SCHMIDT, who was at least the most laborious and voluminous expositor of this age. After this learned writer, may be ranked CALOVIVUS, GEIER, SCHOMER, and others of inferior note.

note [z]. The contests excited by the persons called *Pietists*, though unhappy in several respects, were nevertheless attended with this good effect, that they engaged many to apply themselves to the study of the Holy Scriptures, which they had too much neglected before that period, and to the perusal of the commentators and interpreters of the sacred oracles. These commentators pursued various methods, and were unequal both in their merit and success. Some confined themselves to the signification of the words of Scripture, and the literal sense that belonged to the phrases of the inspired writers; others applied their expositions of Scripture to the decision of controverted points, and attacked their adversaries either by refuting their false interpretations of Scripture, or by making use of their own commentaries to overturn their doctrines; a third sort, after unfolding the sense of Scripture, applied it carefully to the purposes of life and the direction of practice. We might mention another class of interpreters, who, by an assiduous perusal of the writings of the Cocceians, are said to have injudiciously acquired their defects, as appears by their turning the sacred history into allegory, and seeking rather the more remote and mysterious sense of Scripture, than its obvious and literal signification.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

XVIII. The principal doctors of this century followed, at first, the loose method of deducing their theological doctrine from Scripture under a few general heads. This method had been observed in ancient times by MELANCTHON, and was vulgarly called *Common-Place* divinity. They, however, made use of the principles, terms, and subtle distinctions of the Peripatetic philosophy,

The Didactic theology; or, articles of faith adopted by the Lutherans.

[z] See J. FRANC. BUDÆI *Isagoge in Theologiam*, lib. ii. cap. viii. p. 1686.

which

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

which was yet in high reputation, in explaining and illustrating each particular doctrine. The first person that reduced theology into a regular system, and gave it a truly scientific and philosophical form, was GEORGE CALIXTUS, a man of great genius and erudition, who had imbibed the spirit of the Aristotelian school. His design, in general, was not so much censured, as the particular method he followed, and the form he gave to his theological system; for he divided the whole science of divinity into three parts, *viz.* the *end*, the *subject*, the *means*; and this division, which was borrowed from ARISTOTLE, appeared extremely improper to many. This philosophical method of ranging the truths of Christianity was followed, with remarkable zeal and emulation, by the most eminent doctors in the different schools of learning, and even in our times it has its votaries. Some indeed had the courage to depart from it, and to exhibit the doctrines of religion under a different, though still under a scientific, form; but they had few followers, and struggled in vain against the empire of ARISTOTLE, who reigned with a despotic authority in the schools.

There were, however, many pious and good men, who beheld, with great displeasure, this intrusion of metaphysics into the sphere of theology, and never could be brought to relish this philosophical method of teaching the doctrines of Christianity. They earnestly desired to see divine truth freed from captious questions and subtleties, delivered from the shackles of an imperious system, and exhibited with that beautiful simplicity, perspicuity, and evidence, in which it appears in the sacred writings. Persons of this turn had their wishes and expectations in some measure answered, when, towards the conclusion of this century, the learned BRENER and others, animated by his exhortations and example, began to inculcate the truths

truths and precepts of religion in a more plain and popular manner, and when the eclectics had succeeded so far as to dethrone ARISTOTLE, and to banish his philosophy from the greatest part of the Lutheran schools. SPENER was not so far successful as to render universal his popular method of teaching theology; it was nevertheless adopted by a considerable number of doctors; and it cannot be denied, that, since this period, the science of divinity, delivered from the jargon of the schools, has assumed a more liberal and graceful aspect. The same observation may be applied to controversial productions; it is certain that polemics were totally destitute of elegance and perspicuity so long as ARISTOTLE reigned in the seminaries of learning, and that they were more or less embellished and improved since the suppression and disgrace of the Peripatetic philosophy. It is, however, to be lamented, that controversy did not lose, at this period, all the circumstances that had so justly rendered it displeasing; and that the defects, that had given such offence in the theological disputants of all parties, were far from being entirely removed. These defects still subsist, though perhaps in a less shocking degree; and whether we peruse the polemic writers of ancient or modern times, we shall find too few among them who may be said to be animated by the pure love of truth, without any mixture of pride, passion, or partiality, and whom we may pronounce free from the illusions of prejudice and self-love.

XIX. The science of morals, which must ever be esteemed the *master-science*, from its immediate influence upon life and manners, was, for a long time, neglected among the Lutherans. If we except a few eminent men, such as ARNDT and GERHARD, who composed some popular treatises concerning the internal worship of the Deity, and the

The state of moral science among the Lutherans.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

the duties of Christians, there did not appear, during the greatest part of this century, any moral writer of distinguished merit. Hence it happened, that those who applied themselves to the business of resolving what are called *Cases of Conscience*, were held in high esteem, and their tribunals were much frequented. But as the true principles and foundations of morality were not, as yet, established with a sufficient degree of precision and evidence, their decisions were often erroneous, and they were liable to fall into daily mistakes. CALIXTUS was the first who separated the objects of faith from the duties of morality, and exhibited the latter under the form of an independent science. He did not, indeed, live to finish this work, the beginning of which met with universal applause; his disciples however employed, with some degree of success, the instructions they had received from their master, in executing his plan, and composing a system of *Moral Theology*. This system, in process of time, fell into discredit, on account of the Peripatetic form under which it appeared; for, notwithstanding the striking repugnance that there is, in the very nature of things, between the beautiful science of Morals and the perplexing intricacies of Metaphysics, CALIXTUS could not abstain from the latter in building his Moral system. The moderns, however, stripped morality of the Peripatetic garment, calling to their assistance the law of nature, which had been explained and illustrated by PUFFENDORF and other authors, and comparing this law with the sacred writings, they not only discovered the true springs of Christian virtue, and entered into the true spirit and sense of the divine laws, but also digested the whole science of Morals into a better order, and demonstrated its principles with a new and superior degree of evidence.

XX. These

XX. These improvements in theology and morality did not diffuse such a spirit of concord in the Lutheran church, as was sufficient to heal ancient divisions, or to prevent new ones. That church, on the contrary, was involved in the most lamentable commotions and tumults, during the whole course of this century, partly by the controversies that arose among its most eminent doctors, and partly by the intemperate zeal of violent reformers, the fanatical predictions of pretended prophets, and the rash measures of innovators, who studiously spread among the people, new, singular, and, for the most part, extravagant opinions. The controversies that divided the Lutheran doctors may be ranged under two classes, according to their different importance and extent, as some of them involved the whole church in tumult and discord, while others were less universal in their pernicious effects. Of the former class there were two controversies, that gave abundant exercise to the Polemic talents of the Lutheran doctors during the greatest part of this century; and these turned upon the religious systems that are generally known under the denominations of *Syncretism* and *Pietism*. Nothing could be more amiable than the principles that gave rise to the former, and nothing more respectable and praise-worthy than the design that was proposed by the latter. The *Syncretists* [a], animated with that fraternal love and that pacific spirit, which JESUS CHRIST had so often recommended as the peculiar characteristics of his true disciples, used their warmest endeavours to promote union and concord among Christians; and the *Pietists* had undoubtedly in view the restora-

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

Commo-
tions and
contests in
the Luth-
eran church.

[a] The *Syncretists* were also called *Calixtines* from their chief, GEORGE CALIXTUS; and *Helmstadians*, from the university where their plan of doctrine and union took its rise.

C E N T. tion and advancement of that holiness and vir-
 XVII. tue, that had suffered so much by the influence
 S E C T. H. of licentious manners on the one hand, and by
 P A R T H. the turbulent spirit of controversy on the other.
 These two great and amiable virtues, that gave
 rise to the projects and efforts of the two orders
 of persons now mentioned, were combated by a
 third, even a zeal for maintaining the truth, and
 preserving it from all mixture of error. Thus
 the love of truth was unhappily found to stand in
 opposition to the love of union, piety, and con-
 cord; and thus, in this present critical and cor-
 rupt state of human nature, the unruly and tur-
 bulent passions of men can, by an egregious a-
 buse, draw the worst consequences from the best
 things, and render the most excellent principles
 and views productive of confusion, calamity, and
 discord.

The rise of
 the Syncre-
 tistical or
 Calixtine
 controver-
 sies.

XXI. The origin of *Syncretism* was owing to
 GEORGE CALIXTUS of *Sleswick*, a man of eminent
 and distinguished abilities and merit, and who
 had few equals in this century, either in point of
 learning or genius. This great man being placed
 in a university [b], which, from the very time of
 its foundation, had been remarkable for encour-
 aging freedom of enquiry, improved this happy
 privilege, examined the respective doctrines of the
 various sects that bear the Christian name, and
 found, in the notions commonly received among
 divines, some things defective and erroneous. He
 accordingly gave early intimations of his dissatis-
 faction with the state of theology, and lamented,
 in a more particular manner, the divisions and
 factions that reigned among the servants and
 disciples of the same great master. He therefore
 turned his views to the salutary work of softening

[b] The university of *Helmstedt*, in the dutchy of *Brunswick*,
 founded in the year 1576.

the animosities produced by these divisions, and shewed the warmest desire, not so much of establishing a perfect harmony and concord between the jarring sects, which no human power seemed capable of effecting, as of extinguishing the hatred, and appeasing the resentment, which the contending parties discovered too much in their conduct towards each other. His colleagues did not seem at all averse to this pacific project; and the surprise that this their silence or acquiescence must naturally excite, in such as are acquainted with the theological spirit of the seventeenth century, will be diminished, when it is considered, that the professors of divinity at *Helmstadt* bind themselves, at their admission, by an oath, to use their best and most zealous endeavours to heal the divisions, and terminate the contests that prevail among Christians. Neither CALIXTUS, however, nor his friends, escaped the opposition that it was natural to expect in the execution of such an unpopular and comprehensive project. They were warmly attacked, in the year 1639, by STATIUS BUSCHERUS, a Hanoverian ecclesiastic, a bigoted votary of RAMUS, a declared enemy to all philosophy, and a man of great temerity and imprudence. This man, exasperated at the preference CALIXTUS and his companions had given to the Peripatetic philosophy over the principles of the *Ramists*, composed a very malignant book, entitled, *Crypto-Papismus novæ Theologicæ Helmstädiensis* [c], in which CALIXTUS was charged with a long list of errors. Though this production made some small impression on the minds of certain persons, it is nevertheless probable, that BUSCHER would have almost universally passed for a partial, malicious, and rash accuser, had his invectives and complaints

[c] i. e. *Papery disguised under the mask of the new theological system of Helmstadt.*

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

rendered CALIXTUS more cautious and prudent. But the upright and generous heart of this eminent man, which disdained dissimulation to a degree that bordered upon the extreme of imprudence, excited him to speak with the utmost frankness his private sentiments, and thus to give a certain measure of plausibility to the accusations of his adversary. Both he and his colleague CONRAD HORNEIUS maintained, with boldness and perseverance, several propositions, which appeared, to many others besides BUSCHER, new, singular, and of a dangerous tendency; and CALIXTUS more especially, by the freedom and plainness with which he declared and defended his sentiments, drew upon him the resentment and indignation of the Saxon doctors, who, in the year 1645, were present at the conference of *Thorn*. He had been chosen by FREDERIC WILLIAM, elector of *Brandenburg*, as colleague and assistant to the divines he sent from *Koningberg* to these conferences; the Saxon deputies were greatly incensed to see a Lutheran ecclesiastic in the character of an assistant to a deputation of Reformed doctors. This first cause of offence was followed by other incidents, in the course of these conferences, which increased the resentment of the Saxons against CALIXTUS, and made them accuse him of leaning to the side of the Reformed churches. We cannot enter here into a circumstantial account of this matter, which would lead us from our main design. We shall only observe, that when these conferences broke up, the Saxon doctors, and more especially HALSEMAN, WELLER, SCHARFIUS, and CALOVIUS, turned the whole force of their polemic weapons against CALIXTUS; and, in their public writings, reproached him with apostacy from the principles of Lutheranism, and with a propensity towards the sentiments both of the Reformed and Romish churches. This great man

man did not receive tamely the insults of his adversaries. His consummate knowledge of the philosophy that reigned in the schools, and his perfect acquaintance with the history of the church, rendered him an able disputant; and accordingly he repelled, with the greatest vigour, the attacks of his enemies, and carried on, with uncommon spirit and erudition, this important controversy, until the year 1656, when death put an end to his labours, and transported him from these scenes of dissension and tumult into the regions of peace and concord [d].

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

XXII. Neither the death of CALIXTUS, nor the decease of his principal adversaries, were sufficient to extinguish the flame they had kindled; on the contrary, the contest was carried on, after that period, with more animosity and violence

The continuation and issue of these debates.

[d] Those who desire to be more minutely acquainted with the particular circumstances of this famous controversy, the titles and characters of the books published on that occasion, and the doctrines that produced such warm contests and such deplorable divisions, will do well to consult WALCHIUS, CAROLUS, WEISMAN, ARNOLD, and other writers; but above all, the third volume of the *Cimbria Literata* of MOLLERUS, p. 121. in which there is an ample account of the life, transactions, and writings of CALIXTUS. But, if any reader should push his curiosity still further, and be solicitous to know the more secret springs that acted in this whole affair, the remote causes of the events and transactions relating to it, the spirit, views, and characters of the disputants, the arguments used on both sides; in a word, those things that are principally interesting and worthy of attention in controversies of this kind, he will find no history that will satisfy him fully in these respects. A history that would throw a proper light upon these important matters, must be composed by a man of great candour and abilities; by one who knows the world, has studied human nature, is furnished with materials and documents that lie as yet concealed in the cabinets of the curious, and is not unacquainted with the spirit that reigns and the cabals that are carried on in the courts of princes. But were such an historian to be found, I question very much, whether, even in our times, he could publish without danger all the circumstances of this memorable contest.

C E N T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

than ever. The Saxon doctors, and more especially CALIXTUS, insulted the ashes, and attacked the memory of this great man with unexampled bitterness and malignity; and, in the judgment of many eminent and worthy doctors, who were by no means the partisans of CALIXTUS, conducted themselves with such imprudence and temerity, as were every way adapted to produce an open schism in the Lutheran church. They drew up a new kind of Creed, or confession of the Lutheran faith [e], which they proposed to place in the class of what the members of our communion call their *Symbolical books*, and which, of consequence, all professors of divinity and all candidates for the ministry would be obliged to subscribe, as containing the true and genuine doctrine of the Lutheran church. By this new production of intemperate zeal, the friends and followers of CALIXTUS were declared unworthy of the communion of that church; and were, accordingly, supposed to have forfeited all right to the privileges and tranquillity that were granted to the Lutherans by the laws of the empire. The reputation of CALIXTUS found, nevertheless, some able defenders, who pleaded his cause with modesty and candour; such were TITIUS, HILDEBRAND, and other ecclesiastics, who were distinguished from the multitude by their charity, moderation, and prudence. These good men shewed, with the utmost evidence, that the new Creed, mentioned above, would be a perpetual source of contention and discord, and would thus have a fatal effect upon the true interests of the Lutheran church; but their counsels were overruled, and their admonitions neglected. Among

[e] The title of this new Creed was *Consensus repetiti Fidei veteris Lutheranae*.

the writers who opposed this Creed, was **FREDERIC ULRIC CALIXTUS**, who was not destitute of abilities, though much inferior to his father in learning, genius, and moderation. Of those that stood forth in its vindication and defence, the most considerable were **CALOVIVS** and **STRAUCHIVS**. The polemic productions of these contending parties were multiplied from day to day, and yet remain as deplorable monuments of the intemperate zeal of the champions on both sides of the question. The invectives, reproaches, and calumnies, with which these productions were filled, shewed too plainly that many of these writers, instead of being animated with the love of truth, and a zeal for religion, were rather actuated by a keen spirit of party, and by the suggestions of vindictive pride and vanity. These contests were of long duration; they were, however, at length suspended, towards the close of this century, by the death of those who had been the principal actors in this scene of theological discord, by the abolition of the creed that had produced it, by the rise of the new debates of a different nature, and by other circumstances of inferior moment, which is needless to mention.

XXIII. It will be proper to give here some account of the accusations that were brought against **CALIXTUS** by his adversaries. The principal charge was, his having formed a project, not of uniting into one ecclesiastical body, as some have understood it, the Romish, Lutheran, and Reformed churches, but of extinguishing the hatred and animosity that reigned among the members of these different communions, and joining them in the bonds of charity, mutual benevolence, and forbearance. This is the project, which was at first condemned, and is still known

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

The opi-
nions of
Calixtus.

C. E. N. T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

under the denomination of *Syncretism* [f]. Several singular opinions were also laid to the charge of

[f] It is neither my design nor my inclination to adopt the cause of CALIXTUS; nor do I pretend to maintain, that his writings and his doctrines are exempt from error. But the love of truth obliges me to observe, that it has been the ill hap of this eminent man to fall into the hands of bad interpreters; and that even those who imagine they have been more successful than others in investigating his true sentiments, have most grievously misunderstood them. CALIXTUS is commonly supposed to have formed the plan of a *formal reconciliation* of the Protestants with the church of Rome and its pontiffs; but this notion is entirely groundless, since he publicly and expressly declared, that the Protestants could by no means enter into the bonds of concord and communion with the Romish church, as it was constituted at this time; and that, if there had ever existed any prospect of healing the divisions that reigned between it and the Protestant churches, this prospect had entirely vanished since the council of *Trent*, whose violent proceedings and tyrannical decrees had rendered the union, now under consideration, absolutely impossible. He is further charged with having either approved or excused the greatest part of those errors and superstitions, that are looked upon as a dishonour to the church of Rome; but this charge is abundantly refuted, not only by the various treatises, in which he exposed the falsehood and absurdity of the doctrines and opinions of that church, but also by the declarations of the Roman catholics themselves, who acknowledge that CALIXTUS attacked them with much more learning and ingenuity than had been discovered by any other Protestant writer*. It is true, he maintained that the Lutherans and Roman-catholics did not differ about the *fundamental doctrines* of the Christian faith; and it were to be wished, that he had never asserted any such thing, or, at least, that he had expressed his meaning in more proper and inoffensive terms. It must however be considered, that he always looked upon the popes and their votaries, as having adulterated these fundamental doctrines with an impure mixture or addition of many opinions and tenets, which no wise and good Christian could adopt; and this consideration diminishes a good deal the extravagance of an assertion, which, otherwise, would deserve the severest censure. We shall not enter further into a review of the imputations that were cast

* BOSSUET, in his *Traité de la Communion sans les deux Epectes*, p. 1. § ii. p. 12. speaks thus of the eminent man now under consideration: *Le fameux GEORGE CALIXTE, le plus habile des Luthériens de notre temps, qui a écrit le plus doctement contre nous, &c.*

of this great man, and were exaggerated and blackened, as the most innocent things generally are, when they pass through the *medium* of malignity and party-spirit. Such were his notions concerning the *obscure manner* in which the doctrine of the Trinity was revealed under the Old Testament dispensation; the appearances of the Son of God during that period; the *necessity* of good works to the attainment of everlasting salvation; and God's being *occasionally* [g] the author of sin. These notions, in the esteem of many of the best judges of theological matters, have been always looked upon as of an indifferent nature, as opinions which, even were they false, do not affect the great and fundamental doctrines of Christianity. But the two great principles that CALIXTUS laid down as the foundation and groundwork of all his reconciling and pacific plans, gave much more offence than the plans themselves, and drew upon him the indignation and resentment of

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

upon CALIXTUS, by persons more disposed to listen to his accusers, than to those who endeavour, with candour and impartiality, to represent his sentiments and his measures in their true point of view. But if it should be asked here, what this man's real design was? we answer, that he laid down the following maxims: First, *That if it were possible to bring back the church of Rome to the state in which it was during the first five centuries, the Protestants would be no longer justified in rejecting its communion*: Secondly, *That the modern members of the Romish church, though polluted with many intolerable errors, were not all equally criminal; and that such of them, more especially, as sincerely believed the doctrines they had learned from their parents or masters, and by ignorance, education, or the power of habit, were hindered from perceiving the truth, were not to be excluded from salvation, nor deemed heretics; provided they gave their assent to the doctrines contained in the Apostles' Creed, and endeavoured seriously to govern their lives by the precepts of the Gospel*. I do not pretend to defend these maxims, which seem, however, to have many patrons in our times; I would only observe, that the doctrine they contain is much less intolerable than that which was commonly imputed to CALIXTUS.

[g] *Per accidens.*

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

many. Those principles were; First, That the *fundamental doctrines of Christianity* (by which he meant those elementary principles from whence all its truths flow) *were preserved pure and entire in all the three communions, and were contained in that ancient form of doctrine, that is vulgarly known by the name of the Apostles' Creed.* And, secondly, *That the tenets and opinions, which had been constantly received by the ancient doctors during the first five centuries, were to be considered as of equal truth and authority with the express declarations and doctrines of scripture.* The general plan of CALIXTUS was founded upon the *first* of these propositions; and he made use of the *second* to give some degree of plausibility to certain Romish doctrines and institutions, which have been always rejected by the protestant church; and to establish a happy concord between the various Christian communions that had hitherto lived in the state of dissension and separation from each other.

Debates
carried on
with the
doctors of
Rintelen and
Koningberg.

XXIV. The divines of *Rintelen, Koningberg,* and *Jena*, were more or less involved in these warm contests. Those of *Rintelen*, more especially HENICHIUS and MUSÆUS, had, on several occasions, and particularly at the conference of *Cassel*, shewn plainly that they approved of the plan of CALIXTUS for removing the unhappy discords and animosities that reigned among Christians, and that they beheld with peculiar satisfaction that part of it that had for its object union and concord among the Protestant churches. Hence they were opposed with great animosity by the Saxon doctors and their adherents, in various polemic productions [b].

The pacific spirit of CALIXTUS discovered itself also at *Koningberg*. JOHN LATERMANN, MICHAEL

[b] See ABRAM. CALOVII *Historia Syncretistica*, p. 618.—
JO. GEORGII WALCHII *Introductio in controversias Lutheranas*, vol. i. p. 286.

BEHMUS, and the learned CHRISTOPHER DRYER, CEN. T. XVII. SECT. II. PART II. who had been the disciples of that great man, were at little pains to conceal their attachment to the sentiments of their master. By this discovery, they drew upon them the resentment of their colleagues JOHN BEHMUS and CELESTINE MISLENTA, who were seconded by the whole body of the clergy of *Koningberg*; and thus a warm controversy arose, which was carried on, during many years, in such a manner as did very little honour to either of the contending parties. The interposition of the civil magistrate, together with the decease of BEHMUS and MISLENTA, put an end to this intestine war, which was succeeded by a new contest of long duration between DRYER and his associates on the one side, and several foreign divines on the other, who considered the system of CALIXTUS as highly pernicious, and looked upon its defenders as the enemies of the church. This new controversy was managed, on both sides, with as little equity and moderation as those which preceded it [i].

XXV. It must, at the same time, be acknowledged, to the immortal honour of the divines of *Jena*, and those of Jena. that they discovered the most consummate prudence and the most amiable moderation in the midst of these theological debates. For though they confessed ingenuously, that the sentiments of CALIXTUS were not of such a nature, as that they could be all adopted without exception, yet they maintained, that the greatest part of his tenets were much less pernicious than the Saxon doctors had represented them; and that several of them

[i] See CHRISTOPHER HARTKONCH's *Church-History of Prussia* (written in German), book ii. chap. x. p. 602.—MOLLER, *Cimbria Literata*, tom. iii. p. 150.—See also the *Acts and Documents* contained in the famous collection, entitled, *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A. 1740, p. 144. A. 1742, p. 29. A. 1745, p. 91.

CEN T, were innocent, and might be freely admitted
 XVII.
 SECT. II. without any danger to the cause of truth. SOLO-
 PART II. MON GLASSIUS, an ecclesiastic, renowned for the
 mildness of his temper, and the equity of his pro-
 ceedings, examined with the utmost candour and
 impartiality the opposite sentiments of the doctors,
 that were engaged in this important controversy,
 and published the result of this examination, by
 the express order of ERNEST, prince of Saxe-Gotha,
 surnamed the *Pious* [k]. MUSÆUS, a man of
 superior learning and exquisite penetration and
 judgment, adopted so far the sentiments of CA-
 LIXTUS, as to maintain, that *good works* might,
 in a certain sense, be considered as *necessary to sal-
 vation*; and that of the erroneous doctrines im-
 puted to this eminent man, several were of little
 or no importance. It is very probable, that the
 followers of CALIXTUS would have willingly sub-
 mitted this whole controversy to the arbitration
 of such candid and impartial judges. But this
 laudable moderation offended so highly the Saxon
 doctors, that they began to suspect the academy
 of Jena of several erroneous opinions, and marked
 out MUSÆUS, in a particular manner, as a per-
 son who had, in many respects, apostatized from
 the true and orthodox faith [l].

The rise of
 the contro-
 versy relat-
 ing to Pie-
 tism.

XXVI. These debates were suppressed and suc-
 ceeded by new commotions that arose in the
 church, and are commonly known under the de-

[k] This piece, which was written in German, did not ap-
 pear in public till after the death of GLASSIUS, in the year
 1662; a second edition of it was published in 8vo at Jena
 some years ago. The piece exhibits a rare and shining instance
 of theological moderation; and is worthy of a serious and at-
 tentive perusal.

[l] For an account of the imputations cast upon the divines
 of Jena, and more especially on MUSÆUS, see a judicious and
 solid work of the latter, entitled, *Der Jenischen Theologen Auf-
 sätzliche Erklärung, &c.*—See also JO. GEORGI WALCHII In-
 troducio in Controversias Ecclesiæ Lutheranae, vol. i. p. 405.

nomination

nomination of the *Pietistical Controversy*. This controversy was owing to the zeal of a certain set of persons, who, no doubt, with pious and upright intentions, endeavoured to stem the torrent of vice and corruption, and to reform the licentious manners both of the clergy and the people. But, as the best things may be abused, so this reforming spirit inflamed persons that were but ill qualified to exert it with wisdom and success. Many, deluded by the suggestions of an irregular imagination, and an ill-informed understanding, or guided by principles and views of a still more criminal nature, spread abroad new and singular opinions, false visions, unintelligible maxims, austere precepts, and imprudent clamours against the discipline of the church; all which excited the most dreadful tumults, and kindled the flames of contention and discord. The commencement of *Pietism* was indeed laudable and decent. It was set on foot by the pious and learned SPENER, who, by the private societies he formed at *Francfort*, with a design to promote vital religion, roused the lukewarm from their indifference, and excited a spirit of vigour and resolution in those who had been satisfied to lament, in silence, the progress of impiety. The remarkable effect of these pious meetings was increased by a book published by this well-meaning man, under the title of *Pious Desires*, in which he exhibited a striking view of the disorders of the church, and proposed the remedies that were proper to heal them. Many persons of good and upright intentions were highly pleased both with the proceedings and writings of SPENER, and indeed the greatest part of those, who had the cause of virtue and practical religion truly at heart, applauded the designs of this good man, though an apprehension of abuses retained numbers from encouraging them openly. These abuses actually happened. The remedies proposed

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

posed by SPENER to heal the disorders of the church fell into unskilful hands, were administered without sagacity or prudence, and thus, in many cases, proved to be worse than the disease itself. The religious meetings abovementioned (or the *Colleges of Piety*, as they were usually called by a phrase borrowed from the Dutch), tended in many places to kindle in the breasts of the multitude the flames of a blind and intemperate zeal, whose effects were impetuous and violent, instead of that pure and rational love of God, whose fruits are benign and peaceful. Hence complaints arose against these institutions of *Pietism*, as if, under a striking appearance of sanctity, they led the people into false notions of religion, and fomented, in those who were of a turbulent and violent character, the seeds and principles of mutiny and sedition.

The com-
motions at
Leipsic.

XXVII. These first complaints would have been undoubtedly hushed, and the tumults they occasioned would have subsided by degrees, had not the contests that arose at *Leipsic*, in the year 1689, added fuel to the flame. Certain pious and learned professors of philosophy, and particularly FRANCKIUS, SCHADIUS, and PAULUS ANTONIUS, the disciples of SPENER, who at that time was ecclesiastical superintendent of the court of *Saxony*, began to consider with attention the defects that prevailed in the ordinary method of instructing the candidates for the ministry; and this review, persuaded them of the necessity of using their best endeavours to supply what was wanting, and to correct what was amiss. For this purpose, they undertook to explain in their colleges certain books of holy Scripture, in order to render these genuine sources of religious knowledge better understood, and to promote a spirit of practical piety and vital religion in the minds of their hearers. The novelty of this method drew

drew attention, and rendered it singularly pleasing to many; accordingly, these lectures were much frequented, and their effects were visible in the lives and conversations of several persons, whom they seemed to inspire with a deep sense of the importance of religion and virtue. Whether these first effusions of religious fervour, which were, in themselves, most certainly laudable, were always kept within the strict bounds of reason and discretion, is a question not easily decided. If we are to believe the report of common fame, and the testimonies of several persons of great weight, this was by no means the case; and many things were both said and done in these *Biblical Colleges* (as they were called), which though they might be looked upon, by equitable and candid judges, as worthy of toleration and indulgence, were, nevertheless, contrary to custom, and far from being consistent with prudence. Hence rumours were spread, tumults excited, animosities kindled, and the matter at length brought to a public trial, in which the pious and learned men above mentioned were, indeed, declared free from the errors and heresies that had been laid to their charge, but were, at the same time, prohibited from carrying on the plan of religious instruction they had undertaken with such zeal. It was during these troubles and divisions that the invidious denomination of *Pietists* was first invented; it may, at least, be affirmed, that it was not commonly known before this period. It was at first applied by some giddy and inconsiderate persons to those who frequented the *Biblical Colleges*, and lived in a manner suitable to the instructions and exhortations that were addressed to them in these seminaries of piety. It was afterwards made use of to characterize all those who were either distinguished by the excessive austerity of their manners, or who, regardless of *truth* and *opinion*, were only

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

only intent upon *practice*, and turned the whole vigour of their efforts towards the attainment of religious feelings and habits. But as it is the fate of all those denominations by which peculiar sects are distinguished, to be variously and often very improperly applied, so the title of *Pietists* was frequently given, in common conversation, to persons of eminent wisdom and sanctity, who were equally remarkable for their adherence to truth and their love of piety; and, not seldom, to persons whose motley characters exhibited an enormous mixture of profligacy and enthusiasm, and who deserved the title of delirious fanatics better than any other denomination.

The progress of these debates.

XXVIII. This contest was by no means confined to *Leipsie*, but diffused its contagion, with incredible celerity, through all the Lutheran churches in the different states and kingdoms of *Europe*. For, from this time, in all the cities, towns, and villages, where Lutheranism was professed, there started up, all of a sudden, persons of various ranks and professions, of both sexes, learned and illiterate, who declared, that they were called, by a *divine impulse*, to pull up iniquity by the root, to restore to its primitive lustre, and propagate through the world, the declining cause of piety and virtue, to govern the church of CHRIST by wiser rules than those by which it was at present directed, and who, partly in their writings, and partly in their private and public discourses, pointed out the means and measures that were necessary to bring about this important revolution. All those, who were struck with this imaginary *impulse*, unanimously agreed, that nothing could have a more powerful tendency to propagate among the multitude solid knowledge, pious feelings, and holy habits, than those private meetings that had been first contrived by SPENER, and that were afterwards introduced

duced into *Leipfic*. Several religious assemblies were accordingly formed in various places, which, though they differed in some circumstances, and were not all conducted and composed with equal wisdom, piety, and prudence, were, nowever, designed to promote the same general purpose. In the mean time, these unusual, irregular, and tumultuous proceedings filled, with uneasy and alarming apprehensions, both those who were intrusted with the government of the church, and those who sat at the helm of the state. These apprehensions were justified by this important consideration, that the pious and well-meaning persons, who composed these assemblies, had indiscreetly admitted into their community a parcel of extravagant and hot-headed fanatics, who foretold the approaching destruction of *Babel* (by which they meant the Lutheran church), terrified the populace with fictitious visions, assumed the authority of prophets honoured with a divine commission, obscured the sublime truths of religion by a gloomy kind of jargon of their own invention, and revived doctrines that had long before been condemned by the church. These enthusiasts also asserted, that the *millennium*, or thousand years reign of the saints on earth, mentioned by St. JOHN, was near at hand. They endeavoured to overturn the wisest establishments, and to destroy the best institutions, and desired that the power of preaching and administering public instruction might be given promiscuously to all sorts of persons. Thus was the Lutheran church torn asunder in the most deplorable manner, while the votaries of *Rome* stood by and beheld, with a secret satisfaction, these unhappy divisions. The most violent debates arose in all the Lutheran churches; and persons, whose differences were occasioned rather by mere words, and questions of little consequence, than by any doctrines or institutions

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

CENT. institutions of considerable importance, attacked
XVII. one another with the bitterest animosity; and, in
SECT. II. many countries, severe laws were at length enacted
PART II. against the *Pietists* [m].

The debates
carried on
with Spener
and the di-
vines of
Hall.

XXIX. These revivers of piety were of two kinds, who, by their different manner of proceeding, deserve to be placed in two distinct classes. One sect of these practical reformers proposed to carry on their plan without introducing any change into the doctrine, discipline, or form of government that were established in the Lutheran church. The other maintained, on the contrary, that it was impossible to promote the progress of real piety among the Lutherans, without making considerable alterations in their doctrine, and changing the whole form of their ecclesiastical discipline and polity. The former had at their head the learned and pious SPENER, who, in the year 1691, removed from *Dresden* to *Berlin*, and whose sentiments were adopted by the professors of the new academy at *Hall*; and par-

[m] This whole matter is amply illustrated by the learned Jo. GEORGE WALCHIUS, in his *Introductio ad Controversias*, vol. ii. and iii. who exhibits, successively, the various scenes of this deplorable contest, with a view of the principal points that were controverted, and his judgment concerning each, and a particular account of the writers that displayed their talents on this occasion. It would, indeed, be difficult for any one man to give an ample and exact history of this contest, which was accompanied with so many incidental circumstances, and was, upon the whole, of such a tedious and complicated nature. It were therefore to be wished, that a society of prudent and impartial persons, furnished with a competent knowledge of human nature and political transactions, and also with proper materials, would set themselves to compose the history of *Pietism*. If several persons were employed in collecting from public records, and also from papers that lie yet concealed in the cabinets of the curious, the events which happened in each country where this controversy reigned; and if these materials, thus carefully gathered on the spot, were put in the hands of a man capable of digesting the whole; this would produce a most interesting and useful history.

ticularly by FRANCKIUS and PAULUS ANTONIUS, who had been invited thither from *Leipfic*, where they began to be suspected of *Pietifm*. Though few pretended to treat either with indignation or contempt the intentions and purpose of these good men (which, indeed, none could despise without affecting to appear the enemy of practical religion and virtue), yet many eminent divines, and more especially the professors and pastors of *Wittemberg*, were of opinion, that, in the execution of this laudable purpose, several maxims were adopted, and certain measures employed, that were prejudicial to the truth, and also detrimental to the interests of the church. Hence they looked on themselves as obliged to proceed publicly, first against SPENER, in the year 1695, and afterwards against his disciples and adherents, as the inventors and promoters of erroneous and dangerous opinions. These debates are of a recent date; so that those who are desirous of knowing more particularly how far the principles of equity, moderation, and candour influenced the conduct and directed the proceedings of the contending parties, may easily receive a satisfactory information.

XXX. These debates turned upon a variety of points; and therefore the matter of them cannot be comprehended under any one general head. If we consider them indeed in relation to their origin, and the circumstances that gave rise to them, we shall then be able to reduce them to some fixed principles. It is well known, that those who had the advancement of piety most zealously at heart, were possessed of a notion, that no order of men contributed more to retard its progress than the clergy, whose peculiar vocation it was to inculcate and promote it. Looking upon this as the root of the evil, it was but natural that their plans of reformation should begin here; and, accordingly, they laid it down as an essential

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

The subject
of these de-
bates.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

essential principle, that none should be admitted into the ministry, but such as had received a proper education, were distinguished by their wisdom and sanctity of manners, and had hearts filled with *divine love*. Hence they proposed, in the *first place*, a thorough reformation of the schools of divinity; and they explained clearly enough what they meant by this reformation; which consisted in the following points: That the systematical theology, which reigned in the academies, and was composed of intricate and disputable doctrines, and obscure and unusual forms of expression, should be totally abolished;—that polemical divinity, which comprehended the controversies subsisting between Christians of different communions, should be less eagerly studied, and less frequently treated, though not entirely neglected;—that all mixture of philosophy and human learning with divine wisdom was to be most carefully avoided;—that, on the contrary, all those who were designed for the ministry, should be accustomed, from their early youth, to the perusal and study of the holy Scriptures;—that they should be taught a plain system of theology, drawn from these unerring sources of truth;—and that the whole course of their education was to be so directed, as to render them useful in life, by the practical power of their doctrine and the commanding influence of their example. As these maxims were propagated with the greatest industry and zeal, and were explained inadvertently by some, without those restrictions which prudence seemed to require; these professed patrons and revivers of piety were suspected of designs that could not but render them obnoxious to censure. They were supposed to despise philosophy and learning, to treat with indifference, and even to renounce, all inquiries into the nature and foundations of religious truth, to disapprove of the

the

the zeal and labours of those who defended it against such as either corrupted or opposed it, and to place the whole of *their* theology in certain vague and incoherent declamations concerning the duties of morality. Hence arose those famous disputes concerning the use of philosophy and the value of human learning, considered in connection with the interests of religion—the dignity and usefulness of *systematic* theology—the necessity of polemical divinity—the excellence of the mystic system—and also concerning the true method of instructing the people.

The *second* great object, that employed the zeal and attention of the persons now under consideration, was, that the candidates for the ministry should not only, for the future, receive such an academical education as would tend rather to solid utility than to mere speculation; but also that they should *dedicate themselves to God* in a peculiar manner, and exhibit the most striking examples of piety and virtue. This maxim, which, when considered in itself, must be acknowledged to be highly laudable, not only gave occasion to several new regulations, designed to restrain the passions of the studious youth, to inspire them with pious sentiments, and to excite in them holy resolutions; but also produced another maxim, which was a lasting source of controversy and debate, *viz.* “that no person, that was not himself a model of piety and divine love, was qualified to be a public teacher of piety, or a guide to others in the way of salvation.” This opinion was considered by many as derogatory from the power and efficacy of the word of God, which cannot be deprived of its divine influence by the vices of its ministers; and as a sort of revival of the long-exploded errors of the Donatists: and what rendered it peculiarly liable to an interpretation of this nature was, the imprudence of some Pietists,

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

who inculcated and explained it, without those restrictions that were necessary to render it unexceptionable. Hence arose endless and intricate debates concerning the following questions: "whether the religious knowledge acquired by a wicked man can be termed theology?"—"whether a vicious person can, in effect, attain to a true knowledge of religion?"—"how far the office and ministry of an impious ecclesiastic can be pronounced salutary and efficacious?"—"whether a licentious and ungodly man cannot be susceptible of illumination?"—and other questions of a like nature.

XXXI. These revivers of declining piety went yet further. In order to render the ministry of their pastors as successful as possible, in rousing men from their indolence, and in stemming the torrent of corruption and immorality, they judged two things indispensably necessary. The *first* was, to suppress entirely, in the course of public instruction, and more especially in that delivered from the pulpit, certain maxims and phrases which the corruption of men leads them frequently to interpret in a manner favourable to the indulgence of their passions. Such, in the judgment of the Pietists, were the following propositions: *No man is able to attain to that perfection which the divine law requires—good works are not necessary to salvation—in the act of justification, on the part of man, faith alone is concerned, without good works.* Many, however, were apprehensive, that, by the suppression of these propositions, truth itself must suffer deeply: and that the Christian religion, deprived thus of its peculiar doctrines, would be exposed, naked and defenceless, to the attacks of its adversaries. The *second* step they took, in order to give efficacy to their plans of reformation, was to form new rules of life and manners, much more rigorous and austere than

than those which had been formerly practised; and to place in the class of *sinful* and *unlawful* gratifications several kinds of pleasure and amusement, which had hitherto been looked upon as innocent in themselves, and which could only become *good* or *evil* in consequence of the respective characters of those who used them with prudence, or abused them with intemperance. Thus, dancing, pantomimes, public sports, theatrical diversions, the reading of humorous and comical books, with several other kinds of pleasure and entertainment, were prohibited by the Pietists, as unlawful and unseemly; and, therefore, by no means of an indifferent nature. Many, however, thought this rule of moral discipline by far too rigid and severe; and thus was revived the ancient contest of the schoolmen, concerning the famous question, *whether any human actions are truly indifferent?* i. e. equally removed from moral good on the one hand, and from moral evil on the other; and *whether*, on the contrary, it be not true, that *all actions, whatever, must be either considered as good, or as evil?* The discussion of this question was attended with a variety of debates upon the several points of the prohibition now mentioned; and these debates were often carried on with animosity and bitterness, and very rarely with that precision, temper, and judgment that the nicety of the matters in dispute required. The *third* thing, on which the *Pietists* insisted, was, that besides the stated meetings for public worship, private assemblies should be held for prayer and other religious exercises. But many were of opinion, that the cause of true piety and virtue was rather endangered than promoted by these assemblies; and experience and observation seemed to confirm this opinion. It would be both *endless* and unnecessary to enumerate all the little disputes that arose from the appointment of

C E N T. these private assemblies, and, in general, from the
 XVII. notions entertained, and the measures pursued by
 SECT. II. the *Pietists* [n]. It is nevertheless proper to ob-
 PART II. serve, that the lenity and indulgence shewn by these
 people to persons whose opinions were erroneous,
 and whose errors were, by no means, of an indif-
 ferent nature, irritated their adversaries to a very
 high degree, and made many suspect, that the
Pietists laid a much greater stress upon practice
 than upon belief, and, separating what ought ever
 to be inseparably joined together, held virtuous
 manners in higher esteem than religious truth.
 Amidst the prodigious numbers that appeared in
 these controversies, it was not at all surprising,
 if the variety of their characters, capacities, and
 views, be duly considered, that some were charge-
 able with imprudence, others with intemperate
 zeal, and that many, to avoid what they looked
 upon as unlawful, fell injudiciously into the op-
 posite extreme.

These re-
 formers of
 vital reli-
 gion endeav-
 our to pro-
 mote piety
 at the ex-
 pence of
 truth.

XXXII. The other class of *Pietists* already mentioned, whose reforming views extended so far, as to change the system of doctrine and the form of ecclesiastical government that were established in the Lutheran church, comprehended persons of various characters and different ways of thinking. Some of them were totally destitute of reason and judgment; their errors were the reveries of a disordered brain; and they were rather to be considered as lunatics than as heretics.

[n] These debates were first collected, and also needlessly multiplied, by SCHLEGVIGIUS, in his *Synopsis Controversiarum sub pietatis pretextu motarum*, which was published in the year 1761, in 8vo. The reader will also find the arguments, used by the contending parties in this dispute, judiciously summed up in two different works of LANGIUS, the one entitled, *Anti-barbarus*; and the other the *Middle-way*; the former composed in Latin, the latter in German.—See also the TIMOTHEUS VERINUS of VAL. ERN. LOSCHERUS.

Others

Others were less extravagant, and tempered the singular notions, they had derived from reading or meditation, with a certain mixture of the important truths and doctrines of religion. We shall mention but a few persons of this class, and those only who were distinguished from the rest by their superior merit and reputation.

Among these was GODFREY ARNOLD, a native of Saxony, a man of extensive reading, tolerable parts, and richly endowed with that natural and unaffected eloquence, which is so wonderfully adapted to touch and to persuade. This man disturbed the tranquillity of the church towards the conclusion of this century, by a variety of theological productions, that were full of new and singular opinions; and more especially by his *ecclesiastical history*, which he had the assurance to impose upon the public, as a work composed with candour and impartiality. His natural complexion was dark, melancholy, and austere; and these seeds of fanaticism were so expanded and nourished by the perusal of the *Mythic* writers, that the flame of enthusiasm was kindled in his breast and broke forth in his conduct and writings with peculiar vehemence. He looked upon the *Mythics* as superior to all other writers, nay as the only depositaries of true wisdom; reduced the whole of religion to certain internal *feelings* and *emotions*, of which it is difficult to form a just idea; neglected entirely the study of truth; and employed the whole power of his genius and eloquence in enumerating, deploring, and exaggerating, the vices and corruptions of human nature. If it is universally allowed to be the first and most essential obligation of an historian to avoid all appearance of partiality, and neither to be influenced by personal attachments nor by private resentment in the recital of facts, it must be fairly acknowledged, that no man could be less

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

fit for writing history than ARNOLD. His whole history, as every one must see who looks into it with the smallest degree of attention, is the production of a violent spirit, and is dictated by a vehement antipathy against the doctrines and institutions of the Lutheran church: One of the fundamental principles that influences the judgment, and directs the opinions and decisions of this historian, throughout the whole course of his work, is, that all the abuses and corruptions that have found admittance into the church since the time of the apostles, have been introduced by its ministers and rulers, men of vicious and abandoned characters. From this principle, he draws the following goodly consequence: that all those who opposed the measures of the clergy, or felt their resentment, were persons of distinguished sanctity and virtue; and that such, on the contrary, as either favoured the ministers of the church, or were favoured by them, were strangers to the spirit of true and genuine piety. Hence proceeded ARNOLD's unaccountable partiality in favour of almost all that bore the denomination of *Heretics* [o]; whom he defended with the utmost zeal, without having always understood their doctrine, and, in some cases, without having even examined their arguments. This partiality was highly detrimental to his reputation, and rendered his history peculiarly obnoxious to censure. He did not, however, continue in this way of thinking; but as he advanced in years and experience, perceived the errors into which he had been led by the impetuosity of his passions and the contagious influence of pernicious examples.

☞ [o] ARNOLD's History is thus entitled, *Historia Ecclesiastica et Heretica*. Dr. MOSHEIM's account of this learned man is drawn up with much severity, and perhaps is not entirely destitute of partiality. See the Life of ARNOLD in the *General Dictionary*.

This

This sense of his mistakes corrected the vehemence of his natural temper and the turbulence of his party spirit, so that, as we learn from witnesses worthy of credit, he became at last a lover of truth and a pattern of moderation [p].

CEN. T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

XXXIII. ARNOLD was far surpassed in fanatical malignity and insolence by JOHN CONRAD DIPPELIUS, a Hessian divine, who assumed the denomination of the *Christian Democritus*, inflamed the minds of the simple by a variety of productions, and excited considerable tumults and commotions towards the conclusion of this century. This vain, supercilious, and arrogant doctor, who seemed formed by nature for a satyrist and a buffoon, instead of proposing any new system of religious doctrine and discipline, was solely employed in overturning those that were received in the Protestant church. His days were principally spent in throwing out sarcasms and invectives against all denominations of Christians; and the Lutherans, to whose communion he belonged, were more especially the objects of his raillery and derision, which, on many occasions, spared not those things that had formerly been looked upon as the most respectable and sacred. It is much to be doubted, whether he had formed any clear and distinct notions of the doctrines he taught; since, in his views of things, the power of imagination domineered evidently over the dictates of right reason and common sense. But, if he really understood the religious maxims he was propagating, he had not certainly the talent of rendering them clear and perspicuous to others; for nothing can be more ambiguous and obscure than the expressions under which they are conveyed, and the arguments by which they are supported.

Dippelius.

[p] See COLERI *Vita ARNOLDI*.—*Nouveau Diction. Histor. et Critique*, tom. i. p. 485.

CENT. XVII. A man must have the gift of divination, to be able to deduce a regular and consistent system of doctrine from the various productions of this incoherent and unintelligible writer, who was a chemist into the bargain, and whose brain seems to have been heated into a high degree of fermentation by the fire of the laboratory. If the rude, motley, and sarcastical writings of this wrong-headed reformer should reach posterity, it will be certainly a just matter of surprise to our descendants, that a considerable number of their ancestors should have been so blind as to chuse for a model of genuine piety, and a teacher of religion, a man who had audaciously violated the first and most essential principles of solid piety and sound sense [7].

The inventions and reveries of Petersen.

XXXIV. The mild and gentle temper of JOHN WILLIAM PETERSEN, minister and first member of the ecclesiastical consistory of *Lunenburg*, distinguished him remarkably from the fiery enthusiast now mentioned. But the mildness of this good-natured ecclesiastic was accompanied with a want of resolution, that might be called weakness, and a certain floridness and warmth of imagination, that rendered him peculiarly susceptible of illusion himself, and every way proper to lead others innocently into error. Of this he gave a very remarkable specimen in the year 1691, by main-

[7] His works were all published, in the year 1747, in five volumes in 4to; and his memory is still highly honoured and respected by many, who consider him as having been, in his day, an eminent teacher of true piety and wisdom. No kind of authors find such zealous readers and patrons as those who deal largely in invective, and swell themselves, by a vain self-sufficiency, into an imagined superiority over the rest of mankind. Besides, DIPPELIUS was an excellent chemist and a good physician; and this procured him many friends and admirers, as all men are fond of riches and long life, and these two sciences were supposed to lead to the one and to the other.

taining

taining publicly that ROSAMOND JULIANA, Countess of *Asseburg* (whose disordered brain suggested to her the most romantic and chimerical notions) was honoured with a vision of the Deity, and commissioned to make a new declaration of his will to mankind. He also revived and propagated openly the obsolete doctrine of the *Millennium*, which ROSAMOND had confirmed by her pretended authority from above. This first error produced many; for error is fertile, especially in those minds where imagination has spurned the yoke of reason, and considers all its airy visions as solid and important discoveries. Accordingly, PETERSEN went about prophesying with his wife [r], who also gave herself out for a kind of oracle, and boasted of her extensive knowledge of the secrets of heaven. They talked of a general *restitution* of all things, at which grand and solemn period all intelligent beings were to be restored to happiness, the gates of hell opened, and wicked men, together with evil spirits, delivered from the guilt, power, and punishment of sin. They supposed that two *distinct natures*, and both of them *human*, were united in CHRIST; one assumed in heaven before the reformation of this globe, the other derived, upon earth, from the Virgin MARY. These opinions were swallowed down by many among the multitude, and were embraced by some of superior rank; they met, however, with great opposition, and were refuted by a considerable number of writers, to whom PETERSEN, who was amply furnished with leisure and eloquence, made voluminous replies. In the year 1692, he was at length deposed; and, from that period, passed his days in the tranquillity of a rural retreat in the territory of *Magdeburg*, where he cheered his solitude by

[r] Her name was JOHANNA ELEONORA à MERLAU.

C E N T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

Schade and
Bosius.

epistolary commerce, and spent the remainder of his days in composition and study [s].

XXXV. It is not easy to determine, whether JOHN CASPAR SCHADE and GEORGE BOSIUS may be associated properly with the persons now mentioned. They were both good men, full of zeal for the happiness and salvation of their brethren; but their zeal was neither directed by prudence, nor tempered with moderation. The former, who was minister at *Berlin*, propagated several notions that seemed crude and uncouth; and, in the year 1697, inveighed, with the greatest bitterness, against the custom that prevails in the Lutheran church of confessing privately to the clergy. These violent remonstrances excited great commotions, and were even attended with popular tumults. Bosius performed the pastoral functions at *Soraw*; and, to awaken sinners from their security, and prevent their treating, with negligence and indifference, interests that are most important by being eternal, denied that God would continue always propitious and placable with respect to those offenders, whose incorrigible obstinacy he had foreseen from all eternity; or that he would offer them beyond a certain period, marked in his decrees, those succours of grace that are necessary to salvation. This tenet, in the judgment of many grave divines, seemed highly injurious to the boundless mercy of God, and was accordingly refuted and condemned in several treatises; it found, nevertheless, an eminent patron and de-

[s] PETERSEN wrote his life in German, and it was first published in 8vo. in 1717.—His wife added her Life to it, by way of supplement, in the year 1718. These pieces of biography will satisfy such as are desirous of a particular account of the character, manners, and talents, of this extraordinary pair. For an account of the troubles they excited at *Lunenburg*, see JO. MOLLER, *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 639. the *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A. 1748. p. 974. A. 1749. p. 30—200. & passim.

sender

sender in the learned RECHENBELG, professor of divinity at *Leipfic*, not to mention others of less note, who appeared in its behalf [1].

C E N T.
XXII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

XXXVI. Among the controversies of inferior note that divided the Lutheran church, we shall first mention those that broke out between the doctors of *Tubingen* and *Gieffen* so early as the year 1616. The principal part of this debate related to the abasement and humiliation, or, to what divines call, the *exinanition* of *Jesus Christ*; and the great point was to know in what this *exinanition* properly consisted, and what was the precise nature and characteristic of this singular situation: That the *Man Christ* possessed, even in the most dreadful periods of his abasement, the divine properties and attributes he had received in consequence of the *hypostatic union*, was unanimously agreed on by both of the contending parties; but they differed in their sentiments relating to this subtle and intricate question, *Whether Christ, during his mediatorial sufferings and sacerdotal state, really suspended the exertion of these attributes, or only concealed this exertion from the view of mortals?* The latter was maintained by the doctors of *Tubingen*, while those of *Gieffen* were inclined to think, that the exertion of the divine attributes was *really* suspended in CHRIST during his humiliation and sufferings. This main question was followed by others, which were much more subtle than important, concerning the *manner* in which God is *present* with all his works, the reasons and foundation of this universal presence, the true cause of the omnipresence of CHRIST's body, and others of a like intricate and unintelligible nature. The champions that distinguished themselves on the side of the doctors of *Tubin-*

Contest concerning the omnipresence of Christ's flesh, between the doctors of *Tubingen* and *Gieffen*.

[1] See WALCHIUS's *Introductio ad Controversias*, p. 1. cap. iv.

C E N T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

gen were, LUCAS OSIANDER, MELCHIOR NICOLAS, and THEODORE THUMMIUS. The most eminent of those that adopted the cause of the divines of *Giessen* were, BALTHAZAR, MENZER, and JUSTUS FEVERBORN. The contest was carried on with zeal, learning, and sagacity; it were to be wished that one could add, that it was managed with wisdom, dignity, and moderation. This, indeed, was far from being the case; but such was the spirit and genius of the age, that many things were now treated with indulgence, or beheld with approbation, which the wisdom and decency of succeeding times have justly endeavoured to discountenance and correct. In order to terminate these disagreeable contests, the Saxon divines were commanded, by their sovereign, to offer themselves as arbitrators between the contending parties in the year 1624; their arbitration was accepted, but it did not at all contribute to decide the matters in debate. Their decisions were vague and ambiguous, and were therefore adapted to satisfy none of the parties. They declared, that they could not entirely approve of the doctrine of either; but insinuated, at the same time, that a certain degree of preference was due to the opinions maintained by the doctors of *Giessen* [u]. Those of *Tubingen* rejected the decision of the Saxon arbitrators; and it is very probable, that the divines of *Giessen* would have appealed from it also, had not the public calamities, in which *Germany* began to be involved at this time, suspended this miserable contest, by imposing silence upon the disputants, and leaving

[u] JO. WOLF. JAEGER. *Hist. Eccles. et Polit. Sæc. xvii. Decenn. iii.* p. 329.—CHRIST. EBERH. WEIFMANNI *Hist. Ecclesiast. Sæc. xvii.* p. 1178.—WALCHIUS, *loc. cit.* p. 206.—See also CAROLI ARNOLD, and the other writers, who have written the Ecclesiastical History of these times.

them

them in the quiet possession of their respective opinions.

XXXVII. Before the cessation of the controversy now mentioned, a new one was occasioned, in the year 1621, by the writings of HERMAN RATHMAN, minister at *Dantzic*, a man of eminent piety, some learning, and a zealous patron and admirer of ARNDT's famous book concerning *true Christianity*. This good man was suspected by his colleague CORVINUS, and several others, of entertaining sentiments derogatory from the dignity and power of the sacred writings. These suspicions they derived from a book he published, in the year 1621, *Concerning Christ's Kingdom of Grace*, which, according to the representations of his adversaries, contained the following doctrine: "That the word of God, as it stands in the sacred writings, hath no *innate* power to illuminate the mind, to excite in it a principle of regeneration, and thus to turn it to God; that the external word sheweth, indeed, the way to salvation, but cannot *effectually* lead men to it; but that God himself, by the ministry of another, and an *internal word*, works such a change in the minds of men, as is necessary to render them agreeable in his sight, and enables them to please him by their words and actions." This doctrine was represented by CORVINUS and his associates as the same which had been formerly held by SCHWENCKFELD, and was professed by the Mystics in general. But whoever will be at the pains to examine with attention the various writings of RATHMAN on this subject, must soon be convinced, that his adversaries either misunderstood his true sentiments, or wilfully misrepresented them. His real doctrine may be comprised in the four following points: "*First*, that the divine word, contained in the Holy Scriptures, is endowed with the power of healing the minds of men,

C E N T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

The controversy occasioned by the writings of Rathmannus.

" and

C E N T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

“ and bringing them to God: but that, *secondly*, cannot exert this power in the minds of corrupt men, who resist its divine operation and influence; and that of consequence, *thirdly*, it is absolutely necessary, that the word be preceded or accompanied by some divine energy, which may prepare the minds of sinners to receive it, and remove those impediments that oppose its efficacy; and *fourthly*, that it is by the power of the *holy spirit*, or *internal word*, that the external word is rendered incapable of exerting its efficacy in enlightening and sanctifying the minds of men [*w*].” There is, indeed, some difference between these opinions and the doctrine commonly received in the Lutheran church, relating to the efficacy of the divine word; but a careful perusal of the writings of RATHMAN on this subject, and a candid examination of his inaccurate expressions, will persuade the impartial reader, that this difference is neither great nor important; and he will only perceive, that this pious man had not the talent of expressing his notions with order, perspicuity, and precision. However that may have been, this contest grew more general from day to day, and, at length, extended its polemic influence through the whole Lutheran church, the greatest part of whose members followed the example of the Saxon doctors in condemning RATHMAN, while a considerable number, struck with the lustre of his piety, and persuaded of the innocence of his doctrine, espoused his cause. In the year 1628, when this controversy was at the greatest height, RATHMAN died, and then the warmth and animosity of the contending parties subsided gradually, and at length ceased.

[*w*] See MOLLERU'S *Cimbria Literata*, tom. iii. p. 559.—HARKNOCH'S German work, entitled *Preussische Kirchen-Geschichte*, book iii. ch. viii. p. 812. ARNOLD'S *Kirchen und Ketzer-Historie*, p. iii. ch. xvi. p. 115.

XXXVIII. It would be repugnant to the true end of history, as well as to all principles of candour and equity, to swell this enumeration of the controversies that divided the Lutheran church, with the private disputes of certain individuals concerning some particular points of doctrine and worship. Some writers have, indeed, followed this method, not so much with a design to enrich their histories with a multitude of facts, and to shew men and opinions in all their various aspects, as with a view to render the Lutherans ridiculous or odious. In the happiest times, and in the best modelled communities, there will always remain sufficient marks of human imperfection, and abundant sources of private contention, at least in the imprudence and mistakes of some, and the impatience and severity of others; but it must betray a great want of sound judgment, as well as of candour and impartiality, to form a general estimate of the state and character of a whole church upon such particular instances of imperfection and error. Certain singular opinions and modes of expression were censured by many in the writings of TARNOVIVS and AFFELMAN, two divines of *Rostock*, who were otherwise men of distinguished merit. This, however, will surprise us less, when we consider, that these doctors often expressed themselves improperly, when their sentiments were just; and that, when their expressions were accurate and proper, they were frequently misunderstood by those who pretended to censure them. JOACHIM LUTKEMAN, a man whose reputation was considerable, and, in many respects, well deserved, took it into his head to deny that CHRIST remained *true man* during the three days that intervened between his death and resurrection. This sentiment appeared highly erroneous to many; hence arose a contest, which was merely a dispute

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

Private controversies.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

dispute about words, resembling many other debates, which, like bubbles, are incessantly swelling and vanishing on the surface of human life. Of this kind, more especially, was the controversy which, for some time, exercised the talents of BOETIUS and BALDUIN, professors of divinity, the former at *Helmstadt*, and the latter at *Wittenberg*, and had for its subject the following question, *Whether or no the wicked shall one day be restored to life by the merits of Christ?* In the dutchy of *Holstein*, REINBOTH distinguished himself by the singularity of his opinions. After the example of CALIXTUS, he reduced the fundamental doctrines of religion within narrower bounds than are usually prescribed to them; he also considered the opinion of those Greeks, who deny that the *Holy Ghost* proceeds from the *Son*, as an error of very little consequence. In both these respects, his sentiments were adopted by many; they, however, met with opposition from several quarters, and were censured, with peculiar warmth, by the learned JOHN CONRAD DANHAVER, professor of divinity at *Strasburg*; in consequence of this, a kind of controversy was kindled between these two eminent men, and was carried on with more vehemence than the nature and importance of the matters in debate could well justify [x]. But these and other contests of this nature must not be admitted into that list of controversies, from which we are to form a judgment of the internal state of the Lutheran church during this century.

[x] For an account of all these controversies in general, see ARNOLDI *Histor. Eccles. et Hæret.* p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. vi. p. 957. That which was occasioned by REINBOTH is amply and circumstantially related by MOLLERUS, in his *Introducō ad Historiam Chersonesi Cimbricæ*, p. ii. p. 190. and in his *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 692.

XXXIX. We cannot say the same thing of certain controversies, which were of a personal rather than a real nature, and related to the 'orthodoxy or unsoundness of certain men, rather than to the truth or falsehood of certain opinions; for these are somewhat more essentially connected with the internal state and history of the church, than the contests last mentioned. It is not unusual for those, who professedly embark in the cause of declining piety, and aim, in a solemn, zealous, and public manner, at its revival and restoration, to be elated with high and towering views, and warm with a certain enthusiastic, though noble fervour. This elevation and ardour of mind is by no means a source of accuracy and precision; on the contrary, it produces many unguarded expressions, and prevents men of warm piety from forming their language by those rules which are necessary to render it clear, accurate, and proper; it frequently dictates expressions and phrases that are pompous and emphatic, but, at the same time, allegorical and ambiguous; and leads pious and even sensible men to adopt uncouth and vulgar forms of speech, employed by writers whose style is as low and barbarous as their intentions are upright and pious, and whose practical treatises on religion and morality have nothing recommendable but the zeal and fervour with which they are penned. Persons of this warm and enthusiastical turn fall with more facility than any other set of men into the suspicion of heresy, on account of the inaccuracy of their expressions. This many doctors found to be true, by a disagreeable experience, during the course of this century; but it was, in a more particular manner, the fate of STEPHEN PRÆTORIUS, minister of *Solzswedel*, and of JOHN ARNDT, whose piety and virtue have rendered his memory precious to the friends of true religion.

VOL. V.

Z

TORIUS

C E N T.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

The debates relating to Prætorius and Arndt.

CENT.
XVII.
SECT. II.
PART II.

TORIUS had, so early as the preceding century, composed certain treatises, designed to revive a spirit of vital religion, and awaken in the minds of men a zeal for their future and eternal interests. These productions, which were frequently republished during this century, were highly applauded by many, while, in the judgment of others, they abounded with expressions and sentiments, that were partly false, and partly adapted by their ambiguity to lead men into error. It cannot be denied, that there are in the writings of PRÆTORIUS some improper and unguarded expressions, that may too easily deceive the ignorant and unwary, as also several marks of that credulity that borders upon weakness; but those who peruse his works with impartiality will be fully persuaded of the uprightness of his intentions.

The unfeigned piety and integrity of ARNDT could not secure him from censure. His famous book concerning *true Christianity*, which is still perused with the utmost pleasure and edification by many persons eminent for the sanctity of their lives and manners, met with a warm and obstinate opposition. OSIANDER, ROSTIUS, and other doctors, inveighed against it with excessive bitterness, pretended to find in it various defects, and alleged, among other things, that its style was infected with the jargon of the *Paracelsists*, *Weigelians*, and other *Mystico-chemical* philosophers. It must, indeed, be acknowledged, that this eminent man entertained a high disgust against the philosophy that, in his time, reigned in the schools; nor can it be denied, that he had a high, perhaps an excessive, degree of respect for the chemists, and an ill-placed confidence in their obscure decisions and pompous undertakings. This led him sometimes into conversation with those fantastic philosophers, who, by the power and ministry of *fire*, pretended to unfold both the
secrets

secrets of nature and the mysteries of religion. But, notwithstanding this, he was declared exempt from any errors of moment by a multitude of grave and pious divines, among whom were EGARD, DILGER, BRELER, GERHARD, and DORSCHÆUS; and in the issue the censures and opposition of his adversaries seemed rather to cast a new lustre on his reputation than to cover him with reproach [y]. We may place in the class, now under consideration, VALENTINE WEIGELIUS, a minister of the church of *Zilcopavia* in *Mishia*; for though he died in the preceding century, yet it was in this that the greatest part of his writings were published, and also censured as erroneous and of a dangerous tendency. The science of chemistry, which at this time was making such a rapid progress in *Germany*, proved also detrimental to this ecclesiastic; who, though in the main a man of probity and merit, neglected the paths of right reason, and chose rather to wander in the devious wilds of a chimerical philosophy [z].

C E N T.
XVII.
S E C T. II.
PART II.

XL. There were a set of fanatics among the Lutherans, who in the flights of their enthusiasm far surpassed those now mentioned, and who had such a high notion of their own abilities as to attempt melting down the present form of religion, and casting a new system of piety after a model drawn from their wanton and irregular fancies; it is with some account of the principal of these spiritual projectors that we shall conclude the

Jacob Bohemius or Boemen.

[y] See ARNOLDI *Hist. Eccles. et Hæretica*, p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. vi. p. 940.—WEISMANNI *Histor. Eccles. Sæc. xvii.* p. 1174. 1189.—GODOF. BALTH. SCHARFII *Supplementum Historiæ, Litiquæ Arndtianæ. Wittem.* 1727, in 8vo.

[z] There is an account of WEIGELIUS, more ample than impartial, given by ARNOLD, *loc. cit.* lib. xvii. cap. xvii. p. 1088.

C E N T. XVII. history of the Lutheran church during this cen-
 S E C T. II. tury.
 P A R T II.

At the head of this visionary tribe we may place JACOB BEHMEN, a taylor at *Gorlitz*, who was remarkable for the multitude of his patrons and adversaries, and whom his admirers commonly called the *German Theosophist*. This man had a natural propensity towards the investigation of mysteries, and was fond of abstruse and intricate inquiries of every kind; and having, partly by books and partly by conversation with certain physicians [a], acquired some knowledge of the doctrine of ROBERT FLUDD and the *Rosicrucians*, which was propagated in *Germany* with great ostentation during this century, he struck out of the element of *fire*, by the succours of imagination, a species of theology much more obscure than the numbers of PYTHAGORAS, or the intricacies of HERACLITUS. Some have bestowed high praises on this enthusiast, on account of his piety, integrity, and sincere love of truth and virtue; and we shall not pretend to contradict these encomiums. But such as carry their admiration of his doctrine so far as to honour him with the character of an *inspired messenger of heaven*, or even of a judicious and wise philosopher, must be themselves deceived and blinded in a very high degree; for never did their reign such obscurity and confusion in the writings of any mortal, as in the miserable productions of JACOB BEHMEN, which exhibit a motley mixture of chemical terms, crude visions, and mystic jargon. Among other dreams of a disturbed and eccentric fancy, he entertained the following chimerical notion: "That the
 "divine grace operates by the same rules, and
 "follows the same methods, that the divine providence observes in the natural world; and

[a] *Viz.* TOBIAS KOBER and BALTHAZAR WALTHER.
 "that

“ that the minds of men are purged from
 “ their vices and corruptions in the same way
 “ that metals are purified from their dross;”
 and this maxim was the principle of his fire-
 theology. BEHMEN had a considerable number
 of followers, in this century, the most emi-
 nent of whom were JOHN LEWIS, GIFTTHEIL,
 JOHN ANGELUS, WERDENHAGEN, ABRAHAM
 FRANCKENBERG, THEODORE TZETSCH, PAUL
 FELGENHAVER, QUIRINUS KUHLMAN, JOHN
 JACOB ZIMMERMAN; and he has still many vo-
 caries and admirers even in our times. There
 was, indeed, a signal difference between his fol-
 lowers; some of them retained, notwithstanding
 their attachment to his extravagant system, a cer-
 tain degree of moderation and good sense; others
 of them seemed entirely out of their wits, and by
 their frenzy excited the compassion of those who
 were the spectators of their conduct; such were
 KUHLMAN and GICHTELIUS, the former of whom
 was burnt at *Moscow* in the year 1684; but, in-
 deed, it may be affirmed in general, that none of
 the disciples or followers of BEHMEN propagated
 his doctrine, or conducted themselves, in such a
 manner as to do honour either to their master or
 to his cause in the judgment of the wise [b].

XLI. Another

[b] It is needless to mention the writers who employed their
 pens in stemming the torrent of BEHMEN's enthusiasm. The
 works of this fanatic are in every body's hands, and the books
 that were composed to refute them are well known, and to be
 found every where. All that has been alleged in his favour
 and defence has been carefully collected by ARNOLD, who is,
 generally speaking, peculiarly eloquent in the praises of those
 whom others treat with contempt. For an account of KUHLMAN,
 and his unhappy fate, see the German work, entitled,
Unschuld. Nachricht. A. 1748.

☞ BEHMEN, however, had the good fortune to meet with,
 in our days, a warm advocate and an industrious disciple in
 the late well-meaning, but gloomy and visionary, Mr. WIL-

CENT.
XVII.

SECT. II.

PART II.

The prophets of
this age.

XLI. Another class of persons, who deserve to be placed immediately after BEHMEN, were they, whom a disordered brain persuaded that they were prophets sent from above, and that they were divinely inspired with the power of foretelling future events. A considerable number of these delirious fanatics arose during the course of this century; and more especially at that juncture when the house of *Austria* was employed in maintaining its power, in the empire, against the united armies of *Sweden*, *France*, and *Germany*. It is remarkable enough, that the tribe of pretended prophets and diviners is never more numerous than at those critical and striking periods when great revolutions are expected, or sudden and heavy calamities have happened, as such periods, and the scenes they exhibit, inflame the imagination of the fanatic, and may be turned to the profit of the impostor. The most eminent of the fanatical prophets now under consideration, were NICHOLAS DRABICIUS, CHRISTOPHER KOTTER, CHRISTINA PONIATOVIA, who found an eloquent defender and patron in JOHN AMOS COMENIO; not to mention JOACHIM GREULICH, ANNE VETTER, MARY FROELICH, GEORGE REICHARD, and several others, who audaciously assumed the same character. It is not necessary to enter into a more circumstantial detail of the history of this visionary tribe, since none of them arose to such a degree of reputation and consequence, as to occasion any considerable tumults by their predictions. It is sufficient to have observed in general, that, even in this century, there were among the Lutherans certain crazy fanatics, who, under the

LIAM LAW, who was, for many years, preparing a new edition and translation of BEHMEN'S works, which he left behind him ready for the press, and which have been published in two vols. 4^{to}, since his decease. N.

impulse