

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

NO. 55--APRIL, 1901.

I. CALVIN'S TRADUCERS—WHO THEY WERE AND WHAT THEY THOUGHT.

To understand a man should be the honest purpose of all who undertake to write about him. It is acknowledged by those not too friendly to the system known as Calvinistic, that John Calvin is the worst understood of all the men of history, and the best hated. Fairbairn says: "He is one of the best hated men in history; round his name fierce controversies have raged, and still rage. * * There is something imposing in the multitude and variety of aversions that converge on Calvin."

Calvin's doctrine of Election, which he describes as a profound mystery and which must not be curiously examined, but nevertheless is a profitable doctrine, calculated to destroy the very roots of pride and presumption, is the initial cause of the intense hatred of his name. In his system of theology, under this doctrine, occurs the startling statement, that God, for the glory of his righteousness, consigns some to damnation; and the expression, brought against him, "A terror-moving decree." "This celebrated place; *Decretum quidem horribile fateor*, which does honor to his feelings, has also served as the foundation of abuse." (Ancillon, *Melanges Critiques*, p. 37. People accuse Calvin, says that writer, of describing God's decrees as horrible, whereas he simply meant that we ought to tremble at contemplating this mystery; as he himself expresses it in the French version of the "Institutes." Rivett, III, in his treat-

ise "Apologeticus," says the same thing."

The system of theology formulated by Calvin is recognized as exalting God and humbling man. He says : "If that term be diabolical, which exalts man in his own opinion, let us not admit it, unless we wish to take the counsel of an enemy. It is pleasant, indeed, to have so much innate strength as to confide in and be satisfied with ourselves. But from being allured into this vain confidence, let us be deterred by the many awful sentences which severely humble us to the dust." *Institutes*, Book II, Chap. II. The majesty of God was so clearly apprehended by him in all the work of redemption that he reckoned those vain and supercilious who were bold enough to attack the doctrines which he believed with all his being. Humility was his mark for the elect.

"I have always, indeed, been exceedingly pleased with this observation of Chrysostom, that humility is the foundation of our philosophy ; but still more with this of Augustine : ' As a rhetorician,' says he, on being interrogated what was the first thing in the rules of eloquence, replied, ' Pronunciation ;' and on being separately interrogated what was the second and what was the third, gave the same reply ; so should any one interrogate me concerning the rules of the Christian religion, the first, second and third, I would always reply, ' humility.' " *Institutes*, Book II, Chap. II.

Nothing is better calculated to engender hatred for a man than a constant placing of his finger upon the pride and arrogance of his opponents.

Another prolific cause of the contempt heaped upon Calvin was his doctrine of the Will. This subject is fully discussed in the second book of the *Institutes*. He maintained that there was no such thing as free-will in an absolute sense. "This being admitted will place it beyond all doubt, that man is not possessed of free will for good works, unless he be assisted by grace; and that special grace which is bestowed on the elect alone in regeneration. For

I stop not to notice those fanatics, who pretend that grace is offered equally and promiscuously to all. But it does not yet appear, whether he is deprived of power to do good, or whether he yet possesses some power, though small and feeble; which of itself can do nothing, but by the assistance of grace does also perform its part. Lombard, in order to establish this notion, informs us that two sorts of grace are necessary to qualify us for the performance of good works. One he calls operative, by which we efficaciously will what is good; the other co-operative, which attends as auxiliary to a good will. This division I dislike, because, while he attributes an efficacious desire of what is good to the grace of God, he insinuates that man has of his own nature antecedent, though ineffectual, desires after what is good; as Bernard asserts that a good will is the work of God, but yet allows that man is self-impelled to desire such a good. But this is very remote from the meaning of Augustine, from whom, however, Lombard would be thought to have borrowed this division. The second part of it offends me by its ambiguity, which has produced a very erroneous interpretation. For they have supposed that we co-operate with the second sort of Divine grace, because we have it in our power either to frustrate the first sort by rejecting it, or to confirm it by our obedience to it. The author of the treatise 'On the Vocation of the Gentiles' expresses it thus—that those who have the use of reason and judgment are at liberty to depart from grace, that they may be rewarded for not having departed, and that what is impossible without the co-operation of the Spirit, may be imputed to their merits, by whose will it might have been prevented. These two things I have thought proper to notice as I proceed, that the reader may perceive how much I dissent from the sounder schoolmen. For I differ considerably more from the later sophists, as they have departed much further from the judgments of antiquity. However, we understand from this division, in what sense they have ascribed free will to man. For Lombard at length pronounces, that we are not therefore, possessed of free will, because we have an equal

power to do or to think either good or evil, but only because we are free from constraint. And this liberty is not diminished, although we are corrupt and the slaves of sin, and capable of doing nothing but sin."

Then man will be said to possess free will in this sense, not that he has an equally free election of good and evil, but because he does evil voluntarily, and not by constraint. That, indeed, is very true; but what end could it answer to decorate a thing so diminutive with a title so superb? Egregious liberty indeed, if man be not compelled to serve sin, but yet is such a willing slave, that his will is held in bondage by the fetters of sin. I really abominate contentions about words, which disturb the Church without producing any good effect; but I think that we ought religiously to avoid words which signify an absurdity, particularly when they lead to a pernicious error. How few are there, pray, who, when they hear free will attributed to man, do not immediately conceive, that he has the sovereignty over his own mind and will, and is able by his innate power to incline himself to whatever he pleases? But it will be said, all danger from these expressions will be removed, if the people are carefully apprized of their signification. But, on the contrary, the human mind is naturally so prone to falsehood, that it will sooner imbibe error from one single expression, than truth from a prolix oration; of which we have a more certain experiment than could be wished in this very word. For neglecting that explanation of the fathers, almost all their successors have been drawn into a fatal self-confidence, by adhering to the original and proper signification of the word." Institutes, Book II, Chap. II, Par. VI and VII.

There is no such thing as free-will and Calvin, who was followed by Jonathan Edwards, was as far along on the doctrine of the will as the psychologist who writes in the year 1901. Dr. R. L. Dabney was carrying out Calvin's suggestion when he used free-agent as a substitute for free-will as ordinarily interpreted by ordinary men.

"In respect of the exercise of volition there are two

opposed doctrines, that of liberty and that of necessity, with modifications of each. Strict necessity is fatalism. This extreme doctrine philosophers of the necessitarian school generally reject. Some would prefer that their doctrine should be called determinism. They do not wholly deny freedom, but they give it a special definition. They say the will is free when acting according to its nature, and that it is in its nature to be determined by desires. Every scheme of necessity or determinism represents desires as controlling the will, and voluntary acts as effects which follow from their mental causes as certainly and invariably as physical effects follow physical causes." Davis, p. 318.

"We are free-agents; that is to say, wherever action is our own, we ourselves determine our volitions. Consciousness so clearly evinces this, that it is almost a truism. I know intuitively that my spirit is free—in other words—self-determined in every intelligent volition. To deny this is virtually to deny that the action is my own. As Cousin well declares, no pretended argument to prove that my volitions are fated or compulsory are valid; because the premise of such argument, be it what it may, cannot be as certain to me as my intuitive consciousness of free agency. We infer our freedom again from our conscious responsibility. Conscience assures us that we are responsible for our intelligent volitions; but the reason also declares that our responsibility could not be just if we were not free agents." Dabney's *Practical Philosophy*. P. 143.

These quotations are given simply to show how the doctrine of the will must powerfully affect even philosophers in their opinions of the merit or demerit of philosophical writings. When we recall that here, perhaps more than anywhere else, theology receives its deepest coloring, and that Calvinism and Arminianism are more distinctive from the place given the will in either system than possibly from the combination of all other points of divergence, it is readily understood. The two systems are the antipodes of each other, and the poles are found by going in opposite directions from this common point in dispute. It is here that

predestination looks its ugliest. To affirm that there is an all-sufficient Will that guides all and never can be defeated or surprised; that controls every human will so that all which is willed is in accord with a fixed pre-arrangement, is to antagonize all who are of a contrary mind. Calvin felt to the last that it was his duty to contend for his doctrine. He expressed his indignation that men hated the system out of hatred to him.

Having given, as we believe, some of the causes of the intense hatred of Calvin and his system, let us ascertain who were the more prominent individuals opposed to him, and what was their manner of thought. There is quite a list of names of greater or lesser prominence: Bolsec, Caroli, Castalio, Servetus, Gentilis, Georgii, Gribaldi, Gruet, Krell, Loyola, Menno, Motte, Perrini, Pighius Sadolet, Siculus, Socinus, Stancaras, Troillet, Welsius, Westphal. Many others could be added to this list, but these suffice to show that antagonism to Calvin was something imposing. His opponents were discordant in many ways; they were, however, concordant in their hatred of Calvin.

In the limited space assigned this article it is not practicable to fully ascertain the beliefs and teachings of all we have named as opposed to Calvin. It shall be our purpose to get the opinions of those who were the more conspicuous and whose views are more generally known. We will confine our investigation to Caroli, Bolsec, Servetus, Castalio and Westphal.

In 1536 Calvin writes of Caroli: "Scarcely were four months passed when we were assailed, on the one side by the Anabaptists, and on the other by a scandalous apostate, who, secretly supported by some person of rank, gave us much to do." He, with Farel and Viret, was obliged to defend his orthodoxy against Caroli. "This dangerous, vain, and insufferable man would have been unworthy of notice had he not had the honor to excite Calvin's indignation. Full of hypocrisy he read and preached the Word of God in Paris, where Farel was well acquainted with his immoral life. Being accused as a heretic, because he in

some measure taught the truth, he recanted and persecuted the reformed. Again attaching himself to the Protestants he came to Geneva. In Basel he played the part of a hypocrite. At Neufchatel he married, and being subsequently appointed pastor at Lausanne, he used his utmost efforts to weaken the influence of Farel and Viret, who accused him of immorality. In his sermons he upheld the doctrine of purgatory, and the practice of praying for the dead."

"Caroli was deprived of his office and banished. He made his peace with the evangelical party while Calvin was in Strasburg, but again separated himself. At last he went to Rome, and was re-admitted into the Roman Catholic Church." Henry, Vol. I.

Calvin had been much disturbed by the charge of Arianism and Sabellianism brought against him by Caroli. He refuted the charge by citing his teachings "*Conscriptus aliquanto ante catechismus a nobis fuerat Gallice etiam editus, ubi sub una essentia nos Patrem, Filium et Spiritum Sanctum complecti testabamur.*" Of his banishment Calvin wrote, "That sycophant has been banished by a decree of the Senate, and now we are acquitted not only of all guilt but of all suspicion. Although, therefore, he is now boasting of the name of Athanasius, as if he were suffering for the defence of the truth, the world is in no danger of finding an Athanasius in this church-robber, whoremonger and murderer, dripping as he is with the blood of many saints. While I thus describe him, I say nothing but what I should be able to prove through competent witnesses." Letter to Grynæus from Bern.

BOLSEC.

The following is sufficient to give the reader a very correct idea of Bolsec and his relation to the reformation :

"Jerome Bolsec was born in Paris, and became a Carmelite monk. Having cast aside his cowl, he was obliged to flee into Italy, dreading the consequence of having spoken too freely respecting the Catholic Church. The Duchess of Ferrara had received him with her accustomed kindness, as a clergyman. But he became a physician, married and,

went to Geneva. There he became acquainted with many persons of distinction, among others, with DeBourgogne, who had settled in that city at the earnest request of Calvin. Bolsec was, to all appearance, a good Christian, and there are good reasons to believe that he employed himself at one time in compiling materials for the life of Calvin; traces of such a collection being found at the beginning of his libel, published at a later period. Not by any means vicious or despicable at first, this man sank by degrees into the lowest depths of error, and became the declared enemy of truth. He commenced by discussing vehemently, in the different circles at Geneva, the abstruse doctrine of election. Calvin admitted him to a conference, and explained to him the nature of the subject, so difficult and profound, but without effect. Bolsec was called into the consistory, and he was desired to consider the inconsistency of his opinion; but he refused to listen. But such an opposition could not be tolerated in the midst of the reformation. It was the well-known custom at Geneva for a minister, whether of the city or country, to preach every Friday, according to his turn, in the cathedral, the other ministers examining and deciding upon the merits of the discourse. Any individual also might at that time go up to the preacher, even in the church, and make such observations as he pleased. This was allowed in order to accustom the people to contend firmly for all points connected with the reformation.

On the 16th of October the minister of St. Andrew's preached to a crowded congregation, on St. John, Chap. viii, Ver. 47. "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." All those who are not of God resist him to the end, because God affords the grace of obedience to his elect alone. As the preacher uttered this remark, a man suddenly started up from the midst of the congregation, and combated with unbecoming vehemence the doctrine which had been thus advanced. All were silent. "How," he said, can you believe that God has determined the lot of a man before his

birth, destining this one to sin and punishment, and that one to virtue and eternal reward? It is a false and impious notion, which Laurentius Valla has started, namely, that the will of God is the cause of all things, and that therefore the origin of all the evils and all the sins which exist must be ascribed to him, as the old poets feign with regard to Jupiter. Would you make of God, the eternal and righteous one, a senseless tyrant? Would you rob virtue of its glory, free vice from its disgrace, and the wicked from the terrors of conscience?"

He who spoke thus was the physician Bolsec. The fathers of the church were cited in his speech, and he concluded by exhorting the people, in the most seditious and abusive language, not to allow themselves to be deceived by the clergy. He was probably induced to adopt this course by some of Calvin's enemies.

A curious scene now took place. Bolsec had ventured to act as he had done, because Calvin was not then present; but just as he was in the midst of his speech, the reformer entered the church. He was concealed by the mass of the people, and listened, in secret, but with astonishment to the attack made upon his grand doctrine. Scarcely had Bolsec ended, when he pressed through the crowd, hastened up to his opponent, and without preparation proved at once his prodigious powers of argument. He thundered against the antagonist with so many and such opposite quotations from Scripture, and with so many passages from Augustine—he so assailed him with arguments, that all who were present, it is said, blushed for the defeated monk. He himself, however, appears to have felt no shame."

"Bolsec returned to Thonon, where he began again to dogmatize. He was then silent for a time; he soon recommenced the strife, and was at last banished as an insufferable disputant, even by the Bernese, who would fain have kept him quiet. The worst part of his character now showed itself; he proceeded to Paris, and spoke of repentance, in the hope of obtaining a position as a reformed pas-

tor. A conference with the ministers was allowed him. They represented to him his errors and wicked course, and referred his case to the Synod, which was to meet at Orleans, that he might there solemnly renounce his errors. He appeared, exhibited the signs of deep contrition, promised to subscribe the orthodox confession, and to give satisfaction to the churches of Bern and Geneva. But when he saw the reformed church in more danger than ever of a fearful persecution, he fell back into his old state of wretched doubt, and sank deeper and deeper. He again sought Switzerland. We find him some time after in Lausanne, practicing as a physician. He was admitted to the rights of a citizen, under the condition that he should adopt the Bernese confession of faith. But he did not remain long there. Beza wrote against him to the faithful of Lausanne. He was once more received by the Bernese, but Haller being full of zeal for purity of doctrine, he was told to remove. His next place of abode was Mompelgard: he there found Tossanus, who was opposed to Calvin, and in the end re-joined the Catholics. Such was the hatred of this man against the reformer, that twelve years after the death of the latter he wrote a libel upon him, which has been the source of all the detestable slanders current in later times." Henry, Vol. II.

SERVETUS.

Servetus is ranked as a person of importance by many because of the extravagances of Mosheim in his writings about this unfortunate man. Mosheim estimates his mental qualities high; he even places them on a level with Calvin's. We have been impressed with two marks of the intellect of Servetus: the one is, that he furnished the material, which every infidel, since his time, down to Bradlaw, in England, and Bob Ingersoll, in America, have worked with; the other is, that his troubles with the Bible seem to be identically those of the extreme higher critics at the present time. If some modern writers had been sufficiently acquainted with Servetus, they need never have put pen to

paper, for he has conveyed their views to the world equally as well, if not better than, they have done.

Trechsel gives his estimate of the man thus: "He had a certain penetrating acuteness of mind, which was subsequently increased by the study of law—a powerful fancy, which held the understanding in abeyance. He was skilled in analyzing, and could annihilate by his critical acumen the notions of others, but he could not bridle his own imaginations, or reduce his thoughts to a tranquil and logical development. By his natural wit he could everywhere discover types, similes, analogies, allegories, but could not perceive the eccentricity and perverseness of his own opinions."

HISTORY OF SERVETUS.

"The history of Servetus may be divided into three periods: 1. That during which he was developing his system, and when he first appeared, a period extending to the year 1532, when he left Basel and Strasburg. 2. That from 1532 to 1553, during which he lived in various parts of France, and printed his great work. And 3. The period of his trial and death." Henry, Vol. II.

THE MAN.

"That man must indeed have been remarkable whom Catholics and Protestants equally hate; whom both parties condemn with horror; and who when found guilty by the whole world, could venture to call upon God and Christ with fervent supplications, and in words which had an edifying sound, as if, indeed, the Spirit of truth dwelt with the culprit. The smoke which arose from Champel long darkened the pure, gladsome air of the Geneva Lake. But now, after three centuries, when we only desire the truth, independent of party interests, the history of Calvin lies clear before us. Public opinion has fixed a brand upon his name. The world has done this because it has no proper understanding either of Servetus or of the character of his age. I shall relate the events of which we are speaking as fully, and yet as succinctly, as possible, and adduce all that can

be advanced from Servetus, filling up what may still appear wanting in the evidence on his behalf. The remarkable life of this man ; his genial nature ; his end ; his system, so imperfectly comprehended, even by himself, and which Calvin examined only from the point of view, which the church afforded—these have all tended infinitely to increase the difficulty of the subject.” Henry, Vol. II.

His work, “*De Trinitatis Erroribus*,” caused consternation among Catholics as well as Protestants. Of this work we will quote from Henry, Vol. II :

“The plan of the work consists mainly in an endeavor to prove the great mystery of the Trinity through the man, the historical Christ. Thus the author seeks, in the first place, to show that this man is Jesus Christ ; that he is the Son of God ; and lastly, that he is God himself.

“No sooner had the work made its appearance than the clamor against it became universal. It was felt that the seeming belief of the writer did, in reality, tread the holy creed of true Christians in the dust. People could scarcely understand how Servetus had dared to conceive such extraordinary errors in respect to a doctrine which had been so long free from attack. It was even fabled that he had made a journey into Africa and had gathered his notions from the Koran ; this idea seemed justified by the fact, that he had employed arguments from that book to illustrate his reasoning.

Servetus exhibited in this, his first work, the pride and bitterness which never left him. His principles are very apparent, and it naturally excites surprise, that in the one-and-twentieth year of his age he could undertake to attempt the reformation of religion and philosophy with such a show of knowledge. His doctrine was original. The anti-trinitarians before him were of little account. He professed that the Holy Scriptures were the source of all his knowledge ; in the same manner he asserted that they had both a literal and a mystical, or spiritual signification ; the former depended upon history, the latter upon Christ. True Christianity, according to him, had been darkened through the

Aristotelian philosophy, and a want of the knowledge of Hebrew. Paul of Samosata, he said, who represented Christ as man, had originally a perception of the truth. The doctrine of the Trinity was framed in opposition to the heretics who existed at the time when the Pope assumed the sovereignty of the church. It was then that we lost Christ. The two principles on which Servetus found his reasonings are the incommunicability of the divine essence; for God is one, and therefore the modifications in God can only be variations or forms, and not persons. God is incomprehensible without a revelation. To make himself known he sent forth two forms or manifestations, the Son and Spirit. He desires, therefore, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost to be acknowledged; but only in the sense in which the Latins use the word *persona*, as representing an outward form. The operation, which is called 'the Word,' became flesh; God, that is, united himself in this manner with man; Christ, therefore, is God, and must be adored. The Holy Ghost is a divine energy; an angel. This Trinity is not eternal, but, like the world, is eternal, according to the divine idea; ideal as Logos; real only in the world.

"This new system of ideas would have had even an attractive appearance, had not Servetus heaped terrific abuse upon the ancient faith of the Church, calling the persons of the Godhead inventions of the devil, and the triune deity a hell-hound. So much that was new was here thrust upon the world that Catholics and Protestants agreed in their expression of indignation. Quintana, offended beyond measure that a Spaniard was the author of such a work, obtained immediately an imperial order that the book should be everywhere suppressed. The Protestants were in still greater excitement. Servetus was in communion with them, and they might be accused of agreeing with him in opinion. It happened that about this time Melancthon wrote in the strongest terms respecting him to Camerarius: 'Good God! what tragedies will not the questions, whether the Logos and the Holy Ghost be persons, create for future times?' To Brentius he complains especially, that the

Logos should be represented only as the thinking Father, or as his voice. He calls Servetus a fanatic."

Considerable correspondence was had with Calvin between 1540 and 1548, during which time Servetus wrote: "I labor incessantly for the quickening of the church, and you are indignant with me because I take part in the conflict of Michael, and wish all pious men to follow my example. Consider well the passage, and you will see that there are men thus struggling who are ready to sacrifice their lives, in blood and in the testimony of Christ. That they are called angels is according to the use of Scripture. The new birth from above makes us like the angels. See you not that the subject here spoken of is the revivifying of the ruined church?"

Claiming to be a reformer, it was necessary for Servetus to measure his strength with the most powerful spirit of the Protestant party; consequently he wrote to Calvin for answers to the following questions: "Is the crucified man, Jesus, the Son of God, and on what account is he so? Is the kingdom of God in men, when they go into this kingdom—when they are born again? Must the baptism of Christ take place in faith, as the Lord's Supper; and why did he institute baptism and the Supper?"

In answer Calvin showed earnestness but disclaims either anger or hatred. He said: "I neither hate you nor despise you, nor do I wish to persecute you, but I would be hard as iron when I behold you insulting sound doctrine with such audacity." *Refut. Error Serv.*

That Calvin regarded Servetus as insincere and believed he wished to involve him in a controversy that thereby he might gain some point of advantage, is apparent in what Calvin afterwards wrote: "When he was at Lyons he sent me three questions to answer. He thought to entrap me. That my answer did not satisfy him I am not surprised." *Calvin's Tracts.*

In this correspondence between Calvin and Servetus occurs one sentence from Calvin that is worthy of all remembrance, by those who insist that Calvin taught the reprobation

tion of infants. In his defense of the baptism of children, Calvin says : " Should God take them out of the world before they could be spiritually circumcised, we must leave them to the secret dispensation of divine grace."

If ever a man had the occasion to say he believed in the reprobation of infants Calvin had it here. Servetus was ridiculing his system because it allowed of the baptism of children on the same conditions and at the age that circumcision was allowed ; now when Servetus pushes the inquiry about the final state of children beyond the age at which they could be spiritually circumcised ; that this attempt at the *reductio ad absurdum* should have been answered as in the above, puts it beyond controversy, that whether Calvin ever declared his belief in the salvation of all dying in infancy, or not, he positively refused to declare his belief in the reprobation of any in the infant state.

The following is an extract from a letter to Frellon which gives Calvin's estimate of Servetus at the time he was in correspondence with him : " Herr Johann ! I would fain satisfy your wish ; not that I have much hope to effect anything with such a man, but because I am anxious to try whether any means exist to bring him to a right understanding, or whether God may have wrought in him any change. He has written to me in a very haughty spirit, and I have desired to humble him a little ; hence I have spoken to him rather more severely than is my wont. This is all I could do ; and I assure you, that nothing is more necessary for him than a lecture on humility. True it is, he can only acquire that grace through the Spirit of God ; but we must lend him what help we can. If God be so gracious to him and to us as to render this answer profitable to him, I shall have cause to rejoice ; but if, on the other hand, he continue to pursue his present course, you will lose your time in urging me to labor for him. I have other occupations of a more pressing nature, and I shall make it a matter of conscience not to concern myself any longer about him, for I have little doubt that he is a Satan whose end it is to divert me from other and profitable studies. I entreat you, there-

fore, remain content with what has been already done, if there be no change."—Mosheim.

After this letter it may be seen from Calvin's writings that he entertained a hope that the Holy Spirit might effect the conversion of Servetus. We have space for only a few extracts from Servetus, showing his blasphemy, the charge upon which he came to his tragic end.

Calvin, in the examination of Servetus to show his blasphemy, had said: "We do not doubt, but that God upholds all things by his power, but it does not follow from this position, that there is an essential Deity in all things; still less can it be argued that the floor on which we tread is a part of the god-head, and that all the devils are full of the divine essence."

In reply Servetus said: "That is all one. Thou hast heard from Irenaeus and others, that 'being' or 'substance' is that which supports us. By moving thy foot, thou deniest that it is moved in God. Thus thou wouldst move in Satan. We, on the contrary, assert that we move in God, in whom we live; and thou, though a devil, must also move in him."

He further said: "I would fain make a list of thine errors. He who is not Simon Magus is, according to Calvin, a Pelagian. The whole body of Christians, consequently are condemned by him; even the apostles, and the disciples of the apostles, and the doctors of the church; for none of them rejected free-will, as this sorcerer has done. Thou liest, thou liest, thou liest, thou most wicked, wretched monster."

We give now the closing scenes of the life of Servetus with the part that Calvin took in them: "The proceedings had now reached their last stage. It was not lawful for the lesser council to pronounce sentence of death, without having previously conferred with that of 'The Sixty,' and obtained a majority of votes. The discussions of the council lasted three days. Opinions were greatly divided. Some of the members advocated perpetual banishment; others perpetual imprisonment; but the greater number were in

favor of capital punishment. But of what kind? The majority determined upon that by fire, according to the old law, unless the prisoner should recant."

"As soon as Calvin heard that the assembly, in its zeal, had gone too far, he called the ministers together: and they, with one voice, besought the council to soften the mode of execution. Another color, in fact, had been given to the whole proceeding, by dooming the culprit to the flames. Calvin had already said to Farel, 'I think he will be condemned to die; but I wish that what is horrible in the punishment may be spared him.'"

"We find that it was his blasphemy. his rash jesting with holy things—the insult with which he treated the majesty of God, which weighed heaviest upon him. The judges passed over everything else; such as his supposed pantheism, his rejecting the prophecies of Isaiah, and his doubts respecting the spirituality of the soul. Instead of insisting on these things, they confined their attention to that which he had said on the person of Christ without plunging into the depths of speculation. That, however, which all regarded with the greatest horror was his blasphemy; his insult of the majesty of God was viewed alike by all. Calvin in his admonition, and Farel in his address, at the place of execution, and also in his letter to Blaer, insist on this; and here the offender still remained unbending as iron. He could not be induced to ask forgiveness, or to retract his infamous expressions. Hence it was that he could not die tranquilly; and that all future generations will lift up the stone against him." Henry, Vol. II.

"Farel, who was intent upon leading his soul to the true faith, began again to speak of his errors, and then passed to the subject of Christian love. He besought him to 'repent of his sins, and to confess the God who had thrice revealed himself.' But the unhappy man persevered in his original statement, and required that it should be proved to him from Scripture, that Christ was called the Son of God before he became man. Farel answered him, but he could not be convinced of his error; he had nothing to reply, but remained

impenetrable and obstinate. The struggle was long continued, and the hour of execution drew near. Farel, therefore, and some ministers from the country who were then present, warned him, that if he would die as a Christian, he must be reconciled to Calvin, whom he had treated so unjustly. Servetus consented. Calvin was sent for, and appeared accompanied by two members of the council, probably on the supposition that the prisoner might still retract.

“Servetus received Calvin tranquilly. The solemnity of the hour of death had sharpened his conscience, and tamed his pride and wrath. Calvin himself has described these last moments : ‘ When one of the members of the council asked him what he wished with me, he answered that he desired to ask my forgiveness. I readily answered, and it was strictly the truth, that I had never sought to resent any personal affront received from him. I also tenderly reminded him, that sixteen years before, I had diligently sought, at the hourly peril of my own life, to win him to the Lord ; that it was not my fault that all pious people had not extended the hand of friendship toward him, and that this would have been the case had he but shown some degree of judgment ; that although he had taken to flight, I had still continued to correspond freely with him ; that, in a word, no duty of kindness had been neglected on my part, till, embittered by my free and candid warnings, he had resigned himself not merely to a feeling of anger, but to absolute wrath against me. Turning, however, from that which concerned myself, I prayed him to implore the forgiveness of God, whom he had so awfully blasphemed, seeking to annihilate the three-fold personality, and calling it a three-headed hell-hound, whenever mention was made of a distinction between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. I besought him to seek the pardon of the Son of God, whom he had dishonored by his heresies, denying that Christ, by the human nature which he had taken, had become like us ; and destroying the band of brotherly union between us and the Saviour, and our only hope of deliverance.’ But Servetus

gave him no answer. Calvin continues : ' When I found that I could effect nothing by arguments and persuasions, I would not attempt to be wiser than the precept of the Master. I withdrew from the presence of a man who had sinned as a heretic, and was condemned of himself.' Titus III. 10, 11. And thus Calvin and Servetus parted."

CASTALIO.

Castalio was a free-thinker, a man of much learning, and by his ultra liberal spirit was calculated to put Calvin in a worse light than any opponent he encountered during his stormy life.

'Calvin became acquainted with Castalio at the University of Strasburg in 1539-'50. He lived for some time in the same house with him, and endeavored to obtain the diligent young man, the ingenious student of antiquity, for Geneva, it always being the wish of the great reformer to secure for his church a scientific cultivation. But Castalio was determined to be a theologian also. Beza described him according to his own style, by the Greek term, *ιδιογενώμων*, self-opinionated. His residence at Geneva, as principal tutor in the Gymnasium, lasted about three years. He did not receive any appointment as a preacher, but he now began to put forth some singular exegetical opinions on Scriptural subjects. Thus he declared the Canticles to be a mere obscene song, especially the seventh chapter. It was written, he said, by Solomon in his youth, and ought to be struck out of the canon. He never considered the difficulty of setting bounds to such experiments and to what end they would lead where the Catholics were concerned. His perverseness was even still more apparent in his denial of the descent of Christ into hell, in his refusal to receive Calvin's intelligent and cautious exposition of the subject, or to consider the vast importance of a reference to the sentiments of the early believers.

Calvin was obliged to declare aloud his disapprobation of this conduct. He spared him, from the great regard which he entertained for him, as much as he could ; but Castalio,

deeply offended, wished to enter into an open discussion with him on the point in dispute. The council refused its consent, and thereby evinced its discretion ; but for the sake of truth, and not to limit the freedom of opinion, the discussion was allowed to take place in the presence of the assembled preachers. It was continued a long while, but without any good result. Castalio was now so embittered that he openly abused the ministers in a sort of congregation, in which every one was allowed to bring forward his complaints. He then took his departure, but without being obliged to leave Geneva in a degrading manner, as Beza falsely reports." Henry, Vol. II, p. 33; 34.

Calvin wrote to Farel, May 30th, 1544: "I now again see what it is to live in Geneva. I lie among thorns. There have been terrible quarrels among my colleagues during the last two months. Our Castalio, on the other hand, raves against us with the fury of despair. About sixty hearers were present at the meeting yesterday, when the Scriptures were expounded. The following passages were proposed : ' Let us prove ourselves the servants of God in all long-suffering ' Castalio now raised a constant opposition, in order to create between us and Christ's servants the greatest possible dissension. Thus he played with the words in this manner : ' Paul was a servant of God, we serve only ourselves ; he was the most patient of men, we are impatience itself ; he watched the night through for the edifying of the church, we watch to amuse ourselves ; he was modest and temperate, we have a drunken boldness ; he was persecuted by the rebellious, we excite them ; he was chaste, we are licentious ; he was himself cast into prison, we cast others in, if they but utter a word against us ; he looked to the power of God, we to the strength of others ; he was oppressed, but we oppress, and that the innocent.' What more is necessary ? It was in short a cruel, exciting speech throughout. I was silent for the moment, lest a greater dispute might be kindled in the presence of our numerous friends, but I complained to the syndics. Such a conduct marks the beginning of all schis-

matics. I am induced to oppose myself to his rage, not so much on account of the perverseness of his conduct and the rashness of his abuse, as because of the perfect groundlessness of his accusations."

The character of the man may be understood from the following :

"Castalio published a paper on the doctrine of predestination and justification, as founded on the ninth chapter of Romans. It was directed against Calvin's principles. The essay on toleration is also generally, and rightly, ascribed to him. It appears after the trial of Servetus, under the assumed name of Martin Bellius, and with the following title : '*Haeretici, an sint persequendi, mul'or, sententiae.*' Calvin aswered this work. Beza also wrote a very strong reply to it, at Lausanne, under the title of '*De Haereticis a magistratu gladio puniendis.*' He supported his views with great talent, painted Servetus in the darkest colors, and undertook the defence of his friend against all assailants. But Castalio was not yet silenced. An anonymous writing, the author of which Calvin and Beza could easily guess, appeared at Paris, under the title of '*Extracts from the Latin and French Works of Calvin.*' In this publication the fundamental doctrine of election, that which supplied all deficiencies, was trodden under foot with biting wit and the keen logic which might have been looked for from a Voltaire. Beza and Calvin, however, exhibited far greater ability in the answer, and again trod the adversary in the dust. Worth and dignity were on their side, and it can not be denied that Castalio would have done better to have been silent. It is not so much a matter of surprise, therefore, that they should have spoken severely of him in the preface to their translation of the New Testament, and warned every Christian to beware of a man 'who had been chosen by Satan to deceive the thoughtless and indifferent.' Castalio indeed, in his '*Apology*,' published in 1558, complains of Calvin's fierceness against him, and declares that he had never seen the two works which Calvin ascribed to him. But who can doubt that they were his,

when they breathe so entirely his spirit ?" Henry, Vol. II.

WESTPHAL.

We give a brief account of Calvin's controversy with Westphal, because it serves a double purpose. It reveals the intensity of the opposition the great reformer encountered, and it reveals the greatness of the man in acknowledging his weakness :

"The controversy with Westphal seems to have exercised a favorable influence on Calvin's character. He had in this case to do with a man of violent passions, who had inflicted an injustice on him. All the failings peculiar to Calvin were exaggerated, so that the latter had occasion to consider the hatefulness of such defects, and to reflect on the nature of anger and impatience. He repeatedly confessed his failings in this controversy, though not yet overcoming them ; and it is probable that he attained, in this manner, to a higher degree of self-knowledge, confessing, as he did upon his death-bed, and with sincere repentance, his too great impetuosity.

"He also freely confessed that he was often carried too far, and that against his will ; observing, as is worthy of remark, that a man's indiscretion will frequently urge him on in spite of his will. He can not, as it were, do otherwise ; he is driven forward by a tempestuous wind. Partial judges, however, would not impute to Calvin the failings, to the force of which he apparently yielded against his will. But so little conscious was he, in many cases, of his impetuosity and arrogance, and we might also say his insolence, that he could observe, 'It is easy for Master Joachim to object to me, that my language is seasoned with a black salt of vain and tasteless pleasantry, and with the biting asperity of a calumniator. If I ought to be called a slanderer, because I have afforded Master Joachim, so blinded by his vices, a mirror, by the help of which he may at length begin to know his own shame, he must address his complaints to the prophets, to the apostles, and to Christ himself, who did not scruple sharply to reprove the adver-

saries of holy doctrine, when they were seen to be proud and obstinate.'

'We are quite agreed,' he adds, 'that injurious expressions, and foolish pleasantries, are little becoming of Christians. But since even the prophets did not refrain altogether from the use of reproaches, and Christ employed very sharp expressions in rebuking deceivers and false teachers, and as the Holy Spirit continually assails such persons, crying against them without ceasing, so it is a foolish and thoughtless thing to question whether it be lawful to reprove, sternly, boldly, and with a good heart, those who have justly exposed themselves to blame and infamy.'" Henry, Vol. I.

"The agreement in doctrine established between the Swiss and the Genevese extended their influence to France, England, Scotland and Holland. In the same manner, the union between Melancthon and Calvin on the subject of the sacrament, secured the peace of the Protestant church; and there was every reason to expect its continuance, till Westphal, Hesshuss, and some others, designedly created a breach, and thus aroused the holy indignation of Calvin."

"That which was so calculated to excite Calvin's anxiety was evidently the prospect of the indescribably evils which threatened the church through these proceedings in Germany. In the case of a man like Luther, he could forgive anything, even when he most fiercely assailed the doctrine of Zwingli, and rent the church. But Westphal manifestly awakened the strife from an ignorant love of disputation; and Calvin, in order to bridle him, threatened him with the fire, but of an altogether different kind from that which consumed Servetus. Calvin's main effort had ever been to establish concord between the two great parties in the church. He had placed himself in the midst that he might bind them together." Henry, Vol. II.

"This first work, however, against Westphal was published in French, November 28, 1554, that the people might be made acquainted with the nature of the controversy. In the preliminary address to the Swiss ministers,

Calvin expresses his utter unwillingness to engage in controversy with a set of men indulging in absurdities. He would write against one of them only; and to show his contempt even for him, he would not mention his name. In his last epistle, however, to Westphal, he intimates that it was from tenderness to him that he refrained from naming him.

'This vain and foolish doctor,' he says in his French dedication, 'who has published a wretched work against the Sacramentarians, although we know better than he how to defend the sacraments, speaks also against our 'Consensus,' as if we contemplated in that document, not the sacrament, but an empty sign.' The Latin text is the more correct. We meet with the following reproachful expressions: 'This calf afterwards cites our own words, in which we openly confess, that the body of Christ is actually communicated to the faithful. He answers, that we speak only of a spiritual eating. What then? He would like, I suppose, to make it appear that the flesh of Jesus Christ may be eaten like the flesh of the oxen on his farm. Christ has a real natural body, as it was once offered upon the cross; and this is daily presented to us in the sacrament.'

"Calvin complained that Westphal had perverted the expressions employed in the 'Consensus.' 'Is he not like a foolish dog, which bites at every stone that lies in his way? This confusion-counsellor pretends that we are guilty of trickery; that we deceive the simple, by speaking of a spiritual eating. In the same manner this fine champion shows that we are all at variance with each other in our views. He has thereby done us a service; for nothing can more plainly prove that we are agreed, since all our views tend to the same end, namely that the mystery is figuratively exhibited. Even the apostles differ in their words, but this man supposes that we differ in sense. Some may indeed, seem to contradict each other; but the church-fathers and the apostles express themselves in various ways on the mystery of the sacrament.'

"'You see,' he continues, 'what grounds this brainless

man has for fabricating thunderbolts in his chamber to set, if possible, all Europe in a blaze. In one place he asserts, that the words of Christ are perfectly clear and need no commentary, when he says that the bread is his body ; but that he said this figuratively, which yet does not lessen the truth. that the bread is indeed the body of Christ.'

"Lastly, Calvin objects to him his unholy desire to involve the church in schism, whereas Zwingli Œcolampadius, and especially Bucer had agreed to the 'Consensus.' 'I will confine my answer to three words: It is the property of Satan to slander, to darken the light ; and as the father of contention, to destroy peace and break the unity of the faith. Such being the characteristics of this babblers, nothing remains for us but to designate him a child of the devil.'" Henry, Vol. II.

We leave for the reader to decide what word, if any, shall be spoken against Calvin, as we have watched him encounter his traducers. If their characters do not justify every word and act of Calvin's, judged by putting ourselves in his place, we are at a loss to say what would. It is worth much to know why a man is hated and by whom hated. It may be a badge of honor and a sign of loyalty to truth and to God to be hated.

Against the idea of the reformation the old institutions, both secular and ecclesiastic, brought all the weight of historic continuity and papal order. "Kings, with faith in their own divine rights, grew grave ; where the old ecclesiastic only troubled, the new reform threatened to overturn.'" Rome argued that having ruled the world well, she should continue to rule by historic right. She asked the question: "If Protestantism, which produced these lawless and leveling sects, be allowed to exist and conquer, what will become of our rights, properties, civilization ?" Kings joined with Rome and "marshalled armies and fought battles to end what was to them less a pestilent heresy than a disorganizing and destructive political movement."

"Under Elizabeth, Calvinism was dominant ; the Thirty-nine Articles are in their doctrine higher than the old *Con-*

fessio Seoticana; the Bishop's Bible, as sanctioned by Elizabeth's bishops, contains the true Genevan doctrine; Parker and Grindal, Whitgift and Bancroft, were quite as Calvinistic as Goodman or Jewel, Cartwright or Perkins; the Lambeth Articles are as high as the Genevan Catechism; Hooker thinks Calvin "incomparably the wisest man that ever the French Church did enjoy," and though he opposed the Genevan discipline, he had nothing to say against the theology. But under Charles, the Anglican tendency was Arminian, the milder theology and the high polity going hand in hand. The significance of the change does not so much lie in the new theology as in the more elastic political doctrine it allowed. Laud was not an Arminian simply because he was able the better to resist the Puritans by contradicting their theology, but because his theory of the Divine right of kings and bishops had free scope and could have a more justified existence under a conditional theology, than under one which so magnified the divine sovereignty as to have no place for any absolute sovereignty of man over the people of God. And Laud did not stand alone; the Anglicans, like Jeremy Taylor, Bull, Sancroft, Barrow, became the severest critics of Calvinism; and never again do we see, as under Elizabeth and James, the highest offices of the Church, held by Calvinists and representative theologians sent as delegates to help a Calvinistic synod to formulate a high, aggressive, and uncompromising Calvinism."

We slip along the line of history scarcely one hundred years, and in England the questions asked by kings and bishops are the same as those asked by kings and popes in the life time of Calvin and Luther. Archbishop Laud, as we have indicated, was opposing the reformation idea in his efforts in behalf of divine rights for kings and bishops. The public conscience answered with a stroke of the axe on January 10th, 1645. The coming to the front of that much abused, because much misunderstood man, Oliver Cromwell, was because kings insisted on having the old order, though acknowledged to be bad, restored. The ground of

hatred for Cromwell is similar, if not identical to the ground of the hatred of Calvin. The one stood solitary and alone, and brought order out of disorder in one of the wickedest cities of Europe, by means of banishment and fire ; the other, backed by an army selected on belief in, and fear of, the one living and true God, brought liberty and religious toleration from the merciless grasp of kings, by a stroke of the sword, in 1649, on the ground that the right could be conserved in no other way. It has been aptly put ; that with Cromwell and Charles it was, "Your head or mine." Let the reader retrace his steps to the year 1576, and study the famous union of Utrecht, which formed the basis of the Dutch republic, and when he understands why Philip offered 25,000 crowns and a patent of nobility for the assassination of William of Orange, he will understand why timid men, who always see double when singleness of eye is most needed, cannot help the world when human rights are being trod under foot. The world calls for its Calvins, Luthers, Williams, Cromwells, because it cannot maintain the value of every unit and guarantee the right of every human soul without them.

There is a rigidity about Calvinism that provokes all manner of opposition, and invites a variety of hypotheses to explain what Calvinism asserts as fact. What Calvinism insists on most is the sovereignty of God and the reality of the Fall. Many theological distinctions have been advanced in the hope of escaping difficulties, and rendering these facts less obnoxious. Supra-lapsarianism has been denominated the highest form of speculative Calvinism, and has been described as a philosophy advocating a theory of the divine will, which claims that that will is conditioned on the divine nature and nothing else. This theory, it is claimed, precludes anything in the creature from being capable of moving the Creator. This makes God's will the only efficient will in the universe, and consequently the only ultimate cause. Thus the history of man, with all its anomalies as regards evil and good was to be explained. It eliminates "Chance" from the universe and compels a reading of all

events through the all-ordering will. Supra-lapsarianism placed the decrees of God before the Fall instead of after it. This shifted the place occupied by the divine will in the universe without destroying its efficiency. It changed the way of looking at the origin of evil, without in the slightest changing the effects of evil in the soul. It raised the question of divine injustice without giving the answer to the question, "How is God unjust in punishing the sinner?" So far as these distinctions in theology are concerned they leave the facts, as believed by all true Calvinists, much as Calvin stated them. Calvinism will never make friends by planing down its rough lines to suit those who do not like hard doctrines and the flint side of truth. When we undertake to make Calvinism fawn, we make it a weakling among the systems of theological thought. Dr. Henry Van Dyke has tried it in his *Gospel for an Age of Doubt*. The only perfect antithesis to Calvinism is Romanism. The nearest approach to that in Protestantism is Arminianism. Arminianism rests on two main ideas, viz., equity and man. It insists that God is compelled to save somebody. Calvinism insists that God is under necessity to save nobody. In Arminianism moral principles and laws are made the condition of the divine will for equity's sake, and physical limits are set to the divine action for man's sake. Calvinism bases justice on the supremacy and rights of God, and places the rights of man over against God's rights. There is no middle ground between these points, one or the other is true. To attempt a go-between is to be involved in ridicule. We remember having heard two theological students in debate when one was trying to show the middle ground between these antagonistic systems, his opponent answered him by saying: "There are two systems of theology, Calvinism and Arminianism: there is a crack between them, and you are following the crack."

The most perfect embodiment of Calvinism is to be found in the Westminster Confession of Faith, consequently that work excites as many enemies as Calvin. Its enemies are confined to no class; they are found among non-professing

believers and infidels, as well as among professing believers, and all denominations, including Presbyterians. Such dislike, it would seem, argues for the truth of the Confession of Faith and Calvinism. Coming to our own day, what an array of names marks this dislike ! To begin with, there are Dr. David Swing, Dr. Chas. Briggs, Dr. Henry Preserved Smith, B. Fay Mills, Dr. George L. Prentiss, Dr. McGiffert, Dr. Chas. H. Parkhurst, Dr. Dwight Hillis, Dr. Lyman Abbott, and many others. Each has some complaint against John Calvin, the Confession of Faith, or the Bible. Truly it is true, "there is something imposing in the aversion heaped on Calvin."

We do not know how many people there are who are as ignorant as we are, but we confess that the literature of the last decade led us to look upon Calvin as an inhuman monster, and Calvinism as anything but lovable. This article is written to undeceive others if possible. When we have revised, or foot-noted, or amended the old Confession—if it is ever done—we will find that the "elect infant clause," and the "preterition clause," after they are stricken out will leave the facts of the sovereignty of God, the Fall, and Christ the only redeemer, as much realities as ever.

We shall attempt, in the words of others, to put John Calvin in contrast with his immediate traducers, and we shall leave for the reader to infer, it may not be possible that some in our own time still misjudge Calvin and do injustice to the system of theology that bears his name.

Later than 1835 Paul Henry wrote : "The genius and solid merits of this great reformer have rarely been estimated according to their value. It is only of late years that attention has been drawn to his talent as a commentator. We may also mention it as a singular fact, that while the world is so ready to censure the ignorance of former times, it should still have so generally retained its prejudice against Calvin. While this is shown by particular criticisms directed against him, it is equally evident from the circumstance that not a single complete biography of this remarkable man has appeared. The life of Calvin by the Genevese, Senebier,

and translated into German by Ziegenbein, and that by Tischer, are simple biographical notices, and contain even less than that by Beza, which is itself but a mere outline. Bretschneider's excellent and solid, though short memoir, in the "Reformations-Almanach," on the genius and character of Calvin, combines a knowledge of the man with that of his history. The earlier works about him are either filled with abuse, or are mere panegyrics. It was impossible, perhaps, that Calvin should have been regarded at a former period in a historical point of view. As a polemic, he could only be treated with a one-sided prejudice. Assailed with passionate violence by his opponents, a sort of church-patriotism taught his friends to represent him as infallible and immaculate. Thus he shared the fate of many other great men, namely, to be fanatically hated or loved extravagantly. But during the reign of apostasy and indifference he was forgotten or despised. Now, however, when it has ceased to be the fashion to magnify, in a spirit of controversy, the failings of the great teachers of the church or to lessen and conceal them; and when it is seen that evangelical churches rest upon a very different foundation to that laid by the mere virtues of the reformers, it becomes possible to form an unprejudiced opinion of this man, and to expect it from all religious parties, even from evangelically-minded Roman Catholics. We may now also look for justice to be done to the greatness of his genius.

"The old prejudice against him has even prevailed in reformed France, and such has been the indifference respecting him, that till now, amid all the variety of books, good and bad, proceeding from the press, no one has thought of writing the history of this great theologian. It has been no better in Switzerland. In England only has some love for the forgotten Calvin been displayed."

"May the world then, perverted as it has been by French example, listen to the fact, that at no remote period there existed in France a moral tribunal; that a sublime experiment was made there to preserve the Christian church, by a moral power and strength, pure from the contagion of a

miserable heathenism ; that the unworthy were excommunicated, whilst the church offered up its supplications for those who were thus separated from its communion—all of which may sound as a wonder in the ears of the present sensual age. Here too we might speak of the martyrs of that country, who afforded examples of fortitude not excelled in the primitive church. France will never, we believe, arrive at a proper knowledge of herself till she learn to know and to love the great reformer sent her by God. He was given to her as a bitter medicine, but she must take it. The stone which the builders rejected is become a corner-stone. He may be one of stumbling to many, but he will be also for the rising of many. In a word, Calvin is as a source of living faith, hitherto despised, but to which we now direct attention : he is also as an armory, whence weapons may be drawn for every Christian in his good fight against all the powers of Antichrist."

"We are not likely, however, to yield ourselves to the influence of this great man, unless we be first made acquainted with the task imposed upon him by God, and with the force by which he overcame its difficulties. We must live and pray with him, and see how his strength armed itself more and more for the conflict, and how the Holy Spirit led, supported and comforted him throughout his life. The only thing to be advanced against him is, that he was not in every respect superior to his age ; and that, like all other men, he had to strive with human infirmities. And if Providence should grant the church another such teacher, how would he in the present day, and after an experience of three hundred years, speak to us in the new circumstances of the world ? What judgment would he pass upon our creed, upon our systems of doctrine, and dogmatics ? How would he assail the infidel ? Would he endeavor to impart holiness to the church of Christ ? What methods would he employ to secure the church in its rightful position against Catholic despotism and Protestant anarchy ? To establish its proper relation to the State ? To restore and preserve its unity ?"

It may appear extravagant to some who read these pages, but it is nevertheless true, that Calvin was the mildest, most evenly poised of all the spirits of the reformation, not excepting the gentle Philip Melancthon.

"Calvin's life has been rarely understood, because it exhibits almost incomprehensible extremes, in the same manner as his system, which appears on the one side the impractical of systems, through the doctrine of election, and on the other the most practical, through the sternness of its morality. These contrasts in his life are partly the cause why he had such bitter enemies and such enthusiastic friends; and why no man in the world has been so variously judged, as people have directed their attention to the one or the other extreme of his character. But this renders a familiar acquaintance with his history so much the more interesting, and there is a greater charm in diligently separating the true from the false. They only can know this who are capable of feeling that the sublimest element in his doctrine, as well as in his intellect, was the deep religious feeling of which we have spoken, and that it was with this, and not from thought or speculation, that he began his career. The main source of all the false opinions passed upon this great man may be traced to the notion, that he was a mere dialectician, passionately engaged in unfolding one idea. His life in God, his love of truth and purity of conscience are overlooked, while it was these alone which determined his conduct, and exercised a commanding influence on his practice, and on his zeal for the unity of the church." Henry's Preface.

"His holy zeal was a righteous one, and it is our drowsiness only which has provoked his Christian indignation, his tumultuous and stormy feeling of duty. And what remains for the Christian if he will not use the sword? It is not by soft remedies that he could heal the wounds of Zion. He would not have gained his end, and it would have been objected to him, "If you are not yourself convinced in your whole soul, why do you disturb the existing order of things?" Morus,

"The ordinary rule by which we measure common men and circumstances, is not available in the case of great men, whose course is more eccentric." Bretschneider.

A historian of Switzerland, predisposed to the Roman Catholic Church, says : "John Calvin had the spirit of an old lawgiver ; he had the genius and qualities which endowed him on the one side with indisputable excellences, and he had failings which were only those virtues in excess, by which he completed and carried out his work. Like the other reformers, he exhibited an unwearied diligence in the firm pursuit of a single object, an inflexible firmness in principle and duty. and both in his life and death the earnestness and dignity of an old Roman censor. He very greatly promoted the freedom of Geneva, his influence often giving harmony to the otherwise discordant element of its government. Through his position and discourse he aided the progress of the human mind far more than he himself supposed. Among the Genevese, and in France, the principles of free discussion, upon which he was at first obliged to depend, and which he afterwards sought in vain to limit, produced much more important consequences than in other nations less inquisitive than the Genevese, and not so bold as the French. Hence, by degrees, were evolved these philosophical ideas, which, although not sufficiently free from the passions and designs of their authors, were sufficient to banish a mighty host of dark and shameful prejudices, and to open for the future a brighter prospect, the hope of happiness, founded on the genuine wisdom of social life."

Another writes : "Calvin was not only a profound theologian, but also an able legislator. The part which he took in framing the civil and religious laws, which have been the happiness of Geneva for so many centuries, gives him perhaps a higher title to glory than his theological works ; and that republic, celebrated notwithstanding its smallness, which has united morality to knowledge, riches to simplicity, simplicity to taste, liberty to order, and which has been a nursery for talent and virtue, has well proved how deeply

acquainted Calvin was with the nature of man, and the art of government."

Calvin's death revealed more than his life how deeply he was loved and revered by all good men. Beza thus writes of his end: "The day on which he died, May 27th, he seemed to suffer less, and even to speak with greater ease; but this was the last effort of nature. In the evening, about eight o'clock, the sure signs of death became suddenly apparent. As soon as this was made known to me, and to one of the brethren, by the servants, I hastened to the bedside, and found him just as he quietly expired, neither feet nor hands were convulsed; he had not even breathed hard. He had retained his consciousness and reason to the end. Even his voice was preserved till his last breath, and he looked rather like one sleeping than one dead. Thus on this day, with the setting sun, the brightest light in the world, and he who had been the strength of the church, was taken back to heaven."

"During the night, and on the following day, great was the mourning throughout the city. The entire state wept for the prophet of the Lord; the Church lamented the departure of its faithful pastor; the academy the loss of so great a teacher; all exclaimed in their grief, that they had lost a father, who, after God, was their truest friend and comforter. Many inhabitants of the city desired to see him after he was dead, and could hardly be induced to leave his remains."

"Some of those also, who had come from distant places to make his acquaintance and to hear him, among whom was a very distinguished man, the ambassador of the Queen of England to France, were particularly anxious to behold his countenance, even in death. At first, all who wished, were admitted; but as they were merely influenced by curiosity, it seemed advisable to his friends, in order to prevent the misrepresentation of adversaries, to put him early the next day, which was Sunday, in a shroud, and then inclose him as usual in a wooden coffin. At two o'clock in the afternoon, he was carried to the city church-yard, called the

Plain-Palais. All the patricians of the city followed ; they were accompanied by the clergy, the professors of the high-school, and by almost the whole city ; not without many tears."

"He was buried without the slightest pomp ; this was according to his own expressed desire. Beza, however, wrote an epitaph on him. He had lived fifty-four years, ten months, seventeen days ; and the half of this time he had consecrated to the service of the Gospel. Respecting his last will, the Genevese neither raised a monument to his memory, nor marked his grave with a stone. Thus, in the church-yard which is so decorated with the tombs of others, the grave of Calvin is unmarked and unknown. It will be shown at the last day. A beautiful brass medal has been lately cast in honor of his name. But his writings, and the example of his firm faith, have a durability greater than that of marble and brass ; and certain it is, that wherever a church is praying, or a martyr is struggling for the faith, there Calvin is also present with his power of faith and prayer."

"In proportion to the grief experienced in the reformed church, was the joy of the Roman Catholics. The Pope expected that he might again win Geneva to his side, and even named seven missionaries for this especial work ; but the council venerated the majesty of Calvin's character, and held firm to the truth, as if it had still the invisible before its eyes." Henry, Vol. II.

As we read these words of Beza and Dr. Henry, we recall the closing time of another life. A life lived in an age and in a land that had been benefitted by the powerful influence of Calvin : "It was in the dining-room at Abbotsford that Sir Walter died. Here, at the age of sixty-one, and attended by all his children, his gentle spirit passed away from earth ; and while his family knelt around his bed, his eldest son kissed and closed his eyes."

"A wonderful procession was that which followed Scott's body to the grave. Mourners had come from every part of Scotland. The line of carriages alone, was more than a

mile in length Hundreds of yeomanry followed on horseback In every village on the way, the entire population stood before their doorways, clothed in black. The heavens, too, were hung with clouds, as if in lamentation for the poet's death."

These two men, so unlike in life, in work, in environment, were alike in child-like faith in God and in the adoration of the people. We say Scott was so loved because he was lovable. Shall we say less, when from Geneva we hear the sound of lamentation where he, whom the people loved and adored, lies dead?

It is certainly impressive that the man who has done more for the world than any uninspired man who ever lived, should be so maligned, and that his system of thought should be so misrepresented. One is possessed with the feeling that action so violent must one day cause a reaction equally as violent. There are certain things true about Calvinism, and such results have been attained because of it, that the honesty and good sense of the world will save them from calumny and falsehood, and put them where the people shall recognize their benefactor and the sources from whence come their liberties.

Clear visioned, the world is learning through each upward struggling year, that he is prince whose life is noblest. Nobility of nature, goodness in life, and suffering for mankind the world will not suffer to be lost. We conclude this article in the words of Rufus Choate, which link Calvin's influence and every important event of history from his work in Geneva to the birth time of our own Republic.

"In the reign of Mary (of England), a thousand learned artisans fled from the stake, and home to the happier States of Continental Protestantism. Of these a great number, I know not how many, came to Geneva. I ascribe to that five years in Geneva, an influence which has changed the history of the world. I seem to myself to trace to it, as an influence on the English character, the opening of another era of time and liberty. I seem to myself to trace to it the great civil war in England; the Republican constitution

framed in the Mayflower ; the theology of Jonathan Edwards, the battle of Bunker Hill, the Independence of America."

JNO. W. STAGG.

Charlotte, N. C.

This article is intended to be simply a compilation and arrangement of materials easily accessible to any who may wish to investigate further.