

# **The Life of Hugo Grotius eBook**

## **The Life of Hugo Grotius by Charles Butler**

The following sections of this BookRags Literature Study Guide is offprint from Gale's For Students Series: Presenting Analysis, Context, and Criticism on Commonly Studied Works: Introduction, Author Biography, Plot Summary, Characters, Themes, Style, Historical Context, Critical Overview, Criticism and Critical Essays, Media Adaptations, Topics for Further Study, Compare & Contrast, What Do I Read Next?, For Further Study, and Sources.

(c)1998-2002; (c)2002 by Gale. Gale is an imprint of The Gale Group, Inc., a division of Thomson Learning, Inc. Gale and Design and Thomson Learning are trademarks used herein under license.

The following sections, if they exist, are offprint from Beacham's Encyclopedia of Popular Fiction: "Social Concerns", "Thematic Overview", "Techniques", "Literary Precedents", "Key Questions", "Related Titles", "Adaptations", "Related Web Sites". (c)1994-2005, by Walton Beacham.

The following sections, if they exist, are offprint from Beacham's Guide to Literature for Young Adults: "About the Author", "Overview", "Setting", "Literary Qualities", "Social Sensitivity", "Topics for Discussion", "Ideas for Reports and Papers". (c)1994-2005, by Walton Beacham.

All other sections in this Literature Study Guide are owned and copyrighted by BookRags, Inc.



# Contents

<a href="#">The Life of Hugo Grotius eBook.....</a>	<a href="#">1</a>
<a href="#">Contents.....</a>	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">Table of Contents.....</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">Page 1.....</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">Page 2.....</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">Page 3.....</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">Page 4.....</a>	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">Page 5.....</a>	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">Page 6.....</a>	<a href="#">19</a>
<a href="#">Page 7.....</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">Page 8.....</a>	<a href="#">22</a>
<a href="#">Page 9.....</a>	<a href="#">24</a>
<a href="#">Page 10.....</a>	<a href="#">26</a>
<a href="#">Page 11.....</a>	<a href="#">28</a>
<a href="#">Page 12.....</a>	<a href="#">30</a>
<a href="#">Page 13.....</a>	<a href="#">32</a>
<a href="#">Page 14.....</a>	<a href="#">34</a>
<a href="#">Page 15.....</a>	<a href="#">36</a>
<a href="#">Page 16.....</a>	<a href="#">38</a>
<a href="#">Page 17.....</a>	<a href="#">40</a>
<a href="#">Page 18.....</a>	<a href="#">42</a>
<a href="#">Page 19.....</a>	<a href="#">44</a>
<a href="#">Page 20.....</a>	<a href="#">46</a>
<a href="#">Page 21.....</a>	<a href="#">47</a>
<a href="#">Page 22.....</a>	<a href="#">48</a>



[Page 23.....49](#)

[Page 24.....50](#)

[Page 25.....51](#)

[Page 26.....52](#)

[Page 27.....53](#)

[Page 28.....55](#)

[Page 29.....56](#)

[Page 30.....58](#)

[Page 31.....60](#)

[Page 32.....61](#)

[Page 33.....62](#)

[Page 34.....64](#)

[Page 35.....66](#)

[Page 36.....67](#)

[Page 37.....69](#)

[Page 38.....71](#)

[Page 39.....72](#)

[Page 40.....74](#)

[Page 41.....75](#)

[Page 42.....77](#)

[Page 43.....79](#)

[Page 44.....81](#)

[Page 45.....83](#)

[Page 46.....85](#)

[Page 47.....87](#)

[Page 48.....88](#)



[Page 49..... 90](#)

[Page 50..... 91](#)

[Page 51..... 93](#)

[Page 52..... 94](#)

[Page 53..... 96](#)

[Page 54..... 98](#)

[Page 55..... 100](#)

[Page 56..... 102](#)

[Page 57..... 104](#)

[Page 58..... 106](#)

[Page 59..... 107](#)

[Page 60..... 108](#)

[Page 61..... 110](#)

[Page 62..... 112](#)

[Page 63..... 114](#)

[Page 64..... 116](#)

[Page 65..... 118](#)

[Page 66..... 120](#)

[Page 67..... 122](#)

[Page 68..... 124](#)

[Page 69..... 126](#)

[Page 70..... 127](#)

[Page 71..... 128](#)

[Page 72..... 130](#)

[Page 73..... 132](#)

[Page 74..... 134](#)



[Page 75..... 136](#)

[Page 76..... 138](#)

[Page 77..... 140](#)

[Page 78..... 142](#)

[Page 79..... 144](#)

[Page 80..... 146](#)

[Page 81..... 148](#)

[Page 82..... 149](#)

[Page 83..... 151](#)

[Page 84..... 153](#)

[Page 85..... 155](#)

[Page 86..... 157](#)

[Page 87..... 158](#)

[Page 88..... 160](#)

[Page 89..... 162](#)

[Page 90..... 164](#)

[Page 91..... 166](#)

[Page 92..... 168](#)

[Page 93..... 170](#)

[Page 94..... 171](#)

[Page 95..... 173](#)

[Page 96..... 174](#)

[Page 97..... 175](#)

[Page 98..... 177](#)

[Page 99..... 178](#)

[Page 100..... 180](#)



[Page 101..... 182](#)

[Page 102..... 183](#)

[Page 103..... 184](#)

[Page 104..... 185](#)

[Page 105..... 186](#)

[Page 106..... 187](#)

[Page 107..... 188](#)

[Page 108..... 190](#)

[Page 109..... 192](#)

[Page 110..... 194](#)

[Page 111..... 195](#)

[Page 112..... 196](#)

[Page 113..... 197](#)

[Page 114..... 199](#)

[Page 115..... 201](#)

[Page 116..... 202](#)

[Page 117..... 203](#)

[Page 118..... 204](#)

[Page 119..... 206](#)

[Page 120..... 207](#)

# Table of Contents

Section	Table of Contents	Page
Start of eBook		1
A.D. 800-911.		1
CHAPTER I.		1
BIRTH, AND EDUCATION OF GROTIUS		1
CHAPTER II.		1
CHAPTER III.		1
CHAPTER IV.		1
CHAPTER V.		1
CHAPTER VII.		1
CHAPTER VIII.		1
JAMES I. VORSTIUS		1
CHAPTER IX.		1
CHAPTER X.		2
CHAPTER XI.		2
CHAPTER XII.		2
CHAPTER XIII.		2
CHAPTER XIV.		2
APPENDIX I.		2
APPENDIX II.		2
FOOTNOTES		2
I. 1.		3
I. 2.		3
I. 3.		7
II. 1.		8
II. 2.		9
III. 1.		11
III. 2.		11
IV. 1		12
IV. 2.		14
V. 1.		15
V. 2.		16
V. 3.		17
V.4.		18
CHAPTER I.		19
CHAPTER II.		21
CHAPTER III.		25
CHAPTER IV.		30
CHAPTER V.		33



CHAPTER VI.	41
CHAPTER VII.	46
CHAPTER VIII.	50
CHAPTER IX.	53
CHAPTER X.	56
X 1.	56
X. 2.	57
X.3.	60
X. 4.	61
X.5.	63
X.6.	65
CHAPTER. XI.	66
CHAPTER XII.	71
XII. 1.	71
XII. 2.	74
XII. 3.	76
CHAPTER XIII.	80
CHAPTER XIV.	84
XIV. 1.	84
XIV. 2.	85
XIV. 3.	87
APPENDIX	88
I.	88
	89
III. The symbolic books of the GREEK CHURCH,—are,	89
VII. The symbolic books of the <i>Bohemians</i> ,—are,	90
	90
XII. The symbolic book of the ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIANS,—is	90
XIV. The symbolic books of the Quakers,—are,	90
APPENDIX II.	91
I.	92
II.	93
II. 1.	94
II. 2.	94
II. 3.	95
II. 4.	96
III.	97
III. 1.	97
III. 2.	99
III. 3.	100
III. 4.	101



IV.	104
V.	106
FINIS.	108



# Page 1

## A.D. 800-911.

- I. 1. *Boundaries, and Devolution of the Empire of Germany, during the Carolingian dynasty*
2. *State of Literature, in the time of Charlemagne*
3. *Decline of Literature, under the Descendants of Charlemagne*

A.D. 911-1024.

- II. 1. *Boundaries, and Devolution of the empire of Germany, during the Saxon dynasty*
2. *State of Literature, during the Saxon dynasty*

A.D. 1024-1138.

- III. 1. *Boundaries, and State of Germany, during the Franconian dynasty*
2. *State of German Literature, during the Franconian dynasty*

A.D. 1138-1519.

- IV. 1. *State of Germany, from the beginning of the Suabian dynasty, until the accession of the Emperor Charles V.*
2. *State of German Literature, during this period*

A.D. 1138-1519.

- V. 1. *Antient, and modern Geography of the Netherlands*
2. *The formation, of the different provinces of the Netherlands, into one State*
3. *Brief view, of the History of the Netherlands, until the acknowledgment of the Seven United Provinces, by the Spanish monarch*
4. *Their constitution, and principal officers*

## CHAPTER I.

A.D. 1582-1597.



# **BIRTH, AND EDUCATION OF GROTIUS**

## **CHAPTER II.**

A.D. 1597-1610.

GROTIUS, EMBRACES THE PROFESSION OF THE  
LAW

## **CHAPTER III.**

THE EARLY PUBLICATIONS, OF GROTIUS

## **CHAPTER IV.**

HISTORICAL MINUTES, OF THE UNITED PROVINCES,  
FROM THEIR DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE,  
TILL THE ARMINIAN CONTROVERSY

## **CHAPTER V.**

A.D. 1610-1617.

THE FEUDS, IN THE UNITED PROVINCES, BETWEEN  
THE DISCIPLES OF CALVIN, AND THE DISCIPLES  
OF ARMINIUS, UNTIL THE SYNOD OF DORT

CHAPTER VI. A.D. 1618.

THE SYNOD OF DORT

## **CHAPTER VII.**

A.D. 1618-1621.

TRIAL AND IMPRISONMENT OF GROTIUS; HIS  
ESCAPE FROM PRISON

## **CHAPTER VIII.**

A.D. 1622



## **JAMES I. VORSTIUS**

### **CHAPTER IX.**

A.D. 1621-1634.

GROTIUS, AFTER HIS ESCAPE FROM PRISON, UNTIL  
HIS APPOINTMENT OF AMBASSADOR, FROM  
SWEDEN, TO THE COURT OF FRANCE



## Page 2

### CHAPTER X.

SOME OF THE PRINCIPAL WORKS, OF GROTIUS

1. *New edition of Stobaeus*
2. *His treatise de Jure Belli et Pacis*
3. — *de Veritate Religionis Christianae*
4. — *de Jure summarum potestatum circa sacra.*—And *Commentatio ad loca quaedam Novi Testamenti, quae de Antichristo agunt, aut agere videntur*
5. *His Commentaries on the Scriptures*
6. *His other works*

### CHAPTER XI.

A.D. 1634-1645.

GROTIUS, AS AMBASSADOR FROM THE KINGDOM OF SWEDEN, TO THE COURT OF FRANCE

### CHAPTER XII.

THE RELIGIOUS SENTIMENTS OF GROTIUS; SOME OTHER OF HIS WORKS, 1. *Subsequent History of Arminianism* 2. *Grotius's religious sentiments* 3. *Projects of religious Pacification*

### CHAPTER XIII.

THE DEATH OF GROTIUS

### CHAPTER XIV.

A.D. 1680-1815.

HISTORICAL MINUTES OF THE REVOLUTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE SEVEN UNITED PROVINCES, FROM THE DEATH OF WILLIAM II. TILL THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS.



1. *William III.*
2. *John William Count of Nassau Dietz, 1702-1711;*  
*William IV. 1711-1751*
3. *From the death of William IV. till the erection of*  
*the Kingdom of the Netherlands*

## APPENDIX I.

*Some Account of the Formularies, Confessions of Faith,  
or Symbolic Books, of the Roman-Catholic, Greek,  
and principal Protestant Churches*

## APPENDIX II.

*On the Reunion of Christians*

## FOOTNOTES

### INTRODUCTION.

SUCCINCT NOTICE OF THE GEOGRAPHY, PRINCIPAL POLITICAL EVENTS, AND LITERATURE, OF THE NETHERLANDS, BEFORE THE BIRTH OF GROTIUS.

800-1581.

We propose to present to our readers, in this chapter, a succinct account, of the Geography, Devolution, and Literature of the Netherlands,—considering them, until they became subject to the princes of the House of Burgundy, as a portion of the German Empire, and included in its history:—and from that time, as forming a separate territory.

[Sidenote: 800-1581.]

Contemplating the Netherlands in the first of these views,—we shall briefly mention the Boundaries and Government, of the German Empire, and the state of learning in its territories, during the Carlovingian, Saxon, Franconian and Suabian Dynasties, and the period, which intervened, between the last Suabian emperor and the election of the Emperor Charles the fifth.

## Page 3

From this time, we shall confine ourselves to the History of the Netherlands. We shall then, therefore, endeavour to give a short view of the geography of these countries, and of the manner in which they were acquired by the Princes of Burgundy; then, shortly mention the successful revolt of the Seven United Provinces.

In one of them, GROTIUS, the subject of these pages, was born; the part which he took in the public events of his times, forms the most important portion of his biography.

### I. 1.

*Boundaries and Devolution of the Empire of Germany during the Carolingian Dynasty.*

800-911.

The Ocean on the north, the Danube on the south, the Rhine on the west, and the Sarmatian Provinces on the east, are the boundaries assigned by Tacitus to Antient Germany. It formed the most extensive portion of the territories of Charlemagne; descended, at his decease, to his son, Lewis the Debonnaire; and, on the partition between his three sons, was allotted to Lewis, his second son.

All the territories of Charlemagne were united in Charles the Fat; he was deposed by his subjects, and his empire divided. Germany was assigned to his third son, Charles the Brave. On his decease, it was possessed by Arnold, a natural son of Carloman, the elder brother of Charles: from him it descended to Hedwiges, the wife of Otho, Duke of Saxony, and she transmitted it to their son Henry the Fowler, the first emperor of that house.

[Sidenote: 800-911.]

From the skirts of Germany and France two new kingdoms arose: the kingdom of Lorraine, which comprised the countries between the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Scheld; or the modern Lorraine, the province of Alsace, the Palatinate, Treves, Cologne, Juliers, Liege and the Netherlands;—and the kingdom of Burgundy: This was divided into the Cis-juranan, or the part of it on the east, and the Trans-juranan, or the part of it on the west of Mount Jura. The former comprised Provence, Dauphine, the Lyonese, Franche-comte, Bresse, Bugey, and a part of Savoy; the latter comprised the countries between Mount Jura and the Pennine Alps, or the part of Switzerland between the Reus, the Valais, and the rest of Savoy.

Such was the geographical state of Germany at the close of the Carolingian Dynasty.

## I. 2.

*State of Literature in the time of Charlemagne.*

So far as Literature depends upon the favour of the monarch, no aera in history promised more than the reign of Charlemagne. His education had been neglected; but he had real taste for learning and the arts, was sensible of their beneficial influence both upon the public and the private welfare of a people; and possessed the amplest means of encouraging and diffusing them; his wisdom would suggest to him the properest means of doing it, and the energy of his mind would excite him to constant exertions.



## Page 4

[Sidenote: I. 2. State of Literature in the time of Charlemagne.]

Nothing that could be effected by a prince thus gifted and disposed, was left untried by Charlemagne. He drew to him the celebrated Alcuin, Peter of Pisa, Paul Warnefrid, and many other distinguished literary characters: he heaped favours upon them; and a marked distinction was always shewn them at his court. He formed them into a literary society, which had frequent meetings. Their conversation was literary, he often bore a part in it; and, what was at least equally gratifying, he always listened with a polite and flattering attention while others spoke. To establish perfect equality among them, the monarch, and, after his example, the other members of this society, dropt their own and adopted other names. Angelbert was called Homer, from his partiality to that poet; Riculphus, archbishop of Mentz, chose the name of Dametas, from an eclogue of Virgil: another member took that of Candidus; Eginhard, the Emperor's biographer, was called Calliopus, from the Muse Calliope; Alcuin received, from his country, the name of Albinus; the archbishop Theodulfe was called Pindar; the abbot Adelard was called Augustine; Charlemagne, as the man of God's own heart, was called David.

[Sidenote: 800-911]

The Emperor corresponded with men of learning, on subjects of literature; they generally related to religion. In one of his letters, he requires of Alcuin an explanation of the words Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima, which denote the Sundays which immediately precede, and the word Quadragesima, which denotes the first Sunday which occurs in Lent. The denominations of those Sundays give rise to two difficulties; one, that they seem to imply that each week consists of ten, not of seven days; the other, that the words sound as if Septuagesima were the seventieth, when it is only the sixty-third day before Easter Sunday; Sexagesima, as if it were the sixtieth, when it is only the fifty-sixth; Quinquagesima, as if it were the fiftieth, when it is the forty-ninth; Quadragesima, as if it were the fortieth, when it is the forty-second. Alcuin's answer is more subtle than satisfactory.

At the meals of Charlemagne some person always read to him. His example was followed by many of his successors, particularly by Francis I. of France, who, in an happier era for learning, imitated with happier effects, the example of the Emperor.

[Sidenote: I. 2. State of Literature in the time of Charlemagne.]

Alcuin was general director of all the literary schemes of Charlemagne. He was an Englishman by birth; skilled both in the Greek and Latin language, and in many branches of philosophy. Having taught, with great reputation and success, in his own country, he travelled to Rome. In 780, Charlemagne attracted him to his court.



## Page 5

There, Alcuin gave lectures, and published several treatises. In these, he began with Orthography; then proceeded to Grammar; afterwards to Rhetoric, and Dialectic. He composed his treatises in the form of dialogues; and, as Charlemagne frequently attended them, Alcuin made him one of his interlocutors. Few scholars of Alcuin were more attentive than his imperial pupil; he had learned grammar from Peter of Pisa; he was instructed in rhetoric, dialectic, and astronomy by Alcuin. He also engaged in the study of divinity; and had the good sense to stop short of those subtleties, in which Justinian, Heraclius, and other princes, unfortunately both for themselves and their subjects, bewildered themselves. Letters from Gisela and Richtrudis, the daughters of Charlemagne, to Alcuin, shew that they partook of their father's literary zeal: his favourite study was astronomy.

[Sidenote: 800-911.]

The number of persons in his court, who addicted themselves to pursuits of literature, was so great, and their application so regular, that their meetings acquired the appellation of "The School of Charlemagne." Their library was at Aix-la-Chapelle, the favourite residence of the monarch: but they accompanied him in many of his journies. Antiquarians have tracked them at Paris, Thionville, Wormes, Ratisbon, Wurtzburgh, Mentz, and Frankfort.

Charlemagne established schools in every part of his dominions. In 787, he addressed a circular letter to all the metropolitan prelates of his dominions, to be communicated by them to their suffragan bishops, and to the abbots within their provinces. He exhorted them to erect schools in every cathedral and monastery. Schools were accordingly established throughout his vast dominions: they were divided into two classes; arithmetic, grammar, and music were taught in the lower, the liberal arts and theology in the higher.

[Sidenote: 1. 2. State of Literature in the time of Charlemagne.]

In France, the abbeys of Corbie, Fontenelles, Ferrieres, St. Denis, St Germain of Paris, St. Germain of Auxerre, and St. Benedict on the Loire;—in Germany, the abbeys of Proom, Fulda, and of St Gall;—in Italy, the abbey of Mount Casino, were celebrated for the excellence of their schools. One, for the express purpose of teaching the Greek language, was founded by Charlemagne at Osnabruck. All were equally open to the children of the nobility and the children of peasants; all received the same treatment. It happened that, on a public examination of the children, the peasant boys were found to have made greater progress than the noble. The Emperor remarked it to the latter, and declared with an oath, that "the bishopricks and abbeys should be given to the diligent poor." "You rely," he said to the patrician youths, "on the merit of your ancestors; these have already been rewarded. The state owes them nothing; those only are entitled to favour, who qualify themselves for serving and illustrating their country by their talents and their merits."



## Page 6

[Sidenote: 800-911.]

The civil law then consisted of the Theodosian code, the Salic, Ripuarian, Allemannic, Bavarian, Burgundian, and other *codes*; and of the *formularies* of Angese and Marculfus. To these Charlemagne added his own *capitularies*. The whole collection, in opposition to the canon or ecclesiastical law, received the appellation of *Lex Mundana*, or *worldly law*. The canon law consisted of the code of canons which Charlemagne brought with him from Rome in 784; a code of the canons of the church of France; the canons inserted in the collection of Angelram, bishop of Metz; the apostolic canons, published by St. Martin, bishop of Braga; the capitularies of Theodulfus, of Orleans; and the penitential canons, published in the Spicilegium of d'Acheri.[001] To the study, both of the canon and civil law, schools were appropriated by Charlemagne: few, except persons intended for the ecclesiastical state, frequented them. Rabanus Maurus,[002] abbot of Fulda, and afterwards archbishop of Mentz, has left an interesting account of the studies of this period; it shews that all were referred to theology, and only considered to be useful so far as they could be made serviceable to sacred learning. Such a plan of study could conduce but little to the advancement of general literature or science. Still, it was productive of good, and led to improvement.

[Sidenote: I.2. State of Literature in the time of Charlemagne.]

It is observable that both antient and modern civiliziers of nations, have called music to their aid; among these we may mention Charlemagne. In his residence at Rome, he was delighted with the Gregorian chant. After his return to Germany, he endeavoured to introduce it, both into his French and German dominions. The former had a chant of their own; they called it an improvement, but other nations considered it a corruption of the Gregorian. Greatly against the wish of Charlemagne, his Gallic subjects persisted in their attachment to their national music; the merit of it was gravely debated before the Emperor; they vehemently urged the superiority of their own strains. "Tell me," said the Emperor, "which is purer, the fountain or the rivulet?" They answered, "the former." "Return ye, then," (said the Emperor) "to St. Gregory: he is the fountain, the rivulets are evidently corrupted." The Emperor was obeyed, and the Gregorian chant was taught, both in France and Germany, by Italian choristers. The Italian writers of the times describe the difficulties which they experienced in forming the rough and almost untuneable voices of their French and German pupils to the softness of the Gregorian song. They appear to have succeeded better with the Germans than the French. By these, their lessons were so soon and so completely forgotten, after the decease of Charlemagne, that Lewis the Debonnaire, his son, was obliged to request Pope Gregory IV. to send him from Rome, a new supply of singers to instruct the people.



## Page 7

But music continued to prosper in Germany; it abounded in songs. Some were amatory, (*muennelien*); some were satirical, (*cantica in malitiam*); some heroic, (*cantica in honorem*); some diabolical, (*cantica diabolica*.) These consisted of incantations, and of narratives of the feats of evil spirits.

[Sidenote: 800-911.]

Vernacular poetry, and vernacular composition, of every kind, were almost wholly left to the vulgar; all, who aimed at literary eminence, wrote in the Latin language. Some discerning spirits became sensible that the German language was susceptible of great improvement, and excited their countrymen to its cultivation. Among these was Otfrid; he translated the Gospel into German verse. He describes, in strong terms, the difficulties which he had to encounter: "The barbarousness of the German language is," he says, "so great, and its sounds are so incoherent and strange, that it is very difficult to subject them to the rules of grammar, to represent them by syllables, or to find in the alphabet letters which correspond to them." It is however remarkable, that, although he complains of the dissonance of the German language, he never accuses it of poverty.

While France and Germany continued subject to the same monarch, German was the language of the court, and generally used in every class of society. When the treaty of Verdun divided the territories of Charlemagne, the *Romande*, or *Romance* language, a corruption of the Latin, superseded the German in every part of France: it was insensibly refined into the modern French, but the German continued to be the only language spoken in Germany.

Great progress was made in architecture: the churches and palaces constructed by the direction of Charlemagne at Aix-la-Chapelle, the Basilisc at Germani, the church of St. Recquier at Ponthieu, and many other monuments of great architectural skill and expense, belong to the age of Charlemagne, and bear ample testimony to the well-directed exertions of the monarch, and of some of his descendants, and to their wise and splendid magnificence.

### I. 3.

*Decline of Literature under the Descendants of Charlemagne.*

[Sidenote: 800-911]

[Sidenote: I. 3. Decline of Literature under the Descendants of Charlemagne.]

That literature began to decline immediately after the decease of Charlemagne, in every part of his extensive dominions, and that its decline was principally owing to the wars among his descendants, which devastated every portion of his empire, seems to be universally acknowledged; yet there are strong grounds for contending that it was not so

great as generally represented. *Abbe le Beuf*, [003] in an excellent dissertation on the state of the sciences in the Gauls during the period which elapsed between the death of Charlemagne and the reign of Robert, king of France, attempts

## Page 8

to prove the contrary; and the preliminary discourses of the authors of "l'Histoire Literaire de la France," on the state of learning during the ninth and tenth centuries, strongly confirm the abbe's representations. It is surprising how many works were written during these dark, and, as they are too harshly called, ignorant ages. It is more to be wondered, that while so much was written, so little was written well. The classical works of antiquity were not unknown in those times; the Latin Vulgate translation of the Old and New Testament was daily read by the clergy, and heard by the people. Now, although the language of the Vulgate be not classical, it is not destitute of elegance, and it possesses throughout the exquisite charms of clearness and simplicity. It is surprising that these circumstances did not lead the writers to a better style. They had no such effect; the general style of the time was hard, inflated and obscure. It should, however, be observed, that Simonde de Sismondi, as he is translated by Mr. Roscoe, justly observes, that "during the reign of Charlemagne, and during the four centuries which immediately preceded it, there appeared, both in France and Italy, some judicious historians, whose style possesses considerable vivacity, and who gave animated pictures of their times; some subtle philosophers, who astonished their contemporaries, rather by the fineness of their speculations than by the justness of their reasoning; some learned theologians, and some poets. The names of Paul Warnefrid, of Alcuin, of Luitprand, and Eginhard, are even yet universally respected. They all, however, wrote in Latin. They had all of them, by the strength of their intellect, and the happy circumstances in which they were placed, learned to appreciate the beauty of the models which antiquity had left them. They breathed the spirit of a former age, as they had adopted its language: we do not find them representatives of their contemporaries: it is impossible to recognize in their style the times in which they lived; it only betrays the relative industry and felicity with which they imitated the language and thoughts of a former age. They were the last monuments of civilized antiquity, the last of a noble race, which, after a long period of degeneracy, became extinct in them."

### II. 1.

*Boundaries and Devolution of the German Empire during the Saxon Dynasty.*

911-1024.

We have mentioned that, on the death of Lewis, the son of Arnhold, the empire descended to Henry I. in the right of his mother. From him, it devolved through Otho, surnamed the Great, Otho II., and Otho III., to Henry II. the last emperor of the Saxon line.

In this period of the German history, the attention of the reader is particularly directed to two circumstances,—the principal states, of which Germany was composed, the

cradles, as they may be called, of the present electorates, and the erection of the principal cities and monasteries in Germany.



## Page 9

[Sidenote: II. 2. State of Literature during the Saxon Dynasty.]

A curious altercation between Nicephorus Phocas, the Greek emperor, and Luitprand bishop of Cremona, ambassador from Otho I. to the Greek sovereign, shews the state of Germany during this period. "Your nation," said the empire to the ambassador, "does not know how to sit on horseback; or how to fight on foot: your large shields, massive armour, long swords, and heavy helmets, disable you for battle."—Luitprand told the emperor that "he would, the first time they should meet in the field, feel the contrary." Luitprand observed, that "Germany was so little advanced in ecclesiastical worth; that no council had been held within its precincts:" the ambassador remarked, that "all heresies had originated in Greece." The emperor asserted, that "the Germans were gluttons and drunkards:" Luitprand replied, that "the Greeks were effeminate." All writers agree, that, in what each party to this conversation asserted, there was too much truth.

We have noticed the advance towards civilization which Henry I, made by the construction of towns; he effected another, by the introduction of tournaments and field sports, on a large, orderly and showy plan. Speaking generally, society in Germany during the Saxon line of its princes, was always improving.

## II. 2.

*State of Literature during the Saxon Dynasty.*

[Sidenote: 911-1024.]

"In the school of Paderborn," says the biographer of Meinwert, as he is cited by Schmidt, "there are famous musicians, dialecticians, orators, grammarians, mathematicians, astronomers and geometricians. Horace, the great Virgil, Sallust, and Statius, are highly esteemed. The monks amuse themselves with poetry, books and music. Several are incessantly employed in transcribing and painting."

A German translation of the Psalms, by Notker, a monk of the abbey of St. Gall, shews that some attention was paid to the language of the country. The Greek was cultivated; the writers of the times mention several persons skilled in it. Notker, in a letter to one of his correspondents, informs him, that "his Greek brothers salute him."

[Sidenote: II. 2. State of Literature during the Saxon Dynasty.]

Poetry was a favourite study: the celebrated *Gerbert*, afterwards Pope Silvester II, and *Waldrum*, bishop of Strasburgh, were the best poets of their times. Hroswith,[004] a nun in the monastery of Gardersheim, published comedies: "Many Catholics," she says, in her preface to them, "are guilty of a fault, from which I myself am not altogether free; they prefer profane works, on account of their style, to the holy Scriptures. Others



have the Scriptures always in their hands, and despise profane authors; yet they often read Terence, and their attention to the beauties of his style does not prevent the objectionable passages in his writings from making an impression on them.”



## Page 10

To this age, the origin of Romances is usually assigned: but these belong to the French; no specimen of them has been discovered in Germany. Music was much cultivated. Hroswith introduced it into her comedies.

It has been mentioned, that Sallust was read in the school at Paderborn. It is supposed that Tacitus was known to Wittikind or Dittmar: both relate visions, and several puerile circumstances; but they write with precision, and shew, on many occasions, great good sense.

The same cannot be said of the Legend-writers; the account which the authors of "The Literary History of France" give of them is very just. "The ancient legends," they say, "were lost, in consequence either of the plunder or the burning of the churches; it was considered necessary to replace them, as it was thought impossible to honour the memory, or to preserve the veneration of the saints, without some knowledge of their lives. It is to be remarked, that the saints, whose memories were thus sought to be honoured, had been long dead, or had lived in foreign countries, so that little was known of them except by oral tradition. From this it may be easily guessed, that those who employed themselves upon the legends, were deprived of necessary information, and upon that account could not produce exact and true histories. Thus, to the general defects of the age in which they lived, they added uncertainty, confusion, and some falsehood. Their pages abound with visions. In the place of the simple and natural, they substituted the wonderful and extraordinary. It even happened too frequently that they took leave to tell untruths. Heriger, the abbot of St Lupus, says, in direct terms, that they piously lied."

[Sidenote: 911-1024.]

Dialectic was in great favour: it was called philosophy; no work was more read than "the Book of Categories," erroneously ascribed to St. Augustine; and a work, upon the same subject, imputed to Porphyry.

[Sidenote: II. 2. State of Literature during the Saxon Dynasty.]

The schools of the cathedrals and principal monasteries contributed essentially to the increase and diffusion of literature. Among the monasteries, those of Fulda, St. Gall, Corbie and Kershaw, were particularly renowned. Bishops and abbots exerted themselves to procure books, and to have copies of them made and circulated: they were often splendidly illuminated. Henry I. caused a painting to be made, of a battle which he had gained over the Hungarians. Bernard, bishop of Hildersheim, in imitation of what he had seen in Italy, ornamented the churches of his diocese with mosaic paintings; he also introduced, among his countrymen, the art of fusing and working metals; he caused precious and highly ornamented vases to be made in imitation of the antients. Large and small bells were cast; chalices, patines, incensories, images, and even altars of gold and silver, or ornamented with them, were fabricated. Aventin

relates, that at Mauverkirchen, in Bavaria, figures in plaster, hardened by fire, had, in 948, been made of a duke of Bavaria and his general.



# Page 11

[Sidenote: 911-1024.]

The establishment of schools, and the protection given to the arts and sciences, invited the whole body of the nation to the acquisition of useful and ornamental knowledge; but the invitation was not even generally accepted. There was much superstition in every order of the laity. An opinion prevailed among them, that the world was to end, and the day of judgment arrive, in the year 1000. An universal panic spread itself over Europe. Strange to relate, the people sought to avoid the catastrophe, by hiding themselves in caverns and tombs.

The existence of this ignorance cannot be denied: but, to the ecclesiastics, who strove against it, who erected and fostered so many schools to dispel it, and who exerted themselves in the manner we have mentioned, to establish another and a better order of things, a great share of praise and gratitude should never be denied.

The mines of Hartz were discovered in the time of Otho I. and diffused so much wealth over Saxony, and afterwards over all Germany, as gave the reign of that emperor the appellation of "the age of gold." Before this time, Nicephorus Phocas had called Saxony, from the dress, or rather the coverings of its inhabitants, "the land of skins." But all the wealth of the country still continued to be concentrated among the great landowners.

## III. 1.

*Boundaries and State of Germany during the Franconian Dynasty.*

1024-1138.

Under Henry III. the second prince of this line, the German empire had its greatest extent. It comprised Germany, Italy, Burgundy and Lorraine. Poland, and other parts of the Slavonian territories, were subject to it. Denmark and Hungary acknowledged themselves its vassals.

The emperors affected to consider all kingdoms as forming a royal republic, of which the emperor was chief. For their right to this splendid prerogative, they always found advocates in their own dominions: they reckon, among these, the illustrious Leibniz. Out of Germany, nothing of the claim, beyond precedence in rank, has ever been allowed. This, no sovereign in Europe has contested with the emperors: it is observable, that, as the French monarchs insisted on the Carlovingian extraction of Hugh Capet, they affected to consider Henry the Fowler the first prince of the Saxon dynasty, and all his successors in the empire as usurpers. Lewis XIV. expresses himself in this manner in some memoirs recently attributed to him.

## **III. 2.**

*State of German Literature during the Franconian Dynasty.*

[Sidenote: 1024-1138.]



## Page 12

Throughout this period, commerce was always upon the increase; and literature, science and art, increased with it. The monuments of the antient grandeur of the eternal city, began about this time to engage the attention of the inhabitants of Germany, and to attract to Rome many literary pilgrims. They returned home impressed with admiration of what they had seen, and related the wonders to their countrymen. "The gods themselves (they told their hearers) behold their images in Rome with admiration, and wish to resemble them. Nature herself does not raise forms as beautiful as those, which the artist creates. One is tempted to say that they breathe; and to adore the skill of the artist rather than the inhabitant of Olympus represented by his art." Thus the uncultivated Germans began to perceive the beauty of these relics of antiquity, and to feel the wish of imitation. This first appeared on the seals of the emperors and bishops; several of distinguished beauty have reached our times. The German artists soon began to engrave on precious stones, and to work in marble and bronze. Four statues of emperors of the house of Saxony, of the workmanship of these times, are still to be seen at Spire; they are rudely fashioned, but are animated, and have distinct and expressive countenances.

[Sidenote: III. 2. State of German Literature during the Franconian Dynasty.]

When the emperors or nobility travelled, they were frequently accompanied by artists. These sometimes made drawings of foreign churches and edifices, and on their return home, raised others in imitation of them. Thus the cathedral at Bremen was built on the model of that of Benevento. The cathedral of Strasburgh, and many other churches, were built about this time.

Music was considerably improved; the system of Guido Aretinus was no where understood better, or cultivated with greater ardour, than in Germany. Some improvement was made in poetry, but it chiefly appeared in the songs of the common people. A monk of Togernsee, in Bavaria, composed a collection of poems under the title of Bucolics; they resemble those of Virgil only in their title. Lambert, of Aschaffenburgh, published a history of his own times, inferior to none which have reached us from the middle ages.

[Sidenote: 1024-1138]

Dialectic, however, still continued the favourite study; and the art of disputation was never carried so far: the interest which the public took in these disputes was surprising. When it was announced that two celebrated dialecticians were to hold a public dispute, persons flocked from all parts to witness the conflict; they listened with avidity, and with all the feelings of partisans. This appears ridiculous; but, in the present times, is there no *fancy* which deserves equal ridicule?

## **IV. 1**

*The State of Germany, from the beginning of the Suabian Dynasty, till the Accession of the Emperor Charles V.*



## Page 13

1138-1519.

The principal events in the reigns of the latter princes of the Franconian, and of all the princes of the Suabian line, were produced or influenced by the contests between the popes and emperors, respecting investitures, or the right of nominating to vacant bishoprics;—by the pretensions of the popes to hold their antient territories independent of the emperors;—or by the new acquisitions of the popes in Italy.

1264-1272.

These contests reduced the empire to a state of anarchy, which produced what is generally called, by the German writers, the Great Interregnum. While it continued, six princes successively claimed to be emperors of Germany.

1272-1438.

The interregnum was determined by the election of Rodolph, count of Hapsburgh. From him, till the ultimate accession of the house of Austria, in the person of Albert the Second, the empire was held by several princes of different noble families.

1438-1519.

Albert was succeeded by Frederick III.; Frederick, by Maximilian I.; and Maximilian, by Charles V.

To the period between the extinction of the Suabian dynasty and the accession of the emperor Albert, may be assigned the rise of the Italian republics, particularly Venice, Genoa and Florence; the elevations of the princes of Savoy and Milan, and the revolutions of Naples, and the Two Sicilies.

[Sidenote: IV. 1. The State of Germany, from the beginning of the Suabian Dynasty till the Accession of the Emperor Charles V.]

The boundaries of Germany, during this period, were the Eider and the sea, on the north; the Scheld, the Meuse, the Saone and the Rhone, on the west; the Alps and the Rhine, on the south; and the Lech and Vistula, on the east. They contained,—1. The duchy of Burgundy; 2. The duchy of Lorraine; 3. The principalities into which Allemmania and Franconia were divided; 4. The Bavarian territories, which the Franks had acquired in Rhoetia, Noricum, and Pannonia; 5. Saxony; 6. The Sclavic territories between the Oder and the Vistula: these were possessed by the margraves of Brandenburg, and the dukes of Poland and Bohemia, and the princes dependent upon them in Moravia, Silesia and Lusatia;—7. by the provinces of Pomerania and Prussia, on the east of Saxony; 8. and the Marchia Orientalis, Oostrich, or Austria, on the east of Bavaria.



At first, the emperor was chosen by the people at large; the right of election was afterwards confined to the nobility and the principal officers of state: insensibly, it was engrossed by the five great officers,—the chancellor, the great marshal, the great chamberlain, the great butler, and the great master of the palace. But their exclusive pretensions were much questioned. At length, their right of election was settled; first, by the Electoral Union, in 1337; and finally, in the reign of the emperor Charles IV. by the celebrated constitution, called, from the seal of gold appended to it, *the Golden Bull*. By this, the right of election was vested in three spiritual and four temporal electors: two temporal electors have since been added to their numbers.



# Page 14

## IV. 2.

*State of German literature during this period.*

[Sidenote: 1438-1519]

While the empire was possessed by the princes of the house of Saxony, a copy of the Pandects of Justinian was discovered at Amalfi. "The discovery of them," says Sir William Blackstone, in his Introductory discourse to his Commentaries, "soon brought the civil law into vogue all over the west of Europe, where before it was quite laid aside, and in a manner wholly forgotten; though some traces of its authority remained in Italy, and the eastern provinces of the empire.—The study of it was introduced into many universities abroad, particularly that of Bologna, where exercises were performed, lectures read, and degrees conferred in this faculty, as in other branches of science; and many nations of the continent, just then beginning to recover from the convulsions consequent to the overthrow of the Roman empire, and settling by degrees into peaceable forms of government, adopted the civil law (being the best written system then extant,) as the basis of their several constitutions; blending or interweaving in it their own feudal customs, in some places, with a more extensive, in others, a more confined authority."

[Sidenote: IV. 2. State of German Literature, from the Suabian Dynasty to Charles V.]

This was a great step toward the civilization of Germany, and of the other countries in which the institutions of the civil law were thus introduced. They certainly tended to animate the nations, by whom they were received, to the study of the history and literature of the people from the works of whose writers they had been compiled. They produced this effect in several countries of Europe; but their influence in Germany was very limited: the disposition to subtilize, which was at that time universal throughout the German empire, led those who cultivated literature rather to refine upon what was before them, than to new inquiries. The language of the Pandects is of the silver age; it might therefore be expected, that it would have improved the general style of the times; but this improvement is seldom discernible.

[Sidenote: 1438-1519]

[Sidenote: IV. 2. State of German Literature, from the Suabian Dynasty to Charles V.]

Good or evil is seldom unmixed: civil contests and dissensions, generally produce both public and private misery; sometimes, however, they generate mental excitement. This is favourable to Literature and Science. Its good effects appeared in the contests between the Popes and the Emperors. Great were the public and the private calamities which they caused, both in church and state; but they promoted inquiry and intellectual exertions. These were often attended with happy results. Irnerius, by birth a German,

had studied Justinian's law at Constantinople. Towards the year 1130, he was appointed professor of civil law at Bologna:

## Page 15

the contests between the popes and the emperors produced a warfare of words among the disciples of Irnerius. It has been mentioned that the German emperors pretended to succeed to the empire of the Caesars. The language and spirit of the Justinianean code, being highly favourable to this claim, the emperors encouraged the civilians, and in return for it, had their pens at command. The decree of Gratian was favourable to the pretensions of the popes; and on this account was encouraged by the canonists. Hence, generally speaking, the civilians were partisans of the emperors, the canonists of the popes. From their adherence to the law of Justinian, the former were called Legistae; from their adherence to the decree of Gratian, the latter were called Decretistae. The controversy was carried on with great ardour and perseverance; the schools both of Italy and Germany resounded with the disputes, and in both, numerous tracts in support of the opposite claims, were circulated. The question necessarily carried the disputants to many incidental topics: these equally increased the powers and curiosity of the disputants, and stimulated them to better and more interesting studies.

### V. 1.

*Antient and Modern Geography of the Netherlands.*

We have thus brought down our historical deduction of the German Empire to the accession of the Emperor Charles the Fifth.

About 160 years before this event, that portion of the empire, to which its situation has given the appellation of THE NETHERLANDS, began to have a separate history, and both a separate and important influence on the events of the times. To them we shall now direct our attention.

These spacious territories are bounded on the north, by the German Ocean; on the west, by the British Sea and part of Picardy; on the south, by Champagne or Lorraine; on the east, by the archbishoprics of Triers and Treves, the dutchies of Juliers and Cleves, the bishopric of Munster, and the county of Embden or East Friesland.

[Sidenote: V. 1. Antient and Modern Geography of the Netherlands.]

When the Romans invaded Gaul, it was divided among three principal clans: the Rhine then formed its western boundary. The left banks of this river were occupied by the Belgians: this tract of land now comprises the catholic Netherlands, and the territory of the United States; the right bank of the Rhine was then filled by the Frisians, and now comprises the modern Groeningen, east and west Friesland, a part of Holland, Gueldres, Utrecht, and Overyssell: the Batavians inhabited the island which derives its

name from them; it now comprises the upper part of Holland, Utrecht, Gueldres, and Overysell, the modern Cleves between the Lech and the Waal.



## Page 16

In antient geography, the Netherlands were separated into the Cisrhenahan and Transrhenahan divisions: the Cisrhenahan lay on the western side of the Rhine, and included the Belgic Gaul; it was bounded by the Rhenus, the Rhodanus, the Sequana, the Matrona, and the Oceanus Britannicus: the Transrhenahan lay on the eastern side of the Rhine; it was a part of Lower Germany, and bounded on the north by the eastern Frisia, Westphalia, the Ager-Colonensis, the Juliacensis-Ducatus, and the Treveri. The classical reader will have no difficulty in assigning to these denominations, their actual names in the language of modern geography.

The whole of these territories is called the Netherlands by the English; and Flanders by the Italians, Spaniards, and French.

### V. 2.

*The formation of the different Provinces of the Netherlands into one State.*

In 1363, John the Good, the king of France, gave to Philip the Bold, his third son, the dutchy of Burgundy: it then comprised the county of Burgundy, Dauphine, and a portion of Switzerland. The monarch at the same time created his son duke of Burgundy. Thus Philip, became the patriarch of the second line of that illustrious house.

History does not produce an instance of a family, which has so greatly aggrandized itself by marriage, as the house of Austria. The largest part by far of the Netherlands was derived to it, 1st, from Margaret of Franche Comte; 2dly, from Margaret of Flanders; 3dly, from Jane of Brabant; 4thly, from Mary of Burgundy; 5thly, from Jacqueline of Holland; and 6thly, from Elizabeth of Luxemburgh.

[Sidenote: Formation of the Provinces of the Netherlands into one State.]

The possessions of the three first of these splendid heiresses, descended to Margaret of Flanders. She married Phillip the Bold, who, as we have just mentioned, was the first of the modern Dukes of Burgundy. By this marriage, he acquired, in right of his wife, the provinces of Flanders, Artois, Mechlin, and Rhétel; and transmitted them and his own dukedom of Burgundy to his son Charles the Intrepid. From Charles, they descended to his son Philip the Good. He purchased Namur; and by a transaction with Jacqueline of Holland, acquired that province, Zealand, Hainault, and Friesland. By other means, he obtained Brabant, Antwerp, Luxemburgh, Limburgh, Gueldres, and Zutphen. On the failure of issue male of Philip the Good, all these fourteen provinces descended to Mary his only daughter. She married the Emperor Maximilian. He had two sons by her, the Emperor Charles V. and Ferdinand. The former acquired, by purchase or force, Utrecht, Overyssell and Groeningen.

These territories formed what are generally called the SEVENTEEN PROVINCES OF THE NETHERLANDS.

In the language of the middle ages, they consisted of the Dutchies of Brabant, Limburgh, Luxemburgh, and Gueldres; the Earldoms of Flanders, Artois, Hainault, Holland, Zealand, Namur, Zutphen, Antwerp, (sometimes called the Marquisate of the Holy Empire) and the Lordships of Friesland, Mechlin, Utrecht, Overyssell, and Groeningen. Cambrai, the Cambresis, and the County of Burgundy, though a separate territory, were considered to be appendages, but not part of them.



## Page 17

### V. 3.

*Brief View of the History of the Netherlands, till the acknowledgement of the Independence of the Seven United Provinces by the Spanish Monarch.*

The laws, the customs, and the government of all these provinces were nearly alike: each had its representative assembly of the three orders, of the clergy, nobility, and burghers: each had its courts of justice; and an appeal from the superior tribunal of each lay to the supreme court at Mechlin.

Public and fiscal concerns of moment fell under the cognizance of the sovereign. The people enjoyed numerous and considerable privileges: the most important of them was the *Droit de Joyeuse entree*, the right of not being taxed without the consent of the three estates. Commerce, agriculture, and the arts, particularly music and painting, flourished among them. The people were honest, frugal, regular and just in their general habits; more steady than active; not easily roused; but, when once roused, not easily appeased.

[Sidenote: Brief View of the History of the Netherlands.]

Charles V. made over his hereditary territories in Germany to his brother Ferdinand; but retained the Netherlands, and annexed them to the crown of Spain.

With that crown, they descended to Philip the Second, the only son of Charles.

Unwise and unjust measures of that monarch drove the inhabitants into rebellion.

On the 5th of April 1566, a deputation of 400 gentlemen, with Lewis of Nassau, a brother of the prince of Orange, at their head, presented a petition to Margaret of Austria, the Governor of the Netherlands. From the coarseness of their dress, they acquired the name of *gueux* or *beggars*, and retained it throughout the whole of the troubles which followed.

[Sidenote: Brief View of the History of the Netherlands.]

Calvinism had, before this time, made great progress in these countries, and gained over to it numbers of the discontented party. Philip proceeded to the most violent measures, and sent the Duke of Alva, with an army of 20,000 men, into the Netherlands. William, Prince of Orange, placed himself at the head of the malcontents, and raised an army. At an assembly of the States of Holland and Zeeland in 1559, he was declared Stadtholder, or Governor of Holland, Friesland, and Utrecht: Calvinism was declared to be the religion of the States. In 1579, the three provinces were joined by those of Gueldres, Zutphen, Overysse, and Groeningen. All signed, by their deputies, the TREATY OF UNION; it became the basis of their constitution: still,



however, they acknowledged Philip for their sovereign. But in 1581, the deputies of the United States assembled at Amsterdam, subscribed a solemn act, by which they formally renounced allegiance to Philip and his successors, and asserted their independence. They declared in their manifesto, that “the prince is made for the people, not the people for the prince;” that “the prince, who treats his subjects as slaves, is a tyrant, whom his subjects have a right to dethrone, when they have no other means of preserving their liberty;” that “this right particularly belongs to the Netherlands; their sovereign, being bound by his coronation oath to observe the laws, under pain of forfeiting his sovereignty.”

## Page 18

In 1584, the Prince of Orange was assassinated by Balthazar Gerard, a Catholic fanatic: the war was continued till 1609, when it was suspended by a truce of twelve years. At the expiration of it, the war burst forth with fresh fury: it was finally terminated by the peace of Munster, or Westphalia, in 1648, when the King of Spain acknowledged, in the fullest manner, the INDEPENDENCE OF THE SEVEN UNITED PROVINCES, and of all their possessions in Asia, Africa, and America.

### V.4.

*Their Constitution and principal Officers.*

[Sidenote: Constitution of the Netherlands.]

Thus the United Provinces became a confederacy of seven independent principalities, called in the aggregate the States General. Several years elapsed before their constitution was finally settled. Then, the supreme sovereignty of the whole was considered to be vested in the people of every province represented by the States. These consisted of deputies appointed to them from the different provinces. Each province might send to the assembly more than one deputy; but, whatever was the number of deputies sent by them, they had one vote only in the proceedings of the assembly. The government of each province was vested in its states: these were composed of two orders, the deputies from the towns, and those from the equestrian order.

Each province contained several independent republics.

The States General could not make war or peace, or enter into alliances, or raise money, without the consent of all the seven provinces; nor did the decrees of any one of the States bind the constituent parts of it, without their consent.

[Sidenote: Constitution of the Netherlands.]

The Stadtholder was appointed by the States General, and held his office at their will. The offices of captain-general and admiral were united in him: thus he had the appointment of all military commands, both by sea and land; and had considerable influence and power in the nomination to civil offices. Three officers,—the *treasurer, the conservator of the peace, and the grand pensionary*, were appointed by the States General, and were immediately subject to their controul; they were wholly independent of the Stadtholder. The grand pensionary was always supposed to be profoundly versed in civil, ecclesiastical, and consuetudinary law; and in foreign diplomacy. All transactions between subjects or foreigners with the States General, passed through his hands. He attended the deliberations of the States; he was not entitled to vote, but was expected to sum up the arguments on each side, and to deliver his opinion upon them.



Each province had its advocate, syndic or pensionary; a public officer who superintended their public concerns; and represented them, but only with a deliberative voice, in the assembly of the States.

[Sidenote: Brief View of the History of the Netherlands.]



## Page 19

We now reach the aera, at which our intended biography commences. A Literary History of the Netherlands, from the time of their becoming subjects to the Dukes of Burgundy, till this aera, is much wanted.

### CHAPTER I.

#### THE BIRTH AND EDUCATION OF HUGO GROTIUS.

1582-1597.

The Life of Erasmus, which we have offered to the public, presents to its readers, the interesting spectacle of a person, born under every disadvantage for the acquisition of literature, surmounting them all by his genius and perseverance, and reaching, at an early age, the highest summit of literary eminence: the Life of GROTIUS, which we now attempt, exhibits the successful literary career of a person, born with every advantage, undeviatingly availing himself of them, and attaining equal eminence; with the addition of high reputation for great political wisdom and public integrity.

[Sidenote: His Birth and Education.]

He was born at Delft, on the 10th April 1582. His parents were John de Groote, and Alida Averschie. John was the second son of Hugo de Groote by Elselinda Heemskirke. Hugo was the son of Cornelius Cornet by Ermingarde, the daughter and sole heiress of Diederic de Groote. Upon their marriage, Diederic stipulated that Cornet should adopt the surname of Groote: it signifies *Great*, and is said to have been given to Diederic for some signal service, which he had rendered to his sovereign. All the males and females mentioned in the genealogy of Grotius were of noble extraction.

Learning appears to have been hereditary in the family: John, the father of Hugo, the subject of our biography, was both a lawyer in great practice, and a general scholar.

The 10th of April, on which GROTIUS was born, was Easter Sunday in that year: he always observed his birthday with religious solemnity.

All the biographers of Grotius assert, and their assertion will be easily believed, that he discovered, in his earliest years, great aptitude for the acquisition of learning, great taste, judgment and application, and a wonderful memory. He found, in his father, an excellent tutor: by him, Grotius was instructed in the rudiments of the Christian doctrine, and his infant mind impressed with sound principles of morality and honour; in this, he was aided by the mother of Grotius. The youth corresponded with their cares. He has celebrated, in elegant verses, their pious attention to his early education. The mention of these verses will bring to the recollection of every English reader, the magnificent strains, in which, Milton addressed *his* father.

[Sidenote: CHAP. I. 1582-1597.]



## Page 20

As soon as Grotius had passed his childhood, he was placed with Utengobard, an Arminian clergyman: we shall see that this circumstance had a decisive influence upon his future life. He retained a lasting regard for Utengobard, and a grateful recollection of his obligations to him. At the age of twelve years, Grotius was sent to the university of Leyden, and committed to the care of Francis Junius. Here, he distinguished himself so much by his diligence, his talents, and his modesty, as to obtain the notice and regard of several of the most famous scholars of the times. Even Joseph Scaliger, equally distinguished by his learning and caustic arrogance, noticed him, and condescended to direct his studies. He was scarcely eleven years of age when Douza, one of the princes of the republic of letters in those times, celebrated his praises in verse: He declared that “he could scarcely believe that Erasmus promised so much as Grotius at his age:” he announced that “Grotius would soon excel all his contemporaries, and bear a comparison with the most learned of the ancients.”

Grotius also gained the esteem of Barneveldt, the grand pensionary, in whose fate he was afterward involved. In 1587, the Dutch sent Count Justin of Nassau and Barneveldt, at the head of an embassy, to Henry IV. of France. Barneveldt permitted Grotius to accompany him.

[Sidenote: His Birth and Education.]

Grotius had been preceded by his reputation. He was known to M. de Busenval, the monarch’s ambassador in Holland. Busenval described him favourably to the monarch. Henry gave Grotius a gracious reception, and was so pleased with his conversation and demeanour, that he presented him with his picture and a golden chain. Grotius gives an account of this embassy, in the seventh book of his Annals: he abstains, with a praiseworthy modesty, from any mention of himself: but, in one of his poems, he dwells with complacency on his having seen the monarch, “who owed his kingdom only to his valour”—

" ... *Le Heros, qui regna sur la France,*  
*Et par droit de conquete et par droit de naissance.*"  
VOLTAIRE, *Henriade*.

Grotius was so much pleased with his reception, and the present which he received from Henry, that he caused a print of himself, adorned with the chain presented to him by Henry, to be engraved. He was introduced to many of the most distinguished persons at Paris: there was one, whom he particularly esteemed, but whom, from some unexplained circumstance, he missed seeing.

[Sidenote: Chap. 1. 1582-1597]



## Page 21

This was *the President de Thou*, a name never to be mentioned without veneration. He had been employed by his sovereign on many delicate and important commissions, and had acquitted himself in all, with ability and honour. He had filled the office of *Maitre des Requetes*, and been advanced to that of *President a Mortier*. He was employed, at this time, upon his immortal History. In the account which it gives of the events, that took place in France, it is entitled to almost unqualified praise: in regard to what happened to other countries, he necessarily depended on the information which he received from them, and cannot therefore be equally relied upon. The prolixity, with which he is now reproached, was not felt at the time in which he wrote; every event, however small, was then thought to be important, and multitudes were personally interested in it. But the charm of his work is, that every page of it shews a true lover of his country, an impartial judgment, and an honourable mind. The memoirs, which he has left us of his own life, recently translated into English by Mr. Collinson, are interesting and entertaining. He collected a very large library, both of printed books and manuscripts, and had them splendidly bound. The whole was sold by auction in the reign of Louis XIV, and scarcely produced half the sum which the binding of its volumes had cost: The same has been said of the Harleian collection, sold in our times.

[Sidenote: His Birth and Education.]

Having remained a twelvemonth at Paris, Grotius returned to Holland. Immediately after his arrival, he addressed a letter to the president de Thou, in which he expressed great mortification at not having seen him, and requested his acceptance of a book accompanying his letter, which he had dedicated to the Prince of Conde. The president de Thou was highly pleased with this letter: a correspondence took place between them. Grotius furnished the president with materials for that portion of his history which related to the troubles in the Low Countries.

In the last letter of the President de Thou, in this correspondence, he earnestly dissuades Grotius from engaging in the religious disputes of the times. In reply to it, Grotius respectfully intimates to the president, that “he found himself obliged to enter into them by his love of his country; his wish to serve his church, and the request of those to whom he owed obedience:” promising, at the same time, “to abstain from all disputes that were not necessary.” After the death of the President, Grotius celebrated his memory in a poem, which was considered by the bard’s admirers to be one of his best performances.

## CHAPTER II.

GROTIUS EMBRACES THE PROFESSION OF THE LAW. HIS FIRST PROMOTIONS.

1597-1610.

## Page 22

In the ruin of the Roman Empire, her laws were lost in the general wreck. During the 200 years, which followed the reign of Constantine the Great, Europe was a scene of every calamity, which the inroads of barbarians could inflict, either on the countries through which they passed, or those in which they settled. About the sixth century, Europe obtained some degree of tranquillity, in consequence of the introduction of feudalism; the most singular event in the annals of history. At first, it produced a general anarchy; but the system of subordination upon which it was grounded, contained in it the germ of regular government, and even, of jurisprudence. Its effects were first visible in the *various codes of law* which the barbarous nations promulgated. Such are the Salic, the Ripuarian, the Alemannic, the Burgundian, the Visigothic, and the Lombard laws.

[Sidenote: Feudal Jurisprudence.]

A complicated or refined system of jurisprudence is not to be looked for in them; but, if they are considered with due regard to the state of society for which they were calculated, they will be found to contain much that deserves praise. The *capitularies*, or short legislative provisions, propounded by the sovereign, and adopted by the public assemblies of the nation, were a further advance in legislation. By degrees, so much regularity prevailed in the judicial proceedings and legal transactions, that they were regulated by established *formularies*; and, in addition to those provisions, every nation contained a collection of unwritten usages or *customs*, which had the force of law. The natural tendency of these institutions to introduce order and peaceful habits into society was great; but it was so much counteracted by the turbulent spirit of every class of men, that it was not till the beginning of the thirteenth century that this effect of them became discernible.

[Sidenote: CHAP. II. 1597-1610]

From this time, the governments of Europe sensibly improved. A better spirit of legislation shewed itself; the administration of justice became more regular; trade and husbandry were protected, several arts were encouraged; and a general wish for a better order of things prevailed in every part of Europe. While the public mind was in this state of improvement, an event fortunately happened, which gave it a very salutary direction. This was, (what we have already noticed), the discovery of a complete copy of the *Pandects of Justinian* at Amalfi, a town in Italy, near Salerno. From Amalfi, it found its way to Pisa; and in 1406, was carried to Florence, where it has since remained.

[Sidenote: The Civil Law]

## Page 23

Few events in history can be mentioned which have conduced more to the welfare of Europe than this discovery. The codes, the capitularies, the formularies, and the customs, by which, till that time, the feudal nations had been governed, fell very short of affording them the legal provisions, which society, in the improved state of civilization, to which it was then advancing, evidently required. Unexpectedly, a system of law presented itself, which seemed to contain every thing that the most enlightened men of those times could have desired. The wisdom and justice of the system of law expressed in the Pandects seem to have been universally felt. The study of it was immediately pursued with ardour. It was introduced into several universities; exercises were performed, lectures read, and degrees conferred in that, as in other branches of science; and most of the nations of the continent adopted it, if not as the basis, at least as an important portion of their civil jurisprudence. A regular *succession of civil* lawyers followed. At first, they rather incumbered the text with their subtleties, than illustrated it by learning and discrimination. *Andrew Alciat* was the first who united the study of polite learning with the study of the civil law: he was founder of a school called the *Cujacian*, from *Cujas*, the glory of civilians. Of him, it may be truly said, that he found the civil law in wood and left it in marble.

This school has subsisted until our time: it has never been without writers of the greatest taste, judgment and erudition; the names of Cujacius, Augustinus, the Gothofredi, Heineccius, Voetius, Vinnius, Gravina and Pothier, are as dear to the scholar as they are to the lawyer; an Englishman however must reflect with pleasure, that the Commentaries of his countryman, Sir William Blackstone, will not suffer in a comparison with any foreign work of jurisprudence. So far as the researches of the present writer extend, the only one that can be put into competition with them, is the *Jus Canonicum of Van-Espen*.

[Sidenote: CHAP. II. 1597-1610]

The judicial process of the nations on the continent differed considerably from that of England. Trial by jury, and separate courts of equity, were unknown to them. Some causes were heard and decided by all the magistrates of the courts; others were referred to one or more of their number. The king's advocate, or the advocate of the state, as he was termed in a republic, held a situation between the judges and the suitors: his province was to sum the facts and arguments of the cause, and to suggest his opinions upon them to the judges.—We trust our readers will excuse this summary view of foreign jurisprudence.



## Page 24

Grotius, by the advice of his father, addicted himself to the profession of the law. He was only in his seventeenth year, when he pleaded his first cause. He acquired by it, great reputation; and this was constantly upon the increase, through the whole of his professional career. He observed in his pleadings a rule, which he afterwards recommended to his son: "That you may not," he told him, "be embarrassed by the little order observed by the adversary counsel, attend to one thing, which I have found eminently useful: Distribute all that can be said on both sides, under certain heads; imprint these strongly in your memory; and, whatever your adversary says, refer it not to his division, but to your own."

[Sidenote: Grotius embraces the profession of the Law.]

The brilliant success of Grotius at the bar soon procured him very considerable promotions. The place of Advocate-General of the Fisc of the provinces of Holland and Zeeland becoming vacant, it was unanimously conferred on him. This situation was attended with great distinction and authority; the person invested with it, being charged with the preservation of the public peace, and the prosecution of public offenders. In 1613, Grotius was advanced to the situation of Pensionary of Rotterdam; and his high character authorized him to stipulate before he accepted it, that he should hold it during his life, and not, at will, its usual tenure. It immediately gave him a seat in the assembly of the States of Holland; and, at a future time, a seat in the assembly of the States General.

Between the time of his appointment to the advocacy of the Fisc of Holland and Zeeland, and his being appointed Pensionary of Rotterdam, he married Mary Reygersburgh, of an illustrious family in Zeeland. It proved a marriage of happiness. The most perfect harmony subsisted between Grotius and his consort: we shall find that she was an ornament to him in prosperity, his comfort and aid in adverse fortune. The marriage was solemnized in July 1608, and celebrated by many a Belgic bard.

[Sidenote: CHAP II. 1597-1610.]

A dispute arising about this time between England and the States General, upon the exclusive right claimed by the former to fish in the Northern seas, the States, with a view to an amicable adjustment of it, sent Grotius to England. Several meetings took place between him and commissioners appointed by James, the British sovereign. If we credit the account, given by Grotius, of the point in dispute, and the negotiation to which it gave rise, justice was decidedly on the side of the States General; and England only carried the point by the lion's right,—the *droit du plus fort*.

[Sidenote: Grotius embraces the profession of the Law.]

## Page 25

Grotius had every reason to be pleased with his reception by the English monarch and his court. Between Grotius and Casaubon, who, at this time, resided in England, an intimacy had long subsisted. It was cemented by mutual esteem, similarity of studies, and the earnest wish of each for an amicable termination of religious differences: each respected the antient doctrines and discipline of the church; each thought that many of the points in controversy were disputes of words; that much might be gained by mutual concessions; and that the articles, upon which there was any substantial difference, were few. "I esteem Grotius highly,"—Casaubon writes in a letter to the president de Thou, "on account of his other great qualities; but particularly because he judges of the modern subjects of religious controversy like a learned and good man. In his veneration for antiquity, he agrees with the wisest men." ... "I heartily pray God," says Casaubon in a letter to Grotius, "to; preserve you: as long as I shall live, I shall hold you in the highest esteem: so much am I taken with your piety, your probity, and your admirable learning." [005]

### CHAPTER III.

#### THE EARLY PUBLICATIONS OF GROTIUS.

There is not, perhaps, an instance of a person's acquiring at an age equally early, the reputation, which attended the first publication of Grotius. It was an edition, with notes, of the work of "*Martianus Mineus Felix Capella*, on the Marriage of Mercury and Philology, in two books; and of the same writer's Seven Treatises on the Liberal Arts." They had been often printed; but all the editions were faulty: a manuscript of them having been put into the hands of Grotius by his father, he communicated it to Scaliger, and by his advice undertook a new edition of them.

The time, in which Capella lived, and the place of his birth, are uncertain; the better opinion seems to be, that he flourished towards the third century, resided at Rome, and attained the consular dignity. His works are written in prose, intermixed with poetry. His diction has some resemblance to that of Tertullian, but is much more crabbed and obscure: none, but the ablest Latin scholars, can understand him. The Marriage of Mercury and Philology,—or of Speech with Learning, is not uninteresting. His other treatises contain nothing remarkable: that upon music, is hardly intelligible; it is printed separately in the collection of *Meibomius*. With all his harshness and obscurity, Capella seems to have been much studied in the middle ages,—some proof that there was more learning in them, than is generally supposed,—he is so often quoted by the writers of those times, that some persons have supposed that his work was then a text book in the schools.

[Sidenote: The early publications of Grotius.]

[Sidenote: CHAP. III. 1597-1610.]

## Page 26

When Grotius undertook his edition of *Capella*, he was only twelve years of age: he published it in his fourteenth year, and dedicated it to the Prince of Conde. The learning and critical discernment displayed by him in this publication excited astonishment, and obtained for him the applause of all the literary world. Grotius himself gives the following account of his work: "We have collated *Capella* with the several authors, who have investigated the same subjects. In the two first books, we have consulted those whose writings contain the sentiments of the antient philosophers, as Apuleius, Albericus and others, too tedious to name; on grammar, we have compared, *Capella* with the antient grammarians; in what he has said on rhetoric, with Cicero and Aquila; on logic, with Porphyry, Aristotle, Cassiodorus and Apuleius; on geography, with Strabo, Mela, Solinus, and Ptolemy, but chiefly Pliny; on arithmetic, with Euclid; on astronomy, with Hyginus, and others, who have treated on that subject; on music, with Cleonides, Vitruvius and Boethius." In Grotius's Annotations all these writers are mentioned in a manner, which shews that he was thoroughly conversant with their works. Grotius's edition is become, from its extreme scarcity, a typographical curiosity: all the other editions are scarce. The writer of these pages found, with great difficulty, a copy of it in the London market.[006] That of Bonhomme, published at Lyons in 1539, he procured by loan. The celebrated Leibniz began to prepare an edition of *Capella in usum Delphini*; but his collections being purloined from him, he desisted from his project: it must be owned that the general learning of Leibniz qualified him admirably for such a task.[009]

[Sidenote: The early Publications of Grotius.]

While yet in his fourteenth year, Grotius published a translation of a work, published by Simon Steven in 1586, upon Navigation, and shewed by it a profound knowledge of mathematics:[010] he dedicated it to the republic of Venice.

[Sidenote: CHAP. III. 1597-1610.]

In the following year, Grotius published *the Phenomena of Aratus*, a poetical treatise of that author upon astronomy, with Cicero's translation of it, so far as it has reached us. Grotius supplied the vacancies. It is universally admitted that the parts supplied by him, are not inferior to those of Cicero. The abbe d'Olivet, the editor of Cicero's works, and an enthusiastic admirer of his style, declares that "the Muse of Cicero[011] did not throw the Muse of Grotius into the shade:" he therefore inserted the supplementary verses of Grotius in his edition. Grotius dedicated his work to the States of Holland and West Friseland; and promised them in his dedication something more considerable. He was complimented upon it by several of the greatest men of the age.

The following simile, taken from Cicero's translation of *Aratus*, and Voltaire's version of it, are greatly admired:



## Page 27

Sic Jovis altisoni subito pennata satelles,  
Arboris e trunco, serpentis saucia morsu;  
Ipsa feris subigit transfigens unguibus anguem  
Semianimum, et varia graviter cervice micantem;  
Quem se intorquentem laniens rostroque craentans,  
Abjicit efflantem, et laceratum effundit in undas,  
Seque obitu a solis nitidos convertit ad ortus.

CICERO.

Tel on voit cet oiseau, qui porte le tonnere,  
Blesse par un serpent elance de la terre;  
Il s'envole, il entraine au sejour azure  
L'ennemi tortueux dont il est entoure.  
Le sang tombe des airs: il dechire, il devore  
Le reptile acharne, qui le combat encore;  
Il le perce, il le tient sous ses ongles vainqueurs,  
Par cent coups redoubles il venge ses douleurs;  
Le Monstre en expirant, se debat, se replie;  
Il exhale en poison le reste de sa vie;  
Et l'aigle tout sanglant, fier et victorieux,  
Le rejette en fureur, et plane au haut des cieux.

VOLTAIRE.

[Sidenote: The early Publications of Grotius.]

About the year 1608, Grotius published his celebrated work *Mare Liberum*, to assert in it against the English, the general freedom of the sea. The controversy arose upon the claim of Great Britain to enjoy the dominion of the British seas, in the most extensive sense of those words, both as to the right of navigating them, and the right of fishing within them. Against this claim, Grotius attempted to shew that the sea was, from its nature, insusceptible of exclusive right; and that, if it were susceptible of it, England did not prove her title to it. Selden, in opposition to Grotius, asserted the British claim, by his treatise *Mare Clausum*,—a noble exertion of a vigorous mind, fraught with profound and extensive erudition. It is pleasing to add, that he treats Grotius with the respect due to his learning and character. Selden's treatise was thought of so much importance to his cause, that a copy of it was directed to be deposited in the British Admiralty. Grotius was highly pleased with the respect, which was shewn to him by Selden.

On Selden's *Mare Clausum* he composed the following epigram:—

Ipsum compedibus qui vinxerat Ennegisaeum,  
Est Greca Xerxes multus in historia:



Lucillum Latii Xerxem dixere togatum;  
Seldenus Xerxes ecce Britannus erit.

[Sidenote: CHAP. III. 1597-1610]

The States General were gratified by his work; but at that time it was so much their interest to preserve the strictest amity with England, that they discountenanced any further advocation of their claim.[012]

## Page 28

The year after his publication of his "Treatise on the Freedom of the Sea," Grotius printed his work on the "*Antiquity of the Batavian Republic*." He gives in it an account of the antient *Batavians*; he professes to shew that they were the allies, not the subjects of the Romans; that, after a period of anarchy, during which little is known of their history, they became subjects of the Counts of Holland; that these were not vassals of the empire, but independent princes; and, strictly speaking, elected by the people, although, in the election of them, great regard was always shewn to the hereditary line: that they were bound to conform to the laws of the state; and always required, before their election, to swear to the observance of the constitution; that the taxes were always imposed by the States, and that Philip the Second had occasioned the grand war, by repeated infractions of the public and private right of the people of the United Provinces.

[Sidenote: The early Publications of Grotius.]

The States of Holland were highly pleased with this work; they voted thanks to its author, and accompanied them with a present. It is considered that his partiality to his country led him to advance some positions favourable to its antient independence, which his proofs did not justify.

For the use of *Du Maurier*, the French ambassador to the States General, Grotius published, about this time, his "Directions for a Course of general Study," *De omni genere studiorum recte instituendo*. It was favourably received, both by the diplomatist for whose use it was composed, and the public at large; but, on account of the great extension of literature, since the time of Grotius, it is now little read. Mentioning the Roman history, he shews that a knowledge of it is better acquired by reading its Greek than by reading its Latin historians; because foreigners give more attention to the public manners and customs of a country than natives.

[Sidenote: CHAP. III. 1597-1610.]

All the works, which we have mentioned, were most favourably received in every part of the United Provinces. It was now become evident that the exertions for their independence were on the eve of being crowned with complete success. All the European Powers had deserted Spain, so that she was left to her own single and unaided strength, to maintain the contest against the insurgent provinces. The glory, which they acquired by their successful resistance to her, determined them to make choice of an historian, who should transmit to future ages the signal exploits of their memorable struggle. With this view, they appointed Grotius their historiographer.

[Sidenote: The Poems of Grotius.]



## Page 29

It remains to mention the "*Poems of Grotius*:" throughout his life, he sacrificed to the Muses. The *Prosopopoeia*, in which he introduces the City of Ostend addressing the world, when, in the third year of her siege, the Marquis Spinola led the troops of Spain against her, was greatly, admired. All the adjacent territory had been taken by the Spaniards, so that nothing remained of it to the confederates, but the precinct within the walls of the city; and even much of this had been wrested from the besieged. All Europe had its eye fixed on the operations of Spinola. It is therefore, with great propriety of language, that Grotius makes Ostend thus address herself to the world, in the following lines:—

“Area parva ducum, totus quam respicit orbis;  
Celsior una malis, et quam damnare ruinae  
Nunc quoque fata timent,—alieno in litore resto.  
Tertius annus abit; toties mutavimus hostem:  
Saevit hyems pelago, morbisque furentibus aestas;  
Et minimum est quod fecit Iber,—crudelior armis  
In nos orta lues,—nullum est sine funere funus.  
Nec perimit mors una semel:—Fortuna quid haeres?  
Qua mercede tenes mixtos in sanguine manes?  
Quis tumulos moriens hos occupet hoste perempto?  
Queritur,—et sterili tantum de pulvere pugna est.”

“A small area of chiefs, whom the whole world contemplates; alone loftier than my woes;  
I, whom the Fates even yet, fear to condemn to ruin;—remain on a foreign shore.

“The third year now passes away; thrice has my foe  
been changed:

“The winter rages on the sea; the summer, by its furious  
heats.

“The Spaniard has been my least enemy;—more cruel  
than arms, a pestilence has risen among us; no funeral is  
without another; the dying never perish by a single death.

“Fortune! why do'st thou hesitate? By what reward  
do'st thou detain the manes mingled in blood?

“Who, dying, will, after the destruction of the enemy,  
occupy these tombs?—This is enquired.—  
The contest is only for sterile dust.”

With the following poetical translation of these verses, the writer has been favoured by Mr. Sotheby, the elegant translator of “Oberon.”



Scant battle-field of Chiefs, thro' earth renown'd,  
Opprest, I loftier tow'r;—and, now, while Fate  
Dreads to destroy, in foreign soil I stand.  
Thrice chang'd the year, thrice have we chang'd the Foe.  
Fierce Winter chafes the Deep, the Summer burns  
With fell disease: less fell th' Iberian sword.  
Dire Pestilence spreads;—on funerals funerals swell:  
Nor does one death at once extirpate all.  
Why, Fortune! linger? why our souls detain  
With blood immingled? Who, the Foe extinct,  
Who, dying, shall these sepulchres possess,  
And in this sterile dust the conflict close?



## Page 30

W.S.

March 28, 1826.

[Sidenote: CHAP. III. 1597-1610.]

These verses produced a great sensation in the literary world: they were ascribed by many to Scaliger, as the best Latin poet of the age; the only person considered to be capable of writing them. The celebrated Peyresck hinted this to that learned man: Scaliger answered, that "he was too old not to be the aversion of the virgins of Helicon," and announced that the verses were written by Grotius. They were translated into French by Du Vair, afterwards the keeper of the seals; by Rapin, grand-provost of the Constabulary of France; by Stephen Pasquier, and by Malherbes: Casaubon translated them into Greek.[013]

[Sidenote: The Poems of Grotius.]

Three Generals had successively been entrusted with the siege of Ostend; nine commanders had successively been entrusted with its defence: the siege had cost the besiegers and besieged 100,000 lives: all the historians of the times agree, that few important consequences were derived to either side by the success of the Spaniards. The Archduke and Infanta, had the curiosity to view the city, after it was taken. They found in it nothing but heaps of ruins: little that shewed the former state of the town; its ditches were filled, its fortifications overthrown, its buildings, and the works of attack and defence, were levelled with the ground. Spinola led them to the spots in which the most remarkable events had taken place; and, finally to that, in which the forces of the besieged had made their last stand; had, for want of space, found themselves unable to raise military works, and had, on that account, found themselves forced to surrender. The Archduke and the Infanta were moved to tears at the melancholy sight; and declared that such a victory was not worth its cost.

[Sidenote: CHAP. III. 1597-1610.]

The success of the siege of Ostend covered Spinola with glory: his reply to a person, who asked him,—who, in his opinion was the greatest general of the age,—is generally known: "Prince Maurice," he said, "is the second." [014]

The principal poetical performances of Grotius in the collection we have mentioned, are—*three tragedies*, "Adam in Banishment," "Christ Suffering," and "Sophomphaneos," which signifies in the language of Egypt, "the Saviour of the world:" it exhibits the story of Joseph. Sandys translated it into English verse, and dedicated his translation to Charles I. From the second of these tragedies, Lauder transcribed many of the verses, upon which he founded the charge of plagiarism against Milton.



An eminent rank among modern Latin poets, has always been assigned to Grotius: his diction is always classical, his sentiments just. But those who are accustomed to the *wood notes* of the Bard of Avon, will not admire the scenic compositions, however elegant or mellifluous, of the Batavian Bard.

## CHAPTER IV.

## Page 31

HISTORICAL MINUTES OF THE UNITED PROVINCES, FROM THEIR DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, TILL THE ARMINIAN CONTROVERSY.

The present chapter will lead our readers to the public life of Grotius: in a former page we succinctly mentioned the principal events in the history of the United Provinces, from their first insurrection against Philip II. till their declaration of independence. On that event, they continued Prince William of Orange in the Stadtholderate: he was entitled to it by his civil and military talents. Application, activity, liberality, eloquence, intrepidity, enterprise and discretion, were united in him in an extraordinary degree: he could accommodate himself to all persons and occurrences, accelerate or retard events, as best served the interests of his cause, or his own designs. In the rare talent of governing popular assemblies, and procuring the co-operation of persons of opposite views, he has had few equals. He wanted no quality, which a chief of a party should possess, either to insure the success of the public object, or to further his private aims.

[Sidenote: CHAP. IV. 1597-1610.]

These had, for some time, been suspected: it was generally observed, that he affected the exercise of sovereign authority; that he endeavoured to attach the military to his own person; that he always sought to have the acts of the States issued in his own name; that, on many occasions, he avoided consulting the States, or doing any thing which could be considered an explicit recognition of their supremacy; and that in several instances, in which the constitution required the co-operation of the States, he acted independently of them. This gave rise to a party, which was jealous of his power, and on many occasions thwarted, what they thought the projects of his private ambition. From their attachment to the constitution, they were termed the republican party: Barneveldt, the Grand-Pensionary of the States General, was their leader.

[Sidenote: Assassination of William Prince of Orange.]

Whatever were the projects of the prince, there appeared to be great probability of their ultimate success. In 1684, he had gained so far, that the States of Holland, Zealand and Frizeland, had come to a resolution to confer upon him the sovereignty of their states, under the title of Count. All the conditions were settled: on one hand, the rights of the prince, on the other, the rights of the people, were defined and recognised; a contravention of them by any of the people was declared to be treason; the infringement of them by the prince, was declared to be a forfeiture of his sovereignty. Thus the prince seemed to be on the eve of receiving the fruit of all his exertions. But, as we have already mentioned, he was assassinated by Balthazar Gerard, a fanatic Spaniard. The last words of the prince were, "Lord! have mercy on my soul! have pity on my poor country!"

## Page 32

In 1585, Prince Maurice, the second son of William, was, chiefly by the influence of Barneveldt, proclaimed Stadtholder by the States General. They were not less jealous of his views, than they had been of his father's; but the misconduct of the Earl of Leicester had made it necessary for them to throw themselves into the prince's arms. The weakness of Spain, and the troubles in France, now permitted the United Provinces to enjoy some repose. They availed themselves of it, to settle the constitution: the towns were repaired, the fortifications completed, Universities were founded or revived at Utrecht, Leyden and Franker; and the arts of peace began to be cultivated.

[Sidenote: CHAP. IV. 1597-1610.]

Maurice inherited all the civil talents of his father; he had greater military skill, and at least equal ambition. The art of war seems to consist, at the present time, in directing immense masses of men, by skilful evolutions and positions, to the destruction of the force opposed. In the wars of the Netherlands, it was principally shewn by surprising strong-holds, besieging towns, regular assaults, advantageous encampments, and wasting the army of the enemy by skilful marches. The camp of Maurice became a school, in which the nobility and gentry of the empire, France, and England, entered as volunteers, to learn the art of war. His taking of the city of Breda, raised his reputation to the highest: from this time, the war, which, on the part of the United Provinces, had till then, been a defensive war, became offensive, and their arms were attended with almost uninterrupted success: they equally triumphed on Sea.

In 1698, the war between Spain and France was terminated. Philip II. soon afterwards died: he was succeeded by Philip III. a weak monarch. Then, began the naval glory of the United Provinces; their attacks on the West Indian and East Indian colonies of the Spaniards. In 1600, prince Maurice gained a decisive victory at Nieuport near Ostend: it was followed by other important successes. In 1607, Admiral Heemskirk obtained a complete victory over the Spanish fleet, though protected by the batteries of Cadiz, and seized their ships and treasures.

[Sidenote: Armistice between Spain and the United Provinces.]

The war between Spain and the United Provinces had now continued forty years: the resources of Spain were so exhausted, that she herself was forced to solicit an armistice. Prince Maurice objected to it, as the continuance of the war was essential to the furtherance of his own ambitious views. On this account, the truce was promoted by Barneveldt and the republican party. They justly thought that the aggrandizement of the house of Orange would be the extinction of the liberties of their country, so that the result of the war would only be, that the United Provinces would change their masters. After a long negotiation, an armistice of twelve years was agreed upon in 1609, and England and France guaranteed the execution of the treaty.



## Page 33

### CHAPTER V.

THE FEUDS IN THE UNITED PROVINCES BETWEEN THE DISCIPLES OF CALVIN AND THE DISCIPLES OF ARMINIUS, UNTIL THE SYNOD AT DORT.

1610-1617.

It has generally happened, when a people have risen against their sovereign, that their first successes have been followed by divisions among themselves; and that these have endangered, and sometimes even ruined, their cause. Such a division took place, in a remarkable manner, in the conflict between the United Provinces and Spain. No sooner did the arms of the former begin to prosper, and promise ultimate success, than the ARMINIAN CONTROVERSY burst forth. At first, it was merely a religious dispute; but it soon mixed itself in the national politics; split the people into two very hostile parties, and produced contentions between them, which more than once brought their cause to the brink of destruction. Grotius was unfortunately involved in them. This part of the history now claims our attention.

[Sidenote: Calvinism.]

The reformed church, in the largest import of the word, comprises all the religious communities, which have separated themselves from the church of Rome. In this sense, the words are often used by English writers; but, having been adopted by the French Calvinists to describe *their* church, these words are most commonly used, on the continent, as a general appellation of all the churches who profess the doctrines of Calvin.

[Sidenote: CHAP. V. 1610-1617.]

About the year 1541, the church of Geneva was placed by the magistrates of that city, under the direction of Calvin. He immediately conceived one of the boldest projects, that ever entered into the mind of an obscure individual. He undertook to new model the religious creed of the reformed church; to give it strength and consistency, and to render the church of Geneva the mother and mistress of all Protestant churches. His learning, eloquence, and talents for business, soon attracted general notice; and, while the fervour of his zeal, the austerity of his manners, and the devotional cast of his writings, attracted the multitude, the elegance of his compositions, and his insinuating style, equally captivated the gentleman and the scholar. By degrees, his fame reached every part of Europe. Having prevailed upon the senate of Geneva to found an academy, and place it under his superintendence, and having filled it with men eminent throughout Europe for their learning and talent, it became the favourite resort of all persons, who leaned to the new principles, and sought religious or literary instruction. From Germany, France, Italy, England and Scotland, numbers crowded to the new



academy, and returned from it to their native countries, saturated with the doctrine of Geneva, and burning with zeal to propagate its creed.

Calvin's peculiar doctrine on Predestination and Free-will soon attracted attention, and gave rise to *more than a civil war*[015] of controversy,[016]



## Page 34

We feel that we are free: if we were not free, conscience could not exist; for, if a man had not freedom of action, conscience could not intimate to him either its approbation or its disapprobation of his actions.

But—*how* are we free? *How* is free-will reconcileable, either with the influence of motive upon will? or with the order of the universe, prescribed by the Deity? or, with his prescience? For that, which his infinite mind prescribes or foresees, must be fixed.

[Sidenote: Disputes on the Free-will of Man.]

This question soon engaged the attention of the Greek Philosophers: some advocated the free-will of man; others denied it, and ascribed his actions to Fate or Destiny; a being or energy, which they were never able to define or describe. Among the Jews, the Sadducees embraced the former opinion; the Pharisees, the latter. Among the Mahometans, a like division took place between the followers of Omar, and those of Ali.

Unfortunately, the Christians engaged in these ungrateful speculations: their disputes chiefly turned upon the effect, which motive, suggested by grace, or the divine favour, has upon will. Does it necessitate? then, there is no free-will,—no merit,—no demerit. Does it not necessitate? then, in the choice of good, man acts by his own power, and thus achieves a good of which God is not the author.

[Sidenote: CHAP. V. 1610-1617.]

The dispute was brought to an issue by *Pelagius* and his disciples. They held, that man acts independently of divine grace, both in the choice and execution of good. This independence was denied by *St. Augustin*, he asserted, that man co-operates with grace, yet, that grace begins, advances and brings to perfection every thing in man, which can be justly called good. *St. Thomas of Aquin* new-modelled the system of *St. Augustin*, and used new terms in describing it: his subtile distinctions, in the opinion of many, considerably improved it.

*Calvin* aggravated the doctrine of *St. Augustin*. He maintained,[017] that the everlasting condition of mankind in the future world, was determined from all eternity, by the *unchangeable order* of the Deity; and that this *absolute* determination of his will was the only source of *happiness or misery* to individuals. Thus *Calvin* maintained, without any qualification, that God, from all eternity has doomed one part of mankind to everlasting happiness, the other to everlasting misery; and, was led to make this distinction, without regard to the merit or demerit of the object, and by no other reason or motive than his own pleasure.

*Luther*,[018] in opposition to *Calvin*, maintained, that the *divine decrees* respecting the salvation or misery of men, are founded upon a previous knowledge of their sentiments and characters; or, in other words, that God, foreseeing from all eternity the faith and

virtue of some, and the incredulity or wickedness of others, has reserved eternal happiness for the former, and eternal misery for the latter.



## Page 35

[Sidenote: Disputes on the Free-will of Man.]

These, and other doctrinal differences, separated the Protestants into the adherents to the creed of Luther, and the adherents to the creed of Calvin. The United Provinces were among the latter: the creed of Calvin was, as we have mentioned, one of the fundamental laws of the Union.

The Calvinistic doctrine, that God, from all eternity, consigns one portion of mankind, without any fault on their side, to everlasting torments, shocks our feelings, and is totally repugnant to the notions entertained by us of the goodness and justice of the Deity: it is not therefore surprising that it should be called in question. From the first, several objected to it; but it was not till the successes of the United Provinces appeared to afford them a near prospect of triumph, that the opposers of Calvin's doctrine formed themselves into a party, and occasioned a public sensation.

[Sidenote: CHAP. V. 1610-1617.]

The celebrated JAMES ARMINIUS[019] was at their head. He was born in 1560, at Oudewater in Holland, of respectable parents. He lost his father in his infancy, and was indebted, for the first rudiments of his education, to a clergyman, who had imbibed some opinions of the reformed religion. Under his tuition, Arminius studied, during some time, at Utrecht. After the clergyman's decease, Rudolphus Snellius, a clergyman of eminence, took Arminius under his protection, and, in 1575, placed him at Marpurch. There, he heard of the taking of Oudewater by the Spaniards, and their massacre of its inhabitants. His mother, sister, and two brothers were among the victims. On the first intelligence of the calamity he repaired to Oudewater, in hopes that the account of it might have been exaggerated. Finding it true, he retired to Leyden: there, his severe application to study, and the regularity of his morals, gained him universal esteem. In 1563, he was sent to Geneva, at the expense of the magistrates of Amsterdam, to perfect his studies under the care of Beza. Unfortunately, by adopting the philosophical principles, of *Ramus*, and unguardedly professing them, he displeased some leading men of the university, and was obliged to leave it: he then went to Basle. There, his reputation having preceded him, he was received with great kindness: the faculty of divinity offered him a doctor's degree; but a general wish for his return being expressed at Geneva, he declined the honour, and returned to that city. He then visited Italy, and, during some months, studied under Zabarella, a famous philosopher, who then lectured at Padua. In 1588, Arminius was ordained minister at Amsterdam.

[Sidenote: Arminius.]



## Page 36

Some theologians of Delft having attacked the sentiments of Calvin and Beza upon predestination, and given great offence by it, they defended themselves by a book, entitled; “An Answer to certain Arguments of Beza and Calvin, in the treatise concerning Predestination; or upon the ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.” They transmitted their defence to Martin Lydius, a partisan of the divines whom it attacked; he sent it to Arminius, with a request that he would answer it. Arminius undertook the task, and attentively examined and weighed the arguments on each side; the result was, that he embraced the opinions which he had been called upon to confute, and even went further than the ministers of Delft. Upon this account, the friends of the rejected principles raised a great clamour against him; but were quieted by the intervention of the magistrates. The opinions, which Arminius adopted, he endeavoured to propagate. They are contained in the Remonstrance of his disciples, which we shall afterwards transcribe.

[Sidenote: CHAP. V. 1610-1617.]

As the language of Arminius seemed to express notions, more consonant than those of Calvin, to the sentiments entertained by rational Christians, of the goodness and justice of the Deity, it is not surprising that they found many advocates among the learned and moderate; but some ardent spirits were offended by them, and instilled their dislike of them into the populace. This, Arminius was soon made to feel. In 1603, he was appointed, on the death of Francis Junius, to a professorship of theology in the university of Leyden: great efforts were made, first to prevent, and afterwards to procure a rescision of his appointment. He was accused of having said in a sermon, that “God had not yet sent his letter of divorce to the church of Rome;” but his friends produced a work of Francis Junius, his predecessor in the theological chair, in which that celebrated theologian had used the same expression. Arminius was also accused by his adversaries, of elevating the action of reason in the choice of good, at the expense of grace. To this Arminius replied, by accusing his adversaries of sacrificing reason entirely to grace. But the greater number of the enemies of Arminius supported their charges against him, by making it a question of authority: “the States,” they said, “had decided the question, by adopting Calvin’s doctrine at the union; so that the gainsayers of it were guilty of treason.” The friends of Arminius replied, that he did not deny Calvin’s doctrine, but merely explained it.

[Sidenote: Arminius.]

Thus they disputed;

“And found no end, in wandering mazes lost.”  
Milton.

In fact, the subject,—as the writer has more than once observed,—is above human reason: the day will come, “when the Almighty will be judged, and will overcome;”—

when the secret of his councils will be unfolded, and their justice and goodness made manifest to all.[020]

## Page 37

The friends of Arminius also observed, that he was by no means singular in his doctrine; that it was favoured by professors in Gueldres, Friesland, Utrecht, and other parts of Holland; and, that in all the provinces, it was patronized by the higher ranks of the laity. Was it fitting, they asked, that the peace of the church, and the tranquillity of the state, should be disturbed by such a dispute? by a dispute which affected no essential article of christianity; no civil, no moral, no religious observation?

[Sidenote: CHAP. V. 1610-1617.]

The principal adversary of Arminius was *Gomarus*, also a professor of theology at Leyden. When the election of Arminius was proposed, Gomarus announced suspicions of his orthodoxy; he afterwards raised his tone, and accused Arminius of Pelagianism, of secretly inclining to the church of Rome, and holding principles which led to general scepticism and infidelity.

Arminius died on the 19th October 1609.

Grotius made his eulogium in verse. He had hitherto applied little to these matters; he acknowledges, in a letter written in 1609, his general ignorance of them. Entering afterwards into the dispute, he became convinced that the idea, which we ought to have of the goodness and justice of God, and even the language of the scriptures and the early fathers of the church, favoured the system of Arminius, and contradicted that of Gomarus.

The prejudices against the Arminians increasing, they drew up a Remonstrance, dated the 14th January 1610, and addressed it to the States of Holland. It begins by stating what they do not believe: it afterwards propounds their own sentiments in the five articles following:[021]

[Sidenote: Remonstrance.]

1. "That God, by an eternal and immutable decree in Jesus Christ his son, before the world was created, resolved to save in Jesus Christ, on account of Jesus Christ, and through Jesus Christ, those, from among mankind fallen in sin, who, by the grace of the Holy Spirit believe in his same son Jesus; and through the same grace continue in the faith and obedience to the end; and, on the contrary, to leave under sin, and wrath, and to condemn the obstinate and unbelieving, as having no part in Christ; according to what is said *St. John* iii. 36.2. "That accordingly, Jesus Christ the Saviour of the world, died for all and every man; and by his death on the cross has merited for all, reconciliation with God, and remission of sin; in such manner nevertheless, that no one can partake of them but believers, according to the words of Jesus, *St. John* iii. 16., 1 *John* ii. 2.3. "That man hath not saving faith of himself, and by the strength of his own free will; since, while in a state of sin and apostasy, he cannot of himself think, desire, or do, that which is truly good, which is what is chiefly meant by saving faith; but it is



necessary that God in Jesus Christ, and by the Holy Spirit, regenerate and renew him in his understanding and affections, or in his will and all his powers; that he may know the true good, meditate on it, desire, and do it. *St. John xv. 5.*

[Sidenote: CHAP. V. 1610-1617.]



## Page 38

4. "That to this grace of God is owing the beginning, the progression, and accomplishment of all good; in such manner, that even the regenerate, without this antecedent, or preventing, exciting, concomitant, and cooperating grace, cannot think that, which is good, desire or practise it; nor resist any temptation to evil; so that all the good works or actions he can conceive, spring from the grace of God; that as to what regards the manner of operation of this grace, it is not irresistible, since it is said of several, they resisted the Holy Spirit. See *Acts vii.* and other places.5. "That those, who by a lively faith are engrafted into Christ, and consequently made partakers of his quickening spirit, are furnished with sufficient strength to be able to combat, and even overcome Satan, sin, the world, and their own lusts; and all this, as is carefully to be observed, by the assistance of the grace and the Holy Spirit; and that Jesus Christ succours them by his spirit in all temptations, reaches to them his hand, (provided they be willing to engage, ask his assistance, and are not wanting to themselves,) supports and strengthens them: so, that they cannot be led away by any wile or violence of Satan, or snatched out of Christ's hands, as he says himself, *St. John x. My sheep shall no man pluck out of my hands.* For the rest, if it be asked whether these may not through negligence let go the confidence they had from the beginning, (*Heb. iii. 6.*) cleave again to the present world, depart from the holy doctrine, which was delivered, make shipwreck of a good conscience? (*2 Pet. i. 10., Jude iii., 1 Tim. i. 19., Heb. xii. 15.*) This must be previously examined with more care, by the Scriptures, to be able to teach it with full assurance to others."

Such is the Confession of Faith of the Arminians: they gave it the name of *Remonstrance*; and were styled from it REMONSTRANTS. It was drawn up by *Utengobard*, minister at the Hague, with the help, it is supposed, of Grotius: it was signed by forty-six ministers.

[Sidenote: Contra-Remonstrance.]

The Gomarists opposed to it a *Contra-Remonstrance*; which gave them the name of the CONTRA-REMONSTRANTS.

It was about this time, that Grotius was elected Pensionary of Rotterdam, and ordered to England: it has been suggested, that he had secret instructions from the Arminians, to induce king James to favour their principles.

[Sidenote: CHAP. V. 1610-1617.]

We are informed, by Mr. Nichols, (*Calvinism and Arminianism compared*),[022] that the Arminians sent to King James by Grotius, a true state of their case; that Grotius found an adversary in *Archbishop Abbott*, and friends in *Bishops Andrews* and *Overal*; and that by their advice the monarch addressed to the States General, a wise and conciliatory letter.



## Page 39

The irritation of the public mind increasing, the States of Holland, to restore tranquillity, published an edict of Pacification, by which they strongly enjoined forbearance, toleration, and silence. This was favourable to the Arminians, but it increased the violence of the *Contra-remonstrants*. Thus, it became a signal of war. The States of Holland transmitted it to King James: his Majesty, the archbishop of Canterbury, and the other English prelates, allowed its doctrine to be orthodox.

[Sidenote: Remonstrants—Contra-Remonstrants.]

Still, the troubles in Holland augmented: riots took place and greater riots were apprehended. In an evil hour, Barneveldt, the Grand-Pensionary, proposed to the States of Holland, that the magistrates of the cities of that province should be empowered to raise troops for the suppression of the rioters. Amsterdam, Dort, and other towns, that favoured the Gomarists, protested against this measure, styling it a declaration of war against the *Contra-remonstrants*. Yet, on the 4th August 1617, Barneveldt's proposition was agreed to, and promulgated.

We have mentioned the enmity of Prince Maurice to Barneveldt, on account of his having promoted the armistice of 1609, and his favouring the republican party. The Prince professed to consider the edict of Pacification as derogatory of his authority, and forbade the soldiers to obey the States, if they should be ordered to act against the rioters. He publicly declared, that he favoured the Gomarists; he assisted, at the divine service, in their churches only, and shewed them every other mark of public favour. Exulting in this powerful support, the Gomarists separated themselves, formally, from the Arminians.

[Sidenote: CHAP. V. 1610-1617.]

To bring over Amsterdam to their sentiments, the States of Holland sent a deputation to the burgomasters of that city, and placed Grotius at its head. On the day after their arrival in Amsterdam, the burgomasters assembled to receive the deputies. Grotius addressed them in an argumentative and eloquent speech. He urged the necessity and advantage of religious toleration, particularly upon theoretical points of doctrine. He observed to the assembly, that Bullinger and Melancthon had been tolerated by Deza and Calvin; that James, the King of Great Britain, had advanced, in his writings, that each of the two opposite opinions on Predestination might be maintained without danger of reprobation; that Gomarus himself had declared that Arminius had not erred in any fundamental article of Christian doctrine; that the contested articles were of a very abstruse nature; that the affirmative or negative of the doctrines expressed in them, had not been determined; and that toleration would restore tranquillity and union, and favour the assembling of a numerous and respectable synod, which might labour with success in restoring peace to the church.

Grotius delivered his speech in the Dutch language; it was afterwards translated into Latin; all, who heard, admired it; but it produced no effect on them. The deputies were uncivilly dismissed; and the oration of Grotius, by an order of the States General, was suppressed.[023]

## Page 40

[Sidenote: Feuds of the Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants.]

He was much affected by the bad success of his mission: he was seized with a fever, which nearly proved fatal to him. Many of his friends sought to persuade him to retire from the contest: he told them that he had taken his resolution after deep deliberation; that he was aware of his danger, and that he submitted the event to providence.

The next effort of the States of Holland to pacify the troubles, was to prepare a *formula* of peace, which the ministers of the two parties should be obliged to sign. It contained nothing contrary to the doctrine of Calvin; it referred the five articles to future examination, and prescribed, in the mean time, silence upon the parts in dispute. Grotius drew up the Formula; it was shewn to Prince Maurice, and rejected by him.

[Sidenote: CHAP. V. 1610-1617.]

Matters now converged to a crisis:—we have more than once mentioned the opposite politics of Prince Maurice and Barneveldt, the Grand-Pensionary; the former wishing to draw the whole sovereign power to himself; the latter endeavouring to preserve and stabilitate the the constitution of the Provinces, as it had been settled by the Act of Union. We noticed that the Gomarists sided with the Prince; the Arminians with the Grand-Pensionary. As the Prince was aware that the States of Holland were favourable to the Arminians, that the States General were opposed to them, and that the clergy of each denomination partook of the civil and ecclesiastical opinions of their flocks, he convened a national synod of the clergy; and, that he might the more overawe his opponents and strengthen his own party, he appointed the synod to meet in Holland. Against this synod the provinces of Holland, Utretcht, and Overyssell protested. Barneveldt was so much affected by the disturbances, and a view of the evils with which they appeared to threaten his country, that he sought to resign his place of Grand-Pensionary; but the States of the province of Holland, which needed more than ever the counsels of such an experienced minister, sent a deputation to him, beseeching him not to abandon them in times of so much difficulty. He thought it his duty to yield to their entreaty, and continued to exercise the functions of his office.

[Sidenote: Imprisonment of Barneveldt, Grotius and Hoogerbetz.]

To frustrate the designs of Prince Maurice, several cities favourable to the Arminians levied bodies of militia, and gave them the name of *Attendant Soldiers*. The States-General, at the instigation of Prince Maurice, enjoined the cities to disband them. The cities generally disobeyed these orders. In this they were justified by the established constitution: the Prince, however, treated their conduct as rebellious; and, in concert with the States General, marched in person, at the head of his troops, against the refractory cities. Wherever he came, he disarmed and disbanded the new levies; deposed the Arminian magistrates, and expelled the ministers of their party.



## Page 41

In the provinces of Gueldres and Overysell, he met with no resistance; and little at Arnheim: greater resistance was expected at Utrecht: the States of Holland sent Grotius and Hoogerbetz, the Pensionary of Leyden, to stimulate the inhabitants to resistance; but the fortune of the Prince prevailed. In an extraordinary assembly, which consisted of eight persons only, yet assuming to act as the States General, the Prince procured an ordonnance to be passed, which directed Barneveldt, Grotius, and Hoogerbetz to be taken into immediate custody. They were accordingly arrested, and confined in the Castle at the Hague.

[Sidenote: CHAP. V. 1610-1617.]

Thus the Prince's party prevailed in every part of the United Provinces. About this time, he succeeded, in consequence of the death of his elder brother, to the dignity of Prince of Orange.

## CHAPTER VI.

THE SYNOD OF DORT.

1618.

[Sidenote: CHAP. VI. 1618.]

The States General determined that the Synod[024] should be composed of twenty-six divines of the United Provinces, twenty-eight foreign divines, five professors of divinity, and sixteen laymen;—seventy-five members in the whole. The expence was calculated at 100,000 florins. The English divines were, Dr. George Carlton, Bishop of Llandaff; Dr. Joseph Hall, Dean of Worcester; John Davenant, professor of divinity, and Master of Queen's college, Cambridge; Samuel Ward, Archdeacon of Taunton, and head of Sidney college, Cambridge. To these were added, Walter Balcanqual, a Scottish theologian, as representative of the Scottish churches. The ever-memorable John Hales of Eaton, as that learned and amiable person is justly termed by protestant writers, was permitted to attend the debates of the Synod, but was not allowed to speak, or take any part in its proceedings.

[Sidenote: The Synod of Dort.]

We have mentioned that Arminius was converted to the opinions, which he defended afterwards so strenuously, by the perusal of a work in support of the opposite doctrine, which he had been desired to confute. In the same manner, the proceedings of the Contra-Remonstrants, at the Synod of Dort, made Mr. Hales a Remonstrant. We are informed by his friend Mr. Faringdon, that, in his younger days, he was a Calvinist; but that some explanations given by Episcopius of the text in John iii. 16, induced him, as he himself said, to "bid John Calvin, Good Night." His letters from Dort to Sir Dudley



Carleton, the English ambassador at the Hague, contain an interesting account of the proceedings of the assembly.[025] [Sidenote: CHAP. VI. 1618.]

Dr. Heylin says, in his "Quinquarticular History," that the theologians sent by King James to Dort, were inclined to condemn the Remonstrants; but he intimates that the monarch acted from reasons of state; and that he was more hostile to their persons than their doctrines: Brand makes the same remark upon Prince Maurice. It seems to be admitted, that, in the conference at Hampton Court, King James declared against absolute predestination.[026]



## Page 42

The English divines arrived at the Hague on the 5th November 1618: they were immediately presented to the States General, and most honourably received.

[Sidenote: The Synod of Dort.]

The King of France had permitted two Protestant theologians of his kingdom to attend the Synod; but afterwards revoked the permission. The French Protestant churches had deputed to it, the celebrated Peter de Moulin and Andrew Rivet; but the King prohibited their attending it, under severe penalties.

After the election of the members was finally adjusted, the Synod appeared to be composed of about seventy Contra-Remonstrants and fourteen Arminians.

It was opened on the 13th of November 1618. Two commissioners of the States placed themselves on the right side of the chimney of the room; the English divines were placed on the left; seats were kept vacant for the French; the third place was assigned to the deputies from the Palatinate; the fourth, to those from Hesse; the fifth, to the Swiss; the sixth to the Genevans; the seventh to the theologians from Bremen; and the eighth to those from Embden. The professors of theology were placed immediately after the commissioners; then, the ministers and elders of the country. By an arrangement, favoured by the States, thirty-six ministers and twenty elders were added to the five professors. Of this the Remonstrants complained, on the just ground, that it evidently gave their adversaries an undue preponderance.

[Sidenote: CHAP. VI. 1618.]

The commissioners nominated the celebrated Daniel Heinsius secretary. The Remonstrants objected to him; they admitted his extensive acquaintance with polite literature, and his elegant taste; but asserted, that he possessed no theological learning, and was prejudiced against them. Episcopius was always considered to be at the head of the Remonstrants: he has seldom been excelled in learning, eloquence, or power of argumentation.

No further business than arranging the forms of sitting and voting, was transacted at the *first session* of the Synod. *At the second*, the Synod constituted John Bogerman its president, and appointed two assessors and two secretaries: all five were distinguished for their known hostility to the Remonstrants. The appointment of Bogerman particularly offended them, as he openly avowed it to be his opinion that heretics should be punished by death; and had translated into the Dutch language the celebrated treatise of Beza, *de haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis*, in which this doctrine is explicitly maintained in its fullest extent.

[Sidenote: The Synod of Dort.]



*In the third session,*—the deputies from Geneva produced their commission: it was expressed in terms decidedly hostile to the Remonstrants.

*In the fourth session,*—the grand preliminary question,—in what manner the Remonstrants were to be summoned,—came under consideration. After much argument, it was settled, by a great majority of voices, that “Episcopius and some other Remonstrants should within a fortnight, appear before the Synod, as the sovereign ecclesiastical tribunal of the United States.”



## Page 43

The Remonstrants and the advocates of their cause protested against this proceeding: they called in question the authority of the Synod to sit as judges upon them, or even to decide any point of doctrine definitively: they averred it contrary to the evangelical liberty professed and taught by the first Reformers. Every friend to the true principles of the reformation must admit the force of this objection.

The *5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th and 13th Sessions* of the intermediate fortnight, were consumed in debates upon a projected new translation of the Scriptures; *the 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th and 21st Sessions* were employed in discussions, upon a new catechism, and other ecclesiastical arrangements.

[Sidenote: CHAP. VI. 1618.]

The *22d Session* was held on the 6<sup>th</sup> of December. The Remonstrants appeared before the Synod, and requested further time for preparing their defence on the articles with which they were charged. Their request was denied: and Episcopius having said, that "They wished to enter into a conference with the Synod," a resolution was passed, by which the Synod declared, that "the Remonstrants had not been cited to *confer* with the Synod; but to propound their opinions, and submit to its judgment."

The Remonstrants then paid their visits to the foreign theologians: these they found greatly prejudiced against them; they therefore published two short writings, explaining and justifying their sentiments.

In *the 23d Session*, Episcopius made a long discourse. Mr. John Hales praised it highly, in a letter addressed by him to the English ambassador An oath was prescribed to the members, by which they promised, that, in the examination of the five articles, "or any other points of doctrine which should be discussed, they would confine themselves to the Scriptures, and resort to no human authority." But, what was the Synod itself more than human authority? The oath was not tendered to the Remonstrants; it was declined by the Swiss.

[Sidenote: The Synod of Dort.]

The *24th Session* was consumed in debates: *on the 25th*, Episcopius read a long document, and afterwards presented it to the Synod. He protested in it against the authority of the Synod, and asked the searching question, whether the Calvinists would "submit to a Synod of Lutherans?" To this question, no answer was given: an angry discussion followed.

It continued during *the 27th and 28th Sessions*.

*On the 29th*, the opinions of foreign divines were produced in favour of the authority of the Synod: those of the English divines, and the divines of Bremen, were expressed



with more moderation than the others. The divines of Geneva stated, that, “if a person obstinately refused to submit to the just decisions of the church, he might be proceeded against in two ways; the *magistrate* might coerce him, and the *church* might publicly excommunicate him as a violator of the law of God.”

## Page 44

The dispute was more violent in *the 30th Session*.

Finally, the Remonstrants agreed to propound their sentiments in writing; but with an express salvo, of their right to liberty of conscience, and to retain their objections to the authority of the Synod.

In *the 31st Session*, the Remonstrants presented to the Synod a writing, containing their sentiments upon Predestination,—the first and most important of the five articles.

[Sidenote: CHAP. VI. 1618.]

In *the 34th Session*, they presented their sentiments upon the four other articles; and in *the 39th Session*, upon the Catechism of Heidelberg. The Synod had enjoined them to confine themselves to explanations of their own doctrine, and to abstain from controverting the doctrines of the Calvinists. These debates carried the Synod to its *46th Session*.

In that session, the resolution of the States General upon the proceedings of the Synod was produced. They declared by it, that “the Remonstrants were obliged to submit to the decrees of the Synod,”—and that “if they persisted in their disobedience to them, both the censures of the church, and the penalties by which the States punished violators of public authority, should be inflicted upon them.” The States ordered the Remonstrants to remain, in the meantime, in the town.

The Remonstrants persisting in their refusal to acknowledge the authority of the Synod, an assembly of it met on *the 57th Session*, and formally expelled the Remonstrants from the Synod. Episcopius exclaimed, “May God decide between the Synod and us!” “I appeal,” said Niellius, “from the injustice of the Synod, to the throne of Jesus Christ.” All remained firm in their protestation.

[Sidenote: The Synod of Dort.]

Mr. Hales and Mr. Balcanqual, in their letters to the English ambassador, blame the proceedings of the Synod.[027] The only question between the Synod and the Remonstrants was, whether the latter would submit to acknowledge the authority of the former. This, the Remonstrants uniformly refused to do. In almost every Synod there was a repetition of the same demand, and of the same answer. By every English reader, the demand of the Synod will be thought exorbitant.

[Sidenote: CHAP VI. 1618.]

The Synod relaxed afterwards so far, as to permit the Remonstrants to deliver their sentiments in writing: they did it at great length. But they still persisted in objecting to the authority of the Synod, and to be examined by it. The Synod therefore proceeded against them in their absence; and ultimately, on the 24th of April 1610, pronounced



them guilty of pestilential errors, and corruptors of the true religion. The five articles were formally condemned; Episcopius and the other ministers were deposed.

[Sidenote: The Synod of Dort.]

## Page 45

“There are conclusions,” says Grotius,[028] in a letter written by him in the same year, “in the canons of the Synod of Dort, of which, if good Melancthon were again to make his appearance, he would express his disapprobation, and with which Bullinger would be no less grieved; there are others, which alienate all the Lutherans from the Calvinists; although amity and concord are desirable between them and us at this juncture. There are some points in them, which forbid the Greek churches from uniting with us, though they are very favourable to us; but there are others of the Dort canons, which admit of no controversy.—It is possible that they may recall to mind my labours for unity. Even those writings, which I published since my calamity, have not been diverted from the same peaceful object.” If ever any Protestant divines deserved the reproach cast by Mr. Gibbon,[029] on the first reformers in general, “of being ambitious to succeed the tyrants whom they had dethroned,” they were the members of the Synod of Dort.

The Synod was closed on the 29th of May.

The sentence passed by it on the Remonstrants was approved by the States General on the 3d July 1619. On the same day, the Arminian ministers, who had been detained at Dort, were, by a sentence of the States General, banished or imprisoned, deprived of their employments, and the effects of some were confiscated. Similar severities were exercised on the Arminians in most of the territories subject to the States General. To avoid the persecution, some fled to Antwerp, some to France, the greater part to Holstein. There, under the wise protection of the reigning duke, they settled, and afterwards built a town, which from him they called Friedericstadt.

They continued to assert the irregularity of the Synod: the Bishop of Meaux shrewdly observed, that “they employed against the authority of the Synod, the same arguments as the Protestants use against the authority of the Council of Trent.”

[Sidenote: CHAP VI. 1618.]

[Sidenote: The Synod of Dort.]

For the publication of *Acts of the Council*, divines were chosen out of various districts of the United Provinces: their edition of the Acts was published at Dort in the year 1620, in folio, in the types of the Elzevirs; and was soon afterwards republished with greater correctness, in the same year, at Hanover, in quarto, with an addition of a copious index.—An Epistle of their High Mightinesses the States General, addressed to the Monarchs, Kings, Princes, Counts, Cities and Magistrates of the Christian world, and vouching for the authority and authenticity of the Acts,[030] is prefixed to this edition. The Remonstrants published an edition of the Acts in 1620, in 4to.: it is said,[031] that from a fear of their adversaries, it was printed on ship-board.

Here, the history of the Arminians, so far as it is connected with that part of the Life of Grotius to which our subject has hitherto led us, seems to close. We shall hereafter be called upon to resume it.



## Page 46

### CHAPTER VII.

TRIAL AND IMPRISONMENT OF GROTIUS. HIS ESCAPE FROM PRISON.

1618-1621.

While the Synod of Dort continued its sittings, Prince Maurice and his party were actively employed in increasing the popular ferment against Barneveldt, Grotius and Hoogerbetz; in collecting evidence of the designs and practices of which they were accused, and in framing the legal proceedings against them in such a manner as was most likely both to procure their conviction, and to persuade the public of their guilt.

We have mentioned that their confinement took place on the 20th of August 1618, and that they were removed from the Hague, the original place of their imprisonment, to the Castle of Louvestein. On the 19th November, the States General, at the instigation of Prince Maurice, nominated twenty-six commissioners for their trial. All the prisoners objected both to the jurisdiction of the commissioners, and to that of the States General; and asserted that the States of Holland were their only competent judges. They observed, at the same time, that many of the judges were notoriously prejudiced against the Arminians.

[Sidenote: Trial and Imprisonment of Grotius.]

The act of accusation contained many general charges, and many averments of particular facts, supposed to substantiate them. It was alleged against the prisoners, that they had disturbed the established religion of the United Provinces; that, in direct contradiction of the articles of union, they had asserted the right of each province to decide for itself in matters of religion; that they had set up the authority and interests of the States of Holland and West Friesland against those of the States General; that they were the authors of the Insurrection at Utrecht; had levied, in opposition to the orders of government, the attendant soldiers; had raised jealousies between the Prince and several of the Provincial States, and between these and the States General; and that, by their habitual conduct, they had become public disturbers of the tranquillity of the republic, and councillors and practisers of schemes hostile to its welfare.

[Sidenote: CHAP. VII. 1618-1621.]

The Commissioners proceeded to the trial of Barneveldt. Uniformly protesting against the competency of the tribunal, Barneveldt defended himself with great firmness and ability. He controverted every article of the accusation, and concluded his defence, by a long and pathetic enumeration of the services, which he had rendered to the republic; and of the numerous actions, by which he had shewn his attachment to Prince William and Prince Maurice:—he proved that it had been principally owing to him, that the Stadthoderate had been conferred on the latter. He admitted that he had suspected the



Prince of designs hostile to the constitution of the United Provinces, and had opposed the Prince in every measure, which appeared to have such a tendency; but he asserted that he never had resorted to means which the laws or constitution of the Provinces did not warrant. His arguments were unanswerable; but Prince Maurice was determined on his ruin; and the Commissioners were wholly subservient to the prince's views: they accordingly passed unanimously a sentence of death upon Barneveldt.



## Page 47

[Sidenote: Trial and Imprisonment of Grotius.]

Many of the princes of Europe expressed their dissatisfaction at these proceedings: none so much as the French monarch. To him, the great merit of Barneveldt had been long known. He considered that the conduct of Prince Maurice was likely to involve the United Provinces in troubles, of which Spain might take advantages. From personal regard to Barneveldt, and with a view of terminating the discord, the monarch sent an ambassador extraordinary to the United States, and ordered him to join Du Maurier, his ambassador in ordinary, in soliciting them in favour of the accused, and in labouring to restore the public tranquillity. The ambassadors executed their commission with the greatest zeal. They made many remonstrances, and had several audiences both with the States and the Prince. The States, instigated by the Prince, expressed great indignation at the proceedings of the ambassadors.

All the accused were respectably allied, and had many friends: numerous applications were made in their favour. They undeviatingly demeaned themselves with the firmness and modest dignity of conscious innocence. They persisted in denying the guilt attributed to them, and in protesting against the competency of the tribunal. They made no degrading submission. At a subsequent time, a son of Barneveldt having been condemned to death, his mother applied to Prince Maurice, for his pardon. The Prince observed to her, that she had made no such application in behalf of her husband; "No," she replied, "I know my son is guilty, I therefore solicit his pardon; I knew my husband was innocent, I therefore solicited no pardon for him."

[Sidenote: CHAP. VII. 1618—1621.]

On Monday morning, May 13, 1619, Barneveldt was informed that he was to be executed upon that day. He received the notification of it with great firmness; he inquired whether Grotius and Hoogerbetz were to suffer: being answered in the negative, he expressed much satisfaction, observing that "they were of an age to be still able to serve the republic."

"The scaffold for his execution," says Burigni, "was erected in the Court of the Castle at the Hague, facing the Prince of Orange's apartments. He made a short speech to the people, which is yet preserved in the *Mercure Francoise*. 'Burghers!' he said, 'I have been always your faithful countryman; believe not that I die for treason: I die for maintaining the rights and liberties of my country!' After this speech, the executioner struck off his head at one blow. It is affirmed that the Prince of Orange, to feast himself with the cruel pleasure of seeing his enemy perish, beheld the execution with a glass; the people looked on it with other eyes: many came to gather the sand wet with his blood, to keep it carefully in phials; and the crowd of those, who had the same curiosity, continued next day, notwithstanding all they could do to hinder



## Page 48

them. "Thus fell that great minister, who did the United Provinces as much service in the cabinet, as the Prince of Orange did in the field. It is highly probable that the melancholy end of this illustrious and unfortunate man was owing to his steadiness in opposing the design of making Prince Maurice Dictator." [032]

[Sidenote: Trial and Imprisonment of Grotius.]

The Prince pursued his triumph. Soon after the arrest of Grotius, the States of Holland presented a petition to the Prince, representing the arrest as a breach of their constitutional rights; the Prince referred it to the States General. To these, therefore, they presented a similar petition; praying at the same time, that Grotius might be tried by the laws and usages of the Provinces of Holland: no regard was shewn to their petitions.

[Sidenote: CHAP. VII. 1618—1621.]

Grotius had an invaluable friend:—he was no sooner arrested, than his wife petitioned to share his confinement throughout the whole of his imprisonment: it was denied. Grotius fell ill: she renewed the application: it was absolutely rejected: but neither his wife, nor any of the friends of Grotius ever recommended to him an unworthy submission. He always denied the competency of the tribunal appointed to try him: his wife and brother uniformly recommended him to persist in his plea.

Much disregard of form took place, and many arbitrary acts were perpetrated, in the proceedings against Grotius. On the 18th of May 1619, the Commissioners pronounced sentence against him. After enumerating all the charges, of which he was accused, and asserting that all were proved against him, the judges condemned him to perpetual imprisonment, and his estates to be confiscated. The same sentence was passed on Hoogerbetz; but the house of the latter was assigned to him for his imprisonment.

On the 6th of June, Grotius was taken to Louvestein. It lies near Gorcum, in South Holland, at the point of the island formed by the Vaal and the Meuse. Twenty-four sous a day were allowed for his maintenance; but his wife undertook to support him, during his confinement, from her own estate. She was at length admitted into prison with him, on condition that she should remain in it, while his imprisonment lasted.

[Sidenote: Trial and Imprisonment of Grotius.]

At first, his confinement was very rigid: by degrees it was relaxed: his wife was allowed to leave the prison for a few hours, twice in every week. He was permitted to borrow books, and to correspond, except on politics, with his friends.



He beguiled the tedious hours of confinement by study, relieving his mind by varying its objects. Antient and modern literature equally engaged his attention: Sundays he wholly dedicated to prayer and the study of theology.

Twenty months of imprisonment thus passed away. His wife now began to devise projects for his liberty. She had observed that he was not so strictly watched as at first; that the guards, who examined the chest used for the conveyance of his books and linen, being accustomed to see nothing in it but books and linen, began to examine them loosely: at length, they permitted the chest to pass without any examination. Upon this, she formed her project for her husband's release.



## Page 49

She began to carry it into execution by cultivating an intimacy with the wife of the commandant of Gorcum. To her, she lamented Grotius's immoderate application to study; she informed her that it had made him seriously ill; and that, in consequence of his illness, she had resolved to take all his books from him, and restore them to their owners. She circulated every where the account of his illness, and finally declared that it had confined him to his bed.

[Sidenote: CHAP. VII. 1618—1621.]

In the mean time, the chest was accommodated to her purpose; and particularly, some holes were bored in it, to let in air. Her maid and the valet of Grotius were entrusted with the secret. The chest was conveyed to Grotius's apartment. She then revealed her project to him, and, after much entreaty, prevailed on him to get into the chest, and leave her in the prison.

The books, which Grotius borrowed, were usually sent to Gorcum; and the chest, which contained them, passed in a boat, from the prison at Louvestein, to that town.

[Sidenote: His Escape from Prison.]

Big with the fate of Grotius, the chest, as soon as he was enclosed in it, was moved into the boat. One of the soldiers, observing that it was uncommonly heavy, insisted on its being opened, and its contents examined; but, by the address of the maid, his scruples were removed, and the chest was lodged in the boat. The passage from Louvestein to Gorcum took a considerable time. The length of the chest did not exceed three feet and a half. At length, it reached Gorcum: it was intended that it should be deposited at the house of David Bazelaer, an Arminian friend of Grotius, who resided at Gorcum. But, when the boat reached the shore, a difficulty arose, how the chest was to be conveyed from the spot, upon which it was to be landed, to Bazelaer's house. This difficulty was removed by the maid's presence of mind; she told the bystanders, that the chest contained glass, and that it must be moved with particular care. Two chairmen were soon found, and they carefully moved it on a horse-chair to the appointed place.

Bazelaer sent away his servants on different errands, opened the chest, and received his friend with open arms. Grotius declared, that while he was in the chest, he had felt much anxiety, but had suffered no other inconvenience. Having dressed himself as a mason, with a rule and trowel, he went, through the back door of Bazelaer's house, accompanied by his maid, along the market-place, to a boat engaged for the purpose. It conveyed them to Vervie in Brabant: there, he was safe. His maid then left him, and, returning to his wife, communicated to her the agreeable information of the success of the enterprise.

[Sidenote: Chap. VII. 1618-1621.]

## Page 50

As soon as Grotius's wife ascertained that he was in perfect safety, she informed the guards of his escape: these communicated the intelligence to the governor. He put her into close confinement; but in a few days, an order of the States General set her at liberty, and permitted her to carry with her every thing at Louvestein, which belonged to her. It is impossible to think without pleasure of the meeting of Grotius and his heroic wife. From Vervie he proceeded to Antwerp; a few days after his arrival in that city, he addressed a letter to the States General: he assured them, that, in procuring his liberty, he had used neither violence nor corruption. He solemnly protested that his public conduct had been blameless, and that the persecution he had suffered would never lessen his attachment to his country.

[Sidenote: His Escape from Prison.]

It was on the 22d March 1621, that Grotius obtained his liberty. In the same year, the truce, concluded for twelve years between Spain and the United Provinces expired: it was expected, that the war would be resumed with more fury than ever. But this did not happen; the war of thirty years, which we shall afterwards have occasion to mention, had mixed the contest between Spain and the United Provinces with the general military plans and operations of the parties engaged in it, and had carried much of the conflict from the Low Countries into Germany. Prince Maurice still appeared at the head of the army of the United Provinces; but he had lost, by his persecution of the Arminians, and his selfish intrigues, the confidence of the people. Conspiracies against his life were formed: fortune no longer favoured his arms. His attempts to compel the Marquis Spinola to raise the siege of Breda were unsuccessful. This reverse of fortune preyed upon his mind. He thought himself haunted by a spectre of Barneveldt: he was frequently heard, during his last illness, to exclaim, "Remove this head from me!" "This anecdote," says the author of the *Resume de l'histoire de la Hollande*, "is related by all the republican historians of the United Provinces; it is concealed by the flatterers of the House of Orange.... To relate the remorse of princes for their crimes, is one of the most useful duties of historians."

Prince Maurice died in 1625.

M. Le Clerc, in the 2d volume of the *Bibliothèque Choisee*, art. 3, shews, by unquestionable facts and irresistible arguments, that both Prince William and Prince Maurice sought to obtain the independent sovereignty of the United Provinces. It was the aim of all their successors: it has been effected in our times by means, which certainly were foreseen by none.

## CHAPTER VIII.

VORSTIUS,—JAMES I.



1622.

We must now carry back our readers to events which preceded the Synod of Dort. We have mentioned the decease of Arminius: soon after it, a circumstance took place, which, to the exquisite delight of the monarch, who, at that time filled the British throne, involved him in the theological disputes of the Belgic theologians.



## Page 51

Not long after the commencement of the Reformation, several bold inquirers began to deny the trinity of persons in the Deity, the divine authority of the Old and New Testament, and the existence of mystery in the Christian dispensation. Both Catholics and Protestants united against them. To avoid their hostilities, the maintainers of these opinions fled to Poland, and, forming themselves into a distinct congregation, published, in 1574, their First Catechism. They established congregations at Cracow, Lubin, Pinczow, Luck and Smila: but their most flourishing settlement was at Racow.

[Sidenote: Vorstius—James I.]

They spread their doctrines over each bank of the Danube, and at length penetrated Italy. There, they were adopted by Loelius Socinus. After many peregrinations in different parts of Europe, he finally settled at Zurich. Faustus Socinus, his nephew, inherited his sentiments; and, on this account, was obliged to quit Zurich. After many wanderings, he fixed his residence at Racow. There, he was received with open arms by the new communion, and completed their system of theology. From him, they derived their appellation of SOCINIANS. Their doctrine is expressed in the Racovian catechism, published, in the Polish language, in 1605. Other editions of it have appeared. An English translation of the edition of 1605, was published at Amsterdam in 1652: Dr. Toulmin, in his Life of Socinus, ascribes it, seemingly by conjecture, to Mr. John Biddle. In 1818, Mr. Rees published a new translation of it, prefixing to it an interesting historical preface.

[Sidenote: CHAP. VIII. 1622.]

Among the disciples of Arminius, was the celebrated CONRADE VORSTIUS, born at Cologne in 1569, of parents in reduced circumstances: he was soon remarked for his diligence and irreproachable conduct; and was, in 1605, appointed to a professor's chair at Steinfurth. In 1610, he quitted it, and was named to succeed Arminius, in the chair of Professor of Theology, at Leyden. "He was beloved and honoured," says Mr. Chalmers, "at Steinfurth; there, he enjoyed the utmost tranquillity, and was in the highest reputation; he doubtless foresaw, that in the state in which the controversies of Arminius and Gomarus were at that time, he should meet with great opposition in Holland. But he was tempted by the glory he should gain by supporting a party, which was weakened by Arminius's death."

[Sidenote: Vorstius—James I.]

He had previously published his Treatise "*de Deo*." Some passages in it were thought to favour the doctrine of Arminius; some, to lead to Socinianism; and some, to have an ulterior tendency. That Arminius himself discovers these views in his writings, has been frequently asserted. Doctor Maclaine, the learned translator of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History,[033] observes it to be a common opinion, that "the disciples of Arminius, and more especially Episcopius, had boldly transgressed



## Page 52

the bounds, that had been wisely prescribed by their master, and had gone ever to the Pelagians, and even to the Socinians.” “Such,” continues Dr. Maclaine, “is the opinion commonly entertained upon this matter. But it appears on the contrary evident to me, that Arminius himself had laid the plan of the theological system, that was, in after times embraced by his followers; that he had instilled the principles of it into the minds of his disciples; and that these latter did really no more than bring this plan to a greater degree of perfection, and propagate with more courage and perspicuity the doctrines it contains.” To prove this assertion, the Doctor cites a passage from the Will of Arminius, in which he declares, that “his 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.” “These words, on this account,” continues Dr. Maclaine, “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 sects and opinions may be, (Papists excepted) may be formed into one religious body, and live together in brotherly love and concord.” It is not surprising that in the state of religious effervescence, in which the minds of men were at the time of which we are now speaking, a suspicion that Vorstius entertained the sentiments we have mentioned, or sentiments nearly approaching to them, should have rendered him a subject of jealousy. So greatly was this the case, that the Contra-remonstrants appealed against his doctrines to several Protestant states, and represented to them the doctrine of Vorstius in the most odious light. Our James I. accepted the appeal: by a royal proclamation, he caused Vorstius’s Treatise *de Deo* to be burnt in London, and each of the English Universities. He drew up a list, of the several heresies, which he had discovered in it, commanded his resident at the Hague to notify them to the States; to express his horror of them, and his detestation of those, who should tolerate them.

[Sidenote: CHAP. VIII. 1622.]

[Sidenote: Vorstius.—James I.]

With some intimation of their independence, the States replied, that “the case was of *their* cognizance;” that “they would examine it;” and that, “if it should appear that Vorstius maintained the doctrines imputed to him, they would not suffer him to live among them.” The monarch’s orthodoxy was not satisfied with this answer. He repeated his suggestions, that the States should proceed against Vorstius; and hinted, that if the doctrines should be proved against him, and if he should persist in them, burning might be a proper punishment for him. The monarch added that, if the States did not use their utmost endeavours to extirpate the rising heresy, he should publicly protest against their conduct; that, in quality of defender of the faith, he would exhort all Protestant churches to join in one general resolution to extinguish the abomination, and would, as sovereign of his own dominions, prohibit his subjects to frequent so

pestilential a place as the University of Leyden. To his menaces he added the terrors of his pen, and published a “Confutation of Vorstius.”



## Page 53

By the advice of the States, Vorstius replied to his royal adversary in a most respectful manner; still, the royal adversary was not satisfied. Finally, the States condemned the obnoxious doctrines of Vorstius, divested him of all his offices; and sentenced him to perpetual banishment. Vorstius remained concealed during two years; then found an asylum in the dominions of the Duke of Holstein, who, as we have mentioned, took the remains of the Arminians into his protection.

Vorstius died in 1622.

### CHAPTER IX.

GROTIUS AFTER HIS ESCAPE FROM PRISON, TILL HIS APPOINTMENT OF  
AMBASSADOR FROM SWEDEN TO THE COURT OF FRANCE.

1621-1634.

Soon after the escape of Grotius from prison, he repaired to Paris: in this, he followed the advice of Du Maurier, the French ambassador at the Hague. His works had made him known in every part of Europe, in which learning was cultivated: but persons properly qualified to appreciate their merit, existed no where in such abundance as at Paris: he was personally esteemed and regarded by the monarch; and the principal officers of state were attached to him. Paris was also recommended to him by its libraries, the easy access to them, and the habitual intercourse of the men of letters, who, during, at least, a great part of the year, made that city their place of residence.

[Sidenote: From the Escape of Grotius till his appointment of Ambassador.]

Grotius arrived at Paris on the 13th of April 1621. He was immediately noticed by a multitude of persons of distinction and rank; but it was not till March 1622, that he was presented to the king. His majesty received him graciously, and settled upon him a pension of 3,000 livres. The Prince of Conde, the Chancellor, and the Keeper of the Seals, had exerted themselves to dispose the king in his favour. His majesty professed kindness towards those, who had been persecuted by the States; and issued an edict, dated the 22d April 1622, by which he took them under his protection, in the same manner as if they were his own subjects; he even extended this benefit to their children. The celebrated President Jeannin was one of the most active and useful of Grotius's friends; but he died soon after Grotius arrived at Paris.

Grotius, during his stay in that city, attended frequently the courts of justice. He observed the wretched style of oratory, which at that time, prevailed in them. It was, in some measure, corrected by *Patru* and *Le Maitre*; but it did not reach its best state, till the end of the reign of Lewis XIV. The rhetorical march and laboured amplifications allowed at the French bar, are offensive to English ears. Has any nation produced a



more perfect style of forensic or judicial eloquence, than that of *Sir William Grant*? The wisdom and justice of *Lord Stowell's* decisions, and the admirable arguments by which he explains or illustrates them, are known and acknowledged by every Court.



## Page 54

[Sidenote: CHAP. IX. 1621—1634]

Grotius's love of his native country continued unabated; all his views, all his hopes, were directed thither. With these feelings he wrote his *Apology*. He composed it in the Dutch language, and translated it afterwards into Latin: it was published in 1622. He dedicated it to the people of Holland and West Friesland. It is divided into twenty chapters; in the first, he argues the important point, that each of the United Provinces is sovereign and independent of the States General, and that the authority of these is confined to the defence of the provinces against their enemies. In the second chapter, he applies the position to ecclesiastical concerns; these, he says, are subject to the sovereign power of each State. In the following chapters, he descends into the particular charges against him; defending himself against all the crimes and irregularities of which he was accused, and shewing the informality of the judicial proceedings by which he and his companions in misfortune were tried and condemned.

[Sidenote: From the Escape of Grotius till his appointment of Ambassador.]

His answer was universally read and approved: It greatly incensed the States General: They proscribed it, and forbade all persons to have it in their possession, under pain of death; but no answer to it was published. The edict made Grotius and his friends entertain apprehensions for his personal safety. On this account, he obtained from the French monarch letters of naturalization, dated the 26th February 1623: By these, his majesty took him under his special protection.

Grotius retained many friends in every part of the United Provinces: Prince Frederick Henry, the brother of Maurice, was among them. He had never entered into his brother's persecuting projects.

"The Count d'Estrades has given us," says Burigni, "some anecdotes on this subject, which we shall relate on his authority. He assures us, that, being one day *tete a tete* with Prince Henry Frederick in his coach, he heard him say, that he had much to do to keep well with his brother Maurice, who suspected him of secretly favouring Barneveldt and the Arminians. He told me, (these were the Count's own words), it was true that he kept a correspondence with them, to prevent their opposing his election, in case his brother should die; but that, as it imported him to be on good terms with his brother, and to efface the notion he had of his connection with the Arminians, he made use of Vandenuse, one of his particular friends, and Barneveldt's son-in-law, to let the cabal know, that it was necessary for him to accommodate himself to his brother, that he might be better able to serve them,—which Barneveldt approved of."

[Sidenote: CHAP. IX. 1621—1634.]

In the meantime, the situation of Grotius at Paris, became very uncomfortable. His resources, and those of his wife, were small; and his pension was paid irregularly.



Cardinal de Richelieu wished to attach Grotius; but required from him an absolute and unqualified devotion to him, which was utterly irreconcilable with the slightest degree of honourable independence. Grotius therefore declined the offers of the Cardinal. From this time, the Cardinal regarded him with an evil eye, and often made him feel the effects of his displeasure.



## Page 55

This rendered Grotius desirous of quitting France. Trusting to some protestations of friendship, which he had received from Prince Frederick; to his numerous friends, to his claims upon the gratitude of the States of Holland, to his feelings of innocence, and to the effect produced, as he flattered himself, by his *Apology*, he ventured into Holland in 1631. But he met with no countenance: and in that year was banished a second time. Upon this, he formally bade a final adieu to Holland, and determined to seek his fortune elsewhere: He then fixed his residence at Hamburgh.

[Sidenote: From the Escape of Grotius till his appointment of Ambassador.]

He sought to preserve his friends in France; but announced to them his intention to receive no more money from the French government.

“I shall always,” he said in a letter to the First President of the Cour des Monnoies, “be grateful for the King’s liberality; but it is enough that I was chargeable to you, while I resided in France. I have never done you any service, though I made you an offer of myself. But it would not be proper that I should now live, like an hornet, on the goods of other men. I shall not, however, forget the kindness of so great a king, and the good offices of so many friends.”

[Sidenote: CHAP. IX. 1621-1634.]

It may appear surprising that Prince Frederick of Orange should pertinaciously exclude Grotius from his native country. But ambition listens to nothing that conflicts with its own views. Prince Frederick inherited from his father and brother the wish of becoming the sovereign of the United Provinces. To this, he knew he should always find a zealous and able opponent in Grotius: hence, notwithstanding his great personal regard for Grotius, he always kept him a banished man. Grotius wished to be employed by the Government of England, and Archbishop Laud was sounded upon this subject; but the application was coldly received[034]. Prince Frederick sustained, both in military and civil concerns, the character of the former princes of his family. Under his administration, the affairs of the republic prospered at sea and land. Peter Haim captured the Spanish flotilla, estimated at twelve millions of florins. The Prince took Bois-le duc, Maestricht, and Breda, and reduced the Dutchy of Limburgh. Under his auspices, the celebrated Van Tromp commenced his career of naval glory, by obtaining a complete victory over the Spanish fleet, consisting of seventy men of war. Prince Frederick died in 1658.

From the close of his Stadtholderate, we may date the origin of the jealousy entertained, by France and England, of the rising power of the United Provinces. It is to be observed that Prince Frederick was Stadtholder only of the Provinces of Holland, Zealand, Utrecht, Gueldres and Overyssell: Count Ernest Casimir of Nassau was Stadtholder of the provinces of Groeningen, Frizeland, and the county of the Drenta. In 1631, their eldest sons were chosen, in the lifetime of their fathers, their successors in their

respective Stadtholderates. This was a great step towards making the Stadtholderate hereditary in their families,—one of the leading objects of their ambitious views.



# Page 56

## CHAPTER X.

SOME OF THE PRINCIPAL WORKS OF GROTIUS.

1. *His Edition of Stobaeus.*
2. *His Treatise de Jure Belli et Pacis.*
3. *His Treatise de Veritate Religionis Christianae.*
4. *His Treatise de Jure summarum potestatum circa sacra.*
5. *His Commentary on the Scriptures.*
6. *Some other Works of Grotius*

[Sidenote: CHAP. X. 1621-1634]

That literature is an ornament in prosperity, and a comfort in adverse fortune, has been often said by the best and wisest men; but no one experienced the truth of this assertion in a higher degree than Grotius, during his imprisonment at Louvestein. In that wreck of his fortune and overthrow of all his hopes, books came to his aid, soothed his sorrows, and beguiled the wearisome hours of his gloomy solitude. His studies often stole him from himself, and from the sense of his misfortunes. In the exercise of his mental energies, he was sensible of their powers; and it was impossible that he should contemplate, without pleasure, the extent, the worth, or the splendour of his labours; the services, which he rendered by them to learning and religion, and the admiration and gratitude of the scholar, which he then enjoyed, and which would attend his memory to the latest posterity. He himself acknowledged that, in the ardour of his literary pursuits, he often forgot his calamities, and that the hours passed unheeded, if not in joy, at least without pain.

### X 1.

*His Edition of Stobaeus.*

Being ourselves unacquainted with this work, we cannot do better than present our readers with the account given of it by Burigni.

“The year after the publication of his *Apology*, that is to say in 1623, Nicholas Huon printed at Paris, *Grotius’s improvements and additions to Stobaeus*. This author, as is well known, extracted what he thought most important in the ancient Greek writers, and



ranged it under different heads, comprehending the principal points of philosophy. His work is the more valuable, as it has preserved several fragments of the Ancients, found no where else. Grotius, when very young, purposed to extract from this author all the maxims of the poets; to translate them into Latin verse, and to print the original with the translation. He began this, when a boy; he was employed in it at the time of his arrest; and continued it as an amusement, whilst he had the use of books, in his prison at the Hague. He tells us that, when he was deprived of pen and ink, he was got to the forty-ninth title, which is an invective against tyranny, that had a great relation to what passed at that time in Holland. On his removal to Louvestein, he resumed this work, and finished it at Paris. He made several happy corrections in the text of Stobaeus; some, from his own conjectures or those of his friends; others, on the authority of manuscripts in the King's library, which were politely lent him by the learned Nicholas Rigaut, librarian to his majesty.

[Sidenote: His edition of Stobaeus.]

## Page 57

[Sidenote: CHAP. X. 1621-1634]

“Prefixed to this book, are *Prolegomena*, in which the author shews that the works of the ancient Pagans are filled with maxims agreeable to the truths taught in holy writ. He intended to dedicate this book to the Chancellor Silleri: he had even writ the dedication, but his friends, to whom he shewed it, thought he expressed himself with too much warmth, against the censurers of his *Apology*. They advised him therefore to suppress it; and he yielded to their opinion. It may be observed in reading the royal privilege, that the present title of the book is different from what it was to have had. To these extracts from the Greek poets translated into Latin verse, Grotius annexed two pieces, one of Plutarch, the other of St. Basil, on the use of the poets; giving the Greek text with a Latin translation.”

The work was received with universal approbation.

### X. 2.

*His Treatise de Jure Belli et Pacis.*

Grotius may be considered as the founder of the modern school of *the Law of Nature and of Nations*. He was struck with the ruthless manner, in which wars were generally conducted; the slight pretences, upon which they were generally begun; and the barbarity and injustice, with which they were generally attended. He attributed these evils to the want of settled principles respecting the rights and duties of nations and individuals in a state of war. These, he observed, must depend on the previous rights and duties of mankind, in a state of peace: this led him to the preliminary inquiry into their rights and duties in a state of nature.

Thus, an ample field was opened to him. He brought to it, a vigorous discerning mind, and stupendous erudition. From antient and modern history, philosophy, oratory, and poetry, he collected facts and sayings, which appeared to him to establish a general agreement of all civilized nations upon certain principles. From these, he formed his system; applying them, as he proceeded in his work, to a vast multitude of circumstances. These are so numerous, that some persons have not scrupled to say, that no case or international law, either in war or in peace, can be stated, to which the work of Grotius does not contain an applicable rule.

[Sidenote: X. 2. *The Treatise de Jure Belli et Pacis.*]

[Sidenote: CHAP. X. 1621-1634]

Three important objections have been made to this celebrated work,—one, that the author defers in it, too little, to principle, too much, to authority;—another, that the work is written in a very desultory manner, with small attention to order, or classification;—a

third, that his authorities are often feeble, and sometimes whimsical. "Grotius," says Condillac, "was able to think for himself; but he constantly labours to support his conclusions by the authority of others. Upon many occasions;



## Page 58

even in support of the most obvious and indisputable propositions, he introduces a long string of quotations from the Mosaic law, from the Gospels, from the fathers of the church, from the casuists, and not unfrequently, even in the very same paragraph, from Ovid, and Aristophanes.” This strange mixture is subject of many witticisms of Voltaire. But let us hear what is urged in the defence of Grotius, by a gentleman, of whose praise the ablest of writers may be proud:

“Few writers,” says Sir James Mackintosh, in his Discourse on the Study of the Law of Nature and Nations, “were more celebrated than Grotius in his own days, and in the age which succeeded. It has, however, been the fashion of the last half century to depreciate his work, as a shapeless compilation, in which reason lies buried under a mass of authorities and quotations. This fashion originated among French wits and declaimers, and it has been, I know not for what reason, adopted, though with far greater moderation and decency, by some respectable writers among ourselves. As to those, who first used this language, the most candid supposition that we can make with respect to them is, that they never read the work; for, if they had not been deterred from the perusal of it by such a formidable display of Greek characters, they must soon have discovered that Grotius never quotes, on any subject, till he has first appealed to some principles; and often, in my humble opinion, though, not always, to the soundest and most rational principles.

[Sidenote: His treatise de Jure Belli et Pacis.]

“But another sort of answer is due to some of those, who have criticised Grotius; and that answer might be given in the words of Grotius himself. He was not of such a stupid and servile cast of mind as to quote the opinions of poets or orators, of historians and philosophers, as those of judges, from whose decision there was no appeal. He quotes them, as he tells us himself, as witnesses, whose conspiring testimony, mightily strengthened and confirmed by their discordance on almost every other subject, is a conclusive proof of the unanimity of the whole human race on the great rules of duty, and the fundamental principles of morals. Of such matters, poets and orators are the most unexceptionable of all witnesses; for they address themselves to the general feelings and sympathies of mankind; they are neither warped by system, nor perverted by sophistry; they can attain none of their objects; they can neither please nor persuade, if they dwell on moral sentiments not in unison with those of their readers. No system of moral philosophy can surely disregard the general feelings of human nature, and the according judgment of all ages and nations. But, where are these feelings and that judgment recorded and preserved? In those very writings which Grotius is gravely blamed for having quoted. The usages and law of nations, the events of history, the opinions



## Page 59

of philosophers, the sentiments of orators and poets, as well as the observation of common life, are, in truth, the materials out of which the science of morality is formed; and those who neglect them, are justly chargeable with a vain attempt to philosophise without regard to fact and experience, the sole foundation of all true philosophy.

[Sidenote: Chap. X. 1621-1634]

“If this were merely an objection of taste, I should be willing to allow, that Grotius has indeed poured forth his learning with a profusion, that sometimes rather encumbers than adorns his work, and which is not always necessary to the illustration of his subject. Yet, even in making, that concession, I should rather yield to the tastes of others, than speak from my own feelings. I own that such richness and splendour of literature have a powerful charm for me. They fill my mind with an endless variety of delightful recollections and associations. They relieve the understanding in its progress through a vast science, by calling up the memory of great men and of interesting events. By this means we see the truths of morality clothed with all the eloquence (not that could be produced by the powers of one man, but) that could be bestowed on them by the collective genius of the world. Even virtue and wisdom themselves acquire new majesty in my eyes, when I thus see all the great masters of thinking and writing called together, as it were, from all times and countries, to do them homage and to appear in their train.

[Sidenote: X. 2. His Treatise de Jure Belli et Pacis]

“But this is no piece for discussions of taste, and I am very ready to own, that mine may be corrupted. The work of Grotius is liable to a more serious objection, though I do not recollect that it has ever been made. His method is inconvenient and unscientific. He has inverted the natural order. That natural order undoubtedly dictates, that we should first search for the original principles of the science, in human nature; then apply them to the regulation of the conduct of individuals; and lastly employ them for the decision of those difficult and complicated questions that arise with respect to the intercourse of nations. But Grotius has chosen the reverse of this method. He begins with the consideration of the states of peace and war, and he examines original principles, only occasionally and incidentally, as they grow out of the questions, which he is called upon to decide. It is a necessary consequence of this disorderly method, which exhibits the elements of the science in the form of scattered digressions, that he seldom employs sufficient discussion on those fundamental truths, and never in the place where such a discussion would be most instructive to the reader. This defect in the plan of Grotius was perceived, and supplied by Puffendorf, who restored natural law to that superiority which belonged to it, and with great propriety, treated the law of nations as only one main branch of the parent stock.”

[Sidenote: CHAP X. 1621-1634]

## Page 60

Whatever may be the merit of the work of which we are speaking, it must be admitted, that few, on their first appearance, and during a long subsequent period after publication, have received greater or warmer applause. The stores of erudition displayed in it, recommended it to the classical scholar, while the happy application of the author's reading to the affairs of human life, drew to it the attention of common readers. Among those, whose approbation of it, deserved to be recorded, Gustavus Adolphus,—his prime minister the Chancellor Oxenstiern,—and the Elector Palatine Charles Lewis, deserve particular mention.[035] As the trophies of Miltiades are supposed to have kept Themistocles awake, it has been said that the trophies of Grotius drove sleep from Selden, till he produced his celebrated treatise, "*De Jure naturali et gentium secundum leges Ebraeorum*." This important work equals that of Grotius in learning; but, from the partial and recondite nature of its subject, never equalled it in popularity.

[Sidenote: X. 9. His Treatise de Jure Belli et Pacis]

The supposed want of general elementary principles in the work of Grotius gave occasion to Puffendorf's treatise *de Jure Naturae et Gentium*; afterwards abridged by him into the small octavo volume *De Officio hominis et civis*: an edition of it in octavo was published by Professor Garschen Carmichael, of Glasgow, in 1724.

The best edition of Grotius's treatise *de Jure Belli et Pacis* was published at Amsterdam in 1730, by John Barbeyrac.

Foreigners observe, that the study of the law of nature and nations is less cultivated in England than upon the continent. Is it not, because Englishmen are blessed with a free constitution; are admitted into a general participation of all its blessings; are thus personally interested in the national concerns; and have therefore a jurisprudence, which comes nearer to their bosoms? Is it not also, because the law of nature and nations, with all its merit, is so loose, that its principles seldom admit of that practical application, which renders them really useful; and which an English mind always requires?

### X.3.

*De Veritate Religionis Christianae.*

[Sidenote: CHAP. X. 1621-1634.]

Grotius, while a prisoner in the Castle of Louvestein, had written, in the Dutch language, "A treatise on the Truth of the Christian Religion." He afterwards enlarged it, and translated it, so enlarged, into Latin. It was universally read and admired. French,



German, English, modern Greek, Persic, and even Turkish versions of it have been made: it was equally approved by Catholics and Protestants.

[Sidenote: De Veritate Religionis Christianae.]

It was invidiously objected, that he did not attempt to prove, or even mention, the Trinity, and some other gospel mysteries: he replied, satisfactorily in our opinion, that a discussion of any particular tenet of the Christian religion did not fall within the scope of his work. In this respect, he was afterwards imitated by *Abadie* and *Houteville*, two of the most eminent apologists of Christianity. The latter expresses himself of the work of Grotius in the following terms:



## Page 61

“Grotius’s work is the first, in which we find the characteristics of just reasoning, accuracy, and strength: he is extremely concise; but even this brevity will please us, when we find his work comprehends so many things, without confounding them or lessening their evidence or force. It is no wonder that the book should be translated into so many languages.”

The best edition of it is that published by Le Clerc,[036] in 1709 at Amsterdam, in 8vo. To this edition, Le Clerc has added a curious *dissertation on religious indifference*. He presumes that the supposed indifference is persuaded of the authenticity of the New Testament:—He then (says Le Clerc) must ascertain,—

1. Which are the denominations of religionists which avow their belief of it:
2. Which of these are most worthy of the name of Christians:
3. And which profess the Christian religion in most purity and with least extraneous alloy:
4. He will find, that all Christians agree in the fundamental articles of faith:
5. That all these articles are clearly expressed in the New Testament:
6. That no tenet should be believed to be of faith, unless the New Testament contains it.
7. That the providence of God is admirable in the preservation of these tenets, amidst the confused multitude of religious opinions, which have prevailed in the world:
8. That this confusion was foreseen by God:
9. That he permitted it as a consequence of his gift of free-will to man:
10. That the inquirer should aggregate himself to that religious communion, which receives the New Testament as its only rule of faith, and does not persecute others:
11. That episcopacy without tyranny is the most antient form of ecclesiastical government, and most to be desired; but that it is not essential to a Christian church:



12. That these were the opinions of Grotius:

13. Finally, that it is greatly to be desired that a belief of no dogma, not explicitly propounded in the New Testament, should be required.

Such is the religious system propounded by Le Clerc.—Does any religious communion really profess it?—Many Protestant churches declare, that the Bible, and the Bible only, contains their creed: but, do they not all mean by this—the Bible, as it is explained by the Articles, the Formulary, or the Confession received by their church?

#### **X. 4.**

*Grotius's Treatise De Jure summarum potestatum circa sacra.—And, Commentatio ad loca quaedam Novi Testamenti, quae de Antichristo agunt, aut agere putantur.*

Nothing in the life of Grotius places him in a more amiable or respectable point of view, than his constant attempts to put Catholics and Protestants into good humour with each other, and to put both into good humour among themselves.

## Page 62

[Sidenote: X. 4. His Treatise De Jure summarum potestatum. &c.]

We have mentioned the *pacific decree of the States of Holland*, which ordered the contending communions to tolerate each other. Grotius is supposed to have framed this wise decree. The Contra-remonstrants attacked it: Grotius reprinted it, with a collection of proofs and authorities.

It gave rise to a controversy on the nice question, respecting the authority of the temporal power to interfere in the ecclesiastical concerns of the state. Grotius adopted, upon this point, the sentiments of what is termed in England the Low Church: he seems to have pushed them to their utmost bearings. With these sentiments, he published his treatise *de Imperio summarum potestatum circa sacra*. It was disliked by King James and his bishops: Grotius, in their opinion, gave too much authority, in sacred things, to the secular power.

On the work of Grotius, respecting *Anti-christ*, we prefer transcribing Burigni's sentiments to delivering our own.

"This deep study of the Holy Scriptures led Grotius to examine a question, which made much noise at that time. Some Protestant synods had ventured to decide that *the Pope was Antichrist*; and this extravagance, gravely delivered by the ministers, was regarded by the zealous schismatics, as a fundamental truth. Grotius undertook to overturn such an absurd opinion, that stirred up an irreconcilable enmity between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants; and, of consequence, was a very great obstacle to their re-union, which was the sole object of his desires. He entered therefore upon the consideration of the passages of Scripture relating to Antichrist, and employed his Sundays in it.

[Sidenote: CHAP. X. 1621-1634.]

"It was this work, that raised him up most enemies. We see by the letters he wrote to his brother, that his best friends were afraid lest they should be suspected of having some hand in the publication of the books, in which he treated of Antichrist. 'If you are afraid of incurring ill will, (he writes thus to his brother), you may easily find people that are far from a factious spirit, who will take care of the impression. Nothing has incensed princes against those, who separated from the church of Rome, more than the injurious names, with which the Protestants load their adversaries; and nothing is a greater hindrance to that re-union, which we are all obliged to labour after, in consequence of Christ's precept and the profession we make of our faith in the creed. Perhaps the Turk, who threatens Italy, will force us to it. In order to arrive at it, we must first remove whatever obstructs a mutual quiet hearing. I hope I shall find assistance in this pious design. I shall not cease to labour in it, and shall rejoice to die employed in so good a work.'

[Sidenote: His Treatise De Jure summarum potestatum, &c.]



## Page 63

“Reigersberg, Blaeu, Vossius himself, however much devoted to Grotius, beheld with concern the printing of this book, because they did not doubt but it would increase the number of his enemies. Grotius informs his brother, of the uneasiness which Vossius gave him on this subject. ‘Among those, who wish this work destroyed,’ says he, ‘I am astonished and grieved to see Vossius. Whence could he have this idea? I imagine somebody has told him, that it would injure the fortune of his children, if he approved of such books; and that, on the contrary, he would find favour by hurting me. We must therefore have recourse to Corcellius or Corvinus.’ He elsewhere complains of the too great timidity of this old friend, who at bottom approved of Grotius’s sentiments, but durst not own them publicly, because he was not so independent as Grotius.

[Sidenote: CHAP. X. 1621-1634.]

“The treatise on Anti-christ made much noise among all the declared enemies of the Romish church. Michael Gettichius wrote to Ruarus, that he had only glanced over Grotius’s book on Antichrist; but as far as he could judge by the first reading, that learned man, who was possessed of such an excellent genius, and such singular erudition, had no other intention than to engage the learned in a further inquiry concerning Antichrist; and to determine them to attack with greater strength, the Romish Antichrist; or, if he wrote seriously, he wanted to cut out a path for going over, without dishonour, to the Papists. Ruarus answers this letter Dec. 16, 1642, from Dantzic. ‘I have always (he says) looked on Grotius as a very honest and at the same time a very learned man. I am persuaded that love of peace engaged him in this work. I don’t deny but he has gone too far; the love of antiquity perhaps seduced him: no Remonstrant, that I know of, has as yet answered him; but he has been confuted by some learned Calvinists, particularly Desmonets, minister of Bois le duc, who has written against him with much bitterness.’

“Grotius’s work was printed in 1640, with this title: *Commentatio ad loca quaedam Novi Testamenti, quae de Antichristo agunt aut agere putantur:—Expedenda eruditus.*”[037]

### X.5.

*His Commentary on the Scriptures.*

[Sidenote: X. 5. His Commentary on the Scriptures.]

The theological works of Grotius are comprised in four volumes folio: the three first contain his Commentary, and Notes upon the Scriptures. On their merit, both Catholics and Protestants considerably differ. All allow that an abundance of sacred and profane learning is displayed in them; and that Grotius, by his references to the writings of the Rabbis, and his remarks upon the idiom of the sacred writings, has happily elucidated a

multitude of passages in the text. He uniformly adopts the literal and obvious signification of the language used by the holy



## Page 64

penmen. In explaining the predictions of the prophets, he maintains that they referred to events anterior to the coming of Christ, and were accomplished in these; so that the natural and obvious sense of the words and phrases, in which they were delivered, does not terminate in Christ; yet, that in some of the predictions, those particularly, which the writers of the New Testament apply to Christ, there is, *besides* the literal and obvious signification, a hidden and mysterious sense, which lies concealed under the external mark of certain *persons*, certain *events*, and certain *actions*, which are representative of the person, the ministry, the sufferings, and the merits of the Son of God.

[Sidenote: CHAP. X. 1621-1634.]

It has been objected, that this system leads to Socinianism, and even beyond it. All Catholic, and several episcopalian Protestant divines object to it; they generally contend, that the sacred writings ought always to be understood in that sense *only*, which has been attributed to them, by the early fathers.—Against this system, Dr. Whitby published his celebrated work “Concerning the Interpretation of Scripture after the manner of the Fathers.”[038]

[Sidenote: X. 5. His Commentary on the Scriptures.]

The system of Grotius was defended, to a certain extent, by *Father Simon*, the oratorian, the father of the modern biblical school. Against both Simon and Grotius, Bossuet wielded his powerful lance,—in his “Pastoral Instruction on the Works of Father Simon,” and his “Dissertations upon Grotius.” In these works he says that, during thirty years,

“Grotius searched for truth in good faith, and at last was so near it, that it is wonderful that he did not take the last step, to which God called him. Shocked at Calvin’s harsh doctrines, he embraced Arminianism; then, abandoned it. More a lawyer than a theologian, more a polite scholar than a philosopher, he throws the doctrine of the immortality of the soul into obscurity. He endeavours to weaken and steal from the church, her most powerful proofs of the divinity of the Son of God, and strives to darken the prophecies, which announce the arrival of the Messiah.”

Bossuet proceeds to particularize some of the principal errors of Grotius: Le Clerc replied to the prelate’s criticism, by his *Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de la Hollande*.—Grotius had also an able advocate in Father Simon. His defence of Grotius against the charge of *semi-Pelagianism*, in the *Bibliothèque de Sainjore*,[039] appears to be satisfactory. He cites the note of Grotius, on the Acts of the Apostles, (the celebrated ch. xiii. ver. 38), in which he says expressly that he does not exclude preventive grace: this the semi-Pelagians denied altogether. But in his defence of

Grotius against the charge of *Socinianism*, he is not equally successful. Bossuet sent his *Pastoral Instruction*, and *Dissertations upon Grotius*, to the bishop of Frejus, afterward Cardinal de Fleury: he accompanied them by a letter, which closes with these remarkable words:



## Page 65

“The spirit of incredulity gains ground in the world every day: you have often heard me make this remark. It is now worse than ever, as the Gospel itself is used for the corruption of religion. I thank God that at my age he blesses me with sufficient strength to resist the torrent.”

[Sidenote: CHAP. X. 1621—1634.]

Dom. Calmet[040] calls Grotius,

“one of the most able and moderate Protestant writers: one who spreads throughout his notes a pleasing profusion of profane literature, which causes his works to be sought for and read by those, who have taste for that kind of literature. His high reputation, great erudition, and rare modesty,” says Dom. Calmet, “render it easy for him to insinuate his particular sentiments respecting the divinity of Christ, against which, his readers should be guarded.”

### X.6.

*Some other Works of Grotius.*

1. The first which we shall mention is his history of the *Goths, Vandals, and Lombards*, written in the Latin language, and accompanied by learned dissertations. He composed it, as a testimony of his gratitude to the Swedes, by doing honour to their gothic ancestors. The preface has always been admired, for its erudition and sound criticism. But the Belgic friends of Grotius accused him of elevating the Swedes at their expense.

[Sidenote: X. 6. Other Works of Grotius.]

2. A more important work consists of his *Annals, and History of the United Provinces*. The Annals begin with the year 1588, when Prince Maurice had the greatest influence in the affairs of the United Provinces; and concludes with the truce of twelve years, signed between them and Spain. The impartiality, with which these works are written, has been praised by every writer.

It is to be lamented that Grotius professed to imitate, both in his Annals and History, the style of Tacitus. Expressed by his own pen, the style of Tacitus is energetic, picturesque, and pleasing; but it is impossible to deny its frequent abruptness and obscurity. Generally speaking, an imitation of what is defective, contains a larger share, than the original, of its distinctive defect. It should however be added, that Grotius's own style is short, sententious and broken; and possesses nothing of the mellifluous ease of the ultramontane Latinists; or of our Milton or Buchanan. None of the works of Grotius, which we have mentioned in this Article, were published till after his decease.



3. It remains to notice the *Letters of Grotius*, published at Amsterdam in one volume folio, in 1687.—A multitude of his unpublished letters is said to exist in different public and private libraries.

[Sidenote: CHAP. X. 1621-1634.]



## Page 66

His published letters are an invaluable treasure: they abound with wise maxims of sound policy, and curious discussions on points arising on Roman or Belgic jurisprudence. Many points of sacred and profane learning, and particularly of the civil and canon law, are treated in them with equal learning and taste. For the perfect understanding of them, the letters of the correspondents of Grotius should be perused: they are principally to be found, in the *Praestantium et Eruditorum Virorum Epistolae Ecclesiasticae et Theologicae*, published at Amsterdam in 1684. A critical account of the Letters of Grotius, executed with great taste and judgment, is inserted in the first volume of the *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique*. [041]

[Sidenote: X. 6. Other Works of Grotius.]

It is acknowledged that the letters of Grotius, are written in the finest latinity, and contain much valuable information; but the point, the sprightliness, the genius, the vivid descriptions of men and things, which are so profusely scattered over the letters of Erasmus, are seldom discoverable in those of Grotius. A man of learning would have been gratified beyond measure, by the profound conversations of Grotius and Father Petau: but what a treat must it have been, to have assisted with one, two, or three good listeners, at the conversations between Erasmus and Sir Thomas More!

## CHAPTER. XI.

GROTIUS.—AS AMBASSADOR FROM THE KINGDOM OF SWEDEN TO THE COURT OF FRANCE.

1634—1645.

The embassy of Grotius is connected with an important period in the history of the War of Thirty years.

This celebrated war was principally caused by the religious disputes of the sixteenth century. Very soon after Luther's first attack on the See of Rome, the Reformation was established in Saxony, Livonia, Prussia, and Hesse-cassel; in many imperial towns; in Friezland and Holland; in several of the Swiss Cantons; in Pomerania, Mecklenburgh, Anhalt; Sweden, Denmark, Norway; England, and Scotland. Its progress in Germany is particularly connected with the subject of these pages.

[Sidenote: Embassy of Grotius in the Court of France.]

At the diet of Augsburgh, in 1530, the Protestant princes of Germany delivered to the emperor their Confession of Faith; they afterwards, at Smalcald, entered into an offensive and defensive league against the emperor. Being sensible that they were unable to resist him, they engaged the French monarch in their cause. At first, the emperor was victorious; but a new league was formed. France then took a more active



part in favour of the confederates, and the contest ended in the peace of Passau, in 1552, there the two parties, for the first time, treated as equals, and the free exercise of the Lutheran religion was allowed. Things remained quiet during the reigns of Ferdinand the First and Maximilian the Second;



## Page 67

but, in consequence of the disputes, which arose on the succession to the dutchies of Cleves and Juliers, the religious differences broke out with fresh animosity:—the Protestant princes formed a confederacy called the *Evangelical Union*, and placed, at its head, the Elector Palatine; the Catholics formed a confederacy called the *Catholic League*, and placed, at its head, the Duke of Bavaria. In the year 1618, they burst into open war; every state in Europe, and even the Ottoman princes, at one time or other, took a part in it. France was the soul of the Protestant cause; she assisted it with her armies, and her subsidies:—it may be truly said, that, if there be a Protestant state from the Vistula to the Rhine, or a Mahometan, state between the Danube and the Mediterranean, its existence is owing to the Bourbon monarchs. From the period of its duration, it has been called the WAR OF THIRTY YEARS: it is divided, by its *Palatine*, *Danish*, *Swedish*, and *French* periods.

[Sidenote: CHAP. XI. 1634-1645.]

1. Frederick, the fifth *Electeur Palatine* of that name, being elected King of Bohemia, by the states of that kingdom, made war on the emperor Ferdinand the Second. Being defeated in 1620, at the battle of Prague, and abandoned by his allies, he was driven from Bohemia, and deprived of his other states.

2. Christian the Fourth of *Denmark*, then placed himself at the head of the confederacy against the emperor; but, having in 1626, lost the battle of Lutter, in which Tilly commanded the Austrian forces; he signed, three years after that event, a separate peace with the emperor.

In the following year, Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, was placed at the head of the confederacy. Their cause appeared desperate: Walstein, the Austrian general, had been uniformly successful, and almost the whole of Germany had submitted to the emperor: but the Austrians soon experienced a severe reverse of fortune.

[Sidenote: Embassy of Grotius to the Court of France.]

3. Lewis XIII filled at that time, the throne of France; his councils were guided by Cardinal Richelieu, one of the ablest statesmen that has appeared upon the theatre of the world. Vast, but provident in his designs; daring, but considerate in his operations; capable of the largest views and the most minute attentions; he formed three immense projects, and succeeded in all.

“When your Majesty,” he thus addresses the monarch in his celebrated *Testament Politique*, “resolved at the same time to admit me into your councils, and to give me a great portion of your confidence, I can say with truth that the Hugonots divided the state with you; that the great, conducted themselves, as if they were not your subjects, and

the governors of the provinces, as if they were the sovereigns of them; and that France was contemned by her foreign allies.”



## Page 68

To reduce the Hugonots, to lower the nobility, to elevate France to be the preponderating power in Europe, were the three objects, which the Cardinal proposed to himself. In each, he had difficulties to encounter, which extraordinary talents only could surmount. By a strict administration of justice, and severely punishing, without respect to rank or connections, those, who engaged in treasonable practices, he completely subdued the towering spirit of the nobility; by victorious armies and a vigorous dispensation of the laws, he reduced the Hugonots; and, by calling forth all the energies of his country, and arraying half the Continent against Austria and Spain, he gave to France an almost irresistible ascendant in the concerns of Europe.

[Sidenote: CHAP. XI 1634-1645.]

To the last only of these three designs our present subject leads us.

*Sweden* had long been engaged in a war against Denmark, and highly dissatisfied with Austria. By the persuasion of Richelieu, she made peace with the Danes, and entered into an offensive and defensive alliance with France. In consequence of it, Gustavus Adolphus was placed at the head of the Protestant confederacy: a large army of Swedes entered Germany; Gustavus was invested with the command of the confederate forces, and his brilliant campaigns turned the tide of success in their favour. At Lutzen he obtained a complete victory, but lost his life.

[Sidenote: Embassy of Grotius to the Court of France.]

After the death of Gustavus, the States assembled, and the Mareschal of the Diet proposed, that the celebrated Christina, the only child of Gustavus, then an infant of very tender years, should be crowned: the Mareschal carried her in his arms into the midst of the assembly. On observing her, all were struck with her likeness to her father. "Yes!" they cried, "it is she herself! she has the eyes, the nose and the forehead of Gustavus! We will have her for our queen!" She was immediately seated on the throne, and proclaimed queen. The regency of the kingdom, during the minority of Christina, was conferred on the Chancellor Oxenstiern: he had been the confidential minister and friend of Gustavus, and shewed through life that he deserved that confidence, by his wisdom, eminent talents, and spotless integrity. Both the monarch and his minister entertained a high opinion of the abilities and virtue of Grotius: His treatise *De Jure Belli et Pacis* was found, after the death of Gustavus, in the royal tent.

4. Not long after the disastrous victory of the Swedes at Lutzen, the Austrian and confederate armies conflicted at Nordlingen, in one of the most obstinate and bloody battles recorded in history: the confederates were completely defeated. The blame was thrown on the Swedes; they were deserted by almost all their Protestant allies, and the weight of the war devolved almost entirely upon the Swedes and *the French*. Till this time, they had acted and negotiated on an equality: the loss of this battle made the

Swedes dependent upon France, and the haughty genius of Richelieu made them severely feel it.



## Page 69

[Sidenote: CHAP. XI. 1634-1645.]

The first object of Oxenstiern was to renew the treaty with France: a skilful negociator on the part of Sweden was necessary. Oxenstiern fixed his eye upon Grotius: the penetrating minister had several conversations with him. The embassy to France was certainly the most important commission, with which a minister from Sweden could be charged: Oxenstiern's appointment of Grotius to it, demonstrated the minister's high opinion of him. Some time in July 1634, he declared Grotius councillor to the Queen of Sweden, and her ambassador to the court of France. Grotius made his public entry into Paris on Friday the 2d of March 1635. Nothing of the customary ceremonial or compliment was omitted in his regard, by the court of France.

Unfortunately for the success of the embassy of Grotius, two envoys from some of the Protestant states in Germany had previously signed a treaty with France, which was generally considered by the confederates to be injurious to their interests.

[Sidenote: Embassy of Grotius to the Court of France.]

The first interview of Grotius with the Cardinal took place on the 28th March. During their conference, a dispatch arrived from Oxenstiern to Grotius: it was immediately put into his hands, by the Cardinal's desire. It announced a resolution, taken by the Chancellor, to repair to Paris, and that he was actually on his journey thither. Richelieu was displeased: but he determined to give the chancellor the most honourable and flattering reception. On the 21st of April, Grotius met Oxenstiern at Soissons: they proceeded together to Paris. Conferences between the Cardinal and the Chancellor immediately took place. The matter in discussion between the courts were soon arranged: France undertook to declare war against the emperor, to subsidize Sweden, and to send an army to co-operate with her forces in Germany. It has always been considered highly creditable to the firmness and talents of Oxenstiern, that, in the reduced condition of the Swedes, he could obtain for them such advantageous terms. Immediately after the treaty was signed, the Chancellor quitted France. During his stay, he shewed a marked attention to Grotius, and expressed unqualified approbation of his conduct and views.

The arms of Sweden again triumphed. In Pomerania, General Bannier obtained important advantages over the imperialists; in Alsace, the arms of the Duke of Saxe-Weimar were equally successful. In the following year, the two victorious generals carried their arms into the heart of the Austrian territories, and, were almost uniformly successful.

[Sidenote: CHAP. XI. 1634-1645.]



## Page 70

But it is foreign to these pages to dwell further on the military achievements or political intrigues of the times of which we are speaking. Humanity shudders at the perusal of the events of this war. Through the whole of its long period, Germany was a scene of devastation. In its northern and central parts, the ravages of advancing and retreating armies were repeatedly experienced in their utmost horrors: many of its finest towns were destroyed; whole villages depopulated; large territories laid waste. Frequently the women, the children, and the aged, naked, pale, and disfigured, were seen wandering over the fields, supporting themselves by the leaves of trees, by wild roots, and even grass. The war extended itself into Lorraine: an affecting account of the calamities, which it produced in that beautiful province, was published by Father Caussin, who accompanied Lewis XIII into it, as his confessor.

[Sidenote: Embassy of Grotius to the Court of France.]

Struck with the scene of woe, St. Vincent of Paul, an humble missionary priest, who, at that time, resided at Paris, requested an audience of Cardinal de Richelieu. Being admitted, he represented to his eminence, with respect, but with firmness, the misery of the people, the sins, and all the other enormities, which are the usual consequences of war: he then fell upon his knees, and in a voice, equally animated by grief and charity, "Sir!" he said to the Cardinal "have mercy upon us! Have compassion upon the world! Give us peace!" The stern and vindictive genius of the Cardinal sunk before the man of God. He raised Vincent from the ground. He told him, with much apparent benignity, that "the general pacification of Europe was his great object, but that unfortunately it did not depend on him alone; there being, both within and without the kingdom, those who sought the contrary, and prevented peace." Few ministers have shewn greater ability, or produced greater public or private misery, than Richelieu. It may, on the other hand, be doubted, whether, at the day of general retribution, when every child of Adam will have to account for his works, even one will appear with more numerous deeds of useful and heroic charity than St. Vincent of Paul.[042]

[Sidenote: CHAP. XI. 1634-1645.]

The affairs of the important embassy entrusted to Grotius, prospered in his hands. In his conduct, there was an uniform assemblage of prudence, activity, moderation, and firmness. To the French monarch, he was always acceptable—not always so to the cardinal minister. It was the constant object of the latter, to delay the payments of the subsidies promised to Sweden, or to make deductions from them; and to lessen the number of soldiers, which France was bound, by treaty to supply. Sometimes by blandishments, sometimes by loftiness, the minister or his agents endeavoured to induce Grotius to sanction these irregularities: but Grotius was always true to the interests of the country which he represented: it does not appear, that the Cardinal gained a single point against him. Towards the close of his embassy, Grotius succeeded in renewing the treaty between Sweden and France, on terms which were considered to do great honour to his diplomatic talents.



## Page 71

In the discharge of his embassy, Grotius had to sustain other unpleasantnesses. His pension was not regularly paid: this often subjected him to great inconveniences. He had disputes respecting rank and ceremonial, both with the French ministry and the ambassadors of other states. It must surprise an English reader to find, that Grotius questioned the right of the English ambassador to precedence over him: the French court often played one ambassador, against the other.

[Sidenote: Embassy of Grotius to the Court of France.]

In the midst of these troubles, Grotius preserved the serenity of his mind; and his attachment to sacred and profane literature. He cultivated the acquaintance of the learned and the good, of every communion; and possessed their esteem and regard. His conduct as ambassador was always approved by the Chancellor Oxenstiern, while he lived, and after his decease, by his son and successor in his office. The Queen of Sweden was equally favourable to Grotius; but she unadvisedly took an adventurer into her confidence, and sent him, in an ambiguous character, to Paris. This disgusted Grotius: and age and infirmities now thickened upon him. He applied to the Queen for his recall. She granted it in the most flattering terms, and desired him to repair immediately to Stockholm, to receive, from her, distinguished marks of her favour. She wrote to the Queen of France, a letter, in which she expressed herself in a manner highly honourable to Grotius: she acknowledged her obligations to him and protested that she never would forget them. This was towards the month of March 1645.

[Sidenote: CHAP. XI. 1634-1645.]

About three years after this event, the war of thirty years was concluded by the peace of Westphalia. France and the Protestant princes of Europe dictated the terms: the Swedes were indemnified for their charges of the war, by Pomerania, Steten, Rugen, Wismar and Verden: the house of Brandenburg obtained Magdeburgh, Halberstad, Minden and Camin; Alsace was conquered, and retained by France; Lusatia, was ceded to Saxony. The history of the treaty of Westphalia has been ably written by *Father Bougeant*, a French Jesuit: some critics have pronounced it the best historical work in the French language. Till the late revolution of France, it was the breviary of all French aspirants to political distinction.

## CHAPTER XII.

THE RELIGIOUS SENTIMENTS OF GROTIUS:—SOME OTHER OF HIS WORKS.

1. *Subsequent History of Arminianism.* 2. *Grotius's Religious Sentiments.* 3. *His Projects of Religious Pacification.*

## **XII. 1.**

*Subsequent History of Arminianism.*



## Page 72

We left the Arminians under the iron arm of Prince Maurice:—He died in 1625:—We have mentioned, that Prince Frederick-Henry his brother, and successor in the Stadtholderate, adopted more moderate councils in their regard; that he recalled the Remonstrants, with some exceptions, from banishment; that many settled at Amsterdam and Rotterdam; and that the Arminians founded a college in the former city:—*Episcopius* was its first professor of theology:—it has never been without teachers, of eminence for learning, as Courcelles, Pollemberg, Limborch, Le Clerc, Cottenburgh, and Wetstein.

[Sidenote: CHAP. XII.]

It should be added, that the authority of the Synod of Dort insensibly declined:—its authority was never formally acknowledged by the provinces of *Friesland, Zealand, Utrecht, Gueldreland* and *Groeningen*: In 1651, they were induced to intimate that they would see with pleasure, the reformed religion maintained upon the footing, upon which it had been maintained and confirmed by the Synod of Dort; but this intimation was never considered to have the force of a legislative enactment.[043]

[Sidenote: XII.1. History of Arminianism.]

The theological system of the Arminians, after their return to Holland, underwent, if we credit Dr. Mosheim,[044] a remarkable change. They appear, by his account, to have almost coincided with those, who exclude the necessity of divine grace in the work of conversion and sanctification; and think that Christ demands from men, rather virtue than faith; and has confined that belief, which is essential for salvation, to very few articles. Thus the modern Arminians, according to Dr. Mosheim, admit into their communion,—1st. All, with an exception of Catholics, who receive the holy scriptures; and more especially the New Testament; allowing at the same time to every individual, his own interpretation of the sacred books:—2dly. All whose lives are regulated by the law of God:—3dly. And all, who neither persecute nor bear ill will towards those who differ from them in their religious sentiments. Their *Confession of Faith* was drawn up by *Episcopius* in 1622: four divines of the established church of Holland published a *Refutation* of it: the authors of the *Confession* replied to it in the following year, by their *Apology*.

[Sidenote: CHAP. XII.]

James I. of England directed his theological representatives in the Synod of Dort, to join the members in the condemnation of the doctrines of Arminius:—but, when the English divines returned from that assembly, and gave a full account of its proceedings, the King and the greatest part of the English clergy expressed their dissatisfaction with them, and declared that the sentiments of Arminius on the divine decrees, was preferable to those of Calvin and Gomarus. By the exertions of Archbishop Laud, and afterwards, in consequence of the general tendency of the public mind to doctrines of mildness and

comprehension, an Arminian construction of the English articles on predestination and free-will was adopted:—it has since prevailed,—and the Arminian creed, by the number of its secret or open adherents, has insensibly found admittance into every Protestant church.



## Page 73

[Sidenote: History of Arminianism.]

If we believe the celebrated Jurieu[045], Arminianism even in its Socinian form, abounded, in less than a century, after the death of Arminius, in the United Provinces, and among the Hugonots of the adjacent part of France. By his account, the dispersion of the French Hugonots, in consequence of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, revealed to the terrified reformers of the original school, the alarming secret of the preponderance of Socinianism in the reformed church. Its members, according to Jurieu, being no longer under the controul of the civil power, spread their Socinian principles every where, with the utmost activity and success: even in England, Jurieu professed to discover the effect of their exertions. He mentions that in 1698, thirty-four French refugee ministers residing in London addressed a letter to the synod, then sitting at Amsterdam, in which they declared, that Socinianism had spread so rapidly, that, if the ecclesiastical assemblies supplied no means for checking their growth, or used palliatives only, the mischief would be incurable.

[Sidenote: CHAP. XII.]

This charge, however, the Arminians have indignantly rejected. A writer in the *Bibliothèque Germanique*[046] relates, that

“the celebrated Anthony Collins called on M. Le Clerc of Amsterdam: He was accompanied by some Frenchmen, of the fraternity of those, who think freely. They expected to find the religious opinions of Le Clerc in unison with their own, but, they were surprised to find the strong stand which he made in favour of revelation. He proved to them, with great strength of argument, the truth of the Christian religion. Jesus Christ, he told them, was born among the Jews; still, it was not the Jewish religion which he taught; neither was it the religion of the Pagan neighbourhood; but, a religion infinitely superior to both. One sees in it the most striking marks of divinity. The Christians, who followed, were incapable of imagining any thing so beautiful. Add to this, that the Christian religion is so excellently calculated for the good of society, that, if we did not derive so great a present from heaven, the good and safety of men would absolutely demand from them an equivalent.”

Throughout the conversation, M. Le Clerc reproached the Deists strongly, for the hatred, which they shewed to Christianity. He proved, that, by banishing it from the world,

“they would overturn whatever was most holy and respectable among men; break asunder the surest bonds of humanity; teach men to shake off the yoke of law; deprive them of their strongest incitement to virtue, and bereave them of their best comfort. What,” (he asked them) “do you substitute in its place? Can you flatter yourself, that you will discover something better? You expect, no doubt, that men will erect statues to you, for your exertions to deprive them of their religion! Permit me to tell you, that the part you act makes you odious and despicable in the eyes of all honest men.”

He finished the conversation by requesting Mr. Collins to bring him no more such visitors.



## Page 74

[Sidenote: XII. 1. History of Arminians.]

From the close of the 17th century, till the present time, Arminianism has been continually on the increase. It is a just observation of Mr. Gibbon, that “the disciples of Arminius must not be computed by their separate congregations.”

Doctor Maclaine says, it is certain, that the most eminent philosophers have been found among the Arminians. “If both Arminians and Calvinists,” says Mr. Evans, in the excellent work we have cited,

“claim a *King* (*James I.*), it is certain that the latter alone can boast of a *Newton*, a *Locke*, a *Clarke*, or a *Boyle*. Archbishop *Usher* is said to have lived a *Calvinist*; and died an *Arminian*. The members of the episcopal church in Scotland; the Moravians, the general Baptists, the Wesleyan Methodists, the Quakers or Friends, are Arminians; and it is supposed that a great proportion of the Kirk of Scotland teach the doctrines of Arminius, though they have a Calvinistic confession of faith. What a pity it is that the opinions either of Calvinists or Arminians,”

—(we beg leave to add: or any other Catholic or Protestant opinions whatsoever)—

“cannot in the eyes of some persons be held without a diminution of Christian charity!”

## XII. 2.

*Grotius's Religious Sentiments.*

[Sidenote: CHAP. XII.]

To the milder form of Arminianism, Grotius always inclined. During his embassy in France, he adopted it without reserve. He was soon disgusted with the French Calvinists. The ministers of Charenton accepted the decisions of the Synod of Dort, and, in conformity with them, refused, when Grotius repaired to Paris, after his escape from Louvestein, to admit him into their communion. On his arrival at Paris, in quality of ambassador, they offered to receive him: Grotius expressed pleasure at the proposal; and, intimated to them, that if he should go into any country, in which the Lutherans, knowing his sentiments on the sacrament of our Lord's Supper, should be willing to receive him into their communion, he would make no difficulty in joining them. Thus every thing appeared to be settled; but the ministers then objected to receive Grotius as ambassador from Sweden, because that kingdom was Lutheran. Grotius, upon this, resolved to have the divine service performed in his house. Lutherans publicly attended it. “We have celebrated,” he writes to his brother, “the Feast of the Nativity in my house: the Duke of Wirtemberg, the Count de Saxenburgh, and several Swedish and



German lords, attended at it." His first chaplain was imprudent, his second gave him great satisfaction.

[Sidenote: XII. 2. Grotius' Religious Sentiments.]

Burigni has collected, in the last chapter of his Life of Grotius, a multitude of passages, which shew his gradual leaning to the Roman Catholic faith. He produces several passages from his works, which prove,—



## Page 75

*That* he paid high regard to decisions of the councils, and the discipline of the primitive church; and thought the sentiments of the antient church should be deferred to, in the explanation of the Scriptures: [047]

*That*, the early reformers were held by him in no great esteem:[048]

*That*, mentioning Casaubon's sentiments, Grotius said that this learned man thought the Roman Catholics of France better informed than those of other countries, and came nearer to truth than the ministers of Charenton:—

“It cannot,” says Grotius, “be denied, that there are several Roman Catholic pastors here, who teach true religion, without any mixture of superstition; it were to be wished that all did the same:”[049]

*That* the Calvinists were schismatics, and had no mission:[050]

[Sidenote: CHAP. XII.]

*That* the Jesuits were learned men and good subjects. “I know many of them,” he says, in one of his writings against Rivetus, “who are very desirous to see abuses abolished, and the church restored to its primitive unity.”—We shall hereafter see that Father Petau, an illustrious member of the society, possessed the confidence of Grotius:[051]

*That*, Grotius looked upon the abolition of episcopacy and of a visible head of the church, as something very monstrous:[052]

*That*, he acknowledged that some change was made in the eucharistic bread; that, when Jesus Christ, being sacramentally present, favours us with his substance,—as the Council of Trent expresses its doctrine on the Eucharist,—the appearances of bread and wine remain, and in their place succeed the body and blood of Christ: [053]

[Sidenote: XII. 2. Grotius's Religious Sentiments.]

*That*, Grotius did not approve of the sentiments of the Calvinists concerning the Eucharist, and reproached them with their contradiction.

“You will hear them state in their confessions,” says Grotius, “that they really, substantially and essentially partake of Christ's body and his blood; but, in their disputes, they maintain that Christ is received only spiritually, by faith. The antients go much further: they admit a real incorporation of Jesus Christ with us, and the reality of Christ's body, as Saint Hilarius speaks.”

It must however be remarked that, although Grotius thought that the term *Transubstantiation* adopted by the council of Trent, was capable of a good



interpretation, it is not clear, what was his precise opinion respecting the Eucharist. He proposed the following formulary:

“We believe that, in the use of the supper, we truly, really, and substantially,—that is to say,—in its proper substance,—receive the true body and the true blood of Jesus Christ, in a spiritual and ineffable manner: [054]”

*That*, Grotius justified the decision of the Council of Trent, concerning the number of the sacraments:[055]



## Page 76

*That*, after the year 1640, he took no offence at the use of images in churches, or at prayers for the dead:[056]

*That*, he thought the bishops of Rome may be in error, but cannot long remain in it, if they adhere to the universal church;—this seems to presuppose the church's infallibility:[057]

[Sidenote: CHAP. XII.]

*That* in the opinion of Grotius; fasting was early used in the church; the observance of Lent was a very early practice: the sign of the cross had something respectable in it; the fathers held virginity a more perfect state than marriage; and the celibacy of the priests conformable to the antient discipline of the church:[058]

And

“that those, who shall read the decrees of the Council of Trent, with a mind disposed to peace, will find that every thing is wisely explained in them: and agreeable to what is taught by the Scriptures and the antient fathers.”[059]

It is certain, that Grotius was intimate with Father Petau, a Jesuit, inferior to none of his society, in genius and learning; that the good father used all his endeavours to convert Grotius to the Roman Catholic religion; and was, at length, so much persuaded of his friend's catholicity, that, when he heard of his death, he said prayers for the repose of his soul.[060]

[Sidenote: XII. 3. His Project of Religious Pacification.]

As the religion of Grotius was a problem to many, Menage wrote the following Epigram upon it: the sense of it is, that—

“As many sects claimed the religion of Grotius, as the towns, which contended for the birth of Homer.”

*Smyrna, Rhodos, Colophon, Salamis, Chios, Argos, Athenae,  
Siderei certant vatis de patria Homeri:  
Grotiadae certant de religione, Socinus,  
Arrius, Arminius, Calvinus, Roma, Lutherus.*

### XII. 3.

*Grotius's Project of Religious Pacification.*



A wish for religious peace among Christians grew with the growth and strengthened with the strength of Grotius. It was known, before his imprisonment at Louvestein, that he entertained these sentiments: he avows them in the dedication to Lewis XIII. of his treatise *de Jure Belli et Pacis*.

“I shall never cease,” he says in a letter to his brother,[061] “to use my utmost endeavours for establishing peace among Christians; And, if I should not succeed, it will be honourable to die in such an enterprise.” “I am not the only one, who has conceived such projects,” he writes in another letter to his brother:[062] “Erasmus, Cassander; Wicelius and Casaubon had the same design. La Meletiere is employed at present in it. Cardinal de Richelieu declares that he will protect the coalition; and he is such a fortunate man, that he never undertakes any thing, in which he does



## Page 77

not succeed. If there were no hopes of success at present, ought we not to sow the seed, which may be useful to posterity?[063] Even if we should only diminish the mutual hatred among Christians, and render them more sociable, would not this be worth purchasing at the price of some labour and reproaches?"[064]

Grotius expressed himself in similar terms to Baron Oxenstiern: Surely it is the true language of the Gospel.

[Sidenote: CHAP. XII.]

In the first appendix to this work,—we shall insert, an account

“of the Formularies, Confessions of Faith, and Symbolic Books, of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and principal Protestant churches:”—

In the second appendix,—we shall insert an account of the principal attempts made, since the Reformation, for the re-union of Christians.—The former is abridged from the “Historical and Literary Account of the Confessions of Faith,” which was formerly published by the present writer;—the second is an essay appended to that work:—both have been before referred to in the present publication.

[Sidenote: XII. 3. His Project of Religious Pacification.]

Grotius[065] thought that the most compendious way to produce universal religious peace among Christians, would be to frame, with the concurrence of all the orthodox Eastern and Western churches, a formulary which should express, briefly and explicitly, all the articles of faith, the belief of which they agree in thinking essential to salvation. In a letter addressed from Paris in 1625,[066] he mentions that Gustavus Adolphus had entertained projects of religious pacification, and had taken measures to effect it; that he had procured a meeting of divines of the Lutheran and Reformed churches and that they had separated amicably: Grotius says that the differences between them were as slight as those between the Greek and Coptic churches.

For some time, Grotius flattered himself that he should succeed in his project of pacification. In one of his letters to his brother, he mentions distinguished Protestants, who approved and encouraged them

“I perceive,” he says, “that by conversing with men of the most learning among the reformed, and explaining my sentiments to them, they are of my opinion; and that their number will increase, if my treatises are dispersed. I can truly affirm, that I have said nothing in them from party spirit, but followed truth as closely as I could.”[067]

[Sidenote: CHAP. XII.]

He imagined that some Catholics entered into his views.

“The ablest men among the Catholics,” he thus writes to his brother, “think that what I have published is written with great freedom and moderation, and approve of it.”[068]

These pacific projects of Grotius cemented the union between him and Father Petau.



## Page 78

"I had," says that most learned Jesuit, in his 12th Letter, "a great desire to see and converse with Grotius. We have been long together, and very intimate. He is, as far as I can judge, a good man, and possesses great candour. I do not think him far from becoming a Catholic, after the example of Holstenius as you hoped. I shall neglect nothing in my power to reconcile him to Christ, and put him in the way of salvation." [069]

[Sidenote: His Project of Religious Pacification.]

[Sidenote: CHAP. XII.]

[Sidenote: XII. 3. His Project of Religious Pacification.]

[Sidenote: CHAP. XII.]

As Grotius lays so much stress on the pacific labours of Erasmus, Wicelius, Cassander and Casaubon, we shall briefly mention, in the present chapter, the labours of the three first: Casaubon's we shall notice, in the second appendix to this work.

[Sidenote: XII. 3. His Project of Religious Pacification.]

[Sidenote: CHAP. XII.] It appears that *Erasmus* had it in contemplation to compose three dialogues, upon the important subject of religious pacification: the speakers were to have been Luther, under the name of Thrasimachus, and a Catholic divine, under that of Eubolus. In the first dialogue, they were to have discussed the proper methods of terminating the religious controversies of the times; in the second, to have investigated what were the points in controversy, the belief of which was essential to a member of the church of Christ; in the third, they were to have inquired what were the best means to procure a good understanding between the contending parties, and to effect their union. It is to be lamented that Erasmus did not execute his design. His general sentiments appear in his *Paraphrase upon the 83d Psalm*; they are expressed with great wisdom and moderation. [071]

[Sidenote: XII. 3. His Project of Religious Pacification.]

*Wicelius*,—who is next mentioned by Grotius, had been professed in a religious order: had quitted it, and embraced Lutheranism: he afterwards forsook that communion, and returned to the Catholic: upon this, he was appointed to a curacy; and, in the discharge of his functions, obtained general esteem: he was much regarded by the Emperors Ferdinand and Maximilian. In 1537, he published at Leipsic a Latin work, "On the method of procuring Religious Concord,—*Methodus Concordiae Ecclesiasticae*." He addressed it to the pope, to all sovereigns, bishops, doctors, and generally to all christians, exhorting them to peace, and to desist from contention. He assumed in it, that the true religion had been preserved in the Catholic church; but he allows that modern doctors had involved it in numerous scholastic subtleties, unknown to antiquity.



He complains that on one hand the reformers left nothing untouched; that, on the other, the scholastics would retain every abuse, and every superfluity: Wisdom, he thought, lay between them; the reformers should have respected what antiquity consecrated; the Catholics should have abandoned modern doctrines and modern practices to the discretion of individuals.



## Page 79

The “Royal Road,” or *Via Regia* of Wicelius, a still more important work, was published by him at Helmstadt in 1537. Both works were approved, and the perusal of them warmly recommended, by the emperors: they have been often reprinted; they are inserted, with a life of their author, in the second volume of *Brown’s Fasciculus*.

“If all the divines of those times,” says Father Simon the oratorian,[073] “had possessed the same spirit as Wicelius, the affairs of religion might have taken a different turn.”

[Sidenote: CHAP. XII.]

[Sidenote: XII.3. His Project of Religious Pacification]

*Cassander*, another peacemaker, mentioned with praise by Grotius, is the subject of a long and interesting article in *Dupin’s Ecclesiastical History*:[074]

“He was,” says Dupin, “solidly learned; and thoroughly versed in ecclesiastical antiquity and the controversies of his own times. The flaming zeal, which he had for the re-union and peace of the church, made him yield much to the Protestants, and led him to advance some propositions that were too bold. But he always kept in the communion of the Catholic church. He declared that he submitted to its judgments, and openly condemned the authors of the schism and their principal errors. He was a gentle, humble and moderate man; patient under afflictions, and entirely disinterested. In his disputes, he never returned injury for injury; and neither in his manners nor in his writings were presumption or arrogance ever discoverable. He avoided glory, honor, or wealth; and lived private and retired, having no other thought or wish, but to promote the peace of the church; no employment, but study; no business, but to compose books, which might be profitable to the public; and no passion, but knowing and teaching the truth.”

His character procured him universal respect. The emperor and several Catholic princes in Germany fixed upon him as a mediator in the religious disputes, by which the empire was, at that time, agitated. In conformity with their views he published his celebrated, “*Consultatio de Articulis Religionis inter Catholicos et Protestantas Controversis*.”

“In this work,” says Mr. Chalmers, “he discusses the several articles of the Augsburg Confession, stating their difference from the doctrines of the Catholic church, and the concessions that might safely be made in respect to them. This work was written with great liberality, was much applauded by those, who were desirous of a coalition: they were too soon convinced that every attempt of this kind was nugatory. Cassander presented it to the Emperors Ferdinand I. and Maximilian II. They received it favourably; the former invited Cassander to Vienna, but his infirmities prevented his accepting the offer.”



[Sidenote: CHAP. XII.]

In 1542, Grotius published his "*Road to Religious Peace,—Via ad Pacem Ecclesiasticam:*" he inserted in it Cassander's "*Consultation,*" and accompanied it with notes.



## Page 80

All pacific persons revered Grotius, and still reverence his memory, for his attempts to restore the religious peace of Christendom: all the violent condemned him, and opposed his projects. The contradictions, which he met with, chagrined him; so that he sometimes lost that tranquillity of mind, which he had possessed in his deepest adversity. But, to use his own words, he looked to the blessed Peacemaker for his reward, and trusted that posterity would do justice to its intentions.—

“Perhaps, by writing to reconcile such as entertain very opposite sentiments, I shall,” says Grotius, “offend both parties: but, if that should so happen, I shall comfort myself with the example of him, who said, If I please men, I am not the servant of Christ.”

[Sidenote: XII. 3. His Project of Religious Pacification.]

“Grotius,” says Burigni, “content with gratifying his pacific desires, expected his reward from posterity. This he clearly intimates in the following verses, written by him on the subject:

*“Accipe, sed placide, quae, si non optimo, certe  
Espressit nobis non mala pacis amor.  
Et tibi dic, nostro labor hic si displicet avo,  
A gratia pretium posteritate feret.”*

The projects of religious pacification did not cease with Grotius: several divines of distinction adopted it; and attempted, some with more prudence and ability than others, to carry it into effect. The principal of these are noticed in the second appendix to the present work. None succeeded: One description of persons, who engaged in this design, was denominated *Syncretists*, or *Calixtines*, from *George Calixtus* their leader: the other, from their calling men from controversy to holiness of life, received the appellation of *Pietists*: A third party,—perhaps we may style them, the *Ultra-orthodox*,—more hostile to the former than to the latter—arose in opposition to both, and accused them of sacrificing the doctrines of faith to a mistaken zeal for union and sanctity.[075]

It is certain[076] that the friends of union too often erred in this,—that they aimed rather at an uniformity of *terms* than of *sentiments*; and thus seemed satisfied, when they engaged the contending parties to use the same *words and phrases*, though their *real difference* in opinion remained the same. This could not be justified: it tended evidently to extinguish truth and honour, and to introduce equivocation.

## CHAPTER XIII.

### THE DEATH OF GROTIUS.

1645

[Sidenote: CHAP. XIII. 1645.]



## Page 81

Every thing respecting the recall of Grotius being settled, he embarked at Dieppe for Holland. He was extremely well received at Amsterdam and Rotterdam: the constituted authorities, of the former city fitted a vessel, which was to take him to Hamburg: there, after along and harassing journey, he arrived on the 16th of May. From Hamburg he proceeded to Luebec: the magistrates of that city gave him an honourable reception. He proceeded to Wismar; where Count Wismar, the admiral of the Swedish fleet, gave him a splendid entertainment, and afterwards sent him in a man-of-war to Colmar: thence, he went by land to Stockholm. When he arrived there, Queen Christina was at Upsal; but, hearing that Grotius was at Stockholm, she returned to that city to meet him. On the day after her arrival, she favoured him with a long audience: she expressed to him great satisfaction at his conduct, and made him large promises. These audiences were often repeated; and once she permitted him to have the honour of dining with her. She assured him, that if he would continue in her service, as Councillor of State, and bring his family into Sweden, he should have no reason to complain of her. But Grotius was anxious to leave Sweden; and his passport being delayed, he resolved to quit it without one, and actually proceeded to a seaport about seven leagues distant from Stockholm. The Queen, being informed of his departure, sent a gentleman to inform him, that she wished to see him once more. On this invitation he returned to Stockholm, and was immediately admitted into the Queen's presence; he then explained to her his reasons for wishing to quit Sweden. The Queen appeared to be satisfied with them: she made him a present in money of twelve or thirteen thousand Swedish imperials, of the value of about ten thousand French crowns; she added to the present, some plate, the finishing of which had, she told him, been the only cause of the delay of his passport. She then put it into his hands, and a vessel was appointed to carry him to Luebec. On the 12th August he embarked for that city.

[Sidenote: The Death of Grotius.]

What were his real motives for refusing Christina's offers, or in what place he ultimately intended to fix himself, is not known.

The vessel in which he embarked had scarcely sailed from Luebec, when it was overtaken by a violent storm, and obliged, on the 17th August, to take shelter in a port fourteen miles distant from Dantzic. Grotius went from it in an open wagon to Luebec, and arrived very ill at Rostock[077] on the 26th August. No one, there, knew him: his great weakness determined him to call in the aid of a physician: one accordingly attended him: his name was Stochman. On feeling Grotius's pulse, he said his indisposition proceeded from weakness and fatigue, and that, with rest and some restoratives, he might recover; but, on the following day he changed his opinion. Perceiving that the weakness of Grotius increased, and that it was accompanied with a cold sweat and other symptoms indicating an exhaustion of nature, the physician announced that the end of his patient was near. Grotius then asked for a clergyman. *John Quistorpius* was brought to him. Quistorpius, in a letter to Calovius, gives the following particulars of Grotius's last moments:



## Page 82

“You are desirous of hearing from me, how that Phoenix of Literature, Hugo Grotius, behaved in his last moments, and I am going to tell you. He embarked at Stockholm for Luebec, and after having been tossed for the three days, by a violent tempest, he was shipwrecked, and got to shore on the coast of Pomerania, from whence he came to our town of Rostock, distant above sixty miles, in an open wagon through wind and rain. He lodged with Balleman; and sent for M. Stochman, the physician, who observing that he was extremely weakened by years, by what he suffered at sea, and by the inconveniences attending the journey, judged that he could not live long. The second day after Grotius’s arrival in this town, that is, on the 18th of August, O.S. he sent for me, about nine at night, I went, and found him almost at the point of death: I said, ‘There was nothing I desired more, than to have seen him in health, that I might have the pleasure of his conversation.’ He answered, ‘God had ordered it otherwise.’ I desired him: to prepare himself for a happier life, to acknowledge that he was a sinner, and to repent of his faults: and, happening to mention the publican, who acknowledged that he was a sinner, and asked God’s mercy; he answered, ‘*I am that publican.*’ I went on, and told him that he must have recourse to Jesus Christ, without whom there is no salvation.’

“He replied, ‘*I place all my hope in Jesus Christ.*’

[Sidenote: The Death of Grotius.]

“I began to repeat aloud in German, the prayer which begins *Herr Jesu*:<sup>[078]</sup> he followed me in a very low voice; with his hands clasped. When I had done, I asked him, ‘if he understood me.’ He answered, ‘*I understand you very well.*’ I continued to repeat to him those passages of the word of God, which are commonly offered to the remembrance of dying persons; and asking him, ‘if he understood me,’ he answered, ‘*I heard your voice, but I did not understand what you said.*’“These were his last words; soon afterwards he expired; just at midnight. His body was delivered to the physicians, who took out his bowels. I easily obtained leave to bury them in our principal church, which is dedicated to the Virgin.”

His corpse, was afterwards carried to Delft, and deposited in the tomb of his ancestors. He wrote this modest epitaph for himself,

“GROTIUS HIC HUGO EST, BATAVUM  
CAPTIVUS ET EXSUL,  
LEGATUS REGNI, SUECIA MAGNA, TUI.”

Burigni informs us that Grotius had a very agreeable person, a good complexion, an aquiline nose, sparkling eyes, a serene and smiling countenance; that he was not tall, but very strong, and well built. The engraving of him prefixed to the *Hugonis Grotii Manes* answers this description.



It is needless to give an account of his descendants, or their prosperous or adverse fortunes: they are noticed at length by Burigni. In *Mr. Boswell's Life of Johnson*, mention is made of one who was then in a state of want. Dr. Johnson, in a letter to Dr. Vyse,



## Page 83

“requests him to recommend, an old friend, to his grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. His name,” says the Doctor, “is De Groot. He has all the common claims to charity; he is poor and infirm in a great degree. He has likewise another claim, to which no scholar can refuse attention: he is, by several descents, the nephew of Hugo Grotius; of him, of whom every man of learning has perhaps learned something. Let it not be said, that, in any lettered country, the nephew of Grotius, ever asked a charity, and was refused.”

The reader must be pleased, to be informed, that the application,—it was for some situation, in the charter-house,—was successful. Dr. Vyse informed Dr. Johnson of it, by letter. In his answer,

“Dr. Johnson,” by Dr. Vyse’s account, “rejoiced much, and was lavish of the praise he bestowed upon his favourite Hugo Grotius.”[079]

[Sidenote: The Death of Grotius.]

Three points were united in Grotius, each of which would strongly recommend him to Dr. Johnson: he was learned, pious, and opposed to the doctrines of Calvin. It is still more unnecessary to mention the various encomiums, which the learned of all nations have made of Grotius, in prose and verse. That he was one of the most universal scholars, whom the world has produced, and that he possessed sense, taste, and genius in a high degree, is universally confessed. It is equally true, that both his public and his private character, are entitled to a high degree of praise.

When Queen Christina, heard of his death, she wrote to his widow, a letter of condolence, and requested, that the manuscripts which he had left, might be sent to her:

“My ambassador,” the Queen says in this letter, “has made you acquainted, with my high esteem, for his learning, and the good services he did me; but he could not express, how dear I hold his memory, and the effects of his great labours. If gold, or silver, could do any thing towards redeeming such a valuable life, I would gladly employ all, I am mistress of, for that purpose.”

She concludes by asking his widow, for all the manuscripts “of that learned man, whose works had given her such pleasure.” The Queen assures her, that “they could not fall into better hands,” and that, “the author, having been useful to her in his lifetime, it was not just that she should be deprived, after his death, of the fruits of his labours.”

It remains to mention, that, after the death of Grotius, his wife communicated with the Church of England: this, it is said, she did in conformity to the dying injunctions of her husband: it is certain, that Grotius respected the Church of England. His wife died at the Hague, in the communion of the Remonstrants. Through life, she was uniformly

respected; and, whenever the services of Grotius, to sacred and profane literature, are recorded, her services to him, should be mentioned with praise.



## Page 84

### CHAPTER XIV.

HISTORICAL MINUTES OF THE REVOLUTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE SEVEN UNITED PROVINCES, FROM THE DEATH OF WILLIAM II. TILL THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS.

1680-1815.

In some of the preceding pages, the principal events in the history of the Seven United Provinces, till the death of William II, in 1680, have been briefly mentioned: in the present chapter, we shall insert a summary account of the revolutions of their government, till the present time.

#### XIV. 1.

*William III.*

1650-1702.

William III. was born after the death of William II. his father. Immediately after that event, his mother claimed for him the stadtholderate, and all the other dignities, pre-eminences, and rights, which his father and grandfather had enjoyed; but, so great, at that time, was the public jealousy of the ambitious views of the house of Orange, that the States General would not even take her claims into deliberation. A general assembly of the States was held in 1661. They confirmed the Treaty of Union, of 1579; attributed to themselves, the appointment of all civil and military offices; placed the army under the authority of the provinces and municipalities, and invested the council of state with the general direction of the military concerns of the nation. A war with England, which was then governed by Cromwell, soon followed; it was the commencement of the naval glory of the United States. But the government was distracted by the contests and dissensions between the republican and the Orange factions. The former were headed by John de Witt. He possessed transcendent abilities, was a true lover of his country, and, on every occasion, advised the wisest measures. Some of the military operations of the States proving unsuccessful, the Orange faction endeavoured to persuade the people, that this reverse of fortune was owing to the want of a Stadtholder; and exhorted them to confer this dignity on the young prince, to be exercised, during his minority, by one of the family. This proposition was successfully resisted by De Witt. Peace between England and the United Provinces being concluded, Cromwell endeavoured to unite them to England by a federative alliance; but they rejected the proposition. At the suggestion of De Witt, the States of Holland passed an Act, by which they bound themselves never to appoint the Prince of Orange, or any of his descendants, to the office of Stadtholder, or Captain General; and to prevent, to their utmost power, the other States from making such an appointment. This



measure displeased the other States. In 1665, the office of Commander in Chief becoming vacant, the opposite party endeavoured to procure it for one of the Orange family; this attempt also proved abortive. In 1661 a war broke out between England,--- which was then governed by Charles II., and the United States; these displayed in it, chiefly under the command of De Ruyter, prodigies of valour and naval skill; the year 1667 was famous in their annals, by their fleet's sailing up the river Thames, and burning the English fleet at Chatham. The peace of Breda immediately followed.



## Page 85

[Sidenote: XIV. 1. William III.]

Still, the civil discord continued. The States of Holland renewed the *Edict of Exclusion*, with the addition of a clause, that, whenever a person should be invested, with the office of Captain, or Admiral General, he should swear never to aspire to the office of Stadtholder, and to refuse it, if it should be offered to him.

[Sidenote: CHAP. XIV 1650—1702.]

The year 1671 is remarkable for the league entered into by Louis XIV. and Charles II. against the United States, and by their vigorous resistance to it. The circumstances into which it drove the United States, compelled them to appoint the Prince of Orange Captain General and Admiral: he took the oath prescribed by the Perpetual Edict, not to aspire to the stadtholderate, and to reject it, if offered. He was at this time in his twenty-second year: he owed his elevation to the critical situation in which the United States were then placed; but it was also owing to the great prudence with which he had conducted himself when fortune was opposed to him; and to the talents and application to business which he then discovered.

At sea, the navy of the United States was generally successful. At land, the arms of Lewis XIV. triumphed; he conquered Gueldres, Overyssell, and the city and province of Utrecht. This maddened the populace. They massacred John De Witt, and Cornelius De Witt, his brother, after having subjected them to the cruellest tortures and the most brutal indignities. To the indelible reproach of William III. he did not interfere to prevent or stop these horrors. His measures for obtaining the stadtholderate succeeded.

[Sidenote: XIV. 1. William III.]

On the 4th of July 1672, it was re-established in the person of William III.; and all the dignities and rights enjoyed by his predecessors were conferred upon him. These, in 1674, were made hereditary in his family. His subsequent conduct is entitled, on many accounts, to the warmest praise. The success of the United States at sea compelled Charles II. to make peace with them, so that Lewis XIV. was their only enemy. The war with him was terminated by the peace of Nimeguen in 1678. Ten years after it, the Stadtholder, on the abdication of James II. became King of England. In 1690, England, Spain, Austria, and the United Provinces, entered into the Grand Alliance against France. The Duke of Savoy and several Princes of Germany afterwards joined it. In general, the proceedings of the confederacy were unsuccessful; the war was terminated in 1697 by the peace of Ryswick. In 1700, the disputes on the succession to the Spanish monarchy, in consequence of the death of Charles II. of Spain, without issue, called the world again to arms. William III. died in 1702.

## **XIV. 2.**

*John William Count of Nassau Dietz, 1702-1711; William IV. 1711-1751.*



## Page 86

The government of William III. was generally displeasing to the United States: they accused him of sacrificing them to the interests of his English monarchy, and to the hatred which he always bore to the French. He was also suspected, and not without reason, of a design to acquire the independent sovereignty of the provinces. At first, his influence within them was so great, that he was said to be King in the United States, and Stadtholder in England; but it declined gradually; and an attempt by him to obtain the succession to the stadtholderate for John Friso, Prince of Nassau and Hereditary Stadtholder of Frizeland, absolutely failed. He made, by his will, that prince his testamentary heir.

Upon the decease of William III. a general wish to discontinue the stadtholderate was expressed in most of the provinces; those of Holland, Zealand, Utrecht, Gueldres, and Overyssell, came to a formal resolution to this effect They recognised the supreme power of the States General, and conferred the direction of their political concerns on Heinsius, the actual Grand Pensionary, a person of great learning, uncommon talents for business, and acknowledged integrity.

[Sidenote: XIV. 2. John William Count of Nassau Diets, 1702-1711; William IV. 1711-1749.]

As testamentary heir of William III., John-William assumed the title of Prince of Orange: he died in 1711, without having exercised the power of the stadtholderate, except in the province of Frizeland.

The war of the succession terminated in 1713, by the peace of Utrecht: it was succeeded in 1715 by the Barrier Treaty, and in 1719 by the Quadruple Alliance, ever memorable for the triumphant campaigns of Marlborough, by which it was followed. The pensionary Heinsius died in 1720. In his life-time, several weak attempts had been made, in different provinces, to restore in them the stadtholderate. They succeeded only at Gueldres; and even there, it was restored with great limitations.

Upon the decease of Prince William-John, his rights and pretensions descended to Prince William, his son. In 1733, he married Mary, the daughter of George II. of England. This strengthened his cause; but the general spirit of the United Provinces was so averse to the Stadtholderate, that it was not till the invasion of Holland, by the French, in 1747, that the prince's party judged it advisable to bring forward his claim. At first they met with resistance, but finally prevailed, and Prince William of Orange became the sole Stadtholder of every province: until his time each of the provinces of Frizeland and Groningen had its particular Stadtholder. The dignities of Captain General and Admiral were also conferred on him; and, in addition to these, some rights and privileges which no former Stadtholder had enjoyed.



## Page 87

The reverses of the United Provinces continued, and the aggrandisement of the Stadtholderate increased proportionally. As yet William IV. had no male issue. In 1748, the Orange faction proposed that the Stadtholderate should be declared hereditary; and that, in default of males, females should be admitted into the succession. After some opposition the measure was carried in all the provinces, except Frizeland and Groningen. From this time the United Provinces ceased to be a republic, and became a monarchy, limited by the antient usages and institutions. William IV. died in 1749.

### XIV. 3.

*From the Death of William IV. till the Erection of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.*

1749-1815.

At the death of William IV. William, his son, and afterwards his successor in the Stadtholderate, was an infant, in very tender years. His mother was named by the states Governess of the United Provinces. She appointed the Duke of Brunswick to the command of their armies; thus, after all their exertions and sacrifices for liberty, the United Provinces became subject to the government of an English princess and a German prince; and an English party became predominant in their politics; William V. married a princess of Prussia, and thus the Orange party was strengthened by Prussian influence.

[Sidenote: XIV. 3. From the death of William IV. till the erection of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.]

These opposite, and conflicting interests, filled every province, with dissension; and, on some occasions, armed one body of citizens against another. The English party, sided with the Orange faction; the French, with the republicans. At first the latter prevailed; they led the states into measures, which forced England to declare war against them. In 1782, they acknowledged the independence of the United States of America. Still, the dissensions continued. After a long conflict, the republican party acquired the ascendant; they suspended the Prince of Orange from his functions, and filled all the principal places of trust with their own adherents. But the Orange party soon rallied; the Duke of Brunswick entered Holland at the head of a victorious army, and, in 1787, re-established the Stadtholderate.

[Sidenote: CHAP. XIV. 1749-1816.]

His victorious career, was soon terminated. In 1799, the revolutionary army of France made themselves masters of the whole territory of the United States; and established *The Batavian Republic*. It was successively governed, but always under the overpowering controul of France, by a Convention, a Directory, and a Consul, with the



appellation of Grand Pensionary. In 1806, even these forms of her antient government were abolished; Napoleon sending Louis, one of his brothers, to reign over the United Provinces, with the title and powers of royalty; but with an intimation, that France was entitled to his



## Page 88

first attentions and a priority of duty. The demands of Napoleon for attentions and duties were so exorbitant, that rather than be instrumental in the infliction of the miseries which a compliance with them must occasion, Louis resigned his throne. Napoleon then incorporated the United Provinces into his empire, "as an alluvion," for such he termed them, "to the Rivers of France." Scenes of the most grinding oppression followed: the Batavians were relieved from it by the fall and abdication of Napoleon.

[Sidenote: XIV. 3. Establishment of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.]

Before this event, William V. died, leaving a son, called from his pretensions to the stadtholderate, William VI. We have seen that, on the death of the Emperor Charles V. all the seventeen provinces, composing the Netherlands, devolved to Philip II. his son; the successful defection of the Seven United Provinces has been mentioned; the ten remaining provinces were afterwards transferred to the House of Austria, and were inherited by the Emperor Joseph II. The French made an easy conquest of them in an early stage of the Revolution.

We now reach the ultimate fate of both the divisions of the Netherlands. The congress of Vienna, by an act of the 9th June 1815, created and conferred upon this prince, THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS, consisting of the seventeen provinces, and a portion of Luxemburgh. It is confessedly the first among the kingdoms of the second order.

\* \* \* \* \*

It was our wish to present our readers with a sketch of the literary history of the Netherlands, during the period treated of in this chapter; but after most diligent and extensive searches, both in the British and foreign markets, we have not been able to discover materials for it; persons of acknowledged learning, both in Germany and the Netherlands, have assured us that no such history exists.

\* \* \* \* \*

## APPENDIX

### I.

REFERRED TO IN PAGE 188.



SOME ACCOUNT OF THE FORMULARIES, CONFESSIONS OF FAITH, OR SYMBOLIC BOOKS, OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC, GREEK, AND PRINCIPAL PROTESTANT CHURCHES.

The constitutions of the Roman Catholic, and Protestant Churches, differ in nothing more, than in the following important points: The Catholic Church, acknowledges the authority of the Scriptures, and, in addition to them, a body of traditional law. She receives both under the authority, and with the interpretation of the Church, and believes that the authority of the Church in receiving and interpreting them is infallible. The Protestant Churches generally profess to acknowledge no law but the Scriptures, no interpreter of the Scriptures, but the understanding and conscience of the individual who peruses them.

## Page 89

That the Roman Catholic Church should propound a formulary of her faith, enlarge this formulary from time to time, as further interpretation is wanted, and enforce acquiescence in it by spiritual censures, is consistent with *her* principles. Whether such a pretension can be avowed, without inconsistency, by any Protestant Church, has been a subject of much discussion. In point of fact, however, no Protestant Church is without her formulary, or abstains from enforcing it by temporal provisions and spiritual censures. To enforce their formularies by civil penalties, is inconsistent with the principles, of every christian church. All churches howsoever have so enforced, and have blamed the others, for so enforcing them.

Such formularies, from the circumstance of their collecting into one instrument, several articles, of religious belief, are generally known on the Continent, by the appellation of SYMBOLIC BOOKS.

I. The symbolic books, received by ALL TRINITARIAN CHRISTIAN CHURCHES,—are,

1. *The Symbol of the Apostles*; and
2. *The Nicene Symbol*.

II. **The symbolic books, received by the ROMAN CATHOLIC Church,—are,**

1. The General Councils;
2. Among these,—*the Council of Trent*,—as immediately applying to the controversies between the Catholic and Protestant Churches, is particularly regarded;
3. *The Symbol of Pope Pius IV.*;
4. *The Catechism of the Council of Trent*.

III. **The symbolic books of the GREEK CHURCH,—are,**

1. *The Confession, of her true and sincere faith*, which, on the taking of Constantinople, by Mahomet II, in 1453, Gennadius, its patriarch, presented to the conqueror;
2. *The Orthodox Confession, of the Catholic and Apostolic Greek Church*, published in 1642, by Mogilow, the Metropolitan of Kiow.

IV. **The symbolic books of the LUTHERAN CHURCHES, are**

1. *The Confession of Augsburg*;



2. *The Apology of the Confession of Augsburgh;*

3. *The Articles of Smalcald;*

4. *And, (in the opinion of some Lutheran Churches),—The Form of Concord;*

5. *The Saxon, Wirtenburgian, Suabian, Pomeranian, Mansfeldian, Antwerpensian, and Copenhagen Confessions*, possess, in particular places, the authority of Symbolic books:—the two first are particularly respected.

V. The symbolic books of the REFORMED CHURCHES. The reformed Church, in the largest extent of that expression, comprises all the religious communities, which have separated from the Church of Rome. In this sense, it is often used by English writers: but, having, soon after the Reformation, been used by the French Protestants to describe their church, which was Calvinistic, it became, insensibly, the appellation of all Calvinistic churches on the Continent. The principal symbolic books of these churches, —are,



## Page 90

1. *The Confession of the Helvetian Churches*;
  2. *The Tetrapolitan Confession*,—signed by the four cities of Strasburgh, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau;
  3. *The Catechism of Heidelbergh*;
  4. *The Gallic Confession of Faith*;
  5. *The Belgic Confession of Faith*;
  6. *The Canons of the Council of Dort*.
- VI. The symbolic books of the WALDENSES,—are,  
*Their original and reformed Creeds.*

### VII. The symbolic books of the Bohemians,—are,

1. *The Confession of faith of the Calixtines and Taborites*, signed at the Synod of Cuttenburgh in 1541;
2. *The Confession of the faith of the Bohemians*,—inserted in the “Harmony of Confessions,” published at Cambridge in 1680.
3. *The Consent of faith at Sendomer*.

### VIII. The symbolic book of the ARMINIANS,—is

*The Declaration of the Remonstrants*, drawn up by Episcopius, and signed in 1622.

IX. The symbolic book of the SOCINIANS is *The Catechism of Racow*;—the best edition of it was published in 1609, reprinted at Frankfort, in 1739. An English translation of it has been published by Mr. Rees.

X. The UNITARIANS have no symbolic book. To Doctor Lardner’s *Letter on the Logos* they shew universal respect.

### XI. The symbolic books of THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,—are,

1. *The Theological Oaths*,—containing a Declaration of the belief of the Monarch’s spiritual supremacy;—and Declarations against Transubstantiation,—the invocation of Saints,—and the sacrifice of the Mass;



2. *The Thirty-nine Articles.*

## **XII. The symbolic book of the ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIANS,—is**

“*The Articles of Religion* approved and passed by both Houses of Parliament after advice had with an assembly of divines, called together for that purpose.” These were sent into Scotland, and immediately sanctioned by the General Assembly, and Parliament of that kingdom; and thus became a law of the Church and State.

## **XIII. The symbolic books of the Anabaptists may be said to be,—**

THEIR SEVERAL CONFESSIONS OF FAITH:—Five were published at Amsterdam, in 1675, in one volume 8vo.

## **XIV. The symbolic books of the Quakers,—are,**

1. *Barclay’s Catechism and Confession of Faith*, published in 1675;
2. *His Theses Theologicae*;
3. *His Apology*,—a logical demonstration of the propositions in the Theses. It was translated into almost every language and presented to all the ministers assembled at Nimeguen;



## Page 91

4. But some persons assert that the real doctrines of the Quakers are more easily discoverable from *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.*—This work appeared in 1674; the first part of it was written by Penn, the second by Whithead, one of his most distinguished disciples.

### **XV. It may be added, that the symbolic book of the Jews,—is**

*The Schelosch aikara ikkarim,—the Thirteen Articles of Faith* framed by Rabbi Moses Ben Maimon in the 12th century: it is frequently inserted in the Jewish prayer books. Sebastian Munster published it with a Latin translation and an abridgment of the History of Josephus, in one vol. 8vo. at Worms in 1529.

Many Christian Catechisms have been translated into Hebrew for the benefit of the Jews.

\* \* \* \* \*

An historical and literary account of all these Confessions of Faith, and of several works and circumstances connected with them, is attempted to be given, by the Author of these pages, in his "*Historical and Literary Account of the Formularies, Confessions of Faith, and Symbolic Books, of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and principal Protestant Churches.*"

THE SYLLOGE CONFSSIONUM printed at the Clarendon Press in 1804, contains the *Professio Fidei Tridentinae, Confessio Helvetica, Augustana, Saxonica, Belgica.*"

"The Harmony of the Confessions of the Faith of the Christian and Reformed Churches" published at Cambridge in 1586, 8\_vo\_. attempts to reconcile the Confession of Augsburgh, the Confession of the Four Cities, the Confession of Basle, the first Confession of Helvetia; the Confession of Saxony, the Confession of Wirtemburgh, the French Confession, the English Confession, the latter Confession of Helvetia, the Belgic Confession, and that of Bohemia.

On the general subject, *Walchius's Bibliotheca Theologica Selecta*, may be usefully consulted.

## **APPENDIX II.**

REFERRED TO IN PAGE 188.

ON THE REUNION OF CHRISTIANS.



The attempts, made at different times for the re-union of Christians, are the subject of a learned and interesting work, published at Paris, with the title of "*Histoire critique des projets formes depuis trois cents ans pour la Reunion des communions Chretiennes, par M. Tabaraud, ancien Pretre de L'Oratoire, Paris, 1824.*" An excellent sketch of these attempts had been previously given by *Doctor Mosheim, in his Ecclesiastical History, Cent. XVI. Ch. III. sect. 3. part 2. c. 1. and Cent. XVII. Cha. I. sect. 2. p. 1.* To these publications the reader is referred:—the present Essay may be found to contain,

I. A general view of the attempts made after the Reformation, to unite the Lutheran and Calvinist churches:



## Page 92

II. Some account of the Attempts made at different times by the sovereigns of France for the conversion of their protestant subjects:

III. The correspondence of Bossuet and Leibniz, under the auspices of Lewis the Fourteenth, for the reunion of the Lutheran Churches to the Church of Rome:

IV. Some account of an attempt made in the reign of George the First, to reunite the Church of England to the Church of Rome:

V. And some general remarks on the Reunion of Christians.

### I.

#### *Attempts made to unite the Lutheran, and Calvinist Churches.*

The great division of Protestant Churches is, into the Lutheran, and Calvinist communions. The Abbe Tabaraud relates in the work, which we have just cited, not fewer than fifteen different attempts to effect a reunion of their churches. In reading his account and that given by Mosheim of these attempts, the writer thinks that, on each side, there was something to commend and something to blame. It seems to him, that the Lutherans deserve credit for the open and explicit manner, in which, on these occasions, they propounded the tenets of their creed to the Calvinists; that the conduct of the Calvinists was more liberal and conciliating; but that, on the other hand, the conduct of the Lutherans towards the Calvinists, was generally repulsive, and sometimes deserving a much harsher name; while the conduct of the Calvinists, was sometimes chargeable, with ambiguity.

“It was deplorable,” says Mosheim, (Cent. xvii. sect. 2. part 2. art. 3.) “to see two churches, which had discovered, an equal degree of pious zeal, and fortitude, in throwing off the despotic yoke of Rome, divided among themselves, and living in discords, that were highly detrimental, to the interests of religion, and the well-being of society. Hence, several eminent divines, and leading men, both among the Lutherans, and Calvinists, sought anxiously, after some method, of uniting the two churches, though divided in their opinions, in the bonds of Christian charity, and ecclesiastical communion. A competent knowledge, of human nature, and human passions, was sufficient, to persuade these wise, and pacific mediators, that a perfect uniformity in religious opinions, was not practicable, and that it would be entirely extravagant, to imagine that any of these communities, could ever be brought, to embrace universally, and without limitation, the doctrines of the other. They made it, therefore, their principal business, to persuade those, whose spirits were inflamed with the heat of controversy, that the points in debate between the two churches, were not essential, to true religion; —that the fundamental doctrines, of Christianity, were received, and professed, in both

communions; and that the difference of opinion, between the contending parties, turned, either upon points of an abstruse, and incomprehensible

## Page 93

nature, or upon matters of indifference, which neither tended, to make mankind wiser, or better, and in which the interests of genuine piety, were in no wise concerned. Those, who viewed things in this point of light, were obliged to acknowledge, that the diversity of opinions, between the two churches, was by no means, a sufficient reason, for their separation; and that of consequence, they were called, by the dictates of that gospel, which they both professed, to live, not only in the mutual exercise, of Christian charity, but also to enter, into the fraternal bonds, of church communion. The greatest part, of the reformed doctors, seemed disposed, to acknowledge, that the errors of the Lutherans, were not, of a momentous nature, nor of a pernicious tendency; and that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, had not undergone, any remarkable alteration, in that communion; and thus, on their side, an important step, was made, towards peace, and union, between the two churches. But the greatest part of the Lutheran doctors declared, that they could not form, a like judgment, with respect, to the doctrine, of the Reformed churches; they maintained tenaciously, the importance of the points, which divided the two communions, and affirmed, that a considerable part of the controversy turned upon the fundamental principles, of all religion, and virtue. It is not at all surprising, that this steadiness and constancy of the Lutherans, was branded by the opposite party, with the epithets, of morose obstinacy, supercilious arrogance, and such like odious denominations. The Lutherans, were not behind hand with their adversaries, in acrimony, of style; they recriminated with vehemence, and charged their accusers with instances of misconduct, different in kind, but equally condemnable. They reproached them with having dealt disingenuously, by disguising, under ambiguous expressions, the real doctrine of the Reformed churches; they observed further, that their adversaries, notwithstanding their consummate prudence and circumspection, gave plain proofs, on many occasions, that their propensity to a reconciliation, between the two churches, arose from views of private interest, rather than from a zeal for the public good."

It is observable that Mosheim applies these observations to a late stage of the reformation, when much of its first violence had subsided.

The nearest approach[080] to a reunion, between any Protestant churches, seems to be that, which took place at Sendomer, in the year 1570.

## II.

### *Attempts for a Reunion of the Calvinist Churches to the See of Rome.*

Having thus summarily noticed, the unsuccessful attempts, to effect an union, between the Lutheran, and Calvinist churches, we proceed to a similar summary mention of the attempts, equally unsuccessful, to effect the reunion of the Calvinists, to the church of Rome, which were made,

## Page 94

1st, during the reign of Henry the Fourth:

2dly, during the reign of Lewis the Thirteenth: and

3dly, during the reign of Lewis the Fourteenth:

4thly, we shall afterwards notice, the Revocation of the edict of Nantes, and the complete restoration of the protestants of France, to their civil rights, in the reign of Lewis the Eighteenth.

### II. 1.

An attempt to reunite the Calvinists to the church of Rome was made at the celebrated Conference held at Poissi in 1561. In the work which we have cited, the Abbe Tabaraud gives a short and clear account of this conference. It failed of success, and a long civil war of religion ensued. It was closed by the conversion of *Henry the Fourth* to the Roman Catholic religion. He was no sooner quietly seated on the throne, than he conceived the arduous, but certainly noble project of pacifying the religious contests of the world. It appears that he was induced to entertain hopes of the success of this measure, by the assurances given him by the Calvinist ministers, when his change of religion, was in agitation, that salvation might be obtained in the church of Rome; and from his expectation of finding a spirit of conciliation, and concession, in the see of Rome.

“I have heard, from persons of distinction,” says Grotius[081], “that Henry the Fourth declared that he had great hopes of procuring for the King of England, and the other protestant princes, who were his allies, conditions, which they could not honorably refuse, if they had any real wish of returning to the unity of the church; and that he had once an intention of employing bishops of his own kingdom on this project; but that this project failed by his death.”

It is said, that with these views he had sent for *Isaac Casaubon*, a protestant divine of equal learning and moderation, and appointed him his librarian; and that he intended confidentially employing him in preparing means for the success of the measure, and smoothing the obstacles which might impede its progress. Grotius[082] mentions, as a saying of Casaubon, that “the catholics of France had a juster way of thinking than the ministers of Charenton:” these were the most rigid of the French Hugonot ministers. It is observable that the French government always considered the Hugonots of a much more refractory disposition than the Lutherans.



## II. 2.

The pacific views of Henry the Fourth, were terminated by his decease. The capture of la Rochelle by the arms of *Lewis the XIIIth*, was a fatal blow to the political consequence of the Protestant party in France. Cardinal Richelieu immediately set on foot a project, for the general conversion, of the body: two persons, of very different characters, were employed by him, in this measure; Father Joseph, a capuchin friar, the confident, of all the cardinal's



## Page 95

political and private schemes, and Father P. Dulaurens, an oratorian, who lived in retirement, wholly absorbed in the exercises of religion. They began the work of reunion by holding frequent conferences, on an amicable footing, with several of the protestant ministers; and it was resolved, that, with the permission of the pope, and the authority of the king, an assembly, should be convened, of ecclesiastics of each communion. Father Dulaurens, recommended that the intended communications with the ministers, should not take place, till they reached, the capital; but, the cardinal, thought it more advisable, that the ministers, should be separately informed, of the project, before they left the provinces. It was accordingly communicated to them, and favourably received, by the ministers, of Languedoc, and Normandy, but met with an unfavourable reception, from the ministers of Sedan. It was resolved, that the assembly, should meet, and begin their deliberations, with the differences in the opinions, of the two churches, respecting the Sacraments. Father Dulaurens recommended, that for some time, at least, the Bible, even in the Calvinist version, of Olivetan, should be the only book appealed to, on either side, as authority: but the Cardinal insisted, on a resort to tradition. Grotius mentions that in several articles, (as communion under both kinds, and the invocation of saints), the Cardinal was willing, that concessions, should be made to the Protestants; and suggested, that, as a medium, to reconcile them to the Pope, a patriarchate should be established, in France, and he himself, be the first patriarch[083].

Notwithstanding the general loftiness, and overbearing nature, of his manners, it appears, particularly from M. de Rullhieres[084] (6.) that the Cardinal, acted on this occasion, with great moderation, and recommended to his royal master, a similar line of moderation, in all his conduct, towards his Protestant subjects.

### II. 3.

The Cardinal's project, was suspended, by his decease; and resumed, under *Lewis the Fourteenth*. In 1662, a plan, drawn up by M. le Blanc de Beaulieu, a professor of Divinity, at Sedan, singularly esteemed, both by the Roman Catholics, and Protestants, by which the essential articles, in dispute, were reduced to a small number, was adopted, by the Court, to serve as the basis of discussion. It was resolved, that different synods of Protestant ministers, should be convened; that these, should be composed, of ministers of known moderation, and pacific views, and the articles, drawn up by M. le Blanc de Beaulieu, presented to them. Three years were employed, in negotiations for effecting this project: several ministers in the lower Languedoc, and the Isle of France, expressed themselves, in terms favourable, to the measure, but the synod of Charenton, took the alarm, and the project, was abandoned.



## Page 96

The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, a measure equally unwise, and unjust, too soon followed. It is more to be attributed, to his ministers and advisers, than to Lewis the Fourteenth himself. From the *Eclaircissemens Historiques* of M. de Rullhieres, and the life of Bossuet, by M. Bausset[085], it seems evident, that Lewis the Fourteenth, had been induced, to believe, that the number of Protestants was much smaller; that the conversions of them, would be much more rapid, general, and sincere; and that the measures, for hastening their conversion, would be much less violent than they really were. It is also due, to the monarch, to add, that from the authors, whom we have cited, it is evident, that when he began to perceive the true state, of the transaction, though from false principles of honour, and policy, he would not revoke the edict, he wished it not to be put into great activity, and checked the forwardness, of the Intendants general in its execution.

It is whimsical, (if on so serious a subject such a word may be used), that the dragonade, or employment of the dragoon troops, in forcing the conversion, of the Hugonots, was owing to the wish of Louvois, the minister, of Lewis the Fourteenth, to become himself, a missionary. Observing how much the apparent success, of the missionaries, recommended them, to Lewis the Fourteenth, he began to consider them as dangerous rivals for the favour of his royal master, and determined, therefore, to become himself, a principal performer. With this view, he instituted the dragoon missions, and thus brought a material part, of the work of conversion, into the war department.

### II. 4.

The death of Lewis, and the known disposition of the Regent, appeared to the Protestant party, in France, to afford a proper opportunity of recovering their rights. Duclos, in his *Memoires secrets sur les regnes de Louis XIV. et de Louis XV.*, says, that the Regent himself wished to restore the Protestants, to their civil rights, but was dissuaded by his council. Still, he seldom permitted the edicts against them to be executed; and speaking generally, the Protestants seem to have suffered no active persecution in any part of the reign of Lewis, the XVth. One intolerable grievance, however, they unquestionably suffered in every part of it. Their religious principles did not permit them to be married by a Roman Catholic priest, in the manner prescribed by the law of the state, and that law did not recognize the legal validity of a marriage, celebrated in any other form. The consequence was, that in the eye of the law, the marriage of Protestants was a mere concubinage, and the offspring of it illegitimate. To his immortal honour, *Lewis the XVth*, by his edict of the 17th of November, 1787, accorded to all his Non-catholic subjects the full and complete enjoyment of all the rights of his Roman-catholic subjects. On a division in the Parliament, this edict was registered by a majority of 96 votes against 16.

## Page 97

The persecution of the Hugonots in consequence of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, was condemned by the greatest men in France. M. d'Aguesseau, the father of the celebrated chancellor, resigned his office of Intendant of Languedoc rather than remain a witness of it: his son repeatedly mentions it with abhorrence. Fenelon, Flechier, and Bossuet,[086] confessedly the ornaments of the Gallican church, lamented it. To the utmost of their power, they prevented the execution of the edict, and lessened its severities, when they could not prevent them. Most sincerely lamenting and condemning the outrages committed by the Roman Catholics against the Protestants at Nismes, as violations of the law of God and man, but doubting of the nature and extent, which some have attributed to them, the writer of these pages begs leave to refer to the sermon preached on them by the Reverend James Archer, a Roman Catholic priest, and printed for Booker, in Bond-street, by the desire of two Roman Catholic congregations, as expressing the doctrine of the Roman Catholic church, and of all real christians on heretics and the persecution of heretics.

### III.

*The Correspondence of Bossuet and Leibniz, under the auspices of Lewis the XIVth, for the Reunion of the Lutheran Protestants to the Roman Catholic Church.*

This correspondence forms one of the most interesting events in the life of Bossuet; the letters, of which it consists, and the other written documents, which relate to it, are highly interesting. We shall attempt to present our readers with a short account—

- 1st. Of the circumstances which led to this correspondence;
- 2ndly. Of the Project of Reunion, delivered by Molanus, a Lutheran Divine, and Bossuet's sentiments on that Project;
- 3dly. Of the intervention of Leibniz in the negotiation; and
- 4thly. Of the Project suggested by Bossuet, and the principal reasons, by which he contended for its reception.

### III. 1.

It appears that, towards the 17th century, the Emperor Leopold, and several sovereign princes in Germany, conceived a project of re-uniting the Roman Catholic and Lutheran churches. The Duke of Brunswick, who had recently embraced the Roman Catholic religion, and published his *Fifty Reasons for his conversion*, (once a popular work of controversy), and the Duke of Hanover, the father of the first prince of the illustrious house, which now fills the throne of England, were the original promoters of the attempt. It was generally approved; and the mention of it at the Diet of the Empire was

favourably received. Some communications upon it took place between the Emperor and the ducal Princes: and with all their knowledge, several conferences were held upon the subject, between certain distinguished Roman Catholic and Protestant Divines.

## Page 98

In these, the Bishop of Neustadt, and Molanus, the Abbot of Lokkum, took the lead. The first had been consecrated Bishop of Tina in Bosnia, then under the dominion of the Turks, with Ordinary Jurisdiction over some parts of the Turkish territories. His conduct had recommended him to Innocent the XIth, and that pope had directed him to visit the Protestant states in Germany, and inform him of their actual dispositions in respect to the Church of Rome. In consequence of this mission, he became known to the Emperor, who appointed him to the See of Neustadt, in the neighbourhood of Vienna. Molanus, was Director of the Protestant Churches and Consistories of Hanover. Both were admirably calculated for the office intended them, on this occasion. Each possessed the confidence of his own party, and was esteemed by the other; each was profoundly versed in the matters in dispute; each possessed good sense, moderation, and conciliating manners; and each had the success of the business at heart, with a fixed purpose, that nothing, but a real difference on some essential article of doctrine, should frustrate the project.

The effect of the first conferences was so promising, that the Emperor and the two Princes resolved, that they should be conducted in a manner more regular, and more likely to bring the object of them to a conclusion. With this view, the business was formally entrusted by both the princes to Molanus alone, and the Emperor published a rescript, dated the 20th March, 1691, by which he gave the Bishop of Neustadt full authority to treat, on all matters of religion, with the states, communities, and individuals of the empire, reserving to the ecclesiastical and imperial powers, their right to confirm the acts of the Bishop, as they should judge adviseable. Under these auspicious circumstances, the conference between the Bishop of Neustadt and Molanus began.

But, before the events which we have mentioned took place, a correspondence on the subject of a general reunion between Catholics and Protestants had been carried on for some time, between Pelisson and Leibniz. The former held a considerable rank among the French writers, who adorned the reign of Lewis the Fourteenth; the latter was eminently distinguished in the literary world. In the exact sciences, he was inferior to Newton alone; in metaphysics, he had no superior; in general learning, he had scarcely a rival. He had recommended himself to the Brunswick family, by three volumes, which he had recently published, on the Antiquities of that illustrious House; and was then engaged in the investigation of its Italian descent, and early German shoots. The result of it, under the title of *Origines Guelphicae*, was published, after his decease, by Scheidius, and is considered to be a perfect model of genealogical history. He was also thoroughly conversant in the theological disputes of the times; and in all the questions of dogma, or history, which enter into them.



## Page 99

His correspondence with Pelisson, came to the knowledge of Louisa, Princess Palatine, and Abbess of Maubrusson. She was a daughter of Frederick, the Elector, and Count Palatine of the Rhine, and a sister, of the Duchess of Hanover. In early life, she had been converted to the Roman Catholic religion, and had the conversion of her sister, very much at heart. With this view, she sent to her, the correspondence between Leibniz and Pelisson, and received from her an account of what was passing, between the Bishop of Neustadt, and Molanus. Both the ladies were anxious, to promote the measure, and that Bossuet should take in it, the leading part, on the side of the Catholics. This was mentioned to Lewis the Fourteenth, and had his approbation. The Emperor and both the Princes, by all of whom Bossuet, was personally esteemed, equally approved of it, and it was finally settled that Bossuet and Leibniz, should be joined, to the Bishops of Neustadt, and Molanus, and that the correspondence with Bossuet, should pass through the hands of Madame de Brinon, who acted, as secretary to the Abbess of Maubrusson, and is celebrated, by the writers of the times, for her wit and dexterity in business. Thus the matter assumed, a still more regular form, and much was expected from the acknowledged talents, learning, and moderation of the actors in it, and their patrons.

### III. 2.

The conferences between the Bishop of Neustadt, and Molanus continued for seven months, and ended in their agreeing on 12 articles, to serve for the basis of the discussion, on the terms of the reunion.

The Bishop of Neustadt, communicated these articles to Bossuet. He seems, to have approved of them generally, but to have thought, that some alteration in them, was advisable. This being mentioned to Molanus, he published his *Cogitationes Privatae*, a profound and conciliating dissertation. Without entering into any discussion, on the points in dispute, between the churches, he suggested in it a kind of truce, during which, there should be ecclesiastical communion between them: the Lutherans, were to acknowledge the Pope, as the first of Bishops, in order, and dignity: the Church of Rome, was to receive the Lutherans, as her children, without exacting from them, any retractation of their alledged errors, or any renunciation, of the articles in their creed, condemned by the Council of Trent. The anathemas of that council, were to be suspended, and a general council was to be convened, in which the Protestants were to have a deliberative voice: the sentence of that council, was to be definitive, and, in the mean time, the members of each party, were to treat the members of the other, as brethren, whose errors, however great they might appear, were to be tolerated, from motives of peace, and in consideration, of their engagements to abandon them, if the council should pronounce against them. To show the probability of a final accommodation, Molanus notices, in his Dissertation, several points, in which one party imputed to the other errors, not justly chargeable on them; several, on which they

disputed, merely for want of rightly understanding each other; and several, in which the dispute was of words only.



## Page 100

It appears that the Bishop of Neustadt, communicated this dissertation, to Bossuet, and that Bossuet was delighted, with the good sense, candour, and true spirit of conciliation, which it displayed. In his letters he frequently mentions the author, and always in terms, Of the highest praise. His own language was equally moderate and conciliating.

“The Council of Trent,” he says in one of his letters, “is our stay; but we shall not use it to prejudice the cause. This would be, to take for granted, what is in dispute between us. We shall deal more fairly with our opponents. We shall make the council serve, for a statement, and explanation, of our doctrines. Thus, we shall come to an explanation, on those points, in which either of us imputes to the other, what he does not believe, and in which we dispute, only because we misconceive each other. This may lead us far; for *the Abbot of Lokkum, has actually conciliated the points so essential, of Justification, and the Eucharist: nothing is wanting in him, on that side, but that he should be avowed. Why should we not hope to conclude, in the same manner, disputes, less difficult, and of less importance? Cela se peut pousser si avant, que M. l’Abbe de Lokkum, a concilie, actuellement les points si essentiels, de la justification, et du sacrifice de l’Eucharistie, et il ne lui manque de ce cote la, que de se faire avouer. Pourquoi ne pas esperer de finir, par les memes moyens, des disputes, moins difficiles, et moins importantes?*”

With these rational and conciliatory dispositions, Bossuet, and Molanus, proceeded. But, after this stage of the business, Molanus disappears, and Leibniz comes on the scene.

### III. 3.

A Letter, written by Bossuet to M<sup>^</sup>me de Brinon, having been communicated by her to Leibniz, opened the correspondence between him and Bossuet. In that letter, Bossuet declared explicitly, that the Church of Rome, was ready, to make concessions, on points of discipline, and to explain doctrines, but would make no concession in respect to defined articles of faith; and, in particular, would make no such concession, in respect to any which had been defined by the Council of Trent. Leibniz’s Letter to M<sup>^</sup>me de Brinon, in answer to this communication, is very important. He expresses himself in these terms;

“The Bishop of Meaux says,

“1st. That the Project delivered to the Bishop of Neustadt, does not appear to him quite sufficient;

“2dly. That it is, nevertheless, very useful, as every thing must have its beginning:



“3dly. That Rome will never relax from any point of doctrine, defined by the church, and cannot capitulate, in respect to any such article;

“4thly. That the doctrine, defined in the Council of Trent, is received in and out of France by all Roman Catholics;



## Page 101

“5thly, That satisfaction may be given to Protestants, in respect to certain points of discipline, or in the way of explanation, and that this had been already done in an useful manner, in some points, mentioned in the Project of the Bishop of Neustadt. “These are the material propositions, in the letter of the Bishop of Meaux, and I believe all these propositions true. Neither the Bishop of Neustadt, nor those who negotiated with them, make any opposition to them. There is nothing in them, which is not conformable to the sentiments of those persons. The third of them in particular, which might be thought, an obstacle, to these Projects of Accommodation, could not be unknown to them; one may even say, that they built on it.”

It seems difficult to deny, that, in this stage of the business, much had been gained to the cause of reunion. The parties were come to a complete understanding on the important articles of Justification, and the Eucharist; and it was admitted, both by Leibniz, and Molanus, that, in their view of the concern, an accommodation might be effected, between the Roman Catholic, and Lutheran churches, though the former, retained all her defined doctrines, and, in particular, all her doctrines, defined by the Council of Trent. The question then was, what should be done in respect to the remaining articles in difference between the churches? It is to be wished, that it had been left to Bossuet, and Molanus, to settle them, in the way of amicable explanation, in which they had settled, the two important articles, which we have mentioned. It is evident, from the passages, which we have cited, from Bossuet, that it was his wish, that the business should proceed on that plan, and that he had hopes of its success. Unfortunately, the business took, another direction: Leibniz proclaimed, that after every possible explanation should be given, the Lutheran church would, still retain, some articles, contrary to the defined doctrines, of the Church of Rome, and anathematized, by the Council of Trent. To remove the final effect of this objection, Leibniz held out Molanus’s first project, that the Lutherans should express a general acquiescence, in the authority of the church, and promise obedience, to the decisions of a General Council, to be called, for the purpose of pronouncing, on these points; and that, in consequence of these advances, on their part, the anathemas of the Council of Trent, should be suspended, and the Lutherans received, provisionally, within the pale, of the Catholic church. To bring over Bossuet to this plan, he exerted great eloquence, and displayed, no common learning.

### III. 4.



## Page 102

But the eloquence, and learning, of Leibniz, were without effect. In language, equally temperate and firm, Bossuet, adhered to his text, that in matters of discipline, or any other matter, distinct from faith, the Church of Rome, would show the utmost indulgence to the Lutherans; but that, on articles of faith, and specifically, on those propounded by the Council of Trent, there could be no compromise. This, however, he confined to articles of faith alone: and even on articles of faith, he wished to consult the feelings of Protestants, as much as possible. He offered them every fair explanation of the tenets of the council; he required from them no retractation, of their own tenets:

“Molanus,” he says, “will not allow retractation to be mentioned. It may be dispensed with; it will be sufficient, that the parties acknowledge, the truth, by way of declaration or explanation. To this, the Symbolical Books, give a clear opening, as appears by the passages, which have been produced from them, and will appear, by other passages, which may be produced from them.”

If Bossuet was thus considerate, in what regarded faith, it will easily be supposed, how indulgent his sentiments were, in respect to all, that merely regarded discipline. A complete confession of faith, being once obtained from the Lutherans, he was willing, to allow them, if they required it, communion under both kinds; that their Bishops, should retain their Sees; and that, where there was no Bishop, and the whole body of the people, was Protestant, under the care, of a superintendant, *that* superintendant, should be consecrated their Bishop; that, where there was a Catholic Bishop, and a considerable part of the diocese, was Lutheran, the superintendant, should be consecrated priest, and invested with rank, and office, that the Lutheran ministers, should be consecrated priests; that provision should be made for their support; that such of their bishops, and ministers, as were married, might retain their wives, and that the consciences of those, who held possessions of the church, should be quieted, except in respect, to hospitals, whose possessions he thought, could not conscientiously be withheld, from the poor objects of their foundations; and that every other arrangement should be made, by the church and state, which would be agreeable, to the feelings, and prejudices, of their new brethren.

Such were the advances made by Bossuet; and much discussion on them, took place, between him, and Leibniz. It continued ten years. They are very learned, and a scholar will read them with delight; but, unfortunately, they rather retarded, than promoted, their object. The real business ended, when Molanus quitted the scene. We shall close this article, with the following extract from the last letter but one, written by Bossuet, on the subject. It is addressed to Leibniz, and bears date the 12th August, 1701, ten years, after his first letter, on it was written:



## Page 103

“Among the divines of the Confession of Augsburg, I always placed M. Molanus, in the first rank, as a man, whose learning, candour and moderation made him one of the persons, the most capable I have known, of advancing the NOBLE PROJECT OF REUNION. In a letter, which I wrote to him some years ago, by the Count Balati, I assured him, that, if he could obtain, the general consent of his party, to what he calls, his Private Thoughts, *Cogitationes Privatae*, I promised myself, that, by joining to them, the remarks, which I sent to him, on the Confession of Augsburg, and the other Symbolic writings of the Protestants, the work of the Reunion would be perfected, in all its most difficult and most essential points; so that well disposed persons might, in a short time, bring it to a conclusion.”

The passage is so important, that it is proper to present it to the reader in Bossuet's own words.

“Parmi les Theologiens de la Confession d'Ausbourg, j'ai toujours mis, au premier rang, M. l'Abbe de Lokkum, comme un homme, dont le scavoir, la candeur, et la moderation le rendent un des plus capables, que je connusse, pour avancer CE BEAU DESSEIN. Cela est si veritable, que j'ai cru devoir assurer ce docte Abbe, dans la reponse que je lui fis, il y a deja, plusieurs annees, par M. le Comte Balati, que s'il pouvoit faire passer ce qu'il appelle ses Pensees Particulieres *Cogitationes Privatae*, a un consentement suffisent, je me promettois qu'en y joignant les remarques, que je lui envoyois, sur la Confession d'Ausbourg, et les autres ecrits Symboliques des Protestans, l'ouvrage de la Reunion seroit acheve dans ses parties les plus difficiles et les plus essentielles; en sorte qu'il ne faudroit a des personnes bien disposees, que tres peu de tems pour la conclure[087].”

Dom. de Foris, the Benedictine Editor of the new edition of the works of Bossuet and the Abbe Racine, *Abrege de l'Histoire Ecclesiastique*[088] are very severe in their censures of the conduct of Leibniz in the negotiations for the Reunion, and attribute its failure to his presumption and duplicity. To the writer of these pages, it appears clear, that Leibniz was sincere in his wishes for the reunion; and that, if he occasioned its failure, it was unintentionally. While the business was in the hands of Bossuet, and Molanus, it was a treaty, not for the reunion of the Roman Catholic church, and all Protestant churches, but for the reunion of the Roman Catholic church, and the Lutheran church; and to this, Molanus's endeavours to reconcile differences, were directed. Leibniz, whose principles in religion, were much wider, than those of Molanus, seems to have wished, that the negotiation should be placed, on a broader basis, and extended to a reunion of the church of Rome, with every denomination of Christians. This gave the negotiation a different direction, and in a great measure, undid what had been, so happily begun. We have seen, that, to the very last, Bossuet, called out for Molanus, and entertained great hopes, that, if the matter were left to Molanus, and him, the noble Project of Reunion, would be crowned with success. There is no part of Bossuet's literary or active life, in which he appears to greater advantage, or in a more amiable light, than on this occasion.



## Page 104

### IV.

*Attempt in the reign of Lewis the XV. to effect an union between the Church of Rome and the Church of England.*

Of all Protestant churches, the national church of England most nearly resembles the church of Rome. It has retained much of the dogma, and much of the discipline of Roman Catholics. Down to the sub-deacon it has retained the whole of their hierarchy; and, like them, has its deans, rural deans, chapters, prebends, archdeacons, rectors, and vicars; a liturgy, taken in a great measure, from the Roman Catholic liturgy; and composed like that, of Psalms, Canticles, the three creeds, litanies, epistles, gospels, prayers, and responses. Both churches have the sacraments of baptism, and the eucharist, the absolution of the sick, the burial service, the sign of the cross in baptism, the reservation of confirmation, and order to bishops, the difference of episcopal, and sacerdotal dress, feasts, and fasts. Without adopting all the general councils of the church of Rome, the church of England has adopted the first four of them; and, without acknowledging the authority of the other councils, or the authority of the early fathers, the English divines of the established church, allow them to be entitled, to a high degree of respect.[089] On the important article of the eucharist, the language, of the Thirty-nine Articles, sounds very like, the doctrine of the church of Rome.

At the time, of which we are speaking, the doctrines of the high church, which are generally considered to incline to those of the Roman Catholics, more than the doctrines of the low church, were in their zenith; and in France, where the ultramontane principles on the power of the Pope had always been discountenanced, the disputes of Jansenism were supposed to reduce it very low. On each side, therefore, the time was thought favourable to the project of Reunion.

It was also favourable to it, that, a few years before this time, an event had taken place, which naturally tended to put both sides into good humour.

On the occasion of the marriage of the Princess Christina of Wolfenbuttell, a Lutheran, with the archduke of Austria, her court consulted the faculty of theology of the University of Helmstadt, on the question,

“Whether a Protestant Princess, destined to marry a catholic prince, could, without wounding her conscience, embrace the Roman Catholic religion?” The faculty replied, that, “it could not answer the proposed question, in a solid manner, without having previously decided, whether the catholics were, or were not engaged in errors, that were fundamental, and opposed to salvation; or, (which was the same thing), whether the state of the catholic church was such, that persons might practise in it, the true worship of God, and arrive at salvation.” This question the divines of Helmstadt, discussed at length; and concluded in these terms: “After having



## Page 105

shown, that the foundation of religion, subsists in the Roman Catholic religion, so that a person may be orthodox in it, live well in it, die well in it, and obtain salvation in it, the discussion of the proposed question, is easy. We are, therefore, of opinion, that the most Serene Princess of Wolfenbuttel, may, in favour of her marriage, embrace the catholic religion.”

This opinion is dated the 28th of April 1707, and was printed in the same year at Cologne. The Journalists of Trevoux inserted both the original and a French translation of it in their journal of May, 1708.

Under these circumstances, the correspondence in question took place. It began, in 1718, through Doctor Beauvoir, chaplain to Lord Stair, his Britannic majesty's ambassador at Paris. Some conversation, on the reunion of the two churches, having taken place, between Doctor Dupin, and him, he acquainted the archbishop of Canterbury, with the subject of them. This communication, produced some compliments from the archbishop, to Dr. Dupin, and these, led the latter, to address, to his grace, a letter, in which he mentioned generally, that, on some points in dispute, the supposed difference between the two communions was reconcilable. The correspondence getting wind, Doctor Piers, pronounced a discourse in the Sorbonne, in which he earnestly exhorted his colleagues, to promote the reunion, by revising those articles, of doctrine, and discipline, which protestants branded with the name of papal tyranny; and contended, that, by proscribing the ultramontane doctrines, the first step to the reunion would be made. The discourse, was communicated to Dr. Wake: in his answer, he pressed Dr. Dupin, for a more explicit declaration, on the leading points, in controversy.

In compliance with this requisition, Doctor Dupin drew up his *Commonitorium*, and communicated it, to several persons of distinction, both in the state, and church of France. He discussed in it, the Thirty-nine Articles, as they regarded doctrine, morality, and discipline. He insisted on the necessity of tradition, to interpret the scriptures, and to establish the canonicity of the books, of the Old and New Testament. He insisted on the infallibility, of the church, in faith, and morals; he contended, that the sacrifice of the mass, was not a simple sacrament, but a continuation of the sacrifice of the cross.

The word Transubstantiation, he seemed willing to give up, if the Roman Catholic doctrine, intended to be expressed by it, were retained. He proposed, that communion under both kinds, or under bread alone, should be left, to the discretion of the different churches, and consented, that persons in holy orders should retain their state, with such provisions, as would place the validity of their ordination, beyond exception. The marriage of priests, in the countries, in which such marriages were allowed, and the recitation of the divine service in the vulgar tongue, he allowed;



## Page 106

and intimated that no difficulty would be found in the ultimate settlement of the doctrine, respecting purgatory, indulgences, the veneration of saints, relics, or images. He seems to have thought, that the Pope can exercise, no immediate jurisdiction, within the dioceses of bishops, and that his primacy invested him, with no more than a general conservation, of the deposit of the faith, a right to enforce, the observance of the sacred canons, and the general maintenance of discipline. He allowed, in general terms, that there was little substantially wrong, in the discipline of the Church of England; he deprecated all discussion, on the original merit of reformation, and he professed to see no use in the Pope's intervention, till the basis of the negotiation, should be settled.

The answer of the archbishop, was not very explicit. It is evident from it, that he thought, the quarrels on Jansenism, had alienated the Jansenists and their adherents, from the Pope, much more, than they had done, in reality. He was willing to concede, to the Pope, a primacy of rank and honour, but would by no means allow him, a primacy of jurisdiction, or any primacy, by divine right. On the other points, he seemed to have thought, that they might come to an agreement, on what they should declare, to be the fundamental doctrine of the churches, and adopt, on every other point of doctrine, a general system, of christian toleration.

The correspondence, which is very interesting, may be seen, in the last volume of the English translation, of Doctor Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History. To facilitate, the accomplishment of the object of it, Doctor Courayer, published his celebrated treatise, on *the Validity of English Ordinations*.

Both Dr. Wake, and Dr. Dupin. were censured, by the members of their respective communions, for the parts, which they had taken, in this business. Several rigid members of the English Church, and even some foreign protestants, blamed Dr. Wake, for what they termed, his too great concessions. In France, the worst of motives, were imputed to Dr. Dupin, and his associates; they were accused, of making unjustifiable sacrifices, in order to form an union, between the Jansenists, and the members of the English Church. Even the regent, took the alarm: he ordered Dr. Dupin, to discontinue the correspondence, and to leave all the papers, respecting it, with the minister. This was done, but the most important of them, have been printed, in the interesting and extensively circulated publication, which has been mentioned.

### V.

*Miscellaneous Remarks on the Reunion of Christians.*



## Page 107

It does not appear, that subsequently to the communications, between Archbishop Wake, and Dr. Dupin, any attempts for a general, or partial reunion of christians, were made in the last century: but, early in the present, *Napoleon*, conceived the project, of effecting, such a reunion. He is said, to have particularly had in view, the catholicizing, as it was termed, the northern part, of Germany. To forward his design, many works were published: one of them, the *Essai sur l'Unite des Cultes*, of M. Bonald, is written, with great ingenuity. That Essay, and several others by the same author, were inserted in the *Ambigu* of Peltier, and deserve the attention, of every reader. Though they contain some things, to which a Roman Catholic writer, would object, they are evidently written, by a Roman Catholic pen.

The first point to be considered, by those, who meditate the project of reunion, is, its practicability—those, who are disposed, to contend for the affirmative, will observe, the number of important articles, of Christian Faith, in which, all Christians, are agreed, and the proportionally small number of those, in which, any Christians disagree.

All Christians believe,

- 1st. That there is one God;
- 2d. That he is a Being, of infinite perfection;
- 3d. That he directs all things, by his providence;
- 4th. That it is our duty to love him, with all our hearts, and our neighbour, as ourselves;
- 5th. That it is our duty, to repent, of the sins we commit;
- 6th. That God, pardons the truly penitent;
- 7th. That there is a future state, of rewards, and punishments, when all mankind shall be judged, according to their works;
- 8th. That God, sent his Son, into the world, to be its saviour, the author of eternal salvation, to all, that obey him;
- 9th. That he is the true Messiah;
- 10th. That he taught, worked miracles, suffered, died, and rose again, as is related in the four gospels;
- 11th. That he will hereafter, make a second appearance on the earth, raise all mankind from the dead, judge the world in righteousness, bestow eternal life on the virtuous, and punish the workers of iniquity.



In the belief of these articles, all Christians, the Roman Catholic, all the Oriental churches, all the members of the Church of England, all Lutherans, Calvinists, Socinians, and Unitarians, are agreed. In addition to these, each division, and subdivision of Christians, has its own tenets. Now, let each settle among its own members, what are the articles of belief, peculiar to them, which, in their cool deliberate judgment, they consider as *absolutely necessary* that a person should believe, to be a member of the church of Christ; let these articles be divested of all foreign matter, and expressed in perspicuous, exact,



## Page 108

and unequivocal terms; and, above all, let each distinction of Christians, earnestly wish, to find an agreement, between themselves and their fellow Christians:—the result of a discussion conducted on this plan, would most assuredly be, to convince all Christians, that the essential articles of religious credence, in which there is, a real difference among Christians, are not so numerous, as the verbal disputes, and extraneous matter, in which controversy is too often involved, make them generally thought.

Still,—some articles will remain, the belief of which, one denomination of Christians, will consider to be the obligation of every Christian, and which other Christian denominations, will condemn. On some of those, a *speedy* reunion of Christians is not to be expected: but, to use the language of Mr. *Vansittart*, in His excellent letter to the reverend Dr. Marsh and John Coker, Esq.,

“There is an inferior degree of Reunion, more within our prospect, and yet perhaps as perfect as human infirmity allows us to hope for; wherein, though all differences of opinion, should not be extinguished, yet they may be refined, from all party prejudices, and interested views, so softened by the spirit of charity, and mutual concession, and so controuled by agreement, on the leading principles, and zeal, for the general interests of christianity, that no sect, or persuasion, should be tempted to make religion, subservient to secular views, or to employ political power, to the prejudice of others.—The existence of Dissent, will, perhaps, be inseparable from religious freedom, so long, as the mind of man, is liable to error: but it is not unreasonable to hope, that hostility, may cease, though perfect agreement, cannot be established. IF WE CANNOT RECONCILE ALL OPINIONS, LET US RECONCILE ALL HEARTS.”

These pages, cannot be closed better, than by these golden words!!!

## FINIS.

\* \* \* \* \*

### FOOTNOTES.

[Footnote 001: Tom. xi. p. 1. 200.]

[Footnote 002: De Institutiones Clericorum, L. iii. c. xviii. &c.]

[Footnote 003: In his “Recueil des Ecris pour servir d’eclaircissement de l’histoire de France, 2 vol. Paris 1798.”]

[Footnote 004: “Roswede, or Aroswethe, a nun in the monastery of Gardersheim, lived in the reigns of Otho II. and III. towards the end of the tenth century. She composed



many works in prose and verse. In 1501, some of her poems, on the Martyrdom of St. Denys, the Blessed Virgin, St. Ann, &c. were printed at Nuremburgh. Her verses in praise of Otto II. would be tolerable, if they were not Leonines: there are in them some errors of prosody." Bib. Univers. et Histor. Vol. ii. p. 46.]

[Footnote 005: For a fuller account of Feudal and Civil Jurisprudence, the writer of these pages begs leave to refer to his work, entitled, "HORAE JURIDICAE SUBSECIVAE, being a connected series of Notes respecting the Geography, Chronology, and Literary History of the principal Codes and original Documents of the Grecian, Roman, Feudal, and Canon Law." 1 vol. 8vo.]



## Page 109

[Footnote 006: It is entitled, "*Martiani Minei Felicis Capellae Carthaginiensis, Viri Procursularis, Satyricon, in quo de Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii libri duo, & de septem artibus liberalibus libri singulares. Omnes, et emendati et Notis sive Febris Hug. Grotii illustrati. Ex Officina Plantiniana, Apud Christophorum Raphelingium Academiae Lugduno-Bat. Typographum M. D. C.*" [Transcriber's note: Apostrophic date 1600] The Dedication to the Prince of Conde follows: then, Encomiastic Verses by Scaliger, and Tiliabrogus. The two works are then inserted, with an address to the reader, Errata, and Various Readings. Afterwards, *Hugeiani Grotii Februa*[007] in *Satyricon Martiani Capellae*: this contains his notes. They are preceded by an Engraving of Grotius. Round it, is written, "Anno M. D. C." [Transcriber's note: Apostrophic date 1600] Hora Ruit.[008] AEt.xv. Under the engraving the following verses are printed,

*"Quem sibi quindenis ASTRAEA sacrauit ab annis,  
Talis, HUGEIANI GROTII ora fero."*

[Footnote 007: "Corrections"—or more literarily, "Purifications".]

[Footnote 008: These words were used by Grotius for his motto.]

[Footnote 009: Fabricii Bibliotheca Latina, Lib iii. c. 15. In 1794, John Adam Goetz published the "Treatise on the Marriage of Philology and Mercury" separately, in a duodecimo volume: he mentions, in the preface, an edition of it by Walthard. It is on the authority of Goetz that we have assigned the age of Capella to the third century: others place him in a much later period.]

[Footnote 010: Montucla. Histoire des Mathematiques, Vol.ii. p.657.]

[Footnote 011: Vol. 9. p. 147. ii. 1.]

[Footnote 012: A similar exclusive claim in respect to the Indian seas, under the grant of Pope Alexander VI., was set up by the Portuguese; similar claims to the Ligustic and Adriatic seas, have been and still continue to be made by the Genoese and Venetians. Those, who seek for information on the subject, should consult the *Dissertation of Bynkershook de Dominio Maris*, and note 61 to the recent edition of Sir Edward Coke's Commentary upon Littleton.]

[Footnote 013: "Mais, dites vous, dans ce tems meme, le jeune Pison pouvoit avoir dix ans: Grotius faisoit bien des vers a cet age. Je le scais, mais les Grotius sont ils bien commune! combien d'enfans trouveres vous de dix ans, qui ayent nonseulement assez du feu pour faire des vers, mais encore assez de jugement pour en juger sainement." Gibbon's Posthumous Works, 8vo. vol. i. p. 520.—"Salmasius," says Mr. Gibbon in another part of the same entertaining publication, (vol. v. p. 209), "had read as much as Grotius; but their different modes of reading had made the one an enlighten'd



philosopher; and the other, to speak plainly, a pedant puffed up with an useless erudition.”]

[Footnote 014: Bentivoglio, Histoire des Guerres de Flandres, I, xxviii.]



## Page 110

[Footnote 015: *Bella plusquam civilia*. Lucan.]

[Footnote 016: Those who wish to obtain a clear, concise, and exact notion of Calvinism and Arminianism, will usefully peruse the account of them in Mr. Evans's "*Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World*." The thirteenth Edition is now before us, and we believe that it has been often since reprinted.]

[Footnote 017: Mosheim's *Ecc. Hist. Cent. xvi, ch. 2. Sec. 3. part 2.*]

[Footnote 018: Chalmer's *Biographical Dictionary*, Title "Arminius."]

[Footnote 019: A short and clear account of Arminianism is given by Le Clere, in his *Bibliothèque ancienne et moderne*, Vol. II. Art. 3. p. 123.]

[Footnote 020: The best discussion of this subject, which has fallen into the hands of the writer, is Bourduloue's *Sermon sur la Predestination*.]

[Footnote 021: English Translation of Burigni's *Life of Grotius*, pp. 43, 44, 45.]

[Footnote 022: Vol. i.]

[Footnote 023: *Letters from and to Sir Dudley Carleton, during his Embassy in Holland, from January 1615-16*[\*\*Modern presentation.] *to December 1620. London, 1757, p. 84,*—Sir Dudley Carleton's Letters abound with harsh expressions respecting Grotius. The Editor of this correspondence has inserted (p. 415) a letter from Grotius to Dr. Lancelot Andrews, written from the Castle at Louvestein. "This letter," says the Editor, "which was never printed before, deserves a place here, not only for its elegance and spirit, and its connection with the subject of the work, but likewise in justice to the memory of the great writer, as it contains his own justification of his conduct, which may be compared with the less favourable accounts of it in the preceding letters of Sir Dudley Carleton. The original is extant among the manuscripts in the library of the late Sir Hans Sloane, bart. now part of the British Museum."—"Utinam," says Grotius in this letter, "D. Carleton mihi esset plus aequior; cui mitigando propinqui mei operam dant. Sed partium, studia mire homines obcaecant."]

[Footnote 024: The history of this Synod, and of the whole controversy upon Arminianism, is contained in Brand's *History of the Reformation*: the account of the synod in these pages, is principally extracted from the French abridgment of that work, in 3 volumes 8vo. The Calvinian representation of the Arminian doctrines, and the proceedings of the synod, may be seen in the late Mr. Scott's *Articles of the Synod of Dort*, to which he has prefixed the History of the Events which *made way for that Synod*: it is severely censured by Mr. James Nichols, in his *Calvinism and Arminianism compared*. Introd. cxlii.



## Page 111

The Abridgment of Brand's History, was translated into the English language and published in 1724-25[\*\*Modern presentation.] by *M. de la Roche*. He concludes his Preface to it by observing, that "No good man can read the work without abhorring arbitrary power, and all manner of persecution." The persecution of the Scottish Non-conformists by the Episcopalians, and the persecution of the Remonstrants by the Contra-Remonstrants, were attended with this enormity, that, in most other instances, when one denomination of christians has persecuted another, it has been on the ground that the errors of the sufferers were impious, and led the maintainers of them to eternal perdition, and therefore rendered these wholesome severities, as the persecutors term them, a salutary infliction. But, when the Protestant Episcopalian persecuted the Scottish Non-conformist, or the Contra-Remonstrant persecuted the Remonstrant, he persecuted a Christian who agreed with him in all which he himself deemed to be substantial articles of faith, and differed from him only about rites and opinions, which he himself allowed to be indifferent.—See Mr. Neale's just remark, Vol. II. ch. vi.]

[Footnote 025: In 1765, Lord Hailes published a beautiful edition of "The Works of the Ever-memorable Mr. John Hales of Eaton, then first collected together," in three volumes, at Glasgow. It is to be lamented that he did not accompany it with a full biographical account of Mr. Hales.

"His biographers," says Mr. Chalmers, "all allow that he may be classed among those divines who were afterwards called Latitudinarians." May he not be termed the founder of that splendid school? Perceiving that the minds of men required to be more liberally enlightened, and their affections to be more powerfully engaged on the side of religion than was formerly thought necessary, they set themselves, to use the language of Bishop Burnet, "to raise those who conversed with them to another sort of thoughts, and to consider the Christian religion as a doctrine sent from God, both to elevate and to sweeten human nature. With this view, they laboured chiefly to take men from being in parties from narrow notions, and from fierceness about opinions. They also continued to keep a good correspondence with those who differed from them in opinion and allowed a great freedom both in philosophy and divinity." (Burnet's History of his own Times. Vol. I. p. 261-268, oct. edit.) Hales, Chillingworth, Taylor, Cudworth, Wilkins, Tillotson, Stillingfleet, and Patrick, were among their brightest ornaments. They were in some respects hostile to the Roman Catholics: *in hoc non laudo*.—See the Writer's History of the English, Irish, and Scottish Catholics. Vol. III. c. lxxviii. sect. 1. 3d edition.]



## Page 112

[Footnote 026: “King James,” says Mr. James Nichols, in his *Calvinism and Arminianism compared*, p. 242, “sent a deputation of respectable British divines, for the double and undisguised purpose of condemning the Remonstrants, but especially Vorstius, (whom his Majesty had long before exposed to the world as an arch-heretic), and of assisting the Prince of Orange in his design of usurping the liberties of the United Provinces, and assuming the supreme authority. The Elector Palatine sent his Heidelberg divines for the same family purpose; and the Duke of Bouillon employed all his influence with the chief pastors among the French reformed.”]

[Footnote 027: The words of the former are remarkable: “The errors of public actions, if they be not very gross, are with less inconvenience tolerated than amended. For the danger of alteration, of disgracing and disabling authority, makes that the fortune of such proceeding admits of no redress; but being howsoever well or ill done, they must ever after be upheld. The most partial spectator of our synodal acts cannot but confess, that, in the late discussion of the Remonstrants, with so much choler and heat, there was a great oversight committed, and that,—whether we respect our common profession of Christianity, ‘*quae nil nisi justum suadet et lena*,’ or the quality of this people, apt to mutiny by reason of long liberty, and not having learned to be imperiously commanded,—in which argument the clergy should not have read their first lesson. The synod, therefore, to whom it is not now *in integro* to go back and rectify what is amiss, without disparagement, must now go forward and leave events to God, and for the countenance of their actions do the best they may.” Letter to Sir Dudley Carleton, 11 January 1619.]

[Footnote 028: *Nichol’s Calvinism and Arminianism compared*, Vol. II. p.592]

[Footnote 029: *Decline and Fall*, Ch. LIV. towards the end.]

[Footnote 030: The writers who have given an account of the Synod of Dort are mentioned by Fabricius, *Bib. Graeca*, Vol. XI. p. 723. Some useful observations upon the proceedings of the Synod may be found in “Mr. Nichols’s *Calvinism and Arminianism compared*.” It is much to be wished that the promised continuation of this work should speedily make its appearance.

But no work upon this famous Synod deserves more attention than “*Johannis Halesii, Historia Concilii Dordraceni, J. Laur. Moshemius Theol. Doct. et P.P.C. ex Anglico Sermone latine vertit, variis observationibus et Vita Halesii ausit. Accessit ejusdem de auctoritate Concilii Dordraceni Paci Sacrae noxii, Consultatio. Hamburgi, 8vo.*” M. Le Clere’s criticism on this work (*Bibliothèque ancienne et moderne* Vol. 23, art. 4.) contains much valuable information upon the Synod, and a summary of the life and writings of Mr. Hales.—Des Maizeaux published a curious account of them in 1719.]



## Page 113

[Footnote 031: Pfaffii Hist. Literaria, vol. ii. p. 303.]

[Footnote 032: Burigni's Life of Grotius, lib. ii. sect. 12.]

[Footnote 033: Cent XVII, sect. 2, Part 2 (Note Y.)]

[Footnote 034: Mr. James Nicholls's Calvinism and Arminianism compared. Vol. i. p. 597, 600, 634, 636.]

[Footnote 035: See Mr. Dugald Stewart's first Dissertation, sect. III.]

[Footnote 036: See Joannis Christopheri Locheri Dissertatio Epistolica Historiam libelli Grotiani *De Veritate Religionis Christianae* complectens, 1725, in quarto; and the Journal de Scavans for the year 1724.]

[Footnote 037: See Nichols's Calvinism and Arminianism compared, vol. i. p. 289.]

[Footnote 038: On the respect, which the Church of England considers to be due to the writings of the early Fathers, see the excellent Appendix to the Sermons of Dr. Jebb, the Right Reverend Bishop of Limerick.]

[Footnote 039: Vol. iii. L. 38. This letter merits a serious perusal.]

[Footnote 040: Dict. Historique, Preliminaire, p. xxix.]

[Footnote 041: Vol.1. p. 121]

[Footnote 042: Those, who will read his life, published by the writer of these pages, with other Tracts, in 1819, will not, it is believed, think this too strong an assertion. Is it not to be earnestly hoped, that in the distress by which we are now visited, and the greater distress with which we are threatened, many St. Vincents will appear?]

[Footnote 043: Mosheim's Ecc. Hist. ch. ii. sect. ii. part. ii. and Bynkershock's Quest. Juris publici, lib. ii. ch. 18.]

[Footnote 044: Le Clerc, (Bib. Anc. et Mod. vol. xxiii. Art. iv.) strenuously objects to this representation of Dr. Mosheim. "The Arminians," he says, "have introduced no dogma as necessary to salvation, which was unknown to the framers of their Confession of Faith; neither have they retrenched from it, any article essential to faith." He however observes, "that there are many ways of explaining dogmas." Now, the same dogma explained in two ways, amounts to two dogmas.]

[Footnote 045: See the third part of "*the last of Bossuet's Six Addresses to the Protestants*," and the passages which he cites in it from Jurieu.



For the actual state of Religious Doctrine, both in the Lutheran and Reformed Churches of Germany, the reader may usefully consult, "*The State of the Protestant Religion in Germany, in a series of Discourses preached before the University of Cambridge, by the Rev. Hugh James Rose, M.A. 8vo. 1825;*" and "*Entretiens Philosophiques sur la Reunion des differens communions chretiens, par feu M. le Baron Starck, Ministre Protestant, et premier predicateur, de la Cour de Hesse Darmstadt, &c. 8vo. 1818;*" and "*Tabaraud's Histoire des Re-unions des Chretiens.*"

[Footnote 046: Tom. XLVI. Art. 12. p. 208.]

[Footnote 047: Page 283.]



## Page 114

[Footnote 048: Page 284, 285.]

[Footnote 049: Page 286.]

[Footnote 050: Page 287.]

[Footnote 051: Page 288.]

[Footnote 052: Page 288.]

[Footnote 053: Page 291.]

[Footnote 054: Page 292.]

[Footnote 055: Page 293.]

[Footnote 056: Page 294.]

[Footnote 057: Page 296.]

[Footnote 058: Page 298.]

[Footnote 059: Page 299.]

[Footnote 060: Page 300. M. Le Clerc, (*Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande, dix-septieme Lettre*) defends Grotius with great ability against the charge of Socinianism: he justly observes, that, his abstaining from unpleasing propositions, his silence on offensive doctrines, and his conciliating expressions, should not too easily be accounted proofs, of belief of his precise sentiments of any particular tenets. Grotius, says Le Clerc, was like an arbitrator, who, to bring to amity the parties in difference, recommends to each, that he should give something of what he himself considers to be his strict right.]

[Footnote 061: Ep. 363. p. 364]

[Footnote 062: Ep. 491. p. 195.]

[Footnote 063: Ep. 494. p. 896.]

[Footnote 064: Ep. 1706. p. 736.]

[Footnote 065: *Comparison of Calvinism and Arminianism*. vol. ii. p. 560.]

[Footnote 066: *Ib.* Vol. ii. p. 609.]

[Footnote 067: Ep. 1538. p. 573, 690, 926.]



[Footnote 068: Ep. 528. p. 400.]

[Footnote 069: "Those," says Mr. James Nichols,[070]

"who wish to behold the praises to which HUGO GROTIUS or HUGH DE GROOT, is justly entitled, and which he has received in ample measure from admiring friends and reluctant foes, may consult SIR THOMAS POPE BLOUNT's *Censura celebriorum Authorum*. His well earned reputation is founded on too durable a basis to be moved by such petty attacks as those to which I have alluded in a previous part of this introduction (p. xxi.), or those of Mr. Orme in page 641. "That a man so accomplished, virtuous, fearless, and unfortunate, should have had many enemies, among his contemporaries, is not wonderful. But the number of those who evinced their hatred to him, or to his philanthropic labours, increased after his decease, when they could display it with impunity. 'This very pious, learned, and judicious man,' says Dr. Hammond, 'hath of late, among many, fallen under a very unhappy fate, being most unjustly calumniated, sometimes as a SOCINIAN, sometimes as a PAPIST, and, as if he had learnt to reconcile contradictions, sometimes *as both of them together*.'"One cause of the Charge of SOCINIANISM being preferred against him, has been already mentioned, (p. xxxiii.) and it is more fully explained in pages 637, 642. The reader will not require many additional reasons to convince him of the untenable ground for such an accusation, when



## Page 115

he is told that VOETIUS, one of the most violent of his enemies, laid down this grand axiom—'To place the principal part of religion in an *observance of Christ's commands is RANK SOCIANISM!*' To such a *practical observance of the* requisitions of the Gospel, by what name soever it might be stigmatized, Grotius pleaded guilty. He says (p. 637) 'I perceive this was accounted the principal part of religion by the Christians of the primitive ages; and their various assemblies, divines, and martyrs taught, 'that the doctrines *necessary to be known* are exceedingly few, but that God forms his estimate of us from the purpose and intention of an obedient spirit.' I am likewise of the same opinion, and shall never repent of having maintained it."But as the charge of POPERY is of the utmost consequence, I have discussed this topic at great length, (pp. 566, 746), and have proved (pp. 549, 561), that Grotius was as little attached to the principles or the practice of the Romish church as the most zealous of his accusers. Whatever tends to vindicate the conduct of Grotius in this matter, will operate still more powerfully in favour of Archbishop Laud. The design of Grotius is well described by Dr. Hammond, in a *Digression* which he added to his *Answer to the Animadversions on his Dissertations*; in which he says, "For the charge of Popery that is fallen upon him, it is evident from whence that flows,—either from his *profest opposition to many doctrines of some Reformers, Zuinglius and Calvin, &c.* or from his *Annotations on Cassander, and the Debates with Rivet consequent thereto, the Votum pro pace and Discussio.*"For the former of these, it is sufficiently known what contests there were, and at length how profest the divisions betwixt the Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants; and it is confessed that he maintained (all his time) the Remonstrants party, vindicating it from all charge, whether of Pelagianism or Semi-Pelagianism, which was by the opposers objected to it, and pressing the favourers of the doctrine of Irrespective Decrees with the odious consequences of making God the *author and favourer of sin*, and frequently expressing his sense of the evil influences that some of those doctrines were experimented to have on men's lives. And by these means it is not strange that he should fall under great displeasure from those who, having espoused the opinion of Irrespective Decrees, did not only publish it as the THE TRUTH and TRUTH OF GOD, but farther asserted the questioning of it to be injurious to God's free grace and his Eternal Election, and consequently retained no ordinary patience for or charity to opposers. But, then, still this is no medium to to infer that charge. The doctrines which he thus maintained were neither branches nor characters of Popery, but asserted by some of the first and most learned and pious Reformers. Witness



## Page 116

the writings of Hemingius in his *Opuscula*, most of which are on these subjects. Whereas on the contrary side, Zuinglius and others, who maintained the rigid way of Irrespective Decrees, and infused them into some of this nation of ours, are truly said, by an excellent writer of ours, Dr. Jackson, to *have had it first from some ancient Romish Schoolmen*, and so to have had as much or more of that guilt adherent to them, as can be charged on their opposers. So that from hence to found the jealousy, to affirm him a papist because he was not a contra-remonstrant, is but the old method of speaking all that is ill of those who differ from our opinions on any thing; as the Dutchman in his rage calls his horse an ARMINIAN, because he doth not go as he would have him. And this is all that can soberly be concluded from such suggestions, that they are displeased and passionate that thus speak. "As for the *Annotations on Cassander*, &c. and the consequent vindications of himself against *Rivet*, those have with some colour been deemed more favourable toward Popery; but yet I suppose will be capable of benign interpretations, if they be read with these few cautions or remembrances:

"*First*. That they were designed to shew a way to peace whensoever men's minds on both sides should be piously affected to it.

"*Secondly*. That he did not hope for this temper in his age, the humour on both sides being so turgent, and extremely contrary to it, and the controversy debated on both sides by those 'who,' saith he, '*desire to eternize, and not to compose contentions*,' and therefore makes his appeal to posterity, when this paroxysm shall be over." *Thirdly*. That for the chief usurpations of the papacy; he leaves it to Christian princes to join together to vindicate their own rights, and reduce the Pope *ad Canones*, to that temper, which the ancient canons allow and require of him; and if that will not be done, to reform every one in their own dominions." *Fourthly*. That what he saith in favour of some Popish doctrines, above what some other learned Protestants have said, is not so much by way of *assertion* or *justification* of them, as to shew what reasons they may justly be thought to proceed upon, and so not to be go irrational or impious as they are ordinarily accounted; and this only in order to the peace of the christian world, that we may have as much charity to others and not as high animosities, live with all men as sweetly and amicably, and peaceably, and not as bitterly as is possible, accounting the wars and seditions, and divisions and rebellions, that are raised and managed upon the account of religion, far greater and more scandalous unchristian evils, than are the errors of some Romish doctrines, especially as they are maintained by the more sober and moderate



## Page 117

men among them, Cassander, Picherel, &c.“*Fifthly*. What he saith in his *Discussio*, of a conjunction of Protestants with those that adhere to the Bishop of Rome, is no farther to be extended, than his words extend it. That there is not any other visible way to the end there mentioned by him, of acquiring or preserving universal unity. That this is to be done, not crudely, by returning to them as they are, submitting our necks to our former yokes, but by taking away at once the division, and the causes of it, on which side soever; adding only in the third place, that the bare primacy of the Bishop of Rome, *secundum Canones*, such as the ancient canons allow of, (which hath nothing of *supreme universal power*, or authority in it,) is none of those causes, nor consequently necessary to be excluded in the [Greek: diallaktikon], citing that as the confession of that excellent person Philip Melancthon. So that in effect, that whole speech of his which is so solemnly vouched by Mr. Knott, and looked on so jealously by many of us, is no more than this, 'that such a Primacy of the Bishop of Rome, as the ancient canons allowed him, were, for so glorious an end as is the regaining the peace of christendom, very reasonably to be afforded him, nay absolutely necessary to be yielded him, whensoever any such catholic union shall be attempted, which as it had been the express opinion of Melancthon, one of the first and wisest Reformers, so it is far from any design of establishing the usurpations of the Papacy, or any of their false doctrines attending them, but only designed as an expedient for the restoring the peace of the whole christian world, which every disciple of Christ is so passionately required to contend and pray for.'

“At the conclusion of the Doctor's *Continuation of the Defence of HUGO GROTIUS*, he thus expresses himself:

“As this is an act of mere justice and charity to the dead,—and no less to those who, by their sin of uncharitable thoughts towards him, are likely to deprive themselves of the benefit of his labours,—so is it but a proportionable return of debt and gratitude to the signal value and kindness, which in his lifetime, he constantly professed to pay to this church and nation, expressing his opinion, “that of all churches in the world, it was the most careful observer and transcriber of primitive antiquity,” and more than intimating his desire to end his days in the bosom and communion of our mother. Of this I want not store of witnesses, which from time to time have heard it from his own mouth whilst he was ambassador in France, and even in his return to Sweden, immediately before his death; and for a real evidence of this truth, it is no news to many, that, at the taking his journey from Paris, he appointed his wife, whom he left behind, to resort to the English Assembly at the Agent's house, which accordingly she is known to have practised.”]

[Footnote 070: Calvinism and Arminianism compared, Introduction, cxxxii.]



## Page 118

[Footnote 071: A dialogue on the Reformation was also in the contemplation of Mr. Gibbon: "I have," he says in the Memoirs of his life and writings,[072] "sometimes thought of writing a dialogue of the dead, in which Luther, Erasmus and Voltaire should mutually acknowledge the danger of exposing an old superstition to the contempt of the blind and fanatic multitude."]

[Footnote 072: Vol. i. p. 269, of the 8vo. edition of his works.]

[Footnote 073: A full account of the writings of *Wicelius*, and of his projects of Pacification, is given by *Father Simon* in the *Biblioteque Critique, par M. de Sainjore*, Tom. ii. ch. 18. He concludes it, by observing, that

"the great love which *Wicelius* had for the peace of the church, might induce him to use expressions, somewhat harsh, but which really ought not to be censured with too much rigour. It is evident that his only view was to be useful to persons of his own time, to whom he consecrated the latter part of his life.—I do not recollect to have read that he was censured at Rome, and the Spanish Inquisitors seem to have observed the same moderation in his regard."]

[Footnote 074: XVI. Cent. Book V. p. 41, in the English translation.]

[Footnote 075: See Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, Cent. XVII. ch. ii. sect. ii. Part II.]

[Footnote 076: Eccles. Hist. Cent. XVI. ch. ii. sect. iii. Part. II.]

[Footnote 077: Observat. Hallen, 15 t. p. 341.]

[Footnote 078: It is a prayer addressed to Jesus Christ, and suited to the condition of a dying person who builds his hope on the Mediator. *M. Le Clerc* has inserted it at length in the *Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande*, 17 Lettre, p. 397.]

[Footnote 079: Boswell's Life of Samuel Johnson, 2d Vol. p. 502. 2d Edition.]

[Footnote 080: The author's "Confessions of Faith," mention this convention, its dissolution, and the subsequent union of the Helvetian, and Bohemian protestant congregations, in the Synods, held at Astrog, in the years 1620, and 1627. The original settlement of these churches, was in Bohemia, and Moravia. Persecution scattered the members of them: a considerable number of the fugitives, settled at Herrenhut, a village in Lusatia. There, under the protection and guidance of Count Zinzendorf, they formed themselves into a new community, which was designed to comprehend their actual and future congregations, under the title of "*The Protestant Church of the Unitas Fratrum, or United Brethren of the Confession of Augsburg*." That Confession is their only symbolic book; but they profess great esteem for the eighteen first chapters of the Synodical Document of the church of Berne in 1532, as a declaration of true Christian

Doctrine. They also respect, the writings of Count Zinzendorf, but do not consider themselves, bound by any opinion, sentiment, or expression, which these contain.



## Page 119

It is acknowledged, that, towards the middle of the last century, they used in their devotional exercises, particularly in their hymns, many expressions justly censurable: but these have been corrected. They consider Lutherans and Calvinists, to be their brethren in faith, as according with them in the essential articles of religion; and therefore, when any of their members reside at a distance from a congregation of the United Brethren, they not only attend a Lutheran, or Calvinist church, but receive the Sacrament, from its ministers, without scruple. In this, they profess to act in conformity to the Convention at Sendomer. The union, which prevails both among the congregations, and the individuals which compose them, their modest and humble carriage, their moderation in lucrative pursuits, the simplicity of their manners, their laborious industry, their frugal habits, their ardent but mild piety, and their regular discharge of all their spiritual observances, are universally acknowledged and admired. Their charities are boundless, their kindness to their poor brethren is most edifying; there is not among them a beggar. The care, which they bestow, on the education of their children, in forming their minds, chastening their hearts, and curbing their imaginations,—particularly in those years,

“When youth, elate and gay,  
Steps into life and follows, unrestrained,  
Where passion leads, or reason points the way.” *Lowth*.

are universally acknowledged, universally admired, and deserve universal imitation.

But, it is principally, by the extent and success of their missionary labours, that they now engage, the attention of the public. These began, in 1732. In 1812, they had thirty-three settlements, in heathen nations. One hundred and thirty-seven missionaries, were employed in them: they had baptized, twenty-seven thousand, four hundred converts: and such had been their care, in admitting them to that sacred rite, and such their assiduity, in cultivating a spirit of religion, among them, that scarcely an individual, had been known, to relapse into paganism. All travellers, who have visited their settlements, speak with wonder, and praise, of the humility, the patient endurance of privation, and hardship, the affectionate zeal, the mild, and persevering exertions of the missionaries; and the innocence, industry and piety of the converts:—the European, the American, the African, and the Asiatic traveller speaks of them, in the same terms: and, that they speak without exaggeration, the conduct both of the pastor, and the flock in the different settlements of the United Brethren in England, incontestibly proves. Whatever he may think of their religious tenets, *Talis cum sitis, utinam nostri essetis*, must be the exclamation of every christian, who considers their lives. Those, who desire further knowledge of this amiable, and worthy denomination of Christians, will find it



## Page 120

in *David Cranz's ancient and modern History of the Brethren, printed at Barby, 1771, and the two continuations of it, Barby, 1791, and 1804.* The History has been translated into English; and is become exceedingly scarce; the Continuations have not been translated. Mr. La Trobe, the Pastor of the United Brethren in London, has published a *Concise Historical Account of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren adhering to the Confession of Augsburgh.*]

[Footnote 081: Epist. 1706, p. 736.]

[Footnote 082: Ib. Epist. 613.]

[Footnote 083: Epist. part. I. Epist. 432. part II. Epist. 53. The French public strongly suspected the Cardinal of this design. It gave rise to the celebrated libel, entitled "*Optatus Gallus,*" *Grotius,* (Lit. 982.) notices a prophecy of Nostradamus, then in circulation:

*"Celui qui etait bien avant dans le regne, Ayant chat rouge, proche, hierarchie, Apre et cruel, et se fera tant craindre, Succedera, a sacree Monarchie."*

If the event in question had happened, Nostradamus would have passed, with many for a prophet.]

[Footnote 084: Eclaircissemens de l'edit de Nantes, page 1. c. 6.]

[Footnote 085: V. 2. p. 38, 148.]

[Footnote 086: We are grieved to add, that he allowed the *right* of a sovereign to persecute for religion.]

[Footnote 087: This article is extracted from *Oeuvres Posthumes de Bossuet*, vol. i. *Nouvelle edition des Oeuvres de Bossuet*, vol. ii. *Leibnizii Opera*, studio Ludovici Dutens, vol. i. and v. And the *Pensees de Leibniz*, vol. ii. 8vo.]

[Footnote 088: Tom. xiii.]

[Footnote 089: See the Appendix to the Sermons of Dr. Jebb, the present excellent Bishop of Limerick.—Cadel, 1824.]

\* \* \* \* \*

Luke Hansard & Sons,  
near Lincoln's-Inn Fields, London.



\*\*\*\*\*

By the same Author,

THE LIFE OF ERASMUS:

WITH

HISTORICAL REMARKS ON THE STATE OF LITERATURE BETWEEN THE TENTH  
AND  
SIXTEENTH CENTURIES.