Antonius Walaeus:
His Life, Belief, Work, and Influence

English Edition

Gerald Milton Smith, Jr.

Written for my grandson Samuel, and Drs. Maddox and Thomas in partial completion of the requirements of the PhD program at North American School of Theology

A Letter to Samuel

Dear Samuel,

I am putting into your hands a book about a man most readers will not have heard of, Antonius Walaeus. He was born at Ghent, taught and preached in Zeeland, sat at the Synod of Dort, and ended his days as a professor of theology at Leiden. I write of him because I want you to know him as the sources allow: the gracious man who went to the prisoner, Oldenbarnevelt, on the night of 12–13 May 1619 to offer him comfort; the Leiden teacher whose colleagues and students the book names from the records; and the theologian of the decree and of Christ's whole obedience, who on middle knowledge stands with Gomarus and not with the Jesuit line he names.

This book asks why a man like Walaeus should be known again. It puts the questions that have been asked of Calvin's successors and answers them from what the chapters show of him. It gathers a continuous account of his life, his part in the movements of his day, his doctrine, and his work and influence, chapter by chapter, with every fact set against a source a reader can check. Where the evidence runs out, the book says so. It also leaves finding aids for the pages of his Opera and of Bates, so that you or another reader can find the leaves again.

You are due in January of 2027. I hope that one day, after I am gone, you will take these books up and read them. I love you, and I want you to know the men of the faith who have gone before us, and to know them only as far as the sources allow.

Your grandfather,

Milton Smith

Statement of Purpose and Scope

I want to write the book on Antonius Walaeus that I do not believe exists. I want it to deal with the man: where he came from, where he was taught, where he taught, and the people around him. I want it to deal with his part in the church movements of his day, above all the Synod of Dort. I want it to deal with his doctrine, first in general and then at the point that interests me most, where he parts from the majority on middle knowledge and stands with Gomarus. And I want it to show the man himself, including the graciousness reported of him, such as his going to the prisoner, Oldenbarnevelt, in May 1619 to offer him comfort, which the book will set out only as far as the sources allow. For that night I take the Life and Brandt as the two tellings that name Walaeus and say how they came by him, and I read Bilderdijk's Dutch as the Life again.

This is to be a full treatment of the man, his life, his belief, his work, and his influence, so that others can refer to it in the future. Every fact in it must carry a source that a reader can check. Where the evidence runs out, the book will say so plainly and will not fill the gap with a guess.

Scope and readers. I want this to be a comprehensive reference book on Walaeus. It is written for researchers who will cite it, and also for Samuel and for the students of Chi-Rho Academy.

The book is in four parts: the man, the movements he belonged to, his doctrine, and his work and influence. The appendices are a timeline; the Latin of the Oldenbarnevelt night with an English rendering; a note on sources; the primary-source list; and the bibliography.

Abstract

This book is a full treatment of Antonius Walaeus (1573–1639): his life, his belief, his work, and his influence. He was born at Ghent, taught and preached in Zeeland, sat at the Synod of Dort, and ended his days as a professor of theology at Leiden. The aim is a comprehensive reference on him, in which every fact carries a source a reader can check, and where the evidence runs out the book says so plainly and does not fill the gap with a guess.

The book is in four parts. The first is the man: his family, education, Middelburg years, and Leiden professorship, and his graciousness, above all his going to the prisoner, Oldenbarnevelt, on the night of 12–13 May 1619 to offer him comfort. The second is the movements he belonged to: the Remonstrant controversy, the Synod of Dort, and church order, ministry, and the Sabbath. The third is his doctrine, read from named pages of the 1643 *Opera omnia*: the decrees and grace; middle knowledge, which he classifies under simple intelligence and cleanses of the Jesuit abuses he names, standing with Gomarus; will, freedom, contingency, and ethics; and the whole obedience of Christ and its imputation. The fourth is his writings and their editions, their reception, and why he matters now, where Richard Muller's questions about Calvin's successors are put to Walaeus alone. What is new is not a newly found manuscript but the gathering of a continuous account from named pages, with finding aids for the leaves of his *Opera* and of Bates.

Contents

I. The Man

Chapter 1. Birth, Family, and the Setting 1
- 1.1 Birth and Parentage 2
- 1.2 Relatives 4
- 1.3 The Geographical and Religious Setting 6

Chapter 2. Education, Teachers, and Influences 11
- 2.1 School and the Call to the Ministry 11
- 2.2 Leiden, 1596 to 1599 14
- 2.3 The Study Tour, 1599 to 1601 17
- 2.4 Influences as They Appear in His Own Writing 22

Chapter 3. Early Ministry and the Middelburg Years 28
- 3.1 Koudekerke and Middelburg Pastorates 29
- 3.2 Teaching at Middelburg 35
- 3.3 Gomarus at Middelburg 37
- 3.4 *Het ampt der kerckendienaren* (1615) 41

Chapter 4. The Leiden Professorship, Colleagues, and Students 45
- 4.1 The Call and the Inaugural 46
- 4.2 Colleagues and the Disputation Cycle 49
- 4.3 Offices at Leiden 51
- 4.4 Students 56
- 4.5 Last Illness, Death, and Burial 58

Chapter 5. Graciousness: The Prisoner and Other Kindness 61
- 5.1 The Prisoner 62
- 5.2 Walaeus's Own Account 63
- 5.3 The Requests and the Mediation 64
- 5.4 What the Night Shows 68
- 5.5 Other Kindness and Character 70

II. The Movements

Chapter 6. The Remonstrant Controversy Before Dort 73
- 6.1 The Treatise Against Wtenbogaert 73
- 6.2 Prince Maurice and The Hague 74
- 6.3 Grotius 75
- 6.4 Letters Before the Synod 76
- 6.5 The Responsio of 1625 78
- 6.6 What the Pages Show 79

Chapter 7. The Synod of Dort 81
- 7.1 Called to Dort 81
- 7.2 Before the Synod Met 82
- 7.3 What He Says Was Done in the Synod 83

7.4 After the Synod....84
7.5 The Faculty Defends the Synod....84
7.6 The Fourteen Disputations of the Synopsis....86
7.7 What the Record Gives....86

Chapter 8. Church Order, Ministry, and the Sabbath....89
8.1 The Treatise and Its Translator....89
8.2 The Thesis of the Treatise....90
8.3 The Revisers and the Seminary....91
8.4 The Dissertation on the Sabbath....92
8.5 The Lord's Day....93
8.6 What He Holds....94

Chapter 9. His Relations with Gomarus, Voetius, Episcopius, Rivet, and Others....96
9.1 Gomarus....96
9.2 Voetius....99
9.3 Episcopius, Corvinus, and the Remonstrant Side....99
9.4 Polyander and the Question of Foreknowledge....100
9.5 Rivet, Thysius, and the Leiden Faculty....101
9.6 Du Moulin, Grotius, and Others....102
9.7 What the Pages Show....104

III. Doctrine

Chapter 10. His Theology in General....106
10.1 The Two Works and Their Order....106
10.2 How a Locus Is Built....107
10.3 What Theology Is....107
10.4 Holy Scripture....108
10.5 God: The Limit, the Description, and the Unity....109
10.6 The Trinity....110
10.7 The Vision of God....111
10.8 The Shape of the Whole....111

Chapter 11. Predestination, Grace, and the Order of the Decrees....113
11.1 Election Defined....113
11.2 The Object of Election....114
11.3 One Decree, and an Order among Its Objects....115
11.4 The Fall and the End....115
11.5 Where He Puts the Dispute....116
11.6 Election and Foreseen Faith....117
11.7 Grace....118
11.8 The Covenant Words....118
11.9 What He Holds....119

Chapter 12. Middle Knowledge: Where He Stands with Gomarus and Where He Parts from the Jesuits....120
12.1 The Knowledge of Simple Intelligence and the Knowledge of Vision....121
12.2 The Question and Its Definition....121

12.3 The Position He Takes....122
12.4 The Objection and the Answer....124
12.5 What He Purges....124
12.6 One Species and Not Two....125
12.7 The Letter to Polyander....126
12.8 The Responsio....127
12.9 Infallibility and the Order of Things....129
12.10 The Names He Gives It....130
12.11 What He Holds....130

Chapter 13. Will, Freedom, Contingency, and Ethics....132
13.1 Free Choice Defined....132
13.2 The Voluntary and the Four Uses of Liberty....133
13.3 The Seat of Liberty....134
13.4 The Decree and Freedom....134
13.5 Necessity and Infallibility....135
13.6 The Manner of the Effect....136
13.7 Contingency in the Second Act....137
13.8 Certainty of Salvation....138
13.9 Ethics and Natural Man....139
13.10 What He Holds....139

Chapter 14. The Whole Obedience of Christ: Active and Passive, and Imputation....141
14.1 What It Is to Justify, and What Receives the Righteousness....141
14.2 The Dispute as the Enchiridion States It....143
14.3 Three Arguments from Scripture....144
14.4 The Objections and the Concession....145
14.5 Obedience and Remission in the Loci....145
14.6 Imputation, Faith, and Inherent Righteousness in the Loci....146
14.7 Imputation Defined....148
14.8 The Letter to Lubbertus....149
14.9 One Decree for the End and the Means....150
14.10 The Two Covenants as They Appear....151
14.11 What He Holds....152

IV. Work and Influence

Chapter 15. His Writings and Their Editions....153
15.1 The Opera omnia of 1643 and the Other Dates Given for It....153
15.2 Works Inside the Opera, with Their Sizes....155
15.3 Separate Prints....158
15.4 The Synopsis Disputations....160
15.5 What Exists in English....161
15.6 Items Looked for and Not Found....162
15.7 How to Cite Him....162

Chapter 16. Later Reception and Open Questions....164
16.1 The Reference Works....164
16.2 Lind van Wijngaarden on Walaeus as a Dogmatician....166

16.3 The Synopsis and Its Later Editions..... 167
16.4 Later Reformed Use: te Velde..... 168
16.5 Two Later Studies: Campos and Abbink..... 169
16.6 Questions for Study..... 170

Chapter 17. Why He Matters Now..... 173
17.1 The Muller Question..... 173
17.2 What Is New..... 174
17.3 The Use for Others..... 175

Appendix A. Timeline..... 177
A.1 Birth to Middelburg..... 177
A.2 Koudekerke, Middelburg, and the Night of May 1619..... 177
A.3 Leiden, the Writings, and Death..... 178

Appendix B. The Latin of the Oldenbarnevelt Night, with a Translation..... 180

Appendix C. A Note on Sources..... 189

Appendix D. Primary-Source List..... 192
D.1 Works..... 192
D.2 Page Maps..... 193

Appendix E. Bibliography..... 194

Chapter 1
Birth, Family, and the Setting

Antonius Walaeus was born at Ghent on 3 October 1573[1] and died at Leiden on 9 July 1639.[2] Between those two dates lie sixty-five years that carried him from the Flemish city of his birth to a Zeeland pulpit, then to a chair of theology at Leiden and a seat at the Synod of Dort. This chapter asks the question that comes before all of that, where he came from and who he came from. I want the family, the town, and the country in which he was formed set out from the records that speak of them, with each fact placed against the source that gives it, and where two records say different things I say so and give both.

A man's beginnings are given to him and are not earned by him. Nothing in his birth, or in the family he is born to, or in the town and the country that receive him, puts God in his debt, because God owes no one salvation, and the life I describe here is better read as something placed than as something achieved. Paul says as much to the Athenians, that God "made from one man every nation of mankind to live on all the face of the earth, having determined allotted periods and the boundaries of their dwelling place."[3] The allotted period for the boy at Ghent fell in the years when his city stood against the Prince of Parma and was lost, and the boundary of his dwelling place was moved while he was still a child, from Ghent to Walcheren. I describe both as given, and I describe them as the sources give them.

The evidence is of two kinds. The first is contemporary and printed. In 1643 his son Johannes saw the *Opera omnia* through the press at Leiden, and the first volume carries an engraved portrait of Walaeus with a Latin caption, a dedicatory letter sent in the name of his widow and children, a short

---

[1] Johannes Polyander à Kerckhoven, *Oratio funebris in obitum … Antonii Walæi*, in Antonius Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), unpaginated front matter, image 8, left column; J. C. van Slee, "Walaeus, Antonius," in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40 (1896), 643; A. J. van der Aa, "Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale," in *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20 (1877), 32–33; L. W. A. M. Lasonder, "Walaeus, Antonius," in *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, ed. P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2 (1912), col. 1513. Translations from the Latin, German, and Dutch in this chapter are mine. Image numbers are those of the Internet Archive scan walaeusoperaomnia01, and the bracketed "PDF" numbers given for Bates are the page numbers of the Internet Archive scan vitaeselectoruma00bate. In quotations from the Latin the accents and ligatures (æ, œ) are kept as printed, the long s is printed as s and VV as W, and abbreviations are expanded in square brackets, except the courtesy title D., which is left as printed; other oddities of spelling and punctuation stay as printed, with [sic]. Latin titles and imprints in citations follow the same rule, except that the capitals and u/v of display lines are normalized in them; in quotations those capitals and u/v stay as printed. Printed page numbers repeat in places in Bates, so each citation of him in the notes gives the printed page and, in brackets, the page of the digitized copy, which is the printed page plus fifty.

[2] The caption beneath the engraved portrait in the *Opera omnia* reads, in part, "obiit tertium Academiæ Rector magnificus IX Iulii," with the year following in the printer's numerals as 1639 (Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, portrait leaf, image 16). The ADB (644), the NNBW (col. 1516), and the Biografisch Portaal excerpt of G. P. van Itterzon give the same day and year. Sources differ on the year: van der Aa gives 18 September 1634, with an age of sixty-five and burial in the choir of St. Peter's (van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34). Sixty-five years from 3 October 1573 are complete on 3 October 1638, so that age agrees with a death in July 1639 and not with September 1634, when he would have been sixty, in his sixty-first year. Polyander, who recited the oration on 14 July 1639, says that Walaeus was called away on the sabbath just past ("præterito die sabbathi," *Oratio funebris*, image 8, left column), and Bates has him go to church on Sunday, 3 July, and die at about the eleventh hour of the sabbath day that followed. William Bates, *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum* (London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681), 657–58 [PDF 707–8]. Both accounts fit Saturday, 9 July 1639.

[3] Acts 17:26 (ESV).

letter to the reader, and the funeral oration that his colleague Johannes Polyander recited on 14 July 1639, five days after the death.[4] The second kind is the reference literature: the article by J. C. van Slee in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, the entry in van der Aa's *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, the entry by L. W. A. M. Lasonder in the *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, the entry by S. J. M. Hulsbergen in the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*, and the notice by G. P. van Itterzon that the Biografisch Portaal reproduces in part.[5] These were written long after the events, and they do not always agree. The oration was spoken to men who had known him, within a week of his death, and I give it the weight that belongs to that. It is also a funeral oration, and its business is to praise, so I use it for what it reports and not for what it admires.

The NNBW points to the fuller accounts. It calls the Life of Walaeus written by his son Johannes the most complete description of his life, says that the essay by J. Borsius in 1848 is more exact than that Life for the Middelburg years, and describes the Leiden dissertation of J. D. de Lind van Wijngaarden, 1891, as a full study composed with care, above all from the theological side.[6] The ADB likewise lists Lind van Wijngaarden's biography in its notice of the literature.[7] These are the works against which any further account of his life has to be set. The Life itself is not in the front matter of the volume of 1643; it is printed in William Bates's *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum*, which appeared in 1681.[8] For his birth, his family, and the setting of his boyhood, I rely on the oration, on the five notices just named, and on the Life as Bates prints it, and I take from each only what it says.

1.1 Birth and Parentage

The name comes first, because the sources spell it in more than one way. The title leaf of the *Opera omnia* gives it in Latin as Antonii Walæi, and the engraved portrait is captioned Antonius Walaeus.[9] Van der Aa heads his entry "Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale," treating the Latin form

---

[4] Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1. The title leaf gives the imprint "LVGDVNI BATAVORVM, Ex officina FRANCISCI HACKII," with the year 1643 in the printer's numerals (image 1). The ADB (644) and the NNBW (col. 1516) cite the edition of 1647, and van der Aa (34) prints 1623 for the date of the *Opera*; the volume that contains the oration carries the Hackius imprint of 1643.

[5] S. J. M. Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus," *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* (entry from the 1982–84 print edition), https://www.encyclopedievanzeeland.nl/index.php?title=Antonius_Walaeus&oldid=69677 (accessed 1 October 2026); G. P. van Itterzon, "Walaeus, Antonius," in *Biografisch lexicon voor de geschiedenis van het Nederlands protestantisme*, as excerpted in "Walaeus, Antonius," Biografisch Portaal van Nederland, bioport no. 91680571, http://www.biografischportaal.nl/en/persoon/91680571 (accessed 1 October 2026).

[6] Lasonder, "Walaeus," cols. 1516–17. The NNBW places the Life at the front of the *Opera omnia*, says that it was later printed literally in Bates, and cites Borsius's essay as *Archief van Kerkelijke Geschiedenis* 19 (1848): 3 ff. Sources differ on the volume of Borsius's essay: the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* lists it as "Antonius Walaeus, in zijn leven en zijne verdiensten geschetst," *Nederlandsch archief voor kerkelijke geschiedenis* 8 (Leiden, 1848) (S. J. M. Hulsbergen, rev. J. Francke, "Jacobus Borsius," *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*, https://www.encyclopedievanzeeland.nl/index.php?title=Jacobus_Borsius&oldid=106816, accessed 2 October 2026).

[7] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 644.

[8] The front matter of the volume of 1643 holds the title leaf, the privilege, the dedication, the letter to the reader, the oration and its tables of contents, the title leaf of the *Enchiridion*, and the portrait, and it has no Life (Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, images 1–16); the title leaf's own list of contents, "Continet: Enchiridion Religionis Reformatæ, Locos Communes S[anctæ] Theologiæ," names none. The ADB (644) and the NNBW (cols. 1516–17) place the Life in the *Opera omnia* of 1647. Bates, *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum*, carries the "Vita Antonii Walæi" on pages 600–659 [PDF 650–709]. The title leaf reads 1681; the NNBW gives 1687 (col. 1517).

[9] Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, title leaf (image 1) and portrait leaf (image 16).

and the Flemish family name as one name, and he writes the father's name as Jacques de Wale, where the NNBW and the Biografisch Portaal write Jacques de Waele.[10] I use Walaeus for the man, as his own title leaf does, and I keep each source's spelling when I report what it says.

All five notices give Ghent as the place of his birth and 3 October 1573 as the day.[11] Polyander gives the day with a mark that the notices drop. His words are "this man of God was born at Ghent, in the year of our Lord 1573, on the third day of October, in the old style."[12] I report the date as the oration and the notices report it, and I leave it so.

His father was Jacques de Waele and his mother Margaretha Wagenaers, and on these two names the ADB, the NNBW, and the Biografisch Portaal agree. Van der Aa gives them as Jacques de Wale and Margaretha de Wagenaers.[13] Polyander places the father in "a patrician family of Ghent," and the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* says the same of the whole family, calling it a family of Ghent patricians that held to the Reformation.[14]

The father had not always lived at Ghent, and the sources tie his earlier life to the Count of Egmont. The NNBW says that he had been attached to the Count's court and that, after the Count was beheaded, he left for Ghent; the excerpt of van Itterzon in the Biografisch Portaal likewise places him at the Count's court; the ADB says that he withdrew to Ghent from Brussels after the Count's execution; and van der Aa says that he had been brought up at the Count's.[15] Polyander gives more. He puts the father's birth not at Ghent but at Gerardimontium, the Latin name of Geraardsbergen, to which the father's grandfather had withdrawn; he says that the father was brought up in the household of the Count of Egmont together with his brothers; and he says that the father, weary of court life, left it for Ghent in the nineteenth year of his age, after the Count had been struck down by the axe, and there was employed in the treasury and in other public administration.[16] That agrees with the ADB, which says that at Ghent the father married Margaretha Wagenaers and received a post in the fiscus.[17]

Polyander also names two of the father's brothers, and they show a family whose members took different roads. The eldest, Johannes, became provost of the Minim friars at Bruges, and the second, Adrianus, followed a court career and was prefect of the household of the Count of

---

[10] Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 32; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1513 (the NNBW itself writes "Jacques de Wale" once, at col. 1514); van Itterzon, as excerpted at Biografisch Portaal. The ADB writes Jacques de Waele (van Slee, "Walaeus," 643). Polyander writes the father's name in Latin (Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 8, left column).

[11] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643; van der Aa, "Walaeus," 32–33; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1513; Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus"; van Itterzon, as excerpted at Biografisch Portaal.

[12] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 8, left column. "Stilo veteri" is the old style (13 October in the new style).

[13] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1513; van Itterzon, as excerpted at Biografisch Portaal; van der Aa, "Walaeus," 32. Polyander names the mother Margareta Wagenaers (*Oratio funebris*, image 8, right column).

[14] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 8, left column; Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus": "Antonius Walaeus stamde uit een familie van Gentse patriciërs, die de Reformatie was toegedaan."

[15] Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1513; van Itterzon, as excerpted at Biografisch Portaal; van Slee, "Walaeus," 643; van der Aa, "Walaeus," 32 ("bij den graaf van Egmond … was opgevoed").

[16] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 8, right column: "Gerardimontium secesserat: ubi hic Iacobus natus & in familia Comitis Egmondani … cum fratribus suis educatus fuit"; "Pater Walæi, securi percusso Egmondano, pertæsus vitæ aulicæ, XIX. ætatis anno ex illa Gandavum concessit; ibique ad curam ærarii, aliasque Reipublicæ Administrationes adhibitus fuit." Van der Aa adds that the Count had a maternal uncle as confessor ("die zijn oom van moederszijde tot biechtvader had"); the clause does not make plain whose uncle is meant (van der Aa, "Walaeus," 32; Polyander's "cui à sacris erat ipsius avunculus," after "Egmondani," leaves "ipsius" equally open).

[17] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643 ("erhielt eine Stelle beim Fiscus").

Lalaing.[18] I set that down as Polyander gives it. A friar and a courtier stood on the father's side of the house, and the father himself had left the court behind him.

Of the mother's side the sources say less. Polyander calls her family "a family of knightly standing among the Flemish," and the NNBW says that the family of Walaeus's mother was among those who joined the insurgents, which is the same side his father took.[19] The father's house and the mother's house, in other words, were not at odds. Both stood with the revolt, and the household, on the word of the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*, held to the Reformation.

The household's side had its cost. The ADB tells us that in 1583 the father was thrown into prison by Johann de Hembyze as an adherent of the Prince of Orange, and the NNBW that he was imprisoned with some other men of the Prince's party; I come back to the prison and its outcome in the third section.[20] What belongs here is the plain result, that the father of Antonius Walaeus left one court after its master's death, took up work in the public finances of a great Flemish city, and was in that city on the Orange side when the quarrel came to blows.

1.2 Relatives

The relative the sources name first is an uncle. The ADB says that from 1581 the boy had his first Latin lessons from his uncle Titius ab Edingen, a Reformed preacher at St. Nicholas, and the NNBW names the same man as Titus van Edingen, preacher at St. Nicholas, and says how he was an uncle: he was the husband of Johanna Wagenaers, a sister of Walaeus's mother.[21] The two accounts agree on the age as well. A boy born in October 1573 was eight years old in October 1581, and the NNBW says that his parents sent him to St. Nicholas when he was eight, though only for a short time, because van Edingen left for Hillegom in 1582 and the boy went back to Ghent.[22] The uncle was therefore a relation on his mother's side and a minister of the Word, and the boy's first schooling was in the care of a minister of his own family.

Who taught him next is a point on which the accounts differ. The NNBW says that on his return to Ghent he was given into the care of the minister Samuel van Lansbergen; van der Aa says that at ten years old he was entrusted to Frans van Lansberghe, then minister there, and received his instruction in Latin from him; and Polyander says that when he had reached his tenth year his parents, seeing his bent for letters, gave him into the household instruction of Franciscus Lansbergius, pastor of Ghent, that he might receive the first rudiments of the Latin language.[23] Bates, who like the NNBW has Titus ab Edingen first, says that the boy was then handed over to Samuel Lansbergius, pastor of Ghent.[24] All four name a pastor of Ghent with the one surname, and

---

[18] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 8, right column: "Horum major natu Ioannes Brugis fuit Præpositus fratrum Minimorum … secundus Adrianus vitam aulicam secutus, præfectus aulæ Comitis Lalainii fuit."

[19] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 8, right column; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1513.

[20] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643 ("wurde aber 1583 als Anhänger des Prinzen von Oranien von Johann de Hembyze ins Gefängniß geworfen"); Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514.

[21] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643 ("schon seit 1581 von seinem Oheim Titius ab Edingen, reformirtem Prediger zu St. Nicolas lateinischen Unterricht erhalten hatte"); Lasonder, "Walaeus," cols. 1513–14.

[22] Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514 ("den 8-jarigen Antonius").

[23] Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514; van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33; Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 8, right column ("in domesticam Francisci Lansbergii, Pastoris Gandavensis disciplinam traditus est"). Sources differ on the first name: Samuel in the NNBW, Frans in van der Aa and Franciscus in Polyander. The ADB names no second teacher.

[24] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 602 [PDF 652]. The first name is Samuel there, as in the NNBW.

they divide on his first name. I settle nothing there. On every account that names a teacher the lessons of his childhood came from a man of the pulpit.

He married a woman of Middelburg. The ADB calls her Paschyntze van Isenhoudt; the NNBW, Paschasia van Isenhout, "uit Middelburg"; van der Aa, Paschasie van Isenhoudt, daughter of Nicolaas Isenhoudt, a *schepen* of that city; and Polyander, who writes in Latin, calls her Paschasia ab Isenhout, the daughter of Nicolaus ab Isenhout, a man who had held high offices in the city of Middelburg and who had died young, and describes her as sprung from "noble and ancient families."[25] The accounts agree that she was a Middelburg woman and that her father had stood high in the town. The date of the marriage is not so plain. Bates alone gives a day, 11 August 1603; the other accounts give a year at most.[26]

Nine children were born to them. Polyander, speaking in July 1639, says that by her he "had nine children, of whom six are still surviving: that is, three sons, and as many daughters."[27] Van der Aa agrees on the number born and says that seven outlived him.[28] The oldest son was Johannes, whom Polyander calls professor of medicine at Leiden and an excellent imitator of his father's virtues.[29] The daughters made marriages that carried the family into the civil and church life of other towns. The eldest, Margareta, married Johannes à Breda, secretary of the city of Kampen, and the second, Catharina, married Antonius Clement, pastor of the Walloon church at Zierikzee.[30]

Bates, whose Life speaks of the children, names among them the sons Johannes, Antonius, and Balduinus, and the daughters Margareta, Catharina, and Susanna. Bates says of the three whom Polyander does not name that Antonius, the second son, was learned in the law and a much esteemed quaestor of the Walcheren countryside, that Susanna chose to remain a support to her

---

[25] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515; van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34; Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column: "uxorem duxit virginem lectissimam Paschasiam ab Isenhout, è nobilibus & antiquis … familiis oriundam; filiam Ampliss[imi] viri Nicolai ab Isenhout, qui magnos in civitate Middelburgensi honores adeptus immatura morte obierat." Bates likewise writes Paschasia ab Isenhout and says of her father, "Hujus autem pater Nicolaus ab Isenhout, anno ætatis quadragesimo nominatus obierat Consul," that is, named consul in his fortieth year, he had died (or had held the office); "obierat" beside "nominatus" leaves the sense open, and Polyander's "immatura morte obierat" makes "died" the likelier (Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 618 [PDF 668]). Van der Aa has a *schepen*.

[26] Sources differ on the date and the place of the marriage. The ADB says that after taking up the pastorate at Koudekerke in November 1602 he soon married there ("Dort heirathete er bald Paschyntze van Isenhoudt"), which names the place and no year (van Slee, "Walaeus," 643). The NNBW likewise says that he married at Koudekerke in 1603 (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515), and van der Aa that he married in 1603 at Middelburg (van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34). Bates's Life gives the day, 11 August 1603 (Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 618 [PDF 668]), and no other account cited here gives one. Polyander writes "in ipsam urbem Middelburgensem. Vbi & uxorem duxit virginem lectissimam Paschasiam ab Isenhout," so that the adverb "Vbi" follows the mention of Middelburg (*Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column), and he says that Walaeus lived with his wife for thirty-six years ("annos 36"), and thirty-six years counted back from July 1639 agree with 1603 (*Oratio funebris*, image 9, right column).

[27] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, right column.

[28] Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34 ("9 kinderen … waarvan hem 7 overleefden"). Sources differ by one on the number of surviving children, six in Polyander and seven in van der Aa.

[29] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, right column ("Horum filiorum natu maximus Iohannes Medicinæ hic Professor & egregius paternarum virtutum imitator").

[30] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, right column: "Filiarum vero natu prima Margarita, viro amplissimo ac consultissimo Iohanni à Breda fidelissimo civitatis Campensis Secretario; secunda Catharina, Antonio Clement Ecclesiæ Gallobelgicæ apud Zirizeenses Pastori doctissimo, feliciter nupsit." Polyander spells the name of the eldest daughter as Margarita.

mother as she aged, and that Balduinus gave himself to theology, a young man of great promise.[31] Bates tells also of a first child, Ægidius, born to the mother, who did not live long.[32]

It was Johannes who gathered his father's writings. The first volume of the *Opera omnia* of 1643 is dedicated to Jacob Cats, and the dedicatory letter, dated at Leiden in the spring of that year, is signed by Johannes Walaeus in the name of the widow and children and of all.[33] Four years after his death, then, the widow and the children still wrote in one name, with the eldest son, a physician at the same university where his father had held a chair, writing for them. He did not work alone. The letter to the reader in that volume speaks in the plural, and says that, having taken their youngest brother, Balduinus Walaeus, into a share of the labor, they compared the whole work again with the author's manuscript.[34] Balduinus, then, the youngest son, had a part in the edition.

1.3 The Geographical and Religious Setting

The setting has three parts, and I take them in the order in which the boy met them: the Ghent of his birth and early childhood, the siege and fall of that city, and the Walcheren to which his family went.

Ghent first. His father had come to it from the court of the Count of Egmont and found work in the finances of the city; his mother's family was of knightly standing in Flanders; and the household stood, as the ADB, the NNBW, and the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* indicate in their several ways, on the Reformed side of the quarrel that was then dividing the Netherlands.[35] The first teachers whom the sources name were men of the pulpit. Titius ab Edingen is called by the ADB a Reformed preacher at St. Nicholas, and the pastor Lansbergius of the next lessons is called a *predikant* at Ghent by van der Aa and the NNBW and a pastor of Ghent by Polyander and Bates.[36] A boy taught his letters by ministers, in a family that held to the Reformation, was a boy of the Reformation from his earliest years, and I make no more of that than the sources do.

The city did not stay quiet. The ADB reports that in 1583 the father was imprisoned by Johann de Hembyze as an adherent of the Prince of Orange, and that his innocence was brought to light through the mediation of a man named Walheen, so that he was set free.[37] The NNBW tells the same event in other terms. It says that in 1583 the father was cast into prison with some others of the Prince's party, that he was not executed but released, "vooral door de tusschenkomst van Petrus Dathenus," chiefly through the intervention of Petrus Dathenus, and that soon afterward the roles

---

[31] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 656–57 [PDF 706–7].

[32] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 601 [PDF 651].

[33] Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, dedication, images 3–5. The letter is dated "Ex Academia Batava V. Kalend[as] Aprilis" 1643, which is 28 March, and ends with the words "Tui Clientes. VIDVA ET LIBERI: Omniumque nomine IOHANNES WALÆVS." The NNBW says that the works were collected and published by his eldest son Johannes (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1516: "door zijn oudsten zoon Johannes verzameld uitgegeven").

[34] Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, letter to the reader ("Lectori"), image 7: "Quare assumpto in molestiarum partem fratre natu minimo Balduino Walæo, totum opus ad autoris manuscriptum denuo contulimus." Bates names Balduinus among the sons (*Vitæ selectorum*, 656–57 [PDF 706–7]).

[35] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1513; Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus."

[36] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643; van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514; Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 8, right column; Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 602 [PDF 652].

[37] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643.

were reversed, the Spaniards laid siege to Ghent, and the father, foreseeing that the Spaniards would in the end become masters of the city, left for Walcheren before the surrender.[38]

When the family left is a point on which the sources differ, and I give each reading with its source. The ADB says that when Ghent had surrendered to Parma in 1585 the family emigrated to Middelburg in Zeeland. The NNBW says that the father went to Walcheren before the surrender and that his wife and children followed him in 1584. Van der Aa says that when the city had surrendered to the Duke of Parma in 1584 the boy went with his parents to Middelburg. Polyander gives the year in so many words: toward the end of 1584, the year in which Ghent was handed over to the Duke of Parma, the boy went to Middelburg with his parents. Bates, who names no year in the passage, has the father leave the city a few days before the surrender, and the mother follow later, by night and on foot, with Antonius, then ten years old, and two daughters. The *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* says that the family left "vóór de overgave van Gent (1594)"; the year printed there stands alone among the notices.[39] What the accounts share is more than they dispute. All of them tie the departure to the fall of Ghent, and all of them send the family to the same place, Middelburg on Walcheren.

Polyander gives two reasons for the move. He says that the boy went to Middelburg with his parents "partly on account of religion," and "partly because" his father, whom he calls a leader of the citizens, had set himself rather sharply against the Prince of Parma as the Prince besieged the city.[40] The NNBW puts the father among the many refugees ("vluchtelingen") who had done the same, and the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* says that the Reformation-minded family "uitweek," moved away, to Middelburg.[41] The NNBW gives the father's own reckoning: he foresaw that the Spaniards would in the end become masters of the city, and he left before the surrender. Religion, the father's resistance to Parma, and the foresight that the city would fall are the reasons the accounts give, and I add none.

What the move cost is told by three of the accounts. The ADB says that the means of his parents had been greatly reduced, partly by confiscation and partly by the dishonesty of a friend. The NNBW

---

[38] Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514. Sources differ on who obtained the father's release: the ADB names Walheen, and the NNBW says that it was done chiefly through Petrus Dathenus.

[39] Sources differ on the year of the departure from Ghent. Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643: "Als Gent sich 1585 dem Parma ergeben hatte, wanderte die Familie nach Middelburg in Zeeland aus." Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514: the father went first, "nog vóór de overgave der stad," and his wife and children followed "in 1584." Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33: the boy went with his parents in 1584, after the surrender. Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus." Polyander: "sub finem sequentis anni 1584. quo urbs Gandavensis in potestatem Ducis Parmensis fuit tradita," that is, toward the end of the following year, 1584, in which the city of Ghent was handed over into the power of the Duke of Parma (*Oratio funebris*, image 8, right column). Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 603 [PDF 653]: the father went out of the city a few days before the surrender; the mother, after a public edict had forbidden departure, fled by night on foot with Antonius, aged ten, and two daughters as far as Philippine and crossed from there to her husband on Walcheren. Sources also differ on the day of the surrender itself: W. Waterschoot gives 17 September 1584 ("Op 17 september 1584 onderwierp Gent zich aan Alexander Farnese," "Hieroglyphica te Gent in 1584," *Verslagen en mededelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde*, n.s. [1978]: 47), and the NNBW entry on Dathenus says that Ghent had fallen by the end of September ("eind Sept."; A. A. van Schelven, "Dathenus (Petrus, Pieter)," in *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, ed. P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2 [1912], col. 375).

[40] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 8, right column: "Middelburgum Zelandiæ Metropolim secessit; tum religionis causa; tum quia Pater ejus, civium Dux … se Principi Parmensi urbem Gandavensem obsidenti, acrius opposuerat."

[41] Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514; Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus." The ADB says that the family "wanderte … aus," emigrated (van Slee, "Walaeus," 643).

says that the possessions of the father and mother had almost entirely been lost through the fortunes of that time, and Polyander says that his parents, through the calamity of those times and of the fatherland, were stripped of their goods for the most part.[42] Three accounts that differ on the year of the move and on the name of the teacher agree that the family had lost most of what it owned.

On Walcheren the father kept his standing. The NNBW says that among the many refugees who had done the same, "bleef Jacques de Waele voortdurend in groot aanzien," that is, he continued always in great esteem, and that the government of Zeeland put him at the head of the fleet that sailed between Zeeland and Flanders for the benefit of the refugees, and that later he was charged with provisioning the naval and land forces in Zeeland.[43] The boy stood by him in this, the NNBW says, and as his father saw that no soldier lay in his son, the father judged it better to place him as a clerk in the office of the notary Joost van Laren.[44] The NNBW draws the line from these years to the ministry in its own words: because of his "emotievolle jeugd," his emotion-filled youth, his love of the pastor's office was strongly kindled.[45] I report that as the NNBW's judgment and not as a fact of the record.

Middelburg became his home in a fuller sense than a refuge usually does. Polyander calls it the metropolis of Zeeland, and the NNBW says that when he came back from his travels in 1601 Middelburg, where, it adds, his parents were still living, laid claim to the young preacher at once.[46] It was in the province of Zeeland that he was sent to Leiden to study in 1596. The ADB, the NNBW, and the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* say that he held a scholarship from the States of Zeeland, and van der Aa says that he went at the expense of the Middelburg government.[47] In Zeeland he took his first pulpit, at Koudekerke near Middelburg, married a Middelburg woman, and was called to Middelburg itself. Zeeland, the sources agree, is the place that took in his family, the place that paid for his study, and the place from which he went to Dort.[48]

---

[42] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643 ("theils durch Confiscation, theils durch die Unehrlichkeit eines Freundes bedeutend zurückgegangen"); Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514 ("nagenoeg geheel waren verloren gegaan"); Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 8, right column ("parentes ejus per temporum illorum & Patriæ calamitatem bonis suis magna ex parte exuti fuerunt").

[43] Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514. Polyander describes the father's office as that of procurator of war and of the public provisions in Zeeland and the neighboring parts of Flanders and Brabant (*Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column: "Rei Bellicæ Annonæque publicæ in Zelandia & vicina, Flandriæ & Brabantiæ regione Procurator").

[44] Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514. The ADB says only that at Middelburg the young Antonius entered the service of a notary (van Slee, "Walaeus," 643). Polyander says that about his sixteenth year the boy returned to the study of letters at Middelburg, and that his father, though he needed his help on his journeys, allowed it (*Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column).

[45] Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514.

[46] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 8, right column ("Middelburgum Zelandiæ Metropolim"); Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515 ("waar bovendien zijn ouders nog woonachtig waren").

[47] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643 ("als Alumnus der Staaten von Zeeland"); Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515; Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus"; van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33 ("op kosten der Middelburgsche regeering"). Bates names no such body; he says that his mother went with him, together with Johannes Ytsenbachius, preacher of Middelburg (*Vitæ selectorum*, 606 [PDF 656]). Sources also differ on the time of his leaving for Leiden: Polyander says at the beginning of the year 1596 ("initio Anni 1596," *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column), and Bates says in April of that year (*Vitæ selectorum*, 606 [PDF 656]).

[48] Sources differ on the capacity in which he sat at Dort. The ADB says that he attended the national synod as a delegate of the higher school ("Hochschule") at Middelburg, where he was also a professor (van Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44); van der Aa and the NNBW say that he attended as a professor on behalf of the States of Zeeland (van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515); the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* says that he sat in the Synod "namens Zeeland" (Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus").

I want to say precisely what this chapter has shown. A boy was born at Ghent in 1573 to a father who had served at a count's court and then in the finances of the city and who, with his wife's family, stood with the revolt and, on the word of one notice, with the Reformation. He was taught his first Latin by ministers. The city was besieged, the father was imprisoned and released, the family lost most of what it had, and it moved to Walcheren. There the father kept his standing and served the province, the son became a notary's clerk, then a pupil at the Latin school, and then a student at Leiden, and the town that received them, and the province behind it, became his own.

He would sit at the Synod of Dort for Zeeland, and I hold that the Canons of Dort are provably exegetically correct. That conviction is mine, and it does not decide what any record says about a boy's father, a boy's teachers, or the year his family left Ghent. The next chapter follows him from the notary's office to the Latin school, to Leiden, and out on the road to the Reformed schools of France, Switzerland, and Germany.

Works Cited

Aa, A. J. van der. “Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale.” In *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20, 32–35. 1877. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/aa__001biog24_01/aa__001biog24_01_0091.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Bates, William, ed. *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum*. London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681. “Vita Antonii Walæi,” 600–659. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/vitaeselectoruma00bate.

Hulsbergen, S. J. M. “Antonius Walaeus.” *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*. Entry from the 1982–84 print edition. https://www.encyclopedievanzeeland.nl/index.php?title=Antonius_Walaeus&oldid=69677. Accessed 1 October 2026.

Hulsbergen, S. J. M., rev. J. Francke. “Jacobus Borsius.” *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*. https://www.encyclopedievanzeeland.nl/index.php?title=Jacobus_Borsius&oldid=106816. Accessed 2 October 2026.

Itterzon, G. P. van. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Biografisch lexicon voor de geschiedenis van het Nederlands protestantisme*. As excerpted in “Walaeus, Antonius.” Biografisch Portaal van Nederland, bioport no. 91680571. http://www.biografischportaal.nl/en/persoon/91680571. Accessed 1 October 2026.

Lasonder, L. W. A. M. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, edited by P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2, cols. 1513–17. 1912. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/molh003nieu02_01/molh003nieu02_01_2538.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Polyander à Kerckhoven, Johannes. *Oratio funebris in obitum … Antonii Walæi*. Recited 14 July 1639. In Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1. Unpaginated front matter.

Schelven, A. A. van. “Dathenus (Petrus, Pieter).” In *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, edited by P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2. 1912. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/molh003nieu02_01/molh003nieu02_01_0850.php.

Slee, J. C. van. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40, 643–44. 1896. https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz84297.html.

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01.

Waterschoot, W. “Hieroglyphica te Gent in 1584.” *Verslagen en mededelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde*, n.s. (1978): 47–85. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/_ver016197801_01_0003.php.

Chapter 2
Education, Teachers, and Influences

The previous chapter left Walaeus on Walcheren, a clerk in the office of a Middelburg notary and the son of a family that had lost most of what it had. This chapter follows him from the notary's office to the Latin school, from the school to Leiden, from Leiden out on the road to the Reformed schools of France, Switzerland, and Germany, and from the road home to the village pulpit at Koudekerke in November 1602. At each stage it asks three questions: who taught him, what he read, and whom he afterward names in his own pages.

I hold to a plain rule in answering them. A man's teachers are the men whom the records name as his teachers, and a man's influences are the writers and masters whom his own books name, and where a later writer assumes a debt that neither kind of record gives, I do not supply it. I want Walaeus to stand as the author of what he wrote, in the company that he himself kept in print, and not as the product of a lineage that others have drawn for him.

The evidence is of four kinds. The first is the funeral oration of Johannes Polyander, recited at Leiden on 14 July 1639, which carries him through these years in a single run of sentences and puts a year to most of the stages.[1] The second is the Life of Walaeus printed in William Bates's collection of lives, which tells the same stages at length, with the lecture rooms, the lodgings, the books, and the towns.[2] The third is the reference notices named in the previous chapter, and the fourth, which I count the best witness to influence, is Walaeus's own writing: the *Loci communes*, a letter to Polyander, and the dedicatory letter of his *Compendium ethicæ*.[3] The Life is the fullest of these witnesses, and I give its details as its details. Where it agrees with the oration, I say so, and where the two differ, I give both.

2.1 School and the Call to the Ministry

The notices say that the boy became a notary's clerk, and the Life says more of how he came to it. It says that when he was eleven his father, who had the provisioning of Zeeland for the war, took him into a share of the work, as a boy steadier and more prudent than his age, and that for two years he

---

[1] Johannes Polyander à Kerckhoven, *Oratio funebris in obitum … Antonii Walæi*, in Antonius Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), unpaginated front matter, image 9, left column. Translations from the Latin, German, and Dutch in this chapter are mine. The conventions for Latin quotations and titles, for "image n," and for the "PDF" page numbers of Bates are those declared in note 1 of Chapter 1. The digitized copy of the *Opera omnia* (walaeusoperaomnia01) holds both volumes; volume 2 begins at image 573, and the printed page of volume 2 is the image number less 584.

[2] *Vita Antonii Walæi*, in *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum*, ed. William Bates (London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681), 600–659 [PDF 650–709] (hereafter *Vita*). Printed page numbers repeat in places in Bates, so each citation of the Life in this chapter gives the printed page and, in brackets, the page of the digitized copy, which is the printed page plus fifty. The contents leaf names an author for the Life of Putean, for example ("per Nic[olaum] Rigaltium"), and names none for this Life, and the text itself carries no name. The ADB and the NNBW say that a Life by his son Johannes stands in the *Opera omnia* (J. C. van Slee, "Walaeus, Antonius," in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40 [1896], 644; L. W. A. M. Lasonder, "Walaeus, Antonius," in *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, ed. P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2 [1912], cols. 1516–17). I cite the text only as it is printed in Bates.

[3] The notices are Van Slee, "Walaeus"; Lasonder, "Walaeus"; A. J. van der Aa, "Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale," in *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20 (1877), 32–35; and S. J. M. Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus," *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*, https://www.encyclopedievanzeeland.nl/index.php?title=Antonius_Walaeus&oldid=69677 (accessed 1 October 2026).

went about with the stores, to the public granary and the arsenal of each city, at sea at one time, in the soldiers' winter quarters at another, and in the towns at a third.[4] It says that the father then feared that the soldiers, rough in word and manner, would rub something of their roughness onto the boy, and kept him at Middelburg with his mother to be fitted for an honorable way of life.[5] The family's means had been cut by the exile and the household had grown, and his parents, who had long had it in mind to give their eldest son to study but had not dared to do it in fact, having several times felt the turns of fortune, wished him to be fit for any duty of life.[6] So he was handed to be trained under Joost van Laren, a notary public, whom the Life, which gives his name as Jodocus Larenus, calls a man of long experience, of sound judgment, and of tested honesty.[7]

What he learned there was a craft of the pen and of public business. Under the notary, the Life says, he learned by constant practice to write with great skill, to take in the matters laid before him, to put them in order and in words, to set them down, and to bring them into the form of a public instrument, and he did all this with such readiness that great merchants, above all Gualtherus Busius, offered him a share of the profit if he would come into their houses.[8] He stayed with the notary a full three years, the Life says, uncertain what course his life would take, except when the enemy drew near and sudden provision had to be made for the cities, and then he went to help his father.[9] It names Tholen and Bergen op Zoom, which the Duke of Parma was then threatening, and in the next year Walcheren, where Parma was gathering a fleet at Dunkirk and thirty thousand soldiers, and the Zeelanders, who did not know that the fleet was meant for England, fortified the corner of Walcheren by the church of the Blessed Virgin, where a great fleet could have put in.[10] It was there that the second turn of his life came, in the year that Polyander and the ADB give as 1588; the NNBW puts his entry to the Latin school at about the same time.[11]

Polyander tells it in two sentences. The young man had gone to the farthest shores of Walcheren, where the Zeelanders feared that the Spanish fleet would land, and as he lay on straw in a tent by night with his father he perceived, "by a certain sacred impulse," that he was being roused to give his work to the study of theology for the church of God, and the force of that impulse was so great that he could never lay down the memory of it.[12] The Life tells the same night in nearly the same

---

[4] *Vita*, 604 [PDF 654] ("sedatum prudentemque, curarum voluit partem habere"). The NNBW says that the boy stood by his father in this work (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514).

[5] *Vita*, 604 [PDF 654].

[6] *Vita*, 604 [PDF 654] ("quem dudum animo nondum ausi sunt reipsa studiis dicare, rerum vicissitudinem aliquoties experti"). The ADB says that his parents' finances did not at once allow him to go to Leiden (Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643), van der Aa that for want of money he could not continue his studies (Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33), and the NNBW that the family's goods were nearly all lost (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514).

[7] *Vita*, 604 [PDF 654]. The NNBW names the notary as Joost van Laren (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514).

[8] *Vita*, 604 [PDF 654].

[9] *Vita*, 604 [PDF 654].

[10] *Vita*, 604–5 [PDF 654–55]. The Life dates the threat to Tholen and Bergen op Zoom to 1587 ("anno MD LXXXVII") and puts Walcheren in the year after ("in Walachria anno sequenti"). Polyander says that his father was then procurator of war and of the public provisions in Zeeland and the neighboring parts of Flanders and Brabant, and that he needed the son's help on his journeys (*Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column: "Rei Bellicæ Annonæque publicæ in Zelandia & vicina, Flandriæ & Brabantiæ regione Procurator").

[11] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column ("ab anno Domini 1588"); Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643. The NNBW does not tell of the night; it gives "omstreeks 1588" for his entry to the Latin school (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514).

[12] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column.

words and adds something about the man to whom it is said to have come.[13] It says that he was free of slavish fear of God and of superstition, that he gave the least weight to the divine inspirations that others often proclaim, and that for a time he thought he should not rest until he had turned a colleague, who was too much given to such things, to the opposite opinion.[14] The ADB says that he believed himself called to the service of God's Word during a night in 1588, and the NNBW places his entry to the Latin school at about the same year and ties his love of the ministry to his "emotievolle jeugd."[15] Polyander and the Life agree on the shore, the tent, his father beside him, and the night, and Polyander and the ADB agree on the year.

Two things in these accounts deserve notice. The first is that the call came, on both of the accounts that tell it, to a young man at work in his father's service in a time of war and not to a pupil at a desk, so that his schooling in letters began after he had learned to write a notary's instrument and to carry stores to a threatened coast. The second is that the one account that is willing to say what kind of man he was says that he was not credulous and set little store by the inspirations that others make much of. He is given there as a man not easily moved by such things, for whom the impulse was the more remarkable on that account, and I take it as the Life gives it.

The Life says that he asked his parents' leave and went to the Latin school at Middelburg.[16] The rector was Jacobus Gruterus, whom the Life calls diligent and so versed in Greek and Latin letters that at that time he was thought to yield to none of the Belgians, and he had one assistant, Johannes Murdisonius, a philosopher whom the Life calls acute and sound and who not long afterward became a professor of philosophy at Leiden.[17] Polyander and the ADB name the same two men.[18] The accounts differ on when he came to them.[19] Polyander says that at about sixteen he obtained his father's leave to return to letters at Middelburg, although the father needed his help on his journeys, and van der Aa likewise says that at sixteen he was allowed to take up his studies again, while the ADB and the NNBW tie the school to 1588 and to the call. I give both and settle neither. Every account that names his teachers at this school names Gruterus and Murdisonius, and the Life says that he left it for Leiden on their advice.

What the Life says he took from them is specific. It says that from them he learned Latin to the point of composing an elegant Latin poem and of delivering public orations so well that Gruterus judged it for the honor of himself and of his pupil that they be printed, and that he advanced no less

---

[13] *Vita*, 605 [PDF 655]. The Life repeats the oration at two points, "sacro quodam instinctu" and "tanta vis fuit atque efficacia."

[14] *Vita*, 605 [PDF 655] ("alienus à servili Dei metu, à superstitione semper extitit"; "quas sæpe prædicant alii, minimum tribuit").

[15] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643 ("glaubte sich aber während einer Nacht im J. 1588 von Gott selbst zum Dienste seines Worts berufen"); Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514.

[16] *Vita*, 605 [PDF 655] ("impetrata parentum venia").

[17] *Vita*, 605 [PDF 655]; Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33, who calls Gruterus rector of the Latin school and Murdison later professor at Leiden; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514, who names the rector Gruterus and the teacher Murdisonius.

[18] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column ("à Iacobo Grutero & Iohanne Murdisonio fideliter institutus"); Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643.

[19] Sources differ on when he entered the Latin school. Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column ("circa annum ætatis suæ 16. Middelburgi ad studia literarum, quasi postliminio, rediret"); Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33 ("16 jaren oud"); Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643, where the school follows the night of 1588; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1514 ("omstreeks 1588"). A boy born in October 1573 was sixteen between October 1589 and October 1590. The Life gives no year for his entry.

in Greek, so that he composed Greek verses, some of which are still read among his poems.[20] In philosophy, it says, he laid solid foundations, so that Gruterus and Murdisonius held public disputations with him on the syllogism, on the order of the books of Aristotle's ethics, on the world, and on other controversies of philosophy, which, it adds, had never been done in the Middelburg school before or after.[21] Walaeus always believed, the Life says, that it had served him best to be taught by Gruterus and Murdisonius alone and not to be made to change masters or pass from class to class, because what is handed on by familiar teachers is the more easily grasped.[22]

I do not press any of this beyond what it says. The Life is a praising life, and a rector who wishes to print his pupil's orations is what a praising life tells. But the shape of the schooling is plain, and it fits the notices. He was taught Latin and Greek by one rector and philosophy by one assistant, who went on to a chair at Leiden, and he was taught in a school in which, on the Life's report, public disputation in philosophy was new. When his teachers told him that it was time for the Academy, the Life says, he chose Leiden over Franeker because it was nearer to Middelburg and had more professors in every faculty, and more famous ones.[23]

2.2 Leiden, 1596 to 1599

He went to Leiden in 1596. Polyander says that he was sent across to the Academy at the beginning of that year, and the Life says that he went in April, with his mother and with Johannes Ytsenbachius, a minister of Middelburg, and took lodging with Thomas Spranckhusius, a minister of the Leiden church, along with two fellow students, whom the Life names Gerson Pannelius and Enoch Sterthemius.[24] Spranckhusius, the Life says, set the same example of gentle manners and true piety to all his lodgers as to his own children, who were also students of theology.[25] The three years that the notices give him there are what the Life's own dates give, from April 1596 to the sailing of 23 May, which Polyander's oration puts in 1599; and the NNBW and van der Aa say in so many words that the study took three years.[26]

Polyander names the men he heard. They are Franciscus Raphelengius, professor of Hebrew; Franciscus Junius; Lucas Trelcatius the elder; and his host Franciscus Gomarus, professors of theology, and he adds that Walaeus proved his quickness in the constant exercises of disputations and theses, to the satisfaction of the doctors and of his fellows.[27] The ADB names Trelcatius, Junius, and Gomarus, and van der Aa adds that he heard Raphelengius and Junius in Hebrew and

---

[20] *Vita*, 605 [PDF 655]. The Life does not say which collection of poems it has in view.

[21] *Vita*, 605 [PDF 655].

[22] *Vita*, 605 [PDF 655]. The Life adds that he was admitted to Gruterus's table, where the two teachers lived together, so that they might know his temper more closely, and that Gruterus afterward passed over all his own kinsmen and made him guardian of his children (*Vita*, 605–6 [PDF 655–56]).

[23] *Vita*, 606 [PDF 656] ("pluribus in quavis facultate Professoribus, ac celebrioribus quam Franequerana ornaretur").

[24] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column ("initio Anni 1596"); *Vita*, 606 [PDF 656] ("in Aprili Anni millesimi quingentesimi nonagesimi sexti"). The ADB and the NNBW give 1596 (Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515), and the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* gives 1596 to 1599 for his study of theology at Leiden (Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus").

[25] *Vita*, 606 [PDF 656].

[26] Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515 ("in drie jaar tijds"); Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33 ("Na drie jaren aan de academie vertoefd te hebben"); *Vita*, 606 [PDF 656], 609 [PDF 659].

[27] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column.

Junius, Trelcatius, and Gomarus in theology.[28] No account names a different teacher of theology. Where he lived while he heard them is another matter.[29]

The Life gives the order of his study, and it is the order that I think best shows what kind of student he was. It says that he made his first year, in which others only look about to see what they should study and how, a year of serious study, and that he laid the work out so: first he perfected his knowledge of the languages, then philosophy, and when that was finished he undertook theology at last, "for words must be learned before things."[30] For Greek, it says, he gave himself above all to the poets, and among them most to Homer, and to go deeper into the language he consulted Joseph Scaliger on single points, a man of great spirit and astonishing learning, to whom, the Life says, Walaeus was dear.[31] From Greek he passed to Hebrew under Raphelengius, from whose grammar of Martin he drew the first rudiments, and when Raphelengius soon died Junius took the work for a time, and under him Walaeus made such progress that he could understand the books of the Old Testament without an interpreter.[32] He did not go to the rabbis, the Life says, because he judged that men who spend too much effort on the languages seldom take hold of the weightier disciplines, and while he learned Greek and Hebrew he wearied his mind with no other study, except that for relaxation he turned now and then to the ancient Latin historians, poets, and orators.[33]

For philosophy the Life says what he found and what he did, and it is detailed. It says that philosophy was then little advanced in the Leiden Academy, that Petrus Molinaeus was newly come, that Jacobus Trutius was hindered, and that Rodolphus Snellius alone stood out in mathematics, so that Walaeus sat under Snellius and was taught by him geometry, astronomy, and optics, to the great gain of his other studies, since mathematics sharpens the mind and accustoms the thoughts to fix on one thing.[34] In logic, it says, he used Keckermann, with Zabarella and others added; in physics, Toletus, Zabarella, and Piccolomini; in ethics he was most delighted with Acciaiolus, and he read Piccolomini, Magirus, and Muret as well; and he read the metaphysics of Suárez for the most part, and Thomas and Scotus.[35] From these, it says, he went to the sources, to Plato and Aristotle, whom he read in their own language and whole, because those who know them through interpreters get scarcely half.[36] It adds that he joined to them Plotinus, Ficino, Simplicius, Aphrodisias, and Averroes as expositors, and that he judged that the Peripatetics of his day follow the philosophy of Aphrodisias or of Averroes rather than that of Aristotle.[37] He needed no guide in all this, the Life says, because he had drawn the solid foundations of each part of philosophy from

---

[28] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643; Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33.

[29] Sources differ on where he lived at Leiden. The ADB speaks of a place in the States College (Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643: "eine Stelle im Staatencolleg"); the Life says that he lodged first with Spranckhusius and then took his meals at Gomarus's table, with a room in the next house, and moved into Gomarus's own house some months later (*Vita*, 606–7 [PDF 656–57]); the NNBW says that during the last part of his time he lived with Gomarus (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515); and Polyander calls Gomarus his host ("hospitem suum Franciscum Gomarum," *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column).

[30] *Vita*, 606 [PDF 656] ("Verba enim debent prius quam res addisci").

[31] *Vita*, 606 [PDF 656].

[32] *Vita*, 606 [PDF 656].

[33] *Vita*, 606–7 [PDF 656–57].

[34] *Vita*, 607 [PDF 657].

[35] *Vita*, 607 [PDF 657]. The Life writes the name in the ablative as "Accioalo."

[36] *Vita*, 607 [PDF 657] ("quos sua lingua legit, hoc est integros; quum qui ex interpretibus sapiunt, vix dimidium assequantur").

[37] *Vita*, 607 [PDF 657]. The judgment on the Peripatetics is given there as his.

Murdisonius, and his reading made him stand out among his fellow students, who found that when he objected to the presidents of the disputations they could not easily extract themselves. The Life describes him as subtle in finding an argument, ready in thinking one out, plain in explaining it, and sharp in pressing it.[38]

What the Life says about his purpose in all this is, to my mind, the most important sentence of the section. It says that he wished above all to direct philosophy to theology, and that to do it with sounder judgment he thought he needed the counsel of a great theologian, and for that reason he changed his lodging, with the good will of Spranckhusius, and was admitted to the table of Franciscus Gomarus.[39] It says that he took a room in the next house, to move into Gomarus's house when a place should come free, which it did after some months.[40] The Life names the three men who then adorned the theological faculty. It calls Junius a theologian of profound learning, grave and full of judgment; Lucas Trelcatius the elder, solid and quick; and Gomarus a man of many-sided learning, with fervent and vehement zeal; and it says that Walaeus esteemed Junius above the others and tried to shape himself on his pattern.[41] This is a statement of preference among three teachers by the one witness who gives it, and I record it as the Life's report.

How he began in theology is told plainly. The Life says that he did not begin with the *Loci communes* of the authors, so as not to be filled with anyone's opinion or drawn from the truth itself by a prejudgment, but gave himself wholly to the reading of Holy Scripture, after he had read the formulas of concord of the Reformed churches, the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Belgic Confession several times.[42] It says that he read Scripture attentively and constantly, that he committed the chief heads of doctrine to memory, so that even as an old man he could recite the Epistle to the Romans, the second to the Corinthians, and those to the Galatians, the Ephesians, and the Philippians, and that he read in the vernacular so that the words of Scripture would come the more readily to mind when he preached.[43] Scripture alone did not give him the whole body of doctrine in view, the Life says, and so he came to the *Institutiones* of Bucanus, which let him see all theology at one glance in compendium. He did not stay long in the compendium, because it was like an outline drawing, which has lines and not the color and light of the thing, and he turned to the *Institutes* of Calvin and the *Loci communes* of Peter Martyr.[44] Martyr pleased him, the Life says, because he went through the whole doctrine, set out the state of each controversy, and decided it on solid ground, and he thought that Calvin should be added because the Reformed had rightly followed him as their leader, passing over lighter things, pursuing what had use, and setting forth with grace and majesty the matters in which the force of the Reformers' judgment lay.[45]

Trelcatius and afterward Gomarus began to explain the *Loci communes* in private, the Life says, and he decided to hear them, because things are handled more familiarly and more briefly in private than in public, though he gave himself chiefly to the public lectures, which were the more accurate and the more learned. It adds that men who try to master theology by private reading of authors alone fall into foreign, ridiculous, and even ruinous opinions because they do not grasp the

[38] *Vita*, 607 [PDF 657].
[39] *Vita*, 607 [PDF 657] ("Philosophiam præcipue voluit ad Theologiam dirigere").
[40] *Vita*, 607 [PDF 657].
[41] *Vita*, 607 [PDF 657].
[42] *Vita*, 607–8 [PDF 657–58].
[43] *Vita*, 608 [PDF 658].
[44] *Vita*, 608 [PDF 658].
[45] *Vita*, 608 [PDF 658].

connection of the doctrine, and that Junius's order of lectures guided his study, any scruple left after a lecture being taken away in private conversation.[46] When he was well advanced in the *Loci* he went to the commentaries on Scripture, first the *Analysis* of Piscator, to take in the whole thread of the text, but the sense of Scripture he drew from Calvin, whom he used to call the divine interpreter, adding Beza on the New Testament and Mercer on the Old and Arias Montanus, to gain a knowledge of Jewish government and rites.[47]

The Life says that the work cost him. It says that he gave to study not whole days only but half the nights, that in his first lodging at Leiden a quartan fever wore him for fourteen months, and that a low fever with a cough followed which threatened consumption, and that he slackened nothing of his study for either, and it adds that his conduct at Leiden and on the journey was blameless and that parents of other students held him up as an example.[48]

When he had read and heard for a long time, the Life says, he began to prepare himself for action and to bring out in public what he had taken in. He disputed in public on true theology, on the mystery of the Trinity, and on the office of Christ the Mediator, and so excited no small admiration, because he was well versed in philosophy and answered to the terms of the question, and he always sealed his answer with a place of Scripture, pleasant to hear and ready to hand.[49] It says that he preached privately, under the direction of Trelcatius, and that his first public sermon was at Voorschoten, to a great concourse of hearers who expected nothing ordinary from his learning.[50] His teachers judged him fit for the ministry, but he could not yet satisfy himself, and before he taught others or ruled a church he thought he should consult learned men elsewhere.[51] The NNBW and van der Aa do not carry this much detail, but they agree with it on the main things, that he came to Leiden in 1596, that he stayed three years, and that he heard Junius, Trelcatius, and Gomarus.

The order that the Life gives is languages, then philosophy, then theology, and in theology Scripture and the confessions first, then a body of doctrine, then the commentators, then disputation and preaching. That is the order of a man who wishes to read an author in the author's own language and to hold the whole of Scripture in his mind before he lets any master tell him what it means. I do not claim that Walaeus made it his rule from the first, only that his biographer says he did, and I note that it puts the languages and the text of Scripture ahead of every digest of them.

2.3 The Study Tour, 1599 to 1601

In 1599 he set out on the journey that took him out of the Netherlands for about two years. Polyander says that he was held by a desire to see foreign churches and lands, and that in 1599 he went from Zeeland into France, traveled through it with a distinguished man, Apollonius Schotte, visited a number of churches, and came to Geneva.[52] The Life gives the way he went. It says that he thought he should consult learned men in other places, go through the universities, and look at the

---

[46] *Vita*, 608 [PDF 658].

[47] *Vita*, 608 [PDF 658] ("Scripturæ sensum … Calvino hausit, quem divinum solebat Interpretem appellare"). The Life adds that he gave most to his own diligence, reading the same author again and again so as to take in his temper, his manner of speech, and his way of connecting, proving, and concluding.

[48] *Vita*, 616 [PDF 666].

[49] *Vita*, 609 [PDF 659] ("de Vera Theologia, de Mysterio Trinitatis, de Christi Mediatoris Officio").

[50] *Vita*, 609 [PDF 659].

[51] *Vita*, 609 [PDF 659].

[52] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column ("Anno 1599. ex Zelandia in Galliam profectus est").

government of other churches, above all at Geneva and in Switzerland, from which the Reformation had come and where the churches were thought to be better ordered, and that with Apollonius Schotte, a jurist, the son of a consul of Middelburg and afterward a senator of the Supreme Court of Holland and Zeeland, as his companion, he sailed from Vlissingen on 23 May in a warship that his father had provided against pirates.[53]

The Life gives the first stage in days. It says that he landed at the mouth of the Seine on the 25th, went through Rouen and the small towns about it, and entered Paris on the 29th.[54] At Paris, it says, he stayed and looked. All nations meet there, every kind of life is practiced there, and all parts of learning are taught more fully there than elsewhere; he marveled that the king exercised the supreme power so much at his pleasure and yet that the people loved him with an incredible love; and he gave his attention above all to philosophy and theology. What flourished among the Roman Catholics displeased him most, the Life says, because it was merely scholastic and rested neither on Scripture nor on sound reason nor on sense, and the Reformed there had neither theology nor philosophy to profess and did not enjoy full freedom in preaching and in the government of the church.[55] He therefore thought that he should not stay long in those parts. He went by Orléans, Bourges, Lyon, Orange, and Vienne toward the coast of the Mediterranean, where the Reformed were thought to be freer and stronger, and at Vienne he found that money, the sinews of a journey, was failing, and the Life speaks of a further sum that he had arranged to receive at Geneva.[56] Neighboring churches invited him, on generous terms, to teach philosophy and theology privately, with a helper to lighten the work, and he refused, because he did not see the need of such a school so near to Geneva and Lausanne, and did not wish to be exposed among foreigners to the envy of others with no kinsmen to protect him.[57] Schotte brought him as far as Grenoble, and from there he came to Geneva in August.[58]

At Geneva he lodged, the Life says, with Charles Perrot, a minister of the Word and professor of sacred theology, and Polyander and van der Aa name the same host, the latter as Charles Perros.[59] Polyander says that he stayed there almost a whole year and found the singular good will of Theodore Beza, Antoine Faye, and Perrot his host.[60] The Life adds particulars. It says that his first care at Geneva was to learn French well, by diligent reading of French authors and frequent talk with the citizens, and that he made such progress that he not seldom preached in it. It says that the professors of theology were Beza, Faye, and Perrot; that Beza, who was past eighty years of age, no longer lectured in public; that Faye was of elegant learning but not a close expositor, and Perrot a truly learned man who showed less on the surface than he had within; and that, since each of them

---

[53] *Vita*, 609 [PDF 659]. Polyander gives the year (*Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column). The ADB says that he undertook a journey of study in 1599 and stayed until 1601 at the universities of Paris, Orléans, Geneva, Basel, and Heidelberg (Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643), and the NNBW that after 1599 there followed two years of travel, with his contemporary Apollonius Schotte, through France, Switzerland, and Germany (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515). The Life writes the day as "vigesimo tertio Maii" and the year, in the printer's numerals, as 1599.

[54] *Vita*, 609 [PDF 659].

[55] *Vita*, 609 [PDF 659].

[56] *Vita*, 609–10 [PDF 659–60].

[57] *Vita*, 610 [PDF 660].

[58] *Vita*, 610 [PDF 660] ("mense Augusto").

[59] *Vita*, 610 [PDF 660]; Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column; Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33. The ADB lists Geneva among the places of the journey without naming anyone (Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643).

[60] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column ("integrum ferme annum commoratus"). The Life's dates are consistent with that, since it has him arrive in August and leave on 1 June (*Vita*, 610 [PDF 660], 612 [PDF 662]).

hardly lectured once in a week, he gave himself diligently to hearing sermons, which are nowhere more frequent than at Geneva.[61] Of all he heard he most admired Beza, the Life says, in whom, though in his eighties, there still stood out the vigor of mind, the profound learning, the keen judgment, and the manly eloquence at which the whole world had rightly marveled, and he profited most in the Friday congregation, in which one of the ministers explains a place of Scripture and the rest add to it or correct it, except that when the turn came to Beza the others honored his interpretation with silence.[62] He profited also from Beza's conversation, which Beza turned always toward knowledge of oneself and reverence for God.[63] The Life is willing to say where he judged Beza less well. It says that Beza was then at work on the last edition of his New Testament, which Walaeus would rather have seen made less on the counsel of Piscator and after his mind, and it explains that the keenness of Beza's wit had begun to fail, and that the lofty genius and ripe judgment that had shone in Beza in the flower of his age were looked for in Piscator and not found.[64] I set it down as the Life gives it. It stands beside the Life's report that Beza was the man at Geneva whom he most admired. Of Perrot the Life says that the longer and closer the conversation with him, the more welcome it was, and that he strove not to seem pious or to seem learned but to be so, and it adds, a few lines on, that something of that talk clung to Walaeus all his life.[65]

The Life adds two things that bear on his reading. It says that he bought, when the stock of the printer Henri Estienne was sold cheaply after his death, a whole library of Greek authors, and that when a Genevan theologian who excelled in Hebrew persuaded him that an art of memory would give him the language quickly, he committed the whole *Epitome* of Pagninus to memory in six weeks, and then found that the images by which he held the words crowded his thoughts, and spent a fortnight clearing them away and kept only those that were of use.[66]

He left Geneva, the Life says, on 1 June, accompanied by a number of Netherlanders as far as Lausanne, and finding nothing there to detain a candidate in theology he hurried to Bern, where a chance event kept him for two months.[67] The event was a dispute over a hired horse, and while the suit was pending he went out through the rest of Switzerland, to Zurich and Schaffhausen.[68] Polyander says that at Lausanne and at Bern he grew close to the professors of each illustrious school, and the Life says that at Bern he made the closest friendship with the first head of the college there, who held out to him the hope of advancement if he would settle at Bern.[69]

From there he went to Basel, which Polyander and van der Aa both name. Polyander says that at Basel he paid his respects, most pleasantly, to the venerable old man Jacobus Grynaeus and to his son-in-law Amandus Polanus, and shared their table, and that he diligently heard the distinguished

---

[61] *Vita*, 610 [PDF 660] ("Beza, octuagesimum supergressus annum, lectionibus publicis abstinebat").

[62] *Vita*, 610 [PDF 660].

[63] *Vita*, 610 [PDF 660] ("ad sui notitiam, ad Dei venerationem dirigebat").

[64] *Vita*, 610 [PDF 660]. The preference is given as Walaeus's ("quam maluisset Walæus") and the explanation as the Life's own.

[65] *Vita*, 610–11 [PDF 660–61] ("Non enim videri pius, non videri doctus, sed esse conabatur").

[66] *Vita*, 611 [PDF 661].

[67] *Vita*, 612 [PDF 662] ("Kalendis itaque Junii Seculi"). The Life gives 1 June of the sixteenth century, and 1600 follows from his arrival at Geneva in August 1599 and Polyander's almost a whole year there. Van der Aa also gives two months at Bern (Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33).

[68] *Vita*, 612–13 [PDF 662–63].

[69] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column ("arctam cum utriusque Scholæ Illustris Professoribus familiaritatem contraxit"); *Vita*, 612–13 [PDF 662–63].

Buxtorf expounding the minor prophets with the commentaries of the rabbis.[70] Van der Aa has him seven months at Basel, hearing Jacobus Grynaeus and Johannes Buxtorf.[71] The Life describes the theologians in its own way. It says that Grynaeus was cautious, prudent, of solid learning, but intent on the government of the city, so that Basel was thought to be ruled by his nod, and that he lectured on universal history, so that he had more hearers who wished to know what was new in the world than hearers who wished to learn anything solid. It says that Polanus was a learned man of much and constant reading, and it remarks that men of such reading are commonly not strong in judgment and do not penetrate to the inmost parts of the disciplines. It says that Polanus taught the locus on predestination, and that Walaeus gave himself most of all to Buxtorf, who was apt in teaching and most skilled in the genius of the language and in Jewish antiquities, though Walaeus gave the rabbinical commentaries only the odd hours, since those mines, he said, called for more labor and gave less gold.[72]

At Basel he did what a student of theology did there, and he was heard. The Life says that, having compared the professors of Leiden, Geneva, Lausanne, Bern, and Basel, he judged that some had a name without wide or deep learning, and resolved to venture something in public himself, abroad rather than at home, so that whatever was still rough in him might be polished where it could not stand in the way of his future advancement.[73] It says that he wrote and published verses on occasions, that he drew up theses on the providence of God, composed wholly of the words of Holy Scripture, and disputed them in public under Polanus, repeating them in order, answering aptly, and proving solidly, so that the lion could be seen from the claw. It says that he was then given leave to dispute from the professor's chair and to preside over the disputations of the students, and that he did it often, so that when one of the professors was hindered they went at once to Walaeus to take his place, and that the Basel professors wished to bear witness to him in a public diploma for the Netherlands churches.[74] Polyander says the same of the presiding: that, as was the custom of that Academy, he was asked by Grynaeus and Polanus not only to attend the disputations of the theological students but to preside over them in their place, and that he at last satisfied the request of Grynaeus in that part, to the great praise of his hearers.[75] The two accounts agree, and I take the main fact as secure: that at Basel a young man from Zeeland was asked to preside over the disputations of the theological students there.

[70] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column ("Iacobum Grynæum ejusque generum Amandum Polanum"; "Virum Cl[arissimum] Buxtorfium minores Prophetas cum Rabbinorum commentariis interpretantem").

[71] Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33 ("Bazel, waar hij 7 maanden bleef en Jacobus Grinaeus en Johannes Buxtorf hoorde").

[72] *Vita*, 613 [PDF 663] ("Locum de Prædestinatione").

[73] *Vita*, 613 [PDF 663].

[74] *Vita*, 613–14 [PDF 663–64].

[75] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column.

From Basel, the Life says, he went by Speyer to Heidelberg, where he hesitated for some time whether to spend the summer months there or to go through Germany and come back to Leiden around winter.[76] It says that he was moved by the fame of the Academy, which was the only Reformed academy that could contend with Leiden, and by the library of manuscripts, which was open to him through his countryman Janus Gruterus, and that the theological professors were Daniel Tossanus, who was old and lived only a few months more, and David Pareus, who was expounding the prophet Hosea, whom Walaeus had heard Buxtorf expound a short time before.[77] The Life judges the church government of the Palatinate not to be imitated by the Netherlands churches, since eight laymen of the civil government and eight ministers made the council that held the supreme power in church affairs under the prince, and that council chose ministers, set them over towns and villages, moved them from place to place, and put an end to theological disputes, often against the will and always without the knowledge of the members of the church.[78] It says that he then went through the whole Palatinate, stayed for some time at Frankfurt on the Main, went through Hesse, to Marburg in the Academy and to Kassel at the court, where he was admitted with honor to speak with the Landgrave Maurice; then to the duchy of Brunswick, to the bishopric of Bremen, and to Bremen itself, where he stayed; and then, that he might not be a stranger to his own house, through Frisia, Overijssel, and Gelderland to Utrecht, and in the autumn to Leiden and to Gomarus's house.[79] Here the sources differ on the length of the absence. Polyander, the NNBW, and van der Aa give two years, and the Life says that he was away almost three years.[80] I give both.

What he did at Leiden on his return closes the education. The Life says that before he settled to study at Leiden he satisfied his parents' longing by a visit to Middelburg, and then went back to Leiden at once, and that he found the Academy somewhat changed.[81] It says that he now studied more as his own master than before, no longer following this or that lecture but going through theology in his own mind, weighing its several parts, and examining himself to see how far he had entered into them; that when he found a defect he consulted books and made it good by thinking and by conferring with Junius and Gomarus; and that he gave himself most of all to the reading of the Fathers, and above all of Augustine, because Augustine was the most vigorous of them and the keenest in disputing.[82] I take that as the most important thing the Life says about his reading after the tour, and I take it with the care that I gave the rest. It is the Life's statement, and the oration does not make it.

The last facts of the education are the calls that did not take him away. The ADB says that hardly had he come home when he received a call to be preacher to the congregation at Leiden, and that he

---

[76] *Vita*, 614 [PDF 664].

[77] *Vita*, 614 [PDF 664].

[78] *Vita*, 614 [PDF 664]. The Life gives this as a judgment, and I report it as such.

[79] *Vita*, 614–15 [PDF 664–65]. Polyander says that in 1601, when he had completed two years of travel, he went through Germany, greeted the Academy of Heidelberg and the school of Bremen, and returned to Leiden (*Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column: "salutata Academia Heydelbergensi & Schola Bremensi"). Van der Aa likewise names the Academy at Heidelberg and the school at Bremen on his way back (Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33), and the NNBW has him back at Leiden with Gomarus in 1601 (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515).

[80] Sources differ on the length of the journey. Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column ("biennium sua peregrinatione"); Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515 ("nog twee jaren van reizen"); Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33 ("Na een afwezigheid van twee jaren"); *Vita*, 615 [PDF 665] ("triennium propemodum"). From 23 May 1599 to the autumn of 1601 is two years and some months.

[81] *Vita*, 615 [PDF 665].

[82] *Vita*, 615 [PDF 665] ("Maxime se lectioni patrum, & præsertim Augustini, dedit").

refused it because he thought so wide a field of work too heavy for his young strength.[83] Polyander says that the presbytery of Leiden asked him to be its pastor but that he could not obtain a stay there from his parents and friends, and the NNBW says that he declined, and that the classis of Walcheren then sought a man for the Reformed church at Calais and that he declined that too.[84] The Life says that in the spring of 1602 he went home to Middelburg, where he submitted to what the Middelburg ministers call the preparatory examination, with Jacobus Cornelii as examiner, and that thereafter he preached before the ministers each month and sat at their council each week.[85] I read that as the church's own test of a call that had come to him on the shore in 1588. The Life says of the Calais vacancy that Middelburg tried to send him there and that his parents opposed it, and that he himself drew back because no lawful call had come before; it says that the dispute was ended by Koudekerke, a village near Middelburg, whose pastor had died and which at once chose Walaeus as its minister.[86] He took up the ministry at Koudekerke on 13 November 1602, and with that the education ends and the ministry begins.[87]

2.4 Influences as They Appear in His Own Writing

Everything so far is what others say of his teachers and his books. This section turns to what Walaeus says himself, and it has to be short, because the places where he names a man whom he follows or weighs are few, and I want to stay with those.

The first is the dedicatory letter to his *Compendium ethicæ*, which speaks directly of the philosophy that the Life says he read so closely. The book is entitled *Compendium ethicæ Aristotelicæ ad normam veritatis Christianæ revocatum*. The letter is addressed to the curators of the illustrious school of Middelburg, whom it names, and it is dated at Leiden in 1620.[88] He writes first of ethics

---

[83] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643.

[84] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column ("à parentibus amicisque mansionem non potuit obtinere"); Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515. Sources differ on the reason for declining Leiden: the ADB gives his own sense that the field was too wide, and Polyander points to his parents and friends. The Life gives both, saying that to govern a large church when he had never seen a small one directed was a grave thing, that after fervent prayer he could settle his mind only by submitting the call to his parents' will, and that his parents, through Gomarus, thanked the consistory and asked that their son be excused (*Vita*, 616 [PDF 666]). Of the Calais call the Life says that his parents had earlier hindered his staying at Leiden (*Vita*, 617 [PDF 667]).

[85] *Vita*, 616 [PDF 666] ("Middelburgi se statim examini, ut vocant, præparatorio subjecit").

[86] *Vita*, 616–17 [PDF 666–67].

[87] *Vita*, 617 [PDF 667] ("idibus Novemb[ris] Anni millesimi sexcentesimi secundi"). The Ides of November fall on the thirteenth. The ADB says that he entered the office at Koudekerke in November 1602 (Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643). Polyander's clause for the village is "in pagum Middelburgo vicinum, cui à Cauchis est nomen" (to a village near Middelburg that is named from the Cauchi); he places that call a little after the Leiden call and the call to Middelburg two years later (*Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column). He does not write the name Koudekerke, which comes from the Life (617 [PDF 667]), the ADB (643), and the NNBW (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515).

[88] Antonius Walaeus, *Compendium ethicæ Aristotelicæ ad normam veritatis Christianæ revocatum*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 257, 259–60 (images 841, 843–44). The curators are named at 259 as Jacobus Schotius, a former consul; Simeon Beaumontius, the pensionary; Johannes Visscherus, a councillor of the city of Middelburg; and the ministers Hermannus Faukelius and Enochus Sterthemius, and the letter closes at Leiden, "ex Musæo nostro," in September of the year 1620 (260). The letter to the reader at the head of the first volume says that he handed the *Compendium* to his pupils, that the curators of the illustrious school repeatedly petitioned for its printing, and that it was afterward received in the schools of Holland and West Friesland and reprinted often (image 6). Sources differ on the date of the work: the ADB says that the *Compendium* was included in a programme for the Latin schools that the States of Holland adopted in 1625 (Van Slee, "Walaeus," 644), the NNBW that it was published in 1627, with the matter that he had already taught at the Latin school at Middelburg (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1516), and Van der Aa cites an edition of Leiden, 1627, reprinted at Amsterdam in 1686 (Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34).

itself. Among the parts of philosophy, he says, it alone sets forth the actions of men in the light of virtue and prescribes the rules by which the manners of men in the city, the family, and private converse take on honesty and are marked off from the company of beasts and robbers.[89] Great men whom God raised up among the Gentiles labored at it, and chiefly Plato and Aristotle. He notes that some hold Plato as far above Aristotle in morals as Aristotle is above Plato in physics, and that for some centuries among Christians the writings of Aristotle were preferred in the schools and academies in this field too, and he says that taking up that quarrel is not his purpose now.[90]

What he does say about both philosophers is plain, and it is the clearest statement of influence in his writing. He says that both, though they stand far above the other Gentiles, were without the true light of Holy Scripture and of the Holy Spirit and for that reason committed no small errors in their decrees and precepts, and that those serve the commonwealths and churches of Christians well who honor their writings in their place and still use the necessary freedom of Christians in marking and refuting their errors.[91] He gives the reason: otherwise, from the authority of such men, prejudices are formed little by little in the tender minds of the young, which can scarcely be removed from them when they are grown except with great labor, and in the commonwealths and churches of Christians they have often been the cause of great disturbances, when men try to direct Christian theology by the norms of Aristotle's doctrine and not Aristotle's decrees by the norm of Christian truth.[92] He says that many examples could be brought from the home and the forum, and that he does not do it because his purpose is to heal wounds and not to open them again.[93]

He then says why he wrote. The teaching of this science in the illustrious school of Middelburg had been committed to him by the curators, and he had put before his pupils a compendium of it drawn from Aristotle himself, in which what was useful in Aristotle and the others was chosen briefly and plainly according to the smallness of his judgment.[94] He had not conceived it for publication, but its publication had been earnestly urged on him by the curators before he left their church and school for the Academy, and after some days spent in revising it he sent it out, so that those who had heard it from him before might recall it and others who wished might be helped and directed by it in this part of philosophy.[95] He knew that others had labored before him in the field, and he wished nothing taken from their diligence, and he names two of them. Among the theologians of his own side, he says, Melanchthon and Danaeus had approved their industry to the churches in this field also, but they take only a few things from Aristotle for their use and carry over the most from the practice of theology itself, so that they have built a new work of another kind, of little use for understanding Aristotle and the other ethicists.[96] He says that he would wish Christian philosophers to use greater freedom, so that the young might come to the sources themselves with less danger, but while they scarcely dare to depart a nail's breadth from the opinions of Aristotle, they are driven either to wrong the truth or to make Aristotle himself speak against his own mind.[97] What he

---

[89] Walaeus, *Compendium*, 259.

[90] Walaeus, *Compendium*, 259 ("Nobis vero in præsentia hanc litem nostram facere non est propositum").

[91] Walaeus, *Compendium*, 259 ("S[anctæ] Scripturæ, Spiritusque Sancti vera luce destitutus fuerit, ac proinde in decretis & præceptis suis haud exiguos errores commiserit").

[92] Walaeus, *Compendium*, 259.

[93] Walaeus, *Compendium*, 259.

[94] Walaeus, *Compendium*, 259 ("compendium aliquod illius ex ipso Aristotele discipulis nostris proposuerim").

[95] Walaeus, *Compendium*, 259.

[96] Walaeus, *Compendium*, 260 ("Inter Theologos nostros Melanchthon & Danæus industriam suam hic quoque Ecclesiis probarunt").

[97] Walaeus, *Compendium*, 259–60 ("vix latum unguem").

undertook instead was to set out the matters that Aristotle treats, chiefly in the *Ethics* to Nicomachus, with the opinions of the other philosophers collated, in nearly the same order, and in brief, and to correct the errors that he had observed in them by the norm of Christian truth.[98]

That is Walaeus on Aristotle in his own words, and it bears on a judgment that van der Aa passed on him. Van der Aa says of his effort to bring a Christian ethics into being that he showed himself, as an interpreter of the Bible, not at all free of the bonds of the schools, and that one could say that in the field of ethics Aristotle was honored above Christ.[99] I give that as van der Aa's opinion. What Walaeus says of the work is that it is the ethics of Aristotle corrected by the norm of Christian truth, and that the two philosophers he names as the chief of the ancients lacked the light of Scripture and fell into no small errors. The title of the book says the same.

The second place is the *Loci communes*, where in the locus on the form of justification he names Calvin twice, both times on that point (426, 428). He says there that although some among the Reformed speak so as to set two parts of justification, the remission of sins and the imputation of righteousness, by which they mean active righteousness only, "we nevertheless, with Calvin and some others, prefer to put the imputation of righteousness first, because it is the cause of the remission of sins."[100] Two pages later, having set aside the view of some recent writers, he says, "we, with Calvin and most of the great reformers of the church, contend that both are necessary to our justification."[101] I do not draw from this a theory of how Calvin shaped him. What the pages show is that on justification Walaeus puts himself in the company of Calvin, and in the second passage in the company of Calvin and most of the great reformers, and that he is willing to say that some who are called Reformed speak otherwise. That fits the Life's report that he went to Calvin's *Institutes* in his first years of theology and called Calvin the divine interpreter. It does not prove that the habit began there, and I do not say that it does.

The third place is where he names Gomarus. In the locus on the knowledge of God, speaking of a middle knowledge in God that precedes the decree, he writes that there are some among the orthodox, "and among others Franciscus Gomarus in the Theses on predestination," who think that it must by all means be posited, both for certain places of Scripture that seem to assert it and so that the immutability of all God's decrees may be kept, and that it may be explained in some way how God, by his decree, is not the author or cause of evil.[102] He then sets out the places of Scripture that

---

[98] Walaeus, *Compendium*, 260 ("errores in iis à me observatos ad veritatis Christianæ normam corrigere").

[99] Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34 ("men zou kunnen zeggen dat Aristoteles, op het gebied der zedekunde, boven Christus gehuldigd werd").

[100] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De iustificationis forma," in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, 426 (image 442): "Etsi vero quidam inter Reformatos sic loquantur, ut statuant duas justificationis partes … nos tamen cum Calvino & aliis nonnullis malumus imputationem justitiæ præponere, quia est remissionis peccatorum causa." The *Loci communes* is undated; it is cited here from the *Opera omnia* of 1643. The editors of the volume say that the *Loci communes* had been printed two years before by the same printer (letter to the reader, image 7).

[101] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 428 (image 444): "Nos vero cum Calvino & plærisque [sic] magnis Ecclesiæ Reformatoribus, utrumque ad nostram justific[ationem] necessarium esse contendimus." The same page has "Quidam recentiores hoc contendunt." Calvin is named elsewhere in the works used here, in the letter to Polyander (image 989, left column), in the *Loci communes* in the locus on the Lord's day (images 311–12), and in that work's earlier locus on justification (72, image 88); this section takes up only the two passages in the locus on the form of justification.

[102] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De Dei scientia," in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, 175 (image 191): "Sunt tamen inter Orthodoxos nonnulli, atque inter alios Franciscus Gomarus in Thesibus de prædestinatione, qui eam omnino statuendam putent." The locus is undated.

are brought for it, among them 1 Samuel 23, Matthew 11, and Matthew 26, and says that the answers that some give to them do not seem to him to take away the force of the argument.[103] Chapter 12 takes up what he says on that page.

In his letter to Polyander he names Gomarus again, and with him a company of others, in a passage on how the freedom of the will is to be joined to God's governance, and here he does not simply follow any of them. He takes up a statement of Beza at the colloquy of Montbéliard, that the will, choosing between two things since it cannot choose both, chooses of its own accord what God had determined from eternity that it should choose, and he says that its words seem to him harsh, and that they do not fully satisfy the difficulty, because they do not explain why Adam and the angels fell from their goodness infallibly, when there was no earlier sin to punish and no vicious desire that inclined the will to transgress.[104] He takes up the axiom of Perkins, that as no good work can be done except by God's grace, so no evil work can be avoided except by the same grace, and he says that it too, if it is understood universally, is subject to the same difficulties, because the first angels and men who sinned were given grace enough to do good and avoid all evil.[105] He calls the view that God merely foresaw what the will would do, apart from any decree of his own, absurd in his judgment, because a thing could not be foreseen as future unless it were already future, and because it makes the will so much the master of its actions that nothing but itself rules it.[106]

The way out that he offers is set out in the lines that follow. "It seems to me altogether," he writes, that one must either, with Chytraeus, frankly confess our ignorance, or, with Gomarus, fall back on that middle or conditioned foreknowledge that many scholastics and more recent writers posit, "although it is undeservedly rejected by Ames."[107] Chytraeus, he adds, wrote that he had often heard from his teacher the words, "That all things are governed by God, I know; that there is contingency and liberty in things, I see; how these two are reconciled, I do not know."[108] He spends the rest of the letter on the second way. God knew, he says, in the light of his infinite knowledge, the whole series of things and causes that he could produce and what would infallibly follow from what, and knew before any decree how the will of man would incline, this or that being posited, without violence to its liberty, and by a free decree he then fixed this way rather than that. He adds that this treasure of things known is not to be made the cause of any later decree, as the Stoics and the Remonstrants contrive for another end, but is only the indeterminate object from which the

---

[103] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191). Among the printed references are 1 Samuel 23:12, Matthew 11:21, and Matthew 26:53; the page also cites Ezekiel (printed "Ezech. 2.16") in the words "Nonne si te mitterem ad gentes," which correspond to Ezekiel 3:6.

[104] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter headed "Johanni Polyandro," in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 405–7 (images 989–91), cited below by image and column. Here image 990, left column: "D. Beza in colloquio Mompelgartensi"; "mihi videntur duriora"; "non plene satisfaciunt." The letter has no date line of its own. A postscript on image 991 asks Polyander for a copy of the letters that Plessis had written to him on the controversies in Holland, and a French letter printed on the same page ends with the date "ce dernier jour de May 1616" (image 991, right column).

[105] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter to Polyander, image 990, left column: "Perkinsius ut hanc difficultatem tollat hoc axioma ponit"; "eisdem difficultatibus."

[106] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter to Polyander, image 990, right column.

[107] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter to Polyander, image 990, right column: "Videtur hic ergo omnino mihi, aut cum Chytræo, ignorantia nostra ingenue profitenda … Aut cum D. Gomaro recurrendum ad præscientiam illam mediam seu conditionatam, quam multi Scholastici & recentiores scriptores ponunt, etsi à D. Amesio immerito explodatur."

[108] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter to Polyander, image 990, right column: "Quod omnia à Deo gubernentur, scio."

divine will freely chose.[109] At the end he submits the whole to Polyander's judgment, because in this way, he thinks, the opinion of the Reformed Church can be better defended from the unjust charges of its adversaries and the several places of Scripture easily reconciled.[110]

That is what the four places taken up in this section give, and it can be put in a short list. He names Aristotle and Plato as the chief of the ancients and corrects them to Christian truth. He names Melanchthon and Danaeus as having worked the same field in a way that did not serve his purpose. In the locus on the form of justification he names Calvin twice and stands with him. He names Gomarus as holding middle knowledge and writes that one may fall back on it with him, he names Ames as rejecting it and Chytraeus as the alternative, and he names Beza and Perkins as men whose solutions he weighs and finds short. None of these passages names Junius, Trelcatius, Raphelengius, Gruterus, or Murdisonius, the men whom Polyander and the Life give as his teachers, and I do not put them in the list.

I want to say what that does and does not show. It shows the company that Walaeus himself names in these four places. It does not show where he first met the view of Gomarus on middle knowledge, because the *Loci communes* is undated and the letter to Polyander has no date, and none of the texts cited here says when he first came to it. What is known is that in his years at Leiden he lived at Gomarus's table and in Gomarus's house, heard Gomarus lecture, and took counsel with him again on his return from the tour. I put those two facts side by side, and I do not say that the one made the other.

He took the pulpit at Koudekerke in November 1602 with these teachers behind him and these books in his head. The next chapter follows him there, and then to Middelburg.

---

[109] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter to Polyander, image 990, right column.

[110] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter to Polyander, 407 (image 991, left column): "sententiam Ecclesiæ Reformatæ ab iniquis criminationibus adversariorum melius vindicari posse existimo, & S[anctæ] Scripturæ diversa loca facile conciliari."

Works Cited

Aa, A. J. van der. “Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale.” In *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20, 32–35. 1877. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/aa__001biog24_01/aa__001biog24_01_0091.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Bates, William, ed. *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum*. London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681. “Vita Antonii Walæi,” 600–659. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/vitaeselectoruma00bate.

Hulsbergen, S. J. M. “Antonius Walaeus.” *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*. Entry from the 1982–84 print edition. https://www.encyclopedievanzeeland.nl/index.php?title=Antonius_Walaeus&oldid=69677. Accessed 1 October 2026.

Lasonder, L. W. A. M. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, edited by P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2, cols. 1513–17. 1912. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/molh003nieu02_01/molh003nieu02_01_2538.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Polyander à Kerckhoven, Johannes. *Oratio funebris in obitum … Antonii Walæi*. Recited 14 July 1639. In Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1. Unpaginated front matter.

Slee, J. C. van. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40, 643–44. 1896. https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz84297.html.

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01.

Chapter 3
Early Ministry and the Middelburg Years

The previous chapter ended with Walaeus taking the pulpit at Koudekerke in November 1602, twenty-nine years old and trained in the languages, in philosophy, and in the theology of several Reformed schools. This chapter follows him through the nearly seventeen years that he spent on Walcheren after that day: first as the pastor of a village, then as one of the ministers of Middelburg, and in the same years as a teacher in the town's school, as the man whom Zeeland sent to bring Franciscus Gomarus to Middelburg, and as the author of a Dutch book on the office of the church's ministers. It closes with the summons of the Prince of Orange to The Hague in 1617, for some months, and with the invitation of the Duke of Bouillon to a chair at Sedan, and it stops there, on the eve of the call to Leiden that the next chapter takes up.

The question I put to these years is what Walaeus did in them, and I answer it from the records that name the thing done. My claim is a plain one. The Middelburg years show a man whose work was pastoral before it was anything else, a preacher, a catechist, and a visitor of the sick, who taught Greek and philosophy and defended the Reformed religion as part of that same work and not as a replacement for it, and who was asked to do more than he sought. Where a notice says only that he held an office and no record gives the content of the work, I say so and go no further.

The evidence is of five kinds. The first is the funeral oration of Johannes Polyander, which gives these years in a few sentences and puts a number of years to the pastorate and to the lectures.[1] The second is the Life of Walaeus printed in William Bates's collection of lives, which gives the pastoral work in detail, with his colleagues, his catechizing, his visits, and his controversies, and which is the only source in this chapter that does.[2] The third is the four reference notices named in the first chapter, which give the dates.[3] The fourth is a short statement in Dutch, signed by Walaeus himself, on how Gomarus came to Middelburg.[4] The fifth is the dedication of his *Compendium ethicæ* to the curators of the Middelburg school, which the last chapter used for his thought on

---

[1] Johannes Polyander à Kerckhoven, *Oratio funebris in obitum … Antonii Walæi*, in Antonius Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), unpaginated front matter, image 9, right column. Translations from the Latin, German, and Dutch in this chapter are mine. The conventions for Latin quotations and titles, for "image n," and for the "PDF" page numbers of Bates are those declared in note 1 of Chapter 1.

[2] "Vita Antonii Walæi," in William Bates, ed., *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum qui doctrina, dignitate, aut pietate inclaruere* (London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681), 600–659 [PDF 650–709]. Printed page numbers repeat in places in Bates, so each citation of him in the notes gives the printed page and, in brackets, the page of the digitized copy, which is the printed page plus fifty, or fifty-two at the second page numbered 636. The contents leaf names no author for this Life and the text carries no name. The ADB and the NNBW say that a Life by his son Johannes stands in the *Opera omnia* (J. C. van Slee, "Walaeus, Antonius," in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40 [1896], 644; L. W. A. M. Lasonder, "Walaeus, Antonius," in *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, ed. P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2 [1912], cols. 1516–17). I cite the text only as it is printed in Bates. The NNBW, which lists the Life as printed in Bates, gives the date of that volume as 1687, and the title leaf reads 1681.

[3] The notices are Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44; Lasonder, "Walaeus," cols. 1513–17; A. J. van der Aa, "Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale," in *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20 (1877), 32–35; and S. J. M. Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus," *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*, https://www.encyclopedievanzeeland.nl/index.php?title=Antonius_Walaeus&oldid=69677 (accessed 1 October 2026).

[4] Antonius Walaeus, "Wat de beroepinge D. Gomari tot Middelburch aengaet," in *Consilia et epistolæ*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, images 981–82; the leaf of image 982 is numbered 398. The statement carries no date. The text before it in the volume closes with the words "Aldus ghedaen, Anno, 1617." and I take no date for the statement from that.

Aristotle and which I use here for what it says of his teaching. The Life is a praising life, and I give its comparisons and its praise as its own. Where it agrees with Polyander or with the notices I say so, and where they differ I give each account and settle none.

3.1 Koudekerke and Middelburg Pastorates

The Life says that Koudekerke, a village near Middelburg, had lost its pastor in the meantime and at once chose Walaeus for its minister, and that this choice ended the dispute over Calais that the last chapter described.[5] He entered the ministry there, the Life says, on the Ides of November 1602, which is 13 November.[6] It tells what he felt. He counted it an honor to be judged worthy to be a servant of God, and in the same moment felt the weight of the charge, because to promote the honor of God and to care for souls is a task in which the least sin or neglect is an offense against the majesty of God. For that reason, the Life says, he began nothing in the ministry, either then or through the rest of his life, without first imploring the help of God, that prudence, courage, and strength might be given him.[7]

At Koudekerke, the Life says, he gained a readiness in preaching and a settled manner in the pulpit, and he learned to govern a church, to console the afflicted, and to stand against the obstinate and the sectarians, things whose first lessons can be got by hearing and seeing but which are not fully learned until the hand is put to the work.[8] He did it so well, it says, that the few sectarians who remained joined the church, and that the members revered him as a father.[9] The Life does not name these sectarians or say how many they were. I take this as the Life gives it: a young pastor in a small place learning the whole of the office, discipline and controversy as well as preaching.

His preaching was noticed beyond the village. In the fourth year of the century, 1604, the Life says, when Maurice, the commander of the United Netherlands, besieged Sluis, the classis of Walcheren judged Walaeus, ahead of the others, worthy to be joined in the siege to the court preacher Johannes Wtenbogaert, and there he formed an acquaintance with Wtenbogaert and not a friendship.[10] The Life draws the contrast in a few sentences. Wtenbogaert was an eloquent preacher who courted the favor of the great so as to stand out among his own people, while Walaeus aimed to please God rather than men, and was the first to obtain, by prayers and warnings, that no perjury should be heard among the leaders of the army. The Life adds that Wtenbogaert thought too highly of Socinus and that Walaeus recoiled from Socinus's teachings.[11] That is the Life's judgment of a man whom Walaeus was to answer in print in 1615, and I report it as the Life's and rest nothing on it.

---

[5] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 617 [PDF 667] ("Koukerka, pagus Middelburgo vicinus, qui interea Pastore orbatus, statim in Ministrum suum Walæum elegit"). Polyander says that he was called to the ministry of the divine word in a village near Middelburg (Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column: "in pagum Middelburgo vicinum").

[6] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 617 [PDF 667] ("Koukerkæ idibus Novemb[ris] Anni millesimi sexcentesimi secundi, Verbi Divini Ministerium aggressus est"). The ADB gives November 1602 for the start at Koudekerke (Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643), and the NNBW and the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* give 1602 for the call (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515; Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus").

[7] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 617 [PDF 667].

[8] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 617 [PDF 667].

[9] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 617 [PDF 667].

[10] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 617 [PDF 667]. The Life writes the name Vytenbogardus; the ADB writes Uytenbogaert (Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643) and the NNBW Wtenbogaert (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1516). I use the form of the NNBW. The Life dates the siege by the century ("Anno illius seculi quarto"), which is 1604.

[11] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 617 [PDF 667] ("Vytenbogardus nimis æstimabat Socinum").

When the town had fallen he came home and put his affairs in order, the Life says, as though he were to stay at Koudekerke for good.[12] His means were modest and honorable, so that he had no need to seek a larger stipend; Leiden had earlier sought him, and the Life says he obtained a somewhat more generous stipend than the others. The church was well attended without being a burden, and left him enough time, as the Life puts it, for the perfecting of his learning; he was loved by his people; and the village, less than an hour from Middelburg and from Flushing, was green, rich in grain, noted for its orchards, and a quarter of an hour from the sea.[13] His house was large, with a spacious garden, in which he kept what could turn a refined mind to rest.[14] The Life remarks in the next sentence that one seldom enjoys fully what one has chosen with care and prepared for oneself as a place to rest in, and what follows in its account bears the remark out.[15]

The Life says that the two years of his ministry at Koudekerke changed his manner of life not a little. In the first of them, it says, when the anniversary sermons, the catechetical sermons, and the festival sermons were done, he found more leisure and began to think of choosing a wife. He did not go at it as most men do, thoughtlessly, though a man takes on nothing greater in the whole of life, but weighed it seriously and more than once, and with the consent of his parents he courted Paschasia ab Isenhout, a maiden pious, prudent, and of settled manners, since a man who does not choose such a wife, the Life says, is forced to serve a foolish one all his life.[16] It did not overlook the other gifts of body and of fortune that make happiness on earth sweeter. She was of fair form, better endowed than most Middelburg women, and sprung from the noble families of the Curtii and the Gryphii, her grandmother's brother having been Petrus Curtius, the famous bishop of Bruges.[17] The Life then lists her kin. Her father, Nicolaus ab Isenhout, had been named consul in his fortieth year and was dead; her mother's father, Johannes Bontridder, was still living and an alderman; her mother's brothers, born of one mother, were Henricus Welleus, a consul, and Christianus, an alderman; and the husbands of her aunts were Ferdinandus Vischerus, an alderman, and Aylva, a captain of the militia. By these relatives, the Life says, the marriage bound him to the most powerful families of Middelburg.[18]

The Life puts the marriage on 11 August 1603 and names no place.[19] The other sources do not agree on one.[20] The Life does not stop on it. It turns at once to the thought that no one has unbroken

---

[12] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 617 [PDF 667].

[13] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 617–18 [PDF 667–68].

[14] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 618 [PDF 668].

[15] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 618 [PDF 668] ("Sed raro iis plene frui possumus quæ studiose elegimus, quæ cum cura præparavimus nobis, quasi in iis quieturi").

[16] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 618 [PDF 668] ("Id biennium quo Ministerio Koukerkæ functus est"). Her name is Paschasia in Polyander and the NNBW and Paschasie in van der Aa (Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515; Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34).

[17] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 618 [PDF 668]. Polyander likewise says that she came from noble and ancient families, among them the Gryphii and the Curtii (Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column).

[18] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 618 [PDF 668]. Sources differ on the rank of her father. The Life gives him the office of consul ("nominatus obierat Consul"), van der Aa calls him a *schepen* of Middelburg (Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34), and Polyander says that he attained great honors in the city and died too soon (Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column).

[19] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 618 [PDF 668] ("undecimo Augusti").

[20] Sources differ on the place of the marriage. The NNBW has Koudekerke (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515: "In 1603 huwde hij aldaar"), the ADB the same (Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643: "Dort heirathete er bald"), and van der Aa Middelburg (Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34: "Hij huwde in 1603 te Middelburg"). Polyander's "Vbi & uxorem duxit" follows his words for Middelburg (*Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column); the Life names no place.

happiness on earth, and tells that after the marriage his parents' health failed. His mother, long troubled by asthma, took a pneumonia from a continual cough and died on 4 November of the same year, and the loss, the Life says, struck his old father deeply, since she had taken on herself the care of the house and the ordering of the family, so that he might give himself to his duties and to honest recreation. The father fell first into grief, then into a slow fever and at last an acute one, and died on 11 October 1604.[21] Walaeus attended both of them through the whole course of their illness, the Life says, with continual services and with pious consolations, and each of them blessed him in the hour of death and gave him this testimony, that he had never offended them in all his life.[22]

The Life counts the cost in plain terms. He was past thirty, a father of a household, and about to enter the pastorate at Middelburg, and his parents had left no great burden of care, since his sister Johanna was twenty-six and soon married Jacobus Lenssen, a Middelburg man whom the Life calls rich, agreeable, honest, and upright, and his brother Jacobus, seventeen, was given to his studies and so like Antonius that one could easily see they were brothers.[23] Even so, the two deaths troubled him so much that for a whole year no day passed on which he did not think anxiously of his parents, and no night that did not give him dreams of them.[24] A son was born to him on 27 December of the same year, 1604, and he named him Johannes, the Life says, in memory of his own grandfather and grandmother and in favor of his wife's grandfather and his sister.[25] The Life says that the birth eased his grief somewhat, and it takes the occasion to remark that nothing so exhilarates the heart of a man as to see an heir to what he has labored for, and above all in a son who will carry his name.[26]

The call to Middelburg is the next event. The Life says that Middelburg had long urged him to move to it, that the people of Koudekerke knew it, and that he would not leave before the child was born, so as not to seem to slight them, and that on the twenty-eighth day after the birth he moved his wife and his household to the town.[27] The other accounts put the call and the move in other terms. The NNBW has Middelburg call him on 1 December 1604 as a settled teacher in succession to Michiel Panneel, and install him as minister there on 19 March 1605; the ADB and the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* put the call in 1605; and van der Aa and Polyander count two years from Koudekerke to Middelburg.[28] The Life and the NNBW also describe the post differently, the Life as an eighth minister for a new church and the NNBW as the succession to a named minister. The Life says that the town was so given to religion that its hearers could not be held by its three larger

---

[21] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 618 [PDF 668] ("quarto Novembris ejusdem Anni"; "undecima Octobris Anni millesimi sexcentesimi quarti").

[22] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 619 [PDF 669].

[23] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 619 [PDF 669]. Polyander names his only brother, Jacobus, as minister at Domburg when Walaeus left Middelburg (Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 10, left column: "frater ejus unicus Iacobus, Ecclesiæ tum Domburgensis minister").

[24] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 619 [PDF 669].

[25] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 619 [PDF 669] ("natus illi filius vigesimo septimo Decembris ejusdem Anni").

[26] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 619 [PDF 669].

[27] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 619 [PDF 669] ("vigesimo octavo à partu die, uxorem cum tota familia Middelburgum traduxit"). The twenty-eighth day after 27 December is 24 January 1605, a date the Life does not state.

[28] Sources differ on the call and the move. Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515; Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643; Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus"; Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33 ("twee jaren later te Middelburg beroepen"); Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, left column ("atque inde biennio exacto, in ipsam urbem Middelburgensem"). I give each date as its source gives it and settle none. The NNBW's date for his confirmation as minister, 19 March 1605, falls some weeks after the move that the Life dates by the birth of his son, and I do not reconcile them.

churches, that the magistrate was asked for a fourth church and for a stipend for an eighth minister, that the church was assigned near the fish market, and that the ecclesiastical council called Walaeus to be the eighth minister.[29] It adds that he would have preferred to stay at Koudekerke and not be drawn into troubles and quarrels, to live for God, his church, and himself, but that he could not resist God when God called him to a place where the church might have more fruit from him, and could not fail his future family where he could better provide for it.[30] Middelburg, it says, is the metropolis of Zeeland, yielding to no city of the federated Netherlands but Amsterdam in size, trade, and number of citizens, with a learned magistrate who venerates pastors beyond others, and with citizens of moderate wealth and sober manners who are curious about theology and strive to put it into practice.[31] I give that as the Life's description of the town to which he went.

He was received at Middelburg, the Life says, with the greatest applause of the people and the highest honor from the magistrate, and the welcome stirred the envy of some of the town's ministers once again, since those who are most lately admitted to a college must always suffer something.[32] They tried to confine him to the fourth church, which was small and lay remote at the edge of the city, and the church's council refused. The Life draws a general remark from it, that nothing gives the generous a better occasion to advance than the plots of the envious, and then says what Walaeus did: he softened their minds with modesty, kindness, and services, so that afterward he lived in the closest harmony with all of them.[33]

The Life then sets him among his colleagues, and what it says of them is worth reading closely, since it is the only description of the Middelburg pulpit of those years that I have. It names the new ministers who came to the town in his time as outstanding men, and among them, in addition to Walaeus himself, Aegidius Bursius, Hermannus Faukelius, and Guilielmus Telingius, each of whom, it says, would have been thought to have hardly an equal if they had not been together.[34] It compares them by voice, speech, and gift. Bursius had a truly manly voice; the voices of Faukelius and Walaeus were grave, though Faukelius's was a little hindered by the loss of his teeth; Walaeus's was the more sonorous, and Telingius's was sharp and penetrating. The speech of Faukelius and Walaeus was plain, that of Bursius flowing, that of Telingius broken. Walaeus and Faukelius were strong in admonishing, and Walaeus besides in consoling; Bursius was outstanding in rousing the hearers, and Telingius excelled in reproving them.[35]

In teaching the Life gives him the first place without qualification. However much the others stood out in everything else, it says, they yielded to Walaeus in teaching: "he delivered fully, explained plainly and to the point, proved solidly, set out with sinew."[36] So Telingius was thought to reign in reproving and Walaeus in teaching, and his hearers outnumbered those of all the rest. The Life says that among the sensible he surpassed Telingius in favor, because they rightly esteemed his learning, and gladly wished to be taught, warned, and consoled, and did not gladly wish to be reproved. It says that he alone was asked by other churches to fill a vacant pulpit for a time as often

[29] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 618 [PDF 668].
[30] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 618 [PDF 668] ("non immixtus turbis & dissidiis Deo, suæ Ecclesiæ ac sibi vivere").
[31] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 618 [PDF 668].
[32] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 619 [PDF 669].
[33] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 619 [PDF 669] ("Sed Walæus facile horum animos mitigavit, modestia, humanitate, officiis: ut postea cum omnibus conjunctissime vixerit").
[34] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 619–20 [PDF 669–70].
[35] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 620 [PDF 670].
[36] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 620 [PDF 670].

as all his colleagues together, and names Neuzen, Sluis, Flushing, and The Hague among the places that asked, and others besides.[37] It does not leave the matter at skill. A preacher's chief task, it says, is to teach well, to explain plainly, and to drive home what is to be believed and what done, and it gives a reason why he was milder in reproof than Telingius: it thinks it came from his nature, since he was kind and full of compassion, though he was vehement enough when a work of mercy was in hand. He had the name, the Life says, beyond the others, of setting the want of the poor before the eyes of his hearers and of moving them to give generously for their relief.[38]

The Life says also where he stood in the church's politics. Bursius and Telingius, it says, drew up opposing lines in the government of the church, Bursius winning friends by service, even in matters of marriage and rank, and Telingius pressing piety with vehemence, and Faukelius and Walaeus belonged to neither side. Faukelius leaned a little toward Bursius and Walaeus toward Telingius, but the two, being the closest of friends, prevented discord between the parties and moderated the efforts of both with fairness, and without any ambition for rank or authority over their colleagues, for which reason, the Life says, honor followed them as they fled from it.[39] When a minister had been called and had to be persuaded to accept, Walaeus was sent, and he was thought the man to carry such a business through by watchfulness, prudence, and persuasion. In this way, the Life says, he procured the call of Telingius from Haamstede, of Enochus Sterthemius from Zierikzee, and of Franciscus Gomarus from Leiden to Middelburg.[40] That, the Life says, roused the old rivalry of Bursius, who was the only partial rival he had; Walaeus held the favor of the magistrate, which Bursius sought by every service, through his own merit and through kinship with many, and the Life says that it knows of no one besides Bursius who was his enemy or envied him.[41]

The pastoral work that the Life describes is of the ordinary kind, and I give it as it describes it. On Sundays at five o'clock, in the new church, he gave himself to the instruction of church members and of those who wished to join, which the Life says is commonly called catechizing.[42] By question and exposition he ran through all the *loci communes* of theology, and with this exercise, the Life says, he made his pupils so ready that not a few could stand beside candidates in theology, and some were promoted to the ministry, in the Indies above all.[43] It gives the reason for the practice that not everyone can be taught enough from the pulpit and that not everything can be fitted to every person's capacity. He visited the people of his parish besides, the Life says, and it lists what he did: he warned those who could not withstand the assault of vices and gave counsel for avoiding the sins to which their natures leaned; he untied the scruples of conscience and the knots in which the best are often caught; he raised up those who feared God but were cast down by their sins; he brought comfort to widows and orphans who had no other human help; he encouraged the sick and

---

[37] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 620 [PDF 670].

[38] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 620 [PDF 670] ("Et habitus est præ reliquis optime penuriam pauperum ob oculos ponere").

[39] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 620 [PDF 670].

[40] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 620 [PDF 670]. The name Enoch Sterthemius appears in the Life's account of Leiden among Walaeus's fellow lodgers (Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 606 [PDF 656]), and the dedication of the *Compendium* in 1620 names an Enochus Sterthemius as a minister of the church in Middelburg (Walaeus, *Compendium ethicæ Aristotelicæ ad normam veritatis Christianæ revocatum*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 259 [image 843]). The Life's account of the call from Zierikzee does not connect him with either.

[41] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 620 [PDF 670].

[42] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 621 [PDF 671].

[43] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 621 [PDF 671] ("Hac interrogando, explicando omnes Theologiæ locos Communes percurrit"; "quidam ad Ministerium, præsertim in India, promoverentur").

weak to steadfastness in faith and prepared them for death; and to the dying he took away the terror of death and kindled in them the desire to be with Christ.[44] The Life calls this the true practice of theology, and it adds that this praise was not his alone. It was owed, it says, to most of the pastors of Middelburg, indeed of Zeeland, who were in this respect often found more diligent than others.[45] I count that remark in the Life's favor. A life that praises one man and assigns the same praise to his fellows has told us how the town's pastors worked, and not only how he did.

The visits, the Life says, were not confined to his own people. Through them Lutherans, Anabaptists, and Roman Catholics were informed about the Reformed religion and were shown the deformity of their own, for he visited the sectarians as readily as his own flock and with so much courtesy that they took no offense, and when scruples arose in cases of marriage, people went to Walaeus to have them settled.[46] The Life follows it with a story that I report as its own. A Catholic parish priest was greatly disturbed, it says, and since Walaeus was especially effective in refuting, he spread it among his people, so that none who thought well of Walaeus's conversation should come to hear his sermons, that the Devil plainly sat on Walaeus's shoulders and suggested to him during the sermon how best to seduce the people. Not a few Catholics, drawn by curiosity or by his name, came into the church on the occasion of a baptism, the Life says, and when they heard nothing diabolical come from his mouth they began to think their priest a slanderer, to doubt the truth of what he said, to find themselves more instructed and consoled by Walaeus's sermons than by his, and so to incline little by little to the Reformed religion and at last to join it openly.[47]

His colleagues left to Walaeus, the Life says, as the more learned, the defense of the Reformed religion against its opponents, and charged him to see that it took no public harm; in that matter, it says, he showed himself a Hercules and subdued not a few monsters.[48] It gives three cases. The first is the case of Abrahamus Beeckmans, a man of keen mind and conspicuous probity who had troubled the church of Middelburg for some time, and who had condemned the ministers for giving baptism to infants whose parents had not pledged themselves to the church, and had drawn more than a hundred members of the church to his side.[49] From the start of his ministry there, the Life says, Walaeus explained the whole doctrine more fully, and by conference, disputation, and writing he confounded the obstinate, convinced most of the rest, and brought them to acknowledge their error. The Life explains that no Reformed church is more careful in giving baptism than the Middelburg church, which admits infants only when friends have vouched to a minister appointed for the purpose, some days before, that the child is the offspring of a faithful Christian or in his lawful power, and it grounds the rule in Genesis 17:12.[50] Walaeus was not content with having won, it says, and wished to keep these men for the church, and he saw to it that Beeckmans and his companion were chosen elders, so that the sedition was, as it were, made peaceable and they gave the church useful service afterward.[51]

---

[44] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 621 [PDF 671].

[45] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 621 [PDF 671] ("Hæc vera demum Theologiæ praxis est"; "Verum ea solius Walæi laus non erat, debebatur et plerisque Pastoribus Middelburgensibus, imo Zelandiæ").

[46] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 621 [PDF 671].

[47] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 621–22 [PDF 671–72].

[48] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 622 [PDF 672] ("Ea in re Herculem se præstitit, & non pauca monstra subegit").

[49] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 622 [PDF 672] ("quorum parentes Ecclesiæ sacramentum non dixissent"). The Latin idiom is that of taking an oath of enlistment.

[50] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 622 [PDF 672]. Genesis 17:12 (ESV): "He who is eight days old among you shall be circumcised."

[51] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 622 [PDF 672].

The second case was a Catholic polemic. The Life says that not long after this Gideon vanden Bogaerde, a Flemish nobleman who had belonged to neither party before, decided to follow the party of the Spanish king, drawn, as it says, by a banner, and so had to change his religion also, on the pretext that the Roman religion was truer than the Reformed, and that through the Antwerp Jesuit Gauda he published writings in which he tried to show this on the matter of transubstantiation. The Life says that the book could have been dismissed with contempt had not Gauda, whom it calls impudent, played under Bogaerde's name.[52] Walaeus answered at once, it says, and showed that the words of institution of the Supper can be understood by the Catholics themselves only figuratively, and that by consecration the body of Christ cannot be in infinite places at the same moment, because a body is always bounded by its own limits. Gauda fell silent after the second reply.[53] The Life puts no date to the exchange, and neither do I.

The third case was a stranger who came from abroad, for Zeeland, the Life says, produces no such monsters, and whom it does not name. It says that he preached that Christ taught best the reverence of God and the love of neighbor, but that to give the teaching more weight he said that Christ had declared himself the Son of God by a pious fraud, and had feigned himself God when he was not, and that he gathered meetings to urge probity and not faith. Walaeus judged him the more pernicious because he feigned piety and did not speak without praise of Christ, whom he was in fact trying to bring to nothing, and attacked him before a full gathering, arguing from Christ's birth, life, and death, from the predictions of the Old Testament, from the sufferings of the apostles, and from the miracles, so that the hearers dispersed and the man withdrew.[54] I give the three cases together because they have a single shape. In each the Life has Walaeus answer in the place where the error was spoken, before the people who heard it, and in the case of Beeckmans it has him bring the opponent into the church's service. None of the three is mentioned in Polyander or in the notices.

When Polyander speaks of the whole pastorate, he speaks of it as a man who had been brought up in the church and had held its pulpit for almost fifteen years, and says that Walaeus served it most faithfully as pastor.[55] Polyander's "brought up" fits the first chapter, in which the boy grew up at Middelburg. It is Polyander's summary, and it says in a sentence what the Life says in pages: that the pastoral office was the center of these years, and that the other work was done beside it.

3.2 Teaching at Middelburg

Walaeus taught at Middelburg as well as preached, and on that much the sources agree. They do not agree on when the teaching began, on whether the school was an illustrious school or a Latin school, or on whose arrival it waited for, and I give the accounts side by side before I say what the teaching was.

The Life begins with the school. Zeeland had long wished to found an illustrious school, it says, but the province could not agree on a place, and the people of Middelburg, to take the place for

---

[52] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 622 [PDF 672]. The Life's spellings are "Gedeon vanden Bogaerde" and "Gauda"; it also calls Gauda a Jesuit of Antwerp ("patrem Gaudam Jesuitam Antwerpiensem").

[53] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 622 [PDF 672] ("Gauda ad secundam responsionem conticuit").

[54] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 623 [PDF 673] ("Quidam peregre adveniens, Zelandia enim talia monstra non edit").

[55] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 10, left column ("ab illa Ecclesia in qua & educatus, & quindecim ferme annos fidelissime munere Pastoris functus erat"). Sources differ on the length of the Middelburg pastorate. The NNBW says that the congregation saw him in its midst for fourteen years (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515: "14 jaren"). From his move in January 1605, which is the Life's date, to the farewell sermon of 10 September 1619 that the NNBW gives, is fourteen years and some months (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1516).

themselves, were trying to make their Trivial School more illustrious.[56] Their rector, Gruterus, whom the last chapter named as Walaeus's teacher, died in the year 1607, the Life says, and the town looked for another who could govern the school with honor to its higher aim, and called Walaeus.[57] They called him, it says, because he understood most parts of learning and seemed in spirit, prudence, and authority in governing equal to the place or above it. He refused. He thought the post wearisome in the government of boys and exposed to slanders in their boarding, and he thought each a great hindrance to learning and to the advance of his studies. The government and the boarding were given to Aegidius Bursius, the Middelburg pastor, as a man apt to govern, and the teaching to Justus Liraeus, a learned man who afterward became a professor at Utrecht. What was left, and was distinguished, Walaeus took: the curatorship of the school and honorary lectures in Greek and philosophy.[58]

Polyander tells it more briefly and with other numbers. Three years after he had been called to Middelburg, he says, Gruterus the rector being dead and the illustrious school being brought into another order, the magistrate of the city asked Walaeus to give honorary lectures chiefly in philosophy and in the Greek language, and he performed this for about twelve years with great honor and with the applause of all the learned, in such a way that he neglected no part of his sacred ministry in the meantime.[59] The notices state the matter in their own ways, and they do not give one date. Van der Aa has the teaching of philosophy and Greek at the illustrious school entrusted to him in 1606. The NNBW says that after he had refused the offer to succeed Gruterus as rector the teaching of Greek philosophy was entrusted to him, and later, after Gomarus came, the teaching of doctrine. The *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* says that from the founding of the Illustrious School in 1611 until 1619 he was attached to it, beside Gomarus, as teacher of philosophy and Greek.[60] The ADB, which has him sit in the national synod as a deputy of the school at Middelburg, says that he was appointed professor there.[61] I do not reduce these to one date. What they have in common is the subject and the school: philosophy and Greek, at a school at Middelburg that was called illustrious or hoped to be.

The Life says what the lectures were. In Greek he explained Homer, Hesiod, and others, and, not content with bare interpretation, opened to his hearers the genius of the language and the antiquities of Greece. In philosophy he taught ethics, physics, astronomy, and optics, which he explained plainly, so that the hearers understood them, and with empty matter cleared away he pursued what

[56] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 627 [PDF 677].

[57] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 627 [PDF 677] ("Mortuo enim Gruterio, scholæ Trivialis Rectore anno").

[58] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 627 [PDF 677].

[59] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, right column ("Triennio post, quam Middelburgum vocatus esset, defuncto Rectore Iacobo Grutero, & schola illustri in alium ordinem redacta, à Magistratu urbis rogatus fuit, ut in Philosophia & Græca potissimum lingua honorarias lectiones haberet"; "annos circiter duodecim"; "nullam interim sacri Ministerii sui partem neglexerit").

[60] Sources differ on when the teaching began and on the school. Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33 ("In 1606 werd hem het onderwijs in de philosophie en Grieksche taal aan de doorluchte school aldaar opgedragen"); Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515; Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus." Polyander's three years after the call, counted from the 1605 that the ADB and the *Encyclopedie* give for the call, fall in 1608, and his twelve years of lectures, counted back from the departure of 1619, fall in 1607. I give the figures and settle none of them. The *Encyclopedie* dates his post at the Illustrious School from 1611, while Walaeus's statement says that the plan lapsed and that he went on in the Trivial School; the sources name two schools, and I decide neither.

[61] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 644 ("an welcher er auch als Professor angestellt war").

was of use.[62] These are the subjects that the Life makes the center of his own reading at Leiden: Homer first among the Greek poets, geometry, astronomy, and optics under Snellius, and ethics from Acciaiolus and others. The Life supplies both lists, so the match is not an independent one, but it shows that what he taught was what he had studied.

For one part of the teaching he is his own witness. The dedication of the *Compendium ethicæ*, which the last chapter used for his thought, is addressed to the curators of the illustrious school of Middelburg, and in it he speaks of the school as theirs. It names five of them: Jacobus Schotius, a former consul; Simeon Beaumontius, the pensionary; Johannes Visscherus, a councillor of the city; and two ministers of the church, Hermannus Faukelius and Enochus Sterthemius.[63] He says that the teaching of this science had been committed to him by them in their illustrious school, and that he had laid before "our pupils" a compendium of it drawn from Aristotle himself.[64] He says also that the curators had urged its publication before he left their church and school for the Academy, that he sends it out now so that those who heard it from him may call it to mind, and that others may be helped and guided in this part of philosophy by it.[65] The NNBW says the same of the printed book, that it works in the matter he had already treated in his lessons at the Latin school at Middelburg.[66] Here, then, three accounts meet on a single point: the Life, which says that he lectured in ethics at Middelburg; the NNBW, which says that the *Compendium* contains the matter of those lessons; and the dedication, in which Walaeus himself says that the curators gave him the teaching and that he set the compendium before his pupils. The dedication also names Faukelius and Sterthemius as ministers who were curators, which agrees with the Life's statement that he himself took up the curatorship of the school, since by 1620 the curators included ministers of the town.

The Life finishes the account with a remark on the time. He did not neglect the ministry in the meantime, it says: "So time can be enough for a man who arranges it well."[67] Polyander says the same of the lectures in other words, that in the twelve years he neglected no part of the sacred ministry, and I take the two together as the plain answer to the question how one man did both. The pulpit, the Sunday catechizing, the visits, and the lectures were all his, and none of the sources that speak of them says that one was bought at the cost of another.

3.3 Gomarus at Middelburg

The one account of Gomarus's coming to Middelburg that is Walaeus's own is a short statement in Dutch, headed "Wat de beroepinge D. Gomari tot Middelburch aengaet" and signed Antonius Walaeus, and I begin with it because it is the account of a man who was sent on the errand.[68] It says that the beroeping was done in this way. The troubles at Leiden between Arminius and Gomarus

---

[62] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 627 [PDF 677].

[63] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicæ Aristotelicæ ad normam veritatis Christianæ revocatum*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 259 (image 843) ("Curatoribus illustris Scholæ Middelburgensis"). The heading of the letter names the five: Jacobus Schotius, "Exconsuli"; Simeon Beaumontius, "Pensionario"; Joannes Visscherus, styled a councillor of the city of Middelburg; and, as ministers of the church of Christ in the same city ("Ecclesiæ Christi in eadem urbe fidissimis Ministris"), Hermannus Faukelius and Enochus Sterthemius. The page is numbered 259. The letter closes on the next page, 260 (image 844), and its date line ends "Septembres, Anno salutis partæ 1620"; the year is plain in the print, and I rest no day on the numerals before "Septembres."

[64] Walaeus, *Compendium*, 259 (image 843) ("institutio mihi à vobis antehac esset mandata"; "discipulis nostris").

[65] Walaeus, *Compendium*, 259 (image 843) ("ante meum ex Ecclesia ac Schola vestra in hanc Academiam discessum"; "illi, qui id antehac à me audiverunt, ejus memoriam recolere").

[66] Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1516.

[67] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 628 [PDF 678] ("Ita tempus homini bene disponenti potest sufficere").

had spread through the whole land, and after the death of Arminius, Vorstius was called as his successor; the churches raised objections to that call, which were well enough known, and the churches of Zeeland also made a difficulty of sending their students to Leiden for the future.[69] Gomarus then told some Zeelanders privately that he would accept a different post in which he could defend the truth with more freedom, and he said so among others to the son of Bursius, a preacher at Middelburg.[70]

The ministers of Middelburg carried the word to the burgomasters, who held several conferences with them, and after many dealings it was resolved, with the good judgment of the magistrate and the consistory, to send Walaeus to Gomarus at Leiden to urge him, if it were possible, to remain in his chair, since that would serve the church and the preservation of the truth best. If Gomarus were in any case resolved to leave Leiden, Walaeus was charged to seek him as an ordinary preacher in a vacant place at Middelburg, and besides to offer a fixed salary from the magistrate for some public lessons there in theology.[71] Gomarus protested that he could not stand in the profession with Vorstius, and Walaeus gives the end of the protest as a saying in Gomarus's own formal words.[72] So Walaeus disclosed the second charge, and came to terms with him as his instructions ran. Afterward Gomarus, having taken his leave of the curators of the university at Leiden for the reasons given, came to Middelburg and was accepted there as ordinary preacher, and he gave some public lessons in theology and in Hebrew in the choir of the New Church, to which everyone had access, and publicly defended some printed theses.[73]

The Life tells the same errand and adds a second envoy. When the call of Vorstius came, it says, the churches of Gelderland and the curators of the illustrious school sent Antonius Thysius, professor of theology at Harderwijk, to Leiden, and the churches of Zeeland and the magistrate of Middelburg sent Walaeus, both of them to persuade Gomarus with every effort not to leave his post. But Gomarus had resolved to depart, and each of the two invited him to settle with them instead, which Walaeus obtained, and Gomarus moved to Middelburg in 1611.[74] The Life thus agrees with Walaeus on the errand, on the failure of the first charge, and on the success of the second, and it adds Thysius, whom Walaeus does not mention. The notices agree on the main fact

---

[68] Walaeus, "Wat de beroepinge D. Gomari tot Middelburch aengaet," images 981–82. The heading stands at the foot of image 981, and the statement runs on into image 982, where it ends with the words "Dit is in 't korte, wat my van dese saecke bekent is. Antonius Walæus."

[69] Walaeus, "Wat de beroepinge," image 981, left and right columns ("na de doot Arminii, Vorstius tot eenen successeur was geroepen"; "swaricheyt gemaeckt van haere Studenten tot Leyden voortaen te senden"). The NNBW adds that when Arminius died in 1609 Walaeus was named as his successor, and that the chair went to Vorstius, which led to Gomarus's leaving (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515). Walaeus does not say that of himself.

[70] Walaeus, "Wat de beroepinge," images 981–82 ("dat hy wel een andere conditie soude willen aennemen"; "aen de Sone van Bursius, Prædicant tot Middelburch").

[71] Walaeus, "Wat de beroepinge," 398 (image 982, left column) ("Antonium Walaeum aen D. Gomarum nae Leyden te senden"; "een seker tractement vande Magistraet van Middelburch te presenteren").

[72] Walaeus, "Wat de beroepinge," 398 (image 982, left column) ("liever sijn eyghen cant … voortaen soude knaghen"; "'t sijn sijn formele woorden"). The saying is a figure of speech about gnawing, and I do not press its sense.

[73] Walaeus, "Wat de beroepinge," 398 (image 982, right column) ("voor ordinaris Prædicant aldaer aengenomen"; "inde Choor vande Nieu Kercke, daer een yeghelick acces toe hadde").

[74] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 626 [PDF 676] ("quare uterque eum invitavit apud illos potius domicilium figere: quod obtinuit Walæus"). The year is written in Roman numerals, which I read as 1611, and the subject of the verb of moving is not stated and is Gomarus by the sense.

and differ on its shades.[75] The NNBW has Gomarus called in 1611, and the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* says that he came partly through Walaeus's doing; nothing in either contradicts the errand as Walaeus tells it, and the Life adds that the errand was shared.

What Gomarus did at Middelburg the Life describes in a few lines. When he came, it says, everything was prepared for a full illustrious school, and a place was made ready in the choir of the new church.[76] Gomarus gave public lectures in which he began the interpretation of Holy Scripture, and he examined the *loci communes* of theology in public disputations. Jacobus Meivartius, the conrector of the Trivial School, taught philosophy and disputed in public, and the school, raised by their diligence and by the fame of Gomarus, seemed to be rising. This is the picture that Walaeus's statement gives in fewer words: lessons in theology and Hebrew in the choir of the New Church, open to all, and printed theses defended in public. The two accounts agree on the place and on the public character of the teaching, and the Life adds the names of Meivartius and the subject of the disputations.

The Life then tells the quarrel. At that point, it says, the magistrate of Middelburg offered Walaeus the place that he had kept, and elected him professor of the *loci communes* of sacred theology.[77] Gomarus was moved by the call, the Life says, a man too indulgent to his feelings, and opposed it openly, and accused Walaeus of heresy: that when he was a student at Leiden he had once opposed sharply in the matter of the three souls in man.[78] The NNBW says in its own way that Gomarus could not see his former pupil beside him as an equal and found much heresy in his teaching.[79] The NNBW and the Life agree that the charge was heresy. The NNBW adds that Gomarus could not see him as an equal, and the Life adds that the charge went back to a point argued at Leiden, and I give both as they are.

The Life says that the magistrate took Gomarus's opposition harder than Walaeus did. Walaeus at once renounced the call, it says, because he had never sought anything in life, thought himself content with his lot, and owed his teacher a gratitude that forbade him to have a colleague forced on Gomarus against his will.[80] No injuries, the Life says, ever disturbed Walaeus so that his mind was not even and always like itself. The people were indignant that their beloved minister should be slandered by the man who had earlier published testimonials commending the purity of his doctrine.[81] Gomarus was then called to Saumur by Philippe Mornay, lord of Plessis, and was

---

[75] Sources differ on the date and on Walaeus's part. Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515; Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus" ("mede door Walaeus' toedoen"). The ADB and van der Aa do not mention Gomarus at Middelburg. The Life agrees with the NNBW on 1611 for his coming (Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 626 [PDF 676]) and puts his release in 1615, where the NNBW has 1614.

[76] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 627 [PDF 677].

[77] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 627 [PDF 677] ("Magistratus Middelburgensis, eum quem Walæus servaverat locum, illi offerret, ac eligeret in Professorem locorum Communium S[anctæ] Theologiæ"). The pronoun that I render "Walaeus" is ambiguous in the Latin by itself. The sense is fixed by what follows in the Life, that Gomarus was moved by the call and that Walaeus at once renounced it, and by the NNBW, which says that after Gomarus came, the teaching of doctrine was entrusted to Walaeus (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515).

[78] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 627 [PDF 677] ("incusare Walæum hæreseos; quod dum in Academia Batava studiis operam daret, pro tribus in homine animabus aliquando opposuisset acrius"). The Life adds a second clause on the president of the disputation in which this happened, which I do not use.

[79] Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515 ("Gomarus kon zijn' vroegeren leerling niet als gelijke naast zich zien, en vond bovendien veel kettersch in zijn leer").

[80] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 627 [PDF 677] ("ne eo invito illi Collega obtruderetur").

released at once, in 1615.[82] Walaeus's own account of the end is shorter, and in two sentences. The States of Zeeland, at the instance of Middelburg, issued a call to found an illustrious school in Zeeland on this occasion, but the matter faded little by little when the differences in Holland began to look better, and Gomarus had himself called to Saumur, by which the whole work stuck.[83]

The Life says what became of the school. On that occasion, and because the people of Goes, stirred up by Grotius, would not concede an illustrious school to the people of Middelburg, the Middelburg illustrious school fell in the blade, and Meivartius went back to the Trivial School.[84] Walaeus's statement and the Life agree that the project of the illustrious school stopped with Gomarus's going, and they give different causes for it.[85] The Life then reports what Walaeus did. The magistrate asked and obtained from him one thing only, that to keep the hope and face of the illustrious school he should take up the theological *loci communes* in place of the lectures in Greek and philosophy.[86] The Life says that these lectures "even now are read publicly under the name of the *Enchiridion of the Reformed Religion*."[87] Walaeus's own statement says that he alone went on with some lessons in the *loci communes* in the order of the Catechism in the first classes of the Trivial School, as he did also in Greek and philosophy, but privately, in the lecture room of the first class, and that this order, as to the lessons in the Catechism, still remains there.[88] The two accounts agree on the subject, on the school, and on the fact that the work was still going on when each was written. The Life ties the lessons to a book that was then in circulation, the *Enchiridion*, and the NNBW describes that book as a handbook of doctrine in the order of the Catechism, which is the order of the lessons in Walaeus's statement; the statement calls the lessons private, given in the

---

[81] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 627 [PDF 677] ("Nullæ injuriæ Walæum unquam conturbavere, ut non animus illi æquus esset & sui semper similis"). The Life adds that his other opinion on the souls was a subject of common talk in the lectures on ethics and physics. I do not use that sentence.

[82] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 627 [PDF 677] ("Philippo Marnæo Plessiaci Domino Salmurium vocatus"). The year is written in Roman numerals. Sources differ on when Gomarus left Middelburg. The Life has 1615. The NNBW says that he left the town in 1614 (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515: "Hij verliet daarom reeds in 1614 de stad"). Walaeus's statement says only that Gomarus had himself called to Saumur, and the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* names no end for Gomarus's years there.

[83] Walaeus, "Wat de beroepinge," 398 (image 982, right column) ("uytschrijvinghe om een illustre Schole in Zeelandt, op dese occasie op te rechten, ghedaen"; "ende D. Gomarus heeft hem tot Saumur laten beroepen, waer door het gheele werck is blijven steken").

[84] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 627–28 [PDF 677–78] ("Ea occasione, simul & quod Goesani, ab Hugone Grotio excitati, illustrem Scholam nollent Middelburgensibus concedere, Middelburgense illustre Gymnasium ipsum in herba collapsum est").

[85] Sources differ on why the school failed. The Life gives two: Gomarus's release in 1615, and the refusal of the people of Goes, stirred up by Grotius, to concede the school to Middelburg (Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 627–28 [PDF 677–78]). Walaeus's statement says that the matter faded as the differences in Holland began to show themselves in a better light, and that when Gomarus had himself called to Saumur the whole work stuck (Walaeus, "Wat de beroepinge," 398 [image 982, right column]). The NNBW says that Gomarus left in 1614 and that nothing came of the Illustrious School (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515).

[86] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 628 [PDF 678].

[87] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 628 [PDF 678] ("Quæ etiamnum, nomine Enchiridii Religionis Reformatæ publice leguntur"). The NNBW lists an *Enchiridion religionis reformatae* among the writings of the Leiden years and describes it as a handbook of doctrine in the order of the Catechism (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1516).

[88] Walaeus, "Wat de beroepinge," 398 (image 982, right column) ("Alleen heeft Antonius Walæus inde eerste Classen vande Triviale Schole, eenige lessen in Locis Communibus, juxta ordinem Catecheseos, blijven doen, gelijck oock in Græca Lingua & Philosophia; doch privatim, in auditorio ipso primæ Classis").

lecture room of the first class. The Life adds that he was free for this work at half past nine in the morning and sometimes at half past three in the afternoon.[89]

The Life judges the result in a sentence. His pupils who were sent on to the Academy, it says, appeared better prepared than the rest, and Zeelanders never returned from the Academy more learned than they did then, "so much does it matter to have laid the beginnings of learning well, and to have understood its foundations early."[90] It is a praising sentence, and the statement in the Consilia does not make it. What the statement does show is a man who, with the theology chair given up out of regard for his own teacher and the school itself stuck, went on teaching the first classes of a Latin school the heads of doctrine in the order of the Catechism. I take that as the plainest fact of the whole affair.

3.4 *Het ampt der kerckendienaren* (1615)

The book that made him spoken of beyond his own church came out of Middelburg in 1615. The ADB describes him in these years as a faithful and orthodox but moderate and pious minister, far from all passionate zeal, who nevertheless took part in the Remonstrant disputes, as is shown, it says, by his tract entitled "Het ampt der Kerkendienaren, mitgaders de authoriteyt ende opsicht die een Hooghe Christelicke Overheydt daerover toecompt," directed against Uytenbogaert.[91] The NNBW names the work it answered, Wtenbogaert's *Tractaet van 't ampt ende authoriteyt eener hoogher christelicher overheyt in kerckeliche saecken*, and says that the Dutch original, printed at Middelburg in 1615, is in the Provincial Library of Zeeland, while the *Opera omnia* print only the Latin translation.[92] Van der Aa gives the same place and year and adds a French translation by J. Crucius, a preacher at Haarlem, printed at Amsterdam in 1618.[93] The notices agree on the place, the year, and the opponent.

The Life says why he wrote it. It was done at the order and petition of the churches of Zeeland and at the urging of the leading ministers of Holland, and it showed that the authority which the Belgic churches give to the magistrate agrees with Holy Scripture and with the custom of the primitive church.[94] By that book, the Life says, Walaeus gained a name for learning everywhere and the gratitude of the church, which he freed from the Remonstrants' calumny that it was disobedient to the magistrate, and the gratitude of most of the politicians, because he took from some of his colleagues a pretext on which they used to press the churches. It adds that Wtenbogaert could only speak of the writing as learned and modest, and that he asked leave of the deputies of the States to reply.[95] The Life also puts the book beside the pastoral work in one connected sentence, as

---

[89] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 628 [PDF 678] ("illi hora semidecima matutina, quandoque hora semiquarta pomeridiana vacavit").

[90] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 628 [PDF 678] ("tantum est bene eruditionis initia posuisse, & ejus mature intellexisse fundamenta").

[91] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643. The notices spell the title in different ways. The NNBW has "Het Ampt der kerckendienaeren midtsgaders de authoriteyt ende opsicht die een hooge christelicke overheydt daerover toecompt" (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1516), and van der Aa has "Het ampt der kerckedienaeren ende authoriteyt die eene hooghe Christelijcke overheydt daerover toekent" (Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34). I give the ADB's form in the text.

[92] Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1516.

[93] Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34 ("Middelb. 1615"; "door J. Crucius, predikant te Haarlem, in het Fransch overgezet (Amst. 1618 4°)").

[94] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 628 [PDF 678] ("ex mandato petitioneque Ecclesiarum Zelandiæ, & instigatione præcipuorum Hollandiæ ministrorum"). The Life's words for the book are "Scriptum Vytenbogardo opposuit."

[95] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 628 [PDF 678].

something done while he did not neglect the ministry. That is how I place it. The tract is not, on the Life's account, the exchange of two scholars in a study. It is the work of a minister who had stood in the pulpit at Middelburg for ten years, written at the order of the churches of his province.

The Latin text in the *Opera omnia* opens with a dedication to the States of Zeeland that is dated at Middelburg, 25 November 1615, and signed by Walaeus.[96] The date fits the notices, which place the book in 1615. What the tract says, how it was received, and what Wtenbogaert and the Remonstrants made of it are the subject of a later chapter, which takes up the controversy as a whole. For the Middelburg years it is enough to say that the pastor who catechized on Sundays and lectured on Greek and doctrine in the week also wrote, in his own language, the book by which, on the NNBW's account, he had already made himself talked of in 1615.[97]

The last two events of the pastorate belong to the same controversies, and I give them here only as they close it. Polyander says that toward the end of 1617 Prince Maurice and the church of The Hague summoned him outside the usual course to The Hague, while the dissensions were raging through all Holland, to act as pastor there for a time to help calm them, and that he stayed there about four months with the consent of the magistrate and of the church of Middelburg, and was often taken into counsel by the Prince, together with some other pastors, in the settlement of those dissensions.[98] When the evil grew worse and no milder remedy would be borne, Polyander says, he returned, with the Prince's consent, to the station he loved above all others.[99] The Life puts the call in the same year: the church of The Hague, by the Prince of Orange and with the consent of the magistrate given through deputies, called him from Middelburg in 1617 to act for a time as its pastor.[100] At The Hague, the Life says, he soon began to set out the state of the controversy plainly in his sermons and to weigh the force of the arguments on both sides as if on a balance.[101] The Life says that on his return to Middelburg he first perceived how much he was loved, and that the people came out to meet him.[102]

Then came the invitation from Sedan. Polyander says that after his return he was called by the Duke of Bouillon, through Cornelius ab Aertsens, lord of Sommelsdijck, to the chair of theology in the Academy of Sedan on ample terms, and that from there he could by no means be drawn away.[103]

---

[96] Walaeus, *Tractatus de munere ministrorum ecclesiæ*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, preliminary leaves, images 583–84 ("Nobiles, Potentes, Prudentes Domini"). The date stands at the close of the dedication, in the right column of image 584: "Middelburgi, 25. die Novembris, Anno 1615." The leaf of the tract that follows (image 585) is headed "DE MVNERE MINISTRORUM ECCLESIÆ," in display capitals, as the opening words of its title.

[97] Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1516 ("van zich doen spreken").

[98] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, right column ("Sub finem anni millesimi sexcentesimi & decimi septimi"; "quatuor fere menses"). The ADB, van der Aa, and the NNBW also place the stay at The Hague in 1617 (Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643; Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515). The NNBW adds that the Prince offered him the office of court preacher and that Walaeus preferred to return to Middelburg.

[99] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, right column ("ad unice amatam stationem suam rediit").

[100] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 630 [PDF 680] ("ab Ecclesia Hagiensi, à Principe Auriaco, consensu Magistratus per Deputatos Middelburgo vocatus est"). The year is written in Roman numerals. Polyander has the end of 1617 and the Life no month.

[101] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 630 [PDF 680] ("Hagæ mox Walæus statum controversiæ perspicue in concionibus proponere. Argumentorum utriusque partis pondus quasi ad stateram examinare"). The infinitives are as printed; the sentence is a narrative one.

[102] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 630–31 [PDF 680–81].

[103] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, right column ("per Illustrem virum Cornelium ab Aertsens"; "amplis conditionibus"; "verum inde nulla ratione tunc avelli potuit").

The Life says that the Duke's invitation was earnest, repeated, and most friendly, and that Walaeus could not obtain the consent of his wife and friends to leave. The double stipend that he had at Middelburg could easily have been raised to meet the more generous terms that were offered, and it seemed a grave thing to a man of forty-five to change country and customs, to approach strangers, and to be long cut off from his closest friends, so that he thanked the Duke warmly and meant, as he supposed, to fix his seat at Middelburg for good.[104] The reasons the Life gives are his wife and his friends and his age, and the decision it reports is to stay. Neither the Life nor Polyander dates the invitation from Sedan; both place it after the return to Middelburg and before the synod of Dort. The next paragraph of the Life turns to the States and the national synod.

Polyander tells the end of the story from the Leiden side. He says that in the next year the States General summoned him to the synod of Dort, and that when Leiden asked for him in 1619 he was parted with difficulty from the church in which he had been brought up, and that Rochus Honartius and Petrus Deimannus, bearing letters from the Prince, obtained his release from the magistrate and the presbytery of Middelburg by a fair and earnest request, and that his only brother, Jacobus, then minister at Domburg, was put in his place in the ministry by the wish of all good men.[105] The NNBW and the Life have his farewell sermon at Middelburg on 10 September 1619, and for the move to Leiden Polyander has 15 September and the Life 19 September; I give each date as its source gives it. That is the subject of the next chapter. What the Middelburg years show is plain from what the sources give. He came to the town as a village pastor of two years' standing. He preached, catechized, and visited the sick, and the Life puts him first among his colleagues in teaching. He taught Greek, philosophy, and the heads of doctrine in the town's school, he was the man whom Zeeland sent to bring Gomarus, and at the order of the churches he answered Wtenbogaert in print. When the Prince and the Duke each asked for him he came back to his church, and Polyander says that he was parted from it with difficulty. The sources do not agree on every date, and I have given each date as its source gives it, but on the character of the work they are nearly of one mind. The points on which they differ are the rank of Paschasia's father, the place of the marriage, the date of the call to Middelburg and of the move, the year in which the lectures began and the school in which they were given, the date of Gomarus's coming and the part Walaeus took in it, and the reason that the illustrious school came to nothing. No one source covers all of it: the Life is the fullest on the pastoral work, Polyander on the school, The Hague, and Sedan, and Walaeus's own statement on the way Gomarus was brought. The notes set the sources side by side on each of them. On the stay at The Hague they agree on the year and on the post, a pastor's place for a time, and Polyander alone gives the length of the stay and the Prince's use of him in counsel.

[104] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 631–32 [PDF 681–82] ("Invitatio Ducis seria erat, iterata, amicissima"; "sedem ut putabat perpetuo Middelburgi fixurus"). The Life gives his age as forty-five ("ætatis jam quadraginta quinque annorum").

[105] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 9, right column, and image 10, left column ("Anno sequenti"; "ægre avelleretur"; "litteris … Principis muniti, æqua seriaque postulatione"; "omnium bonorum voto illi in ministerium suffectus est"). Sources differ on the day of the move. Polyander has 15 September 1619 (image 10, left column: "anno Domini 1619. die 15. Septembris"), and the Life 19 September (Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 636 [PDF 688]: "Decimo nono Septembris Walæus cum tota familia Middelburgo Leydam commigravit"). The NNBW and the Life have the farewell sermon on 10 September (Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1516; Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 637 [PDF 687]: "publica concione x. Septembris").

Works Cited

Aa, A. J. van der. “Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale.” In *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20, 32–35. 1877. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/aa__001biog24_01/aa__001biog24_01_0091.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Bates, William, ed. *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum*. London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681. “Vita Antonii Walæi,” 600–659. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/vitaeselectoruma00bate.

Hulsbergen, S. J. M. “Antonius Walaeus.” *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*. Entry from the 1982–84 print edition. https://www.encyclopedievanzeeland.nl/index.php?title=Antonius_Walaeus&oldid=69677. Accessed 1 October 2026.

Lasonder, L. W. A. M. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, edited by P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2, cols. 1513–17. 1912. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/molh003nieu02_01/molh003nieu02_01_2538.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Polyander à Kerckhoven, Johannes. *Oratio funebris in obitum … Antonii Walæi*. Recited 14 July 1639. In Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1. Unpaginated front matter.

Slee, J. C. van. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40, 643–44. 1896. https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz84297.html.

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

Chapter 4
The Leiden Professorship, Colleagues, and Students

The last chapter stopped in the summer of 1619, on the eve of the call to Leiden. This chapter follows Walaeus through the nearly twenty years he spent there as a professor of theology, from his arrival in September 1619 to his death on 9 July 1639. I ask what the records show of his work among his colleagues and in front of his students, and who those students were, so that the reach of his teaching can be measured by names and not guessed at. The answer is uneven, and I say where. The records are good on his coming, on his inaugural oration, on the agreement he made with his three colleagues, on the offices he held, and on his death. They are thin on the lecture room: these sources give no list of his lectures, no roll of the men who sat in them, and no date for any one of his disputations. They are best on the one group of students whom he housed and taught himself, the young men trained for the East Indies in his own house, and even there the lists differ.

The evidence is of six kinds. The first is the funeral oration of Johannes Polyander, who sat beside him in the faculty for twenty years and who gives the call, the move, the offices, and the last days.[1] The second is the Life of Walaeus printed in William Bates's collection of lives, which I use for the call, the doctorate, the agreement among the colleagues, the seminary, the rectorate, and the death.[2] The third is his own writing in the *Opera omnia*: the inaugural oration, two orations that he gave as Rector, the plan for the seminary, two statements of the faculty, and several letters.[3] The fourth is the preface to the *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, which the colleagues wrote together, in the edition of Herman Bavinck.[4] The fifth is a Leiden doctoral dissertation of 1891 by J. D. de Lind van Wijngaarden, which cites the resolutions of the Curators, the Acts of the Academic Senate, and a Leiden tax register; I give what Lind says and what he cites.[5] The sixth is the reference notices named in the first chapter and two modern studies, one on the East India Company's seminary and one on the Leiden university in these years.[6] The Life is a praising life, and I give its praise as its own. Where the sources agree I say so, and where they differ I give each account and settle none.

---

[1] Johannes Polyander à Kerckhoven, *Oratio funebris in obitum … Antonii Walæi*, in Antonius Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), unpaginated front matter, images 8–13. Translations from the Latin, German, and Dutch in this chapter are mine. The conventions for Latin quotations and titles, for "image n," and for the "PDF" page numbers of Bates are those declared in note 1 of Chapter 1.

[2] "Vita Antonii Walæi," in William Bates, ed., *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum qui doctrina, dignitate, aut pietate inclaruere* (London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681), 600–659 [PDF 650–709]. Printed page numbers repeat in places in Bates. Each citation of him in the notes therefore gives the printed page and, in brackets, the page of the digitized copy, which is the printed page plus fifty up to the first page numbered 637. Where the numbers repeat, as at 636, 637, and 640, the bracket still gives the digitized page. The contents leaf names no author for this Life, and the text carries no name. The ADB and the NNBW say that a Life by his son Johannes stands in the *Opera omnia* (J. C. van Slee, "Walaeus, Antonius," in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40 [1896], 644; L. W. A. M. Lasonder, "Walaeus, Antonius," in *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, ed. P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2 [1912], cols. 1516–17).

[3] Antonius Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643). The digitized copy holds both volumes in one file, and the second volume begins at image 573. Its printed page is the image number minus 584. Citations of vol. 2 give the printed page and, in brackets, the image.

[4] *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, ed. Herman Bavinck (Leiden: Donner, 1881), iv–v.

[5] J. D. de Lind van Wijngaarden, *Antonius Walaeus* (Leiden: G. Los, 1891). I cite the printed page.

[6] The notices are Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44; Lasonder, "Walaeus," cols. 1513–17; Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 32–35; and Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus," *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* (accessed 1 October 2026). The studies are Lin, *Christian Contextualization in Formosa*, and Otterspeer, *Groepsportret met Dame I*, chap. 17, "De nieuwe orde, 1619–1631." Full entries are in the Works Cited.

4.1 The Call and the Inaugural

Lind sets the call in the weeks after the Synod of Dort. The Synod closed on 29 May 1619, and Walaeus, he says, went back to Zeeland with a silver medal struck in memory of it.[7] The States of Holland, now rid of the Remonstrant party, had resolved in 1618 that the Curators of the Leiden university should serve only a fixed number of years, and two of them, who leaned to the Remonstrants, were the first to leave. On 4 July 1619, Lind says, the new board was empowered to add four persons for a time and, on their advice, to dismiss every professor whose staying they judged harmful to the country and appoint others in his place. In the same month Walaeus was named to the theological faculty as its "inlandsch" professor, the Dutch word Lind puts in quotation marks.[8] The Synod, and what Walaeus did for the imprisoned Oldenbarnevelt, belong to later chapters. Here it is enough to say that the faculty he joined had been emptied by the troubles of the years before, and that the Curators wanted it filled quickly.

The Life gives the decision and the names. The Curators resolved at once, it says, to add to Polyander three men, Andreas Rivet, Antonius Walaeus, and Antonius Thysius.[9] Two men went to Middelburg for Walaeus. They were Rochus Honartius, a member of the supreme court and the principal Curator of the Academy, and Petrus Deimannus, the principal consul of Leiden. They announced the call, urged him to accept it, and carried letters of Maurice, Prince of Orange, asking the same.[10] The Life dates the journey only to the middle of July, and its sentence can be read to attach "Medio Julii" either to the deputation that went to Middelburg or to the one that went to Amsterdam for Thysius.[11] Lind adds what the deputies carried. They had several letters that set out the state of the university and the need for a quick and sound filling of the theological faculty, and the Curators' own letter to Walaeus said, in Lind's quotation, that because the professorships of the faculty had fallen vacant they had been forced to provide for its restoration, and that they trusted his learning and fitness.[12]

He hesitated, and the sources agree on that. The Life says that he asked for time to consult God, his friends, the church, and the magistrate, that the deputies obtained his release, which the church and the magistrate gave unwillingly, and that a pastor's place at Leiden was added to the professorship.[13] Lind lists what held him: a congregation he loved, in touch with the first families of

---

[7] Lind van Wijngaarden, *Antonius Walaeus*, 54. The medals are described in his note there.

[8] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 54 ("Als 'inlandsch' hoogleeraar bij de Theologische Faculteit werd nog in die zelfde maand Antonius Walaeus benoemd"). Lind's notes on this passage cite Brandt's *Historie der Reformatie*, vol. 3, 841 ff.

[9] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 637 [PDF 687] ("adjungere decreverunt, Andream Rivetum"; "Antonium Thysium").

[10] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 637 [PDF 687] ("Litterasque adjunxerunt Mauritii Principis Auriaci, quibus idem petebat"). The sources spell the two names differently. Polyander has "Rochus Honartius" and "Petrus Deimannus" (*Oratio funebris*, image 10, left column), and Lind has "Rochus van den Honaert" and "Petrus Deyman" (Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 54–55). I use Polyander's Latin forms. Polyander adds that Honartius had been a Curator of the Academy "quondam" and that both came with letters of the Prince.

[11] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 637 [PDF 687]. There is no stop in the sentence between the Amsterdam deputation and "Medio Julii", and the ADB says only "im Juli 1619" (Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643). Lind gives the Curators' letter to Walaeus the date of Leiden, 20 July 1619 (Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 55 n. 1: "Geschreven tot Leyden den 20 Julii 1619"), and says the Curators authorized the two deputies to go to Middelburg, to offer the post, to persuade him to accept, and to press the authorities there for his release (55). Sources differ on the day, and I give each and settle none.

[12] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 55 n. 1, citing the Curators' resolutions, no. 1, fols. 4v–5.

[13] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 637 [PDF 687].

the town, and a good future for his children there, against the larger harvest he could expect at Leiden, where he would train preachers who would be scattered through the whole land.[14] Lind says that the consistory of Middelburg met three times on the matter, on 27 and 31 July and 1 August, and that it gave its consent only with reluctance.[15]

Walaeus's own answer to the Prince is in the *Opera omnia*. It is a letter addressed to Prince Maurice, printed on page 419 of the second volume, and it is a text of his in which he speaks of the call itself.[16] He writes that he has received with due respect the letter that the Prince graciously wrote to further the call that the Curators of Leiden had made of him. He feels himself unworthy of such an honor and without the strength for so heavy a burden. So as not to put aside the judgment of so many distinguished men, and above all the request of the Prince, he has prayed earnestly, and has left the matter to "het goet vinden" of those who had a voice in it. They have consented, as the Prince will learn from the report by word of mouth, and he has at last resolved to accept the call.[17]

He preached his farewell at Middelburg on 10 September 1619. The Life, the NNBW, and Lind agree on the day, and Lind says that the farewell lasted more than an earnest hour and became a moving ceremony.[18] On 3 September he had written to Sibrandus Lubbertus that he had decided, by God's grace, to move to Leiden with his family after two weeks. In the same letter he says that he received Lubbertus's letter of 6 July only about the middle of August.[19] The day of the move itself is given two ways. The Life has Walaeus move with his whole family from Middelburg to Leiden on 19 September, and Polyander has him move on 15 September.[20] At Leiden, the Life says, he was received honorably, with a public banquet from the magistrate, with congratulation from the Academy, and most warmly by old friends.[21]

---

[14] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 55. The weighing is Lind's own, and he does not cite a source for it.

[15] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 56 and n. 2 ("De Kerkeraad had er driemaal over vergaderd, 27, 31 Juli en 1 Augustus"), citing the Curators' resolutions, no. 1, fols. 13v–14r. I give the dates as Lind gives them.

[16] Walaeus, letter to Maurice, Prince of Orange, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 419 [image 1003]. The heading reads "Mauritio Principi". The letter is given in Dutch.

[17] Walaeus to Maurice, *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 419 [image 1003] ("in het goet vinden van die gene, die in dese saecke over my hadden te spreken"; "het selve beroep aen te nemen"). The letter closes with the place and the month, "Vyt Middelburch den … Iulij 1619", and the day of the month is blank in the print. Lind quotes the same passage (*Antonius Walaeus*, 56 n. 1). The letter is dated July, and Lind has the consistory meeting on 31 July and 1 August. I do not reconcile the two.

[18] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 637 [PDF 687] ("publica concione x. Septembris Ecclesiæ membris discessum annuntiavit & valedixit"); Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1516 ("10 Sept. 1619"); Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 56.

[19] Walaeus to Lubbertus, 3 September 1619, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 421 [image 1005] ("Statui per Dei gratiam post duas septimanas Lugdunum Bat[avorum] cum familia mea migrare"), and Lubbertus's letter, dated 6 July 1619, vol. 2, 420 [image 1004] ("Literas tuas 6. Iulii datas ad mediam Augusti demum accepi"). Two weeks from 3 September is 17 September, by my count. The letter is on the Lubbertus dispute about the whole obedience of Christ, which a later chapter takes up.

[20] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 636 [PDF 688] ("Decimo nono Septembris Walæus cum tota familia Middelburgo Leydam commigravit"); Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 10, left column ("anno Domini 1619. die 15. Septembris, ex Zelandia in Academiam hanc Leydensem cum familia sua commigravit"). Sources differ on the day of the move, and I settle none.

[21] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 636 [PDF 688] ("honorifice & publico convivio à Magistratu, gratulabunde ab Academia, suavissime à veteribus amicis exceptus est").

The terms are in Lind's notes. He was called, Lind says, at a salary of 1,200 guilders with 300 guilders more for rent, and a rise of 200 guilders came in later years.[22] Lind adds that he and a few others received 36 guilders from the Curators because he had dedicated his inaugural oration to them.[23] The Life says that at Leiden the Academic Senate at once conferred on him the title of Doctor of Theology, with no previous examination, as is usual for those who have given proofs of their learning in public.[24] Polyander says that on the judgment of the Senate he himself pronounced Walaeus a Doctor of Holy Theology, and that he then lectured several times to the students on the common places of theology with the fruit that was hoped for.[25] The ADB says that he received the professorship in July 1619 and took it up on 17 October.[26] It does not say what taking it up meant. The oration followed four days later.

The Life says that on 21 October, about to begin his professorship, he gave an oration on the right institution of theological study, that it was received with a great crowd and the applause of all, and that it soon displeased Walaeus himself, because he saw that many things are splendidly conceived that cannot be put into practice.[27] The *Opera omnia* prints it under the title "De Studii Theologici recta Institutione", and its heading says that it was delivered by Antonius Walaeus when he publicly began the professorship of Holy Theology, in the Leiden Academy on 21 October 1619.[28] The next oration in the volume begins on page 307, so the oration runs eight pages, 299 to 306. What follows describes pages 299 to 303.

It opens on its subject. For a beginning, he says, "nothing occurs to me sooner than that same thing which is the subject of this new calling of ours, namely Theology."[29] It pleased God, he says, to turn the minds of those charged with the care of the Academy to the restoration of the theological faculty, and to call him, who is not equal to so great a burden, to a part in it. So he thought it fitting to speak briefly of the nature and dignity of theological study and of how it should rightly be begun. He sees two faults in those who come to the study in the present troubled state of the church. Some forget its dignity and approach it without the reverence that is due. Others do not enter on the straight and royal road that leads to its goal. He takes the dignity first. He defines theology as the wisdom of divine things, and distinguishes the knowledge that is in God from the knowledge that is given to creatures, which is given in three ways: to Christ in the union of his two natures, to the angels and the blessed by sight, and to men on earth by revelation, by natural and by supernatural

---

[22] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 92 n. 1 ("Hij was beroepen op 1200 gld. + 300 gld. huishuur. De laatste jaren was zijn tractement met 200 gld. verhoogd"), citing the Curators' resolutions, no. 1, fols. 5r, 102r, 164 ff., and 188v.

[23] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 92 n. 1.

[24] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 636 [PDF 688] ("Titulus Theologiæ Doctoris, nullo previo examine").

[25] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 10, left column ("per me S[anctæ] Theologiæ Doctor renunciatus"; "locos communes Theologicos nostris studiosis aliquoties cum fructu exoptato prælegit"). Neither the Life nor Polyander gives a day for the doctorate.

[26] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643 ("im Juli 1619 dort die Professur für Theologie, welche er am 17. October antrat").

[27] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 636 [PDF 688] ("vigesimo primo Octobris Professionem suam auspicaturus, Orationem de Studii Theologici recta institutione habuit. Quæ magna frequentia, omnium applausu excepta").

[28] Walaeus, "De Studii Theologici recta Institutione," in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 299 [image 883] ("Cum professionem SS. Theologiæ publice inchoaret, In Academia Leidensi 21. Octobris 1619"). Van der Aa gives the same day and the title "Oratio de recta institutione studii theologiae" with a Leiden printing of 1619 (Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33, who says he took the professorship "na de docterale waardigheid verkregen te hebben"), and Lin gives 21 October 1619 as the day of his appointment (Lin, *Christian Contextualization in Formosa*, 41).

[29] Walaeus, "De Studii Theologici recta Institutione," 299 [image 883] ("nihil mihi potius occurrit, quam illud ipsum quod huic novæ vocationi nostræ est subjectum, nempe Theologia").

principles. The theology he means is the last, the revelation of Scripture.[30] He then sets out the names that Scripture gives the ministers of the word and the benefits that God gives through them, and turns from that to the remedies against pride in the man who takes up the work: humility, the thought that the effect is God's and not his own, and the thought of what is threatened to the idle servant.[31] Then comes the right institution of the study. The candidate must first separate himself from the pleasures of the world and from impurity of life, with constant meditation on Scripture, above all on Paul's letters to Timothy and Titus, and with fasting when the flesh rises against the spirit.[32] Then follows the course of study. Latin is the common bond of Christianity. Greek and Hebrew let him hear the prophets and apostles in their own tongues and not through translators. History and philosophy serve theology, and of the philosophical arts he says that they must be handmaids to theological truth and not rule it.[33]

This is a plan for a student's life, and it is of one piece with the pastor of the last chapter, who began nothing in the ministry without prayer. It is also the oration of a man who came to a faculty that had to be built again, and who put the character of the student before the books. In pages 299 to 303 he says nothing of what he himself will teach. The Life's report that it displeased him is a short one, and I do not read more into it than that he thought its plan more easily conceived than followed.

4.2 Colleagues and the Disputation Cycle

He did not come alone. The preface to the *Synopsis purioris theologiae* gives the order in which the four professors who wrote it came to the faculty: Polyander was put in Gomarus's place in 1611, and Walaeus followed him in 1619. In the same year Thysius, who had been a professor at Harderwijk, was inaugurated, and Rivet, called from France, took up his office as the fourth in 1620.[34] The preface adds a comparison of the four that it says it takes from the Life of Walaeus by his son. Thysius excelled in memory, and Walaeus and Rivet in native ability. Walaeus was full of vigor, and more practiced in philosophy than the others. In theology Thysius and Rivet had the more wide-ranging learning, and Walaeus and Polyander the more solid. In scholastic theology Walaeus was the strongest, and in the disputes with the Socinians, the Anabaptists, and the Remonstrants he was the more versed.[35]

The four made an agreement that the sources describe in nearly the same words. The Life says that they decided that no one of them would give a judgment on a controversy of religion, on church government, or on a case of conscience by himself, but only together with his colleagues. It adds

---

[30] Walaeus, "De Studii Theologici recta Institutione," 299–300 [images 883–884].

[31] Walaeus, "De Studii Theologici recta Institutione," 300–302 [images 884–886].

[32] Walaeus, "De Studii Theologici recta Institutione," 302–3 [images 886–887].

[33] Walaeus, "De Studii Theologici recta Institutione," 303 [image 887] ("ut ancillentur veritati Theologicæ, non præsint").

[34] *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, iv ("Jam anno 1611 in Gomari locum substitutus est Polyander, quem anno 1619 secutus est Walaeus. Eodem anno Thysius, professor Harderovicensis, inauguratus est. Et Rivetus e Gallia vocatus, quartus, anno 1620 munus suscepit"). Otterspeer says the same in Dutch: "Polyander kreeg in 1619 Walaeus en Thysius naast zich en in 1620 werd Rivet binnengehaald" (Otterspeer, "De nieuwe orde, 1619–1631"). The Life says that Thysius came with Walaeus and that Rivet followed from France a little after (Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 636 [PDF 688]).

[35] *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, iv ("Memoria praepollebat Thysius, ingenio Walaeus et Rivetus"; "solidam Walaeus et Polyander"; "Versatior in controversiis Socinianorum, Anabaptistarum et Remonstrantium Walaeus"). The Life has the same comparison in the same shape (Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 636 [PDF 688]) and says that Polyander was the calm one. The comparison is a son's praise of his father, and I give it as such.

two further rules, that no theses were to be disputed in public unless all the colleagues had seen and approved them, and that no book was to be published that all had not examined.[36] The preface to the *Synopsis* gives the first rule almost word for word and says that it takes it from the Life: "as we read in the life of Walaeus, they decided and continually observed" it.[37] The ADB puts the agreement as a promise not to publish any writing without the approval of all, and Lind says that the four resolved to show their unanimity by publishing nothing and giving no advice except with the approval of all.[38] None of these sources dates the agreement. The Life sets it after the colleagues had come together, and the ADB puts it in "the next following years".

How strictly the rule was kept shows in a letter of 1633. A friend in Zeeland had asked him for his own opinion on a question of church law, and Walaeus declined to give it. For his own part, he wrote, he and his colleagues "souden daer over wettelick ende collegialiter moeten worden ghevraecht", that is, they would have to be asked about it lawfully and as a college before they could say more. They had bound themselves to one another, he adds, to keep unity and peace the better, so that no one should advise on such differences on his own account.[39] Lind has the same example, and notes that questions of every kind were put to the faculty in those years by the States General, the Council of State, the States of Holland, the Prince, synods, consistories, and private persons, that the professors answered the authorities as a body, and that they sent private askers back to their own pastors unless the matter was very grave.[40]

The colleagues' common work was the *Synopsis* itself. The preface counts fifty-two disputations in it and says that the first nine were written in the order Polyander, Walaeus, Thysius, and that the rest, from the tenth to the last, were written in turn by Polyander, Rivet, Walaeus, and Thysius, so that Polyander wrote fourteen, Rivet eleven, Walaeus fourteen, and Thysius thirteen.[41] The order explains which numbers are his. He has the second, fifth, and eighth, and then every fourth from the twelfth to the fifty-second, which makes fourteen.[42] In the heading of each of the fourteen Walaeus

---

[36] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 637 [PDF 689] ("neminem judicium de Religionis controversia, Ecclesiæ regimine, casu conscientiæ seorsim; sed non nisi una cum Collegis suis daturum"; "Nullas theses publice disputandas esse, nisi omnes Collegæ eas viderint approbaverintque"; "Nullum librum edendum, quem non examinaverint omnes Collegæ").

[37] *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, v ("Imo, quemadmodum in Walaei vita legimus, decreverunt et observarunt continuo, neminem judicium de religionis controversia, Ecclesiae regimine, sive casu conscientiae, seorsim, sed nonnisi una cum collegis suis daturum").

[38] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44 ("verpflichteten sich unter einander, keine Schriften heraus zu geben, welche nicht die Genehmigung ihrer aller erhalten hätten"); Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 63.

[39] Walaeus, letter of 1633, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 484 [image 1068], right column ("wy souden daer over wettelick ende collegialiter moeten worden ghevraecht, eer wy nader daer van souden connen spreken. Ende wy hebben malcanderen verbonden, om de eenicheyt ende de ruste te beter te houden, dat niemant in sijn particulier op sulcke verschillen sal adviseren"). The letter begins on page 483. Lind quotes the passage, citing the letter at vol. 2, 483 ff., and gives the year 1633 and the recipient as "een Zeeuwschen vriend" (Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 63–64 and 64 n. 1).

[40] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 63 and 79. Lind adds that the professors did the same with the censorship of books, and gives as an example the case of Daniel van Laren, whom the Prince asked the faculty about before approving his call (79 n. 1). The archive he cites for these requests is the Archive of the Theological Faculty, volume C.

[41] *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, v ("Quinquaginta duarum disputationum"; "ita ut a Polyandro quatuordecim, a Riveto undecim, a Walaeo quatuordecim et a Thysio tredecim disputationes conscriptae sint"). The four numbers add to fifty-two.

[42] My count from the rule in the preface. By it the thirty-third, on justification, falls to Thysius, which agrees with the heading of that disputation.

presides, and each names a respondent.[43] They are, in order: the necessity and authority of Scripture; its perspicuity and interpretation; the person of the Father and the Son; the good and evil angels; actual sin; the oath; divine predestination; the state of exaltation of Jesus Christ; repentance; the cult of invocation; the Church; the sacrament of baptism; ecclesiastical discipline; and eternal life and death and the consummation of the age. That is a course in dogmatics from its first principles to its last things, and it is spread through the whole of the *Synopsis*. I do not call the respondents his students on the evidence of the headings alone.

The headings give no date for any single disputation. Lind lists six editions of the *Synopsis*, the first in 1625 and the last that of Bavinck in 1881, says that it was dedicated to the States of Holland and West Friesland, and describes the preface as saying that the peace in the land had been fought for on behalf of the truth and had not been bought at the cost of the truth, and that the book was a handbook for young theologians and a pledge to the churches of the harmony found in the school of their preachers.[44] The dates of the disputations themselves are a question that a later chapter on the disputations takes up, and here I say only that none of these sources gives them.

4.3 Offices at Leiden

The chair brought duties that the lecture lists do not show. I take them in this order: his standing toward the church, his work for the authorities and the schools, the Bible and the seminary, and the rectorate. For the translation of the Bible and for the seminary I say here only what the Leiden sources say, because a later chapter takes each up at length.

The first question was the professor's standing toward the church, and Lind gives it the most room. The Synod of Dort had drawn up articles to be laid before the States of each province that had a university. They asked that a professor of theology, once the Curators had named him, should need the consent of the provincial synod, that he should subscribe the Forms of Unity, and, as a proposal, that professors might if need be be called before that body to give account of their teaching and submit to its judgment.[45] The Synod had also fixed a formula for the professors of theology to sign, by which they would bind themselves in matters of doctrinal discipline to the provincial synods. The deputies charged with carrying it out pressed the professors at Leiden to sign. It was almost three years, Lind says, before the faculty made any concession. It then drew up a formulary of its own, and Polyander and Walaeus offered it to the Curators, who approved it with a small change at

---

[43] *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, headings of the disputations, each of the form "Praeside D. ANTONIO WALAEO". Disputation 2 ("S[acrae] Scripturae Necessitate et Auctoritate"), respondent Johanne Crucio; 5 ("Sacrae Scripturae Perspicuitate et Interpretatione"), Romberto Stellingwerf; 8 ("Persona Patris et Filii"), Antonio Scriverio; 12 ("Angelis Bonis ac Malis"), Adriano Hasio; 16 ("Peccato Actuali"), Laevino Coolman; 20 ("Juramento"), Petro Laovico; 24 ("Divina Praedestinatione"), Isaaco Biscopio; 28 ("Statu Exaltationis Jesu Christi"), Daniele Suavio; 32 ("Resipiscentia"), Adriano Jansonio; 36 ("Cultu Invocationis"), Antonio Delieno; 40 ("Ecclesia"), Jacobo Bosschaert; 44 ("Sacramento Baptismi"), Michaele a Gogh; 48 ("Disciplina Ecclesiastica"), Johanne Livensio; 52 ("Vita ac Morte Aeterna et Consummatione seculi"), Francisco Boogardo. The names are as printed in the headings of the 1881 edition.

[44] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 64 and n. 2. Lind's list of the editions before 1881 reads 1625, 1632, 1642, 1652, 1658, and the ADB also has 1632. I give only the first year and the last.

[45] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 60 and n. 1, citing the *Kerkelijk Placaatboek*, vol. 1, 126 ff. (arts. 4, 6, 9). The States of Holland, Lind says, did not decide whether the church should have a voice in appointments but left the point to the Curators (60 n. 2). He adds that the Curators called Walaeus before the synod of South Holland had met, and that the letter of call is dated 20 July and that the synod met at Leiden on 23 July (60 n. 3).

their meetings of 6 and 7 June 1622.[46] It was bound in one volume with the three Forms of Unity, signed by the professors, and placed in the archive of the faculty. The deputies were told, and they reported to the synod of South Holland at Gorinchem in 1622 that the content agreed in substance with the formula of Dort, apart from what that formula said about submission to the provincial synod.[47]

The documents are in the *Opera omnia*, and Lind's account fits what the pages show. Page 421 prints in Latin the formula that the national Synod of Dort had fixed for the professors, under a Dutch heading that belongs to the provincial synod of South Holland and speaks of the signing by the professors of theology, the regents, and the sub-regents of the Netherlands Confession, the Catechism, and the canons of the national Synod, and of the church of Leiden's asking the professors to sign.[48] The clause that Lind calls the offending one is on page 422. In it the signer promises that if the synod, for grave cause of suspicion, should ask him "that we expound more fully, or declare more closely" his view on some point of the Confession, the Catechism, or the Synod's Declaration, he will be ready to do so, and that he will submit to the synod's censure, with a right of appeal.[49] Below it on the same page stands the professors' answer, in Dutch. It replies to the call of the deputies of the churches of Leiden, who had it in charge from the synod of South Holland that the professors should sign. The professors say, after taking the advice of the Curators and the burgomasters of Leiden, that they hold the doctrine of the formularies "in alles Gods woort houden conform", that they are therefore resolved to maintain it and teach it on every occasion and to refute what is contrary to it, and that for this reason they have had the formularies bound in one book and have signed it. On the further submission to the provincial synods they say that they cannot now dispose of it, since the States of Holland have given the Curators and the burgomasters an act to the contrary, by which the professors are to regulate themselves until the faculty's correspondence with the synods is settled with the States' approval.[50]

The church was not satisfied. Lind says it asked the professors to draft the closer arrangement themselves, and that the draft came to the table in 1623, but was rejected because it sought the new tie in the professors' appearing before the provincial synod, which sat badly with the synod's want of power over the faculty. The professors were urged once more, and once more refused, citing the States, who forbade it so long as the professors were not admitted as members. In 1624 the synod resolved to hold to its resolutions and to deal no further with the faculty, at least until the next national synod, which Lind remarks it would wait long for.[51] The ADB puts the matter in a sentence, that Walaeus with Rivet, Thysius, and Polyander defended in the following years the

[46] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 60–61 ("het duurde bijna drie jaar"; "op 6 en 7 Juni 1622 met kleine wijziging goedgekeurd"), citing the Curators' resolutions, no. 1, fol. 109 ff., where the draft is said to have been "gevisiteert ende gedresseert" by the Curators (61 n. 2).

[47] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 61–62. Lind adds that the faculty did this provisionally and that the document binds little: of later professors it says only that they would follow the example of the present ones (62 n. 1).

[48] *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 421 [image 1005].

[49] *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 422 [image 1006] ("sententiam nostram super aliquo hujus Confessionis, Catechismi, aut Declarationis Synodicæ latius exponamus, aut pressius declaremus"). Lind quotes the same clause (*Antonius Walaeus*, 61 n. 1). It is the clause on submission that, as Lind reads it, the faculty's own text left out.

[50] *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 422 [image 1006]. Lind's "in alles aan Gods Woord conform" (*Antonius Walaeus*, 63) is his paraphrase of it.

[51] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 62–63 and nn., citing N. C. Kist in Kist and Royaards, *Archief voor kerkelijke geschiedenis*, 1st series, vol. 9 (Leiden, 1838), 475 ff. Lind places the draft of 1623 in the *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, from p. 422 (62 n. 4).

independence of the university from the provincial synod, and Otterspeer says that the signing of a formulary of submission in matters of doctrinal discipline was delayed with success.[52] None of these sources gives Walaeus a part in this that differs from his colleagues'. His name stands with Polyander's on the offer of 1622, and the rest was the faculty's act. Lind draws the line this way: on the doctrine Walaeus bound himself to Scripture and the Forms, because he held them in all things conform to the Word of God, but as a professor he kept a free position toward the church.[53] Lind sets beside it the agreement of the four professors to publish nothing and to advise on nothing except together, which I described above.

The authorities asked of the faculty more than the churches did. Polyander gives the list in his oration. Walaeus took part, with Polyander and some other Leiden theologians, in putting the Acts of the Synod of Dort, which Polyander and the other synodal deputies had presented to the States General, into the more polished style that the Synod's decree required.[54] At the order of the States of Holland and West Friesland, he and other professors chose books of the best writers and furnished them with learned notes, so that the youth in the Latin schools might be well taught in the arts and languages.[55] Lind adds that when the States of Holland and West Friesland took in hand the reform of the Latin schools, Walaeus was named to the commission of six, with Cunaeus, Thysius, Vossius, Heinsius, and Burgersdicius, and that its plan was issued as the school order of 1 October 1625. Lind says that the plan opens with the words that piety must be the beginning and the end of study, and that the program of the first, which is the highest, class names the "Ethick" of Walaeus.[56] Lind says that the Leiden Latin school had made him one of its Curators.[57] The sources give no date for the curatorship, and Polyander gives none for the choice of the books.

The Bible comes next, and I give only what Polyander says. He gave himself eagerly and faithfully, Polyander says, to the weightier tasks that the national Synod laid on him. Chosen with Festus Hommius and Jacobus Rolandus for the translation of the New Testament and the Apocrypha, he gave it several years of the closest labor, and when the version had been revised by deputies from the provinces, he was elected president of the revisers.[58] His part in the work is for Chapter 8.

---

[52] Van Slee, "Walaeus," ADB ("vertheidigte er dort in den nächstfolgenden Jahren die Unabhängigkeit der Universität von der Provinzialsynode"); Otterspeer, "De nieuwe orde, 1619–1631" ("met succes getraineerd").

[53] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 63.

[54] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 10, left column ("Præterquam quod ad Acta Synodalia … Ordinibus Generalibus per me aliosque deputatos Synodales exhibita, stylo exquisitiore juxta illorum decretum conscribenda, mecum & cum aliis quibusdam Theologis Leydensibus, industriam suam … contribuit").

[55] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 10, left column ("in nostris Scholis Trivialibus optimarum artium ac linguarum scientia recte imbui posset").

[56] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 78 and nn. 1–5 (the commission, n. 2, citing the Senate's Acts, vol. 9, fol. 29; the opening words from the *Kerkelijk Placaatboek*, vol. 2, 462, "Pietas prora ac puppis studiorum esse debet"; the order of 1 October 1625 from vol. 1, 469 ff.). Lind also says that Walaeus had given lectures on Aristotle's ethics to the Latin school at Middelburg and published them at the wish of the Curators of that school after he left (78).

[57] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 77. Polyander, in his closing address, says that the pupils of Rector Schrevelius had lost "Curatorem hujus scholæ vigilantissimum" (*Oratio funebris*, image 12, right column), and Lind renders that as a curator of the Latin school (97). I take the school to be the Latin school of Leiden, as Lind does.

[58] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 10, left column ("cum Festo Hommio & Iacobo Rolando electus aliquot annos, summo studio, indefesso labore illi versioni impendit") and the passage that follows on the revisers. The portrait caption in volume 1 of the *Opera omnia* says the same: "Novi Testam[enti] Lib[rorum] Apocryphorum in Linguam Belgicam Versor." and "Collegii Revisorum ejusdem versionis Præses" (image 16). Lind says that Rivet, Walaeus, and Hommius brought the first copy of the Bible, bound in red velvet and gilt-edged, to the States General (88–89).

The seminary is the one office in which his students can be named. The East India Company, Polyander says, was much concerned for the salvation of souls among the heathen and decided to found in Leiden a seminary of students of theology, from which young men trained in piety and the Scriptures might be sent to the Indies. The Company's directors obtained from Walaeus that he should take the office of Regent of the Indian College, partly through the request of the Curators Honartius and Pavius, partly through that of Rivet and Thysius, and through Polyander's own urging. He ran it, Polyander says, in his own house for some years, and out of that house several pious and learned students, after a lawful examination, were sent to the Indians.[59] The Life puts it in numbers. From the year 1622, it says, in the course of ten years, twelve ministers of the church went out of the seminary. The students lodged in his house, and they never went above six. In the end Walaeus gave up the office, and the seminary ceased.[60]

Lind gives the circumstances, with some reading of his own in them. The Company had been pressed repeatedly to supply ministers for the Indies, he says, and on 1 April 1622 the Chamber of Seventeen resolved to found the school. It had before it a plan headed "Necessitas ac forma erigendi collegii seu seminarii Indici", which is in the *Opera omnia* at vol. 2, p. 437.[61] The plan asks that the candidates be of an age to have chosen for themselves, that they bring a testimonial from their consistory or classis, and that they serve a probationary year. They are to live together in one house under a Regent, to be given to self-restraint, fasting, prayer, and the visiting of the sick, and to study, beyond the common course, the Jewish, Muslim, and pagan religions, and Malay.[62] Walaeus accepted the post, Lind says, at the urging of two Curators and of the faculty, after hesitating; the cares of the household that he and his wife would take on were, Lind thinks, the reason.[63] The directors then drew up an ordinance on housekeeping, which Lind says was surely in his spirit, if not at his proposal, and which eased the lady of the house. The students furnished their own rooms and bedding, the washing went out of the house, and a respectable woman put the rooms in order each day and nursed the sick. A house rule followed, and Lind says it was strict in the manner of the time. It forbade carousing, cursing, and quarreling, and the visiting of tennis courts and taverns. The student was to put out his lamp at ten in the evening and was not to come home after nine, and smoking was forbidden. He bound himself to the rule by oath before the faculty and the Company's delegates, the Regent punished breaches, and in a stubborn case the

[59] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 10, left column ("partim DD. Curatorum Honartii & Pavii interpellatione, partim Rev[erendorum] virorum Riveti & Thysii, meoque hortatu ab eo obtinuere ut munus Regentis Collegii sui Indici susciperet. Quod prompto animo ac prospero successu in domo sua aliquot annos administravit"). The two Curators are named as Polyander gives them.

[60] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 647–48 [PDF 697–98] ("duodecim Ecclesiæ Magistri prodiere"; "in domo ejus"; "nunquam tamen senarium numerum excessere"; "Walæus se muneri abdicavit, & seminarium esse desiit"). The Life gives the year in Roman numerals and no date for his withdrawal.

[61] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 77; 197 and n. 1; 199 and n. 1 ("Den 1sten April 1622 besloot de Kamer van XVII"). The title of the plan is as Lind prints it, and it stands on p. 437 of the *Opera omnia* (image 1021). Lind thinks that the faculty, which is to say Walaeus, put the plan in, and that the Company's ordinances and the house rule followed from it; he gives that order as the probable course (199 n. 1, citing J. C. Neurdenburg, 47 ff.). A Mr. Grothe, Lind says, translated the plan (197 n. 1).

[62] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 197–99.

[63] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 199–200 ("Op aandringen van twee Curatoren en van de Theologische Faculteit nam Walaeus de benoeming aan. Hij had geaarzeld"). The reason is Lind's conjecture, and he gives no source for it.

faculty was called in and the directors' leave was asked to remove the offender.[64] As reward for these services, Lind says, the Company gave the professor a gilt cup.[65]

Sources differ on the seminary's years, and I settle none. The Life, the ADB, Van der Aa, and the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* put the start in 1622, as do Lin and Lind. The NNBW has 1627.[66] On the end, the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* has 1632, and Lin says that the board reviewed it in 1628 and in September 1631, and after the second decided to close it, so that it ended in 1632. The NNBW has 1637. The Life, the ADB, and Van der Aa say only that it lasted ten years.[67]

The last office is the rectorate. The Life says that he was three times Rector Magnificus and that he died in that office, and the caption of his portrait says the same, that he died "Rector Magnificus of the Academy for the third time."[68] Polyander says in his oration that Walaeus now for the third time took the first part in the government of the Academy, and that in his last days he went on helping the affairs of the Academy, with the care of a rector, and commended them to the Pro-Rector, Constantinus l'Empereur, his intimate friend.[69] The years of the terms come from Lind alone. He says that Walaeus was four times Assessor, that in 1622 he had the most votes for the rectorate but the Prince chose another, and that in 1625 the dignity was his.[70] It was in his term, Lind says, that Frederick Henry succeeded his brother as stadholder, and the Rector with his three assessors was sent to congratulate the Prince. The next year, he says, it was resolved to leave the rectorate unchanged, with the Prince's consent, because the Academy's anniversary fell on a Sunday.[71] Lind says that he spoke at the close of his rectorate in February 1626 and in February 1627. The *Opera omnia* has two orations that fit: one, which sets out that the Christian man should seek civil prudence not from profane writers alone but first of all from the springs of Scripture, is dated at Leiden 8 February 1626, and another, which describes the duties of the true student in the Academy, 8 February 1627. Lind says that the first was an address to the students of law, to show that the jurist should study the laws given through Moses, and the second an address to all the students, on temperance, modesty, respect for teachers, and piety, with Titus 2:12 as its text.[72] Lind

---

[64] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 200–201 and 201 n. 1, citing [Grothe], 49, for both the ordinance on housekeeping and the house rule. Lind adds that smoking was not then so common a habit as it later became (201 n. 1).

[65] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 77.

[66] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 647 [PDF 697]; Van Slee, "Walaeus," ADB; Van der Aa, "Walaeus"; Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus," *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*; Lin, *Christian Contextualization in Formosa*, 38; Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 199, 202; Lasonder, "Walaeus," NNBW ("1627–1637").

[67] Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus"; Lin, *Christian Contextualization in Formosa*, 38, 48; Lasonder, "Walaeus," NNBW; Van Slee, "Walaeus," ADB; Van der Aa, "Walaeus." Lind says it lasted ten years (77; 202).

[68] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 641 [PDF 691]. The caption is on the portrait page of the first volume, *Opera omnia*, image 16 ("obiit tertium Academiæ Rector magnificus").

[69] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 10, left column ("In Academiæ vero nostræ regimine jam tertium primas Rectoris partes egit"), and image 10, right column ("Pro-Rectori Constantino l'Empereur amico suo intimo").

[70] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 89 ("Vier malen was hij Assessor en reeds in 1622 verkreeg hij de meeste stemmen voor het algemeen rectoraat. Koos de Prins toen een ander, in 1625 werd Walaeus met die waardigheid bekleed"), citing the Senate's Acts, vol. 9, fols. 24, 53, 58, 60, and 29.

[71] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 90 and nn. 1–2 (the resolution is dated 22 September; Lind gives no year). By my count of the calendar 8 February 1626 was a Sunday. I draw no conclusion from that.

[72] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 93–94 and nn.; Walaeus, "Oratio in qua ostenditur Prudentiam Civilem non ex solis prophanis scriptoribus, sed inprimis ex Sacræ Scripturæ fontibus viro Christiano esse petendam," in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 307 [image 891] ("Habita Lugd[uni] Bat[avorum] 8. Febr[uarii]", with the year following in the printer's numerals as 1626), and "Oratio in qua Officia veri Studiosi in Academia describuntur," 313 [image 897] ("Habita Lugd[uni] Batav[orum] 8. Febr[uarii]", with the year following in the printer's numerals as 1627).

says that the third rectorate began in February 1639.[73] I give the years as Lind gives them. On his account the three terms are 1625, the year after, and 1639, and I do not press the point.

In 1632, Lind says, Walaeus lived in the large house that ran from the Rapenburg through to the Pieterskerkhof, which Donellus had lived in in 1585 and Professor Bronckhorst in 1601.[74] The Life says that husband and wife lived in the closest union, and that he told his wife all that befell him in the state, the church, and society, and often followed her counsel.[75] The eldest son, Johannes, took the degree in medicine and followed his father into the Academy, as an extraordinary professor in Lind's account of the years before 1639; the Life carries him on to a professorship of medicine. The second son, Antonius, was a jurist in Walcheren. The youngest, Balduinus, born at Leiden, was by 1639 enrolled as a student for the ministry.[76]

4.4 Students

The men whom Walaeus taught in the lecture room are mostly nameless in the sources. The headings of the fourteen disputations that he presided over in the *Synopsis* name respondents, whom I do not count as his students. Lind says that Walaeus received students in his house and taught them there without fee, and that in teaching them to compose sermons he urged texts whose matter occurs often in the Bible, and that the churches of Zeeland, who knew him, gave him their own pupils to oversee.[77] The one group whose members the records allow me to name is the seminary's.

Lind's names are in a note, and he says that he did not learn all of the students with certainty. The note begins from a letter of Abraham de Roy that is printed in the *Opera omnia*. De Roy says there that all the quarters of the Indies except Amboina and the Moluccas are supplied with Walaeus's disciples. De Roy puts Abraham Rogerius at Paliacate, Willem Holtenus and Michaël Clarenbeeck on the Banda islands, and Robertus Junius on Formosa, and Lind therefore counts them on de Roy's authority as Walaeus's pupils. Lind adds Vertrecht, whom the same letter expressly calls a "disciple". He excludes Scotten, whom de Roy places in the Moluccas.[78] De Roy himself, and Nicolaas Molinaeus, he proves to be former seminarists from the Leiden tax register of 1622, the *Hoofdgeld*, which lists, in the household of Walaeus, five students "for the West India Company": Jacobus Tolleens of Bremen, Johannes Cavelier of Middelburg, Abraham de Roy of Leiden, Nicolaes Molleneus of Leiden, and Michiel Franciscus, whom Lind identifies as Clarenbeeck.[79]

---

[73] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 93 ("zijn derde rectoraat, waartoe hij Februari 1639 benoemd werd"), citing the Senate's Acts, vol. 9, fol. 63.

[74] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 92–93 and 93 n. 1, citing the Leiden municipal archive.

[75] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 656 [PDF 706] ("Cum uxore vixit conjunctissime"; "Eam enim non ut familiæ præfectam, sed vitæ sociam habuit"; "exquisivit ejus consilium, sæpe secutus"). Lind quotes the same passage (*Antonius Walaeus*, 91 n. 1).

[76] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 91–92 and nn. 2–5 (the degree was given by Heurnius on 24 June, the year not stated); Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 656 [PDF 706]. The Life also says that Susanna stayed with her mother.

[77] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 77 ("Gratis gaf hij hun daar onderwijs"). Lind gives no source for the free teaching. He adds that already at Middelburg Walaeus's teaching had enabled some to go to the Indies as religious instructors.

[78] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 208 n. 1, citing de Roy's letter in the *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 481 ff. The sentence in Lind's quotation reads "Alle de quartieren van Indiën, uytgenomen Amboyna ende de Moluque, sijn versien met V. K. discipelen".

[79] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 208 n. 1, citing the *Kohier van 't Hoofdgeld* of 1622 of the city of Leiden (manuscript), ward "van over 't Hoff", fol. 107. The names are as Lind prints them. That the register says "West Indiesche compagnie", and not the East India Company, is as Lind prints it.

Georgius Candidius is a separate case. De Roy lists him among "de particuliere vrienden", and Heurnius says that he studied under Festus Hommius at the States College, which Lind allows may have been before the seminary was founded. Lind says that the question here is not whether Candidius can rightly be called a pupil of Walaeus, but whether Walaeus's son could find some ground to count him as one. Candidius, Lind adds, studied at Leiden until November 1623.[80] That makes a round ten, Lind says, and to them he adds from the album of students of the University Samuel Carlier of Middelburg, entered on 30 November 1629, and Antonius van der Hagen of Utrecht. He speaks of the seminary's twelve pupils in the text.[81]

Lin has a longer list with years, and the years do not agree with the register. He gives a list of twelve names with dates of study: Candidius (1622–24), Johannes Celavier (1622–24), Nicolaes Robert du Moulin (1623–25), Jacobus Tolleens (1623–25?), Abraham de Roy (1625–27), Michiel Clarenbeek (1625–27), Robertus Junius (1626–28), Willem Holtenus (1626–28), Jacobus Vertrecht (1629–31), Antonius van der Hagen (1630–32), Samuel Carlier (1631–33), and Abraham Rogerius (1630–32).[82] The register of 1622 has Tolleens, Cavelier, de Roy, Molinaeus, and Clarenbeeck in Walaeus's house in that year, three years before Lin's dates for de Roy and Clarenbeeck begin. Sources differ on when these men were in the house, and I settle none. Joosse, Lin says, found other names in other sources, among them Enoch Sterthemius, Johannes Levius, Johannes Loosvelt, and Conradus Cleve, and put the number of graduates at sixteen or seventeen. Lin keeps to twelve, for among other reasons that Loosvelt, whom Van Troostenburg de Bruyn dates as going out to the Indies in March 1640, would have gone eight years after the seminary closed.[83]

What the students did comes from Lind, who draws on the letters printed in the *Opera omnia* and on a church history of 1884. Jacob Vertrecht served at Amboina, where he wrote of the Dutch in terms that show how much they needed pious preachers, and compared them to the people of Sodom and Gomorrah. He found Ambonese hard to understand and preached to the people in Malay, and in 1635 counted fifty-six Ambonese among his members, two of them elders and two deacons, with schools of more than sixty children. He kept a private school of ten Ambonese boys to be taught theology. He stayed in the Indies until 1655 and served at Banda and Formosa after Amboina. Lind says he quarreled with the governor, who called him a Judas and in 1636 suspended him, until the church council of Batavia stepped in and he was restored.[84] Molinaeus was placed on the coast of Coromandel about 1628, where most of the people spoke Portuguese, and became the

[80] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 208 n. 1, citing Heurnius's letter in the *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 475 ff., and Van Troostenburg de Bruyn, 291. Lin lists Candidius among the seminary's students (*Christian Contextualization in Formosa*, 47, 165). Sources differ on whether Candidius was Walaeus's student, and I settle none.

[81] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 207, 208 n. 1. The names I count in his note are Rogerius, Holtenus, Clarenbeeck, Junius, Vertrecht, de Roy, Molinaeus, Tolleens, Cavelier, Candidius, Carlier, and van der Hagen, which are twelve. Lind does not say that his Cavelier of the register is the Cavallerius of his text (206).

[82] Lin, *Christian Contextualization in Formosa*, 47, citing L. J. Joosse, "*Scoone dingen sijn swaere dingen*" (Leiden: Groen en Zoon, 1992), 487, who in turn, Lin says, cites Lind van Wijngaarden's book. Lind's note at 208 gives names and not years. Lin's "du Moulin" may be Lind's Molinaeus, and Lin's "Celavier" may be Lind's Cavelier; I do not identify them. Lin's Appendix I gives different years for Candidius (1621–23) and for Junius (1625–27), who he says enrolled at nineteen under Walaeus (165).

[83] Lin, *Christian Contextualization in Formosa*, 47–49. I make no identification of this Sterthemius with the minister Sterthemius of the previous chapter.

[84] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 204–6 and nn. ("Tot 1655 bleef hij in Indië en diende na Amboina nog Banda en Formosa"), citing C. A. L. van Troostenburg de Bruyn, *De Hervormde Kerk in Nederlandsch Oost-Indië onder de Oost-Indische Compagnie* (Arnhem, 1884), 446 and 147.

first minister of the Portuguese congregation at Batavia.[85] Johannes Cavallerius, one of the first, died soon after he was posted. Jacobus Bontius wrote to Walaeus, Lind says, that he had married the widow of the "most faithful minister of the Gospel" Johannes Cavallerius.[86] In 1632, Lind says, Clarenbeeck and Holtenus were at work on the Banda islands, at first with much success, when the governor Raemburch was ordered by his superiors to send two deputies always to the church meetings and to require that all letters for Batavia pass through his hands. When the church councils objected, their meetings were forbidden. The two wished to go home, where the churches since the National Synod had regained their old independence.[87]

The seminary's reach can be put in a few lines. The respondents of the *Synopsis* are names without men. The seminary's graduates are twelve in the Life and in Lind, and they served at Amboina, Banda, Formosa, Coromandel, Batavia, and Paliacate. The lists of their names and the years of their study do not agree, and the sources that give their work are one church history of 1884 and the letters in the *Opera omnia*, and not a roll of the seminary. These sources give no roll of the men he taught in the lecture room.

4.5 Last Illness, Death, and Burial

The Leiden years end with his death, and two sources describe it. The Life says that he fell ill on 29 June 1639, that on the third of July, which was a Sunday, he went to church, and that on the Saturday, near the eleventh hour of the day, he died. It says that he was buried in the choir of the church of St. Peter, on its east side.[88] Polyander, in the oration he gave at the funeral, has the same days and more. Walaeus went to church on the third of the month, and then went on, with the care of a rector, helping the affairs of the Academy until the seventh day, when he spoke with Daniel Heinsius. Soon after, a pain in the stomach laid him low. On the evening of the eighth he was visited by Thysius, Triglandius, and Polyander himself, and was somewhat refreshed, and with a calm and composed mind he took leave of his wife and children. On the next day he received the address of his son Johannes and of Ludovicus de Dieu. He could not then speak clearly, but by a sound and a sign he showed that it would be most welcome if De Dieu prayed for him. About the eleventh hour of that day he gave back his soul to God his Redeemer, in peace.[89]

---

[85] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 205–6 and n. 1, citing J. F. G. Brumund in the *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, vol. 12 (1864), 29–30 and 103.

[86] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 206 and n. 2, citing the *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 479.

[87] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 206–7 and nn. 1–2, citing Heurnius's letter of 8 March 1631 (*Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 475 ff.) for the governor's order, and de Roy's letter (481) for the churches. Lind's text places the events in 1632, and the letter he cites for the governor's order is dated March 1631. He does not explain the difference. Sources differ, or Lind's citation is loose, and I settle nothing.

[88] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 657–58 [PDF 707–8] ("Tertio Julii, die Dominico Ecclesiam adiit"; "ad diei Sabbathi horam undecimam, expiravit"; "Sepultus est in choro Templi divi Petri, ad partem ejus orientem"). The Life's date for the start of the illness is in the same pages.

[89] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 10, right column ("tertio hujus mensis die"; "usque ad septimum diem"; "placida compositaque mente valedixit"; "circa horam undecimam ejusdem diei, animam suam Deo Redemptori suo pie ac placide reddidit"). Polyander also says that Walaeus's son Johannes, a physician, had told him that the illness went back to his father's thirtieth year, and that Walaeus had foreseen it as fatal. Asked by Johannes what oration he would end his rectorate with, if God spared him, he answered that it would be on eternity: "de æternitate, quam rerum humanarum satur spiro ac spero" (Lind quotes this, *Antonius Walaeus*, 95 n. 1). The oration is dated "Recitata ad xiv. Julii" in 1639 (image 8).

The two accounts give the same day. By my count of the calendar, the third of July 1639 was a Sunday, the ninth a Saturday, and the fourteenth, the day of the oration, a Thursday. The portrait caption, the ADB, and the NNBW also give 9 July 1639.[90] Lind adds that it was at eleven in the morning and that he was buried some days later in the family grave in the choir of St. Peter's.[91] Lind gives a fuller story of the last week. After the service of the third, Walaeus received his students up to the Wednesday evening and then fell into a sleep of twenty-four hours, from which a cupping glass woke him on the Friday evening, and on the Saturday De Dieu came and prayed with him, and then he died.[92]

Polyander spoke on 14 July in the great hall of the Academy. Lind describes it: the Curators and burgomasters on one side of him and his colleagues on the other, the members of the synod of South Holland, then meeting at Leiden, many learned men and ministers, and the students.[93] Polyander told the Curators and burgomasters that they had lost an ornament of their city and Academy. He told the professors that they had lost a colleague, dear, wise, and prudent, and the members of the Academy that they had lost a Rector Magnificus whom their memory should hold. He told the deputies of both synods of Holland that they had lost a theologian most skilled in counsel, and the pastors of the city that they had lost an ornament of their church. To the pupils of the Latin school he said that they had lost a most watchful Curator.[94] Lind says that Polyander ended by urging them to hold fast in the contest of faith with the dead man as their example.

The collected works in which Polyander's oration is printed came out four years later. Both title leaves of the *Opera omnia* give the imprint of Franciscus Hackius at Leiden and the year 1643, and the dedication to Jacob Cats is dated at the Batavian Academy "the fifth [day before the] Kalends of April" of that year.[95] The portrait in the front matter of the first volume names his offices in order. It calls him Doctor of Sacred Theology and Professor in the Leiden Academy, Regent of the Indian Seminary, translator of the New Testament and the Apocrypha into Dutch, and president of the board of revisers of that version.[96] These are the offices that this chapter has followed.

---

[90] *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, image 16 ("IX Iulii A°."); Van Slee, "Walaeus," ADB ("am 9. Juli 1639"); Lasonder, "Walaeus," NNBW. Van der Aa has 18 September 1634, which is not possible beside these, and I do not use it. Lind quotes the Senate's minute of 9 July 1639, in which Polyander is asked to celebrate the memory of the Rector Walaeus by a public oration, "qui die Julii nono pie in Domino expiravit" (*Antonius Walaeus*, 97 n. 1, citing the Senate's Acts, vol. 9, fol. 64).

[91] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 96. Neither Latin text says "morning". The Life places the grave on the east side of the choir, and Lind does not (Bates, 658).

[92] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 95–96 and n. 1 ("apposita collo cucurbitula"). Polyander has the visit of Thysius and Triglandius on the evening of the eighth, the Friday, which Lind does not mention. Sources differ on the course of the last days, and I settle none.

[93] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 96–97. Lind gives no source for the details of the hall. The Senate's minute he quotes, of 9 July, asks only for a public oration (97 n. 1).

[94] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 12, right column ("Vos DD. Curatores, Consules ac Senatores magnum vestræ Academiæ ac Civitatis ornamentum"; "Vos utriusque Synodi Hollandicæ deputati … Theologum consultissimum"; "Curatorem hujus scholæ vigilantissimum"). Lind's Dutch version of the address and of how it ended is at 97.

[95] *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, dedication, image 5 ("Ex Academia Batava V. Kalend. Aprilis A°.", with the year following in the printer's numerals as 1643), which is 28 March 1643 by my conversion. The ADB and the NNBW date the *Opera omnia* 1647, and Van der Aa has "L.B. 1623". The Life is not in that front matter (images 1–16).

[96] *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, portrait caption, image 16 ("S[anctæ] Theol[ogiæ] Doct[or] et Professor in Acad[emia] Leydensi. Seminarii Indici Regens·Novi Testam[enti] Lib[rorum] Apocryphorum in Linguam Belgicam Versor. Collegii Revisorum ejusdem versionis Præses"). Lind says that two portraits were made of Walaeus, the first probably in his fifty-second year for Meursius's *Athenae Batavae* of 1625, and the second by the painter Baly when he was sixty-three, which hangs in the Senate chamber of the University (*Antonius Walaeus*, 97 n. 2).

Works Cited

Aa, A. J. van der. “Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale.” In *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20, 32–35. 1877. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/aa__001biog24_01/aa__001biog24_01_0091.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Bates, William, ed. *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum*. London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681. “Vita Antonii Walæi,” 600–659. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/vitaeselectoruma00bate.

Hulsbergen, S. J. M. “Antonius Walaeus.” *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*. Entry from the 1982–84 print edition. https://www.encyclopedievanzeeland.nl/index.php?title=Antonius_Walaeus&oldid=69677. Accessed 1 October 2026.

Lasonder, L. W. A. M. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, edited by P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2, cols. 1513–17. 1912. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/molh003nieu02_01/molh003nieu02_01_2538.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Lin, Changhua. *Christian Contextualization in Formosa: A Remarkable Episode (1624–1662) of Reformed Mission History*. PhD diss., Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2014.

Lind van Wijngaarden, J. D. de. *Antonius Walaeus*. Leiden: G. Los, 1891.

Otterspeer, Willem. *Groepsportret met Dame I*. Chap. 17, “De nieuwe orde, 1619–1631.” 2000. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/otte010groe01_01/otte010groe01_01_0018.php.

Polyander à Kerckhoven, Johannes. *Oratio funebris in obitum … Antonii Walæi*. Recited 14 July 1639. In Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1. Unpaginated front matter.

Slee, J. C. van. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40, 643–44. 1896. https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz84297.html.

Synopsis purioris theologiae. Edited by Herman Bavinck. Leiden: Donner, 1881. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/synopsispurioris00poly.

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

Chapter 5
Graciousness: The Prisoner and Other Kindness

Chapter 4 left to one side what Walaeus did in May 1619 for the prisoner Johan van Oldenbarnevelt. This chapter takes it up. It asks what the sources say he did on the evening of 12 May and through the night that followed, how they tell it, where they differ, and what the night shows of the man and of the way he understood a minister's place beside the magistrate's. It then asks what else the sources say of his kindness, at the bedside, among his colleagues, and in his house. The first question has a fuller answer than most questions about his life, because the account of the night goes back to Walaeus himself. The second has a shorter one, and what answers it is chiefly the praise of friends and of the reference notices, which I give as praise.

The evidence is of five kinds.[1] The first is the Life of Walaeus printed in William Bates's collection of lives, which tells the night at length and says that its writer has the account from Walaeus's own mouth and finds it noted down in his hand.[2] The second is the history of the trial of Oldenbarnevelt, Hoogerbeets, and Grotius by G. Brandt, printed at Rotterdam in 1708, which tells the first meeting in its own words and says that it follows the oral telling and the written notes of Walaeus as his son Johannes set them down.[3]

The third is a Dutch text that Willem Bilderdijk printed in 1835 under the heading "Uit eigenhandige Aanteekening van Walaeus" ("From Walaeus's own handwritten note"), which his editor says is plainly translated from the Latin Life.[4] The fourth is the *Memorien* of Gulielmus Baudartius, printed at Arnhem in 1620, which tells the same Sunday without naming Walaeus, together with a letter that Baudartius wrote to Walaeus in 1622 and that stands in the *Opera omnia*.[5] The fifth is the later literature: Polyander's funeral oration and the reference notices already used in earlier chapters, John Lothrop Motley's *Life and Death of John of Barneveld*, and

---

[1] Translations from the Latin, German, and Dutch in this chapter are mine. The conventions for Latin quotations and titles, for "image n," and for the "PDF" page numbers of Bates are those declared in note 1 of Chapter 1. The digitized copy of the *Opera omnia* (walaeusoperaomnia01) holds both volumes; volume 2 begins at image 573, and the printed page of volume 2 is the image number less 584.

[2] "Vita Antonii Walæi," in William Bates, ed., *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum qui doctrina, dignitate, aut pietate inclaruere* (London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681), 600–659 [PDF 650–709]. Printed page numbers repeat in places in Bates, so each citation of the Life in this chapter gives the printed page and, in brackets, the page of the digitized copy. Printed 633–37 are PDF 683–87 (the printed page plus fifty), and printed 655–56 are PDF 705–6. The contents leaf names no author for this Life, and the text carries no name. The ADB and the NNBW say that a Life by his son Johannes stands in the *Opera omnia* (J. C. van Slee, "Walaeus, Antonius," in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40 [1896], 644; L. W. A. M. Lasonder, "Walaeus, Antonius," in *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, ed. P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2 [1912], cols. 1516–17). I cite the text as it is printed in Bates.

[3] G. Brandt, *Historie van de rechtspleging gehouden in de jaren 1618 en 1619 ontrent de drie gevangene Heeren Mr. Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, Mr. Rombout Hoogerbeets, Mr. Hugo de Groot* (Rotterdam: Barent Bos, 1708). The title leaf says that the work was never before printed ("Nooit te vooren gedrukt"). I cite the printed page.

[4] Willem Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis des vaderlands*, vol. 8 (Amsterdam, 1835), 214–23, and the editor's notes in the same volume, 287–89 (note 12). The editor's name is not given on the page of the digitized text that carries the notes. I cite the printed page.

[5] Gulielmus Baudartius, *Memorien, ofte Kort verhael der ghedenckweerdighste geschiedenisse van Nederlandt ende Vranckryck*, "Eerste editie" (Arnhem: Jan Jansz., 1620), fol. 421 [leaf 859 of the digitized copy]; his letter is in Antonius Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), 430 [image 1014].

Willem Otterspeer's history of the Leiden university.[6] The Life is a praising life, and I give its praise as its own. Where the sources agree I say so, and where they differ I give each account and settle none.

5.1 The Prisoner

The prisoner is Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, Advocate of Holland. The sources spell his name in several ways, Barneveldus in the Life, Barnevelt in Baudartius, Oldenbarnevelt on Brandt's title leaf; I use the last for the man and the sources' own spelling inside quotations. By May 1619 the Synod of Dordrecht was near its end, and the men who had led the Remonstrant side in the States of Holland, Oldenbarnevelt, Hoogerbeets, and Grotius, stood condemned by judges whom the States General had delegated; a fourth, Ledenberg, had escaped the penalty by his own death.[7] Walaeus was at the Synod. The Life says that one of the delegated judges, Jacobus Schotte, consul of Middelburg, was sent to Dordrecht by the States General to take him to The Hague, and that Schotte brought him there on 12 May so that no suspicion of the coming punishment should rise among the people. On the road, the Life says, Schotte told him that the States had called him to make the condemned ready for death, because they believed that his prudence and persuasion would do it best.[8]

The days are not in doubt. Baudartius writes that on Sunday the 12th of May, new style, the former Advocate was told that he must prepare himself to hear the sentence of death on the next day, and the printed sentence in his book ends with the date "the thirteenth of May 1619."[9] The Life has Walaeus and Schotte reach The Hague in the fifth hour of the evening and has Walaeus led to the prison toward the sixth, and Bilderdijk gives six o'clock.[10]

The sources give the reason for the choice in a sentence each. The ADB says that on account of the excellent qualities of his heart and mind he seemed to the States General the fittest comforter of the last hours of the condemned man; van der Aa says that he was sent to offer the consolations of religion to the gray-haired prisoner in his last hours; and Hulsbergen says that he stood by Oldenbarnevelt at the request of the Zeeland judge.[11] Otterspeer calls it the painful task that fell to

---

[6] Johannes Polyander à Kerckhoven, *Oratio funebris in obitum … Antonii Walæi*, in Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), unpaginated front matter, images 8–13; the notices are Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44; Lasonder, "Walaeus," cols. 1513–17; A. J. van der Aa, "Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale," in *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20 (1877), 32–35; and S. J. M. Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus," *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* (accessed 1 October 2026). Motley and Otterspeer are cited by chapter, from the Project Gutenberg and DBNL texts.

[7] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 633 [PDF 683].

[8] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 633 [PDF 683] ("XII Maii Hagam ducit, ne ulla populo futuri supplicii suspicio suboriretur"). Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 214, calls Schotte "Burgemeester van Middelburg." Brandt, *Historie van de rechtspleging*, 137, calls him "de Heer Schotte." Sources differ on the judge's name. The Life, Bilderdijk, and Brandt give Schotte; Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus," gives "de Zeeuwse rechter Jacob Schone."

[9] Baudartius, *Memorien*, fol. 421 [leaf 859] ("Des Sondaechs den xij. Mey stylo novo, is den gheweesenen Advocaet Barnevelt aen-ghesept / dat hy sich moeste bereyden om s'anderen daechs de sententye des doodts aen te hooren"); fol. 424 ("den derthienden May anno 1619"). Motley, *Life and Death of John of Barneveld*, chap. 20, places Walaeus's coming on the "Sunday afternoon, 12th May."

[10] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 633 [PDF 683]; Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 214.

[11] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44 ("der geeignetste Tröster der letzten Stunden des zum Tode verurtheilten Oldenbarnevelt"); Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33 ("afgevaardigd om de vertroostingen van den godsdienst aan den grijzen Oldenbarneveld in zijn jongste uren aan te bieden"); Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus" ("op verzoek van de Zeeuwse rechter Jacob Schone, Van Oldenbarnevelt … bijgestaan").

him.[12] The account itself makes him a stranger to the prisoner. It says that Oldenbarnevelt asked who he was and knew his name but not his face, and Brandt says the same in other words.[13] Bilderdijk had said at page 83 of his volume that Walaeus was already personally attached to Oldenbarnevelt and that Oldenbarnevelt on that account had him fetched from the Synod. His editor answers that he finds neither claim borne out, and that Walaeus's own telling shows the contrary: the prisoner had only just heard his sentence when the preacher, fetched by the judges from Dordrecht, was brought to him.[14]

5.2 Walaeus's Own Account

The Life stops its general narrative to say how it knows what follows. It will tell the last hours of Oldenbarnevelt, it says, because it will not be unwelcome to hear them, and it has them from Walaeus's mouth and finds them noted down in his hand.[15] The writer is not named. Brandt, who knew the Life, names him. He introduces the account by saying that the last words of great men are always worth noting and instructive, and that he will give it piece by piece with what others write of it; the first meeting is told, he says, as it was written down from the oral account and the written notes of Walaeus by his son Johannes, who was in his lifetime professor of medicine at Leiden.[16] Bilderdijk's editor, thinking the same, writes "I think Jo. Walaeus, son of Antonius and professor of medicine at Leiden."[17]

Two things follow for how the account is to be weighed. The first is that Walaeus told it, and put it in writing, and that the Life rests on both. The second is that what stands under his name in Bilderdijk is the same account at one remove. Bilderdijk prints it in Dutch under the heading "From Walaeus's own handwritten note," and his editor says plainly that Bilderdijk did not use any separate handwritten note of Walaeus's: everything in it is evidently translated from the Latin Life of Walaeus, which stands in the second enlarged edition of the *Opera omnia* of 1647.[18] A comparison of the two texts bears him out. The Dutch follows the Latin in order and in detail, and it differs only in what Bilderdijk adds, a parenthesis of his own, a few footnotes of commentary, and a remark at the end, and in the closing lines of the Life, which he leaves out.[19] I therefore take the Life and Bilderdijk as one witness and give the Life's page for each point, with Bilderdijk's where his Dutch shows how the point was understood.

---

[12] Willem Otterspeer, *Groepsportret met Dame I*, chap. 17, "De nieuwe orde, 1619–1631" ("Walaeus had de pijnlijke taak gehad Oldenbarnevelt als zielzorger in zijn laatste momenten bij te staan").

[13] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 634 [PDF 684]; Brandt, *Historie van de rechtspleging*, 138 ("De gevangen hem niet kennende").

[14] Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 288 (editor's note 12: "reeds te voren personeel toegenegen"; "is mij even min gebleken").

[15] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 633–34 [PDF 683–84] ("non ingratum enim erit illius extrema audire, quæ Walæi ore habeo & ejus manu invenio fuisse annotata").

[16] Brandt, *Historie van de rechtspleging*, 137 ("'t Geen toen tuschen hen beiden voorviel, gelyk het uit de mondelinge vertelling en schriftelyke Aenteekeningen van Walaeus, door zijn zoon Johannes Walaeus in zijn leven Professor der Medicynen tot Leyden, is beschreven"). Brandt cites the Life again at p. 178 ("'t leven van Walaeus").

[17] Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 287 ("ik denk, jo. walaeus, zoon van ant. en Medic. Prof. te Leiden").

[18] Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 287 ("In tegendeel is al wat B. aldaar heeft, blijkbaar vertaald uit het Latijnsche Vita walaei"). The *Opera omnia* used in this book is the edition of 1643.

[19] Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 214–23, set beside Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 633–37 [PDF 683–87]. The Life ends the scene with a reflection and with Walaeus's return to Dordrecht, which Bilderdijk does not give; Bilderdijk adds "(t.w. Schotte, Burgemeester van Middelburg)" at p. 214. The footnotes under his Dutch are commentary on the prisoner's politics, and the Life has nothing like them.

The editor adds that Baudartius also used handwritten notes of Walaeus for the long narrative that he gives in the second edition of his *Memorien*, and that his story agrees with the Life apart from some difference of order and a few points added from elsewhere. He gives as the proof the letter of Baudartius to Walaeus in the *Opera omnia*, where Baudartius thanks him for the communication.[20] The letter is dated at Zutphen in November 1622 and is addressed to Walaeus at Leiden. In it Baudartius says that Walaeus's letter, with the historical account of what had befallen him and the other preachers with the Advocate Barnevelt near his end, had reached him some weeks before, and he calls it a most memorable history.[21] He thanks Walaeus for pointing out errors in "this first edition" and hopes to mend them "in this second edition."[22] So by the autumn of 1622 Walaeus had written out his account of the night and sent it to the historian. The edition of 1620 is the first, and it came out two years before that letter. It does not name Walaeus, and what it says of the night differs from the Life in places that I give below.

Baudartius's first edition tells the same Sunday. The former Advocate is told on the 12th that he must prepare himself to hear the sentence of death on the next day, and he answers that he had not thought it. Then a preacher, whom Baudartius does not name, comes into the room. The prisoner says that he is now more than seventy years old and knows how to conduct himself. In the evening he has a good meal and treats the preacher as if he were in his own house; then he undresses and goes to bed; and in the morning he asks one of the preachers to go to the Prince.[23]

The account therefore comes down in four forms. The Life gives it in Latin and says that it is from his mouth and his hand. Brandt gives it in Dutch from the same two sources through the son. Bilderdijk gives the Life again in Dutch. Baudartius gives a Dutch telling in 1620, without Walaeus's name, and afterward received Walaeus's written account. I take the Life and Brandt as the two tellings that name Walaeus and say how they came by him, and I take Baudartius's first edition as an earlier and separate telling.

5.3 The Requests and the Mediation

What Walaeus asked for before he went, and what he asked for and carried once he was there, make up most of what the sources record of the night. The Life says that on the road he saw he could not avoid the task and tried to limit it, and that he made three requests. He asked not to be made to announce his death to a condemned man. He asked not to be made to attend Grotius, since, because of the intimacy he had formed with him, he would himself need comfort. And he asked not to be present at the execution.[24] Bilderdijk's Dutch has the same three, and adds that they were carried that same evening to the Deputies of the States and the judges and were granted, with the word that

---

[20] Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 287–88 and 289 ("volkomen overeenstemt"; the note on the letter: "a. walaei Operum. T. II. p. 430"). Brandt, *Historie van de rechtspleging*, 147 and 178, also says that Baudartius used the notes of Walaeus ("d'Aenteekeningen des Professors Walaeus").

[21] Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 430 [image 1014] ("Antonio VValæo Gulielmus Baudartius"; "met het historisch verhael der dinghen die V.E. ende den anderen Predicanten wedervaren sijn, by den Advocaet Barnevelt, ontrent sijn eynde, is my al voor eenighe weecken wel ter hand gecomen. Het is een seer gedenckweerdige historie").

[22] Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 430 [image 1014] ("dese eerste editie"; "dese tweede editie").

[23] Baudartius, *Memorien*, fol. 421 [leaf 859] ("Dat had' ick niet ghemeynt"; "Hy ware nu al over de seventich jaren out / ende wiste wel hoe hy hem draeghen ofte stellen soude"; "Doe quaem daer een Predicant in de camer").

[24] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 633 [PDF 683] ("ne adesse Grotio cogeretur, ipse solatio, ob contractam cum eo familiaritatem, opus habiturus"). Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 214, gives the reason for the second request more fully: Grotius was one "als wiens bijzondere vriend hij altijd geweest was, en wiens ongeluk hem zoodanig trof, dat hij veeleer zelf vertroosting noodig had, dan in staat was hem die … toe te dienen."

Grotius and Hoogerbeets were not condemned to die and that the fiscals had already told Oldenbarnevelt his sentence, and that Walaeus should go to him as soon as he could.[25] The Life has him led to the prison toward the sixth hour.

He found the prisoner much disturbed and writing to his wife and children. Walaeus greeted him and said he was sorry to have to come at so sad a time. Oldenbarnevelt, much moved, answered that he had no need of a minister of the divine word, that he was an old man and a Christian, and that he was busy with the affairs of his house.[26] Walaeus said that he did not doubt it, but that even for an old soldier of Christ that knowledge must be roused at the end, by warnings and by comfort, and that he did not wish to hinder him in settling his household and would wait; and he sat down at a distance.[27] Brandt tells these first minutes in other words. In his telling the prisoner, who did not know him, asked what he had come to do, and Walaeus answered that he had not come without a commission but to console him in his distress.[28]

When the letter was finished and sent, the Life says, the prisoner asked who he was. He had known the name and not the face. He asked what had been done at the Synod, and Walaeus told him that the doctrine of the Remonstrants had been condemned by the foreign and the Dutch theologians alike and the canons fixed with full agreement. Oldenbarnevelt said that he was not surprised at the Dutch, who came from the Contra-Remonstrant side, but had not expected it of the foreigners, and he asked how they explained certain places of Scripture that seemed to favor the Remonstrants. When Walaeus had explained them, he told him that it was time to think of his own salvation, to confess his sins, and to ask God's pardon.[29]

The prisoner did not like to hear of sins, as if by confessing them he were admitting that he deserved the penalty. He objected that his enemies had examined him and had taken much in the worse sense, that some things he had written to the English ambassador as to an intimate friend had been turned into a crime, that in all he had done he had wished to defend the liberties and privileges of Holland, and that the punishment was now to be the reward of forty-three years of unwearied care and labor.[30] The next sentence of the Life is the one on which the account turns. He said this, it says, with groans and a few tears, and Walaeus wept as well, for who does not pity the lot of men, who a little while before were lords of affairs and are soon of less account than drones and are shamefully slaughtered by the executioner? When Oldenbarnevelt saw Walaeus's tears, he said,

---

[25] Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 214; the Life has the same order of events at Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 633 [PDF 683].

[26] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 634 [PDF 684] ("dixit, dolere se cum tam tristi tempore deberet accedere"; "se verbi divini Ministrorum non indigere, se senem & Christianum esse").

[27] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 634 [PDF 684]; Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 215.

[28] Sources differ on how the first meeting opened. In the Life (Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 634 [PDF 684]) and in Bilderdijk (*Geschiedenis*, 215), Oldenbarnevelt asks who Walaeus is only after he has finished his letters, and Walaeus answers that he is Antonius Walaeus, come from the Synod of Dordrecht and asked to attend him in these last hours. In Brandt (*Historie van de rechtspleging*, 138), at the first greeting the prisoner asks "Wat koomt gy hier doen?" and Walaeus answers "Ik koom hier niet sonder last, maer om mijn Heer te trooften in sijn swaerigheit." Motley (*Life and Death of John of Barneveld*, chap. 20) follows Brandt: "'I am not here without commission,' said the clergyman. 'I come to console my lord in his tribulation.'" Brandt prints the prisoner's letter to his family in full after the exchange.

[29] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 634 [PDF 684]; Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 215. Baudartius, *Memorien*, fol. 421 [leaf 859], whose preacher is not named, has the same wonder: the prisoner is "fich verwonderende dat de wtheemsche ende inlandsche Theologi so eenparlick in alles waren over een gecomen."

[30] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 634 [PDF 684] ("Caronio Legato Anglico … ut amico intimo"; "pro quadraginta trium annorum indefessis curis, exantlatis laboribus"). The Life calls the ambassador Caronius.

"You too, Walaeus, are moved by my misfortune," and from that time, the Life says, he gave himself to him fully as to a friend.[31]

What Walaeus then said of the case is short. He told the prisoner that he had not so full a knowledge of the acts that he could pass judgment on each thing, and that he had not come for that. One thing he knew, that the delegated judges would one day have to answer for this sentence before the throne of God.[32] Oldenbarnevelt agreed that they would, but said that the judges had judged not by the laws that had been received before but by what was now held. Walaeus pressed him again: God does not forgive sins to those who think themselves innocent, and he should ask pardon, with David, even for the hidden ones. The prisoner promised to do so and said that he had already begun.[33]

The talk then turned to doctrine, and I leave the doctrine itself aside here. Walaeus asked on what he rested his hope of salvation. The prisoner answered that men are saved by faith in Christ and adorn their faith with good works. Walaeus said that this was true, but that it must also be believed that the faith and the works were not gained from oneself or by a better use of the free will but were received wholly from God, out of pure grace, according to his decree from eternity. Oldenbarnevelt answered that he believed this and had learned it as a young man at Heidelberg.[34] The Dutch of Bilderdijk, like the Life, then carries the exchange into the prisoner's politics, and it contains the hardest sentence the account gives him. When the prisoner said that he had meant to give the Contra-Remonstrants only the public worship and not to let the Remonstrants be oppressed, Walaeus answered that the opposite had happened, and that the prisoner seemed to be looking for evasions, when God's pardon is not won except by an open confession; and he asked what can be holy to a man who suppresses the religion on which he believes his own salvation and that of the many he governs to depend, and does it in order to rule.[35]

The talk lasted until word came that supper was ready, and the prisoner asked Walaeus to stay. The Life says that he asked him to say the prayer, set food before him, and received him as if in his own house, which could only come from a composed mind that was master of itself; he ate rather freely, as men do whose thoughts are scattered but not crushed, and he would take no wine, so that his thoughts should not trouble the calm that he had.[36]

---

[31] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 634 [PDF 684] ("illachrymavit quoque Walæus"; "viliores fucis fiunt, & probrose à carnifice mactantur"; "Has Walæi lachrymas cum animadvertisset Barneveldus, Et tu quoque, inquit, Walæe meo infortunio commoveris; ac ab eo tempore se illi plene ut amico dedit"). Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 216: "Gij ook, Walaeus, zijt met mijn ongeluk bewogen; en toen gaf hij hem een volkomen vertrouwen." Otterspeer, *Groepsportret*, chap. 17: "Het siert hem dat hij daar zijn tranen niet bij kon inhouden."

[32] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 634 [PDF 684] ("se actorum non eam notitiam habere qua de singulis ferre judicium posset, neque se eam in rem eo venisse: unum se scire, Delegatos Judices novisse, latæ hujus sententiæ aliquando illis rationem coram Dei throno reddendam esse"). Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 216, renders the Latin "neque se eam in rem eo venisse" as "en daartoe ook niet geroepen was," that is, was not called to it. Baudartius, *Memorien*, fol. 421 [leaf 859], has the prisoner told, without a speaker being named, "datmen daer niet ghecomen en was om reden te geven van de sententye der Richteren, ofte om de selfde daer te justificeren."

[33] Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 216–17; Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 634 [PDF 684].

[34] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 634–35 [PDF 684–85]; Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 217.

[35] Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 217–18 ("Wat eenen Staat- of heerschzuchtige heilig kan zijn, die een Godsdienst verdrukt, waarvan hij zijne zaligheid en die van zoo vele zielen waar over hij een bewind voert, gelooft af te hangen, en dat, om te heerschen!"); the Life has the exchange in the same order at Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 635 [PDF 685].

[36] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 635 [PDF 685] ("plane quasi in propria domo"); Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 218. Baudartius, *Memorien*, fol. 421 [leaf 859], has the supper too ("als of hy in sijn huys … ware gheweest").

After supper he asked Walaeus to go to Prince Maurice for him, to ask that the Prince forgive whatever he might have done against him and show his favor to his children, who by marriage were bound to the first families of the land and had always held to the Reformed religion. Walaeus asked whether it would not be better to ask pardon without a condition, and whether the request was meant to reach so far as to hold back the sentence. The prisoner was silent for a time and then said that it did not, and asked him to put it to the Prince as he had said it. Walaeus carried the request to the Prince about ten o'clock.[37] The Prince, in the Life as in Bilderdijk, answered that he had long borne the Advocate good will, that he forgave gladly what had been done against him but that the prayer could have been made without the condition, and that he left it to Walaeus's prudence to say or not say the rest to the prisoner, for he wished only the man's welfare and salvation; he had also asked the judges not to hold against the children what the father had done, and he would do well by them as long as they behaved. He asked as well whether the prisoner spoke of stopping the sentence. Walaeus carried it all back, and the prisoner said that he wished nothing more for his children, and that as to the sentence the Prince was mistaken. He added that he had always been so fond of the Prince that he would have given him the sovereignty if it had been in his hands and could have been done in due order, but he confessed that he had been somewhat embittered against him when the Prince began to attend the church of the separated Contra-Remonstrants at The Hague.[38]

While Walaeus was with the Prince, the pastors of The Hague, Lamotius and Beyerus, came to the prisoner, as the custom of the Reformed churches of Holland was with the condemned, and pressed him again to confess his sins and trust in Christ, and had nearly the same answer. He asked each of them whether Grotius and Hoogerbeets must die too, since they were young and could still serve the country. He asked Walaeus to beg the judges that his servant might stay with him to the last moment, and the Life says that Walaeus obtained it easily. He warned the pastors not to be hard on the Remonstrants, so that the Republic might be quiet.[39]

When the talk had worn him out, the prisoner asked to rest and that the pastors rest too. Walaeus said that he had been ordered to stay the whole night with him. Oldenbarnevelt answered that there was no need, and the ministers slept in the next room. He lay down and could not rest. His servant read him the consolation for the dying that is printed behind the Dutch psalter, and since he could not fix his attention on it he read in his own French psalter. When one of the three guards set over him told the pastors, they sent Beyerus, the youngest, who spent the rest of the night with him in reading Scripture and the comfort drawn from it. About the fourth hour Walaeus and Lamotius went back to him, and Walaeus poured out the morning prayers, and they saw easily from the talk that he was fully ready for death.[40]

---

[37] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 635 [PDF 685] ("Hæc sub horam decimam detulit Auriaco Principi Walæus"); Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 218–19. Sources differ on when the prisoner sent to the Prince. In the Life and in Bilderdijk it is after supper and about ten in the evening. Baudartius, *Memorien*, fol. 421 [leaf 859], has it in the morning: "Des morgens versocht hy op een van de Predicanten om te willen gaen tot syn Princ. Exc."

[38] Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 219–20; Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 635–36 [PDF 685–86]. Brandt, *Historie van de rechtspleging*, 147, names Walaeus as his authority for the prisoner's confession that he had become somewhat violent against the Prince ("Doch hy bekende, schrijft Walaeus").

[39] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 636 [PDF 686] ("de more Ecclesiarum Hollandiæ circa condemnatos"); Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 220–21 ("Moet mijn de Groot ook sterven, en Hogerbeets ook?").

[40] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 636 [PDF 686]; Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 221.

Not long after, the judges called Walaeus out and asked whether the prisoner did not wish to say a last farewell to his wife, children, and grandchildren. Walaeus asked him, and Oldenbarnevelt answered that he thought it not advisable, since he was now ready for death and a farewell could only trouble him and his friends again. Walaeus did not know, and so could not tell him, that his wife and children had asked this of the judges.[41] When the prisoner was summoned to hear the sentence, Walaeus took leave of him and offered what services he could, and Oldenbarnevelt thanked him warmly for what he had done.[42]

The Life goes on to the sentence and the scaffold, and says no more of Walaeus until the next day. It has the prisoner answer that the judges had put into the sentence things that were not in his confession, that he had thought the States General would be content with his life and blood and leave his goods to his wife and children, and that this was the reward of forty years of service; it has him speak to the people from the scaffold, and, as he was led to the place of execution, ask his servant, "Joannes, is no one coming?" as if he still hoped for a pardon; the servant said that no one was coming, and the prisoner knelt, and his head was struck off.[43] Walaeus had asked to be spared the execution, and the Life does not put him there. It closes the scene with a reflection of its own: men long set over the government of a republic, it says, gain great authority among their colleagues by their wit, judgment, and eloquence, but when they have used it to advance friends and think themselves secure, they act no longer from the republic's advantage but at their pleasure, and so give their rivals and their superiors the means of their fall.[44] It then returns to Walaeus. On the day after the execution, it says, he went back to Dordrecht and gave himself to the business of the Synod until the end of May, when he was given a silver coin and was sent away with honor, having been received by the Delegates of the States at a public banquet with all the members and at a private one with the principal ones.[45]

5.4 What the Night Shows

The act is simple, and the Life, Bilderdijk, and Otterspeer agree on its center. A man who had been asked to do what he dreaded went to a condemned stranger, was told at first that no minister was needed, waited, stayed, and wept with him. The sources that tell the night in detail do not describe his kindness; they show it in what he did, and in what he did not do.

---

[41] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 636 [PDF 686]; Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 221.

[42] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 636 [PDF 686]; Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 222. Sources differ on how Walaeus parted from him. In the Life and in Bilderdijk he takes leave when the prisoner is summoned to hear the sentence. In Motley (*Life and Death of John of Barneveld*, chap. 20), "Walaeus now came back with a message from the judges" that it was beginning, proposed a prayer, and the prisoner went down to the judges' chamber afterward.

[43] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 637 [PDF 687] ("Joannes, an nemo venit"); Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 222–23 ("Joannes, koomt er niemand?"). The sentence and the reply to it are at Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 636 [PDF 686], and Bilderdijk, *Geschiedenis*, 222. Sources differ on this question to the servant. Brandt, *Historie van de rechtspleging*, 178, says that it is told in the life of Walaeus, and finds it the less credible because it is not mentioned in the memoirs and notes of the servant Jan Franken and of others who were present at his death, or by Baudartius, who, he says, used Walaeus's notes in telling the story. Bilderdijk's editor calls a long narrative that goes under Franken's name unworthy of belief (*Geschiedenis*, 288–89).

[44] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 637 [PDF 687] ("Ita qui perpetuo Reipublicæ regimini admoventur").

[45] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 637 [PDF 687] ("Insequenti à supplicio die Walæus Dordracum revorsus est, ac Synodi negotiis usque ad Maii finem vacavit: quando argenteo donatus nummo, publico convivio cum omnibus, privato cum præcipuis à Delegatis Ordinum exceptus, honorifice dimissus est").

He did not push in. He sat apart while the prisoner wrote to his family, and when the prisoner said that there was no need for him to stay the whole night, he went to the next room, though he had been ordered to stay. He did not flatter either. He pressed the prisoner to confess his sins, argued with him over faith and works, and said to him, in Bilderdijk's Dutch, the hardest thing in the account, that a man who suppresses the religion on which he thinks his salvation depends, in order to rule, has little that is holy. The Life's writer does not soften this, and it does not make it the end of the story; the next lines are the supper at which the prisoner treats him as a guest in his own house. The tears come in the middle of the argument and not after it, and the Life says that it was they that opened the prisoner to him.

He kept to his own office. He asked first not to be the one to tell the condemned that he must die, and in the Life the fiscals of the court do that. When the prisoner said that his judges had judged by new rules, Walaeus did not take up the case on either side. He said that he did not know the acts well enough to judge and had not come for that, and that the judges would answer for the sentence before the throne of God. Nowhere in these pages does he say whether he thought the prisoner guilty. That is not a defense of the court and it is not a charge against it. It is what a minister can say to a man who is going to die, when the court that has condemned him is also the power that sent the minister.

Within that office he did what he could for the prisoner's small requests. At the prisoner's request he asked the judges for the servant, and obtained him. He carried the prisoner's message to the Prince and the Prince's answer back, and when the prisoner had asked a pardon that was conditioned, he asked whether it should not be made without a condition and whether it was meant to reach as far as the sentence, and so made the petition say plainly what it asked. When the judges asked whether the prisoner would see his family once more, he put the question to him. The Life notes that he did not know, and so could not say, that the family had asked for the meeting.

These are, I think, the marks of a minister who stands beside the magistrate without being the magistrate's instrument. The judges send him, order him to stay, and call him out, and he obeys them; but he asks beforehand to be excused from what belongs to them, and he does not give the sentence his approval. His book of 1615 on the office of the ministers and the authority and oversight of a Christian magistrate over them is the subject of a later chapter, and I do not read the night through it. What the night supplies, for that later reading, is a case in which the same man had to act between the two offices and did so as the Life describes.

The Life is a praising life, and it writes with warmth of what he did. What it keeps is the length of the night, the handling of the Prince's answer, and the prisoner's thanks at the end, along with the tears. Motley, who follows Brandt for the first meeting, calls him "a learned and amiable man." The reference notices say much the same in a sentence. The ADB says that it was his excellent qualities of heart and mind that made him seem the fittest comforter; van der Aa says that he was sent to offer the consolations of religion; Otterspeer calls it a painful task and says that it does him credit that he could not keep back his tears.[46]

[46] Motley, *Life and Death of John of Barneveld*, chap. 20 ("a learned and amiable man, sent by the States-General to minister to the prisoner on this supreme occasion; and not unworthy to be thus selected"). Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44; Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33; Otterspeer, *Groepsportret*, chap. 17. The quotations from these three are given in the notes to section 5.1.

5.5 Other Kindness and Character

The friends and the notices give the rest, and they give it in general terms. The fullest is Polyander's, who sat beside him in the faculty for twenty years. He says that Walaeus's conduct was holy and blameless, at home and abroad; that he was hospitable to friends from other countries, generous to the poor, gentle to all, sober and not given to wine; that he abhorred vanity, quarrels, pride, boasting, and shameful avarice; that he never abused the means he came by justly but used them with moderation; and that he made friends with everyone but formed his closest intimacy with the fewest.[47] The few he names are Festus Hommius, Ludovicus de Dieu, Abraham Heidanus, and Johannes Latius, in Leiden, and, elsewhere, Andreas Rivetus, Johannes Bocardus, and Johannes Cloppenburg.[48] Polyander says too that in his controversies with the adversaries of the Gospel he fought not with abuse and curses but with strong arguments drawn from Scripture, and that his delivery was modest and yet manly, mild, and simple.[49] Of his work for the States and the church, he says that when the States or the Prince asked him to go to The Hague to mend discord in church or university affairs by his counsel he spared no labor, and that whenever the magistrate or the presbytery sent him on a difficult business, even one that exposed him to the abuse of malicious men, he feared no trouble, no inconvenience, and no danger.[50] Polyander does not tie these words to any one commission, and I do not tie them to the night of 12 May.

The Life gives, in its closing pages, a fuller domestic picture. It says that he never put abuse into the books he published, that he never sought titles, and that he asked nothing for his kin or his children that they did not deserve or that could be had at the cost of others.[51] It tells that when the city of Leiden offered him, unasked, the house in which Arminius and his widow had lived, he would not take it until the widow and Arminius's children let him know that, since they had no hope of staying, they would gladly give it up to him and thank him.[52] It tells that Gomarus, sent to Leiden for the revision of the Dutch translation of the Bible, confessed before many that he had been outdone by Walaeus in kindnesses, and asked him to forgive what he had planned against his professorship of theology at Middelburg, which he said he had done chiefly at another's urging; and it adds, as if to explain, that Gomarus was not gloomy or malicious but quick-tempered. Gomarus had been his teacher and host at Leiden, as Chapter 2 showed, and the Life gives the confession to him.[53] It says that he lived with his wife in perfect harmony, without anger or quarrels, that he feared nothing in life more than that death would take her first, that he treated her not as the head of a household but as the companion of his life, told her everything that befell him in the republic, the church, and the town, and often followed her counsel; and that he and she taught

---

[47] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 11, right column ("Conversatio ipsius fuit sancta atque inculpata, domi forisque. Hospitalis fuit erga exteros amicos, liberalis erga pauperes, placidus erga omnes, non vinosus, sed sobrius: ab omni vanitate, à rixis, fastu, jactantia, turpique avaritia prorsus abhorrebat. Opibus juste partis nunquam abusus, sed temperanter usus est. Cum omnibus quidem amicitiam, sed cum paucissimis arctissimam consuetudinem contraxit").

[48] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 11, right column.

[49] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 11, right column ("Contra veritatis Euangelicæ adversarios, non convitiis, nec maledictis, sed validis argumentis ex Sacra Pagina deductis certavit"; "modesta & tamen mascula, lenis, simplex"). Polyander adds that his voice was sometimes sharper and more vehement when zeal for the Lord's glory, love of the truth, or the heat of a disputation seemed to require it.

[50] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, image 11, right column ("nulla incommoda, nullaque pericula reformidavit").

[51] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 655 [PDF 705].

[52] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 655 [PDF 705].

[53] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 656 [PDF 706] ("beneficiis superatum").

their children piety first, reading some chapters of Scripture to them every day, and let them learn what they liked, guiding them gently when they strayed.[54] Otterspeer, describing the Leiden faculty, gives one case from outside the house: when the quick-tempered Thysius fell out with Polyander, Walaeus acted as peacemaker.[55]

The reference notices speak in the same key. The ADB describes him as a faithful and orthodox but moderate and pious servant of the church, far from all passionate zeal, who in the church assemblies constantly urged moderation and the quieting of the dispute. Van der Aa says that his learning and composure moved the Leiden curators to offer him the chair, and that on the side of doctrine he belonged to the most tolerant theologians of his time.[56]

All of these witnesses are friendly: a colleague speaking at his funeral, a Life that rests on his son and on his own notes, and notices that draw on both. The night of 12 May is the episode in which the sources follow his conduct hour by hour. In that account the kindness and the firmness fall in the same hours, and the Life does not take the one out in order to praise the other.

[54] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 656 [PDF 706].

[55] Otterspeer, *Groepsportret*, chap. 17 (“Antonius Walaeus (1573-1639) trad dan op als vredestichter”).

[56] Van Slee, “Walaeus,” 643–44 (“gemäßigter und frommer Kirchendiener, fern von allem leidenschaftlichen Eifer”; “zur Mäßigung und Beschwichtigung des Streites”); Van der Aa, “Walaeus,” 33 (“Zijne geleerdheid en bezadigheid”; “overigens tot de meest verdraagzame godgeleerden van zijn tijd”).

Works Cited

Aa, A. J. van der. “Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale.” In *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20, 32–35. 1877. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/aa__001biog24_01/aa__001biog24_01_0091.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Bates, William, ed. *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum*. London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681. “Vita Antonii Walæi,” 600–659. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/vitaeselectoruma00bate.

Baudartius, Gulielmus. *Memorien, ofte Kort verhael der ghedenckweerdighste geschiedenisse van Nederlandt ende Vranckryck*. “Eerste editie.” Arnhem: Jan Jansz., 1620. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/ned-kbn-all-00004999-001.

Bilderdijk, Willem. *Geschiedenis des vaderlands*. Vol. 8. Amsterdam, 1835. Pp. 214–23 and editor’s notes, pp. 287–89. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/bild002gesc08_01/bild002gesc08_01_0013.php.

Brandt, G. *Historie van de rechtspleging gehouden in de jaren 1618 en 1619 ontrent de drie gevangene Heeren Mr. Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, Mr. Rombout Hoogerbeets, Mr. Hugo de Groot*. Rotterdam: Barent Bos, 1708. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/gbrandtshistori00brangoog.

Hulsbergen, S. J. M. “Antonius Walaeus.” *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*. Entry from the 1982–84 print edition. https://www.encyclopedievanzeeland.nl/index.php?title=Antonius_Walaeus&oldid=69677. Accessed 1 October 2026.

Lasonder, L. W. A. M. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, edited by P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2, cols. 1513–17. 1912. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/molh003nieu02_01/molh003nieu02_01_2538.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Motley, John Lothrop. *Life and Death of John of Barneveld, Advocate of Holland: With a View of the Primary Causes and Movements of the Thirty Years’ War, 1618–19*. Project Gutenberg, 2004. https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/4896.

Otterspeer, Willem. *Groepsportret met Dame I*. Chap. 17, “De nieuwe orde, 1619–1631.” 2000. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/otte010groe01_01/otte010groe01_01_0018.php.

Polyander à Kerckhoven, Johannes. *Oratio funebris in obitum … Antonii Walæi*. Recited 14 July 1639. In Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1. Unpaginated front matter.

Slee, J. C. van. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40, 643–44. 1896. https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz84297.html.

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01.

Chapter 6
The Remonstrant Controversy Before Dort

This chapter asks where Walaeus stood in the quarrel with the Remonstrant party before the Synod of Dort, and how he spoke of it afterward. The evidence is of three kinds. The first is his treatise against Wtenbogaert, which the *Opera omnia* gives in a Latin translation by another hand. The second is a group of letters in the *Consilia et epistolæ*: to Hugo Grotius, to Johannes Polyander, and to Festus Hommius. The third is the *Responsio ad Censuram Corvini*, which is a writing of 1625 and therefore comes after the Synod, not before it. I place it last for that reason. It shows what he thought the Synod had settled and whom he thought he was answering.

I take his words from the second volume of the *Opera omnia*: from the *Tractatus* at its title leaf and its first page;[1] from the *Consilia et epistolæ* at pages 398 to 400, 405 and 406, 408 to 410, 416, and 419;[2] and from the *Responsio* at pages 75 to 79, 84, and 110.[3] Where a page gives a date I give it as the page does, and where he leaves a person unnamed I leave him so.

6.1 The Treatise Against Wtenbogaert

The treatise stands in the *Opera omnia* in a Latin that is not Walaeus's own. Its title leaf says that he wrote it in Dutch and that it was turned into Latin by Ludovicus à Renesse. The title closes with "MINISTRORUM ECCLESIÆ: ET INSPECTIONE MAGISTRATVS CIRCA ILLUD.", and the translator's place is given in the words "in the church of Breda, translated into the Latin tongue."[4] Renesse was a minister of the divine word in the church at Breda. What I quote from the treatise is therefore Renesse's Latin of a Dutch writing of Walaeus. The doctrine of the ministry and of the magistrate that it sets out is the subject of Chapter 8. Here I take it as a writing against a man and a party.

The first page shows what kind of quarrel it is. The opening sentence is a supposition. If Wtenbogaert had defended only the just "authority of magistrates from the prescription of God in divine matters," then all the faithful teachers of the churches would owe him the highest praise and "the greatest thanks." Walaeus gives the ground of the thanks at once. Experience from every age has taught, he says, that

---

[1] Antonius Walaeus, *Tractatus de munere ministrorum ecclesiae et inspectione magistratus circa illud*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), title leaf (image 577) and page 1 (image 585). Image numbers are those of the Internet Archive scan walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584. Where I give the sense of a Latin sentence in English the rendering is mine; quotations in the text are given in English, and the notes keep the Latin. In quotations from the Latin the accents and ligatures (æ, œ) are kept as printed, the long s is printed as s and VV as W, and abbreviations are expanded in square brackets; other oddities of spelling and punctuation stay as printed, with [sic]. Latin titles and imprints in citations follow the same rule, except that the capitals and u/v of display lines are normalized in them; in quotations those capitals and u/v stay as printed. These are the conventions declared in note 1 of Chapter 1. Scripture is quoted from the English Standard Version (ESV).

[2] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 398–400, 405–6, 408–10, 416, and 419 (images 982–84, 989–90, 992–94, 1000, and 1003).

[3] Walaeus, *Responsio ad Censuram Corvini in Molinaei Anatomen*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 75–79, 84, and 110 (images 659–63, 668, and 694).

[4] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, title leaf (image 577).

> "the church is truly free only then, when it is subject to such a magistrate as rightly takes and holds the power over it that he has by God's command."

The quarrel is not over whether the magistrate has a power in the church. Walaeus grants that he has one, and he grants that the church is free under it. What he says is that Wtenbogaert has not kept within it: "his treatise not seldom [crosses] just limits." At that point he names no limit. He asks only "who will rightly take it ill that we examine this book at the Lydian stone of Holy Scripture," and he adds that it will be shown in what places the book turns from the royal path of truth.[5] The measure of the examination is Scripture. The treatise does not oppose Wtenbogaert by setting the church against the magistrate. It opposes him by holding both to a limit that Scripture draws.

Renesse prints in a note after the title a letter from Walaeus that bears on this. Renesse says that he has followed the text closely and been freer in the rendering, and that he therefore submitted his version to the judgment of Walaeus; and Walaeus wrote to him, as Renesse reports, "who [wrote] thus to me on the 10th of April in the year 1637." He sends back the version of "my writing against Wtenbogaert," which in his judgment "[expresses] my mind everywhere" faithfully enough and in Latin, a few little words excepted that he has changed a little.[6] The letter is Walaeus's own certificate that the Latin may be read as his mind.

He then gives his counsel on publication. "As to its publication," he writes, "I submit this whole [matter]" to the judgment of Renesse and the other brethren, and he gives his own view: it is wiser that the work be published hypothetically "than [that it] be published thetically or without mention of him against whom I write." His reason is that those against whom he writes no longer stand by their own hypotheses:

> "they set up new churches against the edicts of the highest magistrates, on this pretext only, that they do not invade the public places belonging to the magistrates."

He adds that "they themselves have tried this in our city too."[7] He names neither the city nor the party, and I name neither.

The two passages fit together. The first page concedes the magistrate his God-given power and tests the book by Scripture. The letter of 1637 shows what Walaeus took the practical danger to be: churches set up against the edicts of the magistrates, under the plea that they take no public place. His counsel to publish without naming the man is the counsel of a writer who wants the treatise to stand on its argument and not on a quarrel with a person.

6.2 Prince Maurice and The Hague

A single report concerns the Prince. Van der Aa writes that Prince Maurice summoned Walaeus to The Hague toward the end of 1617 to consult him on church affairs, and that Walaeus then went back to Middelburg.[8] I give the report as van der Aa has it and add no detail of my own to the consultation.

---

[5] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, 1 (image 585).

[6] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, prefatory note by Renesse (image 577).

[7] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, prefatory note (image 577).

[8] A. J. van der Aa, "Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale," in *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20 (1877), 32–35.

6.3 Grotius

Three letters of Walaeus to Hugo Grotius and one of Grotius to Walaeus stand in the *Consilia et epistolæ*. They show a man who corrects a distinguished correspondent without sharpness, and a correspondent who takes the correction.

The first letter, on page 398, concerns a treatise of Grotius's that the letter calls the *Meletius*. Walaeus writes that it is some days since he read through "that treatise of yours, which" is entitled *Meletius*. He praises it warmly:

> "In which indeed I found very many things worthy not only of praise but also of wonder, so packed with sentences both frequent and excellent, its author both truly learned and sincerely"

The treatise, he goes on, shows its author everywhere truly learned and sincerely Christian. Then he asks leave to speak. He hopes "that my freedom will find pardon with you" if he admonishes Grotius of a few things. The admonition, he says, is not meant to dictate Grotius's judgment:

> "be prescribed, to which I do not acknowledge myself equal, but so that the fruit which, if it is published, will come abundantly from it to many may not be gradually intercepted among the rest by some prejudice conceived against the author. In the first, that"

The treatise is therefore unpublished when he writes, and his concern is for its reception. The letter goes on to its points on page 399 and closes there with a dateline: given at Middelburg exactly on the Kalends of November, 1611.[9]

A second letter to Grotius is printed on page 400. In it Walaeus thanks Grotius for the way he took what was written: "that my writing and its cause were not unwelcome to you." He recognises Grotius's goodwill toward himself:

> "so on the other side I admire the candour of your judgment. For this is truly the mark of a great and Christian mind, in matters of such moment not only to put the judgments of others to the test, but also"

Such a mind, the sentence ends, does not lightly scorn even the warnings of the weaker, if the case requires. The praise is of a particular habit, that of hearing a correction. He adds "that it had already before been anticipated in your own mind, that which I had judged you should think over further at this time," and that from this it is easy to suspect that "the minds of others [would hesitate] somewhat on those points too." He then turns to the argument of Grotius's letter.[10]

The third letter of Walaeus begins on page 408, and its subject is different. He excuses a late reply by his church occupations and by his absence from the city. He has read, he says, a defence of Grotius's "handed to me by your kinsman," and he has read it diligently and with pleasure:

> "I read, so learnedly and so solidly do you affirm the orthodox view in it and weaken the contrary."

---

[9] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 398–99 (images 982–83).

[10] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 400 (image 984).

He wishes that God would keep such a mind in Grotius and in others strong in learning and authority, so that more such monuments may be published for us, "by which saving truth may be vindicated from the malice of heretics, and the contagion of at least capital errors may be stopped!" The letter praises a defence of the orthodox teaching, and it hopes for more of the same sort. Walaeus calls the work simply a defence.[11]

Then comes a caution about a word. At the head of page 409 the letter ends with a sentence about "satisfaction." It cannot be said, he writes, "that [by] a good work a preceding evil is compensated, unless the word 'satisfaction' [is taken] very" loosely. He puts the matter to Grotius with the words "I commit [these things] to be weighed a little more carefully by your judgment."[12] The point is about a word, and it is stated as a caution that the word needs a limit.

Grotius's answer follows on the same page, addressed to Middelburg. He writes, "of which matter I trust that you are certain from the reading of the little book. But yet," and he has decided "to follow you, who admonish rightly, and to put other [words] in their place." He is in doubt about one change. Whether he should dare to put an affection in place of a propensity to punish, with some softening, he does not know. In the same passage he notes that "Holy Scripture so often attributes the word to God," the word of wrath.[13] He accepts a second correction. He had not remembered that the word "acceptilation" was named by Beza: "I had not remembered. Therefore that passage too will be corrected." He goes on, "In this too I will follow your counsel, so as to testify that by the name of the torments which"

> "come into satisfaction, not bodily pains alone ought to be understood, but even above all the sufferings of the soul, which the Evangelists express in the words"[14]

The letter ends on page 410 with a blessing, "May God, Best [and] Greatest, bless you and your ministry. At Rotterdam," and it is dated on the third day before the Kalends of July, 1615.[15]

The exchange is of a kind that is easy to pass over. A minister of Middelburg writes to a distinguished correspondent, and the minister's concern is wording: what the word "satisfaction" can be allowed to mean, and what may be said of wrath in God. The reply grants the point on Beza, grants the point on the soul's sufferings, and holds back on one. The two dates, 1611 and 1615, are four years apart, and in both Walaeus writes as a colleague who admonishes with care and gives his reasons.

6.4 Letters Before the Synod

Three further letters bear on the quarrel: two to Polyander and one, in Dutch, to Hommius.

The first is a letter of Walaeus to Polyander, on page 405. It takes up a set of theses of Polyander's: "which you lately put out on the providence of God, which were handed to me by D. Dreminius, I have read gladly, because" they renewed the memory of a conversation that passed between them as he was leaving, and he is glad that Polyander's opinion agrees wholly with the one he has always approved. He asks pardon for raising difficulties, and then he states a point of agreement:

---

[11] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 408 (image 992).
[12] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 409 (image 993).
[13] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 409 (image 993), the letter of Grotius.
[14] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 409 (image 993).
[15] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 410 (image 994).

> "That the voluntary permission of sin, with its perpetual direction from the beginning of the action to its end, is a cause great enough why such an action may also be ascribed to God in a certain respect, I hold with you altogether."

He turns next to "an event which depends on two associated causes, of which one" effects and the other directs the action.[16] What the passage shows is a division that Walaeus accepts, between permitting and directing, and he wants it examined, not dropped.

The letter carries on to the next page, where it sets two ways before the reader. The first is to confess our ignorance frankly, and he gives the saying of one who said that he often heard it from his teacher: "That all things are governed by God, I know"; that there is contingency and freedom in things he sees, but how the two are reconciled he does not know. The second is that "recourse is to be had to that middle or conditioned foreknowledge which many" Scholastics and more recent writers posit, and for which the letter names Gomarus.[17] The page offers this second way. It does not say that Walaeus takes it, and I do not say so.

A Dutch letter to Festus Hommius on page 416 concerns the conduct of ministers in Holland in the face of a resolution of the States. He writes with pleasure of what he has heard,

> seer geerne verstaen, de stantvasticheyt die vele Kerckendienaren in Hollandt op het aensenden der resolutie der H[eeren] Staten hebben

the steadfastness that many ministers in Holland have shown on receiving the resolution of the Lords States, and he trusts that God through these and like means will give the whole matter a good outcome. The resolution is not named on the page and I do not name it. He turns to a man called Rosaeus, of whom nothing has been heard: "en hebben tot noch toe van hem niet vernomen." He has heard, in writing from The Hague and afterwards by word of mouth, how some politicians in the place where he writes blame the man greatly for the extraordinary sharpness that he showed in this affair: "den Hage, ende daer naer oock mondelick, eenige politijcke alhier hem groot ongelijck hooren geven, over de extraordinare scherpicheyt die hy in dese handeling".[18] Walaeus reports the blame and does not take it up.

A letter of 24 August 1618 to Polyander, on page 419, comes from before the Synod met. Walaeus tells Polyander that "D. Gomarus some days ago asked of [me]" a copy of his letter to Grotius on this business, and that he had answered that he would send it to Ravensperger when he learned that Polyander and Thysius had done so.[19] The reason he gives is that it seems the censures of his side are to be worked into a reply. Whether that is wise at this time or not he leaves to the judgment of Polyander and those with him, and he has decided to follow and not to go before. Of the Synod he writes:

> "of the National Synod nothing yet [heard] by us"

The words concern its progress, and he asks Polyander that he may "learn from you whether some new occasion will bring it delay." The letter closes with a prayer, "I ask God that he keep you safe

[16] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 405 (image 989).
[17] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 406 (image 990).
[18] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 416 (image 1000).
[19] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 419 (image 1003).

for us and for his Church a long while," and with the date "24 August, 1618."[20] It joins three things: the letter to Grotius, the censures that were to be answered, and the Synod not yet convened.

6.5 The Responsio of 1625

The *Responsio* is a defence written after the Synod. Its title page says what it answers: "To the censure of Johannes Arnoldi Corvinus, on" the *Anatome Arminianismi* of the distinguished Petrus Molinaeus, "and to the writings of the Remonstrants who were cited to the Synod of Dort. For the defence" of the doctrine explained and established in the same Synod.[21] Molinaeus is Pierre du Moulin, and the work is his *Anatomy of Arminianism*, which Corvinus had censured. The book is the answer to the censure and to the Remonstrant writings together.

The Leiden faculty prints a letter on the next page, and it gives the book its place. The faculty says that its colleague Walaeus, professor of sacred theology and at present rector of the Academy, had earlier communicated to it his purpose, which was to defend the orthodox doctrine:

> "strenuously and solidly asserted by D. Petrus Molinæus, and assailed with cavils and calumnies by Joannes Arnoldi Corvinus."

The faculty then speaks of the part of the work that deals with the preliminary questions on the five controverted articles and with the first article:

> "examines, when he had finished it and had handed it to us to be weighed, we judged the labour most worthy to be made public; and to him"

The faculty persuaded him to publish the finished part. The letter closes with the hope that the book "will be most welcome and most acceptable" to all the orthodox. It is dated at Leiden in the year 1625, and it is signed "IOHANNES POLYANDER. ANDREAS RIVETVS. ANTONIVS THYSIVS."[22] Walaeus is not among the signers; the three who sign are his colleagues on the Leiden faculty. The book thus goes out with the approval of the faculty, and the letter speaks of the part then finished, which is the preliminary questions and the first article.

In the dedication he says what he wants of the work. He writes that he thought he should apply himself to it to resist those adversaries whose "errors were condemned in the Synod of Dort from the word of God," and who leave nothing undone to feed the schism in the churches.[23] The adversaries are the Remonstrant party, described by the judgment of the Synod. On the next page he says what he had been before the Synod met. He was summoned to Dort among others, he writes, chiefly by the vote of the States, but "before the holding of the Synod itself [he had been] employed in various difficulties of the churches of Holland."[24] He passes over the particulars. He says that he was employed in the difficulties, and that the States later moved him by their authority from the church and school of Middelburg to the professorship at Leiden.

The preface follows on page 79. Its heading says that in it the reason of the writing is given, the preface of Corvinus is examined, and the proceeding of the Synod of Dort is defended from

[20] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 419 (image 1003).
[21] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 75 (image 659).
[22] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 76 (image 660).
[23] Walaeus, *Responsio*, dedication to the States of Holland and West-Friesland, 77 (image 661).
[24] Walaeus, *Responsio*, dedication, 78 (image 662).

calumnies.[25] On page 84 he is at work on that defence. He answers the complaint that liberty was refused to the Remonstrants in the Synod. The complaint is Corvinus's, and Walaeus addresses him in the second person. Of what Corvinus asks he writes, "nor to any good or pious [man], of the Reformed religion,"

> "will it ever be able to seem [right]. Nor will there ever be any Synod in the Christian world in which a like licence was either granted to those cited to the Synod, or was ever asked to be granted. And yet this is that [licence], by no laws"

This licence, he adds, is the power of acting as one wishes, bound by no laws. He turns on Corvinus: "here you define liberty from the Stoics, you who elsewhere charge us with Stoicism, [the liberty] which [was] denied to you and yours in the Synod."[26] The answer is a distinction between liberty and licence. What the Remonstrants had asked, he says, was licence, not liberty, and no Synod will grant it.

By its running heads the book then takes up, after the preface, the usefulness of the doctrine of predestination, at page 89; predestination itself, at pages 91 to 99; providence and foreknowledge, at pages 100 to 119; the will of God and its distinctions, at pages 120 to 133; the sin of Adam and original sin, at pages 134 to 166; whether the powers of evangelical faith were lost, at pages 167 to 177; election, with a long treatment of the ninth chapter of Romans, at pages 178 to 209; and the argument against election on foreseen faith, at pages 210 to 246. Christ as the cause and foundation of election follows at pages 247 to 252, and reprobation at pages 252 to 256.[27]

One name needs care. In the section on providence, on page 110, Walaeus turns on a list of Jesuit writers, among whom he names Fonseca and Molina. They are those, he says, who

> "by the middle [knowledge] and moral causations, as they call them, try to reconcile the providence of God with free choice."

His charge is that they nonetheless bring in "some determining necessity on the specific actions of free choice," which is not from free choice but from the providence of God, and that therefore, of every determining necessity, they "do not grant [that it] conflicts with liberty, which I show thus."[28] Molina stands there as one name in a polemical list. Walaeus neither quotes him nor discusses him on that page, and he cites no work of his. I draw nothing from the list about what Walaeus had read. Molinaeus, the author whose *Anatomy* the *Responsio* defends, is another man.

6.6 What the Pages Show

The pages show a writer who is courteous in manner and who holds a line. Against Wtenbogaert he holds that the magistrate's power comes from God and is limited by what God prescribes, and that a book on the subject is to be tried by Scripture. With Grotius he asks leave to admonish and weighs words: what the name of satisfaction may cover, and what may be said of wrath in God. To Polyander he writes that the permission of sin, with its direction, is a ground for ascribing an action to God in a certain respect. In the letter to Hommius he reports the blame laid on Rosaeus and does

[25] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 79 (image 663).
[26] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 84 (image 668).
[27] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 79–256 (images 663–840).
[28] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 110 (image 694).

not take it up. In 1625, with the approval of his faculty, he defends what the Synod taught and answers a complaint of denied liberty by calling it a demand for licence.

Two things recur. The first is the care with which he draws a limit. The magistrate's power has its measure in God's prescription; a word like "satisfaction" is allowed only so far; and the doctrine of permission is accepted with the direction that goes with it. The second is that the quarrel is not carried on by names. He names Wtenbogaert and Corvinus, whose writings are the occasion, and he speaks to Grotius by name, but he describes the others by what they do. The party that sets up a church against an edict, the party that asks licence, and the adversaries condemned at Dort are described by their acts. This chapter leaves them as he does.

Works Cited

Aa, A. J. van der. "Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale." In *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20, 32–35. 1877. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/aa__001biog24_01/aa__001biog24_01_0091.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

Chapter 7
The Synod of Dort

This chapter asks what part Antonius Walaeus took in the Synod of Dort, no more and no less than the record shows. The Synod met in 1618 and 1619, and Walaeus was there. I want to know in what capacity he came, what he says of the Synod himself, and what the pages let me say of his share in its work.[1]

The pages of the *Opera omnia* that I cite contain no Acts of the Synod and no speech, vote, or opinion of Walaeus delivered there. What they contain is his writing about the Synod from outside it: a letter to Polyander written before it met; three passages of the *Loci communes*; the dedication of the *Responsio* to the States of Holland; and an examination written by the Leiden faculty in 1626. Beside these stand the reference notices on his life, which say more about his place at Dort than he does and which do not agree among themselves. I report each at the strength it has. My claim is limited to the pages I cite, and I make none about pages I have not cited.

The argument of the chapter is this. The pages show a man who has given his assent to the Synod, who speaks of what was done there in the plural, who names its doctrine as the standard of his own teaching, and who with his colleagues defends its authority against attack. They do not show which part of its work was his. I say so at each place. The last section turns from the Synod to the fourteen disputations of the *Synopsis purioris theologiae* that the preface to that work assigns to him.

7.1 Called to Dort

The *Responsio* to Corvinus is dedicated to the States of Holland and West-Friesland, and in the dedication Walaeus reminds the States of what they did for him. He was summoned to the Synod of Dort, he says, chiefly by their vote among others. He adds a second point: "but moreover even before the holding of the Synod itself [he had been] employed in various difficulties of the churches of Holland." By their authority, the sentence goes on to say, he was afterwards moved from the church and school of Middelburg, through the Curators and the consuls of Leiden, to the professorship of theology.[2]

The sentence names who called him and says what he had been used for. The States of Holland voted, with others, to send him to Dort. He had already been called on in the troubles of the Holland churches, though the sentence does not say which troubles or in what capacity. It does not say that he came as the delegate of Zeeland, or of the school at Middelburg. The reference notices speak to the year before. Van der Aa says that Prince Maurice summoned him to The Hague towards the end of 1617 to consult him on church affairs; the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* says that he gave the Prince

---

[1] Antonius Walaeus, *Loci communes*, *Responsio ad Censuram Corvini in Molinaei Anatomen*, *Consilia et epistolæ*, and *Disputationes*, in *Opera omnia* (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643). The *Loci communes* are cited from vol. 1, pages 223, 319, and 343 (images 239, 335, and 359). The *Responsio* is cited from vol. 2, page 78 (image 662), the *Consilia et epistolæ* from vol. 2, pages 419 to 437 (images 1003 to 1021), and the *Disputationes* from vol. 2, pages 319 to 365 (images 903 to 949). Image numbers are those of the Internet Archive scan walaeusoperaomnia01. The printed page of the first volume is the image number less sixteen. The printed page of the second volume is the image number less 584. Where I give the sense of a Latin sentence in English the rendering is mine; quotations in the text are given in English, and the notes keep the Latin. In quotations from the Latin the accents and ligatures (æ) are kept as printed, the long s is printed as s, and other oddities of spelling and punctuation stay as printed. These are the conventions declared in note 1 of Chapter 1. Scripture is quoted from the English Standard Version (ESV).

[2] Walaeus, *Responsio*, vol. 2, 78 (image 662).

advice in 1617; the NNBW says that Middelburg lent him to the Prince that year; and the ADB says that he was for a time a preacher at The Hague in 1617.[3] The dedication does not connect any of this with the difficulties it mentions, and I do not connect it either.

The sources differ on the body that sent him to the Synod. Polyander, in the funeral oration, says that the States General summoned him to Dort.[4] The ADB calls him a deputy of the school at Middelburg, where he was also a professor.[5] The *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* says that he sat in the Synod for Zeeland; the NNBW says that he kept the title of professor and sat as such for Zeeland in 1618; and van der Aa says that he attended in 1618 and 1619 as professor on behalf of the States of Zeeland.[6] The accounts are not all of one kind. Polyander names the body that summoned him, the dedication names the body whose vote sent him, and the notices name the body he sat for. They may fit together, and I do not try to make them fit. The pages I cite do not reconcile them, and whose delegate he was cannot be settled from them.

7.2 Before the Synod Met

One letter in the *Consilia et epistolæ* is dated before the Synod sat, and it shows him in correspondence with a colleague while the Synod was still to come. It is addressed to Polyander and stands on page 419 of the second volume. The date line reads "24 August, 1618." The letter opens with an apology for a delay: "I would long since have answered yours, most distinguished Sir, sent to me some weeks ago, had not both my poor health and a rumor about your".[7]

Near the end the letter turns to business in which others are involved. Walaeus writes, "D. Gomarus some days ago asked of [me]," and the sentence goes on to name "my letters sent to D. Grotius on this business." He answered that he would send it to a third man once he learned that Polyander and Thysius had done the same. Then a further thought, which runs across a break in the lines I cite: "for he seems to wish to insert our censures into his own …; whether that is advisable at this time or not, I". The letter does not say who wishes it or what the business was, and I name neither the third man nor the matter.[8]

Then comes the Synod. A sentence on the National Synod opens "of the National Synod nothing yet [heard] by us," and Walaeus asks "to learn from you whether some new occasion will bring it delay." He mentions a letter: "I received a letter only the day before yesterday, in which how much time". He closes: "[if it] pleases, you will greet [them], and you will share this letter, unless it seem burdensome. Farewell, most distinguished Sir. I ask God that he keep you safe for us and for his Church a long while. 24."[9]

The letter shows him in August 1618 asking a colleague whether the National Synod would be delayed. It shows him handling a matter that touched other men by consulting two colleagues about what each had done before he acted. And it shows the manner of that consultation: he asks, he

---

[3] Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33; Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus"; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515; Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44.

[4] Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, in Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, front matter, images 9–10 (image 9, right column, and image 10, left column).

[5] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44.

[6] Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus"; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515; Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33.

[7] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, vol. 2, 419 (image 1003).

[8] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, vol. 2, 419 (image 1003).

[9] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, vol. 2, 419 (image 1003).

reports, and he puts the question of advisability to Polyander. It does not tell me what he expected of the Synod, and it does not tell me what part he thought to take in it.

7.3 What He Says Was Done in the Synod

The *Loci communes* speak of the Synod in three places that I can cite. In none of them does Walaeus say what he himself did there. In each he joins himself to the Synod.

The first is on Acts 13:48. Walaeus writes: "This place is of great moment, and [was] by us in the Synod of Dort publicly," and the sentence goes on to say that this was done in the presence of the chief men of the Remonstrants, continuing "chief [men], explained; to which explanation, in their own" writings against the Synod, the Remonstrants replied.[10]

The verb is plural. The words "by us" can mean Walaeus and his colleagues, or the Reformed divines of the Synod, or the party to which he belonged, and the page does not say which. It does not say that Walaeus alone spoke, and it gives no day or session. What it does say is that the explanation of this verse was given "publicly" at the Synod, that leading Remonstrants were present, and that they answered in writing. It also says that Walaeus counts himself among those who gave it. That is a modest claim for the speaker and a firm one for the Synod: the verse was not passed over, and the Remonstrants did not pass over the explanation either.

The second passage opens a section of the *Loci* whose subject, as far as its running head shows, is election. Walaeus states his method. "Nor indeed do we resolve here to heap up the opinions of all writers, but we will above all take pains that the doctrine of the Reformed Church, which in the Synod of Dort", and the sentence goes on, "[was] put on record, be set forth from Holy Scripture as certain and firm;" and "that the weakness of the opinions of others may be plain; above all of those who" stirred up contention among them over the matter.[11]

The passage makes the Synod the standard of the section. Walaeus does not say that he will prove what the Synod held; he says that he will set it forth from Scripture, and he describes it as something that was "put on record" in the Synod. He also distinguishes his task from a survey of opinions. The weight lies on the doctrine, and the contention that the section is meant to meet is one that had arisen among his own people. Nothing here tells me which articles of the Canons he had in hand at the Synod. It tells me that when he writes on the matter he treats the Synod's doctrine as the one to be set forth.

The third passage is on infants who die in infancy. Walaeus reports that some think "that those infants belong to election who die in infancy." As they "perished in Adam without knowledge of his sin, so also [they are] redeemed in Christ without knowledge of him." He names Franciscus Junius among them and gives the work in which Junius says it. A commentary is cited beside him: "on the Apocalypse, on chap. 7, verse 9." Then Walaeus gives his own position, and he gives it with synods. He holds with the Synod of Middelburg and with the National Synod of Dort: "and with the National Synod of Dort we determine that here the judgments of God are rather to be adored than searched too curiously."[12]

---

[10] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, vol. 1, 343 (image 359). The passage is Acts 13:48–49: "And when the Gentiles heard this, they began rejoicing and glorifying the word of the Lord, and as many as were appointed to eternal life believed. And the word of the Lord was spreading throughout the whole region."

[11] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, vol. 1, 319 (image 335).

[12] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, vol. 1, 223 (image 239).

The passage shows what holding with the Synod means in his usage. He sets the National Synod beside the Synod of Middelburg, he speaks in the plural, and he uses the Synod to close a question where he declines to go further. The sentence does not say what Dort decided about infants; it says that he holds with it that here God's judgments are to be adored. The page gives no statement of what the Canons say of infants, and I add none.

7.4 After the Synod

Two letters in the *Consilia* show a question from the Synod carried into correspondence. At pages 420 and 421 of the second volume stand a letter of Sibrandus Lubbertus to Walaeus and Walaeus's reply. Lubbertus writes that when they were leaving Dordrecht it was agreed between them that the sense of the twenty-second article of the Belgic Confession would be taken up.[13] The letters are examined in Chapter 14. Here I take from them only what bears on Dort. They show that a question was still open between the two men after the Synod had ended, and that Lubbertus recalled an agreement made as they were leaving. They give no vote or speech of Walaeus on the article in the Synod itself.

The reference notices add three things to the Synod's end. The first is that he was called away from Dordrecht to attend Oldenbarnevelt: the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* says that he assisted the prisoner, van der Aa says that he was sent to offer him the consolations of religion, and the NNBW says that the Prince summoned him from the Synod and that he was absent from it for a long time.[14] Chapter 5 tells that night from the longer accounts. The second is that the Synod charged him with a share in the new translation of the Bible. Van der Aa says that the Synod gave him part of the New Testament, the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* that he had an important role in the New Testament translation the Synod ordered, and the NNBW that he took an important share in the Bible translation ordered by the Synod.[15] The translation is a subject of its own, and I leave it to a later chapter. The third is the judgment of the NNBW on the whole. Lasonder writes that he had taken so important a part in the proceedings that he was chosen for a chair at Leiden.[16]

Lasonder's sentence is the strongest statement in the notices of a share in the Synod's business, and it is a statement of effect: a part so important that it led to the chair. It does not say what the part was, and the pages I cite do not say either. What they give is a man whom the States of Holland had a hand in summoning, who had been used in the churches' troubles beforehand, who joined in explaining a verse before the Remonstrant leaders, and who afterwards treated the Synod's doctrine as the standard of his own teaching; and the chair at Leiden followed. These facts fit Lasonder's sentence, and they do not prove it.

7.5 The Faculty Defends the Synod

The longest text in the *Consilia* that speaks of the Synod is a collective one. At pages 434 to 437 stands an examination of a booklet by Antonius Hornhovius, pastor of Eemnes, put before the States General. The heading reads, in the lines I cite: "To the Lords States General, by Antonius Hornhovius, pastor at Eemnes, of the diocese". Of the booklet it says, "in which certain modes or ways of restoring peace to the churches of these" regions he "proposes and commends. By order of

[13] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, vol. 2, 420–421 (images 1004–1005).
[14] Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus"; Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515.
[15] Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33; Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus"; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1516.
[16] Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1516.

the same High Mighty Lords States"; and the examination was "undertaken by the professors of the Theological Faculty in" Leiden.[17]

The professors are not named. The examination ends with a judgment given in the meeting of the faculty on 24 May 1626: "to treat of these more broadly is not for this place. So they judged in" and "of the Theological Faculty of the Academy of Leiden, on the 24th of May 1626. In the service of your High Mightinesses". The signature is that of the professors of sacred theology, without their names.[18] Walaeus belonged to that faculty, and so the examination is the work of a body of which he was a member. I do not say that he wrote it, and I assign no part of it to him.

Two passages show how the faculty defended the Synod. In the first it answers an appeal that Hornhovius had made to the Acts. The author, it says, brings something forward: "this same author, in confirmation". What he says of the end of the National Synod is that the English, Hessian, and Bremen theologians had asked for a revision and mitigation of its canons and had not been heard.[19] The faculty answers that nothing like this is true. It speaks of "such as was decided in the Synod of Dort against the disturbers of the Church, and afterwards communicated to the Churches." Then it takes up that claim: "It also lacks all truth, that toward the end" and, after the break, "of the National Synod; as if, that is, the English, Hessian, and Bremen theologians had sought such a revision and mitigation of the canons of the same Synod, and had not been heard: for in that session no question is raised about the canons of the Synod themselves or about their certainty, as the words themselves and all who were present at it can testify, and all those".

The faculty's reply has two parts: the denial, and the witness of the words and of those present. It adds that no one spoke against those canons: "with not even one contradicting, the same canons pro-". The session is identified in the faculty's text by its number, and I do not repeat the figure, since the argument does not rest on it. It rests on what was said in the session and on the witness of those who were there.

In the second passage the faculty speaks of the Synod's authority. It asks what authority "the whole Synod of Dort has had with others hitherto, since it [consisted] not only of [men] from all the synods and academies of our country". The answer has three parts. The first is the make-up of the Synod: "and of men eminent in piety summoned from abroad, who had not been entangled in the zeal of parties in our country: and moreover by the High Mighty Lordships". The second is that it "was confirmed and defended: and which afterwards by the National Synod of the Reformed Churches of all France, whose deputies for causes well enough known to the Synod of Dort". The third is that the French synod made "the examination of the same canons," and the Synod "was approved in all respects, and with only the title changed, into part". The sentence breaks off there, and I say no more of what the French synod did with them.[20]

The passages show the form that the faculty's defense took. It was an argument from the Synod's composition, from its confirmation by the magistrate, and from the agreement of a sister church, and it denied that the foreign divines had sought a change in the canons. It is the same stand as the one in the *Loci*, where the Synod's doctrine is the doctrine to be set forth. The examination does not

[17] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, vol. 2, 434 (image 1018).
[18] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, vol. 2, 437 (image 1021).
[19] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, vol. 2, 435 (image 1019).
[20] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, vol. 2, 435 (image 1019).

say that any one professor spoke for the faculty at Dort. It speaks as a body, and it is as a member of that body that Walaeus belongs to its defense.

7.6 The Fourteen Disputations of the Synopsis

The *Synopsis purioris theologiae* is a work of four Leiden professors, and Walaeus's share in it is fourteen disputations. The preface to Bavinck's edition of 1881 counts fifty-two disputations in all and says how they were divided. The first nine were written in the order Polyander, Walaeus, Thysius, and the rest, from the tenth to the last, in turn by Polyander, Rivet, Walaeus, and Thysius, so that Polyander wrote fourteen, Rivet eleven, Walaeus fourteen, and Thysius thirteen.[21] By that order the disputations that are his are the second, fifth, and eighth, and then every fourth from the twelfth to the fifty-second: 2, 5, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32, 36, 40, 44, 48, and 52. Walaeus presides in the heading of each. They treat in order the necessity and authority of Scripture; its perspicuity and interpretation; the person of the Father and the Son; the good and evil angels; actual sin; the oath; divine predestination; the state of exaltation of Jesus Christ; repentance; the cult of invocation; the Church; the sacrament of baptism; ecclesiastical discipline; and eternal life and death and the consummation of the age.[22] I name no respondent. The lines of the *Opera* that I cite do not reach that part of the headings, and none of the passages I cite gives a date for any one of the disputations.

Eleven of the fourteen are in the *Opera omnia* as separate texts. The *Disputationes* of the second volume, pages 319 to 365 (images 903 to 949), print Disputation 2 at page 319, 5 at page 322, 8 at 326, 12 at 329, 16 at 334, 28 at 337, 32 at 341, 40 at 345, 44 at 349, 48 at 354, and 52 at 360.[23] Within those pages I find no text of Disputations 20, 24, and 36, on the oath, divine predestination, and invocation. The *Loci communes* treat the oath and election at their own length, and whether any page of them repeats those three disputations is a question I leave open. As far as I compared them, the opening theses of ten of the eleven, as the *Opera* print them, agree with the openings of the same disputations in the 1881 edition.[24]

As far as I compared those openings, the Synod is not named in them, and neither they nor the preface gives a date for any of the fourteen, so I draw no conclusion about how the course stands to the Synod in time. What the disputations teach belongs to the later chapters on his doctrine, and I do not take it up here. What I can say in this chapter is that they are the work of a professor of theology at Leiden who, in the *Loci*, treats the Synod's doctrine as the one to be set forth.

7.7 What the Record Gives

The pages show a man whom the States of Holland had a hand in sending to the Synod, who had been used in the troubles of the Holland churches before it met, and who wrote to a colleague in August 1618 asking about the timing of a Synod that had not yet sat. They show him afterwards speaking of the Synod in the plural: of an explanation of Acts 13:48 given there before Remonstrant leaders, of the doctrine of the Reformed Church put on record there, which he proposes to set out from Scripture, and of a question about infants on which he holds with it that God's judgments are to be adored. They show the faculty of which he was a member defending the

---

[21] *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, ed. Herman Bavinck (Leiden: Donner, 1881), v.

[22] *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, printed pages 7, 38, 67, 96, 134, 175, 221, 272, 320, 372, 432, 489, 576, and 653.

[23] Walaeus, *Disputationes*, vol. 2, 319, 322, 326, 329, 334, 337, 341, 345, 349, 354, and 360 (images 903, 906, 910, 913, 918, 921, 925, 929, 933, 938, and 944).

[24] *Synopsis*, 7, 38, 67, 96, 134, 272, 320, 432, 489, and 653, for Disputations 2, 5, 8, 12, 16, 28, 32, 40, 44, and 52.

Synod in 1626 on its composition, its confirmation, and the agreement of a sister church. And they show him as the author of fourteen disputations of the *Synopsis*, eleven of which the *Opera* print.

They do not show a speech, a vote, an article of the Canons assigned to him, or a session of his own. The reference notices give him a large share in the Synod, a seat on behalf of Zeeland, a call to the prisoner Oldenbarnevelt, and a charge to help with the Bible, and the notices agree on some of these and differ on others. The *Opera* pages I cite say none of this in his own voice. They show that he was at the Synod and held its doctrine, and in the pages I cite they say no more of his part.

Works Cited

Aa, A. J. van der. “Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale.” In *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20, 32–35. 1877. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/aa__001biog24_01/aa__001biog24_01_0091.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Hulsbergen, S. J. M. “Antonius Walaeus.” *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*. Entry from the 1982–84 print edition. https://www.encyclopedievanzeeland.nl/index.php?title=Antonius_Walaeus&oldid=69677. Accessed 1 October 2026.

Lasonder, L. W. A. M. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, edited by P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2, cols. 1513–17. 1912. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/molh003nieu02_01/molh003nieu02_01_2538.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Polyander à Kerckhoven, Johannes. *Oratio funebris in obitum … Antonii Walæi*. Recited 14 July 1639. In Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1. Unpaginated front matter.

Slee, J. C. van. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40, 643–44. 1896. https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz84297.html.

Synopsis purioris theologiae. Edited by Herman Bavinck. Leiden: Donner, 1881. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/synopsispurioris00poly.

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

Chapter 8
Church Order, Ministry, and the Sabbath

The question of this chapter is how Walaeus thought the church should be ordered, what he took the work of the minister to be and where the magistrate's authority over it ends, and how he handled the dispute over the Sabbath that divided the Reformed churches of his country. I take him where he speaks in his own words and in the words of those who print his letters, and I claim no more than the pages I cite show.

The evidence stands in the *Opera omnia*. The first part is the *Tractatus de munere ministrorum ecclesiae et inspectione magistratus circa illud*, the treatise on the office of the ministers of the church and the magistrate's oversight of it: its title leaf and the translator's note, and its pages 1 and 15.[1] The second is the dissertation on the Sabbath in the *Loci communes*, pages 275, 276, and 310.[2] The third is a letter on the Lord's Day in the *Consilia et epistolæ*, page 389.[3] The fourth is the caption printed beneath his portrait.[4] I do not order these passages by time, and I give no date to any of them that the pages do not give. He does not name some of those he has in view, and neither do I.

8.1 The Treatise and Its Translator

The Latin treatise in the *Opera omnia* is a translation. Its title leaf says that Antonius Walaeus wrote it in Dutch and that Ludovicus à Renesse turned it into Latin. The leaf names the translator's place in these words: "in the church of Breda, translated into the Latin tongue."[5] Renesse was a minister of the divine word in the church at Breda. The Latin I quote from the treatise is therefore Renesse's Latin of a Dutch writing of Walaeus, and I say so wherever it matters.

The title leaf is followed by a note in which Renesse prints parts of two letters from Walaeus. The first answers an offer. Renesse had come upon the book many years before and had advised the most distinguished man, as he calls him, "that either he himself should turn it into Latin, or allow it to be done by me." Walaeus replied that the offer could not be unwelcome to him, since in this way the things "which were written some years ago for our countrymen" could be shared with other nations. Though "I do not value my labor so highly" as to ask learned men to translate it, he writes,

---

[1] Antonius Walaeus, *Tractatus de munere ministrorum ecclesiae et inspectione magistratus circa illud*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), title leaf and prefatory note (image 577), and pages 1 and 15 (images 585 and 599). Image numbers are those of the Internet Archive scan walaeusoperaomnia01. The printed page of the second volume is the image number less 584. Where I give the sense of a Latin sentence in English the rendering is mine; quotations in the text are given in English, and the notes keep the Latin. In quotations from the Latin the accents and ligatures (æ, œ) are kept as printed, the long s is printed as s and VV as W, and abbreviations are expanded in square brackets; other oddities of spelling and punctuation stay as printed, with [sic]. Latin titles and imprints in citations follow the same rule, except that the capitals and u/v of display lines are normalized in them; in quotations those capitals and u/v stay as printed. These are the conventions declared in note 1 of Chapter 1. Scripture is quoted from the English Standard Version (ESV).

[2] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "Dissertatio de Sabbatho," in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), 275, 276, and 310 (images 291, 292, and 326). The printed page of the first volume is the image number less sixteen.

[3] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 389 (image 973). The lines I cite do not give the date of the letter or the name of the man addressed.

[4] Portrait caption, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, image 16 (unpaginated). The caption is printed by the publishers of the volume.

[5] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, title leaf (image 577).

"I would not wish either to deter anyone from it" who took it on of his own accord. That holds above all of a man whose teaching and whose "style has already become known from other labors too." He then turns to Renesse himself and says that it will not be unwelcome "if what has been happily begun" is finished at leisure.[6] The letter shows a writer who did not press for a Latin version and who welcomed one made by a man he trusted.

The second letter bears on how far the Latin can stand for his mind. Renesse writes, "I follow the footsteps of the text word for word, freer in rendering it, yet without any injury to the sense," and "therefore I submitted my [work] to the careful judgment of brother Walaeus." Walaeus answered, "who [wrote] thus to me on the 10th of April in the year 1637," sending back the version of what he calls "my writing against Wtenbogaert." He says that it "[expresses] my mind everywhere" faithfully enough, and in Latin, with a few little words excepted that "I have changed a little."[7] That is Walaeus's own certificate of the translation, and it is the warrant on which this chapter reads the Latin as his mind. It is not a claim that any given word is his, because he says that he altered some.

He then gives his view on publication, and it bears on the question of this chapter. He writes, "As to its publication, I submit this whole [matter]" to Renesse and the other brethren. His own judgment is that it is wiser to publish it in a hypothetical form "than [that it] be published thetically or without mention of him against whom I write." His reason is that those he has in view no longer stand by their own hypotheses, and that

> "they set up new churches against the edicts of the highest magistrates, on this pretext only, that they do not invade the public places belonging to the magistrates."[8]

He adds that "they themselves have tried this in our city too."[9] The lines do not say who set up these churches or which city is meant, and I say neither. They show the point that the treatise defends: churches are not to be set up against the magistrates' edicts, and the plea that a church takes no public place does not alter that.

8.2 The Thesis of the Treatise

The treatise begins on page 1 with a supposition. If Wtenbogaert had defended only the just authority of the magistrates in divine matters, which is the authority "from the prescription of God in divine matters," all the faithful teachers of the churches would owe him the highest praise and "the greatest thanks."[10] He gives the ground of this at once. Experience teaches, he says, that

> "the church is truly free only then, when it is subject to such a magistrate as rightly takes and holds the power over it that he has by God's command."[11]

His idea of freedom is therefore not freedom from the magistrate. It is freedom under a magistrate who keeps to what God has given him. He adds that the church stands in its fullest splendor when

---

[6] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, prefatory note (image 577).
[7] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, prefatory note (image 577). The note gives the date of the letter as 10 April 1637.
[8] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, prefatory note (image 577).
[9] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, prefatory note (image 577).
[10] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, 1 (image 585).
[11] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, 1 (image 585).

the true nursing-fathers of the churches, with all their authority and strength, "busy themselves to defend and establish in every way the order instituted by Christ."[12]

The supposition is contrary to fact. He says that Wtenbogaert's treatise "not seldom [crosses] just limits," and he asks who could rightly be vexed that the book is examined "at the Lydian stone of Holy Scripture."[13] The measure of the examination is Scripture, and the measure of the magistrate's authority is the prescription of God.

Lower in the same column he states the principle that underlies both measures. No man can give the salvation of souls or eternal happiness:

> "this is the gift of God alone; the one means of attaining it is true religion: as therefore the reward and end of happiness is in the hands of God alone, so also he alone can prescribe the effective and sufficient means to this end."[14]

The sentence goes on into the next column, which I do not cite. I do not carry the argument beyond these words. They state the principle on which the treatise rests, that the means to the end are prescribed by God and by no one else.

On page 15 the second part of the treatise opens by looking back at the first, to what was shown there from the word of God:

> "we have demonstrated by arguments the perpetual and necessary distinction of the magistrate's and the ecclesiastical office; and so we have prepared the way to a right understanding of this second part. For when these three essential parts of the pastoral function remain unimpaired, they have the whole foundation of their calling; and certain limits are thus set before the magistrate"[15]

Those who hold the magistracy, in the care of Christ's church that falls to them, "will not try to cross" those limits. With that foundation laid he asks "how far this office [is subject] to the jurisdiction" of the magistrate.[16] The lines do not name the three parts, and I do not supply them. What they show is the shape of the argument. The first part separates the two offices, the second asks how far one is subject to the other, and the answer is given by what the pastoral office must keep. Page 1 gives the magistrate his authority from God's prescription, and page 15 draws the limit on that authority from the calling of the pastors; both rest on the premise that it is God who prescribes.

8.3 The Revisers and the Seminary

In the first of the two letters Walaeus writes to Renesse of the revision of a New Testament version. He tells Renesse, "among the revisers of the version of the N. Testament, you too," and "you have been appointed by your synod," and that "perhaps around the summer," he writes, "we shall be compelled to meet," and to confer on that occasion "about the whole version." The letter closes with a prayer: "and meanwhile I will pray God that he bless your labors."[17] The lines show a body

[12] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, 1 (image 585).
[13] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, 1 (image 585).
[14] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, 1 (image 585).
[15] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, 15 (image 599).
[16] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, 15 (image 599).
[17] Walaeus, *Tractatus*, prefatory note (image 577).

of revisers, a member appointed by a synod, and a meeting expected. They do not say what office Walaeus himself held in it.

The caption under his portrait names his offices. It is printed by the publishers of the *Opera omnia* and is not his own writing. It calls him "Doctor of Sacred Theology and Professor in the Leiden Academy." It gives him as regent of the seminary for the Indies, as translator into Dutch of books of the New Testament and the Apocrypha, and as president of the college of revisers of that version, "Translator into Dutch. Of the Board of Revisers".[18] I take from the caption those titles and no more. It does not say which books he translated or revised, or in what years, and I name none.

8.4 The Dissertation on the Sabbath

The dissertation on the Sabbath opens with an account of why he wrote it. For some time, he says, he had labored more diligently to find the true sense of the fourth precept of the divine law, and he gives the reason:

> "For when I saw, not only in certain other Reformed Churches, but in our own country too, disputes sharp enough and dangerous being stirred up on this matter; of which these defended a somewhat more rigid sense of the fourth precept concerning the Sabbath, and those a somewhat laxer one, as much by voice as by writings; and indeed in such a way that each party found its followers and approvers"[19]

He judged it his office "to inquire diligently into those opinions," and to weigh "what the word of God, what likewise the consensus of the orthodox Church here" held, "according to the gifts received from the common Lord, to weigh seriously."[20] He sets two measures before himself, the word of God and the consensus of the orthodox church, and he sets them between two parties.

He then gives articles on which both sides had agreed. They are, he says, "articles, moreover, on which both sides agreed at that time, and which were therefore commended to our churches by the same Synod." He took them from the authentic Acts of the National Synod of Dort, "whence we have copied them," as they stood in its Session 164.[21] The articles are therefore the Synod's and not his own formulation, and he says so. The first says that the fourth precept has something ceremonial and something moral. The second says that the ceremonial part was "the rest of the seventh day from creation." It adds that the strict keeping of that day was laid on the Jewish people in particular. The third says that the moral part is that a certain and fixed day be set apart for God, and as much rest as the worship of God and holy meditation on him require. The fourth says that "the Sabbath of the Jews being abrogated," the Lord's Day is to be solemnly kept by Christians. The fifth says that this day, "from the apostles onward," "was always observed" in the primitive church. The sixth says that the day is to be given to the worship of God in such a way that all cease from work except what belongs to charity or to present necessity, and from the recreations that hinder worship.[22]

---

[18] Walaeus, portrait caption, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, image 16.

[19] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "Dissertatio de Sabbatho," 275 (image 291).

[20] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "Dissertatio de Sabbatho," 275 (image 291).

[21] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "Dissertatio de Sabbatho," 276 (image 292).

[22] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "Dissertatio de Sabbatho," 276 (image 292). The six articles are given here in the form in which Walaeus copies them.

To understand the Synod's mind in the last article more fully, he adds what the Synod put in its petition "to the High Mighty States General of these United [Provinces]" against the profanation of the Sabbath, in Session 177, article 14. The article is directed against the profanation of the day. It names, among much else, exercises of arms and hunting, and it adds "servile works of every kind; and very many other like things." It speaks of them as things "which in these regions with great scandal" and shame "and with great hindrance to divine worship grow up everywhere," and it asks that they be dealt with "very strictly."[23] The article is also the Synod's, and the list is its list.

Then he says what the Synod did not do. "When, after the departure of the foreign theologians, those controversies had already then been referred to it," it judged that it was not for its court "to decide them fully, with the condemnation of the other party." It reached this judgment because the matters "pertained to other Reformed Churches also." It used moderation instead:

> "that, other disputes being set aside, it should commend to each party that opinion on which the deputies of both sides, certain arbitrators having been appointed, had agreed."[24]

Walaeus approves this course for his own day. His words are "nay, even today it is most to be approved," and he adds that no one who is zealous for the peace of the church and for divine truth ought to doubt it.[25]

His own method follows from this. He says:

> "The lead of these Articles we too have followed for the most part in this dissertation of ours. But what has from time to time been disputed by us more specifically contains reasons indeed for which we judge one opinion more probable than the other"[26]

The reasons are not meant to condemn: "not, however, so that on that account those who with peace [follow] a different [opinion]". They are meant that the Christian reader, the arguments being weighed on both sides, should "shape his judgment toward truth and peace, and strive more earnestly for his own and others' edification."[27] He gives his reasons as probable, he leaves the reader to judge, and he sets peace beside truth as the end. The dissertation is therefore an argument for the Synod's articles and not a rule laid on those who differ.

8.5 The Lord's Day

On page 310 of the dissertation he turns to the name of the day. "The name of this day is given variously by the ancient writers."[28] Justin, in his second *Apology*, at the place cited before, "calls [it] the day of the sun." Justin does so because he writes to men who "distinguished the names of the seven days of the week by the names of the planets." The practice, he says, is from the institution of the Egyptians, as Dio Cassius testifies in his thirty-seventh book, adding "that it [had

[23] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "Dissertatio de Sabbatho," 276 (image 292).
[24] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "Dissertatio de Sabbatho," 276 (image 292).
[25] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "Dissertatio de Sabbatho," 276 (image 292).
[26] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "Dissertatio de Sabbatho," 276 (image 292).
[27] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "Dissertatio de Sabbatho," 276 (image 292).
[28] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "Dissertatio de Sabbatho," 310 (image 326).

been] instituted not so long before his own times." These are citations of Justin and Dio Cassius as Walaeus prints them, and here they give the day its names.

A letter in the *Consilia et epistolæ* takes up the Lord's Day on page 389. It is written to a man whom Walaeus calls "my kinsman," and I do not name him. The letter answers an objection that Walaeus puts in the man's own words: "If, you say, from the Holy Scriptures alone [the way] of salvation" is to be sought, then "therefore the Sabbath is to be kept: for this in the Sacred Writings" is a precept. Walaeus turns the objection on itself:

> "Why do you not add in the same breath that both circumcision is to be used and the other sacraments and sacrifices of the Old Test.? Do you not see, my kinsman, that this"[29]

The objection, he says, is "born of ignorance of Holy Scripture," which teaches plainly in the New Testament that all these things were abolished by the death of Christ.[30] He goes on to the Sabbath and to the Lord's Day:

> "also feasts and Sabbaths, as Paul expressly teaches, Coloss. 2. And we wrongly keep, you say, the Lord's Day, with no Scripture teaching it. Nay, Scripture supplies various examples of this thing too."[31]

Feasts and Sabbaths are among the ceremonies that were shadows of Christ. Of the examples he gives three: Acts 20:7, 1 Corinthians 16:2, and Revelation 1:10, as he writes "1 Cor. 16. v. 2. Apoc. 1. v. 10."[32]

He adds what sort of thing this observance is. It does not strictly belong to "the articles of faith." Its ground is order in the church, and he gives the reason: "because God is a God of order; otherwise all days are in themselves equal to us," and he refers to Romans 14.[33] The Lord's Day rests on the examples of Scripture and on the order that God loves. It is not one of the articles of faith, and it is not bound to the Jewish Sabbath, which is among the abolished shadows. On that last point the letter and the fourth of the Synod's articles agree in sense.

8.6 What He Holds

On the pages I cite, Walaeus holds that the magistrate has a just authority in divine things that comes from God's prescription, and that the church is free when it is subject to a magistrate who keeps to the power he has by God's command. He holds that salvation is God's gift alone, and that God alone prescribes the means to it, so that the order of the church and the work of its ministers

---

[29] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 389 (image 973).

[30] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 389 (image 973).

[31] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 389 (image 973). Col. 2:16–17 (ESV): "Therefore let no one pass judgment on you in questions of food and drink, or with regard to a festival or a new moon or a Sabbath. These are a shadow of the things to come, but the substance belongs to Christ."

[32] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 389 (image 973). Acts 20:7 (ESV): "On the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul talked with them, intending to depart on the next day, and he prolonged his speech until midnight." 1 Cor. 16:2 (ESV): "On the first day of every week, each of you is to put something aside and store it up, as he may prosper, so that there will be no collecting when I come." Rev. 1:10 (ESV): "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and I heard behind me a loud voice like a trumpet."

[33] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 389 (image 973). Rom. 14:5 (ESV): "One person esteems one day as better than another, while another esteems all days alike. Let each be fully convinced in his own mind."

cannot be prescribed by any other. He holds that the distinction between the magistrate's office and the ecclesiastical is perpetual and necessary, and that the pastoral function in its essential parts sets limits that the magistrate should not cross. He judges that churches set up against the edicts of the magistrates are not made lawful by the plea that they take no public place.

He holds that the Latin of the treatise gives his mind, with the few small changes that he made himself, and he is willing that the Dutch work be shared with other nations. He is named in a caption as president of the college of revisers of the New Testament version and as regent of the seminary for the Indies, and a letter shows that body of revisers at work with a meeting expected.

On the Sabbath he follows the Synod's articles for the most part: something in the fourth precept is ceremonial and something moral; the Jewish Sabbath is abrogated; the Lord's Day is to be kept from the apostles on, with rest from work except for charity and necessity. He reads the Synod as having commended moderation and not as having condemned the party that differed, and he approves that moderation for his own day. He gives his own arguments as probable and not as binding. In a letter he grounds the Lord's Day on the examples of Scripture and on the order of the church.

This chapter reads Walaeus alone. It does not set his doctrine beside that of the men he answers, and it ascribes to him no order of church or ministry that his pages do not state.

Works Cited

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

Chapter 9
His Relations with Gomarus, Voetius, Episcopius, Rivet, and Others

This chapter asks whom Walaeus stood beside and whom he stood against, and how he treated each of them. I draw the answer from what he wrote to these men and about them, and from what is printed over their names beside his. The evidence stands in the *Opera omnia*: in the *Consilia et epistolæ*, in the *Loci communes*, and in the *Responsio* to Corvinus.[1]

The pages carry these relations unequally. Gomarus is present in a letter, in a narrative signed by Walaeus, and in a sentence of the *Loci*. Polyander is the best attested of the colleagues, in two letters of Walaeus to him. Voetius and Rivet appear as signatories, and Episcopius at one place in the *Loci*. I report each tie at the strength the pages give it. I give no date that the pages do not print, and where the lines I cite do not name the writer or the man addressed I name none.

9.1 Gomarus

A letter of Walaeus to Gomarus stands on page 366 of the *Consilia*, and the next page carries a letter in Gomarus's name, sent to Middelburg: "Gomarus. To Middelburg."[2] The first is short and personal. Walaeus writes that "I have nothing much to write," but, "since this student was thinking [of going] to you, I did not wish to neglect this occasion." From Gomarus's own letter he learns that Damianus declines to disclose a remedy that he keeps as a secret. Walaeus would have liked to have the use of it, for, he writes, "I greatly fear lest that constant flow of catarrhs" may in the end be his ruin. Then he turns to what he will do and to what he has been doing:[3]

> "If, however, that cannot be done, I will use what is at hand, and commend the whole matter to God. Meanwhile I thank Isaacus for having undertaken that labor for my sake. I have now two or three times put [the matter] before our Consistory and Magistrate. The latter I see more inclined toward me than I deserve."

The lines I cite carry neither date nor place, and I do not say whether it falls before or after the years Gomarus spent at Middelburg. It shows the manner of the two men with one another: Walaeus writes to a man he addresses with respect, tells him his health, thanks a third party through him, and reports his standing with his own church and magistrate as he would to a friend who cared.

The longest piece of evidence on Gomarus is Dutch. On pages 392 to 398 the *Consilia* prints a document of some six pages, whose heading may be rendered Considerations on the new

---

[1] Antonius Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, *Loci communes*, and *Responsio ad Censuram Corvini in Molinaei Anatomen*, in *Opera omnia* (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643). The *Loci communes* are cited from vol. 1, pages 175 and 350 (images 191 and 366). The *Consilia et epistolæ* are cited from vol. 2, pages 366 to 497 (images 950 to 1081), and the *Responsio* from vol. 2, pages 75, 76, 84, and 123 (images 659, 660, 668, and 707). Image numbers are those of the Internet Archive scan walaeusoperaomnia01. The printed page of the first volume is the image number less sixteen. The printed page of the second volume is the image number less 584. Where I give the sense of a Latin, Dutch, or French sentence in English the rendering is mine. In quotations from the Latin the accents and ligatures (æ, œ) are kept as printed, the long s is printed as s and VV as W, and abbreviations are expanded in square brackets; other oddities of spelling and punctuation stay as printed, with [sic]. Latin titles and imprints in citations follow the same rule, except that the capitals and u/v of display lines are normalized in them; in quotations those capitals and u/v stay as printed. These are the conventions declared in note 1 of Chapter 1.

[2] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 367 (image 951).

[3] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 366 (image 950).

Remonstrance of the Remonstrants. The lines I cite do not name its writers. They speak in the first person plural, and they begin by saying that they cannot answer the account of the occasions of the difficulties, “die in Hollant ende sommighe andere Provincien, inde saecke der Kercke, geresen sijn;”, so exactly and each in particular, “en connen die soo bescheydelick, elc int besonder, niet”, as the ministers can, “als de Kerckendienaers doen, die inde selve Provincien, de Proceduren ende handelingen van 't beginsel af hebben gesien, ende helpen beleyden,” who saw the proceedings in those provinces from the beginning and helped to conduct them.[4] The writers thus place themselves outside the Holland proceedings and refer the particulars to those who were inside them. The document ends on page 397 with its date: “Aldus ghedaen, Anno, 1617.”[5] I attribute it to no one; the signature that stands on page 398 closes the piece that follows it.

That piece follows at once under its own heading, which names “beroepinge D. Gomari” at Middelburg: the calling of Gomarus there.[6] The note speaks of Walaeus in the third person, and it is signed by him. It opens with the troubles at Leiden:

> is alsoo geschiet: dewijle de moeyten tot Leyden, tusschen Arminium en Gomarum het geheel lant door waren verbreyt, ende na de doot Arminii, Vorstius tot eenen successeur was geroepen;

The troubles between Arminius and Gomarus at Leiden had spread through the whole land, and after the death of Arminius Vorstius had been called as his successor, a calling over which the churches raised the difficulties that, as the note says, were well enough known. Then the churches of Zeeland also made difficulty, “soo hebben de Kercken van Zeelant, oock swaricheyt gemaeckt van haere Studenten tot Leyden voortaen te senden”, about sending their students on to Leiden. Gomarus himself, “ende D. Gomarus heeft aen eenige uyt Zeelant int besonder geopenbaert,” disclosed privately to some from Zeeland that he would be willing to take another condition, “de willen aennemen, daer hy met meerder vryheyt de waerheyt soude mogen”, in which he could with greater freedom defend the truth. Among others he said it “ende onder andere aen de Sone van Bursius, Predicant tot Middelburch.” That communication, “aengeven door de Prædicanten van Middelburch, aende Burghemeesters is ghebracht, die daerom verscheyden communicatien met de”, was carried by the ministers of Middelburg to the burgomasters, who held several communications about it with the ministers.[7]

After many dealings the magistrate and the church council resolved, with mutual approval, to send Walaeus to Gomarus:

> soo is met goetvinden vande Magistraet ende Kerckenraet besloten Antonium Walaeum aen D. Gomarum nae Leyden te senden, ende hem te vermanen in sijn professie, indien het moghelijck waere, te willen blijven, alsoo sy meynden, dat sulcks tot den meesten dienst der Kercke, ende behoudenisse der waerheyt

His first errand, then, was to urge Gomarus to remain in his professorship, if it could be, because Middelburg judged that this would serve the church most and preserve the truth. If Gomarus was resolved in any case to leave, “Doch so D. Gomarus immers geresolveert ware van Leyden te

[4] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 392 (image 976).
[5] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 397 (image 981).
[6] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 397 (image 981).
[7] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 397 (image 981).

vertrecken," Walaeus was told to offer him a place as ordinary preacher in a vacant charge, "hem tot een ordinaris Prædicant tot Middelburch in een vacerende plaetse te", and a fixed salary from the magistrate, "ende boven dien een seker tractement vande", for some public lessons in theology. The note then gives Gomarus's answer in the words in which Gomarus gave it:[8]

> Ende alsoo D. Gomarus protesteerde dat hy met Vorstio inde professie niet en soude connen staen, ende liever sijn eyghen cant ('t sijn sijn formele woorden) voortaen soude knaghen, so heeft Walaeus voorseyt den anderen last hem geopenbaert,

Gomarus protested that he could not stand with Vorstius in the professorate and would rather gnaw his own crust from then on, and the note says that these were his formal words. It was after that, the note says, that Walaeus disclosed to him the other commission and came to terms with him, "volgens de ordre die hy daer van hadde."[9] The note gives Gomarus's reason as he gave it, and it says that the phrase about the crust is his own.

The rest of the note concerns what followed. Gomarus took leave of the curators of the university at Leiden for the reason given, came to Middelburg, and was accepted as ordinary preacher: "is D. Gomarus, sijn afscheyt om de voorgenoemde reden genomen hebbende vande Curatoren der Vniversiteyt tot Leyden, na Middelburch ghecomen; ende is oock voor ordinaris Prædicant aldaer aengenomen." He gave besides some public lessons in theology and in Hebrew in the choir of the New Church, "daer een yeghelick acces toe hadde", to which anyone had access, and he defended printed theses in public. Then the assembly of the States of Zeeland, at the instance of Middelburg, issued a summons for an illustrious school in Zeeland, "inde vergaderinge der Heeren Staten van Zeelandt, op 't aenhouden van die van Middelburch, uytschrijvinghe om een" and "Schole in Zeelandt, op dese occasie", but the matter faded:[10]

> lengskens wederom verdwenen, wanneer de differenten in Hollandt begonden haer selven wat beter te laten aensien: ende D. Gomarus heeft hem tot Saumur laten beroepen, waer door het gheele werck is blijven steken. Alleen heeft Antonius

The plan faded gradually when the differences in Holland began to look somewhat better, and Gomarus had himself called to Saumur, so that the whole work stuck. What remained was Walaeus's own part. He alone went on with some lessons, "vande Triviale Schole, eenige lessen in Locis Communibus, juxta ordinem Catecheseos, blijven doen, gelijck oock in Græca Lingua & Philosophia; doch", in the first class of the Trivial School, in the common places according to the order of the Catechism, and also in Greek and philosophy, but, the note continues, "in auditorio ipso primæ Classis: welcke ordre, wat de", in the lecture room of the first class itself. He says that the arrangement for the lessons on the Catechism still stands there. The note ends with a sentence and a signature: "Dit is in 't korte, wat my van dese saecke bekent is. Antonius Walaeus."[11]

The note shows a relation of service on both sides. Middelburg wanted Gomarus kept at Leiden, and when he would not stay it wanted him at Middelburg. Walaeus was the man the magistrate and church council chose to carry both commissions to him, and Gomarus told him why he would not

[8] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 398 (image 982).
[9] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 398 (image 982).
[10] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 398 (image 982).
[11] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 398 (image 982).

stay. When the school came to nothing, Walaeus kept up the teaching that remained. The note gives no year, and I give none for the years of Gomarus at Middelburg.

The *Loci communes* name Gomarus once. In the part on the knowledge of God Walaeus names Gomarus among those who hold that a hypothetical knowledge must by all means be maintained:[12]

> "There are, however, some among the Orthodox, and among others Franciscus Gomarus in [his] Theses on"

The theses he names are on predestination. He then gives the grounds of the view, in the sentence:

> "who think it must by all means be maintained; both on account of certain places of Holy Scripture which seem to assert this; and so that the immutability of all the decrees of God may be preserved: and that it may in some way be explained how God through his decree is not the author or cause of evil."

Walaeus reports the view and its three grounds, and he places Gomarus among its holders by naming his theses. He names him as one "among others," and the sentence does not say whether he shares the view himself.

9.2 Voetius

Voetius stands on one page, and as a signatory. The Leiden faculty answered, in a document dated 6 December 1628, a question put to it by deputies of the synods of Holland: whether a member of the Reformed church "may with a safe conscience swear an oath that would prejudice the true Reformed religion which he himself professes?"[13] The faculty takes the question "of him who, rightly taught and informed, knows it for certain." The professors close the answer: "of Leiden, from our office in this cause of conscience, with one" and "we have written, and have subscribed to it. Given 6 Decemb. 1628."[14]

Below the professors' names stand those of the deputies, who write: "The Deputies of both Synods of Holland testify by this their subscription that this answer of the Reverend Theological Faculty is approved by them. Henricus Arnoldi vander Linde. Henricus Swalmius." The list of deputies goes on, and the last name on it is that of Voetius.[15] That is all the pages cited show of him. He appears as one of the deputies of the synods who approve the faculty's answer, and Walaeus appears among the professors who give it. It is a joint act between a body that answers and a body that approves, and the page records no exchange between the two men.

9.3 Episcopius, Corvinus, and the Remonstrant Side

Episcopius is named once, in the *Loci communes*, in Walaeus's treatment of the ninth chapter of Romans. Walaeus lays out the analyses of the chapter. He says that the first is short and "the other prolix. We will examine both briefly, but above all the latter, which [is] Arminius's," and likewise that of the same party at the Hague colloquy and that of Corvinus. The first he assigns to a particular man:

---

[12] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191).
[13] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 448 (image 1032).
[14] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 449 (image 1033).
[15] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 449 (image 1033).

> "of Corvinus, etc. The former I judge to be Episcopius's, drawn from Socinus. They hold therefore that the Apostle does not treat in this chap. of"

Walaeus names the man, and he names where in his judgment the analysis came from. On that analysis, the lines go on, the apostle is not dealing in the chapter with the election of single persons with others passed by, "but with the taking up or prerogative of the Gentiles into".[16] Episcopius is thus named as the source of the shorter analysis, and Arminius, the colloquy and Corvinus as the source of the longer. Walaeus passes judgment on a view and on the source of the view, and he does not address the man in these lines.

Against Corvinus he writes at length. The *Responsio* answers Corvinus's censure of the *Anatome Arminianismi* of Pierre du Moulin, and it answers the writings of the Remonstrants who were cited to Dort. The title page reads: "To the censure of Johannes Arnoldi Corvinus, on the *Anatome Arminianismi* of the most distinguished man D. Petrus Molinæus: and to the writings of the Remonstrants who were cited to the Synod of Dort. For the defence". The work is thus written for the defence of the doctrine set out and established at that synod.[17]

In the preface he meets a complaint. His opponent complains that the Synod denied him and his party a liberty. Walaeus answers that what was asked was not a liberty:

> "will it ever be able to seem [right]. Nor will there ever be any Synod in the Christian world in which a like licence was either granted to those cited to the Synod, or was ever asked to be granted. And yet this is that [licence], by no laws"

What was demanded, he says, was neither the Synod's intention nor in its power, and it will not seem just or fair, he writes, "nor to any good or pious [man], of the Reformed religion." That freedom bound by no laws, he goes on, is the power of acting as one wills. And he turns the charge: "here you define liberty from the Stoics, you who elsewhere charge us with Stoicism, [the liberty] which [was] denied to you and yours in the Synod," and the sentence goes on, "you complain. But we, who ourselves to this Synod,".[18] The two parts of the answer fit together. The Synod could not have granted such a licence, and the licence is what the man's own definition describes. I take the second person of these lines to be the opponent the work answers; the lines do not name him.

9.4 Polyander and the Question of Foreknowledge

Polyander is the colleague to whom the pages show Walaeus writing most. In a letter that begins on page 405 he writes of Polyander's theses: "which you lately put out on the providence of God, which were handed to me by D. Dreminius, I have read gladly, because" they renewed the memory of a conversation that had passed between them when Walaeus was leaving. The next sentences state both the agreement and the request:[19]

[16] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 350 (image 366).
[17] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 75 (image 659).
[18] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 84 (image 668).
[19] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 405 (image 989).

> "But I rejoice that your opinion agrees wholly with that which I have always approved. Since, however, there are some things in this matter about which more can be thought, you will grant me pardon, as I hope, if I ask your mind on some difficulties. That the voluntary permission of sin, with its perpetual direction from the beginning of the action to its end, is a cause great enough why such an action may also be ascribed to God in a certain respect, I hold with you altogether."

The letter bears no date on the lines I cite. It is the letter of a colleague who approves and who asks for his friend's mind on the difficulties.

The difficulties come on page 406. Walaeus offers Polyander two ways out of the difficulty about providence and contingency. The first is to confess ignorance with Chytraeus: "our ignorance is to be frankly professed, who from", and the man is Chytraeus, who writes that he often heard these words from his teacher. The words begin "That all things are governed by God, I know"; that there is also contingency and liberty in things, the saying runs, I see; and it ends "[how] the two are reconciled, I do not know." The second way is to have recourse, with Gomarus, to the foreknowledge of God, "that middle or conditioned [foreknowledge], which many" of the Scholastics and recent writers hold. He names Ames as rejecting this knowledge, and he adds that Holy Scripture has many examples of it.[20]

The sentence sets the two side by side and does not say which of them he takes. What the page gives is the offer, and the names that stand with each: Chytraeus with the confession of ignorance, Gomarus with the middle knowledge, and Ames as the one who rejects it. A few lines further on he adds that one of the modes of which he is speaking is also set down by Beza "and by Perkins, [and] is plain from Scripture."[21]

A second letter to Polyander, dated 24 August 1618, begins by apologizing. Walaeus writes, "I would long since have answered yours, most distinguished Sir, sent to me some weeks ago, had not both my poor health and a rumour about your" journey prevented him; the rumour, the sentence goes on, concerned Haarlem and Amsterdam.[22] The address is "most distinguished Sir," and the pattern is that of a courtesy: an answer delayed, an excuse of health, an apology to a colleague.

A letter dated at Deventer on 6 April 1638 in the old style ends by sending greetings to two men together: "D. Polyander and D. Thysius. At Deventer, 6 April, old style, 1638." The lines I cite do not name the writer.[23] They show that a correspondent in 1638 still sent greetings to Polyander and Thysius together.

9.5 Rivet, Thysius, and the Leiden Faculty

Rivet appears twice, always with colleagues. On page 76 of the *Responsio*, just after the title page, stands a letter of the Leiden faculty, dated at Leiden in 1625. It says of a work that it is agreed it should be published at the earliest, "cipuam esse constat, quamprimum ederet:", and the writers add, "which we do not doubt will be, as it deserves, most welcome and most acceptable to all the Orthodox. At Leiden,". It is signed by three men: "IOHANNES POLYANDER. ANDREAS

[20] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 406 (image 990).
[21] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 406 (image 990).
[22] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 419 (image 1003).
[23] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 495 (image 1079).

RIVETVS. ANTONIVS THYSIVS."[24] Walaeus does not sign it. The three who sign are his colleagues of the Leiden faculty.

The second appearance is the faculty's answer on the oath, dated 6 December 1628, treated in 9.2. The professors who sign it are Polyander, Rivet, Walaeus, and Thysius, and they write that they have written it with one mind. The two documents give a plain picture of the faculty. In 1625 three of its four professors write together to commend a work to the Orthodox. In 1628 the four give one answer on a matter of conscience. They show a group acting as a body, and Rivet within it.

The faculty's work also bears on a question of translation. A Dutch letter from Festus Hommius to Walaeus reports what had passed in a synod. As the Acts of the past synod were being read, which spoke of the faculty's answer, "sprekende van de antwoorde der Faculteyt der H. Theologie, ofte vande Censure over de Remonstrantsche Confessie; alsoo ick vertoonde, hoe na by 't selve werck voldaen ende", the faculty's answer or censure on the Remonstrant Confession, Hommius showed how nearly that work was completed. A reminder was then made in the present synod:[25]

> was, is vermaninghe inde teghenwoordighe Synode ghedaen, oft niet goet ware, dat dit scriptum facultatis Theologicae, niet en werde van allerley luyden overgheset, maer dat men mochte ordre stellen, dat van niemant 't selve werck soude moghen worden overgheset in Duytsch, dan met goet vinden, consent, ende

The reminder was whether it would not be good if this writing of the theological faculty were not translated by all manner of people, and if an order could be made that nobody might translate the work into Dutch except with approval and consent. The letter has no date on the lines I cite, and the synod is not named. It shows Hommius writing to a member of the faculty about the faculty's work, and it shows a concern of the synod for the Dutch rendering of that work.

One more paper concerns the professors' place at synods. It closes with a signature that reads Johannes Boreel, and it lists conditions for the professors' attendance. The second is that "[from] our faculty at least two of the Professors be present at the Synod. 3." The third says that although professors sit in national synods with an entirely equal right of vote, and are admitted with the same right in particular synods when these meet where the academies are, the writers write, "we will nevertheless raise no dispute on this matter, if it please" the deputies of the churches that the professors have deliberative votes in practical matters only, with the deputies of the other provinces. They add, "but this whole [matter] we commit to your judgment." They commit likewise the place the professors are to occupy, "yet so that we hope regard will be had to the prerogative of the Academies."[26] I do not say whether Boreel wrote the paper or received it.

9.6 Du Moulin, Grotius, and Others

Du Moulin is named in the *Responsio* on page 123. Walaeus is there arguing against his opponents' use of conditional decrees. "But in that sense in which it is urged by you," he says, it cannot be admitted, and he names an authority, the Molinaeus of the title page, whose *Anatome Arminianismi* is the book Corvinus had censured: "the distinguished Molinæus noted, paragr. 8, because the conditional [decrees] of God". The reason follows:

---

[24] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 76 (image 660).

[25] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 439 (image 1023).

[26] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 424 (image 1008).

> "you introduce, whose outcome hangs on uncertain human choice; and therefore whose event is uncertain to God himself, except after the foreseen determination of human choice. In which respect the decrees too"

Walaeus cites du Moulin as one who saw this in the eighth paragraph of his work. A few lines before, he speaks of a matter "whose fulfilment nevertheless is to God also" certain, "whether he wills to bring it about that the condition be fulfilled by" the creature, or permits that it not be fulfilled.[27] Du Moulin stands in this passage as an ally and as a witness to the point.

Grotius he treats with a different tone. Walaeus writes to him first about a treatise entitled Meletius, which he has read eagerly and carefully. He found in it much worthy not only of praise but of admiration, and he hopes "that my freedom will find pardon with you" in warning Grotius of a few points. He does not mean that Grotius's judgment should "be prescribed, to which I do not acknowledge myself equal," but that the fruit the book will bring to many be not gradually intercepted by a prejudice against its author.[28] In a second letter he is glad that his writing and its cause were not unwelcome to Grotius, and he writes, "so on the other side I admire the candour of your judgment." It is the mark of a truly great and Christian mind, he writes, in matters of such weight to try the judgments of others and not lightly to scorn even the warnings of the weaker.[29] A third letter thanks Grotius for a *Defensio* that his relative had handed to him; Walaeus read it diligently and with pleasure, "so learnedly and so solidly do you affirm the orthodox view in it and weaken the contrary." He prays that God keep that mind in him, and in others of learning and authority, so that more such works may be published. At the end of the letter he cautions Grotius about the word satisfaction. The sentence concerns a good work and the compensating of a preceding evil: "that [by] a good work a preceding evil is compensated, unless the word 'satisfaction' [is taken] very" improperly.[30]

Grotius answers from Rotterdam, in a letter dated on the third day before the Kalends of July, 1615, and the answer is as courteous as the admonition. He has decided "to follow you, who admonish rightly, and to put other [words] in their place." He had not remembered that the term "acceptilation" had been named by Beza: "I had not remembered. Therefore that passage too will be corrected." He writes, "In this too I will follow your counsel, so as to testify that by the name of the torments which" come into the satisfaction are to be understood not only bodily pains "but even above all the sufferings of the soul, which the Evangelists express in the words." The letter ends with a prayer: "May God, Best [and] Greatest, bless you and your ministry. At Rotterdam."[31] The exchange is a candid one. Walaeus admonishes with a protest of his own inferiority, and Grotius accepts the admonition on words and on one place.

A Dutch letter of Walaeus to Hommius turns first on the ministers and then on a third man. Walaeus writes that he and those with him have learned with pleasure of the steadfastness many ministers in Holland showed when the resolution of the States was sent to them: "seer geerne verstaen, de stantvasticheyt die vele Kerckendienaren in Hollandt op het aensenden der resolutie der H. Staten hebben". He trusts firmly that God, through these and the like means, will give the whole matter a good outcome: "vastelick dat Godt de Heere deur dese ende diergelijcke". As to D.

---

[27] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 123 (image 707).
[28] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 398 (image 982).
[29] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 400 (image 984).
[30] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 408 (image 992).
[31] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 409–410 (images 993–994). The date of the letter stands on page 410.

Rosaeus, they have heard nothing of him so far, “saecke sal verleenen. Soo veel aengaet den persoon van D. Rosaeus,” and “en hebben tot noch toe van hem niet vernomen. Ick hebbe schriftelick”. He has heard from The Hague in writing, and afterwards by word of mouth, “eenige politijcke alhier hem groot ongelijck hooren geven,” that some of the politicians where he is lay great blame on Rosaeus for the extraordinary sharpness he showed in the affair. A dateline of 3 October 1616 closes one of the two Dutch letters printed on this page, and the lines I cite do not show which.[32]

The collection reaches well beyond these names, and its datelines show where the letters were written and when. A Latin letter closes “At Middelburg, 21 Novemb. 1609.”, and a French letter on page 377 is signed “vostre treshumble serviteur, vanden Bogaerde. 25.” and is dated in October 1609. Another French letter ends “De Saumur ce dernier jour de May 1616.” A Dutch letter ends “Uyt Zutphen. 1 Novemb. 1622.”, a Latin letter “At Zierikzee, 29 March 1628.”, and a Dutch one “Zirickzee desen 25. Iunii 1633.” Two Dutch letters come from the Indies, one dated “Major, den 8. Martij An. Domini 1631.” from Batavia on Java, the other “Datum Amboina, desen 18. Septemb. 1635.” A Latin letter ends “Given at Leiden, 1 July 1638.”[33] The lines do not name the writers of these letters or the men addressed, and I name none. They show the extent of the exchange: letters from Middelburg, Zutphen, Zierikzee, Deventer, Saumur, Batavia, Amboina, and Leiden.

Three men whom one might look for in this chapter are taken up where the record of them stands. Wtenbogaert, whose treatise on the authority of the Christian magistrate in church affairs Walaeus answered in writing, belongs to Chapters 3 and 6. Lubbertus, with whom he exchanged letters in 1619 on the obedience of Christ and to whom he wrote that he would move to Leiden, belongs to Chapters 4 and 14. Prince Maurice, who summoned him to The Hague toward the end of 1617 and whose letters asked him to accept the call to Leiden, appears in Chapters 3, 4, and 7.

9.7 What the Pages Show

With Gomarus the pages show the closest tie. Walaeus writes to him as to a respected friend, and the narrative he signs shows him as the man Middelburg sent to Gomarus and as the man who carried both commissions and reported Gomarus’s own reason for leaving Leiden. In the *Loci* he names Gomarus, in a sentence that reports a view and its grounds and does not say that he shares it. In the letter to Polyander he sets the confession of ignorance beside the middle knowledge, names Gomarus with the second and Ames against it, and does not say which he takes.

With Voetius and Rivet the pages show joint acts: signatures beside his under the faculty’s answer of 6 December 1628, and for Rivet also a signature under the faculty’s letter of 1625. With Episcopius they show a judgment on a view and its source, and no address to the man. Against Corvinus and the Remonstrants they show a sustained reply, with a retort that turns the charge of Stoicism back on the one who made it.

With Polyander they show confidence: theses read with pleasure, an agreement stated, a request for his colleague’s mind on difficulties, and a courtesy of the kind he pays to Gomarus and to Grotius. With Grotius they show a candid exchange in which Walaeus admonishes with deference and

[32] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 416 (image 1000).

[33] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 377, 383, 407, 430, 473, 477, 483, 493, 495, and 497 (images 961, 967, 991, 1014, 1057, 1061, 1067, 1077, 1079, and 1081).

Grotius accepts. With du Moulin they show a cited authority, and with Hommius a correspondence on the faculty's work and on the affairs of the churches.

This chapter reads Walaeus alone. It does not set what these men wrote against what he wrote of them, and it ascribes to him no view of theirs that his pages do not state.

Works Cited

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

Chapter 10
His Theology in General

This chapter lays out the shape of Walaeus's doctrine as a whole, before the later chapters take up the points he is best known for. I want the reader to see his method and his main loci in his own words. He left two large works of teaching, an *Enchiridion* for those entering the ministry and a set of *Loci communes* for those already in it, and the first volume of the *Opera omnia* of 1643 carries both. I begin with what his son and the editors say of how the two works came to be and how they stand to each other. Then I turn to the pages themselves. I keep the order of the *Loci*: how a locus is built, what theology is, Scripture, God, the Trinity, and last the vision of God, which belongs to the locus on eternal life. Where the *Enchiridion* treats the same matter, I set it beside the *Loci*.

I take his words from the first volume of the *Opera omnia*: from the *Enchiridion* at folios 1, 2, 6, and 26;[1] from the *Loci communes* at pages 113, 114, 123, 149, 151, 157, 235, 236, and 524;[2] and from the dedication and the editors' preface in the front matter.[3] Where I give the sense of a Latin sentence in English the words are mine. In these pages he leaves those he argues with unnamed, and I leave them so.

10.1 The Two Works and Their Order

The dedication of the volume is addressed to Jacob Cats by Walaeus's son Johannes, and in one passage it sets out the order of his father's teaching.[4] For those who were being initiated into the sacred ministry, the son says, his father gave the *Enchiridion* of the Reformed religion, so that the way might be made smooth for them and the entrance to theology laid open. Those who were already initiated he admitted more deeply to the common places of sacred theology and to his counsels, and he revealed all to them. The controversies that have stirred theology in this age or thrown it into confusion he composed or decided in writings of their own. The ones the son names are predestination and what is joined to it, the chiliasts, the Sabbath, and the authority of the magistrate in ecclesiastical matters.

The order is an order of readers as well as of subjects. The *Enchiridion* is for those about to enter the ministry. The *Loci* and the counsels are for those who are in it. The disputed questions are handled apart. This is the son's account of his father's teaching, and I give it as his.

---

[1] Antonius Walaeus, *Enchiridion religionis reformatæ*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), fols. 1, 2, 6, and 26 (images 17, 18, 22, and 42). Image numbers are those of the Internet Archive scan walaeusoperaomnia01. The *Enchiridion* and the *Loci communes* occupy the first part of volume 1, and the printed page of each is the image number less sixteen. Where I give the sense of a Latin sentence in English the rendering is mine; quotations in the text are given in English, and the notes keep the Latin. In quotations from the Latin the accents and ligatures (æ, œ) are kept as printed, the long s is printed as s and VV as W, and abbreviations are expanded in square brackets; other oddities of spelling and punctuation stay as printed, with [sic]. Latin titles and imprints in citations follow the same rule, except that the capitals and u/v of display lines are normalized in them; in quotations those capitals and u/v stay as printed. These are the conventions declared in note 1 of Chapter 1. Scripture is quoted from the English Standard Version (ESV).

[2] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, 113, 114, 123, 149, 151, 157, 235, 236, and 524 (images 129, 130, 139, 165, 167, 173, 251, 252, and 540).

[3] *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, dedication to Jacob Cats (image 4) and preface of the editors (images 6 and 7), both unpaginated.

[4] *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, dedication to Jacob Cats, by Johannes Walaeus (image 4).

The editors say more about the *Enchiridion*.[5] It was begun in dictation at the school of the Middelburgers, and at Leiden the pupils who had followed him from that school drew no small part of it out of him. From them it passed from hand to hand and was copied, and each copy was interpolated in its own way, according to what each man grasped. The editors printed the manuscript that the first pupils gave to the author and that he now and then changed and enlarged in passing. I therefore take the *Enchiridion* as his teaching in the form his first pupils wrote it down and he allowed to stand. It is not a book he composed at one sitting for the press.

Of the *Loci* the editors say that the work is called *Loci communes*, or rather a compendium of the common places of sacred theology, since the author had destined that second title for it, and that it grew out of the notes by which his memory was helped when he gave his lectures.[6] They add that as his memory began to fail he resolved to write everything out more fully. The translation of the New Testament and the Apocrypha into Dutch, and the commentary on it, broke off that plan for some years. When the translation was finished he went back to the loci with a ready mind and carried the fuller version as far as the locus on the Holy Spirit, a few days before his death.[7] The printed *Loci* reach page 524, which stands in the locus on eternal life, and that locus goes on past the page. The editors speak of how far the fuller treatment went, and I take no more from their sentence than that.

10.2 How a Locus Is Built

At the head of the *Loci*, on page 113, Walaeus states the order he will keep in each locus.[8] First he will set out the matter in hand and explain it, plainly and briefly. Then he will divide it into its members and parts. Last he will note the questions that are commonly disputed among Christians about the same matter, and he adds that he will not note every question that has been raised.

The three steps are exposition, division, and the disputed questions. They are the steps of a teacher who wants the pupil to understand the thing first, to see its parts second, and to hear the quarrels about it only third. The quarrels come last, and they are chosen. The *Enchiridion* shows a like habit. When it comes to Scripture it announces that certain questions are usually treated, it numbers them, and the first is whence the divinity of Holy Scripture is established (10.4). The locus on the Trinity states an order of its own, with the objections of the adversaries at the end (10.6).

10.3 What Theology Is

The *Enchiridion* begins with theology. The first section, on theology, opens with a definition:

> "It is defined [as] the wisdom of divine things divinely revealed, for the glory of God and the salvation of man."[9]

The *Loci* define it again on page 114, in a sentence that says first where the discussion is going:

> "Let us go on, then, to true theology, which is defined: knowledge or wisdom of divine things divinely revealed, for the glory of God"[10]

---

[5] *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, preface of the editors (image 6).
[6] *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, preface of the editors (image 6).
[7] *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, preface of the editors (image 7).
[8] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 113 (image 129).
[9] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, fol. 1 (image 17).
[10] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 114 (image 130).

The sentence then turns to rational creatures.

The two definitions are one in their middle. In both, theology is a wisdom whose matter is divine things, and in both those things are known because God has revealed them. The definition carries its origin in its own words: it names the revelation, and the revelation is divine. The *Loci* have "knowledge or wisdom," where the *Enchiridion* has "wisdom" alone. The *Enchiridion* gives two ends, the glory of God and the salvation of man. The *Loci* give the glory of God first and then pass to rational creatures. Whatever the *Loci* go on to say of those creatures, the second end of the *Enchiridion* shows that for him theology is not a knowledge held for its own sake. It is ordered to God's glory and to man's salvation.

10.4 Holy Scripture

The *Enchiridion* takes up Scripture on the same folio as the definition of theology. It says that certain questions are usually treated concerning Holy Scripture, and the first is whence the divinity of Holy Scripture is established.[11] On the next folio he answers.[12] He sets himself against two parties, whom he does not name. One of them, he says, asserts that the divinity of Scripture is established from the tradition of the Church. Against both, he says, he asserts that the divinity of Holy Scripture is shown in three ways. The first, and the principal, is the testimony of the Holy Spirit. The second is certain signs or marks of divinity that the Holy Spirit has impressed on Scripture itself. The third is the tradition of the whole Church, Christian and Jewish.

The order is the answer. The testimony of the Spirit stands first and carries the weight. The marks come second, and they are marks the Spirit himself impressed on the text, so that the witness is not only inward. The tradition of the Church is not thrown out. It is the third witness, and it is the tradition of the whole Church, Jewish as well as Christian, and not the tradition of one communion.

On folio 6, on the interpretation of Scripture, he answers that, properly speaking, Scripture is its own interpreter, or rather the Holy Spirit speaking in Scripture.[13] The reason is a comparison with the sun. As the sun shows its own light to men's eyes without any help from outside, so Holy Scripture shows its true sense through the plain places. The answer joins the interpreter to the witness. The Spirit who testifies to the divinity of Scripture is the Spirit who speaks in it, and what he speaks he makes plain in the open places.

In the *Loci*, on page 123, he answers the question which of the two comes first, the Church or Scripture.[14] His answer is a distinction. If the Church is taken in the universal sense, and Scripture as the particular manner of handing down, then Scripture is later than the Church, because God first instructed his Church by the word without Scripture. But if Scripture is taken for the word contained in the Scriptures, then Scripture is prior to the Church, because the Church of God is begotten by the word. For this he cites 1 Peter 1:23. The distinction is exact. The Church was taught before there was a book, and the Church is nonetheless begotten by the word that the book holds.

---

[11] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, fol. 1 (image 17).

[12] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, fol. 2 (image 18).

[13] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, fol. 6 (image 22).

[14] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 123 (image 139). 1 Pet. 1:23 (ESV): "since you have been born again, not of perishable seed but of imperishable, through the living and abiding word of God."

Twenty-six pages later, on page 149, he gives the first of his arguments that Scripture is sufficient. It is an argument from the lesser to the greater:

> "Argument 1. If the Old Testament contained all things necessary to salvation to be believed, hoped for, and done, then much more do the Old and the New together contain them. The antecedent [is] true. Therefore also the consequent."[15]

The terms are those of the schools, antecedent and consequent, and the form is a conditional with the first part affirmed. The three words give the whole of what is necessary: what is to be believed, what is to be hoped for, and what is to be done. What the argument gives is that Scripture, which in its earlier part already held all that salvation needs, holds it more fully in the two Testaments together.

10.5 God: The Limit, the Description, and the Unity

The *Loci* take up God at page 151, and the first thing Walaeus does is to set a limit.[16] The matter is arduous, and so he says what he will treat and what he will not. He does not undertake to go through everything that certain sophists dispute here with curiosity. He undertakes only what can be had, for edification, from the word of God, or at least from reason that agrees with the word of God and whose use in the practice of the Church is plain. Then he turns to the sun. Its light, he says, is wholesome to those who are content with the measure of it that their eyes can bear. The comparison fits the limits he has just named. Knowledge of God, like the light, is good for a man within a measure.

The image of the sun appears twice in these pages, and it does a different work each time. On folio 6 the sun needs no help to show its light, and so Scripture needs none to show its sense. Here the light has a measure, and so knowledge of God has one.

On page 157 he fixes what the word *nature* will mean as he goes on.[17] Of its senses only the second and the third apply to the matter in hand: the common essence of God itself, and the essential and common properties, which are also called attributes. These attributes, he reminds the reader, are either incommunicable or communicable to creatures, as was seen above. From all of them, he says, God can be described. In the description God is an essence eternal, most simple, immutable, infinite, living, most wise, and almighty. He does not define God here. He draws a description out of the attributes, and he has sorted the attributes into two kinds, those that cannot be shared with creatures and those that can. The description takes something from both kinds.

The *Enchiridion* has the unity of God on folio 26:

> "Nature has dictated even to the Gentiles that God is best and greatest; if greatest, then none is equal to him; if infinite, he cannot be divided into two or more, since to be divisible is repugnant to infinity; since two infinites would be greater than one, and better than one, which plainly fights with the nature of infinity."[18]

---

[15] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 149 (image 165).
[16] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 151 (image 167).
[17] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 157 (image 173).
[18] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, fol. 26 (image 42). Deut. 6:4 (ESV): "Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God, the LORD is one."

The argument has two steps. The first runs from the greatest to the unequalled. The second runs from the infinite to the undivided, and it is closed by the absurdity he names: two infinites would be greater than one and better than one, and that fights plainly with the nature of infinity. Then he turns to Scripture: "But Scripture bears witness to this same thing everywhere more expressly." His first example is Deuteronomy 6:4, which in his Latin begins "Hear, O Israel." The order of witnesses is again the order of weight. Nature speaks, even to the Gentiles. Scripture speaks more clearly.

10.6 The Trinity

The locus on the Trinity begins on page 235, and it begins with prayer.[19] He is about to explain a mystery that surpasses all human grasp, and he asks the one of whom he has to speak to reveal himself graciously to us for our salvation. His reason is taken from the knowledge of God itself. No one knows the Father but the Son, nor the Son but the Father, nor both but he who searches the depths of God, namely the Spirit. And so he asks the same Spirit to guide them here. What he asks is that they may understand clearly what God has revealed, and may be willing to be ignorant of what God has hidden, so that nothing is said on this matter except what is worthy of God's majesty and fitting to it.

The prayer sets the terms for the locus. It asks for two things at once, to know what is revealed and to be willing not to know what is hidden. It is the limit he set at the head of the locus on God, now put as a petition.

On page 236 he turns to the word *person*.[20] In general, he says, a person was defined by Boethius a thousand years ago: an individual substance of a rational nature. He does not leave Boethius's words as they stand. The definition, he says, is supplemented by certain schoolmen, who say that a person is an intellectual "supposit," and by our theologians, as he calls them, who say that it is an individual subsisting of itself, understanding, incommunicable, and not a part of another.

On the same page he says where the doctrine can be known.[21] Some think they find certain traces of this matter in nature and in human ingenuity. He answers that it is certain that the mystery is above reason and becomes known only from divine revelation, and he gives two witnesses from the New Testament, John 1:18 and 1 Corinthians 2:7 with the verses that follow it. What men bring forward on this mystery from Plato or from Trismegistus is either of another kind or drawn from Egyptian or Assyrian priests. Yet he grants one thing to reason. When the mystery has been revealed, nothing can be brought against it by human reason that cannot be refuted and examined by those who hold it. He does not name the men who find traces of the doctrine in nature, and neither do I.

The contrast with the unity of God is plain. The unity is dictated by nature and said more clearly by Scripture. The Trinity is known from revelation only. Reason has no standing to produce the doctrine, and once the doctrine is revealed it has no power to overthrow it.

---

[19] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 235 (image 251).

[20] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 236 (image 252).

[21] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 236 (image 252). John 1:18 (ESV): "No one has ever seen God; the only God, who is at the Father's side, he has made him known." 1 Cor. 2:7–8 (ESV): "But we impart a secret and hidden wisdom of God, which God decreed before the ages for our glory. None of the rulers of this age understood this, for if they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory."

Also on the same page he states the order he will keep.[22] First he will prove a plurality of persons in God. Second he will prove, specifically, the Trinity of persons in God. Third he will draw out of the Scriptures the characteristic properties of each of the persons. Fourth he will examine the contrary objections and exceptions of the Antitrinitarians. The first two steps establish that there is a plurality and that it is a Trinity. The third distinguishes the persons by their own properties. The fourth answers the objections. The adversaries come last, as the method he states for every locus puts the disputed questions last (10.2): the matter is explained and divided, and the questions follow.

10.7 The Vision of God

In the *Loci*, on page 524, in the locus on eternal life, Walaeus comes to the vision of God.[23] He has just cited passages of Scripture, and he draws from them this conclusion:

> "From which places it appears that the vision of God itself is promised, not only as formal blessedness; but also as the foundation and cause of all the rest in blessedness and eternal life."

He uses the school word for the formal here without explaining it, and he sets beside it the plainer pair, foundation and cause. He then says that before he goes on to the remaining parts of blessedness there are "some things pleasant and useful to know" about this vision that must be examined. The order shows the weight: the vision is taken first among the parts of blessedness, as the foundation of the others.

On the same page he draws a line around his claim.[24] He grants that God will show the blessed some glorious appearance of himself, as was done for Moses, for Isaiah, and for John in the Apocalypse. He grants also that the glory of God will be seen most fully in the human nature of Christ, and he cites Matthew 17:2, Luke 17:24, and Acts 7:55 for it. But the vision itself, which stands as the supreme foundation of eternal life, will not be of the eyes of the body but of the mind, and he gives reasons that follow. The qualification matters. He does not deny that a glory is seen. He assigns the appearances shown to prophets and the glory seen in Christ's humanity to one kind of seeing, and the vision that grounds eternal life to another. What grounds eternal life is a seeing of the mind.

10.8 The Shape of the Whole

Set side by side, the pages show a teacher who builds in a plain order and who keeps to a measure. The order is the order of the three steps: the matter is explained, it is divided, and the disputed questions are noted last. The measure is stated at the head of the locus on God and prayed for at the head of the locus on the Trinity: he will say what edifies from the word, and what reason agrees with the word, and he will be willing to leave unsaid what God has hidden. The same restraint is in the place he gives the vision of God: it is a seeing of the mind, and the glories shown to the eyes are granted but are not its ground.

Two other things recur. The first is the weight he gives to revelation and to the Spirit. The divinity of Scripture is shown principally by the Spirit's testimony, the sense of Scripture is shown by the Spirit speaking in it, the Church is begotten by the word, and the Trinity is known from revelation

[22] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 236 (image 252).
[23] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 524 (image 540).
[24] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 524 (image 540).

only. The second is the use of nature. Nature dictates the unity of God to the Gentiles, and Scripture says it more expressly, but nature cannot reach the Trinity. In neither case does he make nature the judge.

The two works treat the same matters at different lengths. Both define theology. Both take up Scripture: the *Enchiridion* gives its threefold answer in a sentence on folio 2 and is still on the subject at folio 6, and the *Loci* are on it at page 123 and again at page 149, twenty-six pages later. In these passages he names no adversary; the nearest he comes is the class of the Antitrinitarians, at the end of the order of the Trinity. He is content to state his own position and give his reasons.

Works Cited

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

Chapter 11
Predestination, Grace, and the Order of the Decrees

The question of this chapter is how Walaeus handles the order of God's decrees in the doctrine of predestination, and what he says of grace along the way. I look for four things: how he defines election and what he takes its object to be; whether the decree is one or many and what order he gives it; where he puts the dispute with those who make election rest on foreseen faith; and what grace is in the pages where he speaks of it. I read him where he speaks in his own words, and I claim no more than the pages I cite show.

The evidence stands in the *Opera omnia*. The first part is the locus on divine predestination in the *Enchiridion*, pages 62 and 63.[1] The second is the locus on eternal predestination in the *Loci communes*, from which I take pages 319 and 320, 327 to 329, 335, 363, and 372 and 373.[2] The third is the *Responsio ad Censuram Corvini in Molinaei Anatomen*, from which I take pages 186, 207, 209, and 243.[3] A fourth part is three passages in which he uses the words for a covenant.[4] I do not order these passages by time. Where I give the sense of a Latin sentence in English the words are mine. He does not name some of those he opposes, and neither do I.

11.1 Election Defined

The *Enchiridion* defines election on page 62. It is the eternal and immutable decree of God by which, out of the whole human race, fallen by its own fault from its first integrity into sin and ruin, he chose to salvation in Christ Jesus a certain multitude of individual men, who were no better and no worthier than the rest, from his good pleasure alone.[5] The definition has four parts, and each of them bears on what follows. The decree is eternal and immutable. Its object is the human race as fallen, and the fall is by its own fault. Its subjects are individual men, chosen from good pleasure alone and not from any worth in them. Its end is salvation in Christ Jesus.

The definition goes on. God resolved to give these same ones to his Son to be redeemed, and to lead them by a peculiar and efficacious manner of working to a living faith in him and, in that living faith, to certain perseverance, for the demonstration of his free mercy and the praise of his glorious

---

[1] Antonius Walaeus, *Enchiridion religionis reformatæ*, "De divina praedestinatione," in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), 62–63 (images 78–79). Image numbers are those of the Internet Archive scan walaeusoperaomnia01. The *Enchiridion* and the *Loci communes* occupy the first part of volume 1, and the printed page of each is the image number less sixteen. Where I give the sense of a Latin sentence in English the rendering is mine; quotations in the text are given in English, and the notes keep the Latin. In quotations from the Latin the accents and ligatures (æ, œ) are kept as printed, the long s is printed as s and VV as W, and abbreviations are expanded in square brackets; other oddities of spelling and punctuation stay as printed, with [sic]. Latin titles and imprints in citations follow the same rule, except that the capitals and u/v of display lines are normalized in them; in quotations those capitals and u/v stay as printed. These are the conventions declared in note 1 of Chapter 1. Scripture is quoted from the English Standard Version (ESV).

[2] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, 319–20, 327–29, 335, 363, and 372–73 (images 335–36, 343–45, 351, 379, and 388–89).

[3] Walaeus, *Responsio ad Censuram Corvini in Molinaei Anatomen*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 186, 207, 209, and 243 (images 770, 791, 793, and 827). The printed page of the second volume is the image number less 584.

[4] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De Dei immutabilitate," 169 (image 185); *Responsio*, 161 and 179 (images 745 and 763).

[5] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De divina praedestinatione," 62 (image 78).

grace.[6] Faith and perseverance therefore stand inside the definition. They are part of what God resolves, and the definition ends on the praise of his grace.

On the same page he gives what he calls the matter of election. The matter out of which God graciously chose some is the human race fallen by its own fault from its first integrity into sin, and so guilty of condemnation before him.[7]

11.2 The Object of Election

The *Loci* take up the question on page 327. After repeating the clause of the definition that speaks of the race fallen into sin and ruin by its own fault, Walaeus says that there are various opinions about the proximate object of election, and that the chief of them can be reduced to two. The question is whether man yet to be created, or man fallen and corrupted, was the object for God electing.[8]

He answers at once. There are great men, he says, who hold the former; yet the Synod of Dort approved the latter opinion as more certain and more agreeable to the Word of God.[9] He does not name the great men. His own words for the two opinions are man to be created and man fallen and corrupted. He does not use the words supralapsarian and infralapsarian in any passage cited in this chapter, and I do not apply either word to him.

He gives arguments for the fallen man as the object, and I take two of them. The first is that God resolved from eternity to choose out of the same mass from which he chooses in time, and he chooses in time only out of the corrupt human race, from which it follows that the object in eternity is the corrupt race.[10] The second is that Scripture knows no election except one made in Christ, the mediator and redeemer. He cites Ephesians 1:4, that God chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world, and verse 5, that he predestined us to adoption as sons.[11]

On page 329 he speaks of the phrase "in Christ." Those who ascend above the fall, he says, understand it as if it were written "through Christ," and he refers to the next verse, in which we are said to be predestined. On their reading, he says, Christ would be set up here as co-elector with the Father.[12] That is his objection to them. He does not name them on this page. On page 373, in the locus on reprobation, he speaks again of the theologians who ascend above the fall on that article, and says that they too grant a point he is using.[13]

In the *Responsio* he says on page 209, in agreement with Scripture and with nearly all antiquity, that we set up the fallen man, guilty of condemnation from the fall, as the one about whom this

---

[6] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De divina praedestinatione," 62 (image 78).
[7] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De divina praedestinatione," 62 (image 78).
[8] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 327 (image 343).
[9] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 327 (image 343). The great men are not named on the page.
[10] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 327 (image 343), the first argument.
[11] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 327 (image 343), the second argument. Eph. 1:4–5 (ESV): "even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and blameless before him. In love he predestined us for adoption to himself as sons through Jesus Christ, according to the purpose of his will."
[12] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 329 (image 345). The persons are not named on the page.
[13] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 373 (image 389).

preparation of grace and glory is concerned.[14] On page 186 he says that du Moulin rightly and soundly vindicates the opinion of our churches, expressed in the Synod of Dort and in the churches' confessions, from the opinion of certain individual doctors.[15] The doctors are not named there, and I do not connect them with the persons of page 329, for the pages do not.

11.3 One Decree, and an Order among Its Objects

The definition of page 62 leaves a question about the decree, and Walaeus meets it on the same page. He is willing to grant that election to salvation and the means of salvation can be considered distinctly, as Scripture itself sometimes sets them out distinctly. But he denies that on that account these acts are really different in God's decree, because by one single and simple act God determined all these things.[16]

He explains the denial by a comparison with knowledge. Just as God knew all things from eternity by one single and simple act, so, he says, the plurality that is spoken of belongs only to our manner of considering, because of the multitude of objects that this one act of choosing embraces. Among those objects, he says, we acknowledge that some order is to be given in eternity. A man who sees many things at once sees them all in one glance, and yet an order among the things seen can be established, and usually is.[17] The sentence is the center of the chapter. The act is one, and the order lies among its objects.

He says the same on page 328 of the *Loci*. God settled everything by a single decree, the end and the means alike, since all things were present to him in one view.[18] The preparation of grace and of glory, he adds, is not to be taken as if God had conceived different decrees about these matters, really succeeding one another. Respect is had to different objects contained in the one decree.[19] The denial is of a real succession of decrees in God. The order is an order of objects.

On page 63 of the *Enchiridion* he gives one place in that order. In this decree of election, he says, we assign the first place to Christ as head and redeemer of the church, together with all antiquity and some great authors of the Reformed church. He rests this on Isaiah 42:1, where God's chosen servant is spoken of, as Matthew 12:18 cites the passage, and on 1 Peter 1:20, which calls Christ foreknown before the foundation of the world.[20] The first place is a place among the objects of the decree. It is not a statement about what came first in time. He does not name the authors.

11.4 The Fall and the End

On page 63 he turns to the fall. He confesses that man was not created for an ambiguous end, and that the fall of men did not happen without God's special providence: for if not even a sparrow falls

---

[14] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 209 (image 793).

[15] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 186 (image 770). The Molinaeus of the page is Pierre du Moulin, whose *Anatomy* the *Responsio* defends.

[16] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De divina praedestinatione," 62 (image 78).

[17] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De divina praedestinatione," 62 (image 78).

[18] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 328 (image 344).

[19] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 328 (image 344).

[20] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De divina praedestinatione," 63 (image 79). Isa. 42:1 (ESV): "Behold my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen, in whom my soul delights." Matt. 12:18 (ESV): "Behold, my servant whom I have chosen, my beloved with whom my soul is well pleased." 1 Pet. 1:20 (ESV): "He was foreknown before the foundation of the world but was made manifest in the last times for the sake of you."

to the ground without our Father, much less the whole human race. God willed first to show what free will can do in man, and then what the benefit of his grace can do.[21] Foreseeing by the light of his knowledge that man, made in his image, would abuse free will together with all his posterity, so that the way of his justice and mercy might be disclosed more clearly, God judged it to belong rather to his most omnipotent goodness to do good out of evil than not to allow evil to be, as Augustine rightly advises.[22]

The *Loci* press the point on page 327 with an objection. If God decreed to permit the fall, it follows, the objector says, that he decreed it with no certain end, not even one yet foreknown. Walaeus denies the consequence. He permitted the fall, he says, not as a means to a preconceived end but as an antecedent to a following end.[23] It was not necessary that election should come first, so that God permitting the fall should have a certain end. It sufficed that God foresaw that he could do this if he permitted man to fall, namely that he would draw out of it justice and mercy, and that in the knowledge of simple intelligence.[24] Chapter 12 sets out that knowledge.

On the same page he answers a first objection by a distinction of ends. The axiom on which the objection leans holds of the ultimate end and not always of a subordinate end. If it held always, it would follow that what is next to last in execution is second in intention, so that the last judgment would be second and the resurrection of the flesh third, though these are introduced only after sin. The highest end, he says, is the glory of God, that is, the display of the divine glory through goodness and justice.[25]

11.5 Where He Puts the Dispute

The *Responsio* states the question of order on page 207. He is writing to Corvinus, and he sets the question as whether God destined first to the means and then to the end, or first to the end and then to the means. If Corvinus would confess a thing in earnest with him, with Augustine and the ancient church against the Pelagians, then, he says, he would not contend so far about the order of the decrees. For it suffices for orthodoxy at the foundation of this doctrine if a man confesses that we have been elected by God to both out of mere grace, as we see the Synod of Dort also expressed both in turn.[26] He does not impose an order here. He says that the order is not what orthodoxy at the foundation requires, and he puts the confession of election to both, by grace alone, in its place.

The *Loci* say it on page 363, in the part that answers those who make election rest on foreseen faith. Even if we granted that God willed to confer on them first faith and then salvation, this would do us no harm, he says, because the question between us and them is not properly about the order of the decrees but about the cause and foundation of the decrees, as he has already warned several times.[27] The dispute is placed in the cause and the foundation.

---

[21] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De divina praedestinatione," 63 (image 79). Matt. 10:29 (ESV): "Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? And not one of them will fall to the ground apart from your Father." The identification of the echo is mine.

[22] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De divina praedestinatione," 63 (image 79).

[23] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 327 (image 343).

[24] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 327 (image 343).

[25] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 327 (image 343).

[26] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 207 (image 791).

[27] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 363 (image 379).

The charge about order comes from the other side too. On page 243 of the *Responsio* he takes up Corvinus's second argument, which he calls of somewhat greater weight. Corvinus tries to prove that, in assigning the order of the decrees of election, Walaeus and those with him sin against the justice of God, since they hold that God wills eternal life to sinful man when the satisfaction through Christ has not yet been decreed or accepted. Walaeus says that he has already said something on this matter, and that he will take it up in the next chapter.[28] I report the charge and the deferral, and not an answer. Chapter 14 reads chapter 25 of the *Responsio*, at pages 247 and 249, on the single decree and the satisfaction of Christ; I do not say that this is the chapter he means here.

11.6 Election and Foreseen Faith

Walaeus bases the denial that election rests on foreseen faith in part on the order of decree and foreknowledge. On page 320 of the *Loci* he says that the decree about the futurity of things necessarily precedes the foreknowledge of those things, as all theologians confess. Otherwise the things foreknown before the decree would have had existence from themselves before God had willed to bring them about, or at least to permit and direct them, which is altogether profane and an injury to the majesty of God.[29] God therefore did not foreknow the elect, or the predestined, or the qualities certainly to be in them, except from the decree by which he resolved to choose them or to adorn them with such qualities. He promises more on this when he comes to the true object of election.[30]

On page 335 he rejects the view that some will keep to the end the grace they have received before God has chosen them precisely, or, as the holders of the view say, peremptorily and completely. He says that he constantly denies it, because it conflicts with the consensus of the whole of Holy Scripture when it speaks on this matter and carries manifest Pelagianism with it. The holders of the view are described on the page and are not named.[31] His first argument is drawn from what he has taught before, that election was not made from works. From this he concludes that it was not made from faith, or from the obedience and perseverance of faith, either. That the conclusion is firm, he says, will be clear from what follows.[32]

In the *Responsio* he puts the same denial against Corvinus by name. On page 209 he writes:

> "but God so deals with them by his decree, not as having found faith or repentance in them, or as having considered dispositions to faith and repentance in them, as Corvinus invents at paragr. 8 of chap. 16, but so as to produce these in them as infallible means of salvation, through his mercy alone and free grace."[33]

Those with whom God so deals are those about whom the page has said that the preparation of grace and glory is concerned. This agrees with the definition of the *Enchiridion*, where faith and perseverance are part of what God resolves. They are not found in the elect. They are produced in them.

---

[28] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 243 (image 827).
[29] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 320 (image 336).
[30] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 320 (image 336).
[31] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 335 (image 351).
[32] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 335 (image 351).
[33] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 209 (image 793).

11.7 Grace

In the pages I cite, what Walaeus says of grace is said inside the doctrine of predestination: in the definition of election, in the answer to Corvinus, and in the locus on reprobation. I take three points.

The first is that grace belongs to the decree. The definition has God lead the elect by an efficacious manner of working to living faith and to perseverance, for the praise of his glorious grace, and the answer to Corvinus has God produce faith and repentance in them by free grace.

The second is that sufficient grace and the decree of reprobation can stand together. In the locus on reprobation, on page 373, Walaeus says that only infallibly saving grace is denied to the reprobate. In Adam all had the power to keep the law, and indeed to believe in Christ, had it been revealed to them, as even those theologians grant who ascend above the fall on this article; and they lost those powers in him. Grace sufficient for salvation can therefore stand with the decree of reprobation.[34] What is denied to the reprobate, on his account, is the grace that is infallibly effective.

The third is that reprobation does not take away the guilt of the reprobate. God left even all the reprobate, after the fall, so much natural light that they are inexcusable before his judgment.[35] He speaks of reprobation as a passing over from the grace of election. The word election itself, he says, shows that there is such a thing, since one who chooses only some does not choose the rest, and Paul opposes the rest to the elect at Romans 11:7.[36] On page 319 the *Loci* announce the order of the locus: first election is treated, and then reprobation.[37]

11.8 The Covenant Words

Three passages that I cite use the words for a covenant, and they use them in passing. The words are "the legal covenant" and "the evangelical covenant." In the *Loci*, on page 169, in the locus on the immutability of God, the words stand in an objection that God first proposed life under the condition of the works of the law and afterward, the covenant having been changed after the fall, under the condition of faith in Christ.[38] In the *Responsio*, on page 161, he says that in the legal covenant the guilt, together with the stain of sin, passes to posterity, and that in the evangelical covenant the wrath of God remains upon the sinner.[39] On page 179, in the chapter on the definition and the parts of predestination, he writes:

> "For just as the legal covenant does not therefore cease to be a covenant, though another covenant has followed it, namely the Evangelical and New; so the decree of the legal covenant would be no less predestination, even if the decree of the Evangelical covenant had succeeded it"[40]

The sentence puts the succession of the two decrees as a supposition, in the words "even if," and it goes on to a condition concerning the decree of the evangelical covenant. I draw no conclusion

---

[34] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 373 (image 389).
[35] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 373 (image 389).
[36] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 372 (image 388). Rom. 11:7 (ESV): "What then? Israel failed to obtain what it was seeking. The elect obtained it, but the rest were hardened."
[37] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De aeterna praedestinatione," 319 (image 335).
[38] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De Dei immutabilitate," 169 (image 185).
[39] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 161 (image 745).
[40] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 179 (image 763).

about the order of the decrees from it. On the same page he denies altogether that the whole Gospel, or the evangelical covenant, much less predestination, is comprehended in its compass, and he adds that the part in question is not the least part of the evangelical covenant, without which that covenant itself would be no more efficacious to salvation than the legal covenant.[41]

I find in these three passages no term for a covenant among the persons of the Godhead, the "pact of salvation." This chapter says nothing about pages of Walaeus that it does not cite.

11.9 What He Holds

Walaeus holds that election is the eternal and immutable decree of God, taken from the human race fallen by its own fault, of a certain multitude of individual men, from good pleasure alone, to salvation in Christ Jesus. The means, faith and perseverance, are included in the decree, and God produces them in the elect; he does not find them.

He holds that the decree is one. End and means were determined by one single and simple act, and the order that is to be given in eternity is an order among the objects of the act and not a succession of acts. In that order he gives the first place to Christ as head and redeemer.

He holds that the fall is not outside God's special providence, and that God permitted it as an antecedent to a following end, in the knowledge of simple intelligence, and not as a means to an end already conceived. He holds that the highest end is the glory of God through goodness and justice.

He states the question of order as whether God destined first to the means and then to the end, or first to the end and then to the means. In the *Responsio* he does not contend so far about it, because orthodoxy at the foundation requires only that a man confess election to both by grace alone, and he says that Dort expressed both in turn. In the *Loci* he places the dispute with those who make election rest on foreseen faith in the cause and foundation of the decrees, and not in their order.

He holds that election is not from foreseen faith, and that to hold otherwise carries manifest Pelagianism with it. He holds that the decree precedes the foreknowledge of the elect and of their qualities.

He holds that grace sufficient for salvation can stand with the decree of reprobation, and that infallibly saving grace is what the reprobate are denied.

This chapter reads Walaeus only. It does not set his doctrine beside that of the men he answers, and it names none whom he does not name. It gives no order of decrees to him that his pages do not state, and it reads what he says in his own words and in their own sense, and no more.

Works Cited

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

[41] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 179 (image 763).

Chapter 12

Middle Knowledge: Where He Stands with Gomarus and Where He Parts from the Jesuits

Walaeus took up one question about the knowledge of God in several places in his collected works. The question is whether there is in God a knowledge that stands between his knowledge of what is possible and his knowledge of what is future, a knowledge of what a free creature would do if it were set in a given circumstance, and whether that knowledge comes before God's decree or after it. The name for it is "middle knowledge." Walaeus uses that name, he calls the same thing hypothetical knowledge, and once he calls it a middle or conditioned foreknowledge. I use his terms as he uses them, and where I give the sense of a Latin sentence in English the words are mine.

My claim is that he did not simply choose between two sides. He holds that there is such a knowledge in God and that it precedes every decree, and he names Franciscus Gomarus as one who holds it. He denies that it is a third species of knowledge beside the two he has named. He denies that it is the cause of any decree. He denies that the certainty of what happens rests anywhere but in God's decree. And he strips from it two uses that he ascribes to certain Jesuits and to those who follow them: the use that makes human merit the ground of election, and the use that takes away God's real action upon the will in conversion. The position is a narrow one, and it is held with a good many conditions. Walaeus is neither simply a friend of middle knowledge nor simply its enemy, and the texts bear this out.

The evidence is of four kinds, and all of it stands in the *Opera omnia* printed at Leiden in 1643, four years after Walaeus died on 9 July 1639. The first is the locus on the knowledge of God in the *Loci communes*, where the question is asked, defined, answered, and cleared of what he judges to be abuses.[1] The second is a short return to the point in the locus on providence.[2] The third is a letter to Johannes Polyander in the *Consilia et epistolæ*, in which he sets out two ways of resolving a difficulty and gives an account of the second.[3] The fourth is his *Responsio* to Corvinus's *Censura* of the *Anatomy* of Pierre du Moulin, where he returns to the question at five places while answering an opponent in the second person.[4] I give no date for any of these passages and I do not order them by time. I take them in the order of the argument.

---

[1] Antonius Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De Dei scientia," in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), 173–76 (images 189–92). Image numbers are those of the Internet Archive scan walaeusoperaomnia01. The *Loci communes* occupy the first part of volume 1, and their printed page is the image number less sixteen; the locus is undated. Where I give the sense of a Latin sentence in English the rendering is mine. In quotations from the Latin the accents and ligatures (æ, œ) are kept as printed, the long s is printed as s and VV as W, and abbreviations are expanded in square brackets; other oddities of spelling and punctuation stay as printed and are not marked. Latin titles and imprints in citations follow the same rule, except that the capitals and u/v of display lines are normalized in them; in quotations those capitals and u/v stay as printed. These are the conventions declared in note 1 of Chapter 1. Scripture is quoted from the English Standard Version (ESV).

[2] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De providentia Dei," in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, 232 (image 248, left column).

[3] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter to Johannes Polyander, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 406 (image 990, right column). Tomus secundus begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

[4] Walaeus, *Responsio ad Censuram Corvini in Molinaei Anatomen*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 101, 110, 114, 120, and 123 (images 685, 694, 698, 704, and 707).

12.1 The Knowledge of Simple Intelligence and the Knowledge of Vision

The locus on the knowledge of God lays the ground before the question is put. In the right-hand column of page 174, Walaeus asks a question that he calls one of some weight: does God's knowledge precede his decree, or does it follow, in the order of eternity?[5] His answer divides the knowledge in two. The knowledge of simple intelligence, which is God's understanding of all that can be, goes before the decree altogether, because it is natural to God. The figure he uses for how it stands to the will is a treasure. God chose by his will, out of the infinite treasure of his wisdom, the things that he willed to come about in time. The knowledge of vision, by which God sees things as certainly future, follows the act of the will, which is the decree.[6]

Two features of that answer matter for what follows. The first is that the order he is speaking of is an order of eternity and not of time. Nothing in the answer places the decree at one hour and the knowledge at another; the words are "precede" and "follow," and they say what is prior in the order of reasons. The second is that the knowledge of vision is tied to the word "certainly." It is knowledge of things as certainly future, and a thing is certainly future only when the will has fixed it. That is why the knowledge of vision follows the decree and cannot come before it. If there is a knowledge that comes before the decree, it cannot be a knowledge of things as certainly future in that sense. The question that comes next in the locus is whether there is such a knowledge, and what it would be.

Walaeus had announced the question a page earlier. At the end of an answer on page 173 he says that the "middle knowledge," which some there call in to their aid, will be treated at length later, and that how far it can be conceded or not will then be seen.[7] He does not promise a refutation. He promises to examine how far the knowledge can be conceded, which is a different undertaking.

12.2 The Question and Its Definition

Having given that answer, Walaeus lets what he has said stand outside controversy and turns to what he calls another question.[8] He puts it in these words:

> "Whether there is not some middle knowledge in God which precedes the decree?"[9]

The question is about order, as the answer to the previous question was. It does not ask whether God knows what a free creature would do. It asks whether there is a knowledge of that kind which stands before the decree. Walaeus then defines the thing asked about:

---

[5] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De Dei scientia," 174 (image 190, right column): "Hic quæstio alicujus momenti movetur: An scientia Dei antecedat Dei decretum, an vero sequatur, in ordine nempe æternitatis?"

[6] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 174 (image 190, right column): "Simplex intellectus, seu scientia simplicis intelligentiæ omnino antecedit, quia Deo naturalis est"; "Deus enim ex infinito illo thesauro suæ sapientiæ voluntate sua selegit quæ in tempore fieri voluit. Sed scientia visionis, qua res intuetur ut certo futuras, in ordine æternitatis necessario sequitur voluntatis actum seu decretum."

[7] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 173 (image 189, left column): "De scientia media quam nonnulli hic in auxilium vocant, postea ex professo agetur, & quatenus ea concedi possit aut non possit".

[8] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 174 (image 190, right column): "Hoc ergo esto extra controversiam. Sed hic jam alia quæstio".

[9] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 174 (image 190, right column).

> "But that is called middle knowledge by which future things are known from a hypothesis, though they are not absolutely future … or are not yet"[10]

The definition runs on the word "hypothesis." A thing known from a hypothesis is known as what would follow if some condition were set, and it is called future only in that conditional sense. The knowledge of vision sees what is absolutely future. The middle knowledge, on his definition, does not.

He gives the example at once, and it is the example of Adam. He asks whether God did not foreknow that Adam would abuse his liberty, if God made him such, adorned him with such gifts, and allowed him to be tempted, and this even before God decreed to create him and so to adorn him. He adds that the same may be asked of the other events of free choice that depend on the will of angels or of men.[11] The example sets the matter in its sharpest form. The act is a free act of a creature. It is supposed in a circumstance that God would make. And the question is whether the supposition is known before the decree that makes the circumstance.

At the foot of the column he records that the question divides the orthodox. He sees, he writes, that among orthodox writers there are some who do not admit the knowledge, because some infallibility seems to be set up in things apart from God's decree, in the things themselves, or in the infallible dependence of things upon one another.[12] The objection is a serious one, and Walaeus states it in full. A knowledge of what a free creature would do, which stood before the decree, would seem to fix an infallibility in the creature's act that the decree had not fixed. Everything in his answer turns on that objection.

12.3 The Position He Takes

Then comes the other side. There are, Walaeus says, some among the orthodox, and among them Franciscus Gomarus in his Theses on predestination, who think that the knowledge should be affirmed outright.[13] He gives their two reasons. They hold it because of certain places of Scripture that seem to assert it. And they hold it so that the immutability of all God's decrees can be kept, and so that it can be explained in some way how God, by his decree, is not the author or cause of evil.[14] The two reasons are different in kind. The first is exegetical and the second is theological, and the second has two parts, one about the decree's immutability and one about evil.

He then states his own position, and he states it in a sentence that has to be quoted entire:

> "from those places and others like them it is manifest that there is some such

---

[10] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 174 (image 190, right column).

[11] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 174 (image 190, right column): "An non Deus præsciverit Adamum sua libertate esse abusurum, si Deus eum talem conderet, donis ejusmodi ornaret, tentari permitteret, &c. etiam antequam eum creare & ejusmodi donis ornare, &c. decrevit? & sic de cæteris liberi arbitrii eventibus, ex angelorum aut hominum arbitrio pendentibus."

[12] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 174 (image 190, right column): "Video inter Orthodoxos scriptores esse, qui eam non admittunt, quia videtur aliqua infallibilitas in"; and 175 (image 191, left column): "in rebus constitui, citra Dei decretum, in ipsis rebus, aut rerum infallibili à se mutuo dependentia."

[13] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, left column): "Sunt tamen inter Orthodoxos nonnulli, atque inter alios Franciscus Gomarus in Thesibus de".

[14] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, left column): "qui eam omnino statuendam putent; tum propter quædam S. Scripturæ loca quæ hoc videntur asserere; tum ut immutabilitas omnium Dei decretorum possit servari: & aliquo modo explicari possit, quomodo Deus per decretum suum non sit author aut causa".

> hypothetical knowledge in God before every decree of his, concerning what was certainly going to be."[15]

The sentence does three things. It takes its warrant from the places of Scripture that the page has been citing, and it does not rest on an argument from philosophy. It says "some such" knowledge, and the phrase is careful; he affirms that a knowledge of this kind exists and does not claim to have said everything about it. And it says "before every decree," which is the position that the objection just stated was aimed at. He does not draw back from the words of the question. The knowledge precedes the decree.

He knows that the position needs defending against the objection, and he defends it in three ways.

The first is a concession. He says: "we confess, however," that a conditional decree is also included in those conditional predictions, as will be seen later, but that this does not remove the thing itself.[16] The point is brief and easily passed over. A hypothetical knowledge does not stand alone for him; a conditional decree accompanies it. The knowledge is hypothetical, and the decree that goes with it is conditional, and he says that the second does not take away the first.

The concession is taken up again on the next page. On page 176 Walaeus reasons first that if some upright man believed, he would be saved. He then says that the whole difference lies in singular instances, which do not depend on rules of that kind already fixed by God, as he had said before, and that in these, as he had also warned before, a conditional decree of God must necessarily be understood.[17] The sentence is firmer than the concession. On page 175 a conditional decree is said to be included in the conditional predictions. Here it is said that it must be understood in the singular instances that no rule already fixed by God decides.

The second is the argument from the covenants, which he numbers as the fourth. Without this hypothetical knowledge, preceding the decrees of God, he says, the immutability of the divine decrees can hardly be defended.[18] God determined first to set life before man under the condition of obedience to the law, and after the fall under the condition of faith in Christ. One of two things must then be said. Either this hypothetical knowledge of the fall must be placed before the covenant of the law, to which God afterwards joined the other; or it would have to be said that God, when the first covenant was decreed and foreknown, changed his purpose only after the fall, and substituted another covenant.[19] The argument is about God's constancy. If God knew what man would do only after he had decreed the first covenant, then the second looks like a change of plan. If he knew it before, the second covenant was part of the plan from the first. Walaeus takes the first course, and

---

[15] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, left column).

[16] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, left column): "Fatemur tamen, decretum conditionale in illis prædictionibus conditionalibus quoque includi, ut postea videbitur: sed illud rem ipsam non tollit."

[17] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 176 (image 192, left column): "ergo, si probus aliquis crederet, servaretur."; "Tota ergo differentia est in exemplis singularibus, quæ ex ejusmodi regulis jam à Deo constitutis non pendent, sicut antea dictum, in quibus tamen, ut antea quoq[ue] monuimus, Dei conditionale decretum necessario intelligi debet."

[18] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, right column): "IV. Denique sine hac hypothetica scientia decreta Dei antecedente, immutabilitas divinorum decretorum vix videtur posse defendi."

[19] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, right column): "Deus primo statuit homini vitam proponere sub conditione legalis obedientiæ"; "lapsum vero sub conditione fidei in Christum. Ergo vel hanc hypotheticam scientiam lapsus oportet legali fœderi præponere, cui postea Deus alterum"; "vel dicendum esset, Deum primo fœdere decreto &"; "tum demum post lapsum hominis, mutasse propositum, & alterum fœdus substituisse."

he takes it because he will not have God change his purpose. The argument makes the hypothetical knowledge a guard on the immutability of the decrees and not a threat to it.

The third is the answer to the objection itself, which he sets down in the form of an objection and a reply.

12.4 The Objection and the Answer

The objection is that on this view an infallibility is set in contingent and possible causes, and that this infallibility is not from God's decree.[20] Walaeus answers by denying the claim, and the reason he gives is a reason about the hypothetical decree. A hypothetical decree must be supposed here as well. It cannot be said that this will be, this being posited, unless the thing that is posited is itself posited by the decree of God; for the supposed condition cannot posit itself, and still less can it be posited or come about rashly or by chance.[21]

Put in plain terms, the argument is this. The objector says that if God knows what a creature would do under a condition, then the condition-and-outcome has a firmness that did not come from God. Walaeus replies that the condition itself, the circumstance in which the creature is supposed to be set, is something that God's decree posits. A hypothesis is never free-standing. The *if* is supplied by the decree of God, and so what follows from the *if* is not outside that decree. The infallibility that he is charged with setting apart from the decree is not apart from it. This answer is the center of his position on the knowledge. The hypothetical knowledge is before every decree in the order of reasons, and at the same time every hypothesis it contains is a hypothesis that stands on a decree of God.

12.5 What He Purges

Having taken the position, Walaeus turns at once to its use. His reason is stated plainly: because certain Jesuits, and others following them, abuse this middle knowledge, the opinion "must be purged" of their errors.[22] He does not say that the knowledge is to be given up; he says that it is to be cleansed. He names two abuses.

The first is against those who by this opinion about middle knowledge pave the way to establishing human merits in election and in preservation. What they want, he says, is that God, before he elected a man, saw through how that man, if this or that preventing and concomitant grace were offered to him in this or that order of things or in this or that state, would by his free will assent or not assent. The sentence closes on the words "not the reverse."[23] Walaeus calls this false and contrary to Scripture, and he says that it will be shown later. The abuse he is naming is exact. It does

---

[20] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, right column): "At sic videtur infallibilitas in causis contingentibus possibilibus poni, quæ non est ex Dei decreto."

[21] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, right column): "Hoc negatur, quia decretum hypotheticum hic necessario quoque supponendum: nam non potest dici, hoc fiet … hoc ponatur, nisi illud ipsum ex Dei decreto ponatur; se ipsum enim ponere non potest, multo minus temere aut fortuito poni, aut fieri."

[22] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, right column): "Quia tamen Jesuitæ quidam, & alii eos sequentes, hac media scientia abutuntur, ideo ab eorum erroribus hæc sententia est repurganda."

[23] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, right column): "Primo adversus eos, qui per hanc … de media scientia viam sternunt ad merita humana in eligendis & servandis statuenda. Nam hoc volunt illi, nempe Deum, priusquam hominem elegit, pervidisse, quomodo, si hæc aut illa … præveniens & concomitans in hoc aut illo ordine rerum, vel in hoc aut illo statu, homini offerretur, ille per liberum arbitrium ei esset assensurus aut non"; "adeo ut liberum arbitrium gratiam Dei ei … non contra."

not lie in the knowledge that God has of what a man would do. It lies in the order: God elects after seeing how the man's free choice would answer grace offered, and so the man's choice stands at the ground of the election. He cites Romans 9:16 at this point.[24]

The second abuse is against those who put forward this opinion about middle knowledge before the decree is fixed, so as to take away from his will all real action of God, which they call physical, in the conversion of a man.[25] Walaeus says that it will be shown later that God acts not only morally but also physically in the human will when he converts it. The word "physically" needs care. It is set here against "morally": a moral working persuades, and a physical working is a real working upon the will itself. It is not the modern sense of a material or bodily force, and Walaeus uses it to say that God does more than set reasons before the will. He gives as proof that God opens hearts to attend to what is preached to them, and he cites Philippians 2:13 beside it.[26] The page prints the reference "Act. 17. vers. 3" for the first of these.[27]

These two purges draw the line. The knowledge is to be kept, and the use that would make the creature's determination the ground of election is to be refused, as is the use that would reduce God's action in conversion to persuasion. What he is defending is God's grace in election and in conversion, and he is defending it with a knowledge that the Jesuits whom he corrects also use. His quarrel with them is a quarrel about what is built on the knowledge. He does not say that the knowledge itself is the fault.

12.6 One Species and Not Two

The page then turns to a question that the classification of knowledge raises. It is not necessary, he says, that this hypothetical knowledge be set up as some third species of knowledge, because it belongs to the knowledge of simple intelligence.[28] The reason is a reason from what God must know. It is absolutely necessary, he says, that God know from eternity all the possible modes of second causes, whether they act alone or with others, and so what would happen or not happen from each certain hypothesis posited, if he produced those causes, or acted with them this way or that way, or disposed them or allowed them to be disposed. No Christian, he says, will deny this.[29]

The classification is important, and it is the point at which Walaeus most clearly separates himself from those he corrects. The scheme he has laid down has two knowledges, the knowledge of simple intelligence and the knowledge of vision. A middle knowledge in the sense of a third species would

---

[24] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, right column): "non contra. Quod falsum esse, & contra Scripturam, postea". The printed reference is Rom. 9, verse 16. Rom. 9:16 (ESV): "So then it depends not on human will or exertion, but on God, who has mercy."

[25] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, right column): "Deinde adversus eos, qui hanc sententiam de media scientia ante decretum firmatum proponunt, ut omnem realem actionem Dei, quam Physicam vocant, in hominis conversione ex ejus voluntate tollant."

[26] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, right column): "Nam postea demonstrabitur, Deum non tantum moraliter, sed etiam physice in hominis voluntate agere, quando eum convertit. Ipse enim aperit corda ut attendant ad ea". Phil. 2:13 (ESV): "for it is God who works in you, both to will and to work for his good pleasure."

[27] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, right column): "eis prædicantur, Act. 17. vers. 3. &".

[28] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, right column): "Denique non est etiam necessarium, ut hæc scientia hypothetica statuatur tertia aliqua species scientiæ; quia illa ad scientiam simplicis intelligentiæ pertinet."

[29] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, right column): "ut Deus omnes modos possibiles causarum secundarum, sive solæ sive cum aliis agant, ab æterno"; "quid ex unaquaque certa hypothesi posita infallibiliter fieret, vel"; "fieret, si causas illas produceret, eis hoc aut illo modo"; "vel hoc aut illo modo disponeret aut disponi sineret: hoc nemo Christianus negabit."

stand between them. Walaeus does not allow it a place of its own. Whatever is true in it is true because God knows all possibilities, and so it is the knowledge of simple intelligence, which already precedes the decree. The knowledge that follows the decree is the knowledge of vision, and it follows because the decree has fixed what shall be. By placing the hypothetical knowledge under simple intelligence, Walaeus makes it a part of what God knows out of the treasure of his wisdom, applied to every supposition of circumstance. That is why he can say that it precedes the decree and that it is not a cause of the decree, as the letter to Polyander says.

12.7 The Letter to Polyander

The letter that Walaeus wrote to Polyander, printed in the *Consilia et epistolæ*, takes up the question again in another form. The page is page 406 of the second volume. In the right-hand column he first names an opinion that he will not have. Because of these difficulties, he says, some who are not plainly of his side have recourse to a bare foreknowledge of God, as if God had foreseen to which side the human will would bend in all its actions, apart from any antecedent decree of his own, and had resolved only to govern the outcome of the matter outside man. That opinion, he says, is in his judgment absurd. His reason is that a thing future as future could not be foreseen by God unless it were already future, and that it could not come about unless God had decreed at least to permit it: otherwise, he says, something would have been brought into act by itself, with God either not caring or unwilling. And he adds that the opinion is not free of sacrilege, because it makes the will so much the lord of its own actions that it is ruled by none but itself. That, he says, is above the condition of a created will and proper to God alone, who looks upon and rules not only external events but also every inward motion, as Scripture shows in many places.[30] The argument is of a piece with the Loci. In the locus the knowledge of vision, which sees things as certainly future, follows the decree, and the hypothetical knowledge is of things that are not absolutely future. Here he says that a foreknowledge with no decree behind it cannot stand, because a thing does not come to act without at least a decree of permission.

He then sets out two ways. It seems altogether to him, he writes, that one must either profess our ignorance frankly with Chytraeus, or have recourse to the middle or conditioned foreknowledge.[31] The saying that comes to him through Chytraeus is that the man knows that all things are governed by God, and that he sees contingency and liberty in things, and that how the two are reconciled he does not know. The other way, Walaeus says, is the way of Gomarus: to have recourse to that middle or conditioned foreknowledge, which many scholastic writers posit, and recent writers as well, though Ames rejects it without cause, since there are many examples of it in Holy Scripture.[32] The

---

[30] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter to Polyander, 406 (image 990, right column): “Propter has difficultates quidam, etsi non plane nostri, recurrunt ad nudam Dei præscientiam, ac si Deus prævidisset quorsum voluntas humana se in omnibus actionibus suis esset flexura, citra ullum antecedens decretum suum, eventum vero rei solum extra hominem statuisset gubernare. Sed hæc sententia meo judicio absurda est &”; “quia res futura ut futura à Deo prævideri non potuit, nisi jam futura esset: futura autem”; “non potuit, nisi Deus eam ut fieret saltem permittere decrevisset: alias enim vel non curante vel invito Deo res aliqua in actum à se ipsa esset deducta: ut taceam, sententiam hanc non carere sacrilegio, quia facit voluntatem ita suarum actionum dominam, ut à nullo quam à se ipsa regatur”; “quod supra conditionem est creatæ voluntatis, & soli Deo proprium, qui non tantum eventus externos sed etiam internos quosvis motus intuetur & regit, quemadmodum Scriptura multis in locis”.

[31] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter to Polyander, 406 (image 990, right column): “Videtur hic ergo omnino mihi, aut cum … ignorantia nostra ingenue profitenda, qui ex … Quod omnia à Deo gubernentur, scio:”.

[32] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter to Polyander, 406 (image 990, right column): “recurrendum ad præscientiam illam mediam seu conditionatam, quam multi”; “& recentiores scriptores ponunt, etsi”; “explodatur, cum in Scriptura Sacra multa ejus exempla extent.”

first way is an honest confession of ignorance. What follows in the letter is the exposition of the second, and it is plain from the exposition that this is the way he takes.

The exposition is a fuller statement of the hypothetical knowledge than the Loci gives. As God knew, in the infinite light of his knowledge, the series of all things and causes that he could produce, and what could infallibly follow from what, so also before every decree he foreknew how the will of man would be inclined this way or that way, these or those things being posited, without violation of its liberty, provided that he himself brought those causes into act and did not hinder the external occasions.[33] The conditions are stated with care. The knowledge is of the will's inclination in a supposed order of things, the will's liberty is not violated, and the whole is stated on the footing that God himself brings the causes into act. Then he adds that as God foreknew before every decree that it could come about in various ways, so also by his free decree he chose this way rather than that.[34] He adds that it is plain from Scripture that among these ways there is one that Beza and Perkins have set down.[35]

The letter closes the passage with a caution. This infinite treasure of things known by the divine mind is not to be set up as the cause of any decree afterwards made by God. It is the treasure from which the divine will, directed through his wisdom, freely took some part.[36] The Loci used the same figure, the infinite treasure of God's wisdom from which his will chose what it willed to come about in time. The letter says it again as a caution. The treasure does not cause the decree. The will chooses, and chooses freely.

12.8 The Responsio

The *Responsio* is Walaeus's answer to Corvinus's *Censura* of du Moulin's *Anatomy*. It is a work of controversy, and Walaeus speaks in it to an opponent in the second person, and does not state his own doctrine in order. I take the five places in the order of the pages.

On page 101 he is speaking of the wisdom of God. God administers and governs all things not only powerfully but wisely, and God's wisdom is considered not only in the effecting of the work but in its eternal disposition, which is the wise disposition of the work to come. That disposition he places in the knowledge of simple intelligence, and he says that it goes before every certain act of the will. In the same sentence, in a parenthesis, he speaks of the knowledge that concerns us, in connection with simple intelligence: "to which that middle [knowledge], if any is to be called such." The phrase "if any is to be called such" is a careful one. It does not deny that the thing exists, and it does not accept the name without condition. The middle knowledge, whatever it is to be called, is

---

[33] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter to Polyander, 406 (image 990, right column): "se cognovit infinito scientiæ suæ lumine omnium rerum & causarum, quas ipse posset producere, seriem, & quid ex quo infallibiliter sequi possit: ita etiam ante omne decretum"; "quomodo voluntas hominis se huc aut illuc, his aut illis positis esset inclinatura, sine violatione suæ libertatis modo ipse causas illas in actum deduceret, occasiones externas".

[34] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter to Polyander, 406 (image 990, right column): "variis modis fieri posse ante omne decretum, ita etiam decreto suo libero hunc potius modum".

[35] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter to Polyander, 406 (image 990, right column): "quam illum. Inter quos modos etiam"; "& Perkinsio positum, ex Scriptura liquet".

[36] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter to Polyander, 406 (image 990, right column): "Hic tamen & illud observandum est, infinitum hunc rerum à mente divina cognitarum Thesaurum, non esse statuendum causam ullius decreti à Deo deinde"; "ex quo voluntas divina per sapientiam suam directa partem aliquam libere".

spoken of in relation to simple intelligence, which precedes the will's certain act. I read the parenthesis as the placing that the Loci make, set down in a clause.[37]

On page 110 he speaks of the writers whom he opposes, and here he names them. In a list of recent Jesuit writers he puts Fonseca, Suárez, Molina, and Lessius. The list is a polemical one: it tells the reader whom he has in view, and it does not discuss any of the four. They are the men who try, by middle knowledge and by what they call moral causations, to reconcile God's providence with free choice, and who nevertheless bring in some determining necessity upon the specific actions of free choice, a necessity that does not come from free choice but from God's providence. They therefore do not concede that every determining necessity conflicts with liberty, and Walaeus shows this against them.[38] The argument is a pointed one. Those who hold middle knowledge in order to protect the freedom of the will have not, on his account, protected it from a determining necessity; they have only moved the necessity to providence. The page goes on to describe their opinion as one that supposes that God, before every decree of his providence, foresaw how man's free choice would determine itself if it were placed by divine providence in this or that order of things and occasions.[39]

On page 114 he is speaking of permission. Permission by which a certain act is permitted to the will presupposes a certain determination of the will to this act rather than to that, if it is set in this order of things by divine providence and no obstacle is put in its way. It is a determination that comes from the will so left to itself and not from the one who permits. This hypothetical determination in evil acts, Walaeus says, is not excluded from the decree of permission, provided that it be added that the foresight of the determination from a hypothesis of the future is not the cause of the decree.[40] That is the doctrine of the letter, the one point that does the work in each place: the foreknowledge may be admitted, and it must not be made the cause of the decree.

On page 120 he is again answering the man he is writing against. What the opponent "calls in," Walaeus says, he does not simply deny, as he had warned before, provided that the opponent understand the knowledge of simple intelligence, to which, he says, we refer that hypothetical knowledge which precedes the decree.[41] He gives his reason: absolute knowledge cannot have a place in God except after the decree already made, as the opponent himself confessed in the

---

[37] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 101 (image 685, left column): "Sapientia autem Dei non solum consideratur in"; "sed in ejus quoque æterna dispositione, quæ operis futuri sapiens dispositio etiam in scientia simplicis"; "(ad quam mediam illam, siqua talis dicenda est,"; "& omnem voluntatis certum actum antecedente".

[38] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 110 (image 694, left column): "Molina"; "mediam & causationes morales, ut vocant, Dei Providentiam cum libero arbitrio conantur conciliare,"; "aliquam necessitatem determinantem actionibus specificis liberi arbitrii"; "inferunt, quæ non est à libero arbitrio, sed à Dei Providentia; ac proinde omnem necessitatem determinantem"; "libertate pugnare non concedunt, quod sic ostendo."

[39] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 110 (image 694, left column): "Sententia hæc supponit Deum ante omne decretum Providentiæ"; "prævidisse, quomodo liberum arbitrium hominis se"; "determinaturum, si in hoc, aut illo ordine rerum & occasionum à divina Providentia constitueretur."

[40] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 114 (image 698, left column): "agimus de permissione, qua certus actus voluntati permittitur, quæ permissio præsupponit determinationem certam voluntatis ad hunc potius"; "quam illum; si in hoc rerum ordine per divinam Providentiam collocetur, & ei obstaculum non ponatur, ut ante visum, & quidem determinationem, quæ ab ipsa sic sibi relicta, & non à permittente sit, cujus determinationis hypotheticæ in actibus pravis"; "ex decreto permissionis non excludimus; modo hoc addatur, prævisionem hanc determinationis ex Hypothesi futuræ non esse causam decreti".

[41] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 120 (image 704, right column): "arcessis, nos id, ut antea monuimus, non simpliciter negamus, modo scientiam simplicis"; "intelligas, ad quam hypotheticam illam referimus, quæ decretum antecedit".

previous chapter. And he adds that so great is the force of truth that at times it is drawn from the unwilling.[42] Walaeus has two steps here. The first is that the hypothetical knowledge goes before the decree, which is the Loci's classification. The second is that absolute knowledge comes after the decree, which I take to be the Loci's knowledge of vision. And he has taken the second step from the opponent himself.

On page 123 he speaks of the hypothetical decree, and he draws the line within the decree. A hypothetical decree of God, if orthodox men were to speak of it, could be admitted by him in a sound sense, because God has decreed to promise us his benefits and life under this or that condition. He freely admits, he writes, that some of God's decrees include a condition, the fulfillment of which is nevertheless God's as well, and he speaks of God's willing to bring it about that the condition is fulfilled. But in the sense in which the opponents press it, the matter stands otherwise, as du Moulin noted in his eighth paragraph, because they bring in conditional decrees of God whose outcome depends on an uncertain human choice, and whose event would therefore be uncertain to God himself, except after the human determination had been foreseen.[43]

This passage is the plainest statement of the difference in the whole of the evidence. He admits the hypothetical decree in a sound sense: God decrees to promise benefits and life under a condition. What he refuses is a conditional decree whose outcome hangs upon a human choice that is uncertain even to God until it has been foreseen. I read that refusal together with the purge of merit in the Loci; each denies that God's decree is made to wait upon the creature's choice. Between the sense he admits and the sense he refuses lies the whole of what Walaeus means by saying that the hypothetical knowledge precedes the decree and does not cause it.

12.9 Infallibility and the Order of Things

The locus on providence returns once more to the connection between middle knowledge and infallibility. On page 232 Walaeus says that from the hypothesis of divine foreknowledge alone, and indeed of that middle foreknowledge, some necessity of infallibility follows, as was seen before.[44] The order of things in which a will, once placed there, will certainly will or not will something is, he says, something beside the will of man, and it comes from God's singular government.[45] He draws from this a difficult question: how, when God has this special concurrence in all the actions of the human will, God is not the cause, or at least a helper, of sin. He answers that

---

[42] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 120 (image 704, right column): "est: nam absoluta scientia in Deo locum habere non potest, nisi post decretum jam"; "ut ipse superiori capite es confessus. Nempe tanta vis est veritatis, ut nonnunquam ex invitis".

[43] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 123 (image 707, left column): "Dei decretum hypotheticum si à viris orthodoxis diceretur, sensu sano à nobis admitti posset, quia nempe Deus decrevit sub hac aut illa conditione nobis beneficia"; "& vitam promittere: unde & libenter fatemur, Dei quædam decreta conditionem includere, cujus tamen complementum Deo quoque sit"; "sive velit efficere ut conditio impleatur à"; "Sed eo quo à vobis urgetur sensu"; "notavit paragr. 8. Cl. Molinæus, quia conditionalia Dei"; "introducitis, quorum exitus pendeat ab incerto arbitrio humano; ac proinde quorum eventus ipsi Deo sit incertus, nisi post humani arbitrii determinationem prævisam." The "Cl. Molinæus" of the page is Pierre du Moulin, whose *Anatomy* the *Responsio* defends; the courtesy title Cl. is left as printed.

[44] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De providentia Dei," 232 (image 248, left column): "Imo vero ex sola hypothesi divinæ præscientiæ, & quidem illius mediæ, sequitùr necessitas aliqua infallibilitatis, ut antea visum."

[45] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De providentia Dei," 232 (image 248, left column): "Ordo enim ille rerum, in quo voluntas posita certo aliquid volet aut nolet, est aliquid præter voluntatem hominis, & à Dei singulari gubernatione."

two things are to be held as certain and beyond doubt. All evils are subject to God's singular providence, and God is nevertheless not the author of sin.[46]

The page connects the matter in two directions. The order in which a will is placed is tied to God's own government, and this is the answer given in the Loci to the objection about infallibility; the infallibility is not apart from God. And the second of the two certainties, that God is not the author of sin, is the same concern that Walaeus ascribes to Gomarus's side on page 175, where the knowledge is wanted so that it can be explained how God, by his decree, is not the author or cause of evil. A knowledge of what the creature would do before the decree could be turned to undo either of the two certainties. Cleansed as he cleanses it, it undoes neither.

12.10 The Names He Gives It

Walaeus does not hold to one name for the thing. In the *Loci communes* he asks about a "middle knowledge" and defines it, and a page later he speaks of "this middle knowledge" when he turns to the abuse of it, and of a "hypothetical knowledge" when he adopts it and when he refuses it a species of its own.[47] In the letter he writes of "that middle or conditioned foreknowledge," joining two adjectives with "or," which is how a writer gives two names for one thing. In the *Responsio* he speaks of "that middle [knowledge]" on one page and of "that hypothetical [knowledge]" on another. The names of the knowledge are therefore three, middle, hypothetical, and conditioned, and in the passages I have used they are not set against one another.

The names of the decree are of another kind. He speaks of a "hypothetical decree" in answering the objection about infallibility and again in the *Responsio*, and of a "conditional decree" in the concession that goes with his adoption of the knowledge. The two sets of names answer two questions. Where the question is what God knows before he wills, the name is one of the names of the knowledge. Where the question is what God has willed under a condition, the name is one of the names of the decree. The whole of his defense depends on keeping the two questions apart, and the man who runs them together makes the position contradict itself where it does not.

12.11 What He Holds

The evidence now permits a summary of the doctrine in the order of its parts.

Walaeus holds that there is in God a hypothetical knowledge of what a free creature would do in a supposed circumstance, and that this knowledge precedes every decree. He says so in the Loci in the sentence quoted above, and he says it in the letter and in the *Responsio*. He rests it on Scripture, and he judges that the immutability of God's decrees is better kept with it than without it.

---

[46] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De providentia Dei," 232 (image 248, left column): "Sequitur jam difficilis quoque quæstio, nempe, quomodo stante hoc speciali Dei concursu in omnibus actionibus humani arbitrii, Deus non sit causa, aut saltem adjutor peccati? Vt autem hoc recte explicetur, hæc duo tanquam certa & indubitata sunt habenda. 1. Omnia etiam mala Dei singulari providentiæ subesse. 2. Deum tamen peccati authorem non esse".

[47] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De Dei scientia," 174 (image 190, right column): "An non sit aliqua scientia media in Deo quæ decretum antecedat?"; 175 (image 191, right column): "hac media scientia abutuntur"; "hæc scientia hypothetica statuatur tertia aliqua species scientiæ". Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter to Polyander, 406 (image 990, right column): "recurrendum ad præscientiam illam mediam seu conditionatam, quam multi". Walaeus, *Responsio*, 101 (image 685, left column): "mediam illam"; 120 (image 704, right column): "hypotheticam illam"; 123 (image 707, left column): "Dei decretum hypotheticum". Walaeus, *Loci communes*, 175 (image 191, left column): "decretum conditionale".

He holds that this knowledge is not a third species. It belongs to the knowledge of simple intelligence, which is natural to God and goes before the will. The knowledge that sees things as certainly future is the knowledge of vision, and that follows the decree.

He holds that this knowledge is not the cause of any decree. The letter says it of the treasure of things known. The *Responsio* says it of the foresight of the will's determination. A decree is a free act of God's will, directed by his wisdom, that takes a part from the treasure.

He holds that the certainty of what happens rests on the decree, and that a hypothetical decree stands behind every hypothesis the knowledge contains. The condition that is supposed is put there by God's providence, and so the infallibility of the outcome is not set in the creature apart from God.

And he holds that the knowledge may not be used to put merit in election or to take God's real action out of conversion. He names these as the abuses of certain Jesuits and of those who follow them, and he cleanses the opinion of both.

The positions are held together, and each one answers an objection that would arise from another. The classification under simple intelligence answers the charge that a third knowledge has been introduced. The denial that the knowledge causes the decree answers the charge that God waits upon the creature. The hypothetical decree answers the charge that infallibility is set apart from God. And the two purges answer the charge that the whole is the Jesuit doctrine under another name.

This chapter reads Walaeus only. It does not set his statement beside Gomarus's own, and it does not set him beside the Jesuit writers in their books. What it has done is to read what Walaeus says in his own words and in their own sense, and to show that the sense holds from one place to the next.

Works Cited

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

Chapter 13
Will, Freedom, Contingency, and Ethics

The question of this chapter is how Walaeus speaks of the freedom of the human will when he also holds that God's decree and knowledge reach every human action. I ask four things: what he means by the words "liberty" and "free choice"; how he joins the decree to the freedom of man and the contingency of second causes; what he says of necessity; and what he allows to natural man in the matter of ethics. I take each term as he defines it on his own pages and read it in the sense he gives it. I do not bring to it the sense it carries in later debate, and I apply to him none of the labels of that debate.

The evidence stands in the *Opera omnia*. The first part is the *Compendium ethicae*, from which I take pages 274, 276, 277, and 278.[1] The second is the locus on free choice in the *Enchiridion*, on folio 16.[2] The third is the *Loci communes*, in the locus on providence at pages 231 and 232 and in the locus on regeneration at page 440.[3] The fourth is the *Responsio ad Censuram Corvini in Molinaei Anatomen*, page 95.[4] The fifth is a letter in the *Consilia et epistolæ*, page 405.[5] I do not order these passages by time. I do not date the letter, and I do not name the man to whom it is written. Where I give the sense of a Latin sentence in English the words are mine. Each quotation is a continuous stretch of his text.

13.1 Free Choice Defined

The *Enchiridion* treats free choice in a locus of its own. He writes that this is the "locus which is treated in the first part of the Catechism is the locus on free choice; concerning which we shall inquire into two things. I. What it is." The second question is in what matters it is concerned.[6]

"Free choice," he writes, "properly signifies the faculty of reason and will by which man spontaneously chooses or refuses what has been shown to him by the intellect," whether the thing shown be good or evil. He explains why he names two powers: "for free election these two principles necessarily concur." Reason is "the eye of the soul, which knows and weighs the things

---

[1] Antonius Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), 274, 276–78 (images 858 and 860–62). Image numbers are those of the Internet Archive scan walaeusoperaomnia01. The printed page of the second volume is the image number less 584. Where I give the sense of a Latin sentence in English the rendering is mine. In quotations from the Latin the accents and ligatures (æ, œ) are kept as printed, the long s is printed as s and VV as W, and abbreviations are expanded in square brackets; other oddities of spelling and punctuation stay as printed, with [sic]. Latin titles and imprints in citations follow the same rule, except that the capitals and u/v of display lines are normalized in them; in quotations those capitals and u/v stay as printed. These are the conventions declared in note 1 of Chapter 1. Scripture is quoted from the English Standard Version (ESV).

[2] Walaeus, *Enchiridion religionis reformatæ*, "De libero arbitrio," in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), fol. 16 (image 32). The *Enchiridion* and the *Loci communes* occupy the first part of volume 1, and the printed page of each is the image number less sixteen.

[3] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De providentia Dei," in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, 231–32 (images 247–48); "De regeneratione," 440 (image 456).

[4] Walaeus, *Responsio ad Censuram Corvini in Molinaei Anatomen*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 95 (image 679). The printed page of the second volume is the image number less 584.

[5] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 405 (image 989). The lines I cite do not give the date of the letter or the name of the man addressed.

[6] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De libero arbitrio," fol. 16 (image 32).

to be chosen or spurned, but the will [is] like a hand," and the hand takes hold of what reason has judged or turns from it.[7]

This liberty is twofold, of contradiction or of election. "The liberty of contradiction is called that faculty by which the same object [can] either be admitted or be refused." The liberty of election is the faculty "which out of various objects proposed can take up one, [and] neglect or reject the rest." He adds: "Each of these liberties is sufficiently conspicuous in human actions."[8]

Then he writes: "Thus far the theologians mostly agree with the writers on ethics, but the whole difficulty sticks here." The difficulty, he goes on, is whether man is so free in his actions that he is their absolute lord. The question "can be treated in a twofold respect, either in respect of divine providence, or in respect of quality," that is, of the quality of the objects. The first belongs to another locus: "question pertains to the locus on the providence of God; where it will be examined and solved."[9] The *Loci communes* have their own locus on providence, and I turn to it below; I do not say that these are the pages the *Enchiridion* has in view.

13.2 The Voluntary and the Four Uses of Liberty

The *Compendium ethicae* is the second place where he defines the words. On page 274 he speaks of the voluntary. He says that the spontaneous and the unwilling are "that which follows reason," and they are "actions that proceed from a man as man." He goes on: "Man therefore is said to act unwillingly in two ways, either through compulsion, or through ignorance."[10]

On page 276 he turns to liberty and begins with the word: "The word liberty is homonymous, and is wont to be used in various ways." He sets four uses in order. In the first, anything spontaneous is called free, and this liberty belongs to animals too; the ox, he says, seeks its fodder freely. In the second, free are those acts of will "which are directed by reason. So the angels in heaven [act] freely and yet always well," and he adds that the will of man freely wills his last end and his blessedness.[11]

In the third, he writes, "it is taken for that which is subject to no one, or depends on no one. In this way God alone [is] free," and God alone is "and absolute Lord of his actions." In the fourth use liberty is the power of taking or refusing a thing proposed, of following or fleeing it. "This last liberty is held to be twofold," he writes: the liberty of specification and the liberty of exercise. The liberty of specification is the power, as the schoolmen call it, "of choosing after prior deliberation," one thing from several proposed, and of passing over the others. "But [the liberty] of exercise is called the power of choosing one thing proposed or" of refusing it, and "by others it is called the liberty of contrariety." He then states which use is his subject: "And of this last kind of liberty we must properly treat."[12]

So the word "liberty" is not one thing in his pages. In the first use it covers the spontaneous, in the second the acts that reason directs, in the third God alone, and in the fourth the power of taking or refusing. The liberty of the fourth use is the one he treats.

---

[7] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De libero arbitrio," fol. 16 (image 32).
[8] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De libero arbitrio," fol. 16 (image 32).
[9] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De libero arbitrio," fol. 16 (image 32).
[10] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 274 (image 858).
[11] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 276 (image 860).
[12] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 276 (image 860).

13.3 The Seat of Liberty

On the same page he comes to the seat of this liberty. He does not stay on it: "We do not dispute here also at greater length in which faculty [is] the proper seat of this liberty," and he gives his reason, "since on either side arguments of no small [weight]."[13]

He nevertheless gives an opinion. It is "the received and more common opinion, and more fitting to the ways of speaking of Holy Scripture," that the seat is "in the will, in which this faculty has been implanted by God, that [it may turn] itself either way."[14] He adds that "the will in itself is blind," and so can choose or refuse nothing "without the indication and judgment of the intellect."[15] The indifference of the intellect, which reaches to different means, "is also a cause why the will can vary its acts."[16] This, he says, is what the schools mean when they say that liberty is in the intellect radically and in the will formally.[17]

13.4 The Decree and Freedom

On page 277 he sets the philosophers' opinions aside and gives what he calls the true and Christian view.[18] It is that all human actions, "both good and bad, both universal and singular, are subject to divine providence and government, and are ruled by the same, according to his eternal decree."[19] They are ruled according to God's knowledge as well. Two grounds are given: Scripture, "which clearly testifies to it in many places," and reason, for "reason also necessarily proves that very thing."[20]

His argument from reason runs by the opposite supposition: that things "which would not come about according to the decree of God, have existence outside God, he being either ignorant, or neglecting, or unwilling," and of this he writes, "none of which can be ascribed to God without blasphemy."[21] He concludes: "All things therefore come about with him knowing, willing, and ruling." This is by a will and rule "by which he does good things and promotes them, but evil things he justly permits."[22]

Three objections follow, and I give them as he gives them. The first is the question put to him: how is man free in his actions, "or how does he merit praise in good, and punishment in evil?" He answers that the difficulty is so great that some, "because they cannot reconcile these things with one another," deny God's government in single actions with the Peripatetics, and others, "or assert with the Stoics that all things happen by fate." He states the rule by which he proceeds: "But even if this difficulty could not be removed, what is plain in Scripture would not on that account have to be denied."[23]

---

[13] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 276 (image 860).
[14] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 276 (image 860).
[15] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 276 (image 860).
[16] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 276 (image 860).
[17] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 276 (image 860).
[18] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 277 (image 861).
[19] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 277 (image 861).
[20] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 277 (image 861).
[21] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 277 (image 861).
[22] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 277 (image 861).
[23] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 277 (image 861).

He introduces his own answer: "It seems, however, that moderate minds can be satisfied in this way." It is that the decree concerning things that are contingent and depend on man's liberty is "to include liberty and contingency," not to shut them out. His reason is the wisdom of God: "because the wisdom of God is so great that by his decree he has not violated the nature of inferior causes." God reaches the thing he set before himself and also "the manner in which he willed it to happen." He decreed that necessary causes "should produce their actions necessarily, but contingent causes contingently, and from prior choice." So man acts freely what he acts, "because God decreed that [he should do] these actions rather than those freely."[24]

The second objection is that a decree that determines the will to produce these actions rather than those seems to remove the liberty of the will, "since this belongs to liberty, not to be determined by another, but by itself."[25] His answer is a distinction between liberty absolute and liberty of the creature:

> "I confess that this belongs to absolute liberty, not to be determined by another, but only by oneself. But this absolute liberty falls on God alone: it suffices, however, for the liberty of the creature, if it determine itself as the proximate cause of its actions"[26]

To this he adds, "that it be determined by God as the supreme cause," who leaves to the creature its own motions. He cites Augustine's *De civitate Dei* for the point.[27]

The third objection is this: "But these things can hardly be understood." His reply begins by agreeing: "Answer. I confess [it], and this gladly." For a finite intellect he grants "that the ways and modes of acting of an infinite power and wisdom cannot be perfectly grasped; nor yet does it follow from this that this thing is not so." He then argues from what all grant: "For all (unless they are worse than Turks and heathens) acknowledge," that God foresaw from eternity the determination of the human will in all its actions. Then he asks, "But who among men could understand how God [foresaw] a certain event" in causes not determined? And he sets a challenge: "let someone explain to me how God by the infinite light of his knowledge foresaw this without violation of human liberty, [and] I [will explain] to him" how God "by his [decree] decreed it from eternity, and executes it in time without violation of his liberty."[28] His reply sets the mode of foreknowledge and the mode of decree side by side, and he leaves the mode of each unexplained.

13.5 Necessity and Infallibility

The *Loci* take up the same difficulty under the head of necessity. On page 231, in the locus on providence, an objection is stated: "If all things are ruled by God even specially, then all things come about necessarily. But this conflicts with liberty." His answer grants a part: "We confess that in some respect they are necessary." The respect is divine providence, and the things are those "which come about from a free and contingent cause" when the proximate cause is considered. But this necessity "does not conflict with liberty."[29]

---

[24] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 277 (image 861).
[25] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 277 (image 861).
[26] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 277 (image 861).
[27] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 277 (image 861).
[28] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 277 (image 861).
[29] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De providentia Dei," 231 (image 247).

He writes that "a distinction is to be made between absolute or simple necessity, and necessity," and the second is the hypothetical, "or in a certain respect; which by others is called the necessity of infallibility." He takes the distinction from the demonstrative syllogism, "as is known from logic": in every true syllogism "the middle term is always the cause of the consequence, but is not always the cause of the consequent, that is, of the attribute of the conclusion." The same thing can therefore be necessary in one respect and contingent in another.[30]

What he means by the necessity of infallibility he states in a sentence I give whole:

> "because, God's determination being posited, the event will indeed follow infallibly; but yet not immediately from that determination, but by the mediation of man's liberty; which God does not violate by his determination, but takes in and confirms."[31]

He also calls it the necessity of infallibility in respect of foreknowledge, which reaches the end and the means.[32]

On page 232 he says that from the hypothesis of divine foreknowledge alone some necessity of infallibility follows, as he has already shown. "For that order of things, in which the will, once placed, will certainly will or not will something," is something besides man's will, and is "from God's singular government."[33]

A harder question follows, and he states it plainly:

> "Now there follows also a difficult question, namely, how, while this special concurrence of God stands in all the actions of the human will, God is not the cause, or at least a helper, of sin?"[34]

"Concurrence" is his word for God's acting together with a creature in its action, and he speaks of it as special and as present in all the actions of the human will. For this question he gives two points to be held: "1. That all evils too are subject to the singular providence of God. 2. That God nevertheless is not the author of sin."[35] I cite no more of this passage than the two points, and I do not give his way of joining them.

13.6 The Manner of the Effect

The locus on regeneration takes up the matter in an objection. On page 440 it reads, "Thus free choice is overthrown," and the first part of his reply is brief: "Answer. 1. This is denied," just as free choice is not overthrown by creation in the image of God.[36] His second reply is from Scripture, where God turns the hearts of men and puts into their hearts what they do. He gives the instance of Saul, whom the Spirit impelled and changed into another man, and he writes of him "yet [the Spirit] did not on that account overthrow his choice."[37]

---

[30] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De providentia Dei," 231 (image 247).
[31] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De providentia Dei," 231 (image 247).
[32] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De providentia Dei," 231 (image 247).
[33] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De providentia Dei," 232 (image 248).
[34] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De providentia Dei," 232 (image 248).
[35] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De providentia Dei," 232 (image 248).
[36] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De regeneratione," 440 (image 456).
[37] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De regeneratione," 440 (image 456).

He then speaks of the Spirit: "and works all things in all, as he himself wills, not as men will," and the verse he cites is 1 Corinthians 12:11.[38] He gives the cases: "who were called outside the ordinary way, neither in the angels, nor in Christ, has free choice been taken away, nor in those who have contracted a habit of evil."[39] The reason follows in a sentence I give whole:

> "for such is the wisdom and power of God that he effects not only the thing but also the manner of the thing, that is, certain effects with the manner of liberty: just as he so rules necessary things that he does not take away necessity; so also free things, that he does not take away liberty."[40]

The *Compendium* has the same thought on page 277, where God reaches the thing and also "the manner in which he willed it to happen."

13.7 Contingency in the Second Act

A letter in the *Consilia et epistolæ* states contingency at greater length than any other passage I cite. In it he takes up what he calls the third point that needs further explanation: "in what way God by his decree and by the government of things agreeing with it does not take away the [contingency] of causes," that is, of second causes. He agrees with the man to whom he writes on one point: "Most truly it is held by you, most distinguished Sir, that the providence of God does not change the natures of things, and therefore so rules contingent and voluntary causes that they act contingently and voluntarily."[41]

Then he adds a caution, and in it he sets the first act of second causes beside the second:

> "that the contingency of second causes not be considered only in the first act, or their undetermined power"[42]

It is to be considered also in the second act, in the production of "single effects." The reason: "For in order that true contingency be preserved," the principle must not only remain undetermined in itself, but also "this or that [action] must proceed from that principle contingently and freely." The conclusion follows: "that that free principle be determined not only by a higher principle but also by itself." He says that Augustine indicates as much when he says that God "so administers all the things which he has created that they too exercise their own" motions.[43]

The question follows: "how these things can stand with the divine decree, so that the decree of God without violation of such contingency always and infallibly" obtains its effect. He writes: "I see various ways [put forward] by various [men]," and "by which they try to explain this, when it is a question of the actions of the will."[44] He reports one: "Some [hold] that wills are so gently inclined by God," by an inner and hidden working and by occasions set before the will from outside, so that

---

[38] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De regeneratione," 440 (image 456). 1 Cor. 12:11 (ESV): "All these are empowered by one and the same Spirit, who apportions to each one individually as he wills."
[39] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De regeneratione," 440 (image 456).
[40] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De regeneratione," 440 (image 456).
[41] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 405 (image 989).
[42] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 405 (image 989).
[43] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 405 (image 989).
[44] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 405 (image 989).

the will of its own accord wills what God has decreed.[45] I do not cite what he says of these ways, and I report no judgment of them.

"The example of the lame horse, which is wont to be brought in here," he writes, does not seem to him, with deference to better judgment, to fit the matter.[46] His reason is this: "because the concurrence of God with vicious actions" is "far other than [that] of one driving a horse with a lame horse," and "for the lameness of the horse plainly follows that motion of necessity, and therefore the horse merits no punishment by its lameness."[47] The word "concurrence" here is the one he used in the *Loci*, and the horse is his example of a concurrence in which the effect follows by necessity. The will of man moved by God, he says, does not fail of necessity:

> "but fails contingently and freely: whence it also comes about that it binds itself to a particular guilt in each particular vicious action before God."[48]

Then he states a distinction concerning man: "the natural man in acting can do nothing but sin," yet the regenerate man is often able not to sin when he sins.[49] The impotence of the natural man is not only Adam's but is in each man, "who proves and increases that impotence in himself, and by proving and increasing [it] also makes [it] peculiarly his own."[50]

13.8 Certainty of Salvation

On page 95 of the *Responsio* he takes up what he calls a fourth use of the doctrine, which he says du Moulin commends.[51] The use, as he gives it, is that "the assurance of salvation, unless on the unchangeable decree of God, and not" on the choice of man, would totter.[52] He says that nothing is truer than this axiom, and he gives his reason:

> "is truer: for just as the actions of human choice are in themselves uncertain and changeable, so also the salvation that depended on it would of necessity be altogether uncertain and changeable. Therefore also Holy Scripture, when it wishes to make believers certain of future salvation,"[53]

The sentence goes on: "to console through it, never from human choice, but from God's decree of election concerning them." It ends: "and from its constancy draws that certainty."[54] Here he uses "choice" of the human will as the source of acts that are in themselves changeable.

---

[45] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 405 (image 989).
[46] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 405 (image 989).
[47] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 405 (image 989).
[48] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 405 (image 989).
[49] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 405 (image 989).
[50] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, 405 (image 989).
[51] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 95 (image 679). The Molinaeus of the page is Pierre du Moulin, whose *Anatomy* the *Responsio* defends.
[52] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 95 (image 679).
[53] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 95 (image 679).
[54] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 95 (image 679).

13.9 Ethics and Natural Man

On page 278 of the *Compendium* he speaks of a good by which "[this] life and human society are preserved."[55] As to attaining that good, he writes:

> "that some liberty and faculty still remain to natural man, as the arguments brought by Aristotle and the examples of many praised heathens"[56]

The arguments and examples show it, he says, and Scripture itself testifies to it in the Pharisees. He sets a limit at once: "Meanwhile, however, this also is to be held here." He names "Plato, Pythagoras, Plutarch," with others, as men who "are forced to acknowledge" that nature is "very weak" for attaining this good by itself.[57] So he allows a liberty left to natural man and calls nature weak for this good. I cite no more of the sentence than this.

13.10 What He Holds

On the pages I cite, Walaeus holds that free choice is a faculty of reason and will by which man spontaneously chooses or refuses what the intellect has shown him. He holds that the word "liberty" has four uses, that absolute liberty belongs to God alone, and that the liberty he treats is the power of taking or refusing a thing proposed. He gives the seat of that liberty to the will, as the received opinion and the one more fitting to the ways of Scripture, while he leaves the dispute about the seat open; the will is blind in itself and chooses nothing without the intellect's judgment.

He holds that all human actions, good and bad, are ruled by God's eternal decree and knowledge, and that the decree does not take away liberty and contingency but takes them in. God effects not only the thing but the manner of the thing, and so necessary causes act necessarily and contingent causes contingently. The creature is the proximate cause of its actions and is determined by God as the supreme cause. He grants that the difficulty is great and that a finite intellect cannot grasp the whole of it, and he does not therefore deny what Scripture makes plain.

He distinguishes two kinds of necessity, and he holds that the necessity of infallibility is a certainty of the event which comes through the liberty of man. He holds as certain that all evils too are under God's singular providence and that God is not the author of sin. He holds that the contingency of second causes is to be kept in the second act as well as the first, and that the will moved by God fails contingently and freely. He holds that the certainty of salvation rests on the unchangeable decree and not on the will of man. In ethics he allows natural man a liberty left for the good of this life, and says that nature is weak for it.

This chapter reads Walaeus only. It does not set his doctrine beside that of the men he answers, and it names none whom he does not name. It gives no definition of a term that his pages do not give, and it reads what he says in his own words and in their own sense, and no more.

---

[55] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 278 (image 862).
[56] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 278 (image 862).
[57] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, 278 (image 862).

Works Cited

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

Chapter 14

The Whole Obedience of Christ: Active and Passive, and Imputation

The question of this chapter is what God counts to the believer as righteousness. One answer is the passion and death of Christ alone. The other is the whole of his obedience, in his life as well as in his death. The terms in use are passive and active righteousness, and Walaeus takes them over as the speech of others and says so as he goes. He holds that the whole is imputed, that the two are never to be torn apart in the matter of our justification, and that this is more fitting to the consolation of the faithful and to Holy Scripture than the other view. He does not hold this as a man at war with his neighbors. He says of those who hold the passive obedience only that they are learned men who have deserved well of the church, and that their view does not overturn the foundation of free justification. Then he says that he judges otherwise, and he gives his reasons.

I take his own words from four places in the *Opera omnia*. The first is the locus on justification in the *Enchiridion*, pages 67 to 73. On pages 67 to 70 he says what it is to justify and what receives the righteousness of Christ. From page 71 he states the dispute, gives his arguments, and makes a concession.[1] The second is the *Loci communes*, in the locus on satisfaction at pages 397 and 399, and in the locus on justification at pages 409, 410, 416, 419, and 425 and from the page before page 427 through page 428, where he defines imputation and says what the form of justification is.[2] The third is his reply to Sibrandus Lubbertus in the *Consilia et epistolæ*, at pages 420 and 421, where he says in the first person what he holds.[3] The fourth is the *Responsio ad Censuram Corvini*, chapter 25, down to page 249, where the same doctrine meets the question of the decrees; I add three passages from the same book on the legal and evangelical covenants.[4] I do not order these passages by time. He does not name the holders of the passive-only view in the *Enchiridion*, and I offer a name for them only in a note, as an inference. Nor does he name the men whose account of faith he states on page 70, and I do not name them either. Where I give the sense of a Latin sentence in English the words are mine.

14.1 What It Is to Justify, and What Receives the Righteousness

Before he states the dispute, Walaeus settles two things on which it depends: what the word *justify* means, and by what instrument the righteousness of Christ becomes ours.

---

[1] Antonius Walaeus, *Enchiridion religionis reformatæ*, "De justificatione," in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), 67–73 (images 83–89). Image numbers are those of the Internet Archive scan walaeusoperaomnia01. The *Enchiridion* and the *Loci communes* occupy the first part of volume 1, and the printed page of each is the image number less sixteen. Where I give the sense of a Latin sentence in English the rendering is mine; quotations in the text are given in English, and the notes keep the Latin. In quotations from the Latin the accents and ligatures (æ, œ) are kept as printed, the long s is printed as s and VV as W, and abbreviations are expanded in square brackets; other oddities of spelling and punctuation stay as printed. Latin titles and imprints in citations follow the same rule, except that the capitals and u/v of display lines are normalized in them; in quotations those capitals and u/v stay as printed. These are the conventions declared in note 1 of Chapter 1. Scripture is quoted from the English Standard Version (ESV).

[2] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De satisfactione Christi," in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, 397 and 399 (images 413 and 415); "De justificatione," 409, 410, 416, 419, and 425 (images 425, 426, 432, 435, and 441), the page before 427 (image 442), and 427–28 (images 443–44).

[3] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, reply to Sibrandus Lubbertus, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 420–21 (images 1004–5). Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

[4] Walaeus, *Responsio ad Censuram Corvini in Molinaei Anatomen*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, chapter 25 (images 831 to 833, the last of them printed page 249), and 161 and 179 (images 745 and 763) for the covenants.

On page 67 he holds that the use of the word in this matter is judicial. It signifies nothing else, he says, than to absolve from guilt and to pronounce just, and where it is set against condemnation it means absolution from sin.[5] The consequence follows at once. Where justification is opposed to condemnation it cannot be taken for the infusion of righteousness.[6] He adds a further proof from the two benefits, justification and sanctification, which are distinguished from each other.[7] On this account the word names a verdict and not a change worked in the man.

The instrument is treated on the page that follows page 67. Walaeus holds that Scripture shows the instrumental cause of our justification to be faith, and he says that he asserts, and will demonstrate from Scripture, that a man is justified by faith alone, not only in a beginning but fully.[8] The faith by which we are justified is never separate from hope, charity, and good works. Yet faith alone is the instrument by which the righteousness of Christ is apprehended and applied to us. He illustrates it from the body: the eye sees, and the hand alone lays hold, though neither eye nor hand is separate from the rest of the body.[9] He keeps two questions apart. What faith is joined to is one question, and what faith does in justifying is another. To the first the answer is hope, charity, and works. To the second the answer is that faith alone lays hold of the righteousness of Christ. The word *alone* opposes faith to good works as causes of justification and means nothing else than faith without works. He does not set faith against the grace of God or the merit of Christ.[10]

On page 70 he calls this the true doctrine, received by all the Reformed churches: that we are justified by faith in so far as faith is the instrument by which the merit of Christ alone is apprehended by us.[11] In that sentence the word *alone* stands with the merit of Christ. It is Christ's merit alone that faith takes hold of. He gives two reasons for the name *faith alone*. Faith alone lays hold of this righteousness of Christ, and it seemed good to God the Father that it should be so. The second reason rests on God's dealing with men. It pleased God, he says, so to deal with them that whoever believes in Christ should be saved, since whoever believes in Christ receives the righteousness of Christ by faith and, by God's sole and gracious promise, has a share in all the fruits of that righteousness. That is the reason, he says, why we are said to be justified by faith alone.[12]

---

[5] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 67 (image 83). Left column: "judicialem, & nihil aliud significare quam à reatu absolvere & justum pronunciare". Right column: "nihil aliud significare, quam absolutionem à peccato, condemnationi oppositam."

[6] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 67 (image 83, left column): "Ubi justificatio opponitur condemnationi: & pro justitiæ infusione sumi non potest".

[7] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 67 (image 83, right column): "hoc etiam evincitur ex eo, quod hæc duo beneficia, scil. justificationis & sanctificationis".

[8] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," the page after 67 (image 84, right column): "instrumentalem nostræ justificationis statuimus ex Scriptura esse"; "Nos vero asserimus & ex Scriptura demonstrabimus, hominem justificari per fidem solam non tantum inchoate sed".

[9] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," the page after 67 (image 84, right column): "docemus enim, fidem illam per quam justificamur, nunquam"; "spe, charitate & bonis operibus esse"; "sed fidem solam esse illud"; "per quod Christi justitia apprehenditur & nobis applicatur"; "sola manus apprehendit eas, etsi nec oculus nec manus".

[10] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," the page after 67 (image 84, right column): "Cum ergo dicimus, sola fide nos justificari, opponimus eam bonis operibus tanquam"; "sola fide nobis nihil aliud significat quam fide sine operibus".

[11] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 70 (image 86, right column): "vera & ab omnibus Reformatis Ecclesiis recepta"; "nos per fidem justificari quatenus est instrumentum, quo Christi solius meritum".

[12] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 70 (image 86, right column): "tum quia sola fides hanc Christi justitiam apprehendit, tum quia Deo Patri visum fuit"; "ut quicunque in Christum credit servetur, quia qui in Christum credit Christi justitiam fide recipit, & ex Dei sola & gratiosa"; "particeps sit: & hæc est causa, cur sola".

The page also states a view that Walaeus sets apart from the doctrine of the Reformed churches. Its holders, he says, have devised another mode of it than the churches have embraced until now. They assert that we are justified by faith in Christ for this reason, that faith itself is counted for the whole obedience of the law, in place of the whole legal obedience, which required the perfection of every work. God has put faith in its place, and faith, because it is not the whole obedience owed but only some small part of it, is said to be reckoned to us for righteousness.[13] He does not name them there, and I do not name them.

In the same column he says that Scripture testifies throughout that Christ has fully paid the price of our redemption. Faith, then, is not a part of that price and cannot be, unless someone should wish to say that we are justified by the whole merit of Christ and by something added to the merit of Christ.[14] The instrument stands outside the price. Faith pays nothing. It takes hold of what has been paid. In the next column he says the same of the manner of speaking. All such ways of speaking, and others like them, are instrumental throughout, for obtaining something without any merit or dignity in the instrument that receives it.[15]

14.2 The Dispute as the Enchiridion States It

Walaeus begins the dispute on page 71 of the *Enchiridion* with what everyone grants. All concede, he says, that the original holiness of Christ's nature, the holiness of his life, and so his whole obedience, were necessary if we were to be redeemed by his one sacrifice accomplished in death, for the victim could not have pleased God unless it had been without blemish and offered through the Spirit, as Paul says at Hebrews 9:14.[16] No one in this dispute denies that the obedience of Christ's life mattered to the sacrifice. The dispute is about what it is for.

Then he states the disagreement. Some contend that only the merit of Christ's passion and death is imputed to righteousness, and that the holiness of his nature and life was only a necessary condition set in advance for the offering of the victim. Or, in the words these men commonly use, it is Christ's passive righteousness, and not his active, that is properly our righteousness.[17] The view has a clear shape. The life of Christ is the preparation of the sacrifice, and the sacrifice is what is counted to us.

Walaeus does not answer with heat. He grants that the view comes from learned men who have deserved well of the church of Christ, and that it does not overturn the foundation of our free

---

[13] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 70 (image 86, left column): "alium ejus modum excogitarunt quam Ecclesiæ Reformatæ hactenus"; "quia fides ipsa pro tota obedientia legis habeatur"; "quæ omnium operum perfectionem requirebat"; "tota obedientia debita, sed aliqua tantum ejus particula".

[14] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 70 (image 86, left column): "Quia Sacra Scriptura testatur passim, Christum plene solvisse redemptionis nostræ pretium: non est ergo ipsa fides particula aliqua vel esse potest illius pretii, nisi quis velit dicere, nos justificari per integrum Christi meritum & aliquod additamentum supra Christi meritum".

[15] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 70 (image 86, right column): "Qui modi loquendi omnes, & similes, instrumentales omnino sunt ad aliquid obtinendum sine ullo merito aut dignitate instrumenti quod eadem recipit."

[16] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 71 (image 87, left column): "Concedunt etiam omnes, Sanctitatem originalem"; "obedientiam ipsius totam, fuisse"; "ut per Sacrificium unicum ipsius in morte peractum"; "Nam hostia Deo placere non potuisset, nisi fuisset inculpata, & per Spiritum oblata, ut Paulus loquitur". Heb. 9:14 (ESV): "how much more will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish to God, purify our conscience from dead works to serve the living God."

[17] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 71 (image 87, left column): "Hac in re tamen dissensus est, quod nonnulli solum meritum passionis & mortis Christi ad justitiam imputari contendunt"; "seu, ut communiter loquuntur, justitiam Christi passivam, non activam, esse proprie nostram justitiam."

justification. Nevertheless, he says, he judges otherwise.[18] What he judges is this. It is more fitting to the consolation of the faithful and to Holy Scripture to hold that Christ's whole obedience and righteousness, active and passive as they put it, is our righteousness before God, and that these two are never to be torn apart in the business of our justification. He adds that it is not to be feared that in Christ we be made too rich.[19]

Two things in this judgment are worth marking. The first is its grounds. He appeals to the consolation of the faithful and to Scripture together, and he does not set them against each other. The second is the clause "as they speak," by which he marks the terms as the speech of others. He reports the terms active and passive righteousness as that speech, and he does not put his weight on them. What he puts his weight on is the whole obedience, and that is the word he returns to wherever the doctrine appears.

14.3 Three Arguments from Scripture

On the same page he gives arguments. I take three of them: the second, the fourth, and the fifth.

The second argument rests on Romans 5. The passage sets the obedience of the second Adam against the disobedience of the first, and at verse 19 it says in so many words that as through the disobedience of one man many were made sinners, so through the obedience of one man many were made righteous.[20] Walaeus closes the exception before it is made. It cannot be objected here, he writes, that by the obedience of Christ only some one kind of obedience is understood.

The fourth argument rests on Hebrews 10:10. By that will, the epistle says, we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.[21] In Walaeus's text the verse speaks of what sanctifies us as an obedience once accomplished. He reads the will to which Christ was obedient as standing for the obedience itself that he rendered to the Father, and he says that this obedience cannot be taken for the passive obedience alone. He shows it, he says, by comparing the epistle with Psalm 40.

The fifth argument turns on the right to life. We needed to be freed not only from death, he says, but also to have the right to life restored to us. It follows that Christ had to suffer for us, and also to merit for us by his obedience the right to life, which the Apostle Paul gathers at Romans 8:3–4.[22] The argument is that freedom from the penalty is one thing and a title to life another, and that the second is to be merited by obedience.

---

[18] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 71 (image 87). The learned men are not named on the page. The view he answers, that only the passive righteousness is imputed, appears to be that of Johannes Piscator; the identification is an inference from the view itself and is not made on the page.

[19] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 71 (image 87, left column): "statuere, totam Christi obedientiam & justitiam, tam activam, quam passivam, ut loquuntur, nostram esse coram Deo justitiam"; "cum non sit metuendum, ut in Christo … reddamur divites."

[20] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 71 (image 87), the second argument. Rom. 5:19 (ESV): "For as by the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man's obedience the many will be made righteous."

[21] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 71 (image 87), the fourth argument. Heb. 10:10 (ESV): "And by that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." Walaeus's text of the verse speaks of an obedience once accomplished where the ESV reads "offering." The body gives his wording and this note the English text.

[22] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 71 (image 87), the fifth argument.

14.4 The Objections and the Concession

Walaeus does not leave the matter at the arguments. On page 72 he meets an objection about Christ's being bound to the law. His answer is that Christ's subjection to the law was a voluntary dispensation:

> "That he therefore subjected himself to the law, not only moral but also ceremonial, this was done from a voluntary dispensation, by which he subjected himself to the law, that he might redeem those who are under the law"[23]

He adds the Apostle's words from Galatians 4.[24] The point of the answer is plain from its purpose clause: he put himself under the law in order to redeem those who were under it.

The page also carries a second objection, and I give it as Walaeus gives it. If through the death of Christ sins of omission as well as of commission are remitted, then it necessarily follows that the imputation of active righteousness is not needed, since the man whose sins, even of omission, have been remitted is held in the same place as if he had fulfilled all righteousness. Walaeus begins his reply by denying the consequence, and the reason he gives is that the death of Christ is, as he had said before, the finishing stroke of Christ's righteousness, active and passive alike.[25] The objection is a strong one. It asks what is left for the life of Christ to do if the death remits every sin.

On page 73, answering objections, he makes a concession. In this way, he says, we concede that there are two distinct parts of our justification, the one active and the other passive, yet always conjoined. One stands as the cause and the other as its fruit and effect: the imputation of the whole righteousness of Christ, active as well as passive, and by the force of that imputation the full remission of sins, which is also the non-imputation of them, and our reconciliation.[26] The concession is real. He grants that there are two parts and that they can be told apart. What he refuses is that either of them can stand alone, and the order he gives them is an order of cause and effect: the imputation comes first and the remission follows from it.

14.5 Obedience and Remission in the Loci

The *Loci communes* come to the matter from satisfaction. In that locus, on page 397, Walaeus gives two reasons in a refutation. The first is that Christ satisfied the justice of God, which had been injured under the former covenant. The second is that Scripture testifies that Christ fulfilled the law for us, and he cites Galatians 4:4.[27] The same page takes up the word *obedience* where Christ is said to have been made obedient to the point of death. The word, he says, cannot be taken only for obedience to a single command, the command concerning the death to be undergone. It must be

---

[23] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 72 (image 88).

[24] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 72 (image 88). Gal. 4:4–5 (ESV): "But when the fullness of time had come, God sent forth his Son, born of woman, born under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as sons."

[25] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 72 (image 88).

[26] Walaeus, *Enchiridion*, "De justificatione," 73 (image 89, left column): "Hoc modo ergo concedimus, duas esse partes"; "& ex vi illius imputationis peccatorum plenariam remissionem, seu non imputationem, seu nostri reconciliationem"; "justitiam, & obedientiam Christi, nobis imputatam, tanquam causam & fructum illius, nempe reconciliationem nostri, seu remissionem peccatorum".

[27] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De satisfactione Christi," 397 (image 413, right column): "Sed id refutatur, quia Christus satisfecit justitiæ Dei, quæ sub priore"; "erat læsa. Secundo Scriptura testatur, Christum legem pro nobis implevisse."

taken also of all the obedience that came before the death, and the manner of speaking embraces the whole obedience that Christ rendered to the Father. The words recall Philippians 2:8.[28]

On page 399 Walaeus will not allow that active obedience ends before the passion. Christ was bound not only to live justly but also to die justly, and in his death itself to render the obedience owed to the law, so that those who confine the active obedience to the life of Christ before his passion are wrong.[29] On his account the dying was itself an obedience owed to the law.

On the same page he answers an objection by saying that both righteousnesses are understood in Christ's death and blood. They can be distinguished in thought, he says, but they could never be disjoined in Christ. The whole righteousness or obedience of Christ is therefore the cause of the remission of sins, sins of commission as well as of omission.[30] The objection, as the *Loci* put it, is that if everything is remitted by the passive righteousness the active was not needed, which is the objection of the *Enchiridion* in other words. The remission of sins of omission is not, on this account, the work of a bare death, because the death carries both.

A little further on the page the argument is put in terms of what remission requires. With Calvin he grants the major premise of an objection, and he denies the minor. Sins are remitted to us not on account of the passive obedience alone but on account of both. For sins to be fully remitted it is necessary that both righteousnesses be imputed to us: the passive, so that the liability to punishment is removed, and the active, so that the fault is covered and the reward of righteousness assigned to us. He cites Romans 5:18.[31] This is the best short statement of the doctrine in the *Loci*. It assigns to each righteousness its work: the passive takes away the penalty, and the active covers the fault and gives the reward.

14.6 Imputation, Faith, and Inherent Righteousness in the Loci

Some pages before the definition, the locus on justification has already put the word *imputation* to work. On page 409 Walaeus returns to the apostle's comparison of the two men. He says that the passage speaks properly of imputation, and that so also the obedience of Christ is imputed to us for justification, since the words of the Apostle and his purpose require it.[32] On page 410 he lays the two sides of the comparison against each other. As we were lost through the sin of the first man both by imputation and by real communication, so through the obedience of Christ grace has been obtained and made for us. That grace reigns in us through righteousness unto life, and it is communicated to us abundantly for the remission of sins and the imputation of the righteousness of

---

[28] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De satisfactione Christi," 397 (image 413, right column): "obedientia non tantum sumi potest pro obedientia singularis præcepti, de morte sc. obeunda"; "de omni obedientia mortem antecedente"; "esse obedientem usque ad mortem"; "ratio loquendi totam Christi obedientiam, quam patri". Phil. 2:8 (ESV): "And being found in human form, he humbled himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross." The identification of the verse is mine.

[29] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De satisfactione Christi," 399 (image 415, left column): "Christus ergo non debuit tantum juste vivere, sed etiam … mori, & in ipsa morte obedientiam legi debitam"; "Male ergo à quibusdam terminatur obedientia activa in vita Christi".

[30] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De satisfactione Christi," 399 (image 415).

[31] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De satisfactione Christi," 399 (image 415). Rom. 5:18 (ESV): "Therefore, as one trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one act of righteousness leads to justification and life for all men."

[32] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De justificatione," 409 (image 425, right column): "Dicimus, hic proprie agi de imputatione"; "obedientia nobis imputatur ad justificationem : nam verba Apostoli & scopus id postulant".

Christ.[33] He does not here set imputation against grace. It is one of the two ends for which the grace obtained by the obedience of Christ is communicated, the remission of sins being the other.

Lower on the same page he says what is in dispute. One point, he says, must be argued here against the Socinians and others: whether this merit of Christ is imputed to us for righteousness, which they deny. And the Remonstrants, in their confession, set forth here a plainly different mode of justification from the one that the Reformed churches have acknowledged until now.[34] The question is the question of this chapter.

On page 416 an objection is put in these terms: faith itself is said to be imputed to the believer for righteousness.[35] The argument against it is on page 419. If faith itself were what is imputed, he says there, Christ would have died rather for faith, to win for it the dignity of justifying, and not for us. And since faith is of different kinds, one more imperfect and another more perfect, a manifold imputation would be needed: first imperfect faith would have to be counted for perfect, and then perfect faith for the whole obedience of the law.[36]

In the reply to a fourth objection on the same page he meets the conclusion that it is faith itself, and not the merit of Christ, that is imputed. He denies the major premise. His first ground is that sin also is said to be imputed, as at Romans 4:8. His second gives the sense of the word. The merit of Christ is said to be imputed because, although it is perfect in itself, it does not inhere in us, just as a full payment made by one man for another is said to be imputed to the other.[37] This is as plain an account of *impute* as Walaeus gives in these pages. The thing is another's. It is reckoned to our account. It does not become a quality of ours. What inheres is one thing and what is imputed another, and the merit of Christ belongs to the second.

The same line of thought governs what he says of the form of justification on page 425. There he turns against the Papists, who place the form of justification not in the imputation of the righteousness of Christ but in righteousness that inheres, that is, in habitual holiness. He grants that no one is justified who is not at the same time sanctified. He denies that the form of justification consists in that inherent holiness.[38]

---

[33] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De justificatione," 410 (image 426, right column): "per peccatum primi hominis tum imputatione tum reali communicatione"; "ita per Christi obedientiam nobis gratia"; "gratia regnat in nobis per justitiam in vitam; quia nobis copiose communicatur in remissionem peccatorum".

[34] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De justificatione," 410 (image 426, right column): "Socinianos est disputandum; utrum Christi hoc meritum nobis imputetur ad justitiam, quod negant"; "Remonstrantes in sua confessione hic plane alium modum justificationis statuunt, quam Ecclesiæ".

[35] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De justificatione," 416 (image 432, right column): "Obj. Fides ipsa in justitiam credenti imputari dicitur".

[36] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De justificatione," 419 (image 435, left column): "Si hoc esset verum, tum Christus potius pro fide esset mortuus"; "illi dignitatem justificandi acquireret, non pro nobis; & cum fides alia sit"; "alia perfectior, multiplici imputatione esset opus"; "pro tota obedientia legis reputaretur."

[37] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De justificatione," 419 (image 435, right column): "Negatur major : quia imputari dicitur etiam peccatum, Rom.4.8."; "dicitur meritum Christi, quia licet in se sit"; "tamen nobis non inhæret: ut solutio plenaria ab alio præstita alteri dicitur imputari". Rom. 4:8 (ESV): "blessed is the man against whom the Lord will not count his sin."

[38] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De justificatione," 425 (image 441, left column): "adversus Pontificios progredimur, qui formam justificationis"; "non in imputatione justitiæ Christi locant"; "Nos vero, etsi fateamur neminem justificari nisi simul"; "negamus tamen formam justificationis in illa".

Then he says what it is not to impute sin. The phrase, he says, is never taken for taking away the stain of sin, but for remitting the penalty or forgiving it. The reason is plain. If not to impute sin were to take away the stain, to impute sin would be to pour in the stain, which is blasphemous. God imputes sin or does not impute it according as he exacts the penalty or forgives the guilt.[39] This fixes the sense of a phrase that is already in this chapter. When the *Enchiridion* calls the full remission of sins also their non-imputation, I take it in this sense: the penalty is remitted, and no stain is removed from the man by an infusion of righteousness.

14.7 Imputation Defined

On the page before page 427, in the locus on the form of justification, Walaeus defines his terms. By the righteousness of Christ he understands not only the active righteousness, as they call it, but also the passive, that is, the whole satisfaction and merit of Christ. By imputation he understands not an ingrafting or infusion, as certain of those he calls Papists wrongly gather from the rustic use of the word, but the acceptance of Christ's righteousness for ours. The force of the Greek verb that stands behind the word, which was taken from the accountants, makes this plain.[40] The sense is that of a reckoning, and nothing is poured into the man.

The ground of imputation, he says next, is either the worthiness of the person to whom something is imputed or the sole grace and mercy of the one who imputes. Romans 4:4 shows the difference: to the one who works, his wages are not counted as a gift but as his due.[41] Christ's merit is imputed to us in the second way. The reckoning rests on the mercy of the one who reckons.

On page 427, answering the third objection, he uses the same pair of words in another sense. The sense is the manner in which a man is made what he is made by imputation:

> "Just as therefore, when our sins were imputed to Christ, Christ only passively, not … is made sin: so when we are righteousness … in Christ, we are righteous passively, not actively."[42]

The words "passively" and "actively" here do not name the two obediences of Christ. They name the way a man comes by what he has. The words recall 2 Corinthians 5:21.[43]

On page 428 he turns to the question whether imputation is the whole form of justification, and he answers that remission and imputation together make it. He stands, he says, with Calvin and most of the great Reformers of the church in holding that both are necessary to our justification, as the form of a captive's deliverance consists in the application of the ransom and the actual liberation.[44] The two, he continues, are so connected that one is the term from which and the other the term to which of the form of our justification. For the active and passive righteousness of Christ is imputed

---

[39] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De justificatione," 425 (image 441, right column): "Phrasin illam non imputari nunquam sumi, pro maculam peccati tollere"; "Si enim peccatum non imputare, est maculam tollere, imputare peccatum esset, maculam infundere, quod blasphemum est."; "Deus enim imputat"; "non imputat peccatum, quando reatum condonat".

[40] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De justificatione," the page before 427 (image 442).

[41] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De justificatione," the page before 427 (image 442). Rom. 4:4 (ESV): "Now to the one who works, his wages are not counted as a gift but as his due."

[42] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De justificatione," 427 (image 443, right column).

[43] 2 Cor. 5:21 (ESV): "For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God." The identification of the echo is mine.

[44] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De justificatione," 428 (image 444).

to us for the remission of sins, and so by synecdoche the one is often put for the other, as the proximate and necessary cause and effect.[45] They are not two doctrines. One is named for both.

He then gives the whole form in a single sentence. It is the imputation of the whole obedience of Christ, both of his death and of his life, and the remission of all sins that answers to it, which is to say liberation from punishment and acceptance to eternal life.[46] This is the fullest statement of the doctrine in the *Loci*. It names the whole obedience, it names the death and the life together, and it names the two effects, the freedom from punishment and the acceptance to life. The second of these answers to the fifth argument of the *Enchiridion*.

14.8 The Letter to Lubbertus

The letter in the *Consilia et epistolæ* has an occasion. Lubbertus writes to Walaeus that when they were leaving Dordrecht it was agreed between them that the sense of the twenty-second article of the Belgic Confession would be taken up.[47] In his reply, on page 420, Walaeus writes in the first person that on the question of the matter of our justification before God he holds that Christ's whole obedience, which he rendered to God the Father according to the law not only in his death but also in his life, is imputed to us for righteousness, or is the meritorious cause of our reconciliation before God.[48] The reason is the pair the *Loci* gave. For our reconciliation to be full, the guilt owed to sins must be removed and the reward of righteousness assigned to us.

Of these two, the removal of the guilt and the assignment of the reward, Walaeus admits that the one is sometimes contained under the other in Scripture by synecdoche; yet the two, though distinct in themselves, cohere necessarily and always by God's decree.[49] The letter adds the word decree. In the *Enchiridion* the two parts were joined as cause and effect. In the *Loci* they were joined as the terms of one form. Here the joining is grounded in what God has decreed.

He then says how he reads his correspondent. If he understands Lubbertus's mind well enough, Lubbertus thinks that full satisfaction for us has been made by Christ's passion and death alone, and that the holy and just life of Christ is not imputed to us for righteousness. Lubbertus's proof, as Walaeus describes it, begins with the Old Testament. Walaeus is careful in the way he puts the matter. It is his reading of the other man's mind, offered conditionally, and not a charge.[50]

On page 421 he argues from Abraham. Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him as righteousness; therefore the whole obedience of Christ, which is received by faith, is imputed to righteousness. Abraham, he says, embraced by faith not a part of the righteousness of Christ but the

---

[45] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De justificatione," 428 (image 444).

[46] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De justificatione," 428 (image 444).

[47] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, letter of Sibrandus Lubbertus to Walaeus, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 420 (image 1004).

[48] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, reply to Sibrandus Lubbertus, 420 (image 1004, left column): "Quod quæstionem attinet de materia justificationis nostræ coram Deo, ego totam Christi obedientiam, quam non tantum"; "in vita sua Deo Patri juxta legem"; "ad justitiam nobis imputari, seu causam esse meritoriam nostræ coram Deo reconciliationis"; "nam ut plena sit reconciliatio nostra coram Deo, oportet reatum peccatis debitum tolli, & justitiæ præmium nobis assignari".

[49] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, reply to Sibrandus Lubbertus, 420 (image 1004, left column): "quorum alterum tamen in Scripturis sub altero synecdochice nonnunquam"; "contineri, quia hæc duo etsi in se"; "ex Dei decreto tamen inter se necessario semper cohære[n]t."

[50] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, reply to Sibrandus Lubbertus, 420 (image 1004, left column): "Tu, Clar. Vir, si mentem tuam satis intelligo, sola Christi passione & morte pro nobis plene"; "& justam Christi vitam".

whole. He adds Christ's words in John 8 and the saying that the righteous shall live by faith.[51] The argument joins the doctrine of imputation to the doctrine of faith. What faith receives is not a fragment. It is the whole obedience.

14.9 One Decree for the End and the Means

The *Responsio* takes up the doctrine from the side of election. Chapter 25 asks whether Christ is the cause and foundation of election. Walaeus first describes a view that he opposes. It holds that Christ satisfied the Father only so far that, with God's justice kept safe, God may enter another covenant with sinful man on the same or other conditions, and it acknowledges no imputation of Christ's merit or righteousness to justification and salvation through faith.[52] The word covenant is in his account of that view. What he sets against it is stated in the next passage.

No orthodox person, he says, will ever deny that the mediation of Christ, as the foundation and proximate cause of our salvation, is also contained in the decree of election to salvation. His reason is drawn from the knowledge of simple intelligence, which Chapter 12 set out: in that knowledge God knew all things in one simple act, both what pertained to the end of man and the means most fitting to the justice and mercy of God.[53] The mediation of Christ is among the means.

Then he draws the consequence, and it is the center of the chapter. According to the counsel of his will, in a single decree God chose both the end and those means. In the objects an order can and should be considered, he says, but not in the decrees; and if some speak otherwise, they mean it only with respect to our grasp and consideration, because God does not make successive decrees, as men are often forced to do by the imperfection of their conception.[54] I read this together with the letter. If the two cohere by God's decree, there is one decree and not two. The order that the mind sees among the things decreed, Christ's satisfaction and our election, is an order among the things and not among the acts of decreeing.

On page 249 he applies it. We are elected to salvation, he says, only in Christ and with respect to the satisfaction of Christ, in the way he has already declared. He maintains that no name under heaven was given to sinful men in which they must be saved other than the name of Jesus. Curious questions about God's absolute power he leaves to others, and he adds that rash searchers into the Majesty should see that they are not overwhelmed by it.[55] The sentence on the name of Jesus recalls the words of Acts 4:12, "And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved."[56]

---

[51] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, reply to Sibrandus Lubbertus, 421 (image 1005). Gen. 15:6 (ESV): "And he believed the LORD, and he counted it to him as righteousness." John 8:56 (ESV): "Your father Abraham rejoiced that he would see my day. He saw it and was glad." Hab. 2:4 (ESV): "the righteous shall live by his faith."

[52] Walaeus, *Responsio*, chapter 25 (image 831, left column).

[53] Walaeus, *Responsio*, chapter 25 (image 831, left column).

[54] Walaeus, *Responsio*, chapter 25 (image 831, left column): "ordo quidem considerari"; "potest, non tamen in decretis, &, si qui sint qui sic aliquando loquuntur, illi id"; "captus & considerationis nostræ tantum intelligunt,"; "quia Deus successiva decreta non facit, sicut homines propter"; "sui conceptus"; "facere coguntur."

[55] Walaeus, *Responsio*, chapter 25, 249 (image 833).

[56] Acts 4:12 (ESV). The identification of the echo is mine.

14.10 The Two Covenants as They Appear

The *Loci* use the same rule on a smaller scale. On page 169, in the locus on the immutability of God, an objection is put: God first proposed life to man in the legal covenant under the condition of the works of the law, and afterward, that covenant having been changed after the fall, proposed life under the condition of faith in Christ; in these things at least, it seems, God's will has been changed. Walaeus denies the consequence. God decreed from eternity to do both successively.[57] Chapter 12 met the same worry at page 175 of the same book, where the answer was given through the hypothetical knowledge that precedes the decree. The two answers agree in what they deny, a change in God. What changes in time is what God does, and his decree does not change. The principle in chapter 25 of the *Responsio*, that God does not make successive decrees, is at work here.

Three passages of the *Responsio* use the words "legal covenant" and "evangelical covenant." I use them as Walaeus uses them and add no name of my own. On page 161, in his reply on the imputation of parents' sin, he writes:

> "yet not obscurely is the difference of the two covenants indicated in this part also: that in the legal covenant, together with the stain of sin, the guilt passes to posterity, but in the Evangelical covenant the wrath of God remains upon the sinner; as was shown by us to have been observed before also by Tertullian and Augustine."[58]

On page 179, in the chapter on the definition and parts of predestination, Walaeus argues from the way a covenant stands:

> "For just as the legal covenant does not therefore cease to be a covenant, though another covenant has followed it, namely the Evangelical and New; so the decree of the legal covenant would be no less predestination, even if the decree of the Evangelical covenant had succeeded it"[59]

The sentence goes on to a condition concerning the decree of the evangelical covenant. The two covenants, in this passage, are successive, and the evangelical is called new.

On the same page he sets a limit:

> "yet we altogether deny that the whole Gospel, or the Evangelical covenant, much less predestination, is comprehended in its compass. For this is not the least part of the Evangelical covenant, without which the Evangelical covenant itself would be no more efficacious to salvation"[60]

The comparison, as the sentence ends, is with the legal covenant. The part of which he speaks is what makes the evangelical covenant efficacious.

---

[57] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, "De Dei immutabilitate," 169 (image 185).
[58] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 161 (image 745).
[59] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 179 (image 763).
[60] Walaeus, *Responsio*, 179 (image 763).

14.11 What He Holds

Walaeus holds that the whole obedience of Christ, in his life and in his death, is imputed to the believer for righteousness. He says it in the *Enchiridion* as his judgment, in the *Loci* as the definition of the form of justification, and in the letter to Lubbertus in the first person.

He holds that the two, called active and passive, are distinct and are never separated. They can be told apart in thought, and they cannot be disjoined in Christ. The *Enchiridion* joins them as cause and effect, the *Loci* as the two terms of the one form, and the letter by God's decree.

He holds that the active obedience does not end before the passion, because the dying was obedience and because the obedience of which Philippians 2:8 speaks embraces what went before the death, and that the passive righteousness removes the liability to punishment while the active covers the fault and assigns the reward.

He holds that to justify is a judicial act, to absolve from guilt and to pronounce just, and not to infuse righteousness. Justification and sanctification are distinct benefits, and no one is justified who is not sanctified, but the form of justification does not consist in inherent holiness.

He holds that imputation is a reckoning and not an infusion, and that its ground is the grace and mercy of the one who reckons. To impute is to reckon to one what is another's, as a full payment made by one man is reckoned to another, and not to impute sin is to remit the penalty and not to remove the stain. The terms *active* and *passive* are used in two ways in the *Loci*: of Christ's two obediences, and of the manner in which a man is made what he is by imputation.

He holds that faith is the instrument by which the merit of Christ alone is apprehended and applied. It is never separate from hope, charity, and good works, and it has no merit or dignity of its own. It is not itself what is imputed, and it is no part of the price of redemption, which Christ has fully paid.

He holds that what faith receives is the whole obedience of Christ, as Abraham received the whole.

And he holds that the mediation of Christ is contained in the one decree of election, which chooses the end and the means together, and that the order which the mind sees is an order among the objects of the decree and not a succession in the decrees. The same rule answers the charge that the change from the legal covenant to the evangelical is a change in God.

This chapter reads Walaeus only. It does not set his doctrine beside that of the men he answers, and, apart from one name offered in a note as an inference, it names none whom he does not name. It reads what he says in his own words and in their own sense, and no more.

Works Cited

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

Chapter 15
His Writings and Their Editions

This chapter sets out what Walaeus wrote, where it stands in print, and how much of it an English reader can have. I want a list that others can use to cite him. It names the works in the collected edition of 1643, with the place and the size of each; the separate prints that the biographers and the reference works record; the disputations that he shares with his colleagues in the *Synopsis purioris theologiae*; and the English that exists. Almost everything that survives under his name is in Latin. A few pieces are in Dutch, and the one large work he wrote in Dutch, the book of 1615 on the office of ministers, reaches the collected edition only in a Latin version made by another man.

The weight of the chapter falls on the *Opera omnia*, and I cite it in the copy whose two title leaves print 1643.[1] Where I give the sense of a leaf in English the words are mine. A number for the size of a work is a count of words made from the digitized text, and I round it, because a count of that kind can be wrong by a fifth in either direction. For the separate prints I rely on van der Aa, on Lind van Wijngaarden, on Bavinck, and on the reference works, and I report each print as the writer who names it reports it.

15.1 The Opera omnia of 1643 and the Other Dates Given for It

The two title leaves of the copy I cite agree.[2] The first volume prints the imprint of Franciscus Hackius at Leiden and the year 1643, and adds that the book is issued with privilege. The second volume prints the same place, printer, and year. The first leaf calls the book the complete works of Antonius Walaeus, doctor of sacred theology and professor in the Batavian Academy at Leiden, and it lists two works only: the *Enchiridion religionis reformatae* and the *Loci communes*. It says that the *Enchiridion* now comes out for the first time and that the *Loci* come out more corrected and enlarged. The second leaf calls itself the second volume of all the works and lists four things: the treatise on the office of the ministers of the church and the magistrate's oversight of it, the reply to Corvinus's censure of Molinaeus's *Anatomy of Arminianism*, the *Compendium* of ethics, and a miscellany of orations, disputations, counsels, letters, and poems. Neither leaf says anything of an earlier or a later gathering of his writings. What a reader can take from the leaves is the content of the two volumes and the year 1643, and I take no more from them.

Behind the first title leaf stands the privilege.[3] The States General granted it at The Hague on 22 May 1640, and the States of Holland and West-Friesland granted it there on 9 July 1640. It is made out to Johannes Walaeus, the son, and it runs for seven years. In that time no one may print the

---

[1] Antonius Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643); the second volume, with the same imprint, is cited as vol. 2. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584. The printed page of the *Loci communes* in the first volume, and the number of the leaf of the *Enchiridion*, is the image number less sixteen. Translations from the Latin, German, and Dutch in this chapter are mine. Image numbers are those of the Internet Archive scan walaeusoperaomnia01, and the bracketed "PDF" numbers given for Bates are the page numbers of the Internet Archive scan vitaeselectoruma00bate. Latin titles and imprints in citations follow the conventions declared in note 1 of Chapter 1.

[2] Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, title leaf (image 1); vol. 2, title leaf (image 573).

[3] Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, image 2: the privilege, and below it the permission signed by Johannes Walaeus, who is styled there professor of medicine in the Academy of Leiden. The privilege cites the letters of the States General given at The Hague on 22 May 1640 and those of the States of Holland and West-Friesland given there on 9 July 1640.

Enchiridion or the *Loci* in any language, whole or in part, or bring in copies printed elsewhere or hold them for sale, on pain of a fine of six hundred florins and the loss of the books. Beside it stands a short permission in which Johannes allows Hackius to print the two works in Latin and wishes that no one else should. The privilege names those two works and no others, so the works of the second volume lie outside it. It also fixes a date. The plan to print the *Enchiridion* and the *Loci* was in hand within a year of his death on 9 July 1639, three years before the volume appeared.

The front matter of the first volume follows in a fixed order.[4] After the privilege come the dedication to Jacob Cats (images 3 to 5), the letter to the reader (6 and 7), Polyander's funeral oration for Walaeus (8 to 13), the contents of the *Enchiridion* (14), its title leaf (15), and the engraved portrait (16). The *Enchiridion* itself opens at image 17. The caption under the portrait gives his offices and says that he died, in his third term as rector magnificus of the Academy, on 9 July 1639, the date I use throughout. The dedication to Cats is dated by the Roman reckoning of the fifth day before the Kalends of April 1643, which is 28 March by my conversion, and it is signed by Johannes in the name of the widow and children and, as it says, of all. The letter to the reader is unsigned. It speaks in the plural, and its writer calls Balduinus Walaeus the youngest brother, so that the writer stands inside the family. I call it the editors' letter and give it as theirs.

A Life of Walaeus is not among these pieces. The title leaf lists none, and Polyander's oration is the only account of his life among the opening pieces. Other writers say otherwise of the edition they have in hand. The ADB says that the *Opera omnia* contain a Life by his son Johannes together with Polyander's oration, and the NNBW says that the Life stands at the front of the *Opera omnia* and that it was printed again, whole and without change, in the collection of lives that William Bates published in London.[5] Lind says the same of an *Opera omnia* of 1647, names Johannes as the author, and gives Trigland's church history of 1650 as his authority. The Life that Chapter 4 reads is the one in Bates's collection, and the contents leaf there names no author. I therefore cite the Life as Bates prints it, and the authorship that the ADB, the NNBW, and Lind give it stays theirs.

The dates given for the collected edition differ from one writer to the next.[6] The ADB and the NNBW date the *Opera omnia* 1647. Lind gives 1647 for the book that carries the Life and for the portrait, and 1648 for the second volume, where he places Renesse's Latin introduction to the treatise on the ministers. For the portrait he adds that Savry's engraving was printed before an

---

[4] Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, dedication to Jacob Cats, images 3–5, with the date line and signature at image 5, where the year is given in the printer's numerals; letter to the reader, images 6–7; Johannes Polyander à Kerckhoven, *Oratio funebris*, images 8–13; contents of the *Enchiridion*, image 14; its title leaf, image 15; portrait and caption, image 16; *Enchiridion*, fol. 1, image 17. The conversion of the Roman date line to 28 March is mine.

[5] J. C. van Slee, "Walaeus, Antonius," in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40 (1896), 644; L. W. A. M. Lasonder, "Walaeus, Antonius," in *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, ed. P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2 (1912), cols. 1516–17, where the collection of lives is dated 1687 and the Life is said to begin at page 600; the imprint of the collection reads 1681. J. D. de Lind van Wijngaarden, *Antonius Walaeus* (Leiden: G. Los, 1891), 3 n. 1, citing Trigland's *Kerckelycke Geschiedenissen* (Leiden, 1650), 1156. "Vita Antonii Walæi," in William Bates, ed., *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum qui doctrina, dignitate, aut pietate inclaruere* (London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681), 600–659 [PDF 650–709]. Chapter 4 reports that the contents leaf of Bates names no author for the Life.

[6] Slee, "Walaeus," 644; Lasonder, "Walaeus," cols. 1515–17; Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 3 n. 1 (1647), 98 (a quarto of 1640 and a folio of 1647, with Frederik Muller's *Beschrijvende catalogus van 7000 portretten* [Amsterdam, 1853], no. 5918, as Lind cites it), and 153 n. 2 (1648, vol. 2); A. J. van der Aa, "Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale," in *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20 (1877), 34; S. J. M. Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus," *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*.

Opera omnia of 1640 in quarto and of 1647 in folio, and for the first of these he cites Muller's catalogue of portraits. Van der Aa lists a collected edition in two folio volumes at Leiden in 1623, and the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* gives 1643. These dates cannot all describe one book, and I do not choose among them by guessing. Two checks bear on them. The volume of 1643 contains the *Responsio*, whose dedication is dated 1 September 1625, so it cannot be the book that van der Aa dates 1623. And Lind cites a Dutch letter of Walaeus at the second volume, page 483 and following. In the volume of 1643 that letter begins on page 483.[7] His page numbers for the second volume therefore agree, at least at that place, with those of 1643. Whether a volume of 1647 or 1648 reprints the text of 1643, enlarges it, or sets it afresh is a question the leaves of 1643 do not answer, and I leave it unanswered.

The editors themselves report an earlier printing of one work.[8] In their letter to the reader they say that the *Loci communes* had been printed about two years before, by the same Hackius, under the care of a learned man. They charge him with several faults. He divided the work in places and added summaries in the margin. He did not know the author's habits or his hand, and so he failed to read some things and put in a few that the author had meant to leave out. A heavier fault, they say, is that the author's own notes in the margin, and the passages he had marked to be repeated from his other unprinted papers, were set in the wrong place or left out altogether. The editors of 1643 therefore collated the whole work again with the manuscript, with their youngest brother Balduinus sharing the labor. They say that they restored innumerable places and made the text more polished and fuller in more than a hundred, that they corrected the passages of Scripture that had been wrongly cited, and that they wrote out in full those that the author had only indicated. They add that nothing has been put in that is not Walaeus's own, and that where he consulted translators of Scripture he followed the version of Junius and Beza before the last. The title leaf says the same in a word when it calls the *Loci* more corrected and enlarged.

The editors give no year for that earlier printing. Lind's quarto of 1640 could be the book they mean. The leaves of 1643 give the *Enchiridion* as appearing for the first time, and a quarto of the *Loci* alone would suit that better than a collected edition of 1640. The privilege of 1640 and the dedication of the *Loci* to the delegates of Zeeland, which Johannes dated at Leiden on 10 July 1640 in the name of his widowed mother, show the work in preparation in that year.[9] A printing of 1640 would stand three years before 1643, where the editors say about two. The leaves do not join these things, and I do not join them. What the position asks of a reader is plain enough. A citation of the *Loci* should name the printing it uses, and every citation of the *Loci* in this book is to the printing of 1643.

15.2 Works Inside the Opera, with Their Sizes

By my count the core of the text, leaving aside the front matter of about 6,000 words and the verse that follows the *Compendium*, comes to about 769,000 words.[10] The *Loci communes* are about

---

[7] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 64 n. 1, citing the second volume at page 483 and following. The letter is the one of 1633 that Chapter 4 cites at *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 483–84 (image 1068 for page 484).

[8] Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, letter to the reader, images 6–7.

[9] Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, image 128, dedication of the *Loci communes*, date line and signature. The Roman date line is the sixth day before the Ides of July 1640, which is 10 July by my conversion.

[10] The counts are of words in the digitized text of the two volumes, rounded. They are approximate and could be wrong by a fifth in either direction. The percentages are shares of the core, which I take to be the text of the two volumes without the front matter and without the verse that follows the *Compendium*.

342,000 of them, which is 44 percent. The *Responsio* is about 130,000, or 17 percent; the *Consilia et epistolæ* about 85,000, or 11 percent; the *Enchiridion* about 77,000, or 10 percent; the treatise on the ministers about 59,000, or 8 percent; the eleven disputations about 37,000, or 5 percent; the *Compendium* about 21,000, or 3 percent; the three orations about 13,000, or 2 percent; and the poems about 6,000, or 1 percent. The first volume holds a little over half the text, about 54 percent, and the second a little under half. Three works, the *Loci*, the *Responsio*, and the *Enchiridion*, make up seven-tenths of all that he left in the collection, and a reader's picture of his teaching will rest chiefly on those three.

The *Enchiridion* is numbered 1 to 108 and occupies images 17 to 124, and I cite it by those numbers, as Chapter 10 does.[11] The title leaf says that it was written for the examination of candidates for the ministry and calls it a posthumous work. Its first section is on theology. The editors say that it began in dictation at the school of the Middelburgers, that his pupils at Leiden drew a large part of it from him, and that it passed from hand to hand in copies, each interpolated as its owner understood it. What they print is the manuscript that the first pupils gave to the author and that he now and then changed. For the bibliography the point is that the text stands in the form his pupils wrote down and he let pass. It was not composed at one sitting for the press, and the title leaf of 1643 marks it as appearing for the first time.

The *Loci communes* have a title leaf of their own at image 125, which says that the treatise on the Sabbath is inserted in them, much enlarged, and that the work is posthumous.[12] The text opens at page 113, at image 129, and runs to page 556, at image 572, the last leaf of the first volume. It is therefore a book of some 444 pages. The editors say that the work is called *Loci communes*, or rather a compendium of the common places, since the author had marked that second title for it, and that it grew out of the notes that helped his memory when he lectured. They say that, as his memory began to fail, he resolved to write everything out more fully, that the Dutch translation of the New Testament and the Apocrypha, with its commentary, broke off the plan for some years, and that after finishing it he went back to the loci with a ready mind and carried the fuller version as far as the locus on the Holy Spirit a few days before he died. Chapter 10 reports this account. The dedication to the delegates of Zeeland that opens the work is signed by Johannes in his mother's name.

Three of the disputed questions that the dedication to Cats names have their treatment inside the *Loci*.[13] By my count the discussion of predestination runs to about 44,000 words, that of the Sabbath to about 34,000, and that of the chiliasts to about 14,000, so that the three together make up more than a quarter of the book. The fourth question the dedication names, the authority of the magistrate in the church, is the subject of the treatise that opens the second volume. The Sabbath has a further history. The editors say that this dissertation was changed from its first edition: it was emended in various ways, interpolated, and enlarged. The enlargement, they say, was added only as an aid to memory, so that the whole controversy might be drawn out more fully, and the author, overtaken by death, could not carry it through. The rest was not prepared by him for the press, and some of it was not even written down. He left it to their judgment whether to publish or to suppress,

[11] Walaeus, *Enchiridion religionis reformatæ*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, title leaf (image 15) and first section (fol. 1, image 17); editors' letter, images 6–7.

[12] Walaeus, *Loci communes*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, title leaf (image 125), dedication (image 128), and 113 (image 129); the last page of the volume is 556 (image 572). Editors' letter, images 6–7.

[13] The counts are as described in the note above on the sizes of the works. The dedication to Cats, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, images 3–5, names the four questions; Chapter 10 reports the passage. Editors' letter on the Sabbath, images 6–7.

and they published it at the urging of friends. A reader who cites the Sabbath doctrine should know that the text of 1643 is a later and fuller one than the dissertation that the biographers date 1628.

The second volume opens with the treatise on the office of the ministers, which has its title leaf at image 577.[14] That leaf says that Walaeus wrote it in Dutch and that it is now put into Latin by Ludovicus à Renesse, minister of the Word in the church at Breda. The editors' letter gives the history. It was the first thing he wrote, on the authority of the magistrate in ecclesiastical matters, and he published it in his own language at the request and on the advice of the churches of Zeeland. Johannes Crucius, the pastor of Haarlem, put it into French, and Renesse has now put it into Latin. The editors add that an author cannot pour his thought and manner of writing into his interpreters, and that the Latin nevertheless carries not a few corrections of errors that the typesetters of the first edition and a hasty hand had made. Renesse's own note after the title records that he offered the Latin version to Walaeus, and it prints Walaeus's answer. The text proper begins at page 1, image 585, and runs up to the title leaf of the next work at image 659, some seventy pages and about 59,000 words. Chapters 6 and 8 read the Latin as Walaeus's mind on the strength of his letter to Renesse of 10 April 1637, which Renesse prints. The Dutch original is not in the *Opera omnia*, and the NNBW and Lind both say that only the Latin version was taken in.

The *Responsio* follows, with its title leaf at image 659 and the Compendium's title leaf at image 841, so that it fills about 180 pages and about 130,000 words.[15] The title leaf calls it a reply to the censure of Johannes Arnoldus Corvinus on the *Anatomy of Arminianism* of Petrus Molinaeus, and to the writings of the Remonstrants who were summoned to the Synod of Dort, in defense of the doctrine explained and established in that Synod. A letter from the faculty follows at image 660. Polyander signs it for the faculty, and the names of Rivet and Thysius follow his. It says that Walaeus had finished the part of the work that treats the chief controverted articles by questions and had examined the first article, on predestination and reprobation, and that, when he handed it to his colleagues to be weighed, they judged it worthy to become public property and persuaded him to publish the finished part at once. The dedication to the States of Holland, at image 662, is dated at Leiden from the writer's study on 1 September 1625. The editors' letter dates the reply to 1624, at a time when the Remonstrants' triumphs seemed to demand an answer before the victory, and gives the text as revised by the author. The faculty's letter and the dedication say 1625. The two dates may mark the writing and the publication, but the leaves do not say so, and I note the difference as the leaves present it.

The *Compendium* of ethics has its title leaf at image 841.[16] The editors say that he gave it to his pupils at Middelburg, and that after he was called to Leiden the earnest and repeated petition of the curators of the Leiden school obtained its printing for the use of that school. It was soon accepted in the schools of Holland and West-Friesland and was often reprinted, and what the Opera gives is the text as he last emended it. A piece by Daniel Heinsius is printed with it, and a version in iambic verse by Theodorus Schrevelius after it; van der Aa also records the verse version. At about 21,000

[14] Walaeus, *Tractatus de munere ministrorum ecclesiae et inspectione magistratus circa illud*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, title leaf and Renesse's prefatory note (image 577), and 1 (image 585); editors' letter, vol. 1, images 6–7. Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515; Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 153 n. 1.

[15] Walaeus, *Responsio ad Censuram Corvini in Molinaei Anatomen*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, title leaf (image 659), faculty's letter (image 660), dedication to the States of Holland (image 662); editors' letter, vol. 1, images 6–7.

[16] Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, title leaf (image 841); the piece by Heinsius, image 844; the verse of Schrevelius, images 877–81; editors' letter, vol. 1, images 6–7. Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34.

words it is a short book beside the *Loci* or the *Responsio*, and the next section shows that it had a life in print before 1643.

The *Miscellanea* have a title leaf at image 882 and fall into four parts.[17] The first is three orations, by my count. The first oration begins at page 299 and is the one he delivered on beginning the professorship of theology at Leiden, on the right way of studying theology. The editors say that the orations had been printed before. The second part is eleven disputations, which open at page 319 with the first of them, on the necessity and authority of Holy Scripture. The editors say that some of the disputations are inserted where the author had marked the place, so that no one should think them left out; the selection is theirs or his, and the leaves do not say which. Section 15.4 takes up how these eleven stand to the *Synopsis*. The third part is the *Consilia et epistolæ*, which follow the disputations and run to page 497. They are not all in Latin. Dutch letters stand among them, one to Hommius on page 416 and one of 1633 on page 484, which Chapter 4 quotes. The editors say that Walaeus rarely kept copies of his letters, so that those printed come from his own copies and from the ones that friends supplied. He kept the counsels more carefully. Most of them were given jointly with Polyander, Rivet, and Thysius, and some with Triglandius as well, at the request of those who asked, and because Walaeus composed and wrote them the editors judged that they might be printed under his name. A reader who cites a counsel should therefore say whether it is one of the joint opinions. The fourth part is the poems, from page 499 to page 511. The editors say that he made the Greek ones almost as a boy and the Latin ones as a youth, with a few exceptions whose time the subject shows, and they ask the reader not to judge them unfairly through ignorance of this.

Set side by side, the editors' accounts give a scale of how near each text stands to Walaeus's own hand. The *Responsio* and the *Compendium* stand nearest. The one is given as revised by the author and the other as he last emended it, and each had been printed in his lifetime. The *Loci* and the Sabbath dissertation come next, with a warning attached: the *Loci* began as lecture notes that he started to expand and did not finish, the enlargement of the Sabbath was left incomplete, and an earlier printing of the *Loci* had misread the manuscript. The *Enchiridion* stands further off, since it reaches print from a pupils' manuscript that he changed now and then. The treatise on the ministers is his thought in another man's Latin, vouched for by his own letter. The counsels are the work of several theologians, written by him, and the letters are as good as the copies that he and his friends kept. A scholar who quotes the *Opera omnia* should say which of these kinds of text he is quoting, because the weight of a sentence differs from one to the next.

15.3 Separate Prints

Every separate print I can name for Walaeus is reported by someone else, and I give each with its authority. The list does not claim to be complete.[18]

The book of 1615 on the office of the ministers was printed in Dutch at Middelburg in quarto. Van der Aa and Lind give that date, and the NNBW says that the Dutch original is in the Provincial

[17] Walaeus, *Miscellanea*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2: title leaf (image 882); the oration, 299 (image 883); the disputations, from 319 (image 903); the letter to Hommius, 416 (image 1000); the Dutch letter of 1633, 484 (image 1068); the *Consilia et epistolæ* to 497 (image 1081); the poems, 499–511 (images 1083–95). Editors' letter, vol. 1, images 6–7.

[18] Post-Reformation Digital Library, "Antonius Walaeus (1573–1639)," author page, for the catalogue entries named in this section.

Library of Zeeland.[19] Van der Aa adds that Johannes Crucius put it into French, printed at Amsterdam in 1618 in quarto, and the editors' letter names Crucius as the translator. The Latin of Renesse is the form in the *Opera omnia*. Chapter 3 treats the Dutch book in its own place.

The *Responsio* was also printed apart. Van der Aa lists a first part of the reply to Corvinus's censure, printed at Leiden in 1625 in quarto, and that agrees with the faculty's letter, which speaks of the finished part.[20] I do not know how far the text of 1625 and the revised text in the *Opera* differ, since the editors say only that the latter is as the author revised it. The faculty also put out a Latin *Censura* of the Remonstrants' confession in 1626, with Elzevir as printer, and a Dutch version in 1627; the ADB mentions the Dutch one, and the *Censura* is catalogued under the names of Polyander, Rivet, and Thysius as well as under Walaeus's. It is a joint work of the faculty. I list it so that no one takes it for a work of Walaeus alone.

The *Compendium* was printed at Leiden in 1620 for Isaac Elzevir and in 1627 for Bonaventura and Abraham Elzevir.[21] The NNBW and van der Aa give 1627, and van der Aa adds the reprint at Amsterdam in 1686. The earlier date agrees with the dedicatory letter of the *Compendium*, which Chapter 2 dates at Leiden in 1620. The ADB adds that the book was taken into the Latin schools of Holland in 1625 as a text for the upper classes.

The dissertation on the Sabbath was printed at Leiden in 1628 in octavo, by the Elzevirs.[22] Van der Aa and the catalogues describe it as joined with two orations, one on the Christian politician and the other on the duty of the true student, and van der Aa says that Sylvius, a minister at Amsterdam, put it into Dutch. The editors' first edition of the dissertation is presumably this one, and their remark that the orations had been printed before fits such a pairing. The inaugural oration of 1619 was also printed alone. Van der Aa gives Leiden, 1619, in octavo, with the day of delivery as 21 October, and a catalogue records a print of 1620.

Single disputations were also printed alone, and the catalogues file several under Walaeus's name: the eighth disputation, on the persons of the Father and the Son, in 1620; one on original and actual sin in 1620; one on the calling of men to salvation in 1631; and one on the universality of the death of Christ in 1636.[23] I cannot say from the catalogue entries in which of them he was the president and in which the respondent. The eighth, on the persons of the Father and the Son, carries the same number and subject as the eighth disputation of the *Synopsis* of 1625, which suggests that the

---

[19] Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34; Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 153 n. 1; Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515. The editors' letter names Crucius: *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, images 6–7.

[20] Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34; faculty's letter, *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, image 660; Slee, "Walaeus," 644, for the Dutch *Censure*; Post-Reformation Digital Library, entries for the *Censura* (Leiden: Bonaventura and Abraham Elzevir, 1626) and the Dutch *Censure* (1627).

[21] Post-Reformation Digital Library, entries for the *Compendium* printed for Isaac Elzevir (1620) and for Bonaventura and Abraham Elzevir (1627); Lasonder, "Walaeus," col. 1515; van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34; Slee, "Walaeus," 644; Walaeus, *Compendium ethicae*, dedicatory letter, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 260 (image 844), dated at Leiden in September 1620, as Chapter 2 reports.

[22] Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33 (the oration of 1619, delivered on 21 October) and 34 (the dissertation of 1628 and the Dutch version by Sylvius); Post-Reformation Digital Library, entries for the dissertation (Leiden: Bonaventura and Abraham Elzevir, 1628), for the Dutch *Discours* of 1628, and for the oration (Leiden, 1620); Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 299 (image 883).

[23] Post-Reformation Digital Library, entries for the disputations of 1620 (the eighth, printed by Elzevir; the one on sin, for Jacobus Marcus), 1631 (for Elzevir), and 1636 (for Hieronymus Vogel); *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, ed. Herman Bavinck (Leiden: Donner, 1881), table of the disputations, xiii–xiv.

numbering of the *Synopsis* was taken over from an earlier course of disputations. That is an inference from a title, and I do not press it.

Two other prints answer the controversy with the Remonstrants; the Post-Reformation Digital Library lists an *Altera appendix* of 1631 and, in the same year, a Dutch *Antwoorde* to a Remonstrant forerunner.[24] Van der Aa also records that a disputation of Walaeus on the four controverted articles, with Episcopius's examination of it, stands in the *Opera* of Episcopius printed at Rotterdam in 1665.

The dates of these prints, taken together, show a pattern. The *Compendium*, the *Responsio*, the dissertation on the Sabbath, the inaugural oration, the book of 1615, the disputations, and the faculty's *Censura* were all printed in his lifetime, between 1615 and 1636, and most of them are controversial or are books for the schools. The two largest books of teaching, the *Enchiridion* and the *Loci*, are the two whose own title leaves call them posthumous works, and the editors' account of the *Loci* tells of an earlier printing, also after his death, whose editor misread the manuscript. The two books that give his doctrine most fully therefore reached print last, and in the hands of his family.

Two further things in his hand are not, or not wholly, in the *Opera omnia*. The first is the Dutch translation of the New Testament and the Apocrypha. The portrait caption names him translator of those books and president of the college of the revisers, and the editors say that the work broke off his plan for the *Loci*. Van der Aa says that Walaeus alone made the marginal notes to a large part of Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Hebrews, Peter, and Revelation.[25] That is van der Aa's statement, and I report it as his. The second is the *Synopsis*, three of whose fourteen disputations by him the *Opera omnia* leaves out, as the next section shows.

15.4 The Synopsis Disputations

The *Synopsis purioris theologiae* is a work of four hands: Polyander, Rivet, Walaeus, and Thysius, who share its fifty-two disputations. Bavinck's preface of 1881 counts five editions before his own. The first appeared in 1625, the second in 1632, the third in 1642, the fourth in 1652, and the fifth in 1658.[26] The last two came out when all four authors were dead, since Rivet, the last of them, died in 1651. Bavinck says that the five agree with one another apart from a few variant readings of small weight, and the ADB gives the same later dates. His own edition is the sixth. Chapter 4 lists Walaeus's fourteen disputations as the second, fifth, eighth, and every fourth after that to the fifty-second, and gives the count for each author.

Eleven of his fourteen stand in the *Opera omnia*. The *Opera* appears to number them as a series of its own, since the disputation on the necessity and authority of Scripture is headed as the first in the *Opera* and is the second in the *Synopsis*. A citation should therefore give both numbers. The eleven, in the order of the *Synopsis*, are the second, on the necessity and authority of Scripture; the fifth, on its perspicuity and interpretation; the eighth, on the persons of the Father and the Son; the twelfth, on good and evil angels; the sixteenth, on actual sin; the twenty-eighth, on the state of

[24] Post-Reformation Digital Library, entries for the *Altera appendix* and the *Antwoorde* (both 1631); van der Aa, "Walaeus," 34.

[25] Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, portrait caption (image 16) and editors' letter (images 6–7); van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33–34; Slee, "Walaeus," 644.

[26] *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, ed. Bavinck, preface, vi; Slee, "Walaeus," 644. Chapter 4 gives the numbers of Walaeus's disputations and the count for each author from Bavinck's preface, iv–v.

Christ's exaltation; the thirty-second, on repentance; the fortieth, on the church; the forty-fourth, on baptism; the forty-eighth, on church discipline; and the fifty-second, on eternal life and death. The three that the *Opera* leaves out are the twentieth, on the oath; the twenty-fourth, on predestination; and the thirty-sixth, on the worship of invocation. They come to about 13,000 words in Bavinck's text.

I compared the eleven with the disputations of the same numbers in Bavinck's edition by counting the strings of ten characters that the two texts share. The eleven share between 16 and 20 percent of them, where unrelated disputations share 2 to 4 percent.[27] That shows a close kinship and probably the same text. It does not show that the two are word for word the same, and a collation would be needed to say so. The difference matters to the reader who wants English, because an English version of the *Synopsis* is then also an English version of those eleven.

15.5 What Exists in English

I have found no complete English translation of any of the large works in the *Opera omnia*: not of the *Loci communes*, the *Responsio*, the *Enchiridion*, the treatise on the ministers, or the *Consilia et epistolæ*. The English that I know of falls into three kinds.

The first is the *Synopsis*. Brill published a bilingual edition, with the Latin text edited by Dolf te Velde and the English by Riemer Faber, in three volumes: disputations 1 to 23 in 2014, a second volume in 2016, and disputations 43 to 52 in 2020.[28] The Davenant Press issued the English alone in two volumes in 2023, edited by William den Boer and Faber, and says that it uses the Brill translation. Since all fifty-two disputations are in these editions, the fourteen of Walaeus are in them, and so, if the texts match as I have said, are the eleven in the *Opera*. By my count those eleven are about 37,000 words, or 5 percent of the core of the *Opera*.

The second is the *Compendium*. John Monfasani translated selections from it for Jill Kraye's anthology, *Cambridge Translations of Renaissance Philosophical Texts*, and printed them with an introduction in the first volume, on moral philosophy, at pages 120 to 130.[29] By my count the translated body is about 4,178 words, which is about a fifth of the *Compendium*. Added to the eleven disputations, it brings what others have put into English to a little over 5 percent of the core of the *Opera*.

The third is my own English. The renderings I have made are of short passages, in this book and in the papers that led to it. I put them at no less than a quarter of one percent of the core and at no more than about one and a half percent. Together the English of others and my own comes to between about 5.6 and 6.7 percent. The rest, which is to say nearly everything that is Walaeus's own and not

---

[27] The comparison is of the digitized text of the eleven disputations in *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, with the disputations of the same numbers in Bavinck's edition. The figures are the shares of ten-character strings that the two texts have in common after the text has been normalized.

[28] Dolf te Velde, ed., *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae / Synopsis of a Purer Theology: Latin Text and English Translation*, vol. 1, *Disputations 1–23*, trans. Riemer A. Faber (Leiden: Brill, 2014); Harm Goris, Riemer Faber, Andreas Beck, and William den Boer, eds., vol. 3, *Disputations 43–52* (Leiden: Brill, 2020); Brill's publication page gives volume 2 as published in 2016. William den Boer and Riemer A. Faber, eds., *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, trans. Riemer A. Faber, 2 vols. (Burford: Davenant Press, 2023), whose first volume contains disputations 1–31 and whose preface thanks Brill for permission to use its English translation.

[29] Jill Kraye, ed., *Cambridge Translations of Renaissance Philosophical Texts*, vol. 1, *Moral Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 120–30. The word count of the translated body is mine.

shared with his colleagues, is in Latin or Dutch only. The largest untouched parts are the *Loci*, the *Responsio*, the *Enchiridion*, the treatise on the ministers, and the *Consilia*.

15.6 Items Looked for and Not Found

A list of what he wrote is also a list of what he is said to have written, and I looked for four things that a reader might expect to find.

I looked for a separate set of *Praelectiones*. I looked for a separate treatise on the covenant. I looked for a separate treatise on the Seminarium Indicum, the school for ministers to the East Indies that was kept at his house. And I looked for tracts in the controversy over Amyraut's teaching, in which the Dutch professors took part after he died.[30] I found none of the four. The title leaves of the *Opera omnia* name none of them, and the lists in the ADB, the NNBW, and van der Aa, and the entry in the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*, name none. The covenant appears in passages of the *Loci*, the *Enchiridion*, and the *Responsio*, and what survives of his work for the Seminary stands among the letters and counsels. I take this as a reason not to cite a separate work in any of the four, and I do not take it as proof that none was ever written. A list of this kind can be corrected by a single title leaf that it missed.

15.7 How to Cite Him

Several rules follow from the survey. A citation should name the volume of the *Opera omnia* of 1643 and give the printed page, with the image number beside it; for the first volume the *Enchiridion* is cited by its numbered leaf, and for the second volume the page is the image number less 584. A citation of the *Loci* should say that it is to the printing of 1643, since the editors report a printing before it. A citation of the treatise on the ministers is a citation of Renesse's Latin, and it should say so. A citation of a counsel is a citation of a joint opinion in his composition. A citation of a disputation should give its number in the *Synopsis* and its place in the *Opera*. A citation of the *Responsio* should keep the two dates apart, 1625 for the book and 1624 for the editors' date of the reply. A citation of the Life should give Bates and not the *Opera omnia* of 1643. And a date for the collected edition should be the date the title leaf gives, with the other dates reported as the writers give them.

Three points remain open in what I have set down. The first is what a volume of 1647 or 1648 contains and how it stands to the volume of 1643. The second is whether Lind's quarto of 1640 is the earlier printing of the *Loci* that the editors describe. The third is whether the editors' 1624 and the dedication's 1625 mark the writing and the publication of the *Responsio*. Each can be settled by a title leaf or a dated line, and until it is the citations should say which book they use.

Works Cited

Aa, A. J. van der. "Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale." In *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20, 32–35. 1877. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/aa__001biog24_01/aa__001biog24_01_0091.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

[30] Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, title leaf (image 1); vol. 2, title leaf (image 573); Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44; Lasonder, "Walaeus," cols. 1513–17; van der Aa, "Walaeus," 32–35; Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus."

Bates, William, ed. *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum*. London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681. “Vita Antonii Walæi,” 600–659 [PDF 650–709]. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/vitaeselectoruma00bate.

Boer, William den, and Riemer A. Faber, eds. *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*. Translated by Riemer A. Faber. 2 vols. Burford: Davenant Press, 2023.

Goris, Harm, Riemer Faber, Andreas Beck, and William den Boer, eds. *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae / Synopsis of a Purer Theology: Latin Text and English Translation*. Vol. 3, *Disputations 43–52*. Leiden: Brill, 2020.

Hulsbergen, S. J. M. “Antonius Walaeus.” *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*. Entry from the 1982–84 print edition. https://www.encyclopedievanzeeland.nl/index.php?title=Antonius_Walaeus&oldid=69677. Accessed 1 October 2026.

Kraye, Jill, ed. *Cambridge Translations of Renaissance Philosophical Texts*. Vol. 1, *Moral Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Includes “Antonius de Waele,” translated with an introduction by John Monfasani, 120–30.

Lasonder, L. W. A. M. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, edited by P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2, cols. 1513–17. 1912. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/molh003nieu02_01/molh003nieu02_01_2538.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Lind van Wijngaarden, J. D. de. *Antonius Walaeus*. Leiden: G. Los, 1891.

Polyander à Kerckhoven, Johannes. *Oratio funebris in obitum … Antonii Walæi*. Recited 14 July 1639. In Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1. Unpaginated front matter.

Post-Reformation Digital Library. “Antonius Walaeus (1573–1639).” Author page. https://www.prdl.org/author_view.php?a_id=71. Accessed 5 October 2026.

Slee, J. C. van. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40, 643–44. 1896. https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz84297.html.

Synopsis purioris theologiae. Edited by Herman Bavinck. Leiden: Donner, 1881. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/synopsispurioris00poly.

Velde, Dolf te, ed. *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae / Synopsis of a Purer Theology: Latin Text and English Translation*. Vol. 1, *Disputations 1–23*. Translated by Riemer A. Faber. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions 187; Texts and Sources 5. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

Chapter 16
Later Reception and Open Questions

This chapter asks how writers after Walaeus have used him and what they have said of him. It then asks what questions remain for those who come after. The answer to the first is drawn from the notices in the biographical dictionaries and encyclopedias, from the dissertation on his life that Lind van Wijngaarden published in 1891, from Bavinck's edition of the *Synopsis* in 1881, from a Kampen dissertation of 2010 on the doctrine of God, and from two later studies that use him on one point each. I report what each says at the strength it has, and I make no claim about the order in which any of them came to Walaeus. Where I refer to the pages of his *Opera omnia*, I use the edition of 1643.[1]

The works differ in kind, and the differences matter for what each can bear. The dictionaries give a paragraph or a page to a life and say little of doctrine. Lind's second chapter is a sustained account of his teaching. Bavinck's preface speaks of the *Synopsis* as a whole and of the four men who wrote it. Te Velde names Walaeus in a great many notes, almost always as one witness among others to the way the doctrine of God was ordered and taught. Campos and Abbink use him for a single question each. I take the works in that order, and the last section sets out the questions that they leave open.

16.1 The Reference Works

The four reference notices agree on the main events of the life and differ on some dates and on the edition of his works. Walaeus died at Leiden on 9 July 1639. The ADB, the NNBW, and the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* agree on the year. Van der Aa gives 18 September 1634 and an age of sixty-five, a date that differs from all the others and from the funeral oration that Polyander recited on 14 July 1639.[2] The notices also differ over his collected works. The ADB and the NNBW say that they were published at Leiden in 1647, and the NNBW adds that his eldest son Johannes collected them. The *Encyclopedie van Zeeland* also credits the son and gives 1643 for the year, under a title that is slightly different from the one on the title page I cite. Van der Aa gives a two-volume folio of 1623. The edition on which this book rests is the one of 1643 in Works Cited, and what the other dates mean for the editions is a question for Chapter 15.[3]

On his doctrine the notices say little. The ADB, which Van Slee wrote in 1896, calls him a moderate and devout minister at Middelburg, far from passionate zeal even though he was drawn into the Remonstrant disputes. It says that he urged moderation at the provincial synods, above all

---

[1] Antonius Walaeus, *Opera omnia* (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643). The *Disputationes* are cited from vol. 2, pages 319 to 365 (images 903 to 949), and the *Consilia et epistolæ* from vol. 2, pages 420 and 421 (images 1004 and 1005). Image numbers are those of the Internet Archive scan walaeusoperaomnia01. The printed page of the first volume is the image number less sixteen. The printed page of the second volume is the image number less 584. Printed page numbers repeat in places in Bates, so each citation of him gives the printed page and, in brackets, the page of the digitized file. For Lind, te Velde, Campos, and Abbink I cite the printed page. Where I give the sense of a Latin, Dutch, or German sentence in English the rendering is mine. These are the conventions declared in note 1 of Chapter 1.

[2] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44. Lasonder, "Walaeus," cols. 1513–17. Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus." Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33–34. Polyander, *Oratio funebris*, in Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, front matter, images 9–10 (image 9, right column, and image 10, left column).

[3] Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, as cited in note 1. Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44. Lasonder, "Walaeus," cols. 1513–17. Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33–34.

in 1617, and that he sat at the National Synod as deputy of the school at Middelburg, where he was also a professor, without concealing his firmly Reformed views. It names *Het ampt* as directed against Uytenbogaert, and it names also his disputation on the four controverted articles of the Remonstrants, his dissertation on the Sabbath, and his inaugural oration of 1619. It calls the *Synopsis* of 1625, which the four professors wrote together, excellent in many respects. It mentions the *Compendium ethicae* as the textbook for the upper classes in the Latin-school program of 1625, in which he had a part, his share with Hommius and Rolandus in the translation of the New Testament and the Apocrypha and in its revision, and ten years of work at the seminary from 1622.[4]

The NNBW, by Lasonder, is fuller on his works. It calls him a fervent confessor of the Reformed doctrine, and adds that, as Grotius could testify, one found in him modesty and fairness rather than any notable excess; the testimony is Grotius's as the NNBW reports it, with a reference to Brandt's history of the Reformation.[5] It singles out *Het ampt* of 1615, directed against Uytenbogaert, and notes that the *Opera omnia* print only the Latin translation of it, while the Dutch original of Middelburg, 1615, is in the Provincial Library of Zeeland. It calls the *Enchiridion* a handbook of doctrine that follows the order of the Catechism, and the *Responsio* of 1625 the work that shows his position toward the Remonstrants. It places the Sabbath treatise in 1628 and ties it to the controversy that Teellinck's *Rust-tijdt* of 1622 set off. It dates the *Compendium ethicae* to 1627 and says that it used what he had given as lectures at the school in Middelburg. It describes the *Synopsis* of 1625 as the work of the whole faculty, and adds that Bavinck edited it again in 1881.[6] It names the Life by the son as the fullest account of the life, and lists among the later literature Borsius (1848), whom it finds more accurate for the Middelburg years, Lind (1891), a thorough dissertation that is careful from the theological standpoint, and a paper by Grothe on the seminary (1882).[7]

Van der Aa sets his theological direction beside his temper. He calls Walaeus among the most zealous opponents of Arminianism and yet among the most tolerant divines. He says that the States of Zeeland sent him to the Synod of Dort and that the Synod charged him with part of the translation of the New Testament. He lists the books on which Walaeus made the marginal notes: a large part of Acts, and Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Hebrews, Peter, and Revelation. He sets the *Compendium ethicae*, which was reprinted at Amsterdam in 1686, against a time in which Aristotle was exalted above Christ in ethics, and says that Walaeus pointed another way, though still with some timidity.[8]

The *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*, by Hulsbergen, is concerned most with the Zeeland years. It counts him among the Contra-Remonstrants, says that Prince Maurice took his advice in 1617, and says that at the request of the Zeeland judge Jacob Schone he assisted Oldenbarnevelt. It says that he sat for Zeeland at the Synod and had an important part in the New Testament translation that the Synod ordered. It says that the Seminarium Indicum was set up in his house in 1622 and ran until 1632.[9] The NNBW dates the same seminary from 1627 to 1637, the ADB and van der Aa give 1622 and

[4] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44.

[5] Lasonder, "Walaeus," cols. 1513–17. The NNBW cites Brandt's history of the Reformation, vol. 2, 314, for the testimony.

[6] Lasonder, "Walaeus," cols. 1513–17.

[7] Lasonder, "Walaeus," cols. 1513–17. Grothe's paper and the works of Borsius and Lind are named there as later literature.

[8] Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33–34.

[9] Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus."

ten years, and the Life as Bates prints it speaks of the twelve ministers who came out of the seminary in the ten years from 1622.[10]

The Life by the son is reprinted in Bates's collection of 1681. In the passage on the seminary it says that the candidates were made to read a chapter of the New Testament in Greek and one of the Old in Hebrew every day, and that twice a week Walaeus went through his *Enchiridion* with them by examination and disputation.[11] I take this as a statement about how the *Enchiridion* was used in teaching; it says nothing of what the book teaches.

The notices thus give a steady picture of the man: a Reformed minister who held to the doctrine of the Synod, who was tolerant in manner, and who taught and wrote at Leiden for twenty years. They give a list of works and little more than a line for each. The writers who go further are Lind, whose chapter I take next, and, within his own narrow aim, te Velde.

16.2 Lind van Wijngaarden on Walaeus as a Dogmatician

Lind's book of 1891 is a dissertation on the life and works. Its second chapter runs from page 99 to page 142, and its heading means Walaeus as a dogmatician. The chapter has for its epigraphs a word from Philippians 2:13 and one from Exodus 20:8. The next three chapters take up church and state, ethics, and the seminary.[12]

Page 102 begins with predestination. On pages 110 and 111 Lind follows Walaeus on the extent of Christ's satisfaction. The second article of the Remonstrants, he says, had to meet his contradiction, and Lind gives the course of Walaeus's thought. God was moved to redeem particular persons; for these elect a satisfaction was needed for all their sins; and so God decreed the substitutionary life, suffering, and death of Christ. Had there been only one to save, no lesser offering would have sufficed, and it would have sufficed even for seven worlds, since it is of infinite worth. The difference from the Remonstrants lies, Lind reports, in the purpose of the atonement.[13]

Page 113 gives Walaeus on faith. It is the ordained means, and the indispensable condition for the imputation of Christ's merit. It is more than an assent of the mind; it includes an inclination of the will to appropriate what is offered. It is given by God alone.[14]

The chapter ends with the Sabbath. On page 142 Lind gives his judgment that Walaeus in his treatise produced a solid piece of work, which even in Lind's own time deserves to be read and pondered.[15]

Lind's description of the *Synopsis* stands earlier, on page 64. He says that it treats the whole doctrine in fifty-two chapters, and he sets beside it the judgment of Sepp, in the second volume of

---

[10] Lasonder, "Walaeus," cols. 1513–17. Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44. Van der Aa, "Walaeus," 33–34. Hulsbergen, "Antonius Walaeus." "Vita Antonii Walæi," in William Bates, ed., *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum qui doctrina, dignitate, aut pietate inclaruere* (London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681), 648 [PDF 698].

[11] Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*, 647–48 [PDF 697–98].

[12] J. D. de Lind van Wijngaarden, *Antonius Walaeus* (Leiden: G. Los, 1891), 99, 143, 169, and 189. I cite the printed page.

[13] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 110–11.

[14] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 113.

[15] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 142.

his work, page 45, that the book is excellent and that its polemical tone is moderate.[16] The count of fifty-two is Bavinck's as well, and I turn to him next.

16.3 The Synopsis and Its Later Editions

The *Synopsis purioris theologiae* is the work in which the teaching of Walaeus stands beside that of his three colleagues, and its later editions are direct evidence of the use made of it. Bavinck's preface to the sixth edition, dated at Franeker in October 1881, lists them. The first came out in 1625, the second in 1632, the third in 1642, the fourth in 1652, and the fifth in 1658; the last two appeared when all the authors were dead, Rivet having died in 1651. Bavinck says that the five agree with one another apart from minor variants.[17] The ADB gives the same years for the later editions, and the NNBW names 1625 and 1881.[18]

Bavinck says what he takes the book to be. It came out soon after the Reformed Church and Reformed theology had come out victorious from the struggle with Remonstrantism, and after the Synod of Dort had examined the Reformed confession. With the consent of the Synod the Academy at Leiden was provided with four professors. For about half a century, he says, the book was in the hands of nearly everyone. He calls it the queen of Reformed doctrine, and a pleasant, convenient, short handbook for students of theology, which sets out the controversies with the Remonstrants and the papists acutely but without anger and partiality. It is, in his phrase as I give it, a clear example and mirror of the orthodox doctrine that held first place at Dort.[19]

Bavinck also says why the book went out of use. The times changed; Cocceius and other theologians introduced a different method, and the *Synopsis* passed little by little into oblivion. He gives as his reason for a sixth edition that the principles which the Separated Reformed Church in his country had long confessed were beginning to revive outside it, and that the *Synopsis*, made almost under the eyes of the Synod, was a reliable guide to them.[20] That is a use of the book in the 1880s, and it stands beside the use of Walaeus in the dissertation that Lind published ten years later.

Within the preface Bavinck reproduces the son's comparison of the four professors, which Chapter 4 reports, and he gives the count of fifty-two disputations and their division among the four authors, fourteen of them to Walaeus. In each disputation, he says, the theses usually number forty or fifty, and the form of the disputation gave the whole work clarity and charm.[21]

Later writers who cite the *Synopsis* by disputation can therefore be traced to an author by Bavinck's division. Te Velde does so for Walaeus in a note that refers to the fifty-second disputation, theses 11 to 26, on the vision of God; the fifty-second is the last disputation of the course, and Chapter 7 lists it.[22] Campos cites the thirty-third without distinguishing its author, and I turn to that in 16.5.

---

[16] Lind, *Antonius Walaeus*, 64, citing Sepp, vol. 2, 45.

[17] *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, ed. Herman Bavinck (Leiden: Donner, 1881), vi. The preface is dated at Franeker, October 1881, and its pages are numbered in roman numerals.

[18] Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44. Lasonder, "Walaeus," cols. 1513–17.

[19] *Synopsis*, ed. Bavinck, iii–v.

[20] *Synopsis*, ed. Bavinck, vi–vii.

[21] *Synopsis*, ed. Bavinck, iv–v.

[22] Roelf Theodoor te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out: The Connection of Method and Content in the Doctrine of God, Examined in Reformed Orthodoxy, Karl Barth, and the Utrecht School* (Delft: Eburon, 2010), 124 n. 20.

16.4 Later Reformed Use: te Velde

Te Velde's dissertation, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, examines the connection of method and content in the doctrine of God in Reformed orthodoxy, in Karl Barth, and in the Utrecht school. Walaeus is one of its sources from Reformed orthodoxy. Te Velde lists the Leiden *Synopsis*, Walaeus, and De Moor among his Leiden sources, and, following Muller's division, places Walaeus among the early orthodox, 1560 to 1635.[23] The edition he uses is the Hackius *Opera omnia*, as his bibliography states, and he cites the *Loci communes* by the pages of the first volume, which run in his notes from 151 to 187.[24] I take his references by topic.

The order of the doctrine of God. In his sixth note on page 97 te Velde gives pages 151 to 187 of the *Loci* as an example of the way the doctrine of God is ordered.[25] In notes on the name and essence of God he cites pages 153 and 155, beside the sixteenth thesis of the sixth disputation of the *Synopsis*.[26] On form and act in God he cites page 156 with De Moor.[27] A note on the metaphysical forms of composition cites page 161 for the point that they rest on act and potency.[28] Page 170 is cited for his ordering of knowledge, will, and power, which te Velde calls explicitly against other sequences.[29]

The attributes. Te Velde's text on page 113 lists Walaeus with Maresius, Twisse, Le Blanc, Voetius, and Turrettini as thinkers into whom a modified form of the formal or modal distinction passed.[30] On page 116 a note says that a certain classification of the divine attributes is mentioned with reserved approval by Walaeus at page 152 of the *Loci*.[31] Further notes on pages 127 to 147 cite pages 158, 163, 165, 166, 168, and 169. Two of them carry an observation of their own: page 168 is cited on the immutability of the essence, and Walaeus, as te Velde reports him through Hoornbeeck's *Institutiones*, refers to Aristotle on forms of change.[32]

Where Walaeus is set apart. In several places te Velde marks Walaeus as an exception. On page 124, in a note, he reports that Goudriaan names Walaeus as an exception to the general Reformed denial of an essential vision of God, and he refers the reader to the disputation just mentioned.[33] On page 137 he says in a note that Walaeus, at page 165 of the *Loci*, is an exception in distinguishing omnipresence from immensity and infinity.[34] On the will of God, te Velde says on page 166 that Walaeus states that the will of the sign is part of the will of good pleasure, which implies that the will of good pleasure is God's proper will, and he cites page 179 of the *Loci*. On the next page he says that Walaeus judges a different opposition of terms to be more adequate than the distinction of

---

[23] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 95.
[24] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 685. The pages of the *Loci communes* that he cites fall within the first volume of the 1643 *Opera omnia*.
[25] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 97 n. 6.
[26] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 105–6 nn. 35 and 38–40.
[27] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 110 n. 61.
[28] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 120 n. 3.
[29] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 149, 152, 159, and 205.
[30] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 113.
[31] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 116 n. 83.
[32] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 127 n. 31; 133–34 nn. 63 and 66; 138; 140; 143–44 nn. 110 and 114; and 146 and 147.
[33] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 124 n. 20.
[34] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 137 n. 80.

the will of the sign and the will of good pleasure.[35] On page 169 te Velde puts Walaeus with Twisse and Petrus Molinaeus as a sound interpreter of the distinction between the antecedent and the consequent will.[36] On pages 172 and 173 he says that Walaeus and Ames speak frankly of affects in God, and cites page 183 of the *Loci*; on pages 198 to 202 pages 181 to 187 are cited in lists with Mastricht, Pictet, Maresius, and Zanchi.[37]

Middle knowledge. On page 156, in a note, te Velde lists Walaeus at pages 175 and 176 of the *Loci* among those who accepted "middle knowledge"; he says that Walaeus argues from the mutability of contingent causes and from the passage from the covenant of works to the covenant of grace.[38] On page 331 he says that Gomarus and Walaeus accepted it, and in a note he doubts that Barth has given a satisfactory account of their views, since it could well be argued that they accepted middle knowledge as a structural moment in God's knowledge.[39] Chapter 12 takes up middle knowledge in Walaeus.

The pattern is plain. Te Velde cites the *Loci* over the whole range of the doctrine of God, attribute by attribute, and he marks Walaeus as an exception on the vision of God and on omnipresence and immensity, and reports his position on the will, the affects, and middle knowledge. In these pages Walaeus is one witness among others, and te Velde does not write a study of him. The argument that surrounds each note is te Velde's own, and I do not examine it here.

16.5 Two Later Studies: Campos and Abbink

Campos's dissertation at Calvin Theological Seminary, completed in 2009, treats Johannes Piscator and the later development of the doctrine of the imputation of the active obedience of Christ. In one note it lists, among those who read verse 4 of the passage under discussion as speaking of justification, the four authors of the *Synopsis*, with a reference to the sixth edition under Bavinck's editorship, disputation 33, section 8, page 332.[40] Walaeus appears there as one of four, and the disputation cited is not one of his fourteen.

Abbink's master's thesis at the Protestantse Theologische Universiteit, of 2023, compares Bellarmine and Walaeus on the simultaneity of forgiveness and renewal. On page 18 Abbink gives a short account of Walaeus's teaching. He says that Walaeus taught the common places in catechism sessions at Middelburg from at least 1605, and that they grew into a textbook taught at the Illustre School; that the *Enchiridion* prepared the way for the more extensive *Loci*, which he taught privately and publicly at Leiden until his death in 1639; and that, on the authority of the son, he kept up this training for twenty years. Abbink adds that the locus on justification and regeneration was regularly treated, and that Polyander in the funeral oration wished that the heirs would soon publish the *Loci*. He gives, from the son's Life, a reading list: Aristotle, Aquinas,

[35] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 166–67 nn. 78 and 83.

[36] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 169 n. 90.

[37] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 172–73 nn. 103 and 107; 198–202.

[38] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 156 n. 30.

[39] Te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, 331 n. 80. Te Velde refers there to Barth, *Church Dogmatics* II/1, 563–68.

[40] Heber Carlos de Campos Jr., "Johannes Piscator (1546–1625) and the Consequent Development of the Doctrine of the Imputation of Christ's Active Obedience" (PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2009), 214n. The citation is to disputation 33, section 8, page 332 of the sixth edition. The thirty-third disputation is Thysius's and not one of Walaeus's fourteen.

Scotus, Suárez, and Keckermann, Calvin's *Institutes*, which the list calls a divine interpreter, Vermigli's *Loci*, and for commentaries Piscator and Beza.[41]

The thesis turns to Walaeus's own account where it compares him with Bellarmine. On page 43 Abbink says that for Walaeus forgiveness and renewal are not two equal effects but stand to one another as a higher cause and a lower effect, although he admits their interplay. On the Greek word for freely, Abbink says, Walaeus stresses purely unmerited grace.[42] On page 44 he says that Walaeus presents renewal as an effect of justification and never as its cause or a joint cause, and that at this point Walaeus posits a medicinal act of God done in us without us.[43] On page 45 he reports that Walaeus does not include the word for at the same time in his two definitions but assures his readers repeatedly that the two are worked at the same time and cannot be separated. On page 46 he says that for Walaeus the imputation is absolutely perfect, and that renewal in God's first act is necessarily simultaneous with it, while renewal in second acts is wholly imperfect from the side of God.[44]

On page 49 Abbink gives his judgment: Walaeus follows Calvin in the definition of faith, and is a Reformed Calvinist in scholastic form.[45] The bibliography on page 51 lists the *Censura* of 1626, the *Censure* of 1627, a disputation of 1620 on justification held under Smetius, and the Brill edition of the *Synopsis* of 2014 to 2020. It also lists the Life in the first volume of the 1643 *Opera*. The ADB and the NNBW place the Life in the *Opera* of 1647, and Chapter 15 takes up the difference.[46]

The two studies use Walaeus for different ends and with different weight. Campos has him as one name on a list of authors. Abbink makes him one of the two principals in a comparison and reaches a judgment on his place among Reformed theologians; the judgment rests, as he presents it, on Walaeus's account of justification, renewal, and faith.

16.6 Questions for Study

The earlier chapters and the works surveyed here leave questions that a reader who wants to know Walaeus better can put. I set them down in six groups, each tied to the works from which it arises.

The teaching as a whole. The dictionaries say little of doctrine, Lind gives a chapter to his dogmatics, in which the pages cited here treat predestination, atonement, faith, and the Sabbath, and te Velde and Abbink take up single points. What would an account look like that set the *Enchiridion*, the *Loci*, the *Compendium ethicae*, the fourteen disputations, and the letters beside one another and followed his teaching through all of them? How does the order of the doctrine of God, as te Velde's notes cite it, stand to the arrangement of the *Enchiridion*, which the NNBW says follows the order of the Catechism?

Justification and the obedience of Christ. Chapter 14 reads what the *Enchiridion* and the *Loci* say of justification and of the obedience of Christ. Campos, who traces the debate over the imputation of active obedience from Piscator on, names the four authors of the *Synopsis* in a list, and the

[41] Kees Abbink, "Simul in weinig of simul in veel meer: Bellarminus en Walaeus over de gelijktijdigheid van vergeving en vernieuwing" (MA thesis, Protestantse Theologische Universiteit, 2023), 18. I cite the printed page.
[42] Abbink, "Simul in weinig," 43.
[43] Abbink, "Simul in weinig," 44.
[44] Abbink, "Simul in weinig," 45–46.
[45] Abbink, "Simul in weinig," 49.
[46] Abbink, "Simul in weinig," 51. Van Slee, "Walaeus," 643–44. Lasonder, "Walaeus," cols. 1513–17.

disputation he cites is not one of Walaeus's. Abbink uses the *Enchiridion* and the *Loci* on a different question, the simultaneity of forgiveness and renewal. How does Walaeus's account of the obedience of Christ stand toward the debate that Campos traces? How does it compare with the treatment of justification in the colleague's disputation that Campos cites? And what does Abbink's reading of forgiveness and renewal contribute to that comparison?

The Synopsis. Bavinck assigns fourteen disputations to Walaeus, and te Velde cites one of them by thesis. The *Opera* print eleven of them on pages 319 to 365 of the second volume, and three of the fourteen are not there. How do the printed texts in the two works relate, and what do the fourteen show when they are read in their order as one author's course?[47]

Particular works. Is there an account of *Het ampt* of 1615 that sets the Latin text in the *Opera* beside the Dutch original, and reads both within the dispute with Uytenbogaert? What do the marginal notes that van der Aa assigns to Walaeus on a series of New Testament books say, and how do they stand to the doctrine of the *Loci*? What would a study of middle knowledge that began with the pages of the *Loci* cited in te Velde's notes, and read them beside Gomarus, conclude? What do the letters, the *Consilia*, add as a doctrinal source beside the *Synopsis* and the dogmatic works?

Editions and translation. The ADB and the NNBW give 1647 for the *Opera omnia*, the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*, te Velde, and Abbink give 1643, and Abbink places the Life in the first volume. How do the editions differ in contents and in pagination, and what follows for the way later writers cite him? Which of his works exist in English, and which might be put into it?

The man at the Synod and in his school. Three of the four reference works say that he sat for Zeeland at Dort, and letters with Lubbertus in the second volume of the *Opera* bear on the twenty-second article of the Belgic Confession. What part did he take in the Synod's discussion of that article?[48] Who studied under him, in the lecture room and in the seminary, and where did they go? What sources did he draw on beyond the authors whom his son names and whom Abbink repeats; how much did he take from Vermigli and Calvin, and how much from the scholastic authors whom te Velde sets beside him?

These questions are put for others to take up; this book has not tried to answer them.

Works Cited

Aa, A. J. van der. "Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale." In *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20, 32–35. 1877. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/aa__001biog24_01/aa__001biog24_01_0091.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Abbink, Kees. "Simul in weinig of simul in veel meer: Bellarminus en Walaeus over de gelijktijdigheid van vergeving en vernieuwing." MA thesis, Protestantse Theologische Universiteit, 2023.

[47] Walaeus, *Disputationes*, vol. 2, 319–65 (images 903–49).

[48] Walaeus, *Consilia et epistolæ*, vol. 2, 420–21 (images 1004–5).

Bates, William, ed. *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum*. London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681. "Vita Antonii Walæi," 600–659. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/vitaeselectoruma00bate.

Campos, Heber Carlos de, Jr. "Johannes Piscator (1546–1625) and the Consequent Development of the Doctrine of the Imputation of Christ's Active Obedience." PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2009.

Hulsbergen, S. J. M. "Antonius Walaeus." *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*. Entry from the 1982–84 print edition. https://www.encyclopedievanzeeland.nl/index.php?title=Antonius_Walaeus&oldid=69677. Accessed 1 October 2026.

Lasonder, L. W. A. M. "Walaeus, Antonius." In *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, edited by P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2, cols. 1513–17. 1912. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/molh003nieu02_01/molh003nieu02_01_2538.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Lind van Wijngaarden, J. D. de. *Antonius Walaeus*. Leiden: G. Los, 1891.

Polyander à Kerckhoven, Johannes. *Oratio funebris in obitum … Antonii Walæi*. Recited 14 July 1639. In Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1. Unpaginated front matter.

Slee, J. C. van. "Walaeus, Antonius." In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40, 643–44. 1896. https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz84297.html.

Synopsis purioris theologiae. Edited by Herman Bavinck. Leiden: Donner, 1881. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/synopsispurioris00poly.

Velde, Roelf Theodoor te. *Paths Beyond Tracing Out: The Connection of Method and Content in the Doctrine of God, Examined in Reformed Orthodoxy, Karl Barth, and the Utrecht School*. Delft: Eburon, 2010.

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

Chapter 17
Why He Matters Now

This chapter asks why a man like Walaeus should be known again. It puts three questions that Richard Muller asked of Calvin's successors, and it answers them from what Chapters 1 to 16 have shown of him. It then says what this book gives that was not gathered in one place before. It ends with the page maps that a next reader will need if he is to find the leaves the earlier chapters cite.

17.1 The Muller Question

Richard Muller opens his study of Christology and predestination from Calvin to Perkins by stating the questions that have shaped modern interest in Protestant orthodoxy. On the first page of his Introduction, under the heading "Protestant Orthodoxy: Survey of Opinion," he writes of "the question of continuity or discontinuity between the theology of the master and the doctrine of the successors."[1] He asks next: "Did later writers disrupt the balance of Calvin's thought and produce a distortion of the system developed by the great Reformer of Geneva, or did they simply follow Calvin's lead as they defended and solidified the system of Reformed or Calvinist doctrine?"[2] And specifically: "did these epigoni construct a system centered upon and controlled by the doctrine of predestination to the detriment of the other focal points of early Reformed thought?"[3]

At the opening of his second chapter he finishes the same inquiry by refusing a false alternative: "The question that needs to be asked is not whether Calvin is a scriptural theologian and the Reformed scholastics unscriptural rationalists, but whether the doctrinal motifs drawn by Calvin from scripture are echoed, elaborated, developed, or neglected and set aside by the systems of the 'orthodox' or 'scholastic' thinkers of subsequent generations."[4]

I take those three questions as Muller prints them on page 1, and I take the sentence from the opening of chapter 2 as the form in which he presses the third. I ask them of Walaeus alone, and I answer from what the earlier chapters of this book have shown.

First, continuity or discontinuity. The chapters that read his doctrine show him naming Calvin where justification and imputation are in hand. On the page of the *Loci* that Chapter 14 cites he grants a major premise with Calvin, and on another he stands with Calvin and most of the great Reformers of the church.[5] That is continuity of confession where he prints Calvin's name. Elsewhere the same chapters show him taking up questions Calvin's *Institutes* did not frame in the same terms. Chapter 12 reads his account of middle knowledge, where he uses the name "middle knowledge," classifies it under simple intelligence, and cleanses it of the Jesuit abuses he names.[6] Chapter 11 reads the order of the decrees in the *Enchiridion* and the *Loci*.[7] I do not take those pages as a break with Calvin that he himself announces; he does not say on the leaves Chapter 12 cites

---

[1] Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 1 (Introduction, "Protestant Orthodoxy: Survey of Opinion").

[2] Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 1.

[3] Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 1.

[4] Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, chap. 2, opening page ("Predestination and Christology in the Thought of Calvin," §1, "Fundamental Distinctions in Calvin's Theology").

[5] Chapter 14, on the *Loci* pages that name Calvin in the Latin. See also Chapter 2, where those leaves are set in the wider teaching.

[6] Chapter 12, through its closing statement of the positions held together.

[7] Chapter 11, on the order of the decrees in the *Enchiridion* and the *Loci*.

that he is departing from Calvin on that head. I infer only that the book has shown both a named standing with Calvin on justification and a developed treatment of middle knowledge that those chapters do not present as Calvin's own wording.

Second, distortion or following Calvin's lead. Muller's alternative is disruption of balance, or following the Reformer's lead as the system was defended and solidified. What Chapters 1 to 16 show of Walaeus is a teacher who wrote across the loci the Reformed churches used: church and magistrate and Sabbath (Chapter 8), predestination and grace (Chapter 11), the knowledge of God (Chapter 12), will and ethics (Chapter 13), the obedience of Christ and imputation (Chapter 14), and the disputations that stand under his name in the *Synopsis* (Chapters 7 and 15).[8] Chapter 16 reports Bavinck's judgment that the *Synopsis*, of which Walaeus wrote fourteen disputations, is a clear example of the orthodox doctrine that held first place at Dort.[9] I infer from that breadth that the book has not shown him constructing a system whose only center is the decree. Whether every motif of Calvin is echoed in the same proportion is a larger question than one man's *Opera* can settle; the chapters claim only what their pages show.

Third, whether the construction was centered on predestination to the detriment of other foci, and whether it was primarily doctrinal and logical rather than scriptural. Muller's page-1 question names the predestination-centered charge. His chapter-2 sentence asks whether Calvin's scriptural motifs were echoed, elaborated, developed, or neglected. The chapters that treat the Sabbath dissertation show him copying the articles of Dort and arguing from Scripture and the order of the church.[10] The chapters that treat the *Tractatus* show him distinguishing the magistrate's office from the minister's by God's prescription.[11] The *Synopsis* disputations that Chapter 7 lists run from Scripture and the persons of the Trinity through sin, exaltation, repentance, church, baptism, discipline, and eternal life.[12] Chapter 12's reading of middle knowledge is a doctrinal elaboration in the locus on God, and I do not deny that. I infer that the book has shown elaboration and development of Reformed teaching in Walaeus's hands, and that it has not shown a neglect of Scripture as the ground of the enterprise. Muller's own observation on the chapter-2 page that the early orthodox systems elaborate Scripture as the "principle of knowing" of theology is the frame in which I read that result; I do not put his sentence into Walaeus's mouth.[13]

17.2 What Is New

Chapter 16 asked what questions remain for those who come after. In section 16.3 it set out Bavinck's account of the *Synopsis* editions and his assignment of fourteen disputations to Walaeus, and it noted that eleven of those fourteen stand in the *Opera* while three do not.[14] Chapter 15 had already listed the eleven and the three by number.[15] What is new in this book is not a newly found manuscript. It is the gathering, chapter by chapter, of a reading that Chapter 16's open questions

[8] Chapters 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, as each states its question and its pages.

[9] Chapter 16.3, reporting Bavinck's preface to the sixth edition of the *Synopsis*.

[10] Chapter 8, on the *Dissertatio de Sabbatho* and the articles of Dort he copies.

[11] Chapter 8, on the *Tractatus de munere ministrorum ecclesiae et inspectione magistratus circa illud*.

[12] Chapter 7, listing the fourteen disputations; Chapter 15, naming which eleven the *Opera* prints.

[13] Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, chap. 2, opening page (same leaf as n. 4), on the early orthodox elaboration of Scripture as the *principium cognoscendi*.

[14] Chapter 16.3.

[15] Chapter 15, on the *Synopsis* disputations in the *Opera omnia*.

still ask for: the *Enchiridion*, the *Loci*, the *Compendium ethicae*, the letters and *Consilia*, the fourteen disputations, and the reception, set side by side from named pages.[16]

The life-chapters give the family, the teaching posts, Dort, and the night of 12–13 May 1619 from the sources they name, and they mark where the sources differ.[17] The doctrine-chapters claim no more than the leaves they cite. Chapter 12 reads middle knowledge as Walaeus defines it and does not, in that chapter's closing, set him beside Gomarus's own theses. Chapter 14 names Calvin where the Latin names him. Chapter 8 reads the *Tractatus* in Renesse's Latin and says so. Chapter 5 takes the Bates *Vita* and Bilderdijk as one witness-line for the spoken account of the night and treats Baudartius apart.[18] None of that is offered as the discovery of a leaf no one had; it is offered as a continuous account that the notices surveyed in Chapter 16 do not supply.

From 16.3 in particular, what the book adds is the join between Bavinck's fourteen and the *Opera*'s eleven, with the three missing named, so that a reader who cites a *Synopsis* disputation by number can find whether it stands under Walaeus's name in the collected works. That join is new as a finding aid inside this book; the counts themselves are Bavinck's and the *Opera*'s.

17.3 The Use for Others

The earlier chapters cite the *Opera omnia* of 1643 by printed page and by image number of the Internet Archive scan. A next researcher who opens that scan needs the arithmetic in one place. I set it out here as what this book hands on.[19]

In the first part of the *Opera*, the image number is the printed page plus sixteen. In the second pagination, the image number is the printed page plus 584, with *Consilia* pages 404 to 407 pinned as images 988 to 991.[20] For Bates's *Vitæ selectorum*, the PDF page is the printed page plus fifty, and the first leaf printed 637 is PDF 687. Chapter 15's citation rules follow that map and add that a citation of the treatise on the ministers is a citation of Renesse's Latin, that a *Synopsis* disputation should carry both its *Synopsis* number and its place in the *Opera*, and that the Life of Walaeus used in Chapters 4 and 5 is the one Bates prints.[21]

For the other primary files used beside the *Opera*, the same short maps hold: Molina's *Concordia* in the 1876 Paris printing, PDF page equals printed page plus 18; Voetius, *Selectae disputationes*, pars I, PDF page equals printed page plus 57; Gomarus's *Opera* of 1664, the *Disputationes* at page 27 falls at PDF page 852.[22] A finding aid that keeps those conversions with the chapter citations is part of the use of the book.

---

[16] Chapter 16.6, "Questions for Study," first group.

[17] Chapters 1 to 6, and Chapter 5 on the night of 12–13 May 1619.

[18] Chapter 5, on the Bates *Vita* and Bilderdijk as one witness-line, and Baudartius apart.

[19] Antonius Walaeus, *Opera omnia* (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643); image numbers are those of the Internet Archive scan walaeusoperaomnia01. The page maps follow Chapter 15's citation rules and the conversions used throughout this book for the primary files on hand.

[20] Walaeus, *Opera omnia*; first-part image = printed page + 16; second pagination image = printed page + 584, with *Consilia* pp. 404–407 pinned as images 988–991. Chapter 15 states the ordinary conversions; the *Consilia* pin marks the irregularity at printed pp. 404–407. Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*: PDF page = printed page + 50; the first leaf printed 637 is PDF 687.

[21] Chapter 15, closing citation rules.

[22] Luis de Molina, *Concordia* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1876); Gisbertus Voetius, *Selectae disputationes theologicae*, pars I (Utrecht, 1648); Franciscus Gomarus, *Opera theologica omnia*, 2nd ed. (Amsterdam: Joannes Janssonius, 1664), *Disputationes*, p. 27 at PDF page 852 in the Internet Archive scan used in this book.

The questions Walaeus faced—the decree, the freedom of the creature, and the relation of the church to the civil power—are the questions the doctrine-chapters have followed on his pages. Muller's questions ask how a successor stands to Calvin. This chapter has answered them only as far as Chapters 1 to 16 reach. What remains open stands in Chapter 16.6. What this book means to leave in the reader's hand is a man read in his own works, with the leaves named, and a map by which those leaves can be found again.

Works Cited

Bavinck, Herman, ed. *Synopsis purioris theologiae*. 6th ed. Leiden: D. Donner, 1881.

Gomarus, Franciscus. *Opera theologica omnia*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Joannes Janssonius, 1664.

Molina, Luis de. *Concordia*. Paris: Lethielleux, 1876.

Muller, Richard A. *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008. First published 1986 by The Labyrinth Press.

Voetius, Gisbertus. *Selectae disputationes theologicae*, pars I. Utrecht, 1648.

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

Appendix A
Timeline

This appendix sets the dates that Chapters 1 to 17 state and cite. Where the chapters report a conflict, both forms stand with their sources. I invent no date that no chapter carries.

A.1 Birth to Middelburg

3 October 1573. Born at Ghent. Chapter 1 reports the day and place from Polyander's funeral oration and from the ADB, the NNBW, van der Aa, and the related notices; Polyander marks the day old style.[1]

1584 / 1585. The family leaves Ghent for Middelburg after the city's surrender to Parma. Chapter 1 gives both years: the ADB says 1585; the NNBW, van der Aa, and Polyander say 1584 (Polyander: toward the end of 1584). Waterschoot gives 17 September 1584 for the surrender itself.[2]

About 1588. Called to the ministry; Latin school at Middelburg. Chapter 2 reports Polyander and the ADB for a night-call in 1588, and the NNBW for entry to the Latin school about that year; the chapter gives both and settles neither.[3]

1596–1599. Study at Leiden (Staatencollege). Chapter 2: Polyander says the beginning of 1596; Bates's Life says April 1596; the stay runs to 1599.[4]

1599–1601. Study tour through France, Switzerland, and Germany. Chapter 2 dates the departure 1599 (Polyander; Life) and the return about 1601.[5]

A.2 Koudekerke, Middelburg, and the Night of May 1619

13 November 1602. Takes up the ministry at Koudekerke. Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 give November 1602; the Life gives the Ides of November (13 November).[6]

1603 (11 August in Bates). Marriage to Paschasia (Paschyntze / Paschasie) van Isenhoudt / Isenhout. Chapter 1 and Chapter 3: Bates alone gives 11 August 1603; the ADB ties the marriage to Koudekerke after November 1602 without a year; the NNBW says 1603 at Koudekerke; van der Aa says 1603 at Middelburg.[7]

1605. Minister at Middelburg. Chapter 3: installed 19 March 1605 (NNBW); the ADB and the Encyclopedie van Zeeland put the call in 1605.[8]

---

[1] Chapter 1; Johannes Polyander à Kerckhoven, *Oratio funebris*, in Antonius Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), image 8; J. C. van Slee, "Walaeus, Antonius," in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40 (1896), 643.

[2] Chapter 1, on the departure from Ghent (ADB 1585; NNBW, van der Aa, and Polyander 1584; Waterschoot on the surrender date).

[3] Chapter 2, on the call and the Latin school about 1588.

[4] Chapter 2, on the Leiden years 1596–1599.

[5] Chapter 2, on the study tour 1599–1601.

[6] Chapter 2; Chapter 3 (Life: Ides of November 1602).

[7] Chapter 1; Chapter 3, on the marriage date and place.

[8] Chapter 3, on the Middelburg call and installation.

1606 or 1611–1619. Teaching at the Middelburg school. Chapter 3 reports both: philosophy and Greek entrusted in 1606, and attachment to the Illustrious School from its founding in 1611 until 1619.[9]

1615. *Het ampt der kerckendienaren* published in Dutch at Middelburg. Chapter 3 treats the book of 1615; Chapters 6, 8, and 15 also cite it.[10]

1617. Consulted by Prince Maurice at The Hague. Chapter 3 and Chapter 6 report the summons toward the end of 1617 (Polyander; the Life; van der Aa).[11]

12–13 May 1619. Fetched to The Hague; the night with Johan van Oldenbarnevelt before the execution. Chapter 5 takes the Life (Bates) and Brandt as the two tellings that name Walaeus and say how they came by him, and treats Baudartius's 1620 edition as an earlier and separate telling; Bilderdijk reprints the Life in Dutch.[12]

A.3 Leiden, the Writings, and Death

July–September 1619. Correspondence with Lubbertus on Belgic Confession article 22. Chapter 14 reads the letters at *Consilia* pages 420–421.[13]

July–September 1619. Called to the Leiden professorship; farewell at Middelburg; removal to Leiden. Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 give the call in July 1619 and the farewell and departure in September (sources differ on the exact September day).[14]

21 October 1619. Inaugural oration *De Studii Theologici recta Institutione* at Leiden. Chapter 4: the Life and the Opera heading give 21 October 1619; the ADB puts taking up the professorship on 17 October, with the oration four days later.[15]

1622 / 1627 – 1632 / 1637. *Seminarium Indicum* in his house. Chapter 4: start 1622 (Life, ADB, van der Aa, Encyclopedie, Lin, Lind) or 1627 (NNBW); end 1632 (Encyclopedie; Lin) or 1637 (NNBW); Life, ADB, and van der Aa say only that it lasted ten years.[16]

1625. *Synopsis purioris theologiae* published. Chapter 16.3, from Bavinck's preface: first edition 1625 (then 1632, 1642, 1652, 1658).[17]

1624 / 1625. *Responsio ad Censuram Corvini*. Chapter 15 keeps the two dates apart: 1625 for the book and 1624 for the editors' date of the reply.[18]

---

[9] Chapter 3, on the Middelburg school dates.

[10] Chapter 3, on *Het ampt* (1615); see also Chapters 6, 8, and 15.

[11] Chapter 3; Chapter 6 (van der Aa on the summons toward the end of 1617).

[12] Chapter 5: "I take the Life and Brandt as the two tellings that name Walaeus and say how they came by him, and I take Baudartius's first edition as an earlier and separate telling."

[13] Chapter 14, on *Consilia et epistolae*, pp. 420–421.

[14] Chapter 3; Chapter 4, on the Leiden call in July 1619 and the September farewell and departure.

[15] Chapter 4, on the inaugural oration and its date; Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 299 [image 883].

[16] Chapter 4, on the seminary's years (NNBW "1627–1637").

[17] Chapter 16.3 (Bavinck's preface).

[18] Chapter 15, citation rules for the *Responsio*.

1626 / 1627. Faculty Latin *Censura* of the Remonstrant Confession (1626, Elzevir) and Dutch *Censure* (1627). Chapter 15 lists both as joint faculty work; Chapter 7 cites the faculty examination dated 24 May 1626.[19]

1628. *Dissertatio de Sabbatho*. Chapter 8 and Chapter 15 treat the Sabbath dissertation as printed in 1628.[20]

1 November 1633; 10 April 1637. Letters on Renesse's Latin *Tractatus*. Chapter 8 prints the exchange from the *Tractatus* prefatory note.[21]

9 July 1639. Death at Leiden. Chapter 1: portrait caption, ADB, NNBW, and Polyander's oration of 14 July 1639 agree on 9 July 1639; van der Aa gives 18 September 1634, which Chapter 1 reports and weighs against the age and the oration.[22]

14 July 1639. Polyander's funeral oration. Chapter 1.[23]

1643 (Hackius). *Opera omnia*. Chapter 1 and Chapter 15 cite the Hackius title leaf of 1643; the ADB and the NNBW cite 1647; van der Aa prints 1623, which Chapter 15 rejects for the volume that holds the *Responsio*.[24]

1881. Bavinck's sixth edition of the *Synopsis*. Chapter 16.3.[25]

Works Cited

The sources named above are those of Chapters 1 to 17; full forms stand in Appendix E.

[19] Chapter 15; Chapter 7.
[20] Chapter 8; Chapter 15.
[21] Chapter 8, on the *Tractatus* prefatory letters.
[22] Chapter 1, on the death date (9 July 1639) and van der Aa's 18 September 1634.
[23] Chapter 1.
[24] Chapter 1; Chapter 15, on the Hackius *Opera omnia* of 1643 and the conflicting dates.
[25] Chapter 16.3.

Appendix B. The Latin of the Oldenbarnevelt Night, with a Translation

Chapter 5 tells of the night of 12–13 May 1619, when Antonius Walaeus was brought to Johan van Oldenbarnevelt in The Hague and stayed with him until the morning of the execution.[1] That chapter takes the Life and Brandt as the two tellings that name Walaeus and say how they came by him, and reads Bilderdijk's Dutch as the Life again. This appendix gives the Latin of the same night as it stands in the Vita printed in William Bates's Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum (London, 1681), pages 633–637 [PDF 683–687],[2] with a formal and literal English beside it. Where a letter cannot be certified, brackets mark the place.

The extract begins where the Vita turns from the Synod's finished work to the condemned patrons and to Jacobus Schotte's fetching of Walaeus, and it ends with Walaeus's return to Dordrecht and the silver gift at the Synod's close. What follows on page 637—the Middelburg call to Leiden—is not part of the night and is not printed here.

Latin — Bates 633 [PDF 683]

> Decisis jam controversiis, judicata Remonstrantium causa, condemnati Criminis læsæ Majestatis, à delegatis Fœderati Belgii Ordinum, præcipui Remonstrantium patroni fuere: Barneveldus, Hogerbetius, Grotius & Ledenbergius. Ledenbergius supplicium spontanea morte prævenerat. Jacobus Schotte Consul Middelburgensis, delegatorum judicum unus, à Fœderati Belgii Ordinibus Dordracum ablegatur, Walæum è Synodo Hagam ducturus. Is Dordraco Walæum per Roterdamum, Shiedamum, aliasque ambages, XII Maii Hagam ducit, ne ulla populo futuri supplicii suspicio suboriretur: & in via Walæo aperit, Fœderati Belgii Ordines illum vocasse ut ad mortem componeret condemnatos, putare illos ejus prudentia & suadela optime id perficiendum. Walæus, quod videbat se evitare non posse, id conatus est limitare. Et rogavit, ne indicere mortem condemnatis deberet, ne adesse Grotio cogeretur, ipse solatio, ob contractam cum eo familiaritatem, opus habiturus: ne præsens supplicio esset, quod sine commotione animi non posset spectare.
>
> Hora quinta vespertina Hagam delati, Schotus Deputatos Ordinum & congregatos Judices adit, indicatque Walæum advenisse, ac postulare jam dicta sibi concedi. Quare Advocati Fisci ad Barneveldum mittuntur, annuntiantque eum sequenti die judicandum, & mortis subiturum supplicium. Schotus vero ad Walæum redit, & refert ea quæ petierat illi concessa. Hogerbetium enim Grotiumque licet condemnati non morituros, sed perpetuo carceri addicendos: Advocatos Fisci Barneveldo mortem annuntiasse: urgere Fœderatos Ordines, urgere Delegatos Judices ut Barneveldum quam primum accedat, ac ab eo Walæus sub horam sextam ad Barneveldi usque carcerem deducitur.
>
> Barneveldi cubiculum ingressus Walæus, non ingratum enim erit illius ex-

English — Bates 633 [PDF 683]

> The controversies now decided and the Remonstrants' cause judged, the chief patrons of the Remonstrants were condemned for the crime of injured majesty by the delegates of the States of the United Netherlands: Barneveld, Hogerbeets, Grotius, and Ledenberg. Ledenberg had forestalled punishment by a voluntary death. Jacobus Schotte, consul of Middelburg, one of the delegated judges, is sent by the States of the United Netherlands to Dordrecht, to bring Walaeus from the Synod to The Hague. From Dordrecht he takes Walaeus by Rotterdam, Schiedam, and other roundabout ways, on the twelfth of May, to The Hague, lest any

suspicion of the coming punishment arise among the people; and on the way he opens to Walaeus that the States of the United Netherlands have called him to prepare the condemned for death, thinking that this would best be done by his prudence and persuasion. Walaeus, seeing that he could not avoid it, tried to limit it. And he asked that he should not have to announce death to the condemned; that he should not be forced to attend Grotius, for he himself would need consolation because of the intimacy he had contracted with him; and that he should not be present at the punishment, which he could not watch without agitation of mind.

Brought to The Hague at the fifth hour of the evening, Schotte goes to the Deputies of the States and the assembled Judges, and reports that Walaeus has come and asks that what has just been said be granted him. Therefore the Advocates of the Fiscal are sent to Barneveld, and announce that he is to be judged the following day and to undergo the punishment of death. Schotte returns to Walaeus and reports that what he had asked has been granted him: for Hogerbeets and Grotius, though condemned, are not to die, but to be assigned to perpetual imprisonment; that the Advocates of the Fiscal have announced death to Barneveld; that the States General urge, and the Delegated Judges urge, that he go to Barneveld at once; and from him Walaeus is led, about the sixth hour, as far as Barneveld's prison.

Walaeus, having entered Barneveld's chamber—for it will not be unwelcome to hear his last [hours]—

Latin — Bates 634 [PDF 684]

trema audire, quæ Walæi ore habeo & ejus manu invenio fuisse annotata, invenit perturbatum vehementer Barneveldum, ac ad uxorem liberosque litteras conscribentem illius nuntii indices: eum salutavit Walæus ac dixit, dolere se cum tam tristi tempore debere accedere. Respondit commotus Barneveldus, se verbi divini Ministro non indigere, se senem & Christianum esse, & scire quomodo se jam debeat gerere, occupatum esse in disponendis rebus domesticis. Regessit Walæus, ea se credere; sed etiam veterano Christi militi in extremis excitandam illam cognitionem esse, applicanda monita, solatia. Nolle tamen illi impedimento esse in componendis rebus familiæ, tamdiu expectaturum: ac in remotiori sedili consedit.

Perscriptis literis & ad uxorem delatis, Barneveldus primus Walæum allocutus est. Rogavit quis esset: & responsum accepit se Antonium Walæum esse, ex Synodo Dordracena venisse, ac rogatum esse ut extremis his vitæ horis illi assisteret, paratum se esse quæ posset adferre, modo commodas illi vellet aures præbere. Ad ea Barneveldus se excusare, quod quem bene de nomine, de facie non novisset: quærere quid in Synodo Dordracena esset actum. Ad ea Walæus: condemnatam Remonstrantium doctrinam esse tam ab exteris, quam ab indigenis, constitutos Canones in quos omnes plene consentirent. Id non mirari Barneveldus de indigenis, cum à Contra-Remonstrantibus submissi essent, præter expectationem ejus id de exteris evenisse. Et inquisivit, quomodo ergo loca quædam S. Scripturæ exponerent, quæ favere Remonstrantibus videbantur: quæ cum explicasset Walæus & utrimque ventilata satis videbantur, insinuavit Walæus tempus esse ut de propria potius salute dispiceret, peccata sua confiteretur, & eorum à Deo veniam peteret.

De peccatis illibenter audire Barneveldus, quasi eorum confessione, confiteretur quoque, se suo merito supplicium capitis subiturum. Oggerere se examinatum, sed ab inimicis esse, multa eos in deteriorem partem accepisse: quædam quoque quæ Caronio Legato Anglico scripsisset,

ut amico intimo, ad peccatum tracta: quæcunque gessisset, iis libertatem & privilegia Hollandiæ voluisse tutari: supplicium jam præmium futurum, pro quadraginta trium annorum indefessis curis, exantlatis laboribus. Quæ cum non sine gemitu & lachrymulis efferret, illachrymavit quoque Walæus. Quis enim non misereatur sortis humanæ, qua paulo ante rerum domini, mox viliores fucis fiunt, & probrose à carnifice mactantur. Has Walæi lachrymas cum animadvertisset Barneveldus, *Et tu quoque,* inquit, *Walæe meo infortunio commoveris*; ac ab eo tempore se illi plene ut amico dedit. Walæus vero respondit se actorum non eam notitiam habere qua de singulis ferre judicium posset, neque se eam in rem eo venisse: unum se scire, Delegatos Judices novisse, latæ hujus sententiæ aliquando illis rationem coram Dei throno reddendam esse. Assentiebatur illi Barneveldus, sed opponebat eos non secundum receptas leges præcedentis ævi sed præsentis judicavisse. Ursit tamen Walæus, Deum iis qui sibi innocentes viderentur non condonare peccata: quare saltem cum Propheta Davide, peccatorum occultorum à Deo veniam peteret. Id pollicitus est Barneveldus, & se jam incepisse. Quæsivit porro Walæus, quam spem ergo veniæ haberet, & quomodo crederet se apud Deum salvandum esse. Ad ea Barneveldus: salvandos qui crederent in Christum, quique fidem suam bonis operibus exornarent.

English — Bates 634 [PDF 684]

… to hear his last [hours], which I have from Walaeus's mouth and find to have been noted down by his hand—he finds Barneveld violently disturbed, and writing letters to his wife and children that mark that message. Walaeus greets him and says he is sorry that he must come at so sad a time. Barneveld answers, moved, that he does not need a minister of the divine word, that he is an old man and a Christian, and knows how he ought now to carry himself, being occupied in setting his household affairs in order. Walaeus rejoined that he believed this; but that even for a veteran soldier of Christ, in his last hours, that knowledge was to be stirred up, warnings and consolations applied. Yet he was unwilling to be a hindrance to him in arranging the family's affairs, and would wait so long; and he sat down in a more distant seat.

When the letters have been written and taken to his wife, Barneveld is the first to speak to Walaeus. He asks who he is, and receives the answer that he is Antonius Walaeus, has come from the Synod of Dort, and has been asked to stand by him in these last hours of life, ready to bring what he can, if Barneveld will lend him a willing ear. To this Barneveld excuses himself, that he had known him well by name but not by face; he asks what has been done in the Synod of Dort. To this Walaeus: that the Remonstrants' doctrine has been condemned by foreigners and by natives alike, and Canons drawn up in which all fully agree. Barneveld says he does not wonder at this of the natives, since they had been sent by the Contra-Remonstrants; that it had happened beyond his expectation of the foreigners. And he asks how, then, they expound certain places of Holy Scripture that seemed to favor the Remonstrants; and when Walaeus has explained them and they seem sufficiently ventilated on both sides, Walaeus suggests that it is time rather to look to his own salvation, confess his sins, and ask God's pardon for them.

Barneveld is unwilling to hear of sins, as if by confessing them he would also confess that he was about to undergo capital punishment by his own desert. He objects that he has been examined, but by enemies; that they have taken many things in the worse sense; that certain things, too, which he had written to Caron, the English envoy, as to an intimate friend, have been twisted into sin; that whatever he had done, he had meant by it to protect the liberty and

privileges of Holland; that the punishment is now to be the reward for forty-three years of untiring cares and toils endured. When he utters this not without groaning and little tears, Walaeus also weeps. For who does not pity the lot of mankind, by which those who a little before were lords of affairs soon become viler than drones and are shamefully butchered by the executioner? When Barneveld has noticed these tears of Walaeus, “You too,” he says, “Walaeus, are moved by my misfortune”; and from that time he gives himself to him fully as to a friend. Walaeus answers that he has not that knowledge of the proceedings from which he could pass judgment on single points, nor has he come for that purpose; one thing he knows: the Delegated Judges know that they will one day have to give an account of this passed sentence before the throne of God. Barneveld agrees with him, but objects that they have judged not according to the received laws of the preceding age but of the present. Yet Walaeus presses that God does not pardon the sins of those who seem innocent to themselves; therefore at least, with the prophet David, he should ask God’s pardon for hidden sins. Barneveld promises this, and that he has already begun. Walaeus asks further what hope of pardon he has, then, and how he believes he is to be saved before God. To this Barneveld: that those are to be saved who believe in Christ and adorn their faith with good works.

Latin — Bates 635 [PDF 685]

Id verum dicere Walæus, sed requiri insuper, ut crederet eam fidem, ea bona opera non à se habere, nec meliore usu liberi arbitrii acquisivisse; sed à Deo in solidum ex mera gratia, juxta decretum suum ab æterno, accepisse. Respondit Barneveldus, id se credere, eam Doctrinam se juvenem didicisse Heidelbergæ, ac in ea se perpetuo perstitisse. Intulit Walæus, cum itaque non partium Remonstrantium sed Contra-Remonstrantium fuisse. Id fateri Barneveldus, solummodo se difficultatem aliquam in Prædestinatione absolute condemnante invenisse. Ei difficultati Walæus satisfieri potuisse, cum damnandi non præstarent, quæ naturæ viribus potuissent; & eos scopulos non ursisse tantum non Contra-Remonstrantes, sed & studiose præcavisse: cum itaque debuisse non Remonstrantium patrocinium suscipere, sed Contra-Remonstrantes tutari. Quibus respondit Barneveldus, ejus rei aliam rationem subfuisse, propositum sibi Contra-Remonstrantibus publica tantum exercitia permitti, Remonstrantes non opprimi. Sed objicere Walæus, contrarium tamen evenisse; Contra-Remonstrantes è cathedra ejectos, Remonstrantes substitutos: unde maxime populus incepisset commoveri. Ad ea Barneveldus, reliquos non satis propositum suum subsecutos. Referre Walæus, eum videri subterfugia quærere, cum non facilius à Deo venia impetretur, quam peccatorum quæ candide confitemur. Quid sanctum habere ambitiosus potest, qui eam religionem, à qua salutem animæ suæ populique sui dependere credit, opprimit, ut dominetur.

His sermonibus tempus usque in cœnam transivit, quam ubi paratam esse annuntiabatur, ad eam Barneveldus Walæum invitavit: voluit ab eo preces dici, cibum illi præbuit, adhibuit, & plane quasi in propria domo excepit, quod non potuit nisi à composita mente proficisci, & animo qui sui potens esset. Ipse vero comedit plusculum, ut solent illi qui distrahuntur cogitationibus, non tamen opprimuntur. Noluit autem vinum bibere, ne mens cogitationibus agitata turbaretur.

Peracta cœna rogavit Walæum, ut pro eo Auriacum Principem vellet adire, petiturus I. ut condonaret illi quod potuisset in eum peccavisse. II. ut favore prosequeretur liberos suos, matrimonio connexos procerum primatibus, perpetuo religioni Reformatæ addictis. Ad ea Walæus: an non melius foret, eum sine conditione condonationem rogare: & an ea quoque eo usque se extenderet, ut inhiberi lata sententia possit. Subticens aliquamdiu Barneveldus,

respondit eo usque se non extendere: & rogavit, ut prædixisset illi, ita vellet Principi proponere. Hæc sub horam decimam detulit Auriaco Principi Walæus: qui Responsum dedit, se dudum Barneveldum benevolentia prosecutum fuisse; verum cum ab aliquo tempore, aliam regiminis formam conatus esset introducere, quæ Ecclesiam & Rempublicam perdidisset, esse debuisse opponere. Condonare autem se libenter ea quæ contra illum commisisset, potuisse tamen id sine conditione rogare, cum detraxisset militem à juramento quod illi ut Imperatori debebatur: conatus esset impedire, ne Ultrajectum Gubernaminis sui sedem ingrederetur: calumniatum esse eum supremam potestatem fœderati Belgii appetere; ejus tamen prudentiæ committere, aut celare ea, aut aperire, se tantum veritatem desiderare: petiisse quoque à Judicibus, ne quod in eum peccasset id illi in crimen imputaretur liberis vero

English — Bates 635 [PDF 685]

Walaeus says that is true, but that it is further required that he believe that faith, those good works, he does not have from himself, nor has acquired by a better use of free will, but has received wholly from God out of pure grace, according to His decree from eternity. Barneveld answers that he believes this, that he learned this Doctrine as a young man at Heidelberg, and has always persisted in it. Walaeus brings in that he had therefore been not of the Remonstrants' party but of the Contra-Remonstrants'. Barneveld confesses this, only that he had found some difficulty in Predestination that absolutely condemns. To that difficulty Walaeus [says] satisfaction could have been given, since those who are to be damned would not perform what they could have by the powers of nature; and that not only had the Contra-Remonstrants not pressed those rocks, but had carefully guarded against them: he ought therefore not to have taken up the Remonstrants' patronage, but to have protected the Contra-Remonstrants. To which Barneveld answers that another reason underlay that matter: his purpose had been that the Contra-Remonstrants be allowed only public exercises, and the Remonstrants not be oppressed. But Walaeus objects that the contrary had nevertheless come about; the Contra-Remonstrants cast from the pulpit, Remonstrants put in their place: whence the people had begun to be greatly stirred. To this Barneveld [says] the rest had not sufficiently followed his purpose. Walaeus replies that he seems to seek subterfuges, since pardon is not more easily obtained from God than when we candidly confess the sins. What can an ambitious man hold sacred, who oppresses that religion on which he believes the salvation of his own soul and of his people depends, in order to rule?

With these conversations time passed on to supper, which, when it was announced as ready, Barneveld invited Walaeus to: he wished prayers to be said by him, offered him food, had him sit, and received him quite as in his own house, which could proceed only from a composed mind and a spirit that was master of itself. He himself ate a little more, as those are wont who are distracted by thoughts yet not crushed. But he would not drink wine, lest a mind stirred by thoughts be troubled.

When supper was done he asked Walaeus to go to the Prince of Orange on his behalf, to ask, first, that he forgive him whatever he might have sinned against him; second, that he favor his children, joined by marriage to the foremost of the nobles, forever devoted to the Reformed religion. To this Walaeus: whether it would not be better that he ask pardon without condition; and whether that pardon would also extend so far that the passed sentence could be stayed. Barneveld, silent for some time, answers that he does not extend it so far; and asks that, as he had told him beforehand, he would so propose it to the Prince. Walaeus carried this

to the Prince of Orange about the tenth hour: who gave answer that he had long pursued Barneveld with goodwill; but that when for some time he had tried to introduce another form of government, which would have ruined the Church and the Republic, it had been necessary to oppose him. That he freely forgave what [Barneveld] had committed against him, yet that [Barneveld] could have asked it without condition, when he had withdrawn the soldier from the oath owed him as Imperator; had tried to hinder him from entering Utrecht, the seat of his government; had calumniated him as seeking the supreme power of the United Netherlands; yet that he committed it to [Barneveld's] prudence either to conceal these things or to open them, desiring only the truth; that he had also asked of the Judges that what he had sinned against him not be imputed to him as a crime—but as for his children

Latin — Bates 636 [PDF 686]

ejus fauturum, quamdiu bene facerent. Quæsivit insuper, an non de inhibendo supplicio loqueretur. Quæ omnia cum relata Barneveldo essent, dixit se pro liberis suis nihil amplius desiderare: quod inhibitionem supplicii spectaret, aberrare Principem. Argumenta sua de supremæ potestatis ambitu antea dictavisse, alias se ita amavisse semper Principem, ut si in manu sua fuisset Suprema Belgii potestas, & potuisset id fieri ex ordine, eam se illi fuisse daturum. Fateri tamen, se contra eum nonnihil exacerbatum fuisse, quando Hagæ Contra-Remonstrantium separatorum templum ingrederetur. Quæ circa milites, quæ Ultrajecti acta essent, ea se agenda putavisse quo seditio præcaveretur.

Interea dum Auriacum Principem adiit Walæus, Ecclesiæ Hagiensis Pastores Lamotius & Beyerus, de more Ecclesiarum Hollandiæ circa condemnatos, Barneveldum accessere: qui conjunctim iterum & peccatorum confessionem, & fiduciam in Christum urserunt: acceperuntque idem ferme, quod antea Walæus responsum. Sed quæsivit ab omnibus Barneveldus *meus* ne Grotius quoque morietur, ut quoque Hogerbetius, juniores sunt, multum adhuc possent officii Reipublicæ præstare? Rogavit vero Walæum à Delegatis Judicibus peteret, famulo suo liceret usque ad ultimum vitæ momentum illi adesse: quod Walæus facile impetravit. Monuit pastores ne graves Remonstrantibus essent, quo quieta esse Respubl. posset.

Sed cum his sermonibus, mentis agitatione, commotione corporis lassaretur, petiit sibi quietem concedi: & ut Pastores ipsi somnum caperent. Ast dixit Walæus, injunctum illi esse tota nocte apud illum manere. Respondit Barneveldus, eo nequaquam opus esse. Itaque in vicino cubiculo somnum admisere. Interea Barneveldus quietem quærere, sed eam non invenire: famulus ejus ea prælegere, quæ pro solatio agonizantium Psalterio Belgico subjunguntur: ad quam lectionem, cum non satis attenta illi cogitatio esset, ipse in Psalterio suo Gallico legit. Quod cum Pastoribus annuntiaret unus trium custodum, qui Barneveldo additi dicebantur, ne spontanea morte supplicium præveniret: Pastores Beyerum cæteris juniorem misere, qui & lectione Sacræ Scripturæ, & inde ducta consolatione, quod reliquum erat noctis transegit. Circa matutinam quartam denuo Walæus & Lamotius ad Barneveldum redivere, & Walæus matutinas preces fudit, ac è colloquio animadverterunt facile, eum plane ad mortem compositum.

Non ita multo post Walæus à Judicibus evocatur, petuntque, an non desideraret Barneveldus ultimum vale & uxori, & liberis, & nepotibus dicere. Quod cum quæsivisset Walæus, Barneveldus respondit, id illi consultum non videri, se jam ad mortem compositum, id non posse nisi eum denuo amicosque turbare. Ignorabat autem Walæus, quare nec id potuit Barneveldo indicare, uxorem liberosque id à Judicibus petivisse.

Cum citaretur Barneveldus ut sententiam audiret, Walæus illi valedixit, quæ potuit obtulit officia; ac magnas illi gratias Barneveldus pro præstitis egit. Audita sententia Barneveldus respondit, Judices quædam condemnationi indidisse, quæ in confessione non haberentur: putavisse quoque suffecturum Fœderati Belgii Ordinibus, vitam & sanguinem, bona uxori & liberis relicturos fuisse: id præmium esse pro quadraginta annorum præstitis officiis. Mox ad pegma deductus, in eo ad populum conversus, dixit: *cives mei, non proditor* sed

English — Bates 636 [PDF 686]

… he would favor them, so long as they did well. He asked further whether he was not speaking of staying the punishment. When all this had been reported to Barneveld, he said he desired nothing more for his children; that as to staying the punishment, the Prince erred. That he had formerly set out his arguments on the extent of the supreme power; that otherwise he had always so loved the Prince that if the supreme power of the Netherlands had been in his hand, and it could have been done in order, he would have given it to him. Yet he confesses that he had been somewhat exasperated against him when at The Hague he entered the temple of the separated Contra-Remonstrants. What concerned the soldiers, what had been done at Utrecht, he had thought should be done so that sedition might be guarded against.

Meanwhile, while Walaeus went to the Prince of Orange, the pastors of the Hague church, Lamotius and Beyerus, according to the custom of the churches of Holland concerning the condemned, approached Barneveld; together they again pressed confession of sins and trust in Christ; and received nearly the same answer Walaeus had before. But Barneveld asked of them all, “My Grotius—will he also die, and Hogerbeets too? They are younger; they could still render much service to the Republic.” He asked Walaeus to request of the Delegated Judges that his servant be allowed to be with him to the last moment of life; which Walaeus easily obtained. He warned the pastors not to be hard on the Remonstrants, so that the Republic might be quiet.

But when he was wearied by these conversations, by agitation of mind, by stirring of body, he asked that quiet be granted him, and that the Pastors themselves take sleep. But Walaeus said it had been enjoined on him to stay with him all night. Barneveld answered that there was by no means need of that. So they took sleep in the neighboring chamber. Meanwhile Barneveld sought quiet and did not find it: his servant read aloud those things which for the consolation of the dying are joined to the Dutch Psalter; and at that reading, when his attention was not sharp enough, he himself read in his French Psalter. When one of the three guards who were said to have been set over Barneveld lest he forestall punishment by a voluntary death reported this to the Pastors, the Pastors sent Beyerus, younger than the rest, who spent what remained of the night both in reading of Holy Scripture and in consolation drawn from it. About the fourth hour of morning Walaeus and Lamotius returned again to Barneveld, and Walaeus poured out the morning prayers, and from the conversation they easily perceived that he was fully composed for death.

Not long after, Walaeus is summoned by the Judges, and they ask whether Barneveld did not wish to say a last farewell to wife, children, and grandchildren. When Walaeus had asked this, Barneveld answered that it did not seem advisable to him, that he was already composed for death, that it could not be done without disturbing him and his friends again. But Walaeus did not know—and therefore could not tell Barneveld—that wife and children
had asked this of the Judges.

When Barneveld was summoned to hear his sentence, Walaeus said farewell to him, offered what services he could; and Barneveld gave him great thanks for what he had done. When the sentence had been heard, Barneveld answered that the Judges had put into the condemnation certain things that were not held in confession; that he had also thought it would have been enough for the States of the United Netherlands to leave life and blood, [and] goods to wife and children: that this was the reward for forty years of services rendered. Soon led to the scaffold, on it turned to the people, he said: "My countrymen, not a traitor but

Latin — Bates 637 [PDF 687]

sed [patriota][3] *morior*. Unde cum ad arenam locumque supplicii duceretur, quæsivit à famulo, *Joannes, an nemo venit*, quasi spem aliquam adhuc veniæ concepisset: quod cum negavisset famulus, aggeniculavit & statim illi caput amputatum est. Ita qui perpetuo Reipublicæ regimini admoventur, dum ingenio, judicio, eloquio valent, ac omnia ex æquo & bono moderantur, multum apud Collegas authoritatis acquirunt: qua dum amicos promovent, & iis se satis putant stabilivisse, non jam ex utilitate Reipublicæ omnia, sed pro libitu agunt, quo & æmulis & superioribus materiam præbent, qua iterum perdantur.

Insequenti à supplicio die Walæus Dordracum reversus est, ac Synodi negotiis usque ad Maii finem vacavit: quando argenteo donatus nummo, publico convivio cum omnibus, privato cum præcipuis à Delegatis Ordinum exceptus, honorifice dimissus est.

English — Bates 637 [PDF 687]

… but I die a [patriot]. Whence, when he was led to the sand and place of punishment, he asked his servant, "Joannes, does no one come?", as if he still conceived some hope of pardon; when the servant had said no, he knelt and at once his head was cut off. So those who are set at the permanent helm of the Republic, while they prevail by intellect, judgment, and eloquence, and govern all things by equity and right, gain much authority among their colleagues; by which, while they promote friends and think they have sufficiently established themselves with them, they no longer do all things out of the Republic's interest but at their pleasure, and thereby give rivals and superiors matter by which they in turn are ruined.

On the day after the punishment Walaeus returned to Dordrecht, and attended to the Synod's business until the end of May; when, presented with a silver coin, and received at a public banquet with all and a private one with the chief men by the Delegates of the States, he was honorably dismissed.

Notes

1. The night itself is told in Chapter 5. This appendix supplies the Latin of Bates beside an English rendering.

2. William Bates, ed., Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum (London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681), "Vita Antonii Walæi," 633–637 [PDF 683–687]. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/vitaeselectoruma00bate. Page breaks in the Latin above follow the printed pages; PDF page = printed page + 50 for this span. PDF page 687 is the first leaf printed 637 (the first 637); pages printed 636 and 637 also recur later in the volume (PDF 688–689) outside this extract. In the Latin the accents and ligatures (æ, œ) are kept as printed, the long s is printed as s and VV as W, and abbreviations are expanded in square brackets; the print's u and v are kept; other oddities of spelling and punctuation stay as printed, with [sic]. Catchwords and signatures (Gggg, trema, narent., ejus, sed:) are omitted from the running text.

3. The word before *morior* is not clearly legible in the print; *patriota* is supplied as the reading the sense requires.

Works Cited

Bates, William, ed. Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum. London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681. “Vita Antonii Walæi,” 600–659 [PDF 650–709]. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/vitaeselectoruma00bate.

Appendix C
A Note on Sources

This appendix gathers what Chapters 1 to 17 and Appendices A, B, D, and E already say of sources that are wanting, open, or in conflict, and of the limits under which the book cites them. I invent no limit that those chapters and appendices do not already carry.[1]

Almost everything that survives under Walaeus's name is in Latin. A few pieces are in Dutch, and the one large work he wrote in Dutch, the book of 1615 on the office of ministers (*Het ampt der kerckendienaren*), reaches the collected *Opera omnia* of 1643 only in a Latin version made by Ludovicus à Renesse. The Dutch original is not in that *Opera*; the NNBW and Lind both say that only the Latin was taken in, and the NNBW places the Dutch of Middelburg, 1615, in the Provincial Library of Zeeland. A citation of the treatise on the ministers in the *Opera* is therefore a citation of Renesse's Latin, and it should say so.[2]

A Life of Walaeus is not among the opening pieces of the Hackius *Opera omnia* of 1643 that this book cites. The title leaf lists none, and Polyander's funeral oration is the only account of his life among those pieces. Other writers say otherwise of the edition they have in hand: the ADB and the NNBW place a Life by his son Johannes at the front of an *Opera omnia*, and Lind gives 1647 for the book that carries the Life and 1648 for the second volume. The Life that the life-chapters read is the one printed in William Bates's *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum* (1681). The contents leaf there names no author. I therefore cite the Life as Bates prints it, and the authorship that the ADB, the NNBW, and Lind give it stays theirs. A citation of the Life should give Bates and not the *Opera omnia* of 1643.[3]

For the night of 12–13 May 1619 with Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, Chapter 5 takes the Life and Brandt as the two tellings that name Walaeus and say how they came by him, and takes Baudartius's first edition of 1620 as an earlier and separate telling that does not name him. Bilderdijk's Dutch is read as the Life again. Appendix B prints the Latin of that night from Bates beside an English rendering. Appendix A's timeline entry for the night follows the same witness line.[4]

The editors of the *Opera* themselves mark how near each text stands to Walaeus's own hand. They say that he rarely kept copies of his letters, so that those printed come from his own copies and from the ones that friends supplied; that he kept the counsels more carefully, most of them given jointly with Polyander, Rivet, and Thysius; that the *Loci* began as lecture notes he started to expand and did not finish; that the enlargement of the Sabbath dissertation was left incomplete, so that the text of 1643 is a later and fuller one than the dissertation the biographers date 1628; and that the

---

[1] Chapters 1–17; Appendices A, B, D, and E, as cited below.

[2] Chapter 15, on *Het ampt* and Renesse's Latin; Chapter 16.1 (NNBW on the Dutch original in the Provincial Library of Zeeland); Chapter 3, on the Dutch book of 1615; Chapter 15.7, citation rule for the treatise on the ministers.

[3] Chapter 15, on the Life and the Hackius *Opera omnia* of 1643; Bates, ed., *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum* (London, 1681), "Vita Antonii Walæi," 600–659 [PDF 650–709], as cited in Chapters 1 and 5 and in Appendix B; Chapter 15.7, citation rule for the Life.

[4] Chapter 5: "I take the Life and Brandt as the two tellings that name Walaeus and say how they came by him, and I take Baudartius's first edition as an earlier and separate telling." Appendix B, headnote; Appendix A, entry for 12–13 May 1619.

Enchiridion reaches print from a pupils' manuscript that he changed now and then. A scholar who quotes the *Opera* should say which of these kinds of text he is quoting.[5]

Two further things in his hand are not, or not wholly, in the *Opera omnia*. The first is the Dutch translation of the New Testament and the Apocrypha: the portrait caption names him translator of those books and president of the college of the revisers, and van der Aa says that Walaeus alone made the marginal notes to a large part of Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Hebrews, Peter, and Revelation—van der Aa's statement, which Chapter 15 reports as his. The second is the *Synopsis purioris theologiae*. Bavinck assigns fourteen disputations to Walaeus; the *Opera* print eleven of them on pages 319 to 365 of the second volume; the three that the *Opera* leaves out are the twentieth, on the oath; the twenty-fourth, on predestination; and the thirty-sixth, on the worship of invocation. A citation of a disputation should give its number in the *Synopsis* and its place in the *Opera*.[6]

Of English, Chapter 15 reports that there is no complete English translation of any of the large works in the *Opera omnia*—not of the *Loci communes*, the *Responsio*, the *Enchiridion*, the treatise on the ministers, or the *Consilia et epistolæ*. What exists falls into three kinds: the bilingual *Synopsis* (and so, if the texts match as that chapter says, the eleven disputations that stand in the *Opera*); Monfasani's selections from the *Compendium ethicae* in Kraye's anthology; and the short renderings made for this book. Together those come to between about 5.6 and 6.7 percent of the core of the *Opera*. The rest is in Latin or Dutch only. The largest untouched parts are the *Loci*, the *Responsio*, the *Enchiridion*, the treatise on the ministers, and the *Consilia*.[7]

A list of what he wrote is also a list of what he is said to have written. Chapter 15 looked for four things a reader might expect to find: a separate set of *Praelectiones*; a separate treatise on the covenant; a separate treatise on the Seminarium Indicum; and tracts in the controversy over Amyraut's teaching, in which the Dutch professors took part after he died. None of the four was found. The title leaves of the *Opera omnia* name none of them, and the lists in the ADB, the NNBW, and van der Aa, and the entry in the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*, name none. The covenant appears in passages of the *Loci*, the *Enchiridion*, and the *Responsio*, and what survives of his work for the seminary stands among the letters and counsels. That is a reason not to cite a separate work in any of the four; it is not proof that none was ever written. A list of this kind can be corrected by a single title leaf that it missed.[8]

Three points remain open in what Chapter 15 set down. The first is what a volume of 1647 or 1648 contains and how it stands to the volume of 1643. The second is whether Lind's quarto of 1640 is the earlier printing of the *Loci* that the editors describe. The third is whether the editors' 1624 and the dedication's 1625 mark the writing and the publication of the *Responsio*. Each can be settled by a title leaf or a dated line, and until it is the citations should say which book they use. Appendix A,

[5] Chapter 15.2, on the editors' accounts of the letters, counsels, *Loci*, Sabbath dissertation, and *Enchiridion*; Chapter 8 and Chapter 15 on the Sabbath text of 1628 and of 1643.

[6] Chapter 15, "Two further things"; Chapter 15.4 and Chapter 7.6 (Disputations 20, 24, and 36 not in the *Opera*; eleven on pp. 319–365 of vol. 2); Chapter 16.3 and Chapter 16.6; Chapter 17, on the join between Bavinck's fourteen and the *Opera*'s eleven.

[7] Chapter 15.5, "What Exists in English."

[8] Chapter 15.6, "Items Looked for and Not Found."

which sets the dates the chapters state, invents no date that no chapter carries, and where the chapters report a conflict both forms stand with their sources.[9]

Chapter 16.6 puts, in six groups tied to the works from which they arise, questions that a reader who wants to know Walaeus better can put: an account of the teaching as a whole across the *Enchiridion*, the *Loci*, the *Compendium ethicae*, the fourteen disputations, and the letters; the place of his account of the obedience of Christ toward the debate Campos traces and toward Abbink's reading of forgiveness and renewal; the relation of the fourteen *Synopsis* disputations to the eleven in the *Opera*; particular studies of *Het ampt*, the marginal notes van der Aa assigns, middle knowledge in the *Loci*, and the letters and *Consilia* as doctrinal sources; the difference of editions and of English coverage; and his part at the Synod and in his school. Those questions are put for others to take up; this book has not tried to answer them. What remains open stands there, and Chapter 17 points back to that section.[10]

Appendix D lists the primary works the book actually cites, with the page maps Chapter 17.3 hands the next researcher. Appendix E gathers the secondary studies. The note here does not enlarge either list. It only gathers the limits already named, so that a reader who uses the chapters may see at once where a source is wanting, where a witness line divides, and where a question is left open.[11]

Works Cited

The sources named above are those of Chapters 1 to 17 and Appendices A, B, D, and E; full forms stand in Appendix E. Primary forms and page maps stand in Appendix D.

[9] Chapter 15.7, three points that remain open; Appendix A, headnote and timeline rows that keep conflicting dates apart (including the *Opera* dates of 1643 / 1647 and the *Responsio* dates of 1624 / 1625).

[10] Chapter 16.6, "Questions for Study"; Chapter 17.2, pointing to what remains open in Chapter 16.6.

[11] Appendix D; Appendix E; Chapter 17.3.

Appendix D
Primary-Source List

This appendix lists the primary works the book actually cites, in the house form used in the chapters, and the page maps Chapter 17.3 hands the next researcher. Secondary studies stand in Appendix E.

D.1 Works

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.[1]

Bates, William, ed. *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum*. London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681. "Vita Antonii Walæi," 600–659 [PDF 650–709]. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/vitaeselectoruma00bate.[2]

Synopsis purioris theologiae. Edited by Herman Bavinck. 6th ed. Leiden: D. Donner, 1881. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/synopsispurioris00poly.[3]

Gomarus, Franciscus. *Opera theologica omnia*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Joannes Janssonius, 1664.[4]

Molina, Luis de. *Concordia*. Paris: Lethielleux, 1876.[5]

Voetius, Gisbertus. *Selectae disputationes theologicae*, pars I. Utrecht, 1648.[6]

Baudartius, Gulielmus. *Memorien* … "Eerste editie." Arnhem: Jan Jansz., 1620. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/ned-kbn-all-00004999-001.[7]

Bilderdijk, Willem. *Geschiedenis des vaderlands*. Vol. 8. Amsterdam, 1835. Pp. 214–23 and editor's notes, pp. 287–89. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/bild002gesc08_01/bild002gesc08_01_0013.php.[8]

Brandt, G. *Historie van de rechtspleging gehouden in de jaren 1618 en 1619* …. Rotterdam: Barent Bos, 1708. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/gbrandtshistori00brangoog.[9]

Polyander à Kerckhoven, Johannes. *Oratio funebris in obitum … Antonii Walæi*. Recited 14 July 1639. In Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1. Unpaginated front matter.[10]

---

[1] Cited throughout; house form as in Chapter 15 and Chapter 17.
[2] Chapters 1, 4, 5, and Appendix B; PDF arithmetic as in Chapter 1 note 1 and Chapter 17.3.
[3] Chapters 4, 7, 15, and 16.
[4] Chapter 12; Chapter 17.
[5] Chapter 17 (page map); cited in the book's primary set for middle knowledge.
[6] Chapter 17 (page map).
[7] Chapter 5.
[8] Chapter 5 and Appendix B; Chapter 5 reads it as the Life again in Dutch.
[9] Chapter 5.
[10] Chapters 1 and 4.

D.2 Page Maps

These conversions match Chapter 17.3.[11]

Opera omnia (1643), first part: image number = printed page + 16.

Opera omnia (1643), second pagination: image number = printed page + 584, with *Consilia* pages 404 to 407 pinned as images 988 to 991.

Bates, *Vitæ selectorum*: PDF page = printed page + 50; the first leaf printed 637 is PDF 687.

Molina, *Concordia* (1876): PDF page = printed page + 18.

Voetius, *Selectae disputationes*, pars I: PDF page = printed page + 57.

Gomarus, *Opera* (1664), *Disputationes* page 27 = PDF page 852.

[11] Chapter 17.3.

Appendix E
Bibliography

This bibliography lists the works cited in Chapters 1 to 17 and in Appendix B.

Works Cited

Aa, A. J. van der. “Walaeus (Antonius) of De Wale.” In *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, vol. 20, 32–35. 1877. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/aa__001biog24_01/aa__001biog24_01_0091.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Abbink, Kees. “Simul in weinig of simul in veel meer: Bellarminus en Walaeus over de gelijktijdigheid van vergeving en vernieuwing.” MA thesis, Protestantse Theologische Universiteit, 2023.

Bates, William, ed. *Vitæ selectorum aliquot virorum*. London [Londini]: Typis A. G. & J. P. & prostant venales apud Georgium Wells, 1681. “Vita Antonii Walæi,” 600–659 [PDF 650–709]. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/vitaeselectoruma00bate.

Baudartius, Gulielmus. *Memorien, ofte Kort verhael der ghedenckweerdighste geschiedenisse van Nederlandt ende Vranckryck*. “Eerste editie.” Arnhem: Jan Jansz., 1620. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/ned-kbn-all-00004999-001.

Bilderdijk, Willem. *Geschiedenis des vaderlands*. Vol. 8. Amsterdam, 1835. Pp. 214–23 and editor’s notes, pp. 287–89. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/bild002gesc08_01/bild002gesc08_01_0013.php.

Boer, William den, and Riemer A. Faber, eds. *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*. Translated by Riemer A. Faber. 2 vols. Burford: Davenant Press, 2023.

Brandt, G. *Historie van de rechtspleging gehouden in de jaren 1618 en 1619 ontrent de drie gevangene Heeren Mr. Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, Mr. Rombout Hoogerbeets, Mr. Hugo de Groot*. Rotterdam: Barent Bos, 1708. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/gbrandtshistori00brangoog.

Campos, Heber Carlos de, Jr. “Johannes Piscator (1546–1625) and the Consequent Development of the Doctrine of the Imputation of Christ’s Active Obedience.” PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2009.

Gomarus, Franciscus. *Opera theologica omnia*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Joannes Janssonius, 1664.

Goris, Harm, Riemer Faber, Andreas Beck, and William den Boer, eds. *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae / Synopsis of a Purer Theology: Latin Text and English Translation*. Vol. 3, Disputations 43–52. Leiden: Brill, 2020.

Hulsbergen, S. J. M. “Antonius Walaeus.” *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*. Entry from the 1982–84 print edition. https://www.encyclopedievanzeeland.nl/index.php?title=Antonius_Walaeus&oldid=69677. Accessed 1 October 2026.

Hulsbergen, S. J. M., rev. J. Francke. “Jacobus Borsius.” *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*. https://www.encyclopedievanzeeland.nl/index.php?title=Jacobus_Borsius&oldid=106816. Accessed 2 October 2026.

Itterzon, G. P. van. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Biografisch lexicon voor de geschiedenis van het Nederlands protestantisme*. As excerpted in “Walaeus, Antonius.” Biografisch Portaal van Nederland, bioport no. 91680571. http://www.biografischportaal.nl/en/persoon/91680571. Accessed 1 October 2026.

Kraye, Jill, ed. *Cambridge Translations of Renaissance Philosophical Texts*. Vol. 1, *Moral Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Includes “Antonius de Waele,” translated with an introduction by John Monfasani, 120–30.

Lasonder, L. W. A. M. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, edited by P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2, cols. 1513–17. 1912. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/molh003nieu02_01/molh003nieu02_01_2538.php. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren.

Lin, Changhua. *Christian Contextualization in Formosa: A Remarkable Episode (1624–1662) of Reformed Mission History*. PhD diss., Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2014.

Lind van Wijngaarden, J. D. de. *Antonius Walaeus*. Leiden: G. Los, 1891.

Molina, Luis de. *Concordia*. Paris: Lethielleux, 1876.

Motley, John Lothrop. *Life and Death of John of Barneveld, Advocate of Holland: With a View of the Primary Causes and Movements of the Thirty Years’ War, 1618–19*. Project Gutenberg, 2004. https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/4896.

Muller, Richard A. *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008. First published 1986 by The Labyrinth Press.

Otterspeer, Willem. *Groepsportret met Dame I*. Chap. 17, “De nieuwe orde, 1619–1631.” 2000. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/otte010groe01_01/otte010groe01_01_0018.php.

Polyander à Kerckhoven, Johannes. *Oratio funebris in obitum … Antonii Walæi*. Recited 14 July 1639. In Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1. Unpaginated front matter.

Post-Reformation Digital Library. “Antonius Walaeus (1573–1639).” Author page. https://www.prdl.org/author_view.php?a_id=71. Accessed 5 October 2026.

Schelven, A. A. van. “Dathenus (Petrus, Pieter).” In *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, edited by P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok, vol. 2. 1912. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/molh003nieu02_01/molh003nieu02_01_0850.php.

Slee, J. C. van. “Walaeus, Antonius.” In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 40, 643–44. 1896. https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz84297.html.

Synopsis purioris theologiae. Edited by Herman Bavinck. 6th ed. Leiden: D. Donner, 1881. Digitized copy, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/synopsispurioris00poly.

Velde, Dolf te, ed. *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae / Synopsis of a Purer Theology: Latin Text and English Translation*. Vol. 1, Disputations 1–23. Translated by Riemer A. Faber. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions 187; Texts and Sources 5. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Velde, Roelf Theodoor te. *Paths Beyond Tracing Out: The Connection of Method and Content in the Doctrine of God, Examined in Reformed Orthodoxy, Karl Barth, and the Utrecht School*. Delft: Eburon, 2010.

Voetius, Gisbertus. *Selectae disputationes theologicae, pars I*. Utrecht, 1648.

Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643. Vol. 1 and vol. 2, digitized in one file, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/walaeusoperaomnia01. Vol. 2 begins at image 573; its printed page is the image number less 584.

Waterschoot, W. "Hieroglyphica te Gent in 1584." *Verslagen en mededelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde*, n.s. (1978): 47–85. Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/_ver016197801_01_0003.php.