

Arminius and the Reformed Tradition

REFORMED HISTORICAL-THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

General Editors

Joel R. Beeke and Jay T. Collier

BOOKS IN SERIES:

The Christology of John Owen

Richard W. Daniels

The Covenant Theology of

Caspar Olevianus

Lyle D. Bierma

John Diodati's Doctrine of

Holy Scripture

Andrea Ferrari

*Caspar Olevian and the
Substance of the Covenant*

R. Scott Clark

*Introduction to Reformed
Scholasticism*

Willem J. van Asselt et al.

The Spiritual Brotherhood

Paul R. Schaefer Jr.

Teaching Predestination

David H. Kranendonk

*The Marrow Controversy and
Seceder Tradition*

William VanDoodewaard

Unity and Continuity in

Covenantal Thought

Andrew A. Woolsey

The Theology of the French

Reformed Churches

Martin I. Klauber, ed.

Doctrine in Development

Heber Carlos de Campos Jr.

*The Theology of the Huguenot
Refuge*

Martin I. Klauber, ed.

The Claims of Truth

Carl R. Trueman

Providence, Freedom, and the Will

Richard A. Muller

*Arminius and the Reformed
Tradition*

J. V. Fesko

Arminius and the Reformed Tradition

Grace and the Doctrine of Salvation

J. V. Fesko



Reformation Heritage Books

Grand Rapids, Michigan

Arminius and the Reformed Tradition

© 2022 by J. V. Fesko

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews. Direct your requests to the publisher at the following addresses:

Reformation Heritage Books

3070 29th St. SE

Grand Rapids, MI 49512

616-977-0889

orders@heritagebooks.org

www.heritagebooks.org

Printed in the United States of America

22 23 24 25 26 27/10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Fesko, J. V., 1970- author.

Title: Arminius and the Reformed tradition : grace and the doctrine of salvation / J.V. Fesko.

Description: Grand Rapids, Michigan : Reformation Heritage Books, [2022] |

Series: Reformed historical-theological studies | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2022000193 (print) | LCCN 2022000194 (ebook) | ISBN 9781601789341 (paperback) | ISBN 9781601789358 (epub)

Subjects: LCSH: Arminius, Jacobus, 1560-1609. | Salvation—Christianity—History of doctrines—16th century. | Salvation—Christianity—History of doctrines—17th century. | BISAC: RELIGION / Christian Theology / History | RELIGION / Christian Theology / Soteriology

Classification: LCC BT752 .F47 2022 (print) | LCC BT752 (ebook) | DDC 234—dc23/eng/20220216

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022000193>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022000194>

For additional Reformed literature, request a free book list from Reformation Heritage Books at the above regular or e-mail address.

Dedicated to my father,

LEE EDWARD FESKO

(28 October 1944—11 June 2021)

Contents

Preface	ix
Acknowledgments	xiii
Introduction	1
1. <i>Facientibus quod in se est.</i>	13
2. Predestination	31
3. Effectual Calling	51
4. Union with Christ	71
5. Justification	87
6. Perseverance	107
Conclusion	129
Bibliography	133
Index	147

Preface

My study of Arminius began in seminary at the cafeteria lunch table when I was discussing theology with my friends over nachos drenched in a yellow substance that was supposed to be cheese. Our professors' blanket negativity about Reformed theology made us skeptical and drove us back to primary sources to find out whether Calvin actually believed what our professors claimed. We discovered our professors trafficked in myth rather than critique based on a close reading of primary sources. As my friends and I read more Reformed theology, we often expressed our agreement with Calvin and other Reformed theologians and our disagreement with Arminianism (and our professors). These lunchtime discussions cemented in me the need to study primary sources. I told myself that in addition to many great Reformed luminaries I also needed to read Jacob Arminius so that if I disagreed with him on some point I could show where and why I diverged from him.

During my postgraduate studies in Scotland, I had long sessions with Arminius's works, a labor that proved useful on two fronts. First, it was beneficial for my own academic research; I wrote my dissertation on the doctrine of election and engaged Arminius's views in order to understand the various early modern positions. Second, my reading came in handy during my ministerial ordination trials when a presbyter accused me of being Arminian. Instead of losing my composure, I had the confidence to defend my views: "I've read all three volumes of the works of Jacob Arminius from cover to cover, and I can confidently say that I do not hold his views on a number of doctrines." I listed

my differences with Arminius and persuaded the presbytery that my accuser was ill-informed.

Years later I studied the early modern doctrine of union with Christ, and I once again delved into Arminius's works. I discovered that Arminius had all of the requisite pieces for the Reformed doctrine of union with Christ, but he arranged them in a different manner in comparison with his Reformed peers. I came to similar conclusions when I studied Arminius's doctrine of justification and later revisited his doctrine of predestination. I decided to collect my published research on Arminius and supplement it with additional chapters so I could present this book on the Dutchman's soteriology. My goal is neither to reposition nor vilify Arminius but rather to let the early modern Reformed context, his own words, and the subsequent reception of his theology locate his place with respect to the early modern confessional Reformed tradition.

I am grateful for the feedback of various colleagues and friends, including David VanDrunen, Scott Clark, Richard Muller, Herman Selderhuis, and Harrison Perkins. I am also grateful to my teaching assistant, Levi Berntson, for proofreading the manuscript for me. I thank Joel Beeke, David Woollin, and Jay Collier for both their patience and encouragement in completing this book. I am also grateful for the careful work of my editor, Drew McGinnis. I first spoke of the possibility of this project with David Woollin more than five years ago and have finally had time and opportunity to complete it. I am also grateful for my family: my wife, Anneke, and my three children, John Jr., Robert, and Carmen Penelope. You are all a source of great joy, encouragement, and love in my life. Without you I would not be the person that I am. As Winston Churchill once observed, "There is no doubt that it is around the family and the home that all the greatest virtues...are created, strengthened and maintained." I am thankful to our triune God for placing all of you in my life.

I dedicate this book to my father, Lee Edward Fesko, who presently battles liver cancer. My dad shows me the love of Christ in so many different ways by teaching, encouraging, and sacrificing for me. He taught me how to love Christ and exemplifies the life of a godly man. Because of my dad, I also know how to change the oil in my car, build furniture, bake cookies, troubleshoot kitchen plumbing, perform

basic A/C repair, make dinner (if Stouffer's turkey tetrazzini counts as food), work hard and smart, and love my family. Most of all, my dad taught me to laugh, and the thought of not having him with me fills my heart with sorrow. But we do not grieve as the world grieves because we have hope—a hope that comes only through Christ—the resurrection unto eternal life. Do not lose heart, Dad; fight the good fight, and know that when you are weak, He is strong and that our “light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory” (2 Cor. 4:17). Dad, look into the face of death and smile—for it has no claim on you because our Savior, Jesus Christ, has abolished death and has brought life and immortality to life through the gospel (2 Tim. 1:10). Dad, join Paul and taunt our enemy: “O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Cor. 15:55–57).

Postscript: In God's providence, I was able to read this preface to my father and be with him when he took his last breath on June 11, 2021, at 5:56 a.m. Dad, I love and miss you very much and look forward to seeing you again before the throne of grace.

Acknowledgments

Four of the chapters in this book have been previously published and are included here by permission with minor editorial modification:

“Arminius on Union with Christ and Justification.” *Trinity Journal*, n.s., 31, no. 2 (2010): 205–22.

“Arminius on Justification: Reformed or Protestant?” *Church History and Religious Culture* 94, no. 1 (2014): 1–21.

“Arminius on the *Facientibus Quod in Se Est* and Likely Medieval Sources.” In *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism: Studies in Honor of Richard A. Muller on the Maturation of a Theological Tradition*, edited by Jordan J. Ballor, David S. Sytsma, and Jason Zuidema, 347–60. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

“The Everlasting Love of God: Election and Predestination.” In *A Faith Worth Defending: The Synod of Dort’s Enduring Heritage*, edited by Jon D. Payne and Sebastian Heck, 45–62. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2019.

All Scripture quotations come from the King James Version (1611), an early modern translation of the Bible, unless quotations originate within cited primary source texts.

Introduction

Athanasius versus Arius, Augustine versus Pelagius, Ratramnus versus Radbertus, Luther versus Erasmus, and Hodge versus Nevin are just some of the famous pairs of theologians who locked horns over key doctrines. Another pair of names that regularly surfaces is that of Calvin versus Arminius. The pair never met, though their lifespans briefly overlap by some four years: John Calvin (1509–1564) and Jacob Arminius (1560–1609). Nevertheless, theologians and historians have associated these figures with two major early modern theological movements, namely, Calvinism and Arminianism. Over time, the ironies of these theological labels continue to mount for several reasons. The early modern Reformed tradition never ascribed normative status to Calvin the way that the Lutheran tradition has done with Martin Luther (1483–1546).¹ The term *Calvinist* was initially one of derision, an effort by critics to tag Reformed theologians as sectarians despite their claims of being Reformed catholics.² A similar pattern unfolds with Arminius where historians and partisans have associated the Dutch theologian with a movement and views that sometimes

1. Carl R. Trueman, “Calvin and Calvinism,” in *The Cambridge Companion to John Calvin*, ed. Donald K. McKim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 225–45, here 225.

2. See Richard A. Muller, “Demoting Calvin? The Issue of Calvin and the Reformed Tradition,” in *John Calvin: Myth and Reality: Images and Impact of Geneva’s Reformer*, ed. Amy Nelson Burnett (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2011), 3–17; William Perkins, *A Reformed Catholike* (Cambridge: John Legat, 1598).

bear little resemblance to him, a fact inducing some to distinguish between the “Arminius of faith” and the “Harmenszoon of history.”³ In other words, was Calvin a Calvinist and was Arminius an Arminian? Nevertheless, the Arminian and Calvinist labels stubbornly persist despite their historical imprecision.⁴ Perhaps some theological labels will never be deleted from the popular theological lexicon because of their familiarity, but this does not mean that we must accept the historical inaccuracy of such labels.

In recent decades many new studies on early modern Reformed theology have been published, which has done much to reset the conversation. Scholars no longer typically debate Calvin versus the Calvinists but rightly recognize that there is a breadth and diversity to the Reformed tradition that has no one theologian as its lodestar.⁵ Conversely, a small body of literature has begun to emerge that reassesses both Arminius’s theology and his relationship to those who have claimed his theological legacy.⁶ From within the milieu of this renewed effort to understand early modern Reformed theology there

3. Keith D. Stanglin, Mark G. Bilby, and Mark H. Mann, eds., *Reconsidering Arminius: Beyond the Reformed and Wesleyan Divide* (Nashville, Tenn.: Kingswood, 2014), xv.

4. So, e.g., Robert A. Peterson and Michael D. Williams, *Why I Am Not an Arminian* (Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, 2004); Jerry L. Walls and Joseph R. Dongell, *Why I Am Not a Calvinist* (Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, 2004); Michael Horton, *For Calvinism* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011); Roger E. Olson, *Against Calvinism: Rescuing God’s Reputation from Radical Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011).

5. See, e.g., Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones, eds., *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011); Michael Allen and Scott R. Swain, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Reformed Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 189–294; Ulrich L. Lehner, Richard A. Muller, and A. G. Roeber, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology, 1600–1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 167–274.

6. Stanglin, Bilby, and Mann, *Reconsidering Arminius*; Thomas H. McCall and Keith D. Stanglin, *After Arminius: A Historical Introduction to Arminian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020); Keith D. Stanglin and Thomas H. McCall, *Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Th. Marius van Leeuwen, Keith D. Stanglin, and Marijke Tolsma, eds., *Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe: Jacobus Arminius (1559/60–1609)* (Leiden: Brill, 2009); Richard A. Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius: Sources and Directions of Scholastic Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991).

have been those who set aside the theological labels and rightly note the continuities between the Reformed tradition and Arminius. Richard Muller, for example, rightly argues that Arminius's understanding of the *munus triplex* (Christ's threefold office) falls in line with the views of his Reformed contemporaries.⁷

On the other hand, others have claimed that a theological position such as middle knowledge (*scientia media*) is a potential *via media* between the Reformed and Arminian, or more properly, Remonstrant, traditions.⁸ The historical problem with this claim is that Arminius advocated middle knowledge and both his peers and the Synod of Dort (1618–1619) rejected his view. How, then, can Arminius's view constitute a rapprochement between the Reformed and Remonstrant traditions? Likewise, others have claimed that despite the common myth that Arminians rejected the doctrine of justification *sola fide*, they nevertheless hold to the classic Reformation doctrine: "Classical Arminian theology is a Reformation theology. It embraces divine imputation of righteousness by God's grace through faith alone and preserves the distinction between justification and sanctification."⁹ While such a claim may be true of later Arminian or Remonstrant theology, the pressing question is, Is this true of Arminius?

The claim that Arminius was in fact a Reformed theologian originated with the work of his twentieth-century biographer, Carl Bangs (1922–2002). Bangs believed that historians anachronistically judged Arminius by the deliverances of the Synod of Dort, the first national Dutch synod, whose decisions came long after Arminius's death and were primarily aimed against the Remonstrants and not Arminius.¹⁰ Bangs gives eight reasons why Arminius was (and is) in fact a Reformed theologian:

7. Richard A. Muller, "Consecrated through Suffering: The Office of Christ in the Theology of Jacob Arminius," in *Reconsidering Arminius: Beyond the Reformed and Wesleyan Divide*, eds. Keith D. Stanglin, Mark G. Bilby, and Mark H. Mann (Nashville, Tenn.: Kingswood, 2014), 1–22.

8. William Lane Craig, "Middle-Knowledge, a Calvinist-Arminian Rapprochement?" in *The Grace of God and the Will of Man*, ed. Clark H. Pinnock (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989), 141–64.

9. Roger E. Olson, *Arminian Theology: Myths and Realities* (Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, 2006), 200.

10. Carl Bangs, "Arminius as a Reformed Theologian," in *The Heritage of John*

1. He was a native Hollander and was educated at the new national university at Leiden.
2. He knew no other church identification other than being Dutch Reformed.
3. He was a protégé of Amsterdam in 1581 and served as its first fosterling.
4. He studied at the Academy of Geneva.
5. He was the tenth person inducted into the Dutch Reformed ministry in Amsterdam in 1588.
6. In 1603 he was the first Dutch professor at Leiden University.
7. His thought world was Calvinism, not Roman Catholicism, Lutheranism, Anabaptism, or Libertinism, and his theological frames of reference were Reformed theologians and Reformed confessions. In fact he regularly expressed his agreement with the Belgic Confession (1561) and Heidelberg Catechism (1563).
8. He rejected other theological views, such as Roman Catholicism.¹¹

More recently other historians have carried Bangs's thesis forward by arguing that Arminius's "theology might properly be understood as a development *within* rather than *away from* Reformed orthodoxy" and that he is a "potential bridge, rather than a dividing line" between the Wesleyan-Arminian and Calvinist-Reformed traditions.¹²

The claims that tenets of Arminius's theology represent a rapprochement between Reformed and Remonstrant theologians, that Arminians and thus Arminius held to justification *sola fide*, or that Arminius is in fact a Reformed theologian warrant a closer study of the soteriology of Arminius. We must reassess the continuities and

Calvin: Heritage Hall Lectures (1960–70), ed. John H. Bratt (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973), 209–22, here 212.

11. Bangs, "Arminius as Reformed Theologian," 214–19.

12. Mark H. Mann and Mark G. Bilby, "Reconsidering Arminius: Recasting the Legacy," in *Reconsidering Arminius: Beyond the Reformed and Wesleyan Divide*, ed. Keith D. Stanglin, Mark G. Bilby, and Mark H. Mann (Nashville, Tenn.: Kingswood, 2014), xi–xix, here xvii (italics in original).

discontinuities between his views and the early modern Reformed tradition. This reexamination of Arminius's soteriology, however, is not a theological but historical exercise. That is, this book does not evaluate Arminius's theology against the bar of Scripture to render a verdict whether his theology is orthodox or heterodox. Rather, this book's thesis is that Arminius's soteriology differs sufficiently from that of his Reformed contemporaries and Reformed confessional norms to warrant the conclusion that he was not Reformed. His soteriology is an alternative Protestant conception.

The Plan of the Book

This book consists of studies of aspects of Arminius's soteriology in their historical context. Chapter 1 begins with a historical detour from the common whistle-stops on the road of salvation (predestination, effectual calling, union with Christ, justification, and perseverance) and explores a possible medieval source for a key element of Arminius's soteriology, namely, Gabriel Biel's (1420–1495) phrase, *Facientibus in quod se est, et Deus non denegat gratiam* (Do what is in you, and God will not deny grace). Why did Arminius conclude that, on the one hand, sinners required God's grace for salvation while, on the other hand, he departed from the common Reformation Augustinian concept of particular grace? What led him to believe that God dispensed universal or prevenient grace to enable all people freely to choose to accept or reject Christ? Why did he reintroduce a medieval concept that maintained that God would reward a person with more grace if he or she rightly used the grace that God universally dispensed? This chapter shows both that Arminius retrieved the *facientibus* and that it reshaped his soteriology in significant ways that set him on a trajectory at odds with his peers and confessional norms.

Chapter 2 examines the doctrine of predestination and demonstrates that Arminius employed the doctrine of middle knowledge (*scientia media*) as he formulated his concept of election. According to Arminius, God used middle knowledge and foreknowledge in order to determine who was and was not elect. This move affected Arminius's doctrine in such a way as to place him in conflict with the Belgic Confession and Heidelberg Catechism, the confessional norms at that time in the Dutch Reformed Church where Arminius was a pastor.

The verdicts of the Synod of Dort confirm that Arminius was out of step with these confessional documents.

Chapter 3 studies Arminius's doctrine of effectual calling and reveals that his doctrine of election reconfigured effectual calling as his peers understood it. Rather than advocating a regenerating call that was effectual and immutable, Arminius promoted an enabling call. That is, according to early modern Reformed theology of the Reformation and early orthodox periods, God's grace in calling was irresistible, whereas Arminius believed it was resistible. Again, Arminius transgressed the commonly understood interpretation of the Belgic Confession and Heidelberg Catechism, a conclusion confirmed by the deliverances of the Synod of Dort.

Chapter 4 investigates Arminius's doctrine of union with Christ. As different as his soteriology was in comparison with his peers and the Belgic Confession and Heidelberg Catechism, he nevertheless affirmed union with Christ and the *duplex gratia* of justification and sanctification. On the surface, his doctrine of union with Christ looks very similar to common Reformed understandings, such as Calvin's. But a close reading of what Arminius believed about justification and the final judgment shows that he made significant alterations that once again place him at odds with early modern Reformed doctrinal norms.

Chapter 5 takes a closer look at Arminius's doctrine of justification and in particular the role that faith plays in his view. Unlike common Reformed views that characterize faith as a metonymy for the righteousness of Christ, Arminius believed that God justified people *on the basis of* rather than *by* or *through* faith. In other words, faith is foundational for Arminius's doctrine of justification unlike the instrumental role it plays in historic early modern Reformed theology. Confirmation of this claim comes from within Arminius's immediate historical context. Many know that controversy surrounded Arminius's doctrine of predestination, but fewer know that his doctrine of justification was also a flashpoint of debate. The subsequent confessional reception of Arminius's doctrine of justification confirms this conclusion.

Chapter 6 studies Arminius's doctrine of perseverance to show how his use of the *facientibus* and his doctrine of predestination reshape the common Reformed view. For Arminius perseverance rested upon the believer's fidelity whereas for the Reformed it lay on the foundation of

the immutable divine decree, the continual intercession of Christ, and the sealing work of the Spirit. Again, both the immediate and subsequent reception of Arminius's doctrine of perseverance reveals that he stood outside early modern confessional norms. The book concludes with a summary of the key points that substantiate why Arminius's soteriology is not Reformed but rather another form of early modern Protestant soteriology.

Brief Biographical Sketch of Arminius's Life

Before launching into the study, a brief sketch and overview of Arminius's life can help set the context for his soteriology. The same year that Calvin's definitive edition of his *Institutes* was coming off the press, Jacob Harmenzoon (latinized as Arminius) was born in Oudewater, Holland.¹³ Arminius's father died around the time of his birth, but a local priest took responsibility for his early education. Around the same time a well-known scholar saw his potential and enrolled him in school in Marburg. While he was at Marburg, he received word that the Spanish had invaded his hometown and massacred his family including his mother, siblings, and many of his relatives. After he mourned the loss of his family, he continued with his education and enrolled at the newly founded Leiden University on October 23, 1576; he was the twelfth student and completed his studies in 1581. He then moved to the Academy of Geneva where he began his studies under Calvin's successor, Theodore Beza (1519–1605). His stay was brief, though, because he favored the philosophical methods of Peter Ramus (1515–1572), and his affinity for Ramism embroiled him in a minor controversy. Next he departed for the University of Basel where he studied from September 1582 through 1584.

After approximately two years at Basel, Arminius returned to Geneva in October 1584 and remained for two years. By 1587 he passed examination for ministry in the Dutch Reformed Church with high commendation from Beza:

13. This sketch follows the biography presented in Stanglin and McCall, *Jacob Arminius*, 25–46. For a detailed biography, consult the classic biography, Carl Bangs, *Arminius: A Study in the Dutch Reformation* (1985; repr., Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 1998).

To sum up all, then, in a few words: let it be known to you that from the time Arminius returned to us from Basel, his life and learning both have so approved themselves to us, that we hope the best of him in every respect, if he steadily persists in the same course, which, by the blessing of God, we doubt not he will; for, among other endowments, God has gifted him with an apt intellect both as respects the apprehension and the discrimination of things. If this henceforward be regulated by piety, which he appears assiduously to cultivate, it cannot but happen that this power of intellect, when consolidated by mature age and experience, will be productive of the richest fruits. Such is our opinion of Arminius—a young man, unquestionably, so far as we are able to judge, most worthy of your kindness and liberality.¹⁴

Arminius was soon ordained in 1588 and served in the Old Church in Amsterdam for fifteen years, was married, and started a family. During his time as a pastor he began to preach through Romans and taught that Romans 7 was not about the struggles of a Christian but about an unregenerate person, which was a departure from the common Reformed view that Paul was describing his own struggles with sin as a Christian. Arminius's interpretation generated controversy, and he was called before the consistory in Amsterdam in 1592. The following year he was again called before the consistory because of his sermons on Romans 9, but he was exonerated on both occasions.

In 1601–1602 the Black Plague spread throughout the Netherlands and took two of the three theology professors at Leiden University, Lucas Trelcatius Sr. (1545–1602) and Franciscus Junius (1545–1602). The university sought Arminius for an appointment, though local church members and Franciscus Gomarus (1563–1641) opposed his hiring. Arminius was nonetheless hired and the university conferred on him his doctoral degree after a public disputation on the nature of God on July 10, 1603. By the fall of 1603 he began his professorship at Leiden along with Gomarus and the recently appointed Lucas Trelcatius Jr. (1573–1607). Arminius's time at the university, however, was marked by contention. Trelcatius complained about Arminius, and other professors scheduled their lectures at the same time as Arminius's

14. Theodore Beza, as quoted in Bangs, *Arminius*, 73–74.

in the effort to steer students away from him. In 1604 Arminius and a student defended a disputation on predestination. The fiery-tempered Gomarus was upset by Arminius's theses and responded with his own theses.

In 1605–1606 another controversy arose when students heard competing claims from their professors. Trelcatius contended that the Son was *autotheos*, “God from himself,” whereas Arminius rejected this claim. During this time frame Arminius was elected as rector of the university to a year-long term, but on July 3, 1606, the regent of the theological college died and took with him his ability to hold the fractious faculty together. In 1607 Trelcatius also died, which meant that Arminius and Gomarus were the only two professors on the theology faculty. By 1608 continued debate and accusations were in the air, which forced the magistrates in Holland to respond. There were rumors that Arminius was Roman Catholic; Arminius had sided with Rome over and against Reformed supralapsarian views of predestination. The magistrates consequently invited Arminius to present his theological views in October 1608 at The Hague, where he delivered his *Declaration of Sentiments*. Gomarus was upset that he was not allowed to participate in Arminius's examination, and so he presented his opposing declaration before the magistrates a few months later. Despite their best efforts, the magistrates were unable to prevent further controversy. The magistrates summoned both Arminius and Gomarus to The Hague in August 1609, and they debated predestination, justification, and the perseverance of the saints. Arminius, however, was unable to complete the debate because he was suffering from tuberculosis.

Arminius returned to his home in Leiden and took to his bed, received a number of visitors, and drew up his last will and testament. There from his deathbed he offered up one of his final prayers:

Lord Jesus, faithful and merciful high priest—you who were willing to be tempted as we are in all things without sin, so that, being taught by such experience how painful a thing it is to obey God in sufferings, you can be affected with the sense of our infirmities—have mercy on me; help me your servant who is lying ill and oppressed with so many maladies. God of my salvation,

render my soul fit for your heavenly kingdom, indeed my body for the resurrection.¹⁵

Arminius died on October 19, 1609, but his theology would not die with him. His students and a number of his peers shared his doctrinal convictions and filed a gravamen with the magistrates in July 1610. Their gravamen was known as the Arminian Articles or the Remonstrance; it questioned five points of Reformed doctrine: predestination, the extent of the application of Christ's satisfaction, human depravity, divine calling, and perseverance of the saints. The controversies at Leiden University had boiled over into the larger context of the Netherlands and brought national controversy that culminated in the proceedings at the Synod of Dort in 1618–1619.

This brief biographical sketch provides a frame of reference for the major events in Arminius's life and establishes key contextual elements that assist in the analysis of Arminius's soteriology. That Arminius labored in the Dutch Reformed Church means that the Belgic Confession and Heidelberg Catechism serve as historical benchmarks with which to compare his soteriology. Was he in or out of accord with these standards? That Beza was one of Arminius's professors provides us with another point of comparison, as do his colleagues at Leiden, such as Gomarus and Trelcatius. The subsequent reception of Arminius's doctrine by both Remonstrant and Reformed theologians and churches also offers historical texture for a thicker understanding of Arminius's soteriology.

Conclusion

As controversial as Arminius was in his own day, we need to push beyond the myths, assumptions, and secondary sources and seek to apprehend his soteriology on its own terms. Through a contextualized reading of Arminius's key works, we can emerge from the sands of history with a better idea as to why Arminius is not Reformed but instead presents an alternative Protestant soteriology. Such a reading is beneficial for two reasons. First, the church can know exactly what

15. Jacob Arminius, *The Works of James Arminius*, ed. James Nichols and William Nichols (1825; 1828; 1875; repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 1:44–45 (hereinafter cited as *Works*); Stanglin and McCall, *Jacob Arminius*, 35.

concerns sparked controversy that led to the Synod of Dort. Second, outliers, dissenting voices, and minority reports place the common view in sharper relief. With these two vistas, we can see the past more clearly, learn from the differences, have improved insights for the present, and be better prepared for the future.