

THE  
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

---

OCTOBER, 1834.

---

No. IV.

---

*J. S. Alexander*  
ART. I.—*Guerike's Manual of Church History.\**

THE rapidity with which this work was sold, is a sufficient proof that it was wanted. The German press teems, it is true, with valuable books in this department, nor are there wanting in that language convenient manuals for the use of students. But research is continually adding to the stock of knowledge; and the favourable change, which has occurred of late years, in the religious views of many, has created a necessity for a compendious work, which should not only furnish the results of recent investigation, but present them in a form consistent with evangelical belief. This task Professor Guerike has undertaken in the work to which we now invite the attention of our readers. He is *Professor Extraordinarius* of theology in the University of Halle, and is well known as a strenuous adherent to the creed of Luther, but at the same time as an humble and devoted Christian. Some of our readers may perhaps recollect him, as the author of a life of Francke, which was reviewed in a former volume of this work,† and from which the late lamented Rezeau Brown

\* Handbuch der Allgemeinen kirchengeschichte. Von H. E. Ferd. Guerike. a. o. Professor der Theologie zu Halle. Halle, 1833. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 1120.

† See Bib. Rep. for July 1830.

are now persuaded, that to many readers this very circumstance will make the book more useful and agreeable. We must not take our leave of it, without distinctly stating, that it is not so much an article of personal biography, as a contribution to the civil and church history of our country. As such we recommend it to our readers. We earnestly desire to see the history of America treated with skill, with taste, and in a Christian spirit. The concurrence of these qualities in the work before us, leads us to disregard theological partialities, and to urge Professor Knowles to give us more.

ART. IV.—*Cornelius Jansenius; and the Controversies on Grace, in the Roman Catholic Church.*

*J. N. Alexander*

THE limits of a periodical publication would necessarily exclude any thing like a complete history of the Jansenists and their opinions. No controversy among the many which have divided the self-styled Catholic church, has been more fruitful of elaborate treatises and stirring events. The mere citation of authorities which might be named would fill many pages, and the annals of the controversy, whether in its theological or its casuistical aspect, as many volumes. What then remains, but that we should bind ourselves down to a syllabus of the narrative, and a transient survey of the spirited encounter?

The question concerning predestination and grace, which was first brought out in its whole extent in the Pelagian controversy, was never wholly put at rest. Between the Thomists and Scotists, the Dominicans and Franciscans, the Reformers and Italian Papists, the Jansenists and Molinists, and finally the Calvinists and Arminians—the ball of polemic contest has been kept in active motion, until the very moment when we write. Infallible pontiffs failed to settle it. Decrees of silence, sanctioned by sword and fagot, could not suppress it. And the utmost endeavours of packed Councils, representing or embodying the learning, craft, and power of the Roman communion, secured nothing more than violent opposition or sullen compliance. The reason is plain. It is a question which, in its rudiments, suggests itself to every deep thinker, be he Pagan, Mohammedan, or Infidel; a question which the Bible determines in one way, and the modern Catholic church in another way. The decisions of the Council of Trent, as uttered in the cate-

chism framed in the name of that synod by order of Pius V., was meant to ensure uniformity of faith, upon this, as well as on other points. No one who has meditated on the operation of arbitrary injunctions will wonder that the result was an increased agitation. The disputes took a new form, the line of division was changed, but the chasm remained the same. And of all the battles which were waged, perhaps there is none more interesting to the theologian than the Jansenian controversy.

It was not until a thousand years after the time of Augustin that the prevailing party of the Romish church deemed it necessary to proclaim its departure from his tenets. During all this period, however, a retrocession towards semi-pelagian opinions had been taking place. It was but in name that this great father was theologically revered. Yet beyond the scholastic ranks of the Scotists there were not many who openly assailed the doctrines of grace; and the influential disciples of Aquinas, the angelical doctor, rallied around the ensign of Augustin. When the Reformation began to shake all the spiritual powers, a new aspect of polemics showed itself. The Reformers stood upon the highest ground of Augustinian doctrine. This was their very fortress. There are indeed those, especially among the Lutherans and Arminians, who are hardy enough to deny that this was the fact. All documentary testimony is against them, as well as the concessions of their own party. The proof would be easy, but we content ourselves with a single quotation from a living divine of the Lutheran church. Guerike says of Luther: "The idea which gave soul to his religious life, as well as agreed with his experience, was that the sinner is justified throughout (and so sanctified) independently of all merit and worthiness of his own, by the free grace of God, for Christ's sake, through the divine operation of faith; and conformably to this he had adopted, with the strength of a deep practical conviction, the doctrine of absolute Predestination."\* This was common to Luther with his fellow-reformers; and this was also the very question between the two great parties of whom we write. Both, however, claimed Augustin, and, stranger still, both sought refuge in the decrees of Trent, which had been drawn up with oracular ambiguity; and in the *Profession of Faith*, which every clergyman was ordered to subscribe.† But the Reformation and the institution of the Jesuits changed the state of affairs. The Thomists and Dominicans were now in

\* Guerike, Handbuch d. A. Kirchengesch. p. 673. ed. Halle. 1833.

† See Staedlin, theol. Wissensch. p. 212. or the document itself in Pfaff. Intr. in. hist. theol. Tub. 1724. P. II. p. 59.

peril of being denominated Calvinists; and their number was lessened: the Pelagian and semi-pelagian hosts were strengthened by the accession of the whole body of Jesuits; and their forces were increased.\*

In order to clear the way for introducing our principal subject, we must recal to the memory of the reader the names of one or two theologians, which have marked epochs, and especially those of Baius and Molina.

Michael Baius, or de Bay, died in 1589, aged about seventy-six years. He was a doctor of Louvain, where he also held the dignity of Chancellor and Inquisitor. His controversy with the Franciscans arose from his attempt to bring the age back to the doctrines and the piety of primitive times, and to oppose the encroachments of semi-pelagianism.† The Franciscans picked out of his lectures seventy-six propositions, which they sent to Rome, and Pius V. at the instigation of the Jesuits, issued a Bull, in 1567, in which, without naming the author, he condemned the alleged tenets, and forbade all further discussion of the subject.‡ In a certain sense, said the Pope, words might indeed be received, but in *what* sense (out of regard for Augustin and Thomas) the holy father did not define. Through this loop-hole Baius very naturally crept out; but in 1569 he was forced to abjure his errors, and in 1579 Gregory XIII. confirmed the decision of his predecessor by a more decisive Bull. The whole list of propositions is extant in Leydecker. They evince the attachment of their author to the Pauline doctrines. Baius was celebrated as a man of learning, a devout, zealous, self-renouncing Christian, and a successful opposer of dialectic intricacies. He escaped excommunication, first by the cautious policy of Rome, and finally by his unhappy submission. In connexion with him is usually named John of Louvain, or Hessels.§

The theological faculty of Louvain, in the Netherlands, was at this era highly renowned. These doctors in 1587 censured,

\* A. Turretine Ecc. Hist. Cen. xvi. § 11. Mosh. l. iv. Cent. 6. sec. 3. p. 1. c. 1. §§ 34. 40. sqq.

† For the assistance of the memory, take the following list of Popes, with the year of their decease:—Leo X. 1521. Adrian VI. 1523. Clement VII. 1534. Paul III. 1549. Julius III. 1555. Marcellus II. 1555. Paul IV. 1559. Pius IV. 1566. Pius V. 1572. Gregory XIII. 1585. Sixtus V. 1590. Urban VII. 1590. Gregory XIV. 1591. Innocent IX. 1592. Clement VIII. 1605. Leo XI. 1605. Paul V. 1621. Gregory XV. 1623. Urban VIII. 1644.

‡ Leydecker, p. 45. Guerike, p. 775.

§ Bayle's dict. art. Baius. Mosheim, cent. 16. § 3. p. 1. Leydecker, p. 295. Guerike, 774. Dupin, Bibl. xvi. p. 144. In which works see other and copious references.



as semi-pelagian, thirty-four propositions from the lectures of two noted men among themselves, the Jesuits Leonard Lessius and John Hamel. Thus the controversy broke out afresh; but with still more animation in the next year, when a work of the famous Jesuit Molina appeared.\* This man was a Portuguese, who died 1600, aged sixty years. He attempted—futile, though oft-repeated task!—to harmonize semi-pelagianism with the scheme of Augustin; but in such sort as to teach that, while man attains salvation by the mere grace of God, and while this grace is obtained only through Christ's merits, nevertheless every man enjoys the gift, who does his part in employing the yet remaining powers of free will; and consequently that the cause of one man's salvation and another man's ruin, is found in the self-determination of each. Molina was at once attacked by the Dominicans, and even the Jesuits are said at first to have opposed his book. Both sides sent delegates to Rome, and Clement VIII. in 1597 instituted a special investigation, known as the *Congregatio de auxiliis*, or Congregation on the Aids of Grace. All Romish Christendom was on the tiptoe of expectation for nine years. In 1607 Paul V. sent the delegates home, assuring them, by way of placebo, that he would publish his decision at a more convenient season: the issue was, that in 1611 he enjoined on the disputants absolute silence.† These statements bring us down to the time when the Jansenian rupture took its origin, and allow us to recur to the biography of Jansenius himself.

It is important to distinguish this great man from another of the same name, a bishop of Ghent, very eminent in his time, and who died at an advanced age in 1576. CORNELIUS JANSENIUS, of whom we write, was born in the village of Accoy, of Leerdam, in Holland, in the year 1585. After the custom of the day he was called Jansen, from the Christian name of his father Jan Otthe. The precocity of his boyhood led his parents to set him apart for the church, in pursuance of which destination he studied first at home, and afterwards at the college of Utrecht, already celebrated as the nursery of Adrian VI. and of Erasmus. Having excelled in these schools, he repaired to Louvain, when about 17 years old, and at this celebrated university was aided from the purse of a young townsman and fellow student, Otho Zilius, who afterwards became a Jesuit. The 'Society of Jesus' enjoyed at this time a just reputation for learning, and with some

\* *Liberi arbitrii cum gratiae donis, divina praescientia, providentia, praedestinatione, et reprobatione, concordia.*

† Aug. le Blanc. *Hist. Congr. de Auxiliis*. Antv. 1709. fol. See abundant authorities in Dr. Murdock's *Mosheim*, Vol. III. pp. 120—130.

of its accomplished members Jansenius cultivated such a familiarity as to imbibe for a season their opinions on liberty and grace. But he became weary of Jesuitical instruction, and transferred his connexion to the college of Adrian VI. in which there were charitable foundations for poor scholars, and where he had access to Jacobus Jansonius, of Amsterdam, a professor remarkable for piety and science, an admirer of Augustin, and an avowed defender of Baius. In consequence of this connexion he learned more fully the true character of the semi-pelagian party. The latter assert that Jansenius left the Jesuits' college, because he was found too frail in body for their purposes. In 1604, he had made such proficiency, that he was ranked first in the philosophical schools. Such, however, was the opposition to this award, that a tumultuous mob, scarcely dispersed by archducal authority, was the result.

Continued study, chiefly of a theological kind, so impaired Jansen's health, as to render necessary a journey to Bayonne; an event highly remarkable as having given rise to his intimacy with his faithful coadjutor Jean du Verger de Hauranne. This man, better known as the Abbot St. Cyran, was a native of Bayonne, where he inherited a large estate. He studied theology at Paris and Louvain, and here, like Jansenius, he first addicted himself to the Jesuits, and under their guidance made himself familiar with the classics, but afterwards, though with great struggles, extricated himself from their toils, rejected their flatteries, and at the instance of J. Jansonius set himself in decided opposition to their corrupt tenets. It is not surprising that Jansenius and St. Cyran should at once coalesce, or that the Jesuits should consider Verger as the founder of Jansenism.\* Having on his way to Bayonne made the acquaintance of Guibert, Gibieuf, and other fathers of the Oratory, he was the more ready to unite in the sacred conflict with the followers of Loyola. In the vicinity of Bayonne, at a village called Champré, these two enthusiastic students of Augustin sat down to enjoy their favorite author. So assiduously were they employed, that Madame Hauranne used to say to her son, that he 'would kill that honest Fleming by making him study so hard.' After about two years thus spent, St. Cyran was made a canon of the cathedral, and Jansenius moderator of the college at Bayonne. Here, say the Jesuits, were concocted between them the offensive doctrines afterwards broached by Arnault, in his book on Frequent Communion. Verger was about this time made abbot of the Benedictine monastery at St. Cyran, and Jansenius, on the ac-

\* Gautrichius, *Hist. Sacr.* p. 325.

cession of a new bishop to the see of Bayonne, found it expedient, after an absence of almost ten years, to return to Louvain, again to wage war with his old adversaries.

It was not long before he was appointed president of a college recently purchased and dedicated to a certain St. Pulcheria. But the cares of academic discipline did not comport with his urgent desire of usefulness and learning. He therefore both relinquished this post and declined the offer of the philosophical chair; viewing the scholastic finesse with abhorrence, and, perhaps too hastily, denouncing the Stagirite as the patriarch of Pelagianism; while at the same time he was deeply versed in the subtleties which he repudiated.\* In 1619 he was graduated doctor of theology, a title not then bestowed without a fair scrutiny of desert. His enemies have tried to prove that he and St. Cyran were about this time engaged in framing a plot for abolishing the regular clergy, reforming the church, and indeed introducing deism into the communion of Rome:† and this they pretend to corroborate by the fact that Jansenius refused to write against the Archbishop of Spalato. This man, whose name was Antonius de Dominis, was one of the most notable personages of the age. Having been fourteen years a Roman Catholic prelate in Dalmatia, he left all his former connexions in the church, avowing his abhorrence of popish enormities, but secretly actuated by a personal grudge against the pontiff, and came into England in 1616. After being welcomed with the richest favours, he was by the king made dean of Windsor, and master of the Savoy Hospital. In his character of Protestant he wrote a number of pungent works against Romanism. Avaricious, hypocritical, and otherwise odious as he proved to be, he could nevertheless, when a purpose was to be served, make some astounding disclosures concerning his former associates. The mask however fell off, or rather was torn off by Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador, who, while the Dean was seeking English preferment, cajoled him with offers of reconciliation with the Pope. This reconciliation was actually effected, Spalato was caught in his own toils, was banished, carried back to Rome, and suffered to die in contempt; for, says Fuller, "such a crooked stick, which had bowed all ways, was adjudged unfit to make a beam or rafter, either in Popish or Protestant church." It is worthy of note, "that Spalato (Fuller goes on to say) was the first, who, professing himself a Protestant,

\* For a condensed history of the scholastic tendency to Pelagianism, see Twes-ten's *Dogmatik*, vol. 1. p. 100. ff.

† "Pour ruiner le mystere de l'Incarnation, faire passer l'Evangile pour une histoire apocriphe, exterminer la religion Chrétienne, et élever le Déisme sur les ruines du Christianisme." Pascal *Prov. Lett.* 16.

used the word PURITAN to signify the defenders of matters *doctrinal* in the English church: formerly the word was only taken to denote such as dissented from the hierarchy in discipline and church government, which was now extended to brand such as were anti-arminians in their judgments.”\*

In the year 1630 Jansenius was ordered by the king of Spain to read lectures upon the Holy Scriptures, in pursuance of which he expounded the books of Deuteronomy, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Zephaniah. Parts of these commentaries are extant. The Hebrew language is said to have engaged much of his attention during these researches. But next after the word of God he delighted to place the writings of Augustin, and used to say to his acquaintances “that he had, with the greatest attention, perused the whole works of this father ten times, making careful annotations; and had moreover read his treatises against the Pelagians thirty times from beginning to end: also, (so the editors of his celebrated work go on to say) we have more than once heard him say, that he should deem it the most pleasant life, to be shut out in some isle or crag of the ocean from all human converse, with Augustine as his sole companion.”† What his admirers add concerning the aid of his tutelary saint, we omit as superstitious and idle.

The character of Jansenius as given by his friends is truly admirable and lovely. To an acute understanding, sound judgment and tenacious memory, he joined frankness, generosity, diligence and devotion. He is represented as liberal to the distressed, temperate even to austerity in his enjoyments, and accustomed through life to spend a morning and an evening hour daily in the abstraction of religious contemplation. A spark of irascibility is named among his faults; it was lively but transient. Perhaps to moderate this, he was slow to speak, even beyond the wishes of his friends. We may add that when he found it lie in his course against Protestants, this temper became more than a scintillation. It is a delightful trait of his mental habit, that the love of truth—a phrase how sadly prostituted!—seems to have ruled in his heart. When asked what attribute of deity he chiefly venerated, he answered, *truth*; his symbol was *In Veritate et Charitate*. And in the secluded paths of his garden, soliloquies were sometimes overheard, in which his reiterated ejaculation was, *O truth! O truth!* With such a mind, we do not wonder that he learned so much concerning the grace of God, while we lament that he had still so much to learn.

\* Fuller's Ch. Hist. book X. § 6. ed. 1655. fol.

† J. G. Waleh. Einl. in d. Religions-Streitigkeiten, P. II. p. 863. ff. Jena. 1734.



We are now prepared, by what has preceded of his history, to rank him as the chief theologian of Louvain, and the arch-enemy of the Jesuits. These fathers were bent upon monopolizing the philosophical chairs, and it was to thwart their schemes that Jansenius travelled twice to the Spanish court as an academical legate. After having been long debarred by papal authority, the Jesuits obtained in 1624, permission to teach philosophy. The embassy of Jansenius procured a royal prohibition, and after his second mission in 1626, the Loyolists were not allowed to profess any thing but theology. It is the less wonderful that they should have endeavoured to blacken the memory of one who was, as long as he lived, a thorn in their sides, and who being dead yet speaketh their refutation. Among other falsehoods, of which the exposure may be seen in Bayle,\* they gave out that he fled from Spain to escape an inquisitorial process for heresy.

In his great conflict he wisely determined to use the writings of Augustin as the chief weapon of defence, inasmuch as the authority of these was not impugned. To give a fair representation of these writings was the darling effort of his life, and though he did not drink the waters of this fountain in that purity with which Luther and Calvin enjoyed them, he imbibed as much as we can conceive to be compatible with adhesion to Rome. The tenets of Molina, as sustained by the whole order, were his abhorrence. That this estimation of Augustin's doctrines was not altogether peculiar, or wanting among other Papists, may be seen in the judgment of the famous Father Paul Sarpi, who says, in comparing the two schemes of the Dominicans and Franciscans: "The former opinion (namely that of the Dominicans) embracing a great mystery and secret, humbled the mind of man, and while it looked on the one hand at the deformity of sin, and on the other at the excellence of divine grace, caused it, utterly rejecting self-confidence, to be fixed in reliance on God. The latter opinion (that of the Franciscans) being more plausible, popular, spacious, and better fitted to raise the pride of the human mind, was for this very cause more agreeable to the brethren, who ever professed rather the art of preaching, than the accurate knowledge of theology. It also appeared more estimable to courtiers, as consentaneous with political designs."† In correspondence with this Jansenius was accustomed to trace all theological errors to an overweening dependance upon mere reason, and a neglect of the ultimate canon of faith. His language was, that Augustin could be understood not by masters

\* Art. Jansenius, note E.

† Hist. Concil. Trid. lib. II. p. 187.

but scholars, and would certainly mislead such as came to his writings with a preconceived system; that all his tenets depended on a single principle, from which the whole doctrine of grace hung in linked argument.\*

Every thing in the policy of the Romish see contributed to incite Jansenius to the great work of his life. So far as worldly wisdom was consulted, her oracles plainly counselled the popes to suppress all controversy on these vexed questions, as necessarily tending to reveal the variations of doctrine even among successive pontiffs and councils. Hence an awful silence reigned; and the populace listened in vain for any decisive utterance from the seat of infallible judgment. Between 1598 and 1605, Clement VIII. held no less than sixty-eight congregations to settle the differences between the Dominicans and the Jesuits. These taken collectively are the noted *Congregatio de Auxiliis*, of which numerous accounts have been given.† The dispute remained as before. Leo XI. died a few weeks after his accession. Paul V. held fourteen congregations, the beginning of which was in 1605. *Parturiunt montes*; the conclusion was that there should be no further discourse upon the subject. The judge of controversies *would* not, *dared* not, or *could* not, perform that very act of decision, which is, by Roman Catholics, held to be the grand safeguard of mother church, as contradistinguished from the ever-varying Protestants. Each party maintained that the judge was secretly of his side, and the dispute, maugre all bulls, waxed hotter and hotter. Urban VIII. reiterated, in 1625, the decree of Paul V., adding a prohibition of all books on the “Aids of Grace.” The decree was regarded as a *brutum fulmen*. Books multiplied beyond all prior example, and there was scarcely a scholastic work issued in France, Belgium, Spain, or Germany, which did not treat of Free Will, Grace and Predestination.‡ In the meanwhile works were published on the part of Jesuits, intended to win the favour of the pontiff by exalting his power above that of all secular princes. The notorious work of Santarelli was one of these. But successive popes found it safer to make no decision than to publish that most uncatholic division of the church, which actually existed. The body was actually rent, and unity existed but in ritual and name. How different the state of the ancient church, when these identical errors (for Pelagius and Molina may be re-

\* Jansen. Aug. Tom. III. lib. ii. c. 30. 31.

† Mosh. Cent. xvi. § 3. p. 1. c. 1. note m. Leydecker, l. i. c. xi

‡ See *le Clerc*, *Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire de controverses dans l'Eglise Romaine sur la Predestination*, etc. also “*Catechisme sur les Dissensions de l'Eglise*, tom. I. p. 207. *Dictionnaire des livres Jansenistes*, tom. I. p. 120.

garded as symbolizing) were held up by ecclesiastical anathema to the abhorrence of all coming time! And even if we are reminded that the contrary tenets of Jansenius were condemned by Urban VIII. and Innocent X., what does this prove, but that the infallible oracle can contradict its own determinations? Such were the circumstances which wrought in the mind of Jansenius, Jansonius, and St. Cyran, the purpose of devoting their whole souls to the defence of truth.

An additional motive was derived from the current of events respecting the Jesuit Leonard Lessius, of Brabant, (1585—1600,) a Professor at Louvain,\* who wrote theological and ethical works in defence of the Pelagian and Molinistic system. A word or two of these events will serve to bring up the thread of the history. When Baius, of whom above, had been condemned by the bulls of 1570, and 1580, his adversaries were emboldened to bring his name and his works very frequently before the religious world, deriving hence a new implement for awakening odium. The Louvain professors, and those who agreed with them, felt themselves aggrieved by this, no less as friends of truth, than as friends of Baius; and issued a number of polemic dissertations, in their character of a theological faculty. They animadverted upon thirty positions of Lessius, the sum of which is thus given by Leydecker: "God, after the foresight of original sin, wills to give Adam and his posterity aids and means sufficient for attaining eternal life. God enjoins on the sinner no impossibilities, and therefore gives them sufficient aid, that they may be converted. Augustin has incorrectly interpreted, 1 Timothy, ii. 4. 5. (*Who will have all men, &c.*) The concurrence of supernatural grace is like natural concurrence, a preparation to natural power. Efficacious grace, such as efficaciously to determine the will, is not required. Even the hardened and the unbelieving have aid from God sufficient for salvation. Absolutely predestinated works† of the righteous subvert liberty. The number of the predestinated is not certain from such a foreordination as would precede all prescience."

Such is a candid and very strong statement of the principles which on the one part were maintained by Lessius, Molina, and the Jesuits and Franciscans generally, and on the other part were denied by the faculty of Louvain, the most of the Dominicans and Thomists, and all the genuine Augustinians. The reader sees that, on which side soever truth lies, this is the old feud between Austin and Pelagius, revived between the Reform-

\* Staudlin, theol. Wissensch. 405. Leydeck. p. 44.

† Absoluta de voluntate preordinata, Leyd. p. 46.

ers and the dominant Romish party, carried on between the Synod of Dort and the Remonstrants, and after two centuries still existing between Calvinists and Arminians, and to a certain extent between some dissentient theologians who profess to hold our own standards. Hence the natural interest which we expect our readers to feel in the history of Jansenism, however remote from ordinary speculation may be the tract into which we have ventured to invite their thoughts. The censure of these tenets was sent to the pontiff, the archbishop of Mechlin, and the Universities of Paris and Douay. Its second edition appeared in 1641. In this the Jesuitical theology is shown to be the same with that of the Marseilles Pelagians. The censors say, that "it is adverse as well to Augustin as to Scripture," alleging the concurrence of the faculties of Cambray, Mechlin, and Douay; and they conclude with this temperate but earnest paragraph: "This opinion of the Jesuits darkens the goodness and enervates the justice of God; trifles with Scripture, wrests to illegitimate meanings the testimony of the fathers; flatters the corruption of human reason, subverts the basis of humility, and takes away the chief necessity of prayer; engenders reliance on one's own strength in the matter of salvation, giving the greater work to man, the lesser to God; subjects the grace of God to free will, making the former a handmaid of the latter; and in a word is not sufficiently distant from Pelagius."\* After this testimony there was a lively exchange of controversial works, but of such a character, as it regards the Louvain faculty, that the latter fell under the imputation of having receded from their former ground; in opposition to which charge they published in 1613 an explicit avowal of their adhesion to every thing stated in the Censure just mentioned.

The coadjutors of Jansenius were able and numerous. Among them the most remarkable were Fromond, Conrius, the Paludani, Pontanus, Rampen, Schinkelius, Polletus, and Jansonius. Libertus Fromondus (Froidmond) was a professor at Louvain. It was he who assisted in editing the posthumous work of Jansen, entitled *Augustinus*. Though a zealous Romanist, he held orthodox opinions concerning the questions now in dispute. Jansonius, of whom we have said so much, declared of a book written by Conrius, "Your book, my son, comprises all the ten predicaments of Austin's doctrine; and for the truth of this doctrine I would shed my last drop of blood." To these names ought to be added those of the learned Peter Rosaeus, James

\* See *The Early History of Pelagianism*, Biblical Repertory, New Series, Vol. II. p. 77.



Boonen, archbishop of Mechlin, and Henry Calenus, his metropolitan canon.

That Jansenius was all this time a good son of the church, he evinced by his dutiful contention with the Reformed. For when Bois-le-duc was taken by Prince Frederick Henry of Nassau, the supreme civil authorities declared by an edict, in 1629, that the doctrines of the Reformation should be freely dispensed to the inhabitants, and to undertake this labour of restitution, they summoned Gisbert Voetius, Godfrey Udemann, Henry Swalmius, and Samuel Everwinus. These eminent men published an "Apology against the Papists," in which they complained of the calumnies which were disseminated against the Protestant faith and order, asserted the true doctrine, and declared their readiness to maintain a system contained in the word of God, and sealed by the blood of so many martyrs, laying their very souls in pledge for the truth of the same.\* To answer the apology of the Bois-le-duc ministry, Jansenius was ordered by the pope's nuncio to take the field. He obeyed: and the result was his *Alexipharmacum*, or *Formula Antiprovocatoria*, dated 1630. In this work, he forsakes his appeal to Scripture, as no longer available, and begins with the usual method of Romanists, and their imitators, to argue the doubtful matter of apostolical succession, the nullity of Protestant ministrations, the glory of "the church," and the danger of being left without its pale to uncovenanted mercy, if to mercy at all. He demands of the Reformed clergy the diploma of their authority, and ends by declaring their system to be not *apostolical* but *apostatical*.

This book was refuted by Voetius, in his *Notes* published the same year.† Jansenius replied in a treatise entitled the *Sponge*,‡ with which he sought to wipe away the Protestant aspersions. The book is acknowledged to have been learnedly and eloquently written, but it was triumphantly answered by Voetius in his celebrated *Desperata Causa Papatus*, Utrecht, 1635; to which Jansenius made no reply, but transferred this task to Fromond, whose essay, entitled *Crisis*, was met by Schoockius, Professor at Deventer and Groningen, in a work entitled, *Desperatissima Causa Papatus*, with which the series is commonly said to have terminated. It is lamentable to observe, that he who, with truth on his side, dared to come up so frankly and nobly "to the law and to the testimony," should have been

\* Leyd. p. 59. Voet. Caus. desp. Papatus. in praeef.

† V. Voetii Philonium Romanum Correctum.

‡ *Spongia notarum*, was the punning title.

constrained to defend the figments of Popery with weapons, which it is difficult not to believe that he despised in his heart. So did not Augustin, his great exemplar.\* About the same period Jansenius had a contention with one Theodore Simonis, a doubting Romanist, afterwards a Protestant; against whom he is accused of having employed cruel and persecuting measures.†

Before we speak of Jansenius, as a Roman Catholic Bishop, it may be useful to state the political services for which he received the mitre. The bloody tyranny exercised by the Spanish viceroy upon their Belgian subjects is well known, and enters largely into the romance of history.‡ It is also one of the most noted events in the annals of freedom, that in 1581 was founded the *Republic of the United Netherlands*. The independent Belgians were of course treated as rebels by the Spaniards. And when the King of France entered into a treaty with the Hollanders, the Belgian Papists were filled with such indignation, that they took measures to have a book written against the French court. This book is the once famous *Mars Gallicus*, and the acknowledged author was our Jansenius. It was printed in 1635, and is so well characterized by Bayle, that we employ his words, as agreeing with all the other representations to which we have access: "It contains the most malicious outcries, against the continual services which France did to the Protestants of Holland and Germany, to the prejudice of the Catholic religion. The Hollanders are there called rebels, who enjoy a republican liberty by an infamous usurpation. They have answered that reproach a hundred times, and Mr. Leydecker has given it a solid confutation." And here we cannot but note the enslaving influence of his ecclesiastical and political connexions upon a native Hollander, in leading him to aim a dagger at the very liberties of his native country. Such is popery, such is despotic power!—"The Jesuits failed not to exasperate the court of France against the followers of Jansenius, as being a man who had defamed the nation, and their monarchs almost from the first to the last."|| The King of Spain, grateful for this favour, bestowed upon Jansenius the bishopric of Ypres. He was consecrated by the archbishop of Mechlin, primate of Belgium, at Brussels, on the 28th day of October, 1636, being

\* For Augustin's sentiments on this point we are referred to the following passages in his works: De Unitate Ecclesiae Cap. V. XV. XVI. de Utilitate Credendi c. III. de Doct. Christ. lib. II. c. g. de Baptism. lib. II. c. 36. Maximin. lib. III. c. 14.

† Bayle.—Leydecker.

‡ German literature has few more awakening narratives than Schiller's history of the religious troubles in the Netherlands.

|| Bayle, art. Jans. note F. Leydecker l. ii. c. 1—6.

the birth-day of the new prelate. Here again we see how much credit is to be given to those controvertists, who, when pressed with the "variations of Romanism," would insist that Jansenists are not Catholics. For *Cansonius*, a Romish bishop, and secretary to the Holy Consistory at Rome, thus writes to St. Amour: "The bull of investiture was conceded on account of his choice erudition, and his threefold battle with the heretics, a battle of glorious issue, for the honour of the church and the truth of the faith."\* Even the Jesuits, on this occasion joined in doing him honour, and we have before us a copy of the gratulatory verses offered by one of their number, upon the day of his introduction to the see.

During the brief term of his episcopate, the bishop of Ypres is said to have discharged with zeal and ability his appropriate functions. But his attention was chiefly concentrated upon the great exposition of Augustin's tenets, which he left at his death. For more than twenty years he had been engaged in writing this book. His adversaries relate that he secretly endeavoured to provide the requisite materials for printing it, under the conviction that, if his intentions should transpire, he would be prevented; and they add, that he personally obtained the censor's imprimatur, and engaged John Caramuel, a theologian, under an oath of secrecy, to ensure its publication. The Jesuits further allege certain passages, not extant in the printed copies, which were suppressed by the editors, as being unwarrantably strong in opposition to the pope's authority. We reserve the more minute account of this work for the sequel of our remarks, and proceed to speak of the author's death. After having been bishop for about eighteen months, he was suddenly attacked by a pestilential disorder, and in May 1638, departed this life in the fifty-third year of his age.

When he was sensible of the approach of death, he solemnly charged those about him to see that his *Augustinus* was published. Especially did he enjoin this upon Fromond and Calenus, and on his chaplain, Reginald Lamaeus. Then, with tears and sobs he made confession of his sins, and receiving the viaticum and unction from Lamaeus, breathed his last. His testament is worthy of attention, as showing his relation to the church of Rome. It is as follows :

"I, Cornelius, by the grace of God and of the Apostolical See, bishop of Ypres, of my free will, give and present all my writings explanatory of St. Augustin, to my chaplain Reginald Lamaeus; partly because he has with great labour written or dictated them, partly because they cannot be corrected without the

\* V. Journal de St. Amour. p. 327. Leydeck. p. 115.

original copy. Nevertheless I make the donation, with this understanding, that he confer with those learned men, the magnificent lord Libertus Fromond, and the Reverend lord Henry Calenus, canon of Mechlin, and take order concerning the publication with the utmost fidelity. For I know that the alteration of any thing will be made with difficulty. Yet if the Roman see shall choose anything to be altered, I am an obedient son, and to that church in which I have always lived, even unto this bed of death, I am obedient. Such is my last will. Given May the sixth, 1638."

Such was the dying testimony of this eminent man, such his subjugation even in death to the decree of a fellow-mortal, and such is the inevitable tendency of that arch-heresy which substitutes a human rule for the divine standard of faith.

In pursuance of his last will, the friends therein named addressed themselves to the publication of the book, which accordingly appeared in 1640, from the press of Zeger, a printer of Louvain, with the formal license of the emperor and the Spanish king, and the imprimatur of the censors. Great care was used to prevent suspicion, and the whole work was struck off before any inkling of the design had reached the Jesuits. Nor would they have learned anything before its publication, if some few sheets, spread out to dry, had not been carried abroad by the wind, so as to come to the eye of the archdeacon of Cambray. The attempts to arrest the edition were however too late, and it was but a short time before the *Augustinus* was in rapid, extensive, alarming circulation.

It was undoubtedly a stroke of theological finesse in the wily bishop to project such a treatise with such a title. For he left to his followers the opportunity of saying, that they intended no disputation, but a mere statement of Augustin's sentiments.\* This is precisely the apology made by the bishop of Ghent, as it is also the excuse of the author. "For," says he, "if such were certainly the opinions of this doctor, (Austin) let *himself* answer for their truth or falsity; let the prudent judge which is in error, he or the schoolmen; and let the church, by the weight of that authority so often pledged for his doctrine, make the discrimination. For my part, I am resolved, even till my last breath, to follow the same guide of my sentiments which from infancy I

\* Schroeckh, Th. xv. p. 165. See also, on the Jesuitical side, Petavii, de Pelag. et Semipelag. dogm. histor. Paris 1644. Antwerp 1700. Petavius disagrees with his brother Jesuit Bellarmine, so far as to admit that Pelagius allowed some kind of internal grace.



have followed, namely, the church of Rome, and the successor of the most blessed Peter in the Roman see.”\*

The book called Augustinus may be thus analyzed. The first volume gives a history of the Pelagian heresy. The opinions of the Pelagians are stated upon the following topics. Free Will and the original state of man. Book II., Original Sin, and the condition of infants. Book III., of Sin, and its power and principles. Book IV., Pelagianism viewed as *Heathenism*, since it holds out bare nature under the false name of grace; then as *Judaism*, from its method of treating the law. Book V., Pelagianism viewed as *Christianity*, so far as it confesses grace, election, calling and justification: the origin of the heresy, and the philosophy, talents, life, and frauds of its founder. Book VI., relates the subdivisions of the sect, the history of semi-pelagianism, and of Faustus and Cassianus. Book VII., the doctrines of Marseilles, and those called Predestinatiani.

The second volume begins with an account of their principles of theologizing, and a condemnation of their irreverent exaltation of reason in matters pertaining to God; hence are brought into review, the Scriptures, councils, fathers, and the great oracle of the church, in all which the author shows himself a thorough Papist. The character of Augustin is then set forth, his authority vindicated, and his system applauded. After this proem, a single book is taken up with the state of man in innocence and of angels; the strength of free will, the aids of grace then needful, immortality and the other endowments of this condition. Four books follow, on original sin, its propagation, its penalty, the strength of free-will after sin, works wrought before grace, and the seeming virtues of the Gentiles. Next comes the doctrine of the Pelagians concerning a state of pure nature, as to soul and body; which after Augustin he explains and condemns. This part of the volume has much discussion respecting natural ignorance, concupiscence (in the well known theological sense,†) the pains of the human body; in which he animadverts on the Pelagians, and such of the school-men as followed them.

In the third volume he discourses at length, in ten books on the *Grace of Christ the Saviour*. B. I. The nature and excellence of this grace. B. II. *Gratia Voluntatis*, considered in its mode of operation; where the grace of the first man is distinguished from the grace of the fallen man; it is maintained that this grace must be efficacious in order to every habit, and every act. B. III. is taken up in refuting the doctrine of “suffi-

\* Oper. Tom. II. Lib. Proem. c. 29.

† Compare Romans vii. 7. 8, 13, 14; Galatians v. 16. James i. 15.

cient grace," as held by the Jesuits. B. IV. The essence of this grace of Christ. B. V. The effects of this grace; faith, love, &c. Books VI. and VII. of Free Will, (*Liberum Arbitrium*) its nature, necessity of will, indifference of will, &c. Book VIII. of the concord between efficacious grace and Free Will. Book IX. of the Predestination which is held to be free, gratuitous, and previous to foresight of all works. Book X. of the true idea of Reprobation. Hereupon follows an appendix, which draws a parallel between the tenets of the Marseilles errorists, and those of the Jesuits, and shows their agreement in the following points. 1. In the doctrine of predestination; 2. In opposing efficacious grace; 3. In the same conception of that grace which is acknowledged by both; 4. In the objections which they urge, and the steps by which each declined into error. Such is a skeleton of Augustinus.\*

In order to give a more clear conception of the Jansenian system, it becomes necessary to add a brief notice of some tenets with greater particularity. The most satisfactory document of an authentic character is the *Catechism of Grace*, published in 1650, from which the following statement is extracted.†

Grace, according to the Jansenists, is twofold; that which is given through Christ's merits, and that which is not: the former to men, the latter to angels and our innocent progenitors. Both angels and the first man were created in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness; for God at the same time formed their nature and endowed it with grace. Nor could they be created in any other state, since nothing proceeds from the creating hand of God which is not in its right order, and the true order of a rational creature is, that he should go forth towards God as his centre and original. In this, it is evident the Jansenists aimed at the Pelagians and the Jesuits, who, like many in our own day, maintained that man was constituted in a perfect equilibrium between good and evil, without sin, but also without holiness.‡

The *Grace of Christ* is further defined as an internal grace, which occupies the heart, breaks it into tenderness, frees it from its chains, gives it the conquest over the passions, and heals its wounds; which moreover effects that it both wills and does what is good and pleasing to God; not merely giving us the ability, but by its triumphant power and assistance causing us to will. They add, that this grace is always efficacious, and produces its effect, so as never to be rejected, inasmuch as it is of its very

\* Vide *Augustinus*, 3 vols. fol. Leyd. de Dogm. Jans. lib. 1. c. v. p. 238.

† *Elucidationes quarundam difficultatum de Gratia.*

‡ Or as the schools significantly termed it, *in puris naturalibus.*

operation to remove the disposition to reject it, and to overcome all resistance. As to its converting effects, concupiscence is not wholly destroyed in this life, though it is gradually weakened; so that perfect love is not to be expected, on this side of heaven.

This grace does not vitiate our freedom, "for God is nearer to the will than the latter is to itself," perfectly knowing how to rule its nature and every thing in accordance with its nature. They argue thus: Liberty is not injured, because the will is never more free than when in act, since action is the very exercise of liberty itself, and when God causes it to will, he simply causes it to act. The subject is never more free than when he is most subject to his lawful prince, so the will is never more free than when it is subject to God. Liberty is not taken from the prisoner when his chains are broken, and his prison-doors thrown wide, so liberty is not taken from the will, but rather conferred on it, when it is freed from the dominion of concupiscence.

The Jansenists assert that this Grace of Christ is necessary in order to believing, and that it effects in us faith itself; that it is not common to all; that it is necessary to acceptable prayer, to every truly good work, and to the conquest over temptation. And they cite Augustin on these points.\*

Of original sin, they teach, after the same great leader, that the sin of the first man passes over on all his posterity; that original sin consists in criminal *concupiscence*, which deprives man of grace, turns him from the Creator, binds him to the creature, and subjects him to certain miseries in this life, and to death as a penalty. They also follow Jansenius, who could not find the doctrine of Imputation among Augustin's tenets, in tracing the propagation of sin to natural generation. As the penalties of what is theologically called concupiscence, they name ignorance, error, difficulty of acting aright, and death itself, holding, that if man had never sinned he would have been immortal. They represent Predestination to be that divine act by which God infallibly frees whom he will from the eternal perdition to which all are obnoxious, in consequence of the first offence; so that he may, by infallible means, conduct them to eternal life. Or it is the one eternal divine purpose of choosing certain persons to eternal glory, together with certain means of their obtaining this glory; which means are faith, conversion, and perseverance. The Catechism adds, in answer to the question, whether Christ died for all men: "He died for all men, that he might give to the elect, glory, and to certain of the

\* Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 32. de Corrept. et Gr. c. 12. de Bono Pers. c. 17.

reprobates, transitory graces; he died for the common nature of all; for sin, which is common to all; for men of all nations, ranks, ages, and conditions: not, however, with this end, that all and singular of the human race should attain the fruit of his death; but with this end, that he might offer the price of his blood for the saving of his elect, scattered among all places, states, and nations." They add, that God does not will the salvation of any other than the elect, because, otherwise, he, who doth all his pleasure in heaven and earth, would actually save all others. And they expound 1 Timothy, ii. 4, as including, not all and singular of the human race, but all the elect, who are of every age, sex, nation, and condition.\* With such a scheme of doctrine, it must suggest itself to every reader, that Jansenius was very near the ground of the Reformed Church. Most warmly did his foes charge this, most deeply did he feel it, and most basely did he labour to avert the condemnation. With much of Protestantism as to doctrine, he had more of Popery as to rancour, and fanatical enmity. It seemed to be his favourite object to vilify the Calvinists, lest he should be ranked among them. The Reformed faith he declared to be nothing but a "sink of divers errors and sects, which had flourished of old, and were, with their authors, proscribed and condemned."† And such was his gentleness, that he wrote that "they ought not so much to complain of the severity of princes, as congratulate themselves on their clemency."‡ In the *Mars Gallicus*, he says of the Calvinists: "In what, save the name, are the Turks more hateful?"§ And he then declares that they surpass all heretics in "impiety," "unbelief," "impudence," "blasphemy," "obstinacy," and "cruelty"! In these calumnies we regret to say he was followed by his successors, so that even the Provincial Letters of the pious Pascal are blemished by the same intolerance.

We must now leave this subject with our readers; and in so doing we request their serious attention to the dissensions of which this history convicts the Roman Catholic Church; dissensions which will appear still more portentous, if we shall be permitted to resume our narrative, in a contemplated account of the disputes which ensued upon the death of Jansenius.||

\* Catech. chap. 7. Leyd. de Dogm. lib. i. c. 6.

† Spongia, c. 59.

‡ Ib. chap. 62.

§ Lib. ii. c. 27.

|| The reader will perceive, if he takes the trouble of collation, that Leydecker's admirable work has been our principal authority. To the singularly learned, impartial, and profitable memoir of this theologian, Bayle acknowledges himself to have been mainly indebted, and later Protestant writers have usually contented