

This material is in the public domain.

Bibliotheca Symbolica Urbis Universitatis

THE CREEDS OF CHRISTENDOM,

WITH

A HISTORY AND CRITICAL NOTES.

BY

PHILIP SCHAEFF, D.D., LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, N. Y.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

SIXTH EDITION—REVISED AND ENLARGED.

VOLUME I.

THE HISTORY OF CREEDS.

LIBRARY

BOB JONES UNIVERSITY
GREENVILLE, S. C.

NEW YORK AND LONDON:
HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS,

238
Sch 14
Vol. 1
cop. 3

440421

Dutch Church of America is made from the Latin text of the Synod of Dort.

§ 65. THE ARMINIAN CONTROVERSY. A.D. 1604-1619.

Literature.

I. ARMINIAN SOURCES.

Scripta aduersaria COLLATIONIS HAGENSIS. In Dutch. Gravehage, 1619; in Latin, by Petrus Bertius Leyden, 1616. This contains the authentic text of the Remonstrance.

REMONSTRANTIA, or the Five Articles of 1610. A German translation in Böckel's *Evang. Reform. Bekenntnis-Schriften*. Leipzig, 1841, pp. 545-553.

SIXON EPISCOPUS (Prof. at Leyden, 1619; expelled by the Synod of Dort, 1618; Prof. at the Remonstrant Seminary, 1624; d. 1645): *Confessio seu Declaratio Pastorum qui Remonstrantes vocantur*, etc., Hardewijk, 1621 in Dutch, 1622 in Latin (German transl. in Böckel, l. c. pp. 572-640). Also his *Apologia pro Confessione Remonstr.*, 1629. Both are included in the works of Episcopus, 2d ed. London, 1678, vol. II. Part II. pp. 69 sqq.; 95 sqq.

ACTA ET SCRIPTA SYNODALIA DOMINICORUM REMONSTRANTUM *in fœderata Belgio*. 2 Cor. xlii. s. Hardewijk, 1620. This volume (a copy of which is in the Union Theol. Seminary Library) contains the official acts and dogmatic writings of the Remonstrants in explanation and defense of their five articles against the decisions of the Synod of Dort, including a lengthy exposition of the ninth chapter of Romans and other Scripture passages quoted against them.

JAC. AKKINUS (1600-1606): *Disputationes publicæ et private*. Lugd. Bat. 1614, 2d ed. (with the *Oratio Petri Berti de vita et obitu Arminii*). Amst. Opera, Lugd. Bat. 1629, and other editions. English translation of *The Works of James Akkinus*, by James Nichols and William Nichols. London, 1825, 1828, and 1875, 3 vols.

Also the writings of EPISCOPUS (d. 1643); GEORGIUS (d. 1645); LIMBORGH (d. 1714); GRÆGORUS (d. 1736); WYSTRICH (d. 1753), and other distinguished Arminian scholars. Comp. A. VAN CARTERWIJK: *Bibliotheca Scripturorum Remonstrantium*. Amst. 1738.

II. ANTI-ARMINIAN OR CALVINISTIC SOURCES.

The Acts and Proceedings of the NATIONAL SYNOD OF DORT: *Acta Synodi Nationalis, in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, autoritate ordinum generalium Frederici Belgii provinciarum, Dordrecht habitæ anno 1618 et 1619. Accedunt plenissima de quinque articulis theologicorum judiciorum*. Dord. 1620, 4to. (The *judicia theologorum* are omitted in the Elzevir folio ed. of the same date.)

The Suffrage of the Deputies of Great Britain concerning the Articles of the Synod of Dort, signed by them in 1619 [? Lond. 1621].

Reports of BERTHEGGER, the Hessian, and other foreign delegates.

III. HISTORICAL AND CONTROVERSIAL.

P. MORIZIUS (Calvinist): *Andeone Arminianismi*. Leyden, 1619, etc.

N. V. ERAS (Calv.): *Arceus Arminianismi*. Leyden, 1632-34, 4 Paris, 4to.

PETRUS: *Harmonia Remonstrantium et Socinianorum*. Lugd. 1638.

BYSSER: *De prædicatione contra Remonstrantes et Jesuitas*. Gorhnm, 1660.

SAM. RHECTORIUS: *Præsen Arminianismi*. Utrecht, 1668.

JANUS UYENHOEFFER (Arminian): *Kerkelycke Historie*, etc. Rotterdam, 1647.

JAC. THEGELANDUS (Calvinist): *Kerkelycke Geschiednisse van de werren, Nederlanden*. Leyden, 1650.

JO. HANSEN *Historia Conclitii Dordrecht*; *J. L. Moskemia veris, veris observationibus et vita Helastiæ*. Hamburg, 1724. John Hales (1684-1686), Canon of Windsor—called 'the Ever-memorable'—attended the Synod of Dort, by which he became a convert to Arminianism, and wrote *Golden Reminiscences; Letters from the Synod of Dort; Acta Synodi Dordt*; *Sententia Arminii*; see *Works*, 1763, 3 vols.

PETER HEYRIUS (a friend of Land and Arminian, d. 1669): *Historia quinquagintaarticulæ, or, a Declaration of the Judgment of the Western Churches, and more particularly of the Church of England, in the Five Controversial Points, reproached in these last times by the name of Arminianism*. London, 1660, in 3 Paris.

GERHARD BRANDT (Remonstrant preacher at Amsterdam, d. 1689): *Historie der Reformatie* (History of the Reformation) *in and about the Low Countries, from the Eighth Century down to the Synod of Dort*, Amst., 1671-1704, 4 vols. Very full on the Remonstrant controversy. An English translation, by *Graham Blair*, London, 1720-23, 4 vols. fol. (The last volume gives the history from 1600 to 1623.) Also in French, 1726.

ZERUSIA (d. 1738): *Brevitium controversiarum cum Remonstrantibus agitatarum*. Norimb. and Altdorf, 1719.

JAC. REEKBROEG: *Hist. der Remonstranten*, in Dutch. Amsterd. 1774 sqq., 3 vols.; in German, Lemgo, 1741-84.

G. S. FALKNER: *Historia dogmatum Arminianorum*. Kiel, 1814.

THOMAS SCOTT: *The Articles of the Synod of Dort; with a History of Events which made way for that Synod*, etc. London, 1818. [Calvinist.]

JAMES NEVENS (Arminian): *Calvinism and Arminianism compared in their Principles and Tendency*. Lond. 1824, 2 vols. (An ill-digested mass of materials.)

M. GARF: *Betracht zur Geschichte der Synode von Dordrecht*. Basle, 1825.

D. DE BRAU: *Historie de l'Église Arminienne*. Strasbourg, 1825.

JOHANNES TIDEMAN (Remonstrant preacher at Rotterdam): *De Remonstrantie en het Remonstrantisme*. *Hofschied onderzoek*. Te Haarlem, 1821 (pp. 131).

H. HERR (Melancthonian): *Historia Synodi Næd. Dordt*, in Niehner's *Zeitschrift für hist. Theol.*, 1823, pp. 297-327. Contains the Report of the Hessian deputies to Landgrave Moritz, with Introduction and Notes. The same: *Art. Dordrecht* in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* Vol. III. p. 486.

ALEX. SCHWEIZER: *Centraldogmen*. Zurich, Vol. II. (1856) pp. 31-201.

G. FALKNER: *Geschichte der Protest. Theol.* Leipzig, 1822, Vol. I. pp. 408 sqq.

M. SONNENKREUZER (independent, d. 1848): *Vorlesungen über die Lehrbegriffe der kleineren protest. Kirchenordnungen*, ed. by Handeshagen. Frankf. a. M. 1823, pp. 5-26.

WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM (Calvinist): *Historical Theology*. Edinb. 1824, Vol. II. ch. xxv. pp. 37-513.

E. BÖHR: (Calvinist): *Bücher der Entwerfung an der Dordrechter Synode, 250 Jahre nach ihrem Zusammenritt* *allen Freunden der reform. Lehre gewidmet*. Darmstadt, 1868 (41 pp.).

JOHN L. MOTLEY: *The Life and Death of John of Barneveld, Advocate of Holland*. N. Y. 1874, 2 vols., obs. vii. and xiv. Motley gives the political history of the period, but barely touches on the Synod of Dort, and with strong antipathy to Calvinism.

Comp. also WHEBON (Methodist), art. *Arminianism*, and A. A. HOBBS (Presbyterian), *Calvinism*, both in Johnson's *Cyclop.* Vol. I. (1874), representing both sides. Also art. *Arminianism*, in M. Gilmore and Strong's *Cyclop.* Vol. I. p. 412 (Methodist).

The Arminian controversy is the most important which took place within the Reformed Church. It corresponds to the Pelagian and the Jansenist controversies in the Catholic Church. It involves the problem of ages, which again and again has baffled the ken of theologians and philosophers, and will do so to the end of time: the relation of divine sovereignty and human responsibility. It started with the doctrine of predestination, and turned round five articles or 'knotty points' of Calvinism; hence the term 'quinguentular' controversy. Calvinism represented the consistent, logical, conservative orthodoxy; Arminianism an elastic, progressive, changing liberalism. Calvinism triumphed in the Synod of Dort, and excluded Arminianism. So, in the preceding generation, strict Lutheranism had triumphed over Melancthonianism in the Formula of Concord. But in both Churches the spirit of the conquered party rose again from time to time within the ranks of orthodoxy, to exert its moderating and liberalizing influence or to open new issues in the progressive march of theological science.

ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF ARMINIANISM TILL 1618.

The Arminian controversy arose in Holland towards the close of the heroic conflict with foreign political and ecclesiastical despotism. This very contest of forty-five years' duration, so full of trials and afflictions, stimulated the intellectual and moral energies of an honest, earnest, freedom-loving, and tenacious people, and made the Protest-

ant part of the Netherlands the first country in Christendom for industry, commerce, education, and culture. The Universities of Leyden, founded in 1575, as the city's reward for its heroic resistance to Spain, Franeker (1585), Groningen (1612), Utrecht (1636), and Harderwyk (1648) soon excelled older schools of learning. The general prosperity of the United Provinces excited the admiration of the foreign delegates to the Synod of Dort, where they found clean and stately mansions, generous hospitality, and every comfort and luxury which commerce could bring from all parts of the earth. This was the soil on which the Calvinistic system was brought to its severest test. The controversy was purely theological in its nature, but owing to the intimate connection of Church and State it became inevitably entangled in political issues, and shook the whole country. The Reformed Churches in France, Switzerland, Germany, England, and Scotland took a deep interest in it, and sided, upon the whole, with the Calvinistic party; while the Lutheran Church sympathized to some extent with the Arminian.

The founder of Arminianism, from whom it derives its name, is James Arminius (1560-1609).¹ He studied under Beza at Geneva, was elected minister at Amsterdam (1588), and then professor of theology at Leyden (1603), as successor of Francis Junius, who had taken part in the revision of the Belgic Confession. He was at first a strict Calvinist, but while engaged in investigating and defending the Calvinistic doctrines against the writings of Dirk Volckaerts zoon Koornheert,² at the request of the magistrate of Amsterdam, he found the arguments of the opponent stronger than his own convictions, and became a convert to the doctrine of universal grace and of the freedom of will. He saw in the seventh chapter of Romans the description of a legalistic conflict of the awakened but unregenerate man, while Ar-

gustine and the Reformers referred it to the regenerate. He denied the decree of reprobation, and moderated the doctrine of original sin. He advocated a revision of the Belgic Confession and Heidelberg Catechism. He came into open conflict with his supralapsarian colleague, Francis Gomar (1563-1645), who had conferred on him the degree of doctor of divinity, but now became his chief antagonist. Hence the strict Calvinists were called 'Gomarists.' The controversy soon spread over all Holland. Arminius applied to the Government to convoke a synod (appealing, like the Donatists, to the very power which afterwards condemned him), but died of a painful disorder before it convened.¹ He was a learned and able divine; and during the controversy which embittered his life he showed a meek, Christian spirit. 'Condemned by others,' said Grotius, 'he condemned none.' His views on anthropology and soteriology approached those of the Melancthonian school in the Lutheran Church, but the tendency of his theology was towards a latitudinarian liberalism, which developed itself in his followers.²

After his death the learned Simon Episcopius (Bisshop, 1583-1644), his successor in the chair of theology at Leyden, afterwards professor in the Arminian College at Amsterdam,³ and the eloquent Janus Uytenbogaert (1557-1644), preacher at the Hague, and for some time chaplain of Prince Maurice, became the theological leaders of the Arminian party. The great statesman, John van Olden Barneveldt (1549-1619), Advocate-General of Holland and Friesland, and Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), the most comprehensive scholar of his age, equally distinguished as statesman, jurist, theologian, and exegete, sympathized with the Arminians, gave them the weight of their powerful influence,

¹ In the same year (1609) the Pilgrim Fathers of New England arrived in Leyden, where they enjoyed religious freedom till their departure for America (1620). Arminius was born in the same year in which Melancthon died (1560).

² Caspar Brandt: *Historia vite J. Armini*, ed. by Gerhard Brandt (son of the author), with additions by Moshelm, 1725; Engl. transl. by Guthrie, Lond. 1854. Bangs's *Life of Arminius*, N. York, 1843. Moshelm calls him 'a man whom even his enemies commend for his ingenuity, acuteness, and piety.' His motto was, 'A good conscience is a paradise.' In his testament (see extract in Gieselser, Vol. IV. p. 508, note 7), he affirms that he diligently labored to teach nothing but what he could prove from the Scriptures, and what tended to edification and peace among Christians, excepting popery, 'with which,' he says, 'there can be no unity of faith, no bond of piety and peace.' Grotius was much milder towards the Catholics.

³ Limborch: *Vita Episcopii*. Amst. 1701

¹ His Dutch name is Jacob van Hermans or Hermanson, Harmensen.

² Koornheert was Secretarius at Haarlem, and a forerunner of the Remonstrants (d. 1500). He attacked the doctrine of Calvin and Beza on predestination and the punishment of heretics (1578), wrote against the Heidelberg Catechism (1583), and advocated toleration and a reduction of the number of articles of faith. His works were published at Amsterdam, 1630. See Bayle, art. *Koornheert*, and Schweizer, Vol. II. p. 40. Another forerunner of Arminianism was Caspar Koolhaas, preacher in Leyden, who was protected by the civil magistrate, but excommunicated by a provincial Synod at Haarlem, 1582. It should be remembered also that Erasmus, the advocate of free-will, against Luther, was held in high esteem in his native country, and that the views of Castellio, Bolsec, and Huber had made some impression.

and advocated peace and toleration; but they favored a republican confederacy of States rather than a federal State tending to monarchy, against the ambitious designs of Maurice, the Stadtholder and military leader of the Republic, who wished to consolidate his power, and by concluding a truce with Spain (1609) they incurred the suspicion of disloyalty.¹ The Calvinists were the national and popular party, and embraced the great majority of the clergy. They stood on the solid basis of the recognized standards of doctrine. At the same time they advocated the independent action of the Church against the latitudinarian Erastianism of their opponents.

The Arminians formulated their creed in Five Articles (drawn up by Uytendogaert), and laid them before the representatives of Holland and West Friesland in 1610 under the name of *Remonstrance*, signed by forty-six ministers. The Calvinists issued a *Counter-Remonstrance*. Hence the party names *Remonstrants* (Protestants against Calvinism), and *Counter-Remonstrants* (Calvinists, or Gomarists). A Conference was held between the two parties at the Hague (*Colloquium Hagensesis*) in 1611, but without leading to an agreement. A discussion at Delft, 1613, and the edict of the States of Holland in favor of peace, 1614, prepared by Grotius, had no better result.

THE SYNOD OF DORT.

At last, after a great deal of controversy and complicated preparations, the National Synod of Dort² was convened by the States-General, Nov. 13, 1618, and lasted till May 9, 1619. It consisted of eighty-four members and eighteen secular commissioners. Of these fifty-eight were Dutchmen, the rest foreigners. The foreign Reformed Churches were invited to send at least three or four divines each, with the right to vote.

James I. of England sent Drs. George Carleton, Bishop of Llandaff (afterwards of Chichester); John Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury; Samuel Ward, Professor of Cambridge; the celebrated Joseph Hall, afterwards Bishop of Exeter and Norwich (who, however, had to leave

before the close, and was replaced by Thomas Goad), and Walter Ballcangnall, a Scotchman, and chaplain of the King. The Palatinate was represented by Drs. Abraham Scultetus, Henry Alting, Professors at Heidelberg, and Paulus Tossanus; Hesse, by Drs. George Crueiger, Paul Stein, Daniel Angelocrotor, and Rudolph Goelenius; Switzerland, by Dr. John Jacob Breiniger, Antistes of Zurich, Sebastian Beck and Wolfgang Meyer of Basle, Marcus Rutimeyer of Berne, John Conrad Koch of Schaffhausen, John Deodatus and Theodor Tronchin of Geneva; Bremen, by Mathias Martinus, Henry Isselburg, and Ludwig Crocius. The Elector of Brandenburg chose delegates, but excused their absence on account of age. The national Synod of France elected four delegates—among them the celebrated theologians Chammier and Du Moulin—but the King forbade them to leave the country. King James instructed the English delegates to 'mitigate the heat on both sides,' and to advise the Dutch ministers 'not to deliver in the pulpit to the people those things for ordinary doctrines which are the highest points of schools and not fit for vulgar capacity, but disputable on both sides.'

The Synod was opened and closed with great solemnity, and held one hundred and fifty-four formal sessions, besides a larger number of conferences.² The expenses were borne by the States-General on a very liberal scale, and exceeded 100,000 guilders.³ The sessions were public, and crowded by spectators. John Bogerman, pastor at Leuwarden, was elected President; Festus Hominius, pastor in Leyden, first Secretary—both strict Calvinists. The former had translated Beza's tract on the punishment of heretics into Dutch; the latter prepared a new Latin version of the Belgic Confession. The whole Dutch delegation was orthodox. Only three delegates from the provincial Synod of Utrecht were Remonstrants, but these had to yield their seats to the three orthodox members elected by the minority in that province. Gomarns represented supralapsarian Calvinism, but the great majority were infralapsarians or sublapsarians.

Thus the fate of the Arminians was decided beforehand. Episcopians and his friends—thirteen in all—were summoned before the Synod simply as defendants, and protested against unconditional submission.

¹ On Barmenweidt, see the work of Motley; on Hugo Grotius, the monograph of Luden, Berlin, 1806.

² In Dutch, Dordrecht or Dordrecht; in Latin, Dordracum—an old fortified town in which the independence of the United Provinces was declared in 1572.

¹ See the nine instructions of James to the delegates, in Fuller, *Ch. H. of Brit.*, Vol. V., p. 462.

² The Dutch delegates held twenty-two additional sessions on Church government.

³ The five English delegates were allowed the largest sum, viz., ten pounds sterling per day—more than any other foreign divines.—Fuller, l. c. p. 465.

Orthodox Calvinism achieved a complete triumph. The Five Articles of the Remonstrance were unanimously rejected, and five Calvinistic canons adopted, together with the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism. A thorough and most excellent revision of the Dutch Bible from the Hebrew and Greek was also ordered, besides other decisions which lie beyond our purpose.

The victory of orthodoxy was obscured by the succeeding deposition of about two hundred Arminian clergymen, and by the preceding though independent arrest of the political leaders of the Remonstrants, at the instigation of Maurice. Grotius was condemned by the States-General to perpetual imprisonment, but escaped through the ingenuity of his wife (1621). Van Olden Barneveldt was unjustly condemned to death for alleged high-treason, and beheaded at the Hague (May 14, 1619). His sons took revenge in a fruitless attempt against the life of Prince Maurice.

The canons of Dort were fully indorsed by the Reformed Church in France, and made binding upon the ministers at the Twenty-third National Synod at Alais, Oct. 1, 1620, and again at the Twenty-fourth Synod at Charenton, Sept., 1623. In other Reformed Churches they were received with respect, but not clothed with proper symbolical authority. In England there arose considerable opposition.¹ The only Church outside of Holland where they are still recognized as a public standard of doctrine is the Reformed Dutch Church in America.

The Synod of Dort is the only Synod of a quasi-ecumenical character in the history of the Reformed Churches. In this respect it is even more important than the Westminster Assembly of Divines, which was confined to England and Scotland, although it produced superior doctrinal standards. The judgments of the Synod of Dort differ according to the doctrinal stand-point. It was undoubtedly an imposing assembly; and, for learning and piety, as respectable as any ever held since the days of the Apostles. Breitingcr, a great light of the Swiss Churches, was astonished at the amount of knowledge and talent displayed by the Dutch delegates, and says that if ever the Holy Spirit were present in a Council, he was present at Dort. Scultetus, of the Palatinate, thanked God that he was a member of that Synod, and

¹ See Hardwick's *History of the Thirty-nine Articles*, ch. ix., and Heylin's *Historia Quærenticularis*.

placed it high above similar assemblies. Meyer, a delegate of Basle, whenever afterwards he spoke of this Synod, uncovered his head and exclaimed '*Sacro-sancta Synodus!*' Even Paolo Sarpi, the liberal Catholic historian, in a letter to Heinsius, spoke very highly of it. A century later, the celebrated Dutch divine, Campegius Ytringa, said: 'So much learning was never before assembled in one place, not even at Trent?'

On the other hand, the Remonstrants, who had no fair hearing, abhorred the Synod of Dort on account of its Calvinism and intolerance. The Lutherans were averse to it under the false impression that the condemnation of Arminianism was aimed at their own creed. Some secular historians denounce it as a Calvinistic tribunal of inquisition.²

The Canons of Dort have for Calvinism the same significance which the Formula of Concord has for Lutheranism. Both betray a very high order of theological ability and care. Both are consistent and necessary developments. Both exerted a powerful conservative influence on these Churches. Both prepared the way for a dry scholasticism which runs into subtle abstractions, and resolves the living soul of divinity into a skeleton of formulas and distinctions. Both consolidated orthodoxy at the expense of freedom, sanctioned a narrow confessionism, and widened the breach between the two branches of the Reformation.

ARMINIANISM AFTER THE SYNOD OF DORT.

The banishment of the Arminians was of short duration. After the death of Prince Maurice of Nassau (1625), and under the reign of his milder brother and successor, Frederick Henry, they were allowed to return and to establish churches and schools in every town of Holland, which became more and more a land of religious toleration and liberty. In this respect their principles triumphed over their opponents.³ They

¹ Schweizer, Vol. II. pp. 26, 148 sq.; also, Graf and Böhl, l. c.

² Motley (*Life and Death of John of Barneveldt*, Vol. II. p. 309) caricatures the Synod of Dort in a manner unworthy of an impartial historian. 'It was settled,' he said, 'that one portion of the Netherlands and of the rest of the human race had been expressly created by the Deity to be forever damned, and another portion to be eternally blessed. . . . On the 30th April and 1st May the Netherland Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism were declared *infulle*.'

³ Hugo Grotius carried the principle of toleration so far that it was said Socinus, Luther, Calvin, Arminius, the Pope, and Arius contended for his religion as seven cities for the birth of the divine Homer. See the verse of Menage, quoted by G. Frank, *Geschichte der Protest. Theologie*, Vol. I. p. 410.

founded a famous Theological College at Amsterdam (1630), which exists to this day, and has recently been removed to Leyden.

Peace was not so favorable to their growth as controversy. They gradually diminished in number, and are now a very small sect in Holland, almost confined to Rotterdam and Amsterdam.

But their literary and religious influence has gone far beyond their organization. Their eminent scholars, Hugo Grotius, Episcopius, Limborch, Curcellæus, Clericus (Le Clerc), and Wetstein, have enriched exegetical and critical learning, and liberalized theological opinions, especially on religious toleration and the salvation of unbaptized infants. Arminianism, in some of its advocates, had a leaning towards Socinianism, and prepared the way for Rationalism, which prevailed to a great extent in the Established Churches of Holland, Geneva, and Germany from the end of the last century till the recent reaction in favor of orthodox Calvinism and Lutheranism. But many Arminians adhered to the original position of a moderated semi-Pelagianism.

The distinctive Arminian doctrines of sin and grace, free-will and predestination, have been extensively adopted in the Episcopal Church since the reign of Charles I., and in the last century by the Methodists of Great Britain and America, and thereby have attained a larger territory and influence than they ever had in the land of their birth.¹ Methodism holds to the essential doctrines of the Reformation, but also to the five points of Arminianism, with some important evangelical modifications.

§ 66. THE REMONSTRANCE.

The Arminian or quinquarticular controversy started with opposition to the doctrine of absolute decrees, and moved in the sphere of anthropology and soteriology. The peculiar tenets are contained in the five points or articles which the Arminians in their 'Remonstrance' laid before the estates of Holland in 1610. They relate to predestination, the extent of the atonement, the nature of faith, the resistibility of grace, and the perseverance of saints.

The Remonstrance is first negative, and then positive. It rejects

¹ The Wesleys were Arminians, while Whitefield was a Calvinist. They separated on the question of predestination.

five Calvinistic propositions, and then asserts the five Arminian propositions. The doctrines rejected are thus stated :

1. That God has, before the fall, and even before the creation of man, by an unchangeable decree, foreordained some to eternal life and others to eternal damnation, without any regard to righteousness or sin, to obedience or disobedience, and simply because it so pleased him, in order to show the glory of his righteousness to the one class and his mercy to the other. (This is the supralapsarian view.)

2. That God, in view of the fall, and in just condemnation of our first parents and their posterity, ordained to exempt a part of mankind from the consequences of the fall, and to save them by his free grace, but to leave the rest, without regard to age or moral condition, to their condemnation, for the glory of his righteousness. (The sublapsarian view.)

3. That Christ died, not for all men, but only for the elect.

4. That the Holy Spirit works in the elect by irresistible grace, so that they *must* be converted and be saved ; while the grace necessary and sufficient for conversion, faith, and salvation is withheld from the rest, although they are externally called and invited by the revealed will of God.

5. That those who have received this irresistible grace can never totally and finally lose it, but are guided and preserved by the same grace to the end.

These doctrines, the Remonstrants declare, are not contained in the Word of God nor in the Heidelberg Catechism, and are unedifying, yea dangerous, and should not be preached to Christian people.

Then the Remonstrance sets forth the five positive articles as follows :

ARTICLE FIRST.

Conditional Predestination.—God has immutably decreed, from eternity, to save those men who, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, believe in Jesus Christ, and by the same grace persevere in the obedience of faith to the end ; and, on the other hand, to condemn the unbelievers and unconverted (John iii. 36).

Election and condemnation are thus conditioned by foreknowledge, and made dependent on the foreseen faith or unbelief of men.

SECOND ARTICLE.

Universal Atonement.—Christ, the Saviour of the world, died for all men and for every man, and his grace is extended to all. His atoning sacrifice is in and of itself sufficient for the redemption of the whole world, and is intended for all by God the Father. But its inherent sufficiency does not necessarily imply its actual efficiency. The grace of God may be resisted, and only those who accept it by faith are actually saved. He who is lost, is lost by his own guilt (John iii. 16; 1 John ii. 2).

The Arminians agree with the orthodox in holding the doctrine of a vicarious or expiatory atonement, in opposition to the Socinians; but they soften it down, and represent its direct effect to be to enable God, consistently with his justice and veracity, to enter into a new covenant with men, under which pardon is conveyed to all men on condition of repentance and faith. The immediate effect of Christ's death was not the salvation, but only the salvability of sinners by the removal of the legal obstacles, and opening the door for pardon and reconciliation. They reject the doctrine of a *limited* atonement, which is connected with the supralapsarian view of predestination, but is disowned by moderate Calvinists, who differ from the Arminians in all other points. Calvin himself says that Christ died *sufficiens pro omnibus, efficaciter pro electis*.

THIRD ARTICLE.

Saving Faith.—Man in his fallen state is unable to accomplish anything really and truly good, and therefore also unable to attain to saving faith, unless he be regenerated and renewed by God in Christ through the Holy Spirit (John xv. 5).

FOURTH ARTICLE.

Resistible Grace.—Grace is the beginning, continuation, and end of our spiritual life, so that man can neither think nor do any good or resist sin without preventing, co-operating, and assisting grace. But as for the manner of co-operation, this grace is not irresistible, for many resist the Holy Ghost (Acts vii.).

FIFTH ARTICLE.

The Uncertainty of Perseverance.—Although grace is sufficient and abundant to preserve the faithful through all trials and temptations for life everlasting, it has not yet been proved from the Scriptures that grace, once given, can never be lost.

On this point the disciples of Arminius went further, and taught the possibility of a total and final fall of believers from grace. They appealed to such passages where believers are warned against this very danger, and to such examples as Solomon and Judas. They moreover denied, with the Roman Catholics, that any body can have a certainty of salvation except by special revelation.

These five points the Remonstrants declare to be in harmony with the Word of God, edifying and, as far as they go, sufficient for salvation. They protest against the charge of changing the Christian Reformed religion, and claim toleration and legal protection for their doctrine.

§ 67. THE CANONS OF DORT.

The Canons of Dort are likewise confined to five points or 'Heads of Doctrine,' and exhibit what is technically called the Calvinistic system—first positively, then negatively, in the rejection of the Arminian errors.¹ Each Head of Doctrine (subdivided into Articles) is subscribed by the Dutch and foreign delegates.

FIRST HEAD OF DOCTRINE.

Of Divine Predestination.—Since all men sinned in Adam and lie under the curse [according to the Augustinian system held by all the Reformers], God would have done no injustice if he had left them to their merited punishment; but in his infinite mercy he provided a salvation through the gospel of Christ, that those who believe in him may not perish, but have eternal life. That some receive the gift of faith from God and others not, proceeds from God's eternal decree of election and reprobation.

¹ The term '*rejectio errorum*,' instead of *condemnation* and *anathemas* of the Greek and Roman Churches in dealing with heresies, indicates that Protestant orthodoxy is more liberal and charitable than the Catholic.

Election is the unchangeable purpose of God whereby, before the foundation of the world, he has, out of mere grace, according to the sovereign good pleasure of his own will, chosen from the whole human race, which has fallen through their own fault from their primitive state of rectitude into sin and destruction, a certain number of persons to redemption in Christ, whom he from eternity appointed the Mediator and Head of the elect, and the foundation of salvation. These elect, though neither better nor more deserving than others, God has decreed to give to Christ to be saved by him, and bestow upon them true faith, conversion, justification and sanctification, perseverance to the end, and final glory (Eph. i. 4, 5, 6; Rom. viii. 30).

Election is absolute and unconditional. It is not founded upon foreseen faith and holiness, as the prerequisite condition on which it depended; on the contrary, it is the fountain of faith, holiness, and eternal life itself. God has chosen us, not *because* we are holy, but to the *end* that we should be holy (Eph. i. 4; Rom. ix. 11-13; Acts xiii. 38). As God is unchangeable, so his election is unchangeable, and the elect can neither be cast away nor their number be diminished. The sense and certainty of election is a constant stimulus to humility and gratitude.

The non-elect are simply left to the just condemnation of their own sins. This is the decree of reprobation, which by no means makes God the author of sin (the very thought of which is blasphemy), but declares him to be an awful, irreprehensible, and righteous judge and avenger (*Cal. Ch. I. Art. 15*).

SECOND HEAD OF DOCTRINE.

Of the Death of Christ. [Limited Atonement.]—According to the sovereign counsel of God, the saving efficacy of the atoning death of Christ extends to all the elect [and to them only], so as to bring them infallibly to salvation. But, intrinsically, the sacrifice and satisfaction of Christ is of infinite worth and value, abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world. This death derives its infinite value and dignity from these considerations; because the person who submitted to it was not only really man and perfectly holy, but also the only-begotten Son of God, of the same eternal and infinite essence with the Father and Holy Spirit, which qualifications were necessary

to constitute him a Saviour for us; and because it was attended with a sense of the wrath and curse of God due to us for sin.

Moreover the promise of the gospel is, that whosoever believeth in Christ crucified shall not perish, but have everlasting life. This promise, together with the command to repent and believe, ought to be declared and published to all nations, and to all persons promiscuously and without distinction, to whom God out of his good pleasure sends the gospel.

And, whereas many who are called by the gospel do not repent nor believe in Christ, but perish in unbelief; this is not owing to any defect or insufficiency in the sacrifice offered by Christ upon the cross, but is wholly to be imputed to themselves.¹

THIRD AND FOURTH HEADS OF DOCTRINE.

Of the Corruption of Man, his Conversion to God, and the Manner thereof.—Man was originally formed after the image of God. His understanding was adorned with a true and saving knowledge of his Creator, and of spiritual things; his heart and will were upright, all his affections pure, and the whole Man was holy; but revolting from God by the instigation of the devil, and abusing the freedom of his own will, he forfeited these excellent gifts, and on the contrary en-

¹ The advocates of a limited atonement reason from the effect to the cause, and make the divine intention co-extensive with the actual application; but they can give no satisfactory explanation of such passages as John iii. 16 ('God so loved the world,' which never means the elect only, but all mankind); 1 John ii. 2 ('Christ is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world'); 1 Tim. ii. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 9. All admit, however, with the Articles of Dort, that the intrinsic value of the atonement, being the act of the God-man, is infinite and sufficient to cover the sins of all men. Dr. W. Cunningham says: 'The value or worth of Christ's sacrifice of himself depends upon, and is measured by, the dignity of his person, and is therefore infinite. Though many fewer of the human race had been to be pardoned and saved, an atonement of infinite value would have been necessary, in order to procure for them these blessings; and though many more, yea, all men, had been to be pardoned and saved, the death of Christ, being an atonement of infinite value, would have been amply sufficient, as the ground or basis of their forgiveness or salvation' (*Historical Theol.* Vol. II. p. 331). Similarly, Dr. Hodge, Vol. II. pp. 544 seq. After such admissions the difference of the two theories is of little practical account. Full logical consistency would require us to measure the value of Christ's atonement by the extent of its actual benefit or availability, and either to expand or to contract it according to the number of the elect; but such an opinion is derogatory to the dignity of Christ, and is held by very few extreme Calvinists of little or no influence. Cunningham says (p. 331): 'There is no doubt that all the most eminent Calvinistic divines hold the infinite worth or value of Christ's atonement—its full sufficiency for expiating all the sins of all men.'

tailed on himself blindness of mind, horrible darkness, vanity, and perverseness of judgment; became wicked, rebellious, and obdurate in heart and will, and impure in [all] his affections.

Man after the fall begat children in his own likeness. A corrupt stock produced a corrupt offspring. Hence all the posterity of Adam, Christ only excepted, have derived corruption from their original parent, not by imitation, as the Pelagians of old asserted, but by the propagation of a vicious nature in consequence of a just judgment of God.

Therefore all men are conceived in sin, and are by nature children of wrath, incapable of any saving good, prone to evil, dead in sin, and in bondage thereto; and, without the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit, they are neither able nor willing to return to God, to reform the depravity of their nature, nor to dispose themselves to reformation.

What, therefore, neither the light of nature nor the law could do, that God performs by the operation of his Holy Spirit through the word or ministry of reconciliation: which is the glad tidings concerning the Messiah, by means whereof it hath pleased God to save such as believe, as well under the Old as under the New Testament.

As many as are called by the gospel are unfeignedly called; for God hath most earnestly and truly declared in his Word what will be acceptable to him, namely, that all who are called should comply with the invitation. He, moreover, seriously promises eternal life and rest to as many as shall come to him, and believe on him.

It is not the fault of the gospel, nor of Christ offered therein, nor of God, who calls men by the gospel, and confers upon them various gifts, that those who are called by the ministry of the Word refuse to come and be converted. The fault lies in themselves.

But that others who are called by the gospel obey the call must be wholly ascribed to God, who, as he hath chosen his own from eternity in Christ, so he calls them effectually in time, confers upon them faith and repentance, rescues them from the power of darkness, and translates them into the kingdom of his own Son, that they may show forth the praises of him who hath called them out of darkness into his marvelous light; and may glory not in themselves but in the Lord, according to the testimony of the Apostles in various places.

Faith is therefore the gift of God, not on account of its being offered by God to man, to be accepted or rejected at his pleasure, but be-

cause it is in reality conferred, breathed, and infused into him; nor even because God bestows the power or ability to believe, and then expects that man should, by the exercise of his own free will, consent to the terms of salvation, and actually believe in Christ; but because he who works in man both to will and to do, and indeed all things in all, produces both the will to believe and the act of believing also.

FIFTH HEAD OF DOCTRINE.

Of the Perseverance of the Saints.—Whom God calls, according to his purpose, to the communion of his Son our Lord Jesus Christ, and regenerates by the Holy Spirit, he delivers also from the dominion and slavery of sin in this life; though not altogether from the body of sin and from the infirmities of the flesh, so long as they continue in this world.

By reason of these remains of indwelling sin, and the temptations of sin and of the world, those who are converted could not persevere in a state of grace if left to their own strength. But God is faithful, who having conferred grace, mercifully confirms and powerfully preserves them therein, even to the end.

Of this preservation of the elect to salvation, and of their perseverance in the faith, true believers for themselves may and do obtain assurance according to the measure of their faith, whereby they arrive at the certain persuasion that they ever will continue true and living members of the Church; and that they experience forgiveness of sins, and will at last inherit eternal life.

This certainty of perseverance, however, is so far from exciting in believers a spirit of pride, or of rendering them carnally secure, that, on the contrary, it is the real source of humility, filial reverence, true piety, patience in every tribulation, fervent prayers, constancy in suffering and in confessing the truth, and of solid rejoicing in God; so that the consideration of this benefit should serve as an incentive to the serious and constant practice of gratitude and good works, as appears from the testimonies of Scripture and the examples of the saints.

In opposition to the Canons of Dort, Episcopius prepared a lengthy defense of the Arminian Articles and a confession of faith in Dutch, 1621, and in Latin, 1622. It claims no binding symbolical authority, and advocates liberty and toleration.¹

¹ A German translation in Böckel's *Bekennniss-Schriften*, pp. 545-640.