and consequences of Dort. The presence of a British delegation at the synod—whether perceived as officially representing the English Church or simply as ambassadors of James I—provoked an extraordinarily lively response from contemporaries. After all, the synod signalled a conspicuous triumph for orthodox Calvinism and, at precisely that moment, battling factions within the Jacobean world were trying to establish whether that variety of Calvinism had a place in the English Church. More broadly, England’s relationship with the rest of continental Protestantism was at stake. With the arrival of the Laudian ascendancy during the 1630s, it comes as little surprise that the English presence at Dort was bitterly denounced and its judgements categorised as having no relevance or authority in the English religious settlement.

One’s response to Dort, in effect, became something of a shibboleth, and partial, prejudiced analyses of the synod would endure for decades to come. The spectre of Dort loomed large in the seventeenth-century English Protestant consciousness, and any historian hoping to produce a nuanced, sophisticated account of exactly what happened there will be greatly assisted by this exemplary collection of primary sources. This book is a fine example of painstaking, dedicated scholarship and Dr. Milton is to be applauded.


This book is a collection of eleven essays which were presented at the symposium Socinianism and Cultural Exchange which was organized by the editors on 12-13 July 2003 at the Ludwig Maximilian University. The symposium was sponsored by the Center for Collaborative Research “Pluralization and Authority in the Early Modern Era.” Socinianism is the most important and most consequential movement in the sixteenth century that grew out of the critique of Catholic dogmatism, especially of the trinitarian speculations and eventually developed into the Enlightenment and gave foundations for the modern times. The subject of the present volume is a study of the
interactions and relationships between antitrinitarianism and reformed Protestantism: Dutch Remonstrants, some French Huguenots, and English Latitudinarians.

Divided into five parts, the first, Introduction, sets the scene in two essays. Jan Rohls in an essay “Calvinism, Arminianism and Socinianism in the Netherlands until the Synod of Dort” gives a brief outline of the religious scenery in this country from the Congress of Dort in 1572, which established relative religious freedom, to the Synod of Dort in 1618/1619. The dominant church was the Calvinist-inspired Dutch Reformed Church. An important role was played by the University of Leiden, founded by William of Orange in 1574. Rohls traces the history of theological controversies and disputes initiated in 1578 around the issue of predestination connected with the proper relationship between the church and state. Jacobus Arminius, Reformed pastor and later professor at Leiden University, became prominent exponent of opposition to the Calvinist predestination doctrine. The church became split into two camps, Remonstrants and the Contra-Remonstrants after Johannes Wtenbogaert wrote in 1610 a tractate entitled Remonstrance. The other controversy that was to persist for a long time, not only in the Netherlands, but in all of Europe, arose around the doctrines introduced by the Socinian visitors from Poland in 1597/98, Christophorus Ostorodt and Andreas Voidovius, who influenced Conrad Vorstius (1569-1622), the first Socinian in the Netherlands. Vorstius was nominated in 1611 to replace Arminius as professor at Leiden. With him began the Socinian discussions in the Republic. Discussions and debates were characteristic events in the Republic and they were centered on the theological doctrines, especially of satisfaction, predestination and on the church-state relationship. To resolve the issues between the Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants States General appointed a committee to convene a National Synod on November 13, 1618 and which ended on May 9, 1619. The Synod was really a tribunal to convict the Remonstrants over five articles of faith. The Synod confirmed the teachings of the Contra-Remonstrants as legitimate in the Republic and established five conservative canons as the foundation of the public church; it allowed, however, a certain degree of interpretation of the canons. Remonstrants not complying were subject to exile. The persecution finally ended in 1625 when Frederik Henrik became the Stadholder. The decrees of the Synod were abolished in 1631 and a
relative tolerance was established, a confessional pluralism, which included Remonstrants, Contra-Remonstrants, Catholics, Mennonites and Socinians.

The second paper by Martin Mulsow “The New Socinians: Intertextuality and Cultural Exchange in Late Socinianism” discusses the further development of the original Socinianism of the sixteenth century into a new Socinianism in the seventeenth century as a “product of cultural exchanges and transfers …. In other words, the ‘new’ Socinians, as a ‘Transferprodukt,’ are the result of frequent mixing which arose from the migration of Socinian people and ideas to Western Europe, and into a completely different intellectual milieu” (51). This was a long process beginning with the Protestantism in the Italian Cinquecento, then the immigration to Poland, Moravia, and Transylvania, expulsion from Poland and immigration of many Socinians to Brandenburg-Prussia, England, and the Netherlands. Many modern views were crystallized on the basis of the Socinian antitrinitarian and philosophico-religious doctrines. They were formulated on a fundamental intellectual ground: appealing to reason in the interpretation of scripture, worldview, and social and moral doctrines, and appealing to one’s conscience in personal and societal conduct. The next logical step was development of Desism and the Enlightenment. The author traces here ideas and writings of a number of prominent Socinians such as Johann Crellius with his revolutionary ideas about freedom of religion and the effect of his book on the West, Christoph Sand and Samuel Creell in England, Noel Aubert de Versé also in England, translations of the Socinian texts by Charles le Cène, among others. The second part, French Connection, includes one paper by Didier Kahn, “Between Alchemy and Antitrinitarianism: Nicolas Barnaud (1539-1604).” Barnaud was a burger in Geneva of antitrinitarian orientation who is better known for his writings in alchemy. Barnaud translated Socinus into French, wrote several antitrinitarian treatises and corresponded with Socinus and Ostorodt.

Part three entitled “Arminianism and Religious Plurality” contains three papers which discuss in detail the role of Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) in the development of Remonstrantism, how it was affected by Socinianism and in turn how it reacted to other religions exemplified by Islam. The first paper by Florian Mülhegger, “Pluralization and Authority in Grotius Early Works,” deals with early works of Grotius Meletius (1611) and Ordinum Pietas (1613). In these works Grotius defended Remonstrants against accusations of heresy by the orthodoxy. His line of argumentation was based on the idea that
development of a plurality of views and doctrines in Christianity was nothing new; it existed since the beginning, thus it is something genuinely Christian. Moreover, on the level of authority, he referred to the history of dogmas as produced by various councils, church fathers and confessions again documenting plurality. Next he defended the rationality of Christianity by referring to ancient Hellenistic philosophers as authorities, and in the practical aspect of religion he defended subordination of dogmas to ethical concerns. In all these issues he followed the ideas and practice of the Socinians, thus he was accused of being one of them.

In the second paper entitled “Grotius and Socinianism” Hans W. Blom discusses in detail how Grotius participated in the theological debates through several treatises concerning the Socinian doctrines of justification and satisfaction which were spreading in the Netherlands. What is interesting, however, and characteristic of Grotius is that he starts with a theological issue developing it into an issue of secular theory of justice and punishment. He operated at the interface between a theological and natural-law conception of punishment and integrated theological and legal arguments by describing God as a king in execution of justice. At issue were the reordering and reconciling of reason and revelation and the consideration of human and divine justice under one concept. He developed modern and secular ideas which have, however, antecedents in ancient Hellenistic and, especially, Stoic thought. Grotius’ thought underwent a transformation as well, and in the end he developed in De iure belli ac pacis, which was published only in 1868, a very radical doctrine: the justice obtainable among men is the result of the human capacity for self-justification, thus preparing the direct way for the Enlightenment. Further development of Grotius ideas is exemplified by the writings of Lumbertus van Velthuysen (1622-1685) who arrives at similar results but starts from another position, namely from the love of self, the law of self-preservation which is a sufficient cause of benevolence or other-regarding attitudes. He may be considered as precursor of the characteristic Dutch permissiveness, the idea that the evil that does not noticeably damage the state can remain unpunished.

In the third paper, entitled “Hugo Grotius’ Position on Islam as Described in De veritate religionis christianae, Liber VI,” Dietrich Klein discusses a topic which has a direct relevance for our own times. Christians had to deal with Islam since the beginning of its expansion, and the Qur’an was translated
into Latin in 1143. He claimed as others before him that God sent Islam as a means of punishment for Christians and argued for the superiority of Christianity over Islam on the basis of Qur’anic analysis, comparison of the theological doctrines, especially that of Christology and its practice. He treated Islam, however, at the same level as Socinianism, though he recognized fundamental differences between them.

The fourth part of the book contains two papers concerning interaction between Socinians and the Netherlands. Socinians were treated by Reformed theologians as libertines, atheists and later from 1640s as Cartesians and from 1690s as Spinozists. In Amsterdam in the 1660s, they published the multivolume Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum, the most significant and important compilation of their works. Roberto Bordoli in “The Socinian Objections: Hans Ludwig Wölzogen and Descartes” discusses the opposition of Wölzogen (1600-1661) to Descartes’ spiritualism and his defense of materialism against idealism. Wölzogen, in opposition to Descartes, defended the view that all knowledge begins with the senses and sensible reality. Similarly Wölzogen argued that it is impossible to have natural knowledge of God. We can only know God as the causa remotissima ac prima, i.e., as a creator of the world. Further, Wölzogen points to the contradictions in the Descartes reasoning about God. Wölzogen could thus be considered as a precursor of the empiricists of the Enlightenment. Rejection of the Cartesian philosophy by Wölzogen represented the separation of philosophy from religion by the Socinians and their subsequent disinterest in the theological questions independent from scripture. The second paper by Luisa Simonutti “Resistance, Obedience and Toleration: Przypkowski and Limborch” discusses the connection between the Dutch and the Socinians on the example of Samuel Przypkowski, who studied at Leiden during the years 1616-1619, and Philippus Limborch, who published the compilation of Przypkowski’s works in 1692. Przypkowski was one of the most prominent proponents of peace among the various sects and mutual toleration. Przypkowski and later Limborch developed an elaborate theory of the mutual relations between church and state.

Newton, Socinianism and ‘the One Supreme God.’” These papers are concerned with the development of the trinitarian discussions in England under the influence of the Socinianism. Especially interesting is the study of Snobelen on the theology of Newton, until now little known, and his connections with the Socinian theological doctrines. The volume represents an extremely valuable contribution to the history of liberal ideas in Europe which eventually led to the development of the Enlightenment. Spreading such information in America is of particular importance since the American Republic is the country founded directly on the ideology of the Enlightenment.


Anyone writing about Donne’s Sermons at this time is obliged to take very full account of Jeanne Shami’s recent magistral discussion (*John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit*, 2003). Brent Nelson is handsome in his acknowledgement of Shami’s scholarship. A central concern of Shami’s study was to find ways in which to formulate what it is about Donne’s Sermons that renders them simultaneously attractive to present-day readers but yet apparently recalcitrant to appropriate discourse for our present-day response.

Drawing on the recent work of a number of Donne scholars, Nelson, too, is anxious to find an appropriate discourse with which to approach the Sermons. He finds Michael Schoenfeldt’s work on literary courtship particularly amenable to his own thesis, but his argument is most strongly buttressed by a lively and imaginative engagement with the work of Kenneth Burke (1897-1993), a remarkably original but now sadly neglected theorist. Burke outlived his own reputation two or three decades before his death, but is here gratifyingly recuperated by Nelson. Pursuing Burke’s notion of early modern courtship as a suasive device, Nelson quickly and convincingly finds himself in a position to argue that “courtship is tantamount to rhetoric” (9), and it is this identification, based on Burke, that essentially underlies the argument of the rest of his book: elsewhere Nelson writes of “Donne induc[ing] his audience