

impulse of a disordered imagination, assumed the character and authority of prophets sent from above to enlighten the world [c].

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

XLII. It will not, however, be improper to mention, somewhat more circumstantially, the case of those, who, though they did not arrive at that enormous height of folly that leads men to pretend to divine inspiration, yet deceived themselves and deluded others, by entertaining and propagating the strangest fancies and the most monstrous and impious absurdities. Some time after the commencement of this century, ISAIAH STIEFEL and EZEKIEL METH, inhabitants of *Thuringia*, were observed to throw out the most extraordinary and shocking expressions while they spoke of themselves and their religious attainments. These expressions, in the judgment of many, amounted to nothing less than attributing to themselves the divine glory and majesty, and thus implied a blasphemous, or rather a frenetic, insult on the Supreme Being and his eternal Son. It is nevertheless scarcely credible, however irrational we may suppose them to have been, that these fanatics should have carried their perverse and absurd fancies to such an amazing height; and it would perhaps be more agreeable both to truth and charity to suppose, that they had imi-

Ezekiel  
Meth,  
Isaiah Stie-  
fel, Paul  
Nagel.

[c] ARNOLD is to be commended for giving us an accurate collection of the transactions and visions of these enthusiasts, in the third and fourth parts of his *History of Heretics*; since those who are desirous of full information in this matter may easily see, by consulting this historian, that the pretended revelations of these prophets were no more than the phantoms of a disordered imagination. A certain pious but ignorant man, named BENEDICT BAHNSEN, who was a native of *Holstein*, and lived at *Amsterdam* about the middle of the last century, was so delighted with the writings and predictions of these fanatics, that he collected them carefully and published them. In the year 1670, a catalogue of his library was printed at *Amsterdam*, which was full of chemical and fanatical books.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

tated the pompous and turgid language of the mystic writers in such an extravagant manner, as to give occasion to the heavy accusation above mentioned. Considering the matter even in this candid and charitable light, we may see by their examples how much the constant perusal of the writings of the Mystics is adapted to shed darkness, delusion, and folly into the imagination of weak and ignorant men [*d*]. The reveries of PAUL NAGEL, professor of divinity at *Leipfic*, were highly absurd, but of a much less pernicious tendency than these already mentioned. This prophetic dreamer, who had received a light tincture of mathematical knowledge, pretended to see, in the position of the stars, the events that were to happen in church and state; and, from a view of these celestial bodies, foretold, in a more particular manner, the erection of a new and most holy kingdom in which CHRIST should reign here upon earth [*e*].

Christian  
Hoburg,  
Frederic  
Breckling,  
Seidenbe-  
cher.

XLIII. CHRISTIAN HOBURG, a native of *Lunenburg*, a man of a turbulent and inconstant spirit, and not more remarkable for this violence than for his duplicity, threw out the most bitter reproaches and invectives against the whole Lutheran church without exception [*f*], and thereby involved himself in various perplexities. He deceived indeed the multitude a long time, by his dissimulation and hypocrisy; and by a series of frauds, which he undoubtedly looked upon as lawful, he disguised so well his true character that

[*d*] See ARNOLD, *Historia Eccles. et Hæret.* p. iii. cap. iv. p. 32.—THOMASius, in his German work entitled, *Historie de Weisheit und Narrheit*, vol. i. p. iii. p. 150.

[*e*] ARNOLD, *loc. cit.* p. iii. cap. v. p. 53.—ANDR. CAROLI *Memorabilia Ecclesiæ, Sæc. xvii. pars i. lib. iii. cap. iv. p. 513.*

[*f*] HOBURG, in some of his petulant and satirical writings, assumed the names of ELIAS PRÆTORIUS and BERNARD BAUMANN.

he appeared to many, and especially to persons of a candid and charitable turn, much less contemptible than he was in reality; and though the acrimony and violence of his proceedings were condemned, yet they were supposed to be directed, not against religion itself, but against the licentiousness and vices of its professors, and particularly of its ministers. At length, however, the mask fell from the face of this hypocrite, who became an object of general indignation and contempt, and, deserting the communion of the Lutheran church, went over to the Mennonites [g]. There was a striking resemblance between this petulant railer and FREDERICK BRECKLING; the latter, however, surpassed even the former in impetuosity and malignity. BRECKLING had been pastor first in the duchy of *Holstein*, and afterwards at *Zwoll*, a city in the United Provinces, where he was deposed from his ministry, and lived a great many years after without being attached to any religious sect or community. There are several of his writings still extant, which, indeed, recommend warmly the practice of piety and virtue, and seem to express the most implacable abhorrence of vicious persons and licentious manners; and yet, at the same time, they demonstrate plainly that their author was destitute of that charity, prudence, meekness, patience, and love of truth, which are the essential and fundamental virtues of a real Christian [b]. It is un-

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

[g] ARNOLD, *loc. cit.* p. iii. cap. xiii. p. 130.—ANDR. CAROLI, *loc. cit.* vol. i. p. 1065.—JO. HORNBECK, *Summa Controvers.* p. 535.—MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 337.

[b] ARNOLD has given an account of BRECKLING, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica et Hæret.* pars iii. p. 148. and pars iv. p. 1103. he has also published some of his writings (p. 1110.) which sufficiently demonstrate the irregularity and exuberance of his fancy. There is a particular account of this degraded pastor given by MOLLERUS, in his *Cimbria Literata*, tom. iii. p. 72.

doubtedly

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

---

doubtedly a just matter of surprise, that these vehement declaimers against the established religion and its ministers, who pretend to be so much more sagacious and sharp-sighted than their brethren, do not perceive a truth, which the most simple may learn from daily observation; even that nothing is more odious and disgusting than an angry, petulant, and violent reformer, who comes to heal the disorders of a community, armed, as it were, with fire and sword, with menaces and terrors. It is also to be wondered, that these men are not aware of another consideration equally obvious, namely, that it is scarcely credible, that a *spiritual* physician will cure another with entire success of the disorders under which he himself is known to labour.

GEORGE LAURENCE SEIDENBECHER, pastor at *Eisfeld* in *Saxony*, adopted himself, and propagated among the multitude, the doctrine of the MILLENNIUM or thousand years reign of CHRIST upon earth; a doctrine which scarcely ever gains admittance but in disordered brains, and rarely produces any other fruits than incoherent dreams and idle visions. SEIDENBECHER was censured on account of this doctrine, and deposed from his pastoral charge [i].

Martin Seidel.

XLIV. It would be superfluous to name the other fanatics that deserve a place in the class now before us, since they almost all laboured under the same disorder, and the uniformity of their sentiments and conduct was so perfect, that the history of one, a few instances excepted, may, in a great measure, be considered as the history of them all. We shall therefore conclude this crazy list with a short account of the very worst

[i] There is a circumstantial account of this man given by ALB. MENO VERPOORTEN, in his *Commentar. de vita et institutis G. L. SEIDENBECHERI*, *Gedani*, 1739, 4to.

of the whole tribe, MARTIN SEIDELIUS, a native of *Silesia*, who endeavoured to form a sect in *Poland* towards the conclusion of the preceding century and the commencement of this, but could not find followers, even among the Socinians; so wild were his views, and so extravagant his notions. This audacious adventurer in religious novelties was of opinion, that God had, indeed, promised a Saviour or MESSIAH to the Jews; but that *this* MESSIAH had never appeared, and never would appear, on account of the sins of the Jewish people, which rendered them unworthy of this great deliverer. From hence he concluded, that it was erroneous to look upon CHRIST as the MESSIAH; that the only office of JESUS was, to interpret and republish the law of nature; that had been perverted and obscured by the vices, corruptions, and ignorance of men; and that the whole duty of men, and all the obligations of religion; were fulfilled by an obedience to this law, republished and explained by JESUS CHRIST. To render this doctrine more defensible and specious, or, at least, to get rid of a multitude of arguments and express declarations that might be drawn from the holy Scriptures to prove its absurdity, he boldly rejected all the books of the New Testament. The small number of disciples, that adopted the fancies of this intrepid innovator, were denominated *semi-judaizers* [k]. Had he appeared in our times, he would have given less offence than at the period in which he lived; for, if we except his singular notion concerning the MESSIAH, his doctrine was such as would at present be highly agreeable to many persons in *Great Britain, Holland*, and other countries [l].

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

[k] See GUSTAVI GEORGI ZELTNERI *Historia Crypto Socinismi Altorfiani*, vol. i. p. 268. 335.

[l] We are much at a loss to know what DR. MOSHEIM means by this insinuation, as also the persons he has in view; for,

## CHAPTER II.

*The History of the REFORMED CHURCH.*

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

The limits  
of the Re-  
formed  
church ex-  
tended.

I. **I**T has been already observed, that the Reformed church, considered in the most comprehensive sense of that term, as forming a *whole*, composed of a great variety of parts, is rather united by the principles of moderation and fraternal charity, than by a perfect uniformity in doctrine, discipline, and worship. It will, therefore, be proper to take, first a view of those events that related to this great body collectively considered; and afterwards to enter into a detail of the most memorable occurrences that happened in the particular communities of which it is composed. The principal accessions it received during this century have already been mentioned, when, in the history of the Lutheran church, we related the changes and commotions that happened in the principalities of *Hesse* and *Brandenburg* [m]. These, however, were not the only changes that took place in favour of the Reformed

for, on the one hand, it is sufficiently evident, that he cannot mean the *Drifts*; and, on the other, we know of no denomination of Christians, who *boldly reject all the books of the New Testament*. Our author probably meant, that the part of SEIDEL's doctrine which represents Christ's Mission as *only designed to republish and interpret the Law of Nature*, and the *whole* religious and moral duty of man as consisting in an obedience to this Law, would have been well received by many persons in *Great Britain and Holland*; but he should have said so; nothing requires such precision as accusations.

[m] See section ii. part ii. chap. i. § i, ii. where the *History of the Lutheran Church* commences with an account of the loss that church sustained by the secession of MAURICE, landgrave of *Hesse-Cassel*, and JOHN SIGISMUND, elector of *Brandenburg*, who embraced solemnly the doctrine of the Reformed church, the former in 1604, and the latter in 1614.

church.

church. Its doctrine was embraced, about the commencement of this century, by ADOLPHUS, duke of *Holstein*, and it was naturally expected, that the subjects would follow the example of their prince; but this expectation was disappointed, by the death of ADOLPHUS, in the year 1616 [n]. HENRY, duke of *Saxony*, withdrew also from the communion of the Lutherans, in whose religious principles he had been educated; and, in the year 1688, embraced the doctrine of the Reformed church at *Dessau*, in consequence, as some allege, of the solicitations of his duchess [o]. In *Denmark*, about the beginning of this century, there were still a considerable number of persons who secretly espoused the sentiments of that church, and more especially could never reconcile themselves to the Lutheran doctrine of CHRIST's *bodily presence with the sacrament of the eucharist*. They were confirmed in their attachment to the tenets of the Reformed by HEMMINGIUS, and other followers of MELANCTHON, whose secret ministry and public writings were attended with considerable success. The face of things, however, changed; and the Reformed in *Denmark* saw their expectations vanish, and their credit sink, in the year 1614, when CANUT Bishop of *Gottenburg*, who had given too plain intimations

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

[n] JO. MOLLER *Introd. ad Histor. Chersonesi Cimbricæ*, p. II. p. 101.—ERIC. PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ Diplomatici*, tom. III. p. 691.

[o] See MOEBII *Selectæ Diss. Theolog.* p. 1137.—The duke of *Saxony* published to the world a *Confession of his Faith*, containing the reasons of his change. This piece, which the divines of *Leipsick* were obliged by a public order to refute, was defended against their attacks by the learned ISAAC DE BEAUSOBRE, at that time pastor at *Magdeburg*, in a book, entitled, *Défense de la Doctrine des Réformés, et en particulier de la Confession de S. A. S. Misgr. le Duc HENRY DE SAXE contre un Livre composé par la Faculté de Théologie à Leipsic. Magdeb. 1694, in 8vo.*

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

---

of his propensity to the doctrines of CALVIN, was deprived of his episcopal dignity [p]. The progress of the Reformed religion in *Africa, Asia, and America*, is abundantly known; it was carried into these distant regions by the English and Dutch emigrants, who formed settlements there for the purposes of commerce, and founded flourishing churches in the various provinces where they fixed their habitations. It is also known, that in several places where Lutheranism was established, the French, German, and British members of the Reformed church were allowed the free exercise of their religion.

The decline  
of the Re-  
formed  
church in  
*France*.

II. Of all the calamities that tended to diminish the influence, and eclipse the lustre, of the Reformed church, none was more dismal in its circumstances, and more unhappy in its effects, than the deplorable fate of that church in *France*. From the time of the accession of HENRY IV. to the throne of that kingdom, the Reformed church had acquired the form of a body-politic [q]. Its members were endowed with considerable privileges; they were also secured against insults of every kind by a solemn edict, and were possessed of several fortified places, particularly the strong city of *Rochelle*; in which, to render their security still more complete, they were allowed to have their own garrisons. This body-politic was not, indeed, always under the influence and direction of leaders eminent for their prudence, or distinguished by their permanent attachment to the interests of the crown, and the person of the sovereign. Truth and candour oblige us to acknowledge, that the *Reformed* conducted themselves, on some occasions, in a manner inconsistent with the demands of a regular subordination. Some-

[p] PONTOPPIDAN. *Annal. Eccles. Danicæ*, tom. iii. p. 695.  
[q] *Imperium in imperio*, i. e. an empire within an empire.



times, amidst the broils and tumults of faction, they joined the parties that opposed the government; at others, they took important steps without the king's approbation or consent; nay, they went so far as to solicit, more than once, without so much as disguising their measures, the alliance and friendship of *England* and *Holland*, and formed views which, at least in appearance, were scarcely consistent with the tranquillity of the kingdom, nor with a proper respect for the authority of its monarch. Hence the contests and civil broils that arose in the year 1621, and subsisted long, between LEWIS XIII. and his protestant subjects; and hence the severe and despotic maxim of RICHLIEU, the first minister of that monarch, that the kingdom of *France* could never enjoy the sweets of peace, nor the satisfaction that is founded upon the assurance of public safety, before the Protestants were deprived of their towns and strong-holds, and before their rights and privileges, together with their ecclesiastical polity, were crushed to pieces, and totally suppressed. This haughty minister, after many violent efforts and hard struggles, obtained, at length, his purpose; for, in the year 1628, the town of *Rochele*, the chief bulwark of the Reformed interest in *France*, was taken, after a long and difficult siege, and annexed to the crown. From this fatal event, the Reformed party in *France*, defenceless and naked, dates its decline; since, after the reduction of their chief city, they had no other resource than the pure clemency and generosity of their sovereign [r]. Those who judge of the re-

[r] See LE CLERC *Vie de Cardinal RICHLIEU*, tom. i. p. 69. 77. 177. 199. 269.—LE VASSOR, *Histoire de Louis XIII.* tom. iii. p. 676. tom. iv. p. 1. and the following volumes. See also the *Memoirs* of SULLY (the friend and confidant of HENRY IV., who, though a Protestant, acknowledges frankly the errors of his party), vol. iii, iv, v.

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

duction of this place by the maxims of civil policy, considered the conduct of the French court as entirely consistent with the principles both of wisdom and justice: since nothing can be more detrimental to the tranquillity and safety of the nation, than a body-politic erected in its bosom, independent on the supreme authority of the state, and secured against its influence or inspection by an external force. And had the French monarch, satisfied with depriving the Protestants of their strong-holds, continued to maintain them in the possession of that liberty of conscience, and that free exercise of their religion, for which they had shed so much blood, and to the enjoyment of which their eminent services to the house of *Bourbon* had given them such a fair and illustrious title, it is highly probable, they would have borne with patience this infraction of their privileges, and the loss of that liberty that had been confirmed to them by the most solemn edicts.

The injurious and tyrannical treatment it receives from the French court.

III. But the court of *France*, and the despotic views of its minister, were not satisfied with this success. Having destroyed that form of civil polity that had been annexed to the Reformed church as a security for the maintenance of its religious privileges, and was afterwards considered as detrimental to the supreme authority of the state, they proceeded still further, and, regardless of the royal faith, confirmed by the most solemn declarations, perfidiously invaded those privileges of the church that were merely of a spiritual and religious nature. At first, the court, and the ministers of its tyranny, put in practice all the arts of insinuation and persuasion, in order to gain over the heads of the Reformed church, and the more learned and celebrated ministers of that communion. Pathetic exhortations, alluring promises, artful interpretations of those doctrines of popery that were most disagreeable to the Protest-

ants;

ants; in a word, every insidious method was employed, to conquer their aversion to the church of *Rome*. RICHIEU exhausted all the resources of his dexterity and artifice, and put into execution, with the most industrious assiduity, all the means that he thought the most adapted to seduce the Protestants into the Romish communion. When all these stratagems were observed to produce little or no effect, barbarity and violence were employed to extirpate and destroy a set of men, whom mean perfidy could not seduce, and whom weak arguments were insufficient to convince. The most inhuman laws that the blind rage of bigotry could dictate, the most oppressive measures that the ingenious efforts of malice could invent, were put in execution, to damp the courage of a party, that were become odious by their resolute adherence to the dictates of their consciences, and to bring them by force under the yoke of *Rome*. The French bishops distinguished themselves by their intemperate and unchristian zeal in this horrid scene of persecution and cruelty; many of the Protestants sunk under the weight of despotic oppression, and yielded up their faith to armed legions, that were sent to convert them; several fled from the storm, and deserted their families, their friends, and their country; and by far the greatest part persevered, with a noble and heroic constancy, in the purity of that religion, which their ancestors had delivered, and happily separated, from the manifold superstitions of a corrupt and idolatrous church.

IV. When at length every method which artifice or perfidy could invent had been practised in vain against the Protestants under the reign of LEWIS XIV., the bishops and Jesuits, whose counsels had a peculiar influence in the cabinet of that prince, judged it necessary to extirpate, by fire and sword, this resolute people; and thus to ruin, as

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART III.

The edit of  
Nantes re-  
voked.

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

---

it were by one mortal blow, the cause of the Reformation in *France*. Their insidious arguments and importunate solicitations had such an effect upon the weak and credulous mind of LEWIS, that, in the year 1685, trampling on the most solemn obligations, and regardless of all laws, human and divine, he revoked the *Edict of Nantes*; and thereby deprived the Protestants of the liberty of serving God according to their consciences. This revocation was accompanied, indeed, with the applause of *Rome*; but it excited the indignation even of many Roman Catholics, whose bigotry had not effaced or suspended, on this occasion, their natural sentiments of generosity and justice. It was, moreover, followed by a measure still more tyrannical and shocking; even an express order, addressed to all the Reformed churches, to embrace the Romish faith. The consequences of this cruel and unrighteous proceeding were highly detrimental to the true interests and the real prosperity of the French nation [s], by the prodigious emigrations it occasioned among the Protestants, who sought, in various parts of *Europe*, that religious liberty, and that humane treatment, which their mother-country had so cruelly refused them. Those among them, whom the vigilance of their enemies guarded so closely as to prevent their flight, were exposed to the brutal rage of an unrelenting soldiery,

[s] See the *Life of ISAAC DE BEAUSOBRE* (composed by the ingenious ARMAND DE LA CHAPELLE in French, and subjoined to BEAUSOBRE's *Remarques Historiques, Critiques, et Philologiques sur le Nouveau Testament*), p. 259.

Some late hireling writers, employed by the Jesuits, have been audacious enough to plead the cause of the *Revocation* of the edict of *Nantes*. But it must be observed, to the honour of the French nation, that these impotent attempts, to justify the measures of a persecuting and unrelenting priesthood, have been treated almost universally at *Paris* with indignation and contempt.

diery, and were assailed by every barbarous form of persecution that could be adapted to subdue their courage, exhaust their patience, and thus engage them to a feigned and external profession of popery, which in their consciences they beheld with the utmost aversion and disgust. This crying act of perfidy and injustice in a prince, who, on other occasions, gave evident proofs of his generosity and equity, is sufficient to shew, in their true and genuine colours, the spirit of the Romish church and of the Roman pontifs, and the manner in which they stand affected to those whom they consider as *Heretics*. It is peculiarly adapted to convince the impartial and attentive observer, that the most solemn oaths, and the most sacred treaties, are never looked upon by this church and its pontifs as respectable and obligatory, when the violation of them may contribute to advance their interests, or to accomplish their views.

V. The *Waldenses*, who lived in the vallies of *Piedmont*, and had embraced the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the church of *Geneva*, were oppressed and persecuted, in the most barbarous and inhuman manner, during the greatest part of this century, by the ministers of *Rome*. This persecution was carried on with peculiar marks

The sufferings of the Waldenses and Protestants of the Palatinate.

contempt. They who are desirous of seeing a true state of the losses the French nation sustained, by the revocation of the famous edict now mentioned, have only to consult the curious and authentic account of the state of that nation, taken from memorials drawn up by intendants of the several provinces, for the use of the Duke of *Burgundy*, and published in the year 1727, in two volumes in folio, under the following title: *État de la France, extrait par M. le Comte de BOULAINVILLIERS des Memoires dressées par les Intendans du Royaume, par l'Ordre du Roi LOUIS XIV., à la Sollicitation du Duc de Bourgogne*. See also *VOLTAIRE, Sur la Tolerance*, p. 41. and 201. And, for an account of the conduct of the French court towards the Protestants at that dismal period, see the incomparable memorial of the learned and pious *CLAUDE*, entitled, *Plaintes des Protestans de France*, p. 12—85. edit. of *Cologne*.

C E N T. of rage and enormity in the years 1655, 1686,  
 XVII. and 1696, and seemed to portend nothing less  
 SECT. II. than the total destruction and entire extinction of  
 PART II. that unhappy nation [1]. The most horrid scenes  
 of violence and bloodshed were exhibited on this  
 theatre of papal tyranny; and the small numbers  
 of the Waldenses that survived them, are indebted  
 for their existence and support, precarious and  
 uncertain as it is, to the continual intercession  
 made for them by the English and Dutch govern-  
 ments, and also by the Swiss cantons, who never  
 cease to solicit the clemency of the Duke of Savoy  
 in their behalf.

The church of the *Palatinate*, which had been  
 long at the head of the Reformed churches in  
*Germany*, declined apace from the year 1685,  
 when a Roman Catholic prince was raised to that  
 electorate. This decline became at length so  
 great, that, instead of being the first, it was the  
 least considerable of all the Protestant assemblies  
 in that country.

The state of  
 letters and  
 philosophy  
 in the Re-  
 formed  
 church.

VI. The eminent and illustrious figure that the  
 principal members of the Reformed church made in  
 the learned world is too well known, and the reputa-  
 tion they acquired, by a successful application to  
 the various branches of literature and science, is  
 too well established, to require our entering into  
 a circumstantial detail of that matter. We shall

[1] LEGER, *Histoire Generale des Eglises Vaudoises*, p. ii.  
 c. vi. p. 72.—GILLES, *Histoire Ecclesiast. des Eglises Vaudoises*,  
 ch. xlix. p. 353.—There is a particular history of the perse-  
 cution suffered by these victims of papal cruelty in the year  
 1686, which was published in 8vo at Rotterdam, in the year  
 1688.

☞ See also a pamphlet, entitled, *An Account of the late Per-  
 secutions of the Waldenses by the Duke of SAVOY and the French  
 King in the year 1686*, published at Oxford in 4to in 1688.  
 See likewise a particular detail of the miseries endured by these  
 unfortunate objects of papal persecution in the years 1655,  
 1662, 1663, and 1686, related by PETER BOYER, in his history  
 of the Vaudois, ch. 12—21. p. 72, &c.

also pass in silence the names of those celebrated men who have acquired immortal fame by their writings, and transmitted their eminent usefulness to succeeding times in their learned and pious productions. Out of the large list of these famous authors that adorned the Reformed church, it would be difficult to select the most eminent; and this is a sufficient reason for our silence [u]. The supreme guide and legislator of those that applied themselves to the study of philosophy had been ARISTOTLE, who, for a long time, reigned unrivalled in the Reformed, as well as in the Lutheran schools; and was exhibited, in both, not in his natural and genuine aspect, but in the motley and uncouth form in which he had been dressed up by the scholastic doctors. But when GASSENDI and DES CARTES appeared, the Stagirite began to decline, and his fame and authority diminished gradually from day to day. Among the French and Dutch, many adopted the Cartesian philosophy at its first dawn; and a considerable number

[u] The list of the eminent divines and men of learning that were ornaments to the Reformed church in the seventeenth century, is indeed extremely ample. Among those that adorned *Great Britain*, we shall always remember, with peculiar veneration, the immortal names of *Newton*, *Barrow*, *Cudworth*, *Boyle*, *Chillingworth*, *Usher*, *Bedell*, *Hall*, *Pocock*, *Fell*, *Lightfoot*, *Hammond*, *Calamy*, *Walton*, *Baxter*, *Pearson*, *Stillingfleet*, *Mede*, *Parker*, *Oughtred*, *Burnet*, *Tillotson*, and many others well known in the literary world. In *Germany* we find *Pareus*, *Scullet*, *Fabricius Alting*, *Pelargus*, and *Bergius*. In *Switzerland* and *Geneva*, *Hospinian*, the two *Buxtorfs*, *Hottinger*, *Heidegger*, and *Turretin*. In the churches and academies of *Holland*, we meet with the following learned divines: *Drusus*, *Amama*, *Gomer*, *Rivet*, *Cloppenburg*, *Vossius*, *Cocceius*, *Voetius*, *Des Marets*, *Heidan*, *Momma*, *Burman*, *Witticbius*, *Hoornbeck*, the *Spanheims*, *Le Moyne*, *De Mastricht*, and others. Among the French doctors, we may reckon *Cameron*, *Chamier*, *Du Moulin*, *Mestrezat*, *Blondel*, *Drelincourt*, *Dailly*, *Amyraut*, the two *Cappels*, *Du la Place*, *Garnsiole*, *Croy*, *Morus*, *Le Blanc*, *Pajon*, *Bochart*, *Claude*, *Alix*, *Jurieu*, *Besnage*, *Abbadie*, *Beaufobre*, *Lenfant*, *Martin*, *Des Fignoles*, &c.

CENT. of the English embraced the principles of GAS-  
 XVII. SENDI, and were singularly pleased with his pru-  
 SECT. II. dent and candid manner of investigating truth.  
 PART II. 

---

The Aristotelians every where, and more especially  
 in *Holland*, were greatly alarmed at this revolution  
 in the philosophical world, and set themselves,  
 with all their vigour, to oppose its progress. They  
 endeavoured to persuade the people, that the  
 cause of truth and religion must suffer consider-  
 ably by the efforts that were made to dethrone  
 ARISTOTLE, and bring into disrepute the doctrine  
 of his interpreters; but the principal cause of  
 their anxiety and zeal, was the apprehension of  
 losing their places in the public schools; a  
 thought which they could not bear with any de-  
 gree of patience [w]. However, the powerful  
 lustre of truth, which unfolded daily more and  
 more its engaging charms, and the love of liberty,  
 which had been held in chains by Peripatetic ty-  
 ranny, obliged this obstinate sect to yield, and  
 reduced them to silence; and hence it is, that  
 the doctors of the Reformed church carry on, at  
 this day, their philosophical inquiries with the  
 same freedom that is observable among the Lu-  
 therans. It may, indeed, be a question with  
 some, whether ARISTOTLE be not, even yet, se-  
 cretly revered in some of the English Universities.  
 It is at least certain, that, although under the go-  
 vernment of Charles II., and the two succeeding  
 reigns, the mathematical philosophy had made a  
 most extensive progress in *Great Britain*, there  
 were, nevertheless, both at *Oxford* and *Cambridge*,  
 some doctors, who preferred the ancient system of  
 the schools before the new discoveries now under  
 consideration.

Interpreters  
 and exposi-  
 tors of  
 Scripture,

VII. All the interpreters and expositors of  
 Scripture that made a figure in the Reformed

[w] See BAILLET, *Vie de DES CARTES*, passim.



church about the commencement of this century, followed scrupulously the method of CALVIN in their illustrations of the sacred writings, and unfolded the true and natural signification of the words of Scripture, without perplexing their brains to find out deep mysteries in plain expressions, or to force, by the inventive efforts of fancy, a variety of singular notions from the metaphorical language that is frequently used by the inspired writers. This universal attachment to the method of CALVIN was, indeed, considerably diminished, in process of time, by the credit and influence of two celebrated commentators, who struck out new paths in the sphere of sacred criticism. These were HUGO GROTIUS and JOHN COCCEIUS. The former departed less from the manner of interpretation generally received than the latter. Like CALVIN, he followed, in his commentaries both in the Old and New Testament, the literal and obvious signification of the words employed by the sacred writers; but he differed considerably from that great man in his manner of explaining the predictions of the prophets. The hypothesis of GROTIUS, relating to that important subject, amounts to this: "That  
 " the predictions of the ancient prophets were all  
 " accomplished, in the events to which they directly pointed, before the coming of CHRIST;  
 " and that therefore the natural and obvious  
 " sense of the words and phrases, in which they  
 " were delivered, does not terminate in our blessed  
 " Lord; but that in certain of these predictions,  
 " and more especially in those which the writers  
 " of the New Testament apply to CHRIST, there  
 " is, besides the literal and obvious signification,  
 " a hidden and mysterious sense, that lies concealed under the external mask of certain persons, certain events, and certain actions, which

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

“ are representations of the person, ministry, sufferings, and merits of the Son of God.”

The method of COCCÆIUS was entirely different from this. He looked upon the whole history of the old Testament as a perpetual and uninterrupted representation or mirror of the history of the divine Saviour, and of the Christian Church; he maintained, moreover, that all the prophecies have a literal and direct relation to CHRIST; and he finished his romantic system, by laying it down as a certain maxim, that all the events and revolutions that shall happen in the church, until the end of time, are prefigured and pointed out, though not all with the same degree of evidence and perspicuity, in different places of the Old Testament [x]. These two eminent commentators had each his zealous disciples and followers. The Arminians in general, many of the English and French divines, together with those warm votaries of ancient Calvinism who are called *Voetians* (from their chief GISEBERT VOET, the great adversary of COCCÆIUS), all adopted the method of interpreting Scripture introduced by GROTIUS. On the other hand, many of the Dutch, Swiss, and Germans, were singularly delighted with the learned fancies of COCCÆIUS. There are, however, still great numbers of prudent and impartial divines, who, considering the extremes into which these two eminent critics have run, and disposed to profit by what is really solid in both their

[x] It is become almost a proverbial saying, that in the Books of the Old Testament COCCÆIUS finds CHRIST every where, while GROTIUS meets him no where. The first part of this saying is certainly true; the latter much less so: for it appears, with sufficient evidence, from the Commentaries of GROTIUS, that he finds CHRIST prefigured in many places of the Old Testament, not, indeed, directly in the letter of the prophecies, where COCCÆIUS discovers him, but mysteriously, under the appearance of certain persons, and in the secret sense of certain transactions.

systems,

systems, neither reject nor embrace their opinions in the lump, but agree with them both in some things, and differ from them both in others. It is further to be observed, that neither the followers of GROTIVS nor of COCCEIVS are agreed among themselves, and that these two general classes of expositors may be divided into many subordinate ones. A considerable number of English divines of the *Episcopal* church refused to adopt the opinions, or to respect the authority, of these modern expositors; they appealed to the decisions of the primitive fathers; and maintained, that the sacred writings ought always to be understood in that sense *only*, which has been attributed to them by these ancient doctors of the rising church [y].

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

✠ [y] These have been confuted by the learned Dr. WHITBY, in his important work, *Concerning the Interpretation of Scripture after the Manner of the Fathers*, which was published at London in 8vo, in the year 1714, under the following title: *Dissertatio de Scripturarum Interpretatione secundum Patrum Commentarios*, &c.—In this dissertation, which was the fore-runner of the many remarkable attempts that were afterwards made to deliver the right of private judgment, in matters of religion, from the restraints of human authority, the judicious author has shewn, *first*, that the Holy Scripture is the only rule of faith, and that by it alone we are to judge of the doctrines that are necessary to salvation; *secondly*, that the fathers, both of the primitive times and also of succeeding ages, are extremely deficient and unsuccessful in their explanations of the sacred writings; and, *thirdly*, that it is impossible to terminate the debates that have been raised concerning the Holy Trinity, by the opinions of the fathers, the decisions of councils, or by any tradition that is really universal. The contradictions, absurdities, the romantic conceits and extravagant fancies, that are to be found in the commentaries of the fathers, were never represented in such a ridiculous point of view as they are in this performance. The worst part of the matter is, that such a production as Dr. WHITBY'S, in which all the mistakes of these ancient expositors are culled out and compiled with such care, is too much adopted to prejudice young students even against what may be good in their writings, and thus disgust them against a kind of study, which, when conducted with impartiality and prudence, has its uses. It is the infirmity of our nature to be fond of extremes.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

State of Di-  
dactic theo-  
logy in the  
Reformed  
church.

VIII. The doctrines of Christianity, which had been so sadly disfigured among the Lutherans by the obscure jargon and the intricate tenets of the scholastic philosophy, met with the same fate in the Reformed churches. The first successful effort, that prevented these churches from falling entirely under the *Aristotelian* yoke, was made by the *Arminians*, who were remarkable for expounding, with simplicity and perspicuity, the truths and precepts of religion, and who censured, with great plainness and severity, those ostentatious doctors, who affected to render them obscure and unintelligible, by expressing them in the *terms*, and reducing them under the *classes* and divisions, used in the schools. The *Cartesians* and *Cocceians* contributed also to deliver theology from the chains of the Peripatetics; though it must be allowed, that it had not, in some respects, a much better fate in the hands of these its deliverers. The *Cartesians* applied the principles and tenets of their philosophy in illustrating the doctrines of the Gospel; the *Cocceians* imagined, that they could not give a more sublime and engaging aspect to the Christian religion, than by representing it under the notion of a *covenant* entered into between God and man [z]; and both these manners of proceeding

[z] It is somewhat surprising, that Dr. MOSHEIM should mention this circumstance as an invention of COCCÆIUS, or as a manner of speaking peculiar to him. The representation of the Gospel-dispensation under the idea of a *Covenant*, whether this representation be literal or metaphorical, is to be found, almost every where, in the *Epistles* of St. PAUL, and the other Apostles, though very rarely (scarcely more than twice) in the Gospels. This phraseology has also been adopted by Christians of almost all denominations. It is, indeed, a manner of speaking that has been grossly abused by those divines, who, urging the metaphor too closely, exhibit the sublime transactions of the divine wisdom under the narrow and imperfect forms of human tribunals; and thus lead to false notions of the

proceeding were disliked by the wisest and most learned divines of the Reformed church. They complained with reason, that the tenets and distinctions of the Cartesian philosophy had as evident a tendency to render the doctrines of Christianity obscure and intricate as the abstruse terms, and the endless divisions and subdivisions of the Peripatetics. They observed also, that the metaphor of a *covenant*, applied to the Christian religion, must be attended with many inconveniences, by leading uninstructed minds to form a variety of ill-grounded notions, which is the ordinary consequence of straining metaphors; and that it must contribute to introduce into the colleges of divinity the captious terms, distinctions, and quibbles, that are employed in the ordinary courts of justice; and thus give rise to the most trifling and ill-judged discussions and debates about religious matters. Accordingly, the greatest part both of the British and French doctors, refusing to admit the intricacies of *Cartesianism*, and the imagery of Cocceus, into their theological system, followed the free, easy, and unaffected method of the Arminian divines, in illustrating the truths, and enforcing the duties of Christianity.

IX. We have had formerly occasion to observe, that Dr. WILLIAM AMES, a Scots divine, was one of the first among the Reformed who attempted to treat morality as a separate science, to consider

The state of  
practical religion  
and  
morality.

the springs of action, as well as of the dispensations and attributes of the Supreme Being. We have remarkable instances of this abuse, in a book lately translated into English, I mean, the *Oeconomy of the Covenants*, by WITSIUS, in which that learned and pious man, who has deservedly gained an eminent reputation by other valuable productions, has inconsiderately introduced the captious, formal, and trivial terms, employed in human courts, into his descriptions of the stupendous scheme of redemption.

it

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

---

it abstractedly from its connexion with any particular system of doctrine, and to introduce new light, and a new degree of accuracy and precision, into this *master-science* of life and manners. The attempt was laudable, had it been well executed; but the system of this learned writer was dry, theoretical, and subtile, and was thus much more adapted to the instruction of the studious than to the practical direction of the Christian. The Arminians, who are known to be much more zealous in enforcing the duties of Christianity than in illustrating its truths, and who generally employ more pains in directing the will than in enlightening the understanding, engaged several authors of note to exhibit the precepts and obligations of morality in a more useful, practical, and popular manner; but the English and French surpassed all the moral writers of the Reformed church in penetration, solidity, and in the ease, freedom, and perspicuity, of their method and compositions. MOSES AMYRAUT, a man of a sound understanding and subtile genius, was the first of the French divines who distinguished themselves in this kind of writing. He composed an accurate and elaborate system of morality, in a style, indeed, that is now become obsolete; and those more moderate French writers, such as LA PLACETTE and PICTET, who acquired such a high and eminent reputation on account of their moral writings, owe to the excellent work now mentioned a considerable part of their glory. While England groaned under the horrors and tumults of a civil war, it was chiefly the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* that employed their talents and their pens in promoting the cause of practical religion. During this unhappy period, indeed, these doctors were remarkable for the austere gravity of their manners, and for a melancholy complexion and turn of mind; and these appeared abundantly in their  
their

their compositions. Some of them were penned with such rigour and severity, as discovered either a total ignorance of the present imperfect state of humanity, or an entire want of all sort of indulgence for its unavoidable infirmities. Others were composed with a spirit of enthusiasm, that betrayed an evident propensity to the doctrine of the Mystics. But when HOBBS appeared, the scene changed. A new set of illustrious and excellent writers arose to defend the truths of religion, and the obligations of morality, against this author, who aimed at the destruction of both, since he subjected the unchangeable nature of religion to the arbitrary will of the sovereign, and endeavoured to efface the eternal distinction that there is between moral good and evil. CUDWORTH, CUMBERLAND, SHARROCK, and others, [a], alarmed at the view of a system so false in its principles, and so pernicious in its effects; rendered eminent service to the cause of religion and morals by their immortal labours, in which, arising to the *first principles of things*, and opening the primitive and eternal fountains of *truth* and *good*, they illustrated clearly the doctrines of the *one* with the fairest evidence, and established the obligations of the *other* on the firmest foundations.

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

X. About the commencement of this century, the academy of *Geneva* was in such high repute among the Reformed churches, that it was resorted to from all quarters by such as were desirous of a learned education; and more especially by those students of theology, whose circumstances in life permitted them to frequent this famous seminary [b]. Hence it very naturally happened,

The controversies concerning Predestination and Grace.

[a] See LELAND'S *View of the Dissical Writers*, vol. i. p. 48.

[b] The lustre and authority of the academy of *Geneva* began gradually to decline, from the time that, the *United Provinces* being formed into a free and independent republic, universities were founded at *Leyden*, *Franker*, and *Utrecht*.

that

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

---

that the opinions of CALVIN, concerning the *Decrees of God and Divine Grace*, became daily more universal, and were gradually introduced every where into the schools of learning. There was not, however, any public law or confession of faith that obliged the pastors of the Reformed churches, in any part of the world, to conform their sentiments to the theological doctrines that were adapted and taught at *Geneva* [c]. And accordingly there were many, who either rejected entirely the doctrine of that academy on these intricate points, or received it with certain restrictions and modifications. Nay, even those who were in general attached to the theological system of *Geneva*, were not perfectly agreed about the manner of explaining the doctrine relating to the divine decrees. The greatest part were of opinion, that God had only *permitted* the first man to fall into transgression, without positively *predetermining* his fall. But others went much further, and, presumptuously forgetting their own ignorance on the one hand, and the wisdom and equity of the divine counsels on the other, maintained, that God, in order to exercise and display his awful *justice* and his free *mercy*, had decreed from all eternity the transgression of ADAM; and so ordered the course of events, that our first parents could not possibly avoid their unhappy fall. Those that held this latter sentiment were denominated *Supralapsarians*, to distinguish them from the *Sublapsarian* doctors, who maintained the doctrine of *permission* already mentioned.

The Arminian schism.

XI. It is remarkable enough, that the *Supralapsarian* and *Sublapsarian* divines forgot their de-

[c] See, for a full demonstration of this assertion, GROTIUS's *Apologeticus*, &c. as also several treatises, written in Dutch, by THEOD. VOLKH. COORNKERT, of whom ARNOLDT makes particular mention in his *Historia Eccles. et Heret.* tom. ii.



bates and differences, as matters of little consequence ; and united their force against those who thought it their duty to represent the Deity, as extending his goodness and mercy to *all mankind*. This gave rise, soon after the commencement of this century, to a deplorable schism, which all the efforts of human wisdom have since been unable to heal. JAMES ARMINIUS, professor of divinity in the university of *Leyden*, rejected the doctrine of the church of *Geneva*, in relation to the deep and intricate points of predestination and grace ; and maintained, with the Lutherans, that God has excluded none from salvation by an *absolute* and eternal decree. He was joined in these sentiments by several persons in *Holland*, that were eminently distinguished by the extent of their learning and the dignity of their stations ; but he met with the warmest opposition from FRANCIS GOMAR his colleague, and from the principal professors in the Dutch universities. The magistrates exhorted the contending parties to moderation and charity ; and observed, that, in a free state, their respective opinions might be treated with toleration, without any detriment to the essential interests of true religion. After long and tedious debates, which were frequently attended with popular tumults and civil broils, this intricate controversy was, by the councils and authority [d] of MAURICE, prince of *Orange*, referred to the decision of the church, assembled, in a general synod at *Dort*, in the year 1618. The most eminent divines of the United Provinces, and not only so, but learned deputies from the churches

[d] It was not by the authority of Prince MAURICE, but by that of the States-general, that the national synod was assembled at *Dort*. The states were not indeed unanimous ; three of the seven provinces protested against the holding of this synod, *viz. Holland, Utrecht, and Overysel*.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

of England, Scotland, Switzerland, Bremen, Hesse, and the Palatinate, were present at this numerous and solemn assembly. It was by the sentence of these judges, that the *Arminians* lost their cause, and were declared corrupters of the true religion. It must be observed, at the same time, that the doctors of *Geneva*, who embraced the *Sublapsarian* system, triumphed over their adversaries in this synod. For though the patrons of the *Supralapsarian* cause were far from being contemptible either in point of number or of abilities; yet the moderation and equity of the British divines prevented the synod from giving its sanction to the opinions of that presumptuous sect. Nor indeed would even the *Sublapsarians* have gained their point, or obtained to the full the accomplishment of their desires, had the doctors of *Bremen*, who for weighty reasons were attached to the Lutherans, been able to execute their purposes [e].

The effects  
of this  
schism.

XII. It is greatly to be doubted, whether this victory gained over the *Arminians*, was, upon the whole, advantageous or detrimental to the church of *Geneva* in particular, and to the Reformed church in general. It is at least certain, that, after the synod of *Dort*, the doctrine of absolute decrees lost ground from day to day; and its patrons were put to the hard necessity of holding fraternal communion with those whose doctrine was either professedly *Arminian*, or at least nearly resembled it. The leaders of the vanquished *Arminians* were eminently distinguished by their eloquence, sagacity, and learning; and being highly exasperated by the injurious and oppressive treatment they met with, in consequence of their condemnation, they defended themselves,

[e] We shall give, in the *History of the Arminians*, a list of the writers that appeared in this controversy; as also a more particular account of the transactions of the synod of *Dort*.

and

and attacked their adversaries with such spirit and vigour, and also with such dexterity and eloquence, that multitudes were persuaded of the justice of their cause. It is particularly to be observed, that the authority of the synod of *Dort* was far from being universally acknowledged among the Dutch; the provinces of *Friesland*, *Zealand*, *Utrecht*, *Guelderland*, and *Groningen*, could not be persuaded to adopt its decisions; and though, in the year 1651, they were at length gained over so far as to intimate, that they would see with pleasure the Reformed religion maintained upon the footing on which it had been placed and confirmed by the synod of *Dort*, yet the most eminent adepts in Belgic jurisprudence deny that this intimation has the force or character of a law [f].

In *England*, the face of religion changed considerably, in a very little time after the famous synod now mentioned; and this change, which was entirely in favour of *Arminianism*, was principally effected by the counsels and influence of WILLIAM LACE, archbishop of *Canterbury*. This revolution gave new courage to the Arminians; and, from that period to the present time, they have had the pleasure of seeing the decisions and doctrines of the synod of *Dort*, relating to the points in debate between them and the Calvinists, treated, in *England*, with something more than mere indifference, beheld by some with aversion, and by others with contempt [g]. And indeed, if we consider the genius and spirit of the church of *England* during this period, we shall plainly see,

[f] See the very learned and illustrious President BYNKERSHOEK'S *Quaestiones Juris publici*, lib. ii. cap. xviii.

[g] SEV. LINTRUP'S *Dissertatio de Contemptu Concilii Dortrac. in Angliâ*, in *Dissert. Theologicis* HECT. GODOFR. MASII, tom. i. n. xix.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

that the doctrine of the *Gomarists*, concerning Predestination and Grace, could not meet there with a favourable reception, since the leading doctors of that church were zealous in modelling its doctrine and discipline after the sentiments and institutions that were received in the primitive times, and since those early *fathers*, whom they followed with a profound submission, had never presumed, before AUGUSTINE, to set limits to the extent of the divine grace and mercy.

The Reformed churches in *France* seemed, at first, disposed to give a favourable reception to the decisions of this famous synod; but, as these decisions were highly displeasing to the votaries of *Rome* among whom they lived, and kindled anew their rage against the Protestants, the latter thought it their duty to be circumspect in this matter; and, in process of time, their real sentiments, and the doctrines they taught, began to differ extremely from those of the *Gomarists*. The churches of *Brandenberg* and *Bremen*, which made a considerable figure among the *Reformed* in *Germany*, would never suffer their doctors to be tied down to the opinions and tenets of the Dutch divines. And thus it happened, that the liberty of private judgment (with respect to the doctrines of Predestination and Grace), which the spirit that prevailed among the divines of *Dort* seemed so much adapted to suppress or discourage, acquired rather new vigour, in consequence of the arbitrary proceedings of that assembly; and the Reformed church was immediately divided into *Universalists*, *Semiuniversalists*, *Supralapsarians*, and *Sublapsarians*, who, indeed, notwithstanding their dissensions, which sometimes become violent and tumultuous, live generally in the exercise of mutual toleration, and are reciprocally restrained by many reasons from indulging a spirit of hostility and persecution. What is still more remarkable,  
and

and therefore ought not to be passed over in silence, we see the city of *Geneva*, which was the parent, the nurse, and the guardian of the doctrine of *Absolute Predestination*, and *Particular Grace*, not only put on sentiments of charity, forbearance, and esteem for the Arminians, but become itself almost so far Arminian, as to deserve a place among the churches of that communion.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

XIII. While the Reformed churches in *France* yet subsisted, its doctors departed, in several points, from the common rule of faith that was received in the other churches of their communion. This, as appears from several circumstances, was, in a great measure, owing to their desire of diminishing the prejudices of the Roman-catholics against them, and of getting rid of a part of the odious conclusions which were drawn by their adversaries from the doctrines of *Dort*, and laid to their charge with that malignity which popish bigotry so naturally inspires. Hence we find in the books that were composed by the doctors of *Saumur* and *Sedan*, after the synod of *Dort*, many things which seem conformable, not only to the sentiments of the Lutherans, concerning *Grace*, *Predestination*, the *Person of Christ*, and the *Efficacy of the sacraments*, but also to certain peculiar opinions of the Romish church. This moderation may be dated from the year 1615, when the opinion of JOHN PISCATOR, pastor at *Herborn*, concerning the *Obedience of Christ*, was tacitly adopted, or at least pronounced free from error, by the synod of the isle of *France* [b]; though it had been formerly condemned and rejected in several preceding assemblies of the same nature [i]. PISCATOR maintained, that it was

The particular tenets of the Reformed churches in *France*.

not

[b] AYMON, *Actes de tous les Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformées de France*, tom. ii. p. 275, 276.

[i] See AYMON, *loc. cit.* tom. i. p. 400, 401. 457. tom. ii. p. 13.—BOSSUET, *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*,

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

not by his obedience to the divine law that CHRIST made a satisfaction to that law in our stead, since this obedience was his duty considered as a man; and therefore, being obliged to obey this law himself, his observance of it could not merit any thing for others from the Supreme Being. This opinion, as every one may see, tended to confirm the doctrine of the Romish church, concerning the *Merit of good works*, the *Natural power of man to obey the commands of God*, and other points of a like nature [ii]. These less important concessions were

livr. xii. tom. ii. p. 268<sup>a</sup> where this prelate, with his usual malignity and bitterness, reproaches the Protestants with their inconstancy. The learned BASNAGE has endeavoured to defend the Reformed churches against this charge, in the second volume of his *Histoire de l'Eglise*, p. 1533. But this defence is not satisfactory. ¶ To Dr. MOSHEIM, who speaks more than once of the Reformed church and its doctors with partiality and prejudice, this defence may not appear satisfactory; it has, nevertheless, been judged so by many persons of uncommon discernment; and we invite the reader to judge for himself.

[ii] ¶ It does not appear to me that any one, who looks with an unprejudiced eye, can see the least connection between the opinion of PISCATOR (which I shall not here either refute or defend), and the Popish doctrine which maintains the *merit of good works*: for though we are not justified (i. e. pardoned or treated as if we had not offended) in consequence of Christ's active obedience to the Divine Law, yet we may be so by his death and sufferings; and it is really to these, that the scriptures, in many places, ascribe our acceptance. Now a person who ascribes his acceptance and salvation to the death and mediation of Christ, does not surely give any countenance to the doctrine of the strict and rigorous merit of works, although he should not be so *sharp-sighted* as to perceive the influence which certain doctors attribute to, what is called, Christ's *active obedience*. But let it be observed here, in a particular manner, that the opinion of PISCATOR is much more unfavourable to Popery than our author imagined, since it overturns totally, by a direct and most natural consequence, the popish doctrine concerning *works of Supererogation*, which is as monstrous an absurdity in morals, as Transubstantiation is in the estimation of common sense. For if Christ, in his *universal and perfect obedience to the divine laws*, did no more than he was *morally obliged*

were followed by others of a much more weighty and momentous kind, of which some were so erroneous, that they were highly disliked and rejected, even by those of the French Protestants themselves, who were the most remarkable for their moderation, charity, and love of peace [k].

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

XIV. The doctors of *Saumur* revived a controversy, that had for some time been suspended,

The controversy  
excited by  
the Hypothetical  
Universalists.

*obliged* to do by his character as a *man*, is it not absurd, if not impious, to seek in the virtue of the Romish saints (all of whom were very imperfect, and some of them very worthless mortals) an exuberance of obedience, a *superabundant* quantity of virtue, to which *they* were not obliged, and which they are supposed to deposit in the hands of the Popes, who are empowered to distribute it, for love of money, among such as have need of it to make up their accounts?

[k] This affirmation is groundless, and I wish it were not liable to the charge of malignity. The accusation that Dr. MOSHEIM brings here against the Reformed churches in *France* is of too serious a nature not to require the most evident and circumstantial proofs. He has, however, alleged none, nor has he given any one instance of those *weighty and momentous concessions* that were made to popery. It was not, indeed, in his power either to give arguments or examples of a satisfactory kind; and it is highly probable, that the unguarded words of ELIAS SAURIN, minister of *Utrecht*, in relation to the learned LEWIS LE BLANC, professor of *Sedan* (which dropt from the pen of the former, in his *Examen de la Théologie de M. JURIEU*), are the only testimony Dr. MOSHEIM had to allege, in support of an accusation, which he has not limited to any one person, but inconsiderately thrown out upon the French churches in general. Those who are desirous of a full illustration of this matter, and yet have not an opportunity of consulting the original sources of information, may satisfy their curiosity by perusing the articles BEAULIEU and AMYRAUT, in BAYLE's *Dictionary*; and the articles PAJON and PAPIN, in M. DE CHAUFFEPIED's Supplement to that work. Any concessions that seem to have been made by the Protestant doctors in *France* to their adversaries, consisted in giving an Arminian turn to some of the more rigid tenets of CALVIN, relating to *Original Sin*, *Predestination* and *Grace*; and this turn would, undoubtedly, have been given to these doctrines, had popery been out of the question. But these concessions are not certainly what our historian had in view; nor would he, in effect, have treated such concessions as erroneous.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

by their attempts to reconcile the doctrine of Predestination, as it had been taught at *Geneva*, and confirmed at *Dort*, with the sentiments of those who represent the Deity as offering the displays of his goodness and mercy to all mankind. The first person who made this fruitless attempt was JOHN CAMERON, whose sentiments were supported and further illustrated by MOSES AMYRAUT, a man of uncommon sagacity and erudition. The latter applied himself, from the year 1634, with unparalleled zeal, to this arduous work, and displayed in it extraordinary exertions of capacity and genius; and so ardently was he bent on bringing it into execution, that he made, for this purpose, no small changes in the doctrine commonly received among the Reformed in *France*. The form of doctrine he had struck out, in order to accomplish this important reconciliation, may be briefly summed up in the following propositions:

“ That God *desires* the happiness of all men, and  
 “ that no mortal is excluded, *by any divine decree*,  
 “ from the benefits that are procured by the  
 “ death, sufferings, and Gospel of CHRIST;  
 “ That, however, none can be made a partaker of the blessings of the Gospel, and of eternal salvation, unless he *believe* in JESUS CHRIST;  
 “ That such indeed is the immense and universal goodness of the Supreme Being, that he *refuses to none* the power of believing; though he does not grant unto *all* his assistance and success, that they may wisely improve this power to the attainment of everlasting salvation;  
 “ And that, in consequence of this, multitudes perish, through their own fault, and not from any want of goodness in God [1].”

Those

[1] See JO. WOLFG. JAEGERI *Historia Eccles. et Politica, Saeculi xvii. Decenn. iv.* p. 522.



Those who embraced this doctrine were called *Universalists*, because they represented God as willing to shew mercy to *all* mankind; and *Hypothetical Universalists*, because the *condition* of faith in CHRIST was necessary to render them the objects of this mercy. It is the opinion of many, that this doctrine differs but little from that which was established by the synod of *Dort*; but such do not seem to have attentively considered either the principles from whence it is derived, or the consequences to which it leads. The more I examine this reconciling system, the more I am persuaded, that it is no more than Arminianism or Pelagianism artfully dressed up, and ingeniously covered with a half-transparent veil of specious, but ambiguous expressions; and this judgment is confirmed by the language that is used in treating this subject by the modern followers of AMYRAUT, who express their sentiments with more courage,

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

☞ This mitigated view of the doctrine of Predestination has only one defect; but it is a capital one. It represents God, as *desiring* a thing (i. e. salvation and happiness) for *ALL*, which in order to its attainment requires a *degree* of his assistance and succour which he *refuseth* to *MANY*. This rendered grace and redemption *universal* only in *words*, but *partial* in reality; and therefore did not at all mend the matter. The *Supralapsarians* were consistent with themselves, but their doctrine was harsh and terrible, and was founded on the most unworthy notions of the Supreme Being; and, on the other hand, the system of AMYRAUT was full of inconsistencies; nay, even the *Sublapsarian* doctrine has its difficulties, and rather palliates, than removes the horrors of *Supralapsarianism*. What then is to be done? from what quarter shall the candid and well-disposed Christian receive that solid satisfaction and wise direction, which neither of these systems is adapted to administer? These he will receive by turning his dazzled and feeble eye from the *secret* decrees of God, which were neither designed to be *rules* of action nor *sources* of comfort to mortals here below; and by fixing his view upon the mercy of God, as it is manifested through Christ, the pure laws and sublime promises of his Gospel, and the respectable equity of his present government and his future tribunal.

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

plainness, and perspicuity, than the spirit of the times permitted their master to do. A cry was raised, in several French synods, against the doctrine of AMYRAUT; but, after it had been carefully examined by *them*, and defended by *him* at their public meetings with his usual eloquence and erudition, he was honourably acquitted [*m*]. The opposition he met with from *Holland* was still more formidable, as it came from the learned and celebrated pens of RIVET, SPANHEIM, DES MARETS, and other adversaries of note; he nevertheless answered them with great spirit and vigour, and his cause was powerfully supported afterwards by DAILLE, BLONDEL, MESTREZAT, and CLAUDE [*n*]. This controversy was carried on, for a long time, with great animosity and little fruit to those who opposed the opinions of the French innovator. For the sentiments of AMYRAUT were not only received in all the universities of the Hugonots in *France*, and adopted by divines of the highest note in that nation, but also spread themselves as far as *Geneva*, and were afterwards disseminated by the French Protestants, who fled from the rage of persecution, through all the Reformed churches of *Europe*. And they now are so generally received, that few have the courage to oppose or decry them.

The contests occasioned by De la Place and Cappel.

XV. The desire of mitigating certain doctrines of the Reformed church, that drew upon it the heaviest censures from both the Roman-catholics and some Protestant communions, was the true

[*m*] See AYMON, *Actes des Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformées en France*, tom. ii. p. 571. p. 604.—BLONDEL, *Actes Authentiques des Eglises Reformées touchant la paix et la charité fraternelle*, p. 19.—82—Edit. of *Amsterdam* published in 4to, in the year 1655.

[*n*] BAYLE's *Dictionary*, vol. i. at the articles AMYRAUT and BLONDEL; and vol. ii. at the article DAILLE.—See CHRIST. PFAFFIUS, *De formula consensu*, cap. i. p. 4.

origin of the opinion propagated, in the year 1640, by DE LA PLACE, concerning the imputation of original sin. This divine, who was the intimate friend of AMYRAUT, and his colleague at *Saumur*, rejected the opinion generally received in the schools of the Reformed, that *the personal and actual transgression of the first man is imputed to his posterity*. He maintained, on the contrary, that God imputes to every man his natural corruption, his personal guilt, and his propensity to sin; or, to speak in the theological style, he affirmed, that *original sin is indirectly and not directly imputed to mankind*. This opinion was condemned as erroneous, in the year 1642, by the synod of *Charenton*, and many Dutch and Helvetic doctors of great name set themselves to refute it [o]; while the love of peace and union prevented its author from defending it in a public and open manner [p]. But neither the sentence of the synod, nor the silence of DE LA PLACE, could hinder this sentiment from making a deep impression on the minds of many, who looked upon it as conformable to the plainest dictates of justice and equity; nor could they prevent its being transmitted, with the French exiles, into other countries.

In the class of those who, to diminish or avoid the resentment of the papists, made concessions inconsistent with truth, and detrimental to the purity of the Protestant religion, many place LEWIS CAPPEL, professor at *Saumur*, who, in a voluminous and elaborate work [q], undertook

[o] AYMON, *Synodes des Eglises Reformées de France*, tom. ii. p. 680.

[p] CHRIST. EBERH. WEISMANNI *Histor. Eccles. Sac.* xvii. p. 817.

[q] This work, which is entitled, *Arcanum Purgationis Revelatum*, is still extant, with its *Vindiciæ*, in the works of CAPPEL, printed at *Amsterdam*, in the year 1689, in folio, and in the *Critica Sacra* V. T. published in folio at *Paris*, 1650.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

to prove that the Hebrew points were not used by the sacred writers, and were a modern invention added to the text by the Masorethes [r]. It is at least certain, that this hypothesis was highly agreeable to the votaries of *Rome*, and seemed manifestly adapted to diminish the authority of the holy Scriptures, and to put them upon a level with oral tradition, if not to render their decisions still less respectable and certain [s]. On these accounts, the system of this famous professor was opposed, with the most ardent efforts of erudition and zeal, by several doctors both of the Reformed and Lutheran churches, who were eminent for their knowledge of the Hebrew language, and their acquaintance with Oriental learning in general [t].

Lewis le  
Blanc.

XVI. Though these great men gave offence to many, by the freedom and novelty of their sentiments, yet they had the approbation and esteem of the greatest part of the Reformed churches; and the equity of succeeding generations removed the aspersions that envy had thrown upon them during their lives, and made ample amends for

[r] It was also CAPPEL who affirmed, that the characters, which compose the Hebrew text, were those that the Chaldeans used after the Babylonish captivity, the Jews having always made use of the Samaritan characters before that period.

[s] This absurd notion of the tendency of CAPPEL's hypothesis is now hissed almost entirely out of the learned world. Be that as it may, the hypothesis in question is by no means peculiar to CAPPEL; it was adopted by LUTHER, ZUINGLE, CALVIN, the three great pillars of the Reformation; as also by MUNSTER, OLIVETAN, MASIUS, SCALIGER, CASAUBON, DRUSIUS, DE DIEU, WALTON, and BOCHART, those eminent men, who have cast such light on sacred philology; so that CAPPEL had only the merit of supporting it by new arguments, and placing it in a striking and luminous point of view.

[t] See B. JO. CHRIST. WOLFII *Biblioth. Hebraica*, p. ii. p. 27.

the injuries they had received from several of their cotemporaries. This was far from being the case of those doctors who either openly attempted to bring about a complete reconciliation and union between the Reformed and Romish churches, or explained the doctrines of Christianity in a such a manner as lessened the difference between the two communions, and thereby rendered the passage from the former to the latter less disgusting and painful. The attempts of these peace-makers were looked upon as odious, and in the issue they proved utterly unsuccessful. The most eminent of these reconciling doctors were LEWIS LE BLANC, professor at *Sedan*, and CLAUDE PAJON, minister of *Orleans* [*u*], who were both remarkable for the persuasive power of their eloquence, and discovered an uncommon degree of penetration and sagacity in their writings and negotiations. The former passed in review many of the controversies that divide the two churches, and seemed to prove, with the utmost perspicuity, that some of them were merely disputes about words, and that the others were of much less consequence than was generally imagined [*w*]. This manner of stating the differences between the two churches drew upon LE BLANC the indignation of those,

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

[*u*] It is difficult to conceive, what could engage Dr. MOSHEIM to place PAJON in the class of those who explained the doctrines of Christianity in such a manner, as to diminish the difference between the doctrine of the Reformed and Romish churches. PAJON was, indeed, a moderate divine, and leaned somewhat towards the Arminian system; and this propensity was not uncommon among the French Protestants. But few doctors of this time wrote with more learning, zeal, and judgment, against popery, than CLAUDE PAJON, as appears from his excellent treatise against NICOLE, entitled, *Examen du Livre, qui porte pour titre préjugées légitimes contre les Calvinistes.*

[*w*] In his *Theses Theologicae*, which have passed through several editions, and are highly worthy of an attentive perusal. They were twice printed at *London*.

who

CENT. XVII. who looked upon all attempts to soften and modify controverted doctrines as dangerous and detrimental to the cause of truth [x]. On the other hand, the acuteness and dexterity with which he treated this nice matter, made a considerable impression upon several persons, and procured him disciples, who still entertain his reconciling sentiments, but either conceal them entirely, or discover them with caution, as they are known to be displeasing to the greatest part of the members of both communions.

Claude Pajon.

XVII. The modifications under which PAJON exhibited some of the doctrines of the Reformed church, were also extremely offensive and unpopular. This ecclesiastic applied the principles and tenets of the Cartesian philosophy, of which he was a warm and able defender, in explaining the opinions of that church relating to the corruption of human nature, the state of its moral faculties and powers, the grace of God, and the conversion of sinners; and, in the judgment of many, he gave an erroneous interpretation of these opinions. It is, indeed, very difficult to determine what were the real sentiments of this man; nor is it easy to say, whether this difficulty be most owing to the affected obscurity and ambiguity under which he disguised them, or to the inaccuracy with which his adversaries, through negligence or malignity, have represented them. If we may give credit to the latter, his doctrine amounts to the following propositions: "That the corruption of man is less, and his natural power to amend his ways greater, than is generally imagined:—That *original sin* lies in the *understanding* alone, and consists principally in the obscurity and imperfection of our ideas of divine things:—That this imperfection of

[x] See BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the article BEAULIEU.

“ the human understanding has a pernicious influence upon the *will*, excites in it vicious propensities, and thus leads it to sinful actions:— That this internal disorder is healed, not by the mere efforts of our *natural faculties* and powers, but by the assistance and energy of the *Holy Spirit*, operating upon the mind by the *divine word* as its *mean* or instrument:—That, however, this word is not endowed with any divine intrinsic energy, either *natural* or *supernatural*, but only with a *moral influence*, i. e. that it corrects and improves the understanding, in the same manner as human truth does, even by imparting clear and distinct notions of spiritual and divine things, and furnishing solid arguments for the truth and divinity of the Christian religion, and its perfect conformity with the dictates of right reason:—And that, of consequence, every man, if no internal or external impediments destroy or suspend the exertion of his natural powers and faculties, may, by the *use of his own reason*, and a careful and assiduous study of the revealed will of God, be enabled to correct what is amiss in his sentiments, affections, and actions, *without any extraordinary assistance from the Holy Ghost* [y].”

Such is the account of the opinions of PAJON that is given by his adversaries. On the other hand, if we take our ideas of his doctrine from himself, we shall find this account disingenuous and erroneous. PAJON intimates plainly his assent to the doctrines that were confirmed by the synod of *Dort*, and that are contained in the catechisms and confessions of faith of the Reformed

[y] FRED. SPANHEIM, *Append. ad Elenchum Controversar.* tom. iii. opp. p. 882.—JURIEU, *Traité de la Nature et de la Grâce*, p. 35.—VAL. ERN. LOSCHERI *Exercit. de CLAUD. PAJONII usque sectator. doctrina et satis. Lips. 1692.*

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

---

churches; he complains that his doctrine has been ill understood or wilfully perverted; and he observes, that he did not deny entirely an *immediate operation of the Holy Spirit* on the minds of those that are really converted to God, but only such an *immediate operation* as was not accompanied with the ministry and efficacy of the divine word; or, to express the matter in other terms, he declared that he could not adopt the sentiments of those who represent that *word* as no more than an *instrument* void of intrinsic efficacy, *a mere external sign of an immediate operation of the Spirit of God* [x]. This last declaration is, however, both obscure and captious. Be that as it may, PAJON concludes by observing, that we ought not to dispute about the *manner* in which the Holy Spirit operates upon the minds of men, but content ourselves with acknowledging, that he is the true and original Author of all that is good in the affections of our heart, and the actions that proceed from them. Notwithstanding these declarations, the doctrine of this learned and ingenious ecclesiastic was not only looked upon as heterodox by some of the most eminent divines of the Reformed church, but was also condemned, in the year 1677, by several synods in *France*, and, in 1686, by a synod assembled at *Rotterdam*.

Papin.

XVIII. This controversy, which seemed to be brought to a conclusion by the death of PAJON, was revived, or rather continued, by ISAAC PAPIN, his nephew, a native of *Blois*, who, by his writings and travels, was highly instrumental in communicating to *England, Holland, and Germany*,

[x] All these declarations made by PAJON may be seen in a confession of his faith, supposed to have been drawn up by himself, and published by the learned M. DE CHAUFFEPÉD, in his *Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. et Critique*, tom. ii. p. 164. in note (c) of the article *LE CENE*.



the contagion of these unhappy debates. This ecclesiastic expressed his sentiments without ambiguity or reserve, and propagated every where the doctrine of his uncle, which, according to his crude and harsh manner of representing it, he reduced to the two following propositions :

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

" *That the natural powers and faculties of man are more than sufficient to lead him to the knowledge of divine truth :*

" *That, in order to produce that amendment of the heart, which is called REGENERATION, nothing more is requisite than to put the body, if its habit is bad, into a sound state by the power of physic, and then to set truth and falsehood before the UNDERSTANDING, and virtue and vice before the WILL, in their genuine colours, clearly and distinctly, so as that their nature and properties may be fully apprehended.*"

This and the other opinions of PAPIN were refuted, with a considerable degree of acrimony, in the year 1686, by the famous JURIEU, professor of divinity and pastor of the French church at Rotterdam, and they were condemned the year following by the synod of Boisleduc. In the year 1688, they were condemned, with still greater marks of severity, by the French synod at the Hague, where a sentence of excommunication was pronounced against their author. Exasperated at these proceedings, PAPIN returned into France in the year 1690, where he abjured publicly the Protestant religion, and embraced the communion of the church of Rome, in which he died in the year 1709 [a]. It has been affirmed by some, that this ingenious man was treated with great rigour and injustice ; and that his theological opinions were unfaithfully represented by his violent

[a] See JURIEU, *De la Nature et de la Grace*.—MOLLERUS *Cimbria Literar.* tom. ii. p. 608.

CENT. XVII. and unrelenting adversary, JURIEU, whose warmth  
SECT. II. and impetuosity in religious controversy are well  
PART II. known. How far this affirmation may be sup-  
ported by evidence, we cannot pretend to deter-  
mine. A doctrine, something like that of PAJON,  
was maintained in several treatises, in the year  
1684, by CHARLES LE CENE, a French divine of  
uncommon learning and sagacity, who gave a  
new and very singular translation of the Bible [b].  
But he entirely rejected the doctrine of *Original  
Sin*, and of the importance of human nature; and  
asserted, that it was in every man's power to  
amend his ways, and arrive at a state of obedience  
and virtue, by the mere use of his natural facul-  
ties, and an attentive study of the divine word;  
more especially, if these were seconded by the ad-  
vantage of a good education, and the influence of  
virtuous examples. Hence several divines pre-  
tend that his doctrine is, in many respects, diffe-  
rent from that of PAJON [c].

The State of  
the church  
of England  
under  
James I.

XIX. The church of *England* had, for a long  
time, resembled a ship tossed on a boisterous and  
tempestuous ocean. The opposition of the *Pa-  
pists* on the one hand, and the discontents and re-  
monstrances of the *Puritans* on the other, had  
kept it in a perpetual ferment. When, on the  
death of ELIZABETH, JAMES I. ascended the  
throne, these latter conceived the warmest hopes  
of seeing more serene and prosperous days, and  
of being delivered from the vexations and op-  
pressions they were constantly exposed to, on ac-  
count of their attachment to the discipline and  
worship of the church of *Geneva*. These hopes  
were so much the more natural, as the king had

[b] This translation was published at *Amsterdam* in the year  
1741, and was condemned by the French synod in *Holland*.

[c] See the learned and laborious M. CHAUFFEPRIED's  
*Novo. Diction. Hist. et Critiq.* tom. ii. p. 160. at the article  
LE CENE.

received his education in *Scotland*, where the *Puritans* prevailed, and had, on some occasions, made the strongest declarations of his attachment to their ecclesiastical constitution [d]. And some of the first steps taken by this prince seemed to encourage these hopes, as he appeared desirous of assuming the character and office of an arbitrator, in order to accommodate matters between the church and the *Puritans* [e]. But these expectations soon vanished, and, under the government of *JAMES*, things put on a new face. As the desire of unlimited power and authority was the reigning

✠ [d] In a General Assembly held at *Edinburgh*, in the year 1590, this prince is said to have made the following public declaration: "I praise God that I was born in the time of the light of the Gospel, and in such a place as to be the king of the sincerest (i. e. *purest*) kirk in the world. The kirk of *Geneva* keep pasche and yule (i. e. *Easter* and *Christmas*). What have they for them? They have no institution. As for our neighbour kirk of *England*, their service is an evil; said mass in English; they want nothing of the mass but the liftings (i. e. *the elevation of the host*). I charge you, my good ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort your people to do the same; and I forsooth, as long as I brook my life, shall do the same." *CALDERWOOD'S History of the Church of Scotland*, p. 256.

✠ [e] The religious disputes between the church and the *Puritans* induced *JAMES* to appoint a conference between the two parties at *Hampton-Court*; at which nine bishops, and as many dignitaries of the church, appeared on the one side, and four puritan ministers on the other. The king himself took a considerable part in the controversy against the latter: and this was an occupation well adapted to his taste; for nothing could be more pleasing to this royal pedant, than to dictate magisterially to an assembly of divines concerning points of faith and discipline, and to receive the applauses of these holy men for his superior zeal and learning. The conference continued three days. The first day it was held between the king and the bishops and deans, to whom *JAMES* proposed some objections against certain expressions in the liturgy, and a few alterations in the ritual of the church; in consequence of which, some slight alterations were made. The two following days

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

ing passion in the heart of this monarch, so all his measures, whether of a civil or religious nature, were calculated to answer the purposes of his ambition. The *Presbyterian* form of ecclesiastical government seemed less favourable to his views than the *episcopal hierarchy*; as the former exhibits a kind of *republic*, which is administered by various rulers of equal authority; while the latter approaches much nearer to the spirit and genius of *monarchy*. The very name of a *republic*, *synod*, or *council*, was odious to JAMES, who dreaded every thing that had a popular aspect; hence he distinguished the bishops with peculiar marks of his favour, extended their authority, increased their prerogatives, and publicly adopted and inculcated the following maxim, *No bishop, no king*. At the same time, as the church of *England* had not yet abandoned the Calvinistical doctrines of *Predestination* and *Grace*, he also adhered to them for some time, and gave his theological representatives, in the synod of *Dort*, an order to join in the condemnation of the sentiments of *ARMINIUS*, in relation to these deep and intricate points.

the Puritans were admitted, whose proposals and remonstrances may be seen in *NEAL'S History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 15. Dr. WARNER, in his *Ecclesiastical History of England*, observes, that this author must be read with caution, on account of his unfairness and partiality; why therefore did he not take his account of the *Hampton-Court* conference from a better source? The different accounts of the opposite parties, and more particularly those published by Dr. BARLOW, dean of *Ches-ter*, on the one hand, and PATRICK GALLOWAY, a Scots writer, on the other, (both of whom were present at the conference), must be carefully consulted, in order to our forming a proper idea of these theological transactions. JAMES at least obtained, on this occasion, the applause he had in view. The Archbishop of *Canterbury* (WHITGIFT) said, *That undoubtedly his majesty spoke by the special assistance of God's spirit*; and BAYCROFT, falling on his knees, with his eyes raised to — JAMES, expressed himself thus: *I protest my heart melteth for joy, that Almighty God, of his singular mercy, has given us such a king, as since Christ's time has not been.*

ABBOT, archbishop of *Canterbury*, a man of remarkable gravity [f], and eminent zeal both for civil and religious liberty, whose lenity towards their

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

Lord CLARENDON says, in his *History of the Rebellion*, that “ABBOT was a man of very morose manners, “ and of a very fowre aspect, which at that time was called “ *Gravity*.” If, in general, we strike a medium between what CLARENDON and NEAL say of this prelate, we shall probably arrive at the true knowledge of his character. See the *History of the Rebellion*, vol. i. p. 88. and NEAL’s *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 243. It is certain, that nothing can be more unjust and partial than CLARENDON’s account of this eminent prelate, particularly when he says, that *he neither understood nor regarded the constitution of the church*. But it is too much the custom of this writer, and others of his stamp, to give the denomination of latitudinarian indifference to that charity, prudence, and moderation, by which alone the *best interests of the church* (though not the personal views of many of its ambitious members) can be established upon firm and permanent foundations. ABBOT would have been reckoned a good churchman by some, if he had breathed that spirit of despotism and violence, which, being essentially incompatible with the spirit and character of a people not only free, but jealous of their liberty, has often endangered the church, by exciting that resentment which always renders opposition excessive. ABBOT was so far from being indifferent about the *constitution of the church*, or inclined to the *Presbyterian discipline* (as this noble author affirms in his *History of the Rebellion*), that it was by his zeal and dexterity that the clergy of *Scotland*, who had refused to admit the Bishops as moderators in their church-synods, were brought to a more tractable temper, and things put into such a situation as afterwards produced the entire establishment of the episcopal order in that nation. It is true, that ABBOT’s zeal in this affair was conducted with great prudence and moderation, and it was by these that his zeal was rendered successful. Nor have these his transactions in *Scotland*, where he went as chaplain to the Lord High Treasurer DUNBAR, been sufficiently attended to by historians; nay, they seem to have been entirely unknown to some, who have pretended to depreciate the conduct and principles of this virtuous and excellent prelate. King JAMES, who had been so zealous a Presbyterian in appearance before his accession to the Crown of *England*, had scarcely set his foot out of *Scotland*, when he conceived the design of restoring the ancient form of episcopal government in that kingdom; and it was ABBOT’s transactions there that brought him to that high favour with

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

their ancestors the *Puritans* still celebrate in the highest strains [g], used his utmost endeavours

the king, which, in the space of little more than three years, raised him from the deanry of *Winchester* to the see of *Canterbury*. For it was by *ABBOT*'s mild and prudent counsels, that *DUNBAR* procured that famous act of the General Assembly of *Scotland*, by which it was provided, "that the King should have the calling of all general assemblies—that the bishops (or their deputies) should be perpetual moderators of the Diocesan synods—that no excommunication should be pronounced without their approbation—that all presentations of benefices should be made by them—that the deprivation or suspension of ministers should belong to them—that the visitation of the diocese should be performed by the bishop or his deputy only—and that the bishop should be moderator of all conventions for exercising or *prophesying* (i. e. preaching) within their bounds." See *CALDERWOOD*'s *True History of the Church of Scotland*, fol. 168o. 588, 589. *HEYLIN*'s *History of the Presbyterians*, p. 381, 382. and, above all, *SPEED*'s *History of Great Britain*, Book x. fol. 1227. The writers who seem the least disposed to speak favourably of this wise and good prelate bear testimony, nevertheless, to his eminent piety, his exemplary conversation, and his inflexible probity and integrity: and it may be said with truth, that, if his moderate measures had been pursued, the liberties of *England* would have been secured, Popery discountenanced, and the church prevented from running into those excesses which afterwards proved so fatal to it. If *ABBOT*'s candour failed him on any occasion, it was in the representations, which his rigid attachment, not to the discipline, but to the doctrinal tenets of Calvinism, led him to give of the Arminian doctors. There is a remarkable instance of this in a letter of his to Sir *RALPH WINWOOD*, dated at *Lambeth* the 1st of June 1613, and occasioned by the arrival of *GROTIUS* in *England*, who had been expressly sent from *Holland*, by the Remonstrants or Arminians, to mitigate the king's displeasure and antipathy against that party. In this letter, the archbishop represents *GROTIUS* (with whom he certainly was not worthy to be named, either in point of learning, sagacity, or judgment) as a *Pedant*; and mentions, with a high degree of complacence and approbation, the absurd and impertinent judgment of some civilians and divines, who called this immortal ornament of the republic of letters, a *smatterer* and a *simple fellow*. See *WINWOOD*'s *Memorials*, vol. iii. p. 459.

[g] See *ANTON. WOOD, Athenæ Oxoniens.* tom. i. p. 583.—*NEAL*'s *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. ch. iv. p. 242.—*CLARENDON*'s *History of the Rebellion*, vol. i.

to confirm the king in the principles of Calvinism, to which he himself was thoroughly attached. But scarcely had the British divines returned from the synod of *Dort*, and given an account of the laws that had been enacted, and the doctrines that had been established by that famous assembly, than the king, together with the greatest part of the episcopal clergy, discovered, in the strongest terms, their dislike of these proceedings, and judged the sentiments of ARMINIUS, relating to the divine decrees, preferable to those of GOMARUS and CALVIN [b]. This sudden and unexpected

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

[b] See HEYLIN's *History of the Five Articles*.—NEAL, *ibid.* vol. ii. ch. ii. p. 117. This latter author tells us, that the following verses were made in *England*, with a design to pour contempt on the synod of *Dort*, and to turn its proceedings into ridicule :

*Dordrechtii Synodus, Nodus ; Chorus Integer, Æger ;  
Conventus, Ventus ; Sessio, Stramen. Amen \* !*

With respect to JAMES, those who are desirous of forming a just idea of the character, proceedings, and theological sickleness and inconstancy of that monarch, must peruse the writers of English history, more especially LARREY and RAPIN THOYRAS. The greatest part of these writers tell us, that, towards the latter end of his days, JAMES, after having deserted from the Calvinists to the Arminians, began to discover a singular propensity towards Popery ; and they affirm positively, that he entertained the most ardent desire of bringing about a union between the church of *England* and the church of *Rome*. In this, however, these writers seem to have gone too far ; for though many of the proceedings of this injudicious prince deserve justly the sharpest censure, yet it is both rash and unjust to accuse him of a design to introduce Popery into *England*.

\* It would be a difficult, nay, an insurmountable task, to justify all the proceedings of the synod of *Dort* ; and it were much to be wished, that they had been more conformable to the spirit of Christian charity, than the representations of history, impartially weighed, shew them to have been. We are not, however, to conclude, from the insipid monkish lines here quoted by Dr. MOSHEIM, that the transactions and decisions of that synod were universally condemned or despised in *England*. It had its partisans in the established church, as well as among the Puritans ; and its decisions, in point of doctrine, were looked upon by many, and not without reason, as agreeable to the tenour of the *Book of Articles established by law in the Church of England*.

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

---

pected change in the theological opinions of the court and clergy, was certainly owing to a variety of reasons, as will appear evident to those who have any acquaintance with the spirit and transactions of these times. The principal one, if we are not deceived, must be sought in the plans of a further reformation of the church of *England*, that were proposed by several eminent ecclesiastics, whose intention was to bring it to as near a resemblance as was possible of the primitive church. And every one knows, that the peculiar doctrines to which the victory was assigned by the synod of *Dort*, were absolutely unknown in the first ages of the Christian church [i]. Be that

It is not to be believed, that a prince, who aspired after arbitrary power and uncontrouled dominion, could ever have entertained a thought of submitting to the yoke of the Roman pontiff. The truth of the matter seems to be this, that, towards the latter end of his reign, JAMES began to have less aversion to the doctrines and rites of the Romish church, and permitted certain religious observances, that were conformable to the spirit of that church, to be used in *England*. This conduct was founded upon a manner of reasoning, which he had learned from several bishops of his time, (*viz.*) That the primitive church is the model which all Christian churches ought to imitate in doctrine and worship; that, in proportion as any church approaches to this primitive standard of truth and purity, it must become proportionably pure and perfect; and that the Romish church retained more of the *spirit* and *manner* of the primitive church than the Puritan or Calvinist churches. Of these three propositions, the two first are undoubtedly true, and the last is evidently and demonstrably false. Besides, this makes nothing to the argument; for as JAMES had a manifest aversion to the Puritans, it could, in his eyes, be no very great recommendation of the Romish church, that it surpassed that of the Puritans in doctrine and discipline.

[i] Dr. MOSHEIM has annexed the following note to this passage: "Perhaps the king entered into these ecclesiastical proceedings with the more readiness, when he reflected on the civil commotions and tumults that an attachment to the Presbyterian religion had occasioned in *Scotland*. There

† This remark is confuted by fact, observation, and the perpetual contradictions that are observable in the conduct of men: besides, see the note [i].

"are



that as it may, this change was fatal to the interests of the *Puritans*; for, the king being indisposed to the opinions and institutions of Calvinism, the *Puritans* were left without defence, and exposed anew to the animosity and hatred of their adversaries, which had been, for some time, suspended; but now broke out with redoubled vehemence, and at length kindled a religious war, whose consequences were deplorable beyond expression. In the year 1625, died JAMES I., the bitterest enemy of the doctrine and discipline of the *Puritans*, to which he had been in his youth most warmly attached; the most inflexible and ardent patron of the *Arminians*, in whose ruin and condemnation in *Holland* he had been singularly instrumental; and the most zealous defender of episcopal go-

"are also some circumstances that intimate plainly enough, that JAMES, before his accession to the crown of *England*, "was very far from having an aversion to Popery." Thus far the note of our author, and whoever looks into the *Historical View of the Negotiations between the Courts of England, France, and Brussels, from the year 1592 to 1617, extracted from the MSS. State Papers of Sir THOMAS EDMONDES and ANTHONY BACON, Esq;* and published in the year 1749, by the learned and judicious Dr. BIRCH, will be persuaded, that, towards the year 1595, this fickle and unsteady prince had really formed a design to embrace the faith of *Rome*. See, in the curious collection now mentioned, the *Postscript* of a letter from Sir THOMAS EDMONDES to the Lord High Treasurer, dated the 20th of *December 1595*. We learn also, from the *Memoirs of Sir RALPH WINWOOD*, that, in the year 1596, JAMES sent Mr. OGILBY, a Scots baron, into *Spain*, to assure his Catholic Majesty, that he was then ready and resolved to embrace Popery, and to propose an alliance with that king and the Pope against the Queen of *England*. See *State Tracts*, vol. i. p. 1. See also an extract of a letter from TOBIE MATTHEW, D. D. dean of *Durham*, to the Lord Treasurer BURLEIGH, containing an information of Scotch affairs, in STRYPE's *Annals*, vol. iv. p. 201. Above all, see HARRIS's *Historical and Critical Account of the Life and Writings of JAMES I.*, p. 29. note (N). This last writer may be added to LARREY and RAPIN, who have exposed the pliability and inconsistency of this self-sufficient monarch.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

The state of  
the church  
of England  
under  
Charles I.

vernment, against which he had more than once expressed himself in the strongest terms. He left the constitution of *England*, both ecclesiastical and civil, in a very unsettled and fluctuating state, languishing under intestine disorders of various kinds.

XX. His son and successor CHARLES I., who had imbibed his political and religious principles, had nothing so much at heart as to bring to perfection what his father had left unfinished. All the exertions of his zeal, and the whole tenour of his administration, were directed towards the three following objects: "The extending the  
" royal prerogative and raising the power of the  
" crown above the authority of the law—the re-  
" duction of all the churches in *Great Britain* and  
" *Ireland* under the jurisdiction of bishops, whose  
" government he looked upon as of divine insti-  
" tution, and also as the most adapted to guard  
" the privileges and majesty of the throne—and,  
" lastly, the suppression of the opinions and insti-  
" tutions that were peculiar to Calvinism, and  
" the modelling of the doctrine, discipline, ce-  
" remonies, and policy of the church of *England*,  
" after the spirit and constitution of the primi-  
" tive church." The person whom the king chiefly intrusted with the execution of this arduous plan was WILLIAM LAUD, bishop of *London*, who was afterwards raised, in the year 1633, to the see of *Canterbury*, and exhibited, in these high stations, a mixed character, composed of great qualities and great defects. The voice of justice must celebrate his erudition, his fortitude, his ingenuity, his zeal for the sciences, and his munificence and liberality to men of letters; and, at the same time, even charity must acknowledge with regret, his inexcusable imprudence, his excessive superstition, his rigid attachment to the sentiments, rites, and institutions of the ancient church,

church, which made him behold the Puritans and Calvinists with horror [k]; and that violent spirit of animosity and persecution, that discovered itself in the whole course of his ecclesiastical administration [l]. This haughty prelate executed the plans of his royal master, and fulfilled the views of his own ambition, without using those mild and moderate methods, that prudence employs to make unpopular schemes go down. He carried things with a high hand; when he found the laws opposing his views, he treated them with contempt, and violated them without hesitation; he loaded the Puritans with injuries and vexations, and aimed at nothing less than their total extinction; he rejected the Calvinistical doctrine of Predestination publicly in the year 1625; and, notwithstanding the opposition and remonstrances of ABBOT, substituted the Arminian system in its place [m]; he revived many religious rites and ceremonies,

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

[k] See ANT. WOOD, *Athenæ Oxoniens.* tom. ii. p. 55.—HEYLIN's *Cyprianus*, or the *History of the Life and Death of WILLIAM LAUD*, published at London in 1668.—CLARENDON's *History*, vol. i.

[l] "Sincere he undoubtedly was (says Mr. HUME), and, however misguided, actuated by religious principles in all his pursuits; and it is to be regretted, that a man of such spirit, who conducted his enterprizes with such warmth and industry, had not entertained more enlarged views, and embraced principles more favourable to the general happiness of human society."

[m] See MICH. LE VASSOR, *Hist. de Louis XIII.* tom. v. p. 262.

☞ This expression may lead the uninformed reader into a mistake, and make him imagine that LAUD had caused the Calvinistical doctrine of the xxxix Articles to be abrogated, and the tenets of ARMINIUS to be substituted in their place. It may therefore be proper to set this matter in a clearer light. In the year 1625, LAUD wrote a small treatise to prove the orthodoxy of the Arminian doctrines; and, by his credit with the duke of BUCKINGHAM, had Arminian and Anti-puritanical chaplains placed about the king. This step increased the debates between the Calvinistical and Arminian doctors, and produced

C. E. N. T. ceremonies, which, though stamped with the  
 XVII. sanction of antiquity, were nevertheless marked  
 SECT. II. with  
 PART II.

---

produced the warmest animosities and dissensions. To calm these, the king issued out a proclamation, dated the 14th of January 1626, the literal tenor of which was, in truth, more favourable to the Calvinists than to the Arminians, though, by the manner in which it was interpreted and executed by LAUD, it was turned to the advantage of the latter. In this proclamation it was said expressly, "that his majesty would admit of no innovations in the doctrine, discipline, or government of the church;" (N. B. *The doctrine of the church previously to this, was Calvinistical,*) "and therefore charges all his subjects, and especially the clergy, not to publish or maintain in preaching or writing, any new inventions or opinions, contrary to the said doctrine and discipline established by law, &c." It was certainly a very singular instance of LAUD's indecent partiality, that this proclamation was employed to suppress the books that were expressly written in the defence of the xxxix Articles, while the writings of the Arminians, who certainly opposed these articles, were publicly licensed. I don't here enter into the merits of the cause; I only speak of the tenor of the Proclamation, and the manner of its execution.

This manner of proceeding shewed how difficult and arduous a thing it is to change systems of doctrine established by law, since neither CHARLES, who was by no means dissident of his authority, nor LAUD, who was far from being timorous in the use and abuse of it, attempted to reform articles of faith, that stood in direct opposition to the Arminian doctrines, which they were now promoting by the warmest encouragements, and which were daily gaining ground under their protection. Instead of reforming the xxxix Articles, which step would have met with great opposition from the house of commons, and from a considerable part of the clergy and laity, who were still warmly attached to Calvinism, LAUD advised the king to have these articles reprinted, with an ambiguous declaration prefixed to them, which might tend to silence or discourage the reigning controversies between the Calvinists and Arminians, and thus secure to the latter an unmolested state, in which they would daily find their power growing under the countenance and protection of the court. This declaration, which, in most editions of the Common-Prayer, is still to be found at the head of the articles, is a most curious piece of political theology; and had it not borne hard upon the right of private judgment, and been evidently designed to favour one party, though it carried the aspect of a perfect neutrality, it might have been looked

with the turpitude of superstition, and had been justly abrogated on that account; he forced bishops

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

looked upon as a wise and provident measure to secure the tranquillity of the church. For, in the tenor of this declaration, precision was sacrificed to prudence and ambiguity, nay, even contradictions were preferred before consistent, clear, and positive decisions, that might have fomented dissensions and discord. The declaration seemed to favour the Calvinists, since it prohibited the *affixing any new sense to any article*; it also favoured in effect the Arminians, as it ordered all curious search about the contested points to be laid aside, and these disputes to be shut up in *Goa's promises*, as they are generally set forth to us in holy scriptures, and the general meaning of the articles of the church of England according to them. But what was singularly preposterous in this Declaration was, its being designed to favour the Arminians, and yet prohibiting expressly any person, either in their sermons or writings, to put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the article, and ordering them, on the contrary, to take each article in its literal and grammatical sense, and to submit to it in the full and plain meaning thereof; for certainly if the 17th article has a plain, literal, and grammatical meaning, it is a meaning unfavourable to Arminianism; and bishop BURNET was obliged afterwards to acknowledge, that without enlarging the sense of the articles, the Arminians could not subscribe them consistently with their opinions, nor without violating the demands of common ingenuity. See BURNET's remarks on the examination of his exposition, &c. p. 3.

This renders it probable, that the declaration now mentioned (in which we see no royal signature, no attestation of any officer of the crown, no date, in short no mark to shew where, when, or by what authority it was issued out) was not composed in the reign of king CHARLES. Bishop BURNET, indeed, was of opinion, that it was composed in that reign to support the Arminians, who, when they were charged with departing from the true sense of the articles, answered, "that they took the articles in their literal and grammatical sense, and therefore did not prevaricate." But this reasoning does not appear conclusive to the acute and learned author of the *Confessional*. He thinks it more probable, that the declaration was composed, and first published, in the latter part of king JAMES's reign; for though, says he, there be no evidence that JAMES ever turned Arminian in principle, yet that was the party that stuck to him in his measures, and which it became necessary for him on that account to humour, and to render respectable in the eyes of the people by every expedient that

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

---

shops upon the Scots nation, which were zealously attached to the discipline and ecclesiastical polity of *Geneva*, and had shewn, on all occasions, the greatest reluctance against an episcopal government; and, lastly, he gave many and very plain intimations, that he looked upon the Romish church, with all its errors, as more pure, more holy, and preferable upon the whole, to those Protestant churches that were not subject to the jurisdiction of bishops. By these his unpopular sentiments and violent measures, LAUD drew an odium on the king, on himself, and on the episcopal order in general. Hence, in the year 1644, he was brought before the public tribunals of justice, declared guilty of high treason, and condemned to lose his head on a scaffold; which sentence was accordingly executed.

After the death of LAUD, the dissensions that had reigned for a long time between the king and parliament, grew still more violent, and arose at length to so great a height, that they could not be extinguished but by the blood of that excellent prince. The great council of the nation, heated by the violent suggestions of the *Puritans* and *Independents* [n], abolished episcopal government; condemned and abrogated every thing in the ecclesiastical establishment that was contrary to the doctrine, worship, and discipline of the church of *Geneva*; turned the vehemence of their

that might not bring any reflexion on his own consistency. "And  
" whoever, *continues this author*, considers the quibbling and  
" equivocal terms in which this instrument is drawn, will, I am  
" persuaded, observe the distress of a man divided between his  
" principles and his interests, that is, of a man exactly in the situa-  
" tion of king JAMES I., in the three last years of his reign."  
It is likely then, that this declaration was only republished at  
the head of the articles, which were reprinted by the order of  
CHARLES I.

[n] The origin of this sect has been already mentioned.

opposition

opposition against the king himself, and having brought him into their power by the fate of arms, accused him of treason against the majesty of the nation; and, in the year 1648, while the eyes of *Europe* were fixed with astonishment on this strange spectacle, caused his head to be struck off on a public scaffold. Such are the calamities that flow from religious zeal without knowledge, from that enthusiasm and bigotry that inspire a blind and immoderate attachment to the external unessential parts of religion, and to certain doctrines ill-understood! These broils and tumults served also unhappily to confirm the truth of an observation often made, that all religious sects, while they are kept under and oppressed, are remarkable for inculcating the duties of moderation, forbearance, and charity towards those who dissent from them; but, as soon as the scenes of persecution are removed, and they, in their turn, arrive at power and pre-eminence, they forget their own precepts and maxims, and leave both the recommendation and practice of charity to those that groan under their yoke. Such, in reality, was the conduct and behaviour of the *Puritans* during their transitory exaltation; they shewed as little clemency and equity to the bishops and other patrons of episcopacy, as they had received from them when the reins of government were in their hands [o].

XXI. The *Independents*, who have been just mentioned among the promoters of civil discord in *England*, are generally represented by the British writers in a much worse light than the *Presbyterians* or Calvinists. They are commonly accused of various enormities, and are even charged

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

The Independents.

[o] Besides CLARENDON and the other writers of English history already mentioned, see NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. and iii.

with

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

with the crime of parricide, as having borne a principal part in the death of the king. But whoever will be at the pains of examining, with impartiality and attention, the writings of that sect, and their confession of faith, must soon perceive, that many crimes have been imputed to them without foundation, and will probably be induced to think, that the bold attempts of the civil *Independents* (*i. e.* of those warm republicans who were the declared enemies of monarchy, and wanted to extend the liberty of the people beyond all bounds of wisdom and prudence) have been unjustly laid to the charge of those *Independents*, whose principles were merely of a religious kind [*p*]. The religious *Independents* derive their

[*p*] The sect of the *Independents* is of recent date, and still subsists in *England*; there is, nevertheless, not one, either of the ancient or modern sects of Christians, that is less known, or has been more loaded with groundless aspersions and reproaches. The most eminent English writers, not only among the patrons of episcopacy, but even among those very *Presbyterians* with whom they are now united, have thrown out against them the bitterest accusations and the severest invectives that the warmest indignation could invent. They have not only been represented as delirious, mad, fanatical, illiterate, factious, and ignorant both of natural and revealed religion, but also as abandoned to all kinds of wickedness and sedition, and as the only authors of the odious parricide committed on the person of CHARLES I. \*. And as the authors who have given these representations, are considered by foreigners as the best and most authentic relaters of the transactions that have passed in their own country, and are therefore followed as the surest guides, the *Independents* appear, almost every where, under the most unfavourable aspect. It must indeed be candidly acknowledged, that as every class and order of men consists of persons of very different characters and qualities, so

\* DUFFEL (whom nevertheless LEWIS DE MOULIN, the most zealous defender of the *Independents*, commends on account of his ingenuity and candour) in his *Historia Rituum Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, cap. i. p. 4. expresses himself thus: *Fator, si atrocis illius Tragædiæ aut actus fuerint, quot Indictarum esse solent postremum fore Independentium fuisse—Adco ut non acute magis quàm vere, dixerit L'ESTRANGUS Noster: Regem primo à Presbyterianis inter-*



their denomination from the following principle, which they held in common with the *Brownists*,

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

also the sect of *Independents* has been dishonoured by several turbulent, factious, profligate, and flagitious members. But, if it is a constant maxim with the wise and prudent, not to judge of the spirit and principles of a sect from the actions or expressions of a handful of its members, but from the manners, customs, opinions, and behaviour of the generality of those who compose it, from the writings and discourses of its learned men, and from its public and avowed forms of doctrine and confessions of faith; then, I make no doubt but that, by this rule of estimating matters, the *Independents* will appear to have been unjustly loaded with so many accusations and reproaches.

We shall take no notice of the invidious and severe animadversions that have been made upon this religious Community by CLARENDON, ECHARD, PARKER, and so many other writers. To set this whole matter in the clearest and most impartial light, we shall confine ourselves to the account of the *Independents* given by a writer, justly celebrated by the English themselves, and who, though a foreigner, is generally supposed to have had an accurate knowledge of the British nation, its history, its parties, its sects, and revolutions. This writer is RAPIN THOYRAS, (who in the twenty-first book of his *History of England*, vol. ii. p. 514. edit. folio) represents the *Independents* under such horrid colours, that, were his portrait just, they would not deserve to enjoy the light of the sun, or to breathe the free air of Britain, much less to be treated with indulgence and esteem by those who have the cause of virtue at heart. Let us now examine the account, which this illustrious historian gives of this sect. He declares, in the first place, that, notwithstanding all the pains he had taken to trace out the true origin of it, his inquiries had been entirely fruitless; his words are, as translated by Mr. TINDAL, *After all my pains, I have not been able to discover, precisely, the first rise of the Independent sect, or faction.* It is very surprising to hear a man of learning, who had employed seventeen years in composing the *History of England*, and had admittance to so many rich and famous libraries, express his ignorance of a matter, about which it was so easy to acquire ample information. Had he only looked into the work of the learned HORNBECK, entitled, *Summa Controversiarum*, lib. x. p. 775. he would have found, in a moment, what he had been so long and so laboriously seeking in vain. RAPIN proceeds to the doctrines and opinions of the *Independents*, and begins here, by a general declaration of their tendency to throw the nation into disorder

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

*Brownists*, that every Christian congregation ought to be governed by its own laws, without depending

disorder and combustion; his words are, *Thus much is certain, their principles were very proper to put the kingdom in a flame; and this they did effectually.* What truth there is in this assertion, will be seen by what follows. Their sentiments concerning government were, if we are to believe this writer, of the most pernicious kind; since, according to him, they wanted to overturn the monarchy, and to establish a democracy in its place; his words are, *With regard to the state, they abhorred monarchy, and approved only a republican government.* I will not pretend to deny, that there were among the *Independents* several persons, that were no friends to a kingly government; persons of this kind were to be found among the *Presbyterians*, *Anabaptists*, and all the other religious sects and communities that flourished in England during this tumultuous period; but I want to see it proved, in an evident and satisfactory manner, that these republican principles were embraced by all the *Independents*, and formed one of the distinguishing characteristics of that sect. There is, at least, no such thing to be found in their public writings. They declared, on the contrary, in a public memorial drawn up by them in the year 1647, that, as magistracy in general is the ordinance of God, *they do not disapprove of any form of civil government, but do freely acknowledge, that a kingly government, bounded by just and wholesome laws, is both allowed by God, and also a good accommodation unto men.* I omit the mention of several other circumstances, which unite to prove that the *Independents* were far from looking with abhorrence on a monarchical government.

Their sentiments of religion, according to RAPIN's account, were highly absurd, since he represents their principles as entirely opposite to those of all other religious communities: *As to religion*, says he, *their principles were contrary to those of all the rest of the world.* With respect to this accusation, it may be proper to observe, that there are extant two *Confessions of Faith*, one of the English *Independents* in Holland, and another drawn up by the principal members of that community in England. The former was composed by JOHN ROBINSON, the founder of the sect, and was published at Leyden in 4to, in the year 1619, under the following title: *Apologia pro exulibus Angliæ, qui Brownistæ vulgo appellantur*; the latter appeared at London, for the first time, in the year 1658, and was thus entitled: *A Declaration of the Faith and Order owned and practised in the Congregational Churches in England, agreed upon, and consented unto, by the Elders and Messengers, in their meeting at*

depending on the jurisdiction of bishops, or being subject to the authority of synods, presbyteries, CENT.  
XVII.  
SER. II.  
PART II.

the Savoy, October 12, 1658. HORNBECK gave, in the year 1659, a Latin translation of this *Declaration*, and subjoined it to his *Epistola ad DURÆUM de Independentismo*. It appears evidently from these two public and authentic pieces, not to mention other writings of the *Independents*, that they differed from the *Presbyterians* or Calvinists in no single point of any consequence, except that of ecclesiastical government. To put this matter beyond all doubt, we have only to attend to the following passage in ROBINSON'S *Apology for the English Exiles*, p. 7. 11. where that founder of the sect of the *Independents* expresses his own private sentiments, and those of his community, in the plainest manner: *Prostemur coram Deo et hominibus, adeo nobis convenire cum Ecclesiis Reformatis, Belgicis in re religionis, ut omnibus et singulis earundem Ecclesiarum fidei articulis, prout habentur in Harmonia confessionum fidei, parati sumus subscribere.—Ecclesias Reformatas pro veris et genuinis habemus, cum iisdem in sacris Dei communionem prostemur, et, quantum in nobis est, colimus.* It appears evident from this declaration, that, instead of differing totally from all other Christian societies, it may rather be said of the *Independents*, that they were perfectly agreed with by far the greatest part of the Reformed churches. To shew, as he imagines, by a striking example, the absurdity of their religion and worship, our eminent historian tell us, that they not only reject all kind of ecclesiastical government, but moreover allow all their members promiscuously, and without exception, to perform in public the pastoral functions, *i. e.* to preach, pray, and expound the Scriptures; his words are, *They were not only averse to episcopacy and the ecclesiastical hierarchy* (this charge is true, but it may equally be brought against the *Presbyterians*, *Brownists*, *Anabaptists*, and all the various sects of *Non-conformists*), *but they would not so much as endure ordinary ministers in the church. They maintained, that every man might pray in public, exhort his brethren, and interpret the Scriptures according to the talents God had endowed him with.—So with them every one preached, prayed, admonished, interpreted the holy Scriptures, without any other call than what he himself drew from his zeal and supposed gifts, and without any other authority than the approbation of his auditors.* This whole charge is evidently false and groundless. The *Independents* have, and always have had, fixed and regular ministers, approved of by their people; nor do they allow to teach in public every person, who thinks himself qualified for that important office. The celebrated historian has here confounded the *Independents* with the *Brownists*, who, as is well

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

---

teries, or any ecclesiastical assembly composed of the deputies from different churches [9]. It is in

known, permitted all to pray and preach in public without distinction. We shall not enlarge upon the other mistakes he has fallen into on this subject; but only observe, that if so eminent a writer, and one so well acquainted with the English nation, has pronounced such an unjust sentence against this sect, we may the more easily excuse an inferior set of authors, who have loaded them with groundless accusations.

It will however be alleged, that, whatever may have been the religious sentiments and discipline of the *Independents*, innumerable testimonies concur in proving, that they were chargeable with the death of CHARLES I.; and many will consider this single circumstance as a sufficient demonstration of the impiety and depravity of the whole sect. I am well aware, indeed, that many of the most eminent and respectable English writers have given the *Independents* the denomination of *Regicides*; and, if by the term *Independents* they mean those licentious republicans, whose dislike of a monarchical form of government carried them the most pernicious and extravagant lengths, I grant that this denomination is well applied. But if by the term, *Independents*, we are to understand a religious sect, the ancestors of those who still bear the same title in England, it appears very questionable to me, whether the unhappy fate of the worthy prince abovementioned ought to be imputed entirely to that set of men. They who affirm that the *Independents* were the only authors of the death of King CHARLES, must mean one of these two things, either that the *Regicides* were animated and set on by the seditious doctrines of that sect, and the violent suggestions of its members, or that all who were concerned in this atrocious deed were themselves *Independents*, zealously attached to the religious community now under consideration. Now it may be proved, with the clearest evidence, that neither of these was the case. There is nothing in the doctrines of this sect, so far as they are known to me, that seems in the least adapted to excite men to such a horrid deed; nor does it appear from the history of these times, that the *Independents* were a whit more exasperated against CHARLES, than were the *Presbyterians*. And as to the latter supposition, it is far from being true, that all those who were concerned in bringing this unfortunate prince to the scaffold were *Independents*; since we learn from the best English writers, and from the public declarations of CHARLES II., that this violent faction was composed of persons of different sects. That there were *Independents* among them, may be easily conceived. After all; this matter will be best unravelled by the English writers,

in this their notion of ecclesiastical government, that the difference between them and the *Presbyterians*

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

writers, who know best in what sense the term *Independents* is used, when it is applied to those who brought CHARLES I. to the block \*.

On inquiring, with particular attention, into the causes of that odium that has been cast upon the *Independents*, and of the heavy accusations and severe invectives with which they have been loaded, I was more peculiarly struck with the three following considerations, which will perhaps furnish a satisfactory account of this matter. In the *first place*, the denomination of *Independents* is ambiguous, and is not peculiar to any one distinct order of men. For, not to enumerate the other notions that have been annexed to this term, it is sufficient to observe, that it is used sometimes by the English writers to denote those who aim at the establishment of a purely *democrati- cal* or popular government, in which the body of the people is clothed with the supreme dominion. Such a faction there was in *England*, composed, in a great measure, of persons of an enthusiastical character and complexion; and to it, no doubt, we are to ascribe those scenes of sedition and misery,

\* Dr. MOSHEIM's defence of the *Independents* is certainly specious; but he has not sufficiently distinguished the times; and he has perhaps, in defending them, strained too far that equitable principle, that we must not impute to a sect any principles that are not contained in, or deducible from, their religious system. This maxim does not entirely answer here the purpose for which it is applied. The religious system of a sect may be in itself pacific and innocent, while, at the same time, certain incidental circumstances, or certain associations of ideas, may render that sect more turbulent and restless than others, or at least involve it in political factions and broils. Such perhaps was the case of the *Independents* at certain periods of time, and more especially at the period now under consideration. When we consider their religious form of government, we shall see evidently, that a principle of analogy (which influences the sentiments and imaginations of men much more than is generally supposed) must naturally have led the greatest part of them, to republican notions of civil government; and it is further to be observed, that from a republican government, they must have expected much more protection and favour than from a kingly one. When these two things are considered, together with their situation under the reign of CHARLES I. when the government was unhinged, when things were in confusion, when the minds of men were suspended upon the issue of the national troubles, and when the eager spirit of party, nourished by hope, made each faction expect that the chaos would end in some settled system, favourable to their respective views, sentiments, and passions; this will engage us to think, that the *Independents*, at that time, may have been much more tumultuous and republican than the sect that bears that denomination in our times. The reader, that would form just ideas of the matter of fact, must examine the relations given by the writers of both parties. See particularly CLARENDON's *History of his own Life*.—NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. iii. p. 547. &c.—HUME's *History of England*, vol. v. Edit. in Quarto.—BURNET's *History of his own Times*, vol. i. p. 46, 47.

CENT. XVII.  
SECT II.  
PART II.

terians principally consists; for their religious doctrines, except in some points of very little moment,

whose effects are still lamented with justice. The violence and folly that dishonoured the proceedings of this tumultuous faction have been, if I am not mistaken, too rashly imputed to the religious *Independents* now under consideration, who, with all their defects, were a much better set of men than the persons now mentioned. It may be observed further, *secondly*, that almost all the religious sects, which divided the English nation in the reign of CHARLES I., and more especially under the administration of CROMWELL, assumed the denomination of *Independents*, in order to screen themselves from the reproaches of the public, and to share a part of that popular esteem that the true and genuine *Independents* had acquired, on account of the regularity of their lives and the sanctity of their manners. This is confirmed, among other testimonies, by the following passage of a letter from TOLAND to LE CLERC: *Au commencement tous les sectaires se disoient INDEPENDANS, parce que ces derniers étoient fort honorés du peuple à cause de leur piété.* See LE CLERC's *Biblioth. Univers. et Histor.* tom. xxiii. p. ii. p. 506. As this title was of a very extensive signification, and of great latitude, it might thus easily happen, that all the enormities of the various sects who sheltered themselves under it, and several of whom were but of short duration, might unluckily be laid to the charge of the true *Independents*. But it must be particularly remarked, in the third place, that the usurper CROMWELL preferred the *Independents* before all other religious communities. He looked, with an equal eye of suspicion and fear, upon the *Presbyterian synods* and the *Episcopal visitations*; every thing that looked like an extensive authority, whether it was of a civil or religious nature, excited uneasy apprehensions in the breast of the tyrant; but in the limited and simple form of ecclesiastical discipline, that was adopted by the *Independents*, he saw nothing that was adapted to alarm his fears. This circumstance was sufficient to render the *Independents* odious in the eyes of many, who would be naturally disposed to extend their abhorrence of CROMWELL to those who were the objects of his favour and protection.

[q] The *Independents* were undoubtedly so called from their maintaining that all Christian congregations were so many independent religious societies, that had a right to be governed by their own laws, without being subject to any further or foreign jurisdiction. ROBINSON, the founder of the sect, makes express use of this term in explaining his doctrine relating to ecclesiastical government: *Catum quolibet particularum* (says he,

ment, are almost entirely the same with those that are adopted by the church of *Geneva*. The founder of this sect was JOHN ROBINSON, a man who had much of the solemn piety of the times, and was master of a congregation of *Brownists*, that had settled at *Leyden*. This well-meaning man, perceiving the defects that reigned in the discipline of BROWN, and in the spirit and temper of his followers, employed his zeal and diligence in correcting them, and in modelling anew the society, in such a manner as to render it less odious to his adversaries, and less liable to the just cen-

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

he, in his *Apologia*, cap. v. p. 22.) *esse totam, integram, et perfectam ecclesiam ex suis partibus constantem, immediatè et INDEPENDENTER (quoad alias ecclesias) sub ipso Christo*. It may possibly have been from this very passage that the title of *Independents* was originally derived. The disciples of ROBINSON did not reject it; nor indeed is there any thing shocking in the title, when it is understood in a manner conformable to the sentiments of those to whom it is applied. It was certainly utterly unknown in *England* before the year 1640; at least it is not once mentioned in the ecclesiastical canons and constitutions that were drawn up, during that year, in the synods or visitations held by the archbishops of *Canterbury*, *York*, and other prelates, in which canons all the various sects that then subsisted in *England* are particularly mentioned. See WILKIN'S *Concilia Magnæ Britanniae et Hiberniae*, vol. iv. cap. v. p. 548. where are the constitutions and canons ecclesiastical, treated upon by the archbishops of *Canterbury* and *York*, and the rest of the bishops and clergy, in their several synods. AN. MDCXL. It is true, that not long after this period, and more particularly from the year 1642, we find this denomination very frequently in the *English Annals*. The *English Independents* were so far from being displeased with it, that they assumed it publicly in a piece they published in their own defence at *London*, in the year 1644, under the following title: *Apologetical Narration of the Independents*. But when in process of time a great variety of sects, as has been already observed, sheltered themselves under the cover of this extensive denomination, and even seditious subjects, that aimed at nothing less than the death of their sovereign and the destruction of the government, employed it as a mask to hide their deformity, then the true and genuine *Independents* renounced this title, and substituted another less odious in its place, calling themselves *Congregational Brethren*, and their religious assemblies *Congregational Churches*.

CENT. XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

sure of those true Christians, who looked upon charity as the end of the commandment. The *Independents*, accordingly, were much more commendable than the *Brownists* in two respects. They surpassed them both in the moderation of their sentiments, and the order of their discipline. They did not, like BROWN, pour forth bitter and uncharitable invectives against the churches that were governed by rules entirely different from theirs, nor pronounce them, on that account, unworthy of the Christian name. On the contrary, though they considered their own form of ecclesiastical government as of divine institution, and as originally introduced by the authority of the apostles, nay, by the apostles themselves, yet they had candour and charity enough to acknowledge, that true religion and solid piety might flourish in those communities, which were under the jurisdiction of bishops, or the government of synods and presbyteries. They were also much more attentive than the *Brownists* in keeping on foot a regular ministry in their communities; for while the latter allowed promiscuously all ranks and orders of men to teach in public, and to perform the other pastoral functions, the *Independents* had, and still have, a certain number of ministers, chosen respectively by the congregations where they are fixed; nor is any person among them permitted to speak in public, before he has submitted to a proper examination of his capacity and talents, and been approved of by the heads of the congregation. This community, which was originally formed in *Holland*, in the year 1610, made at first but a very small progress in *England* [99]; it worked its way slowly, and in a clandestine manner; and its members concealed

[99] In the year 1616, Mr. JACOB, who had adopted the religious sentiments of ROBINSON, set up the first *Independent* or *Congregational* church in *England*.



their principles from public view, to avoid the penal laws that had been enacted against *Non-conformists*. But during the reign of CHARLES I., when, amidst the shocks of civil and religious discord, the authority of the bishops and the cause of episcopacy began to decline, and more particularly about the year 1640, the *Independents* grew more courageous, and came forth with an air of resolution and confidence, to public view. After this period, their affairs took a prosperous turn; and, in a little time, they became so considerable, both by their numbers and by the reputation they acquired, that they vied in point of pre-eminence and credit, not only with the bishops, but also with the *Presbyterians*, though at this time in the very zenith of their power. This rapid progress of the *Independents* was, no doubt, owing to a variety of causes; among which justice obliges us to reckon the learning of their teachers, and the regularity and sanctity of their manners [r]. During the administration of CROMWELL, whose peculiar protection and patronage they enjoyed on more than one account, their credit arose to the greatest height, and their influence and reputation were universal; but after the restoration of CHARLES II., their cause declined, and they fell back gradually into their primitive obscurity. The sect, indeed, still subsisted; but in such a state of dejection and weakness, as engaged them in the year 1691, under the reign of King WILLIAM, to enter into an association with the *Presbyterians* residing in and about London, under certain heads of agreement that tended to the maintenance of their respective institutions [s].

XXII.

[r] NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 107. 293. vol. viii. p. 141. 145. 276. 303. 437. 549. See also a German work, entitled, *Englische Reformations-Historie*, by ANTHONY WILLIAM BOHM, p. 794.

[s] From this time they were called *United Brethren*. The heads of agreement that formed and cemented this union are

C E N T.  
XVII.  
S E C T. 19.  
P A R T II.

XXII. While OLIVER CROMWELL held the reins of government in *Great Britain*, all sects, even

The state of  
the church  
of England  
under  
Cromwell.

to be found in the second volume of WHISTON'S *Memoirs of his Life and Writings*, and they consist in Nine Articles. The First relates to *Churches and Church Members*, in which the United Ministers, *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, declare, among other things, *That each particular church had a right to chuse their own officers; and being furnished with such as are duly qualified and ordained according to the Gospel rule, hath authority from Christ for exercising government, and enjoying all the ordinances of worship within itself—That, in the administration of church-power, it belongs to the pastors and other elders of every particular church (if such there be) to rule and govern; and to the brotherhood to consent, according to the rule of the Gospel.* In this both *Presbyterians* and *Independents* depart from the primitive principles of their respective institutions. Article II. relates to the *Ministry*, which they grant to have been instituted by JESUS CHRIST, *for the gathering, guiding, edifying, and governing of his church; in this article it is further observed, that ministers ought to be endued with competent learning, sound judgment, and solid piety; that none are to be ordained to the work of the ministry, but such as are chosen and called thereunto by a particular church; that, in such a weighty matter, it is ordinarily requisite, that every such church consult and advise with the pastors of neighbouring congregations; and that after such advice the person thus consulted about, being chosen by the brotherhood of that particular church, be duly ordained and set apart to his office over them.* Article III. relates to *Censure*, and prescribes, first, the *admonishing*, and, if this prove ineffectual, the *excommunication* of offending and scandalous members to be performed by the pastors, with the consent of the brethren. Article IV. concerning the *Communion of Churches*, lays it down as a principle, that there is no subordination between particular churches; that they are all equal, and consequently independent; that the pastors, however, of these churches ought to have frequent meetings together, *that, by mutual advice, support, encouragement, and brotherly intercourse, they strengthen the hearts and hands of each other in the ways of the Lord.* In Article V. which relates to *Deacons* and *Ruling Elders*, the United Brethren acknowledge, *that the office of a deacon is of divine appointment, and that it belongs to their office to receive, lay out, and distribute, the stock of the church to its proper use; and as there are different sentiments about the office of Ruling Elders, who labour not in word and doctrine, they agree, that this difference makes no breach among them.* In Article VI. concerning *Occasional Meetings of Ministers*, &c. the brethren agree, *that it is needful, in weighty and difficult*

even those that dishonoured true religion in the most shocking manner by their fanaticism or their ignorance, enjoyed a full and unbounded liberty of professing publicly their respective doctrines. The *Episcopalians* alone were excepted from this toleration, and received the most severe and iniquitous treatment. The bishops were deprived of their dignities and revenues, and felt the heavy hand of oppression in a particular manner. But though the toleration extended to all other sects and religious communities, yet the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* were treated with peculiar marks of distinction and favour. CROMWELL, though attached to no one particular sect, gave the latter extraordinary proofs of his good-will, and augmented their credit and authority, as this seemed the easiest and least exasperating method of setting bounds to the ambition of the *Presbyterians*, who aimed at a very high degree of ecclesiastical power [1]. It was during this period of religious

scilicet cases, that the ministers of several churches meet together, *in order to be consulted and advised with about such matters*; and that particular churches ought to have a reverential regard to their judgment so given, and not dissent therefrom without apparent grounds from the word of God. Article VII. which relates to the *Demeanor of the Brethren towards the Civil Magistrate*, prescribes obedience to, and prayers for God's protection and blessing upon, their rulers. In Article VIII. which relates to a *Confession of Faith*, the brethren esteem it sufficient, that a church acknowledge the Scriptures to be the word of God, the perfect and only rule of faith and practice, and own either the doctrinal part of the articles of the church of England, or the *Westminster* Confession and Catechisms, drawn up by the *Presbyterians*, or the Confession of the *Congregational Brethren* (i. e. the *Independents*), to be agreeable to the said rule. Article IX. which concerns the duty and deportment of the Brethren towards those that are not in communion with them, inculcates charity and moderation. It appears from these articles, that the *Independents* were led, by a kind of necessity, to adopt, in many things, the sentiments of the *Presbyterians*, and to depart thus far from the original principles of their sect.

[1] A little after CROMWELL's elevation, it was resolved by the parliament, at the conclusion of a debate concerning public worship and church-government, that the *Presbyterian* government

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

religious anarchy, that the *Fifth-monarchy-men* arose, a set of wrong-headed and turbulent enthusiasts, who expected CHRIST's sudden appearance upon earth to establish a new kingdom; and, acting in consequence of this illusion, aimed at the subversion of all human government, and were for turning all things into the most deplorable confusion [u]. It was at this time also, that the *Quakers*, of whom we propose to give a more particular account [w], and the hot-headed *Anabaptists* [x], propagated, without restraint, their visionary doctrines. It must likewise be observed, that the *Deists*, headed by SIDNEY, NEVILLE, MARTIN, and HARRINGTON, appeared with impunity, and promoted a kind of religion, which consisted in a few plain

ment should be the established government. The *Independents* were not, as yet, agreed upon any standard of faith and discipline; and it was only a little before CROMWELL's death that they held a synod, by his permission, in order to publish to the world an *uniform* account of their doctrine and principles.

[u] See BURNET's *History of his own Times*, tom. i. p. 67.

[w] See in Vol. V. *The History of the Quakers*.

[x] We are not to imagine, by the term hot-headed (*furiost*), that the *Anabaptists* resembled the furious fanatics of that name that formerly excited such dreadful tumults in Germany, and more especially at *Munster*. This was by no means the case; the English Anabaptists differed from their Protestant brethren about the *subject* and *mode* of baptism alone; confining the former to *grown Christians*, and the latter to *immersion* or dipping. They were divided into *Generals* and *Particulars*, from their different sentiments upon the Arminian controversy. The latter, who were so called from their belief of the doctrines of *Particular Election*, *Redemption*, &c. were strict Calvinists, who separated from the *Independent* congregation at *Leyden*, in the year 1638. Their confession was composed with a remarkable spirit of modesty and charity. Their preachers were generally illiterate, and were eager in making proselytes of all that would submit to their *immersion*, without a due regard to their religious principles or their moral characters. The writers of these times represent them as tinctured with a kind of enthusiastic fury against all that opposed them. There were, nevertheless, among them some learned and pious persons, who disapproved highly of all violent and uncharitable proceedings.

precepts

precepts drawn from the dictates of natural reason [y].

XXIII. Among the various religious factions that sprung up in *England* during this period of confusion and anarchy, we may reckon a certain sect of *Presbyterians*, who were called by their adversaries *Antinomians*, or enemies of the law, and still subsist even in our times. The *Antinomians* are a more rigid kind of Calvinists, who pervert CALVIN'S doctrine of absolute decrees to the worst purposes, by drawing from it conclusions highly detrimental to the interests of true religion and virtue. Such is the judgment that the other Presbyterian communities form of this perverse and extravagant sect [z]. Several of the *Antinomians* (for they are not all precisely of the same mind) look upon it as unnecessary for Christian ministers to exhort their flock to a virtuous practice and a pious obedience to the divine law, "since they whom God has *elected* to salvation "by an eternal and immutable decree, will, by "the *irresistible* impulse of divine grace, be led "to the practice of piety and virtue; while those "who are doomed by a divine decree to eternal punishments, will never be engaged, by "any exhortations or admonitions, how affecting "soever they may be, to a virtuous course; nor "have they it in their power to obey the divine "law, when the succours of divine grace are withheld from them." From these principles they concluded, that the ministers of the Gospel discharged sufficiently their pastoral functions, when they inculcated the necessity of *faith in Christ*, and proclaimed the blessings of the new covenant to their

CENT.  
XVII.

SECT. II.  
PART II.

The English  
Antino-  
mians.

[y] NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, vol. iv. p. 87.

[z] See TOLAND'S Letter to LE CLERC, in the periodical work of the latter, entitled, *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique*, tom. xxiii. p. 505.—Also HORNBECK, *Summa Controversiarum*, p. 800. 812.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

people. Another, and a still more hideous form of *Antinomianism*, is that which is exhibited in the opinions of other doctors of that sect [a], who maintain, "That as the *elect* cannot fall from grace, nor forfeit the divine favour, so it follows, that the wicked actions they commit, and the violations of the divine law with which they are chargeable, are not *really sinful*, nor are to be considered as instances of their departing from the law of God; and that, consequently, they have no occasion either to confess their sins, or to break them off by repentance. Thus adultery, for example, in one of the *elect*, though it appear *sinful* in the sight of men, and be considered universally as an enormous violation of the divine law, yet is not a *sin* in the sight of God, because it is one of the essential and distinctive characters of the *elect*, that *they cannot do any thing which is either displeasing to God, or prohibited by the law* [b]."

Latitudina-  
rians.

XXIV. The public calamities, that flowed from these vehement and uncharitable disputes about religion, afflicted all wise and good men, and engaged several, who were not less eminent

[a] This second *Antinomian* hypothesis has certainly a still more odious aspect than the first; and it is therefore surprising that our author should use, in the original, these terms: *Hi tantum statuunt, Electos, &c.*

[b] There is an account of the other tenets of the *Antinomians*, and of the modern disputes that were occasioned by the publication of the Posthumous Works of CRISP, a flaming doctor of that extravagant and pernicious sect, given by PIERRE FRANÇOIS LE COURAYER, in his *Examen des défauts Théologiques*, tom. ii. p. 193. BAXTER and TILLOTSON distinguished themselves by their zeal against the *Antinomians*; and they were also completely refuted by Dr. WILLIAMS, in his famous book, entitled, *Gospel Truth stated and vindicated*, 8vo. I have been informed, since the first edition of this history was published, that the book, entitled, *Examen des défauts Théologiques*, which our author supposes to have been written by Dr. COURAYER, is the production of another pen.

for

for their piety than for their moderation and wisdom, to seek after some method of uniting such of the contending parties as were capable of listening to the dictates of charity and reason, or, at least, of calming their animosities, and persuading them to mutual forbearance. These pacific doctors offered themselves as mediators between the more violent *Episcopalians* on the one hand, and the more rigid *Presbyterians* and *Independents* on the other; and hoped that, when their differences were accommodated, the lesser factions would fall of themselves. The contests that reigned between the former turned partly on the forms of church-government and public worship, and partly on certain religious tenets, more especially those that were debated between the Arminians and Calvinists. To lessen the breach that kept these two great communities at such a distance from each other, the arbitrators, already mentioned, endeavoured to draw them out of their narrow inclosures, to render their charity more extensive, and widen the paths of salvation, which bigotry and party-rage had been labouring to render inaccessible to many good Christians. This noble and truly evangelical method of proceeding procured to its authors the denomination of *Latitudinarians* [c]. Their views, indeed, were generous and extensive. They were zealously attached to the forms of ecclesiastical government and worship that were established in the church of *England*, and they recommended episcopacy with all the strength and power of their eloquence; but they did not go so far as to look upon it as of *divine institution*, or as absolutely and indispensably necessary to the constitution of a Christian church; and hence they maintained,

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

[c] See BURNET's *History of his own Times*, vol. i. book ii. p. 188.

**GEN T.** that those, who followed other forms of govern-  
**XVII.** ment and worship were not, on that account, to  
**SECT. II.** be excluded from their communion, or to forfeit  
**PART II.** the title of brethren. As to the doctrinal part of religion, they took the system of the famous *EPISCOPIUS* for their model; and, like him, reduced the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, (*i. e.*) those doctrines the belief of which is necessary to salvation, to a few points. By this manner of proceeding they shewed, that neither the *Episcopalians*, who, generally speaking, embraced the sentiments of the *Arminians*, nor the *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, who as generally adopted the doctrine of *CALVIN*, had any reason to oppose each other with such animosity and bitterness, since the subjects of their debates were matters of an indifferent nature with respect to salvation, and might be variously explained and understood without any prejudice to their eternal interests. The chief leaders of these *Latitudinarians* were *HALES* and *CHILLINGWORTH*, whose names are still pronounced in *England* with that veneration that is due to distinguished wisdom and rational piety [*d*]. The respectable names of *MORE*,

[*d*] The life of the ingenious and worthy Mr. *HALES* was composed in English by M. *DES MAIZEAUX*, and published in 8vo. at *London*, in the year 1719; it was considerably augmented in the Latin translation of it, which I prefixed to the account of the synod of *Dort*, drawn from the letters of that great man, and published at *Hamburg* in 1724. A life of Mr. *HALES*, written in French, is to be found in the first volume of the French translation of *CHILLINGWORTH's Religion of Protestants*, &c.—The life of *CHILLINGWORTH* also was drawn up by *DES MAIZEAUX* in English; and a French translation of it appeared, in the year 1730, at the head of the excellent book now mentioned, which was translated into that language, and published at *Amsterdam*, in three volumes 8vo, in the year 1730. Those who are desirous of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the doctrines, government, laws, and present state of the church of *England*, will do well to read the history of these two men; and more especially to peruse *CHILLINGWORTH's* admirable book already mentioned, I mean, *The Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation*.

CUDWORTH,



## CHAP. II. *The History of the Reformed Church.*

CUDWORTH, GALE, WHICHCOT, and TILLOTSON, add a high degree of lustre to this eminent list. The undertaking of these great men was, indeed, bold and perilous; and it drew upon them much opposition and many bitter reproaches. They received, as the first fruits of their charitable zeal, the odious appellations of Atheists, Deists, and Socinians, both from the Roman Catholics and the more rigid of the contending Protestant parties; but, upon the restoration of King CHARLES II., they were raised to the first dignities of the church, and were deservedly held in universal esteem. It is also well known, that, even at this present time, the church of *England* is chiefly governed by *Latitudinarians* of this kind, though there be among both bishops and clergy, from time to time, ecclesiastics who breathe the narrow and despotic spirit of LAUD, and who, in the language of faction, are called *High-churchmen*, or *Church-tories* [e].

XXV. No sooner was CHARLES II. re-established on the throne of his ancestors, than the ancient forms of ecclesiastical government and public worship were restored with him; and the bishops reinstated in their dignities and honours. The *Non-conformists* hoped, that *they* should be allowed to share some part of the honours and revenues of the church; but their expectations were totally disappointed, and the face of affairs changed very suddenly with respect to them. For CHARLES subjected to the government of bishops the churches of *Scotland* and *Ireland*, the former of which was peculiarly attached to the ecclesiastical

C H M B  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

The state of  
the church  
of *England*  
under  
Charles II.  
and his suc-  
cessors.

[e] See RAPIN's *Dissertation on the Whigs and Tories*. See an admirable defence of the *Latitudinarian* divines, in a book entitled, *The Principles and Practices of certain moderate Divines of the Church of England (greatly misunderstood) truly represented and defended*. London, 1670, in 8vo. This book was written by Dr. FOWLER, afterwards bishop of Gloucester. N.

discipline

CENT. XVII. 1662, a public law was enacted, by which all who  
 SECT. II. refused to observe the rites, and subscribe the doc-  
 PART II. trines, of the church of *England*, were entirely  
 excluded from its communion [*f*]. From this  
 period, until the reign of King WILLIAM III.,  
 the *Non-conformists* were in a precarious and chang-  
 ing situation, sometimes involved in calamity  
 and trouble, at others enjoying some intervals of  
 tranquillity and certain gleams of hope, accord-  
 ing to the varying spirit of the court and ministry,  
 but never entirely free from perplexities and  
 fears [*g*]. But, in the year 1689, their affairs  
 took a favourable turn, when a bill for the *tolera-*  
*tion* of all Protestant dissenters from the church  
 of *England*, except the Socinians, passed in par-  
 liament almost without opposition, and delivered  
 them from the penal laws to which they had been  
 subjected by the *Act of Uniformity*, and other acts  
 passed under the house of STUART [*b*]. Nor did  
 the

[*f*] This was the famous *Act of Uniformity*, in conse-  
 quence of which the validity of Presbyterian ordination was re-  
 nounced; the ministrations of the foreign churches disowned;  
 the terms of conformity rendered more difficult and raised  
 higher than before the civil wars; and by which (contrary to  
 the manner of proceeding in the times of ELIZABETH and  
 CROMWELL, who, both, reserved for the subsistence of each  
 ejected clergyman a fifth part of his benefice) no provision was  
 made for those who should be deprived of their livings. See  
 WILKINS's *Concilia Magnæ Britanniae et Hiberniae*, tom. iv.  
 p. 573.—BURNET's *History of his own Times*, vol. ii. p. 190,  
 &c.—NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, tom. iv. p. 358.

[*g*] See the whole fourth volume of NEAL's *History of the*  
*Puritans*.

[*b*] This was called the *Toleration Act*, and it may be seen  
 at length in the *Appendix*, subjoined to the fourth volume of  
 NEAL's *History of the Puritans*. It is entitled, *An act for*  
*enactment their Majesties Protestant Subjects, dissenting from the*  
*Church of England, from the Penalties of certain Laws.* In this  
 bill the *Corporation* and *Test-Acts* are omitted, and consequent-  
 ly still remain in force. The Socinians are also excepted; but  
 provision

the Protestant dissenters in *England* enjoy alone the benefits of this act; for it extended also to the Scots church, which was permitted thereby to follow the ecclesiastical discipline of *Geneva*, and was delivered from the jurisdiction of bishops, and from the forms of worship that were annexed to episcopacy. It is from this period that the Non-conformists date the liberty and tranquillity they have long been blessed with, and still enjoy; but it is also observable, that it is to the transactions that were carried on during this period, in favour of religious liberty, that we must chiefly impute the multitude of religious sects and factions, that start up from time to time in that free and happy island, and involve its inhabitants in the perplexities of religious division and controversy [i].

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

XXVI. In the reign of King WILLIAM, and in the year 1689, the divisions among the friends of episcopacy ran high, and terminated in that famous schism in the church of *England*, which has never hitherto been entirely healed. SANCROFT, archbishop of *Canterbury*, and seven of the other bishops [ii], all of whom were eminently distinguished both by their learning and their virtue, looked upon it as unlawful to take the oaths of allegiance to the new king, from a mistaken notion that JAMES II., though banished from his

The High  
church and  
Non-jurors.

provision is made for *Quakers*, upon their making a solemn declaration, instead of taking the oaths to the government. This act excuses Protestant Dissenters from the penalties of the laws therein mentioned, provided they take the oaths to the government, and subscribe the *Doctrinal Articles* of the church of *England*.

[i] BURNET's *History of his own Times*, vol. ii. p. 23.

[ii] The other Non-juring bishops were, Dr. LLOYD, bishop of *Normwich*; Dr. TURNER, of *Ely*; Dr. KENN, of *Bath and Wells*; Dr. FRAMPTON, of *Gloucester*; Dr. THOMAS, of *Worcester*; Dr. LAKE, of *Chichester*; Dr. WHITE, bishop of *Peterborough*.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

dominions, remained, nevertheless, their right-ful sovereign. As these scruples were deeply rooted, and no arguments nor exhortations could engage these prelates to acknowledge the title of WILLIAM III. to the crown of *Great Britain*, they were deprived of their ecclesiastical dignities, and their sees were filled by other men of eminent merit [iii]. The deposed bishops and clergy formed a new episcopal church, which differed, in certain points of doctrine and certain circumstances of public worship, from the established church of *England*. This new religious community were denominated *Non-jurors*, on account of their refusing to take the oath of allegiance, and were also called the *High-church*, on account of the high notions they entertained of the dignity and power of the church, and the extent they gave to its prerogatives and jurisdiction. Those, on the other hand, who disapproved of this schism, who distinguished themselves by their charity and moderation towards Dissenters, and were less ardent in extending the limits of ecclesiastical authority, were denominated *Low-churchmen* [k]. The bishops who were deprived of their ecclesiastical dignities, and those who embarked in their

[iii] These were TILLOTSON, MOORE, PATRICK, KIDDER, FOWLER, and CUMBERLAND, names that will be ever pronounced with veneration by such as are capable of esteeming solid, well-employed learning and genuine piety, and that will always shine among the brightest ornaments of the church of *England*.

[k] The denomination of *High-church* is given certainly, with great propriety, to the *Non-jurors*, who have very proud notions of church-power; but it is commonly used in a more extensive signification, and is applied to all those who, though far from being *Non-jurors*, or otherwise disaffected to the present happy establishment, yet form pompous and ambitious conceptions of the authority and jurisdiction of the church, and would raise it to an absolute independence on all human power. Many such are to be found even among those who go under the general denomination of the *Low-church* party.

catholice,

cause, maintained openly, that the church was independent on the jurisdiction of king and parliament, subject to the authority of God alone, and empowered to govern itself by its own laws; that, of consequence, the sentence pronounced against these prelates by the great council of the nation was destitute both of justice and validity; and that it was only by the decree of an ecclesiastical council that a bishop could be deposed. This high notion of the authority and prerogatives of the church was maintained and propagated, with peculiar zeal, by the famous HENRY DODWELL, who led the way in this important cause, and who, by his example and abilities, formed a considerable number of champions for its defence; hence arose a very nice and intricate controversy, concerning the nature, privileges, and authority of the church, which has not yet been brought to a satisfactory conclusion [1].

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART III.

XXVII. The

[1] DODWELL himself was deprived of his professorship of history for refusing to take the oaths of allegiance to king WILLIAM and queen MARY; and this circumstance; no doubt, augmented the zeal with which he interested himself in the defence of the bishops, who were suspended for the same reason. It was on this occasion that he published his *Cautionary Discourse of Schism, with a particular regard to the case of the bishops who are suspended for refusing to take the new oath*. This book was fully refuted by the learned Dr. HODY, in the year 1691, in a work, intitled, *The unreasonableness of a separation from the new bishops: or a Treatise out of Ecclesiastical History, shewing, that although a bishop was unjustly deprived, neither he nor the church ever made a separation, if the successor was not a heretic*; translated out of an ancient Greek manuscript, (viz. among the Boroccian MSS.) in the public library at Oxford. The learned author translated this work afterwards into Latin, and prefixed to it some pieces out of ecclesiastical antiquity, relative to the same subject. DODWELL published in 1692 an answer to it, which he called, *A vindication of the deprived bishops, &c.* to which Dr. HODY replied in a treatise, intitled, *The Case of the Sees vacant by an unjust or uncanonical Deprivation stated, in reply to the Vindication, &c.* The controversy

G E N T.

XVII.

S E C T. II.

P A R T II.

High-  
church  
principles.

XXVII. The *Non-jurors* or *High-churchmen*, who boast with peculiar ostentation of their orthodoxy, and treat the *Low-church* as unsound and schismatical, differ in several things from the members of the episcopal church, in its present establishment; but they are more particularly distinguished by the following principles: 1. *That it is never lawful for the people, under any provocation or pretext whatever, to resist the sovereign.* This is called in England *passive obedience*, and is a doctrine warmly opposed by many, who think it both lawful and necessary, in certain circumstances, and in cases of an urgent and momentous nature, to resist the prince for the happiness of the people. They maintain further, 2. *That the hereditary succession to the throne is of divine institution, and therefore can never be interrupted, suspended, or annulled, on any pretext.* 3. *That the church is subject to the jurisdiction, not of the civil magistrate, but of God alone, particularly in matters of a religious nature.* 4. *That, consequently, SANCROFT and the other bishops, deposed by King WILLIAM III., remained, notwithstanding their deposition, TRUE BISHOPS to the day of their death; and that those who were substituted in their places were the unjust possessors of other men's property.* 5. *That these unjust possessors of ecclesiastical dignities were rebels against the state, as well as schismatics in the church; and that*

did not end here; and it was the hardest thing in the world to reduce Mr. DODWELL to silence. Accordingly he came forth a third time with his stiff and rigid polemicks, and published, in 1695, his *Defence of the Vindication of the deprived bishops*. The preface which he designed to prefix to this work was at first suppressed, but appeared afterwards under the following title: *The Doctrine of the Church of England concerning the Independency of the Clergy on the lay-power, as to those rights of theirs which are purely spiritual, reconciled with our oath of supremacy and the lay-deprivation of the Popish bishops in the beginning of the Reformation.* Several other pamphlets were published on the subject of this controversy.

all,

*all, therefore, who held communion with them were also chargeable with rebellion and schism. 6. That this schism, which rents the church in pieces, is a most heinous sin, whose punishment must fall heavy upon all those who do not return sincerely to the true church, from which they have departed [m].*

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

XXVIII. -It will now be proper to change the scene, and to consider a little the state of the Reformed church in *Holland*. The Dutch Calvinists thought themselves happy after the defeat of the Arminians, and were flattering themselves with the agreeable prospect of enjoying long, in tranquillity and repose, the fruits of their victory, when new scenes of tumult arose from another quarter. Scarcely had they triumphed over the enemies of absolute predestination, when, by an ill hap, they became the prey of intestine disputes, and were divided among themselves in such a deplorable manner, that, during the whole of this century, the United Provinces were a scene of contention, animosity, and strife. It is not necessary to mention all the subjects of these religious quarrels; nor indeed would this be an easy task. We shall therefore pass over in silence the debates of certain divines, who disputed about some particular, though not very momentous, points of doctrine and discipline; such as those of the famous VOET and the learned DES MARETS; as also the disputes of SALMASIUS, BOXHORN, VOET, and others, concerning usury, ornaments in dress, stage-plays, and other minute points of morality; and the contests of APPOLLONIUS, TRIGLAND, and VIDELIUS, concerning the power of the magistrate in matters of religion and eccle-

Theological  
contests  
among the  
Dutch.

[m] See WHISTON'S *Memoirs of his Life and Writings*, vol. i. p. 30.—HICKES'S *Memoirs of the Life of* JOHN KETTLEWELL, printed at London in 1718.—*Nouveau Diction. Histor. et Critiq.* at the article COLLIER.—PH. MASSON, *Histor. Critique de la Repub. des Lettres*, tom. xiii. p. 298.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

fiastical discipline, which produced such a flaming division between FREDERIC SPANHEIM and JOHN VANDER WAYEN. These and other debates of like nature and importance rather discover the sentiments of certain learned men, concerning some particular points of religion and morality, than exhibit a view of the true internal state of the Belgic church. The knowledge of this must be derived from those controversies alone in which the whole church, or at least the greatest part of its doctors, have been directly concerned.

The Cartesian and Cocceian controversies.

XXIX. Such were the controversies occasioned in *Holland* by the philosophy of DES CARTES, and the theological novelties of COCCEIUS. Hence arose the two powerful and numerous factions, distinguished by the denominations of *Cocceians* and *Voetians*, which still subsist, though their debates are now less violent, and their champions somewhat more moderate, than they were in former times. The Cocceian theology and the Cartesian philosophy have, indeed, no common features, nor any thing, in their respective tenets and principles, that was in the least adapted to form a connexion between them: and, of consequence, the debates they excited, and the factions they produced, had no natural relation to, or dependance on, each other. It nevertheless so happened, that the respective votaries of these very different sciences formed themselves into one sect; so far at least, that those who chose COCCEIUS for their guide in theology, took DES CARTES for their master in philosophy [n]. This will appear less surprising when we consider, that the very same persons who opposed the progress of *Cartesianism* in *Holland* were the warm adversaries of the *Cocceian* theology; for this opposition, equally

[n] See FRID. SPANHEIM *Epistola de novissimis in Belgio dissidiis*, tom. ii. opp. p. 973.



levelled at these two great men and their respective systems, laid the *Cartesians* and *Cocceians* under a kind of necessity of uniting their force in order to defend their cause, in a more effectual manner, against the formidable attacks of their numerous adversaries. The *Voetians* were so called from GISEBERT VOET, a learned and eminent professor of divinity in the university of *Utrecht*, who first founded the alarm of this theologico-philosophical war, and led on, with zeal, the polemic legions against those who followed the standard of DES CARTES and COCCEIUS.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

XXX. The Cartesian philosophy, at its first appearance, attracted the attention and esteem of many, and seemed more conformable to truth and nature, as well as more elegant and pleasing in its aspect, than the intricate labyrinths of Peripatetic wisdom. It was considered in this light in *Holland*; it however met there with a formidable adversary, in the year 1639, in the famous VOET, who taught theology at *Utrecht* with the greatest reputation, and gave plain intimations of his looking upon Cartesianism as a system of impiety. VOET was a man of uncommon application and immense learning; he had made an extraordinary progress in all the various branches of erudition and philology; but he was not endowed with a large portion of that philosophical spirit, that judges with acuteness and precision of natural science and abstract truths. While DES CARTES resided at *Utrecht*, VOET found fault with many things in his philosophy; but what induced him to cast upon it the aspersions of impiety, was its being introduced by the following principles: "That the person who aspires after the  
" character of a true philosopher must begin by  
" doubting of all things, even of the existence  
" of a Supreme Being—that the nature or *essence*  
" of spirit, and even of God himself, consists in

Cartesian  
controverisy.

CENT. XVII. "thought—that space has no real existence, is no  
SECT. II. "more than the creature of fancy, and that, con-  
PART II. "sequently, *matter* is without bounds."

DES CARTES defended his principles, with his usual acuteness, against the professor of *Utrecht*; his disciples and followers thought themselves obliged, on this occasion, to assist their master; and thus war was formally declared. On the other hand, VOET was not only seconded by those Belgic divines that were the most eminent, at this time, for the extent of their learning and the soundness of their theology, such as RIVET, DES MARETS, and MASTRICHT, but also was followed and applauded by the greatest part of the Dutch clergy [o]. While the flame of controversy burned with sufficient ardour, it was considerably augmented by the proceedings of certain doctors, who applied the principles and tenets of DES CARTES to the illustration of theological truth. Hence, in the year 1656, an alarm was raised in the Dutch churches and schools of learning, and a resolution was taken in several of their ecclesiastical assemblies (commonly called *Classes*), to make head against Cartesianism, and not to permit that *imperious* philosophy to make such encroachments upon the domain of theology. The States of *Holland* not only approved of this resolution, but also gave it new force and efficacy by a public edict, issued out the very same year, by which both the professors of philosophy and theology were forbidden either to explain the writings of DES CARTES to the youth under their care, or to illustrate the doctrines of the Gospel by the principles of philosophy. It was further resolved, in an assembly of the clergy, held at *Delft* the

[o] See BAILLET's *Vie de M. DES CARTES*, tom. ii. chap. v. p. 33.—DANIEL, *Voyage du Monde de DES CARTES*, tom. i. de ses *Oeuvres*, p. 84.

year following, that no candidate for holy orders should be received into the ministry before he made a solemn declaration, that he would neither promote the Cartesian philosophy, nor disfigure the divine simplicity of religion, by loading it with foreign ornaments. Laws of a like tenor were afterwards passed in the *United Provinces*, and in other countries [p]. But, as there is in human nature a strange propensity to struggle against authority, and to pursue, with a peculiar degree of ardour, things that are forbidden, so it happened, that all these edicts proved insufficient to stop the progress of Cartesianism, which, at length, obtained a solid and permanent footing in the seminaries of learning, and was applied, both in the academies and pulpits, and sometimes indeed very preposterously, to explain the truths and precepts of Christianity. Hence it was, that the *United Provinces* were divided into the two great factions already mentioned; and that the whole remainder of this century was spent amidst their contentions and debates.

XXXI. JOHN COCCEIUS, a native of *Bremen*, and professor of divinity in the University of *Leyden*, might have certainly passed for a great man, had his vast erudition, his exuberant fancy, his ardent piety, and his uncommon application to the study of the Scriptures, been under the direction of a sound and solid judgment. This singular man introduced into theology a multitude of new tenets and strange notions, which had never before entered into the brain of any other mortal, or at least had never been heard of before his time: for, in the first place, as has been al-

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

The sentiments of Cocceius concerning the Holy Scriptures,

[p] FRID. SPANHEIM, *De novissimis in Belgio dissidiis*, tom. ii. opp. p. 959.—The reader may also consult the historians of this century, such as ARNOLD, WEISMANN, JAGER, CAROLI, and also WALCHJUS's *Hist. Controvers. Germanic.* tom. iii.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

ready hinted, his manner of explaining the Holy Scriptures was totally different from that of CALVIN and his followers. Departing entirely from the admirable simplicity that reigns in the commentaries of that great man, COCCÆIUS represented the whole history of the Old Testament as a mirror, that held forth an accurate view of the transactions and events that were to happen in the church under the dispensation of the New Testament, and unto the end of the world. He even went so far, as to maintain, that the miracles, actions, and sufferings of CHRIST and of his apostles, during the course of their ministry, were *types* and images of future events. He affirmed, that by far the greatest part of the ancient prophecies foretold CHRIST's ministry and mediation, and the rise, progress, and revolutions of the church, not only under the figure of persons and *transactions*, but in a literal manner, and by the very sense of the *words* used in these predictions. And he completed the extravagance of this chimerical system, by turning, with wonderful art and dexterity, into holy riddles and typical predictions, even those passages of the Old Testament that seemed designed for no other purpose than to celebrate the praises of the Deity, or to convey some religious truth, or to inculcate some rule of practice. In order to give an air of solidity and plausibility to these odd notions, he first laid it down as a fundamental rule of interpretation, "That the *words* and *phrases* of Scripture are to be understood in every sense of which they are susceptible; or, in other words, that they signify, in effect, every thing that they *can* possibly signify;" a rule this, which, when followed by a man who had more imagination than judgment, could not fail to produce very extraordinary comments on the sacred writings. After having laid down this singular rule of interpretation, he divided the whole

whole history of the church into *seven periods*, conformable to the *seven trumpets* and *seals* mentioned in the *Revelations*.

CENT  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

Concerning  
the doctrinal  
part of  
theology.

XXXII. One, of the great designs formed by COCCEIUS, was that of separating theology from philosophy, and of confining the Christian doctors, in their explications of the former, to the words and phrases of the Holy Scriptures. Hence it was, that, finding in the language of the sacred writers, the Gospel-dispensation represented under the image of a *Covenant* made between God and man, he looked upon the use of this image as admirably adapted to exhibit a complete and well-connected system of religious truth. But while he was labouring this point, and endeavouring to accommodate the circumstances and characters of human contracts to the dispensations of divine wisdom, which they represent in such an inaccurate and imperfect manner, he fell imprudently into some erroneous notions. Such was his opinion concerning the covenant made between God and the Jewish nation by the ministry and the mediation of MOSES, "which he affirmed to be " of the same nature with the New Covenant obtained by the mediation of JESUS CHRIST." In consequence of this general principle, he maintained, "That the *Ten Commandments* were promulgated by MOSES, not as a *rule of obedience*, " but as a *representation of the Covenant of Grace*— " that when the Jews had provoked the Deity, " by their various transgressions, particularly by " the worship of the golden calf, the severe and " servile yoke of the ceremonial law was added " to the *decatalogue*, as a punishment inflicted on " them by the Supreme Being in his righteous " displeasure—that this yoke, which was painful " in itself, became doubly so on account of its " *typical* signification; since it admonished the " Israelites, from day to day, of the imperfection " and

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

“ and uncertainty of their state, filled them with  
 “ anxiety, and was a standing and perpetual  
 “ proof that they had merited the displeasure of  
 “ GOD, and could not expect, before the coming  
 “ of the MESSIAH, the entire remission of their  
 “ transgressions and iniquities—that, indeed, good  
 “ men, even under the Mosaic dispensation,  
 “ were immediately after death made partakers  
 “ of everlasting happiness and glory; but that  
 “ they were, nevertheless, during the whole  
 “ course of their lives, far removed from that  
 “ firm hope and assurance of salvation, which re-  
 “ joices the faithful under the dispensation of the  
 “ Gospel—and that their anxiety flowed natural-  
 “ ly from this consideration, that their sins,  
 “ though they remained unpunished, were not  
 “ pardoned, because CHRIST had not, as yet, of-  
 “ fered himself up a sacrifice to the Father to make  
 “ an entire atonement for them.” These are the  
 principal lines that distinguish the *Cocceian* from  
 other systems of theology; it is attended, indeed,  
 with other peculiarities; but we shall pass them  
 over in silence, as of little moment, and unworthy  
 of notice. These notions were warmly opposed  
 by the same persons that declared war against the  
 Cartesian philosophy; and the contest was carried  
 on for many years with various success. But, in  
 the issue, the doctrines of COCCÆIUS, like those of  
 DES CARTES, stood their ground; and neither  
 the dexterity nor vehemence of his adversaries  
 could exclude his disciples from the public semi-  
 naries of learning, or hinder them from propagat-  
 ing, with surprising success and rapidity, the te-  
 nets of their master in Germany and Switzer-  
 land [q].

[q] See BAILLET's *Vie de M. DES CARTES*, tom. II. p. 33.  
 —DANIEL, *Voyage du Monde de DES CARTES*.—VAL. AL-  
 BERTI ΔΕΚΛΩΝ ΛΟΓΙΚΑ, *Cartesianismus et Cocceianismus descripti  
 et refutati*. Lips. 1678, in 4to.

XXXIII. The other controversies, that divided the Belgic church during this century, all arose from the immoderate propensity that certain doctors discovered towards an alliance between the Cartesian philosophy and their theological system. This will appear, with the utmost evidence, from the debates excited by ROELL and BECKER, which surpassed all the others, both by the importance of their subjects and by the noise they made in the world. About the year 1686, certain Cartesian doctors of divinity, headed by the ingenious HERMAN ALEXANDER ROELL, professor of theology in the University of *Franecker*, seemed to attribute to the dictates of reason a more extensive authority in religious matters, than they had hitherto been possessed of. The controversy occasioned by this innovation was reducible to the two following questions: "1. Whether the divine origin and authority of the Holy Scriptures can be demonstrated by reason alone, or whether an inward testimony of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of Christians be necessary in order to the firm belief of this fundamental point? 2. Whether the sacred writings propose to us, as an object of faith, any thing that is repugnant to the dictates of right reason?" These questions were answered, the former in the affirmative, and the latter in the negative, not only by ROELL, but also by VANDER WAYEN, WESSELIUS, DUKER, RUARDUS AB ANDALA, and other doctors, who were opposed in this by ULRIC NUBER, an eminent lawyer, GERARD DE VRIES, and others of inferior note [r]. The flame excited by this controversy spread itself far and wide through the *United Provinces*; and its progress was increasing from day to day, when

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

The controversy set on foot by Roell, concerning the use of reason in religion.

[r] See *LE CLERC. Biblioth. Univers. et Historique*, tom. vi. p. 388.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

the states of *Friesland* prudently interposed to restore the peace of the church, by imposing silence on the contending parties. Those whose curiosity may engage them to examine with attention and accuracy the points debated in this controversy, will find, that a very considerable part of it was merely a dispute about words; and that the real difference of sentiment that there was between these learned disputants might have been easily accommodated, by proper explications on both sides.

Sentiments  
of Roell  
concerning  
the genera-  
tion of the  
Son of God.

XXXIV. Not long after this controversy had been hushed, ROELL alarmed the orthodoxy of his colleagues, and more particularly of the learned VITRINGA, by some other new tenets, that rendered the soundness of his religious principles extremely doubtful, not only in their opinion, but also in the judgment of many Dutch divines [1]: for he maintained, "That the account we have of the  
" *generation* of the *Son* in the sacred writings is not  
" to be understood in a literal sense, or as a real  
" generation of a natural kind;" he also affirmed, "That the afflictions and death of the right-  
" eous are as truly the *penal* effects of original  
" sin, as the afflictions and death of the wicked  
" and impenitent;" and he entertained notions concerning the *divine decrees*, *original sin*, the *satisfaction* of CHRIST, and other points of less moment, which differed in reality, or by the manner of expressing them seemed to differ greatly, from the doctrines received and established in the Dutch church [2]. The magistrates of *Friesland* used  
all

[1] For an account of ROELL, see the *Bibliotheca Bremensis Theologico-Philolog.* tom. ii. p. vi. p. 707.—CASP. BURMANNI *Trajectum Eruditum*, p. 306.

[2] Those who are desirous of the most accurate account of the errors of ROELL, will find them enumerated in a public piece composed by the *Faculty of Theology* at *Leyden*, in order to confirm the sentence of condemnation that had been pronounced



all the precautions that prudence could suggest, to prevent these controversies from being propagated in their province; and enacted several laws for this purpose, all tending towards peace and silence. This conduct, however, was not imitated by the other provinces, where ROELL and his disciples were condemned, both in private and in public, as heretics and corrupters of divine truth [11]. Nor did the death of this eminent man extinguish the animosity and resentment of his adversaries; for his disciples are still treated with severity; and, notwithstanding the solemn protestations they have given of the soundness and purity of their religious sentiments, labour under the imputation of many concealed errors.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

nounced against them by the Dutch synods; this piece is entitled, *Judicium Ecclesiasticum, quo opiniones quædam Cl. H. A. ROELLI Synodice damnatæ sunt laudatæ a Professoribus Theologiae in Academia Lugduno-Batavia. Lugd. Batav. 1713, in 4to.*

[11] This affirmation is somewhat exaggerated, at least we must not conclude from it, that ROELL was either deposed or persecuted; for he exercised the functions of his professorship for several years after this at Francker, and was afterwards called to the chair of divinity at *Utrecht*, and that upon the most honourable and advantageous terms. The states of *Friesland* published an edict enjoining silence, and forbidding all professors, pastors, &c. in their province to teach the particular opinions of ROELL; and this pacific divine sacrificed the propagation of his opinions to the love of peace and concord. His notion concerning the Trinity did not essentially differ from the doctrine generally received upon that mysterious and unintelligible subject; and his design seemed to be no more than to prevent Christians from *humanizing* the relation between the *Father* and the *Son*. But this was wounding his brethren, the rigorous systematic divines, in a tender point; for if *Anthropomorphism*, or the custom of attributing to the Deity the kind of procedure in acting and judging that is usual among men (who resemble him only as imperfection resembles perfection), was banished from theology, orthodoxy would be deprived of some of its most precious phrases, and our confessions of faith and systems of doctrine would be reduced within much narrower bounds.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

The contest  
occasioned  
by the pe-  
culiar senti-  
ments of  
Becker.

XXXV. The controversy set on foot by the ingenious BALTHAZAR BECKER, minister at Amsterdam, must not be omitted here. This learned ecclesiastic took occasion, from the Cartesian definition of *spirit*, of the truth and precision of which he was intimately persuaded, to deny boldly all the accounts we have in the Holy Scriptures of the seduction, influence, and operations of the devil and his infernal emissaries; as also all that has been said in favour of the existence of ghosts, spectres, sorcerers, and magicians. The long and laboured work he published, in the year 1691, upon this interesting subject, is still extant. In this singular production, which bears the title of *The World Bewitched*, he modifies and perverts, with the greatest ingenuity, but also with equal temerity and presumption, the accounts given by the sacred writers of the power of Satan and wicked angels, and of persons possessed by evil spirits; he affirms, moreover, that the unhappy and malignant being, who is called in Scripture *Satan*, or the *Devil*, is chained down with his infernal ministers in Hell; so that he can never come forth from this eternal prison to terrify mortals, or to seduce the righteous from the paths of virtue. According to the Cartesian definition above mentioned, the *essence of spirit* consists in *thought*; and, from this definition, BECKER drew his doctrine; since none of that influence, or of those operations that are attributed to evil spirits, can be effected by mere *thinking* [u].

Rather,

[u] Our historian relates here somewhat obscurely the reasoning which BECKER founded upon the Cartesian definition of mind or spirit. The tenor and amount of his argument is as follows: "The essence of mind is *thought*, and  
" the essence of matter is *extension*.—Now, since there is no  
" sort of conformity or connexion between a *thought* and *ex-*  
" *ension*, mind cannot act upon matter unless these two sub-  
" stances be united, as soul and body are in man:—therefore

" no

Rather, therefore, than call into question the accuracy or authority of DES CARTES, BECKER thought proper to force the narrations and doctrines of Scripture into a conformity with the principles and definitions of this philosopher. These errors, nevertheless, excited great tumults and divisions, not only in all the *United Provinces*, but also in some parts of *Germany*, where several doctors of the Lutheran church were alarmed at its progress, and arose to oppose it [*w*]. Their inventor and promoter, though refuted victoriously by a multitude of adversaries, and publicly deposed from his pastoral charge, died in the year 1718, in the full persuasion of the truth of these opinions, that had drawn upon him so much opposition, and professed, with his last breath, his sincere adherence to every thing he had written on that subject. Nor can it be said, that this his doctrine died with him; since it is abundantly known, that it has still many votaries and patrons, who either hold it in secret, or profess it publicly.

"no separate spirits, either good or evil, can act upon mankind.  
 "Such acting is *miraculous*, and miracles can be performed by  
 "God alone. It follows of consequence, that the Scripture-  
 "accounts of the actions and operations of good and evil spi-  
 "rits must be understood in an allegorical sense." This is  
 BECKER's argument; and it does, in truth, little honour to his acuteness and sagacity. By proving too much, it proves nothing at all; for if the want of a connexion or conformity between thought and extension renders mind incapable of acting upon matter, it is hard to see how their union should remove this incapacity, since the want of conformity and connexion remains notwithstanding this union. Besides, according to this reasoning, the Supreme Being cannot act upon material beings. In vain does BECKER maintain the affirmative, by having recourse to a miracle; for this would imply, that the whole course of nature was a series of miracles, that is to say, that there are no miracles at all.

[*w*] See LILIENTHALII *Selectæ Historiæ Literar.* p. i. observat. ii. p. 17.—*Miscellan. Lipsiens.* tom. i. p. 361. 364. where there is an explication of a satirical medal, struck to expose the sentiments of BECKER. See also *Nouveau Diction. Hist. et Critique*, tom. i. p. 193.

CENT.

XVII.

SECT. II.

PART II.

Dutch sects

— Verschorists, Hattemists.

XXXVI. The curious reader can be no stranger to the multitude of sects, some Christian, some Half-Christian, some totally delirious, that have started up, at different times, both in *England* and *Holland*. It is difficult, indeed, for those who live in other countries, to give accurate accounts of these separatists, as the books that contain their doctrines and views are seldom dispersed in foreign nations. We have, however, been lately favoured with some relations, that give a clearer idea of the Dutch sects, called *Verschorists* and *Hattemists*, than we had before entertained; and it will not therefore be improper to give here some account of these remarkable communities. The former derives its denomination from JACOB VERSCHOOR, a native of *Flushing*, who, in the year 1680, out of a perverse and heterogeneous mixture of the tenets of COCCEIUS and SPINOZA, produced a new form of religion equally remarkable for its extravagance and impiety. His disciples and followers were called *Hebrews*, on account of the zeal and assiduity with which they all, without distinction of age or sex, applied themselves to the study of the Hebrew language.

The *Hattemists* were so called from PONTIAN VAN HATTEM, a minister in the province of *Zeland*, who was also addicted to the sentiments of SPINOZA, and was, on that account, degraded from his pastoral office. The *Verschorists* and *Hattemists* resemble each other in their religious systems, though there must also be some points in which they differ; since it is well known, that VAN HATTEM could never persuade the former to unite their sect with his, and thus to form one communion. Neither of the two have abandoned the profession of the Reformed religion; they affect, on the contrary, an apparent attachment to it; and HATTEM, in particular, published a treatise upon the *Catechism of Heidelberg*. If I under-

stand

stand aright the imperfect relations that have been given of the sentiments and principles of these two communities, both their founders began by perverting the doctrine of the Reformed church concerning *Absolute Decrees*, so as to deduce it from the impious system of a *fatal* and *uncontrollable necessity*. Having laid down this principle to account for the origin of all events, they went a step further into the domain of Atheism, and denied "the difference between *moral good* and *evil*, "and the corruption of human nature." From hence they concluded, "That mankind were under no sort of obligation to correct their manners, to improve their minds, or to endeavour after a regular obedience to the divine laws—that the whole of religion consisted not in *acting*, but in *suffering*—and that all the precepts of JESUS CHRIST are reducible to this single one, that we bear with cheerfulness and patience the events that happen to us through the divine will, and make it our constant and only study to maintain a permanent tranquillity of mind."

This, if we are not mistaken, was the common doctrine of the two sects under consideration. There were, however, certain opinions or fancies, that were peculiar to HATTEM and his followers, who affirmed, "That CHRIST had not satisfied the divine justice, nor made an expiation for the sins of men by his death and sufferings, but had only signified to us, by his mediation, that there was nothing in us that could offend the Deity." HATTEM maintained, "that this was CHRIST's manner of justifying his servants, and presenting them blameless before the tribunal of God." These opinions seem perverse and pestilential in the highest degree; and they evidently tend to extinguish all virtuous sentiments, and to dissolve all moral obligation. It

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

does not however appear, that either of these innovations directly recommended immorality and vice, or thought that men might safely follow, without any restraint, the impulse of their irregular appetites and passions. It is at least certain, that the following maxim is placed among their tenets, *that God does not punish men FOR their sins, but BY their sins*; and this maxim seems to signify, that, if a man does not restrain his irregular appetites, he must suffer the painful fruits of his licentiousness, both in a present and future life, not in consequence of any judicial sentence pronounced by the will, or executed by the immediate hand of God, but according to some fixed law or constitution of nature [\*]. The two sects still subsist, though they bear no longer the names of their founders.

The disputes in Switzerland concerning the Consensus or form of concord.

XXXVII. The churches of *Switzerland*, so early as the year 1669, were alarmed at the progress which the opinions of AMYRAUT, DE LA PLACE, and CAPEL, were making in different countries; and they were apprehensive that the doctrine they had received from CALVIN, and which had been so solemnly confirmed by the synod of *Dort*, might be altered and corrupted by these new improvements in theology. This apprehension was so much the less chimerical, as at that very time there were, among the clergy of *Geneva*, certain doctors eminent for their learning and eloquence, who not only adopted these new opinions, but were also desirous, notwithstanding the opposition and remonstrances of their colleagues, of propagating them among the people [y]. To set bounds to the zeal of these innovators, and to stop the progress of the new doc-

[\*] See THEOD. HASÆ *Dissert. in Museo Bremensi Theol. Philolog.* vol. ii. p. 144.—*Bibliothèque Belgique*, tom. ii. p. 203.

[y] See LETI *Historia Genevrina*, part iv. book v. p. 448, 488, 497, &c.

trines, the learned JOHN HENRY HEIDEGGER, professor of divinity at *Zurich*, was employed in the year 1675 by an assembly, composed of the most eminent Helvetic divines, to draw up a form of doctrine, in direct opposition to the tenets and principles of the celebrated French writers mentioned above. The magistrates were engaged, without much difficulty, to give this production the stamp of their authority; and to add to it the other confessions of faith received in the Helvetic church, under the peculiar denomination of the *Form of Concord*. This step, which seemed to be taken with pacific views, proved an abundant source of division and discord. Many declared, that they could not conscientiously subscribe this new *form*; and thus unhappy tumults and contests arose in several places. Hence it happened, that the canton of *Basil* and the republic of *Geneva*, perceiving the inconveniencies that proceeded from this new article of church-communion, and strongly solicited, in the year 1686, by FREDERIC WILLIAM, elector of *Brandenburg*, to ease the burthened consciences of their clergy, abrogated this *form* [z]. It is nevertheless certain, that in the other cantons it maintained its authority for some time after this period; but, in our time, the discords

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

[z] It must not be imagined, from this expression of our historian, that this *Form*, entitled the *Consensus*, was abrogated at *Basil* by a positive edict. The case stood thus: Mr. PETER WERENFELS, who was at the head of the ecclesiastical consistory of that city, paid such regard to the letter of the elector, as to avoid requiring a subscription to this *Form* from the candidates for the ministry; and his conduct, in this respect, was imitated by his successors. The remonstrances of the elector do not seem to have had the same effect upon those that governed the church of *Geneva*; for the *Consensus*, or *Form of Agreement*, maintained its credit and authority there until the year 1706, when, without being abrogated by any positive act, it fell into disuse. In several other parts of *Switzerland*, it was still imposed as a rule of faith, as appears by the letters addressed by

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

---

cords it has excited in many places, and more particularly in the University of *Lausanne*, have contributed to deprive it of all its authority, and to sink it into utter oblivion [a].

GEORGE I., king of *England*, as also by the king of *Prussia*, in the year 1723, to the Swiss Cantons, in order to procure the abrogation of this *Form*, or *Consensus*, which was considered as an obstacle to the union of the Reformed and Lutheran churches. See the *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire des troubles arrivés en Suisse à l'occasion du Consensus*, published in 8vo at *Amsterdam*, in the year 1726.

[a] See CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFII *Schediasma de Formula Consensus Helvetica*, published in 4to at *Tubingen*, in the year 1723.—*Membres pour servir à l'Histoire des troubles arrivés en Suisse à l'occasion du Consensus*.



---

T H E  
SEVENTEENTH CENTURY,  
SECTION II.

---

C H A P. III.

*Concerning the ARMINIAN CHURCH.*

I. **T**HERE sprung forth from the botom of the Reformed church, during this century, two new sects, whose birth and progress were, for a long time, painful and perplexing to the parent that bore them. These sects were the *Arminians* and *Quakers*, whose origin was owing to very different principles; since the *former* derived its existence from an excessive propensity to improve the faculty of reason, and to follow its dictates and discoveries; while the *latter* sprung up, like a rank weed, from the neglect and contempt of human reason. The Arminians derive their name and their origin from JAMES ARMINIUS, or HARMENSEN, who was first pastor at *Amsterdam*, afterwards professor of divinity at *Leyden*, and who attracted the esteem and applause of his very enemies, by his acknowledged candour, penetration, and piety [a]. They received also the denomination

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.  
The denomination of  
Arminians,  
whence.

[a] The most ample account we have of this eminent man is given by BRANDT, in his *Historia Vitæ JAC. ARMINII*, published at *Leyden* in 8vo, in 1724; and the year after by

C E N T. nomination of *Remonstrants*, from an humble petition, entitled their *Remonstrances*, which they addressed, in the year 1610, to the states of *Holland*, and as the patrons of Calvinism presented an address, in opposition to this, which they called their *Counter-remonstrances*, so did they, in consequence thereof, receive the name of *Counter-remonstrants*.

The commencement of Arminianism.

II. ARMINIUS, though he had imbibed in his tender years the doctrines of *Geneva*, and had even received his theological education in the university of that city, yet rejected, when he arrived at the age of manhood, the sentiments, concerning Predestination and the Divine Decrees, that are adopted by the greatest part of the Reformed churches, and embraced the principles and communion of those, whose religious system extends the love of the Supreme Being, and the merits of JESUS CHRIST, to all mankind [6]. As time

me at *Brunswick*, with an additional *Preface* and some *Annotations*. See also *Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. et Critique*, tom. i. p. 471. All the works of ARMINIUS are comprised in one moderate quarto volume. The edition I have now before me was printed at *Francfort*, in the year 1634. They who would form a just and accurate notion of the temper, genius, and doctrine of this divine, will do well to peruse, with particular attention, that part of his works that is known under the title of his *Disputationes publicæ et privatæ*. There is, in his manner of reasoning, and also in his phraseology, some little remains of the scholastic jargon of that age; but we find, nevertheless, in his writings, upon the whole, much of that simplicity and perspicuity which his followers have always looked upon, and still consider, as among the principal qualities of a Christian minister. For an account of the Arminian *Confessions of Faith*, and the historical writers who have treated of this sect, see JO. CHRIST. KOECHERUS, *Biblioth. Theol. Symbolicæ*, p. 481.

[6] BERTIUS, in his *Funeral Oration* on ARMINIUS, BRANDT, in his *History of his Life*, p. 22. and almost all the ecclesiastical historians of this period, mention the occasion of this change in the sentiments of ARMINIUS. It happened in the year 1591, as appears from the remarkable letter of  
ARMINIUS

time and deep meditation had only served to confirm him in these principles, he thought himself obliged, by the dictates both of candour and conscience, to profess them publicly, when he had obtained the chair of divinity in the university of *Leyden*, and to oppose the doctrine and sentiments of CALVIN on these heads, which had been followed by the greatest part of the Dutch clergy. Two considerations encouraged him, in a particular manner, to venture upon this open declaration of his sentiments; for he was persuaded, on the one hand, that there were many persons, beside himself, and, among these, some of the first rank and dignity, that were highly disgusted at the doctrine of absolute decrees; and, on the other, he knew that the Belgic doctors were neither obliged by their confession of faith, nor by any other public law, to adopt and propagate the principles of CALVIN. Thus animated and encouraged, ARMINIUS taught his sentiments publicly, with great freedom and equal success, and persuaded many of the truth of his doctrine; but as Calvinism was at this time in a flourishing state in *Holland*, this freedom procured him a multitude of enemies, and drew upon him the severest marks of disapprobation and resentment from those that adhered to the theological system of *Geneva*, and more especially from FRANCIS GOMAR, his colleague. Thus commenced that long, tedious, and intricate controversy, that afterwards made such a noise in *Europe*. ARMINIUS died in the year 1609, when it was just beginning to involve his country in contention and discord [c].

### III. After

ARMINIUS to GRYNÆUS, which bears date that same year, and in which the former proposes to the latter some of his theological doubts. This letter is published in the *Biblioth. Brem. Theol. Philolog.* tom. iii. p. 384.

[c] The history of this controversy, and of the public discords and tumults it occasioned, is more circumstantially related by BRANDT,

CENT.

XVII.

SECT. II.

PART II.

The pro-  
gress of Ar-  
minianism.

III. After the death of ARMINIUS, the combat seemed to be carried on, during some years, between the contending parties, with equal success; so that it was not easy to foresee which side would gain the ascendant. The demands of the Arminians were moderate; they required no more than a bare toleration for their religious sentiments [*d*]; and some of the first men in the republic, such as OLDENBARNEVELDT, GROTIUS, HOOGERBEETS, and several others, looked upon these demands as reasonable and just. It was the opinion of these great men, that as the points in debate had not been determined by the *Belgic confession of faith*, every individual had an unquestionable right to judge for himself; and that more especially in a free state, which had thrown off the yoke of spiritual despotism and civil tyranny. In consequence of this persuasion, they used their utmost efforts to accommodate matters, and left no methods unemployed to engage the Calvinists to treat with Christian moderation and forbear-

BRANDT, in the second and third volumes of his *History of the Reformation*, than by any other writer. This excellent history is written in Dutch; but there is an abridgment of it in French, in three volumes 8vo, which has been translated into English. Add to this, UYTENBOGARD's *Ecclesiastical History*, written also in Dutch.—LIMBORCHI *Historia vitæ Episcopii*.—The *Epistolæ Clarorum Virorum*, published by LIMBORCH.—Those who desire a more concise view of this contest will find it in LIMBORCH's *Relatio Historica de origine et progressu Controversiarum in Fœderato Belgio de Prædestinatione et capitibus annexis*, which is subjoined to the latter editions of his *Theologia Christiana*, or Body of Divinity. It is true, all these are Arminians, and, as impartiality requires our hearing both sides, the reader may consult TRIGLAND's *Ecclesiastical History*, composed likewise in Dutch, and a prodigious number of Polemical writings published against the Arminians.

[*d*] This toleration was offered them in the conference held at the *Hague*, in the year 1611, provided they would renounce the errors of Socinianism. See TRIGLAND, *loc. cit.*—See also HENRY BRANDT's *Collatio scripto habita Hagæ-comitum*, printed at Zwickæe, in 1715.

### CHAP. III. *The History of the Arminian Church.*

43

ance their dissenting brethren. These efforts were at first attended with some prospect of success. MAURICE, prince of *Orange*, and the Princess Dowager his mother, countenanced these pacific measures, though the former became afterwards one of the warmest adversaries of the Arminians. Hence a conference was held, in the year 1611, at the *Hague*, between the contending parties; another at *Delft*, in the year 1613; and hence also that pacific edict issued out in 1614, by the states of *Holland*, to exhort them to charity and mutual forbearance; not to mention a number of expedients applied in vain to prevent the schism that threatened the church [e]. But these measures confirmed, instead of removing, the apprehensions of the Calvinists; from day to day they were still more firmly persuaded, that the Arminians aimed at nothing less than the ruin of all religion; and hence they censured their magistrates with great warmth and freedom, for interposing their authority to promote peace and union with such adversaries [f]. And those, who are well informed and impartial, must candidly acknowledge, that the Arminians were far from be-

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

[e] The writers who have given accounts of these transactions are well known: we shall only mention the first and second volumes of the *Histoire de Louis XIII.*, by LE VASSOR, who treats largely and accurately of these religious commotions, and of the civil transactions that were connected with them.

[f] The conduct of the States of *Holland*, who employed not only the language of persuasion, but also the voice of authority in order to calm these commotions, and restore peace in the church, was defended, with his usual learning and eloquence, by GROTIUS, in two treatises. The one, which contains the general principles on which this defence is founded, is entitled, *De jure summorum potestatum circa sacra*; the other, in which these principles are peculiarly applied in justifying the conduct of the States, was published, in the year 1613, under the following title: *Ordinum Hollandiæ ac Westfrisiæ Pietas a malorum calculis vindicata.*

ing

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

ing sufficiently cautious in avoiding connexions with persons of loose principles; and that by frequenting the company of those, whose sentiments were entirely different from the received doctrines of the Reformed church, they furnished their enemies with a pretext for suspecting their own principles, and presenting their theological system in the worst colours.

The five articles of Arminianism.

IV. It is worthy of observation, that this unhappy controversy, which assumed another form, and was rendered more comprehensive by new subjects of contention, after the synod of *Dort*, was, at this time, confined to the doctrines relating to Predestination and Grace. The sentiments of the Arminians, concerning these intricate points, were comprehended in *five articles*. They held,

“ 1. That God, from all eternity, determined  
“ to bestow salvation on those whom he forefaw  
“ would persevere unto the end in their faith in  
“ CHRIST JESUS; and to inflict everlasting punish-  
“ ments on those who should continue in their  
“ unbelief, and resist, unto the end, his divine  
“ succours:

“ 2. That JESUS CHRIST, by his death and  
“ sufferings, made an atonement for the sins of all  
“ mankind in general, and of every individual in  
“ particular:—that, however, none but those who  
“ believe in him can be partakers of their divine  
“ benefit.

“ 3. That *true faith* cannot proceed from the  
“ exercise of our natural faculties and powers, nor  
“ from the force and operation of free-will; since  
“ man, in consequence of his natural corruption,  
“ is incapable either of thinking or doing any  
“ good thing; and that therefore it is necessary  
“ to his conversion and salvation, that he be *re-*  
“ *generated* and renewed by the operation of the  
“ Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God, through  
“ JESUS CHRIST.

“ 4. That this *Divine Grace*, or energy of the Holy Ghost, which heals the disorder of a corrupt nature, begins, advances, and brings to perfection every thing that can be called good in man; and that, consequently, all good works, without exception, are to be attributed to God alone, and to the operation of his grace; that, nevertheless, this grace does not force the man to act against his inclination, but may be resisted and rendered ineffectual by the perverse will of the impenitent sinner.

“ 5. That they who are united to CHRIST by faith are thereby furnished with abundant strength, and with succours sufficient to enable them to triumph over the seduction of Satan, and the allurements of sin and temptation; but that the question, *Whether such MAY fall from their faith, and forfeit finally this state of grace?* has not been yet resolved with sufficient perspicuity; and must, therefore, be yet more carefully examined by an attentive study of what the holy Scriptures have declared in relation to this important point.”

It is to be observed, that this last article was afterwards changed by the Arminians, who, in process of time, declared their sentiments with less caution, and positively affirmed, that *the saints might fall from a state of grace* [g].

If we are to judge of men's sentiments by their words and declarations, the tenets of the Arminians, at the period of time now under consideration, bear a manifest resemblance of the Lutheran system. But the Calvinists did not judge in this manner; on the contrary, they explained

[g] The history of these *Five Articles*, and more particularly of their reception and progress in *England*, has been written by Dr. HEYLIN, whose book was translated into Dutch by the learned and eloquent BRANDT, and published at *Rotterdam* in the year 1687.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

the words and declarations of the Arminians according to the notions they had formed of their hidden sentiments; and, instead of judging of their opinions by their expressions, they judged of their expressions by their opinions. They maintained, that the Arminians designed, under these specious and artful declarations, to insinuate the poison of Socinianism and Pelagianism into unwary and uninstructed minds. The secret thoughts of men are only known to Him, who is the searcher of hearts; and it is his privilege alone to pronounce judgment upon those intentions and designs that are concealed from public view. But if we were allowed to interpret the *five articles* now mentioned in a sense conformable to what the leading doctors among the Arminians have taught in later times concerning these points, it would be difficult to shew, that the suspicions of the Calvinists were entirely groundless. For it is certain, whatever the Arminians may allege to the contrary, that the sentiments of their most eminent theological writers, after the synod of *Dort*, concerning Divine Grace, and the other doctrines that are connected with it, approached much nearer to the opinions of the Pelagians and Semi-pelagians, than to those of the Lutheran church [b].

Prince  
Maurice de-  
clares a-  
gainst the  
Arminians

V. The mild and favourable treatment the Arminians received from the magistrates of *Holland*, and from several persons of merit and distinction,

[b] This is a curious remark. It would seem as if the Lutherans were not Semi-pelagians; as if they considered man as absolutely *passive* in the work of his conversion and sanctification; but such an opinion surely has never been the general doctrine of the Lutheran church, however rigorously LUTHER may have expressed himself on that head in some unguarded moments; more especially it may be affirmed, that in later times the Lutherans are, to a man, Semi-pelagians; and let it not be thought, that this is imputed to them as a reproach.

encouraged



encouraged them to hope, that their affairs would take a prosperous turn, or at least that their cause was not desperate, when an unexpected and sudden storm arose against them, and blasted their expectations. This change was owing to causes entirely foreign to religion; and its origin must be sought for in those connexions, which can scarcely be admitted as possible by the philosopher, but are perpetually presented to the view of the historian. A secret misunderstanding had for some time subsisted between the Stadtholder MAURICE, prince of *Orange*, and some of the principal magistrates and ministers of the new republic, such as OLDENBARNEVELDT, GROTIUS, and HOOGERBEETS; and this misunderstanding had at length broke out into an open enmity and discord. The views of this great prince are differently represented by different historians. Some allege, that he had formed the design of getting himself declared count of *Holland*, a dignity which WILLIAM I., the glorious founder of Belgic liberty, is also said to have had in view [i]. Others affirm, that he only aspired after

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

[i] That MAURICE aimed at the dignity of Count of *Holland*, we learn from AUBERY's *Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire de Hollande et des autres Provinces Unies*, sect. ii. p. 216. *Ed. Paris*. If we are to believe AUBERY (informed by his father, who was, at that time, ambassador of *France* at the *Hague*), OLDENBARNEVELDT disapproved of this design, prevented its execution, and lost his life by his bold opposition to the views of the prince. This account is looked upon as erroneous by LE VASSOR, who takes much pains to refute it, and indeed with success, in his *Histoire de Louis XIII.*, tom. ii. p. ii. p. 123. LE CLERK, in his *Biblioth. Choisie*, tom. ii. p. 134. and in his *History of the United Provinces*, endeavours to confirm what is related by AUBERY; and also affirms, that the project, formed by MAURICE, had been formed before by his father. The determination of this debated point is not necessary to our present purpose. It is sufficient to observe, what is acknowledged on all sides, that OLDENBARNEVELDT and his associates suspected Prince MAURICE of a design to encroach

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

after a greater degree of authority and influence than seemed consistent with the liberties of the republic; it is at least certain, that some of the principal persons in the government suspected him of aiming at supreme dominion. The leading men above-mentioned opposed these designs; and these leading men were the patrons of the Arminians. The *Arminians* adhered to these their patrons and defenders, without whose aid they could have no prospect of security or protection. Their adversaries the *Gomarists*, on the contrary, seconded the views, and espoused the interests of the prince, and inflamed his resentment, which had been already more or less kindled by various suggestions, to the disadvantage of the Arminians, and of those who protected them. Thus, after mutual suspicions and discontents, the flame broke out with violence; and MAURICE resolved the downfall of those who ruled the republic, without shewing a proper regard to his counsels; and also of the Arminians, who espoused their cause. The leading men, that sat at the helm of government, were cast into prison. OLDENBARNEVELDT, a man of gravity and wisdom, whose hairs were grown grey in the service of his country, lost his life on a public scaffold; while GROTIUS and HOOGERBEETS were condemned to a perpetual prison [k], under what pretext, or in consequence of

encroach upon the liberties of the republic, and to arrogate to himself the supreme dominion. Hence the zeal of BARNEVELDT to weaken his influence and to set bounds to his authority; hence the indignation and resentment of MAURICE; and hence the downfall of the Arminian sect, which enjoyed the patronage, and adhered to the interests, of OLDENBARNEVELDT and GROTIUS.

[k] The truth of this general account of these unhappy divisions will undoubtedly be acknowledged by all parties, particularly at this period of time, when these tumults and commotions have subsided, and the spirit of party is less blind, partial,

of what accusations or crimes, is unknown to us [1]. As the Arminians were not charged with any

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

partial and violent. And the candid and ingenuous Calvinists who acknowledge this, will not thereby do the smallest prejudice to their cause. For should they even grant (what I neither pretend to affirm nor deny) that their ancestors, carried away by the impetuous spirit of the times, defended their religious opinions in a manner that was far from being consistent with the dictates of moderation and prudence, no rational conclusion can be drawn from this, either against them or the goodness of their cause. For it is well known, both by observation and experience, that unjustifiable things have often been done by men, whose characters and intentions, in the general, were good and upright; and that a good cause has frequently been maintained by methods that would not bear a rigorous examination. What I have said with brevity on this subject is confirmed and amplified by LE CLERC, in his *Histoire des Provinces Unies*, and the *Biblioth. Choise*, tom. ii. p. 134. and also by GROTIUS, in his *Apologeticus eorum, qui Hollandiæ et Westfrisiæ, et vicinis quibusdam nationibus præstuerant ante mutationem quæ evenit*, An. 1618. The life of OLDENBARNEVELDT, written in Dutch, was published at the Hague in 4to. in the year 1648. The history of his trial, and of the judgment pronounced on the famous triumvirate, mentioned above, was drawn by GERARD BRANDT, from authentic records, and published under the following title: *Histoire van de Rechtspleginge gebouden in den jgaren 1618 et 1619, omtrent de drie gevangene Heeren JOHANN VAN OLDENBARNEVELDT, ROMBOUT HOOGERBEETS, en HUGO DE GROOT*; a third edition of this book, augmented with Annotations, was published in 4to. at Rotterdam, in the year 1723. The *History of the Life and Actions of GROTIUS*, composed in Dutch by CASPAR BRANDT and ADRIAN VAN CATTENBURGH, and drawn mostly from original papers, casts a considerable degree of light on the history of the transactions now before us. This famous work was published in the year 1727, in two volumes in folio, at Dort and Amsterdam, under the following title: *Histoire van het leven des Heeren HUGO DE GROOT, beschreven tot den Anfang van zyn Gesandchap wegens de Koninginne en Kroone van Zweden aanst Hof van Frankryck door CASPAR BRANDT, en vervolgt tot zyn dood door ADRIAN VAN CATTENBURGH*. Those who desire to form a true and accurate notion of the character and conduct of GROTIUS, and to see him as it were near hand, must have recourse to this excellent work; since all the other accounts of this great man are insipid, lifeless, and exhibit little else than a poor shadow, in-

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

any violation of the laws, but merely with departing from the established religion, their cause was not of such a nature as rendered it cognizable by a civil tribunal. That, however, this cause might be regularly condemned, it was judged proper to bring it before an ecclesiastical assembly or national synod. This method of proceeding was agreeable to the sentiments and principles of the Calvinists, who are of opinion that all spiritual concerns and religious controversies ought to be judged and decided by an ecclesiastical assembly or council [m].

stead of a real and animated substance. The life of GROTIUS, composed by BURIGNI in French, and published successively at *Paris* and *Amsterdam*, in two volumes in 8vo, deserves perhaps to be included in this general censure; it is at least a very indifferent and superficial performance. ¶ There appeared in *Holland* a warm vindication of the memory of this great man, in a work published at *Delft*, in 1727, and entitled, *Grotii Manes ab iniquis obreſtationibus vindicati; accedit scriptorum ejus, tum editorum tum ineditorum, Conſpectus Triplex*. See the following note.

¶ [l] Dr. MOSHEIM, however impartial, seems to have consulted more the authors of one side than of the other; probably because they are more numerous, and more universally known. When he published this history, the world was not favoured with the *Letters, Memoirs, and Negotiations* of Sir DUDLEY CARLETON: which Lord ROYSTON (now Earl of HARDWICK) drew forth some years ago from his inestimable treasure of historical manuscripts, and presented to the public, or rather at first to a select number of persons, to whom he distributed a small number of copies of these *Negotiations*, printed at his own expence. They were soon translated both into Dutch and French; and, though it cannot be affirmed, that the spirit of party is no where discoverable in them, yet they contain anecdotes with respect both to OLDENARNEVELDT and GROTIUS, that the Arminians, and the other patrons of these two great men, have been studious to conceal. These anecdotes, though they may not be at all sufficient to justify the severities exercised against these eminent men, would, however, have prevented Dr. MOSHEIM from saying, that he knew not under what pretext they were arrested.

¶ [m] The Calvinists are not particular in this; and indeed it is natural that debates, purely theological, should be discussed in an assembly of Divines.

VI. Accordingly

VI. Accordingly a synod was convoked at *Dort*, in the year 1618, by the counsels and influence of prince MAURICE [\*], at which were present ecclesiastical deputies from the United Provinces, as also from the churches of *England, Hesse, Bremen, Switzerland*, and the *Palatinate*. The leading men among the Arminians appeared before this famous assembly, to defend their cause; and they had at their head, SIMON EPISCOPIUS, who was, at that time, professor of divinity at *Leyden*, had formerly been the disciple of ARMINIUS, and was admired, even by his enemies, on account of the depth of his judgment, the extent of his learning, and the force of his eloquence. This eminent man addressed a discourse, full of moderation, gravity, and elocution, to the assembled divines; but this was no sooner finished, than difficulties arose, which prevented the conference the Arminians had demanded, in order to shew the grounds, in reason and scripture, on which their opinions were founded. The Arminian deputies proposed to begin the defence of their cause by refuting the opinions of the Calvinists their adversaries. This proposal was rejected by the synod, which looked upon the Arminians as a set of men that lay under the charge of heresy; and therefore thought it incumbent upon them first to declare and prove their own opinions, before

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.  
The synod  
of Dort.

[\*] Our author always forgets to mention the order, issued out by the States-general, for the convocation of this famous synod; and by his manner of expressing himself, and particularly by the phrase (*Mauritio auctore*), would seem to insinuate, that it was by the prince that this assembly was called together. The legitimacy of the manner of convoking this synod was questioned by OLDENBARNEVELDT, who maintained that the States-general had no sort of authority in matters of religion, not even the power of assembling a synod; affirming that this was an act of sovereignty, that belonged to each province separately and respectively. See CARLETON's *Lectures*, &c.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

they could be allowed to combat the sentiments of others. The design of the Arminians, in the proposal they made, was probably to get the people on their side, by such an unfavourable representation of the Calvinistical system, and of the harsh consequences, that seem deducible from it, as might excite a disgust, in the minds of those that were present, against its patrons and abettors. And it is more than probable, that one of the principal reasons, that engaged the members of the synod to reject this proposal, was a consideration of the genius and eloquence of EPISCOPUS, and an apprehension of the effects they might produce upon the multitude. When all the methods employed to persuade the Arminians to submit to the manner of proceeding, proposed by the synod, proved ineffectual, they were excluded from that assembly, and returned home, complaining bitterly of the rigour and partiality with which they had been treated. Their cause was nevertheless tried in their absence, and, in consequence of a strict examination of their writings, they were pronounced guilty of pestilential errors, and condemned as corrupters of the true religion. This sentence was followed by its natural effects, which were the excommunication of the Arminians, the suppression of their religious assemblies, and the deprivation of their ministers. In this unhappy contest, the candid and impartial observer will easily perceive that there were faults committed on both sides. Which of the contending parties is most worthy of censure is a point, whose discussion is foreign to our present purpose [c].

VII. We

[c] The writers who have given accounts of the synod of Dort are mentioned by JO. ALBERT. FABRICIUS, in his *Biblioth. Græc.* vol. xi. p. 723. The most ample account of this famous assembly has been given by BRANDT, in the second and

VII. We shall not here appreciate either the merit or demerit of the divines, that were assembled in this famous synod; but we cannot help observing that their sanctity, wisdom, and virtue have been exalted beyond all measure by the Calvinists, while their partiality, violence, and their other defects, have been exaggerated with a certain degree of malignity by the Arminians [p]. There is no sort of doubt, but that, among the members of this assembly, who sat in judgment upon the Arminians, there were several persons equally distinguished by their learning, piety, and integrity, who acted with upright intentions, and had not the least notion, that the steps they were taking, or encouraging, were at all inconsistent with equity and wisdom. On the other hand, it appears with the utmost evidence, that the Arminians had reason to complain of several circumstances that strike us in the history of this remarkable period. It is plain, in the first place, that

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

The judgment that ought to be formed concerning this synod.

and third volumes of his *History of the Reformation in the United Provinces*; but, as this Author is an Arminian, it will not be improper to compare his relation with a work of the learned LEYDEKKER, in which the piety and justice of the proceedings of this synod are vindicated against the censures of BRANDT. This work, which is composed in Dutch, was published in two volumes in 4to, at Amsterdam, in the years 1705 and 1707, under the following title: *Eere van de Nationale Synode, van Dordrecht voorgestaan en bevestigd tegen de beschuldigingen van G. BRANDT*. After comparing diligently these two productions, I could see no enormous error in BRANDT; for in truth, these two writers do not so much differ about facts, as they do in the reasoning they deduce from them, and in their accounts of the causes from whence they proceeded. The reader will do well to consult the *Letters of the learned and worthy Mr. JOHN HALES of Eaton*, who was an impartial spectator of the proceedings of this famous synod, and who relates with candour and simplicity what he saw and heard.

[p] All that appeared unfair to the Arminians in the proceedings of this synod, has been collected together in a Dutch book, entitled, *Nulliteten, Misbandelingen, ende anbyllike Procecurin, des Nationalen Synodi gehouden binnen Dordrecht, &c.*

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

the ruin of their community was a point not only premeditated, but determined even before the meeting of the national synod [q]; and that this synod was not so much assembled to examine the doctrine of the Arminians, in order to see whether it was worthy of toleration and indulgence, as to publish and execute, with a certain solemnity, with an air of justice, and with the suffrage and consent of foreign divines, whose authority was respectable, a sentence already drawn up and agreed upon by those who had the principal direction in these affairs. It is further to be observed, that the accusers and adversaries of the Arminians were their judges, and that BOGERMAN, who presided in this famous synod, was distinguished by his peculiar hatred of that sect; that neither the Dutch nor foreign divines had the liberty of giving their suffrage according to their own private sentiments, but were obliged to deliver the opinions of the princes and magistrates, of whose orders they were the depositaries [r]; that the influence of the lay deputies, who appeared in the synod with commissions from the States-general and the prince of Orange, was still superior to that of the ecclesiastical members, who sat as judges; and, lastly, that the solemn promise, made to the Arminians, when they were summoned before the synod, that *they should be allowed the freedom of explaining and defending their*

☞ [q] This assertion is of too weighty a nature to be advanced without sufficient proof. Our author quotes no authority for it.

☞ [r] Here our author has fallen into a palpable mistake. The Dutch divines had no commission but from their respective consistories, or subordinate ecclesiastical assemblies; nor are they ever depositaries of the orders of their magistrates, who have lay-deputies to represent them both in provincial and national synods. As to the English and other foreign doctors that appeared in the synod of Dort, the case perhaps may have been somewhat different.

*opinions,*



opinions, as far as they thought proper, or necessary to their justification, was manifestly violated [1].

VIII. The Arminians, in consequence of the decision of the synod, were considered as enemies of their country and of its established religion; and they were accordingly treated with great severity. They were deprived of all their posts and employments, whether ecclesiastical or civil; and, which they looked upon as a yet more intolerable instance of the rigour of their adversaries, their ministers were silenced, and their congregations were suppressed. They refused obedience to the order, by which their pastors were prohibited from performing, in public, their ministerial functions; and thus drew upon themselves anew the resentment of their superiors, who punished them by fines, imprisonment, exile, and other marks of ignominy. To avoid these vexations, many of them retired to *Antwerp*, others fled to *France*; while a considerable number, accepting the invitation sent to them by FREDERICK, duke of *Holstein*, formed a colony, which settled in the dominions of that prince, and built for themselves a handsome town called *Frederickstadt*, in the dutchy of *Sleswyck*, where they still live happy and unmolested, in the open profession and free exercise of their religion. The heads of this colony were persons of distinction, who had been obliged to leave their native country on account of these troubles, particularly ADRIAN VANDER WAEL, who was the first governor of the new city [2]. Among the persecuted ecclesiastics,

who

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

The fate of  
the Armini-  
ans after the  
synod of  
*Dort*.

[1] See LE VASSOR, *Histoire du Regne de Louis XIII.* tom. iii. livr. xii. p. 365, 366.—and MOSHEIM's Preface to the Latin translation of HALE's account of the synod of *Dort*, p. 394—400.

[2] The history of this colony is accurately related in the famous letters published by PHILIP LIMBORCH and CHRIST-

CENT. XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

who followed this colony, were, the famous VORSTIUS, who, by his religious sentiments, which differed but little from the Socinian system, had rendered the Arminians particularly odious, GREVINCKHOVIUS, a man of a resolute spirit, who had been pastor at Rotterdam, GOULART, GREVIUS, WALTERS, NARSIVS, and others [w].

They are  
recalled  
from exile.

IX. After the death of Prince MAURICE, which happened in the year 1625, the Arminian exiles experienced the mildness and clemency of his brother and successor FREDERIC HENRY, under whose administration they were recalled from banishment, and restored to their former reputation and tranquillity. Those who had taken refuge in the kingdom of France and in the Spanish Netherlands, were the first that embraced this occasion of returning to their native country, where they erected churches in several places, and more particularly in the cities of Amsterdam and Rotterdam, under the mild shade of a religious toleration. That they might also have a public seminary of learning for the instruction of their youth, and the propagation of their theological principles, they founded a college at Amsterdam, in which two professors were appointed to instruct the candidates for the ministry, in the various branches of literature and science, sacred and profane. SIMON EPISCOPIUS was the first professor of theology among the Arminians; and since his time, the seminary now mentioned has

IAN HARTSOEKER, entitled, *Epistolæ præstantium et eruditum virorum Ecclesiasticæ et Theologicæ*, of which the last edition was published in folio at Amsterdam, in the year 1704. — See also JO. MOLLERI *Introductio in Histor. Chersonesi Cimbrica*, p. ii. p. 108. — and PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ Diplomatici*, tom. iii. p. 714.

[w] For an ample account of VORSTIUS, see JO. MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 931. as also p. 242. 247. 249. 255. 576. where we find a particular account of the other ecclesiastics above mentioned.

been,

been, generally speaking, furnished with professors eminent for their learning and genius, such as COURCELLES, POELenburg, LIMBORCH, LE CLERC, CATTENBURGH [x], and WETSTEIN.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

X. We have already seen, that the original difference between the Arminians and the Calvinists was entirely confined to the *five points* mentioned above, relative to the doctrines of Predestination and Grace; and it was the doctrine of the *former* concerning these points alone that occasioned their condemnation in the synod of *Dort*. It is further to be observed, that these five points, as explained at that time by the Arminians, seemed to differ very little from the Lutheran system. But after the synod of *Dort*, and more especially after the return of the Arminian exiles into their native country, the theological system of this community underwent a remarkable change, and assumed an aspect, that distinguished it entirely from that of all other Christian churches. For then they gave a new explication of these *five articles*, that made them almost coincide with the doctrine of those who deny the necessity of divine succours in the work of conversion and in the paths of virtue. Nay, they went still further, and, bringing the greatest part of the doctrines of Christianity before the tribunal of reason, they modified them considerably, and reduced them to an excessive degree of simplicity. ARMINIUS, the parent and founder of the community, was, undoubtedly, the inventor of this new form of doctrine, and taught it to his disciples [y]; but it was first digested into a regular

The ancient  
and modern  
system of  
Arminian-  
ism.

[x] There is an accurate account of these and the other Arminian writers given by ADRIAN VAN CATTENBURGH, in his *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Remonstrantium*, printed in 8vo at Amsterdam, in the year 1728.

[y] It is a common opinion that the ancient Arminians, who flourished before the synod of *Dort*, were much more sound

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

gular system, and embellished with the charms of a masculine eloquence, by EPISCOPUS, whose learning and genius have given him a place among the Arminian doctors, next to their founder [z].

## XI. The

found in their opinions, and strict in their morals, than those who have lived after this period; that ARMINIUS himself only rejected the Calvinistical doctrine of absolute decrees, and what he took to be its immediate consequences, adopting in all other points the doctrines received in the Reformed churches; but that his disciples, and more especially EPISCOPUS, had boldly transgressed the bounds that had been wisely prescribed by their master, and had gone over to the Pelagians, and even to the Socinians. Such, I say, is the opinion commonly entertained concerning this matter. But it appears, on the contrary, evident to me, that ARMINIUS himself had laid the plan of that theological system, that was, in after-times, embraced by his followers, and that he had instilled the main principles of it into the minds of his disciples; and that these latter, and particularly EPISCOPUS, did really no more than bring this plan to a greater degree of perfection, and propagate, with more courage and perspicuity, the doctrines it contained. I have the testimony of ARMINIUS to support this notion, besides many others that might be alleged in its behalf; for, in the *last will* made by this eminent man, a little before his death, he plainly and positively declares, that the great object he had in view, in all his theological and ministerial labours, was to unite in one community, cemented by the bonds of fraternal charity, all sects and denominations of Christians, the papists excepted; his words, as they are recorded in the funeral oration, which was composed on occasion of his death by BERTIUS, are as follow: *En proposui et docui . . . quæ ad propagationem amplificationemque veritatis religionis Christianæ, veri Dei cultus, communis pietatis, et sanctæ inter homines conversationis, denique ad CONVENIENTEM CHRISTIANO HOMINI TRANQUILLITATEM ET PACEM juxta verbum Dei POSSENT CONFERRE, EXCLUDENS EX IIS PAPATUM, cum quæ nulla unitas fidei, nullum pietatis aut Christianæ pacis vinculum servari potest.* These words, in their amount, coincide perfectly with the modern system of Arminianism, which extends the limits of the Christian church, and relaxes the bonds of fraternal communion in such a manner, that Christians of all sects and all denominations, whatever their sentiments and opinions may be (papists excepted), may be formed into one religious body, and live together in brotherly love and concord.

[z] The life of this eminent man was composed in Latin by the learned and judicious LIMBORCH, and is singularly worthy

XI. The great and ultimate end the Arminians seem to have in view, is, that Christians, though divided in their opinions, may be united in fraternal charity and love, and thus be formed into one family or community, notwithstanding the diversity of their theological sentiments. In order to execute their benevolent purpose, they maintain, that CHRIST demands from his servants more *virtue* than *faith*; that he has confined that belief which is essential to salvation to a few articles; that, on the other hand, the rules of practice he has prescribed are extremely large in their extent; and that charity and virtue ought to be the principal study of true Christians. Their definition of a true Christian is somewhat latitudinarian in point of belief. According to their account of things, every person is a genuine subject of the kingdom of CHRIST, “1. Who receives the holy Scriptures, and more especially the New Testament, as the rule of his faith, however he may think proper to interpret and explain these sacred oracles; 2. Who abstains from idolatry and polytheism, with all their concomitant absurdities; 3. Who leads a decent, honest, and virtuous life, directed and regulated by the laws of God; and, 4. Who never discovers a spirit of persecution, discord, or ill-will towards those who differ from him in their religious sentiments, or, in their manner of interpreting the holy Scriptures.” Thus the wide bosom of the Arminian church is opened to all who profess themselves Christians, however essentially they may differ from each other in their theological opinions. The papists alone are excluded from this extensive communion, and this

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

The great  
and proposed  
by the Armi-  
nian system,  
and its prin-  
cipal heads.

worthy of an attentive perusal. It was published at *Amsterdam* in 8vo in the year 1701.

because

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

because they esteem it lawful [a] to persecute those who will not submit to the yoke of the Roman pontif [b]. It is not our design here either to justify or condemn these latitudinarian terms of communion; it is true, indeed, that, if other Christian churches adopted them, diversity of sentiments would be no longer an obstacle to mutual love and concord.

[a] It is not only on account of their persecuting spirit, but also on account of their idolatrous worship, that the Arminians exclude the papists from their communion. See the following note.

[b] For a full and accurate representation of this matter, the reader need scarcely have recourse to any other treatise than that which is published in the first volume of the works of EPISCOPUS (p. 508.), under the following title: *Verus Theologus Remonstrans, sive veræ Remonstrantium Theologiæ de errantibus dilucida declaratio*. This treatise is written with precision and perspicuity. LE CLERC, in the *Dedication* prefixed to his Latin translation of Dr. HAMMOND'S *Paraphrase and Commentary on the New Testament*, gives a brief account of the Arminian principles and terms of communion in the following words, addressed to the learned men of that sect: *You declare, says he, that they ONLY are excluded from your communion, who are chargeable with idolatry—who do not receive the holy Scriptures as the rule of faith—who trample upon the precepts of CHRIST by their licentious manners and actions—and who persecute those who differ from them in matters of religion* \*. Many writers affirm, that the Arminians acknowledge as their brethren all those who receive that form of doctrine that is known under the denomination of the *Apostles Creed*. But that these writers are mistaken, appears sufficiently from what has been already said on this subject; and is further confirmed by the express testimony of LE CLERC, who (in his *Biblioth. Ancienne et Mod.* tom. xxv. p. 110.) declares, that it is not true that the Arminians admit to their communion all those who receive the *Apostles Creed*; his words are, *Ils se trompent; ils (the Arminians) offrent la communion à tous ceux, qui reçoivent l'écriture sainte comme la seule règle de la foi et des mœurs, et qui ne sont ni idolâtres ni persécuteurs*.

\* The original words of LE CLERC are, *Proferri solent . . . eos designat a vobis excludi, qui (1) idolotria sunt contaminati, (2) qui minime habent scripturam pro fidei norma, (3) qui impuri moribus sanctæ Christi præceptioni contumacant, (4) aut qui denique aliis religionis causa vexant*.

XII. From all this it appears plain enough, that the Arminian community was a kind of *medley*, composed of persons of different principles, and that, properly speaking, it could have no fixed and stable form or system of doctrine. The Arminians, however, foreseeing that this circumstance might be objected to them as a matter of reproach, and unwilling to pass for a society connected by no common principles or bond of union, have adopted, as their *Confession of Faith*, a kind of theological system, drawn up by EPISCOPUS, and expressed, for the most part, in the words and phrases of holy Scripture [c]. But as none of their pastors are obliged, either by oath, declaration, or tacit compact, to adhere strictly to this confession, and as, on the contrary, by the fundamental constitution of this community, every one is authorized to interpret its expressions (which are in effect susceptible of various significations) in a manner conformable to their peculiar sentiments; it evidently follows, that we cannot deduce from thence an accurate and consistent view of Arminianism, or know, with any degree of certainty, what doctrines are adopted or rejected by this sect. Hence it happens, that the Arminian doctors differ widely among themselves concerning some of the most important doctrines of Christianity [d]; nor are they universally agreed or entirely uniform in their sentiments of almost any one point, if we except the doctrines of Pre-

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

The Arminian Confession of Faith.

[c] This Confession of Faith is extant in Latin, Dutch, and German. The Latin edition of it is to be found in the works of EPISCOPUS, tom. ii. p. ii. p. 69—Where may be found also a *Defence* of this *Confession* against the objection of the professors of divinity at *Leyden*.

[d] They who will be at the pains of comparing together the theological writings of EPISCOPUS, COURCELLES, LIMBORCH, LE CLERC, and CATTENBURGH, will see clearly the diversity of sentiments that reigns among the Arminian doctors.

destination

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

destination and Grace. They all, indeed, unanimously adhere to the doctrine that excluded their ancestors from the communion of the Reformed churches, even *that the love of God extends itself equally to all mankind; that no mortal is rendered finally unhappy by an eternal and invincible decree; and that the misery of those that perish comes from themselves*; but they explain this doctrine in a very different manner from that in which it was formerly understood. Be that as it may, this is the fundamental doctrine of the Arminians, and whoever opposes it, becomes thereby an adversary to the whole community; whereas those, whose objections are levelled at particular tenets which are found in the writings of the Arminian divines, cannot be said, with any degree of propriety, to attack or censure the Arminian church, whose theological system, a few articles excepted, is vague and uncertain [e], and is not characterized by any fixed set of doctrines and principles. Such only attack certain doctors of that communion, who are divided among themselves, and do not agree, even in their explications of the doctrine relating to the extent of the divine love and mercy; though this be the fundamental point that occasioned their separation from the Reformed churches.

The present  
State of Ar-  
minianism.

XIII. The Arminian church makes at present but an inconsiderable figure, when compared with the Reformed; and, if credit may be given to public report, it declines from day to day. The

[e] What renders the *Arminian Confession of Faith* an uncertain representation of the sentiments of the community, is, the liberty in which every pastor is indulged of departing from it, when he finds any of its doctrines in contradiction with his private opinions. See the *Introduction to the Arminian Confession of Faith*, in the third volume of the French abridgment of BRANDT's *History of the Reformation of the Netherlands*.



Arminians have still in the *United Provinces* thirty-four congregations, more or less numerous, which are furnished with eighty-four pastors; besides these, their church at *Frederickstadt*, in the dutchy of *Holstein*, still subsists. It cannot however be said, that the credit and influence of their religious principles have declined with the external lustre of their community; since it is well known, that their sentiments were early adopted in several countries, and were secretly received by many who had not the courage to profess them openly. Every one is acquainted with the change that has taken place in the established church of *England*, whose clergy, generally speaking, since the time of Archbishop LAUD, have embraced the Arminian doctrine concerning Predestination and Grace; and, since the restoration of CHARLES II., have discovered a strong propensity to many other tenets of the Arminian church. Besides this, whoever has any acquaintance with the world, must know, that, in many of the courts of Protestant princes, and, generally speaking, among those persons that pretend to be wiser than the multitude, the following fundamental principle of Arminianism is adopted: "That those doctrines, whose belief is necessary to salvation, are very few in number; and that every one is to be left at full liberty, with respect to his private sentiments of God and religion, provided his life and actions be conformable to the rules of piety and virtue." Even the *United Provinces*, which saw within their bosom the defeat of Arminianism, are at this time sensible of a considerable change in that respect; for while the patrons of Calvinism in that republic acknowledge, that the community, which makes an external profession of Arminianism, declines gradually both in its numbers and influence, they, at the same time, complain, that its doctrines and spirit gain ground from

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

---

from day to day; that they have even insinuated themselves more or less into the bosom of the established church, and infected the theological system of many of those very pastors who are appointed to maintain the doctrine and authority of the synod of *Dort*. The progress of Arminianism in other countries is abundantly known; and its votaries in *France*, *Geneva*, and many parts of *Switzerland*, are certainly very numerous [ee].

The

[ee] It may not however be improper to observe here, that the progress of *Arminianism* has been greatly retarded, nay, that its cause daily declines in *Germany* and several parts of *Switzerland*, in consequence of the ascendant which the Leibnitian and Wolfian philosophy hath gained in these countries, and particularly among the clergy and men of learning. LEIBNITZ and WOLF, by attacking that liberty of *indifference*, which is supposed to imply the power of acting not only *without*, but *against* motives, struck at the very foundation of the *Arminian* system. But this was not all: for, by considering that multiplicity of worlds that compose the universe, as one *System* or *Whole*, whose greatest possible perfection is the ULTIMATE END of creating goodness, and the sovereign purpose of governing wisdom, they removed from the doctrine of *Predestination* those arbitrary procedures and narrow views, with which the Calvinists are supposed to have loaded it, and gave it a new, a more pleasing, and a more philosophical aspect. As the Leibnitians laid down this great END, as the supreme object of God's universal dominion, and the scope to which all his dispensations are directed, so they concluded, that, if this end was proposed, it *must* be accomplished. Hence the doctrine of necessity, to fulfil the purposes of a *Predestination* founded in wisdom and goodness: a necessity, *physical* and *mechanical* in the motions of material and inanimate things, but a necessity, *moral* and *spiritual* in the voluntary determinations of intelligent beings, in consequence of prepollent motives, which produce their effects with *certainty*, though these effects be *contingent*, and by no means the offspring of an absolute and essentially immutable fatality. These principles are evidently applicable to the main doctrines of Calvinism; by them *Predestination* is confirmed, though modified with respect to its reasons and its ends; by them *Irresistible Grace* (irresistible in a *moral* sense) is maintained upon the hypothesis of prepollent motives and a moral necessity. The *perseverance of the Saints* is also explicable upon the same system, by a series of moral causes producing a series of moral effects. In consequence of

The external forms of divine worship and ecclesiastical government in the Arminian church are almost the same with those that are in use among the *Presbyterians*. As, however, the leading men among the Arminians are peculiarly ambitious of maintaining their correspondence and fraternal intercourse with the church of *England*, and leave no circumstance unimproved that may tend to confirm this union; so they discover, upon all occasions, their approbation of the episcopal form of ecclesiastical government, and profess to regard it as most ancient, as truly sacred, and as superior to all other institutions of church-polity [f].

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

CHAP.

of all this, several divines of the German church have applied the Leibnitian and Wolfian philosophy to the illustration of the doctrines of Christianity; and the learned CANZIUS has written a book expressly to shew the eminent use that may be made of that philosophy in throwing light upon the chief articles of our faith. See his *Philosophiæ Leibnitiæ & Wolfianæ Usus in Theologiâ per præcipua fidei capita, auctore ISRAEL. THEOPH. CANZIO*, and of which a second edition was published at Francfort and Leipzig, in 1749. See also WITTENBACH's *Tentamen Theologiæ Dogmaticæ Methodo Scientifica pertractatæ*, which was published in three vols. 8vo. at Francfort, in 1747. See above all, the famous work of LEIBNITZ, entitled, *Essais de Theodicée, sur la Bonté de Dieu, la Liberté de l'homme, & l'origine du mal*.—It is remarkable enough, that the Leibnitian system has been embraced by very few, scarcely by any, of the English Calvinists. Can this be owing to a want of inclination towards philosophical discussions? This cannot be said. The scheme of necessity and of partial evil's tending to universal good, has, indeed, been fostered in some parts of Great Britain, and even has turned some zealous Arminians into moderate and philosophical Calvinists. But the zealous Calvinists have, for the most part, held firm to their theology, and blended no philosophical principles with their system; and it is certain, that the most eminent philosophers have been found, generally speaking, among the Arminians. If both Calvinists and Arminians claim a KING, it is certain that the latter alone can boast of a NEWTON, a LOCKE, a CLARKE, and a BOYLE.

[f] Hence, to omit many other circumstances that shew unquestionably the truth of this observation, the Arminians

CENT  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

## CHAPTER IV.

*The History of the Set called QUAKERS.*

The rise of  
the Qua-  
kers.  
George Fox.

THE sect of QUAKERS received this denomination, in the year 1650, from GERVAS BENNET, Esq; a justice of peace in *Derbyshire* [g], partly on account of the convulsive agitations and shakings of the body with which their discourses to the people were usually attended, and partly on account of the exhortation addressed to this magistrate by Fox and his companions, who, when they were called before him, desired him, with a loud voice and a vehement emotion of body, to *tremble at the word of the Lord*. However sarcastical this appellation may be, when considered in its origin, the members of this sect are willing to adopt it, provided it be rightly understood; they prefer, nevertheless, to be called, in allusion to that doctrine that is the fundamental principle of their association, *Children, or Confessors of Light*. In their conversation and intercourse with each other, they use no other term of appellation than that of *Friend* [h].

This sect had its rise in *England*, in those unhappy times of confusion, anarchy, and civil discord, when every political or religious fanatic, that had formed new plans of government, or invented new systems of theology, came forth with his novelties to public view, and propagated them with impunity among a fickle and unthinking

have been at great pains to represent GROTIUS, their hero and their oracle, as a particular admirer of the constitution and government of the church of *England*, which he preferred before all other forms of ecclesiastical polity. See what LAW CLERC has published on this subject at the end of the edition of GROTIUS's book, *De Veritate Religionis Christiane*, which he gave at the *Hague* in the year 1724. p. 376.

[g] See GEORGE SEWEL's *History of the Quakers*, p. 23.—NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. IV. p. 32.

[h] SEWEL, *loc. cit.* p. 624.

multitude.

multitude. Its parent and founder was GEORGE FOX [1], a shoemaker, of a dark and melancholy complexion, and of a visionary and enthusiastic turn of mind. About the year 1647, which was the twenty-third year of his age, he began to stroll through several counties in England, giving himself out for a person *divinely inspired*, and ex-

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

[1] The anonymous writer of *A Letter to Dr. Formey*, F. R. S. published by NICOL, seems much offended at Mr. FORMEY on account of his calling GEORGE FOX a man of a *turbulent spirit*, &c. He tells us, on the contrary, that, from all the information worthy of credit which he was able to procure, it appears, that FOX "was a man of so meek, contented, easy, steady, and tender a disposition, that it was a pleasure to be in his company,—that he exercised no authority but over evil, and that every where and in all, but with love, compassion, and long suffering." This account he takes from PENN; and it is very probable that he has looked no farther, unless it be to the curious portrait which THOMAS ELLWOOD, another Quaker, has given of FOX, a portrait in which there is such an affected jingle of words, as shews the author to have been more attentive to the arrangement of his sentences, than to a true exhibition of the character of his original: for we are told by ELLWOOD, that this same GEORGE FOX was deep in divine knowledge, powerful in preaching, fervent in prayer, quick in discerning, sound in judgment (*risum teneatis, amici*),—manly in personage, grave in gesture, courteous in conversation, weighty in communication, &c. &c. After having thus painted GEORGE after the fancy of his two brethren (for fancy is the Quaker's fountain of light and truth), the letter writer observes, that Dr. FORMEY has taken his account of George's turbulence and fanaticism from MOSHEIM's *Ecclesiastical History*. As MOSHEIM then is dead, and cannot defend himself, may I be permitted to beg of this Anonymous Letter-writer, who appears to be a candid and rational man, to cast an eye upon SAWEL's *History of the Quakers*, and to follow this meek, courteous, and modest GEORGE, running like a wild man through several counties, refusing homage to his sovereign, interrupting the ministers in the public celebration of divine service at Nottingham, Mansfield, and Market Bosworth? It is remarkable, that the very learned and worthy Dr. HENRY MORE, who was not himself without a strong tincture of enthusiasm, and who looked upon PENN as a pious Christian, treated nevertheless GEORGE FOX as a melancholy fanatic, and as one possessed with the Devil. See his *Myst. of Godliness*, B. 2. ch. 13. As also *Schol. in Dialogue*, v. 55.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

horting the people to attend to the voice of the divine word, that lies hid in the hearts of all men. After the execution of CHARLES I., when all laws both civil and ecclesiastical seemed to be entirely suspended, if not extinct, Fox exerted his fanatical powers with new vigour, and formed more ambitious and extensive views. Having acquired a considerable number of disciples of both sexes, who were strongly infected with his wild enthusiasm, he excited great tumults in several parts of England; and, in the year 1650, went so far as to disturb the devotion of those that were assembled in the churches for the purposes of public worship, declaring, that all such assemblies were useless and unchristian. For these extravagances, both he and his companions were frequently cast into prison, and chastised, as disturbers of the peace, by the civil magistrate [k].

## II. The

[k] Besides the ordinary writers of the ecclesiastical history of this century, the curious reader will do well to consult CROESII *Historia Quakeriana, Tribus Libris comprehensa*, the second edition of which was published in 8vo at Amsterdam, in the year 1703. A physician named KOLHANSIUS, who was born a Lutheran, but turned Quaker, published critical remarks upon this history, under the title of *Dilucidationes*, which were first printed at Amsterdam, in the year 1696. And it must be acknowledged, that there are many inaccuracies in the history of CROESIUS; it is, however, much less faulty than another history of this sect, which was published at Cologne in 12mo, in the year 1692, under the following title: *Histoire abrégée de la naissance et du progrès du Quakerisme avec celle de ses dogmes*; for the anonymous author of this latter history, instead of relating well attested facts, has compiled, without either discernment or choice, such an extravagant medley of truth and falsehood, as is rather adapted to excite laughter than to administer instruction. See the second book of CROESIUS's *Historia Quakeriana*, p. 322. and 376. as also LE CLERC, *Biblioth. Universelle et Historique*, tom. xxii. p. 51.—The most ample and authentic account of this sect is that which was composed by GEORGE SEWEL, from a great variety of genuine records, and partly from the papers of Fox, its founder, and published under the following title: *The History of the Christian people called Quakers*. This work is remarkable both

II. The first association of *Quakers* was composed mostly of visionary fanatics, and of persons that really seemed to be disordered in their brains; and hence they committed many enormities, which the modern *Quakers* endeavour to alleviate and diminish, but which they neither pretend to justify nor to approve. For the greatest part of them were riotous and tumultuous in the highest degree; and even their female disciples, forgetting the delicacy and decency peculiar to their sex, bore their part in these disorders. They ran, like Bacchanals, through the towns and villages, declaiming against Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and every fixed form of religion; railed at public and stated worship; affronted and mocked the clergy, even in the very exercise of their ministerial

CENT.  
XV. I.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

The first  
attempts of  
this sect  
under  
Cromwell.

both for the industry and accuracy which the author has discovered in compiling it. But as SEWEL was himself a *Quaker*, so he is sometimes chargeable with concealing, diminishing, or representing under artful colours, many things, which, if impartially related, *must* have appeared dishonourable, and *might* have proved detrimental, to his community. It must however be granted, that, notwithstanding these defects, SEWEL's history is abundantly sufficient to enable an impartial and intelligent reader to form a just and satisfactory idea of this visionary sect. VOLTAIRE has also entertained the public with *Four Letters*, concerning the Religion, Manners, and History of the *Quakers*, in his *Mélanges de Littérature d'Histoire et de Philosophie*, which are written with his usual wit and elegance, but are rather adapted to amuse than instruct. The conversation between him and ANDREW PITT, an eminent *Quaker* in London, which is related in these *Letters*, may be true in general; but to render the account of it still more pleasing, the ingenious writer has embellished it with effusions of wit and fancy, and even added some particulars, that are rather drawn from imagination than memory. It is from the books already mentioned, that the French *Dissertation on the Religion of the Quakers* (which is placed in the third volume of the splendid work, entitled, *Cerémonies et Coutumes Religieuses de tous les Peuples*), is chiefly compiled, though with less attention and accuracy than might have been expected.—A Lutheran writer, named FREDERIC ERNEST MEIS, has given an account of the English *Quakers* in a German work, entitled, *Einswurf der Kirchen-Gründung und Gebräuche der Quäcker in England*.

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

functions [kk]; trampled upon the laws and upon the authority of the magistrates, under the pretext of being actuated by a divine impulse; and made use of their pretended inspiration to

☞ [kk] A female, contrary to the modesty of her sex, came into *Whitball Chapel stark naked*, in the midst of public worship, when CROMWELL was there present. Another came into the Parliament-house with a trenchard in her hand, which she broke in pieces, saying, *Thus shall he be broke in pieces*. THOMAS ADAMS, having complained to the protector of the imprisonment of some of his friends, and not finding redress, he took off his cap and tore it in pieces, saying, *So shall thy government be torn from thee and thy house*. Several, pretending an extraordinary message from heaven, went about the streets, denouncing the judgments of God against the Protector and his council; and one came to the door of the Parliament-house with a drawn sword, and wounded several, saying, *He was inspired by the Holy Spirit to kill every man that sat in that house*. The most extravagant Quaker that appeared in this time, was JAMES NAYLOR, formerly an officer, a man of parts, and so much admired by these fanatics, that they blasphemously styled him, *The everlasting son of righteousness; the prince of peace; the only begotten son of God; the fairest among ten thousand*. See NEAL's *History of the Puritans*;—*The Life and Trial of NAYLOR*, p. 6, 7, &c. The anonymous author of the *Letter to Dr. Formey*, F. R. S. seems to have lost sight of the state of Quakerism in the time of Fox, when he denies that the charge of turbulence and fanaticism can be proved against him or his friends, and gives the gentle denomination of *imprudence* to the extravagancies exhibited by the Quakers under CHARLES I., and the Commonwealth. The single story of NAYLOR, who was the convert and pupil of Fox, the letters, full of blasphemous absurdity, written to this *Rose of Sharon*, this *new Jesus*, by HANNAH STRANGER, RICHARD FAIRMAN, and others, shew the horrid vein of fanaticism that ran through this visionary sect. See these Letters in the *Life and Trial of NAYLOR*, who, though cruelly scourged, was, however, whipped into his senses, or, at least, brought by his sufferings into a calmer state of mind. See also *Satan Intempered*, &c. p. 4 and 5. If Quakerism be now in England on a more rational footing, we may congratulate its members upon the happy change, but at the same time condole with them on the approaching annihilation of their sect; for if *reason* gets in among them, the *spirit* (I mean *their spirit*) will soon be quenched, and fancy being no more the only criterion of truth, the fundamental principle of their existence will be destroyed. In such a catastrophe, the abettors of ancient Quakerism will find some resource among the Methodists.

excite



excite the most vehement commotions both in state and church. Hence it is not at all surprising, that the secular arm was at length raised against these pernicious fanatics, and that many of them were severely chastised for their extravagance and folly [l]. CROMWELL himself, who was, generally speaking, an enemy to no sect, however enthusiastic it might be, entertained uneasy apprehensions from the frantic violence of the Quakers, and therefore, in his first thoughts, formed a resolution to suppress their rising community. But when he perceived that they treated with contempt both his promises and threatenings, and were, in effect, too powerful or too headstrong to yield to either, he prudently abstained from the use of force, and contented himself with employing wise measures and precautions to prevent their fomenting sedition among the people, or undermining the foundations of his new sovereignty [m].

III. In process of time, the fumes of this excessive fanaticism began to evaporate, and the ardent impetuosity of the rising sect seemed gradually to subside; nor did the *divine light*, of which the Quakers boast, produce such tumults in church and state, as at the first declaration of their celestial pretensions. Under the reign of CHARLES II., both their religious doctrine and discipline assumed a more regular and permanent form, by the care and industry of Fox, assisted, in this very necessary undertaking, by Robert BARCLAY, GEORGE KEITH, and SAMUEL FISHER, men of learning and abilities, who became, notwith-

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

The progress of this sect under Charles II. and James II.

[l] NEALE'S *History of the Puritans*, vol. iv. p. 153.—SEWELL'S *History*, &c. *passim*.

[m] CLARKE tells us, in his *History of the Rebellion*, that the Quakers always persevered in their bitter enmity against CROMWELL. See SEWELL'S *History*, book i. p. 91. 113. 148. 149.

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

standing, members of this strange community. Fox stood in urgent need of such able assistants; for his gross ignorance had rendered his religion, hitherto, a confused medley of incoherent tenets and visions. The new triumvirate, therefore, used their utmost endeavours to digest these under certain heads, and to reduce them to a sort of theological system [\*]. But such was the change of times, that the wiser and more moderate Quakers in England suffered more vexations, and were involved in greater calamities, than had fallen to the lot of their frantic and turbulent ancestors. These vexations, indeed, were not so much the consequence of their religious principles, as of their singular customs and manners in civil life. For they would never give to magistrates those titles of honour and pre-eminence that are designed to mark the respect due to their authority; they also refused obstinately to take the oath of allegiance to their sovereign [o], and to pay tithes to the clergy; hence they were looked upon as rebellious subjects, and, on that account, were frequently punished with great severity [p]. Under the reign of JAMES II., and more particularly about the year 1685, they began to see

[\*] For an account of the life and writings of BARCLAY, see the *General Dictionary*.—SEWEL, in his *History of the Quakers*, gives an ample account of KEITH. There is also particular mention made of FISHER, in a German work, intitled, *Unschuldige Nachricht*, 1750, p. 338.

[o] This refusal to take the oath of allegiance did not proceed from any disaffection to the government, but from a persuasion that all oaths were unlawful, and that *swearing*, even upon the most solemn occasions, was forbidden in the New Testament. They also sincerely believed, that they were as much obliged to obedience by an *affirmation*, which they were willing to make, as by an oath.

[p] See a circumstantial account of their sufferings under CHARLES II., in NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, vol. iv. p. 313. 353. 396. 432. 510. 518. 552. 569.—BURNEY'S *History of his own Times*, vol. i. p. 271.—SEWEL, *loc. cit.* *passim*

more

more prosperous days, and to enjoy the sweets of toleration and liberty, which they owed not to the clemency of the government, but to the friendship of that monarch for the famous WILLIAM PENN [q], who had been employed by him in matters of the utmost moment, and had rendered him signal and important services [r]. What JAMES had done, from motives of a personal or political nature, in favour of the Quakers, King WILLIAM III. confirmed and continued, from a zeal for maintaining the rights of conscience, and advancing the cause of religious liberty. From these motives, he procured a full and ample toleration for dissenters of almost all denominations; and the Quakers, in consequence of this grant,

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

[q] See SEWELL'S *History of the Quakers*.

[r] The indulgence of James II. towards the Quakers, and other dissenters from the established church, was, at bottom, founded on a zeal for popery, and designed to favour the Roman Catholics. More particularly the order he sent to the Lord Mayor of London, the 7th of November 1687, to dispense with the Quakers not swearing, was evidently designed to open a door to the Roman Catholics to bear offices in the state without a legal qualification.—At the same time it was probable enough, that a personal attachment to the famous WILLIAM PENN may have contributed to render this monarch more indulgent to this sect than he would otherwise have been. The reasons of this attachment are differently represented. Some suppose it to have been owing to the services of his father in the fleet commanded against the Dutch, in the year 1665, by King JAMES, when Duke of York. Others attribute this attachment to his personal services. From the high degree of favour he enjoyed at court, they conclude that he was a concealed papist, and assisted the king in the execution of his designs. That the imputation of popery was groundless, appears from his correspondence with Dr. TILLOTSON, which is published in the *Life of PENN*, that is prefixed to the first volume of the works of the latter. It is nevertheless certain, that he was very intimate with Father PETERS, the hot-headed Jesuit, whose bigotry formed the king's projects, and whose imprudence rendered them abortive. It is also certain, that, in the year 1686, he went over to Holland, in order to persuade the prince of Orange to come into King JAMES's measures.

enjoyed

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

The propa-  
gation of  
Quakerism  
out of Eng-  
land.

enjoyed at length, upon a constitutional footing, tranquillity and freedom [1].

IV. Fatigued with the vexations and persecution which they suffered in their native country during the reign\* of CHARLES II., the Quakers looked about for some distant settlements, where they might shelter themselves from the storm; and with this view began to disseminate their religious principles in various countries. Attempts of this nature were made in *Germany, Prussia, France, Italy, Greece, Holland, and Holstein*, but with little success. The Dutch, however, were, after much importunity, persuaded to allow a certain number of these enthusiasts to settle in *Holland*, where they still continue to reside. Multitudes of them also went over to *America*, and formed settlements there not long after the first rise of their sect; and it afterwards happened, by a singular concurrence of events, that this new world became the chief seat of their prosperity and freedom. WILLIAM PENN, son of the famous vice-admiral of that name, who embraced *Quakerism* in the year 1668, received, in the year 1680, from CHARLES II., and from the English parliament, the grant of an ample, fertile, but uncultivated province in *America*, as a reward for the eminent services of his father. This illustrious Quaker, who was far from being destitute of parts, and whose activity and penetration were accompanied with an uncommon degree of eloquence [2], carried over with him into his new dominions a considerable colony of his *Friends*

[1] *Oeuvres de M. de VOLTAIRE*, tom. iv. p. 182.

[2] Bishop BURNET, who knew PENN personally, says, that "he was a talking vain man, who had such a high opinion of his own eloquence, that he thought nothing could stand before it; and that he had a tedious *luscious* way, that was not apt to overcome a man's reason, though it might tire his patience."

and Brethren; and he founded in those distant regions a republic, whose form, laws, and institutions, resembled no other known system of government, whose pacific principles and commercial spirit have long blessed it with tranquillity and opulence, and which still continues in a prosperous and flourishing state [u]. The *Quakers* predominate in this colony, both by their influence and their numbers; but all those who acknowledge the existence and providence of one Supreme Being, and shew their respects to that Being, either by external worship, or at least by the regularity of their lives and actions, are admitted to the rights and privileges of citizens in this happy republic. The large province that constitutes its territory was called *Pennsylvania*, from the name of its proprietor; and its capital city was named *Philadelphia*, from the spirit of union and fraternal love that reigned at first, and is still supposed to prevail, more or less, among its inhabitants.

V. Even during the life of their founder, the *Quakers*, notwithstanding their extraordinary pretensions to fraternal charity and union, were frequently divided into parties, and involved in contests and debates. These debates, indeed, which were carried on in the years 1656, 1661, and 1683, with peculiar warmth, were not occasioned by any doctrines of a religious nature, but by a diversity of opinions about matters of discipline, about certain customs and manners, and other affairs of little moment; and they were ge-

The intestine disputes and contests of the *Quakers*.

[u] The laws and charters of the colony of *Pennsylvania* may be seen in RAPIN's History, PENN's Works, and in other collections of public records; they are also inserted in the *Bibliothèque Britannique*, tom. xv. p. 310. tom. xvi. p. 127.—PENN acquired a great reputation, both by his writings and the active figure he made in life. See the accounts given of him by SEWEL and BURNET.

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

nerally terminated in a short time, and without much difficulty [*w*]. But, after the death of Fox, which happened in the year 1691, some *Friends*, and more especially GEORGE KEITH, who was by far the most learned member of the community, excited, by their doctrines and innovations, new discords of a much more serious and momentous kind than those which had before divided the *Brethren*. This fountain of contention was opened in *Pennsylvania*, where KEITH was charged with erroneous opinions concerning several points of theology, and more particularly concerning the *Human Nature of CHRIST*, which he supposed to be two-fold, the one spiritual and celestial, the other corporeal and terrestrial [*x*]. This and other inventions of KEITH would perhaps have passed without censure, among a people who reduce the whole of religion to fancy and a kind of spiritual instinct, had not this learned man animadverted, with a certain degree of severity, upon some of the fantastic notions of the American *Brethren*, and opposed, in a more particular manner, their method of converting the whole history of CHRIST's life and sufferings into a mere allegory, or symbolical representation of the duties of Christianity. The European *Quakers* dare not so far presume upon the indulgence of the civil and ecclesiastical powers, as to deny openly the *reality* of the history of the life, meditation, and sufferings of CHRIST; but in *America*, where they have nothing to fear, they are said to express themselves without ambiguity, on this subject, and to maintain publicly, that CHRIST never existed, but in the hearts of the *faithful*. This point was debated between KEITH

[*w*] See SEWEL's *History of the Quakers*.

[*x*] *Ceremonies et Coutumes de tous les Peuples du monde*, tom. iv. p. 141.—CROESI *Historia Quakeriana*, lib. iii. p. 446.

and his adversaries, in several general assemblies of the sect held in *England*, and was at length brought before the parliament. The contest was terminated in the year 1695, by the excommunication of KEITH and his adherents, which so exasperated this famous Quaker [y], that he returned, some years after this, into the bosom of the English church, and died in its communion [z]. His friends and followers continued, for a long time, to hold their assemblies and exercise their religion in a state of separation from the rest of the sect; but now, if we may believe public fame, they are reconciled with their Brethren [a].

[y] Bishop BURNET, who was certainly better acquainted with the history of KEITH (with whom he had been educated) than Dr. MOSHEIM, attributes his return to the church of *England* to a much worthier motive than irritation and resentment. He tells us that KEITH, after that the American Quakers had appeared to him as little better than Deists, opposed them so warmly, that they sent him back to *England*. Here he opened a new meeting, and by a printed summons called together the whole party to convince them of these errors. "He continued these meetings, says the bishop, being still, in outward appearance, a Quaker, for some years; till, having prevailed as far as he saw any appearance of success, he laid aside their exterior, and was reconciled to the church." See BURNET's *History of his own Times*, vol. ii. p. 249. \*

[z] See BURNET, *ibid.*—SEWEL's account of the troubles occasioned by KEITH, in his *History of the Quakers*. But SEWEL was either unacquainted with the true nature and state of this controversy, which, as he was an illiterate man, may well have been the case, or he has given designedly a false and ambiguous representation of the matter. See the life of CUSTER, in the *Europa Erudita* of RAHTLEFUS \*, where this controversy is placed in its true light. \* KUSTER was a man of probity, who lived at that time in *America*, and was an eye-witness of these divisions.

[a] See ROGER's *Christian Quaker*, published in 4to at London, in the year 1699;—as also, *The Quakers a Divided People*, published in 1708.—*Unschuldig. Nachricht.* 1744, p. 496.

\* This work is written in German.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

The religion of the Quakers considered in a general point of view.

VI. The religion of the sect, called *Quakers*, has an air of novelty that strikes at first sight; but, when viewed closely, it will appear to be nothing more than a certain modification of that famous *mystic theology*, which arose so early as the second century, was fostered and embellished by the luxuriant fancy of ORIGEN, and passing through various hands, assumed different aspects until it was adopted by the *Quakers*, who set off the motely form with new additions of their own invention. Fox, indeed, is not chargeable with these inventions; his ignorant and inelegant simplicity places him beyond the reach of suspicion in this matter; but it is, at the same time, undoubtedly certain, that all his doctrine concerning the *internal word*, and the divine light within, its operations and effects, was either borrowed from the writings of the Mystics, which were, at that time, in the hands of many, or at least picked up from the conversation and expressions of some persons of the Mystic order. The tenets, however, which this blunt and illiterate man expressed in a rude, confused, and ambiguous manner, were dressed up and presented under a different form by the masterly hands of BARCLAY, KEITH, FISHER, and PENN, who digested them with such sagacity and art, that they assumed the aspect of a regular system. The *Quakers* may therefore be deemed with reason the principal branch of the *Mystics*, as they not only embraced the precepts of their *bidden wisdom*, but even saw its whole tendency, and adopted, without hesitation, all its consequences [b].

VII. The

[b] Most people are of opinion, that we are to learn the true doctrine and sentiments of the Quakers from the *Catechism* of ROBERT BARCLAY, and more especially from his *Apology for the true Christian Divinity*, &c. which was published at London in 4to, in the year 1676, and was translated into several foreign



VII. The fundamental doctrine of *Quakerism*,  
from whence all their other tenets are derived,  
is

U. S. N. T.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

reign languages. Nor do I deny, that the members of this sect are very desirous that we should judge of their religious sentiments by the doctrine that is exhibited in these books. But if those who are disposed to judge by this rule go so far as to maintain, that these books contain all the religious tenets that have formerly been advanced, or are at present adopted by the people called *Quakers*, they may be refuted, without difficulty, from a great variety of books and records, of unquestionable authenticity. It is necessary to enter into the true spirit of BARCLAY'S writings. This ingenious man appeared as a *Patron* and *Defender* of *Quakerism*, and not as a professed teacher or expositor of its various doctrines; and he interpreted and modified the opinions of this sect after the manner of a champion or advocate, who undertakes the defence of an odious cause. How then does he go to work? In the first place, he observes an entire silence in relation to those fundamental principles of Christianity, concerning which it is of great consequence to know the real opinions of the *Quakers*; and thus he exhibits a system of theology that is evidently lame and imperfect. For it is the peculiar business of a prudent apologist to pass over in silence points that are scarcely susceptible of a plausible defence, and to enlarge upon those only which the powers of genius and eloquence may be able to embellish and exhibit in an advantageous point of view. It is observable, in the second place, that BARCLAY touches in a slight, superficial, and hasty manner, some tenets, which, when amply explained, had exposed the *Quakers* to severe censures; and in this he discovers plainly the weakness of his cause. Lastly, to omit many other observations that might be made here, this writer employs the greatest dexterity and art in softening and modifying those invidious doctrines which he cannot conceal, and dare not disavow; for which purpose he carefully avoids all those phrases and terms that are made use of by the *Quakers*, and are peculiar to their sect, and expresses their tenets in ordinary language, in terms of a vague and indefinite nature, and in a style that casts a sort of mask over their natural aspect. At this rate the most enormous errors may be held with impunity; for there is no doctrine, however absurd, to which a plausible air may not be given by following the insidious method of BARCLAY; and it is well known, that even the doctrine of SPINOSA was, with a like artifice, dressed out and disguised by some of his disciples. The other writers of this sect have declared their sentiments with more freedom, perspicuity, and candour, particularly the famous WILLIAM PENN and GEORGE WHITEHEAD, whose writings

The principal tenet of the Quakers.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

is that famous and ancient opinion of the Mystic school, "*That there lies concealed in the minds of all men a certain portion of divine reason, a spark of the same wisdom that exists in the Supreme Being.*" Therefore, those who are desirous of arriving at true felicity and eternal salvation, must, according to their system, by self-converse, contemplation, and perpetual efforts to subdue their sensual affections, endeavour to draw forth, kindle, and inflame that *divine, hidden spark*, which is overpowered by the *darkness of the flesh*, and suffocated, as it were, by that mass of matter with which it is surrounded. They who observe this rule, will feel, say the Quakers, a divine glow of warmth and light, and hear a celestial and divine voice proceeding from the inward recesses of their souls; and by this light and this voice they will be led to all truth, and be perfectly assured of their union with the Supreme Being." This hidden treasure, which is possessed, though not improved, by all the human race, bears different denominations in the language of this fanatical sect. They frequently call it *divine light*, sometimes a *ray of the eternal wisdom*, at others, the *heavenly Sophia*, whom they suppose married to a mortal, and whose wedding garments some of their writers describe with the most gaudy and

writings deserve an attentive perusal preferably to all the other productions of that community. There is, among other writings of these eminent Quakers, one in whose composition they were both concerned, and which was published at London, in the year 1674, under the following title: *The Christian Quaker and his Divine Testimony vindicated by Scripture, Reason, and Authorities, against the injurious Attempts that have been lately made by several Adversaries.* The first Part of this book was written by PRINN; and the second by WHITEHEAD. There is also in SAWEL's History, a *Confession of Faith*, that was published by the Quakers in the year 1693, during their controversy with KEITH; but this confession is composed with great prudence, and is full of ambiguity.

pompous

pompous eloquence. But the most usual epithets given to this spiritual treasure are those of the *internal word*, and of CHRIST *within*; for as, on the one hand, they adopt that doctrine of ORIGEN, and the ancient Mystics, which represents CHRIST as the eternal reason, or wisdom of God; and, on the other, maintain, that all men are endowed naturally with a certain portion of the divine wisdom; they are thus directly led to affirm, that CHRIST, or the *word* of God, dwells and speaks in the hearts of all men [c].

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

VIII. All the singularities and wonderful fancies, that are to be found in the religious system of the Quakers, are the immediate consequences of the fundamental principle now mentioned. For since CHRIST resides in the inward frame of every mortal; it follows, "*First*, That the whole  
" of religion consists in calling off the mind from  
" external objects, in weakening the influence  
" and ascendant of the outward senses, and in  
" every one's entering deeply into the inmost  
" recesses of his heart, and listening attentively  
" to the divine instructions and commands that  
" the *internal word* or CHRIST *within* delivers  
" there; *secondly*, That the *external word*, i. e. the  
" holy Scripture, neither points out the way of  
" salvation, nor leads men to it; since it only  
" consists of *letters* and *words*, which, being *void*  
" of *life*, have not a degree of efficacy and power  
" sufficient to *illuminate* the human mind, and to  
" unite it to God. The only advantage that, in  
" their opinion, results from a perusal of the  
" holy Scriptures, is, that they excite the mind

The tenets  
that flow  
from this  
fundamental  
doctrine.

[c] It is nevertheless to be observed, that the modern Quakers, as appears from the writings of MARTYN and others, are, generally speaking, ignorant of the system of their ancestors, and perpetually confound the innate divine light above-mentioned, with the operations of the Holy Ghost in the minds of the faithful.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

“ to listen to the dictates of the *internal word*,  
 “ and to go to the school of CHRIST, who teaches  
 “ *within them*; or, to express the same thing in  
 “ other words, they look upon the bible as a  
 “ mute master, who, by signs and figures, points  
 “ out and discovers that *living master* and effec-  
 “ tual guide who dwells in the mind. *Thirdly*,  
 “ That they who are without this written word,  
 “ such as the Jews, Mahometans, and savage na-  
 “ tions, are not, on that account, either removed  
 “ from the path, or destitute of the doctrine of  
 “ salvation, though they indeed want this infe-  
 “ rior and subordinate help to its attainment.  
 “ For if they only attend to this *inward teacher*,  
 “ who always *speaketh* when the man is *silent*, they  
 “ will learn abundantly, from him, all that is  
 “ necessary to be known and practised in order  
 “ to their final happiness; that of consequence,  
 “ *fourthly*, The kingdom of CHRIST is of a vast  
 “ extent, and comprehends the whole race of  
 “ mankind. For all have CHRIST within them,  
 “ and therefore, even those who are deprived  
 “ of the means of knowledge, and live in the  
 “ grossest ignorance of the Christian religion, are  
 “ capable of obtaining, through him, wisdom  
 “ here, and happiness hereafter. Hence also  
 “ they conclude, that those who lead virtuous  
 “ lives, and resist the impulse of their lusts and  
 “ passions, whether they be Jews, Mahometans,  
 “ or Polytheists, shall be united to God in this  
 “ life, by means of the CHRIST that lies hidden  
 “ within them, and shall enjoy the fruits of this  
 “ union in the life to come. To these tenets  
 “ they add, in the *fifth* place, That a heavy, dark  
 “ body, composed of corrupt matter, hinders  
 “ men from discerning, with ease, this *hidden*  
 “ CHRIST, and from hearing his divine and in-  
 “ ternal voice. Therefore they look upon it as  
 “ a matter of the highest importance, to watch  
 “ against

“ against the pernicious consequences of this  
 “ union between the soul and body, that the lat-  
 “ ter may not blunt the powers of the former,  
 “ disturb its tranquillity, or, by the ministry of  
 “ the outward senses, fill it with the images of  
 “ vain, sensible, and external objects.” The  
 consideration now mentioned engages them,  
*lastly*, “ To look upon it as utterly incredible,  
 “ that God should ever again shut up, in the  
 “ same material habitation, the souls that are set  
 “ free by death from their bodily prison; and  
 “ therefore they affirm, that the Gospel-account  
 “ of the resurrection of the body must either be  
 “ interpreted in a figurative sense, or be under-  
 “ stood as pointing out the creation of a new  
 “ and celestial body [d].”

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

IX. It appears evidently from all this, that the  
 existence of the man CHRIST JESUS, together with  
 the circumstantial accounts we have in Scrip-  
 ture of his divine origin, his life, and actions,  
 his satisfaction, merits, and sufferings, make no  
 essential part of the theological system of the  
 Quakers, which is built upon a different founda-  
 tion, and derives the whole plan and method of  
 salvation from the CHRIST *within*. Hence several  
 members of that sect, as we learn from writers  
 of unquestionable authority, went such an  
 extravagant length as to maintain, that the ac-  
 counts we have of JESUS CHRIST, in the Gospel-  
 history, do not relate to the son of God, who  
 took upon him the nature of man, but to that  
 CHRIST *within*, whose operations are recorded by  
 the sacred historians in a figurative and allegorical

Their doc-  
trine con-  
cerning  
Christ.

[d] The Quakers adopt all these tenets; they are at least ob-  
 liged to adopt them, unless they renounce the fundamental  
 principles of their system. We have omitted the mention of  
 those points about which they dispute among themselves, that  
 we may not appear to take pleasure in representing them un-  
 der odious colours.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

language. This opinion, if we may confide in the testimonies of unexceptionable witnesses, is so far from having lost its credit among them, that it is still openly professed by the American Quakers. Those of *Europe*, whether from the force of conviction or the suggestions of prudence, differ entirely from their brethren in this respect; they hold, "That the divine *wisdom* or *reason*" resided in the *Son* of the Virgin Mary, and "conveyed its instructions to mankind by his "ministry;" and they profess to believe, "that "this divine man *really* did and suffered what is "recorded concerning him by the sacred writers." It is nevertheless certain, that they express themselves in a very ambiguous manner on many points that relate to the history of the divine Saviour; and, in a more particular manner, their notions concerning the fruits of his sufferings, and the efficacy of his death, are so vague and obscure, that it is very difficult to know what is their real opinion about the degree of this efficacy, and the nature of these fruits. It is still further worthy of observation, that the European Quakers, though they acknowledge the *reality* of the life, actions, and sufferings of CHRIST, yet do not entirely reject the allegorical interpretation of our Saviour's History mentioned above; for they consider the events that happened to CHRIST, in the course of his ministry here upon earth, as the signs and emblems of those scenes through which the *mental* CHRIST must pass, in order to render us partakers of eternal salvation. Hence they talk in high-swollen and pompous strains (like their models the Mystics) of the birth, life, sufferings, death, and resurrection of CHRIST *in the hearts of the faithful*.

Their religious discipline and worship.

X. The religious discipline, worship, and practice of the Quakers, flow from the same original source from which, as we have already observed,

served, their doctrine and tenets were immediately derived. They meet for the purposes of religion on the same days which are set apart for the celebration of public worship in all other Christian churches; but they neither observe festivals, nor use external rites and ceremonies, nor suffer religion, which they place entirely in the mental worship of the *Hidden* CHRIST, to be shackled and cramped by positive institutions. All the members of their community, whether male or female, have an equal right to teach and exhort in their public meetings; for who, say they, will presume to exclude from the liberty of speaking to the *Brethren*, those persons in whom CHRIST dwells, and by whom he speaks? They reject the use of prayers, hymns, and the various outward forms of devotion, by which the public worship of other Christian churches is distinguished; and this, indeed, is an instance of their consistency with themselves, as it is the immediate consequence of their religious system; for, in their judgment, it is not the person who expresses his desires in a set form of words, that can be said to pray truly, but he, on the contrary, who, by a deep recollection, withdraws his mind from every outward object, reduces it to a state of absolute tranquillity, silences every inward motion and affection, and plunges it, as it were, into the abyss of Deity. They neither observe the institution of *Baptism*, nor do they renew the remembrance of CHRIST's death, and of the benefits that result from it, by the celebration of the *Eucharist*. They look upon these two institutions as merely Judaical, and allege, that our Saviour observed them for no other end than to shew for once, in a visible manner, the mystical purification of the soul, under the figure of baptism, and the spiritual nourishment of the inward man, under that of the Eucharist.

CENT.

XVII.

SECT. II.

PART II.

Their moral  
precepts.

XI. The moral doctrine of the Quakers, which is remarkable for its excessive austerity, is chiefly comprehended in the two following precepts: *First*, "That the faithful are either to avoid entirely every thing that tends to gratify the external senses and passions, every thing that can be ranked under the denomination of sensual or bodily pleasure; or, if such rigorous abstinence be impossible in this present state, and contrary to the evident laws of nature, such pleasure is to be so modified and restrained by reason and meditation, as to prevent its debasing and corrupting the mind. For as the whole attention of the mind must be given to the voice and orders of the *internal guide*, so, for this purpose, all possible care must be taken to remove it from the contagion of the body, and from all intimate and habitual commerce with corporeal objects." By the *second* leading precept of morality among the Quakers, all imitation of those external manners, that go by the name of civility and politeness, as also several matters of form, usual in the conduct of life and in the connexions of human society, are strictly prohibited as unlawful. Hence they are easily distinguished from all other Christian sects, by their outward deportment and their manner of life. They never salute any person they meet in their way, nor employ in their conversation the usual manner of address, and the appellations that civility and custom have rendered a matter of decency, at least, if not of duty; they never express their respect for magistrates or persons in authority, either by bodily gestures, titles of honour, or in general by any of the marks of homage that are paid them by persons of all other denominations. They carry their pacific sentiments to such an extravagant length, as to renounce the right of self-defence, and let pass with impunity,



impunity, and even without resistance, the attacks that are made on their possessions, their reputation, nay, on their lives. They refuse to confirm their testimonies by an oath, to appear in behalf of their property before a civil tribunal, or to accuse those who have injured them. To these negative parts of their external conduct, they add peculiar circumstances of a positive kind, that discover the same austere, stiff, proud, and formal spirit; for they distinguish themselves, in a striking manner, from the rest of their fellow-citizens, by the gravity of their aspect, the rustic simplicity of their apparel, the affected tone of their voice, the stiffness of their conversation, and the frugality of their tables. It is, however, affirmed by persons of credit, who are eye-witnesses of what passes among the members of this sect, that the modern, and more especially the English Quakers, whom trade has furnished with the means of luxury, have departed from this rigid and austere manner of life, and daily grow more reconciled to the outward pleasures and enjoyments of the world. These more sociable Quakers are also said to modify and explain the theology of their ancestors, in such a manner as to render it more rational than it was in its primitive state. At the same time it is certain, that many of the members of this sect have either a false notion, or no notion at all, of that ancient theology.

XII. The principles of this community seem to exclude the very idea of order, discipline, and ecclesiastical government. Its leading members, however, began to perceive, in process of time, that without laws and rulers it could not subsist, but must inevitably fall into confusion and ruin. They accordingly erected a council of *Elders*, who discuss and determine matters of a doubtful or difficult nature, and use all possible care and di-

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

Their form  
of ecclesi-  
astical go-  
vernment.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

ligence in inspecting the conduct of the Brethren, and in preventing whatever they look upon as prejudicial to the interests of the community. The names of those that enter into the state of wedlock are given in to those leading members, who also keep an exact register of the births and deaths that happen in their society. They exercise, moreover, a certain degree of authority over those who speak in their meetings; since it is well known, that in some places these speakers shew their discourses to the ruling Elders before they deliver them, in order that they may judge whether or no they are fit to be repeated in public. For since the abuse that was made of the unbounded liberty that every individual had to instruct and exhort the congregation, and to speak and harangue when the pretended *spirit moved them*, new regulations have been observed: and this liberty has been considerably modified, in several places, to avoid the mockery, contempt, and censure, to which the community was constantly exposed, by the absurd, incoherent, and insipid discourses of many of its members. There are also in some of the more considerable congregations, and more especially in those that are erected at *London*, certain persons, whose vocation it is to be always prepared to speak to the people, in case none of the congregation find themselves *inwardly moved*, or disposed to perform that office. The appointment of these professed speakers was designed to remedy an inconveniency that frequently happened in the Quaker-meetings, even that the whole assembly was dismissed without either instruction or exhortation, because none found themselves *moved* to speak. It is indeed to be observed, that this public discourse is not looked upon by the Quakers as an essential part of their religion and worship; for the *Brethren* and *Sisters* do not meet that they may hear the words of an external teacher,

teacher, but that they may listen with recollection to the voice of the *divine instructor*, which every one carries with him in his own breast, or, to use their own phrase, that they may *commune with themselves*. Nevertheless, as these mute assemblies excite the laughter of their adversaries, and expose them to the reproach of enthusiasm and frenzy, they have, on that account, appointed fixed speakers, to whom they give a small salary, that the whole time of their meeting may not be passed in silence [*d*].

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

---

The Quakers have, annually, a general assembly of the whole sect, which meets at *London* the week before Whitfunday, and is composed of deputies from all their particular congregations. They still complain, notwithstanding the toleration they enjoy, of certain severities and hardships; but these are entirely owing to their obstinate refusal to pay those tithes, which, by the laws of the land, are designed for the support of the established church.

☞ [*d*] The truth of this account of *fixed Speakers* appointed to discourse and exhort, when the spirit does not move any of the other brethren, and *rewarded* for their pains, is denied by the writer of the *Letter to Dr. FORMEY*; we leave the decision of the matter to those who have an opportunity of examining the fact.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

## C H A P. V.

## Concerning the MENNONITES, or ANABAPTISTS.

The various  
fortunes of  
the Menno-  
nites,

I. AFTER various scenes of trial and perplexity, the Mennonites at length found, during this century, the tranquillity they had long sought after in vain. They arrived, indeed, at this state of repose by very slow steps; for though, in the preceding age, they were admitted to the rights and privileges of citizens in the *United Provinces*, yet it was a long time before their solicitations and pleas of innocence could engage the *English*, the *Swiss*, and *Germans*, to receive them in their bosom, and to abrogate the laws that had been enacted against them. The civil magistrates, in these countries, had still before their eyes the enormities committed by the ancient Anabaptists; and besides, they could not persuade themselves, that a set of men, who looked upon all oaths as *sinful*, and declared that magistracy and penal laws have no place in the kingdom of CHRIST, had the qualities and sentiments that are necessary to constitute a good citizen. Hence we find, even in this century, several examples of great severities employed against the Anabaptists, and some instances of even capital punishments being inflicted on them [e]. But now, that the demonstrations of their innocence and probity are clear and unquestionable,

[e] The severities exercised in *Switzerland* against the *Mennonites* are recorded by OTTIUS, in his *Annal. Anabapt.* p. 337. and more particularly those that they suffered in the year 1693, by HOTTINGER, in his German work, intitled, *Schweizerische Kirchen-Historie*, vol. i. p. 1101. nor, even in this present century, have they been treated more mildly in the Canton of *Bern*, as appears from SCHYN's *Historia Mennonitar.* cap. x. p. 289. in which we find the letters of the States-General of the *United Provinces* interceding with that Canton in their

tionable, they enjoy the sweets of security and repose, not only in the *United Provinces*, but also in *England*, *Germany*, and *Prussia*, where they procure, by their honest industry, and particularly by their application to trade and commerce, an ample subsistence for themselves and their families.

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

II. The wiser members of this community easily perceived, that their external tranquillity would neither be stable nor permanent, unless their intestine discords were removed, and their ancient disputes, about trifling and unimportant matters, charitably terminated. They accordingly used their most zealous endeavours to diffuse the sweets of charity and concord throughout their sect; nor were their labours altogether unsuccessful. In the year 1630, a considerable part of the Anabaptists of *Flanders*, *Germany*, and *Friesland*, concluded their debates in a conference held at *Amsterdam*, and entered into the bonds of fraternal communion, each, notwithstanding, reserving to themselves a liberty of retaining certain opinions. This association was renewed, and confirmed by new resolutions, in the year 1649, by the Anabaptists of *Flanders* and *Germany*, between whom great divisions had reigned [f]. All these formed a bond of union with those branches of the sect that were most distinguished by their moderation; and they mitigated and corrected, in various respects, the rigorous laws of MENNO and his successors.

Union and  
concord re-  
stored a-  
mong them.

their behalf. A severe persecution was set on foot against them in the *Palatinate* in the year 1694, which was superseded by the intercession of WILLIAM III., king of *Great Britain*. See SCHYN, *ibid.* p. 265. Bishop BURNET mentions some instances of Anabaptists suffering death in *England* during the seventeenth century, in the first volume of his *History of his own Times*.

[f] HERM. SCHYN, *Plenior Deductio Historiæ Mennonit.* P. 41, 42.

III. Therefore,

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
ART II.

Different  
sects of  
Anabaptists.

III. Therefore, at this day, the whole community may be divided into two large sects, the one comprehending the more *Refined* Anabaptists, remarkable for their austerity, who are also called *Flemings* or *Flandrians*; and the others called (in the Dutch language) the *Grosser* Anabaptists, who are of a milder complexion, and an easier and more moderate character, and go commonly under the denomination of *Waterlandians*. We have given already a particular account of the origin and etymology of these denominations. Each of these sects is subdivided into a variety of branches, more especially the *refined* and austere Anabaptists, who have not only produced two separate societies, distinguished by the names of *Groningenists* [g], and *Dantzigers* or *Prussians* [b], but also a considerable number of more obscure and inconsiderable factions, which differ in doctrine, discipline, and manners; and agree in nothing but the name of Anabaptists, and in some ancient opinions that have been unanimously embraced by all the members of that sect. All the refined *Anabaptists* are the rigid followers of SIMON MENNO, and stedfastly maintain, though not all with the same degree of severity and rigour, the sentiments of their chief on the following points—the human nature of CHRIST—the obligation that binds us to wash the feet of strangers in consequence of our Saviour's command—the necessity of excommunicating and of avoiding, as one would do the plague, not only avowed sinners, but also those who depart, even in some light instances, from the simplicity of their ancestors, and are tainted with any appearance of evil—the contempt that is due

[g] So called, because they met at certain stated times in the city of *Groningen*.

[b] They derive this denomination from their adopting the manners and discipline of the Prussians.

to human learning, and other matters of less moment [i]. It is however to be observed, that in our times, some of the congregations of this *reformed* sect have been gradually departing from this austere system, and are proceeding, though with a slow pace, towards the opinions and discipline of the more moderate Anabaptists.

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

IV. All these Anabaptists adopt a form of ecclesiastical government and discipline, that is administered by three distinct orders of persons. The first order is that of the *Bishops* or *Presbyters*, who always preside in the consistory, and are alone invested with the power of administering the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The second is that of the *Teachers*, who are set apart for the purposes of public instruction, and the celebration of divine worship. The third comprehends the *Deacons*, who are chosen out of both sexes. These three orders compose the consistory or council by which the church is governed. All matters of importance are proposed, examined, and decided, in the meetings of the Brethren. The ministers are elected to their holy office by *their* suffrages, and are all, the *Deacons* excepted, installed by public prayers, attended with imposition of hands.

The external form of the Mennonite church.

V. Among the inferior sects of the rigid Anabaptists, the most considerable is that which passes under the denomination of *Uckewallists*, and is so called after its founder UKE WALLIS, a native of *Friesland*. This rustic, rigid, and ignorant sectary, not only exhorted his followers to maintain the primitive and austere doctrine of MENNO, without suffering it to be softened or altered in the smallest degree, but also took it into his head to propagate, jointly with another innovator,

The Uckewallists.

[i] See a German work entitled, *Nachrichten von dem gegenwärtigen Zustande der Menoniten*, by RUES, 1743.

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

---

named JOHN LEUS, in the year 1637, a singular opinion concerning the salvation of JUDAS, and the rest of CHRIST's murderers. To give an air of plausibility to the favourable opinion he entertained concerning the eternal state of this arch-apostate, he invented the following odd hypothesis, "That the period of time that extended from the birth of CHRIST to the descent of the Holy Ghost, and was, as it were, the distinctive term that separated the Jewish from the Christian dispensation, was a time of deep ignorance and darkness, during which the Jews were void of light, and entirely destitute of divine succour; and that, of consequence, the sins and enormities that were committed during this interval were in a great measure excusable, and could not merit the severest displays of the divine justice." This idle fiction met with no indulgence, either from the Mennonites on the one hand, or from the magistrates of *Groningen* on the other; for the former excluded its inventor from their communion, and the latter banished him from their city. He fixed his residence in the adjacent province of *East-Friesland*, and there drew after him a considerable number of disciples, whose descendants still subsist in the neighbourhood of *Groningen*, *Friesland*, and also in *Lithuania* and *Prussia*, and have their own religious assemblies, separate from those of the other Mennonites. As they have little intercourse with any but those of their own communion, it is not an easy matter to know, with certainty, whether they persevere in the singular opinion that proved so detrimental to the interest of their leader. It is at least certain, that they follow scrupulously the steps of their original founder MENNO, and exhibit a lively image of the primitive manners and constitution of the Mennonites. They re-baptize all those who  
leave



leave other Christian churches to embrace their communion. Their apparel is mean beyond expression, and they avoid every thing that has the most distant appearance of elegance or ornament. They let their beards grow to an enormous length; their hair, uncombed, lies in a disorderly manner on their shoulders; their countenances are marked with the strongest lines of dejection and melancholy; and their habitations and household furniture are such as are only fitted to answer the demands of mere necessity. Such, moreover, is the severity of their discipline, that any member of their community, who departs in the smallest instance from this austere rule, is immediately excluded from the society, and avoided by all the Brethren as a public pest. Their inspectors or bishops, whom they distinguish from the ministers, whose office is to preach and instruct, are chosen by an assembly composed of all the congregations of the sect. The ceremony of washing the feet of strangers, who come within the reach of their hospitality, is looked upon by them as a rite of divine institution. We shall not enlarge upon the other circumstances of their ritual, but only observe, that they prevent all attempts to alter or modify their religious discipline, by preserving their people from every thing that bears the remotest aspect of learning and science; from whatever, in a word, might have a tendency to enlighten their devout ignorance.

VI. The more moderate, who are called the *Grosser*, or less scrupulous Anabaptists, are composed of certain inhabitants of *Waterland*, *Flanders*, *Friesland*, and *Germany*, who entered into an association, as has been already observed, and commonly pass under the denomination of *Waterlandians*. This community has abandoned the severe discipline and singular opinions of *MENNO*, whom,

The Waterlandians.

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

---

whom, nevertheless, they generally respected as their primitive parent and founder, and have advanced a step nearer than the other Anabaptists to the religious doctrines and customs of other Christian churches. They are, however, divided into two distinct sects, which bear the respective denominations of *Frieſlanders* and *Waterlandians*, and are both without bishops, employing no other ecclesiastical ministers than *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. Each congregation of this sect is independent on all foreign jurisdiction, having its own ecclesiastical council or consistory, which is composed of *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. The supreme spiritual power is, nevertheless, in the hands of the people, without whose consent nothing of importance can be carried into execution. Their *Presbyters* are, generally speaking, men of learning, and apply themselves with success to the study of physic and philosophy. And there is a public professor supported, at present, by the sect at *Amsterdam*, for the instruction of their youth in the various branches of philosophy and sacred erudition.

The Gal-  
lenists and  
Apostoli-  
ans.

VII. One of these Waterlandian sects was divided, in the year 1664, into two factions, of which the one were called *Galenists*, and the other *Apostolians*, from their respective leaders. The founder of the former was *GALEN ABRAHAM HAAN*, a doctor of physic, and pastor of a Mennonite congregation at *Amsterdam*, who has received the applause even of his enemies, on account of his uncommon penetration and eloquence. This eminent Anabaptist, in imitation of the Arminians, considered the Christian religion as a system that laid much less stress upon faith than upon practice; and he was for receiving into the communion of the Mennonites all those who acknowledged the divine origin of the books of the Old and New Testament, and led  
holy

holy and virtuous lives. Such, in his judgment, were true Christians, and had an undoubted right to all the rights and privileges that belong to that character. These comprehensive terms of communion were peculiarly favourable to his own theological sentiments; since his notions concerning CHRIST's divinity, and the salvation of mankind by his death and merits, were very different from those of the Mennonites, and coincided a good deal with the Socinian-system.

Several persons opposed the sentiments of this Latitudinarian, and more especially SAMUEL APOSTOOL, an eminent pastor among the Mennonites at *Amsterdam*, who not only defended, with the utmost zeal, the doctrine generally received among the Mennonites, in relation to the divinity of CHRIST and the fruits of his death, but also maintained that ancient hypothesis of a visible and glorious church of CHRIST upon earth, that was peculiar to this sect [k]. Thus a controversy was kindled, which produced the division now mentioned; a division which the zealous efforts of several of the wisest and most respectable members of this community have hitherto proved insufficient to heal. The *Galenists* are not less disposed than the Arminians to admit, as members of their community, all those who call themselves Christians; and they are the only sect of the Anabaptists who reject the denomination of Mennonites. The *Apostoolians*, on the contrary, admit to their communion those only who profess to believe all the points of doctrine which are contained in their public confession of faith [l].

[k] For a more particular account of these two Mennonites, see SCHYN's *Deductio plenior Histor. Mennonit.* cap. xv. p. 318. and xviii. p. 237.

[l] CASP. COMMELINI *Descriptio Urbis Amstelodami*, tom. i. p. 500.—STOUFA's *Religion des Hollandois*, p. 20.—BENTHEM's *Hollandischer Schulund Kirchen-Staat*, p. i. ch. xix. p. 830.

## CHAP. VI.

*Concerning the SOCINIANS and ARIANS.*

The flourish-  
ing state  
of the Socin-  
ians.

1. **A**BOUT the commencement of this century, the Sect of the Socinians seemed to be well established, and their affairs were even in a flourishing situation. In *Transylvania* and *Lucko* they enjoyed the liberty of holding, without molestation, their religious assemblies, and professing publicly their theological opinions. The advantages that attended their situation in *Poland* were still more considerable; for they had at *Racow* a public seminary of learning, which was furnished with professors eminently distinguished by their erudition and genius, together with a press for the publication of their writings; they had also a considerable number of congregations in that district, and were supported by the patronage of several persons of the highest distinction. Elated with this scene of prosperity, they began to form more extensive views, and aimed at enlarging the borders of their community, and procuring it patrons and protectors in other countries. There are in being authentic records, from which it appears, that they sent emissaries with this view, about the commencement of this century, into *Holland, England, Germany, and Prussia*, who endeavoured to make proselytes to Socinianism in these countries, among men of learning and men in power. For it is remarkable, that the Socinians, in propagating their religious principles, have always followed a quite different method from that which has been observed by other sects. It has been the general practice of sectaries and innovators to endeavour to render themselves popular, and to begin by gaining the multitude to their side; but the disciples of *SOCINUS*, who are perpetually

perpetually exalting the dignity, prerogatives, and authority of reason, have this peculiarity in their manner of proceeding, that they are at very little pains to court the favour of the people, or to make proselytes to their cause among those who are not distinguished from the multitude by their rank or their abilities. It is only among the learned and the great that they seek for disciples and patrons with a zealous assiduity.

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

II. The effect of the missions now mentioned, though they were conducted and executed by persons of whom the greatest part were eminent, both on account of their rank and abilities, was nevertheless far from answering the views and expectations of the community. In most places their success was doubtful, at best but inconsiderable; in some, however, they were favourably received, and seemed to employ their labours to purpose. They had no where a more flattering prospect of success than in the academy of *Altorf*, where their sentiments and their cause were promoted with dexterity by ERNEST SOHNER, an acute and learned peripatetician, who was professor of physic and natural philosophy. This subtle philosopher, who had joined the Socinians during his residence in *Holland*, instilled their principles into the minds of his scholars with much greater facility, by his having acquired the highest reputation both for learning and piety. The death, indeed, of this eminent man, which happened in the year 1612, deprived the rising society of its chief ornament and support; nor could the remaining friends of Socinianism carry on the cause of their community with such art and dexterity, as to escape the vigilant and severe eye of the other professors. Their secret designs were accordingly brought to light in the year 1616; and the contagion of Socinianism, which was gathering strength from day to day,

The progress and decline of Socinianism at *Altorf*.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

and growing imperceptibly into a reigning system, was all of a sudden dissipated and extinguished by the vigilant severity of the magistrates of *Nuremberg*. The foreign students, who had been infected with these doctrines, saved themselves by flight; while the natives, who were chargeable with the same reproach, accepted of the remedies that were presented to them by the healing hand of orthodoxy, and returned quietly to their former theological system [m].

The decline  
of Socinian-  
ism, and  
the suffer-  
ings of its  
votaries in  
*Poland*.

III. The establishment of the Socinians in *Poland*, though it seemed to rest upon solid foundations, was nevertheless of a short duration [n]. Its chief supports were withdrawn in the year 1638, by a public decree of the diet. It happened in this year that some of the students of *Racow* vented, in an irregular and tumultuous manner, their religious resentment against a crucifix, at which they threw stones, till they beat it down out of its place. This act of violence excited such a high degree of indignation in the Roman Catholics, that they vowed revenge, and fulfilled this vow in the severest manner; for it was through their importunate solicitations that the terrible law was enacted at *Warsaw*, by which it was resolved, that the academy of *Racow* should be demolished, its professors banished

[m] The learned GUSTAVUS GEORGE ZELTNER, formerly professor of divinity in the academy of *Altorf*, composed an ample and learned account of this theological revolution, drawn principally from manuscript-records, which was published at *Leipsic*, in the year 1729, in two volumes, in 4to. by GEBAUER, under the following title: *Historia Crypto-Socinianismi, Altorfinae quondam Academiæ infestæ, arcana*.

[n] We have a circumstantial account of the flourishing state of the Racovian academy, while it was under the direction of the learned MARTIN RUARUS, in the *Cimbria Litterata* of MÖLLERUS, tom. i. p. 572. where we learn that RUARUS was a native of *Holstein*, who became a profelyte to the Socinian system.

with

with ignominy, the printing-house of the Socinians destroyed, and their churches shut. All this was executed without the smallest alleviation or the least delay, notwithstanding the efforts made by the powerful patrons of the Socinians to ward off the blow [o]. But a catastrophe, still more terrible, awaited them; and the persecution now mentioned was the forerunner of that dreadful revolution, which, about twenty years afterwards, brought on the entire ruin of this community in *Poland*: For by a public and solemn act of the diet held at *Warsaw*, in the year 1658, all the Socinians were banished for ever from the territory of that republic, and capital punishment was denounced against all those who should either profess their opinions, or harbour their persons. The unhappy exiles were, at first, allowed the space of three years to settle their affairs, and to dispose of their possessions; but this term was afterwards abridged by the cruelty of their enemies, and reduced to two years. In the year 1661, the terrible edict was renewed; and all the Socinians that yet remained in *Poland* were barbarously driven out of that country, some with the loss of their goods, others with the loss of their lives, as neither sickness, nor any domestic consideration, could suspend the execution of that rigorous sentence [p].

IV. A part of these exiles, who sought for a refuge among their Brethren in *Transylvania*, sunk under the burthen of their calamities, and perished amidst the hardships to which they were

The fate of  
the Socin-  
ian exiles.

[o] *Epistola de WISSOWATII vita in SANDII Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar. p. 233.*—GUST. GEORG. ZELTNERI *Historia Crypto-Socinianismi Altorfni*, vol. i. p. 299.

[p] STANISLAI LUBIENIECII *Historia Reformat. Polonicae*, lib. iii. c. xvii, xviii. p. 279.—*Equites Poloni Vindictæ pro Unitariorum in Polonia Religionis libertate apud SANDIUM, in Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar. p. 267.*

CENT.  
XVI.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

exposed. A considerable number of these unhappy emigrants were dispersed through the adjacent provinces of *Silesia*, *Brandenburg*, and *Prussia*; and their posterity still subsists in those countries. Several of the more eminent members of the sect, in consequence of the protection granted them by the duke of *Brieg*, resided for some time at *Crossen*, in *Silesia* [q]. Others went in search of a convenient settlement for themselves and their brethren, into *Holland*, *England*, *Holstein*, and *Denmark*. Of all the Socinian exiles, none discovered such zeal and industry for the interests and establishment of the sect as *STANISLAUS LUBIENIECIUS*, a Polish knight, distinguished by his learning, and singularly esteemed by persons of the highest rank, and even by several sovereign princes, on account of his eloquence, politeness, and prudence. This illustrious patron of Socinianism succeeded so far in his designs, as to gain the favour of *FREDERIC III.*, king of *Denmark*; *CHRISTIAN ALBERT*, duke of *Holstein*; and *CHARLES LEWIS*, elector *Palatine*; and thus had almost obtained a secure retreat and settlement for the Socinians, about the year 1662, at *Altena*, *Fredericstadt*, and *Manheim*; but his measures were disconcerted, and all his hopes entirely frustrated, by the opposition and remonstrances of the clergy established in these countries; he was opposed in *Denmark* by *SUANINGIUS* bishop of *Zealand*, in *Holstein* by *REINBOTH*, and in the *Palatinate* by *JOHN LEWIS FABRICIUS* [r]. Several other attempts were made, in

[q] *LUBIENIECII Historia Reformat. Polon. cap. xviii. p. 285.* where there is a letter written by the Socinians of *Crossen*.

[r] See *SANDII, Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitar. p. 165.*—*Historia Vitæ LUBIENIECII*, prefixed to his *Historia Reformationis Polonicae*, p. 7, 8.—*MOLLERI Introductio in Histor. Chersens. Cimbricae*, p. ii. p. 105. and his *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 487.—*JO. HENR. HEIDEGGERI Vita JOH. LUD. FABRICII*, subjoined to the works of the latter, p. 38.

different



different countries, in favour of Socinianism ; but their success was still less considerable ; nor could any of the European nations be persuaded to grant a public settlement to a sect, whose members denied the divinity of CHRIST.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

V. The remains, therefore, of this unfortunate community are, at this day, dispersed through different countries, particularly in the kingdoms of *England* and *Prussia*, the electorate of *Brandenburg*, and the *United Provinces*, where they lie more or less concealed, and hold their religious assemblies in a clandestine manner. They are, indeed, said to exercise their religion publicly in *England* [rr], not in consequence of a legal toleration,

[rr] The Socinians in *England* have never made any figure as a Community, but have rather been dispersed among that great variety of sects that have arisen in a country where Liberty displays its most glorious fruits, and at the same time exhibits its most striking inconveniences. Besides, few ecclesiastics, or writers of any note, have adopted the theological system now under consideration, in all its branches. The Socinian doctrine relating to the design and efficacy of the death of Christ had indeed many abettors in *England* during the XVIIth century ; and it may be presumed, without temerity, that its votaries are rather increased than diminished in the present ; but those divines who have abandoned the *Athanasian* hypothesis concerning the *Trinity of Persons in the Godhead*, have more generally gone into the Arian and Semi-Arian notions of that inexplicable subject, than into those of the Socinians, who deny that JESUS CHRIST existed before his appearance in the human nature. The famous JOHN BIDDLE, after having maintained both in public and in private during the reign of CHARLES, and the protectorship of CROMWELL, the Unitarian system, erected an independent congregation in *London*, which is the only British church we have heard of, in which all the peculiar doctrines of Socinianism were inculcated ; for, if we may give credit to the account of SIR PETER PETER, this congregation held the following notions : “ That the fathers under the old covenant had only temporal promises—that saving faith consisted in universal obedience performed to the commands of God and Christ ;—that Christ arose again only by the power of the Father, and not his own ;—that justifying faith is not the pure gift of God,

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

tion, but through the indulgent connivance of the civil magistrate [s]. Some of them have embraced the communion of the Arminians; others have joined with that sect of the Anabaptists that are distinguished by the name of *Gale-nists*; and in this there is nothing at all surprising, since neither the Arminians nor Anabaptists require from those that enter into their communion an explicit or circumstantial declaration of their religious sentiments. It is also said, that a considerable number of this dispersed community became members of the religious society called *Collegiants* [t]. Amidst these perpetual changes

“ but may be acquired by men’s natural abilities;—that *faith*  
“ cannot believe any thing contrary to, or above reason;—  
“ that there is no *original sin*;—that Christ hath not the  
“ *same* body now in glory, in which he suffered and rose  
“ again;—that the saints shall not have the *same* body in  
“ heaven which they had on earth;—that Christ was not  
“ *Lord or King* before his resurrection, or *Priest* before his  
“ ascension;—that the saints shall not, before the Day of  
“ Judgment, enjoy the bliss of heaven;—that God doth not  
“ certainly know future contingencies;—that there is not  
“ any authority of fathers or general councils in determining  
“ matters of faith;—that Christ, before his death, had not  
“ any dominion over the Angels;—and that Christ, by dying,  
“ made not satisfaction for us.” See the *Preface* to Sir PETER PETER’S *Happy future State of England*, printed at London in 1698.

[s] The Socinians, who reside at present in the district of *Mark*, used to meet, some years ago, at stated times, at *Königs-wald*, a village in the neighbourhood of *Frankfort* on the *Oder*. See the *Recueil de Littérature, de Philosophie et d’Histoire* (published at *Amsterdam* in the year 1731, in 8vo \*), p. 44.—They published, in the year 1716, at *Berlin*, their Confession of Faith in the German language, which is to be found, with a refutation thereto annexed, in a book, intitled, *Den Theologischen Heb. Opfern*. part x. p. 852.

[t] This community, of which there is an account given in the beginning of the following chapter, called their religious meetings *Collegies*, a Dutch word, which signifies congregation or assembly, and hence they were denominated *Collegiants*.

\* The author of this collection was one JORDAN, who was pastor of a Church in the neighbourhood of *Berlin*.

and

and vicissitudes, it was not possible that the Socinians could maintain an uniform system of doctrine, or preserve unaltered and entire the religious tenets handed down to them by their ancestors. On the contrary, their peculiar and distinctive opinions are variously explained and understood both by the learned and illiterate members of their community, though they all agree in rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity, and that also of the *divinity* and *satisfaction* of JESUS CHRIST [u].

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

VI. After the Socinians, as there is a great affinity between the two sects, it is proper to mention the Arians, who had several celebrated writers in this century, such as SANDIUS and BIDDLE [w]. Of those who also passed under the ge-

Arians

[u] Many examples might be alleged in proof of this; it will be sufficient to mention that of the learned CRELLIUS, who, though he was professor of theology among the Socinians, yet differed in his opinions, about many points of doctrine, from the sentiments of SOCINUS and the Racovian Catechism, and would not be called a Socinian, but an *Artemonite* \*. See the *Journal Littéraire*, tom. xvii. p. i. p. 150. and the account I have given of this celebrated man in my *Syntagm. Dissertationum ad sanctiores Disciplinas pertinentium*, p. 352.—*Unschuld. Nachricht.* 1750. p. 942.—*Nouveau Diction. Historique et Critique*, tom. ii. p. ii. p. 88. ☞ This last citation is erroneous; there is no account of CRELLIUS in the place here referred to.

[w] For an account of SANDIUS, father and son, see ARNOLD and other writers. The Life of BIDDLE is to be found in the *Nouveau Diction. Historique et Critique*, tom. i. p. ii. p. 288. ☞ Dr. MOSHEIM places BIDDLE improperly among the *Arians*; it is manifest that he belongs to the *Socinians*, since, in the III<sup>d</sup> article of his Confession of Faith, he professeth to believe that *Christ has no other than a human nature*. See the *Socinian Tracts*, intitled, *The Faith of one God, &c.* published at London in 4to. in 1691. See also above, note [rr].

☞ \* After ARTEMON, who lived under the reign of the Emperor SEVERUS, and denied the pre-existence and divinity of JESUS CHRIST.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

neral denomination of *Anti-Trinitarians* and *Unitarians* there are many that may be placed in the class of the Socinians and Arians: for the term *Unitarian* is very comprehensive, and is applicable to a great variety of persons, who, notwithstanding, agree in this common principle, that *there is no real distinction in the divine nature*. The denomination of Arian is also given in general to all who consider JESUS CHRIST as *inferior* and *subordinate* to the Father. But as *this* subordination may be understood and explained in a variety of ways, it is evident, that the term *Arian*, as it is used in modern language, is susceptible of different significations; and that of consequence the persons to whom it is applied cannot be all considered in the same point of light with the ancient Arians, nor supposed to agree perfectly with each other in their religious tenets.

---

## C H A P. VII.

### Concerning some Sects of Inferior Note.

The Collegiants, or Rhinbergers.

I. IT will not be amiss to take notice here of a few sects of inferior consequence and note, which we could not mention with propriety in the history of the larger and more extensive communities that we have been passing in review, and which, nevertheless, we cannot omit, for several reasons. While the disputes and tumults that the Arminian system produced in *Holland*, in the year 1619, were at the greatest height, then arose that religious society, whose members hold at *Rhinberg*, in the neighbourhood of *Leyden*, a solemn assembly every half year, and are generally

rally known under the denomination of *Collegiants* [x]. This community was founded by three brothers, whose name was VANDER KODDE, who passed their days in the obscurity of a rural life, but are said to have been men of eminent piety, well acquainted with sacred literature, and great enemies to religious controversy. They had for their associate ANTHONY CORNELIUS, a man also of a mean condition, and who had no qualities that could give any degree of weight or credit to their cause. The descendants and followers of these men acquired the name of *Collegiants* from this particular circumstance, that they called their religious assemblies *Colleges*. All are admitted to the communion of this sect who acknowledge the divinity of the holy Scriptures, and endeavour to live suitably to their precepts and doctrines, whatever their peculiar sentiments may be concerning the nature of the Diety, and the truths of Christianity. Their numbers are very considerable in the provinces of *Holland, Utrecht, Friesland, and Westfriesland*. They meet twice every week, namely on Sundays and Wednesdays, for the purposes of divine worship; and after singing a psalm or hymn, and addressing themselves to the Diety by prayer, they explain a certain portion of the New Testament. The female members of the community are not allowed to speak in public; but all others, without any exception founded on rank, condition, or incapacity, have a right to communicate the result of their meditations to the assembly, and to submit their sentiments to the judgment of the Brethren. All likewise have an unquestionable right to examine and oppose what any of the Brethren has advanced, provided their opposition be attended with a spirit of Christian charity and moderation.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

[x]. See above, note [t].

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

---

There is a printed list of the passages of Scripture, that are to be examined and illustrated at each of their religious meetings; so that any one who is ambitious of appearing among the *speakers*, may study the subject before-hand, and thus come fully prepared to descant upon it in public. The Brethren, as has been already observed, have a general assembly twice a year at *Rhinberg*, where they have ample and convenient houses for the education of orphans and the reception of strangers; and there they remain together during the space of four days, which are employed in hearing discourses that tend to edification, and exhortations that are principally designed to inculcate brotherly love and sanctity of manners. The sacrament of the Lord's supper is also administered during this assembly; and those adult persons, that desire to be baptized, receive the sacrament of Baptism, according to the ancient and primitive manner of celebrating that institution, even by immersion. Those of the Brethren that reside in the province of *Friesland*, have at present an annual meeting at *Lewarden*, where they administer the sacraments, as the considerable distance at which they live from *Rhinberg* renders it inconvenient for them to repair thither twice a year. We shall conclude our account of the *Collegiants* by observing, that their community is of a most ample and extensive kind; that it comprehends persons of all ranks, orders, and sects, who profess themselves Christians, though their sentiments concerning the person and doctrine of the divine founder of Christianity be extremely different; that it is kept together, and its union maintained, not by the authority of rulers and doctors, the force of ecclesiastical laws, the restraining power of creeds and confessions, or the influence of certain positive rites and institutions, but merely by a zeal for the advancement

vancement of practical religion, and a desire of drawing instruction from the study of the Holy Scriptures [y].

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

II. In such a community, or rather amidst such a multitude as this, in which *opinion* is free, and every one is permitted to judge for himself in religious matters, dissensions and controversies can scarcely have place. However a debate, attended with some warmth, arose, in the year 1672, between JOHN. and PAUL BREDENBURG, merchants of *Rotterdam*, on the one side, and ABRAHAM LEMMERMAN and FRANCIS CUIPER, merchants of *Amsterdam*, on the other. JOHN BREDENBURG had erected a particular society, or *college*, in which he gave a course of lectures upon the religion of nature and reason; but this undertaking was highly disapproved of by LEMMERMAN and CUIPER, who were for excluding reason altogether from religious inquiries and pursuits. During the heat of this controversy, BREDENBURG discovered a manifest propensity towards the sentiments of SPINOZA; nay, he even defended them publicly, and yet, at the same time, professed a firm attachment to the Christian religion [z]. Other debates of less consequence arose in this community, and the

[y] See the *Dissertation sur les usages de ceux qu'on appelle en Hollande Collégiens et Rhinobourgeois*, in the *Ceremonies Religieuses des tous les Peuples du Monde*, tom. iv. p. 323.—as also a Dutch book, containing an account of the *Collégiants*, and published by themselves under the following title: *De Oerspronck, Natuur, Handelwoyz en Oogmerk der zo genaamde Ryburgsche Vergadering*, at *Amsterdam*, in 4to. in the year 1736.

[z] The names of JOHN BREDENBURG and FRANCIS CUIPER are well known among the followers and adversaries of SPINOZA; but the character and profession of these two disputants are less generally known. BREDENBURG, or (as he is otherwise called) BREITENBURG, was a *Collégiant*, and a merchant of *Rotterdam*, who propagated in a public manner the doctrine of SPINOZA, and pretended to demon-

CENT. XVII. the effect of those dissensions was a division of  
SECT. II. the *Collegiants* into two parties, which held their  
PART II. assemblies separately at *Rhinberg*. This division  
happened in the year 1686, but it was healed  
about the commencement of the present century,  
by the death of those who had principally occa-  
sioned it; and then the *Collegiants* returned to  
their former union and concord [a].

### III. The

strate mathematically its conformity to the dictates of reason. The same man not only professed Christianity, but moreover explained, recommended, and maintained, the Christian religion in the meetings of the *Collegiants*, and asserted, on all occasions, its divine original. To reconcile these striking contradictions, he declared, on the one hand, that *reason* and *Christianity* were in direct opposition to each other; but maintained, on the other, that we were obliged to believe, even against the evidence of the strongest mathematical demonstrations, the religious doctrines comprehended in the Holy Scriptures (this, indeed, was adding absurdity to absurdity). He affirmed, that *truth* was twofold, *theological* and *philosophical*; and that those propositions, which were false in theology, were true in philosophy. There is a brief, but accurate account, of the character and sentiments of BREDENBURG, in the learned work of the Jew, ISAAC OROBIO, intitled, *Certamen Philosophicum propugnatae veritatis divinae et naturalis adversus JO. BREDENBURGII principia, ex quibus, quod religio rationi repugnat, demonstrare nititur*. This work, which contains BREDENBURG's pretended demonstrations of the philosophy of SPINOZA, was first published in 8vo at *Amsterdam*, in the year 1703, and afterwards in 12mo at *Brussels*, in 1731. FRANCIS CUIPER, who was the antagonist of BREDENBURG, acquired a considerable reputation by his *Arcana Atheismi detecta*, i. e. *The Secrets of Atheism detected*. He was a bookseller at *Amsterdam*; and it was he that published, among other things, the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum seu Unitariorum*. Those who have a tolerable acquaintance with the literary history of this century, know that CUIPER, on account of the very book which he wrote against BREDENBURG, was suspected of Spinozism, though he was a *Collegiant*, and a zealous defender of the Christian faith, as also of the perfect conformity that there is between right reason and true religion. Dr. MOSHEIM said a little before, in the text, that LEMMERMAN and CUIPER were for excluding reason altogether from religion; how then can he consistently say here of the latter, that he was a defender of the conformity that there is between reason and religion?

[a] Besides the authors who have been already mentioned  
those



III. The sect of the *Labbadists* were so called from their founder JOHN LABBADIE, a native of *France*, a man of no mean genius, and remarkable for a natural and masculine eloquence. This man was born in the Romish communion, entered into the order of the Jesuits, and, being dismissed by them [b], became a member of the Reformed church, and performed, with reputation, the ministerial functions in *France*, *Switzerland*, and *Holland*. He at length erected a new community, which resided successively at *Middleburgh* in *Zealand* and at *Amsterdam*. In the year 1670, it was transplanted to *Hervorden*, a town in *Westphalia*, at the particular desire of the Princess ELIZABETH, daughter of the elector *Palatine*, and abbess of *Hervorden* [c]. It was nevertheless driven from thence, notwithstanding the protection of this illustrious princess; and, in the year

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.  
The Labbadists.

those who understand the German language may consult the curious work of SIMON FREDERIC RUES, intitled, *Nachrichten vom Zustande der Mennoniten*, p. 267.

[b] From this expression of our author, some may be led to imagine, that LABBADIE was expelled by the Jesuits from their society; and many have, in effect, entertained this notion. But this is a palpable mistake; and whoever will be at the pains of consulting the letter of the Abbé GOUJET to Father NICERON (published in the *Memoires des Hommes illustres*, tom. xx. p. 142, 143.) will find that LABBADIE had long solicited his discharge from that society, and, after many refusals, obtained it at length in an honourable manner, by a public act signed at *Bordeaux*, by one of the provincials, the 17th of April 1639. For a full account of this restless, turbulent, and visionary man, who, by his plans of reformation, conducted by a zeal destitute of prudence, produced much tumult and disorder, both in the Romish and reformed churches, see his *Life*, composed with learning, impartiality, and judgment, by the Rev. Mr CHAUFFEPED, in his *Supplement to Mr BAYLE*, intitled, *Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*.

[c] This illustrious princess seems to have had as prevailing a taste for fanaticism, as her grandfather King JAMES I. of *England* had for scholastic theology. She carried on a correspondence

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

year 1672, settled at *Altena*, where its founder died two years after his arrival. After the death of LABBADIE, his followers removed their wandering community to *Wiewert*, in the district of *North Holland*, where it found a peaceful retreat, and soon fell into oblivion; so that few, if any traces of it, are now to be found.

Among the persons that became members of this sect, there were some, whose learning and abilities gave it a certain degree of credit and reputation, particularly ANNA MARIA SCHURMAN, of *Utrecht*, whose extensive erudition rendered her so famous, in the republic of letters, during the last century. The members of this community, if we are to judge of them by their own account of things, did not differ from the Reformed church so much in their tenets and doctrines, as in their manners and rules of discipline [*d*]; for their founder exhibited, in his own conduct,  
a most

correspondence with PENN, the famous Quaker, and other members of that extravagant sect. She is, nevertheless, celebrated by certain writers, on account of her application to the study of philosophy and poetry. That a poetical fancy may have rendered her susceptible of fanatical impressions, is not impossible; but how these impressions could be reconciled with a philosophical spirit, is more difficult to imagine.

[*d*] LABBADIE always declared, that he embraced the doctrines of the Reformed church. Nevertheless, when he was called to perform the ministerial functions to a French church at *Middleburgh* in *Zealand*, he refused to subscribe their confession of faith. Besides, if we examine his writings, we shall find that he entertained very odd and singular opinions on various subjects. He maintained, among other things, “ that God might, and did, on certain occasions, deceive men—that the Holy Scripture was not sufficient to lead men to salvation, without certain particular illuminations and revelations from the Holy Ghost—that in reading the Scriptures we ought to give less attention to the literal sense of the words than to the inward suggestions of the spirit, and that the efficacy of the word depended upon him that preached it—that the faithful ought to have all things in common—that there is no subordination or distinction

a most austere model of sanctity and obedience, which his disciples and followers were obliged to imitate; and they were taught to look for the *communion of saints*, not only in the invisible church, but also in a *visible* one, which, according to their views of things, ought to be composed of none but such persons as were distinguished by their sanctity and virtue, and by a pious progress towards perfection. There are still extant several treatises composed by LABBADIE, which sufficiently discover the temper and spirit of the man, and carry the evident marks

“ distinction of rank in the true church of CHRIST—that  
 “ CHRIST was to reign a thousand years upon earth—that  
 “ the *contemplative life* is a state of grace and union with  
 “ God, and the very height of perfection—that the Christian,  
 “ whose mind is contented and calm, sees all things in God,  
 “ enjoys the Deity, and is perfectly indifferent about every  
 “ thing that passes in the world—and that the Christian arrives  
 “ at that happy state by the exercise of a perfect self-denial,  
 “ by mortifying the flesh and all sensual affections, and by  
 “ mental prayer.” Besides these, he had formed singular  
 ideas of the Old and New Testament, considered as covenants,  
 as also concerning the Sabbath and the true nature of a  
 Christian church.

It is remarkable enough, that almost all the sectaries of an enthusiastical turn, were desirous of entering into communion with LABBADIE. The Brownists offered him their church at *Middleburg*, when he was suspended by the French synod from his pastoral functions. The Quakers sent their two leading members ROBERT BARCLAY and GEORGE KEITH to *Amsterdam*, while he resided there, to examine his doctrine; and, after several conferences with him, these two commissioners offered to receive him into their communion, which he refused, probably from a principle of ambition, and the desire of remaining head of a sect. Nay, it is said, that the famous WILLIAM PENN made a second attempt to gain over the Labbadists; and that he went for that purpose to *Wieuwert*, where they resided after the death of their founder, but without success. We do not pretend to answer for the certainty of these facts; but shall only observe, that they are related by MOLLERUS in his *Cimbria Literata*, on the authority of a MS. Journal, of which several extracts have been given by JOACH. FRED. FELLER, in his *Trimest. ix Monumentorum ineditorum*, sect. iii. A. 1717. p. 498—500.

CENT.  
XVII.  
SECT. II.  
PART II.

of a lively and glowing imagination, that was not tempered by the influence of a sober and accurate judgment. And as persons of this character are sometimes carried, by the impetuosity of passion and the seduction of fancy, both into erroneous notions and licentious pursuits, we are not perhaps to reject, in consequence of an excessive charity, the testimonies of those who have found many things worthy of censure, both in the life and doctrine of this turbulent enthusiast [e].

Bourignon  
and Poirer.

IV. Among the fanatical contemporaries of LABBADIE, was the famous ANTOINETTE BOURIGNON DE LA PORTE, a native of *Flanders*, who pretended to be divinely inspired, and set apart, by a particular interposition of Heaven, to revive the true spirit of Christianity, that had been extinguished by theological animosities and debates. This female enthusiast, whose religious feelings were accompanied with an unparalleled vivacity and ardor, and whose fancy was exuberant beyond all expression, joined to these qualities a volubility of tongue, less wonderful indeed, yet much adapted to seduce the unwary. Furnished with these useful talents, she began to propagate her theological system, and her enthusiastical notions made a great noise in *Flanders*, *Holland*, and some parts of *Germany*, where she had resided some years. Nor was it only the ignorant multitude that swallowed down with facility her visionary doctrines; since it is well known that several learned and ingenious men were persuaded of their truth, and caught the

[e] See MOLLERUS's *Cimbria Literata*, tom. iii. p. 35. & *Isagoge ad Hist. Cbesones. Cimbricæ*, p. ii. cap. v. p. 121.—ARNOLD, *Hist. Ecclesiast.* vol. i. p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. xxi. p. 1186.—WEISMAN, *Hist. Eccles. Sæc. xvii.* p. 297.—For an account of the two famous companions of LABBADIE, viz. DU LIGNON and YVON, see MOLLERUS's *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 472. 1020.

contagion of her fanaticism. After experiencing various turns of fortune, and suffering much vexation and mockeries on account of her religious fancies, she ended her days at *Franeker*, in the province of *Frießland*, in the year 1680. Her writings were voluminous; but it would be a fruitless attempt to endeavour to draw from them an accurate and consistent scheme of religion. For the pretended *divine light*, that guides people of this class, does not proceed in a methodical way of reasoning and argument; it discovers itself by flashes, which shed nothing but thick darkness in the minds of those who investigate truth with the understanding, and do not trust to the reports of fancy, that is so often governed by sense and passion. An attentive reader will, however, learn something by perusing the writings of this fanatical virgin; he will be persuaded, that her intellect must have been in a disordered state; that the greatest part of her *divine effusions* were borrowed from the productions of the Mystics; and that, by the intemperance of her imagination, she has given an additional air of extravagance and absurdity to the tenets she has derived from these pompous enthusiasts. If we attend to the main and predominant principle that reigns throughout the incoherent productions of BOURIGNON, we shall find it to be the following: *That the Christian religion neither consists in knowledge nor in practice, but in a certain internal feeling and divine impulse, that arises immediately from communion with the Deity* [f.] Among the more considerable patrons of this fana-

[f] See for an ample account of BOURIGNON, the following writers: MOLLER. *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 85. — *Introductio in Histor. Chersensis Cimbricæ*, p. ii. p. 151. — BAYLE'S *Dictionnaire*, tom. i. at the article BOURIGNON. — ARNOLD, *Historia Eccles. et Hæret.* vol. ii. See also POIRET'S *Epist. de Auctoribus Mysticis*, sect. xiv. p. 565. This treatise of POIRET is inserted at the end of his book, *De Eruditione Solida & Superficiaria*, vol. ii. edit. 4to.

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

---

tical doctrine, we may reckon CHRISTIAN BARTHOLOMEW DE CORDT, a Janfenist, and priest of the oratory at *Mecklin*, who died at *Nordstrand*, in the dutchy of *Sleswick* [g]; and PETER POIRET, a man of a bold and penetrating genius, who was a great master of the Cartesian philosophy [b]. This latter has shewn, in a striking manner, by his own example, that knowledge and ignorance, reason and superstition, are often divided by thin partitions; and that they sometimes not only dwell together in the same person, but also, by an unnatural and unaccountable union, lend each other mutual assistance, and thus engender monstrous productions.

The Phila-  
delphian  
Society.

V. The same spirit, the same views, and the same kind of religion, that distinguished BOURIGNON, were observable in an English, and also a female fanatic, named JANE LEADLEY, who, towards the conclusion of this century, seduced by her visions, predictions, and doctrines, a considerable number of disciples, among whom there were some persons of learning; and thus gave rise to what was called the *Philadelphian Society*. This woman was of opinion that all dissensions among Christians would cease, and the kingdom of the Redeemer become, even here below, a glorious scene of charity, concord, and felicity, if those who bear the name of JESUS, without regarding the forms of doctrine or discipline that distinguish particular communions, would all join in committing their souls to the care of the

[g] MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 149.

[b] POIRET dressed out in an artful manner, and reduced to a kind of system, the wild and incoherent fancies of BOURIGNON, in his large work, intitled, *L'Oeconomie Divine, ou Systeme Universel*, which was published, both in French and Latin, at *Amsterdam*, in the year 1686, in seven volumes 8vo.—For an account of this Mythic philosopher, whose name and voluminous writings have made such a noise, see *Bibliotheca Brem. Theolog. Philol.* tom. iii. p. i. p. 75.

*internal guide*, to be instructed, governed, and formed by his divine impulse and suggestions. Nay, she went still further, and declared in the name of the Lord, that this desirable event would happen; and that she had a divine commission to proclaim the approach of this glorious communion of saints, who were to be gathered together in one visible universal church, or kingdom, before the dissolution of this earthly globe. This prediction she delivered with a peculiar degree of confidence, from a notion that her Philadelphian society was the true *kingdom of CHRIST*, in which alone the divine spirit resided and reigned. We shall not mention the other dreams of this enthusiast, among which the famous doctrine of the final restoration of all intelligent Beings to perfection and happiness held an eminent place. LEADLEY was less fortunate than BOURIGNON in this respect, that she had not such an eloquent and ingenious patron as POIRET to plead her cause, and to give an air of philosophy to her wild reveries. For PORDAGE and BROMLEY, who were the chief of her associates, had nothing to recommend them but their Mystic piety and contemplative turn of mind. PORDAGE, more especially, was so far destitute of the powers of elocution and reasoning, that he even surpassed JACOB BOEHMEN, whom he admired, in obscurity and nonsense; and, instead of imparting instruction to his readers, did no more than excite in them a stupid kind of awe by a high-sounding jingle of pompous words [i].

[i] See JO. WOLF. JAEGERI *Historia Sacra et Civilis, Sæc. xvii. Decem. x.* p. 90.—PETRI POIRETI *Bibliotheca Mysticor.* p. 161. 174. 283. 286.

