

THE
A M E R I C A N
PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

EDITORS:

HENRY B. SMITH AND J. M. SHERWOOD.

Associate Editors:

ALBERT BARNES, Philadelphia.

ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK, Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.

JONATHAN B. CONDIT, Auburn Theological Seminary, N. Y.

APRIL, 1868.

NEW YORK:

J. M. SHERWOOD, 654 BROADWAY.

(At the Book Store of CHARLES SCRIBNER & Co.)

PHILADELPHIA:

PRESBYTERIAN BOOKSTORE, 1334 CHESTNUT STREET.

BOSTON: A. WILLIAMS & CO.

THE
AMERICAN
PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

NEW SERIES. No. XXII.—APRIL, 1868.

ART. I. RECENT IMPROVEMENTS IN FORMAL LOGIC IN
GREAT BRITAIN.

By JAMES McCOSH, LL. D., Professor in Queen's College, Belfast, Ireland.

If we look back half a century we find Formal Logic taught in nearly all the colleges of Great Britain and Ireland, but exercising an influence infinitely less than nothing (to use a phrase of Plato's) on the thought of the country. Some of the professors and tutors were expounding it in a dry and technical manner, which wearied young men of spirit, and bred a distaste for the study: while others adopted an apologetic tone for occupying even a brief space with so antiquated a department, and threw out hints of a new Logic as about to appear and supersede the old. The lingering life maintained by that old Aristotelian and Scholastic Logic, in spite of the ridicule poured upon it by so many of the fresh thinkers of Europe for two or three centuries after the revival of letters, is an extraordinary fact in the history of philosophy: I believe it can be explained only by its containing substantially the correct analysis of the process which passes through the mind in reasoning. Certain it is that no proffered logical systems have been able to set aside the Aristotelian, whether devised by Ramus, by the school of Descartes, the school of Locke, or the school of Condillac: all have disappeared after creating a brief expectation followed by final disappointment. It is a

forsaken me." And when the last moment came, from His lips the words of Scripture again break forth, and as David had prayed a thousand years before so He prayed His last prayer, and said "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit."

ART. IV. CALVIN'S LOVE OF CHRISTIAN UNION.

By Rev. WILLIAM M. BLACKBURN, Trenton, N. J.

Only a few lives of John Calvin have ever been written, and very few by Calvinists. No great ecclesiastical leader has been less frequently the subject of biography. His powerful name often appears in criticism and controversy; it towers up in theology; it shines in biblical exegesis; but it occupies a small place in the popular memorials of Christian life. No one of the eminent reformers is less known in his true character; his faults are kept before the people; his excellencies are often suppressed. So misrepresented has he been that, to some persons, his name suggests intolerance. If a writer, admitting the austerity of his nature, ventures also to set forth his amiable qualities, this at once rouses the jealousy of those who seem to think that biography should be the record of personal defects. There were strong contrasts in his nature, as there were in that of Luther. Each employed language too severe against certain opponents; but this was due, partly to the manners of an age ruder than our own, and partly to their uncompromising love of what they considered truth. Even if Calvin was the severer man, and if his spirit was sometimes too rigid for our times, yet there must have been a wondrous store of love in the reformer, who drew so many friends to himself, and held such an extended influence over his brethren and over the reformed churches of all lands.

The generous heart of this great man has not been duly appreciated, not even by those who, in the main, adopt the

system of theology which bears his name. Perhaps, if he had invented the system, the better side of his nature would be more frequently exhibited. His followers do not regard him as the framer of new doctrines, nor the founder of a new church, but as the reformer, who did more than any other to restore that which was as old as the New Testament. It was a Restoration, rather than a Reformation. Those who adopt this system are unwilling to acknowledge any uninspired man as their leader and their authority. They use the terms "Calvinism" and "Calvinist" under a sort of protest. They have ever been remarkable for refusing to exalt any man's writings above the sacred Scriptures. They do not bow to Calvin. They have not "almost apotheosized" him. In their adherence to restored truth, they have too much left the personal life and traits of the restorer out of sight.

Calvin was not a separatist, not a schismatic, not a mere sectarian, not a man who regarded himself as the centre of ecclesiastical unity. In his youth he wished to see the communion of the Roman Church maintained unbroken. He would not accept the doctrines of Luther. After his mind was enlightened and his soul renewed, he still hoped to remain in the old church, and be a Christian preacher. It was with reluctance that he abandoned the French idea of Le Févre, Gerard Roussel and Margaret of Navarre, that the errors in the church might be removed, and its faith, worship and discipline restored to the ancient purity. But he was compelled to give up this theory; the first great Frenchman who did, after William Farel. The Sorbonne would not permit such men to reform Romanism. He was alone. He went to the Word of God. He read "the fathers." He drew forth the elements of the system which he ever afterwards maintained. In France, in his twenty-seventh year, he began to write the famous "Institutes." In exile at Basle, he finished and published the first edition, a small work, which was very much

expanded at a later day. The world began to hear of John Calvin. A new light had arisen.

Coming to Geneva to lodge for a night, at the age of twenty-seven, and with a high reputation as the author of the "Institutes," he was there detained by Farel, by whose persistent efforts the gospel had won a foothold. He cast in his lot with the Genevan reformers, and, with the exception of one brief interval, that turbulent city became his home for life. There, as a professor, pastor, preacher and author, he became the attraction of Geneva, binding to himself in strongest cords of affection such noble spirits as Farel, Viret, Cordier and Beza, and drawing thither students from almost all Christendom, refugees from nearly all quarters where persecution raged, and scholars from all Western Europe. From Italy came Peter Martyr; from Scotland John Knox, who was surprised at the power and popularity of Calvin, and who rejoiced in the friendship which all lovers of truth possessed. Thus an extended acquaintance was formed. Calvin made affectionate inquiries of every visitor concerning the state of the church in his country, and sought to know how he might relieve the suffering, send the gospel to distant regions, and confirm the faith and patience of struggling congregations. Purse and pen, heart and soul, were given to the service of the churches of Christ.

No one of the great reformers was shut up in a more narrow corner than Calvin. None traveled less, after he had entered fully upon his work; and no one met less frequently with the leading men of different opinions. Yet his views were not contracted, his plans were not local, his efforts were not confined to one little canton. He had large ideas of Christian brotherhood. With all his immense labors, he maintained a wide correspondence. There was scarcely an eminent man, of whom some good work might be expected, to whom he did not write. Princes and kings received from him

earnest appeals in behalf of the persecuted, or encouragements to reform their States. He had a sublime confidence in the restoration of the true faith and worship. The Lord would build up Zion. Calvin was intent upon the fraternal union of all believers in Christ, whatever their creed or their church.

It has been charged that Calvin was unwilling to enter into any union "except when there was a prospect of implicit submission to his own notions;"* that his only basis of agreement was his own creed, and that "Calvinism, like all creeds which claim exclusive possession of truth, was violent, intolerant, and propagandist;"† that he made himself "Pontiff, and to speak more justly, Caliph of Geneva," and that, while claiming for himself the right of private judgment, he denied it to others, making war upon freedom of intellect.‡

No doubt Calvin had a firm conviction of the truth of his doctrines, and regarded Presbyterianism as the right form of church government. He was conscientious in his views. He derived them from the Word of God, as the only authority in matters of faith and practice. He considered that his entire system was more nearly Scriptural than any other, and that it satisfied all the wants of the church, and met the necessities of human nature. What wonder, then, if he desired to see it everywhere established? And was this a proof of bigotry, or arrogance? In this he was not alone. Have not his opponents wished to see their systems universally prevail? Yet some of them make a boast of their liberalism.

The real question pertains to the conformity of his system with the divine Word, the means employed to extend its power, and the Christian liberality shown to all who held views different from his own. We do not give assent to all his opin-

* Dyer's Calvin. Harper's Ed., p. 242.

† Froude; History of England. vii, 390. New York edition.

‡ Maimbourg; Histoire du Calvinisme, 76. Audin; Vie de Calvin, Schlosser; Hist. Eighteenth Century.

ions; we do not approve of all the means he sanctioned for the rooting out of errors; but we do claim that he had a spirit of large charity toward all the people of God. He loved them. He desired to see a united church, one united in spirit if not in polity. He sought to gather into one vast brotherhood all the forces of Protestantism. Nor did he claim to be the sole apostle of unity; if so, we might find him ringing perpetual changes upon it. When Cardinal Sadolet charged the reformers with having caused dissensions, he replied: "That is unjustly imputed to our Reformers, who, during the whole course of their proceedings, desired nothing more than that religion being revived, the Churches, which discord had scattered and dispersed, might be gathered together into true unity."

The evidence upon this point may be drawn from Calvin's general views of the Church, from certain bases of agreement proposed by him, and from his extended, fraternal correspondence. "Nothing," says L'Enfant, "makes a better discovery of men's characters, than the letters which they write to their particular friends, especially in some nice conjunctures, when they open their hearts, and depend upon secrecy." No great man has been judged more severely by his confidential letters than Calvin. Dragged from their recesses, they have been made to tell against him by citing garbled expressions of severity and denunciation. In justice to him, Dr. Jules Bonnet, and the Presbyterian Board of Publication, have given to the world a large collection of these letters, unmutilated, and aglow with sentiments of moderation and brotherly love. Thorns of indignation bristle upon some of them, but there are abundant roses whose fragrance dispels the reproaches afloat in the air.

Calvin was far from seeking peace and unity at *any* price. "It is admitted," he says, "that when we have to do with neighbors, with whom we desire to cherish friendly feelings, one is disposed to gratify them by giving way in many things.

In worldly matters that may be quite bearable, wherein it is allowable to yield one to another, and to forego one's rights for the sake of peace; but it is not altogether the same thing in regard to the spiritual governance of the Church, which ought to be according to the ordinance of the word of God. Herein, we are not at liberty to yield up anything to men, nor to turn aside, on either hand, in their favor. Indeed, there is nought that is more displeasing to God, than when we would, in accordance with our own human wisdom, modify or curtail, advance or retreat, otherwise than He would have us. Wherefore, if we do not wish to displease Him, we must shut our eyes to the opinions of men."²

But what are some of the proofs of Calvin's love of Unity?

(1.) His definition of the Church. "Wherever we find the word of God purely preached and heard, and the sacraments administered according to the institution of Christ, there, it is not to be doubted, is a Church of God." "The Universal Church is the whole multitude, collected from all nations, who, though dispersed in countries widely distant from each other, nevertheless consent to the same truth of Divine doctrine, and are united by the bond of the same religion."[†] "It is the society of all the saints, a society which, spread over the whole world, and existing in all ages, yet bound together by the one doctrine, and the one spirit of Christ, cultivates and observes unity of faith and brotherly concord. With this Church we deny that we have any disagreement." In that day this was a new and bold definition, upon the broadest ground.

(2.) The marks of the Church, which he considered essential. Although others are intimated here and there through the *Institutes*, yet he chiefly insists upon two, and these two certainly are not sectarian. "The marks by which the Church is to be distinguished are the preaching of the word and the administration of the sacraments." "As soon as falsehood

² Calvin to Protector Somerset, Oct. 22d, 1548.

[†] *Institutes*; Book iv; Chap. i, 9.

has made a breach in the fundamentals of religion, and the system of necessary doctrine is subverted, and the use of the sacraments fails, the certain consequence is the ruin of the Church, as there is the end of a man's life when his throat is cut, or his heart is mortally wounded."* On this ground he denies that the true Catholic church is to be found in the Papacy, among Jews or fanatics.

In one of his tracts, Calvin lays down two other signs; "Unity, which is maintained by the bond of love and peace," and "Catholicity." "These two signs distinguish the Church from flocks of schismatics and heretics, who break the bond of peace, and, to their own destruction, deprive themselves of Catholic union, while they prefer their own party to the whole universal Church." † If Calvin was a mere sectarian, making a new party, he thus wrote his own condemnation. If he adhered to the restored Catholic church, he laid down for himself the duty of seeking union, and cherishing brotherly love.

(3.) Christian Union was not made to depend upon the perfect purity of the Church in doctrine, ordinances, or life. Calvin drew a distinction between matters of faith and matters of opinion; between necessary and non-essential truths. "When we affirm the pure ministry of the word, and pure order in the celebration of the sacraments, to be a sufficient pledge and earnest, that we may safely embrace the society in which both these are found, as a true Church, we carry the observation to this point, that such a society should never be rejected as long as it continues in those things, although in other respects it may be chargeable with many faults. It is possible, moreover, that some fault may insinuate itself into the preaching of the doctrine, or the administration of the sacraments, which ought not to alienate us from its com-

* Reply to Sadolet. Institutes, Book iv, Chap. i, 10; Chap. ii, 1.

† The Adultero-German Interim, Chap. x.

munion. For all the articles of true doctrine are not of the same description." As examples of those which are essential, he refers to the oneness of God, the divinity of Christ, and our dependence upon the mercy of God for salvation. "There are others which are controverted among the churches, yet without destroying the unity of the faith." As examples of these he refers to opinions concerning the state of the souls of believers between death and the resurrection. We wish he had enlarged upon this point, but he asks: "Does not this sufficiently show that a diversity of opinion respecting these non-essential points ought not to be a cause of discord among Christians? It is of importance, indeed, that we should agree in everything; but as there is no person who is not enveloped with some cloud of ignorance, either we must allow of no Church at all, or we must forgive mistakes in those things, of which persons may be ignorant, without violating the essence of religion, or incurring the loss of salvation. * * * In bearing with imperfections of life, we ought to carry our indulgence a great deal further. * * * It is vain to seek for a Church free from every spot." It is a field in which there will be tares. The Church at Corinth, in which "there was not only corruption of morals, but also of doctrine," was still a true Church, and in fellowship with the Catholic body. "The order of the Creed teaches us that pardon of sins ever continues in that Church of Christ, because, after having the Church, it immediately adds the 'forgiveness of sins.'"^{*}

Of the Papists, Calvin says: "We do not deny that there are Churches among them." "In such Churches, Christ lies half-buried, the gospel is suppressed, piety exterminated, and the worship of God almost abolished. * * * I affirm that they are Churches, inasmuch as God has wonderfully preserved among them a remnant of his people, though miserably dispersed and dejected, and as there still remains some

^{*}Institutes; Book iv; Chap. i, 12, 13, 27.

marks of the Church, especially those the efficacy of which neither the craft of the devil nor the malice of men can ever destroy."² If, then, a man, still in the fold of Rome, renounced the destructive errors involved in popery, and cherished the faith of the gospel, Calvin recognized in him a Christian brother. Instances of this occur in his friendship maintained with the lawyer, Francis Daniel of Orleans, Louis Du Tillet, his former protector and fellow traveler, and Margaret, Queen of Navarre.

Here, too, was a broad ground for fraternity with other "denominations" of Protestants. They might still hold some doctrines which Calvin regarded as erroneous; they might administer the sacraments in a somewhat different manner; they might not agree with him in their mode of Church government, the orders of clergy, and the ordination of ministers; they might be Lutherans, Zwinglians, Anglicans, and yet the union of "the holy Catholic church, the communion of saints," involved the recognition of them as Christian brethren.

(4.) The formulas of doctrine, drawn up by Calvin, were intended to promote union. They were not meant to be fences of separation, but bases of union. He did not make the *Institutes* his only basis; he proposed others, under various circumstances, and one may be surprised to find that, in some of them, no striking prominence is given to those strong features which are commonly supposed to distinguish Calvinism. On the "five points" he was moderate; and, as to church polity, he was satisfied with general principles. We now refer to such compends of essential truths, and such expositions as the *Catechism of the Church of Geneva* (date of 1545); *Brief Form of a Confession of Faith, for the use of those who desire to have a Compendium of the Christian Religion always at hand*; *The Confession of the Churches of*

² *Institutes*; Book iv; Chap. ii, 12.

France, made to Henry II, 1557; *Confession of Faith, in the name of the Reformed Churches of France*, drawn up to be presented to the Emperor and Diet, at Frankfort, but which failed to reach them on account of the war; published 1562; the *Consensus Tigurinus*; *Acts of the Council of Trent, with the Antidote* (1547); *The Adultero-German Interim*, and various other treatises upon the Sacraments. We do not here refer to certain other formulas, which served as bases of agreement among those who had already a system peculiarly Presbyterian, such as the *Consensus Genevensis*, intended to unite the Swiss churches in the doctrine of predestination; and the first Protestant Confessions adopted in France, Scotland and Holland, which so fully embodied Calvin's views. These latter had respect to an organic, ecclesiastical union. We are now treating of a unity more comprehensive, and of Calvin's efforts to promote it upon a wider basis. While seeking to consolidate forces already agreed, he sought, also, to conciliate those which were at variance. It was the difference between Church unity and Christian unity—the result being, in the one case, copartnership, in the other, coöperation.

It has been said that Calvin could not even write a catechism without endeavoring to employ it as a bond of general Christian union. His object was not to set forth his differences. In his "Dedication" of the *Geneva Catechism*, to the "faithful ministers of Christ throughout East Friesland," he says: "Seeing it becomes us to endeavor, by all means, that unity of faith, which is so highly commended by Paul, shine forth among us, to this end, chiefly, ought the formal profession of faith which accompanies our common baptism to have reference. Hence, it were to be wished, not only that a perpetual consent in the doctrine of piety should appear among all, but also that our Catechism were common to all the Churches. But as, from many causes, it will scarcely ever obtain otherwise than that each Church shall have its own Catechism, we should not strive too keenly to prevent this;

provided, however, that the variety in the mode of teaching is such that we are all directed to one Christ, in whose truth being united together, we may grow up into one body and spirit, and with the same mouth also proclaim whatever belongs to the sum of faith. * * * I myself, too, as became me, have made it my anxious care not to deliver anything in this catechism of mine that is not agreeable to the doctrine received among all the pious * * * In this confused and divided state of Christendom, I judge it useful that there should be public testimonies, whereby Churches which, though widely separated by space, agree in the doctrine of Christ, may mutually recognize each other. * * * Writings of a different class will show what were our views on all subjects in religion, but the agreement which our Churches had in doctrine can not be seen with clearer evidence than from Catechisms, * * * all the faithful holding them as their formal symbol of Christian communion. This was, indeed, my principal reason for publishing this [Latin edition of the] Catechism." These ministers had requested him to undertake this labor, and to them he felt bound "by his whole soul."

We must charge Calvin with insincerity or evasion, if we do not admit that he sought Christian union on the basis of a cordial acceptance of necessary truths, whatever might be the interpretation put upon certain articles of a creed. He states some of these necessary truths "in his address to all honest ministers of Christ, and sincere worshipers of God in the Churches of Saxony and Lower Germany." For more than twenty years they had shared in the unhappy divisions caused by the Sacramentarian controversies. They were scarcely at peace when Westphal kindled again the flames of discord, by attacking Calvin. Not asking merely for their sympathy towards himself, Calvin says: "You must rather take into account the holy union of so many Churches, which that man is labouring to destroy. * * * In regard to the one God, and his true and legitimate worship, the corruption of human

nature, free salvation, the mode of obtaining justification, the office and power of Christ, repentance and its exercises, faith which, relying on the promises of the gospel, gives us assurance of salvation, prayer to God, and other leading articles, the same doctrine is preached by both. We call on one God the Father, trusting to the same mediator: the same Spirit of adoption is the earnest of our future inheritance. Christ has reconciled us all by the same sacrifice. * * * It is strange if Christ whom we preach as our peace, and who, removing the ground of disagreement, appeased us to our Father in Heaven, do not also cause us mutually to cultivate brotherly peace on earth. What shall I say of our having to fight daily, under the same banner, against Antichrist and his tyranny, against the foul corruptions of the Christian religion, against impious superstitions, and the profanation of all that is sacred? To disregard these many pledges of sacred unity, and this concert which has been visibly sanctioned by heaven, and plot disunion among those who are fighting in the same service, is a not less cruel than impious laceration of the members of Christ."*

(5.) Christian Union was not made dependant upon uniformity of church government. No one will doubt the Presbyterianism of Calvin, but no one can show that in this respect he was "a high-churchman." He did not place the Presbyterian polity among the essential marks of the true church, and yet he held that it was the only one recognized in the New Testament. So far did he go in some of his concessions, that he has been absurdly represented as a defender of Prelacy. Our point now is that he held liberal views, and thought that differences of church order were not obstacles in the way of catholic union.

In reference to Church Order he said, "Distinction is not inconsistent with union. There is nothing to prevent those who hold different offices, from accomplishing many things by

* Preface to Second Defence against Joachim Westphal, 1556.

common exertion, by jointly rolling the same stone."* In the name of the Reformed Churches of France he said: "We do not intend to annihilate the authority of the Church, or of prelates and pastors, to whom the superintendence of its government has been given. We admit that bishops and pastors ought to be listened to with reverence, in so far as they discharge the office of preaching the word of God."† He can not mean that these "prelates" and "bishops" were Presbyterians. He certainly did not mean that Prelacy and Presbyterianism had an equal foundation in Scripture. While conceding something to the one he was not the man to sacrifice the other. And yet he would not destroy a moderate prelatic order already existing, at the risk of turning back the tide of reform, or rooting up the wheat of the gospel. Dr. Henry quotes him as recommending a modified system of Episcopacy for the churches of Poland, and saying, that for a man to be satisfied with a moderate degree of honor, is a very different thing from his wishing to embrace the whole world in his boundless sway.‡

As to the mode of ordination, did he not recognize as ministers and brethren scores of men who left the Romish priesthood, and preached the gospel? They had been ordained in the Romish church. Where is the proof that they received any other ordination? Such were some of his most beloved co-labourers, Farel, Courault, and Peter Martyr; such even were Luther and Cranmer.

(6.) As to ceremonies, he said that God would make little account of them in the judgment. He laid down these rules, in the *Form of Administering the Sacrament*: "First, whatever is not commanded, we are not free to choose. Second, nothing which does not tend to edification ought to be received into the church. If anything of the kind has been introduced, it

* Remarks on the Letter of Pope Paul III. (17).

† Confession of Faith, Art. 21.

‡ Henry's Calvin, Vol. I. 401. Epist. Præstant. Virorum; Amst. 1684. p. 250.

ought to be taken away, and by much stronger reason, whatever serves only to cause scandal, and is, as it were, an instrument of idolatry and false opinion, ought on no account to be tolerated." Yet he regarded some ceremonies as indifferent, and some to be tolerated for the sake of peace. "Let us bear with a sigh what we can not correct." Writing to a friend, whose name and country are not given, and warning him against all papal rites, he says, "In regard to the ceremonies practiced by your countrymen, * * the rule which I would propose for your observance, while you live there, is that those which are not stamped with impiety you may observe, soberly, indeed, and sparingly, but, when occasion requires, freely and without anxiety, so as to make it manifest that you have no superstition either in observing them, or refraining from them."†

In the time of Queen Mary, certain English Protestants refused their assent to the dogma of "the real presence," and were banished. Some of them found refuge at Wezel, where a strange mixture of rites prevailed. To them Calvin wrote: "You should support and suffer such abuses as it is not in your power to correct. We do not hold lighted candles, in the celebration of the Eucharist, nor figured bread, to be such indifferent things that we would willingly consent to their introduction, or approve of them, though we object not to accommodate ourselves to the use of them, where they have been already established, when we have no authority to oppose them. * * Should our lot be cast in some place where a different form prevails, there is not one of us who, from spite against a candle or a chasuble, would consent to separate himself from the body of the Church, and so deprive himself of the use of the Sacrament * * And then it would be for us matter of deep regret, if the French [Presbyterian?] Church which might be erected there should be broken up, because we would not accommodate ourselves to some ceremonies that

* "Unlawful Rites of the Ungodly, &c."

do not affect the substance of faith. For it is perfectly lawful for the children of God to submit to many things which they do not approve. * * Let us lay it down as a settled point, that we ought to make mutual concessions in all ceremonies, that do not involve any prejudice to the confession of our faith, and for this end that unity of the church be not destroyed by our excessive rigour or moroseness."* To other English exiles at Frankfort, who had "stirred up contentions about forms of prayer and ceremonies," he put the matter somewhat differently, for they deserved rebuke. "Though in indifferent matters, such as external rites, I show myself indulgent and pliable, at the same time, I do not deem it expedient always to comply with the foolish captiousness of those who will not give up a single point of their usual routine. In the Anglican liturgy, such as you describe it to me, I see that there are many silly things that might be tolerated. By this phrase I mean that it did not possess that purity which was to be desired."† (This liturgy was not the one in present use.)

Here, then was moderation upon points that have disturbed the Christian Church almost from the day when "there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying." If there be anything in Calvin's views applicable to our times, when bases of union are discussed, it is hardly necessary for us to point it out to the readers of this paper. Grave questions may yet be raised concerning choirs, organs, the use of hymns, attitudes in public prayer, customs pertaining to the reception of the Lord's Supper, baptismal fonts, and the like, by those who seem disposed to be more Calvinistic than Calvin.

(7.) Union in Christ was regarded by Calvin as of the first importance. Without it there could be no union in the Church. Without Christ there could be no Church. He says of the Church, "as a man is recognized by his face, so is she to

* Calvin to Brethren of Wezel, 13th March, 1554.

† To the English at Frankfort, 13th January, 1555.

be beheld in Christ," * * * "the Church is seen where Christ appears, and where his word is heard."* "When I say Christ, I include the doctrine of his gospel, which he sealed with his blood * * * Let it, therefore be a fixed point, that a holy unity exists amongst us, when, consenting in pure doctrine, we are united in Christ alone."† (Eph. iv. 12-15). "Christ is the only bond of unity. He who departs from him disturbs and violates unity * * * We hear the Spirit exhorting us to be 'of one heart, of one mind,' but in Christ. We hear the pious admonition of Hilary. 'The name of peace is indeed specious, and the idea of unity beautiful, but who knows not that the only united peace of the church and the gospel is that which is in Christ.' Let Farnese (Pope Paul III) then show that Christ is on his side, and he will prove that the unity of the Church is with him."‡

Calvin does not mean that he was ready to join heart and hand with all who might say "Lo, Christ is here." Far from it. There must be pure doctrine. Its quality must be pure, catholic, evangelical, divine; its quantity might be limited to necessary truths—those truths which united men to Christ in all his offices. To separate the church from Christ was the greatest schism: to rend the truth from Christ, and deny it, or substitute ruinous error, was heresy. But where the truth which united men to Christ was held in purity, there was a basis for agreement in faith; and where Christ was the life of a church, there was the bond of holy brotherhood. There, too, Calvin saw a ground for something more than spiritual unity. If rightly occupied, if different bodies of Christians would take their stand upon it, and cultivate mutual peace and love, they might make it a common field of labor, and perhaps construct something more nearly like a common ecclesiastical fold.

* Articles of Theol. Faculty of Paris: Antidote xviii.

† Necessity of Reforming the Church.

‡ Remarks on Letter of Pope Paul III. (4.)

Remarkable were the closing words of his reply to Cardinal Sadolet: "The Lord grant that you and your party may at length perceive that the only true bond of ecclesiastical unity would exist if Christ, the Lord, who has reconciled us to God, the Father, were to gather us out of our present dispersion into the fellowship of His body, that so, through His one word and Spirit, we might join together with one heart and one soul." Thus, in 1539, when thirty years of age, Calvin held that Christ was the only true bond of ecclesiastical unity. The means thereto were the word and Spirit of God; not his own interpretation of the word, not the doctrines peculiar to his system, but the Catholic interpretation, the true Catholic theology. It was a grand idea, cherished in a magnanimous soul; nor was its grandeur lost in the partial failure of its realization.

Partial failure, we say, for it certainly was not total. If he had the idea of an organic Ecclesiastical unity among Protestants, corresponding to that among Romanists, he seems not to have hoped for its full realization. Although there was no consolidation of denominational interests, the foundation was laid for the settlement of divisive controversies, and for a more thorough coöperation of believers. Although the words might still be heard, "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas," the way was opening for each one to say, "I am of Christ." Christ should not be divided, nor believers divided in regard to him. And all might begin to say the more heartily, "we are laborers together with God." That Calvin contributed to this result is admitted by many who dissent from his most peculiar doctrines. The editor of the *Methodist*, in 1864, said of the indebtedness of the whole Church to the Genevan Reformer, and of its acknowledgment by large bodies of Christians, who are not Calvinistic: "They, in common with the entire Protestant world, look upon him as the most efficient assailant of the Roman hierarchy, and the restorer of the Biblical idea of the priesthood of all be-

lievers, who, in opposition to the monopoly of power claimed in the Church by a domineering and selfish priesthood, re-established the rights of the laity, and thus prepared the way for a more general and more active coöperation of the mass of Christian believers in carrying out the mission of the Church upon earth, than any former century had yet witnessed. And thus Calvin, by developing in every Christian believer the consciousness of his full rights and duties as a Christian, is justly regarded as having struck a fatal blow at not only ecclesiastical but political despotism, and as having become one of the fathers of the principle of civil and religious liberty—one of the chief and most glorious characteristics of our present civilization."

(8.) A union in the doctrine of the sacraments was earnestly sought by the Genevan Reformers. Concerning Baptism there was little disagreement among the evangelical churches of his day. Calvin's views in the *Institutes* would have been generally acceptable. The mode was scarcely a matter of discussion. In the formulas put forth by him as bases of agreement, he strenuously maintained the right of little children to receive this sacrament, while denying it regenerative power. In the French Confession of 1562 he was silent as to the mode. In the Genevan catechism he seems to leave the matter open, saying that "a figure of death is set before us, when the water is poured upon the head, and the figure of a new life, when, instead of remaining immersed under water, we only enter it for a moment as a kind of grave, out of which we instantly emerge."

The nature of the Lord's Supper—the presence of Christ in it—gave rise to most deplorable controversies among the early reformers. One is surprised at the amount of literature upon that subject. Calvin entered upon it rather in the spirit of conciliation than of debate. His statements are many and full, varying in phraseology, and comprehending all the points at issue. He labored to present a form of statement

which all parties could accept in good faith, thus furnishing a rallying point for all men of moderate views, and calming the violence of those who were most deeply committed in the strife. Into the history of the case we can not now enter, nor have we space for satisfactory quotations from his own writings. We now have to do with the spirit of the man, and the results attained.

In 1540 he published a "Treatise on the Lord's Supper," which was welcomed and commended in quarters unexpected. Even Luther spoke of it in terms alike honorable to himself and gratifying to the heart of the author. It is reported that the great German Reformer said of Calvin, upon reading part of the book, "I might have entrusted the whole affair of this controversy to him from the beginning. I confess my part. If my opponents had done the like, we should soon have been reconciled." He regarded the statement of the doctrine as "fitted to restore union to the distracted Church. And as Luther inclined to Calvin, so did Calvin to Luther. He twice declared his assent to the Augsburg Confession, and stated that, in his opinion, the formulary of the Zurich union contained whatever was found in the Confession."* We know, however, that when Calvin saw the Papists using the Augsburg Confession as a trap, in which to catch the French Protestants, he opposed its adoption with considerable zeal.

After much zealous effort there was obtained, in 1549, a "mutual consent of the churches of Zurich and Geneva as to the Sacraments." This celebrated document, the *Consensus Tigurinus*, proved as oil upon the waters. In it he says: "Though we distinguish, as we ought, between the signs and the things signified, yet we do not disjoin the reality from the signs. * * * The substance of water, bread, and wine, by no means offers Christ to us, nor makes us capable of his spiritual gifts. * * * Faith makes us partakers of

* Henry's Calvin; Vol. ii, pp. 98, 99.

Christ. * * * [In the Lord's Supper] we must guard against the idea of any local presence. For while the signs are present in this world, are seen by the eyes, and handled by the hands, Christ, regarded as man, must be sought nowhere else than in heaven," and yet Christ was really present, spiritually, divinely, in the Supper. "When it is said that Christ, by our eating of His flesh and drinking of His blood, which are here figured, feeds our souls through faith by the agency of the Holy Spirit, we are not to understand it as if any mingling or transfusion of substance took place, but that we draw life from the flesh once offered in sacrifice, and the blood shed in expiation."

Calvin did more to settle the Sacramentarian controversy than any other man. His doctrine has been adopted, generally, by the churches on which was conferred the title of "Reformed." As he saw it gaining ground, and yet vehemently opposed by certain Lutherans, he exclaimed: "Would that Luther were now alive!" His soul was cheered by hope of Christian union. One great barrier was moved.

(9.) A union in the truth would be a union against all great errors. This Calvin sought with zeal. He wished to see a league of all Protestants—not an external one, such as was dreamed of by Philip of Hesse, but one spiritual and informal. He felt the importance of having a strong force, united in faith and spirit against Popery, fanaticism and infidelity. There was a common danger calling for a wise and just suppression of minor differences on the approach of an exterminating foe. There was a common ground upon which all Protestants might gather in harmony and strength.

It was galling to such a mind as Calvin's to see the holy truth in danger of being arrested in its march, and even trampled in the dust, because its advocates were wasting, upon sectarian questions, the energies which ought to have been expended against the legions of error. Why should not the Truth bind together all believers in Christ, and thus form an

invincible host for its defence? Yet there were serious difficulties. Even matters of conscience were in the way. He felt them in himself, and he was not the man to make compromises upon the sacrifice of any essential principle of divine truth. Honest convictions must be sacredly respected. Yet there were differences which might be conceded without a sacrifice of truth. Writing of the ^{ex}immoderation of Luther, he said to Melancthon: "Where there exists so much division and separation as we now see, it is, indeed, no easy matter to still the troubled waters and bring about composure. But were we all of that mind we ought to be, some remedy might, perhaps, be discovered." * If an overbearing spirit appeared "as the early blossom in the springtide of a reviving church," the worst results must be expected. He sought peace. Hence his advice to the Lutheran churches: "Keep your smaller differences; let us have no discord on that account; but let us march in one solid column, under the banners of the Captain of our salvation, and, with undivided counsels, pour the legions of the cross upon the territories of darkness and of death."

This grand idea was worthy of the greatest theologian of his age, and worthy of his theology. Happy the day of its revival in all Christian denominations! It is one sign of their catholicity. Its general utterance in this country is a token of good to the whole American church. If present movements should result in no organic unity of the Presbyterian family, yet, if we be obedient to the divine voice that rouses the various battalions of God's host, there must be formed a spiritual alliance against the encroaching forces of sleepless error.

Such an alliance of the people could not be effected unless their leaders were in harmony. Calvin sought this fraternal concord. In this he was behind no man of that controversial age; indeed, he was far in the advance. To Cranmer, whom he styled "most illustrious Archbishop," he declared that it

* Letter, 28th June, 1545.

"is to be ranked among the chief evils of our time, that the churches are so divided, that human fellowship is scarcely now in any repute among us, far less than Christian intercourse, which all make a profession of, but few sincerely practice. If men of learning conduct themselves with more reserve than is seemly, the very heaviest blame attaches to the leaders themselves. * * * Thus it is that the members of the Church being severed, the body lies bleeding. So much does this concern me, that, could I be of any service, I would not grudge to cross even the seas, if need were, on account of it. * * * Now, seeing that a serious and properly adjusted agreement, between men of learning, upon the rule of Scripture, is still a desideratum, by means of which churches, though divided on other questions, might be made to unite, I think it right for me, at whatever cost of toil and trouble, to seek to attain this object." *

In the many letters written to eminent men, who were not "Calvinists," we see the depth and sincerity of this fraternal spirit. The friendships of Calvin were extraordinary; he chided with severity and yet loved with fervor. Our limited space forbids the quotation of many passages pressing upon us. To Luther, upon whom he had made some severe criticisms in confidential private correspondence, and who still felt the wounds received in the Sacramentarian controversy, he offered the hand of fellowship; and, in his only letter to this "much respected father in the Lord," he says: "Would that I could fly to you, that I might, even for a few hours, enjoy the happiness of your society. I would prefer to converse personally with yourself. But seeing that it is not granted to us on earth, I hope that shortly it will come to pass in the kingdom of God. Adieu, most renowned Sir, most distinguished minister of Christ, and my ever-honorable father. The Lord himself rule and direct you by His own spirit, that you may persevere even unto the end, for the com-

*Calvin to Cranmer, April, 1552.

mon benefit and good of his own Church."* And, yet, Luther was so irritated against the Swiss theologians, and so suspicious of everything from that quarter, that Melancthon either did not venture to show him the letter, or Luther was not willing to receive it.

Early in his ministry Calvin wrote: "What ought we rather, dear Bullinger, to correspond about, at this time, than the preserving and confirming, by every possible means in our power, brotherly kindness among ourselves."† Thenceforth, the successor of Zwingli saw, "eye to eye," with Calvin. One more specimen; it shall be from a letter to Melancthon: "It greatly concerns us to cherish, faithfully and constantly to the end, the friendship which God has sanctified by the authority of his own name, seeing that herein is involved either great advantage or great loss even to the whole Church. For you see how the eyes of many are turned upon us, so that the wicked take occasion, from our dissensions, to speak evil, and the weak are only perplexed by our unintelligible disputations. * * * * Think how painful it would be for me to be estranged from that man whom I both love and esteem above all others, and whom God has not only nobly adorned with remarkable gifts, in order to make him distinguished in the eyes of the whole Church, but has also employed him as His chief minister for conducting affairs of the highest importance. And surely it is indicative of a marvelous and monstrous insensibility, that we so readily set at nought that sacred unanimity, by which we ought to be bringing back into the world the angels of heaven."‡ If such be Calvinistic love, let it be co-extensive with Calvinistic faith, and they will work wonders by uniting the hearts and the energies of the leaders in the Church.

* Letter of January 21, 1545.

† Letter dated, Strasburg, 12th March, 1539.

‡ Letter of 28th November, 1552.

(10.) Calvin went still farther. The conciliation of parties, and the fraternization of the whole Protestant church became a sort of ruling passion with him. Especially did he seek a mutual agreement among all the Reformed churches. Rome was holding her Council of Trent, in order to consolidate all her forces. Division had been threatening her camp. Quarrels had threatened her visible unity. Doctors had begun to disagree. Priests had dared to make the Bible popular. Certain cardinals were tinctured with ideas of reform. The great Council was to unite all parties, so that Sorbonnist and student, Jesuit and "gospeller," conservative and radical, inquisitor and inquirer, might all go again to their work with a new zeal for the Papacy. And why should not Reformed Protestantism gather her forces? Why not hold her general council? If the question did not originate with Calvin, he, at least, gave it worthy consideration.

The doctrines of Calvin had gained a wide prevalence. With irresistible force they had taken hold of the minds of men. Little Geneva was now great in the earth. The old city had wrought a new order of things. Calvinism had arisen on the borders of Italy, Germany and France, and extended in all directions. It had gone into Poland and Hungary. It was filling Holland and England. Among the Scotch and French it was working a revolution under John Knox and the Huguenots, and if they were about to use the sword, it was because the persecution had put it into their hands.

A voice was heard from England. Archbishop Cranmer had recently been convinced that the Swiss churches held the true view of the sacraments. In vain had been his overtures to Luther, because Luther could do nothing openly in England so long as Henry VIII was living, and now he looked to Geneva. Writing to Calvin, he asked: "As our adversaries are holding their councils at Trent, to establish their errors, shall we neglect to call together a goodly synod, for the refu-

tation of error, and for restoring and propagating the truth."* Calvin replied: "Would that it were attainable to bring together into some place, from various churches, men eminent for their learning, and that, after having carefully discussed the main points of belief, one by one, they should, from their united judgments, hand down to posterity the true doctrine of Scripture."†

Why did not the matter proceed farther? In the absence of documents which might reveal the true reason, two conflicting surmises have been broached. Mr. Dyer thinks that Calvin was "never very sanguine about such projects" unless he could carry all before him, and that possibly his views of the "impracticability of a union were more clear-sighted and correct than those of the Archbishop, owing to his superior opportunities for closer observation, and more practical knowledge;" therefore he simply gave "a civil excuse" and did nothing.‡ Mr. Froude, in his intense hatred of Calvinism—one of the striking features of his history—supposes that England had a similar aversion, and was unwilling to permit such a conference. It might restore "a clergy" to England. It might introduce the Genevan system, a thing very terrific to Mr. Froude, who can not let slip the chance of saying, that, "to the Church of Calvin, as well as to the Church of Rome, the darkest breach of the moral law was venial in comparison with errors of opinion," and England might expect some woe-ful result "from restoration of clerical authority."§ As the historian did not live in those times, we shall not accept his explanation, especially since men who did then live, gave no hint of any English animosity among Protestants toward Calvin. Nor did they suspect any such terrors in his system. True, there were persons who feared Calvin; they were the

* Zurich Letters, Parker Soc. Ed. i, 322.

† Calvin's Letters, April, 1552.

‡ Dyer's Calvin, p. 244.

§ Froude's England. Vol. 411.

papists, and there is some ground of suspicion that Bishops Gardiner and Bonner thwarted the peaceful scheme; that they, indeed (in this case or in another shortly after), feigned to be friends of the reform, and after intercepting his letters, "checked him and slighted his proposals."^{*} This rudeness cooled his zeal, so that he made no farther advances. Four months after the proposal, Calvin acknowledged to Cranmer that there was no prospect of a conference of learned men, and commended his plan "to make the English frame for themselves, without delay, a religious constitution." How free from the spirit of interference, and how democratic in his ideas! They did frame a religious constitution, after Cranmer had breathed out his life in the flames, and under the cautious Elizabeth. They heartily adopted Calvin's doctrines, in the main, as the Liturgy, the Thirty-nine Articles and the Homilies abundantly show. The unity of faith, which he sought, was finally attained. After Calvin also had gone to his rest, the bonds of fellowship were strong between Geneva and Canterbury.

Thus far we have dwelt chiefly upon Calvin's love for union in catholic truth, in brotherly love, in Christ, in the sacraments, in a general inorganic league against error, and in fraternal bonds with the leading men of the reformation. This tells powerfully on behalf of the tone of his mind, the temper of his nature, the deep and wide-reaching affections of his heart. He loved the Church—loved it as the whole family of God. Ever seeking closer union, if he could not secure one which was ecclesiastical, he sought the best that the circumstances would permit. And who would put the spiritual below the organic? Not a churchman, but a *Christ-man*, he exerted himself to bring the people of God into the recognition of their unity, having "one Lord, one faith, one baptism."

* Strype's Life of Parker. p. 70.

It was characteristic of him. It ought to be added as a sixth "point" of Calvinism.

(11.) Of his efforts to promote ecclesiastical unity—unity in Presbyterianism—we need say little. Of course he sought it. If he had not loved his own denomination, his own family, there would have been little confidence in the sincerity of his love for the Church in general. If he had not labored to promote and extend it, he could scarcely have commanded the respect of friends or foes, or carried weight into the wider sphere. He who neglects his own particular church to promote Christian union, may work zealously, but it is vanity to himself, and perhaps vexation of spirit to others. Calvin found Geneva turbulent, and the new church discordant. He lived to see the latter united, powerful, attractive, a refuge for exiles, a model for thousands of other organizations. In sessions, presbyteries, and synods, his harmonizing power was felt; not always through gentleness, we admit; not sometimes without more severity than would be agreeable to us; yet always with an honest desire to secure peace and brotherhood. For the closer union of the French churches he toiled as one who would compensate for his absence from his native land. The exile had more real power in France, the last five years of his life, than any man in it. In churches, in synods, in conferences, if not in national councils, the voice of the absent man was heard, his hand was seen, his heart was there. On a St. Bartholomew's day a grand church reeled and almost fell by slaughter; purged by blood from state politics, a glorious church stood forth again by the nurturing grace of God.

Need we more than cite the names of Scotland and the Netherlands, Ireland and North America? Thither went Calvinism, with her vigor of thought and liberty to men. Can we also say with Calvin's love of unity? Has it been maintained even in the Presbyterian family? Was it cherished in Scotland, where the work of disruption first began with alarming power? There forms of doctrine were not composed, or em-

ployed, to heal divisions, but to justify or to strengthen them; not to serve as bases of reconciliation, but as middle walls of partition to separate the fold. Instead of meeting on the common ground of the Confession of Faith, the parties stood upon platforms, made of their own interpretations of it, or of doctrines contained in other forms. The causes were to be found in the State, as well as in the Church. The difficulties were complicated. But so far as doctrines were concerned, the Westminster Confession did not serve as a *Consensus*, as it was originally designed; although the Assembly prohibited all presbyteries from requiring subscription to any formula but such as had been expressly approved by the Assemblies of the church. The question too often was: Who believes, or who disbelieves, the "Auchterarder Creed," the "Marrow of Modern Divinity," or the writings of Boston, Baxter, and Marshall? New declarations and testimonies were made the tests of orthodoxy and discipline. Protests were offered, then followed secession.* It may have been necessary; we are not passing judgment upon the movement. It may have been the least of two evils. Between "Moderatism" and a sound living faith, there may have been no room for the conservative principle. Yet it was "a deplorable secession." We are simply presenting the historic fact, and it is remarkable that the Confession of Faith was still retained by each party. This was the case in all the divisions among the Scottish Presbyterians. There it still remains, a true basis of reunion. Men are looking at it, and beginning to ask, if they can not meet upon that common ground, and establish again the organic, visible, unity.

In this country, the history of Presbyterianism has not been very dissimilar. In all the divisions which she has experienced was it not too much forgotten that the Westminster Confession of Faith was not intended to be so much defensive

* Hetherington's Hist. Ch. Scotland. ch. ix.

as conciliatory? In the first view each party might quote it in array against the other; in the second both parties might claim to accept it as the system of doctrine, and be reconciled. Division came during the last century, and still the good old Formula was so broad that it not only was the platform of each "branch," but it bridged over the chasm between them. Disputes about other matters and other presentations of doctrine—such as the famous "Nottingham Sermon"—died away. But the mutually accepted Confession could not pass away. Its face began again to look conciliatory. It was a peacemaker, as sound doctrine ought ever to be. There was the bond of visible unity, and the key note of reunion was struck as soon as the parties were ready to say: "Both Synods, having always approved and received the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechism, as an orthodox and excellent system of Christian doctrine, founded on the word of God, we do still receive the same as the profession of our faith—" They honestly said it, and were one.

Again, we have divisions among us. But there still remains the one common inheritance, the one true and tried bond of peace, that noble Confession, as conciliatory as if the spirit of Calvin were embodied in it, and so qualified by its birth, its history, and its quiet triumphs over discord, that it has authority to require and effect the union of all who have ever held it as the symbol of their faith. It has not passed away. It has not lost its power. It has not been changed by any truly Presbyterian body, professing to be Calvinistic. Nothing need be added to it, nothing taken from it. Guarded by all with a sacred jealousy, no thorough Presbyterian would dare to strike from it a line, or interpolate a word. Here it is, the declared system, and, with the majority, the defined system of the several Presbyterian bodies, which are seeking a basis of union. Wonderful is the Providence which has

preserved it intact. It was intended to promote agreement and liberality of sentiment. We think it no venture to affirm that, with all her external divisions, the entire Presbyterian family is behind no other in acknowledging the unity, and advancing the brotherhood of the Church of Christ.

The present movements, in this and in other lands, for fraternal correspondence, and agreement in essential doctrines, and even for ecclesiastical oneness, among so many denominations, are not so new as some may imagine. They do not spring out of the age. They are not as contributions of modern progress to the Church. They are not lessons learned in a scientific or national school. They are not the result of a relaxed orthodoxy, a yielding theology. They are restorations of an older spirit, which was manifest when theology is supposed to have been vigorous enough. That spirit was characteristic of the early Christians, who, however, did not merely seek unity; they had it. We need not fear the consequences of its restoration. It is in accordance with a sound faith. It is Calvinistic—not to say Christlike. We call no man master. We take no man's name upon us. We remember how the Lord said: "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren."