



Engr. by W. A. Doolman

JOHN CALVIN.

———— GEORGE S. SMITHSON

THE
LIFE OF JOHN CALVIN.

COMPILED FROM

AUTHENTIC SOURCES, AND PARTICULARLY
FROM HIS CORRESPONDENCE.

BY THOMAS H. DYER.

With a Portrait.

NEW YORK:
HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS,
82 CLIFF STREET.

1850.

7.11.1850.

P R E F A C E.

THE following narrative is founded, as much as possible, on Calvin's correspondence; and, wherever it was practicable, he has been left to speak for himself. Where that could not be done, recourse has been chiefly had to Ruchat's elaborate History of the Reformation in Switzerland,* and to Dr. Paul Henry's recently published biography of Calvin.† Considerable information has also been gathered from the Lives of Farel and Beza, from the pens of Kirchofer and Schlosser; and, for the nature of Calvin's intercourse with Servetus, and other Antitrinitarians, from Mosheim's very ample account of Servetus in the second volume of his "*Ketzer-Geschichte*," and from Trechsel's work, "*Die Antitrinitarier*." In the last are given the minutes of Servetus's trial

* *Histoire de la Réformation de la Suisse*, nouvelle Ed., 7 vols., 8vo, Nyon, 1835-1838.

† *Das Leben J. Calvins des grossen Reformators*, 3 b., 8vo., Hamburg, 1835-1844.

at Geneva, from a copy in the Archives of Berne; and as these differ only in the orthography from the account recently published by M. Rilliet, from the original documents,* the author has less reason to regret that he was unable to procure the latter work. In order to verify as much as possible the facts stated in the course of the narrative, the extracts from the Registers, or Council Book of Geneva, published by M. Grénus, in his "*Fragmens Historiques*," and "*Biographiques*," have also been consulted.

Before the publication of Dr. Henry's Life of Calvin, no adequate biography of him can be said to have existed; but that work presents materials abundantly sufficient to satisfy the most minute inquirer into the actions and opinions of the Genevese Reformer. Its appearance in an English dress, from the pen of Dr. Stebbing, might seem to supersede the necessity for another work on the same subject, and, had that gentleman's book been published earlier, the present one would probably have never been undertaken; but the greater part of it was written, and a considerable portion already in the hands of the publisher, before Dr. Stebbing's translation was announced.

There were circumstances, moreover, which did

* See P. Henry, *Leben Calvins*, iii., Beil. 3.

not discourage the author from proceeding. Without entering into any minute criticism of Dr. Stebbing's version, it may at least be said that it does not place the original work fully and fairly before the English public; the greater part of the notes, and nearly all the appendices, which form together about a third part of it, being omitted. These contain letters and other documents which do not always bear out the statements in the text. The original work itself, too, seemed liable to some objections. The author is far from charging Dr. Henry with any intentional want of candor; for which quality, on the contrary, considering that he is so ardent an admirer of Calvin's character, he is remarkable: but the bias of a probably unconscious prejudice has evidently led him now and then to keep some circumstances in the background, and to represent others in a light not entirely in accordance with the evidence. The form of his work, too, did not seem well adapted to the taste of an English reader; a remark which may, perhaps, be justified by the fact, that Dr. Henry himself has thought it necessary to apologize for its diffuseness and want of connection.*

As the nature and extent of Calvin's intercourse with the Anglican church, and with the Marian

* See the Prefaces to his second and third volumes.

exiles, can not but be of interest to an English reader, considerable attention has been devoted to this part of the subject; on which the author ventures to hope that more information will be found than is contained in Dr. Henry's work, or in any other biography of Calvin.

LONDON, 1849.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION—Calvin's Birth and Childhood—His Education—Conversion to Protestantism—State of Religion in France—The Sorbonne—Alarm inspired by the Reformation—Persecutions—Margaret de Valois—The Reuchlinists and Erasmus—Calvin's first Essays as a Reformer—Flight from Paris—Returns to meet Servetus—The Placards—Calvin flies to Basle—First Edition of the "Institutes"—Visits Ferrara—His Arrival at Geneva..... 13

CHAPTER II.

Some Account of Geneva—Farel's Arrival there—Sketch of Farel's Life—His Labors at Geneva and Expulsion from that City—Froment succeeds him—Disturbances—Return of the Bishop—Guy Furbity—Dissolution of the Monasteries—Reformation established—Genevese Constitution—Calvin joins Farel—Disputation of Lausanne—Anabaptists—Caroli—Accuses Calvin of Arianism—Caroli's Banishment and Apostasy—Calvin and Farel's Orthodoxy suspected—Their Scheme of Discipline—Manners of the Genevese—They revolt against the Discipline—French Intrigues—Synod of Lausanne—Inflexibility of Farel and Calvin—Their Banishment from Geneva—They appeal to the Synod of Zurich—Berne intercedes for them..... 43

CHAPTER III.

Calvin proceeds to Basle—Accepts a Ministry at Strasburgh—Writes to the Church of Geneva—Attends a Diet at Frankfort—His pecuniary Difficulties—His Marriage—Literary Labors at Strasburgh—Caroli again—Diets of Hagenau and Worms—Diet of Ratisbon—State of Parties at Geneva—The new Pastors despised—Disorders—Negotiations for Calvin's Restoration—He reluctantly returns to Geneva..... 84

CHAPTER IV.

Calvin visits Neuchâtel—His Reception at Geneva—State of the Church there—Farel invited—Calvin's Ecclesiastical Polity—Church and State—The Consistory—Service of the Church—Presbyterianism—Calvin's Idea of the Priesthood—Method of upholding it—Practical Discipline—His Scheme not perfected—Calvin's Civil Legislation—Rigor of his Laws 111



L I F E

OF

J O H N C A L V I N.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION—Calvin's Birth and Childhood—His Education—Conversion to Protestantism—State of Religion in France—The Sorbonne—Alarm inspired by the Reformation—Persecutions—Margaret de Valois—The Reuchlinists and Erasmus—Calvin's first Essays as a Reformer—Flight from Paris—Returns to meet Servetus—The Placards—Calvin flies to Basle—First Edition of the "Institutes"—Visits Ferrara—His Arrival at Geneva.

THE great and manifold blessings attending the Reformation were not unalloyed with serious evils, the chief of which were the dissensions that arose among the Reformers themselves. The pretended infallibility of the Romish Church had, at least, secured unity. The right of private judgment, the active principle of the Reformation, was a standard that necessarily varied according to the temper, the understanding, or the knowledge of different men; and hence arose a variety of sects, of some of which the tenets were dangerous alike to civil government, and to those principles of morality and order which are the foundation of society. But of these unwholesome products of the Reformation, some were too extravagant and fanatical, others too cold and speculative, to establish a durable or extensive empire over the hearts and understandings of mankind. The greater part of them either withered shortly after their birth, or obtained only a scanty number of followers. The chief harm that followed from them was, that they threw discredit upon the Reformation; furnished the Papists with their stock argument against it; and produced distrust and intolerance among the Protestants themselves.

The same principle that produced these excrescences, though not pushed to such extravagant results, ultimately divided the

Protestant Church into the three main denominations of Lutherans, Anglicans, and Calvinists. It was, indeed, impossible that the spirit of the Reformation should be bounded by the views of Luther. Notwithstanding his personal boldness, in matters of doctrine and discipline Luther was a timid and cautious innovator. Several years after 1517, when he first began to preach against indulgences, we find him still tolerating the invocation of saints, and addressing his prayers to the Virgin Mary.¹ The establishment of his doctrine of justification seems to have been at first his only object. Step by step he was led to further reforms; but at the outset of his career, he appears to have formed no clear and definite notion of the extent to which he should push them; and in one important article, that of the local presence in the eucharist, though he slightly modified the Romish doctrine, he never, as is well known, entirely departed from it.

Before Luther began his career, another Reformer had already started up in Switzerland, possessing bolder views, and a more philosophical method. Zwingli began by laying down the abstract general principle that the Scriptures contain the sole rule of faith and practice, and that whatsoever is not found in them is either false or superfluous. When his auditors were become familiar with this doctrine, it was easy for him to proceed to its legitimate consequences, and to prove the fallacy of the mass, of the invocation of saints, of the worship of images, and of the other countless abuses of Popery.²

The rejection, however, of the grand Romish dogma of the Real Presence was first publicly advocated by one of Luther's own followers. That dogma had, indeed, been questioned in private circles before Carlostadt began to preach against it;³ but Zwingli himself had not yet ventured to impugn it openly. Carlostadt's conference on this subject with Luther, at the Black Bear at Jena, only served to inflame the controversy between them; and the former found it expedient to retire to Strasburgh, and thence to Basle, where he published some books in defense of his opinion.⁴ These were at first proscribed: but Zwingli, though differing from Carlostadt as to the sense to be affixed to the words of the institution of the

¹ Gerdesius, i., 129.

² On the different characters of Luther and Zwingli as Reformers, see *Grynæi Ep.*, apud Gerdes., i., 121.

³ Pellicanus had expressed his disbelief in Transubstantiation in a conversation with Capito, in 1512 (Gerdesius, i., 112). Indeed, the doctrine had, probably, always had some questioners.

⁴ Scultetus, apud V. der Hardt, p. 71. M. Adamus, *Vita Carlostadii*, p. 84.

Lord's Supper, warmly espoused his main view, advocated it in several treatises, and made it an article of faith in the church which he had founded at Zurich. Hence the Protestants were early divided into two great parties, which regarded each other with an hostility even more bitter than that which they mutually bore to the ~~Romish~~ Church. The followers of Zwingli called themselves the Reformed Church in contradistinction to the Lutherans; while the latter, as well as the Roman Catholics, branded the Zwinglians with the name of Sacramentaries.

Out of these two Churches were developed the Anglican and the Calvinistic: the former, under the auspices of Cranmer, at length inclining toward the tenets of Zwingli, but without adopting his ascetic discipline. Calvin, on the other hand, pushing both the doctrine and practice of Zwingli, though with some modifications of his own, to a rigid extreme, succeeded, nevertheless, in incorporating the Zwinglian Church with his own by the Zurich "*Consensus.*" Finally, we find his system, which he had built up with much learning, and great power of logic, and pushed with indomitable energy, prevailing not only at Geneva, and among that part of the French people which had embraced the Reformation, but also in Scotland and Holland.

Hence, though Calvin's title to be regarded as an original Reformer is eclipsed, in point of priority, as well as in some other particulars, by those of Luther and Zwingli, yet a success so extensive gives to his history a claim upon our attention scarcely smaller than theirs. His life does not, indeed, offer such striking passages of personal adventure. His part was not acted on so large and conspicuous a theater as Luther's was, nor does it present us with that boldness of action which distinguished Zwingli, as well as that Reformer. Calvin's influence flowed mainly from his literary abilities, and much of his biography necessarily relates to those works, the composition of which occupied so great a portion of his life. The vicissitudes of personal fortune form, however, but a minor subject of contemplation in the history of those destined to mold the opinions and principles of men. Yet even in these the life of Calvin is not wholly deficient; and if it be viewed with regard to the consistent and successful pursuit of one great object, it may, in the interest thence resulting, safely challenge a comparison with that of any other Reformer. To attempt the development of this, with all due impartiality, forms the object of the following narrative.

JOHN CALVIN was born at Noyon, in Picardy, on the 10th of July, 1509. His father, Gerard Cauvin, or Caulvin, for the name of *Calvin* was assumed from the Latin form, *Calvinus*, was a notary in the ecclesiastical court of Noyon, and secretary to the bishop. His grandfather is said to have been a cooper at Pont l'Évêque, a village near that city. Gerard married Jeanne Le Franc, a native of Cambrai, by whom he had six children; four sons and two daughters. The eldest son, Charles, was an ecclesiastic, and chaplain of St. Mary's Church at Noyon. He died, however, under the suspicion of heresy, from having refused to receive the sacrament in his last moments; for which reason he was buried under the public gibbet; though, to avoid the scandal of such a scene, it was performed in the night-time. The second son was the great Reformer, the subject of this biography. The third son, Anthony, was also bred up to the clerical profession, and obtained the chaplaincy of Tourneville, in the village of Traversy; but subsequently embraced the Reformed tenets, and followed Calvin to Geneva. The fourth son died in childhood. Of the two daughters, one, Maria or Mary, also accompanied Calvin to Geneva; the other appears to have continued in the Roman Catholic faith, and to have remained at Noyon; where she married and left a son, who followed the trade of a cutler.¹

It is a striking fact, as illustrating the rapid progress which the Reformation was at that time making in France, that three sons of the same family, all enjoying the prospect of a competency from benefices in the Romish Church, should nevertheless have deserted that communion, and embraced the Reformed tenets. Both their father and mother, however, remained unshaken, and died in the Roman Catholic faith. Gerard is said to have been a man of sense and probity, and much esteemed by the higher classes. The chief feature in the character of Calvin's mother, was a piety bordering on asceticism; and as the maternal temperament is frequently observed to descend to the offspring, it was from her, probably, that Calvin inherited those religious feelings which marked even his early years.

Of Calvin's childhood we possess but few particulars; nor is this, perhaps, much to be lamented. That period of life may, indeed, supply hints for conjecture and inference as to the development of the future character; and some materials

¹ Drelincourt, *Défense de Calvin*, p. 33-36, 193, 234, &c. Beza, *Vita Calvinii*.

of this sort we possess in what is known of Calvin's boyhood. Unlike his brother Reformers of Switzerland and Germany, whose early years were, for the most part, spent in penury and hardships,¹ Calvin was brought up with tenderness and care. He received the first rudiments of his education at the Collège des Capettes, in his native town; and in his studies he was associated with the children of the noble family of Mommor, the most distinguished in the district, and received equally with them, though at his father's expense, all those accessory facilities and advantages to which their rank entitled them.² To this method of education it may, perhaps, be owing that we miss in Calvin's character that boldness of outline which marked most of the Swiss and German Reformers; and to the same source we may also ascribe that aristocratic tendency perceptible in his after-life. Beza tells us that he surpassed all his schoolfellows in acuteness of mind and strength of memory; and even then gave token of his future character, by setting himself up as the censor of his young companions. In 1523, at the age of fourteen, he proceeded to the High School of Paris,³ still accompanied by the children of the Mommor family. Here he studied under Mathurin Cordier, regent of the Collège de la Marche, so well known by the name of Corderius, and by his "Colloquies," still used to initiate youths in the Latin tongue. It was under the superintendence of this renowned master that Calvin laid the foundations of that pure and vigorous Latin style in which, even in that learned age, he excelled most of his contemporaries. The relation of master and pupil was, however, afterward reversed. In matters of religion Corderius did not disdain to take a lesson from his scholar; and renouncing the Romish faith, settled at Geneva, where he died, the same year as Calvin, at the age of eighty-four. From this school Calvin removed to the Collège Montaigu, where he made rapid progress under the tuition of a learned Spaniard.

Calvin's father had originally destined him for the Church. With this view he had procured for his son the chaplaincy of *la Gésine*, in the cathedral church of Noyon, before he had reached the age of twelve; and, shortly after he had completed his eighteenth year (September, 1527), he obtained for him the living of Marteville, though Calvin was not properly

¹ In the former country especially, parents were accustomed at that time to make their children depend on their own efforts for their education and maintenance. See Melchior Adamus, *Vita Bullingeri*, p. 477, and the Autobiography of Thomas Platter. A hazardous experiment!

² Beza, *Vie de Calvin*, p. 10.

³ Drelincourt, p. 160.

qualified to hold it ; for, although he had received the tonsure, he had not been admitted into holy orders.¹ But the extraordinary abilities which he had already displayed, seemed to qualify him for a more active and enterprising life than that of an ecclesiastic. Though the profession of medicine offered at that time the surest resource against poverty, that of the law opened the brightest prospects to wealth and honor combined ; and Calvin's father made him renounce the study of theology for that of jurisprudence.² This change did not, however, lead him to abandon the ecclesiastical preferment which he had obtained, though the registers of Noyon contain frequent complaints of Calvin's absence from his duties.³ On the contrary, we find him exchanging, in 1529, the living of Marteville for that of Pont l'Evêque, where he seems occasionally to have preached. These preferments, the last of which Calvin obtained through the Abbot of St. Eloi, a member of the Mommor family, afford strong proof of the lax discipline at that time prevailing in the Romish Church, and of the necessity for the Reformation then in progress.

In compliance with his father's wishes, Calvin repaired to the University of Orleans to study jurisprudence under Pierre de l'Etoile (Petrus Stella), afterward president of the Parliament of Paris, and reputed the acutest lawyer in France.⁴ Beza gives us a few particulars of Calvin's way of life here, which he had learned from some of his fellow-collegians. It was characterized by the most temperate habits, and the greatest devotion to learning. After a moderate supper, he would spend half the night in study, and in the morning lie abed to reflect upon what he had read. It was thus that he acquired his vast stores of knowledge, but at the same time laid the foundation of those disorders which embittered his future life. Such was his reputation for learning, that, in the absence of the professors, he was frequently called upon to supply their place ; and when he left Orleans the degree of doctor was by unanimous consent offered to him without the usual fees : an honor, however, which Calvin declined to accept.⁵ But one of the strongest proofs of the high esteem in which his abilities were held even at this early period is, that his judgment was requested on the subject of Henry the Eighth's divorce, when, in 1530, that question was proposed to the universities

¹ Drelincourt, p. 11, 162. Bayle, *Calvin*.

² See Calvin's *Prefatio in Psalmos*.

³ See Des May, *opud Drelincourt*, p. 161, 170.

⁴ *Hist des Eglises Ref*, i, 9. ⁵ Beza, *Vita Calv*

and learned men of Europe. Calvin took a different view of it from Erasmus, and pronounced against the lawfulness of marriage with a brother's widow. His opinion is still extant, it having been published in Beza's selection of his correspondence.¹

But though the study of the law was Calvin's ostensible pursuit at Orleans, the greater part of his time was still devoted to theology. He had already begun to feel an inclination for the tenets of the Reformers, which he is said to have derived from a relative, Pierre Robert Olivetan, afterward known by his French translation of the Scriptures, to the study of which he exhorted Calvin.² He was also encouraged in these sentiments by a friendship which he had formed with François Daniel, an advocate, and Nicholas du Chemin, a schoolmaster at Orleans, who had adopted the new learning.

How long Calvin remained at Orleans can not be ascertained. He left that city to complete his legal studies at the University of Bourges, the most renowned school in France for that branch of science, where it was taught by André Alciat, a famous Italian jurisconsult.³ Calvin himself tells us that he devoted considerable attention to this study;⁴ and the progress which he made in it must have proved very serviceable to him in after-life, when called upon to assume the part of lawgiver in the little republic of Geneva. But whether it tended to improve him as a theologian may be doubted; and to this source, probably, may be traced that fondness for system and logical demonstration which can not always be successfully applied to religion, and which is too apt to beget a spirit of bigotry and intolerance. It was at Bourges that he began to acquire his knowledge of Greek, at the instance and with the help of Melchior Wolmar, a learned German, then Greek professor at that university. Calvin has recorded his gratitude for the benefit which he derived from Wolmar's instructions in the dedication to him of his Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

By Wolmar, Calvin seems also to have been confirmed in his inclination toward Protestantism, which now began to show itself openly. Calvin represents himself in his earlier years as a pertinacious and devoted bigot to the superstitions of Popery, and as having been converted by a sudden call, like the new birth of the Methodists.⁵ In the course of this narrative there will be occasion to relate other instances of the unexpected intervention of Providence in Calvin's spiritual

¹ See Ep. 384, Lausanne ed.

² Beza, *Vita Calv.*

³ Maimbourg, *Hist. du Calvinisme*, p. 53. ⁴ *Præf. in Psalmos.* ⁵ *Ib.*

career. But though the final impulse which drove him to overleap the pale of the Romish Church may have been sudden and abrupt, it seems probable that, in a man of his studious and reflective habits, so marked a transition must have been some time preparing. Be this as it may, Calvin now began openly to preach the Reformed doctrines, not only at Bourges but in the neighboring villages, and especially at Lignères, where he was encouraged by the *Seigneur* and lady of the place.¹ We learn from his Preface to the Psalms, that before a year had elapsed, all who were desirous of knowing the pure doctrines of the Reformation came to him for instruction, though himself but a beginner, and in spite of his shy and retiring habits, which but little qualified him for a public teacher. It was during his residence at Bourges, and probably in the year 1532, that Calvin lost his father.² This event having made him his own master, he abandoned the study of the law, took up his residence at Paris, and devoted himself wholly to theology, with the view of becoming a minister.

At this period France presented a more remarkable picture than any other country of the struggle between ancient bigotry and prejudice, and the new ideas excited by the Reformation. At one time that nation seemed destined to lead the van of Europe against the papal power. Almost a century before the appearance of Luther, Gerson, one of the greatest ornaments of the University of Paris, had persuaded that body to adopt his opinion, that the Pope was subordinate to a general council.³ In 1510 we find Louis XII. practically carrying out this decision, by assembling the French prelates at Tours, citing the Pope, Julius II., to appear there, and declaring the right of making war upon him. In the following year, Louis, having joined the Emperor Maximilian, and gained over a few cardinals, appointed a general council to be held at Pisa, for the reformation of the Church, both in its head and members. To defeat this, Julius, in 1512, assembled the Council of the Lateran, continued by his successor Leo X., which declared the Pope to be superior to a council.⁴ In token of his unquenchable hatred toward Rome, Louis

¹ *Hist. des Eglises Ref.*, i., 10.

² This occurrence has sometimes been placed in 1528, and there is indeed extant a letter of Calvin's to N. du Chemin, dated on the 6th of May in that year, in which he states that his father was so ill, that his recovery was impossible (P. Henry, i., 36). But Beza tells us that Calvin was about twenty-three when his father died, which would be in the year 1532; and as he calls it a sudden death (*repentina mors*), it seems probable that Gerard recovered from the dangerous sickness alluded to.

³ Sleidan, i., 9.

⁴ Gerdesius, iv., § 1, 2.

had even caused money to be coined, bearing the inscription, "*Perdam Babylonis nomen.*" Had that monarch lived to see the beginning of Luther's Reformation, it seems not improbable that religion might have experienced a different fate in France. The influence of the sovereign in determining the creed of his subjects is a fact that must have struck most readers of the history of those times. The common observation respecting the impolicy of persecution, and its unfitness to attain its ends, is one of those which we rather wish to be true, than in the majority of instances can prove to be so. In Italy and Spain the government succeeded in nipping the Reformation in the bud. In Germany the far greater part of the Emperor Charles's dominions retained the faith of their bigoted master. Even in Saxony it may be doubted whether Luther would have succeeded in carrying out his views without the assistance of the elector. In our own country it is highly probable that there would have been no Reformation, or, at all events, not till many years later, if it had not originated with the monarch; and a strong proof of this are the three changes, which, at the beck of its government, the nation made in its religion in about a quarter of a century. Holland and Scotland may be named as exceptions to this general remark; in which countries the people succeeded in establishing their creed by successful rebellions: and it is a remarkable fact that, in both instances, that creed was the Calvinistic. The circumstance of there being but little public opinion in those days, and few or no organs to express it, may be the most probable way of accounting for these facts. Yet the religion of the principal European states has remained the same as was established in the sixteenth century. The great tide of religious opinion has subsequently ceased to flow, and its inroads were confined to that epoch. France presents a striking illustration of the preceding observations. At first its leading men hesitated and differed on the subject of religion, and the result was a bloody civil war. At length its kings and rulers pronounced for Romanism, which remains the established religion to this day.

In the early part of his reign, the conduct of Louis's successor, Francis I., was not calculated to damp the hopes of the Reformers. It may be true, as an eminent historian has observed, that Francis cared little for theological controversies, and that his concessions to the Reformers were rather the arts of policy than the results of conviction.¹ Nevertheless, this

¹ Robertson, *Charles the Fifth*, b. vi.

indifference, and this policy, were not without their effect in assisting the Reformation : and it is certain, at all events, that his contemporaries interpreted them into an inclination for the new doctrines.¹ His well known love and patronage of literature and the arts, the handmaids of the Reformation, assisted to produce the same result.

These causes had led to the partial adoption of Lutheranism at the French court. It had become a fashion among the courtiers to patronize the new doctrines, though in general they understood but little about them.² Even in the University of Paris a marked change had begun to show itself, which Louis Vives, who paid it a visit in 1521, has described in a letter to Erasmus. He represents the study of poetry as reviving there, which previously had been almost banished from the public schools ; and mentions that Paris, which had been the very citadel of the sophists, had begun to lay aside the scholastic philosophy ; and even the Sorbonne itself to eschew mere verbal subtilties and quibbles, and to take to the study of solid and genuine theology.³ But though the general body of the Parisian university had made these advances, it may be suspected that Vives had been misled by too hasty a glance with regard to the Sorbonne. Among that body there were, it is true, a few enlightened men who rose superior to the general mass, and it is probable that Vives formed his judgment of the whole from having been fortunate enough to fall into their company. Luther himself made the same mistake. Relying on the liberality of that body, from their having, in 1517, reasserted the superiority of councils over the Pope, Luther ventured, in the very year that Vives wrote his letter, to appeal to the Sorbonne on the subject of his dispute with Dr. Eck, at Leipsic. They answered him by selecting a variety of passages from his own works, which they severely censured ; and by animadverting upon his presumption, as if he alone knew the road to salvation : an impious arrogance which they held worthier to be coerced by

¹ Thus Bucer, writing to Luther so late as August, 1531, says of Francis : "For the king is not averse from the true religion, and, now that he has recovered his children, will not be so dependent on the pope and the emperor in this matter."—Gerdesius, iv., 73. Compare Beza, *Vita Calv.*

² This appears from an answer given by the Sorbonne, in 1523, to some questions proposed by Louisa of Savoy : "Que plusieurs et grands personages, avant que les choses fussent par eux bien entendues, ont loué en cour, comme on disoit, icelle doctrine, et disaient mal de tous ceux qui la blâmoient et reprouvoient."—See Gerdesius, iv., Mon. 3.

³ The answer of Erasmus, Ep. 611, gives a rapid sketch of the state of learning throughout Europe.

reproof, by imprisonment, and even by the flames, than to be refuted by argument.¹ And, indeed, if the accounts which we have of this celebrated body may be relied on, the former of these two courses was much the safer one for them to pursue. We are told, that when Luther first appeared there was not a man among them who dared to meet him in scriptural discussion.² Even a lapse of nearly thirty years did not mend matters. Early in 1545, it was proposed that some of the German Reformers should go to Paris to discuss theology with the French doctors. The king assented; but his librarian, Castellan, put a *veto* on the project, by informing his master that the Parisian theologians were no match for those of Germany; and advised him not to expose the whole kingdom to ridicule, by betraying their ignorance.³

Sleidan has left us a picture of the Parisian theologians of this period, taken from the life. They claimed, we are told, to be the leading theologians of Europe, and had two principal colleges: the Sorbonne, and that of Navarre. The students in this faculty, called *baccalauréi*, or bachelors, were exercised in disputation throughout the summer; and, at their examination, were bound to answer the arguments of all comers for twelve consecutive hours. Wonderful were the feats of intellectual gladiatorship here displayed; which, however, for the most part turned either on frivolous points, or on questions beyond the reach of the human understanding. These disputes were conducted amid the greatest clamor, and were commonly terminated by the audience testifying, by their hootings, their impatience at the want of skill, or at the prolixity, of one or other of the disputants. During the progress of these discussions, the doctors in theology listened through the lattices. These men, who were honored with the title of *nos maîtres* (*magistri nostri*), were the recognized censors of theological literature, over which they ruled with despotic power. Without their sanction nobody could publish a treatise relating to divinity. The greater part of them, however, abandoned themselves to idleness; and seemed to aspire to the degree of doctor only, that they might live in luxury, and domineer over

¹ Gerdesius, iv., 6. Their censure of Luther will be found in Mon. 2.

² *Ib.*, i., 30.

³ "Though this advice pleased the king, Castellan refused to trust the French theologians in a disputation with you, unless they were well prepared and instructed beforehand. For, said he, you were men well exercised in that sort of contention, and could not be so easily overthrown; and, therefore, care should be taken, that the king might not expose the whole nation to ridicule by betraying the ignorance of his divines."—Calvin to Melancthon, January, 1545, Ep. 60.

others. Among them were, indeed, a few men of excellent genius, but worthy of other associates and a better culture.¹

The instinct of self-preservation stimulates bigots to oppose even the most harmless reforms. Incapable, from their contracted views, of estimating the results of the slightest innovation, and alarmed at a progress which they are alike unable to comprehend or to arrest, they cling to ancient prejudices with all the tenacity of despair. Amid the blaze of learning which illuminated the sixteenth century, we find recorded against the doctors of the Sorbonne, instances of the grossest ignorance, and of the most childish and obstinate prejudices. Freigius, in his *Life of Ramus*, asserts that some of the Parisian doctors were so pertinacious in maintaining that *ego amat* was as good Latin as *ego amo*, that it was necessary to put them down by a public decree. And so late as 1550, the Sorbonne were so indignant at a richly beneficed ecclesiastic for adopting the reformed pronunciation of Latin, as *quisquis, quamquam, mihi, &c.*, for the old method, *kiskis, kankam, miki*, that they would have stripped him of his preferment, had not the royal professors, by whom these reforms were introduced, actively interfered in his behalf with the Parliament of Paris.² Such facts would almost appear incredible, were they not supported by other instances. In our own country, we find Bishop Gardiner identifying a point in philology with a question of religion, and persecuting Cheke and the other reformers of Greek pronunciation.

The alarm of the Sorbonnists and monks at the rapid diffusion of the doctrines of the Reformation was extreme. In 1521, a Carmelite, preaching before the King of France, predicted the speedy appearance of Anti-Christ, and affirmed that four of his precursors had already appeared: a certain Minorite in Italy; Le Fèvre d'Étaples in France; Reuchlin in Germany; and Erasmus in Brabant.³ It was even reported that the Romish clergy employed poison against the Lutherans, and thus silenced forever those whom they were unable to refute. Erasmus believed this so thoroughly, that the more Aleander, who had a reputation in that art, pressed him to dine with him at Cologne, the more he excused himself.⁴ At

¹ Sleidan, *De Statu, &c.*, p. 39.

² Bayle, art., *Ramus*, rem. G.; and *Rabelais*, ii., 7.

³ Erasmus, Ep. 314, App.

⁴ "Poison, I hear, is the method now. Some open defenders of Luther have been made away with at Paris. Perhaps it has been commanded that, since the enemies of the papal throne—for such is the designation of those who will not unreservedly obey those harpies—can not be otherwise

the head of the bigots of the Sorbonne, two men stood conspicuously forward; Quercu, a Norman, and Natalis Bedda, or Beda. In Beda alone, said Erasmus, are 3000 monks.¹

It was in 1521, as we have seen, that the Sorbonne first openly showed their dislike of Luther's doctrines by publishing a condemnation of them; and shortly afterward they entered the lists against him by printing a book called "Anti-Luther." They soon, however, abandoned the field of argument for the more congenial method of persecution, which in 1523 broke out with open violence. In that year, Jean Le Clerc, who may be considered as the proto-martyr of France, was arrested for having affixed to the cathedral of Meaux a paper condemning the Popish system of pardons. He was whipped and branded; but this did not deter him from planting a Church at Metz, which in 1524 he watered with his blood.² In the following year one Jaques Pavales was burned on the Place de Grève at Paris. But what struck most terror into the Reformers was the execution of Louis Berquin, a gentleman of Artois. Berquin had translated some of the pieces of Erasmus into French, as the "Praise of Marriage," the "Christian Soldier's Manual," and the "Complaint of Peace." Beda, who corresponded occasionally with Erasmus, sent him word that these translations would hurt his character. Erasmus replied, that he was not responsible for the versions of others; but at the same time he wrote to Berquin, advising him to abstain from contests with the divines, which the heat of religious controversy rendered unsafe.³ The life of Berquin had been already twice in danger, in 1523 and 1524, on which occasions Francis had saved him at the intercession of his sister Margaret. After the return of that monarch from his captivity at Madrid, persecution grew warmer; and in 1527 Berquin was again arrested on the charge of having mutilated a statue of the Virgin, which stood in one of the streets of Paris. Twelve commissaries were selected from the Parliament to try him, among whom was Budé, who earnestly endeavored to get him to recant. With a view to save him, the trial was protracted for eighteen months; but, as he would not retract, he was at length condemned to make the *amende honorable* at Nôtre Dame, with a rope round his neck, and a torch in his hand; to have his works burned, and his tongue

overcome, they should, with the blessing of the pontiff, be carried off by poison. Aleander is strong in this art. He pressed me very much at Cologne to come and dine with him, but the more he pressed, the more I refused."—Erasmus, Ep. 317, App.

² *Hist. des Eglises Ref.*, i., 6.

³ Jortin, *Erasmus*, i., 374, et seq.

¹ Ep. 941.

pierced with a red hot iron, and to be imprisoned for life. Berquin, who probably considered death a preferable alternative, refused to make the *amende*, and was burned, with his writings, in the Place de Grève, April 22d, 1529. The first article of his impeachment was, that he had recommended translations of the Scriptures, which had been forbidden by the Parliament of Paris. Erasmus describes him as by no means addicted to Lutheran tenets; and attributes his death to his hatred of certain stupid and ferocious monks and theologians, which he was imprudent enough not to conceal. He died with the greatest constancy, and attempted to address the crowd; but his voice was drowned by the clamor of six hundred guards.¹ The erection of Lutheranism into a distinct and recognized system of faith by the "Confession of Augsburg," increased the jealousy and vigilance of the Sorbonne. All who held reformed tenets, though they might not precisely accord with that Confession, were regarded as Lutherans, and called by that name.

Athwart these dark scenes of bigotry and persecution, Francis's sister, Margaret de Valois, afterward Queen of Navarre, beamed like an angel of light sent to mitigate their gloom and horror. Margaret's character was a curiously compounded one. Plato's divine and earthly love never met more conspicuously in a human being.² The feelings inspired by the former found expression in her "*Miroir de l'Âme pécheresse*:" to the latter she dedicated her "*Heptameron*," the more than equivocal tales of which are all said to have been founded on real occurrences. Whether the mind can dwell upon such incidents, and even commit them to paper, without contamination, we shall leave to casuists.

"Crede mihi, distant mores a carmine nostri;
Vita verecunda est, Musa jocosa mihi—"

is an excuse as old at least as Ovid, and which a poet of the same period as Margaret, and of more pretensions to sanctity than she, even Beza himself, found it convenient to allege. Great allowance must be made for the grossness of the age, as well as for literary fashion. Boccaccio's "*Decamerone*" had just been translated into French, of which the "*Hep-*

¹ Erasmus, Ep. 1060. Petitot, *Mém.*, xvii., 98. Génin, *Lettres de Marguërite*, i., *Notice*, p. 48.

² M. Génin, the recent editor of Margaret's correspondence, observes: "Le trait saillant du caractère de Marguërite c'est d'avoir allié toute sa vie les idées religieuses et les idées d'amour mondain."—Vol. i., p. 72.

tameron" is a professed imitation.¹ Brantôme was the first to attack the reputation of the Queen of Navarre, which seems not to have been impeached during her life; and the character of her writings, as well as her poetical coquetry with Clement Marot, her *valet de chambre*, doubtless lent a color to the attacks of that filthy old scandal-monger. Margaret's preface to her tales—a strange portico to such a building—would lead us to suppose that she herself thought no harm in them. There, under the name of Dame Oisille, she describes her religious exercises: how she reads the Bible the first thing after getting up, and then recites some psalms; how she retires before supper to feed her soul with study and meditation; and how in the evening she recalls the events of each day, asking pardon for faults, and giving thanks for mercies. Is this the language of the shameless and abandoned? No; let us rather think that her true woman's heart was as pure as it was kind.

With such a temperament we are not, however, surprised to find that Margaret was under the dominion of a spiritual mysticism. Of this she made no secret; nay, she rather seems to have been flattered by allusions to it: for Rabelais adverts to it, in some lines, themselves sufficiently mystical, in which he dedicates to her the third book of the "Adventures of Pantagruel."² This spirit led her in after-life to patronize some of the leaders of the sect of spiritual libertines, for which Calvin, as there will be occasion to relate in the course of this narrative, found occasion to reprove her. Hence, also, sprang her correspondence with Briçonnet, Bishop of Meaux, who, like herself, was a great patron of the Reformers.

Briçonnet was the son of the cardinal of that name. He enjoyed the confidence of Louis XII. and Francis I.; had twice filled the office of extraordinary ambassador to Rome; and had been the representative of France at the Councils of Pisa and the Lateran. He had been abbot of St. Germain des Prés, where he had distinguished himself by reforming abuses, and by making great additions to the library: for he was fond of literature, himself an author, and a liberal patron of learned men. When the new doctrines began to make a sensation in France, Briçonnet, who had been raised to the bishopric of Meaux, manifested some inclination toward them,

¹ After all we find nothing in the "*Heptameron*" similar to "*La Ruelle mal assortie*" of a subsequent Margaret de Valois, the authoress of the "*Memoirs*," a tale which at once places her character beyond doubt.

²

"Esprit abstrait, ravy, et ecstac,
Qui frequentant les cieux ton origine
A délaissé ton hoste et domestic, &c.

and invited into his diocese several leaders of the Reformed party; as Farel, then regent of the college of Cardinal le Moine, Le Fèvre d'Étaples, Vatable, Martial and Gérard Ruffi (or Le Roux), and others.¹ Some writers assert that Briçonnet's object was to reconcile these schismatics with the Church of Rome; but, if so, he was very unfortunate in the prosecution of it; for he incurred so strong a suspicion of heresy, that he was obliged to clear himself by dismissing his Reforming friends, and by pronouncing a condemnation of Luther in a synod held expressly for the purpose in 1523. It was in that year that he had begun his correspondence with Margaret, then Duchess of Alençon, and which displays a mysticism bordering on extravagance and folly.² In his letters to Margaret, Briçonnet, though many years her senior, signs himself her unworthy son; and Margaret, on her part, assumes the tone and authority of a spiritual mother.

In 1525 we find her corresponding with Count Hohenlœ, dean of the grand chapter of Strasburgh, who endeavored to bring her over to Lutheranism; but this correspondence Margaret broke off after the return of her brother from his captivity at Madrid.³ After her marriage, in 1527, with Henri d'Albret, king of Navarre—for the Duke of Alençon had died of grief and vexation at the reproaches heaped upon him for his conduct at Pavia—she retired with her husband into Bearn, where her court became the refuge of the persecuted Protestants; among whom we find Le Fèvre d'Étaples, Gérard Le Roux, and, for a short time, Calvin himself. It was the shelter which she gave to men like these that chiefly tended to draw down upon Margaret that suspicion of heresy which other parts of her conduct were not calculated to avert. At her table at Nérac, when surrounded by her ecclesiastics and officers of state, it was her custom to discuss some text of Scripture; and, by way of amusement, little satirical dramas of her own composition were represented, in which the Pope and his satellites were not spared.⁴ In the visits which she frequently made to Paris she used her influence

¹ See Farel's Letter to Scepper in 1524 (Gerdesius, iv., 51).

² M. Génin thus characterizes his letters: "C'est un débordement de métaphores dont la vulgarité tombe à chaque instant dans le burlesque; c'est un galimatias perpétuel, absurde, qui parfois touche à la folie."—*Lettres de Marg.*, i., 124, note.

³ *Ib.*, Notice, p. 16.

⁴ Maimbourg, *Hist. du Calvinisme*, p. 21. *Lettres de Marg.*, i., Notice, p. 70. There are, however, no such pieces now extant among her writings, but only religious mysteries, diversified with Bergeries, or Pastorals. *Ib.*, p. 120.

with Francis in favor of the Reformers; and in this she was assisted by the Duchess d'Etampes, the king's mistress. One day, in the year 1533, they took him to hear Le Coq, the curé of St. Eustache, who, though outwardly a Catholic, taught Zwinglian doctrines, especially with regard to the eucharist, which he made the subject of his discourse on this occasion. Le Coq had even a private audience of the king, and almost succeeded in shaking his faith; but the matter having reached the ears of the cardinals of Lorraine and Tournon, they obliged the adventurous ecclesiastic to make a public recantation in the pulpit.¹

After all it seems doubtful whether Margaret ever really quitted the Roman Catholic communion; and at all events she appears to have finished her eccentric religious career by returning to its bosom. After the death of Francis, in 1547, she retired to a convent in Angoumois, where she officiated as abbess, and chanted vespers with the nuns; and, on her death-bed, after receiving extreme unction from the hands of Gilles Cailleau, a Cordelier, she is said to have protested that all she had ever done in favor of the Reformers was out of pure compassion, and not from any wish to depart from the religion of her forefathers.²

Margaret's love of literature was, doubtless, one of the chief causes which induced her to sympathize with the Reformers. The learning of the age lay almost exclusively on their side. A literary quarrel between Reuchlin and the monks of Cologne proved of the greatest service to the cause of the Reformation. The inveterate malice with which the latter persecuted Reuchlin³ drove all the lovers of true learning to form a confederacy in his favor; and after the appearance of Luther the greater portion of them joined his standard. The efforts of this constellation of wits were directed to ridicule the ignorance of the monks, especially their barbarous Latinity: and it is to them that we owe the "*Epistolæ obscurorum Virorum*," a satire conducted with considerable humor, and which so annoyed the

¹ Maimbourg, *Hist. du Calvinisme*, p. 24.

² Génin, *Lettres de Marguérite*, ii., 18. Petitot, xvii., 183.

³ Hochstraten, prior of the Dominicans of Cologne, spent three years at Rome in endeavoring to get Reuchlin condemned, but without success (Sleidan, ii., 25. Gerdesius, i., 141). In the dedication of his "*Destructio Cabalæ*," published in 1519, Hochstraten pointed out that Capnio's affair (Capnio is a Greek version of Reuchlin's name) was closely connected with Luther's Reformation (Mayerhoff, *Reuchlin, u. s. Zeit.*, p. 234). The progress of the latter, by means of Reuchlin, Erasmus, and Luther, was depicted with truth and humor in a little pantomime acted before Charles V. during the diet at Augsburg. See Jortin, *Erasmus*, i., 514; and Gerdesius, ii., Mon. 7.

monks of Cologne that they are said to have given a large sum to Leo X. for a bull consigning it to the flames.¹

One of the most distinguished of the Reuchlinists was Erasmus. The character of that Reformer, if so he can be called, is well known. Had all the rest resembled him there had been no Reformation. It seems to be a rule of human action, that no great change can be effected in any very corrupt system of civil or religious government without proceeding to extremes in the opposite direction; and that the more grinding and oppressive has been a tyranny the more violent and uncontrollable will be the revolution which upsets it. As in the natural so in the moral atmosphere, the stagnant vapors must be cleared away by storms and lightnings. Erasmus, by his own confession, wanted the courage of a martyr in an age when nothing could be effected but by the spirit of martyrdom. At this distance of time there may be many inclined to think that the reforms which he proposed, with some few additions, would have sufficed to meet the exigencies of the case:² but the suggestions of reason and moderation are seldom of a nature to rouse that enthusiasm without which no great changes can be effected; and by the more ardent Reformers Erasmus was regarded, either with hatred or suspicion, as a temporizer. Luther compared him to Moses, who had, indeed, led the Israelites out of Egypt, but who was himself doomed to perish in the desert. "I wish," rejoined Erasmus, "that he may prove a Joshua, and conduct us all into the land of promise."³ But before that could be effected the world was destined to witness many scenes of violence, fanaticism, and bloodshed, enacted under the sacred name of religion; and though we have made some approach toward that happy region, it may even be doubted whether we are quite arrived there yet.

But, in spite of this moderation, the exertions of Erasmus did much to prepare the way for bolder and more ardent spirits, by exposing the abuses of the existing system, and inspiring men's minds with a desire of change. The moderate views of reform developed in his writings, enforced as they were by the keen sarcasm of his wit, and by the elegant terseness of his style, proved highly attractive at a time when the character of the clergy had begun to create an almost universal feeling of contempt and disgust. This was particularly the case among the highest and more educated portion of society

¹ *Amœnitates Lit.*, ix.

² He has summed these up in his "*Spongia adversus Adspergines Hutteni.*"

³ Erasmus Zuïnglio, *apud* Gerdes, i., 151.

in France; among whom the brilliance and piquancy of Erasmus's writings rendered him an especial favorite. His popularity in that country may be judged of by the fact, that in 1527 a bookseller at Paris ventured to reprint 24,000 copies of his "Colloquies." They are said to have found a rapid sale, which was, perhaps, assisted by the book having been prohibited.¹ Thus unconsciously, and, perhaps, unwillingly, he helped to prepare Calvin's path in France; who, as already related, had gone to Paris in 1532 to begin his career as a Reformer, and to whom we must now return.

Calvin seems at this time to have indulged the ambitious view of becoming the head of the Reformed party in France, and of converting the court and the metropolis. The circumstances of the times were well adapted to stimulate an ardent mind. Enough success had been achieved to justify the most sanguine hopes of the ultimate triumph of the Reformation; and enough danger existed to render the pursuit of it a work of no ordinary difficulty and hazard. Calvin was constantly employed in gaining converts, and in confirming those already made. During his residence at Paris at this period, he was much patronized by a merchant named Estienne de la Forge, whom he mentions in the fourth chapter of his tract against the Libertines, as having suffered martyrdom for his religious principles.² At this time the heat of persecution obliged the evangelical congregations to assemble in the greatest secrecy. To these Calvin preached with zeal and energy, concluding always with the words of St. Paul, "If God be for us, who can be against us?"³ In order to shame the king and the ecclesiastical authorities out of their persecuting principles, he published his first work, the two books of Seneca "*De Clementiâ*," with a Commentary, in which he freely expressed his opinions. In this work, the dedication of which to the abbot of St. Eloi is dated from Paris on the 4th of April, 1532, he first assumed the name of *Calvinus*. The sententious morality of Seneca made him a favorite author with Calvin; but it has been remarked that he has committed the blunder of confounding the two Senecas together, and thus making the philosopher die at the age of 115. From two of Calvin's letters to his friend Daniel, it appears that this work was printed at his own risk; and he

¹ Petitot, xvii., *Introd.*, p. 96. Knight, quoted by Jortin, *Erasmus*, i., 300.

² Beza, *Vie de Calvin*, p. 15, Genève, 1663.

³ P. Henry, *Leben Calvins*, i., 49.

expresses some anxiety, not only with regard to the reception it may meet with, but also for the reimbursement of his expenses.¹

Calvin, however, was not endowed with the masculine and indomitable courage of Luther, and was more inclined to propagate his doctrines by stealth, and at a safe distance, than to risk his life in maintaining them. Thus, though he was continually exhorting others to behave like martyrs, he was himself always disposed to fly at the first appearance of danger. His first great public essay at Paris was made in the person of another. According to custom, Nicholas Cop, the newly-elected rector of the Sorbonne, was to deliver a sermon on the festival of All Saints.² Though thus raised to the very pinnacle of orthodoxy, Cop had imbibed the tenets of the Reformation, and accepted Calvin's offer to compose his sermon. Great was the astonishment of the doctors of the Sorbonne, when, instead of upholding, as usual, the tenets of the Romish Church, Cop insisted on the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and referred to the gospel as the sole standard of religious truth! The attack was too audacious to be overlooked. Cop was denounced to the Parliament of Paris, who sent their officers to apprehend him. A timely notice from a friend enabled him to escape to Basle, his native town. The storm now fell upon Calvin, whose share in the sermon seems to have got wind. Jean Morin, the lieutenant of police, repaired to his lodgings for the purpose of seizing him; but Calvin had also received a private warning, and saved himself by flight. The manner of his escape is differently narrated. According to some writers,³ he let himself down from his window, by means of his sheets, into the Rue des Bernardinus, whence, having gained the Fauxbourg St. Victor, he sought the house of a vine-dresser, whom he knew; and, putting on the man's frock, with a wallet of white cloth, and a hoe upon his shoulders, took the road to Noyon. These romantic details are not found in the narrative of Beza,⁴ who tells us that Cal-

¹ MS. Bern., quoted by P. Henry, *Leben Calvins*, i., 51.

² Maimbourg, p. 57, and the author of the *Egl. Réf.*, call Cop rector of the University.

³ Masson, Maimbourg, Drelincourt.

⁴ Bayle (art., *Calvin*, rem. C.) observes: "Si ce narré était véritable Bèze serait un mauvais historien; car il dit simplement que par hazard Calvin ne se trouva pas dans sa chambre, *quo forte domi non reperto*." On which his annotator observes: "Bèze emploie l'expression *par hazard* dans sa *Vie de Calvin*; mais dans son *Histoire Ecclésiastique* il dit que *les avertissements de quelques amis* garantirent Calvin des poursuites; d'où Le Clerc ne manque pas d'accorder à Bayle, que Bèze est un mauvais historien." The fact, however, is, that Beza was not the author of *Histoire Ecclésiastique*.

vin was saved by the interposition of the Queen of Navarre, who sent for him to the palace, where he was honorably received. His letters and papers fell into the hands of the police, and thus the safety of several of his friends was seriously compromised.

At Noyon, Calvin remained only long enough to dispose of his benefices. He sold his chaplaincy, and resigned the living of Pont l'Evêque in favor of a cousin, whose morals, though a priest, seem to have been any thing but pure.¹ Calvin was now compelled to lead a wandering life; a circumstance, by the way, which hardly agrees with Beza's account of the termination of the affair of the sermon. He first went into Xaintonge, where he must have spent some little time, if, as is reported, he drew up some short sermons for the use of the neighboring clergy, calculated to dispose the minds of their flocks for the reception of the new doctrines. The friend mentioned by Beza as encouraging him in this design, and who afterward fled with him into Switzerland, was Louis du Tillet, brother of the registrar of the Parliament at Paris, and of the Bishop of Meaux. From Xaintonge Calvin went to Nérac, the residence of the Queen of Navarre, where he met, for the first time, with Le Fèvre d'Étaples, whose name there has been already occasion to mention. Le Fèvre, when young, had traveled much in Asia and Africa, and subsequently became professor of philosophy at the college of Cardinal Le Moine, in Paris. He was a truly learned man, and had been intrusted with the education of Charles, Duke of Angoulême. Francis wished to bestow some ecclesiastical dignities upon him, which, however, the tricks and intrigues of the Sorbonne, whose anger had been excited by his translation of the New Testament, published in 1523, prevented him from accepting. In 1524 Margaret sent him and Gérard Le Roux to Strasburgh, to consult with Bucer, Capito, and the other theologians of that town, on matters of religion.² Shortly afterward he introduced into the Sorbonne the ubiquitarian doctrine, that is, the ubiquity of the presence of Christ's body; a doctrine

tique (or rather *Hist. des Eglises Réformées*), which passes under his name, as is manifest from some passages in it; for instance the following: "de Bèze ne répondit rien pour lors, pourcequ'il se contentoit (*comme depuis je luy ay ouï dire*) d'avoir repondu au principal," &c.—Vol. i., p. 358. It was written by Des Gallars, one of the ministers of the Genevese Church. See Schlosser, *Leben des Th. de Bèze*, p. 105, note.

¹ Drelincourt, p. 172. The atrocious calumny of Bolsec, that he was deprived of these benefices for an infamous crime, has long since been rejected by all candid inquirers.

² Scultetus, *apud* V. der Hardt, *Hist. Lit. Reform.*, v. 63.

not known before that age, and afterward adopted by Luther.¹ For this heresy he was banished from France, in 1525, on the accusation of Beda. In 1526 we find him living at Strasburgh, under a feigned name.² Subsequently, he seems to have been appointed to the humble post of librarian at Blois, from which he retired to Margaret's court at Nérac, where he died in 1536, at the advanced age of ninety-one.³ Le Fèvre received Calvin with friendship, and is said to have predicted his future success in spreading the gospel in France.⁴ Calvin's presence in this district seems to have created some sensation, for a vineyard in it is said to have borne his name a century and a half afterward. During his residence at Claix, in the house of Louis du Tillet, he is supposed to have written a great part of his "Institutes," published a few years afterward at Strasburgh.⁵

Before the year 1533 had expired, Calvin again ventured to return to Paris. The persecutions were, indeed, still raging there; but the influence of the Queen of Navarre served in some measure to annul their violence. Under her protection, Gérard Le Roux, originally a Dominican, and two Augustinian monks, Bertault and Courault, the latter of whom subsequently became a minister at Geneva, still preached the doctrines of the Reformation in that city. The hatred which Margaret's conduct excited against her among the clergy, is exemplified by an anecdote related by Calvin in a letter to his friend Daniel. On the 1st of October, 1533, in the play annually produced at the college of Navarre, Margaret was represented on the stage as receiving the gospel from the hands of the fury Megæra, and subsequently conducting herself in a way that might well have been suggested by such a messenger of hell.⁶ Beda and the Sorbonne had previously denounced her "*Miroir de l'Âme pécheresse.*" Because she had not mentioned purgatory, and the intercession of saints, it was inferred that she did not believe in them; but this evidence was merely negative, and Margaret, defended by Petit, bishop of Senlis, escaped the denunciation of Beda. Margaret complained to her brother of these attacks, who, when politics did not stand in the way, was disposed to show her every mark of affection. The pedants of the college of Navarre escaped

¹ *Ib.*, p. 70. Sleidan, v. 84. Basnage, *Egl. Réf.*, ii., 336.

² Scultetus, l. c., p. 114.

³ *Lettres de Marg.*, i., 278, note. Gerdesius, however (i., 172), places his birth in 1440.

⁴ Gerdesius, i., 175.

⁵ Bayle.

⁶ Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. i.

only through the generous intercession of Margaret herself. Beda discovered too late that he had flown at too high a quarry, and expiated his rashness by dying a prisoner at Mont St. Michel.

In 1534 Calvin received a challenge from the arch-heretic Servetus, to meet him in disputation; and, according to Beza, this had been the motive of Calvin's journey to Paris. Many years afterward they were destined to meet under extraordinary circumstances; but, on this occasion, Servetus failed to keep the appointment, for fear, it is said, of Calvin's superior abilities; though a dread of the Sorbonne may be a more probable cause. In the same year Calvin published, at Orleans, his treatise entitled "*Psychopannychia*." It was directed against a notion, said to be of Arabian origin, and revived by the Anabaptists, that the soul, upon quitting the body, falls into a sleep till the day of judgment. Erasmus seems at one time to have entertained this opinion.¹ Calvin also published a Latin version of this treatise at Paris.

About this period, the indiscreet zeal of some of the friends of the Reformation inflicted irreparable damage on that cause in France, and gave occasion to a redoubled violence of persecution. Toward the close of 1534, one Féret, a servant of the king's apothecary, caused a quantity of placards to be printed at Neufchâtel, with the intention of posting them up in the streets and public places of Paris. Farel, the former rector of the college of Cardinal Le Moine, is said to have been concerned in drawing up these productions, which consisted of violent invectives against the mass and the Pope.² These intemperate manifestos, which were highly disapproved of by all moderate men of the Protestant party, were placarded in the night of the 18th of October, in different parts of the

¹ Jortin, i., 122. It was also once held by Sir T. Browne. See *Rel. Medici*, Pt. i., § 7.

² Crespin, *Livre des Martyrs*, apud P. Henry, i., 74. They will be found in Gerdesius, iv., Mon. 11, and in P. Henry, i., Beil. 4. The following are specimens: "Or ne peuvent ils faire entendre à nul de sain entendement que Jésus Christ, les Apôtres, et les prophètes, soyent menteurs; mais faut malgré leurs dents que le Pape et toute sa vermine de Cardinaux, d'Evêques, de prêtres, de moines, et autres caphars, diseurs de messe, et tous ceux qui y consentent soyent tels: assavoir, faux prophètes, damnables trompeurs, apostats, loups, faux pasteurs, idolâtres séducteurs, menteurs, blasphémateurs, exécrables, meurtriers des âmes, renonceurs de Jésus Christ, larrons et ravisseurs de l'honneur de Dieu, et plus détestables que les diables." Again, after a tirade against transubstantiation: "Allumez donc vos fagots pour vous brusler et rostir vous-mêmes, et non pas nous, pour ce que nous ne voulons pas croire à vos idoles, à vos Dieux nouveaux, à vous nouveaux Christs, qui se laissent manger aux bêtes, et à vous pareillement qui estes pires que bêtes," &c.

metropolis; some being affixed to the Louvre itself, and even to the door of the king's chamber. Francis was highly incensed at this audacity, and seized the occasion it presented to vindicate his orthodoxy from the suspicion which his connection with Henry VIII., and his opposition to the Emperor Charles V., the champion of the Catholic Church, had engendered. In order to purify the city from the defilement it had suffered, he directed a solemn lustration to be made on the 29th of January following. The image of St. Génévieve, the patron saint of Paris, whose assistance is resorted to only in cases of the greatest emergency, was paraded through the streets in solemn procession by the company of butchers, to whom, by an ancient custom, that right belonged.¹ Jean du Bellay, the Bishop of Paris, carried the host under a magnificent dais, supported by the dauphin, the Dukes of Orleans and Angoulême, and the Duke of Vendôme, first prince of the blood. The king followed immediately after, bare-headed, on foot, and carrying a white taper in his hand. After him came the rest of the princes; the great officers of state, cardinals, bishops, ambassadors, and others, walking two and two abreast in profound silence, and with lighted flambeaux. The monks and clergy of Paris, the council, the parliament in their red robes, the public officers, according to their degrees, swelled the ranks of the procession, whose course was from the Louvre to Nôtre Dame, where a solemn mass was performed. After this act of humiliation, Francis dined in the great hall of the *Evêché*, where the chief of those who had taken part in the procession were assembled. In the presence of this august meeting, Francis delivered an animated and passionate speech, in which he declared that if he suspected one of his own members to be infected with these new heresies, he would not scruple to cut it off; nor to offer up, with his own hand, as a sacrifice to divine justice, any of his children who might have imbibed them. The pomp of this superstitious pageant was eclipsed by the horror of the scene reserved for the close of the day. Six wretches, convicted of Lutheranism, were condemned by a decree of the Parliament to be burned in a slow fire. They were suspended by a rope to a machine, by which they were several times let down into the flames, and again drawn up, till at length the executioner cut the rope, and precipitated them into the fire. The more educated among them had their tongues slit, lest they should infect the people with their doctrines. Altogether, four-and-twenty

¹ Sleidan, ix., 148.

perished in Paris in this manner. The Germans residing there were particularly the objects of suspicion.¹

This unfortunate occurrence did great damage to the cause of the Reformers. Some fled, others were imprisoned; among the latter Gérard le Roux. Here was an opportunity for the beneficent offices of Margaret, which she did not neglect. A letter of hers to Montmorency is still extant, in which she pleads for Le Roux's life; and asserts not only his orthodoxy but her own.² Her mediation was successful, and Le Roux, on his liberation from prison, retired to her court at Nérac. Here Margaret made him her spiritual director, obtained for him the abbey of Clairac, and subsequently the bishopric of Oleron. But, though he preached at her court in a lay habit, and is said to have maintained, like Calvin, a mystical presence in the eucharist, he never openly separated from the Romish communion. Indeed, after this peril, he not only thought it advisable to adopt an outward compliance with it himself, but persuaded Margaret to do the like, on the ground that mere outward rites are things indifferent. In this their example was followed by many of the higher classes; and thus arose a large body of conformers, who excused themselves by pleading the example of Nicodemus. Against these Calvin subsequently wrote two tracts, as there will be occasion to narrate further on. Le Roux's life, however, was irreproachable. He was diligent in preaching and in instructing the young, and a kind benefactor to the poor. He was publicly assassinated at Mauléon in 1550, during a sermon which he was delivering against the observance of the saints' days. A fanatic, named Arnould de Maytie, cut away the props of the pulpit with a hatchet, and the consequences of the fall were fatal. The son of the assassin is said to have been rewarded with the bishopric thus vacated.³

Notwithstanding this unfortunate occurrence, Francis still showed symptoms of a wish to accommodate the differences in religion, through the mediation of Melancthon. At the instance of Guillaume du Bellay, Seigneur de Langey, and probably, also, of his brother, the bishop of Paris, he wrote a

¹ Sleidan, ix., 145. Latomus to Erasmus, Ep. 1283. *Egl. Réf.*, i., 13.

² "L'on est à cet instant à parfaire le procès de maître Gérard où j'espère que, la fin bien cogneue, le Roy trouvera qu'il est digne de mieulx que du feu, et qu'il n'a jamais tenu opinion pour le mériter, ny quy sente nulle chose hérétique. Il y a cinque ans que je le cognois, et croyés que si j'eusse veu une chose douteuse, je n'eusse point voulu souffrir si longuement une telle poison, ny y employer mes amis."—*Lettres de Marguerite*, i., 299.

³ *Lettres de Marg.*, i., 267. *Egl. Réf.*, p. 14. Maimbourg, *Hist. du Calvinisme*, p. 19.

letter to Melancthon with his own hand, on the 28th of June, 1535, in which he invited him to come and confer with some of the doctors of the Sorbonne. Melancthon, it appears, did not decline the invitation, but the Duke of Saxony refused his permission, apparently, however, not much to the regret of the Reformer.¹

Among those who had made themselves conspicuous by their opinions in religion, and who now thought it high time to quit a country in which they were surrounded with so many dangers, were Olivétan, Caroli, Clement Marot, and Calvin himself, who, accompanied by his friend Du Tillet, set off for Basle.² Near Metz they were robbed by one of their servants; but the other, fortunately, had ten crowns, which enabled them to prosecute their journey. At Basle a new life seemed to dawn upon Calvin. He became personally acquainted with some of the leading German Reformers; as Wolfgang Capito, who, in conjunction with Œcolampadius, had introduced the Reformation into that city, and under whose guidance Calvin applied himself to the study of Hebrew. Here, also, he found Bucer; and the learned Simon Grynæus, who was at that time lecturing both on classical literature and on the Scriptures. Erasmus was still residing at Basle; but it is doubtful whether Calvin became acquainted with him. Florimond de Rémond asserts, indeed, that he was introduced to Erasmus by Bucer; and that, on seeing him, the former exclaimed, "I perceive a great evil springing up against the Church out of her own bosom."³ But this account is not confirmed by any other writer, and Jortin⁴ treats it with contempt as a silly story, of which, indeed, it has all the appearance.

At Basle, Calvin put the finishing hand to the first edition of his "*Institutio*," or "Institutes of the Christian Religion." This was but a slender manual in comparison with what the book afterward became; and at this time his chief object in publishing it was, to lay before the world a sort of confession of faith, in order to rescue the Reformers from the calumnies with which they were assailed.⁵ The dedication to Francis I. has been ranked as one of the three most famous prefaces which the world has seen: that of Casaubon to Polybius, and of De Thou to his History, being the other two. Its tone, however, was but little fitted to convert Francis, which was

¹ M. Adamus, *Vita Melancthonis*, p. 336.

² See Maimbourg, p. 59.

³ See his preface to the Psalms.

⁴ Drelincourt, p. 41.

⁵ *Life of Erasmus*, i., 555.

the object proposed. In the comparison of the spirit of the Reformed with that of the Popish Church, a bitterness prevails which, however justified by facts, was not calculated to conciliate. Beza assumes that Francis never read it, which is very probable; but his conjecture that, had he done so, a great blow would have been inflicted on the Babylonish strumpet, seems more doubtful. This dedication is dated at Basle, in August, 1535; but no edition of that year is now extant. It is probable that the work first appeared in French; but the oldest edition known is a Latin one, bearing the date of 1536, probably a translation.¹ In 1535 Calvin also wrote a preface to his relative Olivétan's translation of the Bible, published at Neufchâtel in that year. It is in the shape of an Epistle to all Christian princes and people, and forms the second letter in Beza's collection of his correspondence.

When Calvin first published his "Institutes," he was only twenty-six; yet it has been remarked that he never varied from the principles he then laid down. His views respecting grace and election were there, and even his doctrine of the eucharist, as he proposed it in the Zurich "*Consensus*" of 1549; though some have maintained that his earlier opinions on that subject inclined toward those of Luther.² But though this consistency with regard to doctrine is remarkable, yet, after the affair of Servetus, he seems to have changed his opinions respecting discipline and church government. Slender as was the first edition of this work in comparison with subsequent ones, yet in the latter several passages are omitted which spoke too strongly in favor of toleration.³

At the end of 1535, according to Bayle, or, as Dr. Henry conjectures, in March, 1536, Calvin, after publishing a Latin version of his "Institutes," set off for Italy, with the purpose of visiting the court of Ferrara. Here another lady of the

¹ See P. Henry, *Leben Calvins*, i., 104, et seq.

² Jos. Scaliger says in his "*Scaligeriana Secunda*:" "It is wonderful that, though he wrote so much, he never made any retractions. I leave you to judge whether he were a great man."—P. Henry, *Leben Calvins*, i., 134. Compare Beza, *Vita Calv.* Dr. Lawrence has observed that Calvin's views at this time respecting grace and election were not quite the same as he afterward entertained; and refers in proof to his preface to Olivétan's Testament. See *Bampton Lecture*, Sermon vii., note 1. Bretschneider has also remarked that, in the first edition of his "*Institutio*," Calvin had not adopted the doctrine of predestination (*Calvin et l'Eglise de Genève*, in the *Reformations Almanach*, p. 95, Fr. translation, Geneva, 1822). But the passage quoted by P. Henry (i., 114) seems decisive on that point: though Calvin had not yet, perhaps, developed the doctrine so systematically as he afterward did. The preface to Olivétan's Testament will be found among Calvin's Epistles, No. 58.

³ See below, chap. x.

royal blood of France, Rénée, the daughter of Louis XII. and Anne of Brittany, who in 1527 had married Hercules II., Duke of Ferrara, afforded protection and encouragement to the persecuted Reformers. The pursuits of Rénée were of an intellectual character, like those of Margaret; from whom she is said to have derived the inclination which she felt toward the new tenets. But Rénée's studies were of a severer kind than those of Margaret; and, besides the languages, she applied herself diligently to geometry, astronomy, and philosophy. She seems, too, to have been less under the influence of imagination than Margaret, and preserved to the end of her life the religious tenets which she had adopted only after a careful inquiry. At Ferrara Calvin met Madame de Soubise, who had been Rénée's governess, together with her daughter Anne, and her son Jean de Parthenai, who afterward became one of the leaders of the Protestant party in France, and with whom Calvin kept up a correspondence. Here, too, he found Clement Marot, who, after the affair of the placards, had fled first to Bearn, and then to Ferrara, where he filled the post of secretary to the duchess.

We have scarcely any particulars of Calvin's visit to Ferrara. He himself used to say, that he had entered Italy only to leave it again. For the sake of security, Calvin adopted during this journey the name of M. Charles d'Espeville. Though, under the circumstances of the times, there may be nothing positively blamable in the assumption of a fictitious name, still the many disguises of this sort which Calvin put on must be regarded as forming a trait in his character which strongly contrasts with the bold and open conduct of Luther. It is ascertained that he adopted at least seven different pseudonyms. The second edition of his "*Institutio*" was published at Strasburgh, in 1539, under the anagram of Alcuin.¹ In his tract against Baudouin, he acknowledges that he had called himself Lucanius, which Baudouin converted into Lucianus. Besides the name of D'Espeville assumed in this journey, he called himself Deperçan or Deparçan, when he fled from Paris. Other names which he adopted at different times, are Carolus Passelius, Joseph Calphurnius, and J. de Bonneville. The last is subscribed to a French manuscript letter, written in June, 1553.²

¹ Bayle is wrong in questioning this fact.

² P. Henry, *Leben Calvins*, i., Beil. 3. There is a book by Liebe on the subject of Calvin's pseudonyms, entitled "*Diatriben de Pseudonymia Calviniana*," Amst. 1723.

Notwithstanding his disguise it is asserted by some writers that the officers of the Inquisition had discovered Calvin's presence at Ferrara, and that he was obliged to fly from their pursuit.¹ Dr. Henry conjectures that he may probably have been driven from Italy by the treaty entered into by the Duke of Ferrara with the Pope and emperor, in 1536, by a secret article of which the duke bound himself to banish all the French from his court.² Beza, however, in his "Life of Calvin," alludes to neither of these causes. His words would rather seem to imply that Calvin voluntarily returned to France, for the purpose of arranging his domestic affairs.³ His eldest brother Charles died in 1536,⁴ who being a priest, and consequently unmarried, the paternal inheritance devolved on Calvin. This seems to have been the event which recalled him to his native town, which he now visited for the last time. After selling his estate and putting his affairs in order he quitted Noyon forever, accompanied by his brother Anthony, his sister Maria, and a few other friends.

Calvin's intention was to proceed either to Basle or Strasburgh, but the Emperor Charles V. having penetrated with his army into France, the way through Lorraine was closed, and he was forced to take a circuitous road through Savoy and Geneva; a circumstance which decided the whole color of his future life. He arrived at Geneva late in the summer of 1536, and took up his lodging at the house of Viret, one of the ministers of that city, with the intention of stopping only a single night. His presence was discovered either by Du Tillet or Caroli, by whom it was communicated to Farel.⁵ The latter had in some degree succeeded in establishing the Reformation at Geneva; but it was still in a weak and tottering state, and assailed by virulent and powerful enemies. The zeal, almost amounting to fanaticism, which characterized Farel, though well calculated to make a sudden conquest of men's minds, lacked that prudence and discretion necessary to conciliate and retain them. Calvin's reputation as a the-

¹ See Maimbourg, p. 62.

² *Leben Calvins*, i., 155.

³ "Cæterum ex Italiâ, in cujus fines se ingressum esse dicere solebat ut inde exiret, in Galliam regressus, rebus suis omnibus ibi compositis," &c. Yet there is a little discrepancy in Beza's French life, in which he makes Calvin return to Basle after leaving Italy (*Vie de Calvin*, p. 20, Genève, 1663.)

⁴ Des May, *apud* Drelincourt, p. 234.

⁵ Calvin (*Præf. in Psalmos*) points to the person as one who had afterward returned to Romanism. According to Maimbourg (p. 59), Du Tillet, while residing with Calvin at Basle, had been reconverted by his brother, the registrar, and induced to return to Paris. But it was most probably Caroli who discovered Calvin's arrival. See Kirchhofer, *Leben Farel's*, i., 193.

ologian was now pretty well established ; and Farel, who felt, and always candidly acknowledged, his superior abilities and learning, upon hearing of his arrival, immediately desired to secure his services. He therefore called upon the traveler, and endeavored to persuade him to remain at Geneva. Calvin at first excused himself, alleging that he did not wish to accept a public office, and had determined to devote his life to retirement and study. Finding persuasion of no avail, Farel assumed the air and prerogatives of an apostle ; and with that manner and voice which had often inspired thousands with awe, threatened Calvin with God's curse upon all his undertakings if he refused his aid in so pressing a conjuncture. Calvin was so alarmed and shaken by this denunciation, that he abandoned his projected journey, as if, he says, God had laid his hand upon him out of heaven.¹ But though he consented to remain, he would not bind himself to accept any definite charge.

Such was the fortuitous origin of Calvin's connection with Geneva, which was destined to have such important results.

¹ Preface to the Psalms.

CHAPTER II.

Some Account of Geneva—Farel's Arrival there—Sketch of Farel's Life—His Labors at Geneva and Expulsion from that City—Froment succeeds him—Disturbances—Return of the Bishop—Guy Furbity—Dissolution of the Monasteries—Reformation established—Genevese Constitution—Calvin joins Farel—Disputation of Lausanne—Anabaptists—Caroli—Accuses Calvin of Arianism—Caroli's Banishment and Apostasy—Calvin and Farel's Orthodoxy suspected—Their Scheme of Discipline—Manners of the Genevese—They revolt against the Discipline—French Intrigues—Synod of Lausanne—Inflexibility of Farel and Calvin—Their Banishment from Geneva—They appeal to the Synod of Zurich—Berne intercedes for them.

IN order that the reader may understand Calvin's position at Geneva, it will be necessary to explain the state of parties there, and the progress which the Reformation had made at the time of his arrival.

Geneva, though nominally a fief of the German empire, had in reality been governed for several centuries by a bishop,¹ whose temporal authority was, however, controlled by certain lay assessors, as well as by the citizens, without whose consent, in general assembly, he could do nothing.² The bishop acknowledged the Count of Geneva, or, rather, of the Genevois, as his feudal lord; and an officer called the Vidomne (*vice-dominus*) administered the law in the bishop's name, but as the representative of the count. The house of Savoy, having acquired the rights of the Counts of Geneva by the cession of Odon de Villars, in 1401, endeavored also to get possession of the temporal rights of the bishop. No serious attempts, however, appear to have been made on the independence of Geneva, till the time of Charles III., who, in 1504, succeeded to the just Duke Philibert. Charles found a willing tool in Bishop John, a natural son of Francis of Savoy. This prelate ceded all his temporal rights to the Duke of Savoy; but the general assembly having annulled his proceeding, a bitter and bloody persecution ensued. The city was divided into two factions; that of the *Mamelukes*, which espoused the pretensions of Savoy; and that of the

¹ In an assembly of the burghesses in 1420, it was stated that the city had then been for more than four centuries under episcopal government. Spon, i., 171.

² Bonnivard, *apud* Ruchat, i., 319. Gerdesius, ii., 364.

patriots distinguished by the name of *Eidgenossen*. In order to shelter themselves from the aggressions of the duke, who frequently sought to attain his object by force of arms, the Genevese concluded a treaty of alliance and fellow-citizenship with Friburgh; to which, in 1526, they added another with Berne. In the latter of these cities the Reformation had already been established through the exertions of Berthold Haller, who began to preach there in 1522;¹ and it was this connection with Berne which laid the foundation of the Reformation at Geneva. But before giving an account of its progress there, it will be better to anticipate a little, and shortly to relate the issue of the struggle with the house of Savoy.

Charles continuing to annoy Geneva, Berne and Friburgh took the field in 1530, in defense of their ally. The duke was compelled to sue for a peace, the articles of which, however, he contrived to evade. A few years afterward the progress of the Reformation among the Genevese not only deprived them of the alliance of Friburgh, but increased the displeasure of Charles; and in 1535 the abolition of Popery at Geneva, and formal suppression of the bishopric, roused him to still more vigorous attacks. For some time the Genevese had to bear the brunt of war unaided; but early in 1536 Berne sent an army of 7000 men to their assistance, which overran the Pays de Vaud, and in eleven days appeared before the gates of Geneva. The Savoyards fled without striking a blow; but the success of the victors was much facilitated by the circumstance of France having, at the very same time, declared war against Savoy. Francis I. had eagerly laid hold on the hesitation of Charles to allow the French troops to pass through his dominions, as a pretext, which he had long been seeking, for making war upon him. In two months the duke was completely stripped of his dominions, which he never regained, but died in exile in 1553;² and thus Geneva was finally delivered from all apprehensions from that quarter.

The profligate and tyrannical conduct of Peter de la Beaume, who, in 1522, had succeeded to John of Savoy in the see of Geneva, contributed to dispose the Genevese toward the Reformation. At first, indeed, that prelate seemed to favor the patriot party; and when, in 1527, he found it expedient to retire from Geneva, in order to avoid the anger of the Duke of Savoy, whom he had offended by pardoning some criminals,³ he formally ceded his civil jurisdiction to the

¹ Scultetus, *apud* V. der Hardt, p. 49.

² Ruchat, iv., 33.

³ Besson, *Mémoires Ecclés.*, cited by Grénus, *Fragm. Biogr.*, p. 145.

magistrates of Geneva. In his exile, however, he reconciled himself with the Duke of Savoy, endeavored to recall the cession he had made of his temporal rights, and early in 1528 even caused a revocation of it to be fixed on the church doors; but this impotent attempt only excited the ridicule of the Genevese. In the same year the Mameluke party having persuaded the Archbishop of Vienne, the metropolitan of Geneva, to excommunicate that city, the indignation of the other citizens was roused to such a pitch, that, in a general assembly held on the 29th of December, they forbade, under rigorous penalties, the future recognition of the archbishop and his spiritual court, and even refused to obey any letters apostolical which might be addressed to them by their own bishop.¹ Meanwhile, in conjunction with the Duke of Savoy, Peter de la Beaume resorted to all methods of annoying the Genevese. It was even discovered, from an intercepted letter, that he had joined the league of the *Gentilhommes de la Cuillère*, or gentlemen of the spoon: a conspiracy hatched among some of the principal inhabitants of the Pays de Vaud, with the design of blockading Geneva and starving the inhabitants; the members of which league, assisted by their dependents, waylaid, plundered, and in some cases even murdered, such of the Genevese as ventured beyond their walls. It was by two members of this league that Bonnard, the prior of St. Victor, was seized in 1536, and, after being robbed, led to the Castle of Chillon, where, with the sanction of the Duke of Savoy, he was detained a prisoner, till the place was captured by the Bernese in March, 1536.²

The hatred inspired by this conduct of the bishop was aggravated by the remembrance of his violence and profligacy, of which he had given a signal instance shortly before his departure from Geneva, by openly carrying off a young lady of good family, whom he detained in his palace till compelled to restore her by the mob which surrounded it.³

But though these occurrences tended to shake the allegiance of the Genevese toward their ecclesiastical government, and, consequently, toward the papal power generally, it was not till 1532 that there appeared among them any open manifestations in favor of the Reformed doctrines. It having been announced in that year that Pope Clement VII. was about to publish a Jubilee, placards were discovered in differ-

¹ Ruchat, ii., 27, et seq.

² *Régistres de Genève*, 1 Avril, 1536. Spon, i., 141.

³ Ruchat, ii., 32.

ent parts of Geneva, promising a general pardon of sins on the sole conditions of repentance, and a lively faith in the promises of Christ. Peter Wernly, a canon of St. Peter's, but a native of Friburgh, having surprised one John Goulas in the act of affixing one of these placards to a pillar in that church, struck him, and drew his sword. Goulas also drew; a combat ensued, and Wernly was wounded in the arm. The council of Friburgh remonstrated: that of Geneva replied that these proceedings had occurred without their knowledge, but added that they were resolved, like their allies at Friburgh, to live in the ancient religion; and, in proof of their sincerity, prohibited the placards by sound of trumpet.¹

In the month of October of the same year, there entered Geneva a little man of mean appearance, with a vulgar face, a narrow forehead, a pale, but sun-burned complexion, and a chin on which appeared two or three tufts of a red and ill-combed beard, but whose fiery eye and expressive mouth announced to the close observer a more remarkable character than his general appearance seemed to indicate.² He rode a fine white horse, and was accompanied by another man, mounted on a black one. It was William Farel, and his friend Anthony Saunier. They had been attending a synod of the Waldenses in the valleys of Piedmont, whence, at the instance of the Bernese council, and well furnished with credentials and letters of recommendation, they had bent their steps toward Geneva, to put their sickles into the harvest of the Lord.

Farel's history is so bound up with that of Calvin that it will be proper to give a short account of him. He was born at Gap, in Dauphiné, in the year 1489, and was descended from a noble family which had some possessions in that province. The blind and unreasoning enthusiasm which formed the salient feature in his character, and which constantly demanded an object, had vented itself in early life in a superstitious observance of the more ascetic parts of papistry, and in an extraordinary veneration for the Pope's person, whom he regarded not merely as an agent appointed by God, but even as a sort of divinity.³ The nature of his education tended at first to increase this disposition. His early youth

¹ Ruchat, iii., 174. Spon, i., 463.

² *Le Chroniqueur*. Sœur Jeanne de Jussie records Farel's appearance at Geneva with a contempt inspired probably by his person: "Au mois d'Octobre vint à Genève un chétif malheureux prédicant nommé maître Guillaume."—Kirchhofer, *Leben Farel's*, i., 157.

³ Kirchhofer, i., 3.

was a little anterior to the revival of sound learning; and at the High School of Paris he became imbued with the scholastic divinity and still more wretched philosophy of the age. At a later period, however, he was fortunate enough to become the pupil of Le Fèvre d'Étaples, at whose recommendation he began to study the Bible; and, in order to understand it the better, applied himself to the acquirement of Greek and Hebrew. Farel was soon struck with the difference between the precepts of Scripture and the practice of the Church; and the result was, his thorough conversion to the tenets of the Reformation. Meanwhile he had become, as we have seen, regent of the college of Cardinal Le Moine: a post of distinguished honor, and subsequently filled by Turnebus, Buchanan, Muretus, and other eminent men. When the persecutions broke out he was forced to abandon this office, and, after a short residence at Meaux, repaired in February, 1524, to Basle. He had been there but a few days, when his restless zeal led him to publish a disputation, in which he engaged to maintain thirteen *theses* against the Roman Catholics. The bishop's vicar and the rector of the academy did all they could to hinder it, but Farel obtained the permission of the municipal council, and the disputation took place on the 15th of February.¹

Farel had come to Basle brimful of indignation against Erasmus, who felt an aversion to this class of hot-headed Reformers, which he was at no pains to conceal. "I abhor the evangelists," said he, "as for other reasons, so because it is through them that literature is declining in every place, and entertained with coldness and contempt, and on the point of perishing; and without letters what is life? They love money and women, and despise all other things. We have been stunned long enough with the cry of *Gospel, Gospel, Gospel*. We want *Gospel manners*."²

To a man of cultivated taste, like Erasmus, it must have been painful to witness the havoc committed by the more fanatical Reformers. In a letter to Pirchheimer, describing the progress of the Reformation at Basle, he complains that pictures, statues, and other works of art, no matter what their merit or value, were sacrificed by their remorseless and indiscriminating zeal.³ The charge of discouraging literature must, however, be confined to the more violent section of the Reformers. Carlostadt, in Luther's absence, emptied the

¹ Gerdesius, ii., 269. These *theses* will be found in Kirchhofer, i., 22.

² Jortin, *Erasmus*, i., 442.

³ See Ep. 1048.

schools, and bade all to labor with their hands ; but Luther himself knew the value of sound learning as the handmaid of pure theology, and considered it the harbinger of all signal revelations of the word of God.¹ Melancthon, too, was one of the most elegant scholars of his age, and in his lectures on Terence, delivered at the University of Tübingen, had first pointed out the meters of that author, whose verses had previously been printed like prose.²

Piqued by the slights and neglects which Farel publicly manifested toward him, Erasmus is said to have sought an interview with him, in which he asked the reason of such conduct, and why he had given him the name of Balaam. A conversation ensued, in which Luther's dogmas were discussed ; and after several sallies on both sides, they parted, as might have been expected, worse friends than ever.³ The impetuosity of Farel, to whom discretion was an utter stranger, led him to attack Erasmus publicly. He charged him with want of courage to avow the true doctrine, though he secretly entertained it, and accused him of a design to repress the gospel, then just bursting into day. After a few attempts at expostulation, Erasmus retired from a contest with so violent an adversary, for which he was naturally disqualified. He avenged himself, after his own fashion, by quietly fixing the nickname of *Phallicus*⁴ on Farel, and by using all his influence to get him expelled from Basle, in which he succeeded.

On leaving Basle, where he had remained only a few months, Farel proceeded to Montbelliard. Here the anger of Erasmus still pursued him. In letters to the bishop's official, at Besançon, and to other friends, he painted Farel as a bold, lying, and turbulent man ; at the same time throwing out a hint that it would be necessary to use compulsion toward him.⁵ It is probable that Erasmus's dislike of the man led him to exaggerate his faults. Yet we have the evidence of one of Farel's own friends, and a man of truly moderate and Christian principles, to his want of charity and gentleness. Œcolampadius, writing to him at Montbelliard says, " I questioned N—— respecting your meekness, than

¹ M. Adamus, *Vita Lutheri*, p. 164.

² *Ib.*, *Vita Melancthonis*, p. 330.

³ Ruchat, i., 584. App.

⁴ Probably from some manifestation of those amorous propensities which led Farel in his old age to marry quite a girl.

⁵ Kirchhofer, *Leben Farel's*, i., 22. See also Erasmus's letters to the Bishop of Rochester, and to Brugnarius at Montbelliard, in the autumn of 1524 (Epp. 698 and 707). From the latter it appears that one of the topics of Erasmus's dispute with Farel had turned on the nature of the Holy Ghost, and whether that person of the Trinity ought to be invoked.

which nothing is more becoming to a Christian, not to say an apostle. But though he wonderfully praised your indefatigable industry, your unquenchable ardor, and your tolerable success, he added that you poured out torrents of reproaches upon the priests. Forsooth, I am not ignorant of their deserts, nor in what colors they ought to be painted; yet with your leave I would say, as a friend, and brother to a brother, that you do not always seem to be mindful of your office. Your mission is to evangelize, and not to curse. I pardon, nay, I praise your zeal, provided it be not deficient in gentleness. Labor, my brother, that my spirit may be rejoiced with this news also; that at the proper time you pour in the wine and oil; that you prove yourself an evangelist, and not a tyrannical lawgiver.¹

Farel remained but a short time at Montbelliard; but whether he was driven thence by the machinations of Erasmus is uncertain. According to an old story, which rests, however, on no certain foundation, he was forced to fly for having snatched the relics of St. Anthony from a priest who was bearing them in solemn procession, and thrown them into the water.²

Strasburgh was then the common refuge of the persecuted, and thither Farel bent his steps. In this town he dwelt more than a year, enjoying the friendship of Bucer and Capito, and living in the latter's house. In October, 1526, he revisited Basle; and before the end of that year, assuming the name of Ursinus, and the profession of a schoolmaster, proceeded into Switzerland as a missionary of the gospel, without any fixed cure or salary. In March, 1527, the council of Berne sanctioned his preaching in the district of Aigle till the incumbent should have provided an efficient curate. This was the first time that the gospel had been preached in Switzerland in the French tongue; and in spite of the repulsive severity of his doctrines, and the opposition he experienced from the court of the Bishop of Lausanne, Farel succeeded in making some converts. He was indeed an excellent field-preacher, for which his undaunted boldness, his fiery zeal, and his trumpet-toned voice, admirably qualified him. In June, 1530, he received a formal commission from the Bernese government to preach in all places subject to their jurisdiction.³

From this period till his arrival at Geneva in 1532, Farel's

¹ M. Adamus, *Vita Farelli*, p. 115.

² Kirchhofer, i., 42. ³ *Ib.*, p. 98.

labors in spreading the gospel were chiefly exerted at Neufchâtel and in the surrounding neighborhood. To detail these does not belong to the present subject. Suffice it to say, that they were often attended with risk of life, and not unfrequently brought upon him severe personal chastisement. The council of Berne was sometimes obliged to admonish him to be discreet; and Zwingli himself, a little before his death, exhorted him not to expose himself rashly, but to reserve himself for the further service of the Lord.¹ His bitter and persevering attacks upon the Romish clergy obtained him the name of "the Scourge of the Priests."

The arrival of such a man at Geneva, where he was well known by reputation, caused, as may be imagined, no little consternation, not only among the clergy, but even in the council. The latter had, indeed, been awakened to a sense of the ignorance, absurdity, and profligacy of the priesthood; and perceiving the growth and tendency of public opinion, had exhorted them to preach the gospel instead of retailing the ridiculous legends and fables with which they were accustomed to amuse their auditory: but political motives, especially the influence of Friburgh, and the dread of losing the alliance of that city, restrained them from openly encouraging the Reformers.

The day after their arrival, Farel and Saunier were visited at their lodgings by numbers of the citizens, whom they addressed on religious topics. Among these was Ami Perrin, a distinguished citizen of Geneva, and one of the earliest and most ardent promoters of the Reformation, but whom there will be frequent occasion to mention in the course of this narrative, as having subsequently become one of Calvin's chief opponents. The news of these proceedings reached the council, who summoned Farel and Saunier to their presence, censured them as disturbers of the peace, and ordered them to depart the city. The former replied that he was no trumpet of sedition, but a preacher of the truth, for which he was prepared to sacrifice not only his labor but his life. He then produced the credentials with which the Bernese had furnished him, and in which they requested their allies to receive him with kindness, and to listen to his doctrine. This somewhat mollified the council; who permitted him to retire to his lodgings, but forbade him to preach his new doctrines.²

¹ Kirchhofer, i., 147.

² Ruchat, iii., 76. Kirchhofer.

Scarce had Farel and Saunier reached home, when they received a summons to attend a disputation at the house of the Abbé de Beaumont, the vicar-general. Nothing, however, was further from the intention of the Roman Catholic priests than discussion. They had been heard to say, "*Sì disputetur, totum nostrum mysterium destruetur.*" "If we argue, our trade is gone." We have the evidence of a bigoted Catholic that it was the intention of this meeting to take Farel's life.¹ The council, however, suspected the violence of the clergy; and lest their conduct toward Farel should occasion a quarrel with Berne, they sent two of the syndics to accompany and protect him, who made the ecclesiastics swear that they would do the ministers no injury, though they should maintain their doctrines against them. Farel and his friend were also accompanied to the meeting by Olivétan, who was now living in a gentleman's family at Geneva, in the capacity of tutor, and who secretly employed himself in furthering the Reformation. On their road they were assailed with abuse, and when they arrived at the place of meeting, they were received with the greatest insolence by De Vegia, the bishop's officer. He reproached them with having the appearance of robbers, and treated them scornfully as laymen, who could neither have knowledge nor authority to preach. When Farel spoke of a call from above, De Vegia required him to prove it by a miracle, as Moses did before Pharaoh. His appearance in the assembly, the members of which carried weapons concealed under their clothes, was the signal for uproar and abuse. "Come, Farel, thou filthy devil," exclaimed the canons, "art thou baptized? Whence art thou? Why dost thou creep about troubling the world? Who invited thee hither? Who gives thee power to preach? Art thou not he that has spread the Lutheran heresy in Aigle and Neuchâtel, seducing the people all around? Wherefore comest thou to sow the seed of heresy here, and in all the land?"

"Sirs," replied Farel, "I have been baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and am no devil. I go about announcing Jesus Christ, who died for our sins upon the cross, and again rose from the dead to further our salvation. Whoever believes in Him shall receive eternal life, but unbelievers shall go into everlasting perdition. I am sent by God, our gracious Father, as a messenger of Christ, and am bound to preach Him to all who will listen; and with all my power have I striven that every one should receive

¹ Jeanne de Jussie, quoted by Kirchofer, i., 158.

Him. On a journey have I come hither to see if any one will hear me ; and am ready to dispute with you, and to give an account of my faith and of my ministry. It is for this, I hear, that you have called me before you. So long as it shall please you to hear me quietly, I will maintain unto the death that what I have preached, and what I daily preach, is the pure truth, and no heresy, as ye charge me. I go not forth in the name of man, but of God, who hath chosen me to be His minister, and am far from designing to disturb this city, as ye object to me. Elias said to King Ahab, 'It is thou, and not I, who disturbest all Israel ;' and so may I say unto you, it is not I who bring the disturbance, but ye and your followers, who disturb not only this town, but all the world, by your teaching, and your worldly laws, and your unholy lives."¹

By this speech the rage of the ecclesiastics was roused to the highest pitch. One of the canons exclaimed, in the words of Caiaphas, "*Blasphemavit ; non amplius indigemus testibus : reus est mortis :*" "He hath blasphemed ; we want no further evidence ; he deserves to die :"² adding, in French, "*au Rhone, au Rhone !*" words which, at Geneva, conveyed no obscure sentence of death. Farel replied, "Speak the words of God and not of Caiaphas." Hereupon the whole assembly called out to kill the dog of a Lutheran. Farel was reviled, struck, and spit upon ; nay, one of the vicar-general's servants even shot at him, but without doing him any harm. From this dangerous situation he was rescued by one of the syndics, who threatened to sound the tocsin and raise the people, unless the assembly desisted from further violence. He and Saunier were, however, ordered by the episcopal council to leave Geneva ; and early on the following morning, the 4th of October, escorted by a large party of friends to protect them from insult, among whom were Ami Perrin, Claude Bernard, and Jean Goulas, they proceeded to the water's edge, and getting into a boat, crossed the lake to a spot between Lausanne and Morsée. Thence they proceeded to Orbe, where they arrived in safety.²

Farel's expulsion from Geneva damped for a while the ardor of the Reformers in that city. He himself, however, did not abandon his hopes. In the neighborhood of Orbe he found a young man named Antoine Froment, a native of Dauphiné, like himself, who, at his request, consented to go to Geneva, and carry on the work which had been begun. Froment arrived there in November, but was received with such cold-

¹ Kirchofer, i., 160.

² Ruchat, iii., 179. Spon, i., 463.

ness and distrust that he was on the point of abandoning his enterprise. He was preparing to leave the place, when it occurred to him that he might obtain his object by a pious fraud. He hired a large room, set up a school, and gave out that he would teach people of all ages to read and write in a month, together with other accomplishments. When he was well established, he began to talk to his pupils, many of whom were of ripe age, on religious topics, and thus excited a spirit of inquiry. Several little books of controversy appeared, and were read with avidity. The labors of Froment were assisted by the sermons of Boquet, a Cordelier, but at heart a Protestant.

On the last day of 1532, some of the Reformers were drinking with the vicar of the Magdalen, when a dispute arose concerning Froment's doctrines. The vicar undertook to refute them from Scripture, and the party adjourned to his house, where several other priests were assembled. Instead of the sacred volume, however, the vicar, amid the jeers of his opponents, produced Nicholas de Lyra, a scholastic writer. The scene grew warm. Much abuse was uttered on both sides. One of the priests laid his hand on his sword; others ran to sound the tocsin. A mob collected, and it was with difficulty that the syndics were able to appease the tumult. In the evening the council forbade these sorts of disputes, and ordered Froment to leave the city.¹

On the following day, however, being the 1st of January, 1533, after hearing a sermon by Boquet, the people went in such numbers to Froment's house that the apartment where he used to preach was not large enough to contain them. A cry arose, "*au Molard!*"² Those nearest Froment carried him off to the market-place, where they placed him on a fish-wife's bench, the crowd exclaiming, "Preach to us the word of God!" Froment accordingly began, nor would he desist at the command of an officer sent by the council; observing, "It is better to obey God than man." Some armed men were sent to seize him, but Froment escaped into the house of a citizen. He now perceived, however, that it was dangerous to remain; and shortly afterward escaped by night to Orbe.³

By way of opposing the Reformers, the ecclesiastics endeavored to instill into the people the greatest horror for their doctrines and persons. They affirmed that since the introduction of these new heresies, Geneva, instead of the bless-

¹ Ruchat, iii., 184. Spon, i., 471.

² An open space where the market was held.

³ Ruchat, iii., 185.

ings which it formerly enjoyed, had been visited by famine, pestilence, sedition, and all the worst evils that can afflict mankind. They represented Farel and Viret to the superstitious multitude as feeding devils at their tables in the shape of huge black cats; they affirmed that a devil hung at every hair of Farel's beard, that he had no white in his eyes, and other absurdities of the like nature.¹ Nevertheless, Protestantism continued to spread, and in 1533 the first communion was celebrated in a garden without the town.²

The clergy in those days went armed, and affrays frequently arose between them and their adherents and the partisans of the Reformation, in which blood was sometimes spilled. A fatal one occurred on the 4th of May, 1533. Many Genevese merchants, who were favorable to the Reformation, were absent at the fair of Lyons, and the priests thought it an excellent opportunity for striking a blow. A preconcerted dispute was got up, and while it was raging, a man ran to the grand-vicar's to give notice of it to the priests assembled there, while another hastened to St. Peter's, to rouse the canons and sound the tocsin. The canons issued forth in a body to the Molard, Peter Wernly at their head, armed *cap-à-pié*, and brandishing a huge two-handed sword. "*Cher Dieu!*" he exclaimed, "where are the Lutherans?" protested that he was ready to die for the Church, and encouraged his followers to attack the other party. The Lutherans, however, were more numerous than had been anticipated. Wernly's band was routed, and he himself killed, while endeavoring to save himself by flight.³

This event caused great embarrassment at Geneva. The Friburghers demanded justice for the blood of their fellow-citizen, and insisted on the Bishop of Geneva being recalled, to try the assassins. The Genevese did not think it prudent to refuse; and on the 1st of July, after an absence of several years, Peter de la Beaume re-entered Geneva with princely honors. One of his first acts was to release the priests who had been imprisoned for the tumult. On the 3d of July, after a solemn mass, he convened a general assembly, and demanded of them, by the mouth of the President of Burgundy, whether they did not recognize him as their lawful prince? The answer being in the affirmative, he exhorted them to live in unity, and addressed some threats to those who had quitted the Romish faith.

¹ Kirchofer, *Leben Farel's*, i., 168.

² Ruchat, iii., 188.

³ Spon, i., 492. Ruchat, iii., 226.

The mode in which the prisoners for the murder of Wernly should be tried, was made a party question, in which Berne and Friburgh exerted their influence: the former in favor of the new and popular constitutional forms, and the latter in behalf of the bishop's jurisdiction. It was at length arranged that the case should be tried by the syndics and council, with the assistance of two clerks of the bishop's, two of Friburgh, and two of Berne, who, however, were not to have a vote. All the prisoners were acquitted, except a wretched carman, who, on being tortured, confessed that he had stabbed Wernly in the back. The bishop, however, did not await the issue of the trial. Fearing, or pretending to fear, some violence from the people, he suddenly left Geneva on the 14th of July, and never again returned.¹

The Catholic party, thus frustrated in their plan for restoring the supremacy of their religion by means of the bishop, resolved on opposing the Protestants with their own weapons. Toward the close of 1533, they caused Guy Furbity, a Dominican, and a doctor of the Sorbonne, who possessed great reputation for learning and eloquence, to be brought to Geneva, to preach the Advent sermons. Instead of preaching at the Convent de Rive, the usual place, he was escorted with great pomp to St. Peter's by a large body of armed Catholics. One of his sermons on the subject of the soldiers dividing our Lord's garment, in which he applied the text to the various sects of heretics into which the Church was split, and loaded the Protestants with abuse, gave great offense to the Bernese, who considered his words as directed against themselves. They demanded his arrest; and in order to counteract the effect of his discourses, sent back Farel, Viret, and Froment, to Geneva, under the protection of their ambassadors. The Friburghers remonstrated, and threatened to cancel their alliance with Geneva; the Bernese, on their side, held out the same menace. The confusion was increased by a proclamation of the grand-vicar's, on the 1st of January, 1534, prohibiting preaching without his or the bishop's license, and ordering all French and German Bibles to be destroyed. It was evident that matters were drawing to a crisis, and that the Genevese must shortly choose between the alliance of Berne or Friburgh, between the Protestant or Catholic faith. In the course of January, an embassy arrived from Berne to demand Furbity's arrest and trial, and to require that a Reformed minister should be appointed to each of the seven par-

¹ Ruchat, iii., 232, et seq.

ishes of Geneva; and these requisitions were supported by an awkward demand for the repayment of the large sums due to the Bernese on account of the war. Furbity being summoned before the council, denied that his discourses had been aimed at the Bernese, and offered to prove all that he had said from Scripture. A public disputation accordingly took place between him and Farel and Viret, which began on the 29th of January, and lasted several days. Furbity broke down in his undertaking, especially with regard to the prohibition of meat in Lent, for which he could produce only the authority of Aquinas. Hereupon the Bernese ambassadors demanded justice against him as a liar, and preacher of dreams; and at their instance he was sentenced to be banished, after he should have made a public retraction in St. Peter's church. Pale, and with hurried steps, the monk mounted the pulpit on the day appointed for his recantation; but, instead of making it, he began to complain of injustice. The Bernese ambassadors insisted on his complying with the verdict; and on his again demurring, the people fell upon him and almost killed him. He was thrown into prison, where he remained for two years, when he was released at the intercession of Francis I. Farel afterward published an account of this dispute with Furbity, and made use of an artifice which can hardly be justified. It purported to be written by a friend of the monk's; and to lend a color to the deception, some praise was bestowed on him in the preface.¹

Under the protection of the Bernese ambassador, Farel, Viret, and Froment, continued vigorously to push the Reformation. At length, even the council showed symptoms of yielding; and to the instances of the Bernese that the Reformed ministers should be allowed to preach publicly, replied, that, though they could not give a formal sanction to such a step, they would not use any means to hinder it.² In consequence of this, on Sunday, the 1st of March, after the Franciscan who usually preached at the Convent de Rive had finished his sermon, Ami Perrin, Baudichon, and other friends of the Reformation, fetched Farel, and made him mount the pulpit, having first rung the bell to assemble the people.³ This was the first Protestant sermon preached in a Genevese church. The Friburghers protested against these proceedings, and threatened to tear their seal from the treaty; a threat which they actually carried into execution, on the 12th of April, 1534.

¹ Kirchhofer, *Leben Farel's*, i., 182. ² Buchat, iii., 284. ³ Spon., i., 528.

There being now nothing further to fear from Friburgh, the Reformation made rapid progress at Geneva. The Protestants, by degrees, obtained possession of other pulpits besides that of the Convent de Rive. Superstition was attacked in its strongholds by the demolition of the three convents, situated in the *Fauxbourgs*, which were pulled down in order to strengthen the fortifications of the city.¹ Others of the religious orders, seeing their occupation gone, fled voluntarily from Geneva, carrying with them the spoils of their monasteries. The nuns of St. Claire obtained permission to depart to Anecy, to an asylum prepared for them by the Duke of Savoy, where they might avoid those heresies which filled them with alarm and horror. One of the sisterhood, the Sœur de Jussie, in a book still extant,² has painted in the most lively colors, and with the utmost *naïveté*, the particulars of their removal, which seemed to them like a migration into a strange and distant country. Some of them had not been outside the convent walls for many years, and were filled with alarm at the commonest objects. They spent a whole day in getting to St. Julien, about a league from Geneva. "It was a piteous thing," says the Sœur de Jussie, "to see this holy company in such a plight, so overcome with fatigue and grief, that several swooned by the way. It was rainy weather, and all were obliged to walk through the muddy roads, except four poor invalids who were in the carriage. There were six poor old women who had taken their vows more than sixteen years before. Two of these, who were past sixty-six, and had never seen any thing of the world, fainted away repeatedly. They could not bear the wind; and when they saw the cattle in the fields, they took the cows for bears, and the long-wooled sheep for ravishing wolves. They who met them were so overcome with compassion, that they could not speak a word. And though our mother, the vicaress, had supplied them all with good shoes to save their feet, the greater number could not walk in them, but hung them at their waists. And so they walked from five o'clock in the morning, when they left Geneva, till near midnight, when they got to St. Julien, which is only a little league off." Appearances, however, would seem to show that these good nuns were not so simple as they wished to be thought; for after their departure, there were discovered in their convent subterra-

¹ Besides these there were three monasteries within the walls, and several chapels.

² *Le Commencement de l'Hérésie en Genève.*

neous passages, which communicated with that of the Franciscans.¹

It is unnecessary to follow minutely the remaining steps which at length, in August, 1535, led to the complete establishment of the Reformation at Geneva. On the 8th of that month the Protestants went in a body to St. Peter's, the cathedral church, and very throne, as it were, of Romanism, and obliged Farel to come and preach them a sermon. In the evening a great multitude again resorted thither, overthrew the images, and committed other acts of violence. On the following day a still more serious disturbance took place. The Reformers assembled in arms, and led by Perrin, Baudichon, and Vandel, went with drums beating to St. Gervais, St. Dominique de Palais, and other churches, where they did still greater damage than they had done at St. Peter's. The council now saw that they could no longer delay taking some decisive step, and therefore on the 10th of August, as Farel had frequently exhorted them to do, they assembled the council of Two Hundred. Before this assembly Farel appeared at the head of the ministers, and addressed it in that style of bold and masculine eloquence which was peculiar to him, concluding with a prayer to the Almighty that it might please him to enlighten the members of it. This had the desired effect. It was resolved to abolish Popery; and on the evening of the same day three of the syndics, and two members of the council, waited on the bishop's grand-vicar to announce the resolution which had been adopted. From this day mass ceased to be publicly performed at Geneva; nay, even its private celebration was forbidden without the permission of the council, whose conduct seems to have been regulated by instructions from Berne.² On the 27th of the same month the council published an order, requiring the citizens to worship God according to the Scriptures, and forbidding all papistical idolatry.³ This may be considered as the virtual establishment of Protestantism at Geneva, though a more solemn sanction was given to it on the 21st of May, in the following year; when, at the instance of Farel, the citizens were assembled, and an oath administered to them that they would live according to the precepts of the gospel. The political

¹ See Grénus, *Fragmens Historiques*, p. 208. Ruchat, iii., 383.

² P. Lullin having requested that he and his friends might be permitted to say mass, we find the following entry in the Registers, Sept. 2d, 1535: "Ordonné d'attendre des nouvelles de Berne, afin de voir ce qu'il y a à faire."—Grénus, *Fragmens Historiques*.

³ Ruchat, iii., 373. Spon, i., 571.

consequences which resulted from these steps have been already alluded to.

The Genevese now turned their attention toward placing the new Church on a permanent footing. Four ministers and two deacons were appointed, with fixed salaries payable out of the ecclesiastical revenues. Regulations were made to enforce a stricter discipline. All shops were ordered to be shut on the Sabbath: a sermon was appointed to be preached at four in the morning for servants and such as could not attend at a later hour; the communion was to be administered four times a year; baptism on any day whatever, but only by a minister, and in the church. Nor was the education of youth neglected. A school was established at the Convent de Rive, and Saunier appointed to the mastership.

But Farel's zeal was accompanied with intolerance. In April, 1536, he summoned to Geneva the priests of the surrounding villages, and required them to make an immediate renunciation of Popery. An aged priest, as spokesman for the rest, remarked with sense and dignity on the hardship of being required to repudiate, at a moment's notice, a system of religion which had lasted for so many ages; and that, too, before any attempt had been made to convince them of its falsehood. "Send teachers," he said, "to instruct us wherein we err, and when we are convinced, we will follow you." In this reply Farel saw only a spirit of obstinate resistance; but Bonnivard, who had recently been released from his long imprisonment, was for giving the country clergy time; and pointed out that so forced and sudden a conversion could never be sincere. In consequence of his representations, a month was allowed them for consideration. This, however, was but a short space in which to get rid of the habits and prejudices of a life; and though at the expiration of it the greater part of the rural clergy gave in their adherence to Protestantism, it is not surprising that many instances of apostasy should have subsequently occurred.¹

The conversion of Geneva into a republic by the overthrow of the episcopal power, was necessarily attended with some changes in its government; and as Calvin's personal history, as well as the form of ecclesiastical polity which he established, are so closely connected with the Genevese constitution as not to be clearly intelligible without a general knowledge of the latter, it will be proper to give a short account of it here.

While the government of the bishop existed at Geneva, he

¹ Ruchat, iv., 124. Spon, ii., 13. Kirchhofer, i., 195.

was assisted by four magistrates, called syndics, and by a council. The duties of the syndics were to keep the peace, and watch over the safety of the city, to preside in the assemblies, and the like. The burgesses, as already said, had the right of meeting in general assembly, and were consulted on all important emergencies. In order to avoid the too frequent convocation of this body, whose proceedings were often turbulent, a council of Sixty had been instituted in 1457,¹ and after the alliance with Friburgh and Berne in 1526, another council of Two Hundred was added, in imitation of the constitution of those cities. The ancient or ordinary council, which was the executive power of the state, consisted of sixteen members, besides the four syndics of the current year, the four retiring syndics, and the treasurer; making a total of twenty-five persons. Gentlemen, graduates in some science, and wholesale dealers, were alone eligible to this office. The Sixty were, of right, members of the council of Two Hundred, and the ordinary or little council formed part of both the other bodies, which did not always consist of the exact number indicated by their names.² Previously to the institution of the Two Hundred, the ordinary council had been elected by the four syndics, each syndic choosing four members to serve for the current year. But as this arrangement was thought to throw too much power into the hands of the syndics, in 1530 the Two Hundred assumed to themselves the election of the ordinary council;³ though, by way of equilibrium, it was resolved that the ordinary council should in its turn elect the members of the Two Hundred. The latter assembly, as well as the Sixty, met only when summoned by the ordinary council; but any member of them could demand their being summoned, provided he paid the expenses; namely, a *sol* to each member, equal to about a *franc* of present money.⁴ The establishment of the Two Hundred did not put an end to the general assembly of the burgesses, though it rendered the necessity for its meeting less frequent; and it was subsequently part of Calvin's policy to curtail the privileges of this democratic body.

¹ Galiffe, quoted by P. Henry, ii., 64. The annotator on Spon (i., 437), places the institution of this council after the Bernese alliance. Bonnard (*apud* Ruchat, i., 319) mentions a council of Fifty at the beginning of the sixteenth century, probably the same body.

² Thus, in the Registers of Geneva, February 12th, 1535, we read: "Conseil des 60 est élu; il est composé de 67 personnes, outre le conseil ordinaire. On élit aussi le conseil des CC; qui, y compris les deux susdits conseils, est composé de 175 personnes."—Grénus, *Fragments Historiques*, sub anno.

³ *Régistres*, 28 Février, 1530.

⁴ Galiffe, *apud* P. Henry, ii., 64.

It assembled, however, as a matter of course, in February to choose the syndics, and in November to fix the price of wine, and to nominate the *lieutenant-criminel*, or chief officer of police, and his court, consisting of four assistants or auditors. The other meetings of the general assembly were according to emergencies. Though it had the election of the syndics, its choice was confined to eight persons, whose names were submitted to it by the little council; and of the four chosen, two were to be taken from the higher, and two from the lower, class of citizens.

From this brief sketch of the Genevese government, it is evident that the real power lay almost entirely in the ordinary council, whose constitution rendered it a kind of oligarchy. The syndics, who, in and out of office, enjoyed their seats for at least two years, formed nearly one third of the whole body; while the treasurer was elected for five years. And though the remaining sixteen members were chosen annually by the Two Hundred, yet, as the choice of that body was restricted to thirty names proposed by the ordinary council itself, and as the latter body elected the members of the Two Hundred, the more influential party in the ordinary council found no difficulty in securing the return of its adherents. It is the more necessary to observe this oligarchical tendency, since it was the means which enabled Calvin to carry out his views, and which it was consequently his policy to foster and augment. The predominance thus conferred on the ordinary council by its constitution, was heightened by the important functions with which it was invested; since it enjoyed not only the executive, but the judicial and legislative powers.¹

Such was the state of Geneva when, as before related, Calvin arrived there in August, 1536. It may be doubted whether his earlier arrival in that city would have materially assisted the cause of the Reformation; since, as we have seen, it was brought about by turbulent changes, demanding great physical energy and courage. But the ground once cleared, and the Reformation established on a tolerably sure footing, the clear and vigorous understanding, the extensive and ready learning, the unshaken fortitude, and the prudence and consistency of purpose which characterized Calvin, admirably adapted him to confirm and extend its empire. Farel had still many obstacles to contend with. Though Protestantism had been established by public authority, the Popish party was still considerable, and offered all the resistance in its

¹ Galiffe, *apud* P. Henry, ii., 63, et seq.

power. Farel had but few to help him ; and even from his own party he sometimes met with opposition instead of assistance. Ministers properly qualified for the office, and who could be confided in, were rare. Viret, who had narrowly escaped with his life the effects of poison which the priests had bribed his cook to administer to him in some soup, had retired from Geneva. At the beginning of the year Farel had sent to Neufchâtel for him and Fabri ; but though the latter came, his stay seems to have been but short, and Viret, while on his journey to Geneva, had been detained at Lausanne, and persuaded to accept the ministry in that city.¹ It is not surprising, therefore, that when Farel heard of Calvin's arrival, he should have felt anxious to secure the services of a man already distinguished by his learning and his zeal. Even after succeeding in this, we find him complaining of the want of laborers for the harvest. In a letter dated on the 21st of November, 1536, and addressed to Fabri, who appears to have been then at Thonon, he says : " I am ordered to bring ministers from all quarters, but where to find them I absolutely know not. They who are fittest, and teach Jesus Christ most purely, are not cared for, while hypocrites and braggarts are extolled to the skies. The over-delicate are not easily persuaded to come into this country ; they would rather be buried in the sepulchers of the Egyptians, than eat the manna, and follow the column, in the desert. If you have any influence with persons of merit, pray assist us,"² &c.

In Calvin, Farel not only gained a powerful coadjutor, but a steadfast friend. He was always ready to do homage to the superior talents and learning of Calvin, to whom, though so much his junior, he looked up with a sort of reverence ; and the latter, on his side, though he sometimes criticised his friend's literary productions with freedom,³ entertained a favorable opinion of Farel's abilities, and a high regard for his personal character.

Shortly after his arrival, Calvin was elected teacher of theology, in which faculty there was at that time no professorship at Geneva, the academy not being yet in existence. He at first declined the office of minister, but accepted it the following year, having been elected by the magistrates and the general assembly. His first labors seem to have been almost gratuitous. In an entry of the Registers of the 13th of February, 1537, we find it proposed to give him six gold crowns, seeing

¹ Kirchhofer, *Leben Farel's*, i., 196.

² Ruchat, iv., 373.

³ See his letters to Farel in P. Henry, i., 168.

that as yet he had scarcely received any thing.¹ His first sermon was received with enthusiasm. Multitudes followed him home to testify their gratification ; and he was obliged to promise that he would preach again the next day, in order that others might have an opportunity to hear him.² At Calvin's instance, Courault, whose exertions at Paris, under the protection of the Queen of Navarre, have been already mentioned, was sent for from Basle, whither he had been driven by the persecutions in France. Blind and old, Courault still possessed unimpaired his powers of eloquence, which had been the means of converting many.

In the month of October following his arrival, we find Calvin, together with Farel, Viret, Fabri, Caroli, and others, attending a disputation which the council of Berne had appointed to be conducted in the French language, in the cathedral of Lausanne, as a means of instructing, in the principles of the Reformation, their subjects in the Pays de Vaud, which country had accrued to them by their victory over the Savoyards. All the clergy of that district were invited to attend ; and though their efforts to avert the disputation were seconded by the citizens of Lausanne, and even by the prohibition of the emperor, they found themselves compelled to enter into it. The priests are said to have planted assassins to murder the Protestant ministers on the road ; but happily the plot was discovered and frustrated.³ The basis of the discussion consisted of ten propositions drawn up by Farel, with whom the main burden of conducting it rested. On the fourth and fifth days, however, Calvin addressed the meeting with so much effect on the subject of transubstantiation, that a bare-footed friar, named Tandi, confessed his conversion on the spot.⁴ The disputation proved of great service in spreading the Reformation in the Pays de Vaud. In order to establish it on a secure foundation, the Bernese divided the country into seven ecclesiastical districts, called classes, appointing proper ministers for each.⁵

At Geneva, Farel continued to push on his schemes of reformation and discipline. With the assistance of Calvin he drew up a short confession of faith in twenty-one articles, which also comprised some regulations respecting church government. Among the latter the right of excommunication,

¹ "Ou donne six écus au soleil à Cauvin, soit Calvin, vù qu'il n'a encore guères reçu."—Grénus, *Fragm. Biogr.*

² P. Henry, i., 173.

³ Kirchhofer, i., 201.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 209. An abstract of the disputation will be found in Ruchat, iv., 181-363.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 413.

allowed by the 19th article, was the most important, as it subsequently became the chief instrument of Calvin's spiritual domination, and the cause of the struggles which ensued. In November this confession, to which Farel had appended the Ten Commandments, was laid before the council of Two Hundred, who ordered it to be printed, to be read in St. Peter's church every Sunday, and the people to be sworn to the observance of it.

Calvin had not been long at Geneva when the Anabaptists began to create some disturbance there. The fanaticism of that sect, as is well known, had proved injurious to the cause of the Reformation in many parts of Europe, especially in Germany and Holland. At Geneva they were headed by two Flemings, Hermann de Liège, and André Benoit. Here, as in other places, they spread their doctrines insidiously. They had given out that Farel was of their way of thinking, and had even succeeded in gaining some members of the council. By these they were introduced to that body, and laid before them certain propositions which they wished to maintain in a public disputation. To this the council were at first averse; but, at the instance of Calvin and Farel, at length consented that one should be held at the Convent de Rive. It took place in March, 1537, before the council and a numerous audience, and lasted several days. The Anabaptists, not being able to support their tenets by Scripture, were declared to be vanquished, and ordered to retract; and, upon their refusal, were banished, under pain of death if they returned.¹

About the same time another opponent succeeded in giving Calvin and Farel a great deal of pain and annoyance. This was Peter Caroli, who had made himself conspicuous at Geneva about two years before by taking part against Jacques Bernard, Farel, and the other Protestant ministers, in a disputation held on the occasion of Bernard's conversion. Caroli was a doctor of the Sorbonne, and used to preach at St. Paul's church, in Paris; but having adopted the new fashion of reading St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, then newly translated into French, instead of a sermon, was cited, in 1524, before the faculty of theology, inhibited from preaching, and ultimately obliged to fly.² Farel had known him at Paris, where he is said to have led a very dissolute life. Subsequently he returned to the Catholic faith, reconciled himself with the Sorbonne, and obtained the cure of Alençon, where

¹ Ruchat, v., 53. Kirchofer i., 219.

² Gerdesius, iv., 52, et seq.

he at first distinguished himself as a persecutor of the Protestants. Vain, fickle, insinuating, and hypocritical, Caroli's only object seemed to be to attract public attention, by any means whatever. He had not been long at Alençon, when he again passed himself off among the Protestants as a convert to their principles; and a fresh persecution breaking out, was compelled to betake himself, in 1534, to Geneva. Here his behavior was marked by the greatest duplicity. Though he fawned on Farel and Viret, he could never be brought to subscribe to their profession of faith. He was suspected even here of leading a disorderly life; and on one occasion Farel had detected him in appropriating the proceeds of a collection for the poor.¹ Nevertheless he contrived, in 1536, to obtain the ministry of Neufchâtel, where he married. After the disputation of Lausanne, he got the Bernese, by dint of solicitation, to appoint him chief minister in that city, and thus, in consideration of his age, and doctor's degree, obtained precedence over the tried and meritorious Viret. His ambition rose with his success. He had not been long in his new office when, in November, 1536, he repaired to Berne, to solicit the inspectorship over the clergy of the whole district. But the Bernese council now began to perceive the man's pride, and he was sent back with a sharp rebuke, and a command to submit himself, as a new comer, to the directions of Viret. Mortified by this repulse, and offended at the admonitions of Farel and Viret, who, knowing his immoral life, exhorted him to reform, Caroli began to meditate on schemes of vengeance.² Meanwhile he laid himself open to suspicion, by insisting in a sermon on the necessity of praying for the dead. For this Viret brought him before the consistory of Berne, by which he was ordered to retract his doctrine, in a humiliating manner. Although Viret and Calvin, who were also present, had interceded in his favor, the anger which had long been smoldering in his heart burst into a sudden flame. To the surprise of the assembly, he got up and charged Calvin, Farel, and Viret, with Arianism. Calvin immediately replied, "It is but a few days ago that I dined with Caroli; I was then his very dear brother, and he told me to make his compliments to Farel. He then treated as brethren those whom he now charges as heretics, and protested that he wished always to live in brotherly love with us. But not a word did he say about Arianism. Where was then the glory of God, or the

¹ Ruchat, v., 17.

² Kirchhofer, i., 222.

honor of the council of Berne? Where the purity of the faith, and the unity of the Church? One of two things: you have either acted perfidiously toward God and man, and wickedly betrayed the truth, or it must be clear to all that you are influenced by some other motive than what you pretend in bringing this accusation. If you have already twice administered the communion with an Arian colleague, where was your conscience? If you had a single spark of true zeal or piety, would you have silently suffered your brothers and colleagues to reject the Son of God? Would you soil yourself with the infection of such an impiety by communicating with them? But, supposing all this of no consequence, I demand how you know that I am infected with the Arian heresy? I believe that I have given a pretty clear testimony of my faith, and that you will find no more ardent supporter than myself of the divinity of Jesus Christ. My works are in the hands of every body, and I have at least derived this fruit from them, that my doctrine is approved by all the orthodox churches. But you! what proof have you ever given of your faith, except, perhaps, in taverns, or other worse places? For such are the haunts in which you have passed your time. Show us, then, the very passage on which you found your accusation of Arianism; for I will wash out this infamy, and will not endure to be unjustly suspected."¹

Caroli was overwhelmed by this spirited remonstrance; and as Calvin continued to press him to bring forward his proof, he became confused, acknowledged that Calvin's writings were orthodox, and offered to retract his charge so far as he was concerned, provided he would not undertake to defend Farel. Viret likewise compelled Caroli to withdraw his charge against him; but both he and Calvin declared that they should not rest satisfied with this retraction, unless their absent brother Farel were included in it. As Caroli manifested no disposition to comply, Calvin represented to the council that the matter was too serious to be passed over in that manner, and begged their assistance in requesting the council of Berne to appoint a synod, before which it might be examined.

One was accordingly summoned to meet at Lausanne about the middle of March. Caroli entered the assembly like a lawyer with a bag full of briefs, and gave vent to the bitterest language, uttered with all the power of his lungs, and accompanied with the most violent contortions.² Caspar Grossman

¹ Ruchat, v., 22.

² Calvin, Ep., 5. P. Henry, i., 181.

(or Megander), who presided, having first required Viret to declare his sentiments on the subject of the Trinity, that minister handed in a written confession to be presented to the council of Berne. Caroli criticised this document, which he found too short and dry ; and then proceeded to repeat aloud the Nicene and Athanasian creeds, using such extravagant gestures as set the whole assembly laughing. Calvin now rose and justified himself in a long discourse, in which he severely reprehended him. "Caroli," said he, "quarrels with us about the nature of God, and the distinction of the persons ; but I carry the matter further, and ask him if he believes in the Deity at all ? For I protest before God and man that he has no more faith than a dog or pig." He then handed in a confession of faith, agreed upon between himself and his colleagues ; but to which Caroli objected, because it did not contain the words *Trinity* or *Person*, and on account of the manner in which the name of *Jehovah* was used with regard to the Saviour.¹ He then required the Genevese ministers to subscribe the three creeds ; but Calvin, in the name of his brethren, refused ; not that they did not accept them, but that they would not show a deference to Caroli to which he was not entitled ; nor sanction the introduction of a sort of tyranny into the Church, by allowing the right of a private individual to compel another to declare his faith. The synod, after due examination, received the confession of the Genevese ministers, declared Caroli convicted of calumny, and expressed their opinion that he ought to be deposed from the ministry.

Caroli appealed to Berne ; but Calvin and his colleagues were also acquitted by a synod held in that town toward the end of May. The Genevese ministers being asked whether, in their turn, they had any accusation to bring against Caroli, the latter thought it best to anticipate them by a free and public confession, in which he acknowledged the immoral life that he had led in France, the perfidy with which he had dissembled his religious opinions, and even thrown into the hands of the persecutors two young men of his acquaintance, of whose conduct and principles he inwardly approved. But Farel showed that even in this confession he had not laid bare the whole extent of his guilt.²

Caroli was banished, and ordered before his departure to acknowledge in public the innocence of the ministers whom he had slandered. To avoid the latter part of this sentence,

¹ It is in Ruchat, v., 27, et seq.

² Ruchat, v., 31.

he fled early the following morning from Berne to Soleure, whence he addressed a violent letter against the ministers to the council of Lausanne. He then betook himself to France, and sought the protection of Cardinal Tournon, at whose recommendation he proceeded to Rome. Here he handed in a paper to the Pope, in which he condemned the lives and doctrines of the Reformers, denouncing Farel as the chief heretic. The Pope received him back into the Romish Church; and released him from his concubine, as he called his wife; restored him to his doctorate; and gave him full power to enjoy benefices, and to exercise the functions of the priesthood.¹ Nor was this the last apostasy of this extraordinary man; whose frequent tergiversations, and the facility with which he was re-admitted, both by Protestants and Catholics, into the communions which he had so repeatedly deserted, show the anxiety felt by both sides in those times to secure the adhesion of any man at all distinguished by rank or learning, however profligate and worthless his character.

It must, however, be confessed that Farel and Calvin's subsequent conduct with regard to the doctrine in question was not only amenable to the charge of obstinacy and self-will, but even of duplicity. Though the synod and council of Berne, to which Caroli had appealed from Lausanne, had, as we have said, acquitted them of the charge brought against them by Caroli, it had required that they should subscribe the Helvetic confession, drawn up at Basle in February, 1536, and ratified by the Reformed cantons in the following May: in the 6th article of which we find the term *Persons* used with regard to the Trinity.² Yet, in spite of this subscription, Calvin and Farel still continued to object to the use of the words *Trinity* and *Person*, and even wished to force their views on some of the ministers of the district of Gex, who complained to the Bernese council of their proceedings. Hereupon, those magistrates addressed the following letter to Farel and Calvin:

“LEARNED, DISCREET, DEAR, AND GOOD FRIENDS,

“We have been informed by some of our preachers of the district of Gex, and other places, that you still continue to inculcate your meaning and opinion of the nullity of the

¹ Kirchhofer, *Lebens Farel's*, i., 229.

² “VI. Voici les sentimens que nous avons de Dieu: Qu'il y a un seul vrai Dieu, vivant et tout-puissant, unique en essence, et qui dans cette unité a trois personnes,” &c. See Ruchat, iv., 62.

words *Trinity* and *Person*, in order to turn aside the aforesaid preachers from the manner of speaking of the Trinity usually received in the Church. And it has even come to our notice, that you, Calvin! have written a letter to a certain Frenchman at Basle, stating that your confession had been approved of in our congregation, and been ratified by our ministers; which is not the fact, but the contrary; that you and Farel then consented and agreed to subscribe our confession, made in the same city of Basle, and to abide by it; so that we are astonished that you should attempt to contravene it by such discourses, and beg of you to desist; otherwise we shall be constrained to provide some other remedy.

“To our good friends, Master William Farel, preacher of the Church, and John Calvin, lecturer in the Holy Scriptures at Geneva.

“From Berne, this 13th of August, 1537.”

It is certain, however, that Calvin's orthodoxy is beyond suspicion; for he had used the word *Trinity* in the first edition of his “*Institutes*,” and declared the necessity of that of *Person*.² His conduct on this occasion seems therefore to have been adopted out of an ill-considered and inexcusable deference for his friend Farel, who was suspected of attaching too little importance to the authority of the Church with regard to this doctrine. And with this feeling, Calvin appealed, not to his “*Institutes*” in proof of his orthodoxy, but to the Genevese Catechism, which had been the joint work of Farel, Viret, and himself, and which had appeared a little before in French. This catechism, in which the Trinity had been described as three persons in one essence, Calvin now turned into Latin, in order that the German Reformers might have an opportunity to read it, as it might serve to dissipate their suspicions. Why Farel should have agreed to this catechism, and, after agreeing, have acted contrary to it, appears inexplicable; unless he had been out-voted by his colleagues when it was drawn up.

The opinion seemed to gain ground in other places besides Berne, that the doctrine of the Genevese ministers on the subject of the Trinity was not completely orthodox. Myconius at Basle, and Bucer at Strasburgh, had written to Bullinger and Melancthon about it in a way which betrayed their apprehension that the Arian heresy was about to be introduced

¹ Ruchat, v., *Pièces justificatives*, No. 1.

² P. Henry, i., 183, note.

into the Church.¹ These ministers, accompanied by Capito and Grynæus, repaired in the following September to Berne, where they drew up two papers: in the first of which they stated the grounds on which they agreed with the ministers of Berne respecting the use of the words *Trinity* and *Person*; and in the second, explained the meaning of the term *JEHOVAH*. It was agreed that the former words were of great use to express the distinctions of the Trinity, and therefore they took upon themselves to use them, and to see that they were not laid aside in the Church. They condemned the abstaining from them as preposterous and superstitious; yet they would bear with people who so abstained, and neither excommunicate nor anathematize them, but would do all in their power to convert them: though they would not find fault with the Bernese Church if they excluded from the ministry those who rejected these words. This was, in fact, a condemnation of Farel and Calvin. At the same time Bucer and Capito, the Strasburgh ministers, who in their negotiations with Luther and other Saxon divines at Eisenach in 1536, respecting a *concordat* on the subject of the eucharist,² had incurred the suspicion of leaning too much to the Lutheran doctrine, and of thus departing from the articles of the Disputation of Berne, and of the Helvetic Confession, agreed to sign a confession drawn up by Calvin, Farel, and Viret, respecting the eucharist, after adding a few words to express more strongly their opinion that the elements were not mere symbols.³

We will now revert to the efforts made by Farel and Calvin to establish their schemes of church government and discipline at Geneva. These proved very unpalatable to the great body of the people. As early as September, 1536, many of the principal citizens, accompanied by great numbers of the lower classes, had demanded an audience of the council; before whom they protested that they could not endure the reproofs of the ministers, and that they wished to live in freedom.⁴ The confession already mentioned, as drawn up by Farel and Calvin, was printed and distributed in the spring of 1537; yet it did not seem to produce much impression,

¹ Trechsel, *Antitr.*, i., 162.

² See M. Adamus, *Vita Buceri*, p. 214.

³ These papers are in Ruchat, v., *Pièces justificatives*, No. 2, and in Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Epp. 348-351.

⁴ "Quelques uns d'entre les principaux citoyens, et un grand nombre d'autres, ne pouvant point endurer les ministres qui les reprentent de leurs vices, protestent devant le conseil vouloir vivre en liberté."—*Régistres de la Répub.*, 4 Sept., 1536. Grénus, *Fragm. Biogr. et Hist.*

and was ill received on all sides. The article respecting excommunication, which put a great deal of power into the hands of the ministers, by enabling them to exclude the refractory from the sacrament, was particularly obnoxious. Far from giving way, however, the ministers pressed upon the government the necessity of establishing still more stringent rules for the maintenance of religion; and unless this were done, Calvin, who was bound to the city by no particular ties, threatened to leave Geneva.¹ The oath taken by the people toward the close of the previous year to observe the confession had been administered collectively; but now Calvin and his colleagues succeeded in persuading the government that it should be offered to them individually. The ceremony accordingly took place in St. Peter's Church, on Sunday the 29th of July, 1537, and following days. After a sermon by Farel, the town secretary mounted the pulpit, and read the confession; after which the people were brought up by tens, and sworn to the observance of it by the syndics. Many, however, especially among the leading people, refused compliance with what can not be designated otherwise than as an act of ecclesiastical tyranny. One of their grounds of objection was that the Ten Commandments were appended to the confession; and it must be owned that it seems an absurd act to swear a man to the observance of a code of moral and religious duty. The council, however, were so devoted to the ministers, that at their instance they ordered the disaffected to leave the city. But they were too numerous to allow of this measure being carried into effect; and the show of such an inclination, without the power of enforcing it, only rendered the malcontents more violent.

Great, indeed, as well as sudden, were the alterations now attempted by the ministers. The transition was almost as abrupt and striking as if a man, after spending all Saturday night at an opera or masquerade, should, without any preparation, walk into a Friends' meeting on the Sabbath morning. The minds of the people had not been prepared for it. Lively and excitable, the Genevese citizen had till recently indulged in an almost unbounded license. He loved dancing and music, and when the season allowed of it, enjoyed those amusements in the open air. The doors of numerous wine-shops lay always invitingly open; and in rainy weather, or to those whose dancing days were over, offered, in addition to

¹ Ruchat, v., 55.

their liquor, the stimulus of a game of cards. Numerous holidays, besides Sundays, released the wearied tradesman from his warehouse or his shop, to seek recreation in the form most agreeable to him. Masquerades and other mummeries were frequent, but above all a wedding was the source of supreme excitement and delight. As the bells rung out a joyous carol, the bride repaired to church, surrounded by her female friends and companions, each adorned as fancy led, or as taste admonished that her charms might be set off to the best advantage; and, on returning home, the fête was concluded by feasting, music, dancing, and revelry. Worship, such as it was, showed the cheerful side of religion. No eternal fiat of reprobation haunted the sinner with the thoughts of a doom which it was impossible to escape. Purgatory opened the way to paradise, and purgatory could be abridged by the masses of the priest. Nay, religion shed its benign influence even over the temporal affairs of the devout Catholic; and a few *credos* and *pater nosters*, a little holy water, or an offering at the shrine of the patron saint, was sufficient, or believed to be sufficient, to avert many of the calamities of life. The silver tone of the convent bells, echoing from the mountains, or stealing softly over the tranquil surface of the lake, preserved all within their sound from bad weather, ghosts, enchantments, and even Satan himself. But this magic power they possessed not unless the priest first consecrated them to the Virgin, their peculiar patroness, and, as it were, ruler of the air. Bells about to be hung were carried to the font dressed out like a child to be baptized. Sponsors stood for them, and in this guise, as in a real baptism, they were sprinkled with water, and smeared with oil and chrism. On these occasions costly dinners were given, and even in poor villages one hundred gold crowns were sometimes spent in the ceremony.¹

Indulged with moderation, many of the relaxations above alluded to were innocent; but it must be admitted that they were carried to excess in Geneva, and that the greatest dissoluteness of manners prevailed. Reckless gaming, drunkenness, adultery, blasphemy, and all sorts of vice and wickedness

¹ Hottinger, ii., 640. Bells were generally inscribed with the words *Ave Maria*, or sometimes a supplicatory distich or two to the Virgin. If a consecrated bell happened to get broken, it was interred in the church like a human body. See an instance in the Registers of Geneva, Jan. 8th, 1535 (Grénus, *Fragmens Historiques*). Cenalis, bishop of Avranche, who wrote a book against the Calvinists, seriously argued that bells were a sign of the true Church.—See *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, i., 125.

abounded. Prostitution was sanctioned by the authority of the state, and the public stews were placed under the superintendence of a woman elected by the council, and called the *Reine du bordel*. The registers abound with entries respecting the regulation of these Pandemoniums.¹ If the manners of the laity were corrupt, those of the clergy were as bad, or worse. The authentic documents just referred to bear frequent evidence of their profligacy. The canons of St. Peter's, whose office conferred upon them a share in the spiritual government of the city, were particularly notorious for their misconduct. They paraded their vices with so much effrontery, that in 1530 the Genevese refused to pay them the tithes, which were so unblushingly applied to the purposes of debauchery; and they were obliged to solicit the interference of Friburgh in order to obtain their money.² Their ignorance was on a par with their profligacy; and during the progress of the Reformation, the Genevese clergy publicly admitted before the council that they were not learned enough either to maintain or to refute the doctrine of the mass, and the authority of human traditions.³

That these vices and disorders demanded a large measure of reform can not be disputed. It was not, however, in human nature, that long confirmed habits like these should be extirpated all at once: they required, rather, to be gradually ameliorated by better education and example. Yet such was the task attempted by the evangelical ministers. Nor did they stop there; but in their zeal for reforming what was wrong, they frequently overstepped the bounds of discretion, and confounded what was really innocent in the same anathema with what was fundamentally vicious. Cards and dancing, plays and masquerades, were absolutely prohibited, as well as the graver vices before enumerated. All holidays, except Sunday, were abolished, and that was observed with the strictness of the Jewish sabbath. Marriage was ordered to be solemnized with as little show as possible. Instead of the joyous fête it had hitherto been, it was converted into a purely religious ceremony, and sanctified by a sermon. If the bride or her companions adorned themselves in a fashion contrary to what was *evangelized*, they were punished with im-

¹ See P. Henry, i., 152, and compare Spon, ii., 45.

² Ruchat, ii., 303.

³ "Les prêtres déclarent par la bouche de Rolet du Pan qu'ils ne sont pas en état ni assez savant pour soutenir ou pour reprouver la messe et les traditions humaines."—*Régistres*, 24 Nov., 1535. Grénus, *Fragm. Biogr.*, sub anno.

prisonment.¹ The church bells were dismantled and cast into cannon;² and thus their cheerful carols converted into the harsh thunder of war. The citizens were strictly enjoined to attend the sermons, and to be at home by nine o'clock in the evening; and tavern keepers were ordered to see that their customers observed these regulations.

It is not surprising that these unwonted severities should have excited many persons against the ministers. By degrees their number increased. Many of those who had sworn to the confession began to join them, and complained that they had been compelled to perjure themselves. They soon began to assume the shape of an organized party, calling themselves "Brothers in Christ," and wearing green flowers as a badge. By February, 1538, they had increased so much, that at the annual election of syndics they got four of their cabal elected to that office, three of whom were not even members of the council.³

The quarrel now began to assume something of a political aspect. The malcontents appealed to the discipline of Berne, which differed in several points from that of Geneva, and thus endeavored to secure the influence of that city in favor of their views. The Bernese were naturally inclined to favor a party which thus made them the arbiters of the quarrel; and as the Reformation had been introduced at Geneva under their auspices, they not unreasonably thought that some deference should be paid to their authority on the points in dispute, especially as they did not involve any important questions of doctrine and faith. The contested points were these. At Berne they used stone fonts for baptism; they celebrated four fêtes during the year, viz., Christmas, New Year's Day, the Annunciation, and the Ascension, and they administered the sacrament with unleavened bread.⁴ To all these the French ministers at Geneva were opposed; and especially Farel, who had, indeed, abolished the observance of these festivals before Calvin's arrival in Geneva.⁵ The latter looked upon these things as in themselves indifferent; and we shall find that subsequently, in order to avoid disputes, he adopted the use of unleavened bread. But if he did not lay much stress on the things themselves, he did on the authority of the clergy,

¹ "Une épouse étant sortie dimanche dernier avec les cheveux plus abattus qu'il ne se doit faire, ce qui est d'un mauvais exemple, et contraire à ce qu'on leur évangélise, on fait mettre en prison sa maîtresse, les deux qui l'ont menée, et celle qui l'a coiffée."—*Régistres*, 20 Mai, 1537.

² *Régistres*, 17 Juillet, 1534.

³ Ruchat, v., 57.

⁴ Spon, ii., 21.

⁵ See Calvin's letter to Haller, Ep. 118.

which he thought might be seriously compromised by yielding these points, or by his differing from his colleagues respecting them; and, therefore, he stood stiffly for their maintenance. But though these were made the ostensible points of dispute, it is probable that what was really desired by the Libertines, as the anti-evangelical party was called, was the milder discipline which prevailed at Berne. Thus we find that, in that town, brides were allowed to be married with flowing tresses; a practice, which, as we have seen, the Genevese ministers had abolished, to the displeasure of the Bernese.¹ In the year 1537, the latter remonstrated with the Genevese respecting the dissensions which prevailed among them. The Genevese threw the blame on Farel, and, on the 15th of December, sent four deputies to Berne to confer on the matter. Farel also went; and it was reported that on this occasion he represented his opponents as desirous of re-establishing the mass. There seems to be no foundation for this charge against him; yet his adversaries used it as a pretext to render him still more obnoxious.

On the other hand, the Genevese ministers inveighed loudly and bitterly from their pulpits against the supineness of the magistrates, and their negligence in maintaining order; nor, as the four syndics were now of the opposite party, is it improbable that there was some foundation for these complaints. At the same time the ministers themselves seem to have overstepped the bounds of decency and order. An event that occurred early in 1538 tended further to embroil matters, and to give them a still more political turn. A gentleman, named Montchénu, in the service of the King of France, came to Geneva, and endeavored to persuade the Genevese to put themselves under the protection of that monarch, by representing the Bernese as desirous of enslaving them, and of establishing a vidomne, or lieutenant of their own, at Geneva. Montchénu also undertook that Francis should fortify their town, transfer two fairs from Lyons to Geneva, and grant them some other privileges. The Bernese sent a deputy to Geneva on the 25th of February, to contradict these reports of their designs; but before his arrival Montchénu had departed. How far Calvin and his colleagues were implicated in this affair does not appear; but that they were so in some degree we can hardly doubt, since we find the council deposing from office, seven members of their own body, for being connected with Montchénu's intrigue, and who had sided with

¹ Ruchat, v., 58.

the ministers. The occasion of this step was that letters from Montchénu had been openly delivered to these councilors, while present at a general assembly on the 3d of March.¹ It seems probable that Calvin and Farel may have inveighed against this exclusion of their friends from the council, for on the 11th of March we find an order issued forbidding them to meddle with politics, or to speak of the magistrates in the pulpit.²

Meanwhile a synod which the Bernese had appointed to be held at Lausanne in mid-lent, for the purpose of settling the differences which prevailed in the Church, was fast approaching. Letters were sent inviting the attendance of Farel and Calvin, but on condition of their complying with the rites of Berne. If they would not do so, they were to be allowed, indeed, to attend the synod, but not to take any part in its proceedings; and, if they had any thing to state, they were to be heard, like strangers, after the sittings were closed. The Church of Berne was rendered still more indisposed toward Calvin and Farel at this time by a change in its ministers. Calvin's friend, Megander, had been dismissed, and the chief ministers now were Sebastian Meyer, and Peter Kuntzen (or Conz); men whom Calvin considered unfit for their office; and who, on their part, harbored a prejudice against him and Farel. Conz was a rough, boorish character, and a great admirer of Luther, under whom he had studied at Wittenberg. He had had a personal quarrel with Farel, in which he displayed the greatest violence.³ He was one of the Bernese deputies at this synod, the others being Erasmus Ritter, also a minister, and two members of the great council, John Huber and John Louis Amman.

Though Calvin and Farel considered the conditions on which their presence was required at Lausanne somewhat extraordinary, they nevertheless attended the synod. The result of its deliberations⁴ was to conform to the rites of Berne. To this decision Calvin and Farel refused to submit. They applied to the president of the synod for time to deliberate; which being refused, they appealed to another synod to be held at Zurich, in the ensuing April, on the subject of a union with the Lutherans. The council of Geneva, on the contrary, wrote to the Bernese that they were desirous of com-

¹ Ruchat, v., 61.

² "On défend aux prédicateurs, et en particulier à Farel et à Calvin, de se mêler de politique."—*Régistres*, 11 Mars, 1538. Grénius, *Fragmens Biographiques*. Ruchat, v., 62.

³ Trechsel, *Antitr.*, i., 165.

⁴ Ruchat, iv., 459.

plying with them in the matter of the ceremonies. Hereupon the latter sent them a copy of the resolutions adopted by the synod, and requested them to confer with Calvin and Farel, who had objected to the three contested articles: viz., fonts, unleavened bread, and the four festivals. They also addressed the following letter to those ministers, dated the 15th of April, 1538:

“VERY LEARNED AND DEAR OUR SINGULAR GOOD FRIENDS
AND BROTHERS:

“Having been made acquainted with the conclusion of the synod of Lausanne, as well as your speeches at that place, and partly also the consultation you have had with the ministers of Strasburgh and Basle, we take occasion to beg and admonish you in brotherly love, for the sake of peace and the advancement of unity, that you will be pleased to accede to the said conclusion, that the church of Geneva and ours, which are united as to the fundamental articles of faith, may also be conformable in ceremonies; by doing which you will deprive our enemies of all opportunity of calumniating us. Wherefore, we beg and admonish you, earnestly and fraternally, to advise with your magistrates, to whom we have written concerning this affair, and to come to such a resolution that there may be no difference between us: taking into your consideration that the disagreement is not of such importance as can hurt truth, if you accept the three articles agreed on by all the ministers at the said synod; to wit, to baptize at the font, to use unleavened bread in our Lord’s Supper, and to observe the four fêtes. May it please you to condescend to this for the love of us, and for the sake of union between us, without suspending the matter till the meeting which is to be held at Zurich. Meanwhile, we pray God give you the grace to live holily.

“L’AVOYER, AND COUNCIL OF BERNE.¹

“*Datum 15 Aprilis, 1538.*”

Nothing could be more conciliating, and even flattering, than for an independent government, like that of Berne, to address such a letter as this to two private ministers; and as Calvin, at least, entertained no serious objection to the ceremonies in question, and as they had been unanimously confirmed by so large a body of the clergy, his resistance seems hardly justifiable. But in spite of this letter, as well as of the

representations of their own government, he and Farel persisted in their views; whereupon the Genevese council protested against them, and came to a resolution to conform to the rites of Berne. This step naturally increased the excitement, and emboldened the Libertine party. Troops of them paraded the town by night, insulted the ministers in their homes, and threatened to throw them into the Rhone. An indiscretion of Courault's hastened the crisis. The injunction not to meddle with politics, published on the 11th of March, did not seem to apply so particularly to himself, as to his colleagues. Notwithstanding his blindness and his age, he caused himself, therefore, to be led into the pulpit, where he spoke in a rude and insulting manner of the state of Geneva, comparing it with the kingdom of the frogs, and the citizens to rats which lived concealed in the straw.¹ He was immediately forbidden the pulpit; but having violated this injunction, was arrested and imprisoned. Next day Farel and Calvin, attended by some of their friends, appeared before the council, and demanded his release. The council refused, and in turn directed the ministers to conform to the usages of Berne. Calvin and Farel requested the council to await the decision of the synod appointed to meet at Zurich; and, on the latter refusing, not only declared that they would not conform to the Bernese ceremonies, but that they would not administer the communion on Easter Sunday, one of the appointed days, and which was now fast approaching; alleging that they could not do so conscientiously in a city where such debauchery and insubordination prevailed. On the Saturday before Easter the council again sent for them, and exhorted them to use unleavened bread in the communion; and as they again not only refused to do this, but even to administer that rite at all, the council forbade them to mount the pulpit.² Regardless of this prohibition, however, they both preached twice, Calvin at St. Peter's and Farel at St. Gervais's, without any communion; though their sermons turned on the sacred nature of that rite, and the necessity that it should not be profaned. This created a great disturbance. Swords were even drawn, but the affair passed over without bloodshed.³

On the following morning the council met and passed sentence of banishment on Farel and Calvin, with an order to quit the city in three days. On this being announced to them they exclaimed: "Very well; it is better to serve God than

¹ P. Henry, i., 199.

² Spon, ii., 23.

³ Ruchat, v., 65.

man."¹ Courault was also released from prison in order to accompany his colleagues into banishment. These sentences were confirmed by the council of Two Hundred, and by the general assembly, convened specially for that purpose. No sooner had they left Geneva, than the council ordered the decrees of the Lausanne synod to be published by sound of trumpet. The fonts were ordered to be re-erected, and on the following Sunday the communion was administered with unleavened bread.

On quitting Geneva, Calvin and Farel repaired to Berne to lay their grievances before the council of that town, and to justify their conduct; while Courault went to Thonon, to his friend Christopher Fabri, who procured him a situation at Orbe, where he died in the October following. The Bernese acted in this affair with moderation and good temper. However anxious they were that their usages should be observed, still, as they were things indifferent, they thought that the Genevese had pushed matters too far in banishing their ministers for non-compliance. Accordingly they wrote a letter on the 27th of April to the Genevese council, in which they expressed their displeasure at their proceedings, and represented the scandal which they were calculated to produce. "If," said they, "we wrote to you to solicit your conformity with our ceremonies, we did it out of friendship toward you, and merely by way of request, and not with any view to constrain either you or your ministers in respect to things which are indifferent." But to this letter the Genevese paid no attention.²

The synod of Zurich, which had been fixed for the 29th of April, was now on the point of assembling, and thither Calvin and Farel bent their steps. The proper object of this meeting was to effect a union with Luther. It was attended by the deputies of the Reformed cantons of Switzerland. The Basle deputies brought with them Capito and Bucer from Strasburgh, whom Luther had charged to explain his sentiments to the Swiss. The deputies from Berne were the ministers Conz and Erasmus Ritter, and the councilor Bernard Tillmann.

It does not belong to our subject to detail the proceedings of this assembly. Calvin and Farel seized the occasion to

¹ "On ordonne à Farel et à Calvin de se retirer dans trois jours puisqu'ils ne veulent pas obéir aux magistrats; et ils répondent, 'A la bonne heure; vaut mieux obéir à Dieu qu'aux hommes.'"—*Régistres*, 23 Avril, 1538.

² Ruchat, v., 68.

complain of the treatment which they had received at Geneva ; they gave a deplorable account of the church there, and requested the protection of the synod not only for it, but for their own persons ; they acknowledged, at the same time, that they might have been too hot on some points, and declared their readiness to be advised. A debate ensued respecting the contested articles, on the occasion of Bucer delivering in a paper which Calvin had drawn up in Latin, in fourteen heads, as the basis on which he and Farel were willing to accommodate matters. In this paper the disputed points were conceded, but with some trifling modifications, as will be seen from the following account of the substance of it : 1. Fonts are admitted, provided baptism be administered during church hours, and that the service be recited from the pulpit. 2. Also the use of unleavened bread, provided it be broken. 3. The four festivals observed at Berne are allowed, provided they be not too strictly enforced, and that they who wished might go to work after prayers. 4. The Bernese were to acknowledge that they did not find fault with the method hitherto used at Geneva as contrary to Scripture, but that their sole view was unity in ceremonies. 5. If the Genevese ministers were restored, they were to be allowed to exculpate themselves. 6. Calvin's scheme of church discipline was to be established. 7. The city was to be divided into parishes. 8. Sufficient ministers were to be chosen to serve the different districts. 9. The German method of excommunication was to be adopted ; viz., the council was to choose from each parish certain worthy and discreet men, who were to exercise that power in conjunction with the ministers. 10. That the ordination of priests, by imposition of hands, was to be left entirely to the clergy. 11. That the Bernese were to be requested to come to an accommodation with them on two other points ; viz., 12. *First*, that the Lord's Supper should be more frequently celebrated, and at least once a month. 13. *Second*, that psalm-singing should form part of divine service. 14. That the Bernese should prohibit obscene songs and dancing, as their example was always pleaded by the Genevese in excuse.¹

The synod admitted the importance of these articles, and considered them a proof that the Genevese ministers were not actuated solely by obstinacy ; but at the same time recommended moderation to them, and Christian mildness in their

¹ See P. Henry, i., Beil. 8.

dealings with a rude and uneducated people.¹ By the advice of Bullinger, the chief minister at Zurich, a letter was addressed to the Genevese in favor of the exiles; and the Bernese were requested to support the application by sending an embassy to Geneva. The Bernese deputies who were present at the synod promised to exert themselves in their favor. Calvin and Farel now returned to Berne, bearing with them several letters of recommendation, both public and private. In that to the provost of Wattenwyl, Bullinger admits that they are over-zealous, but thinks it may be pardoned in favor of their learning and piety.²

In Berne fresh trials awaited them. The treatment they experienced there is described in a joint letter from Farel and Calvin to Bullinger, dated in June, 1538.³ After enduring much insolence, especially from Conz, a day was at length fixed for hearing them; but when it arrived, they were told, after waiting two hours, that the ministers were too busy with consistorial causes to attend to them. In the afternoon they again attended, but found the ministers less prepared than before. They were now told that their articles required time for consideration. Although they plainly saw that they were purposely treated with indignity, they were forced to dissemble their feelings. When the hearing at length came on, almost every syllable of their articles was objected to. On coming to the second, respecting the breaking of the bread, Conz flew into a violent rage, and abused them roundly. His colleagues could hardly hold him down at his desk. Farel, who was not a man to be daunted by trifles, was so impressed by the scene that he declared, long afterward, that it never recurred to him without exciting his horror.⁴ Ritter, however, seems to have supported the exiles. After the lapse of some days they were called before the council of Berne, and required three times in one hour to renounce their articles. Instead of complying, they insisted on the necessity for uniformity; and when the Bernese replied, reasonably enough, that uniformity had been already adopted, they refused to change their opinions, on the ground that they should be sanctioning thereby the proceedings of a worthless faction at Geneva. This reply, on the part of Calvin and Farel, makes us acquainted with the true motive of their conduct, which can not but be characterized as stiff and obstinate. Never-

¹ Kirchhofer, *Leben Farel's*, i., 246.

³ This letter will be found in Henry, i., Beil. 9.

⁴ Kirchhofer, i., 247.

² *Ibid.*

theless, the Bernese magistrates did not desert them. They sent Viret to Geneva to endeavor, by his sermons, to dispose the minds of the Genevese to a milder and more Christian conduct. They also dispatched two councilors, and Erasmus Ritter, to accompany the exiles to Geneva, and to endeavor to get them restored. But at a little distance from that city they were met by a messenger, who forbade Calvin and Farel to enter. The Bernese ambassadors advised them to comply with this injunction; and it was fortunate that they did so, as it was afterward discovered that an ambush had been laid to intercept them a little without the town, and that the gate itself was occupied by twenty armed assassins.¹

The Bernese ambassadors, however, proceeded on their road, and were admitted to an audience of the Genevese council on the 22d of May. They represented, in strong terms, to the Genevese the wrong they had done in banishing their ministers, and that their conduct had been condemned by the synod of Zurich. They requested that the exiles might be permitted to appear; and that, on making a suitable apology, they might be restored to their places, in consideration of the eminent services which Farel had rendered to Geneva. And they further represented that each of them had declared, before the council of Berne, his willingness to adopt the ceremonies in dispute.² But their intercession was in vain. The matter was, however, referred to a general assembly of the people, convened for the 26th of May. In this assembly, Ludvig Ammanu, one of the Bernese deputies, as well as Viret, made eloquent speeches in favor of the exiles. At first they seemed to make a favorable impression on the people, till one of the syndics took from his pocket the articles which had been drawn up by Calvin at Zurich, and read them aloud, making invidious comments as he proceeded. In these articles the exiled ministers had called the Genevese *their* church, and had mentioned the Bernese council without its proper title of honor. "See," cried he, "how they call the church theirs, as if they had already gotten possession of it, and with what contumely they treat their superiors! But, above all, see at what a despotism they aim. For what is excommunication but a despotic power over the church?" Conz, the bitter enemy of Farel and his coadjutors, had sent these articles to Vandel, who boasted, before the embassy arrived from Berne, that he had got the condemnation of the

¹ Farel and Calvin to Bullinger, *apud* P. Henry, l. c.

² Farel and Calvin to Bullinger.

ministers in his pocket.¹ His expectations were not deceived. The feeling excited against them was so strong, that, though a few wished to hear their defense, others drew their swords and demanded their death. The decree of banishment was confirmed almost unanimously.²

The severity of this decision seems almost justified by the conduct of Calvin and Farel ; but the only parties who acted throughout with good sense and Christian moderation were the council of Berne.

¹ "Se venenum nobis letale ferro."—*Ib.* Henry, l. c. Kirchhofer, i., 249.

² Ruchat, v., 85.

CHAPTER III.

Calvin proceeds to Basle—Accepts a Ministry at Strasburgh—Writes to the Church of Geneva—Attends a Diet at Frankfort—His pecuniary Difficulties—His Marriage—Literary Labors at Strasburgh—Caroli again—Diets of Hagenau and Worms—Diet of Ratisbon—State of Parties at Geneva—The new Pastors despised—Disorders—Negotiations for Calvin's Restoration—He reluctantly returns to Geneva.

ON hearing the decision of the general assembly, Calvin and Farel, who had stopped at a little distance from Geneva, returned to Berne, and, after a short stay at that place, proceeded to Basle. This journey they made on horseback in the most unfavorable weather; and in crossing a torrent swollen by the rains, were nearly swept away. The cordiality of their reception at Basle made them some amends for their past misfortunes. Calvin's old acquaintance, Grynæus, received him on terms of the most friendly intimacy; while Farel took up his abode in the house of Oporinus the printer. Here they determined to abide till Providence should open out some new course to them. Viret's friendship induced him to pay them a visit, though they had begged him not to do so, lest he should expose himself to the risk of giving offense.¹ Through his influence, and that of Christopher Fabri, Farel was offered the ministry of Neufchâtel, the inhabitants of which place gratefully remembered his former labors among them: but the troubles and dangers through which he had recently passed had damped even his ardor; and at first he felt disinclined to accept the offer. He foresaw nothing but difficulties in his future course, and was disposed to dedicate himself to the more peaceful pursuits of literature. At the exhortation, however, of his friends, seconded by the representations of some of the German churches, he was at length induced to accept the offer made to him, but with the stipulation that he should be empowered to introduce his scheme of church discipline. He accordingly repaired in July to Neufchâtel, after a residence of about seven weeks at Basle.²

Meanwhile Calvin had received invitations from Bucer to become a minister of the church at Strasburgh. This office

¹ Kirchofer, ii., 3.

² *Ibid.*, ii., 4.

he at first refused, on the ground that it would oblige him to separate himself from Farel. Bucer, however, and probably others of the Reformed ministers, seem to have thought that the separation of the two friends would prove advantageous. Each was inclined to carry his zeal beyond the bounds of discretion; and when united, they mutually encouraged one another in a line of conduct which impartial observers did not look upon as beneficial to the Church.¹ From some expressions which we find in a letter from Grynæus, in answer to one which he had received from Calvin about this time, it would seem that the latter felt conscious that his conduct at Geneva had not been altogether justifiable; and that a genuine or affected penitence was one of the reasons which he alleged for not accepting any other ministry at that juncture.² But Calvin's real sentiments at this time are best shown in a letter which he addressed to his former colleague Farel. In this he mentions that a person with whom he was in correspondence was in hopes that one of their chief opponents at Geneva (probably Vandel), and the councilors who had been hitherto inimical to them, might perhaps be reconciled if they (Calvin and Farel) would first write them a letter expressing their good will. "This is so ridiculous," he continues, "that Bucer himself makes no account of it. Even suppose such a thing could be hoped, yet how could we begin it? Shall we endeavor to propitiate them as if we were the cause of the quarrel? And though we should not decline to do so, what means will there be of wiping out offenses? For my part I am of opinion that neither what is past can be amended, nor the future properly provided for, in that manner. For though we should confess before God and his people that it is partly through our inexperience, sloth, negligence, and error, that the church committed to us hath so miserably collapsed; yet it is our duty to assert our innocence and purity against those by whose fraud, malice, dishonesty, and wickedness, such ruin hath been brought about. I will therefore willingly acknowledge, before God and all good men, that our ignorance and

¹ "Bucer advises that good care should be taken that we be not joined together; as he suspects that we shall mutually impel one another in a course to which each of himself is more than sufficiently inclined."—Calvin to Farel, Aug. 4th, 1538 (MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, i., 206).

² "Even admitting that it is by your own grievous fault that the Church of Christ is thus ruined at Geneva; yet that repentance will not be a pious one, by which, in the present dearth of competent ministers, you, who are adorned with so excellent gifts, not for your own benefit but for that of the Church, should reject the proposed ministry."—Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 8

carelessness were worthy of such a punishment ; but I will never concede that that unhappy church hath fallen through our fault : for in the sight of God we are conscious of the reverse. Nor is there a man who can ascribe to us the smallest portion of blame. Moreover, who does not see that by this conduct we should become a laughing-stock in future ? For every one would immediately cry out, that provided we could get restored, we were willing to submit to any disgrace. God, I trust, will open out a better path for our return. For Bucer hath not yet left off writing to Geneva, whose authority they can not well despise, though they will appear to despise it, unless they at length make some concessions to him. His ultimate hope is that even if he does not obtain a conference before next spring, he shall then at least be able to find some remedy. And perhaps the Lord foresees that this is for the best, in order that meanwhile things may come to a greater state of maturity.”¹

From this letter we perceive that Calvin was far from despairing of being ultimately restored to his ministry at Geneva, but that he had made up his mind not to return thither except on his own terms. His “penitence,” therefore, for his faults at Geneva, would hardly have been the cause of his refusing a ministry. Nobody will accuse either him or Farel of “ignorance and carelessness” in their conduct—the sole errors which he is ready to acknowledge. Their fault rather lay on the other side : in a desire to be wiser than their brethren, and in an over-care and anxiety that every thing should be carried exactly according to their own wishes. As it appears, from the foregoing letter, that Bucer was interesting himself to obtain their restitution, it is probable that Calvin did not wish to settle in any other place while there was a prospect of his speedy return to Geneva ; and that when that was delayed, he was compelled, by pecuniary necessity, to accept the situation which had been offered to him at Strasburgh. By Farel’s appointment to Neufchâtel, his scruple about parting from his friend had been removed. But whatever might have been his motives, it is certain that in September, 1538, he had left Basle for Strasburgh. The former town he seems to have quitted precipitately.

Strasburgh was at that time a free and imperial city. The chief ministers of the Reformed Church then settled there were Bucer, Capito, Sturm, Hedio, and Niger, by all of whom Calvin was received with open arms. The council of Stras-

¹ Ep. 9.

burgh appointed him professor of theology, with a moderate salary. He likewise became pastor of a congregation of French refugees in that city, which gave him an opportunity to introduce his discipline in its fullest extent.¹ This church increased wonderfully under his superintendence. A great many French were attracted to Strasburgh by his presence; not only youths, who came for the purpose of instruction, but men of mature age and extensive literary acquirements.²

But Calvin's views were still directed toward Geneva. On the 1st of October he addressed a long epistle to his beloved brother, who composed the "Relics of the Dispersed Church of Geneva."³ In this he compares himself with Daniel, and justifies his conduct by the example of that prophet's conduct toward Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. "For this," says he, "hath been the conduct of the servants of God in their greatest straits; that, from whatever side evils might threaten them, they always turned their minds toward God and their own sins, so as to impute it to themselves that they were so treated by the Lord. For Daniel knew the wickedness of the king of Babylon, in oppressing and destroying God's people for the sake of gratifying his own selfish avarice, ambition, and lawlessness. He knew, I say, how wrongfully the Jews were treated by that tyrant: nevertheless, he imputes the chief cause to himself and his household (Dan., ix., 5), as he was convinced that the Babylonians could have done nothing against them by their own power. Therefore he properly begins by a confession as well of his own sins as of those of the king and people. But if so great a prophet humbled himself in that manner, let us consider how much reason we have to imitate him. As to what concerns myself personally," he continues, "if I have to plead my cause against the wicked slanderers who would oppress me, I can say, not only that my conscience acquits me before God, but that I have abundant means to purge myself before the whole world. And this I showed sufficiently, when I offered to give an account of my conduct before all, and therefore even before my adversaries. For surely he must be convinced of his right who offers himself for trial in such a manner that, except in his certainty of that right, he must be in all other respects at a disadvantage. But by what I said before of God's judg-

¹ Ruchat, v., 86.

² Sturm, *Antipappus*, iv., 21, quoted by Henry, i., 226.

³ Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 10. It will be found in the original French in Ruchat, v., App. 4.

ment, I mean that I acknowledge I am not undeservedly thus humiliated by him, in order that I may be reminded of my ignorance, imprudence, and other infirmities. These are my sentiments concerning myself; and I thus acknowledge my defects before God's Church. Nor by these animadversions on my own conduct shall I render the cause of my adversaries superior to my own. For neither did Daniel intend to exonerate Nebuchadnezzar when he ascribed the destruction of the Jews to their own sins, though it proceeded from his tyranny. On the contrary, that rather tended to heap reproach upon the tyrant, since it thus appeared that he was but God's scourge, and that Satan and his satellites occupied the first place." There seems to be a good deal of pride in this sort of humiliation.

In the spring of 1539 Calvin was induced, by Bucer and Capito, to attend the diet assembled at Frankfort, whither he was accompanied by Sturm and other friends.¹ The German Protestant princes were assembled in that town for the purpose of considering the state of religion, and the expediency of peace with the emperor. It was at that time part of Charles's policy to foment the divisions between the Lutheran and Swiss churches, from the latter of which he also wished to detach the Reformers of Strasburgh; and one of Calvin's motives for this journey was to watch over the interests of those who adhered to the Swiss confession. He was also desirous of making the personal acquaintance of Melancthon, who was to attend this diet, and of conferring with him on the prospects of the Protestant Church. He had previously forwarded some propositions respecting the eucharist to Melancthon, with a view to discover if there was really any difference between them on that subject. His interview with that Reformer at Frankfort convinced him that their sentiments, as to that doctrine, entirely coincided.² Melancthon, however, never openly departed from Luther's views, either from a love of peace, or rather, perhaps, because Luther's vehement temper held him in constant awe and subjection; and as the majority of the German Protestants were likewise favorable to Luther's doctrine, there appeared but little prospect of an agreement between them and the Swiss churches. During this interview Calvin remonstrated against the numer-

¹ The particulars of this journey will be found in two letters to Farel in March, 1539, Epp. 12, 13.

² "Testatus est mihi (Melancthon) nihil se aliud sentire quam quod meis verbis expressissem."—MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, i, 244, "De ipso nihil dubita quin penitus nobiscum sentiat."—*Ep.* 12.

ous ceremonies still retained by the Lutherans. Melancthon pleaded the necessity of the case ; and Calvin did not see any reason why this circumstance should prevent them from forming a common league for the defense of Protestantism.¹

At this diet the Protestant princes showed more firmness and resolution than had been expected of them. Even the Elector of Saxony, who had hitherto been for postponing matters, expressed an inclination to declare war against the emperor ; and such, at first, appears to have been the general feeling of the assembly. But the arrival of the Count Palatine, and Joachim of Brandenburgh, bearing letters from Charles, as also of a Spanish prelate, who acted as his ambassador, all of whom were invested with powers plenipotentiary to treat for a peace, turned the scale the other way. As both Joachim and the Count Palatine, and especially the former, were regarded as favorable to the Protestants, their mediation was viewed with the less suspicion. Their most effective argument was the danger which impended from the Turk, who would be ready to invade Germany when he saw it torn by intestine dissensions.

Embassadors from England attended this diet to invite Melancthon thither to further some reforms then in progress ; but though the German princes were disposed to send some legation to England, it was suspected that the softness of Melancthon's temper would disqualify him for the office. In one of his letters² from Strasburgh, Calvin describes the miserable state of the Reformation in England. "Henry himself," he says, "is but half instructed. He prohibits the marriage of his clergy by the severest penalties short of deprivation. He uses daily masses, and retains the seven sacraments ; and thus he has a mutilated gospel, and a church stuffed with trifling observances. He had prohibited all translations of the Scriptures, and had recently issued a proclamation to forbid the reading of them. Nay, he had even burned a just and learned man for denying the real Presence." In such a state of things, and where so many compliances would be expected, Calvin was of opinion that even Bucer would be an unfit person to send into England, since his zeal for spreading the gospel was such that he was content to overlook some not unimportant points, provided he could carry the main ones.

Calvin seems to have staid but a short time at Frankfort, and to have quitted that city before the diet was concluded. Bucer remained behind. Some letters to Farel, written from

¹ Ep. 15.

² Ep. 13.

Strasburgh in April and May, 1539, show Calvin's multifarious occupations at this time.¹ He was now preparing the second edition of his "Institutes" for the press. In the first of these letters he says, "I do not recollect a day in which I was more overwhelmed with business of various sorts. A messenger was waiting for the first portion of my book, so that I had to revise about twenty pages; add to this that I was to lecture, to preach, to write four letters, to dispatch some controversies, and to answer more than ten appellants. You will, therefore, excuse the brevity and inaccuracy of this reply." Negotiations had been still going on for his return to Geneva, but Calvin was now beginning to give them up as hopeless. In the second of these letters he says, "What Talaris wrote about our return is not, I think, in progress, for I have heard nothing from him since." He states that he was losing all anxiety about it, and expresses his opinion that Farel and himself should return together: for that otherwise he (Calvin) would seem to be restored through favor, and that what was due to the cause had been conceded to the person. He also expresses an apprehension of the difficulties which would await him there. He found some trouble even at Strasburgh in enforcing his discipline; but at Geneva he thought it would be overwhelming.

This correspondence affords a glimpse of Calvin's pecuniary difficulties at this time. From his letter to Farel, in March, we find that he was in debt to him, and without any immediate prospect of repaying a single penny.² In a subsequent letter we find a still more deplorable account of his embarrassments, which had been increased by the expenses of his journey to Frankfort. These, however, he expected would be defrayed by what he was to receive from Wendelin, the bookseller, who was printing his book. But for the means of his ordinary subsistence till the ensuing winter, he could look only to the sale of his library, which was still at Geneva; and beyond that period he must rely on Providence. Of the many friends he had formerly had in France, not one had offered him a penny, except a certain Louis, whose offers of assistance were, however, accompanied with a sort of exhortation to recant, and the appellation of a renegade from the Church!³ We may imagine the effect of such advice on a mind like Calvin's. In another letter to Farel, dated on the 27th of July, 1539,⁴ he relates the failure of an attempt to get his

¹ See Epp. 14, 15, 16.

² Ep. 15.

³ Ep. 12.

⁴ MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry i., 405.

salary as theological lecturer increased; in consequence of which he instructs Farel to sell his books. They were not to be sold under nine *batzen* each, except any body should take a quantity, when they might go for eight; a sum equal to about a shilling. This must have been a bitter step for a literary man like Calvin, and could only have been wrung from him by hard necessity. The straits to which he was reduced at this time may be inferred from a letter which he addressed some years afterward to Myconius,¹ in which he relates that a certain Alberge had visited him when at Strasburgh, and borrowed, or rather, he says, extorted, twenty *batzen* from him (about half-a-crown); but as he had sold his books, and as his funds were completely exhausted, he was obliged to borrow this paltry sum in order to lend it to Alberge, by whom he got completely cheated.

Yet in spite of the distressed state of his pecuniary affairs, Calvin was at this time looking for a wife to help him to bear his burdens. Calvin in love is indeed a peculiar phase of his history. He had now arrived at the sufficiently mature age of thirty; and as his imagination had never been very susceptible, so, in the business of choosing a helpmate, he was guided wholly by motives of prudence and convenience. In fact he left the matter entirely to his friends, just as one would buy a horse or any other thing; giving them instructions as to the sort of article he wanted. Writing to Farel on the 19th of May, 1539, he says, "I will now speak more plainly about marriage. I know not if any one mentioned to you her whom I wrote about before the departure of Michael; but I beseech you ever to bear in mind what I seek for in a wife. I am not one of your mad kind of lovers who doat even upon faults when once they are taken by beauty of person. The only beauty that entices me is that she be chaste, obedient, humble, economical, patient; and that there be hopes that she will be solicitous about my health. If therefore you think it expedient that I should marry, bestir yourself, lest somebody else anticipate you. But if you think otherwise, let us drop the subject altogether."² In fact Calvin's wretched health, even at this period of his life, led him to seek for a nurse rather than a wife. From another letter to Farel, dated the 6th of February, 1540,³ it appears that a young German lady, rich, and of noble birth, had been proposed to him. Both the brother of

¹ Ep. 54.

² Ep. 16.

³ MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, i., 408.

the lady and his wife were anxious that Calvin should espouse her. The latter, however, scrupled on two grounds; because the lady was unacquainted with French, and because he was afraid that she might think too much of her birth and education. If the marriage was to take place he insisted that his bride should learn French; but on her requiring time to consider of this, Calvin dispatched his brother and a friend to fetch him home another lady, and congratulates himself on the escape he has had. He speaks in high terms of his fresh choice. Matters had gone so far that he invited Farel to come and officiate at his wedding, which was to take place before the 10th of the following March. It appears, however, from another letter to the same friend, dated on the 21st of June, 1540,¹ that this match, of which he had thought so highly, was also broken of. His brother Anthony and another friend had actually arranged the marriage; but a few days after their return to Strasburgh, Calvin heard some particulars regarding the lady which induced him to send his brother back to cancel the contract. After these failures Calvin expresses a doubt whether he should prosecute his matrimonial project any further. Soon afterward, however, by the advice of Bucer, he married Odelette or Idelette de Bures, the widow of an Anabaptist at Strasburgh, whom he had converted. Idelette is represented as a fine woman; but it does not appear whether she brought her husband any money. According to the customs of the times Calvin wished his wedding to be celebrated with all possible solemnity. He invited the consistories of Neufchâtel and Valengin, who sent deputies. Idelette had several children by her former marriage, in whom Calvin seems to have taken some interest. By Calvin she had only one child; a son, who died shortly after his birth.²

Calvin's position at Strasburgh afforded him a good deal more leisure for literary pursuits than he could command at Geneva. The post he filled there was but a subordinate one, and the routine of his duties regular and defined; nor had he to struggle, as at Geneva, for the maintenance of a church, and of a system of discipline, violently opposed from many different quarters at once. It was during this period that his

¹ MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, i., p. 409.

² Some Roman Catholic writers have represented Calvin's marriage as altogether barren, by the curse of God; but this is not strictly correct. Calvin himself says, in his "Answer to Baudouin," "The Lord gave me a son, but soon deprived me of him: and this my want of children Baudouin reckons among my disgraces."—*Opera*, viii., 320 A., Amst. ed.

theological studies were most successfully prosecuted; and those exegetical works begun whose excellence has been less contested than that of some of his other productions, and on which his literary fame chiefly rests. We have already adverted to the second, or perhaps, more properly speaking, the third edition of his "Institutes," which he published at Strasburgh in 1539. This contains every thing essential that is to be found in the last edition published by Calvin himself at Geneva, in 1559, from the press of Stephanus; though the latter is much superior in clearness and method.¹ We have already remarked, as a trait in Calvin's character which strongly contrasts with the open boldness of Luther, that he published this edition under the pseudonym of *Alcuin*, which forms an anagram of his name. This work shows that he was still occupied in his banishment with his scheme of Church discipline, the whole of which is found developed in the eighth chapter.² In the same year he also published at Strasburgh his Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, a work bearing the distinguishing marks of his exegetical style—clearness and brevity. Calvin's mind was essentially logical. Never, perhaps, has there existed so ardent a theologian with so little tincture of superstition or enthusiasm. Hence he would never undertake a commentary on the Revelations; and Bodin relates, that on being asked his opinion of that book, he replied, that he was totally ignorant of the meaning of that obscure writer.³ This is the more remarkable in an age when the best intellects had not entirely succeeded in freeing themselves from the trammels of superstition. On the other hand, this turn of mind sometimes led him to interpret Scripture too strictly and literally, and to turn into demonstration points which must be left to faith, or even to speculation.

It was also in 1539 that Calvin published his answer to Cardinal Sadolet. That prelate, who had been for many years Bishop of Carpentras, in Dauphiné, and who had been recently presented with a cardinal's hat, was a man of irreproachable life, and considerable literary attainments. He, like Contarini and others, was one of those moderate churchmen who, while they admitted the necessity for some reform, were unwilling to give up the essential tenets of Romanism; and who, in the pontificate of Leo X., had founded the *Ora-tory* at Rome, for purposes of mutual edification. The expulsion of the ministers from Geneva seemed to present a favorable opportunity for winning back that important city

¹ P. Henry, i., 288.

² *Ib.*, p. 220.

³ See Bayle, *Calvin*.

to the bosom of the Church. Accordingly, Sadolet, in compliance with the wishes of the Pope, addressed a letter to the council and burgesses of Geneva, dated on the 18th of March, 1539. Calvin, at the beginning of his reply, pays many compliments to Sadolet's learning and eloquence: but for any force of argument we might search the cardinal's letter in vain. The greater part consists of insinuations respecting the motives of the Reformers. He charges them with being actuated by envy in their attacks upon the Romish priesthood, because, with all their industry and learning, they had not succeeded in obtaining a good place in the Church. With more than questionable taste he introduces one of the leaders of the Reformation making this confession before the throne of God. Grave as this charge is, he further insinuates that he had kept back much heavier ones respecting the ambition, the avarice, the love of popular applause, and the secret fraud and malice of the Reformers. That the latter were too often amenable to some of these charges must be granted; but it is evident that Sadolet, feeling the weakness of his cause, strives to divert the attention of his readers from the real merits of the case, and to supply the deficiency of his arguments by attacking the character of his opponents. He concludes his letter with the stock Roman Catholic argument, which was always embarrassing to the leaders of the Reformation; namely, the variety of sects into which its followers were split, while truth is, and can be, only one.¹

The Genevese council acknowledged the cardinal's letter shortly, but politely.² Although it was not particularly formidable, nobody at Geneva was found capable of answering it; and Calvin therefore took up his pen. His reply is considered a good specimen of his Latin style. The cardinal's injudicious charges afforded an excellent opportunity not only for defense, but retaliation. In answer to the imputation of avarice and ambition, Calvin maintains that in the bosom of the Romish Church he could easily have attained the summit of his wishes—literary ease, with a tolerably honorable station. He defends Farel on the same grounds, but with somewhat more warmth than he does himself. He insists very strongly on a prominent tenet of his own theological system—that every thing must be subordinate to the glory of God; and rebukes the cardinal for making a man's own salvation a higher consideration than that of God's honor.

¹ This letter, together with Calvin's reply, will be found translated in the first volume of the *Calvin Society* publications.

² Spon, ii., 27.

In 1540, Caroli, who did not find that a second return to the Roman Catholic Church had brought him the preferment which he expected, again appeared in Switzerland. He took up his abode at Bonneville on the lake of Biemme, and was seeking to obtain another ministry in the Reformed Church. As he showed some signs of humiliation and repentance, Farel interceded for him with the council of Berne, who were highly indignant at his former clandestine flight in order to avoid the sentence which they had passed upon him. But notwithstanding all Farel's exertions in his favor, the Bernese council caused him to be arrested, and tried; and upon his conviction, sentenced him to ask pardon of God, and of all the ministers present, as well as of themselves; and condemned him to pay the expenses of the suit, and a fine of sixty *sous*.¹

After this, Farel advised Caroli to retire to Basle, and live there in such a manner as might enable him to regain the esteem and confidence of those whom he had offended. Instead of doing so, however, he went to Montbelliard, in the hope of obtaining an appointment from Count George of Wurtemberg; but Toussain (Toussanus), the minister there, saw that his character remained unchanged, and dismissed him. He now went into the Valengin, and renewed his correspondence with Farel; but not succeeding in his application to him, repaired to Strasburgh, to see what he could do with Calvin. Calvin consulted Farel, the substance of whose advice was, that Caroli should be put in a way of getting his living, but that he should not be intrusted with a church till he had proved the sincerity of his conversion. Being thus again disappointed, he proceeded to Metz, whence he wrote a vamping and reproachful letter to Calvin; but, nevertheless, expressed a desire to be reconciled with him and Farel if they would procure him a benefice. Calvin's answer, dated on the 10th of August, 1540,² is written with temper and moderation. He represents to Caroli that neither he nor Farel had any churches at their command; and that even if they had, they should not be justified in giving him one, unless they knew that he agreed with them in doctrine. Thus frustrated in his plans, Caroli became once more a Roman Catholic; in which character we shall presently see him again upon the scene.

In June, 1540, we find Calvin attending a diet held at Hagenau, whither, however, he seems to have gone rather by

¹ Ruchat, v., 132.

² Ep. 20. Calvin subscribes himself "ex animo tibi amicus."

way of relaxation and amusement, than for business. A letter addressed from this place to Monsieur de Taillis, in which he describes the state of parties, shows that he fully penetrated the designs of the different German powers.¹ At Hagenau it was resolved that a diet should be summoned to meet at Worms in the following November, for the purpose of settling religious differences. At the instance of Sturm, Calvin was appointed to attend this meeting as a delegate from the city of Strasburgh.² It was thought that his knowledge of French would be of assistance; but in any view, the appointing him to such an office is a strong proof of the esteem in which his abilities were held at Strasburgh. The managers of the conference on the part of the Roman Catholics were Eck, Gropper, and Pflug; on that of the Protestants, Melancthon, Bucer, and Pistorius. Cardinal Granvella presided. On the 15th of January, 1541, before any resolutions had been arrived at, Granvella announced to the meeting the emperor's desire that the conference should be broken off, to be renewed with more solemnity at the diet appointed to meet at Ratisbon in the ensuing spring.³

At Worms, Calvin became acquainted with Caspar Cruciger, a professor of Wittenberg, and one of the most learned men of that learned age. Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, are said to have been as familiar to him as his native tongue;⁴ he had assisted Luther in his translation of the Bible; he was well skilled in medicine and botany, and a first-rate mathematician and astronomer. As he was an adept in short-hand, he acted as secretary to the conference, and during its progress often prompted Melancthon in his answers to Eck. In a private conversation which he had with Calvin, he is said to have approved of the latter's doctrine respecting the eucharist. In an argument on the same subject into which Calvin entered at Worms with the dean of Passau, Melancthon was so struck with his learning and eloquence that he dubbed him with the title of "the Theologian."⁵

It was at Worms that Calvin, for the first and only time in his life, became poetical. In order to greet the new year in the city, which had been the scene of one of the most remarkable passages in Luther's life, Calvin produced an *Epinicion*, or song of triumph, a Latin poem, consisting of nearly

¹ See P. Henry, i., 260.

² Sturm, *Antipappus*, apud Henry, i., 387.

³ Sleidan, *De Statu*, &c., lib. xiii., p. 221.

⁴ M. Adamus, *Vita Crucigeri*, p. 193.

⁵ P. Henry, i., 368.

a hundred and thirty elegiac lines. The subject of it is the expected victory of Christ over the Pope. The Redeemer is described as accomplishing this without the use of arms, and is introduced as in a Roman triumph; while the more eminent of the Roman Catholic champions, as Eck, Cochläus, and others, follow his chariot wheels, bound and abashed. The following lines may serve by way of specimen :

“Annon mirificâ est regis victoria Christi
 Nostra quod intrepido corda vigore fovet?
 Ergo triumphali redimitus tempora lauro
 Quadrijugi emineat conspicuus solio :
 Edomiti currum positoque furore sequantur
 Qui cum sacro ejus nomine bella gerunt.
 Eccius hesterno ruber atque inflatus Iaccho
 Præbeat huc duris terga subacta flagris :
 Huc caput indomitum subdat, verum ante receptâ
 Quâ semper caruit fronte, Cochläus iners,” &c.

His poetry is not of a kind to make us regret that he wrote no more.

Calvin had not been long returned to Strasburgh when he again left that city to attend the adjourned diet at Ratisbon, the proceedings of which began on the 5th of April.¹ This assembly seemed to open under the most favorable auspices. The Protestants were desirous of union; it was the emperor's policy to promote concord, in order that he might be enabled to employ the whole force of the empire against Turkey and France; and even the Pope, Paul III., was disposed to make concessions, as appeared from his choosing Cardinal Contarini as his legate.² Contarini, a patrician and senator of Venice, like Sadolet, and other Roman Catholic prelates of moderate views, had, as we have said, belonged to the society called *The Oratory of Divine Love*, which was for making many reforms in the Church, and which, on the important doctrine of justification, had approximated very closely to the views of Luther. He had formed one of the council which Paul, with the view of mitigating the odium he had incurred by making his nephew cardinal, had appointed, in 1537, to examine without favor into the abuses in the Popedom. Their report embraced a long list of things which required amendment, though it does not appear that their suggestions were adopted.³ By the German and Swiss Reformers, however, this counter-reformation was regarded with suspicion. Luther

¹ Sleidan, p. 224.

² See Ranke's *Hist. of the Popes*, i., 154 (Mrs. Austin's translation)

³ The report will be found in Sleidan, lib. xii, p. 192, et seq

and Sturm wrote books against it; and the former caused a picture to be painted, in which the Pope was represented, surrounded by his cardinals, with foxes' tails. Thus, with the usual fate of all moderate men, he only succeeded in incurring the suspicion of both parties; for the Pope and his college were dissatisfied with his not showing a more determined front to the Lutherans during this meeting.¹

Calvin, with his usual distrust of all such negotiations, had from the first expressed no hopes of a satisfactory result. His forebodings were founded on the characters of the Roman Catholic managers, who were the same as those appointed at Worms. In a letter to Farel, from Ratisbon, he thus describes them: "Julius Pflug possesses eloquence and knowledge of the world, but is a poor theologian; a courtier, moreover, and ambitious, though in other respects of irreproachable life. Deficient in the requisite knowledge and firmness, and warped sometimes by his ambition, you may infer how little is to be expected from him. Gropper goes somewhat further; yet he too belongs to that class of men who would make a compromise between Christ and the world. Still he is a man whom one can confer with to some purpose. Eck you know. Nobody doubts but this Davus will spoil all by his officious meddling. I should not despair; but I can not help thinking on Worms. Truly, my expectations will be deceived if we arrive at any result worth mentioning."²

Dr. Eck, who was a native of Ingoldstadt, was for a long time one of the chief props of the Roman Catholic cause in Germany. He was regarded by the Reformers with the greatest disgust and aversion, as is manifest from this letter of Calvin's, as well as from his verses before quoted. Petrus Mosellanus, in a letter to Pflug, describing the disputation at Leipsic between Luther, Carlostadt and Eck, in June, 1519, gives the following account of his person and character: "Eck is tall and stout, with a sonorous and truly German voice, fit for a tragic actor, or rather for a public crier; yet rough rather than articulate. He is so far from preserving that suavity of the Roman countenance, so praised by Fabius and Cicero, that, from his whole appearance, you would take him for a butcher, or Carian soldier, rather than a theologian. As to his intellect, he hath a wonderful memory, which, if it were supported by a corresponding understanding, he would be perfect. But he wants quickness of apprehension and acuteness

¹ Sleidan, lib. xiv., p. 224.

² MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, i. 364.

of judgment, without which all his other endowments are useless. This is the cause why, in disputation, he heaps up, without choice or discrimination, so many arguments, so many passages from Scripture, and other authorities, without perceiving how frigid most of them are, how irrelevant to the matter in hand—or lastly, how obscure and sophistical. His only aim is to obfuscate his auditors by a copious *farrago*, and so to carry off a show of victory. To this must be added an incredible audacity, concealed, however, with wonderful slyness."¹ Yet Melancthon, in a letter to Œcolampadius, respecting the same disputation, reports more favorably of Eck's powers, and states that his great and various intellectual qualities had excited the admiration of most of his auditors.² Pflug, who was really a man of worth, was a friend of Erasmus, who speaks of him in the highest terms, and is loud in praise of his Latin style.³ He was one of the councilors of George, Duke of Saxony, and subsequently Bishop of Naumburg.

Before the conference began, the emperor sent for the managers, and exhorted them to lay aside all private feelings, and to have regard only to the truth, and the glory of God. He then handed them a book, which he wished to be made the basis of the conference.⁴ Frederick, the Elector Palatine, and Cardinal Granvella were appointed presidents of the assembly, and there was to be a witness on each side. Calvin has given an account of the proceedings in several letters addressed to Farel from Ratisbon and Strasburgh, the first of which contains an elaborate view of European politics at that juncture.⁵ With regard to the business of the meeting, the doctrines of original sin, free-will, and justification, were, from the concessions made by the Roman Catholics, got over with such ease as excited the surprise of Calvin himself. Contarini had been directed by the Pope to ascertain, first of all, whether there was any prospect of coming to an agreement with the Protestants respecting the primacy of the Roman see, and some other articles on which the Reformers dissented most widely from the Romish Church. Contarini, however, thought it prudent to depart from these instructions, and advised the managers, who did nothing without consulting him, to put the question of the Pope's supremacy last instead of first; thinking it bet-

¹ See Jortin, *Erasmus*, ii., App., No. xvii.

² *Ibid.*, No. xviii.

³ See Epp. 1170.

⁴ Sleidan, lib. xiii., p. 225. M. Adamus, *V. Buceri*, p. 216.

⁵ See Epp. 28, 31, 32, 35.

ter to begin with those points in which he and his friends approximated to the Protestants.¹ Thus at first every thing seemed to go on smoothly enough, and Calvin in his letter to Farel of the 11th of May,² says: "When you shall have read the draft with its last corrections, which you will find inclosed, you will wonder, I am sure, that our adversaries should have conceded so much. Our managers have retained the sum of the true doctrine, so that there is nothing in the paper which may not be found in our books. You will desire, I am aware, a clearer explanation, and on that head I agree with you; but if you consider the sort of men we have to deal with, you will admit that much has been done."

The question as to what constituted the Church occasioned more difficulty. The managers were agreed as to its definition, but differed about its power. It was therefore determined to pass over this point for the present. But the question of the eucharist, as might have been expected, proved insuperable. On this subject the managers requested the opinions of their brother ministers, and Calvin was desired to put down his sentiments in Latin. He strongly condemned the doctrine of the local Presence, and denounced the adoration of the host as intolerable. His decisive opinion seems to have influenced the rest. Melancthon drew up a paper in conformity with it, which Cardinal Granvella rejected with many angry expressions. Such being the difference of opinion respecting the fundamental point of that sacrament, little hope could be entertained of coming to an agreement on the difficult questions that still remained of private masses, the sacrifice of the mass, and the communication of the cup.

At this stage of the proceedings, Eck, the chief manager on the Roman Catholic side, was suddenly seized with illness. He is said to have been infuriated by an argument respecting the eucharist advanced by Melancthon, which he could not answer; and, in order to console his rage, drank so much at supper, that he got a fever, and was not afterward in a condition to attend the conference.³ In order to balance this loss, Cardinal Granvella directed Pistorius to be removed from the Protestant side, and that the conference should proceed among the remaining four, but without witnesses. Calvin communicates to Farel the intelligence of Eck's partial recovery in the following terms: "They say that Eck is convalescent:

¹ Ranke's *Hist. of the Popes*, i, 162.

² Ep. 31.

³ M. Adamus, *V. Melancthonis*, p. 340. Calvin, however, calls it an apoplexy.

the world doth not yet deserve to be delivered from that beast."¹

Calvin, seeing that there was little hope of coming to an accommodation, took advantage of an adjournment of the diet to leave Ratisbon, though Bucer and Melancthon were very loth that he should depart. But Capito was ill, and thus the school at Strasburgh was neglected, and the church also stood in need of attention. In a letter to Farel, dated from Strasburgh in July,² Calvin gives a further account of the conference. The Marquis of Brandenburgh, with the privity of the emperor, sent the Prince of Anhalt with a message to Luther, who, it was thought, would be more favorable than the managers to the Papist views; but it does not appear that he made any concessions. The Roman Catholics, on their part, made the following: They were willing to abolish the traffic in masses, and to curtail their number, so that there should be but one mass a day in each church, and that only when a congregation was assembled. They granted free participation of the cup to those who sought it; but the sacrifice of the mass they enveloped in a sophistical explanation. They insisted on the necessity of confession and absolution, but were content that there should be no scrupulous enumeration in the former. But all these articles were rejected by the Protestants; nor could they come to any agreement respecting the invocation of saints, the primacy of the Pope, and the authority of the Church. The emperor dissolved the diet on the 28th of July, promising to use his influence with the Pope to get a council appointed; and that, if neither a general nor provincial one could be obtained within eighteen months, he would then assemble an imperial diet for the purpose of settling religious differences, to which he would take care that the Pope should send a legate.³

Thus ended the celebrated Diet of Ratisbon, in which the Roman Catholics and Reformers came more nearly to an accommodation than at any period before or since. The concessions, it will have been observed, were all on the side of the former; but, from the relative situation of the parties, this was, in a great degree, the natural course of things.

While Calvin was engaged with these conferences, the Genevese were actively negotiating for his return to their city. On the 20th of October, 1540, the council, in a resolution couched

¹ "Eckius, ut aiunt, convalescit: nondum meretur mundus istâ bestia liberari."—Ep. 32. Eck survived about two years.

² Ep. 35.

³ Sleidan, lib. xiv., p. 230.

in the most flattering terms, ordered that he should be invited back ;¹ and their message was delivered to Calvin just as he was on the point of setting out for Worms. In order to understand this change of feeling, we must revert for a moment to the state of parties at Geneva after the banishment of the ministers.

The faction which had succeeded in expelling Calvin and his colleagues at first enjoyed a complete triumph. Farel, in particular, was the object of their railleries. They carried through the streets a frying-pan full of candle-snuffs, which in the *patois* of the place were called *farets*, in order to intimate that they had made a fricassee of Farel.² This faction, at the head of which was Jean Philippe, the captain-general, together with two of the syndics of the year 1538, was in the interest of Berne, and its adherents designated themselves by the name of the *Artichokes*, which plant they took for their device. All who, from whatever cause, were dissatisfied with the state of religion at Geneva, naturally joined this party, and thus it counted in its ranks both Anabaptists and Roman Catholics.

On the other hand, the party of Farel and Calvin was kept in subjection. The city was governed according to the views of Berne, and all, whether Papists or ultra-evangelicals, who refused to conform to the decrees of the synod of Lausanne, were banished. With the majority, however, the adoption of the Bernese rites was but a pretense to get rid of the obnoxious discipline. The old licentiousness of manners again prevailed ; dancing, gaming, drunkenness, and other still worse disorders flourished ; and adulterers were once more dismissed with the punishment of only three days' imprisonment on bread and water.³ The new ministers, besides the inefficiency of their characters, were not numerous enough to superintend the charge committed to them. At first there were only two, Henry de la Mar, and James Bernard ; and at Whitsuntide following the departure of Calvin and Farel, when it was usual to celebrate the communion, two members of the council were obliged to assist at the table at St. Peter's and St. Gervais'. Subsequently two other ministers, Anthony Marcourt and Dr. Morand, both foreigners, were appointed to the

¹ "Pour l'augmentation et l'avancement de la parole de Dieu a été ordonné d'envoyer querir es Strasbourg maître I. Calvinus, lequel est bien savant, pour être notre évangelique en cette ville."—*Régistres*, 20 Oct., 1540. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

² Spon, ii., 26.

³ Ruchat, v 96.

ministry. But neither these, nor their colleagues, were men of any talent or authority, and were consequently despised by the populace. Already, before the expiration of 1538, we find them complaining to the council of being suspected as infidels, Papists, and corrupters of Scripture, as well as of the contempt and ill-will to which they were subjected, and begging to be dismissed from their office.¹ In February, 1539, they are recorded as representing to the council the extreme dissoluteness manifested at Geneva, the blasphemies, balls, masquerades, and indecent songs, and even persons going naked through the town to the sound of drums and fifes.²

This state of things lasted the whole of 1539, and part of the following year. The ministers were conscious of their inability to maintain order, and felt keenly the contempt with which they were treated. Calvin, however, though he disliked and despised his successors, did all he could in his communications with the Genevese to uphold their authority. His motive for this was the fear that, amid these disorders, Geneva might be persuaded to return to the Roman Catholic faith; an attempt to effect which object had, as we have already seen, been made by Cardinal Sadolet. There seems, however, to have been but little ground for such an apprehension; for during Calvin's exile, it being doubtful what religion some persons professed, the council came to a resolution that all should be made to declare themselves; and that such as professed Roman Catholicism should be banished. Among those interrogated was Jean Ballard, one of their own body, who only escaped the penalty by a timely concession.³ Such, nevertheless, being Calvin's apprehension, he thought it the best policy to support the new ministers. Being consulted by Saunier whether he ought to accept of the sacrament at their hands, Calvin, by the advice of Capito, with which his own sentiments agreed, told his correspondent that he should do so, without inquiring too minutely whether they had lawfully supplanted the old pastors; but at the same time dissuaded him from accepting the ministerial office with such colleagues.⁴ Saunier, however, does not appear to have obeyed his injunctions; for at Christmas, 1538, both he and Mathurin Cordier, together with some others, were ordered to leave the city, because they would not receive the sacrament with unleavened bread. In his letter addressed to the church of Geneva on the 25th of June, 1539, Calvin admonishes his former flock

¹ Ruchat, v., App. 5.

³ Spon, ii., 32, note.

² *Ibid.*, p. 112.

⁴ Calvin to Farel, Ep. 11.

of the dangers of schism, and insists strongly on the reverence due to their ministers *de facto*; magnifying the priestly character, and asserting that the ministers of the Word should be regarded as the messengers of God.¹ Yet in a joint letter² from him and Farel to Bullinger, we find the following account of their successors: "Of the two who have invaded our places, one (Bernard) was guardian of the Franciscan convent at the beginning of the Reformation, and was always hostile to it till he beheld Christ in a handsome wife, whom since his marriage he hath corrupted in all possible ways. During his monkhood he lived most impurely and wickedly, without troubling himself to put on even the appearance of the superstition which he professed."—"Since his conversion he has behaved in a manner which indubitably shows that there is no fear of God, nor a grain of religion in his heart. His colleague (H. de la Mar), though very sly in concealing his vices, is yet so notoriously vicious that he can impose only upon strangers. Both are very ignorant, and quite unfit, not only to teach, but even to prate; and yet both are proud to a degree of insolence. They now say that a third has been added, who was lately charged with, and all but convicted of, fornication, had not the assistance of a few friends rescued him from judgment. Nor do they administer their office more dexterously than they have usurped it. They thrust themselves into it partly without consulting, and partly against the express protests of their brethren of the province, though they carry themselves rather as mercenaries than as servants of Christ. Truly nothing grieves us more than that the ministry should be prostituted and disgraced as it is by their levity, ignorance, and stupidity. Not a day passes in which some error is not observed in their conduct by men, women, and even children."

These men, however, such as they are here painted, seem to have done what they could to check the torrent of vice and disorder. In April and July, 1540, we find them appearing before the council, remonstrating against the scandalous scenes which took place both by day and night, representing their inability to maintain order, and demanding their dismissal.³ The council contented themselves with recommending them to do their duty. Shortly afterward Dr. Morand, disgusted at his position, left Geneva secretly; and within two months his colleague, Marcourt followed his example.

¹ See Ep. 17.

² Henry, i., Beil. 9.

³ Ruchat, v., 147.

During this year the party of Farel and Calvin had been gradually gaining strength. It now ventured to show itself openly. Frequent conflicts took place in the streets, which resounded with the names of *Farel* and *Artichoke*, the watchwords of the two hostile factions. In one of these riots Jean Philippe, the captain-general, and head of the Artichokes, killed a man with a partisan; an act for which, in spite of remonstrances from Berne, he was condemned to lose his head.¹ This was a heavy blow to the anti-Calvinistic party, which other circumstances also contributed to repress. Claude Richardet, one of the syndics of the year 1538, who had assisted in banishing Calvin, and had told him that the gates were wide enough, had been convicted of sedition; and being pursued by the officers of justice, had broken his neck in attempting to escape from a window. Two other syndics of the same year had been obliged to fly from Geneva to avoid an accusation of treason, and had in their absence been tried and condemned.² These occurrences seemed like judgments upon the city. The council itself, as well as the majority of the citizens, wearied and alarmed by the constant disturbances, began to desire Calvin's return. The interest he had manifested for them by his letters from Strasburgh, and by his answer to Sadolet, was not without its effect. Political motives, also, had some weight. The Genevese began to fear that Berne was acquiring too much influence in their affairs; and the execution of Jean Philippe had excited considerable animosity between the two cities. In this state of things the secession of the two ministers excited a pressing desire for Calvin's recall; and in October the message was sent, to which we have already alluded. Farel does not appear to have received any invitation till it was known that Calvin hesitated, or at least delayed, to return.³ But though Farel was at that time obnoxious to a large party at Neufchâtel, and though a sentence of banishment was actually suspended over him, yet, upon being recalled by the Genevese, indignation at the treatment he had received from them, as well as an unwillingness to abandon what he now considered the post of duty, deterred him from accepting the invitation.

Calvin communicated the letter of the Genevese council to

¹ Spon, ii., 141.

² Kirchhofer, ii., 18. Henry, i., 385.

³ In a letter to Farel, announcing the invitation he had received, Calvin says: "I dare hardly weigh their design in recalling me; for, if they be sincere, why me rather than him whose ministry would be not less necessary to restore their church, than it was at first to found it."—*Ep.* 23.

Bucer and his other friends at Strasburgh. As they anticipated that much advantage would result from his attendance at Worms, they were of opinion that he should not give up his journey thither. Accordingly, Bucer wrote back a letter to Geneva, which was also signed by the other Strasburgh ministers, in which he pleaded this excuse, and advised the Genevese to procure the services of Viret, who was then at Lausanne, till the Diet of Worms should be concluded.¹ Calvin also wrote a letter to the same effect.² While at Worms, Calvin received another letter of the most pressing kind from the magistrates of Geneva, and which was delivered to him by the hands of Ami Perrin. His reply, dated from that town on the 12th of November, 1540, contains many civil expressions, and many protestations of his love for the church of Geneva. But he pleads his engagements at the conference, and does not hold out any positive hope of his return ever afterward; alleging that he could not quit his vocation at Strasburgh without the consent of those in authority there.³ In the spring of 1541 the entreaties of the Genevese magistrates were renewed. According to the advice of the Strasburgh ministers they had obtained from the Bernese the loan of Viret's services, but only for six months. When, in May, 1541, this time was nearly expired, they addressed a circular letter to the governments of Berne, Basle, and Zurich, to request their influence in procuring Calvin's return.⁴ As this letter is not only characteristic of the times, but shows the important place which Calvin held in the estimation of the Genevese council, some extracts from it are here subjoined:—

“Although,” say they, “we have been troubled with many and serious disturbances in our city for about twenty years past, yet we have experienced, most illustrious princes, in all these tumults, seditions, and dangers, no such wrath of God pressing on our necks, as in the years just past; in which by the art and machinations of factious and seditious men, our faithful pastors and ministers, by whom our church had been founded, built up, and long maintained, to the great comfort and edification of all, have been unjustly driven out and rejected with great ingratitude: those extraordinary favors and benefits being altogether passed over and forgotten, which we have

¹ Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 27.

² See Ruchat, vi., App. 6.

³ This letter is in Ruchat, v., App. 7, and P. Henry, i., Beil. 17.

⁴ That to Zurich is printed in Henry i., Beil. 15, from a Gen. MS.

received at the hand of God through their ministry. For from the hour that they were banished we have had nothing but troubles, enmities, strife, contention, disorders, seditions, factions, and homicides. So that by this time we should have been completely overwhelmed, unless God in his mercy, compassionately beholding us, had sent our brother Viret, who was formerly a faithful pastor here, to gather this miserable flock, which was so dispersed as scarcely to have any longer the appearance of a church. We acknowledge, therefore, that this great anger of God hath fallen upon us, because our Lord Jesus Christ hath been thus rejected and despised in his servants and ministers, and that we are unworthy ever to be esteemed his faithful disciples, or ever to find quiet in our state, unless we endeavor to repair these offenses, so that the due honor of the most holy evangelical ministry be restored; and, by common consent, we desire nothing more ardently than that our brethren and ministers be reinstated in their former place in this church, to which they were called by God.

“Wherefore, most worshipful masters, we beg of you, in the name of Christ, and in so far as ye seek the welfare and safety of the churches, that for our sakes ye deign to beseech and urge the most illustrious princes of Strasburgh, that in their benevolence they not only restore our brother Calvin to us, who is so very necessary to us, and who is so anxiously sought after by our people; but also that they will themselves condescend to persuade and urge him to undertake this office, and to come hither as speedily as possible. You are not ignorant how needful learned and pious men are in this place, such as we know Calvin and the rest of our former ministers to be; as we are, as it were, the very gate of Italy and France, and a place from which either wonderful edification or ruin may proceed. And as many resort hither daily from those as well as other neighboring regions, with what solace and edification will they return, if they behold our city settled in a decent order! But that can not be unless we have those pastors and conductors which we have pointed out as needful for this church; as we experience daily. For since our brother Viret has been conceded to us for some months by our dear friends and allies, their excellencies of Berne, it is truly wonderful what fruit hath proceeded from his evangelical discourses, and in what peace and concord our city now is, by means of the great comfort and edification received from the Lord through him, and communicated even to strangers,” &c.

In consequence of this letter the pastors of the church of Zurich wrote to Calvin, persuading him to return to his ministry at Geneva. Calvin replied in a letter from Ratisbon, dated the 31st of May, 1541.¹ In this he states that he shall refer the matter wholly to Bucer and the other ministers of Strasburgh, and requests that the church of Zurich will likewise send one of their ministers to consult as to what was best to be done. All his business at Strasburgh, he says, was to give a theological lecture; and that his services were not so valuable that the school would suffer much inconvenience by his departure. "One thing only," he adds, "causes anxiety to Capito, Bucer, and the rest. They expect little edification from my ministry at Geneva, unless the Bernese join me *bonâ fide*, and stretch out a helping hand. Nor do I dissemble that my own hope is placed chiefly in their assistance. First of all, therefore, it was thought proper to communicate with them, in order to induce them to do this; and they are by no means averse, provided it shall appear that the church of Geneva can be restored and preserved by my ministry."

Beside these public invitations, Calvin was also solicited by private individuals. Among these we find James Bernard, one of the two remaining ministers at Geneva. In a letter to Calvin, dated the 6th of February, 1541,² he relates, that preaching one day at Rippe, and seeing the people affected even to tears, he admonished them, without mentioning Calvin's name or suspecting that he would be their choice, that they should seek by humble prayer that God would give them a minister. That on the next day there was a meeting of the Two Hundred, and, the day after that, of the general assembly; and that in both these meetings Calvin's return to his ministry was unanimously desired, as being a learned and good man. Bernard adds his own wishes for his return, and says: "You will find me not such a one as the relation of certain persons—God forgive them—has led you to believe; but a pious, sincere, and faithful brother, and moreover your friend, or, rather, your most obsequious and devoted servant in all your wishes." This being the state of public feeling at Geneva, the act of banishment of the three ministers was revoked by the general assembly on the 1st of May, 1541; and, to show their sincerity, dancing and profane songs were prohibited, and people even talked of establishing a consistory.³

¹ Printed in Henry, i., Beil. 19.

² Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 24.

³ Spon., ii., 36.

Yet Calvin still delayed his return. That his reluctance was in some degree real is probable. We can not, however, help suspecting, that he made the most of the conjuncture, and that he was determined that the Genevese should feel and know his worth. Soon after his banishment he had not been disinclined to return, nay, had even negotiated to do so, when the Genevese were unwilling to receive him. Now, when they opened their arms to him of their own accord, it was his turn to coquet and raise difficulties. Several of his letters during this period expressed a dislike almost amounting to horror of returning to Geneva. In reply to Farel's request that he would return,¹ he says: "Who will not pardon me if I do not again willingly throw myself into a whirlpool which I have found so fatal? Nay, who would not blame me for too much facility if I should fling myself into it with my eyes open? Besides, putting my own danger out of the question, what if I can scarcely trust that my ministry will be of any use to them? Since such is the temper of the majority there, that they will be neither tolerable to me, nor I to them. Moreover I shall have a still more difficult fight with my colleagues than with the rest. What can the efforts of one man do, when hampered by such obstacles on all sides? And to confess the truth, though things should prove smooth enough, *yet, by want of use, I have forgotten the art of governing a multitude.*" Writing to Viret from an inn at Ulm, on his road to Ratisbon, on the 1st of March, 1541,² he says: "There is no place under heaven which I more fear than Geneva; not that I dislike it, but because I see so many difficulties in my way there, which I feel myself quite unequal to cope with. Whenever I recall what has passed, I can not help shuddering at the thought of being compelled to renew the old contests. If, indeed, I had to do with the church alone, I should be more tranquil, or, at least, less frightened; but you must necessarily understand more than I express. In short, as I perceive from many signs that the man who can hurt me most still entertains an inexpiable hatred toward me, and when I consider how many opportunities he has of injuring me, how many bellows are always blowing the flames of strife, and how many occasions of contest will offer themselves which I can not foresee, I am paralyzed with fear."

From these two letters we can not but infer that Calvin really felt some alarm at the prospect of returning to Geneva.

¹ Calvin to Farel, Strasburgh, October 21st, 1540, Ep. 23.

² Ep. 25.

In the latter it takes a definite form, and points to some individual whom he does not name; probably Vandel; though in the same letter he still expresses his willingness to go, if absolutely necessary, in spite of these dangers. His answer to the council of Zurich, already referred to, runs much in the same strain.¹ Farel used all his endeavors to persuade Calvin to return. In January, 1541, he wrote to all the Swiss and other Reformed churches, begging them to apply to the government of Strasburgh for Calvin's release from his engagements.² He also wrote several letters to Calvin himself, persuading him to accept the offer of the Genevese, the last of which was couched in such forcible terms that Calvin compared it to the thunders of Pericles.³ Bucer also added his remonstrances, threatening him with God's judgment if he did not accept the vocation; and placing before him the example of Jonas, who refused to go and preach to the Ninevites.⁴ Thus was Calvin for the second time forced, as it were, into the acceptance of the ministry at Geneva. But though he returned from Ratisbon to Strasburgh in July, he did not proceed to Geneva till the beginning of September, having remained at Strasburgh in order to preach there during the fair-time.⁵

¹ Henry, i., Beil. 19.

² Kirchofer, ii., 20.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 21, and Feræus Farello (Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 26).

⁴ Spon, ii., 36.

⁵ See his letter to Farel (MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, i., 397).

CHAPTER IV.

Calvin visits Neufchâtel—His Reception at Geneva—State of the Church there—Farel invited—Calvin's Ecclesiastical Polity—Church and State—The Consistory—Service of the Church—Presbyterianism—Calvin's Idea of the Priesthood—Method of upholding it—Practical Discipline—His Scheme not perfected—Calvin's Civil Legislation—Rigor of his Laws.

It was not without regret that Strasburgh saw itself deprived of Calvin's services. In July, 1539, when he had probably given up all thoughts of returning to Geneva, he had purchased the freedom of that city, and enrolled himself in the guild of tailors.¹ Upon his departure he was requested to retain his right of citizenship, as well as the revenues of a prebend to which he had been presented. The former of these offers he accepted; the latter he declined.²

Calvin's return to Geneva was a sort of triumph. On his part it was a matter of favor and concession, and completely on his own terms. It appears from the Registers that a mounted herald was sent to escort him from Strasburgh. Three horses and a carriage were sent to bring his wife and furniture, and he was also furnished with money and other necessaries.³ While on his journey, however, some news respecting his friend Farel induced Calvin to leave the direct road, and proceed to Neufchâtel. It has been already intimated that at that time Farel did not stand well with his flock. His excessive zeal in introducing a strict system of discipline had proved distasteful to many; and in July this growing feeling of dissatisfaction had been brought to a crisis by his attacking from the pulpit a lady, the mother of several children, who for some reason had thought proper to separate herself from her husband. Shocked and offended at this attack the lady absented herself not only from communion, but even from the ordinary church service; and though Farel urged the government to interpose, his application was not successful. Hereupon, with his usual intemperance, he made a violent sermon against the council and general assembly, which much increased the ill-will against him. The lady's friends bestirred themselves to get him condemned; and a majority of the general assembly voted for his banishment,

¹ P. Henry, i., 225.

² Beza, *Vita Calv.*

³ P. Henry, ii., 18.

though two months were granted him to leave the city. In this state of things Calvin arrived at Neuchâtel, to use his good offices for his friend. From this place he addressed a letter to the syndics and council of Geneva, and then hastened to Berne, to plead Farel's cause with the government of that city. A complete reconciliation between Farel and his flock was not effected, however, till the following January.¹

Calvin's return to Geneva was thus delayed till the 13th of September. On the very same day he appeared before the council to apologize for this delay; and even in this first interview intimated his wish that the affairs of the church should be put in order.² He was received with every mark of honor and affection. The council earnestly entreated him to remain with them forever; and presented him with a new suit of broad-cloth, which was in those days a usual mark of their respect and good-will.³ A house had been provided for him, with a garden attached, situate, as it would appear, in the *Rue des Chanoines*, and thus not far from the cloisters of St. Peter's, where the consistory afterward held its sittings.⁴ His salary was fixed at fifty dollars, besides twelve strikes of corn and two casks of wine. This does not seem very considerable; but we must take into consideration the relative value of money; and the payment in kind seems to argue a want of means on the part of the city. That the Genevese council considered it a very liberal allowance, appears from the terms in which they speak of it in the Registers; where it is mentioned as "handsome wages," given to him on account of his great learning, and the charges he was at by reason of the visits of travelers.⁵ Calvin himself, among whose faults the love of money certainly was not one, seems to have been perfectly satisfied with his remuneration; and though we sometimes find him receiving presents from the council for extra services, yet many instances occur in which he refused them. The pulpit of St. Peter's church was prepared for him. It stood upon a broad and low stone pillar, so that the whole congregation might hear him with ease.

¹ Kirchhofer, *Leben Farel's*, ii., 20. Ruchat, v., 164.

² *Régistres*, 13th September, 1541, *apud* P. Henry, ii., 23, note.

³ "On prie très instamment Calvin de rester ici pour toujours; et on lui donne un habit de drap."—*Régistres*, 13th September, 1541. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

⁴ P. Henry, ii., 19.

⁵ "Gage considérable donné à M. Calvin, à cause de son grand savoir, et de ce que les passans lui coûtent beaucoup."—*Régistres*, 4 Oct. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*. In his French Life (*Généve* 1663, p. 155), Beza states his salary at 600 florins (*i.e.* Genevese florins of about 4½*d.*), or equal to 300 *livres Tournois*, which is about the same as the preceding statement.

The following was the ordinary routine of his indefatigable labors after his return. He preached every day during each alternate week ; thrice a week he gave lectures in theology ; presided in the consistory every Thursday ; and every Friday, at the meetings for scriptural discussion held in St. Peter's church, delivered almost a complete lecture. When it was not his week to preach he had his books brought to him in bed, at five or six o'clock in the morning, and dictated to an amanuensis. When it was his turn to mount the pulpit, he was always ready at the appointed hour ; and when he returned home, either went to bed again, or threw himself upon it in his clothes to pursue his literary avocations. Yet, notwithstanding these multifarious pursuits, he found time to reply to the numerous letters which he received from all parts, on subjects connected with theology and church government.¹

Though Calvin, on his return, prudently abstained from addressing the council on the subject of old and personal grievances, as he had once intended to do, he made them a speech on the state of morals in the city ; but on this score he found little reason to complain of the zeal of the government. When the recall of the exiled ministers had been resolved on, the council had again pushed their regulations on this head to a point of puritanical precision. The Registers show that these were not mere idle thunders. On the 1st of November, 1540, we find several women imprisoned for having danced. On the 18th of June, 1541, it is recorded that the wife of Ami Perrin, the very member of the council who had been deputed to solicit Calvin's return, was punished for the like cause ; as also one Coquet, who had told the people assembled to shoot at the papegay, that they were at liberty to dance.² Calvin, therefore, in addressing Farel soon after his return, expresses himself tolerably satisfied on this head. "The people," he writes, "are pretty obedient ; at least the sermons are regularly attended, and the state of morals sufficiently decent ; but there is still much vice in their hearts ; which, unless it be gradually eradicated, will, I fear, burst forth into open contagion."³ In the same letter he complains sadly of the want of efficient coadjutors. The only one on whom he could rely was Viret. He consequently strained every nerve to get that minister's leave of absence prolonged, and suc-

¹ Beza. *Vita Calv.* Spon, ii., 37. P. Henry, ii., 177.

² See P. Henry, ii., 18.

³ Calvin to Farel, Nov. 11th, 1541, Ep. 39.

ceeded in retaining him at Geneva till July in the following year. In a letter to Myconius, dated on the 14th of March,¹ Calvin represents his labors for the first month after his return as very irksome. Viret had done a little; but had not attempted to establish any regular form of discipline. After thanking Myconius for his good offices with the Bernese, to get Viret's term of absence extended, he thus describes his other coadjutors: "My other colleagues are rather a hinderance than a help to me: they are arrogant and ferocious, have no zeal, and very little learning. The worst is, that I can not trust them, however I might wish it; for they discover many proofs of alienation, but scarce a symptom of good faith and sincerity. Nevertheless, I bear with them, or rather caress them, with the greatest gentleness; from doing which not even their bad conduct shall deter me. If stronger means become necessary, I will take care that the Church shall not be damaged by our quarrels; for I have a perfect horror of those schisms which necessarily follow disagreements among ministers. Had I chosen to do so, I could have gotten them dismissed when I returned, which even now is in my power. But I shall never repent the moderation I have shown toward them, since nobody will be able justly to accuse me of too much vehemence. I mention these things by the way, that you may the more easily see in what a miserable situation I shall be, if deprived of Viret." And further on he adds: "There are in the city, as I have said, the seeds of intestine discord; but my patience and mildness prevent the Church from feeling any ill effects from this circumstance, or the people from becoming acquainted with it. Every body knows Viret's kind and gentle temper; and, at all events, in present circumstances, I myself am not a whit harsher. Perhaps you will hardly believe this; yet so it is. Such is my desire for public peace and concord, that I put a restraint upon myself, for which my very adversaries are compelled to give me credit. A portion of my enemies daily become my friends. To the rest I make advances: and though I do not always succeed, I feel that I make some progress. I could have driven out my opponents, and that, too, with applause, and have attacked successfully all who had injured me: I abstained. I might inveigh against them daily if I chose, not only with impunity, but with the approbation of many: I forbear. Nay, I scrupulously avoid the least appearance

¹ Ep. 54. No year is given; but it must have been 1542, as Viret is mentioned as still at Geneva. It is put among the letters of 1544.

of attacking any one, much more the whole body. May the Lord confirm this disposition."

The triumphant nature of Calvin's return had undoubtedly strengthened his hands against his fellow-ministers; and there is no reason to doubt that he really possessed the power of dismissing them, had he chosen to exert it. In the preceding extracts he plumes himself much on this forbearance; for which he evidently thought that he should hardly find credit among those who knew him. In fact, his behavior on this occasion was the effect rather of his good sense than of his natural disposition. That it cost him an effort, he himself acknowledges. But his recent experience, and perhaps, too, the example of Farel's situation at Neufchâtel, had taught him a lesson of moderation. He perceived that any open rupture with his brethen would be a scandal, and a hinderance both to himself and to the Church of Geneva; and therefore he did his best, though against the grain, to conciliate them. The same tone of new-born moderation pervades his correspondence with Farel at this juncture. In a letter to him, dated on the 16th December, 1541,¹ he says: "Since a good cause needs a good advocate, see that you do not so spare yourself that even the righteous may find something wanting in you. I do not exhort you to maintain a pure conscience; for on that head I feel no misgivings. All I ask of you is to accommodate yourself to the people as much as your duty will permit. There are, you know, two kinds of popularity: in one, ambition and the desire of pleasing lead us to seek men's favor; in the other, we allure them to docility by the exercise of moderation and equity. Pardon me if I seem too free; but on this head I perceive that you do not satisfy the good."

Calvin considered it for the interest of the Church that a thorough reconciliation should appear to have been effected between the Genevese and their banished ministers; and with that view, toward the close of December, 1541, he wrote a letter to Farel, inviting him to Geneva.² At first it had been arranged that when Calvin returned, Farel should escort him back; that, as they had been banished together, so the unity

¹ Ep. 50. In the Lausanne edition it is dated 1543; but the contents evidently show that this is a mistake.

² "Now that I hear things are more peaceable in your parts, it is for the interest of our common ministry, of myself, and of the whole Church, that you should come here once."—*Ep.* 40. In this letter Calvin announces the death of his friend Capito at Strasburgh, and that Bucer was sick of the plague.

of their ministry might still appear to be preserved. But the breach which had occurred between Farel and a large portion of his flock had prevented him from leaving Neufchâtel at that juncture. This was now pretty nearly healed, so that he might absent himself for a while without danger or impropriety on that score: but there seem to have been other scruples brooding in Farel's mind respecting a visit to Geneva. He alleged his dissatisfaction at receiving an invitation only from the council, when his banishment had been the act of the Genevese people. In fact, there seems to have been some little jealousy rankling in his heart, that Calvin had been the object of the people's choice, and that but little had been said about himself. In reference to this feeling, Calvin says in the letter just quoted: "Whence this new scruple? Was not your name proposed to the people when it decreed the return of those whom it had banished? Neither I nor any one else was named, except in the following words: 'Do you not decree that Farel and his colleagues have been wronged?' What more do you require from the people than that they should acknowledge their own guilt by approving your innocence? The form further said: 'Do you decree that Farel, with his colleagues,' &c. Pardon me, brother, should I seem to speak too harshly; but your scruples appear to me to proceed from moroseness rather than sound judgment. For my part, I well know the integrity of your mind; nor have I forgotten the many satisfactory proofs you have given how little you regard yourself: but take care, lest you raise suspicions in those who do not know you intimately; nay, lest those who do not suspect you should, nevertheless, avail themselves of an occasion to defame you." Farel yielded to these representations, and paid a visit to Geneva, where he was much struck by the changes which Calvin had already succeeded in effecting.¹ But in order to understand these it will be necessary to take a view of his system of Church government and discipline.

From the moment that he first set his foot in Geneva, Calvin could not but have been aware of the advantages offered by his position. An ancient polity fallen to the ground, together with the religion which had been its prop: a priesthood retiring discomfited and disgraced, abandoning at once their sacred office, and their secular revenues; a people inflamed with the love of civil and religious liberty, which in their case were identical, and willing to submit themselves to

¹ Kirchhofer, ii., 47.

those who offered to conduct them to both ; a new system of education, of civil laws, and of ecclesiastical government to be built upon the ruins of the old : these were the scattered elements which awaited but the plastic power of some master-spirit to be combined into new and lasting forms. The young republic, though secured by its position and other circumstances from the assaults of external enemies, consisted of a small population, and might thus be easily molded to obey one consistent system of civil and ecclesiastical polity. To effect this was Calvin's chief aim from the moment of his return to Geneva. His next object was to render that city the stronghold of Protestantism, in its severest form, and the center from which it might be propagated throughout Europe.¹ From this period the history of his life consists of little more than his struggles to accomplish these two purposes.

His first efforts were directed to establish his scheme of Church discipline. We have already seen that this was not absent from his thoughts even during his banishment at Strasburgh ; and that he had devoted a chapter of the new edition of his "Institutes," published at that place, to the development of his plans. He was now in a position to carry his theories into practical operation. From a letter to Farel,² dated on the 16th of September, 1541, and written therefore only three days after his return to Geneva, we find that he had already represented to the council the necessity for some scheme of discipline, agreeable to the word of God, and the practice of the ancient church ; and that he had laid some heads before them, from which they might gather his general views. The subject was, however, too extensive to be accurately detailed before that assembly ; and Calvin had therefore requested that certain persons should be appointed to confer with him and his brother ministers on the subject. To this request the council acceded, and nominated six persons for that purpose. With their assistance, Calvin was to draw up a set of articles respecting church polity, which were to be submitted to the council, and afterward to the Two Hundred and to the general assembly ; and as three

¹ How well aware Calvin was of the advantages offered by Geneva in this respect, appears from his correspondence. Thus, in a letter to Bullinger, in May, 1549, he says : "If I wished to consider my own life and private interests, I should immediately depart to some other place. But when I consider the importance of this spot to the propagation of Christ's kingdom, I am with reason solicitous about its preservation : and indeed even your advantage and tranquillity turn in some degree upon this."—MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, i., 164.

² Ep 50

of these colleagues were known to favor the views of himself and Viret, Calvin had no doubt that something would be obtained.¹

As Calvin's scheme of church government forms one of the most prominent traits in his character as a Reformer, and as much of the sequel of this narrative would be but imperfectly understood without some acquaintance with it, it will be proper to give a brief account of it here.

His theory on the subject is laid down in the fourth book of his "Institutes." It naturally divides itself into two principal heads: first, as to what constitutes a church; and second, as to the relation between church and state. The main key to his system is a direct opposition to Rome; a root and branch reform, which was to bring back church government to the model of the apostolic times.

As he allowed no other instrument of interpretation between God and man than the Scriptures, and rejected all traditions, and other human appliances, the first of these questions was easily settled. After a dissertation on the visible church, aimed against that of Rome, he thus defines *a church*. "Wheresoever the word of God is sincerely preached and heard, and the sacraments administered according to the institution of Christ, there, no doubt, is a church of God; since his promise can not fail, that, when two or three are gathered together in his name, he is in the midst of them."² The church, therefore, consisted outwardly of the whole body of the clergy and laity, who were of the same faith in fundamental points; though, according to Calvin's more esoteric doctrine, the true church consisted of the elect, who were known only to God.

The solution of the other question, as to the relations of church and state, was more complicated. Here the Scriptures do not afford so clear a guide, and much is necessarily left to argument and inference.

One point, however, is clearly laid down in Scripture: the duty, namely, of submission to established government. On this subject Calvin carried his views to an extreme which may surprise those who are but little acquainted with his

¹ "Suivant la resolution du grand et petit conseil derechef ordonné que les Srs. Prédicans, avec les 6 Députés, doivent suivre aux ordonnances sur l'ordre de l'Eglise, avec un mode de vivre lequel avant toutes choses sera visité par le petit et ensuite par les CC et Général Conseil, de savoir comment chacun se devra conduire selon Dieu et justice."—*Régistres*, 16 Sept. P. Henry, ii., 23.

² *Instit.*, iv., c. i., § 9.

political principles, and who form their notion of them from the conduct of his followers in Scotland during the time of Knox, and in England at the beginning of the civil troubles. So far from being an advocate of sedition, Calvin inculcated the duty of unconditional submission to the civil power. Christian freedom he holds to be perfectly compatible with political servitude.¹ In considering the three principal kinds of government, namely, monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, he prefers the second;² an opinion which he practically carried out in his legislative reforms at Geneva. Nay, considered abstractedly, he gives the preference to monarchy; and postpones it to aristocracy only from the difficulty there may be of always finding a good and virtuous king. He must, therefore, have had a despotic monarchy in view. In another part of his "Institutes" he maintains the divine right of kings, and the duty of passive obedience.³ The punishment of evil sovereigns, he says, belongs to God alone. "Let princes hear and tremble. In the mean time it behoves us to take the greatest possible care lest we despise or violate the authority of the magistrates, which is so full of venerable majesty, and which God hath sanctioned by the gravest edicts, even though it should be vested in the most unworthy, and in those who do all they can to pollute it by their wickedness. Nor, because the vengeance of the Lord is the correction of unbridled tyranny, let us thence hastily conclude it to be intrusted to ourselves, to whom no other command is given than to obey and suffer."⁴ The fanatical contempt of civil government displayed by the Anabaptists, which had tended to throw much odium and suspicion on the Reformation, seems to have been one of the causes that led Calvin to adopt these sentiments; but they also favored his own views of church discipline and polity.

There was, however, one case in which he sanctioned disobedience to the civil magistrate; and that was when his commands ran contrary to those of God.⁵ Here, it is evident that a large loop-hole was opened to those who should dispute how the precepts of God were to be interpreted. Mere diso-

¹ "For why is it that the same Apostle who commands us to stand fast and not to subject ourselves to the yoke of servitude (*Gal.*, v., 1), in another place forbids servants to be solicitous about their condition (*1 Cor.*, vii., 21), except that spiritual liberty may very well consist with political servitude?"—*Institutions*, iv., c. 20, § 1.

² See *Institutions*, iv., c. 20, § 2. In this part Calvin seems to have Aristotle's *Πολιτικὴ* in view.

³ *Ibid.*, § 25-29.

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 31.

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 32.

bedience, indeed, and active rebellion are two different things : but though Calvin does not appear to have lent any direct sanction to the latter, his conduct at the beginning of the religious wars in France, as there will be occasion to relate further on, shows that, where religion was in question, he gave at least a tacit assent to active resistance.

Calvin was for an established church ; that is, for a church supported by the civil power. Thus offenders against the laws or doctrine of the church were, in the last resort, handed over to the secular arm for punishment ; and never was there a church that permitted less deviation from its established rules, even in the minutest points, than that of Calvin. Dissent was punished, according to the gravity of the case, with fines, imprisonment, exile, and even death. The connection between church and state was strengthened by the admission of laymen to a share of ecclesiastical power.

But though the church, as a civil institution, was thus connected with the state, Calvin was very careful in separating and distinguishing their respective functions. Each was to be supreme in its peculiar province. To the state belongs the superintendence and government of men's temporal affairs ; while the care of their eternal welfare belongs exclusively to the church. The government, therefore, was not to interfere in purely religious questions ; nor, on the other hand, was the church to assume any of the functions which belong to the civil power. Controverted points of faith were to be finally decided by synods. Calvin would have pushed this principle of non-interference to the point of making the church independent on the government for its revenues. In a letter to Viret, dated in September, 1542, after describing the sale of ecclesiastical property to laymen, which, at Geneva, as in other places, was one of the consequences of the Reformation, he subjoins : " You will easily guess my sentiments. You perceive that it is an alienation, and that the church is left naked, in order that the magistrate may give what he pleases, as if it were his own : and that if any minister is wanting in subservience, he may even take away the portion he distributes, or threaten to do so."¹ Notwithstanding Calvin's opposition to all the usages of the Romish Church, he seems, on this point, to have been willing to comply with its practice. From

¹ MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, ii., Beil. i. *Satisfaciat* seems to be a misprint. The Genevese magistrates sold the Church property, and gave the Reformed ministers an annual salary

a letter to Farel, on the same subject,¹ we learn that he sometimes delivered his sentiments concerning it, both before the council, and in the pulpit; and that the government suspected the clergy of being too ambitious in endeavoring to reclaim the property of the church: a suspicion which Calvin desired to avoid, though not in such a manner as to connive at what he calls sacrilege.

Having thus briefly adverted to his theory of a church, let us proceed to inquire how he carried it into practice.

The government of the church was vested in a consistory, composed of six ministers, and twelve lay elders.² Two of the elders were chosen from the members of the little, or ordinary council; and the remainder out of the council of Two Hundred. They were indicated by the ministers, but elected by the ordinary council. Before they took their seats, their names were published, in order that they might be denounced, if known to be unworthy. The general assembly had a *veto* upon their appointment; both citizens and denizens were eligible; and the election was annual; but it was not customary to remove those who had discharged the office worthily, unless they had been appointed to some post in the state. According to the rules, one of the syndics was to preside at the meetings of the consistory; not, however, in his civil capacity, but merely as an elder, and without his *bâton* of office. But Calvin seems to have soon usurped the presidency, and to have retained it till his death.³ The elders were paid two *sols* a day out of the sum accruing from the fines imposed by the consistory, which were put into a box.

The consistory assembled every Thursday. Its jurisdiction extended to matrimonial causes, and the following offenders were amenable to its censures—namely, blasphemers, drunkards, fornicators, brawlers and fighters, dancers, dancing-masters, and the like; as well as those who spread doctrines at variance with the teaching of the church of Geneva, and

¹ *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 66, Oct. 13th, 1545.

² The following sketch is taken from Calvin, *Epp.* 167, 302, and 377, and from Dr. Henry's account of the *Ordonnances Ecclésiastiques*, Th. ii., p. 111, et seq.

³ Thus we find in the *Régistres*, 29 Février, 1580: "Les ministres alléguent, pour faire supprimer la présidence à vie, que le diable a fait brèche dans l'église par l'établissement de differens grades et dignités entre les pasteurs, et qu'il faut prévenir ses astuces, qui commencent par de bien petites choses; que Dieu avait suscité çu-devant dans cette église feu M. Calvin, personnage d'un très grand mérite, et qu'il l'avait comblé de graces toutes particulières, de sorte que par la vénération qu'il s'était attirée, on luy voyoit avec plaisir exercer la présidence, sans qu'il y eût pourtant été appelé par aucune élection." See P. Henry, i., 469.

those who neglected divine service, or showed an open contempt for the church and clergy. Offenders, in minor points, were dismissed with an admonition; those guilty of graver delinquencies were excommunicated, for a time at least. The same minister who had excluded them from the communion, might readmit them on their expressing a proper contrition. Nobody was cited before the consistory except with the unanimous consent of that body, nor unless he had neglected private admonitions. As the power of the consistory did not extend further than excommunication, the secular arm of the council was resorted to in the case of hardened offenders. Persons who obstinately and contumaciously contemned and defied the authority and censures of the church, were handed over to the council, who banished them for a year. The church thus enforced its prerogatives by means of secular punishment, without incurring the odium of actually inflicting it. They who had returned to the Roman Catholic communion for the sake of saving their lives, were compelled to beg pardon on their knees, before the consistory, before they were readmitted into the church. The consistory did not interfere with the course of civil jurisdiction: and that the people might not complain of undue rigor, not only were the ministers themselves liable to the same punishments as laymen, but if they committed any thing deserving of excommunication, they were dismissed.

The service of the church was performed by the ministers, assisted by the elders. The ministers were elected by the college. In order to test their skill in interpretation a text of Scripture was proposed to them; after which they were examined in the principal heads of doctrine. They were then allowed to preach a sermon, at which the ministers were present, as well as two members of the council. If the learning of the candidate was approved, the ministers presented him to the council, with a testimony to that effect. The council had the power of rejecting; but no instance of their exerting it appears to have occurred, during Calvin's life at least. When the council had sanctioned the appointment, the name of the new minister was published, in order that if any one knew aught to the prejudice of his character, he might state it within eight days. When elected, the minister swore to observe the laws established in church and state; but not in such a manner as to preclude himself from the free interpretation of Scripture.

Besides the ministers (or preachers) and elders, there were

likewise doctors (or teachers) and deacons attached to the church. The office of the doctors was to teach the ancient languages, in order that those destined for the church might be able to read the Scriptures in the original. The deacons, who were chosen in the same manner as the elders, distributed alms, and looked after the sick and poor. At the communion table, the preachers or ministers administered only the bread; the cup was served by the elders and deacons.

Baptism was to take place publicly before the congregation. The parents were required to be present with the sponsors; and no person who was not of the same persuasion as the Genevese church, nor any excommunicated person, was permitted to be a sponsor. Nobody was admitted to the Lord's Supper before he had made profession of his faith, and been examined by a minister as to his knowledge of the main points of religious belief. Children were publicly examined four times in the year. Besides this, there was an annual visitation of every house by a minister, accompanied by an elder. New inhabitants were examined as to their faith; but in the case of those who had been received into the church, the inquiry was confined to their mode of life; whether the household lived in peace; whether there was any drunkenness; whether any quarrels and bickerings with neighbors; whether the family attended the sermon regularly. In order to facilitate the working of this system, the city was divided into three parishes—those of St. Peter's, the Magdalen, and St. Gervais. St. Peter's church, where Calvin officiated, was attended by the higher classes. St. Gervais, which was more frequented by the inferior orders, was under the ministry of Viret till his return to Lausanne in July, 1542, when Calvin got two new ministers elected to assist him.¹ Besides this scheme of discipline, Calvin also drew up and published in 1541 his liturgy, or form of prayers, with the manner of administering the sacraments, celebrating marriage, and visiting the sick.

Such was the form of church government established by Calvin, who may be regarded as the founder of the Presbyterian scheme of ecclesiastical polity. Zwingli had, indeed, recognized the equality of rank among the clergy, had instituted synods, and had in a certain degree admitted laymen to a share in the government of the church. In his scheme, however, the services of the latter were almost exclusively employed in matrimonial questions; nor had they those, so to

¹ P. Henry, ii., 27.

term them, episcopal functions of Calvin's lay elders, by which they were invested with the supervision of all the members of the church, the ministers themselves included. There were no traces of such an institution, either at Strasburgh or Geneva, before the time of Calvin. Farel had not thought of establishing a consistory in the latter city; and it is only after Calvin's arrival there that we find any traces of a connection between the laity and clergy. It is true that in April, 1541, and consequently before Calvin's return from banishment, the council had, at the instance apparently of Viret, established a sort of consistory for matrimonial, and other, not strictly civil, causes, at which two members of the little, and two of the great council, were to be present, together with a secretary.¹ But as the Genevese were then negotiating for Calvin's return, there can not be a doubt that this imperfect approach to his scheme was adopted in compliance with the views which he had promulgated some time previously in his "Institutes."²

The system here described would seem to subject the church to the civil power, and such might have been the effect of it in any other hands but those of Calvin. He, however, knew how to wield it in a manner that rendered him an almost absolute dictator at Geneva. The same cause obviated any tendency to anarchy which might be supposed to arise from this mixture of clergy and laymen. Whatever power was wanting to the church, Calvin supplied by the extreme respect which he so jealously exacted for the priestly character, and especially for his own. He did not scruple to place the leaders of the Reformation, among whom he himself claimed a place, on a level with the evangelists. Thus in his "Institutes"³ he says: "According to this interpretation, which appears to me agreeable to the words and meaning of St. Paul, these three offices (viz., apostles, prophets, and evangelists) were not instituted in the church in perpetuity, but only while churches were to be established where none existed before; or, at all events, where they were to be transferred from Moses to Christ. Although I do not deny that God hath sometimes raised up apostles, or, at least, evangelists, subsequently; as in our own time. For there was need of them to bring back the church from the defection of Antichrist." So also in his

¹ "Afin qu'il est besoin de faire plusieurs remontrances à plusieurs qui vivent mal, aussi des causes des mariages, ordonné qu'il soit érigé un consistoire lequel se devra tenir tous les Jendis et qu'il soit present deux du petit conseil et deux du grand, et un secretaire."—*Régistres*, 5 Avril, 1541, *apud* P. Henry, ii., 86.

² See P. Henry, ii., 86.

³ Lib. iv., c. 2, § 4

book against Pighius, he says: "Let Pighius, therefore, cease to wonder whence this new and unheard of efficacy of our teaching proceeds, since the thing itself plainly shows that it was not Luther who spoke in the beginning, but God who thundered through his mouth; nor is it I who now speak, but God, who puts forth his power from heaven."¹ In a letter to a certain congregation he states, with regard to one M. de Vau, who, he complains, had defamed him: "He says that every body here kisses my slipper. I believe you have witnesses enough of my pomp, and how much I seek that homage should be paid to me. I am well assured that if he could get my place he would show a very different sort of pride; for since he, being nothing, is so puffed up, if he was advanced a step he would certainly burst. But he shows what a venomous beast he is, by the sorrow he betrays at seeing every thing here so united; since he calls it kissing my slipper that they do not rise against me and the doctrine that I teach, so as to offend God in my person, and, as it were, tread him under foot."²

But if Calvin was not exactly the Pope, he might, at least, be considered as the Bishop of Geneva. In a conversation with Untenbogaert, Casaubon affirmed that Beza had told him that Calvin, though he had rejected episcopacy, was virtually Bishop of Geneva; and that a little before his death he had offered Beza to make him his successor, but that he had declined.³ This is in allusion to Calvin's having usurped the perpetual presidency of the consistory, as already related, and in which he wished Beza to succeed him.

That the hand of God was indeed in the Reformation no pious Protestant will deny; and it must also be conceded that there was much in the situation of the first Reformers to inspire them with a high notion of their calling. Around them, all the people lay buried in the profoundest ignorance, the grossest superstition, and the utmost corruption of morals. From this state they were suddenly aroused by the preachers of the Reformation; the effect of whose ministry was a constant moral miracle. It was as if the gospel had been now published for the first time. The mentally blind began to see; the morally impotent to take up his bed and walk. Kings and emperors consulted these new apostles; at their bidding, towns, provinces, whole kingdoms, flung off the yoke of Rome;

¹ *Opera*, viii., 118, B., Amst. ed.

² Gen. MS. *apud* P. Henry, ii., Beil. ii.

³ See P. Henry, ii., 137.

nations negotiated and fought respecting their tenets. In all this there was abundance to flatter and gratify, we will not say their spiritual pride, but their religious enthusiasm. But if any one was entitled to indulge such feelings it was undoubtedly Luther. In the vast effects which followed his labors it was natural that he should recognize the finger of God, and feel a noble and enthusiastic confidence in the success of his cause. In this part of his character he forms a striking contrast to the timid and irresolute Melancthon, whom he was frequently obliged to cheer on and encourage. When, after the Diet of Augsburg, the latter abandoned himself to despair and tears, Luther comforted and consoled him by his letters, bidding him lay aside all anxious thought and care, since their cause was not man's cause, but God's.¹ This feeling is characteristically expressed in a letter to Melancthon when he was attending the Diet of Ratisbon in 1541. The latter, whose somewhat hypochondriac temper was tinged with superstition, had been depressed by an accident to his hand from the upsetting of a carriage, which he considered a bad omen. "I have received, my dear Philip," writes Luther, "your second letter, and though I am concerned at the accident to your hand, yet I believe neither in your omens nor my own. Our affairs are not conducted by chance, but by a settled design; not our own felicitous one, forsooth, but that of God alone. The word runs, speech grows warm, hope sustains, faith conquers, so that we are quite out of breath; and if we were not flesh, we might sleep and be idle, remembering that word of Moses, 'The Lord fights for you while you are at rest.'"² But we here find Luther representing himself as the mere instrument and tool of the Almighty. He was far from assuming that personal importance which Calvin arrogated to himself; though, as the chief mover of the Reformation, he was more entitled to do so. The respect and submission exacted by Calvin far exceeded that claimed by other spiritual guides; and was any thing but compatible with the meekness and humility inculcated by the gospel. The most trifling slights and insults, such as most men would have overlooked with contempt, Calvin pursued with bitterness and acrimony. The Registers of Geneva abound with instances, which grew more frequent and more severe as his power became more consolidated. In 1551 we find Berthelier excommunicated by the consistory because he would not allow that he had done wrong

¹ See Sleidan, *De Statu*, &c., lib. vii., p. 119.

² Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 30.

in asserting that he was as good a man as Calvin.¹ Three men who had laughed during a sermon of his were imprisoned for three days and condemned to ask pardon of the consistory. Such proceedings are very numerous, and in the two years 1558 and 1559, alone, 414 of them are recorded! To impugn Calvin's doctrine, or the proceedings of the consistory, endangered life. For such an offense a Ferrarese lady, named Copa, was condemned, in 1559, to beg pardon of God and the magistrates, and to leave the city in twenty-four hours, on pain of being beheaded.² Calvin carried this system almost to a pitch of blasphemy; so that he sometimes dared to justify the harshest and most unchristian-like conduct and words by the example of the apostles, and even of Christ himself! Thus, in his tract against Westphal, he says: "If I am to be called abusive because I have held up the mirror to master Joachim, who is too much blinded by his vices, in order that he might at length begin to be ashamed of himself, he ought to address the same reproach to the prophets, the apostles, and even to Christ himself, who have not scrupled to reproach with bitterness the adversaries of the true doctrine. We are agreed, on both sides, that abusive words and jests by no means become Christians. But since the prophets themselves do not altogether abstain from using scurrilities, and Christ in taxing deceivers and false doctors uses sharp terms, and the Holy Ghost every where attacks such people, crying out and sparing nothing: it is a foolish and inconsiderate question to ask whether we are at liberty to reprehend severely, roughly, and to good purpose, those who expose themselves to blame and infamy."³ Even a modern biographer of Calvin, who has embraced his cause with great warmth, can not help pointing out the impropriety of his using the term *bitterness*, with reference to the Holy Spirit, and his presumption in putting himself on a level with Christ and the apostles. "Throughout," he observes, "great presumption prevails in his manner, mixed with a supercilious raillery which one can not term Christian, and still less compare with the holy anger of our Lord."⁴

¹ "Philibert Berthelier se plaint au Conseil de ce que le Consistoire lui a defendu la cène pour n' avoir pas voulu convenir qu'il avoit fait mal de soutenir qu'il étoit aussi homme de bien que Calvin."—*Régistres*, 27 Mars, 1551. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

² P. Henry, ii., 217.

³ Quoted by P. Henry, i., 460, from the French edition.

⁴ "Aigrement sollte er nicht sagen, denn hierin besteht grade der Unterschied der Apostel und der Reformatoren, dass der heilige Geist in seiner Reinheit keine saure Schärfe kannte. Es ist höchst anmassend sich mit den Aposteln auf dieselbe Linie zu stellen, wenn man, wie Calvin, schmä-

The influence which Calvin acquired at Geneva was doubtless assisted by his extensive learning and great intellectual powers, which in most cases rendered him much superior to the members of the government. Hence he extended his interference even to political matters, in spite of the apparent separation between church and state which formed part of his own theory. Thus, for instance, we find him in 1558 directing the Two Hundred in their choice of syndics; and reading them a long lecture on the evils which had resulted from their former elections.¹

In order that the discipline established by Calvin might not be infringed, spies, or watchmen, were appointed in the country as well as in the city, whose office it was to give information of any breaches² of it, and who were paid out of the fines imposed. It is easy to see to what abuses and inconveniences such a system must be liable. The members of the consistory, also, made their regular reports, which became the subject of inquiry. Every unseemly word, even though spoken in the street, was reported. No respect was paid to persons. Members of the oldest and most distinguished families were brought before the consistory, women as well as men, and examined in the tenderest points of conscience. An appeal to the council was seldom attended with any other result than an order to beg pardon of the consistory. The offender was then compelled to kneel down and receive a reprimand; and, in aggravated cases, he was excluded from the communion. The consistory frequently exhibited scenes of violence and abuse. Calvin would fly into a passion, and call the delinquents hypocrites and other hard names; which were frequently retorted on himself. Upon such occasions he would demand that the affair should be referred to the council.³ The latter body, on the suggestion of the consistory, frequently imprisoned persons on bare suspicion. The supervision of the consistory extended to the most minute things, even to the directing people as to what books they should read. Thus we find an entry in the

hend und ironisch höhrend spricht. Im Ganzen herrscht eine grosse, mit übermüthigem Scherz verbundene Anmassung in seiner Manier, die man wahrlich nicht christlich nennen, noch weniger sie mit der heiligen Entrüstung des Herrn vergleichen kann."—*Ibid*, p. 461, note.

¹ "M. Calvin exhorte les CC à élire pour Syndics des gens de bien, et à se souvenir en quel danger la République avoit été les années dernières pour avoir été gouvernée par de mauvais magistrats," &c., &c.—*Régistres*, 4 Février, 1558. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

² "On élit dans les villages des gens chargés d'obliger le peuple à aller au sermon."—*Régistres*, 25 Avril, 1543. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

³ P. Henry, ii., 215, 216.

Registers, forbidding the perusal of "*Amadis de Gaul*," and ordering the book to be destroyed.¹ They who did not come to church on Sunday were fined three *sols*. They who came after the sermon was begun were censured the first time and fined the second. They who swore by the body and blood of Christ were condemned to kiss the earth, to stand an hour in the pillory, and to pay a fine of three *sols*. He who denied God or his baptism, was imprisoned nine days and whipped. Drunkenness was punished by consistorial censures and a fine of three *sols*. The same punishment was inflicted on him who had invited another to the tavern.²

The chief opposition to the establishment of Calvin's discipline sprang from the higher classes, and from his brother ministers. The latter, though they outwardly pretended to approve of it, secretly used all their endeavors to prevent its establishment, by representing to the council that it would considerably abridge their power, and thus become a means and help to sedition.³ On the other hand, the mass of the people, though fond of dancing and other dissipations, were willing to forego them, and to comply with the strict observances enjoined by the new scheme, in the hope that they would prove a means of humbling their superiors. The ordinances were finally passed on the 20th of November, 1541.⁴ It appears that during their progress through the council, Calvin and the ministers were desirous of knowing what alterations had been made in them; but that body would not submit to this sort of interference, and ordered them to be forwarded at once to the council of Two Hundred.⁵

Calvin, in a letter to Myconius, dated on the 15th of March, 1542, represents the measure which he had succeeded in carrying as still very imperfect and incomplete, and that he had had the greatest difficulty in obtaining even this partial adoption of his views.⁶ The council seem for some time to have contested with him the power of excommunication. In an entry in the Registers, in March, 1543, we find

¹ "Pourceque plusieurs lisent Amadis de Gaul combien qu'il n'y ait que choses dissolues et mauvaises; arrêté de leur faire grandes remontrances. et que le dit livre soit gâté et rompu."—*Régistres*, 13 Mars, 1559. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*, under date.

² P. Henry, ii., 114, note.

³ See Ep. 54.

⁴ "Les ordonnances ont été passées sans contradiction."—*Régistres*, 20 Nov., 1541.

⁵ "Ordonné que à eux n'appartient de les revoir et que l'affaire soit remise aux CC."—*Régistres*, 9 Nov., 1541. P. Henry, ii., Beil. 5.

⁶ Ep. 54.

the council affirming that the consistory has only the right of admonishing, and that the power of excommunicating is reserved to themselves; and, indeed, it was not till after Calvin's final triumph over the Libertine party, in 1555, that the consistory obtained the undisputed power of excommunication.¹ Other parts of his scheme which Calvin failed in carrying out were the institution of synods, and making the clergy independent of the state for their revenues. From the want of synods, the last determination in matters of faith lay with the council, a thing altogether contrary to Calvin's principles. He also disapproved of the selection of elders being confined to members of the different councils, instead of being extended to the congregation generally. The excess in the number of lay elders over the clergy in the consistory seems, however, to have been his own plan.² In France his scheme developed itself in opposition to, and therefore quite independently of the state; and, consequently, in that country he was enabled to carry it out without mutilation.

Not only was Calvin aware that the ecclesiastical polity he had established at Geneva was incomplete, he seems also to have felt that his scheme would not have suited large kingdoms. Thus, in a letter to the King of Poland (9th of December, 1544), he recognizes the jurisdiction of an archbishop and bishops, and pronounces it to be in accordance with the practice of the ancient church.³ And in like manner, in his letter to the Protector Somerset, he finds no fault with the episcopal form of government established in England. Indeed, his own assumption of a *quasi* episcopacy shows that he held it necessary that the supreme administration should be lodged in the hands of one person.

Scarcely had Calvin finished his labors for the establishment of his discipline than we find him employed by the council to assist in drawing up a code of civil law.⁴ The

¹ "Le Consistoire n'a que le droit d'admonester, et celui d'excommunier est réservé au Conseil."—*Régistres*, 19 Mars, 1543. Grénius, *Fragmens Biographiques*, under date.

² P. Henry, ii., 118.

³ "The ancient church erected Patriarchates, and even assigned to single provinces certain primacies, that bishops might be more united by this bond of concord. And in like manner, if one archbishop should now preside over the kingdom of Poland, not indeed to domineer over the rest, nor to arrogate to himself their authority, but for the sake of order to preside over the synods, and to maintain a righteous union among his colleagues and brethren: there might then be provincial or civic bishops, whose duty it should particularly be to preserve order. For nature herself dictates that in every society one should be chosen to direct affairs."—*Ep.* 190.

⁴ "Il (Calvin) fut chargé le 21 Nov. (1541) avec trois conseillers de compiler des édits pour gouverner le peuple." "M^{rs}. Claude Roset, Calvin, et

knowledge that he had at one time been designed for the legal profession probably led to his being charged with this commission, in which he had for his coadjutors Dr. Peter Fabri, the syndic Roset, and another person. From several entries in the Registers of Geneva, it would appear that he was employed in this labor the greater part of the year 1542; and by 1543 the new code of laws and ordinances seems to have been complete. It was based on the *Franchise et Sentences de Payerne*, and on different edicts which had been promulgated from time to time. Some new laws were added, and some old ones revived. The duty of each magistrate was defined, as well as the manner of his election. The new code thus established was observed in civil suits, and, where its provisions fell short, the Roman law was resorted to. It lasted until 1568, when another code was substituted, drawn up by Colladon, a native of Berri, and a distinguished juriconsult, who had been admitted to the citizenship of Geneva in 1555.¹ Even in Colladon's revision, however, which was begun in 1560, Calvin had much influence. The smallest points did not escape his attention. There are minutes respecting danger from fire, instructions for the inspector of buildings, regarding the artillery, the watchmen on the towers, and the like.² In a Gotha manuscript quoted by Bretschneider, there are minute instructions in Calvin's handwriting respecting judicial proceedings, as well as a sketch of a general code of laws.³

Calvin made his civil legislation subservient to his scheme of church polity. The object of both was to found a theocratic state resembling that of the Israelites under Moses, of which he himself was to be the high-priest and prophet. As early as 1516, Erasmus had observed with regret the tendency toward Judaism excited by the revival of Hebrew literature under the auspices of Reuchlin; and had strongly characterized it as a pest the most dangerous to Christianity.⁴ This preference for the Old Testament became a marked characteristic of Calvin and his followers. It was signally displayed by Knox and the Covenanters in Scotland, and subsequently by the English Puritans.⁵ Calvin avows and justi-

le docteur Fabri d'Evian sont chargés de rédiger les édits politiques."—*Régistres*, 15 Mai, 1542. "On donne à Calvin un tonneau de vin vieux pour les peines qu'il prend de la ville."—*Régistres*, 17 Nov., 1542. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

¹ Sénébier, *Hist. litt. de Genève*, i., 343.

³ *Ibid.* ii., Beil. 3.

² P. Henry, ii., 67.

⁴ Erasmus, Ep. 207.

⁵ So Ananias, in Ben Jonson's *Alchemist*: "All's heathen but the Hebrew."

fies the adoption of the rigorous precepts of the Mosaic law in a letter to the Duchess of Ferrara, written in 1564.¹ But though his legislation was modeled on that of the Jewish lawgiver, it was conceived in a spirit of still greater severity. The following parallel is extracted from the work of Calvin's recent biographer, who will not be suspected of a design to give an unfavorable view of his legislation: "The rigor of the Old Testament, which, in announcing God's anger and justice, stepped forth on all occasions with the punishment of death against a stiff-necked people, manifestly prevails with Calvin. With him, as with Moses, the spiritual members of the state are judges. Both are jealous for God's honor, and therefore Calvin, like Moses, punishes idolatry and blasphemy with death. Though the Mosaic laws do not mention high treason, properly so called—which, however, nevertheless occurs in the history of the Jewish state—Calvin places it in the same category with treason against God. To strike or curse a parent is in both codes a capital offense. In both theft is only followed by loss of freedom. Both rigorously punish unchastity, and adultery even with death. Moses does not mention suicide; by Calvin it is branded with infamy. With Moses the severest punishment is stoning; with Calvin death by fire. Moses burned only the corpse of the criminal. Both use degradation as a means of punishment; but infamy, or exclusion from the community, does not appear in the Mosaic law."²

But although Calvin adopted all the rigorous precepts of the Jewish dispensation, and indeed went so far in many instances as to make the code of Moses paramount to the law of Christ, yet it is remarkable that he was utterly averse to that grandeur and ceremony of worship which distinguished the Mosaic ritual. The source of both these characteristics of his system must perhaps be sought in his determination to oppose the practice of Rome at every point; for they can not be reconciled with a consistent study of the Old Testament.

His oligarchical sentiments have been already adverted to; and he followed their guidance in his civil legislation. It seems to have been by his advice that the meetings of the

¹ "C'est que sur ce que je vous avois allégué que David nous instruit par son exemple de haïr les ennemys de Dieu, vous respondez qu' c'estoit pour ce temps là du quel sous la loy de rigueur il estoit parmi de haïr les ennemys. Or, Madame, ceste glose seroit pour renverser toute l'escriture, et partant il la faut fuir comme peste mortelle." Quoted by Dr. Henry, i., 452.

² P. Henry, *Leben Calvins*, ii., 68.

general assembly of burgesses were restricted to two formal ones in the course of the year. It now came to be looked upon as a sign of treasonable designs if any one desired an extraordinary meeting of that assembly. Another of his innovations upon the ancient constitution was that nothing should be submitted to that body which had not been previously discussed in the council of Two Hundred; that nothing should be brought before the Two Hundred which had not been first submitted to the Sixty; and that nothing should be introduced into the latter assembly without the sanction of the ordinary council.¹ The obvious effect of these regulations was to centralize all power in the ordinary council; and we have already seen the intimate connection between that body and the consistory. Thus Calvin gradually became, by means of the influence which he had acquired, the main-spring, as it were, of the Genevese republic, which set all its wheels in motion. When the existing laws did not suffice for his purpose, he would appear before the council, and demand a new law in the name of the consistory; and this he seldom failed to obtain.²

As his power increased, he gradually enhanced the rigor of the laws. Before his return to Geneva adultery had been punished only with a short imprisonment and a trifling fine; Calvin, as we have said, made it death, at least after a second offense. Spon, in his *History of Geneva*,³ recounts the two following instances which occurred in the year 1560, and which he compares with the severe virtue of ancient Rome. The council having ordered a citizen to be whipped for the crime of adultery, he appealed to the Two Hundred, who, he hoped, would absolve him. But, on revising his process, that body finding that he had already been once reprov'd for the same offense, to the great surprise of the criminal, condemned him to death. Shortly afterward a banker was executed for the same crime, who died with great repentance, and blessing God that justice was so well maintained. We have already adverted to the severity with which Calvin pursued all offenses against religion and against his own personal authority, as well as that of the consistory; instances of which will present themselves in the sequel of this narrative. He would have carried these severities much further, but that the council of Two Hundred sometimes stepped in and prevented him.⁴ He left the old laws against heresy on the statute-book, as

¹ *Leben Calvins*, ii., 65.

² *Ibid.*, p. 67.

³ Vol. ii., p. 90.

⁴ See P. Henry, ii., 69.

well as the punishment of burning for witchcraft, and the barbarous custom of torture.¹

That Calvin had to deal with a perverse and corrupt people must be admitted; but it may be doubted whether he took the best method of reforming them. Education and example would have done more to effect this object than all these atrocious severities, and these precise and vexatious regulations, which only caused the evil-disposed to add hypocrisy to their other vices. A recent Genevese writer has remarked: "To those who imagine that Calvin did nothing but good, I could produce our registers, covered with records of illegitimate children, which were exposed in all parts of the town and country; hideous trials for obscenity; wills, in which fathers and mothers accuse their children not only of errors but of crimes; agreements before notaries between young women and their lovers, in which the latter, even in the presence of the parents of their paramours, make them an allowance for the education of their illegitimate offspring; I could instance multitudes of forced marriages, in which the delinquents were conducted from the prison to the church; mothers who abandoned their children to the hospital, while they themselves lived in abundance with a second husband; bundles of law-suits between brothers; heaps of secret negotiations; men and women burned for witchcraft; sentences of death in frightful numbers; and all these things among the generation nourished by the mystic manna of Calvin."²

¹ See P. Henry, ii., 75.

² Galiffe, *Notices Généalogiques*, tom. iii., *Préface*, quoted by P. Henry, ii., 78, note.

CHAPTER V.

Plague and Famine at Geneva—Calvin answers the Sorbonne—Replies to Pighius—Melancthon's Opinions on Free Will—Calvin's Tract on Relics—Farel at Metz—Caroli's Machinations—Sebastian Castellio—Calvin's Tract "De Reformandâ Ecclesiâ"—His remarks on the Pope's Letter to the Emperor—Tracts against the Anabaptists and Libertines—The Queen of Navarre offended—Luther and the Swiss Church—Calvin's Opinion of Luther—Luther's Violence—Calvin's Tracts against the Nicodemites.

IN 1542 Geneva was assailed by famine and pestilence, two terrible calamities which frequently walk hand in hand. These evils were aggravated by the great influx of refugees; for Calvin's residence at Geneva had already caused it to be regarded as the head quarters of the Reformed religion, especially among the French who were obliged to fly their country on account of the persecutions. The lazaretto or pest-house, which lay without the walls, was crowded with the sick; and it became necessary that a minister should attend there, to administer the last consolations of religion to the dying. Beza informs us¹ that on this occasion Calvin, Sebastian Castellio, and Pierre Blanchet, offered their services, while the rest of the ministers shrunk back; that the lot having fallen upon Castellio, he altered his mind, and refused the office; that hereupon Blanchet volunteered to go; and that both he and the council prevented Calvin, much against his will, from again drawing lots. This, however, does not agree with the account which Calvin himself gives of this matter. In a letter to Viret, written apparently in October, 1542, he says: "The plague begins to gain strength here, and few whom it attacks escape. One of our college was to be appointed to attend the sick; but as Pierre (Blanchet) offered himself, we all readily allowed him to go."² If any thing happens to him, *I fear it will be my turn to run the risk.* For, as you observe, since we are debtors to each member of the church, we can not neglect those who need our ministry. And though I am not of opinion that we should desert the very body of the church in our desire to serve a part of it; nevertheless, so long as we hold this office, I do not see what

¹ *Vita Calv.*, anno 1542.

² "Facile omnes passi sumus."

excuse we can allege; if from fear of danger, we abandon those who stand in most need of our assistance."¹

This letter does not betray any great alacrity to volunteer for the post of danger, but rather a very evident desire to escape from it; and the context shows plainly enough that Calvin did not make an offer to go to the hospital, as Beza would have us to believe. In eight or nine months Blanchet fell a victim to his philanthropy, and Calvin found himself in the situation which he had dreaded. It does not appear, however, that he now offered his services. It was on this occasion, and not in the autumn, that Castellio offered to go.² Now, it must be remembered that Castellio was not a minister in the Genevese church, but merely regent of the schools; and consequently it was no part of his duty to administer religious consolation to the dying. He was desirous, however, of becoming a minister; and probably thought that so disinterested an offer might pave the way to that office: and, indeed, the wording of the entry in which it is recorded would lead us to infer that such was his motive. He was probably rejected as not qualified. Beza must have known that Castellio was not a minister; and it is therefore difficult to assign a motive for his dragging Castellio's name forward on this occasion, unless it were to make an invidious insinuation against him. In the entry referred to, we find it stated that M. Gautier remarked that many of the ministers refused to repair to the hospital, and said that they would rather go to the d——.³ On the first of June the ministers were ordered to assemble, and to elect from their body the most proper person to discharge this office; but with a special exception in favor of Calvin, who, it was stated, was necessary to the church.⁴ Shortly afterward, Calvin and his brother ministers appeared before the council to explain in what manner they had obeyed their injunctions. They are represented as stating that to go to the pest-house it was necessary to be firm and not timid; and that they had

¹ MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, ii., Beil. 1.

² "Chatillon régent s'offre pour être ministre de l'hôpital pestilentiel. M. Gautier remarque que plusieurs ministres refusoient d'y aller disant qu'ils iroient plutôt au diable."—*Régistres*, 1 Mai, 1543. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

³ Dr. P. Henry, ii., 42, note, gives this entry somewhat differently, as follows: "1 Mai, 1543. M. Calvin dit que M. Bastien Chatillon est tout prêt pour aller en l'hôpital pestilentiel, et pretend qu'il y a des prédicans qui ont dit que plutôt aller à l'hôpital pestilentiel ils voudroient être aux diable. Resolu de les demander demain et leur faire bonnes remontrances." If this be correct, it was hardly fair in Calvin to denounce his brethren for an unwillingness in which he himself partook.

⁴ *Régistres*, 1 Juin.

found a Frenchman, a faithful brother, whom they presented for that purpose, if the council found it agreeable. And although it was their duty to serve God and his church as well in necessity as in prosperity, even unto death, yet they confessed that in this point they were wanting to their duty. The council seems to have dismissed them with some indignation, and a debate appears to have ensued whether they should be further heard. This was resolved in the affirmative, but Calvin was not required to appear with the rest; "because he was wanted to serve in the church, to answer the questions of travelers, and to give his advice to the council." The remaining ministers again appeared before the council, and confessed "that God had not yet bestowed on them the grace of strength and fortitude sufficient to go to the hospital, and begged to be excused." Only one minister, M. de Génétou, professed himself ready, provided the will of God were taken in the election, and that the lot fell upon him. The council concluded its sitting by the following resolution: "Resolved, to pray to God to give the ministers more constancy in future."¹

Without inquiring how far Calvin acted consistently with his duty and professions in seeking, or at all events in accepting, this immunity, we can not at least concede to him that praise for a generous self-devotion which Beza's account of the matter would demand. Farel's conduct at Neufchâtel, on a like occasion, forms a perfect contrast to that of his former colleague. He visited the sick daily, poor and rich, friend or foe, without distinction.²

Having concluded his legislative labors, Calvin had now more time to devote to literary pursuits. From this period to the end of his life he was at intervals more or less engaged in controversies. In the year 1542 the Sorbonne published a summary of their doctrines in twenty-five articles, which were sanctioned by an edict of the French king. To these Calvin replied in the same year in his "*Antidoton adversus Articulos Facultatis theologicæ Sorbonicæ*," or "Antidote against the Articles of the Sorbonne," and which, in the following year, he translated into French. These articles he prints separately, appending to each an ironical proof, which at first sight the reader might take to be seriously meant, and then subjoins his *Antidote*. This piece displays some humor. The following will suffice to give the reader a specimen of the style.³

¹ The preceding entries are quoted by P. Henry, ii., 43, note.

² Kirchhofer, *Leben Farel's*, ii., 33.

³ See Calvin, *Opera*, viii., 195, B.

“ARTICLE XII.—Concerning the invocation of saints. *It is holy, and particularly acceptable to God, to pray to the blessed mother of our Lord, and to the saints which are in heaven, that they may be our advocates and intercessors with God.*

“This is proved as follows: What should the saints do in heaven if they did not pray for us? But if they pray for us, then must we pray to them. The Lutherans deny this consequence, but it may be demonstrated as follows. The saints resemble God. But God wills that we pray to him. Therefore the saints do so likewise. As for the gibe of the Lutherans, that we make the saints with very long ears (*valdè auritos*) the solution is easy. It is because they see all that is done on earth by the reflection which they have from the irradiation of God. A second proof: Because the pagans always had minor gods for their intercessors, and it is not reasonable that Christians should have fewer privileges than heathens. Whence their error was corrected in this manner, viz., by the honors which they offered to their idols being transferred to the saints; as when the Pope changed the name of the temple which used to be called the *Pantheon*. And, in like manner, from the multitude of festivals it came to pass that, in contempt of the gentiles, the Christians, in celebrating them, got drunk in honor of the saints.”

In the same year Calvin was employed in preparing his answer to Pighius's book on the Freedom of the Will.¹ Albert Pighius was a native of Campen, in Over-Yssel, and had studied at Louvain and Cologne, where he attained considerable proficiency in mathematics and theology. He had been a pupil of Adrian's, the tutor of Charles V., whom that emperor afterward procured to be elected to the Papal throne. He was a fanatical defender of the Papal power; and the zeal with which he espoused this cause obtained him much respect and consideration, not only from Pope Adrian VI., but from his successors, Clement VII. and Paul III. Pighius's work, in which he sought to renew the controversy which had been formerly carried on between Luther and Erasmus on the same subject, was divided into ten books; of which the first six related to the question of the freedom of the will, and the remaining four embraced that of predestination. Calvin was desirous of getting his answer ready by the approach-

¹ *Defensio sanæ et orthodoxæ Doctrinæ de Servitute et Liberatione humani Arbitrii adversus Calumnias Alberti Pighii, Campensis.* Authore J. Calvino. Geneva, 1543.

ing Frankfort fair; and therefore confined himself to the former portion of Pighius's book, or that relating to the will; with the intention of examining the question of predestination at some future opportunity.¹ Dr. Henry states that Calvin's treatise had the effect of converting his opponent.² That on so subtle and intricate a question he should have overcome all that obstinacy and love of his own opinions which usually characterize a controversialist, fortified, too, as they were in this instance, by religious prejudice and animosity, would indeed have been an extraordinary triumph: but, unfortunately, there is one circumstance which prevents our believing that it was achieved. Pighius was dead before Calvin's book was published. A letter of John Vorstius de Lambeca, dean of the cathedral of Utrecht, and one of the executors of Pighius, states that he expired on the 26th of December, 1542; and ascribes his decease to the indefatigable labor which he exerted, while in a bad state of health, in defending himself from an attack which Bucer had made upon him.³ Calvin's dedication of his book to Melancthon is dated in February, 1543, and therefore Pighius must have been dead almost two months before it saw the light. It is true that in this dedication Calvin speaks of his adversary as if he were still alive; and that in the beginning of his book "On the Eternal Predestination of God," he states that Pighius died *shortly after* his former answer to him had been published.⁴ But these circumstances can not be considered as invalidating the direct evidence adduced by Bayle. Owing to the slowness of communication in those days, Calvin might very well have been ignorant in February that his opponent had died toward the end of the preceding December; and as nine years elapsed before he wrote his second book against him, there is nothing extraordinary in his having forgotten—if, indeed, he had ever known—the exact period of Pighius's decease. The story

¹ See the tract, *Opera*, viii., 118, A.

² "Merkwürdig ist für uns dieser Pighius nur weil er sich durch das Lesen der Schrift Calvins von dessen Ansicht überzeugen liess."—*Leben Calvins*, ii., 289. See also the table of contents, Th. ii., cap. 7. "Calvin—setzt den Streit Luthers mit Erasmus gegen Pighius von Campen fort, welcher letztere überzeuget wird."

³ Bayle, *Pighius*, rem. F. A letter of Cardinal Sadolet's, dated June 17th, 1543, also alludes to his death (*Ibid.*, rem. C.) The title of Bucer's work was: "*De vera Ecclesiarum in Doctrinâ, Ceremoniis et Disciplinâ Reconciliatione, una cum Responsione ad Calumnias Alberti Pighii, Campensis, contra Confessionem et Apologiam Protestantium nuper vulgatas,*" &c.

⁴ "Pighius died a little after my book was published. Wherefore, not to insult a dead dog, I applied myself to other lucubrations."—*Opera*, viii., 594.

rests on the authority of Crakanthorpe, who says in his "*Defensio Ecclesie Anglicanæ*," that Pighius, by turning over Calvin's "Institutes," and other works, for the purpose of refuting them, became himself a Calvinist in one of the chief articles of faith.¹ The story, thus vaguely told, gains more probability, and it is somewhat strengthened by the circumstance that the opinions of Pighius do not seem to have been regarded as altogether orthodox by the Romish Church.² The article alluded to may be that of the eucharist: but if by the phrase "one of the chief articles of faith," Crakanthorpe intended to allude to the dogma of predestination, we find as much difficulty as ever; for had Pighius really been a convert to Calvin's opinion on that head, it is not very probable that the latter should have written a book nine years after his death for the purpose of confuting him; and in which he not only takes no credit for his triumph, but loads his adversary with the grossest abuse. And, indeed, the story has been long ago rejected by Gerdesius.³

In the dedication of this work to Melancthon, Calvin states that he offered it to him for two reasons: first, because he knew it would be agreeable, from the personal friendship which Melancthon bore him; and, secondly, because it contained a defense of the *sound* doctrine. He also intimates that at some former period Melancthon had advised him to answer Pighius, in case that author should continue his attacks. It is probable that something of this sort had passed in conversation between the two Reformers when they met either at Frankfort or Worms; but it is well known that the opinions of Melancthon on that difficult and important question underwent a gradual change. Like Luther and most of the other Reformers, he had at first adopted the views of St. Augustin in their fullest extent; and in the first edition of his "*Loci Theologici*," published in 1525, when he was only 24 years of age, had utterly denied all freedom of the will.⁴ In the second edition, however, which appeared in 1535, it is certain that he allowed it a limited freedom, that, namely, of

¹ Quoted by Ancillon (*Melan. crit.*, ii., 43), who says, that if those who wrote against Calvin meditated upon his works, "Il arriveroit peut-être très souvent ce qui est arrivé à Albertus Pighius, lequel comme le dit Crakanthorpe, au ch. 69, de son livre, *Defensio Ecclesie Anglicanæ contra Archiep. Spalatensem*: 'dum refellendi studio Calvinii Institutiones et scripta evolvit, in uno ex præcipuis fidei dogmatibus factus est ipse Calvinianus.'"

² Bayle, l. c.

³ *Hist. Evangelii Renovati*, iii., § 50.

⁴ See Matthes, *Leben Melancthons*, p. 54. Lawrence, *Bampton Lectures*, serm. iv., note 6.

assent and concurrence.¹ In the third edition, published in 1544, he went a step further, and admitted the freedom of the will and the operation of contingency; to which he was led chiefly by the consideration that, on the contrary hypothesis, sin must be ascribed to the will of God.² In the fourth edition, which appeared in 1548, he formally adopted the definition of Erasmus.³

It is curious to observe the different effects which meditation on this abstruse subject produced on the minds of Calvin and Melancthon. The latter was as competent as the former to appreciate the logical force of the argument in favor of necessity; yet, as he grew in years and wisdom, he looked beyond the mere links of the deduction, and doubted a conclusion of human reason which led to such pernicious and absurd consequences. Calvin, on the contrary, with his natural love for hypothesis and dogmatism, clung the faster to his first convictions the more he advanced in life. To his mind the idea of the Divine Being which such a doctrine implies presented nothing repulsive. One who could visit the sins of mankind with temporal punishments such as have been described in the preceding chapter, and think them congenial with the spirit of Christianity, was not unnaturally led to insist upon the theory of absolute decrees.

Melancthon replied to Calvin's dedication in a letter dated on the 11th of May, 1543.⁴ He acknowledges in suitable terms the compliment paid to him; but the letter bears evidence of the change which had already taken place in his opinions. Convinced by experience that, to the great mass of mankind, speculations on this subject would be either unintelligible or mischievous, and therefore useless or worse, he aims in this letter to divert Calvin from pursuing them. He intimates that amid the disputes which attended on the birth of the Reformation his own aim had ever been to lay aside all that was not adapted, by its simplicity, to be easily understood, and therefore to be practically useful. He points out that the

¹ Thus we find the following passage in this edition: "Here there are three concurrent causes of a good action: the word of God, the Holy Ghost, and the human will assenting to the word of God."

² "Having established this proposition, that God neither causes nor wills sin, it follows that there is contingency; that is, that all things that happen do not happen necessarily. For since sin sprang from the will of the devil and man, and not from that of God, it follows that our wills were so formed that they were capable of not sinning. But the freedom of the will is the cause of the contingency of our actions."

³ Matthes, *Leben Melancthons*, p. 55, et seq.

⁴ Calvin, *Opp. et Resp.*, Ep. 43.

Catholics had taken courage from the divisions among the Protestants, and insists on the necessity for the latter abandoning all minor differences, and uniting in defense of their principal tenets. He exhorts Calvin, in preference to treating the subject of predestination, to write on the revelation of our Saviour, on the unperceived wisdom of the Church, on the greatness of human infirmity, on repentance and faith in mercy promised through Christ, on genuine prayer, and the Church's true use and virtue, on the holiness of the Sacraments, on the proper form of ecclesiastical government as established by the Apostles, and, lastly, on eternal life. "I wish," he continues, "you would transfer your eloquence to the adorning of these momentous subjects; by which our friends would be strengthened, our enemies terrified, and the weak encouraged: for who in these days possesses a more forcible or splendid style of disputation?"

There will be occasion, however, to refer to this letter further on; and therefore at present it is only necessary to observe that, from some of the concluding remarks, we may infer that at this time Melancthon's principal objection to the doctrine lay in its practical inconvenience. "I do not write this letter," he concludes, "to dictate to you who are so learned a man, and so well versed in all the exercises of piety. I am persuaded, indeed, that it agrees with your sentiments, though less subtle (*παχύτερα*), and more adapted for use."

In the same year with his answer to Pighius, appeared Calvin's tract on relics,¹ in which he enumerates various false specimens preserved in cathedrals and other places throughout Europe; going through those relating to Christ, the Virgin, the Apostles, &c., in order. It was originally written in French; but a Latin translation, from the hand of Nicholas de Gallars, was published at Geneva in 1548. On the 9th of October, 1543, Calvin addressed an epistle to the Reformed Church of Montbelliard respecting certain points of discipline, which is remarkable for the moderation of its tone.²

In the summer of that year an adventure of his friend Farel's caused Calvin to revisit Strasburgh for a short time. The particulars of this affair are briefly as follows:

Since the year 1524, Metz, at that time a free and imperial city, had always contained a small number of Protestants; who, however, met with much discouragement and opposition.

¹ "Avertissement très utile du grand profit qui reviendroit à la Chrestienté s'il se faisait inventaire de tous les corps saints et reliques qui sont tant en Italie qu'en France," &c.

² Ep. 51.

In 1542 their prospects were assuming a brighter appearance. Some of the Dominicans had begun of their own accord to preach the Reformed doctrines; to which also Gaspar de Huy, the newly-elected sheriff or burgomaster was inclined. De Huy and his brother permitted the Protestants to assemble in their houses for worship; and nothing seemed wanting to the organization of a regular church but an efficient minister. One had been invited from Morsee, but he was deficient in the requisite courage. Under these circumstances Farel, with his usual boldness and zeal, determined to try what he could effect; a resolution which met with the entire approval of Calvin, who thought nobody better qualified for such an undertaking than his experienced and dauntless friend.¹ Farel arrived at Metz early in September, and delivered his first sermon in the churchyard of the Dominicans. In vain the monks tried to drown his voice by ringing their bells; the powerful tones of Farel, raised to a pitch of hoarseness, prevailed above the din.² On the following day three thousand persons assembled to hear him preach; but by the advice of some of the principal among the Reformed party, including De Huy himself, Farel consented to postpone his address till matters had assumed a more tranquil aspect. The news of Farel's arrival had reached the ears of the council, who summoned him before them. He was asked by whose orders he preached. "By the order," said Farel, "of Jesus Christ, and at the requisition of his members:" but he could not be brought to mention any names. He then dilated with force and unction on the sacred nature of his calling, and bade the council to be mindful of their duty. While the latter were deliberating as to what they should do with him, his friends, alarmed for his safety, led him home; and placing a man who bore some resemblance to him in size and appearance upon a horse, pretended to conduct him out of the town. Meanwhile Farel lay concealed, waiting the result of a message which had been dispatched to Strasburgh for support and assistance. The Strasburghers sent a message to the Elector of Saxony and Landgrave of Hesse, requesting that that portion of the citizens of Metz which had embraced the Reformed tenets might be admitted into the Protestant league. This was approved of by the Landgrave, who, without waiting for the reply of the Elector, sent an ambassador, accompanied with two others

¹ Kirchhofer, *Leben Farel's*, ii., 50.

² Bucer Calvino, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 37. This letter is erroneously dated in 1541.

from Frankfort and Strasburgh, to request the government of Metz to allow the Protestants of that city to have one church, and the free exercise of their religion. The council refused to receive these ambassadors, and it was thought expedient that Farel should withdraw. He accordingly retired to the neighboring town of Gorze; where, under the protection of William, Count Furstenberg, he exercised his ministry without opposition. Even here, however, his uncontrollable zeal led him into an awkward adventure. A Franciscan descending in the pulpit on the eternal virginity of Mary, Farel publicly gave him the lie. Hereupon the women who were present set upon him, and dragged him about by the hair of his head and beard; and he would probably have paid for his rashness with his life, had he not been rescued by a Captain Frank.¹

The consequences of this adventure obliged Farel to keep his room for some time. When in a condition to come out, he again resumed his ministry, and his sermons were attended by considerable numbers from Metz. Enraged at his success, the Roman Catholics of that city formed the detestable design of massacring him and his congregation. The renegade Caroli seems to have been at the head of this plot. At his instigation the Duke of Guise sent a company of infantry, together with some cavalry, to fall upon the congregation at Gorze; which on Easter day, 1543, had assembled to the number of 300, to celebrate the Lord's Supper.² Service was ended, and the congregation preparing to depart, when suddenly the trumpet was heard; and Guise's band, led by his son the Duke d'Aumale, fell upon the helpless and unsuspecting multitude. Numbers were slaughtered, and it was with difficulty that Furstenberg and Farel escaped into the castle; whence the count afterward got Farel removed, at considerable hazard, to Strasburgh, with a wagon-load of the wounded. This foul and cowardly massacre is said to have been sanctioned by the French king.³

The Protestant princes and states of the empire now warmly took up the cause of their brethren at Metz; and in a convention held at Strasburgh, they obtained from the magistrates of the former city not only that those who had been obliged to fly should be reinstated in their houses and property, but that they should be allowed the free exercise of their religion, and that a church should be assigned to them for that purpose. This privilege, however, they enjoyed but

¹ Kirchofer, ii., 55.

² Ruchat, v., 211.

³ "Non abnuente neque improbante Galliarum rege."—Gerdes, iv., 149.

a short time. Caroli, who had missed the chief object of his diabolical plot, now attacked Farel and the Protestants of Metz in another way; and endeavored to weaken their cause with the German princes by throwing suspicion on Farel's tenets respecting the eucharist. Encouraged by the clergy and council of Metz, his insolence rose to such a pitch that he challenged Farel to dispute with him either before the Pope, or the Council of Trent, or the theologians of the French universities, or those of Salamanca or Alcala in Spain, or, finally, if those were too distant, either at Louvain or Padua. The dispute was to be conducted at the risk of life on both sides; for which purpose Caroli was to constitute himself a prisoner at Metz, and Farel to place himself in the hands of the French king. Caroli forwarded this citation to the Pope, and to the principal European powers, as well as to the universities before mentioned.¹

Farel answered this absurd challenge with moderation and good temper. He ridiculed the idea of making himself a prisoner; but nevertheless declared his willingness to dispute with Caroli at Metz, provided Calvin and Viret, whom Caroli had also attacked, should be heard at the same time. The councils of Berne and Geneva were unwilling that their ministers should be exposed to this risk. Still, in order that Caroli might not claim a vain-glorious triumph, it was thought advisable that Calvin should proceed to Strasburgh, and endeavor to procure a conference. Both he and Farel appeared before the council of that city, and demanded a safe conduct to Metz. But this could not be obtained; and after spending six weeks at Strasburgh, to no purpose, during which he addressed three letters to the council of Geneva, Calvin at length returned at their request. He and Farel never again came into contact with Caroli, who remained some time longer at Metz.² This apostate subsequently abandoned himself to a life of profligacy; and is said to have died of a disgraceful malady in a hospital at Rome.³

In the following November, Farel paid a visit to Geneva. The persecutions which he had undergone at Metz manifested themselves in the state of his apparel; and the council voted him a new suit, after the fashion of Calvin's. Farel appeared before that body, and admonished them as to their lives, exhorting them to maintain justice, and to reverence the word of God; but he declined their present, and also their

¹ Kirchofer, ii., 64.

² Buchat, v., 134.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

invitation to him to take up his residence at Geneva. The suit seems to have been put in Calvin's keeping till it should find a wearer; and in December he wrote to Farel to banish his scruples and accept of it.¹

The subject of education had occupied Calvin's attention soon after his return to Geneva, as an important auxiliary to his civil and ecclesiastical reforms. In November, 1541, he procured his old master, Maturin Cordier, to be appointed rector of the schools. The Franciscan convent (Couvent de Rive) was assigned him for a residence, together with a salary of 400 florins, besides what payments he might obtain from the scholars. After a few months, however, Cordier seems to have resigned; for early in the following spring we find the celebrated Castellio, whose name has been already mentioned in connection with the lazaretto, invited to Geneva to fill the same post. Bastien de Chatillon, for so he is called in the Registers of Geneva, but who assumed, as he himself admits, out of vanity, the more classical name of Castalio, which has been familiarized into Castellio, was born in the year 1515, either in Savoy, or more probably at Chatillon in Bresse. He had been tutor to some nobleman at Lyons, where he taught the Greek tongue; but Calvin first became acquainted with him at Strasburgh, where they both lodged in the same house. Calvin was much struck with Castellio's genius and learning, and was hence led to procure for him the situation alluded to. He was indeed a true type of the scholar of the sixteenth century; of deep and varied learning, of boundless industry, and whose literary ardor neither poverty nor misfortune could damp. The following works may be mentioned, as showing the extent and variety of his studies: Dialogues, embracing the contents of scriptural history; a translation of the Sibylline oracles; a Latin version of the Pentateuch; a translation of the Psalms and other scriptural songs; a Greek poem on the life of John the Baptist; a description of the prophet Jonas in Latin verse; translations from Homer, Xenophon, and St. Cyril; and of some of the Italian writings of Bernardino Ochino into Latin. In 1551, he published a Latin version of the Bible, remarkable for the elegance of its style; which, however, was carried to a degree of affectation quite out of keeping with the sublime simplicity of the original. Thus he substituted classical for scriptural terms; as *lotio* for

¹ "The suit is at my house till some one be found to take it. Your refusing it was all very well; but you may now very properly accept of it." —MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, ii., 40.

baptismus, genius for angelus, respublica for ecclesia, collegium for synagoge, &c. His introduction and notes are said to display much learning. He entertained some singular opinions respecting the imperfections of Scripture; and thought that the writings of St. Paul, from his superior education, contained a more elevated theology than other parts of the New Testament.¹ He was also the author of several controversial tracts.

Although not a minister, Castellio was desirous of becoming one; and was thus led to devote much time to the study of theology. His labors in this way brought him into collision with Calvin, who was not a man to endure any views which differed from his own. The first public trace of any ill feeling between them occurs in an entry in the Registers under date of the 14th of January, 1544; which states that Calvin had represented to the council, that Bastien (Castellio), the rector of the schools, was a very learned man; but that he held certain opinions which disqualified him for the ministry. It is also stated that he was dissatisfied with his salary of 450 florins. From another entry, on the 28th of the same month, it appears that the principal subject of disagreement between him and Calvin was the Song of Solomon; which Castellio declared to be a poem of a loose and obscene description composed in Solomon's youth, and that it ought to be struck out of the Canon. He also objected to the passage in the Creed respecting Christ's descent into hell.² These disputes, however, between him and Calvin had an earlier origin; and seem to have arisen soon after Castellio came to Geneva, on the occasion of a French translation of the New Testament which he was preparing. In a letter to Viret, written in 1542, Calvin says: "I will tell you a nice story about Sebastian, which will make you at once merry and angry. He came to me the other day and asked if I would allow his edition of the New Testament to be published. I told him that it wanted a great deal of correction; and on his asking the reason, I pointed to some passages in the few chapters which he had left with me some time before by way of specimen. He replied that he had been more careful in the rest, and again asked what I would do? I said that I did not wish to hinder the printing of his book, and was even willing to fulfil the promise I had given to John Gérard (a bookseller at Geneva) to look into it, and alter what wanted correction.

¹ Trechsel, *Antitr.*, i., 208, et seq. P. Henry, ii., 383, note.

² These entries will be found in P. Henry, ii., 385, note.

This proposal he declined ; but he offered to come and read his manuscript to me, if I would appoint an hour. I refused to bind myself down to any fixed time, even if he would give me a hundred crowns, and perhaps to be wrangling two whole hours over a single particle. Hereupon he departed, seemingly in a rather ill humor. To show you what a faithful interpreter he is, and how he makes new faults where he intends to correct, I will just give you a single instance. In the passage—"The Spirit of God which *dwells* in us—(l'esprit de Dieu qui *habite* en nous)—he renders, *haunts* us (*hante* nous :) though in French *hanter* does not mean *to inhabit*, but to *frequent*. This single puerile error is sufficient to condemn the whole book."¹ But to return to the narrative.

In consequence of Calvin's denunciation to the council, Castellio demanded a public disputation with him on the subject of Christ's descent into hell. This, however, the council discreetly refused to permit ; but allowed him to discuss the matter privately with Calvin, and the rest of the ministers. As might have been anticipated, this discussion had no other result than to embitter the feelings of the disputants. Castellio demanded his dismissal from the office of rector of the schools ; and, as it was expected, and as indeed he had given out, that he intended to retire from Geneva, Calvin, at his own request, furnished him with a handsome letter of recommendation, signed by himself in the name of the Genevese ministers.² In this he states that Castellio's conduct had been such that, with the consent of all the clergy, he would have been admitted into the ministry, but for the circumstance of his not being able to agree with them on the points before mentioned. Then, after giving a short summary of the dispute, Calvin concludes his letter thus :—"Lest any one should suspect that Sebastian hath left us for any other cause than the preceding, we furnish him with this testimonial to be used wherever he may go. He vacated the rectorship of the schools of his own accord, and had so behaved himself in it, that we judged him worthy of the ministry. It was not an evil life, nor any impious dogmas respecting the capital articles of our faith, that prevented his being received into it, but the cause which we have explained alone." Besides this public testimonial, Calvin is said to have likewise furnished him with private letters of recommendation to some of his friends.

Of these documents, however, Castellio does not appear to

¹ MS. Goth., *apud* Schlosser, *Leben Bezas*, p. 55, note.

² This document, dated Feb. 17th, 1544, is printed by Dr. Henry, ii., Beil. 13.

have availed himself, nor to have quitted Geneva till his behavior two or three months afterward drew down upon him a public expulsion; the occasion of which is described in a letter from Calvin to Farel, dated on the 30th of May, 1544.¹ The preceding day appears to have been one of those dedicated to public discussions on some text of Scripture. There were about sixty persons present in the church, and the subject proposed was the text, "Showing ourselves the servants of the Lord, in long suffering," &c. On this theme Castellio kept up a continual antithesis, to the disparagement of the Genevese ministers, who, he endeavored to show, formed at all points a complete contrast with the servants of Christ. "Paul," said he, "was the servant of God, but you serve yourselves; he was most patient, you most impatient; he watched by night for the edification of the church, you spend the night in play; he was sober, you are drunken; he was vexed by seditious, you excite them; he was chaste, you are fornicators; he was imprisoned, you imprison those who offend you by a single word; he used the power of God, you a strange power; he suffered from others, you persecute the innocent." During the delivery of this, as Calvin calls it, sanguinary harangue, the latter was silent, lest the dispute, he says, should become too violent before so many strangers. This silence may have been discreet; but it was contrary to Calvin's usual practice: and as the charges which Castellio brought against the Genevese ministers were certainly grave ones, and openly made before a public assembly, they seem precisely of a description which required a public answer. Calvin, however, went privately to the syndics, and complained of Castellio's conduct; who on the following day was summoned before the council, and, after a patient hearing, says Beza, condemned and banished.² Such was the summary process then used at Geneva for getting rid of those who made themselves obnoxious to Calvin and the ministers.

Castellio retired to Basle, where there was more toleration, and where he obtained the Greek professorship. At present, therefore, we shall dismiss him, as he will again claim our notice on the occasion of an attack made upon him by Calvin after the affair of Servetus.

The year 1544 was an active one in Calvin's literary life. During the course of it he published no fewer than six tracts, some of them of considerable length. In that year the Em-

¹ MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, ii., Beil. 13.

² *Vita Calv.*, anno 1544.

peror Charles V. held a diet at Spires. The threatening aspect of the political horizon at this juncture, the French king being leagued against him with Solyman, the Turkish emperor, obliged Charles to court the assistance of the Protestant princes of Germany, and for that purpose to make some important concessions with regard to religion. All the edicts issued against the Protestants were suspended, and the free and public exercise of their religion allowed, until either a general or national council should be assembled in Germany; an event which the emperor undertook to bring about as speedily as possible. Meanwhile, Protestants were declared eligible as members of the imperial chamber.¹ At the request of Bucer, Calvin drew up a tract stating the views of the Reformers, to be presented to the emperor and states at this diet. Bucer, however, expected but little from the turn of Charles's mind, devoured, as he was, in temporal affairs, by an insatiable ambition, and sunk, with regard to spiritual ones, in the most degrading superstition. The instances which Bucer gives of the last show, that though Charles, as in the instance just recorded, may have sometimes sacrificed his religious to his political views, yet that he was at heart a bigoted Roman Catholic, with symptoms of that melancholy fanaticism which attended the close of his days. "He is completely addicted," says Bucer, "to puerile, or rather anile, superstitions. He offers up long prayers every day on his bended knees; he tells his beads while prostrate on the earth, and with his eyes fixed on a portrait of the Virgin."² Charles's character, indeed, presents a curious mixture of bigotry and ambition. During his youth and manhood the latter got the better of the former; but in his declining years the ruling passion asserted its empire, and showed itself strong in death. The full title of Calvin's tract is, "An humble Exhortation to the most invincible Emperor Charles V., and to the most illustrious Princes and other Orders now attending an imperial Diet at Spires, that they should seriously undertake a Reformation of the Church."³ It first sets forth, in very severe terms, not only the abuses in the doctrine and discipline of the Romish Church, but the scandalous lives of its clergy. It then adverts to the amendments introduced by the Reformation, which, it is maintained, are the best that could be applied. Finally, the emperor is recommended to call a

¹ Robertson, *Charles V.*, b. vii.

² Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 52.

³ Its Latin title is, "*De Necessitate Reformandæ Ecclesiæ*," &c.

German council, in preference to a general one, as the best means of restoring peace and concord to the empire: an argument which is supported by several examples of provincial synods.

If the emperor ever read Calvin's book, it shared the same fate with his dedication, to Francis I. ; and, so far from producing any effect upon Charles's convictions, seems to have rendered him more bitter against the Protestants where he could be so without detriment to his political interests, that is to say, in his hereditary dominions. For Myconius, in a letter to Calvin dated from Basle on the 6th of March, 1545, in which he thanks him for a copy of the book, says: "If the emperor has read it, the effect hath been contrary to what you intended, so hotly does he persecute the saints in Belgium."¹

The Pope, Paul III., finding himself obliged, in spite of his reluctance, to call a council, had at first endeavored to procure its assembling in Italy. At the diet held at Spires, however, in 1542, he had authorized his nuncio to propose Trent; which town, though in the German dominions, was still sufficiently near the borders of Italy to render it convenient for him to exercise a control over the proceedings of the assembly. Accordingly, he ordered his legates to proceed thither in November of that year, though the German Protestants had openly expressed their determination not to attend the meeting. After waiting a few months, as nobody appeared but a few prelates from the ecclesiastical states, the assembly began to appear ridiculous, and the Pope found himself compelled to prorogue it.²

When Paul heard of the concessions which the emperor had made to the Protestants at the diet in 1544, he felt highly indignant, and wrote him a letter of remonstrance and exhortation, dated from Rome, on the 23d of August of that year.³ On this epistle Calvin published some remarks which he called *Scholia*, in which he replies to the letter paragraph by paragraph. He is very severe upon the Pope, who was one of the Farnese family; and whom, with no very happy attempt at humor, he addresses throughout by the name of Frenesius. The following translations of some passages will

¹ Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 61.

² Robertson, l. c.

³ It is printed among Calvin's tracts. The title runs, "Admonitio paterna Pauli III., Pontificis, ad invictum Cæsarem, Carolum V. Quâ eum cæstigat quod se Lutheranis præbuerit nimis facilem; deinde quod tum in cogendâ synodo, tum in definiendis fidei controversiis, aliquid potestatis sibi sumpserit."

serve to show the style of controversy usual in those days: "Behold a wonderful metamorphosis. The Pope is become so religious that he actually shudders at hearing of the peace granted to the Protestants. It is a little strange on the other hand, that he makes terms with strumpets, and doth not abhor the contamination of receiving the wages of their sin; that he settles with the Jews for an annual payment, not only that they may despise the Christian religion with impunity, but exercise open robbery through usury; nay, that he is not averse even to the Turks. But his sanctimony chiefly appears in his fearing, with the Apostle Paul, lest evil communications should corrupt good manners. What hast thou to do with these words of the holy Apostle, thou wicked apostate, and leader of all apostasy? Thou who spendest thy days with thy most wicked councilors in hatching treason, in planning frauds, in fanning the flames of war, in inventing new methods of rapine, in compassing the destruction of the innocent, in destroying the Church, and in dissipating religion; during the rest of thy time delighting thyself pleasantly with Epicureans, or wallowing like a swine amid thy herd of harlots, speaking and hearing nothing else but what breathes the most execrable impiety, or what may excite by its obscenity thy worn-out lust, which hath not yet ceased to itch." And, again: "Thou the successor of Peter! who art no more like him than a Nero, a Domitian, or a Caligula? Unless, perchance, thou preferrest Heliogabalus, who added a new priesthood to the empire. All these, indeed, were called pontiffs, or high priests, which was lawful according to the superstition of those times; but thou usurpest that name among a Christian people against all law and right, against the inviolable decree of Christ, against the institutes of all the saintly fathers. Thou the vicar of Christ! whose only thoughts, whose every desire and act, tend to procure the abolishment of Christianity, provided the empty name be retained, which thou abusest as a harlot doth her paint. Thou Christ's vicar! whom even boys now know to be the very Antichrist? What sort of Christ wilt thou fabricate for us, if thou wouldst have us acknowledge his image in thy tyranny? We behold the high priest of all impiety, the standard-bearer of Satan, a ferocious tyrant of souls, a cruel executioner, with regard to his way of life, a monster of all sorts of wickedness; in a word, that Son of Perdition whom the Apostle portrays—and shall we hold him to be Christ's vicar? We behold, I say, a wolf, by whom Christ's sheep

are devoured; a robber by whom they are driven off; a marauder by whom they are slain; and shall he be to us the vicar of Christ?"

In the same year Calvin likewise published two other tracts in French; one of them directed against the Anabaptists, and the other against the sect of Libertines. The chastisement inflicted on the Anabaptists at Munster had not extirpated that fanatical sect, though they were become comparatively harmless. Calvin's tract against them, entitled "*Briefve Instruction pour armer tout bon Fidèle contre les Erreurs de la Secte commune des Anabaptistes*"—was addressed to the church of Neufchâtel. In it he lays down and refutes seven articles of the creed of the Anabaptists. The sixth concerns the civil magistrate; whose functions Calvin upholds by examples chiefly drawn from the Jewish government.

As the Anabaptists were now pretty well subdued, Calvin handled them with mildness; but with the Libertines, a spreading, pestilent, and dangerous sect he was more severe. Pantheism was the distinguishing mark of their speculative tenets; which, however, partook of all the heresies which had ever troubled the Church. By a metaphysical distinction respecting the nature of evil, which they held to be only a negation of good, they attempted to confound the boundaries of right and wrong, to convert immorality into a system, and to establish an unbridled license. They rejected the Evangelists, disbelieved the existence of Satan and of all angels, and denied the resurrection. They characterized each of the Apostle by a ridiculous nickname; calling St. Paul, *pot-cassé*; St. Peter, *renonceur de Dieu*; St. John, *jouvenceau et follet*; St. Matthew, *usurier*, &c.

Absurd and dangerous as were the tenets of this sect, they succeeded in spreading them in several countries in Europe. Strype, in his "*Annals*,"¹ notices the existence of this sect in England at a later period, and gives the following description of their doctrines. They held that there was no devil but such as painters made; that they who had the spirit of God knew all things; that marriage was a sacrament and wonderful speculation; that there were great mysteries and great speculations in the mass, and that it was a God-service; that Adam had no sin, but only Eve; that a man ought not to weary his body in travail and labor, for that the Holy Ghost would not tarry in a body that was weary and irk-

¹ Vol. ii., Pt. ii., p. 287, et seq.

some; that the Bible was not the word of God, but a signification thereof; for that it was but ink and paper, but that the word of God was spirit and life; with other things of the like kind.

Calvin's tract against these fanatics was also addressed to the church of Neufchâtel, and is entitled, "*Aux Ministres de l'Eglise de Neufchâtel contre la Secte fanatique et furieuse des Libertins qui se nomment Spirituels.*" In it he represents them as the worst sect that ever existed, yet without originality in their doctrines. These were nothing but a combination of old heresies; which, however, from the excessive ignorance of the Libertines, they could not have learned by reading: wherefore he concludes that Satan must have been their prompter. In the second chapter he compares them to the sect described in 2 Peter, ii., 12, and in Jude, ver. 10. They affected a tumid and unintelligible diction, and you would sometimes fancy that they were rapt in ecstasy above the clouds; but it was a mere affectation. Their doctrine made them worse than the beasts; for they ridiculed all idea of conscience and morality, and thought that every man should resign himself to the conduct of his own spirit. Bad as was the Pope, this sect was worse; and people should spit in their faces as they passed by. They had a peculiar jargon, like the Bohemians or gipsies; and though they used common words, they distorted them so that they could not be understood. The art of simulation was a principle with them; and they excused their double tongue, by alleging that Christ spoke in parables. They justified all kinds of sin and iniquity by 1 Cor., vii., 20. The crucifixion, they held, was but a play, or morality, designed to typify the mystery of our salvation.

This sect had made considerable progress among the higher classes in France; and Margaret of Navarre, though not, perhaps, herself infected with the tenets of these fanatics, protected at her court two men of note among them, Quintin and Pocques. These men Calvin attacked and ridiculed in his book. He says that he had known Pocques, whom he describes as a short, little mass-priest (*sacrificulus, staturâ parvus*), for three years, that he had been at Geneva, and wanted to get a certificate from him, but that he saw through the man, and refused it. This Pocques had written a book which Calvin characterizes as *Contes du coq à l'âne*, and gives some passages from it with remarks subjoined.¹

¹ See the tract, ch. 4 & 23.

Margaret was highly displeased with Calvin's remarks upon her *protégés*, thinking them in some manner an attack upon herself; and the enemies of the Reformation laid hold of the opportunity to endeavor to make a breach between them.¹ She even caused letters to be written to Calvin in which she expressed her displeasure at his book. Calvin excused himself in a letter to Margaret, dated on the 25th of April, 1545,² in which he particularly insists that he had had no intention to bring royalty and government into contempt; a charge of which he should be acquitted by all who knew him: nor would the respect he entertained for Margaret, on account of her services in spreading the Reformation, have permitted him to harbor such a design. So far from attacking her household, he says he had not even mentioned it; "yet I think," he continues, "that you do not esteem your house more precious than that of our Lord Jesus, of which one member is named Devil; even a servant seated at the table of his master, and appointed to the honorable post of being one of the ambassadors of the Son of God." In this letter Calvin does not retract an *iota* of what he had said against Pocques and Quintin. It appears that Margaret had even gone so far as to say that she would not have Calvin for a servant of hers. His answer to this is at once moderate and dignified. "As for your saying," he writes, "that you would not have such a servant as I, I confess that I am not fit to render you any great service. I have not the faculty, neither have you need of it. Nevertheless, the affection is not wanting; and, by the help of God, so long as I live I will always persist in saying so. And though you should disdain me for a servant, that will not prevent my being such in heart and will. For the rest, they who know me are well aware that I have never studied to enter into the courts of princes; for I was never tempted by preferment and honors. Had I done so it might possibly have been in vain; but I thank the Lord that I was never tempted to it. For I have sufficient reason to content myself with the service of that good master who has accepted and retained me in his house, and appointed me to the honorable office which I hold, however contemptible in the eyes of the world. I should, indeed, be too ungrateful if I did not prefer this condition to all the riches and honors of the world." Calvin then defends

¹ P. Henry, ii., 407.

² Printed from the original French, Gen. MS. in P. Henry, ii., Beil. 14. It forms Ep. 62 in the Lausanne edition.

himself in the same strain of dignified humility, against a calumnious charge which had been made against him of inconstancy in maintaining his principles.

On the 25th of November in this year (1544) we find Calvin writing to Bullinger, and discharging the balance of a small debt which he owed him.¹ In the same letter he alludes to the persecutions which he feared were preparing for the Waldenses in Provence, who had published a confession of their faith about three years previously at Aix. He exhorts Bullinger to be ready to assist those who might take refuge at Zurich, and to employ for them his mediation with the French king. Toward the close of the letter he tenders his advice to Bullinger respecting the course he should pursue with regard to an attack recently made by Luther on the doctrine of the Swiss churches respecting the eucharist. For some years this controversy had been buried in silence; and though Luther, in the form of prayer for deliverance from the aggression of the Turks, published in 1542, had enumerated among the causes of God's anger, "the pestilential sects and abominable heresies of Muntzer, the Zwinglians, the Anabaptists, and several others which had arisen in the august name and under pretense of the gospel," it had been thought prudent to take no public notice of the insult.² Luther had been highly offended by Zwingli's work, "*Christianæ Fidei Expositio ad Christianum Regem*," published by Bullinger in 1536; which appeared to him so contradictory to all Zwingli's professions at the conference of Marburg, that he was persuaded he had acted falsely by him. Luther had also heard rumors that he was but little respected at Zurich; and Melancthon's evident inclination toward the Swiss churches had helped to wound him.³ All these dormant causes of anger were, in 1543, kindled into a sudden flame, by his receiving from Froschover, the printer, copies of some books issued from his press at Zurich, among which was a new Latin version of the Bible, by Leo Juda. Luther wrote back to Froschover, directing him never again to send him any thing published by the Zurich ministers; declaring that he would neither read nor receive their books; that the churches of God could have no communication with men who were not only damned themselves, but drew others to perdition and the flames of hell; and that as long as he lived

¹ Something more than a crown. See Ep. 57.

² Ruchat, v., 230.

³ P. Henry, ii., 349.

he would oppose them by his prayers and writings.¹ It was in vain that Melancthon sought to appease him. In his "Annotations on Genesis," published in 1544, he inveighed against the Sacramentaries; and in a confession of faith, which appeared in the course of the same year, he broke out into open violence, loading Zwingli and his followers of the Swiss confession with abuse, and calling them enemies of the sacrament, and children of perdition.

Luther's violence was lamented by moderate men of all parties, as it cut off all hopes of union among the churches. Melancthon was particularly grieved at it. He wrote to Bullinger to announce the appearance of Luther's confession, in the following terms: "Perhaps before you get this letter you will have received a most atrocious publication of Luther's, in which he revives the war on the subject of the Lord's Supper. He has never before taken up the cause so violently. Cease, therefore, to hope for the peace of the churches."² Writing to Frecht, pastor of Ulm, on the same subject, he says: "If my tears were as plentiful as the waters of the Danube, they would not suffice to exhaust the grief which I feel at this renewal of the sacramental war." He even said to Pontanus that if Luther persisted in this conduct he would seek to establish himself elsewhere.³

Many persons thought that the ministers of Zurich ought to reply to these invectives, but a few of more sedate judgment, among whom were Bucer and Calvin, held the contrary opinion. The latter, in his letter to Bullinger, before referred to, says: "I hear that Luther has at length published an atrocious invective, not so much against you as against us all. In these circumstances I can scarcely venture to ask for your silence; since it is unjust that the innocent should be thus attacked without having an opportunity to clear themselves: although it is at the same time difficult to decide whether that would be expedient. But I hope you will remember in the first place how great a man Luther is, and in how many excellent endowments he excels; with what fortitude and constancy, with what dexterity and efficacious learning, he hath hitherto applied himself both to overthrow the kingdom of Antichrist, and to propagate the doctrine of salvation. I have often said that though he should call me *devil*, I should always be ready to give him due honor, and

¹ M. Adamus, *Vita Lutheri*, p. 151.

² M. Adamus, *Vita Bullingeri*, p. 485.

³ Ruchat, v. 234.

to acknowledge him as a famous servant of God : although, as he abounds in excellent virtues, so likewise does he labor under great faults. I wish he would endeavor to restrain the violence with which he boils over on all occasions ; and that he would always direct the vehemence which is natural to him against the enemies of truth, and not brandish it also against the servants of the Lord. I should be glad if he took more pains in searching into his own defects. Flatterers have done him much harm, especially as he is by nature too much inclined to self-indulgence ; but it is our duty, while we reprehend what is bad in him, to make due allowance for his excellent qualities. I beg of you and your colleagues, therefore, in the first place to consider that you have to deal with a distinguished servant of Christ, to whom we are all much indebted ; and in the next, that all you will obtain by a conflict will be to afford sport to the ungodly, and a triumph over ourselves as well as over the gospel ; for if we indulge in mutual abuse, they will be but too ready to believe both sides."

This letter discovers much good sense, and a due appreciation of Luther's merits. At the same time we must remember that Calvin had but little personal interest in this affair ; and in such cases nobody was better qualified by the excellence of his judgment to give good advice. But the resentment which he discovered when any point of his own more peculiar doctrine was attacked, or in disputes in which he was personally implicated, shows that he formed no exception to the common remark, that it is much easier to give good advice to others than to follow it one's self. The abuse to which he descended in his controversy with the Lutheran Westphal, and which was admirably calculated "to afford sport to the ungodly," sufficiently confirms this observation. In such cases the natural heat and vindictiveness of his temper got the better of his understanding.

Nevertheless, the Zurich divines thought proper to answer Luther ; and published an Apology, or Defense, both in Latin and German, early in the ensuing year (1545), under the title of "Orthodox Confession of the Ministers of the Church of Zurich, containing their Faith and Doctrine, common to them with the Church Universal of the Saints ; particularly with respect to the Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ. Together with a reasonable and modest Answer to the vain and scandalous Calumnies, Opinions, and Insults, of Dr. Martin Luther," &c. In this piece, though it avoided personal

abuse, Luther was pretty severely handled. Although Calvin had opposed this course, he defended the Zurichers after the step had been taken; but he was not satisfied with their production, as we find from a letter of his to Melancthon, dated on the 28th of June, 1545.¹ In this he says: "If the matter be as those of Zurich say, they had just cause for writing; but they should have written in a different style, or have held their tongues. For besides that the whole book is jejune and puerile, that in many instances they defend their Zwingli rather pertinaciously than learnedly, and sometimes with little modesty, and that they occasionally attack Luther undeservedly; so, also, in their treatment of the principal head they fail, in my judgment, in the very statement of their case. Yet you would not believe how pleased they are with themselves, as if they had acquitted themselves most admirably. Thus Zurich breaks down at the beginning. But as to your Pericles (Luther), how violently is he carried away in his thunderings! although, as his cause is not a whit better, what does he gain by such clamor, except to make all the world believe him mad? For my part, sincerely as I honor him, I am ashamed of his conduct. But the worst is, that not only does no man dare to oppose and chastise his insolence, but even to mutter a word. I confess that we all owe him much; nor should I grudge him the chief authority, if he did but know how to govern himself; although in church affairs we should be constantly on the watch as to how far we defer to men. For all is lost when any single man has more power than all the rest; especially if he be inclined to try how far that power reaches."

Luther did not see this apology of the Zurich ministers; but he was highly incensed at the account which he received of it from Jacques Prevôt, minister of the church of Bremen. In a letter to that clergyman he said: I am very glad to hear that the Swiss have written against me with such fury. It was the object of that tract by which they were all offended, that they should make known by some public record that they were my enemies. I have attained my end, and, as I said, I am glad of it. Were I the most wretched of men, it suffices me to have that sole beatitude of the Psalms, 'Happy the man who hath not walked in the counsel of the Sacra-

¹ This letter, which forms Ep. 63 of the Lausanne ed., has been published in a mutilated form by Beza, apparently to avoid giving offense at Zurich. The additional sentences are supplied from a MS. by Hess, *Leben Bullingers*, i., 455.

mentaries, who hath not trod in the path of the Zwinglians, and hath not stood in the pulpit of the Zurichers.'"¹

The violence displayed by Luther in these controversies does not appear to have abated Calvin's veneration for him. On the 20th of January, 1545, he addressed a letter to Luther—the only one he ever wrote to him²—which expresses that feeling in a high degree. The object of it was to obtain Luther's opinion respecting the conduct which should be observed by those Frenchmen who had adopted the reformed tenets, but were afraid to avow them openly. Two tracts of Calvin's on this subject, published in the previous year, had appeared somewhat harsh; and the French Protestants were now desirous of learning the sentiments of Luther and Melancthon on the same subject, in the hope that they might prove milder and more practicable than Calvin's. Calvin, however, was selected as the medium of communication; and it appears that he was requested to make a journey into Saxony for the purpose of conferring personally with Luther on the subject. This he declined; but he made a Latin translation of the tracts alluded to—for the convenience of Luther, who did not read French—and forwarded them to him, together with the letter in question, by a trusty messenger. This letter he accompanied with another of the same date to Melancthon,³ in which he requested that Reformer, as Luther's mind was still excited by his controversy with the Swiss, to read the letter which he had addressed to him, and to use it as his discretion might suggest. Calvin seems to have suspected that Melancthon might consider him too severe and precise in the line of conduct which he had prescribed to the French Protestants.⁴

It appears from Melancthon's reply⁵ that he did not think it expedient to lay the matter before Luther, whom he represents as growing suspicious, and unwilling to have his opinions on such questions circulated; and mentions in modest terms that he had sent an answer of his own to the questions proposed. This, together with those of Bucer and Martyr on the same subject, was afterward appended to the tracts in question, and published at Geneva in 1549.

¹ "Beatus vir qui non abiit in consilio Sacramentariorum, et in viâ Zwinglianorum non stetit, et in cathedrâ Tigurinorum non stetit."—Ruchat, v. 274.

² It is printed by Dr. Henry, from a MS. at Zurich. Th. ii., Beil. 12.

³ Ep. 60, Lausanne ed.

⁴ "You would perhaps prefer that I should somewhat relax so precise a severity."—*Ibid.*

⁵ See P. Henry, ii., Beil. 12.

The tracts were the "*Traité de fuir les Superstitions*," and the "*Excuse de Jehan Calvin à Messieurs les Nicodémites*." The former of these, as already mentioned, was an exhortation to a class of Frenchmen, then sufficiently numerous, who, though converts to the Reformation, attended mass, and outwardly complied with the Roman Catholic rites. These Calvin advises to leave their country, and betake themselves to some place where they might enjoy their religious opinions in security. If they were prevented from so doing by any unavoidable circumstances, then he recommends them to absent themselves from the public churches; to worship God at home, and to endeavor to make as many converts as possible to the true doctrine. This, he acknowledges, could not be done, without incurring the risk of death; but at the same time represents that the glory of God is concerned, which ought to be much dearer to us than this transitory and unstable life, which is nothing but a shadow.

The lofty precepts of self-devotion here inculcated appeared, as we might expect, too harsh and severe to the great mass of persons to whom they were addressed; who excused their conduct by the example of Nicodemus, the Jewish Rabbi, who came secretly to Christ. Hence Calvin gave them the name of *Nicodemites*; and again addressed them in a style still more severe in the second of the tracts before mentioned.

In the beginning of this he compares them to scavengers, who by long use become so accustomed to bad odors, that they lose all sense of smell; and their excuses he likens to the garlic, onions, and other strong food, with which such men seek to fortify their nostrils. He then describes the different kinds of Nicodemites. First, false preachers of the gospel, who, seeing that the world is tired of the mummeries of Popery, adopt some of the Reformed tenets, their only object being to fill their own pockets. This trait was probably directed against Gérard Le Roux (or Roussel),¹ for whom

¹ "Cet écrivain (Sponde) reconnaît que G. Roussel menait une vie irréprochable, prêchait souvent, nourrissait des bataillons de pauvres, et instruisait des troupes de petits enfants; mais il n'en était que plus dangereux. Il était parfaitement Catholique à l'extérieur, *semper se Catholicum exterius profitebatur*; il reniait hautement Luther et Calvin; ce dernier composa même un livre contre G. Roussel, sous ce titre, *Adversus Nicodemitas*; mais Sponde n'en est pas la dupe, et sa pénétration découvre facilement sous ce jeu concerté l'hypocrisie hérétique.

"G. Roussel avait le tort de prêcher à la cour de Nérac en habit de laïc; on dit aussi qu'il donnait la communion sous les deux espèces."—Génin, *Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême*, vol. i, p. 267, note.

Margaret of Navarre had procured the bishopric of Oleron. "The second kind of Nicodemites are your luxurious prothonotaries who do not dislike to have a gospel, and to joke and tattle about it with young ladies: only let it not prevent them from living as they wish. In the same rank may be placed your delicate courtiers and fine ladies, who have been accustomed to nothing but flattery, and never hear a rough word. I am not surprised that these should conspire against me, and with one accord condemn me of immoderate austerity. I long foresaw this, and fancy I hear them saying to one another: 'Away with this Calvin! he is too unpolite. If we would hear him, he would not only reduce us to beggary, but lead us direct to the stake. Ought we to be compelled to such precision? If he wishes all to be like himself, and envies us our repose, what is that to us? We are well enough here; let him content himself with his own lot, and leave us in peace.'"¹

From these two sketches it appears that a tincture of evangelism was a fashion in the *beau monde*. The third class of Nicodemites is described as consisting of literary men, who look upon religion merely as a thing for the multitude; refrain from taking any active part, as supererogatory; and laugh at those who are serious in the matter. Another class consists of merchants and plebeians, who do not care to be interrupted in their avocations by any such thoughts. In short, there was hardly an order of men that had not its Nicodemites.

In one part Calvin rallies them with some wit, on their pleading the example of Nicodemus. "Perhaps we may allow," says he, "that in one thing they resemble him—they bury Christ. The two interments, however, are very different. Nicodemus buried only his body, after anointing it with precious aromatics; they bury both his body and soul, both his divinity and humanity, and that too without honor. Nicodemus interred him when dead; but they thrust him into the earth after he hath arisen. Let them cease then to make Nicodemus their shield, and to persuade themselves that they may dissemble their faith even to the simulation of idolatry; for Nicodemus displayed a hundred times more fortitude in the death of Christ than all of them together after his resurrection."²

Calvin's zeal in exhorting them, when himself at a safe

¹ Calvin, *Opera*, viii., 445, B., Amst. ed.

² *Ibid.* p. 448, B.

distance, could not fail to strike the objects of his admonitions. "If he makes such strenuous professions," said they, "why does he not come hither, and show us how to behave? He resembles the leaders of armies, who incite the common soldiers to the attack, while they themselves stand out of harm's reach." To this Calvin replies by putting himself on a par with the Apostles, who exhorted their followers to bear with constancy the loss of their fortunes, and even death itself. "Somebody," he exclaims, "may object that the Apostles did not escape persecution; and that they were thereby entitled to require others to suffer what they actually underwent themselves. I answer that the Apostles used frequently to exhort to patience and fortitude those churches which they had themselves deserted for fear of danger."¹ Such an answer savors more of spiritual pride than of the courage of a martyr. It should be stated, however, that Calvin is profuse enough of his assertions that he should be ready to sacrifice even life itself for the glory of God.

As the letter which Calvin wrote in reply to the application which had been made to him to undertake a journey into Saxony, for the purpose of consulting Luther and Melancthon on this subject, affords some glimpses of his situation at this time, especially with regard to pecuniary matters, we shall insert some portion of it here.² In it he says: "I have hesitated for some time whether I should accede to the request contained in your last letter. The journey is a long and difficult one. A mounted courier can not accomplish it under twenty days; and it would be dangerous to send any person indiscriminately. I can not trust carriers or couriers, and few else are to be found. The journey would be an exceedingly difficult one for a person ignorant of the language; and the expenses every where exorbitant, on account of the bad harvest. I am, too, by no means well supplied with money. Even in favorable seasons my income barely suffices to meet the charges I am at; and from the scarcity with which we have had to struggle during the last two years, I have been compelled to get into debt. I do not say this, however, by way of complaint; for, through the mercy of God, I have as much as contents me: but I would have you understand that I can not easily find persons here from whom to borrow. They are all merchants, and moreover, needy ones. The sea-

¹ Calvin, *Opera*, viii., 448, A. Amst. ed.

² It is published in Beza's collection, without date, or name of the party addressed (Ep. 392, Lausanne ed.)

son, too, as I have said, is unfavorable for consulting Luther, since he has hardly had time to cool from the heat of controversy. But as you pressed the matter so strongly, I made it my chief care to comply with your request, and have persuaded a young gentleman of tolerable learning to undertake this trouble for my sake. I have translated my books literally into Latin, and sent them with my letters, that they may form their opinion of them. All I ask of them is to tell me freely and candidly what they think; only I added that I should not be pleased if they suffered any considerations for myself to have any weight. My messenger will hardly return before two months are expired. The journey will take forty days; and I allow four days for baiting, and the rest of the time for consultation."

CHAPTER VI.

Another Pestilence—Conspiracy to spread the Plague—Persecution of the Waldenses—The Libertines, or Patriots—Number and Privileges of the Refugees—Case of Pierre Ameaux—Calvin's Despotism—Priestcraft—Struggles with the Libertines—Ami Perrin—Calvin menaced—Affair of Gruet—Perrin imprisoned—Disturbances—Perrin disgraced—Attempts at Accommodation—Calvin embroiled with the Council—Perrin restored and elected Syndic.

IN 1545 Geneva again experienced a severe visitation of the plague, whither it had been brought by some Swiss soldiers in the service of France, who were passing into Italy.¹ Its horrors were enhanced by a diabolical conspiracy, formed with the purpose of spreading the disorder by artificial means, in order to profit by the spoils of the dead. A suspicion of such conspiracies has frequently accompanied similar visitations. The minds of men, terrified and prostrated by the ravages of a disorder whose source is inscrutable, were disposed to assign them to some visible agent. Already, during the former visitation in 1543, plots of this kind had been suspected; and individuals had been subjected to torture in order to extort a confession, but without effect.² That such a conspiracy really existed on the present occasion can not, however, be doubted; even some of the overseers and other persons connected with the Lazaretto were implicated in it. A man named Lentille, who had been servant to a former master of the hospital, and who, according to Spon, only practiced what he had learned from him, began to spread the plague by means of linen which had touched the bodies of those who had died of the disorder: for which purpose he had gained over the greater part of the women who cleaned and perfumed the furniture of the dead. The conspirators engaged in this plot bound themselves by horrible oaths to poison all whom the disorder spared in its natural course. Among the women who were privy to it, the disease went by the familiar

¹ Spon, ii., 42.

² "J. Goulaz accusé d'avoir semé la peste a enduré sept estrapades et le tourment des Bujegnins sans rien avouer; on le gardera encore en prison, puis l'on avisera."—*Régistres*, 27 Avril, 1543. "L'on soupçonne que de nuit il y a des empoisonneurs qui sement la peste par la ville. Ordonné d'en parler à M. Henri portier de la Tartasse."—*Régistres*, 8 Juin, 1543. P. Henry, ii., 414.

name of "Clauda." Their usual greeting was, "How goes Clauda?" The answer was either, "She is quite asleep," or if some fresh house had been attacked, "She goes finely; she fares well in such and such a place." Without inquiring whether or not it was owing to the means adopted by the conspirators, it is certain that the ravages were frightful. Geneva was decimated: two thousand died out of a population of twenty thousand.

The belief in a conspiracy was not confined to the mere populace, but was partaken by the higher classes, and even by Calvin himself. In a letter to Myconius, March 27th, 1545,¹ Calvin says: "The Lord tries us wonderfully. A little while ago a conspiracy of men and women was discovered, who, for these last three years, have been spreading the pest in the city by I know not what incantations. Fifteen women have been burned already; and some men, after being fearfully tortured, have made away with themselves in prison. Twenty-five still remain prisoners; and yet the conspirators continue every day to smear the locks of the houses with their ointment. Such are the dangers which surround us; but God hath as yet preserved our house unhurt, though it hath been several times attempted." And in another letter to Farel on the 25th of April,² he says: "What should I tell you about the poisonings? You have Weber with you, who can tell you the whole story more plainly than I can in a letter. The simplicity shown by Renat from the beginning has puzzled us a good deal. It is strange that he who was so steadfast under torture should have been overcome by a mere promise, on hearing that I had procured his pardon from the council. His wife confessed that she had killed eighteen men by her infernal arts, and he four or five." Altogether, seven men and twenty-one women were burned alive for this offense. The husbands of three women were banished. Jean Lentille died of the consequences of his torture; and the physician of the Lazaretto and two assistants were quartered.

Nevertheless this singular crime continued to flourish at Geneva; which obtained such a reputation for it, that, in 1565, the year after Calvin's death, a simple countryman came thither to purchase the far-famed ointment from the *seigneurs*, or council, themselves! He wanted, he said, to be revenged on the people of the Duke of Nemours, who had stolen his daughter; and she had told him that she was sure

¹ P. Henry, ii., 416, from a Geneva MS.

² P. Henry, l. c., from a Geneva MS.

the council would let him have the poison if he asked for it secretly. The poor old man being brought before the syndics added much more that plainly showed he was crazy. Nevertheless, Colladon, who had been Calvin's assistant in his legal reforms, declared for the torture *forte et ferme*. The unlucky purchaser was indicted under three heads: poisoning, calumniating the Genevese council, and being in league with the devil; and was burned on the Molard in pursuance of his sentence.¹

Calvin's apprehensions that a persecution was hanging over the Waldenses were now on the point of being verified. Excited by the progress of Luther's Reformation, the Waldenses had taken heart, and begun to show themselves more openly; and had even engaged some German doctors to be their ministers. In 1530 they had sent two of their pastors to Œcolampadius at Basle, to Bucer and Capito at Strasburgh, and to Berthold Haller at Berne, to submit their doctrines to them for approval or correction.² It is curious to find these simple men, who held their faith by tradition, thus consulting those who had adopted nearly the same tenets by dint of study and learning. What most perplexed them was Luther's doctrine of predestination; for they themselves held, like Erasmus, for free will. Œcolampadius very sensibly advised them to leave this controversy alone. He also gave them a letter of recommendation to Bucer; from which, however, it would appear that he considered them rather tedious; for he advises him, if he did not wish to lose his time in a great many conversations, to cut the matter short by approving what he (Œcolampadius) had already written.³ Their movements at length attracted the attention of the authorities, and they were cited to appear before the parliament of Aix; but not answering on the third citation, Bartholomew Cassané, the president of the parliament had, in November, 1540, passed the following atrocious sentence upon them: That the heads of families should be burned, and their wives, children, and property confiscated; that Merindol, their chief town, should be razed; their gardens, woods, and plantations be destroyed, and the caves in which they took refuge be blocked up. It was thought advisable, however, to suspend the execution of this sentence till the king's wishes should be ascertained; though

¹ P. Henry, ii., 418.

² Their address to Œcolampadius, explaining their creed, discipline, and rites, will be found in Gerdesius, ii., 402, and in an abridged form in Ruchat, ii., 320.

³ Gerdesius, ii., 418.

many were for carrying it out immediately. The king commissioned Guillaume Bellay de Langé, governor of Piedmont, to inquire into the matter, who reported as follows : That the Waldenses were said to have received from their lords, about three centuries before, their then sterile and uncultivated territory, which, by assiduous labor and cultivation, they had rendered fruitful and fit for cattle ; that they did much work on a slender diet ; were charitable, and abhorred contention ; that they paid their rent and taxes punctually ; that they testified their religion by constant prayer and by the innocence of their lives, yet seldom entered a church except when business called them to the neighboring cities ; that on such occasions they did not kneel before the statues of the saints, nor make them any offerings ; that they did not employ the priests to say mass for the souls of their relatives, nor cross themselves, nor sprinkle holy water when it thundered, but turning their eyes to heaven, implored the help of God ; that they did not uncover before the crucifixes in the streets ; that in their religious service, which was performed in the vernacular tongue, they did not use the accustomed rites ; that they paid no honor to the Pope or bishops, but chose some of their own body for their doctors and preachers.

In February, 1541, Francis sent a diploma to the parliament of Aix, granting a pardon to the Waldenses for the past, but requiring them to recant within three months, under pain of the customary punishment. Hereupon they demanded a disputation ; and Cassané obtained from them a confession of their faith, to be laid before the king. They also presented a copy of this confession to Sadolet, Bishop of Carpentras ; who received those who brought it with his usual benevolence, but pointed out some passages in their creed which he thought might be amended.¹

So long as Cassané lived the sentence pronounced on the Waldenses by the parliament of Aix was not carried into execution, though they still adhered rigidly to their confession. After his death the bloody scenes which Calvin had anticipated were hastened on by the machinations of private revenge. Among their other good qualities the Waldenses were remarkable for their industry ; and the Countess of Cental, a rich and handsome widow of Provence, had found her revenues much increased by getting a considerable number of them to settle upon her estate. Jean Meynier, Baron d'Oppède, who, after the death of Cassané, united the office of chief

¹ Gardesius, iv., 130, where their confession will be found, Mon. 15.

president of the parliament of Aix with that of military governor of Provence, had been a suitor for the hand of the countess; and the mortification of a repulse had goaded him on to form one of the most diabolical schemes of revenge that ever entered a human brain. He determined on depriving the countess of her laborers, by a general massacre of these harmless religionists; and with a view to effect this object, he represented to the French court that the Waldenses had a plot to seize upon Lyons, and to form themselves into republican cantons after the model of the Swiss: though nothing could be further from the intentions of that people, who, of all religious sects, were the least disposed to political innovations. D'Oppède was seconded in his designs by Cardinal Tournon, a bigoted and blood-thirsty prelate, whom we shall again meet with in the course of this narrative; and whose natural cruelty was moreover stimulated by pressing remonstrances from Rome against the impunity enjoyed by these heretics. D'Oppède also got his representations backed by several other fanatical magistrates. Francis, however, still remained undecided; and D'Oppède availed himself of this hesitation to use the means which his military command placed at his disposal. A levy of men raised in Provence against the enemies of France was employed against the helpless Waldenses. On the 28th of April, 1545, a horrible butchery took place. The towns of Merindol and Cabrières, together with twenty-eight villages, were destroyed; the orchards and houses were burned, the women outraged, the men massacred. In one church alone 800 persons are said to have been slaughtered; and the total number of the slain was estimated at 4000. Madame de Cental demanded justice for the losses she had suffered. It is said that when Francis heard of these proceedings he was highly offended, and seemed at first inclined to punish D'Oppède; that when that nobleman went to court the king refused to see him; and that he escaped only through the intercession of Cardinal Tournon, who represented to the king that any proceedings against him or the parliament of Aix, would have the effect of giving fresh vigor to heresy. Some authorities, however, state that Francis approved of what had been done;¹ and it is certain, at all events, that this horrible massacre went unpunished. It is said, indeed, that Francis, on his death-bed, recommended to his successor to avenge this innocent blood; and on the accession of Henry II., a suit was actually instituted against D'Oppède and his accomplices. It

¹ See Maimbourg, p. 90, who quotes Thuanus.

was, however, feebly prosecuted; and after five hearings, all the accused were acquitted, with the exception of Guérin, the *avocat-général*, and one of the principal actors in this horrible affair: though he was executed, not as an assassin, but as a forger.¹

Great numbers of the Waldenses sought safety in flight. Sadolet, much to his honor, received with kindness such as fled to Carpentras, and interceded for them with the king. Four thousand directed their steps toward Geneva, which offered the best place of refuge. Calvin exerted himself to find them lodging and employment, set on foot a subscription which yielded seventy florins, and got the council to employ them in repairing the fortifications. He saw that this blow would prove a great hinderance and discouragement to the Protestant cause in France, and therefore used every endeavor to get the Swiss cantons to intercede with Francis in favor of the remnants of the Waldenses. With this view he traveled to Zurich and Berne to consult the ministers of those cities; and hearing that the cantons were to have a conference at Arau on the 21st of May, he went thither, and addressed a pressing speech to the meeting. The cantons actually wrote to the King of France in the strongest terms, but without effect. He answered dryly that he did not trouble himself concerning their government, and that they need not, therefore, inquire about his. It is said that Calvin had formed the design of going to Paris to solicit the king in person: but unluckily he fell ill just at the time when he should have set off; and Farel suddenly found himself too old to undertake such a journey. Both he and Calvin were French subjects, and a journey to Paris might have been attended with unpleasant consequences to them. This objection did not apply to Viret, a native of Switzerland; who accordingly visited the French court with letters of recommendation, not only from the Reformed cantons, but also from the states belonging to the Smalcaldic league.² His mission does not seem, however, to have produced any fruits.

During the first four or five years which followed Calvin's return to Geneva, he experienced little opposition in consolidating his power, and establishing his favorite scheme of ecclesiastical government; but about this time a party began to be formed, which, for the next eight or nine years, occasioned him considerable trouble. This party assumed the name of *Patriots*; but

¹ Lacratelle, *Guerres de Religion*, i., 28, et. seq.

² Ruchat, v., 253. P. Henry, ii., 331.

as a nick-name often serves to throw discredit on a cause, their adversaries gave them the appellation of *Libertines*, with a view to identify them with the fanatical sect of that denomination, whose tenets have already been described. Of the latter, some were doubtless to be found among the Patriots. As opposed to Calvin and his doctrines, they would naturally attach themselves to a party which sought his overthrow; whose ranks were also swelled by the dissolute and discontented with whom all cities abound, and who follow the leaders of popular movements in the hope of reaping advantage from the tumult and anarchy which usually accompany such struggles. The basis of the party, no doubt, consisted of those who had formerly been the means of procuring Calvin's banishment; but at the head of it were now many members of the old Genevese families: men not naturally indisposed toward him or the Reformation, but who beheld with regret and alarm their amusements interfered with, their power and privileges curtailed, the constitution of their country subverted, and the principal share in its government transferred to the hands of refugees and aliens. Their chief leader was Ami Perrin, upon whose moral character no serious imputation rests, though some members of his family were unfortunate enough to incur the censures of the consistory. Perrin himself had, as we have seen, not only been a zealous promoter of the Reformation at Geneva, but had taken an active part in procuring Calvin's recall.

In their religious views, Perrin, and others of his stamp, had probably been much influenced by a love of civil liberty: for the Reformation had helped to free Geneva from the threatened yoke of Savoy, and from the traitorous designs of its own bishops. In recalling Calvin these men had been partly led by the desire of finding a counterpoise to the pretensions of Berne, whose influence at Geneva seemed to be growing to too great a height: but now they felt a more oppressive power springing up in the heart of the state itself, out of those very institutions which they had adopted for the sake of freedom. The great increase, too, continually taking place in the number of refugees, was calculated to excite alarm and suspicion. A few details will show the extent to which immigration was carried on after Calvin's return. At the beginning of the century Geneva numbered 12,000 souls;¹ and up to the year 1543, that is, in nearly half a century, the population had increased only to 13,000. But in 1550, Geneva contained 20,000 inhabitants; thus showing an in-

¹ Picot, quoted by P. Henry, i., 144.

crease of more than one-half in seven years, or at the rate of about 1000 each year, the sum of the whole increase in the preceding forty-three years. At the last-named period, therefore, the refugees must have formed about one-third of the whole population: a very large proportion, especially when we consider that most of them were males; that many of them were persons of some education and fortune, whose knowledge led, and whose means enabled them to indulge their consciences by quitting their native country; and whose influence, therefore, must not be estimated solely from their numbers. The greater part of them were Frenchmen, though some few there were from Italy, the Netherlands, and Spain. They were, too, especial favorites with Calvin and the consistory. He not only procured as many as he could to be admitted to the rights of citizenship, in order that they might be useful to him in the more popular assemblies, but even contrived to get some of them elected into the ordinary council. The sacrifices they had made in leaving their country were magnified into a sort of confessorship; and it appears from the Registers, that an insult to a refugee was put on the same footing with one offered to a minister, and construed into a blasphemy toward God.¹

The favor and privileges which these refugees obtained were naturally regarded with a jealous eye by the native Genevese, who opposed their admission to the right of citizenship, and their being allowed to carry arms. The power, too, assumed by the consistory, and especially the right of excommunication, exercised, as it frequently was, in cases which might at least be regarded as venial, began to excite great discontent. It was becoming a kind of little Popedom, the more intolerable as its pretensions were more minute and exacting, and more easily enforced. In his struggles with his opponents during this period, Calvin compares himself with David contending with the Philistines.² With such sentiments it was not likely that he should be content with

¹ One Louis B., in going out of church, had said to a refugee: "A` tous les diables soyent tant de prédicans, et malgré Dieu tant de Français, et qu'ils ne se trouvent en leur pais. Après qu'ils ont mangé leur Dieu, ils nous viennent ici contrôler." He also struck him in the face, and drew blood. But on his trial no mention is made of the blows, but only of the words, which are said to be *contre l'honneur de Dieu* (P. Henry, ii., 422, note).

² "For as not only the Philistines and other external enemies molested that righteous king with continual wars, but the malice and wickedness of perfidious enemies at home still more deeply wounded him; so I, attacked on all sides, have scarcely had a moment free from contention either at home or abroad."—*Preface to the Psalms*.

small submissions. He sought to make the power of the consistory absolute in spiritual matters; while the patriots demanded that moral and religious delinquents should not be cited before that body, but before the council.

A remarkable instance of the manner in which Calvin maintained his personal authority occurred in the year 1546, in the case of Pierre Ameaux, a member of the council of Two Hundred. The wife of Ameaux belonged to the spiritual Libertines; and such was the liberality of her principles that, interpreting the doctrine of the communion of saints to mean that we should have all things in common, she not only included houses and lands in the precept, but even her own person.¹ Her husband, however, was so far from partaking in these sentiments, that he sought and obtained a divorce from his wife, who was condemned to perpetual imprisonment. But, though averse to the principles of the Libertines, Ameaux was no friend of Calvin's. After a supper given at his own house, at which a good many persons were present, including Henri de la Mar and Aimé Maigret, two of the ministers of Geneva, Ameaux, who had drunk rather freely, was imprudent enough to declare that Calvin preached a false doctrine, was a very bad man, and nothing but a Picard. It appears that he had been led to utter these words in consequence of a violent quarrel which had occurred, a little previously, between Calvin and Ami Perrin, which it had required the interference of the council to appease. Some of the company, after enjoying Ameaux's good cheer, carried his words to the council, who caused him to be imprisoned and tried for them.² While yet in prison, and before his sentence had been pronounced, Henri de la Mar, in a conversation with one Benedict Tixier, related what had passed at the supper, the substance of which was given by Tixier in a deposition before the council on the 12th of March. Tixier had asked whether Ameaux had said any thing directly against God or man; to which De la Mar replied: "I think he said something against Calvin; nevertheless, if there be any thing wrong, and if he has committed himself, it was after drinking." Of Calvin himself De la Mar said: "I have always known him to be a good and virtuous man, and of great in-

¹ P. Henry, ii., 412.

² "On met Pierre Ameaulx en prison pour avoir dit que M. Calvin prêchoit une fausse doctrine, étoit un très méchant homme, et n'étoit qu'un Picard."—*Régistres*, 27 Jan., 1546. The last word is ambiguous, and may relate either to Calvin's birth-place, or to a term of reproach then in use. See Bayle, *Picard*.

telleet. But he is somewhat governed by his passions ; impatient, full of hatred, and vindictive : and if he once takes a spite against a man he never forgives." This conversation cost De la Mar his place ; who, together with Maigret, was deposed from the ministry, as having sided with Calvin's enemies. Before the council pronounced their sentence on Ameaux, they summoned before them all the ministers, with the exception of the two just named, and also the elders, and examined them as to Calvin's character, and the truth of Ameaux's charges ; all of whom bore testimony to Calvin's piety and charity, and the perfect congruity of his doctrine with the word of God ; in which doctrine they professed that they wished to live and die, and to have no schism among them. Ameaux made an apology, in which he retracted his words, declaring that he had not all his senses about him at the time, and that henceforward he would treat Calvin with proper respect. The council, nevertheless, condemned him in a fine of sixty dollars ; a tolerably large sum in those days, and quite adequate, one would think, to the offense, seeing that it had been committed in his own house, at an unguarded moment—that Ameaux had amply retracted it, and that he had suffered two months' imprisonment on account of it. But Calvin, whose charity had just been vouched by the recorded testimony of his colleagues, was not satisfied. He appeared before the council, accompanied by the other ministers and elders, complained of the mildness of the judges, and demanded that the sentence should be quashed. Hereupon the trial was renewed. By a second sentence Ameaux was condemned to the degrading punishment called the *amende honorable* ; namely, to parade the town in his shirt, with bare head, and a lighted torch in his hand, and to finish by making on his knees a public acknowledgment of his contrition.¹ A striking instance of Calvin's power ! when we find him making the chief judicial and legislative body of the state thus stultify its decision at his pleasure. Besides being deposed from the ministry, Henri de la Mar was also imprisoned for some days for the part he had taken in this affair.

The severity of Ameaux's sentence caused considerable excitement at Geneva, especially in the quarter of St. Gervais, where symptoms of riot and insubordination appeared. On the 30th of March the whole council proceeded to that quarter, attended by the police under arms, and caused a gibbet

¹ P. Henry, ii., 426.

to be erected, by way of terror to the populace. The sale of wine was also forbidden. These steps had the desired effect; and on the 5th of April Ameaux's sentence was quietly carried into execution.

Calvin had thus gained a sort of victory, which served to strengthen his hands; and the proceedings of the consistory for the maintenance of discipline went on more vigorously than ever. Numbers of persons were cited before that body and their morals inquired into. The representation of a play, or morality, called the "History of the Apostles," was forbidden, at the instance of the ministers, after it had been acted several times with great applause, and had even been attended by the council. The minister, Michael Cop, who had made himself conspicuous on this occasion, was cited before the council, for having said, in a sermon at St. Peter's, that the women who should appear in this play were shameless and without honor, and that their only design was to excite impure desires by appearing dressed up in it.¹ Calvin has described this affair in a letter to Farel,² from which it appears that, though he took Cop's part, even he was of opinion that that minister had carried his zeal too far. The affair was near leading to a serious riot, but was settled by the interference of Calvin, and Abel, one of his colleagues. The reforms now sought to be introduced were petty and vexatious. Among other things, people were forbidden to give their children the names of Roman Catholic saints, and instances occur of imprisonment for refusing to comply with this regulation. On the 27th of April, 1546, we find one Chapuis imprisoned for four days for persisting to name his son Claude instead of Abraham, as the minister wished; and for saying that he would sooner keep his son fifteen years unbaptized. At the end of the same entry in the Registers we find it stated that Calvin had called the people of St. Gervais "beasts," and threatened to hang some of them.³ Such was the pitch of despotism at which he had arrived. He seems to have thoroughly despised the council of this year, which indeed he might well do after their conduct in the case of Ameaux. In the letter to Farel, before referred to, he de-

¹ *Régistres*, 28 Juin, 1546. Grénus, *Fragm. Biogr.*

² Ep. 68.

³ "Chapuis mis en prison, 27 Avril, pour avoir persisté à nommer son fils Claude, quoique le ministre n'ait pas voulu, mais Abraham — il avait dit qu'il garderoit son fils plutôt quinze ans sans baptême. On le garda quatre jours en prison. C'étoit le jour de la réconfirmation de la bourgeoisie que Calvin dit que les gens de St. Gervais étoient des bêtes et qu'il en pendroit."—*Régistres*, 1546. P. Henry, ii., 429.

cribes them as entirely at his devotion, but at the same time censures the timidity which constantly characterized them.¹ It was in the autumn of this year that he endeavored to subjugate their minds by a method which, in one so remarkably free from superstition as Calvin, has all the appearance of priestcraft. The affair alluded to—the pretended carrying off of a man by the devil—is noted in the Registers under the date of the 15th of October, 1546, and is described by Calvin himself in a letter to Viret dated on the 14th of November.² A laborer, who lived at a little distance from Geneva, after losing his wife and four children by the plague, had himself been seized with the same disorder. Calvin describes him as a man of an evil and profligate life; a drunkard and frequenter of taverns, a brawler and blasphemer, and an open contemner of God. When his neighbors called him to account for going so seldom to the church, I have heard, says Calvin, that he was accustomed to say: "What! have I hired myself to Calvin to go and hear him preach?" When the disorder had reduced him to such weakness that he could scarce lift up his hand, he was suddenly seized with a frenzy in the night, and endeavored to leap out of bed, but was restrained by his mother and the servant. Meanwhile, his discourse ran wholly on the devil, and on his being a desperate sinner and reprobate, and the destined prey of Satan; and when exhorted to pray to God, he said it was of no use, that he was given over to the devil, and that God was no more to him than the vilest part of an old shoe. About seven in the morning, as his mother was sitting at the door of her cottage, he suddenly flew over her head, as if he had been carried away; and in spite of the efforts both of herself and the servant to hold him, was borne to a distance with wonderful swiftness and force. In his course lay a broad road, with a hedge and ditch on both sides, neither of which he could have jumped over without breaking his limbs; yet, over these obstacles the women asserted that they beheld him carried like a whirlwind, into a vineyard on the other side of the road. They pointed out the very spot where he had vanished from their sight, and where his cap had been found on the banks of the Rhone; but some boatmen were employed in vain to search the river for his body.

Such was the story, which admits of no difficult solution.

¹ See Ep. 68.

² Printed by Dr. Henry, i., Beil. 12. "Enlèvement prétendu d'un laboureur par le diable."—*Régistres*, 15 Oct. Grénu, *Fragm. Biogr.*

The man, in his frenzy, had rushed out of doors, and flung himself into the Rhone: the supernatural incidents alleged to have accompanied the act were merely the exaggerations suggested by the terrified imaginations of the old women. Such, in fact, was the interpretation put upon the story by the sober part of the population of Geneva, who were only inclined to laugh at it: at which levity, however, Calvin was highly offended. His own name had been mixed up in the affair; and, among other sins, the victim of Satan had neglected to attend his sermons, and had even indulged himself in a sneer at them: a point on which Calvin was particularly sensitive. After a discussion among the ministers, it was resolved that the matter deserved inquiry, and Calvin was deputed to bring it under the notice of the council. He accordingly addressed that body in a long speech, in which he insisted on the necessity of discovering the truth, in order that, if the story was a fable, it might be refuted by public authority; but that if it was true, so signal a judgment of God might not be buried in oblivion. He remarked that he saw many who tried to dismiss the affair with a joke; but he admonished them that there never was so plain a miracle which Satan did not endeavor to obscure. In consequence of these representations, the four syndics, the greater part of the council, the lieutenant of police and his court, together with Calvin himself, repaired to the spot, and examined the women. "Though the matter was so plain," says Calvin, "yet some of our chief men were guilty of the most impudent tergiversation. Hereupon I exclaimed with a loud voice, 'If you believe there are any devils, you here clearly behold the devil's power. They who have not faith in God deserve to be blind in open day.'"¹ On the next Sunday Calvin, by the advice of his brethren, inveighed severely in his sermon against those who treated, or pretended to treat, a well-authenticated fact as a fable. He even went so far as to testify that he had demanded death with the most ardent vows more than twenty times during those two days, when he beheld them surveying the judgment of God with such brazen fronts! "For," he adds, "the impiety of our people was never so openly detected. A few only verbally assented, but I know not if a single one believed in his heart. I added two other instances which had recently occurred, though not equally remarkable. A man who had gone into a wine-cellar on a Sunday, during the sermon, to indulge in his potations, happened to fall on

¹ Calvin to Viret (P. Henry, i., Beil., p. 67).

his sword, which had slipped out of its scabbard, and was carried out dying. Another who, in the preceding September, on communion-day, had endeavored to climb up to the window of his mistress, had a terrible fall, and broke several of his bones. At length I concluded: till hell absorbs you, with your whole families, you will not believe when God stretches forth his hand!" Such was the use which Calvin sometimes made of the casualties of the day, to enforce his spiritual authority.

We have already adverted to a quarrel which had taken place between Calvin and Ami Perrin, who at this time enjoyed the post of captain-general, or commander of the Genevese troops; and some occurrences which followed in the course of this year served to embroil them more and more. Perrin had married the daughter of Fabri, who belonged to one of the leading families of Geneva, and one of the most ardent in the Patriotic cause. The consequences of a wedding which occurred in this family led to some severe exercises of the consistorial power. It must be confessed, however, that the occasion on which they were exerted shows that the morals and manners of many even of the higher classes of the Genevese were in a very corrupt and deplorable state, and required great amendment; though it may be doubted whether the violent means adopted by Calvin were the best suited to that purpose. The great want seems to have been that of education, without which it is in vain to expect decency of manners. We shall leave Calvin to describe these occurrences in his own words, in a letter to Viret, dated on the 11th of August, 1546;¹ only it is necessary, to the understanding of some parts of it, to premise that Calvin, at this time, was accustomed to designate the leading personages among his opponents by some nick-name. Thus, the *Penthesilea* mentioned in it was the wife of Perrin; *Proserpine* seems to have been either his mother or mother-in-law. Perrin himself he sometimes calls the *tragic*, and sometimes the *comic Cæsar*; apparently with a view to ridicule his political pretensions.

"A bastard, named D'Orbe, of the house of Fabri, lately," says Calvin, "married another bastard of a certain Nantois, and about thirty persons went out to meet the bride. This was an absurd piece of pomp; for the husband, as you know, is a man of no mark or station; and yet a very unreasonable clatter was raised in the town on his behalf. They left home

¹ Ep. 69.

when the first sermon was delivering, and returned during the second. What was the consequence? The Lord hath humbled all that pomp.¹ Brother Abel performed the marriage ceremony. At the time when he was to pledge the conjugal faith, the rascally husband was thinking of other things; and when told at least to bow assent, he shook his head. There was a murmur of indignation among the people. Nevertheless Abel proceeded, though he ought to have broken off the ceremony; but he asserts that he did not remark the act. But what Abel treated so lightly has been severely punished by the council; and that supercilious gentleman, after eight days of close confinement, has to-day acknowledged his guilt in the face of the church. His wife's uncle is still in prison. The jailor has strict orders to give him nothing but bread and water; nor will he be released without some mark of public ignominy. For when he was reproved by brother Raymond for openly denying God, he repeated his execrable blasphemy, and told him he was sorry he had not pulled his beard, knocked him down, and kicked him. Proserpine also, the day before they received the spouse with such honors, beat the mother-in-law in such a manner that she bled profusely; her whole countenance was disfigured with wounds, and her head covered with dirt. You know the old woman's temper; she was heard through the whole street, calling on God and man to assist her. We cited her before the consistory, but she had escaped to her sister's: however, we shall cite her again on the first opportunity. What could I do? Was I to incur the condemnation of the whole church by seeking, through my silence, to conciliate a single individual? I will take care, however, to give him no just cause of offense. Penthesilea will certainly have to be reprimanded shortly. She patronizes the worst causes, and conducts their defense with fury; in short, her every word and deed betray her utter want of modesty."

The individual whom Calvin appears, from the latter part of this letter, to have been desirous of conciliating, must have been Perrin. But another infringement of the discipline brought not only Perrin and his wife, but the whole family of Fabri, before the consistory. Their crime, on this occasion, was dancing at a wedding celebrated at the house of the widow Balthazar at Bellerive. Among the company was Corné, one of the syndics, as well as Perrin. We will again

¹ The *force* of the original is untranslatable. "Dominus stercore aspersit totam illam pompam."

make Calvin the narrator, of these circumstances, which we find detailed in a letter to Farel.¹

“Since you left us, we have had more trouble about dancing than I thought we should have. All who were present at this fête, with the exception of Corné and Perrin, being cited to appear before the consistory, lied most impudently in the face of God and ourselves. I naturally grew angry at this baseness, and inveighed vehemently against their contempt of God, in turning into ridicule the sacred adjurations I had employed. Being well acquainted with the whole affair, I called God to witness that such gross perjury should not go unpunished; and at the same time declared that if it cost me my life, the truth should be discovered, and that therefore they need not think to gain any thing by their falsehoods. Even Frances Perrin abused me roundly for being so inimical to the Fabris. I answered her as she deserved, and asked if the family enjoyed the privilege of inviolability and exemption from the laws? I pointed out that the father had been already convicted of one adultery; that the proof of another was at hand; and that there was a strong rumor of a third. I stated that her brother had openly contemned and derided both the council and myself. Finally, I added, that if they were not content to submit to us here under the yoke of Christ, they must build another city for themselves: for that so long as they remained at Geneva, they would strive in vain to elude the laws; and that if each furious head in the house of Fabri wore a diadem, it should not prevent the Lord from being superior. Meanwhile her husband (Ami Perrin) had betaken himself to Lyons, in hopes that the matter would be passed over in silence. On my proposing that they should be sworn to confess the truth, Corné admonished them that he would not suffer them to forswear themselves. They then made the desired confession, and moreover, that they had danced that day at the widow Balthazar’s; whereupon they were all thrown into prison. The syndic (Corné) showed a remarkable example of moderation; and spontaneously denounced himself, and the whole of the company, too strongly to render it necessary to have many words with him. Yet he was severely reprimanded by the consistory, and degraded from his office till he should show some satisfactory proofs of repentance. They now say that Perrin is returned from Lyons.”

Perrin had indeed returned, and seems to have been de-

¹ Ep. 71.

sirous of entering into some arrangement or compromise with Calvin respecting this affair ; as appears from a letter addressed to him by Calvin, which, though rather out of its order in his published correspondence, seems referable to this period.¹ In this Calvin says :—

“ MONSIEUR LE CAPITAINE,

“ I would willingly have met you, but that I thought it not expedient ; the reason I will explain to you at the proper time and place. I wish you had appeared before the consistory, in order to set an example to others. As the citation may seem imperfect because you had not been previously admonished, I wish at heart you had been present at the last sermon to-day, that the syndic Corné and myself might have treated with you. I do not see what hindered it ; but I wish you to consider that we can not use different weights and an uneven balance ; and that if equality is to be observed in law, inequality can not be tolerated in the Church of God. You know what sort of man I am, or at least ought to know ; one to whom the word of my Heavenly Master is so dear, that regard for no human being shall prevent me from conscientiously asserting it. I do not myself know that you have other views ; but I perceive that every one is rather blind in his own cause. For my part, I not only desire that the edification of the church and your own salvation should be consulted in this business, but even your convenience, your reputation, and your ease. For you would incur a great deal of odium if you were released from that common law by which all are bound ; and from the love I bear you, it would be better for you to anticipate the danger, than that such a brand should be inflicted on you. I have heard, indeed, the rumor proceeding from your house, that I should take care how I blew the dormant fire, lest the matter should end with me as it did seven years ago. But such words make no impression on me : I did not return to Geneva with the view of obtaining leisure or profit, nor will it be to my sorrow should I have again to leave it. It was the welfare and safety of the Church and of the city that induced me to return ; and if I alone were now in question, I would say once for all to those whom I importune by my presence, ‘ What you do, do quickly.’ But the unworthiness and ingratitude of certain persons, shall not make me wanting to my duty ; nor will I

¹ Ep. 88 (no date).

lay aside till my last breath that love toward this place which I have from God," &c.

In spite of his office, however, Perrin was thrown into prison, though it does not appear how long he remained there. During the following year the quarrel grew still warmer. Perrin and his relations, who formed part of the council, declaimed loudly against the consistory; comparing its functions with the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Church of Rome, and maintaining that the depriving of the magistrates of a portion of their power, and giving it to the consistory, was nothing more nor less than a relapse into Popery. These representations had such an effect upon the council, that in the month of March, 1547, a majority voted that their body should exercise a control over church discipline; but Calvin, supported by the other ministers, made so vigorous a remonstrance that it was determined eventually to abide by the established regulations.¹ Calvin's inflexibility irritated the Libertines more and more, and some further collisions with Perrin's family added fuel to the flame. His father-in-law, cited before the consistory to answer for an adultery, refused to appear; and his wife, called before the same body for having danced, maintained that it had no right to take cognizance of such things, and complained of the bitter affront offered to her in dragging her before a tribunal whose jurisdiction should extend only to rogues and criminals. On Abel Poupin remonstrating with her, she overwhelmed him with abuse, and became so violent that it was necessary to put her out of the room. The council ordered her to be thrown into still closer confinement; whence, however, she managed to escape through the assistance of another lady, whom Calvin describes as the patroness of all bad causes. Accompanied by one of her sons, she fled from Geneva; and meeting Abel Poupin by chance near one of the gates, renewed her attack upon him more violently than before.²

This happened on the 26th of June; and on the following day a libel, couched in the most violent language, was found attached to Calvin's pulpit in St. Peter's church. It was written in the *patois* then current, and its tenor was as follows: "You and your companions will gain little by your pains. If you do not leave the city nobody shall prevent your overthrow, and you will curse the hour that you left your monkery. Warning has been already given that the devil

¹ Ruchat, v. 317.

² Calvin, Ep. 77.

and his renegade priests were come hither to ruin every thing. But after people have suffered long they avenge themselves. Take care that you are not served like M. Wernly, of Friburgh. We will not have so many masters. Mark my words well."¹

The council were alarmed at this audacious threat, and ordered steps to be taken for the discovery of its author. Suspicion fell on one Jaques Gruet, who was known to be one of the leading members of the Libertine faction, and who had been heard to utter some threats against Calvin only a few days previously. He was immediately arrested; and though the libel did not appear to be in his handwriting, yet on searching his house other papers were found which tended to implicate him. Among them was a memorial, or petition, for the abolition of the ecclesiastical discipline, intended to be presented to the general assembly; in which it was maintained that nothing should be vindicated by the laws but what was hurtful to civil government: a proposition which was supported by an appeal to the practice of the Venetians, a people very skillful in political science. It also stated, that while Geneva suffered itself to be ruled by the brain of one melancholy man, there was danger lest a sedition should arise, in which a thousand citizens might fall. Several letters were also found addressed to André Philippe, Pierre de Bourg, and other persons, which were filled with abuse of Calvin, and in which he was described as haughty, ambitious, and obstinate; as a great hypocrite, who wished to make himself adored, and to rob the Pope of his dignity; and as of such audacity that he had said he would make kings and emperors tremble. He was also represented as a man who pretended to divine inspiration; and he was advised to renounce Christianity, and to make himself the head of a new religion. Lastly, there were found two pages written in Latin, in which the Scriptures were ridiculed, and Christ blasphemed; the immortality of the soul was called a dream and a fable; and, in short, the very foundations of religion were attacked and undermined.² This last paper Calvin did not take to be the composition of Gruet, but being in his handwriting it formed one of the articles of indictment against him. A copy of Calvin's work against the Libertines was also found in his possession, against a passage of which he had written in the margin, "*toutes folies.*"³

¹ The original document, from Galiffe, will be found in P. Henry, ii., 441. Compare Spon, ii., 47. Ruchat, v., 318.

² Calvin, Ep. 77. Spon ii., 45, note s.

³ P. Henry, ii., 442.

The suspicion which fell so readily on Gruet had not been, as we have observed, without some antecedents to direct it. The Patriots had now taken a leaning toward the Bernese, who were opposed to the council of Geneva and to Calvin; and Gruet and others had adopted a style of dress then prevalent at Berne, as a symbol of their political principles. This emblem of sedition, against which the consistory repeatedly hurled its thunders, was nothing more nor less than a pair of breeches open at the knee (*caligæ dissectæ*); and from a letter of Calvin's to Viret, written about a month before the affair of Gruet,¹ we find that the subject had been deemed important enough to be brought before the council of Two Hundred. On this occasion Calvin made a speech, in which he declared that he did not care for the trifles in question, except as they were the badge of corruption and sedition; and represents himself as addressing the assembly with such effect as at once deprived his opponents of all their hopes. Besides these attacks in the senate, the ministers also denounced the leaders of the popular party from the pulpit, and even abused them by name. Thus Abel Poupin called Fabri "dog;" and Calvin, in one of his sermons, saluted Gruet with the same title, adding other hard words, such as *goinfre* and *balaufré*.²

After his apprehension, Gruet was tortured morning and evening for a month; but he would not name any accomplices, though he must undoubtedly have had several. He confessed that he had affixed the libel, and that the papers found were his; and with many tears besought the council to put him to death immediately. He was beheaded on the 26th of July. His sentence ran that he had spoken of religion with contempt, and asserted that laws, both divine and human, were but the work of man's caprice; that he had written obscene and ungodly letters and verses, and maintained that fornication was not criminal when both parties were consenting, thus seeking to overthrow the ecclesiastical discipline, and to derogate from the authority of the consistory; that he had threatened the Reformers and clergy, and had especially spoken ill of Calvin; that he had written letters to excite the French court against the latter, and induce the King of France to complain of him; and lastly, that he had threatened the council itself.³

Two or three years after Gruet's execution, a treatise filled with the most horrible blasphemies was found in a garret of

¹ Ep. 76, May 28th, 1547.

² Spon, l. c.

³ P. Henry, ii., 444.

his house, which some have supposed to have been the book known by the title "*De tribus Impostoribus*." ¹ "But the aim of Gruet's work was to show that the founders of Judaism and Christianity were criminals, and that the latter was justly crucified; whereas the treatise "*De tribus Impostoribus*" was a philosophical essay, which, without resorting to blasphemy, endeavored to prove in a quiet and even sorrowful spirit, that the revelations of Moses, Christ, and Mohammed are impostures, and that only natural religion can be regarded as true. Gruet's book was publicly burned by Calvin's advice in May, 1550.²

That Gruet had adopted the most detestable principles of atheism can not be doubted; yet it can hardly be said that he was executed for them. The only evidence against him on this head, at the time of his trial, was the two sheets written in Latin, which Calvin himself did not hold to be his composition. With regard to the charge of high treason, the evidence seems to have been very slender, or, rather, none; and but little account is taken of it in the sentence pronounced against him. On the whole, a verdict of capital punishment seems to have been arrived at, not from any single charge, but from the cumulative charges; and among these it is impossible not to be struck with the prominent place occupied by those which concerned Calvin's system of discipline, and himself personally. The impression left by the proceedings is, that Gruet was the victim of Calvin's ascendancy, and of his desire of making the power of his consistory absolute. That he was for Gruet's execution, appears from a letter of his to Viret, dated on the 24th of July, two days before it took place, in which he condemns the hesitation of the syndics. In this he says: "There is nothing new here. The syndics are protracting Gruet's affair against the wish of the council; which, however, does not protest, as it ought. You are aware that there are few discreet men among them."³ We have before seen that Calvin entertained a supreme contempt for the council, which consisted of men infinitely below himself in intellect and acquirements, and whom he was therefore easily able to govern.

The affair of Gruet made the Libertines furious against Calvin. He could not walk the streets without being insulted and threatened. Writing to Farel on the 21st of August, he

¹ Spon, ii., 50. The authorship of this work has been variously ascribed to the Emperor Frederic II., to his chancellor, Pierre de Vignes, to Boccaccio, Machiavel, Aretin, and others. See Barbier, *Dict. des Ouvrages Anonymes, &c.*, iii., 648.

² For some account of it see P. Henry, ii., Beil. 16.

³ Ep. 80.

says: "Letters were daily received, especially from Lyons, from which I learned that I had been killed more than ten times over."¹ In the letter to Viret just referred to, he mentions being warned of dangers which awaited him in several quarters; but that he dissembled his knowledge of them, in order that he might not seem too solicitous about himself. He observed the same line of conduct toward his followers in France, by extenuating, out of policy, the reports in circulation respecting the troubles which surrounded him at Geneva. In a letter to the French Protestants, dated on the same day as that to Viret (July 24th), he says:² "I do not doubt, my beloved brethren, that every day brings you many tidings, as well from this place as from Germany, which will prove a stumbling block to those who have not taken sufficient root in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ; but with regard to yourselves, I am persuaded that you are so strengthened by the Lord, that you can never be shaken in your faith, either by these or still graver matters. As to the rumors circulated respecting our seditions, they are, for the most part, concocted by the retailers of them during their journey; for if you were here you would not perceive the tenth part of them. We have, indeed, too many of a stiff-necked generation, who now and then endeavor to throw off the yoke, in order to abolish the discipline of the church by their tumults. Among them are to be found both old and young; but the latter, especially, are most depraved, and recalcitrate because they are not allowed an unbridled license. A little while ago they made a disturbance about a very trifling thing, namely, because we had prohibited slashed breeches; though the same had indeed been done twelve years before. Not that we cared about the thing itself, but because we saw that through the chinks of those breeches a door would be opened to all sorts of profusion and luxury. In the midst of these skirmishings the devil suggested something else to them; whence these grave whisperings and reports: for when they found us discreeter than they wished, they gave vent to the venom which lay concealed in their breasts. But it is nothing but smoke, and their threats only the froth of the pride of Moab, whose ferocity must at length fall with a crash."

During this period Calvin inveighed against his opponents from the pulpit with the greatest possible warmth. He betrayed no symptoms of flinching; and, during his whole struggle with the Libertine party, showed so much resolution and

¹ Ep. 81.

² Ep. 79.

courage as forms a perfect contrast with the picture which he sometimes draws of his own pusillanimity. In this respect he seems to have belonged to a numerous class of persons, who dread danger in the contemplation of it, but when actually in its presence show no want of nerve and resolution. His constancy was now about to be rewarded by a temporary triumph over his adversary, Perrin, and his family. Perrin had gone to the court of France as ambassador from Geneva, where he was received with much distinction. The Cardinal du Bellay had sounded him as to whether some French troops, of which he should have the command, could not be received into Geneva, in order to frustrate the plans which the emperor was suspected of meditating against Switzerland.¹ From a letter of Calvin's, before quoted,² it appears that Perrin was then still in France, but that his wife had returned to Geneva, and was living in the house of her father Fabri, where she was indulging in her usual revels and disorders. The absence of Perrin, and the execution of Gruet, had produced a sort of calm; and Calvin describes the town as tranquil, and the council as favorable to him. But these appearances were deceitful. Calvin having confessed at a baptism that his wife and her former husband had once embraced the Anabaptist tenets, Perrin's spouse took occasion to calumniate Calvin's, saying that she must, then, be a strumpet;³ and, in other respects, carried her conduct to such a violent extreme that both she and her father were thrown into prison. Perrin, having returned from France, complained of this, and declared that he would be revenged for such an affront; for which menace he also was sent to prison to keep them company. This excited a sedition, which broke out in the following month, and which Calvin has described in a letter to Viret, dated on the 17th of September, 1547.⁴ In this he says: "Our enemies are so blinded that they have no regard to decency. Yesterday's proceedings not a little served to verify the suspicion I had previously entertained that the object of those persons' insolent behavior was to excite some tumult. The Two Hundred had been summoned, and I had told my colleagues the day before that I should attend the assembly. I arrived too early, and as several of the members were walking in the street, I went out by the gate next the town-hall. Here I heard a mixture of confused cries, which immediately increased so much that I concluded them to be a sure sign of

¹ Galiffe, cited by P. Henry, ii., 437, note.

³ *Ibid.*, and Ruchat, v., 322.

² Ep. 81.

⁴ Ep. 82.

sedition. I ran to the spot, and, though the sight was fearful, threw myself into the midst of the crowd. This seemed to astonish them: yet they all ran toward me, and snatched me hither and thither to preserve me from harm. I called God and man to witness that I was come there with the purpose of exposing my body to their swords; and exhorted them, if their intention was to shed blood, to begin with me. This address had a soothing effect, especially upon the better-disposed portion of the people. At length I was dragged to the hall of the assembly, where I found new contests, in which I interposed. All are of opinion that my intervention prevented a great and horrible carnage. Meanwhile, my colleagues had been mixed up with the crowd. I at length succeeded in tranquilizing the members, and getting them to sit down, and then addressed them in a long and vehement speech suited to the occasion, with which, it is said, all except a few were wonderfully touched: who, however, were as loud in their praises of what I had done as the well-disposed. God hath hitherto invested me and my colleagues with the privilege that even the most depraved at least pretend to regard the smallest injury offered to us in the same light as a parricide. Yet wickedness hath now reached such a pitch here that I hardly hope that the church can be upheld much longer, at least by means of my ministry. Believe me, my power is broken, unless God stretch forth His hand."

The concluding sentences of this letter afford a glimpse of Calvin's real feelings during these struggles, though he thought it expedient to hide them, in order that his followers might not be discouraged. A few days after its date, an event occurred, which for some time humbled his principal opponent. Perrin's transactions with the Cardinal du Bellay had excited a suspicion against him of entertaining a design to deliver Geneva into the hands of the French. He was accordingly arrested on a charge of treason, and of intending to quarter two hundred French cavalry, under his own command, in Geneva. For this offense he was capitally indicted, and but for the mediation of the Bernese it would probably have gone hard with him; as the council paid no attention to his excuse that he had accepted the command of these troops with the reservation of the approval of the Genevese government, nor to his declarations that he had no design against Geneva. The ambassadors of Berne endeavored to divert the storm from the head of Perrin to that of a Frenchman residing at Geneva, named le Magnifique Maignet, whom they accused

of the same designs as were imputed to Perrin: but the latter was expelled from the council, and the office of captain-general was suppressed.¹ The mediation of the Bernese procured, however, the release of Perrin's wife and father-in-law, but on condition of making their submission, and acknowledging their fault before the consistory; and through the same mediation Perrin himself was also released on the 29th of November.²

Shortly after these events a sort of truce was patched up between the parties, but in which Calvin had no confidence from the beginning. Writing to Farel on the 2d of December, 1547, he says:³ "As you exhort me and my colleagues to persevere courageously, I must tell you that neither dangers nor troubles daunt me; but, as in the midst of these confusions I am sometimes at a loss how to act, I wish that God would grant me my dismissal. A foolish wish, you will say. I know it. But Moses—that remarkable example of patience—did he not complain that too heavy a burden was laid on his shoulders? But though these thoughts trouble me, they do not obtain my approval. We have frightened our opponents a little, yet they show no signs of amendment. Such is their impudence, that they receive all our reproaches with deafness; in short, I think many are incurable. We have hitherto tried all means without success: the last act remains, at which I should like you to be present. I suppose Viret told you what a serious tumult the Lord hath quelled, for I wrote an account of the matter to him. The Two Hundred have appointed me and ten other persons to arrange these disputes. Our *çidevant* Cæsar denied that he entertained any grudge against me, and I immediately met him more than half way. I addressed him in a grave and moderate speech, using, indeed, some sharp reproofs, but not of a nature to wound; yet though he grasped my hand while promising to reform, I still fear that I have spoken to the deaf. I wish you could cheer me again by coming hither. Some, I am aware, have complained to Viret of my immoderate asperity. I know not whether he believes the charge; but I suspect he thinks that I indulge my warmth too much. I have invited him hither; for, as the man says in Terence, '*Si hîc esses aliter sentires*;' so might I likewise exclaim, 'If thou wert I, I am not certain of what thou wouldst do.' But this must be swallowed with the rest of my bitter draughts."

On the 10th of January following, the ministers appeared

¹ See Registers, Oct. 9th, in Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

² Ruchat, v. 324-326.

³ Ep. 83.

before the council of Two Hundred, and made some grave remonstrances as to the divisions and animosities which prevailed in the city, recommending the magistrates to effect a reconciliation among themselves, and to live together in peace. This had such an effect, that some even proposed, for the sake of conciliating matters, that Perrin should be restored to his dignities.

But this truce proved a hollow one; though Perrin behaved quietly for some time, with the design of paving his way to the syndicate, which he actually obtained in the following year, 1549. Meanwhile we find Calvin engaged in two or three collisions with the council. On the 9th of July, he and another minister were admonished by that body, for their violence in the pulpit, which, however, they would not consent to abandon.¹ As their violence in this instance appears to have been directed against the disorders of the Genevese youth, it can hardly be condemned as culpable, though it might have been injudicious: but the license which Calvin and others allowed themselves in attacking the constituted authorities from the pulpit, was highly reprehensible. For these attacks they were summoned several times before the council, who admonished them to abstain from them; and told them that if they had any complaints to make, they should be made in private.² An accident which happened to Calvin in this year, brought him into a serious dilemma with that body. He had intrusted to Viret's servant a letter containing many complaints against the Genevese council; in which, among other things, he said that they wanted to govern without God, and that he had to combat their hypocrisy.³ This letter was handed to the syndics; and Calvin, writing to Farel, respecting the matter, 10th of August, 1548, says:⁴ "So far as I can conclude from what is reported to me, my letter has been handed to the council, in which the following is the worst passage: 'Our people, under pretense of Christ, want to rule without him.' They are of opinion that this is a deadly arrow that I have shot against them. But I am prepared to suffer any kind of death, if I serve but the cause of truth." One Troillet, who owed Calvin a grudge, and

¹ "Calvin ayant blâmé certains désordres avec une trop grande colère, et un autre ministre ayant dit que la jeunesse de Genève vouloit renverser la religion: le Conseil les fait exhorter à l'avertir des abus qu'ils remarquent, et à ne pas crier en chaire de cette manière."—*Régistres*, 9 Juillet, 1548. "Ils répondent que leur conscience y est intéressé, et que c'est leur ôter la liberté du ministère."—*Ibid.*, 12 Juillet. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

² Ruchat, v. 360.

³ Spon, ii., 51.

⁴ P. Henry, ii., 448.

took every opportunity of opposing him, made himself very busy on this occasion, and translated the letter—which, however, seems to have been written some years previously¹—into French, in order to circulate it through the city. This man, a native of Geneva, where he had led no edifying life, had formerly retired into Burgundy, and assumed the character of a hermit. About the year 1545 he returned to Geneva, and putting on a great appearance of sanctity, endeavored to obtain an appointment as minister; and by bribing some of the council, he had almost attained this object: but Calvin, who saw through his hypocrisy, and who was likewise unwilling that the church discipline which he had established should be violated by the interference of the council in the appointment of ministers, succeeded, by his remonstrances, in inducing that body to revoke their nomination.² Hence Troillet's attempted revenge. Calvin was summoned before the council; and the letter having been produced, he was obliged to acknowledge his handwriting, and to make the best excuse he could. The affair, however, threatened to produce serious consequences; and Calvin summoned his friends Farel and Viret, who had previously visited Geneva in the spring of the year, to come and assist in extricating him from the dilemma. The former took much interest in Calvin's struggle with the Libertines. He it was who exhorted him to write his work against them; and he had himself written a sharp letter to Perrin, which, however, only served more to embroil the fray. As the danger increased, he reminded Calvin of God's having called him back to Geneva; and that the servants of the Lord are exposed to constant struggles, which they must overcome through faith and hope. Might he not have added, charity, and completed the number of the Christian graces? Viret, too, though the mildness of his temper led him sometimes to disapprove of Calvin's asperity, remained always attached to him; and thus the three friends formed a sort of spiritual triumvirate, which their opponents regarded with jealousy and suspicion.³

At first the council seemed inclined to accept Calvin's excuses, and to bury the matter in oblivion, as he was not again summoned on the day that had been appointed; but he suspected that this was only a trick of his enemies, in order to keep the accusation hanging over him, and to bring it forward when convenient. He therefore wrote to Viret on the 20th

¹ Ruchat, v., 362.

² Ruchat, v., 265. Beza, *Vita Calv.*

³ Calvin to Viret, May 15th, 1538. See Kirchhofer, *Leben Farel's*, ii., 83.

of September, to the following effect: "If I ever needed your assistance it is now more than ever necessary. If you came here and complained of the injustice done you, adding that you had not deserved of this Republic that your letters should be stolen, and desiring that they should be returned to you, the affair might take a better turn."¹

Viret obeyed this summons, and came to Geneva, as did also Farel. Calvin's anticipations were not falsified, and he was cited before the council, to answer for his offense, on the 8th of October. From the following entry in the Registers, under date of the 15th of that month, it would appear that Viret had undertaken his friend's cause with so much warmth, probably in demanding back his letters, as to give offense to the council: "Farel has represented how much attached Calvin, Viret, and himself have always been to the interests of this city, and has begged the council to regard Viret with the same eye as formerly; also to have the same esteem and respect for Calvin, whose merit was so sublime that there was no man on earth who combated Antichrist with such efficacy of Jesus Christ. He likewise stated that he saw with regret that they had not that deference for this servant of God which was due to him."²

Notwithstanding the interference of his friends, however, Calvin was again cited before the council on the 18th of October; when he was reprimanded, and told that in future he would do well to consider better of his duty toward the magistrate. Farel was also present on this occasion, and made a speech for his friend, in which he said that the council had had little consideration for the character and merits of Calvin, which were so distinguished that it might be affirmed there was no man who equaled him in learning; that they should not be so nice as to what he might have said of them, since he had freely reprovèd even the greatest men, such as Luther, Melancthon, and others; and that they should not credit what a heap of worthless people, mere pillars of the public-house, whispered against so great a man. This speech seems to have had the effect of turning the reprovers into the reprovèd; for it was resolved that Farel should be thanked for it.³

Thus ended this affair. In November Perrin was restored to his councilorship and to his office of captain-general, notwithstanding that the latter had been legally abolished.⁴ In

¹ See P. Henry, ii., 449, note.

² See Grénon's *Fragmens Biographiques*, under date.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Trechsel, *Antitr.*, i., 185.

a letter¹ to Viret in November, 1548. Calvin says: "There is nothing new here except that our comic Cæsar has been suddenly restored to the stage from which he had been driven. His friends availed themselves of the absence of a great number of the members of the council, and when there were scarce twenty present, carried his restoration by a majority." This must have been in the council of Two Hundred. This event gave new vigor to Perrin's followers. Early in the year they had begun to distinguish themselves by a party badge, a kind of cross worn over their breasts;² and after Perrin's restoration they indulged in the grossest abuse of Calvin, and many, out of hatred to him, refused to attend the communion. The council endeavored to conciliate matters, and on the 18th of December brought about an amnesty between the principal parties, which was even sanctioned by an oath; after which ceremony the ministers and council supped together in order to obliterate all rancor.³ But Perrin was merely dissembling, in order that he might pave the way to the syndicate, the election for which office was approaching. Calvin was not deceived by appearances, and in a letter to Farel, dated on the 12th of December, expressed his perplexity and apprehensions.⁴ In the following February (1549) Perrin not only obtained the syndicate, but was even elected first syndic, contrary to established custom.⁵ But before proceeding with Calvin's struggles against his domestic enemies, we must take a survey of his labors at this time in the general cause of the Church.

¹ Gen. MS., *apud* P. Henry, ii., 438, note.

² "Une croix découpée sur leur pourpoint." This had been the old device of the Eignots, or Eidgenossen, in 1518 (Ruchat, i., 328).

³ Beza, who erroneously places Perrin's restoration in the spring. *Vita Calvin.*, anno 1548; and *Régistres*, Oct. 18, in Grénus, *Fragments Biographiques*.

⁴ Ep. 95.

⁵ Trechsel, l. c.

CHAPTER VII.

Work against the Council of Trent—Tract against judicial Astrology—The Interim—Melancthon's Concessions—Calvin blames Melancthon—Death of Calvin's Wife—Beza's Arrival at Geneva—The Zurich *Consensus*—Lælius Socinus—Fêtes abolished at Geneva—Calvin's Tract *De Scandalis*.

DURING the course of these annoying, and sometimes dangerous contests with the Patriot, or Libertine party, Calvin found time not only to discharge his ordinary duties as pastor and lecturer, but to compose several works, and to take an active part, by correspondence and otherwise, in the general affairs of the Protestant Church. In 1546 he either translated, or caused to be translated, into French, the "*Locî*" of Melancthon, of which the preface at least is indubitably from his pen.¹ The book appeared at Geneva in that year under the title of "*La Somme de Theologie de Melancthon.*" We have already seen that these two theologians were not entirely agreed upon some points of doctrine, and especially that respecting election and predestination: yet in his preface Calvin made some considerable concessions to Melancthon's opinion on this head, in a remarkable passage, which there will be occasion to produce in the next chapter.

In the following year (1547) Calvin brought out his tract, addressed to the church of Rouen, against a certain Franciscan, a follower of the Libertines, and then a prisoner in that town, entitled, "*Contre un Franciscain, Sectateur des Erreurs des Libertins;*" which piece may be considered as an Appendix to his former tract against that sect. A more important work, which he published in November of the same year, was that against the proceedings of the Council of Trent, originally written in Latin, and entitled "*Acta Synodi Tridentinæ, cum Antidoto.*" That council had been assembled in the previous year; and Calvin prefixed to his book the address of the Pope's legates on opening the first session. In his preface, though he allows great weight to councils, he denies their infallibility, and supports his view by the authority of St. Augustin. He then specially objects to that of Trent, on account of its composition. It is argued, he says,

¹ P. Henry, i., 376.

that a council can not err, because it represents the Church. But what if I deny this argument? This council, he continues, consists of some forty bishops, of whom even the warmest patrons of such assemblies must be heartily ashamed. Passing over the prelates of other nations, he confines himself to the representatives of France, the Bishops of Nantes and Clermont; both of whom he describes as equally ignorant and stupid, and as unacquainted with even the very rudiments of theology: the latter, moreover, as infamous and despicable for his dissolute life. He then attacks the monkish portion of the council; and affirms that there is no school of theology so wretched but what must despise all the doctors of Trent. But were its members angels, they were all dependent on the nod of the Pope: for every decree was sent off post to Rome, where it was mangled and altered to suit the views of the pontiff and his advisers. "The couriers return; a session is proclaimed; the notary reads something which nobody dares to impugn; the asinine tribe signify their assent with their ears. Behold the oracle which is to bind the religion of all the world!"¹ He then proceeds to give, in the body of his tract, the decrees of the several sessions, with remarks upon them.

This piece occupied Calvin two or three months, and was composed amid those struggles with his opponents which have been related in the preceding chapter. Writing to Farel on the 21st of August, 1547, he says: "I have begun my attack on the Tridentine Fathers, but the work proceeds slowly, for I have not a single hour free from interruptions."² When it was published he forwarded a copy to Farel, who sat up all night to read it.³ Such was his admiration of Calvin's literary talents. Farel also dispatched a letter to Calvin, conveying his warm approval of the work, respecting the success of which the latter seems to have entertained some apprehensions; for in his reply he says: "I begin to like my 'Antidote,' now I find that you approve of it so much, for before I was not satisfied with it. It may be that you, who know my daily labors, and the contests by which I am exhausted, are led to pardon the more imperfect parts; but, for myself, I am surprised how I can at this time publish any thing readable."⁴

Calvin's tract was answered, on the part of the papists, by Cochlæus. In the following year, he re-published it in French,

¹ Calvin, *Opera*, viii., 221, A.

² Ep. 81.

³ Kirchofer, ii., 91.

⁴ Ep. 83., Dec. 28th, 1547.

in a more popular form, omitting many learned references and allusions.¹

In 1548, Calvin published his "Commentaries on six of St. Paul's Epistles, viz., Corinthians, Ephesians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, and Timothy."² In the following year appeared his tract against judicial astrology, "*Admonitio adversus Astrologiam quam judiciarum vocant;*" a work which shows that Calvin was much in advance of his age on such points, when some of the most enlightened minds were not free from that superstition. Melancthon, in particular, was a slave to it.³ What rendered it more difficult for Calvin to refute this pretended science was, that he was unacquainted with the true system of the universe. Though the work of Copernicus was written in 1530, it was some years before it became known; and it was not till the beginning of the following century that Galileo first ventured to adopt his system. Beza, in his work on the plague, shows that he had heard of it, but considered it a paradox; and in the last edition of his "Institutes," Calvin still considers the heavens as turning round the earth.⁴ This erroneous system favored astrology, inasmuch as it made the heavens appear only subsidiary to the earth; and thus occasioned a difficulty which Calvin found it hard to meet. The astrologers defended their views by the circumstance that the prophet Jeremiah calls the stars *signs*; and confirmed their argument by appealing to the first chapter of Genesis. A knowledge of the true system would have upset this reasoning; but Calvin could meet it only by referring to other texts of Scripture, as Isaiah, chap. xlv., ver. 25, "That frustrateth the *tokens* of the liars, and maketh diviners mad;" and by entering into a long argument to show in what sense Jeremiah used the word *signs*.⁵ He was of opinion that they do not denote when we should put on a new garment, nor whether we should transact our business on Monday rather than Tuesday or Wednesday, and things of the like sort; but whether we should sow, let blood, take physic, or prune our trees, &c. : for though he disbelieved judicial astrology, he thought that our bodies, as well as other natural objects, had some sympathy with the stars,

¹ P. Henry, ii., 305.

² *Ibid.*, p. 379.

³ Matthes, *Leben Melancthons*, p. 410. Socinus, writing to Bullinger from Wittenberg, August 28th, 1550, says: "All depend upon Melancthon alone, who is so addicted to judicial astrology, that I know not on which he most depends, the stars, or their Maker and Ruler." See Trechsel, *Antitr.*, ii., 154, note.

⁴ P. Henry, ii., 392.

⁵ Calvin, *Opera*, viii., 505, B.

and that a knowledge of the latter was useful in medicine and agriculture. So difficult is it even for the most vigorous understandings, when unaided by the light of science, to shake off ancient prejudices in such matters. He was also of opinion that some meaning might be attached to comets. Besides astrology—which he thinks the revival of polite letters, if not the gospel, should have put an end to—Calvin also ridicules the alchemists in this tract; in the course of which he exhibits considerable profane learning, referring frequently to Greek and Roman history, and quoting Terence, Aristophanes, and other authors.

In 1549, Calvin also published his tract against the *Interim*. The Emperor Charles V. having overthrown the Smalcaldic league, and reduced its leaders, the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse, to submission, found himself enabled to dictate the footing on which religion should be placed throughout the empire: a step to which he was still further prompted by a desire of mortifying the Pope, at whom he was offended for having transferred to Bologna the sittings of the council which had been assembled at Trent. The system known by the name of the Interim, and which was to be the rule of religious practice till the decision of a general council, was laid before the diet assembled at Augsburg on the 15th of May, 1548. The Elector Joachim II., of Brandenburg, is thought to have had a great share in bringing it about; at all events, his court preacher, John Agricola, who passed for a Protestant, but was suspected of having been bribed, was one of the three persons concerned in drawing it up; the other two being Roman Catholics, namely, Pflug and Michael Holding, titular bishop of Sidon. The only concessions of any importance made to the Protestants were the celebration of the communion in both kinds, and permission for married priests to retain their wives. Few of the princes assembled at Augsburg ventured to oppose the promulgation of the Interim; but the Elector Maurice entered a protest against it. Throughout the greater part of Germany it was received with indignation. Hesse and ducal Saxony, Hamburg, Bremen, Lubec, Luneberg, rejected it; at Magdeburg, it was abused and ridiculed; Strasburgh held out against it for a considerable time; and Constance it was necessary to reduce to obedience by force of arms.¹

The correspondence of Calvin and his friends at this period indicates the alarm which this measure had excited. Myco-

¹ Robertson, *Charles V.*, b. ix. Matthes, *Leben Melanc.*, p. 285, et seq.

nius, a minister of Basle, writing to him on the 18th of August, 1548, says: "The imperial Interim has been established in Suabia, and is now impending over the inhabitants of Constance. I have for some time feared that, through them, the emperor will annoy us also with this unrighteous measure. On the 4th of August white linen surplices were sent to each of the ministers of Augsburg by the new council, and they were ordered always to wear them when preaching. Those, however, were excluded from the gift who had not been previously anointed. They were also compelled to swear that they would utter nothing against his imperial majesty, nor against the Interim, on pain of condign punishment. A plain token of what liberty is left to preach the Gospel! At Nuremberg there is said to be only one mass-priest, who is surrounded with guards when going to or returning from church, and, when performing mass, in order to preserve him from injury. So much braver are people there than at Augsburg! The Strasburghers still hold out, but I know not how long it will last. Many of the chief people are said to be emigrating, &c."¹

More than four hundred pastors are said to have been expelled from Suabia and the Rhenish provinces for refusing the Interim.² Among those placed in a painful and dangerous position by its progress, was Martin Bucer, who, as is well known, was at length obliged to fly from Strasburgh to England; where he was appointed professor of divinity at the University of Cambridge. The candor and moderation of Bucer's mind, to which Erasmus frequently bore his willing testimony;³ his ardent wish to see those difficulties reconciled which separated the Swiss and Lutheran churches; as well as his personal friendship for Luther, whom he accompanied in his critical appearance at Worms, in 1521; may perhaps have led him to adopt terms too lax and ambiguous with regard to disputed points of doctrine, and thus to incur the hatred and suspicion of many:⁴ but his conduct on this occa-

¹ Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 84.

² M. Adamus, *Vita Melancthonis*, p. 344.

³ M. Adamus, *Vita Buceri*, p. 213.

⁴ Hence Calvin exhorts Bucer, when in England, to use his endeavors with the Protector for a further Reformation, in order to clear himself from such suspicions: "I especially recommend this to you, in order that you may free yourself from the ill-will with which, as you are aware, you are unjustly regarded by many; for they always name you as the author or abettor of temporizing counsels. I know that this suspicion is too deeply fixed in the minds of some to be easily eradicated, whatever may be your efforts."—Ep. 93.

sion in flying from Strasburgh rather than adopt the new system, shows that he was not disposed to make any compromises at the expense of his conscience. The Elector of Brandenburg and the Palatine, knowing his pacific disposition, had sent for him, in the hope that he might be induced to subscribe the Interim, and thus, by his example, lead others to do so likewise; but Bucer, after examining it, refused to put his name to it.

It was natural that Calvin should feel much interest in the affairs of Bucer and the church of Strasburgh, with which he had, for a considerable period, been so closely connected. His correspondence with Bucer grew very frequent at this time; and the latter seems to have derived much benefit from his consolation and advice. Writing to him, on the 30th of September, 1548, Bucer says: "We have not yet made up our minds here. Our folks besought the emperor to leave us at least a few churches for the service of pure religion, but he has peremptorily refused their request. What they will do God knows: nothing but a miracle can save us. I beseech you, pray for us."¹ In another letter, dated on the 9th of January, 1549, Bucer mentions that the richer citizens threatened to leave Strasburgh unless the emperor were conciliated: and that more than fifty had already done so.² In a third letter, written on the 7th of February, he says: "Offer up your prayers, my excellent brethren, for the remnant of our church and ministry! The bishop hath exacted a promise that preaching against the Interim shall not be allowed here; and consequently the ministry of myself and chief colleagues, will be at an end, if not to-day, at least very shortly. My affairs are all in readiness; and therefore, though the Lord hath not yet signified the time of my departure, pray to him fervently that he may both point it out and conduct me."³ In this letter he represents many parishes as already destitute of ministers, and considers it probable that the directions of the Bishop of Spire would be followed;⁴ namely, that those who refused to be ordained by the bishop, or who, being ordained, were unwilling to serve in the churches in the manner prescribed by the Interim, should be sent to the galleys. From another letter, dated on the 20th of the same month,⁵ it appears that the bishop would allow the Strasburgh ministers only a fortnight for deliberation. Meanwhile, Bucer was apprehensive that the emperor might command their deten-

¹ Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 85.

² Ep. 96.

³ Ep. 98.

⁴ Whom he calls *παρασκόπου* for *ἐπισκόπου*.

⁵ Ep. 100.

tion out of anger at the desertion of so many churches. He was resolved, however, not to desert his congregation till forced to do so; nor had he yet determined whither he should bend his steps, provided he were allowed to fly: but he expresses a hope of being able to visit Calvin before proceeding further.¹

Though it was forbidden to write against the Interim under pain of death, no fewer than thirty-seven attacks upon it appeared, including that of Calvin,² whose situation at Geneva did not expose him to any great risk of incurring the penalty. From a letter to Farel, dated on the 10th of August, 1548,³ it appears that Calvin had been exhorted to undertake this task by Bullinger, but that he had referred the matter to the judgment of Bucer. Bullinger himself was among those who entered the lists on this occasion, at the instance of several illustrious persons, and particularly of George duke of Württemberg, and count of Montbelliard.⁴ Calvin's enemies at Geneva appear to have opposed the publication of his book. Writing to Farel, on the 12th of December, 1548, he observes: "I have at length shamed my opponents into a permission to publish my book, and the whole matter has been left to my judgment and good faith. But when I compare and reflect upon the insults which our brethren have to endure, I almost seem to myself to be only playing an amusing game in the shade."⁵ His work consists of a detailed attack on the different heads of Catholic doctrine.⁶

Saxony, under the guidance of the elector, Maurice, bent before the storm, and thus escaped the evils which afflicted the southern states of Germany. Melancthon's conduct had at first excited the displeasure of the emperor, but Maurice supported him on this occasion. The concessions which that Reformer afterward made led to the adiaphoristic controversy, or dispute concerning things indifferent. Some attempt at accommodation was made in what was called the *Leipsig Interim*, in December, 1548. The Saxons, however, did not finally resolve as to what parts of the imperial Interim they should observe, till the 1st of May in the following year, in a

¹ One of Calvin's letters to Bucer at this period (Ep. 94) contains an elegant parallel between the Christian religion and heathen philosophy.

² P. Henry, ii., 370.

³ MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, ii., 370.

⁴ Ruchat, v. 350. It does not appear, however, that Bullinger's work was printed.

⁵ Ep. 95.

⁶ Its title is, "*Interim adultero-Germanum. Cui adjecta est: Vera Christianæ Pacificationis et Ecclesiæ Reformandæ Ratio.*" 8vo., 1549.

conventus, or synod, held at Grimma; the resolutions adopted at which were published in the following July.¹ Melancthon has been much blamed for the course which he pursued in this conjuncture, and Calvin himself was one of his censurers. But Melancthon was placed in a very delicate and difficult situation; and an unprejudiced examination of his conduct will show that his line of action was the best, not only for his country, but also for the Saxon church. Let us hear how he himself explains his motives, in a letter to Joachim Moller, in September, 1549: "I have frequently advised," he says, "that no alterations should be made, because people immediately exclaim that we wish to persecute the gospel. But the court insists on some concessions to the emperor, in order that he may not send an army into the country and oppress the church here, as he has done in Suabia. I know not whether we shall satisfy him by restoring some indifferent ceremonies; but the courtiers say so, and press upon us the necessity of not exposing both our country and our church to desolation for such trifles. We therefore confine ourselves to contending only for necessary things, as purity of doctrine, and the form of the Lord's Supper; in order that the Popish mass may not be introduced among us, as in Suabia. But I have never contended about festivals, the order of the Psalms, and the like; which, in my opinion, would not become a modest servant of the church in these sad times. Some there are, indeed, who will not hear of any order, especially of laws; but this is being more than unmannerly. For several years previously, I have wished that some of the ceremonies now proposed should be introduced into our church; for such a conformity, in outward things, is favorable to unity: though here also a medium must be observed; and therefore, in *necessary things*, we make absolutely no alteration."²

Such is the account which Melancthon gives of his motives, with which, probably, no reasonable and moderate man will be inclined to find fault. Nevertheless he was assailed from various quarters. The severest attacks proceeded from Magdeburg, where a young man named Matthias Flaccius, out of spite, as Melancthon suspected, that he had not obtained a vacant professorship at Wittenberg, had, with his friends the exiled bishop Armsdorf, the deacon Matthew Judex, Nicholas Gallus, and some others, erected what was called *The Chancery of God*; a body which sent forth one abusive tract

¹ Matthes, *Leben Melancthons*, p. 305.

² *Ibid.*, p. 308.

after another against the Saxon theologians, and particularly Melancthon, for having complied with some parts of the imperial Interim.¹ Melancthon took no notice of these attacks till toward the end of 1549; and then answered with great moderation. Flaccius replied by publishing a number of letters which Melancthon had written to Luther during the diet of Augsburg in 1530, in order to show the world what a timid, pusillanimous man he was, and accompanied them with many bitter annotations.²

It is, however, for the opinion of Calvin, that we are here more particularly concerned. In a letter to Valentine Pacæus,³ a Leipsic doctor, he expressed his fears of the dissensions which these disputes about things indifferent would introduce into the church; a foreboding which was destined to be realized in an unhappy manner in that of England. To Melancthon himself he addressed, in 1551, a letter of free expostulation; in which, after adverting to the scandal which the contests with the Magdeburghers occasioned to the whole Protestant Church, and expressing his opinion that Melancthon was not wholly free from blame, he says: "The sum of your defense amounts to this, that provided purity of doctrine be retained, we should not pertinaciously contend respecting outward things. But if what I hear every where asserted be true, you extend the boundaries of things indifferent too widely. You are aware that the worship of God has been adulterated by the Papists in a thousand ways. The more intolerable of these corruptions we have removed; but now the ungodly, to achieve a triumph over the vanquished gospel, command that they shall be restored. Do you call it obstinacy if any one hesitates to comply? That, I am sure, is quite foreign to the modesty of your temper; and, if you have betrayed some weakness in complying, you should not be surprised if many blame you for it. Besides, some of these things which you call indifferent are manifestly at variance with the word of God. On the other hand, it may be, as is usual in such disputes, that some persons urge certain things with too much preciseness; and regard others in which, after all, there is no such great harm, with too much detestation. Still, if my opinion is worth any thing in religious matters, you should not have conceded so much to the Papists; partly because you have relaxed what is fixed by the hand of God; partly because you have occasioned the gospel to be scandal-

¹ Matthes, *Leben Melancthons*, p. 306.

² *Ibid.*, p. 311.

³ Ep. 115.

ously insulted. I do not see your drift when you say that the Magdeburghers are only quarreling about a linen vest. I think that the use of the suplice is one of the many absurdities hitherto retained among you ; but good and pious men every where loudly proclaim that *you* have likewise admitted still grosser corruptions, and which manifestly tend to vitiate purity of doctrine, and to overthrow the church. Let me recall to your memory what I once said to you, if you forget it : that it would be making ink too precious if we hesitated to testify by our writings that which so many martyrs of the common class daily seal with their blood. I spoke this when we seemed far out of the reach of danger ; and now that the Lord hath brought us into the arena, we ought to strive the more manfully. Your case, you are aware, is very different from that of the common herd ; for it is more ignominious in the general even to tremble, than it is for the common soldier to fly ; and though the timidity of others should be pardoned, every one will say that the vacillation of a man like yourself is not to be borne. Thus you alone, by yielding only a little, have excited more complaints and regrets than the open defection of a hundred ordinary people. And though I am thoroughly persuaded that it is not the fear of death that has driven you to swerve one iota from the right line, yet I suspect that apprehensions of another sort may possibly have biased your mind. The detestation with which you regard inhumanity and rigor is well known to me ; but you should recollect that the servants of Christ are bound to have as much care of their reputation as of their life.”¹

Calvin, in the last sentence, seems to have touched the real spring which actuated Melancthon. It was easy for him, a sojourner in a strange city, where he was out of the reach of danger, and where he owned no superior, to lecture his brother Reformer on the duty of firmness ; and some of his remarks, taken in a general sense, are excellent ; but he makes not the least allowance for the various feelings which must have been at work within Melancthon. The latter had to listen at once to the dictates of loyalty and patriotism ; to consult the commands of his sovereign and the interests of his country ; and to avert, by timely concession in some minor points, that entire overthrow of the Protestant Church, by force of arms, which had taken place in many parts of southern Germany. These were the motives which led him to submit in silence to some alterations which he did not quite

¹ See Ep. 117.

approve, and which had been introduced by the council of the elector.¹ But what a prospect do these squabbles hold out for the future union of the Protestant Church! A silly and scandalous, we had almost said a childish quarrel about a surplice and a few minor ceremonies, divides the Protestants into hostile factions at the moment of their most eminent peril! With such feelings how should they hope in quieter times to arrange those more serious questions, which turned on really important points of doctrine?

From one of Calvin's subsequent letters,² it appears that Melancthon was so offended at these remonstrances as to tear up the letter which contained them; and, indeed, Beza himself acknowledges that Calvin had, on this occasion, lent too ready an ear to Melancthon's accusers, and censured him undeservedly.³

We will now advert to some occurrences in the domestic life of Calvin. On the 5th of April, 1549, he lost his wife. As convenience, rather than affection, had prompted his marriage, so the death of his partner does not seem to have caused him any excessive grief. The letters, indeed, in which he announces the event to his friends, contain the usual phrases of decent regret; but his bereavement did not for a moment divert him from the ordinary routine of his occupations. He thus announces his loss in a letter to Farel:⁴ "The news of my wife's death has, perhaps, already reached you. I make what efforts I can to prevent being devoured by my grief, in which I am assisted by my friends, who do all they can to assuage my sorrow. When your brother left this place her life was already almost despaired of. . . . At six o'clock I was called from home; at seven, after being removed into another room, she immediately began to sink. Perceiving her voice failing, she requested the prayers of those around her. About this time I returned; and, though she was speechless, she discovered much agitation of mind. After saying a few words to her about the grace of Christ, the hope of eternal happiness, our-fellowship in life, and her impending departure, I shut myself up to pray. She had been fully sensible of my prayers, and attentive to my admonitions. Before eight she expired, so placidly, that they who were present could scarce discern the moment of her decease. I swallow my grief in such a manner that I have not intermitted my functions for a

¹ See his letter to Hardenberg, quoted by Matthes, p. 309, note.

² Ep. 141.

³ Beza, *Vita Calv.*, anno 1549.

⁴ Ep. 106, April 11th.

moment. Nay, the Lord hath, meanwhile, exercised me with other contests."

Calvin's equanimity on this occasion excited the surprise of Viret. In acknowledging Calvin's letter, conveying the intelligence of his wife's death, he says: "What I hear from many credible witnesses respecting your constancy and fortitude under your domestic affliction, makes me think that I should address you with congratulations rather than condolence; and the more so from my intimate acquaintance with what you call the tenderness of your mind:¹ for that, I think, is a more fitting name for it than softness; a quality which would prevent your acting as you do. Hence I admire the more the strength of that Holy Spirit which works within you, manifesting itself truly worthy of the name of *Comforter*. Should I not acknowledge its powers in you, who, though you bear so stoutly the bitterest and most touching of all domestic afflictions, are accustomed to feel the misfortunes of others, as if they were your own? Believe me, this is no common virtue, and no ordinary proof of God's mercy toward you. It makes me the more ashamed of myself that, when in the same situation, I could not show the like fortitude, nor even a shadow of it: for my calamity so overwhelmed and prostrated me, that the whole world seemed a solitude; nothing delighted me, nor tended to assuage my grief. Often did I accuse myself for bearing my affliction with so much less fortitude than became, I will not say the office which I hold, but even a person who had made the least acquaintance with that heavenly wisdom in which I not only professed myself a disciple, but a teacher of others; and that I could not apply to my own malady those remedies which I am accustomed to administer to others who are in want of them. You, on the contrary, are so far from being cast down and broken in spirit, that you afford an encouraging example, by showing that you can act up to the precepts which you inculcate; and that you are not only able, when unafflicted yourself, to give sound advice to the suffering, but to apply it to your own case in the like circumstances; and thus to have the same sentiments both in happiness and affliction. I have been incredibly relieved by hearing, not merely from report, but from eye-witnesses, that you discharge all the duties of your office with an unbroken spirit, and as efficiently, nay, with even more success, than before; and that you have retained such a mastery over yourself in the consistory, in the pulpit, in a word, in all

¹ Calvin had said, "Nōsti animi mei teneritudinem, vel mollitiem potius."

your affairs both public and private, as to excite the astonishment of every body; and this, too, at the very time when the recentness of your grief must have torn and prostrated you."¹

As Viret's letter is dated but four days after the death of Calvin's wife, there was, indeed, some ground to wonder at the latter's fortitude; for he must have been pursuing his usual avocations while his wife lay still unburied. Such was either the coldness of his temperament or the sustaining power of his religion. Idollette left some children by her former husband, the Anabaptist. Their fate seems to have caused her some anxiety in her last moments; which, though she betrayed it by her behavior, she seems to have feared to communicate to Calvin. Guessing her feelings, Calvin considerably engaged to provide for them as if they were his own. On her remarking that she had already commended them to God, Calvin observed that that was no reason why he should not also do his part; to which she replied: "If they be under the protection of God, I know that they will be commended to you."² It does not appear what became of them afterward.

Within a month after this event, Beza (Theodore de Bèze) whose history was thenceforward to be so closely bound up with that of Calvin, arrived at Geneva, in company with seven other French gentlemen, whom the persecutions had driven from France.³ Beza was born on the 24th of June, 1519, at Vezelay, a small but strong town of Burgundy. His family was of noble blood; but his father, who was bailiff or mayor of Vezelay, was neither a rich man nor a well educated one. Beza owed his education to two paternal uncles, both of them unmarried, wealthy, and occupying distinguished positions in society: one of them being a councilor in the parliament of Paris, and the other, abbot of Froidmort. At the tender age of three, we find Beza, who had already lost his mother, installed at Paris, in the house of his uncle the councilor, who took upon himself the whole charge of his education. In 1528, he was sent to Orleans for the benefit of the instructions of Melchior Wolmar; and when that learned German accepted the office of Greek professor at Bourges, he carried his young pupil with him to that city. At that time Calvin was also at Bourges; but the disparity in their ages,

¹ Ep. 102.

² Ep. 106.

³ "Huit gentilshommes Français, parmi lesquels est Theod. de Bèze, arrivent ici, et obtiennent la permission d'y demeurer."—*Régistres*, 3 Mai, 1549. Grénus, *Fragments Biographiques*.

Calvin being ten years older than Beza, must, at that time of life, have prevented any great intimacy between them. When Wolmar left Bourges, Beza, at the desire of his uncle, the abbot, who, on the death of the councilor, had undertaken his education, returned to Orleans to study the law. Beza's early life gave no token of that sanctity to which he afterward attained. He was alike distinguished by the profligacy of his morals, and the elegance of his scholarship, and especially by his Latin poetry, with which he beguiled the hours that should have been devoted to the drier study of the law. Catullus and Martial were his models; and in order to come nearer to his originals, he did not eschew those freer passages which the modesty of the modern muse is in general compelled to avoid.¹ His life at Orleans was as free as his verses; and though he nowhere confesses this, says his biographer, yet he would have done so had circumstances allowed him to be as candid as St. Augustin.² After a residence of some years at Orleans, he returned to Paris, where his handsome person, his talents, and a comfortable income, caused him to be every where well received.³ His uncle had procured him a prebend of 700 livres, and promised to get him the reversion of his own abbey, worth 15000 livres. At Paris Beza became acquainted with some of the first scholars of the age, as Turnebus, Buchanan, and others.⁴ He himself acquired considerable fame as a court poet; and this circumstance, together with his various amours, prevented him at this time from thinking much on religion. A poetical compliment addressed to Charles V., on the occasion of his passing through Paris in January, 1540, attracted the notice of that emperor. The lady whom he celebrates in his poems under the name of *Candida*, seems to have been the wife of a tailor living in the Rue de Calandre at Paris,⁵ with whom he had formed a criminal connection. A dangerous illness in 1548, said to have been the result of his profligacy, awakened more serious thoughts, and occasioned his journey to Geneva, where he married the woman with whom

¹ On this subject Beza says in the preface to the second edition of his poems, p. 8 (Stephanus, 1569): "Etsi enim, quod vere dico, illorum obscenitate sic offendebat ut oculos etiam ipsos à quibusdam inter legendum adverterem, tamen, ut illâ ætate non satis cautus, ita illius quidem melle, istius vero salibus capiebar, ut in scribendo quam simillimus eorum (de ipso characterè loquor) evadere studerem."—A fine piece of prudish hypocrisy!

² Schlosser, *Leben des Th. de Beza*, p. 20.

³ "Juventute autem florens, otio, pecuniâ, rebusque aliis omnibus potiusquam bono consilio abundans," says Melchior Adamus, *Vita Bezæ*.

⁴ *Pref. in Poem.*, p. 6.

⁵ Launay, cited by Audin, *Vie de Calvin*, ii., 327.

he had cohabited in France.¹ His intention was to set up a book shop at Geneva, in partnership with a friend named Crespin. In order to provide the necessary funds he sold his benefices; for though he had renounced the errors of the Roman Catholic Church, he did not scruple to enrich himself with her spoils, which he considered lawful prize, according to the example of the Israelites when quitting the land of Egypt.² On his arrival at Geneva, Calvin persuaded him to give up his bookselling scheme, and to devote himself to theology; and as no situation adequate to his abilities then offered itself, either in that city or its neighborhood, Beza made a short visit to his old tutor Wolmar, at Tübingen. During his absence, the place of Greek professor at Lausanne having become vacant, Calvin used all his exertions to procure it for him, and he was installed in it by the council of Berne on the 6th of November, 1549.³ Beza behaved with candor on this occasion; and before he entered upon his office confessed having written his amatory poems, as he tells us in the preface to those pieces which he republished. Calvin, who looked forward to find in Beza a clever and devoted partisan of his doctrines, directed him in his theological studies. As he had not leisure for a regular course of the fathers and schoolmen, Beza chiefly devoted himself to the explanation of the Scriptures in their original tongues. After he had been a little while at Lausanne he published a French poem entitled "*Abraham Sacrifiant*," which drew considerable attention. Soon afterward the French refugees in that city solicited him to edit Paul's Epistle to the Romans; a work which laid the foundation of his edition of the New Testament."

It was shortly after Beza's arrival at Geneva that Calvin proceeded to Zurich to arrange a Concordat with Bullinger and the clergy of that town respecting the sacraments. The quarrel between Luther and the Swiss churches on the subject of the eucharist, which, as we have seen, had been conducted with so much violence on the part of the former, was calculated to damage the general interests of the Protestant Church; and as some suspicion existed, that Calvin himself was in this matter inclined to the Lutheran tenets, many persons thought it highly desirable that some agreement should be come to on the subject between the churches of Zurich

¹ P. Henry, ii., 477. Schlosser, however (p. 24), represents him as having been secretly married to a young woman whom he had not succeeded in seducing.

² See Schlosser, p. 27.

³ Schlosser, p. 28, and Haller's *Diary in the Mus. Helv.*, ii., 87.

and Geneva. But though Calvin stood aloof in the quarrel referred to, and even censured the mode in which the Zurichers had conducted it, still there is no reason to think that he partook in Luther's views. He had, indeed, found fault with Zwingli and Œcolampadius for having, in their zeal to refute transubstantiation, and to prove that Christ's body, after its reception into heaven, would remain there until the day of judgment, omitted to state the nature of his presence in the supper ;¹ thus apparently reducing the rite to a mere sign or symbol. Nay, the different view which he took from those Reformers, had, as he himself tells us, rendered him acceptable to Luther and his followers :² yet there is no reason to believe that he had ever adopted the Lutheran tenet of impanation. The first edition of his "Institutes," the formulary of union in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, presented to the synod of Berne in 1537,³ as well as his tract "On the Lord's Supper," published in 1540, show the contrary.⁴ Nevertheless Calvin evinced no anxiety on this occasion to form a junction with the Swiss ; and indeed throughout his life his predilection for his own peculiar doctrines, and his disinclination to coalesce with any other church unless they were unreservedly adopted, are remarkable. It was only at the pressing solicitation of Farel that he now entered upon the project of a union with Zurich. When Farel first suggested it Calvin alleged the obstinacy of the Zurichers, the view which Berne would take of the matter, the difficulty in leaving Geneva, and other excuses : but perceiving from a correspondence with Bullinger that that minister was more likely to come into his views than he had anticipated, he at length agreed to comply with his friend's wishes.⁵ Accordingly, toward the end of May, 1549, he proceeded to Neufchâtel, in order to carry Farel with him to Zurich to assist in arranging the Concordat. The scheme of it must, however, be regarded as belonging to Calvin. In the preceding March a synod had been held at Berne, which had been attended by all the

¹ See his tract *De Cænâ Domini*, p. 8, B., *Opera*, Amst. ed.

² See his *Secunda Defensio*, sub init.

³ Ruchat, v., 379.

⁴ In this last tract, the following passage, as well as several others, would exclude the Lutheran dogma : "Only I would remark in passing, that to consider Christ to be under the bread and wine, or so to conjoin him with them as that our mind cleave to them, and be not elevated to heaven, is a diabolical madness."—*De Cænâ Domini*, *Opera*, viii., 7, A., Amst. ed. Compare the *Confessio Fidei nomine Ecclesiarum Gallicarum*, drawn up in 1542 (*Ibid.*, p. 97, B.)

⁵ Kirchhofer, *Leben Farel's*, ii., 93, et seq.

ministers of that canton, to the number of three hundred and twenty; and to this assembly Calvin had addressed a letter, exhorting them to unity in the sacraments, and which he accompanied with twenty articles respecting them, which afterward formed the basis of the Zurich *Consensus*.¹ The latter document itself was drawn up with Calvin's own hand; and in the preface he allowed Farel the credit of having been the original promoter of the union.²

Calvin's doctrine on the subject of the eucharist was, as is well known, a mean between those of Zwingli and Luther.³ The manner in which he differed from the latter is thus described by Planck: "According to Luther's opinion the body of Christ descends miraculously during the sacrament, and is brought into such connection with the outward symbols of bread and wine, that it is not only present with them, but *in* them, and *under* them, and can thus be received through the mouth by any body who partakes of the symbols, and even therefore by a man without faith. But according to Calvin the body of Christ does not descend into the sacrament, but the soul of the recipient ascends into heaven through faith; and being thus brought into contact with Christ's body, receives a power of holy life."⁴

Calvin, in one of his letters to Bullinger during the correspondence before mentioned, has himself explained the points in which he differed, or seemed to differ, from the Swiss church on this subject. In this he says: "When the symbols of Christ's body and blood are offered to us in the supper, we hold that they are not offered in vain, but that we derive a real benefit from them: whence it follows, that we eat his body, and drink his blood. By so speaking we neither turn the symbol into a reality, nor confound them both together, nor include the body of Christ in the bread, nor suppose it to be infinite, nor dream of a carnal transfusion of Christ into us, nor set up any other such an invention. You assert Christ, in his human nature, to be in heaven; we do the same. The name of heaven conveys to you the notion of distance of place; and we likewise readily confess that Christ is separated from

¹ This letter, together with the articles, will be found in P. Henry, *Leben Calvins*, ii., Beil. 18.

² This *Consensus* is published among Calvin's tracts, and a translation of it will be found in Ruchat, v., 370, et seq.

³ It is not, however, certain, that Zwingli altogether denied a spiritual presence in the eucharist. There is a difference on this subject in his earlier and later works.

⁴ Quoted by P. Henry, ii., 472.

us by local distance. You deny the body of Christ to be infinite, and hold it to be contained in its own circumference. Here, too, we openly and ingenuously testify our assent. You would not mix the sign with the thing signified; and we also sedulously inculcate that the one must be distinguished from the other. You severely condemn the doctrine of impanation, and to this condemnation we subscribe. What, then, is the sum of our opinion? That when we behold the bread and wine here on earth our souls must be elevated to heaven to partake of Christ, and that he is then present to us when we seek him beyond the elements of this world. Nor is it lawful for us to accuse Christ of deceit; which, however, would be the case, unless we held that the reality was exhibited to us together with the sign. You also concede that the sign is not an empty one; therefore it only remains that we should define what it comprehends. When we briefly answer that we are thereby made partakers of Christ's body and blood, so that he dwells in us and we in him, and thus enjoy his universal benefits, is there any thing, I pray, obscure or absurd in these words?"¹

Hence it appears that the chief difference between Calvin and Bullinger on the subject of this sacrament was, that though both believed in a *real* participation of the body and blood of Christ, the former, with his usual love of system, would explain the manner of it, namely, by the elevation of the soul to heaven, which Bullinger was willing to leave undefined.² The same difference marks the two theologians on the subject of grace and election. Here Calvin defined his doctrine in the most precise terms, and in the harshest manner; while Bullinger, though he recognized the election of God, was unwilling to pursue it through all its logical consequences, and especially to that of reprobation. And thus, though Calvin seized the opportunity offered by this *Consensus* for introducing his favorite doctrine, yet he could not get Bullinger to go all the length he wished upon that head.

At Zurich the *Consensus* was arranged between the clergy and lay councilors: Calvin forwarded the draft of it for Bullinger's approval, and received it back, before the end of Au-

¹ MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, ii., Beil. 18, 6 Cal. Jul., 1549.

² I do not mean, however, to assert that Calvin pretended to explain the *miraculous manner* in which the virtue of Christ's body is communicated to us in the sacrament, which would have been absurd. On this subject see his tracts *De verâ Participatione*, &c., *Opera*, viii., 727, A., Amst. ed., and *De Cœnâ Domini*, near the end.

gust, with a few verbal alterations in the preface and epilogue. In the following October it appeared in print, with a letter from Calvin to Bullinger, and the latter's answer. The clergy of Berne assented to it, but it was not allowed to be printed in that town.¹ Melancthon and the more moderate Lutherans also agreed with Calvin's view; and the Zurich *Concordat* might possibly have led to a union of the whole Protestant Church but for the subsequent interference of Westphal and others; unless, indeed, the doctrine of election should have proved a hinderance. With whatever moderation that doctrine was expressed in the *Consensus*, Melancthon, as Calvin himself tells us, on receiving a copy of it, ran his pen through the passage in which the elect are distinguished from the reprobate.²

At this time Lælius Socinus, the son of Mariano Socinus, a celebrated jurisconsult of Bologna, was residing at Zurich. Lælius had been intended for his father's profession; but a restless and inquisitive spirit drove him in preference to the study of theology, though without any intention of devoting himself to the service of the Church. At the age of twenty-one he went to reside at Venice, where he separated from the Romish communion. That city being neither a safe residence for a heretic, nor containing any learned men who could solve the religious doubts by which he was tormented, Socinus removed, in 1547, to Chiavenna;³ a place noted for heterodoxy in religion, and where Socinus seems to have imbibed some of those peculiar opinions which afterward distinguished the sect called after him and his nephew, Faustus, *Socinians*. After a short residence at Chiavenna, Socinus traveled through Switzerland, France, England, and the Netherlands; and toward the end of 1548, or beginning of 1549, came to Geneva, where he made the acquaintance of Calvin. The skeptical spirit of Socinus was concealed under the modest guise of a disciple and a learner: and he was accustomed to propose his views in the shape of doubts and questions on which he required information, and thus to avoid all appearance of dogmatical assertion. The same dissimulation characterized the sect which he partly helped to found, whose tenets may be regarded as a timid compromise between Deism and Christianity. In 1549 we find him addressing some letters to Calvin, in which he proposed the three follow-

¹ See Haller's *Diary, Mus. Helv.*, ii., 87.

² See Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 141.

³ Trechsel, *Antitr.*, ii., 142, et seq.

ing questions: Whether it was lawful for a member of the Reformed Church to marry a Papist? whether popish baptism was efficacious? and in what manner the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was to be explained? Calvin, who seems to have been struck with the talents and learning of the young Socinus, though he disapproved of his over-inquisitive turn of mind, answered these questions in two elaborate letters.¹ In these he wholly condemns marriage with a Catholic; but does not consider popish baptism as inefficacious, but, on the contrary, thinks it should be resorted to when none other can be had. The reasons he assigns are, that the Papists must still be considered as constituting some remains of a church, however deformed and corrupt; and that the character of the baptizer, whether he be an atheist, or even a devil, is of no consequence as to the validity of the sacrament. With regard to the third question—the resurrection of the flesh—how should it have been possible to answer a man who wished to know the exact manner of it: whether, as our body is continually changing, we should receive again that of our youth, or of our old age, which can not be said to be *the same bodies*? whether those who have been mutilated in life would rise with perfect bodies?² and other questions of the same description. Calvin answered Socinus, as well as he could on such a subject, in his first letter, by referring him to the different texts of Scripture relating to it; at the same time declaring the question to be one rather of curiosity than utility. But when he found that Socinus was not satisfied with his answer, he refused to enter further into the question.

Toward the end of 1549,³ the general assembly suddenly abolished the four festivals, which had still continued to be celebrated at Geneva: namely, those of the New Year, the Annunciation, the Ascension, and Christmas; a step which created a feeling of great discontent at Berne, and indeed almost led to an open rupture with that city. Calvin has given an account of this matter in a letter to Haller, and in one to another minister,⁴ in which he defends himself from the charge of having had any part in it. In these he states, that when he came to Geneva, he found that all festivals had been already abolished by Farel and Viret, except the Lord's day;

¹ Epp. 103 and 104.

² See the tract of Socinus on this subject, in Trechsel, *Antitr.*, ii., Beil. 445.

³ On the 16th of November. See Ruchat, v. 425. Bèza places this occurrence in the following year; but he is not always correct in his dates.

⁴ Epp. 118 and 128.

that the four celebrated at Berne were re-established by the same decree of the people by which Farel and himself were banished; that upon his return from exile he might easily have effected their abolition; but that seeing the heat that prevailed on the subject between the different parties, he preferred a middle course, namely, that these festivals should be observed in the morning by shutting the shops and abstaining from business, but that after dinner they should be reopened, and work resumed; that this practice had led to disorder, and had excited a suspicion among strangers that the Genevese were not well agreed among themselves, inasmuch as some of the citizens observed this regulation, while others did not; and that he had therefore exhorted the council to find some remedy for this difference; but had neither advised, nor even desired, the abolition of the festivals, concerning which he had not been consulted, and which he had heard of with the greatest surprise.

All this may be literally true; yet Calvin himself acknowledges that he was not sorry for the change which had been effected; and in his position it was easy enough to show which way his wishes inclined without expressing any direct and open opinion upon the subject. But what throws something more than a suspicion on the candor of this defense is the fact that in December, 1544, as appears from the Registers, Calvin had actually recommended to the council the abolition of the festival of Christmas, as well as of the other three.¹ At the same time, as he remarks in his letter to Haller, there seems to be no good reason why the Bernese should have taken such offense at the line of conduct adopted by the Genevese, who were surely the best judges of what the interests and discipline of their church required. Calvin was so much blamed for this change that it was even rumored in some quarters that he meant to abolish the Sabbath.²

In 1550 Calvin introduced another alteration in the discipline of the Genevese church. It being thought that sufficient effect was not produced by mere preaching, he determined that at certain seasons each minister, accompanied by one of the elders, should visit the houses of his parishioners, for the purpose of interrogating them as to their faith,

¹ "Le jour de Noel sera célébré comme à l'ordinaire quoique Calvin ait représenté au Conseil que l'on pourroit se dispenser de faire cette fête de même que les trois autres."—*Régistres*, 19 Dec., 1544. Grèvus, *Fragmens Biographiques*, sub anno.

² Ep. 128.

and giving them instructions. Beza ascribes wonderful effects to this practice.¹ But, meanwhile, this extraordinary strictness of discipline was developing one of its usual results by producing the most consummate hypocrisy; as will always be the case in any religious system which demands too great an outward appearance of piety, and exactions too rigid for ordinary human nature. Some of the greatest scoundrels in Geneva were the most regular in attending the sermons. In the course of the year we find Calvin complaining to the council respecting the sentence of a criminal executed for coining base money, in which was inserted that he was one of those who had taken refuge at Geneva for the sake of religion, and that he went to church every day: a clause which he maintained to be derisive and contrary to God's honor.² But is hypocrisy no offense in the eye of God? And if it be, how can it be contrary to his honor to denounce a man as a hypocrite, as well as a rogue? But Calvin would not have a word whispered against the refugees.

To the offense which had been taken at the abolition of the fêtes Beza ascribes the origin of Calvin's work "*De Scandalis*," the dedication of which to M. de Normandie is dated the 9th of July, 1550, the anniversary of Calvin's birthday. *Scandalum* is here used in its primitive sense of "a stumbling-block," or, "rock of offense;" and scandals are divided into three principal classes; first, the offense which proud and worldly men take at the simplicity of the gospel, &c.; second, the sects and divisions which arise among the preachers of the gospel; third, the scandals which spring from the wickedness, hypocrisy, ingratitude, and vanity of worldlings. Among the contemners of the gospel Calvin names Rabelais, Agrippa, and others.

Laurent de Normandie, to whom this work is dedicated, had filled the office of *lieutenant de roi* at Noyon, and had left his native town, with Calvin and his family, for the sake of religion. The popish inhabitants of Noyon held them both in the greatest detestation; and in 1551, a false report having been spread of Calvin's death, they offered up solemn prayers on the occasion.³ Some time afterward M. de Normandie was burned in effigy at Noyon by an *arrêt* of the par-

¹ *Vita Calv.*, anno 1550.

² "Calvin se plaint comme d'une dérision contraire à l'honneur de Dieu de ce que l'on a inséré dans la sentence d'un criminel exécuté pour fausse monnoie, qu'il s'étoit retiré ici pour la religion et alloit tous les jours au prêche."—*Régistres*, 3 Nov. 1550. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

³ Calvin to Farel, Ep. 140.

liament of Paris. By the same *arrêt* the minister Abel was cited to appear before the court of Noyon, though ridiculously enough, no mention was made of Calvin. A few days after the burning of M. de Normandie's effigy a great fire occurred at Noyon, which, by a sort of miracle, left the house of Calvin's father standing, though all around it were reduced to ashes. The person who related this to Calvin regarded it as a judgment of God against the inhabitants of Noyon, for their conduct towards M. de Normandie.¹

¹ Ep. 143.

CHAPTER VIII.

St. Augustin and Pelagius—Predestination—Case of Bolsec—Calvin's Account of his Tenets—Bolsec indicted—The Swiss Churches consulted—Bolsec's Life in danger—Bullinger's Advice to Calvin—Letter of the Bernese Ministers—M. de Fallais patronizes Bolsec—Calvin's Tract on Predestination—Calvin and the English Church—Affair of Dr. Hooper—Cranmer's Principles and Projects of Union—Calvin's Letter to him—Misconceives Cranmer's Situation.

It has been seen that in his book against Pighius, on the subject of predestination, Calvin had only entered into what may be called the philosophical portion of the question, or that concerning the freedom or servitude of the human will; while the treatment of the more awful and important part of it, namely, that of absolute decrees, had been deferred to some future opportunity. His multifarious occupations, and perhaps also the want of some stimulus to draw him out, had hitherto prevented him from again taking up his pen on this subject; but an event which happened in the year 1551, not only led to a public agitation of the question, but induced him to finish the work which he had begun against Pighius. This was his quarrel with Bolsec on the subject of his favorite doctrine.

St. Augustin, who flourished toward the end of the fourth, and the beginning of the fifth centuries, was the first of the Fathers who introduced the doctrine of predestination into the Christian Church. The youth of Augustin had been dissolute, and his education irregular; but a lively genius, and an inquisitive turn of mind, led him into researches respecting the origin of evil, the nature of God, and other difficult and abstruse questions, which only served to perplex and bewilder an understanding untrained by proper discipline and culture. On the very threshold of manhood and reason he fell into the Manichean heresy, in which he remained for nine years; during which period he also indulged in the dreams of judicial astrology. He owed his conversion to the Catholic faith chiefly to St. Ambrose, bishop of Milan; but he had passed his thirtieth year before he became a catechumen.¹ Even after his conversion, however, he was still haunted by his

¹ Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.*, xiii., 51, et seq.

metaphysical notions, and sought a knowledge of God as much in the books of the Platonists as in the Scriptures. In the latter he was particularly struck by the writings of St. Paul; and it was while meditating in his garden on one of the epistles of that Apostle, that Augustin, like St. Paul himself, felt a sudden call to a holy life: though in his case the conversion seems at all events to have been assisted by a growing weakness of the lungs, which disqualified him for the vocation which he followed at Milan of professor of rhetoric.

When, in his fortieth year, Augustin composed his "Questions on the Epistles of St. Paul," he still considered faith as springing, not from grace, but free will;¹ and it was not till three years afterward, in his books addressed to Simplician, that he first laid down the doctrine of predestination, to which he is said to have been led in examining these words of St. Paul: "What have ye that ye have not received?"² This account sufficiently shows that the Fathers before his time were not predestinarian; for, had that been the received doctrine of the early church, St. Ambrose, and the other instructors of Augustin, would scarcely have left him to discover it by his own unassisted researches. This fact was urged against him by the Pelagians, who not only objected that the primitive Fathers did not teach predestination, but that they were actually adverse to it.³ From this objection Augustin endeavored to escape by affirming that the Pelagian heresy not having appeared in their days, they had not found it necessary to declare their sentiments; a subterfuge which still leaves unexplained the fact of their being *against* the doctrine.⁴ Indeed, it was only late in life, and after he had been heated by the Pelagian controversy, that Augustin himself adopted the doctrine in its most unmitigated form: for he was constantly touching up and altering his writings; and his most noted works on the subject are two, written just at the close of his life, entitled, "On the Predestination of Saints," and "On the Gift of Perseverance."⁵

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 189.

² *Ibid.*, p. 286.

³ "For the Pelagians formerly attacked St. Augustine with the same reproach, namely, that the other writers of the Church were *against him* (*adversos*). He first, therefore, defends himself by observing, that previously to the heresy of Pelagius, they had not delivered the true doctrine of predestination very accurately or acutely. 'What need, then, is there,' says he, 'to search their works, who, living before that heresy sprang up, had no occasion to enter into a question of such difficult solution?'"—Calvin, *De æternâ Dei Prædestinatione, Opera*, viii., 596, B.

⁴ Dr. Tomline has shown, in his "Refutation of Calvinism," c. v., that the doctrine of the ancient Fathers was in direct opposition to the peculiar tenets of Calvinism.

⁵ Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.*, xiii., 921.

Pelagius, the opponent of Augustin, pushed his heresy to the contrary extreme; and in his zeal for good works, excited by the scandalous lives both of the clergy and laity of his time, rejected altogether the operation of grace. His own life is said to have been a model of purity; but if he practiced what he preached, we may remember that he was released, through peculiar circumstances, from some of those temptations to which in his youth Augustin had succumbed.¹ The latter, as is well known, obtained the victory over his adversary; and Pelagius, and his assistant, Cœlestius, were twice anathematized by different Popes. But the doctrine of St. Augustin, though thus stamped with orthodoxy, seems never to have been very generally popular in the Romish Church; and—such is the strange mutability of human opinion—we find, as we approach the period of the Reformation, that the sentiments of Pelagius had gained a complete ascendancy among the Romish hierarchy, and were become the very cause and instrument of that corruption against which they were originally directed. Good works were regarded not only as a sure passport to heaven for the doers of them, but the supererogatory ones of the saints formed an inexhaustible fund from which even the grossest sinners might draw the same privilege; and that not only with as much sureness as election itself could confer, but with the additional advantage of its being obtainable for money. But though this gross abuse at first very naturally excited the indignation of the Reformers, and drove them back to Augustinian tenets in their severest form, which had, indeed, never been wholly extinct among the monks of that order, and among the Dominicans; yet after a while we find the more moderate portion of the Reformers becoming gradually sensible of the inconveniences and inconsistencies to which the doctrine of predestination led, and consequently either abandoning it, or at least keeping it as much as possible in the back ground.

Hume has somewhere traced the doctrine of absolute decrees to a spirit of enthusiasm; and in its founder, and many of his followers, this was probably its true origin. There is, however, another disposition of mind, which, in some temperaments, favors its reception—I mean the love of systematizing, and of logical deduction. In Calvin, who was singularly free both from superstition and enthusiasm, it was probably to this quality of mind that we must ascribe the adoption of the doctrine; though he was, perhaps, partly led to it by that

¹ Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.*, xiii., 562.

gloomy view of religion which characterizes him as a theologian, and which, in the establishment of his discipline, induced him to adopt the severities of the Mosaic law, intended only for a peculiar people, rather than those more lenient and cheerful precepts of Christianity which were meant for the use of all mankind. His theory on the subject, viewed merely with regard to its logic, is so far perfect and consistent as to force those who would escape from it into the adoption of two, if not contradictory, at all events, incongruous propositions. That all things spring solely from the will of God; that he foresees them, because he forewills them; that if man's will were free, then there would be another will besides that of God; that things might consequently arise which he had neither foreknown nor fore-ordained, and thus the government of the world be in a great measure taken out of his hands, and left to chance and contingency: these reflections, applied to the doctrine of free will, give rise to difficulties which minds of the highest order have confessed their inability to solve.¹ Viewed, too, more particularly as to the relation between God and man, Calvin's doctrine afforded him an opportunity to insist on the duty of humility and entire submission to God's will; and to inveigh against the pride and self-exaltation of those who would pretend by their merits to wring from him, as it were, the possession of heaven, without being indebted for it to his grace and bounty.²

Though Calvin's scheme was beset with many difficulties, there was nothing positively incomprehensible in it; nor were there wanting many texts of Scripture, and especially in the writings of St. Paul, which he could quote in its support and justification. Yet minds equally pious, equally acute, and equally enlightened with his own, rejected it. They viewed with horror its incompatibility with the attributes of God, as known to us both from reason and revelation, at the same time that they were struck with its inconsistency, not only with the promises contained in the gospel, but with the whole

¹ "The reconciling of the prescience of God with the free will of man, Mr. Locke, after much thought on the subject, freely confessed he could not do, though he acknowledged both. And what Mr. Locke could not do in reasoning upon subjects of a metaphysical nature, I am apt to think few men, if any, can hope to perform."—Letter of Lord Lyttelton to Mr. West, quoted by Dr. Tomline, *Refutation of Calvinism*, c. iv.

² On this point Sir T. Browne very aptly remarks: "Insolent zeals that do decry good works, and rely only upon faith, take not away merit: for, depending upon the efficacy of their faith, they enforce the condition of God, and in a more sophistical way do seem to challenge heaven."—*Religio Medici*, Pt. i., § 60.

scheme of Christian redemption. That God should call all, yet elect only a few; that he should send his Son into the world to suffer an ignominious death, for the purpose of saving those whose fate had been decided before the foundation of the world, and thus to effect a redemption by which nobody was redeemed; that he who is essentially just and merciful should consign one portion of his creation to eternal misery solely from caprice, or, at all events, for sins which he would have necessitated them to commit, as if he were the cause of guilt and evil: these consequences of the doctrine, besides being horrible and revolting, appeared to many minds quite as absurd as the logical incongruity to which its rejection seemed to lead. Such persons submitted their reasoning pride to their conviction of God's mercy and justice, and were willing to say that the doctrine of free will led to consequences which they could not understand, rather than attribute to the Almighty a mode of action utterly incompatible with all their notions of him. From the letter of Melancthon to Calvin before quoted, it appears that a friend of the former, named Francis Stadianus, was first bold enough to avow his belief both in providence and contingency, though he admitted that he could not reconcile their co-existence. Melancthon himself acceded to his views; nor have the researches of more modern inquirers been successful in discovering any other outlet, consistent with revelation, from this intricate labyrinth.¹

Calvin himself was not insensible of the difficulties attending his doctrine. Some of the objections to it he evaded, others he denied. When closely pressed, he would declare that the mystery was too profound for his understanding; that it was one of the deep secrets of God; and would answer in the words of St. Paul: "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus?" &c.² Sometimes he would advance the supralapsarian doctrine, that God decreed the fall of man in order to get glory by it.³ The objection that his doctrine made God the author, or rather, the cause of sin, which Melancthon had brought against it, and which is one of the principal ones urged by Bolsec, Cas-

¹ "With regard to the question of predestination, I had formerly a friend at Tübingen, a learned man, named Francis Stadianus, who used to say that he believed both that all things happened by the decree of Divine Providence, and yet that they were contingent; though he acknowledged that he could not reconcile these opinions."—Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 48.

² See *De aeternâ Dei Predestinatione, Opera*, viii., 595, B.

³ *Instit.* iii., ch. 23, § 8.

tellio, and others, Calvin found it difficult to meet. In his book against Pighius he shortly dismisses this difficulty with the remark that the solution of it is above the human understanding.¹ In his tract against Bolsec he endeavors to explain the matter by the similitude of a just king, who, in pursuing a legitimate war arms a great many soldiers, who may commit the greatest enormities; yet it would be unjust to impute their crimes to the monarch who sends them forth.² This is a striking example of the fallacy of using comparisons by way of argument. As if, forsooth, there was any analogy between an earthly king who merely *uses* such instruments as he finds at hand, and the King of Heaven, who *creates* those instruments! In his tract against Castellio he acknowledges that he can not satisfactorily explain his doctrine: "What a rank calumny, then, is it, he says, to implicate a man who has deserved well of the Church of God (*i. e.*, Calvin himself), in the crime of making God the author of sin? He every where, indeed, teaches that nothing is done but by the will of God; but at the same time he asserts that God directs the wicked deeds of men in such a manner by his secret decree, that the latter has nothing analogous to human guilt. The sum of his doctrine is, that God, in a wonderful manner, and by methods unknown to us, governs all things to what end he pleases, so that his eternal will is the first cause of every thing. But why God should will what appears to us by no means fit and proper he acknowledges to be incomprehensible."³ His system then, by his own admission, was attended with almost as much difficulty as that of free will; which, at all events, affords an outlet from this dilemma. A reasoner as acute, but on this point more consistent and intrepid than Calvin, has not hesitated to push the doctrine to its legitimate conclusion. The philosopher of Malmsbury did not see that it was any dishonor to God to say that he was the cause of sin; though he held that the absolute power of the Deity made it impossible for him to commit sin himself.⁴ Calvin endeavored to avoid this objection to his doctrine by allowing man a one-sided liberty, namely, that of sinning. But when Georgius Siculus objected the absurdity of maintaining at the same

¹ *Opera*, viii., 126, A.

² *Ibid.*, p. 627, B.

³ See *Brevis Responsio*, &c., *Opera*, viii., 629, A.

⁴ "This I know, God can not sin, because his doing a thing makes it just, and consequently no sin; and because whatsoever can sin, is subject to another's law, which God is not. And, therefore, it is blasphemy to say God can sin. But to say that God can so order the world as a sin may necessarily be caused thereby in a man, I do not see how it is any dishonor to him."—Hobbes, *On Liberty and Necessity*. See Works, v., p. 116, 117.

time that man is free to sin, and yet that the reprobate sin of necessity, Calvin evaded instead of answering the difficulty, which he dismissed in two or three short sentences.¹

It is not exactly known at what time Calvin first adopted his doctrine of predestination. Bretschneider affirms that it was in 1539, when preparing his "Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," at Strasburgh;² but we have already seen that the doctrine was laid down in the first edition of his "Institutes," though not so methodically as in the subsequent ones. At all events, however, it does not appear that, up to the rather advanced period of his life to which our narrative has now brought us, Calvin had attempted to enforce his theory with any practical severity. In his tract "*De Scandalis*," published in this very year, 1551, he had expressed himself with much moderation on the subject; reproving all vain curiosity, and exhorting to sobriety of judgment, and to acquiescence in what Scripture reveals concerning it, without searching any further.³ In the preface, too, to his French version of Melancthon's "*Loci*," which, as already mentioned, he published in 1546, and of which a second edition appeared in 1551, we find the following remarkable passage: "The same with regard to predestination. Since he (Melancthon) sees at present so many light-minded persons who abandon themselves too much to curiosity, and observe no moderation in this matter, in order to avoid this danger, he has chosen to treat only of what is necessary to be known, and to leave the rest, as it were, buried, rather than, by drawing all the conclusions he well might have done, to give the reins to many perplexed and intricate disputes, which, however, produce no fruits of useful instruction. I confess, indeed, that whatever be the consequence, nothing which it has pleased God to reveal to us in Scripture, should be suppressed. But he who seeks profitably to instruct his readers may well be excused if he stop short at what he knows will be most expedient, passing lightly over, or leaving entirely behind, that which he does not expect to profit."⁴

A passage in Calvin's tract "*De æternâ Dei Prædestinatione*," written toward the close of the same year, but after his dispute with Bolsec, forms a remarkable contrast with the preceding one. He there says: "My Institutes, to cite noth-

¹ See *De æternâ Dei Prædestinatione*, Opera, viii., 621, B.

² Calvin et l'Eglise de Genève (*Reformations Alm.* French translation, Genève, p. 95).

³ Calvin, Opera, viii., 75, B.

⁴ From the second edition, Genève, 1551.

ing else, are sufficient evidence of my sentiments on this subject. I would particularly request my readers to recollect what I there inculcate: namely, that this is not, as some falsely think, *a subtle or thorny speculation, calculated to weary the mind, without any fruit; but a weighty argument, and excellently adapted to the furthering of piety.* For it is one which may well build up our faith, teach us humility, and excite us to admire and celebrate God's inestimable goodness toward us."¹

In a theologian, whose consistency has been so much vaunted, these variations of opinion are very striking. Can it have been that the irritation caused by Bolsec's opposition to his doctrine, led Calvin to assert it with more strictness and intolerance than before? On this point the reader must form his own opinion from the history of the case, which I shall now proceed to relate.

It was early in the year 1551, that Hieronymus Hermes Bolsec, afterward known by his biography of Calvin, came to Geneva, and established himself as a physician. He was a native of Paris, and had at first been a Carmelite monk; but giving vent to some opinions of too free a character respecting the Roman Catholic Church, had found it expedient to doff the hood, and to fly to Italy, where he was received and protected by the Duchess of Ferrara. Here he married, and adopted for a livelihood the profession of medicine: a calling which in those days of frequent pestilence, arising from ignorance of the saving powers of diet and cleanliness, and when a new and terrible disorder had begun to visit Europe, offered one of the surest resources against poverty. Beza, in his "Life of Calvin," represents Bolsec as having been expelled from Ferrara for some deception which he had practiced on the duchess. That writer, however, subsequently proved a more bitter enemy to Bolsec even than Calvin himself, and his testimony must therefore be received with caution. At all events, Bolsec's character stood sufficiently well at the time of his first visiting Geneva, where he succeeded in acquiring the acquaintance and friendship of some of the leading people. He had not long been there when he began to question Calvin's doctrine of predestination, in the circles which he frequented. He could scarcely have commit-

¹ Calvin, however, introduces two or three sentences into the dedication of his tract "*De æternâ Dei Prædestinatione;*" in order, apparently, to soften down the glaring inconsistency between that work and his preface to the "*Loci.*"

ted a more unpardonable offense. It came to Calvin's ears. Bolsec was sent for, privately admonished, and instructed in that profound mystery. These admonitions proved, however, unavailing; and for a second offense Bolsec was summoned before the consistory, and openly reprehended. Calvin has given an account of this part of the case in the following letter to Christopher Libertet.

“ You are much deceived, my dear Christopher, if you think that the eternal decrees of God can be so mutilated, as that he shall have chosen some to salvation, but destined none to destruction. For if he chose some, it surely follows that all were not elected: and of these latter what else can be said but that they were left to themselves that they might perish? There must therefore be a mutual relation between the elect and the reprobate. Jerome Bolsec acknowledges indeed in words that a certain number is elected by God, but on being urged more closely he is obliged to extend election to all mankind. For he openly maintains that grace efficacious to salvation is equally offered to all; and that the cause why some receive and others reject it, lies in the free will of those who by their own proper motion follow God who calls them. Nor does he dissemble that all men are so endowed with free will, that the power of obtaining salvation is placed at their disposal. In this manner you see that predestination is torn up by the roots, and free will set up as, in some degree at least, procuring our salvation. But it is something more than ridiculous that Jerome, who confesses to free will, should yet abhor the name of merits. For how can he be deprived of merit who is reckoned among the sons of God, because he has conformed himself to the grace of adoption which was offered to him? That this was his meaning, or rather that he was possessed by such a madness, he had before sufficiently shown. He was called before our assembly, when, in spite of his cavils, I dragged him from his hiding-place into the light. Besides the fifteen ministers, other competent witnesses were present; and all know that if he had a single drop of modesty he would have been immediately converted. At first he used trifling and puerile cavils; but being more closely pressed he threw aside all shame. Sometimes he denied what he had twice or thrice conceded, and then again admitted what he had questioned; he not only vacillated, but sometimes entirely abandoned his principles; and kept revolving in the same circle without measure or end. Nor could it have been otherwise. For, un-

less we confess that those who come to Christ are drawn by the Father, and that this is by the peculiar operation of the Holy Ghost on the elect; it follows either that all must be promiscuously elected, or that the cause of election lies in each man's merit. If it be maintained that reprobation begins only with man's second contumacy, it follows that God has no certain design, and that his resolution as to what he shall do with every individual is suspended. Jerome admits that we are all naturally depraved, and holds that the grace of God is offered to all to correct the innate depravity of our nature. But he feigns that some by their own free will admit this correction, so that it may be efficacious; and that others who might have the same liberty, by rejecting it, become twice contumacious; and hence he deduces his fictitious reprobation. Who does not see that in this manner the eternal decree of God is subjected to the will of man? And yet you imagine that you see I know not what elegance in so gross an absurdity! For my part, if I know any thing of divinity, I think this is a far more stupid and absurd invention than that of the papists was. If the fruit of election be a good and proper will in man, it follows that the reprobate are inclined to evil by all the affections of their hearts. Nor does Paul (Romans, ix., 16), when he denies that it is of him that willeth, attribute a vain and imperfect will to the reprobate, but rather teaches that when they who were previously averse from all rectitude, begin to have a good will, and to walk in the right path, it is owing to the mercy of God. Let people, therefore, cease to place the source and first cause of the separation between the elect and the reprobate in the human will, if they would leave any room for the election of God."¹

At that time, as we have seen, a custom prevailed at Geneva somewhat resembling the "Prophesyings," used in some parts of England in the reign of Elizabeth. The ministers preached by turns at St. Peter's on a Friday; and these sermons were not only open to the criticism of their brethren, but even laymen were permitted to step forth and propose difficulties or objections. On the 16th of October, 1551, a numerous congregation was assembled. The preacher, John de St. André, took his text from John, viii., 47: "He that is of God heareth God's words; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God:" which he explained to mean, that they who are not of God, oppose him to the last, be-

¹ Ep. 135.

cause God grants the grace of obedience only to his elect. Suddenly Bolsec stepped forth from the crowd, and opposed the preacher's views, with many unbecoming expressions. He entered into an argument to show that men are not saved because they are elected, but that they are elected because they have faith; and that nobody is reprobated by the absolute decree of God, except those who, by their own fault, deprive themselves of the election offered to all. "How can you believe," he exclaimed, "that God decides the fate of man before his birth, consigning some to sin and punishment, others to virtue and eternal happiness? It is a false and godless notion, introduced by Laurentius Valla, which would ascribe the origin of sin and evil to God, as the ancient poets ascribed it to Jove. Would you convert a just and eternal Being into a thoughtless tyrant, deprive virtue of its excellence, vice of its shame, and the wicked of their pangs of conscience?"¹ Nay, he even quoted the Fathers, and loading the clergy with abuse, exhorted the people not to be led astray.

It has been conjectured that Bolsec was set on by Calvin's enemies; and his audacity was probably increased by not seeing the head of the Genevese church in his accustomed seat. But during his harangue Calvin had entered the church unobserved; and, hidden among the spectators, had listened in silence to Bolsec's attack on his grand doctrine. When Bolsec had finished, he pushed through the circle, and suddenly presenting himself before the orator, overwhelmed him for a long time with arguments supported by texts from Scripture, and unpremeditated quotations from St. Augustin.² Farel, who chanced to be present, also addressed the assembly with fervor.³ All seemed ashamed, except the monk himself, who stood confounded, indeed, but unabashed. With him the most convincing reasoner seems to have been the lieutenant of police; which officer, being among the audience, apprehended Bolsec for abusing the ministers and disturbing the public peace.

On such an occasion Calvin's zeal needed no spur. The very same afternoon the ministers assembled, and drew up seventeen articles against "un Quidam nommé Hierosme;" which they presented to the council, with a request that he should be interrogated concerning them.⁴ In some of these

¹ Calvin, Ep. 133.

² Beza, *Vita Calv.*

³ Ruchat, v., 458.

⁴ These articles, together with Bolsec's answers, &c., will be found in Trechsel, *Antitr.*, i., Beil. ii., and also in P. Henry, iii., Beil. ii., from a copy in the archives of Berne.

articles Calvin's doctrine is stated in the driest and nakedest terms, and a categorical answer required, in a manner which, on a subject at once so awful and so abstruse, appears most repulsive. The following two or three will serve by way of specimen of the spiritual tyranny exercised by Calvin. Bolsec's answers, which are subjoined, seem to breathe a more humble and Christian spirit.

"ARTICLE X.—*Item*, If he does not believe that God, before he saw any difference between men, elected some and rejected others?"

"ANSWER.—I reply that we should not say that God has a foreknowledge of one thing more than of another, for in Him is neither present nor future, but all things are present to Him at once. I therefore say, that He sees at one view the difference between the faithful and the unfaithful, and the election of one and reprobation of the other."

"ARTICLE XI.—*Item*, If it does not proceed from an admirable design of God, the first cause of which is unknown to us, that some are led and others not?"

"ANSWER.—I reply that I do not wish to enter into this admirable and secret design of God; and that it suffices me to confine myself to His simple word, which tells us that they who believe in His Son shall be saved, while the faithless shall be condemned; and that He has sent His Son into the world in order that all might believe in Him. Wherefore, observing that Scripture leads us no further, it might suffice to stop there, without proceeding to puzzle the understanding of the simple."

"ARTICLE XII.—*Item*, That when the gospel is preached, whether the cause why some believe, and others not, be not that God calls efficaciously those whom He has predestined to salvation?"

"ANSWER.—I reply that I do not conceive that God has predestined to save some rather than others, but that He has predestined to save those who believe through His efficacious grace; and that in others who reject the faith, the grace of God, which produces faith, is not efficacious because they do not value and esteem it as they ought; so that their sin in not believing proceeds from their contempt and rebellion, and not from the decree of God."

These questions show that Calvin, in spite of the discretion which he sometimes thought fit to recommend on this subject, would not only himself know the cause, and be in the secret of all God's designs, but even make others subscribe implicitly

to his opinions. Yet in his own case, when he appeared before the synod of Lausanne in 1539, he positively refused to subscribe the three ancient creeds of the Church, when required to do so at the instance of Caroli, *although he professed to believe in them*; and this solely on the ground that he would not sanction the introduction of such a tyranny into the Church as should permit one person to compel another to declare his faith.¹ So dangerous is the possession of absolute authority! and so apt are the sentiments of the wisest and most consistent men to be swayed by the circumstances in which they may happen to be placed.

Bolsec, in his turn, proposed several questions to Calvin, to which he required him to answer categorically, "without human reasons and vain similitudes, but simply according to the word of God." The style of these questions, some of which are very pertinent, must doubtless have proved highly offensive to Calvin, so long accustomed to domineer without opposition in such matters. "These questions," says Dr. Henry, "which possess something attractive for all ages, inasmuch as they represent the views of a sound and natural feeling, but with which the church (*i. e.* Calvin), being compelled to go further in order to repress Pelagianism, could not agree, laid apparently the ground for Calvin's work on election, which appeared shortly afterward."²

As, in his answer to Calvin's fifth interrogatory, Bolsec had asserted that his opinions were shared, among others, by Melancthon, Bullinger, and Brenz, the consistory requested the council not to pass any judgment on his case till the Swiss churches had been consulted. The council accordingly wrote to those of Zurich, Berne, and Basle, sending them a list of Bolsec's errors, and requesting their advice as to how they should proceed with him. The errors imputed to him were the following five:

1. That faith depends not on election, but that election proceeds from faith.

2. That nobody remains in his blindness from the corruption of his nature, since all have the requisite enlightenment from God; and that it is an insult toward God to say that He abandons some to their blindness, because it is His pleasure to do so.

3. That God leads to Himself all rational creatures, and that, at first, He abandons none, but only those who have often resisted Him.

¹ See above, chap. ii., p. 70

² *Leben Calvins*, iii., 52.

4. That the making of a heart of stone into a heart of flesh, means only, that God gives us a heart capable of understanding; but that this grace is universal, and that some are not more predestinated to salvation than others.

5. That when St. Paul says (Ephes., i., 5), that God has elected us through Jesus Christ, this does not regard election to salvation, but the election of disciples, and of St. Paul himself to the office of an Apostle.¹

With regard to this last point, Calvin observes in a letter to the ministers of Basle. "When I objected to him that in that case the Apostles alone would be capable of gratuitous election, they alone reconciled with God, they alone presented with the remission of their sins, he was so far from being touched that he heard these thunders with a dog's grin."²

Besides this letter of the council's, a circular was also addressed to the same churches by Calvin and his colleagues, which has been already quoted, for the account of Bolsec's behavior during the dispute at St. Peter's.³ It speaks in the most offensive and contemptuous terms of Bolsec, who, at that time, at least, does not seem to have deserved the imputations cast upon him. He was well received in the Genevese circles, and was, in particular, patronized by M. de Fallais, and his wife, Mad. de Brederode, persons of nobility and distinction, who had left their country for the sake of religion, and who were at that time actually living in Calvin's house, at his own pressing solicitation. But as Ruchat remarks, "Calvin was, as every body knows, a great zealot for the doctrine of predestination and election. He frequently preached it with warmth, regarded it almost as the basis and foundation of religion, and treated those who rejected it, without ceremony, as scoundrels, rogues, and worthless fellows."⁴

The circular in question begins as follows: "We have here a certain Jerome, who, having laid aside the monk's hood, is become one of those doctors of the market-place, who, by means of cheating and deception, acquire such a degree of impudence, that they are fit and willing to venture upon any thing." Then, after detailing Bolsec's case, as already related, the letter proceeds: "As he boasted that there were many ministers in other churches who shared in his views, we begged our council not to pronounce its judgment till it should receive the answer of your church, and thus learn that the scoundrel wickedly and abusively pleaded your

¹ Ruchat, v., 459.

² Ep. 133.

³ Ep. 134.

⁴ *Réformation de la Suisse*, v., 456.

suffrage. At first he was ashamed to decline this appeal to the churches; but he carped at it, on the ground that your familiarity with our brother Calvin would justly render you liable to suspicion. The council, however, acceded to our request, and resolved that you should be consulted. Bolsec, moreover, dragged your church into the affair. For, while he particularly condemned Zwingli, he falsely affirmed that Bullinger was of his own opinion. In the Bernese ministers he also slyly sought a handle for discord. *It is our wish that our Church should be purged from this pest in such a manner that it may not, by being driven thence, become injurious to our neighbors.*"

What could this last sentence mean? The church of Geneva was to be delivered from the pest, which was not, however, to be driven thence. The problem how this could be accomplished admits but of two solutions: perpetual imprisonment, or death. At that time, however, the former punishment was but little customary. A short poem, composed by Bolsec while in prison, evidently shows that he considered his life in danger. In the course of it the following lines occur:

"En prison suis comme meurtrier inique,
Comme méchant qui à tout mal s'applique;
Privé de biens et d'amis je demeure,
Ou va criant—*Tolle, tolle, qu'il meure.*"

In the course of these doggerels he naturally enough expresses astonishment that he should be subjected to these persecutions at Geneva, the fountain-head of religious liberty:

"En mes travaux l'entendement s'élève,
Considérant que je suis en Genève,
Qui a chassé les abuseurs Papistes,
Sorbonniqueurs, et tels autres sophistes;
Et toutefois pour la parole pure
De Jésus Christ en Genève j'endure!"

He concludes, however, with expressions of constancy and reliance upon God:

"Sus donc, mon cœur, reprends vigueur et force
Chasse douleurs, et de chanter t'efforce—
Louange à Dieu! qui pour ton salut veille;
Il est pour toi, quelque mal qu'on le veuille,
Chasse les pleurs, jette douleur amère,
Pour louer Dieu, pour invoquer ton père!"¹

A passage in the answer of the Bernese council to that of Geneva shows that they also suspected Calvin of desiring to push the proceedings against Bolsec to the extent of capital

¹ The poem will be found at length in P. Henry, iii., Beil. 2.

punishment : for they strongly deprecate such a course on the ground of its impolicy, as being calculated to stimulate the persecution of the Protestants in France and other parts.¹ That such a suspicion should have been entertained shows that a strong opinion must have been already formed respecting Calvin's intolerance ; for as yet there was nothing *in his published works* which tended to justify the capital punishment of real or pretended heretics, but the contrary. The immediate cause of the suspicion of the Bernese was, doubtless, however, the passage just alluded to in the Genevese letter.

Calvin himself denied, in his preface to the *Consensus Pastorum*, as well as in a private letter to Bullinger, that he had harbored any such design, and affirmed that the rumor of it was a malicious invention of his enemies.² If we are to take him at his word, we can only fall back on the other alternative, and assume that the meaning of his ambiguous phrase was imprisonment for life : a tolerably hard punishment for presuming to differ with him on so abstruse a point. As he considered most of his opponents to be reprobates, it may be that his rigid doctrine of predestination caused him to treat them with the more severity : for why should he spare a man whom God had condemned from all eternity ? In the present instance, however, he may have been determined to a milder course, by the nature of the replies from the Swiss churches, which we shall now consider.

These replies were very unsatisfactory to Calvin. It is true that the verdict was, on the whole, in his favor ; but the terms in which it was expressed were both vague and moderate ; and the most material point of the controversy—reprobation—was evaded. The reply of the Basle ministers was very short. They expressed a desire not to penetrate too deeply into the mystery, but to leave it in the hands of God.³ The answer of Bullinger and the Zurich ministers was particularly annoying to Calvin. In their public letter to the council of Geneva, they referred to what had been said on the subject in question in the *Consensus* agreed upon between themselves and the Genevese church in 1549, as embracing

¹ " Car certes si le dit Hieronyme dût souffrir à cause de son erreur punition de corps ou de vie, est à craindre que non seulement en ce pays, mais aussi en France et ailleurs l'on en prendra grand regret et occasion de plus grande malévolonté contre vous et les vôtres, aussi contre tous ceux de la religion évangélique."—See P. Henry, iii., 56, note.

² Calvin to Bullinger, Jan. 21st. 1552 (MS. Tig., *Ibid.*)

³ Their letter will be found in P. Henry, iii., 52.

all that was necessary for the pious. The main point at issue—absolute and eternal reprobation—was passed over in silence: nay, they even seemed to attribute something to the will.¹ In this letter the Zurich ministers defend Zwingli, the great founder of their church, from an imputation cast upon him by Bolsec, to the effect that he held that men were driven by necessity, and therefore compelled by God, to sin. They admit, indeed, that something of this sort might be inferred from his book on the Providence of God; but they refer to other both earlier and later works of his, in which sin is ascribed to the corruption of the human will.

If Calvin disliked this public letter of the Zurich ministers, a private one that Bullinger addressed to him was still more unacceptable. In this Bullinger strongly impressed upon him the necessity for mildness and moderation. "Believe me," said he, "many are displeased at what you say in your Institutes about election, and draw the same conclusions from it as Bolsec has done from Zwingli's book on Providence:" adding, "According to the sentiments of the Apostles, God wills the happiness of all mankind."²

Calvin expressed the displeasure which he felt at the opinion of Bullinger and the Zurich clergy in a letter to Farel (Jan. 27th, 1552), in which he says: "Your letter, in which you requested me to swallow in silence the injury done me by my neighbors, came too late. With respect to the Zurichers the die had been cast three days before; and, though the remedy was in my power, I did not choose to recall the letter which had been sent. I was compelled afterward to write to those of Basle,³ with whose empty and frigid answer I was at first not a little offended: but those which afterward arrived from others contained such indignities as easily reconciled me with it. You are much deceived in thinking that the Zurichers will hereafter see their fault spontaneously. Expect rather that they will deny the election of God altogether. It was a wonderful providence that, without having such a design, I so bound them by the terms of our *Consensus*, that they are at least deprived of the power to hurt us; for I have been told by a certain person that, otherwise, they would now be Bolsac's patrons."⁴ This affair caused a misunderstanding and coldness for some time between Calvin and Bullinger.⁵

¹ See their letter, Dec. 1st, 1551 (MS. Tig., *Ibid.*, Beil. 2).

² *Ibid.*, p. 55.

³ See Ep. 134.

⁴ P. Henry, iii., Beil. 22.

⁵ Trachsel, i., 188.

But of all the letters written on this occasion that of the ministers of Berne is the most remarkable for its mild and tolerant spirit ; which is so strongly impressed upon it, that it would almost seem to be the production of a later age. After applauding the zeal for unity displayed by the Genevese ministers, those of Berne proceeded to say : " Still we feel that the greatest care should be taken not to treat the erring too severely, lest by immoderately vindicating purity of doctrine we desert the rule of Christ's spirit, and transgress that brotherly charity by which we are reckoned his disciples. Truth is dear to Christ : granted, but so also are the lives of his sheep ; not only of those which walk in the truth without offense, but also of those which go astray : nay, according to the gospel parable, the good Shepherd hath even a greater care of the latter. This you know yourselves ; we are not teaching the ignorant, but admonishing the wise. Most of us are so constituted that in this sort of controversies it usually happens that in our zeal to defend the truth of the Christian doctrine we neglect what is required of us by a spirit of charity and Christian gentleness, and are carried away by our fervor, and our desire of upholding the truth, into a conduct unbecoming the disciples of Christ. As if, forsooth, the love of charity were incompatible with a zealous maintenance of the truth ! when in fact the union of both proceeds from the most genuine Christian spirit ; than which, as nothing is more averse from falsehood, so nothing is more given to meekness and charity. We approve your desire of upholding the true doctrine, and we pray God that as he hath sanctified you in his truth, so he will preserve you in it to the end, against the prince of all falsehood, to your own good, and that of many others. At the same time we beseech you to reflect how prone the human understanding is to error ; and on the other hand how noble, and therefore how much easier it is, to win a man back by gentleness than to compel him by severity. As to the particular cause of the dispute between yourselves and Jerome, you can not be ignorant of the perplexity it has occasioned to many good men, and of whom, in other respects, we can not think so ill : who, when they read those texts of holy Scripture which proclaim the universal grace of God, want judgment rightly to perceive and acknowledge the awful mysteries of divine election and predestination ; but cling to the announcement of God's universal grace and goodness, and think it can not be said of him that he reprobates, blinds, and hardens any man, without at the same time saying, with

a blasphemous inference, that he is the author of human blindness and perdition, and, consequently, of all the sins that are committed."

Then, after quoting several texts in favor of universal grace, the Bernese ministers proceed: "Many, by no means bad men, so adhere to these texts, that they are unable to look with the pure eyes of faith on the cause of divine predestination; concerning which some have not idly admonished that we should speak the more cautiously and circumspectly, because it is not milk for babes, but food for men. And so this Jerome clearly shows that he belongs to this weaker sort, inasmuch as he refuses to enter upon this secret counsel of God. These things we mention, not as alien from your own conscience, but, as you have asked our opinion, that we may, like faithful servants of God, notify that which in our judgment may best serve both to the peace and edification of your church, and lead the mind of Jerome himself to a spirit of peace. He is altogether unknown to us, but some say that he is not so bad a man,"¹ &c.

This letter betrays the good sense and moderation which characterized the ministers of Berne. It was, indeed, as Dr. Henry observes, a strong lecture for Calvin; but it was one from which he needed not to have been ashamed to profit, for it breathes the genuine spirit of the gospel. The whole of this correspondence leaves the impression that Calvin had quite miscalculated his position. It revealed to him that Melancthon and the Lutheran church were not his only opponents on the doctrine in question; but that all the Reformed churches of Switzerland disapproved of the lengths to which he pushed it. He found that he stood almost by himself, and hence the angry and disappointed tone of his letter to Farel. The effect of the Swiss letters was a milder judgment on Bolsec. He was sentenced to banishment for life, under pain of being whipped if ever he should be found within the city of Geneva or its territory.² Hereupon he retired to Thonon.

This affair excited considerable discussion in the religious circles. Bolsec's cause was warmly espoused by M. de Fallais, who, as it has been said, was at that time dwelling with Calvin; but who was so disgusted with his conduct on this occasion, that he renounced his friendship, and quitted Geneva.

Jacques de Bourgonne, sieur de Fallais and Bredam, was

¹ MS. Bern., *apud* P. Henry, iii., Beil. 17, et seq.

² Beza, *Vita Calv.*

descended from the dukes of Burgundy; while his wife, Jolande de Brederode, traced her pedigree from the old counts of Holland. Between Calvin and this couple a correspondence had been kept up from 1545 to 1548, which exhibits Calvin in his unbent hours in a pleasanter light than might have been anticipated, and presents a favorable specimen of his French style.¹ He had long pressed M. de Fallais to come to Geneva; but even the temptation of a cask of old wine, which he had laid in expressly, and which he represented as difficult to be replaced,² failed at first to tempt that nobleman. M. de Fallais seems to have felt, as Dr. Henry remarks,³ that Calvin was one of those great men whom it is best to know at a certain distance; and, therefore, when he left his country for the sake of religion, he at first betook himself to Basle in preference to Geneva. In that town, formerly the residence of Erasmus, as it was then of Castellio, a more elegant and liberal tone prevailed in society, nor were its clergy so ascetic and precise as those of Geneva. After much pressing, however, M. de Fallais at length came to Geneva, and took up his abode with Calvin while the latter's wife was still alive. His residence at Basle had not prepared him for the acerbity of Calvin's theology; and it was with surprise that he beheld the bitterness and morosity of the modern Augustin. He embraced the side of his physician, in whose views he subsequently declared his concurrence; and not only left Geneva on the banishment of Bolsec, but used all his influence with the Bernese to induce them to protect him. In this he succeeded, notwithstanding Calvin's efforts to prevent it, whose anger still pursued its victim. Thus writing to Fabri, in December, 1551, Calvin says: "It is of the greatest importance that that knave should not be harbored in the Bernese territories. I am so ashamed of De Fallais, that I can not bear the sight of those who reproach me with his levity."⁴ And in the letter to the clergy of Basle, before referred to, he observes; "Let De Fallais write what he will about his (Bolsec's) not being a bad man, and prostitute his good name to ridicule in favor of an obscure scoundrel, it will soon appear, and with more detriment to the church than I could wish, how pernicious a pest he has been."⁵ He attributed that nobleman's affection for Bolsec to a sort of fascination, arising from a cure which Bolsec had

¹ They were published at Amsterdam in a separate volume, 1774.

² Letter xlv.

³ Vol. iii., p. 65.

⁴ MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 67, note.

⁵ Ep. 134.

performed on one of his maid servants, for a cancer.¹ Turretin, too, affirms that the interest which M. de Fallais took in the matter arose from his fear of losing Bolsec's services; and mentions that he had written to the Swiss churches in his favor, with the view of influencing their verdict.² But these are partial testimonies, and it is quite as likely that M. de Fallais was incited by a dislike of Calvin's doctrine, to which his residence at Basle would naturally have contributed.

It is singular, however, that Bolsec himself, in the "Life of Calvin" which he afterward published, does not mention that his patron's quarrel with that Reformer arose upon any point of doctrine, nor from any regard that he felt for himself, or value for his services as a physician; but makes it the occasion of bringing a charge of a flagrant nature against Calvin. He affirms that the real cause of M. de Fallais' leaving Geneva was, that Calvin had solicited the chastity of his wife, who thereupon requested her husband to remove to Berne; and he asserts that he had frequently heard Madame de Brederode state this in the presence of her husband.³ But this charge does not rest on any other authority than Bolsec's, which must not be lightly taken; for it is certain that one of a still more infamous nature which he brings against Calvin is a gratuitous calumny. Nevertheless, it seems at least probable that such a report was in circulation at that time; since, from an entry in the diary of Haller, one of the Bernese ministers, we learn that Calvin appeared before the council of that city on the 17th of February, 1552, for the purpose of clearing himself from certain calumnies.⁴

No provocation can excuse Bolsec for bringing these infamous charges; yet he was probably incited by Beza's "Life of Calvin" to insert them in his own biography of Calvin. In the work alluded to, Beza charges Bolsec, after he had returned to the Roman Catholic communion, with prostituting his wife to the canons of Autun; an imputation, the truth of which is liable to considerable suspicion, from the virulence displayed by Beza in persecuting Bolsec, and from the fact that that writer, and even Calvin himself, were not always very scrupulous in ascertaining the truth of what they alleged against their adversaries. It is certain that Beza's "Life of

¹ Letter to Bullinger, *apud* P. Henry, iii., 67, note.

² See *Bibl. Germ.*, t. xiii.

³ *Vie de Calvin*, p. 24, Paris, 1557.

⁴ "Calvin came hither, and purged himself before our council from the calumnies of certain individuals."--*Ephém.*, 17 Février, 1552 (*Mus. Helv.*, ii., 99).

Calvin" appeared before Bolsec's, which was not published till many years after Calvin's death.

The breach between Calvin and M. de Fallais was never healed; though the latter did not, as Bayle affirms (art. *Philippe de Bourgogne*), abandon the Protestant communion. Calvin had not only written for him an "Apology" to be laid before the Emperor of Germany, in which De Fallais assigns the motives of his conversion to Protestantism, but had also dedicated to him his "Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians." In the second edition of this work, however, Calvin canceled this dedication, and substituted one to Carraccioli, Marquis of Vico.

In consequence of this dispute with Bolsec, Calvin drew up his tract "On the Eternal Predestination of God;" which, under the name of a *Consensus* or Agreement of the Genevese Pastors, he dedicated to the syndics and council of Geneva, on the 1st of January, 1552. The name of Bolsec, however—whom Calvin parallels with the burner of Diana's temple at Ephesus—is passed over in silence; and he is designated as "too insipid an animal" to be the subject of a regular treatise. Instead of him Calvin adopts "the dead dog" Pighius as his opponent; and seizes the opportunity to complete the work which he had formerly begun against him. It is also made the vehicle for an answer to a certain Georgius Siculus, a Benedictine; an enthusiast who pretended that Christ had appeared to him, and appointed him an interpreter of Scripture.¹

In the course of the year 1552 Calvin was in correspondence with Cranmer. His interference in English affairs began a little earlier, and it was soon after the death of Henry VIII. that he first manifested any direct interest in the spiritual affairs of England, by addressing a long letter to the Protector Somerset, dated on the 22d of October, 1548.² In this Calvin confines himself to points of discipline and church government. He adverts to two factions by which the church of England was distracted; the Papists, and the fantastic Gospels, or Anabaptists. He particularly calls the attention of the Protector to three points: first, the method of instructing the people; second, the extirpation of old abuses; and third, the repression and punishment of vice. With regard to the first, he particularly insists on the necessity of *lively* preach-

¹ Calvin, *Opera*, viii., 594, B.

² It will be found in the original French in P. Henry, *Beil.* 4. It forms Ep. 87 of Calvin's Latin correspondence.

ing. "I say this, sire," he observes, "because it seems to me that there is little of such preaching in the kingdom, but that sermons are for the most part only read." He admits, however, that this was a necessity arising from the scarcity of fit and proper ministers; a want, as our ecclesiastical annals show, felt for many years after this period, owing to the great majority of men bred at the universities being inclined to the old religion. Calvin's hint seems not to have been wholly flung away. In the following year Knox was appointed by the council to preach at Berwick;¹ and afterward we find him one of King Edward's six itinerant chaplains, who were employed to propagate reformed tenets through the country by preaching. Under this head of instruction Calvin also recommends, as a means to repress Anabaptists and other visionaries, that some code of doctrine should be drawn up, to be sworn to by the clergy, and that a catechism for children should be prepared. Both these suggestions were afterward adopted, though it is probable they would have occurred to Cranmer without any hint from Geneva.

With regard to the second head, namely, the extirpation of old abuses, Calvin acknowledges the importance of proceeding with moderation, but maintains that this should not be carried to such a length as to operate to the prejudice of religion. The retained abuses which he objected to were prayers for the dead, anointing (*crême*), and extreme unction.

Under the third head, the repression and punishment of vice, he advises ecclesiastical penalties against adultery, drunkenness, blasphemy, and other vices which do not fall so immediately under the cognizance of civil laws. He would have introduced the same discipline which he had established at Geneva, and have maintained it by the same means, namely, excommunication, or exclusion from the communion. He does not, however, drop a hint respecting the establishment of a consistory, but seems to recognize the episcopal form of government, and the power of the Protector, as head of the Church, by virtue of his representing the king; though he had objected to that function in the person of Henry VIII.²

¹ Strype, *Memorials*, iii.

² "Car comme la doctrine est l'âme de l'Eglise pour la vivifier, ainsi la discipline et correction des vices sont comme les nerfs pour maintenir le corps en son état et vigueur. L'office des Evêques et curés est de veiller sur cela, afin que la cène de nostre Seigneur ne soit point polluée par gens de vie scandaleuse; mais en l'autorité où Dieu vous a mis la principale charge revient sur vous, voyre de mettre les aultres en train, afin que chacun s'acquitte de son devoir, et faire que l'ordre qui aura esté estably soit deurement observé."

This letter contains a remarkable passage in which Calvin recommends the Protector to repress the mutinous Papists and Anabaptists by the sword. It will be recollected that in the following year a commission issued for trying Anabaptists, under which Joan Bocher, or Joan of Kent, was burned. Can it be that the mind of the English primate was fortified in this course by the advice and opinion of so great a theologian as Calvin, even so as to resist the tears and supplications of the young king, and to light up the first fire of persecution in a Reformed community? ¹

After this Calvin's intercourse with England seems to have been intermitted for a year or two. From a letter of his to Farel, dated on the 15th of June, 1551, it appears that his communications were renewed with the English court in that year, and that Cranmer had assured him he could not be more usefully employed than in writing frequently to the young king. ² The renewal of the correspondence at this period was occasioned by Calvin's having dedicated to Edward VI. his "Commentary on Isaiah and the Canonical Epistles," as he mentions in a letter to Bullinger in the month of March in that year; ³ adding that he had accompanied the books with some private letters of exhortation. It appears from the letter to Farel, before referred to, that Calvin had sent one Nicholas, probably Nicholas de la Fontaine, into England with these books and letters, who had nearly suffered shipwreck on his passage homeward. On Calvin's messenger delivering his letters to the Duke of Somerset, and mentioning that he had others for the king, the Protector himself undertook to introduce him to Edward, who, as well as his council, showed much joy on receiving them. At this time the affair of Dr. Hooper, who had been appointed to the see of Gloucester in 1550, was occupying the attention of the English church. Hooper had left England toward the end of Henry's reign, and at the time of the promulgation of the Interim was residing at Zurich, where he seems to have imbibed his aversion to the surplice, and other canonical habits. In the reforms introduced by Cranmer in 1548, the subject of the priestly garments was long under discussion. Some

¹ The passage runs as follows: "Tous ensemble méritent bien d'estre réprimés par le glayve qui vous est commis, veu qu'ils s'attachent non seulement au Roi, mais à Dieu qui l'a assié au siège royal, et vous a commis la protection tant de sa personne comme de sa majesté."—See P. Henry, ii., Beil. 30.

² See Ep. 123.

³ Ep. 120. Calvin's letter to the king, accompanying the Commentaries, is printed by the Parker Society (*Original Letters*, P. ii., p. 707).

objected to them as remnants of superstition; but on the other hand it was contended that the priests, under the Mosaic dispensation, wore white garments; that they were used in the African churches during the fourth century; that they seemed a natural emblem of the purity which became the priestly office; and that many of the English clergy were so poor that they were unable to provide themselves with decent clothing, and would thus become objects of contempt and ridicule to the people if they officiated in the pulpit without the surplice.¹ These arguments had prevailed; but Hooper, on his appointment, refused to be consecrated, objecting to the oath, which contained the words "by God, by Saints, and by the Holy Ghost," and to what he called the Aaronical habits.² The first of these objections was got over by the young king striking out the objectionable words with his own hand. About the habits there was more difficulty. The king and council seemed inclined to abolish them; but Ridley and the other bishops were for retaining them, holding them to be things indifferent, which ought to be complied with. In a subsequent discussion Cranmer showed a disposition to yield; but Ridley and Goodrick stood out. The primate, distrusting his own judgment, wrote to Bucer for his opinion, who was then professor of divinity at Cambridge.³ Bucer answered that the habits might be used without offense to God, and that those who opposed and rejected them on the ground of their unlawfulness were at least in error: but he at the same time expressed a wish that they should be abolished, as affording to some an occasion of superstition, and to others of bickering and contention. He also wrote to Hooper himself to the like effect. Peter Martyr wrote to Bucer to express his concurrence in his view of the question, and his dissatisfaction at Hooper's scruples; which he thought were calculated to create disturbance, and injure the cause of the Reformation.⁴ But however obstinate and unreasonable was Hooper's conduct that of the council was hardly less so. They would not permit him to decline the bishopric, a step which would at once have put an end to the matter; but during the controversy confined him to his house. The affair was at length compromised, and Hooper was consecrated in March, 1551, on the following conditions: that he should consent to wear the robes at his consecration, and

¹ Burnet, *Reformation*, ii., 155.

² *Ibid.*, iii., 389.

³ Cranmer's letter is dated December 2d, 1550. See *Cranmer's Remains*, i., 341, and note

⁴ Burnet, ii., 317.

when he preached before the king or in his cathedral; but that at other times he should be at liberty to dispense with them. This was the first appearance in England of those unhappy differences which afterward prevailed between the Church and the Puritanical party.

Calvin himself thought that Hooper carried his scruples too far. In his letter to Bullinger he says: "I have received the sad news that Hooper has been imprisoned; an event of which I had some apprehensions previously. I fear that the bishops will grow rampant on this victory, and therefore, though I approve of his constancy in refusing to be anointed, yet I should have preferred that he had not contended so pertinaciously respecting the cap and surplice, (although I do not approve of them), and so I lately endeavored to persuade him."¹ Calvin, in his letter to the Duke of Somerset, had recommended Hooper to his protection.² This recommendation seems not to have been neglected. In the following October, Hooper, on the deprivation of Heath, was appointed to the see of Worcester, which he held in *commendam*; and in the following spring, during the meeting of the Parliament, we find him residing in the primate's palace, on a footing of the greatest friendship.³

In the letter to Farel before referred to,⁴ Calvin adverts to the interception of the ecclesiastical revenues by the nobility as one of the most crying evils in the English church, but for which there was no remedy till the king should come of age. Meanwhile they hired improper persons at a low price to discharge the office of the ministers, or rather to fill their places. In the same letter he alludes to the death of Bucer, which had happened a little previously. This he considered a great loss to the Church in general, and particularly to that of England.

When the death of Henry had left Cranmer some liberty of action, one of the designs which lay nearest his heart was the uniting of all the Protestant churches into one common confession of faith.⁵ Many years previously a union had indeed been attempted with the Lutherans; and from a letter of Melancthon's to Camerarius, dated on the 13th of September, 1534, we find that he had then already received two invitations to come to England.⁶ But during the reign of

¹ Ep. 120

² Ep. 121.

³ See Cranmer's letter to Bullinger, March 20th, 1552 (*Cranmer's Remains*, i., 345, and note).

⁴ Ep. 123.

⁵ See Strype, *Cranmer*, p. 407.

⁶ See Matthes, *Leben Melancthons*, p. 151, note.

Henry the question of the eucharist would have prevented any union with the Swiss churches, and indeed with the Lutheran: for that monarch appears never to have discarded the doctrine of transubstantiation; and in his negotiations with the Germans, he gave them plainly to understand that he expected they should submit to him, and not he to them.¹ The opinions of the primate on that question it is not easy to arrive at. During the life of Henry he seems to have inclined to the popish doctrine; and yet there are circumstances which favor the notion of his having been a Lutheran. The "Institution of a Christian Man," published in 1537, in the drawing up of which Cranmer had the principal hand, is altogether Roman Catholic, except on points relating to the power of the see of Rome. In the same year we find him writing to Vadianus, or Wat, a minister of St. Gal, in Switzerland, to express his disapprobation of a book which Wat had written against transubstantiation.² In a letter, however, which he addressed to Cromwell in 1538, we find the following passage: "As concerning Adam Damplic of Calice, he utterly denieth that ever he taught or said that the very body and blood of Christ was not presently in the sacrament of the altar, and confesseth the same to be there really; but he saith that the controversy between him and the prior was by cause he confuted the opinion of the transubstantiation, and therein I think he taught but the truth."³ Now, at this time, if he maintained the local presence, yet denied transubstantiation, he must have been a Lutheran. In the formulary, entitled "A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man," published in 1543, it is hard to say whether the Lutheran or Roman Catholic doctrine be maintained. The exact date of Cranmer's conversion to the tenets held by the Swiss churches on this subject can not be ascertained. Mr. Le Bas places it about the year 1547;⁴ but if that was so, Cranmer, at all events, kept it secret till the end of 1548. On the 31st of December of that year, we find Bartholomew Traheron writing to Bullinger as follows: "On the 14th of December, if I mistake not, a disputation was held at London concerning the eucharist, in the presence of almost all the nobility of England. The argument was sharply contested by the bishops.

¹ See Cromwell's letter to the divines of Wittenberg, and the king's answer to the Duke of Saxony and Landgrave of Hesse. Burnet, iii., 214, and *Recd.*, No. 45.

² *Cranmer's Remains*, i., 195

³ *Ibid.*, i., 257.

⁴ *Life of Cranmer*, i., 315.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, *contrary to general expectation*, most openly, firmly, and learnedly, maintained *your opinion upon this subject.*" And a little further on he adds: "I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism, now that those who were considered its principal, and almost only supporters, have altogether come over to our side."¹

After his conversion on this point, Cranmer, who had hitherto contemplated a union only with the Lutheran church, naturally began to turn his attention to those of Switzerland. We find him, indeed, addressing a letter of invitation to Melancthon, on the 10th of February, 1549; but that Reformer very nearly coincided with the Swiss respecting the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, nor did Cranmer wish to exclude the Lutherans from a union intended to be general. It was early in the year 1552, and consequently after Calvin's dispute with Bolsec, and the publication of his book on predestination, that we first find Cranmer including the church of Geneva in his project. It may be that before that period Calvin was not sufficiently known in England; and yet the dedication of his "Commentaries" to Edward, and the wish expressed by Cranmer on that occasion, would seem to show the contrary. However that may be, on the 20th of March, 1552, Cranmer addressed him a letter on the subject of his favorite scheme for a meeting of the heads of the Reformed churches, in order to draw up a common confession of faith, and especially on the subject of the eucharist.² About the same time Cranmer also appears to have addressed Melancthon and Bullinger to the same effect.

These efforts of the English primate to effect a union of all the Protestant churches are most praiseworthy. There has been already occasion to remark that Calvin was never very sanguine about such projects, nor showed much alacrity to enter into them, except when there was a prospect of implicit submission to his own notions. His answer to Cranmer in the present instance can be regarded as nothing more than a civil excuse; though it may be that his views of the implacable hostility prevailing among the different churches, and the consequent impracticability of a union, were more clear-sighted and correct than those of the archbishop, owing to his superior

¹ Parker Society's *Original Letters*, i., 322.

² This letter will be found in the original Latin in *Cranmer's Remains*, i., 346; and there is a translation in the Parker Society's *Original Letters*, i., 24. It sufficiently refutes the story of the animosity alleged to have existed at this period between Calvin and the English church. On this subject, see *Cranmer's Remains*, Preface, p. civ., note.

opportunities for closer observation and more practical knowledge. After some compliments to the latter, on his zeal for the welfare of the Universal Church, Calvin proceeds to observe: "I wish, indeed, it could be brought about that men of learning and authority from the different churches should meet somewhere, and after thoroughly discussing the different heads of faith, should, by a unanimous decision, deliver down to posterity some certain rule of doctrine. But among the chief evils of the age must be reckoned the marked division between the different churches, insomuch that human society can hardly be said to be established among us, much less a holy communion of the members of Christ; which, though all profess it, few indeed really observe with sincerity. But if the clergy are more lukewarm than they should be, the fault lies chiefly with their sovereigns; who are either so involved in their secular affairs, as to neglect the welfare of the Church, and indeed religion itself, altogether; or so well content to see their own countries at peace, as to care little about others; and thus the members being divided, the body of the Church lies lacerated. As to myself, If I should be thought of any use, I would not, if need were, object to cross ten seas for such a purpose. If the assisting of England were alone concerned, that would be motive enough with me; much more, therefore, am I of opinion, that I ought to grudge no labor or trouble, seeing that the object in view is an agreement among the learned, to be drawn up by the weight of their authority according to Scripture, in order to unite churches seated far apart. But my insignificance makes me hope that I may be spared. I shall have discharged my part by offering up my prayers for what may have been done by others. Melancthon is so far off that it takes some time to exchange letters: Bullinger has, perhaps, already answered you. I only wish that I had the power, as I have the inclination, to serve the cause," &c.¹

A little while afterward Cranmer seems to have written another letter to Calvin, which does not appear to be extant; but, from the latter's reply, it may be inferred that the English primate, finding all his efforts for a union of the Protestant churches unavailing, had communicated in it his determination to prepare a separate formulary for the church of England. As Calvin's answer sets forth at length his view of the state of our church at this period, we shall here insert it entire.

"Since at the present juncture a meeting of the principal

¹ Ep. 126.

ministers of the Reformed churches, for the purpose of promulgating, for the use of posterity, a stable and perspicuous confession respecting the different controverted points of doctrine, though much to be wished, can not be expected, I much approve, reverend lord, the determination you have come to, that the English shall at length maturely fix their form of religion: lest the minds of the people should be kept still longer in suspense by matters being left in uncertainty, or, at least, in a less orderly state than what is proper. To this end all that hold power in your country should contribute, but so as to leave you the principal share. You see what such an office demands of you, or rather what God may justly look for at your hands, in proportion to the functions with which He has intrusted you. In you is vested the chief authority, which falls to you not only from your high station, but from the opinion which hath long been conceived of your prudence and integrity. The eyes of many are upon you, either to follow where you lead, or to remain motionless under the pretext of your remissness. And I wish that under your auspices more progress had been made three years ago, and that so much had not remained to be done and struggled for now, in order to remove gross superstitions. I admit, indeed, that the gospel hath made considerable progress in a short time since it really began to reflower in England. Nevertheless, if you consider what is still wanting, and that too much remissness hath been shown in many things, you should not relax your efforts to reach the goal, as if a great part of the course had been already accomplished: for, to speak freely, the fear continually recurs lest so many autumns be spent in delay, that the cold of a perpetual winter may succeed. Your increasing age should stimulate you the more; lest if you should have to depart hence, leaving all things in disorder, the consciousness of your remissness should oppress you with anxiety in your last moments. I say disorder; because though outward superstitions have been corrected, still numerous shoots have been left behind, which may be constantly springing up. Nay, I am told that such a mass of popish corruption hath been left, as not only to obscure, but almost to overwhelm, the pure and genuine worship of God. Meanwhile, that which is the soul of all ecclesiastical order, I mean preaching, lives not, or at least is not so vigorous as it ought to be. You may be sure that true religion will never flourish till the churches are better provided with fit pastors, who can really undertake the office of teaching. Satan opposes this in artful and secret

ways ; but I understand that one manifest impediment is the spoliation of the ecclesiastical revenues. This is truly an intolerable evil ; but besides this dissipation, which is but too gross, there seems to be another fault as great—the appropriating of the public revenues of the Church to the feeding of idle stomachs, who troll their vespers in an unknown tongue. I say no more, except that it is something too absurd that you should approve of this mockery, which is openly at variance with the legitimate ordering of the Church. But these things, I doubt not, will occur to yourself, and will also be suggested to you by that excellent and most worthy man, Peter Martyr, whose counsel I am very glad that you use. Nevertheless, the many and arduous difficulties with which you are struggling, seem to me such as not to render my exhortations superfluous. Farewell, most excellent and reverend primate. May God long preserve you, enrich you still more with the spirit of prudence and fortitude, and give a blessing to all your labors. Amen.”¹

In the latter part of this letter, Calvin is a little too hard upon Cranmer, probably from not sufficiently understanding the exact state of affairs at that time in England. The cause which occasioned the want of fit and proper preachers has been already pointed out. It was not attributable to the neglect of Cranmer, nor even, perhaps, as Calvin suggests, to the artifices of Satan ; but was a very natural result of the sudden and somewhat violent change in the religion of the nation. In a small city like Geneva, it might be easy to supply the pulpits with efficient ministers, though even there, at the beginning of the Reformation, the want of them was much felt. At a later period, the demand was supplied by the great influx of French and other refugees, which offered Calvin materials ready to his hand ; and thus we find that during his time most of the Genevese clergy were Frenchmen. In England the universities were still filled with Papists, as Calvin might have learned from Bucer. No one could lament more than Cranmer himself the deficiency of competent preachers ; and to remedy the inconvenience, he had, immediately after the death of Henry, caused twelve homilies to be drawn up, to be read from the pulpits.² Under the circumstances, this was surely a better way of providing for the instruction of the people than by leaving it to the *extempore* effusions of ignorant

¹ Ep. 127.

² Three of these, namely those on Salvation, Faith, and Works, are said to have been drawn up by himself. *Cranmer's Remains*, Preface, p. xlvii.

and fanatical enthusiasts ; a method, however, which Calvin himself adopted, to fill the pulpits of France, as there will be occasion to relate further on. The spoliation of the Church by the nobility and courtiers in Edward's reign, Cranmer did all he could to prevent ; but his power and authority were not sufficient for that purpose. With regard to chantries, in which "vespers were trolled in an unknown tongue," an act being introduced into parliament for giving them to the king, Cranmer divided with the Roman Catholic bishops against the measure ; his object being to preserve them intact till the king came of age, in order that their revenues might be appropriated to the Church, instead of being diverted to secular uses.¹ It is to this step that Calvin seems to allude in his letter.

¹ Burnet, *Reformation*, ii., 448.

CHAPTER IX.

Account of Servetus—His Book against the Trinity—His Medical Studies—Settles at Vienne—His Correspondence with Calvin—Broken off by the latter—Publishes his "Restoration of Christianity"—Is denounced by Trie, and apprehended at Vienne—Calvin furnishes Evidence against him—Further Proceedings—Examination at Vienne—Escapes from Prison, and is burned in Effigy.

THE year 1553 was rendered the most memorable in Calvin's life by the burning of Servetus. This act, which has furnished his enemies with their favorite, and perhaps their justest topic of reproach, and which his friends would be willing, were it possible, to bury in eternal oblivion, I shall endeavor to relate with the strictest impartiality: no facts shall be adduced but what are supported by evidence, but, at the same time, none shall be suppressed. The lessons of history lose all their value when delivered in a mutilated form; nor can any reasonable and candid admirer of Calvin's character wish to see it protected by suppression and concealment. The abstract truth or falsehood of the doctrines which he promulgated, is not affected by his personal conduct; and even if it were, that would only be an additional reason why his acts should be shown in their true light. But before relating his proceedings on this occasion, it will be necessary to give a short account of the unhappy man who was the subject of them.¹

Michael Serveto, or, according to the Latinized form of his name, Servetus, was born at Villa-neuva, in Arragon, in the year 1509, and was, consequently, of about the same age as Calvin. His father was a notary, and, if we may trust the deposition of Servetus, in his examination at Geneva, his family was of an ancient, and even noble race. We have few particulars of his early life. Mosheim supposes that he received the first rudiments of his education in a Dominican convent—a conjecture founded on the circumstance that Quintana, the father confessor of the Emperor Charles V., and himself a Dominican monk, had a slight knowledge of him.² As he grew toward manhood, his father sent him to

¹ See Appendix, No. I.

² See Cochläus, *De Actis et Scriptis Lutheri*, quoted by Trechsel, *Antitr.*, i., 63.

Toulouse to study the law, where he seems to have spent two or three years. Servetus possessed, from the cradle, a diseased and sickly body, but a mind both inquisitive and acute, though imbued with a strong tincture of fanaticism. With these dispositions, it is not surprising that he should have ardently addicted himself to study, nor that jurisprudence should have been laid aside for other pursuits more congenial to such a temper. Even the philosophy of the schools had no charms for a mind like his. Endowed with much originality, and a still larger share of pride and self-will, he felt disinclined to recognize the established supremacy of Aristotle, and to submit himself to a discipline whose first demand is an implicit deference. On the other hand, his disposition toward mysticism led him to indulge in the reveries of judicial astrology. But what proved most attractive to him were the novel opinions in religion promulgated by the German Reformers, which were then beginning to make a great sensation throughout Europe. In conjunction with some other scholars of his acquaintance, he entered eagerly on the study of divinity; he began to read the Scriptures, in order to seek the truth at the fountain-head; he perused most of the Fathers, especially those who flourished before the time of Arius, and felt a decided predilection for the works of Tertullian and Irenæus. He also read the books of Luther and the other German Reformers, who seemed to him not to carry their opinions far enough. Even at this early period, Servetus had adopted his anti-trinitarian notions, and was seized with the desire of distinguishing himself as a Reformer. These, however, were dispositions which it was unsafe to manifest at Toulouse, a city which was considered the most superstitious, and its parliament the most sanguinary, in France.¹ He resolved, therefore, to go to Basle, and to submit his views to Cœcolampadius, the distinguished pastor of that city. He arrived at Basle in 1530, having traveled through Lyons and Geneva. Here he introduced himself to Cœcolampadius under his real name, and a correspondence ensued between them; in the course of which that Reformer expressed the greatest dislike of the new-fangled views of Servetus, and represented to him that he could not claim to be called a Christian, unless he admitted the Saviour to be not only the Son of God, but the *eternal* Son of God, of one substance with the Father. He felt it to be his duty to submit to his brother Reformers, Zwingli, Bucer, and Capito, whom he met at Strasburgh, the notions entertained on this

¹ *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, vol. i., p. 10.

subject by Servetus, and to ask their advice as to the conduct which he should adopt toward him, and especially as to whether he should denounce him to the authorities of Basle. This latter proceeding appears to have been opposed by Zwingli, who was averse to all compulsion in matters of conscience;¹ though he recommended Œcolampadius to prevent, if possible, the publication of the blasphemies of Servetus.²

From his intercourse with Œcolampadius, Servetus might have learned that the publication of his opinions respecting the Trinity would be quite as displeasing to the Reformed as to the Roman Catholic Church; but his vanity and obstinacy led him to disregard all such considerations. His book on the "Errors of the Trinity" (*"De Trinitatis Erroribus"*), the materials for which had probably been collected at Toulouse, was now ready for the press, and he had only to seek a publisher. He found one in Conrad Rous, a bookseller of Hagenau, who had also a shop at Strasburgh. The book was probably printed by John Secerius; but though Servetus did not hesitate to put his real name on the title-page, the printer had more prudence than to follow his example. It appeared in 1531, when its author had not completed his twenty-second year.³

The work of Servetus must at least be regarded as original, for all the anti-trinitarians before his time are insignificant. He refers to Scripture as the only source of all religious knowledge, but holds that it has two senses, one mystical, the other literal. Christianity, he thinks, had been prejudiced by the Aristotelian philosophy, and by neglecting the study of Hebrew. He holds that the doctrine of the Trinity was first erected when the Pope became the sovereign of the Church, and thinks that Paul of Samosata was right in representing Christ as a mere man. One of the points mainly insisted on is the impossibility that God should have a son co-eternal with himself. But what made his book doubly offensive was the light, and even blasphemous tone in which these tenets were delivered and enforced.⁴

¹ Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, p. 19.

² P. Henry, iii., 116,

³ The title runs: "*De Trinitatis Erroribus Libri Septem. Per Michaelem Servetum, alias Reves, ab Arragoniâ Hispanum, anno. MDXXXI.*"—There is an analysis of its contents in Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, § ix., et seq.; and in Trechsel, *Antitr.*, 68–98.

⁴ Thus, for example, he presses the last point by questions such as these: "Ubinam uxorem Deus habuerit? an utrumque ipse sexum habeat? aliudne gigni quam caro et sanguis possit?" &c.—Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, Beil. 394. He called the Trinity, a Cerberus—the three persons of the Godhead, deceptions of the devil, &c.

The book was received with equal indignation both by Protestants and Papists. Quintana procured an imperial edict for its suppression. Œcolampadius and Zwingli expressed their displeasure at it. Bucer at Strasburgh, where Servetus was residing, denounced him from the pulpit as worthy to have his entrails torn out.¹ Indeed such was the feeling excited against him in that town that it was no longer safe for him to remain there. Accordingly he returned to Basle, and ventured again to visit Œcolampadius; who, however, received him with anger, and denounced him to the council. Upon this Servetus wrote him a letter requesting to be allowed to send off his books to Lyons; beseeching him to spare his reputation and good name; and deprecating the putting of men to death for erroneous interpretations of Scripture.² Naturally gentle and tender-hearted, Œcolampadius was touched by this appeal. It induced him to give a mild report of the book to the council, who had requested his opinion of it. Although inclined to recommend that it should be altogether suppressed, he nevertheless suggested the alternative that it might be read by those whose principles were in no danger of being hurt by it: nay, he even allowed that it contained some useful things, but corrupted and rendered dangerous by what was mixed up with them. To the question of the council as to how the author should be treated he would make no reply, but requested them to consult other persons.³ The termination of this affair is involved in obscurity. It is certain that Servetus shortly afterward left Basle; but it does not appear that any criminal proceedings had been adopted against him. The answer of the ministers of Basle, when consulted about his case by the council of Geneva in 1553, would lead us to believe that he received no harsher treatment than the written and oral reproofs of Œcolampadius. In his examination at Geneva (Aug. 23d), he stated that he left Germany on account of his poverty, and because he did not understand the language; but, as Mosheim observes,⁴ both these assertions were most probably false; and indeed the former is refuted by his own letter to Œcolampadius, before quoted, which shows a desire to remain in Germany.

On leaving Basle Servetus proceeded toward France, but

¹ Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 156.

² Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, Beil. ii.

³ This paper of Œcolampadius will be found in Mosheim, Beil. iii.

⁴ *Ibid.* 43.

stopped at Hagenau on his way; where he published two more Dialogues on the Trinity, to which was appended a treatise on justification.¹ In the preface to this book he retracted all that he had said in his former work; not, however, as false, but as childish and imperfect.² His intercourse with Œcolampadius and other Reformers, as well as the attacks which had been made upon his book, had acquainted him with many objections to his doctrines of which he was not previously aware, and which he now took a fresh opportunity to combat. It is remarkable that in the second Dialogue Servetus rejected both the Lutheran and the Zwinglian doctrine of the eucharist, and seems to have had a notion of that mystical and spiritual presence afterward inculcated by Calvin.³ He concluded his book by claiming the liberty of freely interpreting Scripture, and by invoking a malediction on "the tyrants of the Church."⁴

Servetus probably arrived in France toward the end of 1531, or the beginning of 1532. His name had now become too well known to be borne with safety, and he accordingly laid it aside, and called himself Michel de Villeneuve, from the place of his birth. He had by this time discovered that, though heresy might consign him to the flames, it would not supply the means of living; and that the care of men's bodies offered a more profitable employment than meddling with their souls. With a view to turn physician, he entered the Collège des Lombards, and devoted himself to the study of mathematics and medicine. Mosheim is of opinion that between the years 1532 and 1534 he visited Italy, taking every opportunity of circulating his books and spreading his doctrines; and thus laying the foundation of those heretical opinions respecting the Trinity which afterward became so prevalent in that country.⁵ It is evident from some passages in his works that he had been in Italy, and had seen the Pope; but it is possible that there may be some truth in that part of his deposition before the inquisitors of Vienne, in which he stated that he entered the suite of Quintana, Charles V.'s confessor, in 1529, and was in it when that emperor was crowned by the Pope at Bologna.⁶ In this case he probably re-

¹ *Dialogorum de Trinitate Libri Duo.*

² The preface is given entire in Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, p. 44.

³ Trechsel, *Antitr.*, i., 105, note.

⁴ "Perdat Dominus omnes Ecclesiæ tyrannos. Amen." *Ibid.*, p. 109, note.

⁵ Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, p. 55.

⁶ Mosheim, *Neue Nachrichten*, p. 31. Charles V. was crowned by Clement VII., February 22d, 1530.

turned to Spain after his residence at Toulouse, and there entered the service of Quintana. Be this as it may, it is certain that he had returned to Paris in 1534; for it was in that year, as before related, that he challenged Calvin to a disputation there. Servetus had now attained great proficiency in medicine; but he was not rich enough to pay for his doctor's degree, without which he could neither lecture nor practice. To raise the necessary sum he repaired to Lyons, where he obtained employment from the celebrated printers, Melchior and Caspar Trechsel, as corrector of the press. Previously, however, to his journey to Lyons he appears to have spent some part of the year 1534 at Orleans. John Wier, or Wierus, in his book "*De Præstigiis Dæmonum*,"¹ alludes to the presence of Michael Villanovus at that university in the year mentioned, when Sleidan, the historian of the Reformation, and Sturmius, the author of the "*Antipappus*," &c., were also there. Wier likewise bears testimony to the Spaniard's abilities in the science of medicine. At Lyons Servetus seems to have been employed as corrector of the press by the Frellons, who were noted for their editions of valuable works, especially those of the Fathers; unless, indeed, his connection with those booksellers should not be referred to a later period of his life, viz., the year 1540, after he left Charlieu.² The employment of correcting the press was then deemed a more honorable one than it is considered at present. The number of men with acquirements sufficient for the task was but small; and some of the most eminent scholars in Europe did not disdain to undertake it. Lyons, too, presented many attractions to a man of literary habits. It abounded with rich and generous patrons of literature among the Italian merchants settled there, especially the Florentines. Here Servetus undertook an edition of the works of Ptolemy, which he got the Trechsels to print for him in 1535, under the name of Villanovanus. In this performance Servetus exhibited a better Latin style than in his theological writings, in which it is generally impure and embarrassed. A passage in this work, in which he gave the preference to Ptolemy's description of the Holy Land as being unfruitful, over that of Moses, was afterward urged against him on his trial at Geneva. Even at this time he seems to have been preparing his "*Restitution of Christianity*" ("*Restitutio Christianismi*"), and to have begun his correspondence with Calvin.

¹ Lib. v., c. 6, quoted by Mosheim, *Neue Nachrichten*, p. 32.

² *Ibid.*, p. 44.

In 1536, Servetus found himself in sufficient funds to return to Paris and take his degrees of magister and doctor of medicine. He was now deep in natural science, and was reckoned one of the cleverest physicians in France. Of the two schools of physic then in vogue he adopted that of Galen in preference to the Arabian. In 1537 he published his book on syrups, entitled "*Syroporum Universa Ratio.*" His subtle and penetrating mind led him to conjecture the circulation of the blood, the demonstration of which was reserved for our own Harvey;¹ though it has been thought that he got a hint on this subject from the works of Nemesius, a bishop of the fourth century, which were printed at Lyons while Servetus was residing there as corrector of the press.² Astrology still continued a favorite pursuit with him. Nor in the midst of all these avocations did he neglect theology, but employed himself in preparing an edition of the Bible.

The lectures of Servetus were numerous attended, and were received with an applause which is said to have excited the envy and ill-will of his brother professors. Proud and overbearing, his manners were but little calculated to mitigate such feelings. He spoke openly and without reserve of the ignorance of contemporary physicians, and charged them in particular with their deficiency in the knowledge of the stars. Several private warnings from the dean of faculty to carry himself with moderation, and especially to eschew astrology, were unheeded. He even published a treatise on his favorite science, entitled "*Apologetica Disceptatio pro Astrologiâ,*" in which the physicians of Paris were severely attacked. The faculty succeeded, however, in inducing the High School of Paris, including the rector, to take part with them against the obnoxious lecturer. A complaint was lodged in the parliament of Paris, denouncing him as an astrologer, and praying that he should be forbidden to prophesy from the stars ;

¹ A passage containing Servetus's thoughts on this subject occurs in his *Restitutio*, lib. v., and will be found appended to Mosheim's *Geschichte Servets*, Beil. 449, and in the *Bibliothèque Anglaise*, vol. i. It is not probable that Harvey should have seen Servetus's book, and he is therefore entitled to all the merit of an original discovery. Mead, the physician, who flourished about a century after Harvey, appears, however, to have possessed a copy, which was used by M. Audin in compiling his *Vie de Calvin*. It contains a Latin note signed by Mead, in which it is stated that the book had belonged to Colladon, the Genevese jurisconsult, who had drawn up an index of the contents. This copy bears marks of the fire, and Mead thought it was the only one which had escaped the flames (Audin, *Vie de Calvin*, ii., 311).

² See *Biographie Universelle*, art. *Servetus*, and Dr. Smith's *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, art. *Nemesius*.

but Servetus had powerful friends who got the matter postponed. His assailants, growing impatient at the delay, appealed to the tribunal appointed to inquire into heresies, but without success. At length, however, in March, 1538,¹ the parliament pronounced sentence against him, ordering him to destroy the book which he had written against the Paris physicians, and to abandon the practice of astrology.

Servetus was so piqued at this sentence that he left Paris for Charlieu. The disgust occasioned by it may also have been the reason why he never assumed the title conferred by his Paris degree, and which he had been at such pains to procure. At Charlieu, a small town near Lyons, he appears to have practiced as a physician for two or three years, till the arrogance of his manners obliged him to quit this place also.² It is possible, however, that his peculiar religious opinions may have had something to do with the "follies" which obliged him to leave that town. While residing there he attained his thirtieth year, when he thought that, after the example of Christ, he should be baptized again; holding that before that time of life the rite was unavailing; and in one of his letters to Calvin he exhorts him to follow his example.³ Whether he was actually rebaptized does not appear. From a passage in the "*Restitutio Christianismi*," he would seem to have belonged to a secret sect, of Anabaptist tendency, which celebrated the Lord's Supper in a manner different both from Protestants and Catholics.⁴

On leaving Charlieu, in 1540, he repaired to Vienne, in Dauphiné. Pierre Palmier, an old pupil of his, who had attended his lectures at Paris, on the mathematics and astronomy, had obtained the see of Vienne. Palmier was a patron of literature; and it seems to have been at his invitation, and that of his brother, the prior of St. Marcel,⁵ that Servetus was induced to settle at Vienne. Lodgings were provided for him in the archiepiscopal palace; and here he seems to have lived comfortably enough, conforming to the Roman Catholic religion, and making a good deal of money by his practice as a physician. He now published a second edition of his

¹ Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, p. 32, and *Neue Nachrichten*, p. 34.

² "(Servetus)—homme vrayment fort arrogant et insolent, comme testifient ceux qui l'ont cogneu à Charlieu, où il demeura chez la Rivoire, l'an 1540. Contrainct de se partir de Charlieu pour les folies lesquelles il faisait, il se retira à Vienne en Dauphiné," &c.—Bolsec, *Vie de Calvin*, p. 4.

³ Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, p. 84.

⁴ P. Henry, iii., 123. Mosheim, *Neue Nachrichten*, p. 42.

⁵ Mosheim, *Ibid.*, p. 29, note.

“Ptolemy,” which he dedicated to his patron, the archbishop ; and in which he struck out his remarks respecting the unfruitfulness of Canaan. In 1542 he brought out a translation of the Bible, chiefly founded on the labors of a learned monk then dead, named Xantès Pagninus, but in which he took the opportunity of inculcating his own peculiar views. The preface, in which he criticises the spirit of the Hebrew language, is said to show much talent.¹ The title-page bears the words “*Lugduni, apud Hugonem, à Porta;*” but Lyons was only the place of sale, and it was in reality printed at Vienne, where Caspar Trechsel, who had separated from the brother, had set up a printing establishment.² This work fell under the censure of the Roman Catholic Church, and was put on the “*Index Expurgatorius*” at Louvain.

Servetus had obtained the office of municipal physician at Vienne, and might have lived there in peace to the end of his days, had not his fanatical spirit still pursued him. He imagined that he was the instrument chosen by God to enlighten mankind ; and a notion that the end of the world was at hand, and the millenium approaching, goaded him on to the fulfillment of his fancied mission. He was now at work on his “*Restitutio Christianismi*” (“Restoration of Christianity”); and, in order to render it more perfect, endeavored to renew his correspondence with Calvin. Nothing can more strongly show the difference between the two men than the fact, that while Calvin declined to edit the Apocalypse, on account of its obscurity, Servetus made it the foundation of his “*Restitutio.*” He fancied that he was the very Michael pointed out as combating with the dragon, which he took to be the Pope.³ The woman he interpreted to mean the Church, and her son, whom God saves, the Christian faith.

Servetus had completed the manuscript of his work by the year 1546, and sent it to Geneva, for Calvin’s opinion, through the medium of Frelon, with whom Calvin was also acquainted, and with whom he corresponded under the signature of Charles D’Espeville.⁴ Servetus had previously written several letters to Calvin, with the view of obtaining his opinion on certain points of doctrine. Among other ques-

¹ P. Henry, iii., 124.

² Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, p. 126.

³ “And there was war in heaven : Michael and his angels fought against the dragon.”—Rev. xii., 7. Beza allows that Servetus may be the man meant, provided the preposition *cum* be not interpreted by *κατά* (against), but by *σύν* (in conjunction with).

⁴ Jean Frelon, one of the brothers, seems to have been a Calvinist at heart (Mosheim, *Neue Nachrichten*, p. 37).

tions put by him, the following are recorded: 1. Whether the crucified man Jesus be the Son of God, and what is the *ratio* of this filiation? 2. Whether the kingdom of Christ exist among men; at what time any one enters it; and when he is regenerated? 3. Whether baptism should be administered to those already in the faith, like the supper; and for what purpose these sacraments were instituted in the New Testament?¹ To these questions Calvin replied; but Servetus having answered with some insolence, he now abruptly broke off the correspondence, alleging want of leisure; at the same time addressing some earnest reproofs to Servetus, and referring him to his "Institutes" for any information he might want. This roused the Spaniard's pride, who, according to Calvin's account, sent him several letters full of abuse and blasphemy; and also forwarded to him a copy of his own "Institutes," covered in the margin with bitter manuscript notes.

Calvin intimated his rejection of Servetus's correspondence in a letter to their common friend Frellon, dated the 13th of February, 1546.² In this letter, which inclosed another to Servetus, Calvin says, that to satisfy Frellon, he had again written to Servetus, but with small hope of doing any good; that he was willing to try if he could be converted, but that this could not happen till God had completely turned his heart; that as he had written to him in so haughty a tone, he had wished to put him down a little, and had therefore addressed him more harshly than was his custom: but that nothing was more necessary than that he should be taught humility. "I shall rejoice," continues Calvin, "if God be so gracious both to him and us, that the present answer may be of profit to him. But if he perseveres in his present style, you will lose your time in soliciting me to take any trouble about him; for I have other and more pressing business, and shall make it a point of conscience not to occupy myself about him; as I doubt not that he is a Satan intended to divert me from other more useful studies."

The tone of Calvin's letter betrays somewhat of the pride which he found fault with in Servetus; and though it seems to express some interest in his welfare and conversion, the real state of Calvin's feelings toward the unhappy Spaniard is best shown by another which he addressed, *on the very same day*, to his friend Farel. The authenticity of this letter, which

¹ D'Artigny, *Nouv. Mémoires*, &c., ii., 69.

² See Appendix, No. II

has been sometimes doubted, is now fully recognized. The original, though not printed in Beza's collection, is extant in the Bibliothèque du Roi, at Paris, and there is a copy at Geneva. In it the following passage occurs: "Servetus wrote to me lately, and accompanied his letter with a long volume of his insanities, adding a thrasonical boast that I should see some wonderful, and, as yet, unheard of things. He offers to come hither if I will allow him. But I am unwilling to give any pledge; for if he does come, and my authority be of any avail, I will never suffer him to depart alive."¹

The "long volume" alluded to by Calvin in this letter must have been the manuscript of the "*Restitutio Christianismi*," which was therefore now complete and ready for the press. Calvin forwarded it to Viret, at Lausanne, and when Servetus wished to have it back again, it was not forthcoming. It appears that when Calvin rejected his correspondence, Servetus applied himself to Viret;² and that he also wrote three letters to Abel Pepin, or Poupin, one of the Genevese ministers, with a view to get his manuscript restored³ in order to correct it; but without success. One of these letters is extant, having been used against him on his trial at Geneva; and has been printed by Mosheim in the appendix to his account of Servetus. Every line of it betrays the heated and fanatical imagination of the writer, and his hatred of Calvin and the Genevese church. It contains a prediction of the fate which awaited himself, and expresses a determination to bear it with fortitude, as a worthy disciple of Christ;⁴ but as he well knew his own temper, and the circumstances of the times, there is, perhaps, nothing very surprising in such a prophecy. To this letter there will be occasion to refer again.

Soon after this period the orthodoxy of Servetus seems to have been suspected at Vienne, though it does not appear that any steps were taken against him in consequence. Servetus attributed the origin of these suspicions to the secret machinations of Calvin, who, however, denied the imputation in his "*Refutatio*;" nor is there any evidence to fix it upon him.⁵

¹ See Appendix, No. III. Bolsec (*Vie de Calvin*, p. 4) gives an extract from a letter of Calvin's to Viret, to the same effect; but its authenticity is doubtful. See Trechsel, *Antitr.*, i., 119, note.

² Calvin to Viret, September, 1548, MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, ii., 460.

³ See Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, Beil. 415.

⁴ "I know I must die for this matter; but, that I may be a disciple like my master, I am not disheartened thereby."—*Ibid.*

⁵ See *Bibliothèque raisonnée des Ouvrages des Savans de l'Europe*, vol. i., p. 379, et seq.

Yet, in his life and conversation at Vienne, Servetus seems to have been constantly on his guard; and when afterward examined by the inquisition there, he boldly appealed to the numerous monks and other ecclesiastics with whom he had been acquainted, to produce any instance of his inclination toward heresy.¹ Neither this suspicion, however, nor the loss of his manuscript, deterred him from completing his projected work. He either possessed another copy, or took the pains of writing it afresh; but he does not seem to have taken any active steps toward its publication before the year 1552. Early in that year he applied to his friend Marrinus, who resided at Basle, to get it printed for him in that town;² but this not succeeding, he determined on effecting his object at Vienne itself.

Archbishop Palmier's patronage of literature had attracted some printers to Vienne, among whom was one Balthazar Arnoullet, whom Servetus selected for his purpose. Guillaume Guérout, the corrector of his press, was a bitter enemy of Calvin, having been driven by him from Geneva, and therefore might easily be gained. With Arnoullet himself there was more difficulty, as he at first hesitated to print a book which had not received the sanction of the ecclesiastical authorities. These scruples were removed by a bribe of one hundred dollars; a large sum in those days, and which testifies at once to the fanatical heat of Servetus's zeal, and the success with which he had pursued the profession of medicine. Two presses were secretly erected, and Servetus undertook to correct the proofs himself. The first sheet was printed about Michaelmas, 1552, and early in January, 1553, the impression was complete. Several bales of the book were forwarded to Lyons, Châtillon, Frankfort, and Geneva. One of the copies fell into the hands of Calvin.

There was at that time living at Geneva one Guillaume Trie, a citizen of Lyons, who had left his native town for the sake of religion, but was still in correspondence with a relation, named Antoine Arneys, a zealous Papist, living at Lyons, and who seems to have been desirous of persuading Trie to return to the church he had deserted. In one of his letters, Arneys would seem to have insisted very strongly on the authority and tradition of the Romish faith, and to have reproached the church of Geneva with being totally destitute of ecclesiastical order and discipline. Trie was stung by these charges, and

¹ Mosheim, *Neue Nachrichten*, p. 54.

² *Ibid.*, p. 45.

replied to them in a letter dated Feb. 26th, 1553;¹ in which, after some general remarks, he expressed his astonishment at Arney's charging the Genevan church with a want of discipline, when, on the contrary, vice was better chastised there than by all the Romish tribunals. He affirmed that, in spite of the liberty enjoyed at Geneva, blasphemy was not suffered to go unpunished, and that all false doctrine and heresies were repressed; and by way of contrast, and to cover his opponent with confusion, he alleged that close by where he dwelt a heretic was tolerated, who deserved to be burned wherever he was found, by Papists as well as by Protestants. By "heretic" he meant one who denied the Trinity, called it a Cerberus, and monster of hell, and vented all conceivable blasphemy and abuse against that sacred mystery. He stated that he had adduced this example in order that there might be no question as to what was heretical; for Arneys himself would confess that this was not only a detestable heresy, but that it tended to subvert Christianity itself. Is it not shameful, he said, that you should put to death those who invoke one God in the name of Jesus Christ, who maintain that there is no other satisfaction but his death and passion, no purgatory but in his blood; who hold that there is no service pleasing to God but that delivered in his word; that all pictures and images are idols that profane his majesty; that the sacraments should be used only according to the institution of Christ; that men of these opinions should not be simply punished with death, but cruelly burned, while one who called Christ an idol, who would destroy the very foundation of faith, who would revive all the dreams of ancient heretics, who would condemn infant baptism, and call it a diabolical invention; that such a one should not only be tolerated, but even be in vogue and honor? "Where," continued Trie, "is the police of your boasted hierarchy? The man I speak of has been condemned by all the churches which you reprove; yet he is allowed to live among you, and even to print books so full of blasphemies that I can say no more of them. He is a Spaniard, and his real name is Michael Servetus, but he now calls himself Villeneuve, and practices medicine. Some time ago he lived at Lyons, but he is at present residing at Vienne, where the book I speak of has been printed by a man named Balthazar Arnoullet, who has set up a press there. And, in order that you may not think

¹ See Appendix, No. IV., where Trie's letters are given at full length. They are extant in the appendix to Mosheim's *Neue Nachrichten*, in the *Nouveaux Mémoires d'Histoire*, &c., and in Chauffepié, art. *Servetus*.

I speak on trust and at second-hand, I send you the first sheet as a proof.”

This letter naturally suggests the following inquiries. How came Trie, who describes himself as a comparatively unlettered man, by his knowledge of a book written in Latin, on abstruse points of scriptural controversy, in about a month after its receipt at Geneva? How did he learn the true name, profession, and history of the author? And, thirdly, by what means did he become acquainted with the fact, that it had been printed by Arnoullet at Vienne?

To the first of these questions it might possibly be answered, that the book had been denounced from the pulpit, and in conversation, by Calvin and other ministers. With respect to the second, it is highly improbable that Trie should have got his information from any body but Calvin. The latter was acquainted with the whole of Servetus's career; had seen his work in manuscript; had corresponded with him, and still had many of his letters in his possession. The third question it is impossible to answer; but it is evident that the secret of Servetus must have been betrayed by some false friend. Mosheim and Dr. Henry are of opinion that Frellon communicated the fact to Calvin.¹

There is another remarkable point in Trie's letter. It was evidently written with the intention of destroying Servetus. Trie was aware that the French authorities, so far from knowing the author of the book, did not even know of its existence. If this was not so, why did Trie take such pains to point out the author? To adduce such minute particulars respecting him, and even to inclose a portion of the book, merely by way of general argument and remonstrance, would have been superfluous and absurd. Yet, knowing that the Roman Catholic prelates were unacquainted both with the book and its author, Trie gravely charges them with willfully harboring and encouraging a heretic! and that, too, at a time when the frequent burnings of Protestants in France furnished but a too convincing and dreadful proof of Popish zeal. It is plain that consistency is overlooked or disregarded, in the wish to sacrifice Servetus. Trie affects to believe that the heretic was perfectly well known at Vienne, and yet writes in a manner which shows that he was persuaded of the contrary; but which, at the same time, manifests the real object of his letter.

What could have been Trie's motive? He does not seem

¹ Mosheim, *Neue Nachrichten*, P. 51, and *Leben Calvins*, iii., 141.

to have had any previous quarrel, or even acquaintance, with Servetus; like Calvin, who, seven years previously, had expressed a wish for his death. Was it pure zeal for the Church? But in that case, would not a man in Trie's position have consulted Calvin about the step he was induced to take? Dr. Henry thinks that Trie's feelings were embittered by the persecutions of his Protestant brethren in France. But how would it have soothed them to send a fresh victim to the flames by Popish hands? The same writer offers another conjecture.¹ Calvin might have expressed his displeasure at Servetus's work in Trie's presence, who incontinently writes off to Lyons to get Servetus burned. Here the scene shifts. Trie's bitterness for the fate of his evangelical brethren vanishes, and he becomes the the *âme damnée* of Calvin. But again it may be asked, would he not have consulted Calvin about a proceeding which, for aught he knew, might have seriously compromised him? The case seems weak which must be propped by such conjectures.

On the other hand, the Abbé d'Artigny goes farther than the evidence warrants, in positively asserting² that Trie's letter was written at Calvin's dictation, and in calling it Calvin's letter in the name of Trie. It is just possible that Trie may have written it without Calvin's knowledge; and the latter is therefore entitled to the benefit of the doubt. He can not be absolutely proved to have taken the first step in delivering Servetus into the fangs of the Roman Catholic inquisition; but what we shall now have to relate will show that he at least aided and abetted it.

Soon after the receipt of Trie's letter, Arneys, as had doubtless been anticipated, laid it before the ecclesiastical authorities. Cardinal Tournon, a zealous Papist, and bloodthirsty persecutor of the Protestants, was at that time Archbishop of Lyons: and his inquisitorial researches were assisted by Matthias Ory, a subtle Italian, whom the cardinal had expressly brought from Rome. On the 16th of March Servetus was summoned to appear before the court of Vienne, where Monsieur de Montgiron, Lieutenant-general of Dauphiné, presided. It is supposed that Servetus had received information of the nature of the summons from his friend M. de la Court, one of the judges, and had thus had time to get rid of all suspicious papers.³ He kept the tribunal waiting two hours, at

¹ *Leben Calvins*, iii., 138.

² In the *Nouveaux Mémoires d'Histoire*, &c.

³ Mosheim, *Neue Nachrichten*, p. 54.

the end of which time he appeared with a very unembarrassed countenance. He affirmed that he had lived long at Vienne, and had frequently kept company with ecclesiastics, but had never yet been suspected of entertaining heretical opinions; that he was willing that his apartments should be searched, in order to avert the suspicions not only of the court, but of any body else; for that he had always been desirous to avoid all cause for such sentiments being imputed to him. The judges, accompanied by the secretary of M. de Montgiron, searched his apartments, but found nothing of a nature to criminate him.

On the following day, the 17th of March, Guéroult was apprehended and examined, but with the same result. The portion of the "*Restitutio*" forwarded by Trie, and which seems to have consisted of the title-page, index, and a few of the first leaves,¹ was then submitted to all the printers in Vienne, and they were interrogated separately as to whether they had any knowledge of such a book. As they unanimously denied it, they were required to give in an inventory of all the books which they had printed during the two previous years, but none was found to be in octavo. Arnoullet himself happened to be absent on a journey; he returned, however, on the 18th, and was immediately summoned before the tribunal; but no evidence could be produced against him. Under these circumstances the court determined that the proof was insufficient to warrant any proceedings against Servetus, or rather Villeneuve; and wrote to Ory to come to Vienne. The Italian inquisitor perceived that the original source must be again resorted to. On his return to Lyons he sent for Arneys, and directed him to write another letter to Trie, the contents of which were dictated by himself. In it Trie was requested to send the whole book, of which he had forwarded some leaves.

Trie's answer is dated on the 26th of March. It is a model of hypocrisy. He protests that he did not think the matter would have gone so far, nor that Arneys would have shown his letter to those whom he had accused of lukewarmness: as such, however, was the case, he hoped God would make it a means of purging Christianity from such deadly pests. If the authorities were really hearty in the cause, there was no difficulty in the affair. He could not, indeed, at present furnish the printed book for which he had been asked; but he would put into Arneys' hands something more convincing,

¹ *Bibliothèque Anglaise*, ii., 192.

viz., two dozen papers written by the person in question, and containing some of his heresies. If the printed book was placed before the accused he might deny it, which he could not do with regard to his handwriting. After stating that there were other documents which might be produced, Trie continues: "But I must confess that I have had great trouble to get what I send you from M. Calvin. Not that he is unwilling that such execrable blasphemies should be punished; but that it seems to him to be his duty, as he does not wield the sword of justice, to refute heresy by his doctrines, rather than to pursue it by such methods. I have, however, importuned him so much, representing to him that I should incur the reproach of levity if he did not help me, that he has at last consented to hand over what I send. For the rest, I am in hopes that if the matter is entertained in your quarter, I shall be able to get from him a ream of paper, or thereabouts, being the manuscript of what this gallant has printed. But it seems to me that you have now proof enough, and there is no longer any mystery, nor reason why he should not be seized and put upon his trial."

Calvin is here brought into direct and immediate connection with these proceedings. He forwards to the officers of the Roman Catholic inquisition, letters which the unhappy writer of them had sent to him under the seal of secrecy and confidence;¹ and if these documents should prove insufficient, he holds out the hope that he will furnish more. It is true that he is represented as taking this step with extreme reluctance. A great principle was involved, on which he had already expressed his sentiments in the first edition of his "Institutes;" no less a one than whether heretics should be confuted by reason, or consigned to the flames. He had already decided for the former of these courses; and his feelings of "duty" dictated that he should pursue it on the present occasion. But the reputation of a friend is at stake. The principle, however momentous, is abandoned, and Servetus must burn lest William Trie should pass for a light and frivolous person. Such, at least, is the ostensible motive.

The "two dozen papers" forwarded by Trie were the letters which Servetus had sent to Calvin during the correspondence to which allusion has already been made; accompanied with some pages from the chapter "*De Baptismo*" in Calvin's "Institutes," covered with marginal notes in the

¹ "*Sub sigillo secreti et comme fraternelle correction.*"—Servetus's deposition at Vienne, April 6th.

handwriting of Servetus. It has been related, that when Calvin, in breaking off his correspondence with him, referred the Spaniard to that work for any information that he might want, the latter sent him his own book, with bitter comments in the margin. Still, however, Ory was not quite satisfied with the proof. Handwriting might be denied on oath, and was not considered satisfactory evidence in inquisitorial proceedings. The main points to be proved were, that the "*Restitutio Christianismi*" was printed at Vienne; that Villeneuve was the author of it; and that Villeneuve and Servetus were identical. In the portion of the "*Restitutio*" forwarded by Trie with his first letter, there was nothing to show who was the author. Servetus had learned a little caution by experience; and, instead of inserting his name at full length in the title-page of the book, as he had done in his "*De Trinitatis Erroribus*," had merely placed the mark $\frac{MSV}{1553}$ (*i. e.*, Michael Servetus Villanovanus) at the end.¹ Yet the characteristic vanity of the man still clung to him, and even in this book he had gratified it, though in a less open manner, yet in a way which might have cost him his life. Part of the "*Restitutio*" was written in the form of dialogues. In the first of these, one of the interlocutors is named Michael; and at the opening of it, the other, called Peter, says: "Behold he comes! It is Servetus, the person whom I was seeking;"² a contrivance by which he seems to have wished to assert the authorship of the book, without parading his name too conspicuously.

Ory thought more evidence might be obtained, and again requested Arneys to write to his relative. Trie was now desired to send the manuscript of the "*Restitutio*," and some stronger proof that Villeneuve was Servetus. He was likewise asked to give his authority for the assertion that Guéroult and Arnoullet had been concerned in printing the work. A special messenger was dispatched with this letter to Geneva; and though it was late at night when he arrived, Trie immediately sat down to answer it.

Trie's third and last letter is dated on the 31st of March. He points out that in the last of the letters which he had already sent, the Spaniard excuses himself for assuming the name of Villeneuve, when his real name was Servetus or Reves, alleging that he had adopted it from the place of his

¹ See P. Henry, iii., Beil. 81.

² "En adest; Servetus est, quem ego quærebam."—*Bibliothèque Anglaise*, ii., 102.

birth. As to the manuscript, he would send it if necessary, but it had been at Lausanne for a couple of years. Had it been in Calvin's possession he would long ago have sent it back to the author; but the latter had addressed it to others besides him, who had retained it. Trie then mentions that Servetus had been banished by the principal churches of Germany twenty-four years previously; and that the first and second letters of Œcolampadius were addressed to him under his real name. Melancthon had also spoken of him. With regard to the printers, he would not give up the source from which he knew that they were Arnoullet and his brother-in-law, Guérout; but said that he was well-assured of the fact, and that they would not be able to deny it. The work might, probably, have been printed at the expense of the author, who might have taken possession of the copies; but they would find that it had proceeded from the office he had named.

Ory having now procured all the evidence he could, notified it to Cardinal Tournon; who, on the 4th of April, 1553, assembled his clergy in the castle of Rousillon. At this meeting the Archbishop of Vienne, Ory, and others were present. Palmier must have been well acquainted with the handwriting of his old master, and would easily have recognized it in the documents furnished by Trie. The result of this deliberation was that it was resolved to apprehend Villeneuve (*alias* Servetus) and Arnoullet.

It was six o'clock in the evening before the archbishop got back to Vienne; but he immediately proceeded to carry the resolution into effect. Servetus was attending upon Madame de Montgiron, who was unwell. A message was sent requesting his attendance on some sick persons in the Palais Delphinal, who were actually in the royal prison; and Servetus on his arrival thus found himself a captive. Nevertheless, he was treated with consideration and respect, being allowed to retain his servant, and to receive the visits of his friends. Arnoullet was arrested at the same time, and confined in a separate prison.

Next morning Palmier dispatched a messenger to Roussillon to acquaint Cardinal Tournon with what had been done, and to summon the inquisitor-general to Vienne. Ory mounted his horse and rode so fast that he was at Vienne by ten o'clock in the morning. After dinner Servetus was brought before the tribunal, which consisted of Ory, Louis Arzellier, the archbishop's vicar-general, and Antoine de la Court, vi-bailli and lieutenant of Vienne.

Servetus having been sworn, was interrogated as to his name, age, and course of life.¹ As the answers which he gave during this examination differ in several points from the account which has been given of him in the preceding pages, it will be proper to record them here. He affirmed that his name was Michel de Villeneuve; that he was a doctor of medicine, forty-two years of age, or thereabout; that he was a native of Tudelle, in the kingdom of Navarre, and had been residing at Vienne for more than twelve years. He stated that about twenty-seven or twenty-eight years ago he entered the service of Quintana, the confessor of Charles V.; and that when the emperor left Spain to be crowned at Bologna, he was in Quintana's suite; that he afterward proceeded with him into Germany, where he lived with him till his death; that after that event he went to Paris, and resided for some time at the Collège Calvi; whence he removed to the Collège des Lombards; that he afterward proceeded to Lyons where he resided for some time, and after a short visit to Avignon returned to Lyons; that from thence he went to Charlieu, where he practiced physic for two or three years; that from Charlieu he returned again to Lyons; and that finally, at the persuasion of the Archbishop of Vienne, and of his brother, he came to reside at that city, where he had remained ever since.

A great part of this deposition is undoubtedly false, and a little reflection on the prisoner's situation will enable us to pronounce pretty confidently what is so. His main object was to prevent himself from being identified as the arch-heretic, Servetus; and with this view he forbore to mention his residence at the University of Toulouse, where he had passed by his real name of Serveto, or Reves,² both of which he had put in the title-page of his first work. Had he admitted having been there, the books of the university might have been searched, and his identity established. The time which he appears, from his answers subsequently at Geneva, to have passed there, he now averred that he had spent in the service of Quintana, which he must have entered, if what he said be true, in the year 1525, or 1526, when he was sixteen or seventeen years of age, or, according to his present evidence,

¹ The account of Servetus's examination at Vienne will be found in the *Nouveaux Mémoires d'Histoire, de Critique, et de Littérature*, vol. ii.; at the end of Mosheim's *Neue Nachrichten*; and in Chauffepié's *Dictionary*, art. *Servetus*.

² The latter seems an anagram of Servet, adopted, perhaps, as more conformable to the French idiom.

fourteen or fifteen. That he accompanied Quintana to Bologna may, however, as before stated, possibly be true. This was an incident in his life which he was so far from having any reason to conceal, that, on the contrary, it would rather have tended to establish his orthodoxy; for Quintana was one of the most zealous Roman Catholics of his time. The same desire to avoid recognition also prompted him to say that he was a native of Tudelle; for he had called himself Villanovanus in his book "*De Trinitatis Erroribus*." We may trace the same motive in his avoiding all mention of having been at Basle, where he had passed by his real name, and where his character and publications were but too notorious. The time which he passed there he now included in that which he spent in Quintana's service. On the other hand the account which he gave of himself after his coming to France is, perhaps, tolerably correct. He had then changed his name to Villeneuve, and thrown off the character of Servetus; and had thus no longer any motive for concealment. This part of his life, too, might be easily traced by his French acquaintance. It should be added that in this examination he acknowledged having written the following works: the "*Syroporum universa Ratio*," the "*Apologetica Disceptatio pro Astrologiâ*," the "*Apologia pro Symphoriano Campugio*;" and notes on Ptolemy's Geography. He affirmed that he had printed no other books of his own, though he had corrected many written by others.

If the answers of Servetus, during this examination, be compared with those he subsequently made before the council of Geneva, they will be found very materially to differ. The reason why the latter have been preferred as materials for compiling the preceding account of Servetus is, that at Geneva he had no motive for concealing the truth, as he had at Vienne. The whole of his previous history was perfectly well known to Calvin, and all attempt at prevarication would have been useless. Besides this, there were other circumstances which led him to speak without disguise at Geneva. He was supported by a powerful faction in that city, nor did he at first imagine that Calvin would actually venture to take his life;¹ but of this in its proper place. We will now return to the course of the narrative.

¹ Yet a recent biographer of Calvin (Audin, tom. ii., c. xii.) adopts some particulars from the depositions at Vienne, which lead to manifest inconsistencies, and gives others which he can only have derived from his imagination.

Having given these answers respecting his early life to the inquisitors, Servetus was shown two printed sheets of paper, bearing the title, "*De Baptismo*, cap. xvii.," with manuscript notes in the margin,¹ some of which he was asked to explain. Let us here stop for a moment, to pay a passing tribute to the subtlety of the Italian, Ory. We have seen that the weak point of his case was that the proof of it depended upon handwriting. Had Servetus been abruptly asked, whether the notes produced were written by him, he would most probably have denied it; but being thus thrown off his guard, he was incautious enough to give some explanations. He immediately perceived his error, and endeavored to retrieve it by pretending to doubt whether the writing were really his: however, he made a sort of qualified acknowledgment of it, protesting, at the same time, that if any thing should be found contrary to the faith, he submitted it to the decision of the Holy Mother Church, from which he had never wished to differ; adding, that the notes had been written lightly, by way of controversy, and without much reflection. It seems not improbable that Calvin had selected that part of Servetus's notes which related to baptism, with the view of making him out an Anabaptist.

On the following day, April 6th, Servetus was again examined. On this occasion the letters which he had formerly written to Calvin were produced, and he was questioned respecting some passages in them. When Servetus saw that this correspondence was in the hands of the inquisitors, he burst into tears, and said, "Sirs, I will tell you the truth." But this was only the preface to a broad and clumsy falsehood. He asserted that the letters were written about twenty-five years ago, when he was in Germany, at which time a book was published there by a certain Spaniard named Servetus; but he did not know from what part of Spain he came, nor where he lived in Germany, except that he had heard it was at Aganon (Hagenau), where the book was printed. That he read the book in Germany, and being then a very young man, thought the author's tenets as good, or better, than those of others. That subsequently he came to France, and hearing Calvin praised for his learning, wrote to him out of curiosity,

¹ These leaves were from Calvin's *Institutes*. Dr. P. Henry (iii., 145, note) says that Mosheim has misunderstood this. But Mosheim says expressly (*Neue Nachrichten*, p. 65) that the leaves were from Calvin's book. It has been stated already that Servetus had sent to Calvin a copy of the *Institutes*, with MS. notes. According to Bayle (Calvin, Rem. F.), the *Institutes* were not divided into books before the edition of 1558; and that of 1550, the next previous one, was only divided into twenty-one chapters.

and without being acquainted with him, begging that any correspondence between them might be confidential, and by way of brotherly correction. That Calvin hereupon charged him with being Servetus, to which he replied that though he was not Servetus, he would assume his person; not caring, he added, what Calvin might think of him, but wishing only for an opportunity of discussion. That in this manner the correspondence was kept up till within about ten years, when it became angry and abusive.

Servetus could have hardly believed that so clumsy a story would meet with any credit; indeed it carries a contradiction on the face of it, as he first asserts that the letters were written in Germany, and then in France. He now perceived that the matter was taking a serious turn, and resolved to attempt his escape. The indulgence with which he was treated in prison favored this design; indeed it is not improbable, as Servetus deposed in answer to the 5th interrogatory, on his first examination at Geneva, that some of the magistrates at Vienne may have connived at his evasion. He had many friends there, including the archbishop, his brother, the vi-bailli, and even Montgiron himself. A garden adjoined his prison, in which he was allowed to walk. Hence the roof of a house could be gained, and from that a wall, from which he could descend into the court of the palace; whence it would be easy to reach the gate of the town and the bridge over the Rhone. The evening after his second examination, Servetus reconnoitered the ground. He also sent his servant to the monastery of St. Peter, to demand three hundred crowns which were due to him, and which the grand prior brought to him in person. He was thus well provided with money, for none of his property had been taken from him. Early on the following morning, the 7th of April, Servetus dressed himself completely; but flinging a night-gown over his clothes, and drawing a velvet cap over his head, pretended a call of nature, and asked the jailer for the key of the garden. Deceived by his appearance, the jailer made no difficulty in complying with his request, and went without suspicion to look after his vineyard. Servetus lost no time in making use of the opportunity. Depositing his gown and cap under a tree, he gained the court of the palace, which he passed with safety, and was soon over the bridge. His flight was not discovered for some hours; when an alarm was given, the gates closed, and the neighboring houses searched; but it was too late. Servetus had escaped.

Nevertheless, the trial proceeded as if he had been present. It was now proved by the evidence of three printers in Arnoullet's office, that the "*Restitutio Christianismi*" had been printed at Vienne. Extracts were made of the heretical doctrines contained in it; but the civil court did not wait for the opinion of the spiritual tribunal respecting them; which, indeed, was not given till six months afterward, and when Servetus had been already executed at Geneva.¹ The judgment of the former court was pronounced on the 17th of June. For his heretical doctrines, violation of the royal ordinances, and escape from the royal prison, Servetus was sentenced to pay a fine of one thousand *livres tournois* to the dauphin; to be carried in a cart, together with his books, on a market-day, from the gate of the Palais Delphinal through the principal streets and squares to the market-place, and thence to the Charnève, the place of execution, where he was to be burned alive by a slow fire. Meanwhile, as he could not at present be captured, the last part of this sentence was to be executed on his effigy; which was done on the day it was pronounced. Arnoullet, who had been apprehended, was discharged on showing that he had been deceived by Guérout, who had represented the book as harmless. The latter seems to have escaped by flight. The confiscated property of Servetus was so considerable, that M. Montgiron begged it of the king for his son.²

Besides its blasphemies, the "*Restitutio Christianismi*" contained attacks upon the Romish Church as strong and bitter as any thing ever uttered by Luther or Calvin.³ Arnoullet took care that the copies remaining in France should be destroyed. Those at Frankfort were burned at the instance of Calvin, who sent a letter to the ministers of that town by a messenger who could point out the bookseller in whose possession they were.⁴ At Geneva, Robert Stephens sacrificed all the copies which had come into his hands. Thus out of an edition of one thousand copies, it is said that six only were preserved.⁵

¹ Trechsel, *Antitr.*, i., 149.

² P. Henry, iii., 150 and 170.

³ Specimens are given by P. Henry, in vol. iii., Beil. iii.

⁴ See Ep. 153.

⁵ Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, p. 343.

CHAPTER X.

Servetus arrives at Geneva—Is arrested and indicted—His Trial—Is claimed by the French Authorities—His Insolence—Opinion of Bullinger, Farel, and others, on his case—Brings a counter Accusation against Calvin—The Swiss Churches consulted—Their Replies—Servetus condemned and executed—His Character—General Indignation against Calvin—Calvin's Book on the Punishment of Heretics—Grounds of his Defense—Justified by Melancthon and others—Calvin and the French Inquisition—Inquiry into his Motives—His Defense unsatisfactory—Replies to his Book.

ON escaping from the prison of Vienne, the first design of Servetus, if we may trust his depositions at Geneva, was to proceed into Spain. Alarmed by the pursuit of the *gens d'armes*, he abandoned this plan, and resolved to make his way to Naples; where he hoped to find subsistence by practicing medicine among the numerous Spaniards settled in that city. Reasons which he does not explain induced him to linger in France for upward of three months; and when he at last set off for Italy, he chose the road through Geneva and Switzerland. Calvin, however, did not believe this account, and suspected that this time had been passed in Italy.¹ In his examination on the 28th of August, Servetus was questioned as to whether he did not last come from Italy and Venice; but he stoutly denied it, and affirmed that he had never been at the latter place in his life. Venice appears to have been at that time the favorite seat of skepticism and heresy. We learn from a letter of Melancthon's to the Venetian senate, supposed to have been written in the year 1539, that the work of Servetus, "*De Trinitatis Erroribus*," was even then much circulated in that city.² Hence, probably, the origin of Calvin's suspicions. But as Servetus, in his trial at Geneva, avowed the authorship both of that

¹ See Servetus's Examinations at Geneva, of the 17th, 23d, and 28th of August, in Trechsel, i., Beil. iii. In a letter to Sulzer (Ep. 156), Calvin says: "He (Servetus) has lately caused a larger volume to be secretly printed at Vienne, but made up of the same errors. When the affair was discovered, he was immediately imprisoned, but contrived to escape, I know not how, and rambled in *Italy* for nearly four months."—P. Henry (iii. 150, note) here accuses Calvin of error, and makes this period less by confounding the date of Servetus's escape with that of his sentence at Vienne.

² See Trechsel, *Antitr.*, i., 36-38.

work and of the "*Restitutio Christianismi*," it is difficult to see how he could have benefited his cause by denying his journey to Italy, had he really been there; or why, if he had actually made his way to Venice, he should have been induced to travel back to Geneva, the residence of the man whom he knew to be his mortal enemy, in the short space of three months.

Whatever may be the truth of this matter, which is not very important, it is certain that Servetus arrived at Geneva about the middle of July, 1553. He was alone, and on foot, and took up his lodging at a small inn on the banks of the lake, called the Auberge de la Rose. He had slept the previous night at the village of Louyset, or Le Cuiset, at which place he had arrived from Lalenove, on a hired horse.¹ His dress and manner bespoke something more than a foot traveler, and excited the attention of his host. He was well provided with money; for, on being committed to prison, he deposited in the hands of the jailer ninety-seven gold crowns, besides a gold chain worth twenty crowns, and six gold rings. He seems to have affected a free and careless manner, and to have conversed without reserve. His host asked him if he was married? to which question Servetus returned a light answer, savoring rather of the cavalier than of the learned doctor and would-be Reformer.² He seems to have relied on his person being unknown, and this behavior was probably put on for the purpose of better concealment. On one occasion he was observed to enter the church while Calvin was preaching. After staying at the inn about a month he talked of proceeding to Zurich, and had actually hired a boat to convey him by the lake as far as possible in that direction; when, on Sunday, the 13th of August, an officer of police suddenly appeared, and arrested him in the name of the council.

The manner in which Servetus was discovered is unknown, but it has been supposed that he was recognized in the church. It seems that he had only come to Geneva with the view of proceeding farther;³ and that Grotius was in error in saying that he went thither to consult Calvin: nor is there much probability in the supposition of Musculus, that he wished to avail himself of the ill-will of some of the principal citizens

¹ Examination of 28th of August.

² "On trouve bien assez de femmes sans se marier."—*Ibid.*

³ "Qu'il se tenoit caché à Genève afin de s'en pouvoir aller sans être reconnu."—Examination of 23d of August.

toward Calvin, and to make Geneva a center for disturbing other churches.¹ Calvin avows that he was arrested at his instance.²

Servetus was confined in the old prison near St. Peter's church. According to the laws of Geneva, it was necessary that, in criminal cases of this description, the prosecutor should also be imprisoned, and make himself responsible with his life for the truth of his accusation. Nicholas de la Fontaine, who had formerly been cook to M. de Fallais, but who was now a student in theology, and Calvin's secretary was induced to undertake this office. On the third day, however, Nicholas was dismissed, Calvin's brother, Anthony, having become bail for him; and on the fourth, at the demand of Colladon, advocate for Nicholas, both he and his surety were entirely discharged from all responsibility.³

On the Monday following his apprehension, Servetus was brought before the court, when La Fontaine produced thirty-eight heads of accusation against him, drawn up by Calvin. In these he was charged with having disturbed the German churches by his heresies for four-and-twenty years; with having published his books, entitled, "*De Trinitatis Erroribus*," and "*Restitutio Christianismi*," and his notes on Ptolemy and on the Bible; and also with having escaped from the prison of Vienne. The rest of the charges turn chiefly on points of doctrinal divinity; but in the eighth he is accused of maintaining his heresies in an insulting manner, not only against the ancient Fathers of the Church, as St. Ambrose, St. Augustin, and others, but also against modern doctors; and especially with calling Melancthon, "a man without faith, a son of the devil, Belial, and Satan." But the most remarkable of these articles is the thirty-seventh, which runs thus: "*Item*, That in the person of M. Calvin, minister of God's word in this church of Geneva, he has defamed in a printed book the doctrine preached in it, uttering all the insults and blasphemies it is possible to invent." In support of these charges, the manuscripts and printed books of Servetus were handed into court.

Servetus did not deny that he was the author of these works. He asserted that he did not think he had blasphemed; but

¹ P. Henry, iii., 152.

² "At length having come hither in an evil hour, one of the syndics, at my instance, ordered him to be imprisoned."—Calvin to Sulzer, Ep. 156. Compare the *Refutatio Serveti*, *Opera*, viii., 511, A., Amst. ed.

³ Calvin to Farel, Ep. 152, and Examination of 17th of August.

that if his blasphemies were pointed out, he was ready to retract them. He acknowledged having called the Trinity a Cerberus; yet he professed to believe in that doctrine, but declared that he interpreted the word *person* in a different sense from most modern expounders. To the charge of having insulted Calvin he answered: "That M. Calvin had before abused him in several printed books; that he had replied and shown that Calvin was wrong in some passages; that when the said Calvin wrote that he (Servetus) was intoxicated with his opinions, he had retorted the charge, and affirmed that Calvin himself was often wrong."

On the following day, Tuesday, August the 15th, the court assembled at the Evêché. Among the judges we find the names of Perrin and Vandel, the leaders of the Patriot party; who were also present at some of the subsequent examinations. The same charges were preferred which had been exhibited the previous day, nor are there any material variations in the answers of Servetus; only he added that he had not abused Melancthon in any published work. He also affirmed that Calvin had persecuted him in such a manner that it was not his fault if he had not been burnt alive. He confessed that he was Servetus.

On the 16th and 17th his examination was renewed on the same articles. On the latter day the copy of Calvin's "Institutes," in which Servetus had made his notes, was handed into court, and also the letter which he had written some years previously to Abel Poupin, and which has been already mentioned.¹

After this Servetus was remanded till Monday, the 21st of August. It had probably been discovered that Nicholas de la Fontaine was no match for his antagonist; for on the day mentioned Calvin appeared against him in person, supported by the other ministers of Geneva. The examination turned wholly on points of doctrine. Calvin refuted the opinions of Servetus from Clement, Justin, Origen, Tertullian, and other Fathers; and showed from Origen's "Homilies" that Servetus was wrong in asserting that the term "Trinity" had not been used previously to the council of Nice. Arguments were en-

¹ This letter will be found in Mosheim's *Geschichte Servets*, Beil. 415, and in the *Bibliothèque Anglaise*, ii., 130. The following is the most obnoxious passage: "Your gospel is without one God, without true faith, without good works. For one God you have a three-headed Cerberus; for true faith a fatal dream; and good works you call empty pictures. The faith of Christ is to you a mere inefficient pretense, man a mere log, and God the chimera of a will that is not free," &c.

tered into respecting the nature of the persons of the Trinity. As the interrogation proceeded Servetus demanded books, which he was allowed to have at his own expense, provided they could be procured at Geneva or Lyons. Calvin undertook to lend him Tertullian, Irenæus, St. Ignatius, and Polycarp. He was also to be furnished with ink and paper.

It was during this examination that Calvin led Servetus to expose his pantheistic principles, and even pushed him to declare his opinion that the divinity resided not only in stocks and stones, but in the very devils themselves.¹ It is remarkable, however, that these words are not to be found in the records of the trial: Dr. Henry conjectures that the clerk may have omitted them out of moral feeling!² The pantheistic notions of Servetus were founded on the axiom that there can be no action without contact. These views he developed in a paper which he afterward drew up and forwarded to Calvin.³ Servetus was really a man of talent; but he failed, as every man will fail, in the vain attempt to apply philosophy to religion.

Proofs sought far and wide were adduced against him. The judgment of Œcolampadius, pronounced twenty-three years previously, was brought forward; and some passages from the "*Loci Theologici*" of Melancthon, in which he is styled "a fanatic," "a cunning and impious man." He was also charged with the passage in his notes on Ptolemy, which contradicted Moses' account of the Holy Land, but which, as we have seen, he had suppressed in his second edition.⁴ Servetus seems justified in treating this charge with contempt. He wiped his mouth, and said, "Let us go on;" which highly offended Calvin. Other heads of accusation were, that he had rejected infant baptism; that he had called the doctrine of the Trinity a dream of St. Augustin; and that he had denied the immortality of the soul. The first of these charges was probably the most dangerous, as the Anabaptists were every where regarded with dread and suspicion, as the enemies of civil order. The last accusation, that he held the soul to be mortal, he

¹ See Calvin's letter to Farel, Ep. 152, and the *Refutatio Serveti, Opera*, viii., 522, B.

² Vol. iii., 157.

³ See Mosheim's *Neue Nachrichten*, p. 102.

⁴ The following seems to have been the objectionable part: "But know, excellent reader, that such good qualities have been ascribed to this country wrongfully, or out of pure boasting, since the experience of merchants and travelers shows it to be uncultivated, sterile, and altogether disagreeable." —See Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, B. ii., note 4.

rejected with all the marks of horror and aversion;¹ nor does it appear to have had any foundation. The second of these charges he acknowledged and defended, maintaining that it was the doctrine of the ancient Church. On this point a warm dispute ensued between him and Calvin, during which he displayed so much insolence, that Calvin and the rest of the clergy were obliged to retire. Calvin affirms, that in this discussion his adversary showed an almost total ignorance of Greek;² but, though he may have made some slip which gave rise to this imputation, it can hardly be believed that Servetus, who was one of the most learned men of his time, who had edited Ptolemy, and written his book on "Syrups," was really ignorant of that language. In the latter work, he adduces numerous passages from Galen, interpreting many, and correcting some; and in his edition of Ptolemy, frequently amends the Latin version of Pirckheimer.³

The severity of Servetus's imprisonment was now increased; and from some of the complaints which he afterward addressed to the council,⁴ it would seem to have been carried to a cruel extent. He was not allowed the means of common cleanliness. Meanwhile Calvin declaimed against him from the pulpit, in order to acquaint the people with his doctrines, and incite them against him, and thus to counteract any efforts of the Libertine party in his favor.⁵

The case was now handed over to the *procureur-général*, and on the 23d of August, Servetus was examined by that officer. The interrogations chiefly turned on his former course of life: but as his answers have for the most part, been embodied in the preceding narrative, it is unnecessary to repeat them. On the 24th, he presented a paper to the council, in which he demanded his release, and stated, 1st, that it was a novel proceeding, unknown to the Apostles and the ancient Church, to subject a man to a criminal prosecution for points of doctrine. 2d, that he had been guilty of no sedition or disturbance in the territory of Geneva; that the questions he treated were of a difficult nature, and addressed only to the small body of the learned; and that he had always condemned the conduct of the Anabaptists in opposing the magistrates. 3d, that as he was a foreigner, unacquainted with the customs

¹ See his letter to the council, 22d of September, *Bibliothèque Anglaise* ii., 148.

² "He could no more read Greek than a boy learning his A, B, C."—*Refutatio Serveti, Opera*, viii., 523, A.

³ Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, ii., § xxxvii.

⁴ *Bibliothèque Anglaise*, ii., 146 and 152.

⁵ P. Henry, iii., 159.

of the country and the practice of the courts of law, he requested to be allowed an advocate to conduct his cause.¹

It must be owned that these representations seem to carry great weight with them. It is difficult to see on what principle the Genevese assumed the right of trying a man who was not a citizen, nor even a resident, but merely a traveler casually passing through their town; and whose offense, even if they could justly establish a tribunal for the trial of heresy, was at least not committed within their territories. Calvin seems here to have claimed a jurisdiction as extensive as that of the Pope. The unhappy instance of Joan Bocher in England, and even the trial of Servetus by the inquisition of Vienne, are at least in some degree justified by the offense having been committed against the laws of those countries, provided for such cases. But how could Servetus be made amenable to any statutes of Geneva, for having published certain books at Hagenau and Vienne? The only head of accusation which would seem to make him amenable to the laws of Geneva is that in which he is charged with having defamed Calvin, and the Genevese church. But this could hardly have been capital; nor have his judges ventured to recapitulate it in his sentence.²

But the most unjust and barbarous part of these proceedings was the denying Servetus the benefit of counsel. When the court next met, on the 28th of August, a "Representation and Articles" were given in, drawn up in the hand-writing of one of Calvin's copyists. The former of these papers begins by saying: "That it was quite evident that Servetus had not replied satisfactorily to the questions put to him, and had done nothing but lie, vary, and tergiversate; making a mockery of God and his word, by quoting, corrupting, and twisting from their proper sense, passages from the sacred Scriptures, in order to conceal his blasphemies, and escape punishment." Then, after adducing instances in support of these charges, there follows a long argument to show that heresy was made capital by the Roman emperors, and that the punishment of death is not contrary to the spirit of the New Testament. In reply to Servetus's petition, it is insisted that he should not be permitted to have counsel. "For who, it is asked, is he who could or would assist him in such impudent lies, and horrible statements? not to mention that

¹ This paper was signed "M. Servetus, en sa cause propre."—See *Bibliothèque Anglaise*, ii., 135, et seq.

² See the sentence in P. Henry, iii., Beil. iii., p. 75, et seq.

it is forbidden by law, and was never yet seen, that such suborners should have the benefit of an advocate. Beside, there is not a single grain of innocence apparent to justify the intervention of a counsel." Strange reasoning! which shows that Calvin had long since prejudged his unhappy victim: which would prove that the more a man needs the assistance of an advocate the less he is entitled to it! As if there might not be cases in which a counsel could dissipate and chase away those mists of seeming guilt which may sometimes envelop and obscure men the most innocent, and causes the most just!

The conduct of the prisoner seemed now much altered. He declared his readiness to die, and loaded Calvin with abuse, calling him Simon Magus, cacodæmon, an impostor, a sycophant, &c. Servetus seems to have applied the first of these names to Calvin on account of his doctrine of predestination.¹ The case may now be almost regarded as closed.

On the 31st of August the viguier, or commandant of the royal palace at Vienne, arrived at Geneva, bearing a letter signed by Chassalis, greffier, on behalf of the vi-bailli and procureur of Vienne, in which he thanked the magistrates of Geneva for having informed them of the detention of Servetus, and begged that he might be sent back with their officer, in order that their sentence upon him might be carried into execution. He added that they would do the like by them in a similar case, but declined sending their proceedings against Servetus, as they could not allow any other judgment to be passed upon him.

It appears, therefore, from this letter, that the tribunal of Vienne had not only been informed of the capture of Servetus, but had also been requested to forward their proceedings, in order to found fresh charges against him. And though they did not comply with this request, yet they forwarded a duplicate of their sentence against the prisoner.²

The viguier was brought into the presence of Servetus, and the latter was asked whether he knew him? To which he replied in the affirmative, adding that he had been two days in his custody. The viguier also recognized his former pris-

¹ "The assertion of Simon Magus, who is mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, and called by ecclesiastical historians the first Christian heretic, that 'Men are saved according to his grace, and not according to just works,' contains in it the essence of Calvinism."—Tomline's *Refutation of Calvinism*, ch. viii., p. 571. For more on the same subject see that work, p. 515, 526.

² See Trechsel, *Antitr.*, i., Beil. iii. Note on Examination of 1st of September.

oner. Some questions were put to him respecting his apprehension at Vienne, and the manner in which he escaped from prison. He again ascribed his prosecution there to the letter which Trie had written at the instance of Calvin. Being asked whether he would return with the officer to Vienne, or remain at Geneva, he flung himself on the ground, and begged with tears to be judged by the Genevese council. He then confessed his sorrow and repentance that he, who had so often written against the mass, should have conformed to it while living at Vienne.¹ The viguier returned with a certificate under the hand of Servetus, that he had escaped without the knowledge of his jailor.

On the 1st of September Calvin, accompanied by the other ministers, visited Servetus in his dungeon, bringing with him a paper containing the heretical passages in his works, which he was desired to retract. Servetus, however, declined to answer in prison, as being an unfit place for such a disputation, for which he also said that he was disqualified by anxiety of mind. A discussion ensued on this point, and the council at length determined that, to prevent all ebullition of feeling, the dispute should be carried on in writing; that Calvin should put down in Latin, in a compendious form, the errors of Servetus; that the latter should give in his answers, with leave to amend them; and that when these papers were ready, they should be submitted to the Swiss churches for their decision.² At this interview Servetus was desired to name those who were indebted to him in several parts of France; which, with a proper feeling, he refused to do, on the ground that it might lead to the confiscation of their property.

The proceedings against Servetus were now suspended for a fortnight, which Calvin employed in preparing his paper. At the next examination, on the 15th of September, Servetus presented a memorial to the council, in which he complained of this delay, and of the filthy and unwholesome state of his prison.³ He also begged that his case should be referred to the council of Two Hundred. This last demand could not be entertained, as Ami Perrin, who, it was suspected, wished to make Servetus an instrument for overthrowing Calvin, had the majority of voices in that assembly.⁴ In the ordinary

¹ P. Henry, iii., 170.

² *Ibid.*, iii., 171.

³ "Les poulx me mangent tout vif, mes chausses sont descirées, et n'ay de quoy manger, ne perpoint, ne chemise, que une méchante."—*Bibliothèque Anglaise*, ii., 146.

⁴ P. Henry, iii., 172.

council Calvin was predominant; and he was resolved to keep the case in their hands.

Calvin's paper consisted of thirty-eight articles, containing heretical and blasphemous propositions, extracted from the work of Servetus. The most important were those containing blasphemies against our Saviour and the Holy Ghost, and the rejection of infant baptism.¹ After Servetus had made a short answer, Calvin drew up his "Refutation," which was subscribed by himself and the rest of the Genevese ministers. The replies of Servetus to this document are very insolent, and seem almost like the productions of a madman. He repeatedly gives Calvin the lie. In one he says: "Deny yourself to be a homicide, and I will prove it by your acts. You dare not say that you are not Simon Magus. Who, therefore, can trust in you, as in a good tree? In so just a cause my constancy is unshaken, and I fear not death." Again: "Whosoever is not a Simon Magus is considered a Pelagian by Calvin. All, therefore, who have existed within the pale of Christianity are condemned by him: the apostles, their disciples, the fathers of the ancient Church, and all the rest. For no one ever thoroughly abolished free-will except Simon Magus." From a letter which Servetus addressed to the council,² it appears that he wrote these answers on Calvin's own paper, for which he naïvely apologizes on the ground that there were many little words (such, for example, as *mentiris*, &c.), which would not be otherwise understood; and he hopes that Calvin will not be offended, as there would have been an inextricable confusion had he not done so!

On the 21st of September, this paper, with the answers, was ready to be submitted to the Swiss churches. Calvin was so far from having advised this step, that, as appears from a letter to Bullinger, he had actually protested against it. He seems to have considered it as derogatory to his authority, and complains that he now stood in such a situation with the council that whatever he said was regarded with suspicion; so that if he asserted that the sun shone at mid-day, they would immediately begin to doubt.³ Yet this letter is hardly consist-

¹ These articles, together with Servetus's answers, will be found at the end of Calvin's *Refutatio Serveti, Opera*, viii., 523, et seq., Amst. ed.

² Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, p. 418.

³ "Our council will shortly send the dogmas of Servetus to you, to learn your opinion of them. I protested against their giving you this trouble; but they had arrived at such a pitch of madness and fury, that they are suspicious of all that I say; so that if I should affirm at mid-day that the sun shone, they would immediately begin to doubt."—Calvin to Bullinger, Sept. 7th, 1553. MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 95.

ent with a passage in Calvin's tract against Servetus, in which he asserts that he willingly complied with a proposition of the latter to appeal to other churches;¹ nor is this the only instance in which we find a discrepancy between his correspondence and the work just referred to. Calvin, therefore, did not want any confirmation of his opinion on the case, though the council did. He had, however, acquainted Bullinger with the whole matter; and he it was who undertook to obtain a unanimous opinion from the churches. Bullinger espoused Calvin's views in this affair more warmly than any other of the ministers; always excepting Calvin's friends and fellow-countrymen, Beza and Farel. He recommended the capital punishment of Servetus in a letter to Beza dated on the 30th of August; when, considering the want of rapid communication in those days, he could have heard but few particulars of the trial. In this letter he said: "But what is your most honorable senate of Geneva going to do with that blasphemous wretch Servetus? If they are wise, and do their duty, they will put him to death, that all the world may perceive that Geneva desires the glory of Christ to be maintained inviolate."²

But of all Calvin's correspondents Farel displayed the greatest violence on this occasion. Calvin had written to him on the 20th of August, to inform him of Servetus's capture, and of the proceedings which had been instituted against him; and in this letter, though he hoped that the Spaniard would be put to death, he at the same time expressed a desire that the atrocity of the punishment should be mitigated. Farel, in reply, says: "In desiring a mitigation of his punishment you act the part of a friend toward a man who has been your greatest enemy. But I beseech you so to bear yourself that none shall rashly dare hereafter to promulgate new doctrines, and throw all into confusion, as Servetus has so long done."³ An atrocious passage from a man calling himself a minister of Christ! and remarkable likewise as pointing to the *private* enmity between Calvin and Servetus, for which Farel here all but exhorts him to take vengeance. Nor can we dismiss Calvin's letter just quoted without ob-

¹ "And when he appealed to other churches, *I willingly acceded to this condition.*"—*Refutatio Serveti, Opera*, viii., 523, B.

² See *Original Letters*, published by the Parker Society, Part ii., p. 742. The editor does not explain why Bullinger, writing to Beza, calls the senate (or council) of Geneva, *his senate*. Beza was at that time living at Lausanne under the government of Berne.

³ Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 155.

servings that it affords another instance of discrepancy between his correspondence and the book he published against Servetus: for in the "*Refutatio*" he remarks that he did not bear so mortal an enmity toward Servetus, but that he might have escaped with his life had he shown any symptoms of modesty.¹

All the churches, however, were not so favorably disposed toward Calvin's view of the case as that of Zurich, through its pastor Bullinger. That of Basle in particular, of which Sulzer was then the chief minister, Calvin suspected, might return an answer not quite in accordance with his wishes. He was in bad odor in that city, where Castellio was residing; and he therefore got some of his friends to use their influence with Sulzer, in order to obtain such a verdict as he wished. At the instance of Bullinger, John Haller, the minister of Berne, wrote to Sulzer on the subject, but could obtain no answer.² Calvin himself addressed a long and labored letter to him, in which, after stating that impiety had reached such a pitch as to demand the interference of the secular arm, though care should be taken to avoid imitating the rabid fury of the Papists, he places the case of Servetus on three grounds: first, the enormous errors and detestable blasphemies by which he had sought to corrupt religion, and destroy piety; secondly, the obstinacy with which he had behaved, and the diabolical pride with which he had rejected all admonitions; and thirdly, the haughtiness with which he still continued to assert his abominations. And in order to stimulate the ministers of Basle still more against him, he mentioned that Servetus had not hesitated to assert that Œcolampadius and Capito, the former ministers of that city, had partaken in his opinions.³ In fact Servetus had affirmed, in his examination of the 23d of August, that Capito had

¹ *Refutatio, &c., Opera*, viii., 517, A., Amst. ed. The exact expression used by Calvin in his letter to Farel, is: "I hope (*spero*) the sentence will at least be capital; but desire the atrocity of the punishment to be abated."—Ep. 152. Yet in the face of this, and of Calvin's former letter to Farel, in 1546 (for which see the preceding chapter), Dr. Henry affirms (iii., 153) that he had no intention to put Servetus to death! To be sure, in the following page he translates the word *spero*, in the passage just quoted, by *think* (*er meine* Servet werde am Leben gestraft werden). But the context will not allow us to take *spero* here in any other than its ordinary sense of *hoping*. And, indeed, Dr. Henry seems to have thought so himself; for, he adds, by way of comment on Calvin's words: "Characteristisch, er muss in der Hitze gleich sein Feuer von sich werfen;" a remark that would have no meaning had Calvin only said, "*I expect* that Servetus will be capitally condemned."

² Mosheim, *Neue Nachrichten*, p. 78.

³ Calvin to Sulzer, Ep. 156.

assented to his doctrines, and, at first, Œcolampadius also ; but that the latter had subsequently changed his opinion. Bucer, he said, had always been against him ; and he had consulted only these three.

Meanwhile Servetus made a last effort to procure his liberation, and endeavored to turn the tables upon Calvin by addressing a memorial to the council, in which he denounced him as a false accuser, a persecutor, and a heretic ; and demanded that he should be imprisoned, and made subject to the *pœna talionis* if his accusation proved unfounded.¹ It was accompanied with another, in which he requested that Calvin should be interrogated as to the share he had had in procuring his imprisonment and trial at Vienne. He likewise required that Calvin's estate should be handed over to him as a compensation for that which he had lost by his means. The council refused to receive these papers, or to grant an audience, as Servetus had requested. On the 10th of October he addressed another letter to the council, in which he complained bitterly of the miseries which he suffered in prison ; but this was also disregarded.

The council of Geneva had consulted the magistrates, as well as the churches, of Zurich, Berne, Basle, and Schaffhausen, on the case of Servetus. They all replied that they had referred the matter to their clergy ; but the magistrates of Zurich and Berne added, on their own parts, a few words, in which they exhorted the Genevese council to firmness and severity. We learn from a letter of Haller's to Bullinger, dated on the 19th of October, 1553, that by command of the council of Berne, he had laid before them, in separate propositions, some of the chief errors of Servetus ; at which they showed so much indignation that, had he been a prisoner of theirs, he doubted not but they would have burned him.² Calvin also says, in a letter to Farel,³ that the Genevese council had been much stimulated by the letter from that of Berne. Yet it does not appear to have contained any direct verdict of death.⁴

¹ This paper concluded as follows : " Je vous demande justice, Messieurs, justice, justice, justice ! Fait en vos prisons de Genève, le 22 de Septembre, 1553. Michael Servetus, en sa cause propre."—P. Henry, iii., Beil. iii., 71, et seq.

² See Mosheim, *Neue Nachrichten*, p. 78.

³ Ep. 161.

⁴ " Les magistrats de Berne mandèrent aussi qu'ils avoient consultés leurs theologiens, et prièrent le conseil de Genève d'empêcher le progrès des erreurs. Vous prions, disent-ils, comme ne doutons point à ce être enclins, de toujours tenir main que les erreurs et sertes, comme les dites sont, ou semblables, ne soient semées en l'Eglise de Jesus Christ, nostre seul

But in such a matter the opinion of the churches is more important. Their answers were received in the course of October; but though they condemned the heresies and blasphemies of Servetus in the strongest possible terms, their sentiments as to his punishment were expressed in the most cautious and guarded language, and which would admit the interpretation of perpetual imprisonment as well as that of death. The letter from Zurich, of which that from Schaffhausen was little more than an echo, was, in the opinion of Calvin himself,¹ the most severe of all; for which reason as well as because it is selected by himself as a specimen of the rest, in his tract against Servetus, that part of it which relates to the mode of punishment is subjoined. "In what manner," say the ministers of Zurich, "your honorable council should coerce a man who revives heresies long ago refuted and condemned by the church on the authority of Scripture, who impugns the firm and primary principles of our faith, and in so doing insults both God and his saints, we leave it to your prudence to consider." Then, after adverting to his work, "On the Errors of the Trinity," and his "Restitution of Christianity," they proceed to say: "We think much faith and diligence are needful to stem this evil, especially as our churches are in bad repute among foreigners, as heretical, and favorers of heretics. But now the holy providence of God hath offered you an opportunity of purging both yourselves and us from so odious a suspicion, provided you be vigilant, and take due care that the contagion of this poison spread no farther by means of this man, as we doubt not you will. May the Lord Jesus Christ add wisdom and fortitude to your piety, and put you into the right way of performing His will, to the glory of His name, and to the preservation of the true faith, and of the church."²

Minus Celsus, whose work against the putting of heretics to death, was published in the year 1577, declares that he had read the letters of the Swiss churches attentively, and that he could not find a single word about shedding Servetus's blood.³ De la Roche, Mosheim, and others, have subsequently expressed the same opinion; and even Haller, the minister of

Sauveur, et par ce garderez de trouble et adversité, et sa gloire avancerez et augmenterez."—*Bibliothèque Anglaise*, ii., 166. Where also will be found the answer of the Zurich magistrates, p. 163.

¹ See Calvin's Letter to Farel, Ep. 161.

² Calvini, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 159.

³ See Mini Celsi Senensis *Disputatio*, Christlingæ, 1577, p. 98. The letters are in Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Epp. 158, 159, 160, and 163.

Berne, who, as we have seen, took an active part in these proceedings, admits in his "Diary" that a verdict of death can not be plainly inferred from all of them.¹ But Bullinger's letter to Beza, of the 30th of August, an extract from which has been already given,² as well as his conduct after the execution of Servetus, can leave no doubt as to *his* sentiments at least, and shows that the Genevese magistrates did not misinterpret the epistle of the Zurich church.³ The question, however, as to the real meaning of the letters, so far as it regards Calvin personally, is of little importance. The appeal to the Swiss churches was quite an affair of the council's, and made in order to remove their own scruples. Calvin, as we have seen, had none. He had not only not advised, but had actually opposed the appeal.

The opinions of the other churches were still less decisive than that of Zurich, and the ambiguous terms in which they were expressed occasioned considerable embarrassment at Geneva. The ordinary council felt unwilling to pronounce sentence on Servetus, without the concurrence of the council of Sixty, which was accordingly summoned. In this assembly opinions were much divided, and the debate lasted for three entire days. Some were for banishment for life, others for perpetual imprisonment; but the majority were for death by fire unless the prisoner made an unreserved recantation. When Ami Perrin, then captain-general and first syndic, who had hitherto countenanced Servetus, perceived, at the very beginning of the debate, that the council inclined toward a sentence of death, he said that he would not be a partaker in his blood, and quitted the senate-house, together with some others.⁴ It seems to have been pretty manifest, from the first, what the decision would be; for in a letter to Bullinger, dated on the 25th of October, Calvin says: "Nothing is yet decided concerning Servetus, but I conjecture that the council will give judgment to-morrow, and that on the next day he will

¹ *Mus. Helv.*, ii., 102.

² See p. 283. Compare his letter to Calvin, Ep. 157.

³ Dr. Henry (iii., 187) rather disingenuously infers that the answers of the Swiss churches sanctioned capital punishment, because the Helvetic confession prescribed it in cases of blasphemy. The passage which he quotes appears only in the *second* confession, published in 1566, and therefore long after the affair of Servetus; by which, indeed, it might have been suggested. (See Ruchat, vii., 272.) In the first Helvetic confession, we find only that the magistrate should "punish and exterminate all blasphemy," not *blasphemers*. (Ruchat, iv., 73.) At Zurich, however, they seem never to have inflicted capital punishment, except heresy had been accompanied with perjury and sedition. See Minus Celsus, *Ibid.*, p. 224.

⁴ The tract, *De Morte Serveti*, quoted by P. Henry, iii., 187.

be led to execution."¹ And we learn from another letter of Calvin's to Farel, dated on the following day, that sentence had been pronounced as he had anticipated, in spite of the efforts of Perrin; who, after absenting himself from the council for three days, on pretense of illness, appeared at the last hour, and endeavored to rescue Servetus, by moving that the case should be referred to the council of Two Hundred. But the prisoner was condemned without a division.²

By the old imperial laws of Geneva, which still remained unrepealed, death by fire was the punishment of heresy. The legal labors of Calvin had left that barbarous statute unreformed. We have already seen from his letter to Farel, communicating the apprehension of Servetus, that though he had desired the Spaniard's death, he had expressed a wish that the mode of it should be alleviated; and from the letter to the same person, just quoted, it would appear that he had really made some efforts to effect that object, but that these had been fruitless, for some reason which he would explain to Farel when they met. The world, therefore, will most probably forever remain in ignorance of the nature of Calvin's exertions on this occasion, and of the causes which nullified his powerful influence in so merciful and praiseworthy an undertaking. Meanwhile, he is entitled to the credit of having made the attempt: though we can not help remarking another variation between this letter and the account which he gives of his own conduct in the "*Refutatio*," in which he says, that after the conviction of Servetus, he had not uttered a single word about his punishment.³

The 27th of October was appointed for the execution of Servetus, and on the morning of that day he requested to have an interview with Calvin. The latter repaired to his dungeon, accompanied by two members of the council. The scene which followed is taken from Calvin's own narrative. On one of the councilors asking Servetus what he wanted, he replied that he wished to beg Calvin's mercy.⁴ Hereupon the latter protested that he had never pursued any private offense.

¹ Ep. 162. With a strange inconsistency Calvin immediately subjoins: "Matters do not improve in France. They do not spare blood wherever there is an opportunity for cruelty. They will shortly burn three at Dijon, unless it be already done!" He could see the mote in his brother's eye.

² Ep. 161.

³ "Not only will all good men be my witnesses that from the time he was convicted I uttered not a single word concerning his punishment, but all bad ones have my permission to produce any, if they can."—*Ref. Serveti*, p. 511, A.

⁴ "Qu'il me vouloit crier merci."—*Opusc. Fr.*, apud P. Henry, iii., 194.

He reminded him that sixteen years before he had used all his endeavors, even at the risk of his life, to reclaim him, and reconcile him with the faithful; that he had afterward exhorted him by letters; in short, that he had shown him all possible kindness, till Servetus, taking offense at some of his free and holy admonitions, had attacked him with rabid fury. Calvin then said, that dropping all that concerned himself personally, he begged him rather to ask mercy of God, whom he had so atrociously blasphemed. "When I perceived," continues Calvin, "that my advice and exhortations were of no avail, I was not willing to be wiser than my Master allows; and following the rule of St. Paul, departed from a self-condemned heretic, who bore his mark and reprobation in his heart."¹

It being now apparent that Servetus would not retract, he was brought before the council, and his sentence was read to him with the customary formalities.² The main grounds of his condemnation therein stated are, his book on the Trinity, published at Hagenau, his "Restitution of Christianity," published at Vienne, and his obstinate perseverance in his errors. It concludes as follows: "We condemn you, Michael Servetus, to be bound, and led to Champel, where you are to be fastened to a stake and burnt alive, together with your book, as well the printed one as the manuscript, till your body be reduced to ashes; and thus shall you finish your days, to be an example to others who would commit the like. And we charge our lieutenant to see that this our present sentence be carried into execution." His gold chain and other property were given to the hospital.

On hearing this dreadful sentence, Servetus was struck with horror and amazement. He entreated the magistrates that he might perish by the sword, lest the greatness of his torment should drive him to desperation, and cause him to lose his soul. He protested, that, if he had sinned, it had been unwittingly, and that his desire had always been to promote God's glory.³ When he found that all his supplications were fruitless, he fell into a kind of stupor, broken at intervals by deep groans and frantic cries for mercy.⁴

¹ *Refutatio Serveti, Opera*, viii., 511, A.

² This sentence, which is somewhat long, will be found in the *Bibliothèque Anglaise*, ii., 180; Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, p. 444, and in P. Henry, iii., Beil. iii.

³ *De Morte Serveti, apud P. Henry*, iii., 196.

⁴ Calvin himself relates this circumstance, *Refutatio, &c., Opera*, viii., 523, A.

Calvin had written to Farel requesting him to come to Geneva, and attend upon Servetus in his last moments; an office which could not well be undertaken by any of the Genevese clergy, who had condemned him. Farel obeyed this summons, and arrived in Geneva time enough to hear the sentence pronounced. He accompanied the unhappy Spaniard to the stake, and has recorded his last moments in a letter to Ambrose Blaarer.

A little way from the city of Geneva rises a gentle but extended eminence, called Champey, or Champel, the place appointed for the execution of Servetus. Early in the morning of the 27th of October, he was led from prison to undergo his doom. As the procession slowly ascended the hill, the stake appeared in sight, though partly hidden by the oak branches which had been heaped around it, still bearing their autumnal leaves. A crowd had gathered round the spot where he was to undergo his sentence, and to escape from his earthly judges to the presence of a higher and infallible tribunal. Arrived at the summit of the hill, he fell on the earth in an attitude of prayer; and while he lay absorbed in his devotions, Farel thus addressed the assembled multitude: "See," said he, "the power of Satan, when he hath once gotten possession of us! This man is particularly learned, and it may be that he thought he was doing right; but now the devil hath him. Beware, lest the same thing happen to yourselves!"¹

Farel, who had been with Servetus since seven o'clock in the morning, had not ceased exhorting him to acknowledge his errors; but so far was he from doing this, that he persisted in saying that he suffered unjustly, that he was led as a victim to the slaughter; at the same time beseeching God to have mercy on his accusers.² At last Farel said: "Do you, who are so great a sinner, attempt to justify yourself? I had determined to accompany you till your last breath, and to exhort all to pray for you, in the hope that you would edify the people; but if you continue to speak as you do, I will resign you to the judgment of God, and abide with you no longer." Hereupon, continues Farel, he was silent, and spoke not again in the same manner.³

When Servetus arose from his devotions, Farel exhorted him to address the people; but sighs and groans almost choked

¹ Kirchhofer, *Leben Farel's*, ii., 119.

² Farel to Blaarer, *apud* P. Henry, iii., Beil. iii., 72, from Zurich, MS.

³ *Ibid.*

his utterance, and all that he could utter was, "Oh, God! Oh, God!" When Farel asked him if he had nothing else to say, he replied, "What can I speak of but of God?"¹ Farel now told him, that if he had a wife or a child, and wished to make his will, there was a notary present; but to this suggestion Servetus made no answer. At a hint of Farel's, he requested the assembled multitude to pray for him; but to the last moment he could not be induced to address Christ as the eternal son of God.²

About mid-day, Servetus was led to the stake. Before it lay a large block of wood on which he was to sit. An iron chain encompassed his body, and held him to the stake; his neck was fastened to it by a strong cord, which encircled it several times. On his head was placed a crown of plaited straw and leaves, strewed with sulphur to assist in suffocating him. At his girdle were suspended both his printed books, and the manuscript which he had sent to Calvin—the causes of his miserable end. Servetus begged the executioner to put him quickly out of his misery. But the fellow, either from accident or design, had not been properly instructed in his duty, and had collected a heap of green wood. When the fire was kindled, Servetus uttered such a piercing shriek, that the crowd fell back with a shudder. Some, more humane than the authorities, ran and threw in fagots: nevertheless, his sufferings lasted about half an hour. Just before he expired, he cried with a terrible voice: "Jesus, thou son of the eternal God, have mercy upon me!" thus persisting in his heresy to his latest breath.³

It is related in the book which passes under the name of "*Vaticanus*," that Bernardin Ochino, the celebrated preacher, on his return from England, arrived in Geneva the day following the execution; and on hearing it related, expressed so much horror and indignation, as to give rise to the hatred with which Calvin ever afterward pursued him.⁴ The scene had such an effect upon Farel himself, that he had not strength to relate it to Calvin, but returned at once to Neuchâtel without seeing him.⁵

In person Servetus was of middling size, thin and pale; his eyes beaming with thought and intelligence, but mingled with

¹ *De Morte Serveti*, apud P. Henry, iii., 199.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, iii., 200.

⁴ See Trechsel, *Antitr.*, ii., 110, note.

⁵ Gaberel, *Calvin à Genève*, p. 231. The long scene which Dr. Henry paints between Calvin and Farel, on the evening of Servetus's execution, seems drawn from imagination.

an expression of melancholy and fanaticism. His memory, says Mosheim, was tenacious, his imagination inexhaustible, his wit great, his industry wonderful, his love of learning ardent; but he had not sufficient understanding to use these advantages wisely. His discoveries, both in religion and science; his cleverness in combating the opinions of others; his happy emendations of Ptolemy; his voluminous and eloquent writings; his ability to seize and present a doctrine in many points of view; and his deep thoughts on some of the passages of Scripture, testify the strength and fruitfulness of his imagination: his love for prediction and astrology; his idea of the double sense of Scripture and prophecy; his groundless interpretations of the prophets, and of the Apocalypse, as well as his strange and unreasonable explanations of some parts of religion, betray the weakness of his understanding. But nothing can show this more than his fanaticism; which was so fostered by pride and self-love, that he looked upon himself as destined by Providence to restore the Church.¹

Such a character presents the greatest possible contrast to that of Calvin, whose strong understanding and practical turn of mind, led him, perhaps, too far the other way, and caused him almost to analyze scriptural truth into a logical formula. The difference in the minds of the two men is strikingly exemplified in their respective styles. Clear, concise, and forcible, Calvin appeals only to the understanding of his reader; diffuse, fanciful, and frequently obscure, Servetus seeks rather to excite his enthusiasm. But for his fanaticism, which gave a wrong direction to his powers, Servetus would probably have left a great name in science for discoveries which the positive mind of Calvin could never have achieved. Besides his theory of the circulation of the blood, he had also attempted to fix the seat of the mind, and to distinguish the principles of animal and vegetable life, "Another of his theories," says a late writer—"the life is in the blood—has been the subject of much discussion among the friends and the opponents of John Hunter. There certainly is a very great obscurity in all the opinions that Servetus advanced: they are so blended with his religious notions, that they are sometimes rendered unintelligible. Still we perceive an original mode of thinking pervades each idea, and much material for reasoning is constantly prepared to us: and when we remember that this extraordinary man gave the world the first clear description of the circulation of the blood seventy-five years before

¹ See Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, B. ii., § 36.

our immortal Harvey published the result of his inquiries, it is but justice that his other theories, which have been almost unknown, should again be brought forward."¹

That according to the doctors of the Church, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, the tenets of Servetus were unorthodox, and his mode of maintaining them blasphemous, can not admit of a doubt. He nevertheless entertained a strong sense of religion, and was disposed to seek the truth, but was led astray by pride and fanaticism. A mere unbeliever would not have maintained his opinions so firmly throughout his life, and at last have sealed them with his blood. His works abound with ardent expressions of devotion :² but it is possible that he may have been as much actuated in his conduct by the desire of becoming noted as a Reformer, as by any real piety. It does not belong to this work to give any detailed account of his religious notions, which, indeed, are frequently obscure and unintelligible. They were founded on a philosophical pantheism, which, while he did not reject the divinity of Christ, led him to deny his co-eternity with the Father, and to regard Trinitarians, whom he called *Tritheists*, as no better than atheists. They who desire to be further acquainted with his tenets will find an account of them at the end of Calvin's tract against him ; in the third book of Mosheim's History of Servetus ; and in the appendix to the third volume of his life, by Dr. P. Henry. The charges of immorality brought against him by Calvin were altogether unfounded.

Previously to the execution of Servetus, a few voices had been raised in his favor. David George, or Joris, who afterward became noted as the founder of an Anabaptist sect, but who was then residing at Basle, under the assumed name of John von Bruck, and who was much respected at that time by the Reformed churches, wrote to the governments of the

¹ *The unnoticed Theories of Servetus*, by Dr. Sigmond, Introd., p. 16.

² He concludes the preface to his *De Trinitate Divina*, with the following prayer : " O Christ Jesus, Son of God, thou who, sent to us from heaven, makest visible in thyself the revealed deity, disclose thyself to thy servant, that so great a manifestation may be truly understood. Bestow upon me now thy good spirit and thy efficacious word ; guide my mind and my pen so that I may be able to describe the glory of thy divinity, and to express the true faith concerning thee. This is thy cause, explaining thy glory from the Father, and the glory of thy Spirit, which, by a certain divine impulse, it occurred to me to treat of, when I was solicitous for thy truth. I treated of it before, and am now again compelled to do so : for the time is complete, as I shall now show to all the pious, both from the certitude of the thing itself, and from the manifest signs of the times. Thou hast taught us not to hide our light : and woe be to me unless I evangelize. It concerns the common cause of all Christians, to which we are all bound."

different towns to avert the fate of Servetus. He may possibly have beheld in him a brother Anabaptist, and his arguments for toleration may not have been altogether disinterested; but that circumstance will not strip them of their eternal truth. Gribaldo, an Italian jurisconsult, residing at Geneva, and whom we shall again have occasion to mention in the course of this narrative, also spoke in favor of Servetus.¹ But while his fate remained undecided, this feeling was only feebly manifested. The final decision of the Genevese magistrates was followed almost immediately by the execution of their prisoner; and there was hardly time, even in Geneva itself, to express an opinion upon an act whose very atrocity might have led people to think that it would never be committed. But the actual tidings of his fate produced an immediate, unequivocal, and, out of the clerical circles, pretty general manifestation of disapproval and aversion.² The more reflecting portion of the public condemned the act, not only for its atrocity, but for its impolicy. They perceived that such a proceeding on the part of a Reformed church, would only strengthen the cause of the Papists, and afford a sanction to their blood-thirsty persecutions.³ The general feeling manifested itself with more heat and violence. Libels appeared against the council in prose and verse; and the Italian refugees were particularly active in composing and circulating these productions.⁴ It was said that an inquisition of a new kind had been erected; that Geneva had its Pope as well as Rome; that Christ himself would have been crucified had he come thither. Even some of Calvin's personal friends could not refrain from expressing their disapprobation. Meanwhile, in reply to these attacks, the pulpits of Geneva resounded with denunciations of Servetus and his doctrines; and Calvin was at first inclined to take no other notice of the assaults of the pamphleteers. He seems to have felt the difficulty and in-

¹ P. Henry iii., 182, et seq.

² "Scarce, therefore, had the ashes of that unhappy wretch grown cold, when people began to agitate the question respecting the punishment of heretics."—Beza, *Vita Calv.*, anno 1553.

³ "Which punishment, though he richly deserved it, gave rise to much dispute; some defending it as proper, while others thought that such a precedent should not have been established in the church, lest it should give further occasion to the Papists of cruelly burning the faithful; and because even the ancients held that heretics were to be confuted by Scripture, and not by punishments."—Haller's *Diary*, 1553, *Mus. Helv.*, ii., 102.

⁴ Trechsel, *Antitr.*, i., 268. A specimen of one of these poems, by a Sicilian, named Camillo Renato, consisting of between eight hundred and nine hundred Latin hexameters, entitled "*In I. Calvinum, de injusto M. Serveti Incendio*," will be found in Trechsel, *Beil.* iv.

vidiousness of justifying his own act in a formal publication ; and to have shrunk from the task till urged to it by the increasing voice of public indignation, and the earnest exhortations of Bullinger. In his answer to Baudouin, he declares that he should never have entered upon the subject but for Bullinger's advice ; and we find the latter, in a letter to Calvin, of the 13th of December, 1553, urging him to describe Servetus and his last moments in such a manner that, according to the style of those days, "all might abhor the beast."¹

Calvin was now to justify and give his sanction to the capital punishment of heretics. This was an important step, but it was one which could no longer be delayed.² Early in the year 1554 appeared his "*Declaration pour maintenir la vraie Foi touchant la Trinité contre les Erreurs de M. Servet,*" &c. ; which was shortly afterward followed by a Latin version, from his own hand, bearing the title of "*Fidelis Expositio Errorum M. Serveti, et brevis eorundem Refutatio ubi docetur jure Gladii coercendos esse Hæreticos.*"

This work is remarkable only for the bitter spirit in which Calvin attacks a man whom he had sent to his last account, and for the atrocious way in which he advocates the general principle laid down in it. That he may not seem to sanction the popish fires, he maintains that the punishment of heretics belongs only to those who hold *the true doctrine*,³ that is, to himself and his followers ; thus claiming a monopoly of persecution. This claim is enforced by a very clear and powerful *argumentum ad hominem* ; namely, that whosoever should dispute his opinions on the point, would himself become obnoxious to a charge of blasphemy, and thus be in danger of lighting his own pyre. The whole passage, for its atrocity, deserves to be inserted. "Whoever," he says, "shall now contend that it is unjust to put heretics and blasphemers to death, will knowingly and willingly incur their very guilt. This is not laid down on human authority ; it is God himself who speaks, and prescribes a perpetual rule for his church. It is not in vain that he banishes all those human affections which soften our hearts ; that he commands

¹ See Calvin, *Responsio ad Balduini Convicia*, Opera, viii., 317, A., Amst. ed., and compare Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 166.

² "The urgent necessity I have mentioned compels me now at least to enter on a task that should have been performed sooner ; especially as the punishment lately inflicted in this city on the very author of the sect has occasioned discussions of a new kind."—*Refutatio*, &c., Opera, viii., 510, B.

³ "Ut compertæ veritati succedat demum pœnarum sanctio."—*Ibid.*, viii., 516, A.

paternal love, and all benevolent feelings between brothers, relations, and friends to cease; in a word, that he almost deprives men of their nature, in order that nothing may hinder their holy zeal. Why is so implacable a severity exacted, but that we may know that God is defrauded of his honor, unless the piety that is due to him be preferred to all human duties; and that, when his glory is to be asserted, humanity must be almost obliterated from our memories."¹ It would be superfluous at the present day to examine the reasoning by which Calvin attempts to support these monstrous sentiments. Servetus called him a Jew for entertaining them, and his line of argument seems to justify the name. Nearly all his authorities are drawn from the Old Testament; those which he attempts to bring from the New are of course utter failures.

Calvin's personal defense in this tract is a question at once more difficult and more interesting. Here we have to consider his individual share in procuring the death of Servetus, and, if culpable at all, how far his guilt extends.

Calvin boldly avows his share in the proceedings at Geneva;² and indeed it was too notorious to be denied, even had he been so inclined. Since, then, he acknowledges his intention, in which the guilt, if any, lies, it is little to the purpose to inquire what power he had to carry it into effect. Yet, as some modern writers have tried to extenuate his conduct on the ground that he had at that time but little influence, it may be as well to state that this assertion does not appear to be borne out by facts. It is true that Perrin and the Patriot party, during that and the following year, made a stronger opposition to Calvin than they were able either before or subsequently to offer. But Perrin's influence lay chiefly in the council of Two Hundred: before whom, as we have seen, the case of Servetus was not permitted to be brought. In the ordinary council Calvin was still predominant, and his power over the life of Servetus is acknowledged by himself in several passages of his tract.³

¹ *Refutatio, Opera*, viii., 516, A.

² See the *Refutatio, &c., Opera*, viii., 517, A.; also, Calvin to Sultzer, Ep. 156.

³ The avowal is particularly striking in the French edition: "Ce m' est assez qu'on sache que je ne l' ay point persécuté si mortellement qu'il ne luy fût loysible de racheter sa vie en donnant quelque signe de modestie." — *Bibliothèque Anglaise*, ii., 132. This passage alone sufficiently refutes M. Rillet's assertion (in his "*Relation du Procès Criminel*," &c.) that Calvin had no influence on the trial of Servetus. Yet Dr. Henry adopts it: and to support it, quotes from Calvin's works a passage wholly irrelevant.

Calvin has been often reproached with his letter to Farel in 1546, in which he expresses his determination to put Servetus to death, if he should ever come to Geneva. But the bold line of defense adopted by Calvin renders it in reality of little importance, except for the change of tone it exhibits the moment that the quarrel becomes personal, and for the contrast which it presents with the language of another letter that he wrote to Frelon on the same day. It would be idle to charge a man who avows and justifies an act with having entertained the idea of committing it.

The history of this sad affair can leave no doubt that Calvin desired, and was the main instrument in bringing about the death of Servetus; but it is possible that he endeavored to mitigate the manner of it. Turretin affirms that Calvin, with the rest of the pastors, dissuaded the council from burning Servetus;¹ but he does not give any authority for this statement, nor does it appear to be confirmed by the Registers of Geneva, nor by any other public document. Yet it is, perhaps, to some such endeavor that a passage in Calvin's tract against Servetus refers, in which he says that whatever was done by the council is ascribed to him;² for it would be inconsistent not only with several other passages in that tract, but with the whole spirit of his defense, to think that he wished to make the council responsible for the mere execution, as well as for the mode of it.

It is impossible at the present day to justify Calvin on his own grounds, and recourse is therefore had to other arguments. The chief of these are drawn from the manners of the time, and from the predominant influence of the Roman Catholic principle.

To say that Calvin was not in advance of his age is to pay but a poor tribute to so eminent a Reformer. Such reasoners should rather affirm that he appears to have been behind it; for, as we have seen, a great many voices were raised to protest against his act. But, as Mosheim observes,³ it is not the fact that Calvin was so ignorant of his duty toward his erring brethren. In the earlier editions of his "Institutes," passages breathing a mild and tolerant spirit show that he had early

(*Leben Calvins*, iii., Beil. iii., p. 50, note.) Even he, however, can not digest Rillet's absurd argument that Servetus was not executed as a blasphemer, or enemy of Calvin's, but for sedition; and has thought it worth while to spend some pages in refuting it. (See the same Beilage.)

¹ See his *Institutio Theologiæ Elencticæ*, iii., 374.

² *Refutatio Serveti, Opera*, viii., 511, A.

³ *Geschichte Servets*, B. ii., § 35.

arrived at the conviction that heretics should not be punished by death. The following quotation from one of these is given in the work of Minus Celsus: "Wherefore though it be not lawful, on account of ecclesiastical discipline, to live familiarly with excommunicated persons, yet we should strive by all possible means, by exhortation and teaching, by clemency and kindness, and by our prayers to God, that they may be converted to better thoughts, and return to the bosom of the Church. Nor are these only to be so treated, but also Turks and Saracens, and the rest of the enemies of true religion. So little to be approved of are the methods by which many have hitherto endeavored to drive them to our faith; by interdicting them from fire and water and the other elements; by denying them the common offices of humanity; and by pursuing them with the sword."¹ This and other passages were much altered in later editions; but even now several remain which stand in glaring contrast with the tenets maintained in the tract against Servetus. What could have induced Calvin to change these opinions? Is it possible that a man so acute, and so little obnoxious to the charge of fickleness and inconstancy, should have been led by the growth of reason and experience to reject such truly Christian sentiments as ill-formed and immature? Or was he influenced by other motives that took his reason prisoner?

The argument that Calvin was guided by the Roman Catholic principle in which he had been brought up, and which he saw in daily operation, stands on much the same grounds, and is liable to the same objections as the preceding one. Of the fact, indeed, of his having adopted that principle there can be no doubt. But we may be sure that Calvin himself would have rejected, with indignation and horror, the imputation that he was under the influence of a church which he regarded as Belial and Antichrist, and of whose principles he sought not how much he could retain, but how much he could reject: and so in his tract he expressly distinguishes his cause from the Roman Catholic. Yet some of his modern defenders would make that church wholly responsible for his conduct on this occasion.² The horrible persecutions of his

¹ This passage is now read differently in *Institutio*, iv., 12, § 10. See Mini Celsi Senensis *Disputatio*, p. 98. Liebe, also, who had seen the edition of the *Institutio* published at Strasburgh, in 1539, says in his *Diatriba de Pseudonymiâ I. Calvini* (p. 32), that it contained many passages in favor of treating heretics mildly, which were expunged from the later editions.

² "Ihr princip also ist es, das noch hier in dem Genfer Rath triumphirt: und sie sind für diese That verantwortlich, dies Blut schreit auf gegen sie."—P. Henry, iii., 208. See also Scott, *Continuation of Milner*, iii., 436.

brethren which were constantly taking place, were calculated, one would think, to excite and keep alive Calvin's horror for that bloody principle; though Dr. Henry has used this argument the other way, and affirms, that when such dreadful murders of the Protestant martyrs were daily heard of in France, Italy, and Spain, it must have appeared *ridiculous* to let such a man as Servetus live; and that we can only wonder at the tranquillity of his judges in such dreadful times!¹ On the value of such a motive the reader must decide.

The most plausible apology for Calvin is, perhaps, to be found in the opinions of his brother theologians. We have already quoted Bullinger's, before the execution of Servetus; and he retained it afterward.² Peter Martyr, in a letter to the Poles who had embraced the gospel, dated the 14th of February, 1556, vindicated the conduct of the Genevese magistrates.³ But the most important approval is that of Melancthon, unequivocally pronounced in a letter to Calvin, acknowledging the receipt of his book against Servetus, and dated the 14th of October, 1554. In this Melancthon says: "I have read your tract in which you lucidly refute the horrid blasphemies of Servetus, and give thanks to the Son of God, who was the arbiter of your contest. The Church owes you her gratitude both now and hereafter. I quite agree in your opinion, and moreover assert that your magistrates acted with perfect justice in putting the blasphemer to death after a regular trial."⁴ He repeats the same opinion in a letter to Bullinger.

Calvin is entitled to all the weight of these opinions in his favor, by which he seems almost to stand acquitted. It must, however, be observed, that they relate only to the trial and execution of Servetus at Geneva, which Calvin avowed: but, for a full appreciation of his conduct and motives, there still remains to be considered the part he took in handing over Servetus to the authorities of Vienne, which he denied. The

¹ "Hierzu kommt dass man täglich von furchtbaren Ermordungen der heiligen Bekenner in Frankreich, Italien, und Spanien hörte, so dass es lächerlich scheinen konnte einen solchen Menschen leben zu lassen, und man wahrlich in jener wilden Zeit die Ruhe der Richter bewundern muss."—*Leben Calvins*, iii., 157.

² Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 173.

³ Trechsel, i., 267, *Zusätze*.

⁴ Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 187 and 214. Melancthon held the same opinion in the case of Campanus. Luther was for treating him with contempt; but Melancthon thought he should be hung on a lofty gallows, and wrote to the sovereign to that effect (Luther, *Tischreden*, apud Schlosser, *Leben Bezas*, p. 52).

eminent theologians, whose opinions have been adduced, might recognize the salutary effect of the formal trial and condemnation of an obstinate heretic by a Reformed tribunal, and yet have objected to his being clandestinely betrayed into the hands of a Roman Catholic one. The two cases stand on grounds perfectly distinct; though one may serve by way of comment on the other. The main cause that weighed with Bullinger was the beneficial effect which such a proceeding would have on the Reformed churches, which were accused of abetting heresy.¹ Martyr and Melancthon advert to a formal trial and condemnation; and the sentence of the Genevese magistrates on Servetus affirms that he was to be "an example to others." But his execution at Vienne would have passed almost unnoticed. He would have been confounded with the numerous martyrs to Calvin's own principles; and so neither God's honor would have been consulted, nor the interests of the Reformed Church advanced; but rather, on the contrary, injured, by the sanction thus given by Calvin to the blood-thirsty persecutions of the Papists.

But Calvin denied having betrayed Servetus, and his denial must therefore be examined. The following is a literal translation of it: "But let the right of the magistrates be what it may, I am not thereby released from the personal invidiousness with which I am sore oppressed by many; who affirm that nothing was more unbecoming than that I should have flung Servetus to the professed enemies of Christ, as to wild beasts. For they assert that it was by my means that he was apprehended at Vienne in the province of Lyons. But whence could I have suddenly acquired so great a familiarity, or rather favor, with the satellites of the Pope? Is it credible, forsooth, that a correspondence should be kept up between those who are not less at variance than Christ and Belial? Wherefore there is no need to use many words in refuting so futile a calumny, which falls to the ground by a simple denial. Servetus himself invented this charge against me four years ago, and took care to spread it at Vienne. I will not inquire whether he was actuated by a malignant wish to excite against me a causeless hatred, or whether he really, though falsely, suspected what he charged me with. I only ask, if he was then betrayed by my evidence, how comes it that he lived for three years quietly, and without molestation, in the presence of his enemies? One of two things must be conceded;

¹ See Bullinger's letter to Calvin, Ep. 157, and the answer of the Zurich ministers, Ep. 159, sub fin.

either the accusation was false, or this holy martyr must have been regarded with too much favor by the Papists for any accusation of mine to hurt him. Nor, were the charge true, should I think it worth while to deny it, since I do not dissemble that it was by my authority he was arrested and tried in this city."¹

To make this denial *literally* true, it is only necessary, as Mosheim remarks, that Calvin should not have actually written or dictated Trie's letters, and that the first should have been dispatched without his knowledge; the possibility of both which circumstances has been already admitted. Calvin would not then have had a correspondence and familiarity with the satellites of the Pope, nor would he have been the first cause of the apprehension of Servetus. But this does not clear him from the charge of having furnished the evidence by which alone Trie's denunciation could be rendered effectual; and of thus having made himself a partaker in whatever guilt attaches to such an act. It may be said that Calvin's character places him above the suspicion of such a subterfuge. But the only way to obviate it is to prove that Trie's letters, supported as they are by the proceedings at Geneva and other collateral circumstances, are not genuine; a feat not yet attempted by Calvin's warmest advocates. And, in fact, his conscience was rather pliant in the matter of reservations, as may be seen in a letter of his to the Duchess of Ferrara; in which he tells her that she is not obliged to keep an oath administered to her when called on to take part in the French government.²

There is no need to inquire into Calvin's denial of having denounced Servetus to the Catholic authorities *some years previously*. It may have been a groundless suspicion on the part of Servetus; but it does not follow that information had not been lodged against him, from some quarter or another, merely because he lived securely at Vienne for three or four years afterward. Yet an argument has been based on this last circumstance by Armand de la Chapelle³ and others, to prove that Calvin had nothing to do with his persecution at Vienne even in 1553. It is said that Calvin had all the documents in his possession long before that period; and,

¹ *Refutatio Serveti, Opera*, viii., 517, A., Amst. ed.

² "Quant au serment qu'on vous a contrainte de faire, comme vous avez failli et offensé Dieu en le faisant, aussi n'estes vous tenue de le garder, non plus qu'un vœu de superstition."—Ruchat, vii., App., p. 379. These *reservations* became characteristic of the Puritans. See Dr. Maitland's *Essays on the Reformation*, Essays i. and ii.

³ *Bibliothèque Raisonnée*, i., 390.

from his not having used them at once, it is inferred that he never did so at all. The obvious answer to this is, that Servetus had not printed his book till 1553. This was an overt act, and furnished something tangible to the Roman Catholic authorities, who would have looked with suspicion on mere manuscript evidence, furnished by a man whom they considered to be a great heretic himself. But though this argument from probability was a somewhat plausible one in the hands of Armand de la Chapelle, who wrote before Trie's letters were published, one is surprised to see it repeated by Dr. P. Henry;¹ since it is entirely demolished by the second of those letters.

In Calvin's denial of this imputation just quoted, we can not help being struck by the very summary way in which he disposes of it; and by the haste with which he passes over the recent charge, and addresses himself to another of the same kind made four years previously: a proceeding which has all the appearance of being designed to put the reader on a false scent, and to divert his attention from a charge that was true, to another, which might have been groundless or difficult of proof. Nor, after the discrepancies already pointed out between some of the statements made in this tract, and Calvin's correspondence, can we be required to place implicit confidence in all his assertions, or be at once silenced by an appeal to character.

Such are the facts of this extraordinary case. Was Calvin's conduct in it guided solely by zeal for God's honor and the welfare of the church? Or was he partly influenced by feelings of a more personal kind? In considering these questions we must not leave out of sight Calvin's irritable pride, which the reader has already seen in more than one instance, and the wounds it had received from the attacks of Servetus. The latter's book on the "Restitution of Christianity" was not worse than his previous one on the "Trinity," for which Bucer had declared that he merited a terrible death. Yet we find Calvin corresponding with him on terms of tolerable courtesy long after the publication of the latter; and suddenly breaking off all communication, and expressing a desire to put him to death, only when the correspondence became angry and personal. The abuse of Calvin is one of the charges against Servetus in his indictment at Geneva; and the former declares in more than one place that Servetus

¹ *Leben Calvins*, iii., 140, note.

might have saved his life had it not been for his pride.¹ His offense against God, then, might have been overlooked, but not his manner of maintaining it against man. Will it be said Calvin merely means that his crime was aggravated by the obstinate pride with which he refused to retract his blasphemies, and thus became worthy of capital punishment? This solution has been alluded to by Mosheim as a possible one; but it seems completely cut off, not only by Calvin's letter to Farel in February, 1546, but also by another to the same person on the 20th of August, 1553, which has been already cited; in which he desires the death of Servetus, though he had been captured only a week; at which time Calvin could not certainly tell whether he would retract or not. But perhaps the most suspicious circumstance in the case is the hesitation with which Calvin furnished the necessary documents to the authorities of Vienne. Dr. Henry says that he was hesitating between the principles of the Old and New Testaments. Whether he was not rather hesitating between the abandonment of a great principle, and the gratification of private revenge, must be left to the reader, or rather to the Searcher of all hearts.

Calvin's defense of his conduct pleased neither himself, nor his friends; which is not much to be wondered at. Zerkinta (Zur-Kinden), the state secretary at Berne, and a friend of Calvin's objected to it on account of its principles. In a letter to Calvin, dated the 10th of February, 1554, he says: "I wish the former part of your book, respecting the right which the magistrate may have to use the sword in coercing heretics, had not appeared in your name, but in that of your council, which might have been left to defend its own act. I do not see how you can find any favor with men of sedate mind in being the first formally to treat this subject, which is a hateful one to almost all."² Bullinger's objections were confined to the manner in which the subject had been handled. Writing to Calvin on the 26th of March, 1554, he says: "I only fear that your book will not be so acceptable to many of the more simple-minded persons, who, nevertheless, are much attached both to yourself and to the truth, by reason of its brevity, and consequent obscurity, and the weightiness of the

¹ See the passage quoted above from his tract against Servetus (p. 303, note); and compare the *Responsio ad Balduini Convicia*, where Calvin says: "Certe arrogantia non minus quam impietas perdidit hominem."—*Opera*, viii., 319, B.

² MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 238, note.

subject. And, indeed, your style appears somewhat perplexed, especially in this work."¹

There is extant in the Zurich archives a letter of Calvin's apparently in answer to this of Bullinger's; from which, as it throws some light on the general feeling in this matter, we give the following extract:² "I always feared that some obscurity would arise from the brevity of my tract; but this I could not guard against, or, rather, I was induced by other reasons not to guard against it. It seemed to me that my chief, if not my only object, should be to make the impiety of Servetus appear in a detestable light. Had I handled the topics of my dissertation in a complete and perfect manner I should have been suspected of the sly purpose of overwhelming, by a splendid treatise, dogmas which, after all, were not so very impious. I do not, myself, perceive that weightiness of style which you remark. On the contrary, I used my best endeavors that, so far as possible, even the unlearned reader might, without much trouble, behold the thorny subtleties of Servetus made smooth and plain. At the same time I am aware that I have been more concise than usual in this treatise.³ However, if I should appear to have faithfully and honestly defended the true doctrine, it will more than recompense me for my trouble. But though the candor and justice which are natural to you, as well as the love you bear me, lead you to judge of me favorably, there are others who assail me harshly as a master in cruelty and atrocity, for attacking with my pen not only a dead man, but one who perished by my hands. Some, even not ill-disposed toward me, wish that I had never entered on the subject of the punishment of heretics, and say that others in the like situation have held their tongues, as the best way of avoiding hatred. It is well, however, that I have you to share my fault, if fault it be; for you it was who advised and persuaded me to it. Prepare yourself, therefore, for the combat."

Calvin's book naturally called forth some replies. In the same year appeared the "Dialogues between Calvin and Vaticanus;"⁴ in which Calvin's propositions respecting the punishment of heretics are first set down with his name over them, and then the author's answers, with the title

¹ *Original Letters* (Parker Society), Part ii., p. 744.

² The letter is printed at length by Dr. Henry in the *Beilagen* to his third volume, p. 86, et seq. It is dated April 29th, 1554.

³ Bullinger's objections to the style seem certainly unfounded.

⁴ The proper title is, "*Contra Libellum Calvinii, in quo ostendere conatur Hæreticos jure Gladii coercendos esse.*"

of "*Vaticanus*" prefixed. It follows Calvin's arrangement throughout, and refutes him step by step. The author is very severe upon Calvin, whom he assails not only for his life, his doctrine of predestination, &c., but even for his learning, which he seems to have considered unapostolical. He does not excuse the doctrines of Servetus, but defends him from the charge of blasphemy on the ground that his attacks were not directed against the Deity, but against men's opinions of him.¹ Another answer came out under the pseudonym of Martinus Bellius, and with the title "*De Hæreticis an sint persequendi*," but which afterward obtained the name of the "*Farrago*." It consisted of passages, selected from the writings of the Reformers of the sixteenth century, condemning capital punishment in cases of heresy. This book was received with great applause, and went through several editions in a short time; in the later of which the opinions of the ancient Fathers of the Church on the same subject were added.² Beza unhesitatingly ascribes the authorship of it to Castellio and Lælius Socinus jointly, though the former denied it upon oath.³ The work of Minus Celsus, already alluded to, was also composed in 1554, but it did not appear till 1577, and, consequently, long after Calvin's death. Unlike the controversial works of the age, it is written with great politeness, in a mild and quiet tone, breathing the true spirit of the gospel. Though Calvin's principles are opposed, he is treated with deference throughout. The author was induced to write it from perceiving that many who had been eye-witnesses of the death of Servetus were led by the constancy he displayed to think that his principles were true, and thus to fall away from the church.⁴

Calvin did not again enter the lists on this question, of which he seems to have been heartily tired, but handed over his antagonists to Beza. In 1554 Zanchi also published a tract, in which Calvin's views were defended. But the latter's conduct had drawn down upon him a very bitter hatred, which went on increasing. Hotoman, writing to Bullinger from Basle, 27th of Sept., 1555, says: "Calvin is no better spoken of here than at Paris. If any one wants to blame another for perjury or immorality, he calls him a Calvinist. He is attacked in all quarters most savagely and importunately."⁵

¹ See P. Henry, *Leben Calvins*, iii., Beil. p. 94.

² Mosheim, *Geschichte Servets*, B. ii., note 11.

³ *Vita Calv.*, sub annis 1554 et 1549. M. Crie attributes it to Socinus. See *Ref. in Italy*, p. 388, note.

⁴ *Leben Calvins*, iii., 237.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 239.

CHAPTER XI.

Affair of Berthelier—Calvin refuses to administer the Lord's Supper—Question of Excommunication—Truce with the Libertines—Libel upon Calvin—His Unpopularity—Disputes with the Bernese Clergy—Calvin visits Berne—Banishment of Bolsec—Further Struggles with the Libertines—The Consistory's power of Excommunication confirmed—Question of Citizenship—Riots—The Libertines discomfited—Sentence upon them.

WE must now return to the civil affairs of Geneva, and the struggles of Calvin with the Libertine, or Patriot party, during the course of this and the two following years.

It will be recollected that Calvin's opponents had for a considerable period been gaining strength; and this they employed in extorting from him and the refugees certain privileges which they had hitherto enjoyed. In March, 1553, the ministers were excluded from the general council, or assembly of the people,¹ and shortly afterward the refugees were forbidden to carry arms. The affair of Servetus tended on the whole to strengthen the Libertines; though, as we have seen, that heretic relied with a too fatal confidence on the power of that party to save him. The season of his imprisonment and trial was deemed a favorable opportunity for making an assault upon the spiritual authority of Calvin and the consistory. The person put forward for this purpose was Philibert Berthelier, who was now sitting as one of Servetus's judges, and was the son of that Berthelier who, in 1518, had been beheaded for the part he had taken in favor of the freedom of Geneva.² Calvin has given an account of this affair in a letter to Viret,³ from which we learn that Berthelier had been excluded from the communion a year and a half before,⁴ on which occasion

¹ "Arrêté que les ministres seront dispensés de se rencontrer au Conseil Général, mais que leurs enfans pourront y aller."—*Régistres*, 16 Mars, 1553. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

² Ruchat. vi., 37.

³ Ep. 154, Sept. 4th, 1553.

⁴ "P. Berthélier se plaint au Conseil que le Consistoire lui a défendu la cène pour n'avoir pas voulu convenir qu'il avoit fait mal de soutenir qu'il étoit aussi homme de bien que Calvin."—*Régistres*, 27 Mars, 1552, Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*, who, however, puts this entry in 1551; while P. Henry (iii., 359) gives the date of 1553. Both Spon (ii., 70), however, and Ruchat (vi., 37), correctly write 1552; which date agrees with Calvin's expression, "ante sesquiannum."

Calvin, on the complaint of Berthelier, had been summoned before the council, "on account of the scoundrel," as he terms it; but after hearing the case that body decided in Calvin's favor, and ratified the sentence of excommunication pronounced by the consistory. Under this ban Berthelier had quietly lain till the present time, either, says Calvin, out of despair, or contempt; but he was unwilling to let the opportunity of Perrin's syndicate slip, without an attempt to regain his rights; and with this view he now moved the council that they should, of their own proper authority, and without consulting the consistory, release him from the sentence of the latter tribunal, and restore him to the church. Before taking any step in the matter, the council summoned Calvin before them, without his colleagues; on which occasion he pointed out, in a long speech, that they could not lawfully assume the power of abrogating Berthelier's sentence; and that it would be exceedingly unjust and improper to undermine the discipline of the church by such a proceeding. On a subsequent occasion Calvin assembled all the ministers, both those of the town and those of the rural districts, and putting himself at their head, appeared before the council. He again employed arguments, threats, and entreaties; and the ministers severally represented that, if such proceedings were allowed, they should be forced to abandon their church and ministry.¹ But all these efforts served only to raise the fury of Calvin's adversaries to a higher pitch. They exclaimed that the consistory wanted to usurp the functions that belonged to the civil power, and demanded that the matter should be referred to the council of Two Hundred. That body, on the matter being brought before them, decided that the ordinary council had the power of receiving such complaints as Berthelier's, and of absolving whom they thought proper from ecclesiastical censures; and, in conformity with this decision, Berthelier obtained absolute letters signed with the seal of the republic.

Perrin now thought that the moment of his triumph was at hand. Either Calvin, he reasoned, would oppose this proceeding of the council's, and he might thereupon get him condemned as a rebel; or if, on the other hand, he should bow to their decision, the power of the consistory was gone forever.² But this opinion was founded on a wrong estimate of Calvin's character. It was on a Friday that Calvin first heard of the absolution of Berthelier by the council; and the following Sunday was the first Sabbath in September, when, according

¹ Ruchat, l. c.

² Beza, *Vita Calv.*

to a custom universally observed in the Reformed churches, the Lord's Supper was to be celebrated. On the intervening Saturday Calvin made one more effort to persuade the council to alter their determination, and protested that he would rather die than profane the sacrament by administering it to an excommunicated person.¹ The council, however, remained firm in their resolution, and Calvin was not long in deciding upon his own line of conduct. The decisive Sunday arrived. Calvin mounted the pulpit as usual; and after descanting on the veneration due to the holy mysteries of God, and inveighing against their contemners, he raised his voice as he approached the conclusion of his discourse, and declared that, after the example of St. Chrysostom, he would never administer the supper to the excommunicate; and that if there were any among them who would extort by force the bread of the Lord, on his head be the consequence. Then, lifting up his hands on high, he exclaimed: "I will lay down my life ere these hands shall reach forth the holy things of God to those who have been branded as his revilers."

Perrin was present, who seems to have always possessed a decent feeling of religion, and indeed some respect for Calvin's character. These words made such an impression upon him that he secretly sent a message to Berthelier, not to approach the table; and the communion was celebrated in profound silence, a sort of awe pervading the assembly, as if, says Beza, the Deity himself were present. In the afternoon Calvin preached another sermon, taking his text from Acts, chap. xx: "Therefore watch, and remember that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears. And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of His grace." In the course of it he declared that he was not the man to resist the constituted authorities, nor to teach others to do so; he exhorted the congregation to abide in the doctrine which he had taught; and declared that he should be always ready to serve the church and each of its members. "But," he added, "such is the state of things here, that this may perhaps be the last time I shall teach God's word to you; since they with whom lies the power would force me to do a thing which God permits not. I must, therefore, say, like Paul to the elders of Ephesus, dearly beloved, I commend you to the grace of God."²

¹ Ruchat, vi., 38.

² Beza. Ruchat, vi., 39. This sermon was taken down by a short-hand writer, and put into Latin by Beza. See Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 162.

But though Calvin talked of leaving his flock, he was not the man to give up such a cause without a struggle. On the following morning, accompanied by the rest of the pastors, and by the lay members of the consistory, he appeared before the council, and subsequently before the Two Hundred, to beg that, as a law was in question which had been sanctioned by the general assembly of the people, he might now be heard before that body. Thus circumstances often strangely alter men's opinions; and we here find Calvin, when he saw himself and his cause threatened with ruin, appealing to those very popular institutions whose power it had previously been one of his chief objects to curtail. Calvin's request was not granted, yet a very different state of feeling was exhibited. It was resolved to suspend the decree by which the power of excommunication had been declared to reside with the ordinary council, and to request the opinion of the four Swiss cities on the matter; and in the mean time it was proclaimed that the established laws ought not to be violated.¹

Thus, though the point was left still undecided, Calvin's energy of purpose bore him for the time safely through the storm. Every thing, indeed, that he had been so long contending for, depended on the issue of the struggle; for if the consistory should be deprived of the right of excommunication, he would lose the main instrument of his power. That under such circumstances he would have consented to remain at Geneva may well be doubted; and his threat of leaving it seems to have been no idle one. In a letter to Bullinger he communicated his determination to do so; and Bullinger in his reply earnestly entreated him to remain.² In another letter to the same pastor, written in the following November, he represents these attacks upon him as a sort of trap laid by his enemies, who knew the irritability of his temper, and thought that, by outraging his patience, they should succeed in driving him to some fatal and irrevocable step.³

In the following November the Libertines endeavored to get up another tumult, of which Farel was the subject. Immediately after the execution of Servetus, Farel had left Geneva; but learning the turbulent proceedings which were taking place there, he hastened back a few days afterward, to support

¹ Beza, *Vita Calv.*

² See Ep. 157, Sept. 14th, 1553.

³ "Wicked men, knowing my irritability, have endeavored to exhaust my patience by frequently exciting my anger in various ways. But though the struggle was a difficult one, they have not succeeded in diverting me from my path, as they desired."—Ep. 162.

Calvin, and to overawe the malcontents by his authority and eloquence.¹ He accordingly mounted the pulpit, and, after preaching a powerful sermon against the Libertine faction, again quitted Geneva abruptly. That party chose to regard his discourse as an insult publicly offered to the state; and instigated the council to apply to the magistrates of Neufchâtel to send him back to take his trial for the offense, which they seem to have made nothing less than capital.² Notwithstanding the serious nature of the penalty, Calvin, who was probably aware that his adversaries could not possibly succeed in so outrageous a proceeding, wrote to Farel, advising him to come and take his trial at Geneva, in preference to waiting till proceedings should be instituted against him at Neufchâtel.³ Farel accordingly set off, on foot, and in wintry weather. His arrival created great disturbance. The council sent an officer to Calvin to say that Farel would not be allowed to mount the pulpit.⁴ To tell a man, however, who was come to plead to a capital indictment, that he was not to preach a sermon, does not argue that his life was in any great danger. Berthelier, however, endeavored to raise a disturbance, by getting the laborers in the mint, who were under his orders, to go to the Guildhall, and make a demonstration against Farel;⁵ and it was probably from this band that the cry arose, which Beza mentions, to fling Farel into the Rhone. On the other hand, Farel's friends began to assemble. The Genevese ministers met, and represented to the council the evil views of Farel's enemies. Many of the townspeople assembled, and formed a guard round the person of their former pastor. Before the council Farel contended, in a long and animated speech, that his adversaries could not have been present at his sermon, for that he had said no more than what became his sacred office; and declared that nothing was farther from his thoughts than to insult a city toward which, as all men knew, he entertained the kindest feelings. This speech had a great effect upon the council, as well as upon the numerous audience which had penetrated into the council-chamber. Even those who had accused Farel declared that they held him to be a faithful minister of the gospel, and their spiritual father. On perceiv-

¹ Kirchhofer, *Leben Farel's*, ii., 119.

² "When our brother Farel was here lately, to whom, as you well know, our people owe every thing, and freely admonished them, as he was well entitled to do, they burst out into such a rage against him as not to scruple at capitally indicting him."—Calvin to the Ministers of Zurich, Ep. 165, Nov. 26th, 1553.

³ See Calvin's letter to Farel, MS. Gen., cited by P. Henry, iii., 364, note.

⁴ Calvin, Ep. 165.

⁵ Kirchhofer, ii., 120.

ing this feeling the council decreed that his accusers should shake hands with him, and that all animosity should be obliterated by a banquet.¹ Perrin, the chief syndic, begged pardon of Farel, declared that he was under obligations to him, and should ever consider him as his father and pastor. The rest did the like; but all this, says the old chronicler Savion, was pure grimace. Perrin saw that his hands were not strong enough.²

The question respecting excommunication still continued to be agitated; and on the 30th of November the Genevese council sent to learn the opinion of the four Swiss cantons, as had been before resolved. The three questions proposed to them were: 1st, How excommunication should be exercised, in conformity with the precepts of Scripture; 2d, If it could not be exercised otherwise than by the consistory; and 3d, What was the custom of their churches on this point.³ Previously, however, Calvin thought it expedient to dispatch Budé, a son of Budæus the illustrious Greek scholar, as a special messenger to Bullinger, to put him in possession of the whole matter, and to dispose him to a favorable opinion on the question about to be submitted to the judgment of the Zurich government. In the letter which he sent at the same time,⁴ he intimated his desire that the council of Zurich should unambiguously approve of the discipline established at Geneva, and dissuade the Genevese from the desire of change; and he accompanied this private letter with another of the same date, addressed to the Zurich ministers, to induce them to exert their influence with their council.⁵ In this, after a short preface, and an apology for troubling them again so soon, he related the case of Berthelier, whom he represented as put forward by the same faction that had undertaken the defense of Servetus. He stated that the question at issue concerned church discipline and the right of excommunication, respecting which he entered into some arguments: he represented the matter as of the utmost importance, and as having now arrived at a crisis; and showed the violent and factious temper of his adversaries, by relating the case of Farel. These letters he accompanied with two other documents, consisting of an extract from the laws of the

¹ "Ceux qui s' étaient plaints de Farel déclarèrent tous qu'ils le tenoient pour un fidèle ministre du St. Evangile et pour leur père spirituel; sur quoi le Conseil ordonna que chacun lui touchât la main, et qu'il se fit un repas de reconciliation." — *Régistres*, 13 Nov., 1553. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*. Kirchhofer, l. c.

² See Ruchat, vi., 63.

⁴ Ep. 164, Nov. 26th, 1553.

³ *Ibid.*

⁵ Ep. 165.

Genevese consistory,¹ and a memorial which the ministers of Geneva had presented to the council to explain their conduct, and to show that they could not conscientiously submit to its decision.

Bullinger answered these letters on the 12th of December.² From his reply it appears that they were read in full council at Zurich, and that the burgomaster, and three of the councillors, were deputed to take the advice of three prudent ministers as to an answer. The latter advised an approval of the method of excommunication exercised by the church of Geneva; for though that used at Zurich was not of the same nature, they considered that both methods were adapted to the respective circumstances of the two cities. Bullinger inclosed an epitome of the discipline observed at Zurich; and in a postscript, dated on the 13th of December, announced that the council of Zurich had coincided in the views just stated. But though he had thus exerted himself in Calvin's cause, it appears, from some expressions in his letter, that he suspected him of being too hasty and intemperate, and admonished him against undue severity.³

The magistrates of Berne replied shortly, that they had no excommunication in their church, but certain ordinances, of which they forwarded a copy. The replies of the two other cantons are not extant, but they appear to have allowed of the Genevan discipline.⁴ Bullinger also sent with his letter an abstract of the Zurich laws respecting adultery, from which it appears that it was punished there by exclusion from the communion, and from all posts of honor, with three days' imprisonment, and if there was no amendment, with banishment.⁵ The Swiss laws were, therefore, considerably milder than those instituted by Calvin. Indeed, they appear to have been too lax in this article; for, from the synodal acts of 1537, we learn that one of the Zurich clergy, Fridolin Keller, the pastor of Regenspurg, who had been deposed for that crime before Easter, was restored to his functions in the course of the same year. The same document contains frequent evidence of the disorders and extravagance of the Zurich clergy.⁶

¹ See Ep. 167.

² Ep. 166.

³ "We exhort you to continue faithful to the Lord, and to observe moderation in all things, lest by too much rigor you should destroy those whom the Lord wishes to be preserved; who doth not break the shattered reed, nor extinguish the smoking flax."—Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 166.

⁴ Ruchat, vi., 68.

⁵ P. Henry, iii., 367, note.

⁶ See Seltzer, *Die drei letzten Jahrhunderte der Schweizergeschichte*, 10te Vorlesung, i., 152.

The answers of the Swiss cantons produced but little immediate effect. On the 31st of December, 1554,¹ we find Calvin writing to Bullinger: "I have to deal with the most wicked calumniators, who will involve me in all manner of strife. Yet I hope to carry off the victory, or at all events to arrive at some tolerable issue."² Yet, externally, every thing wore the appearance of peace. On the 1st of January, 1554, at a grand dinner given to the council and judges, at which Calvin was present, a desire for peace was universally expressed. The council appointed a committee to examine into differences, to hear the complaints of both parties, and to heal the divisions, which had extended even to members of the same families. On the 2d of February, the council of Two Hundred, among which body Calvin's opponents were chiefly to be found, swore with uplifted hands to conform in future to the precepts of the Reformation, to renounce all hatred and animosity, to forget the past, and to live together in unity; at the same time invoking the vengeance of God upon the estates, persons, wives, and children of those who should break this holy resolution.³ But notwithstanding the solemn nature of this reconciliation, Calvin appears to have placed no reliance upon it. He considered it rather as a truce made with himself personally, than with the consistory; for the maintenance of whose authority he foresaw that further struggles awaited him. Writing to Bullinger, on the 23d of February, he says: "A reconciliation has at length been necessarily effected; for the council was divided into open factions, and hatred had so plainly manifested itself, that the wicked felt that the vengeance of God was hanging over them. Yet the well-disposed have not had the courage to regulate the affairs of the church, which are the cause of all this strife. All that was done was to shake hands, and take an oath that none hereafter would patronize evil courses. By this, indeed, my opponents have tacitly read their own condemnation; yet, under the plausible pretense of peace, the lawful order of the church, the sole guaranty of tranquillity, has been neglected, or at all events postponed. When called into the council

¹ By order of their bishop, in 1305, the Genevese thenceforward began the year at Christmas instead of Easter. This was a change from the French to the German style. The French adopted the 1st of January in 1564; and the Genevese followed their example in 1575. See Gréus, *Fragmens Historiques*, p. 2, note.

² MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 367, note.

³ Ruchat, vi., 115. Calvin, Ep. 171. Dr. Henry (l. c.) seems to have no authority for stating that this oath was administered to the whole population.

chamber, I declared that I forgave all who sincerely repented; but that I was but one member of the consistory, and that I would die a hundred times over, rather than arrogate to myself the functions of the entire church. I perceived that Satan desired nothing more than that, in this disturbed state of things, he might supply some fresh occasion of tumult. But I am determined to be beforehand with him. And although my enemies will, perhaps, not be so violent as formerly, yet in a short time I shall have to contend with them again."¹ In another letter of the 11th of the same month, he attributes the reconciliation which had been effected to the artifice of his enemies, and expresses his determination not to make the slightest concession with regard to the right of excommunication, hinting that, if he can not carry his point, he shall leave Geneva.²

In the summer of 1554, an anonymous letter was received by the Genevese council, containing charges of the most frightful kind against Calvin. The council handed it over to Calvin, who suspected that it was written by Castellio; and wrote a letter communicating his suspicions to Sulzer, the pastor at Basle, where Castellio was residing. Sulzer, in his answer,³ expressed his surprise that Castellio, who appeared to be so great a lover of peace and charity, should have been the author of such an attack, and promised that he should be severely admonished. In reply to this, Calvin says: "Castellio, believe me, is a beast as virulent as he is untamed and obstinate. He is a great pretender to charity, and to modesty also, though nothing more arrogant can be imagined. He and others concocted that libel, filled with such atrocious imputations, with the design of exciting a sudden explosion against me. They have, however, been sadly deceived. The council gave it me to read; and it was easy for me not only promptly to confute their calumnies, but even to convert all their odious charges to my praise."⁴ Beza, in his "Life of Calvin," attributes the libel to Bolsec and others, as well as to Castellio, whom he represents as having been instigated to this step by the Libertine faction.⁵ Castellio, indeed, was always the object of his and Calvin's suspicions; and this circumstance, as well as the vagueness of a charge directed against so many, should make us pause before we consider it as well founded on this occasion. Castellio denied before the

¹ Ep. 171.

² MS. Tig., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 363, note.

³ Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 174, July 14th, 1554.

⁴ Ep. 176, Aug. 7th.

⁵ *Vita Calc.*, anno 1554

council at Basle that he was the author of the libel, which Calvin answered in a short tract.

During this year the council would not allow Calvin to publish any thing without their sanction. A book which he was preparing—probably the "*Defensio Sanæ et Orthodoxæ Doctrinæ de Sacramentis*," which appeared in November—was ordered to be submitted to the physician Beljaquet, for examination.¹ Calvin was so offended at this as to declare that, if he lived a thousand years, he would never print any thing more at Geneva; and that he would sooner destroy what had been approved of by pious and learned men, than give it to ignorant dolts to nibble at.²

At this time he could hardly walk the streets without being insulted. Once, as he was returning from St. Gervais, where he had been preaching, he was attacked by some fellows on the bridge of the Rhone. On his quietly observing that the bridge was broad enough for them all, the ruffians turned their attack upon a French refugee who was walking near the spot, pursued him into his shop, and wounded him. A cry was raised of "Death to the foreigners!" A crowd soon gathered, swords were drawn, and blood spilt. On another occasion, when Calvin was proceeding to the lecture-room, he was publicly insulted, and his servant beaten. Such scenes were of daily occurrence. It was unsafe for the refugees to be in the streets at night. Complaints were loudly uttered against Calvin, and what were called his French laws. The admonitions of the consistory were set at naught, and the members of it personally abused and insulted. One man ventured to tell them that they were more cruel than Satan himself, but that they should not be so long. On the other hand, Calvin hotly attacked his adversaries from the pulpit: but the council found his heat untimely, and desired him to moderate his zeal.³

Besides having to contend with his domestic enemies, Calvin was at this time involved in disputes with some of the Bernese ministers, holding cures in the Pays de Vaud, on the subject of his doctrine of predestination, and on the right which he claimed of excommunication. These ministers, as well as many laymen of the same district, were loud in their abuse of the Genevese, and of Calvin in particular. Writing to Bul-

¹ "On charge le médecin Beljaquet d'examiner un livre que Calvin voudrait faire imprimer."—*Régistres*, 19 Juillet, 1554. Grénus, *Fragments Biographiques*.

² Kirchhofer, ii., 131.

³ P. Henry, ii., 369.

linger on the 18th of September, 1554, Calvin says: "Meanwhile I am attacked by our neighbors in a way which it is too little to call atrocious. The preachers in the Bernese territory denounce me from the pulpit as a heretic even worse than the Papists. The more violently any one assails me the more he is favored and protected; meanwhile I hold my tongue, but God will look down from heaven and avenge me."¹ In another letter, dated the 15th of October,² addressed apparently to an old friend, but whose name Beza has suppressed, Calvin thus describes the abuse to which he was subjected: "I may at once candidly confess that I have been informed you do not hold the sound doctrine respecting the eternal predestination of God. Although I always feared this, yet I did not believe so much as, to my bitter grief, I have been compelled to hear. Moreover, though I felt myself injured in various ways, I remained quiet; preferring to swallow such indignities in silent sorrow to snapping the chain of our old friendship. Now, too, I must beg to be silent, though attacked no less undeservedly than bitterly. If you knew but a tenth part of the abuse with which I am wounded, feelings of humanity would make you groan at sufferings to which I am myself grown callous. Dogs bark at me on all sides. Every where I am saluted with the name of 'heretic,' and all the calumnies that can possibly be invented are heaped upon me; in a word, the inimical and malevolent among my own flock attack me with more bitterness than even my declared Papist enemies." Such were the feelings which Calvin's treatment of Servetus had partly helped to excite even in some of his former friends. Some of his complaints on this occasion betray great soreness, and a sad want of dignity. Thus, he even condescended to mention, in one of the letters of himself and brother ministers to those of Berne, that a certain woman had called him a heretic because he made God the author of sin; and that he had been abused in a cobbler's shop by a rustic named Granerius.³

On the 2d of October the council of Geneva wrote to the Bernese to complain of the abuse with which they were loaded in the Pays de Vaud; and denounced by name Zébedée, minister of Nyon; Lange, minister of Bursins; Jerome Bolsec, and a merchant named Foussalet, or Fousselet.⁴ Calvin and the Genevese ministers also wrote to those of Berne on the subject. In their letter they say: "A report prevails tha-

¹ MS., Gen., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 70, note.

² Ep. 189.

³ Calvin to the Bernese Ministers, Dec. 29th, 1554, *apud* Trechsel, i., 196.

⁴ Ruchat, vi., 121.

we have been condemned as heretics by the clergy of Berne. Zebédée, babbling about predestination at a wedding dinner, exclaimed aloud that we were worse than the Papists. Encouraged by him, that fiend (Bolsec), who lives at Thonon, cries that Calvin is a heretic, an antichrist. On the other side of the lake lives another, not much different from him ; his name is Sebastian, a banished Genevese. Now reflect what sport we are preparing for the Papists, and to what scoffing the holy name of Christ is exposed.”¹ One of the charges brought by Calvin’s enemies was, that the doctrine of him and his followers respecting predestination opened a door to all sorts of licentiousness ; for that if people were elected it did not signify what they did, as they were sure to be saved.²

In their reply the council of Berne expressed their sorrow for these disorders, as it had always been their care to maintain Christian unity ; with which view they had strongly forbidden all bitter disputes, whether in speech or writing, as well as all false doctrine and slanderous libels. They assured the Genevese that they should continue to pursue the same conduct, and desired them, on their part, to direct their ministers not to defame the government of Berne, nor their clergy, their Reformation, and their church, either publicly or privately, in writing or by word of mouth, but charitably to recognize them as brothers in Christ.³ The Bernese also wrote to all the classes of the Pays de Vaud, censuring their ministers, for not living in unity with their brethren of Geneva, and for neglecting the edicts already published on this subject. They stated that the offenders richly deserved the banishment with which they had been threatened the preceding year ; and that though they were willing to pardon them this time, yet if they again offended they must expect nothing but deposition and exile.

This conduct of the Bernese magistrates appears moderate and dignified, yet Calvin and his brother ministers were not satisfied. However violent and unjustifiable the behavior of some of the ministers and subjects of Berne may have been, we can not help suspecting that those of Geneva were not far behind them. The accounts we possess are chiefly from Calvin’s friends ; but, from an incidental notice of this matter in

¹ Trechsel, *Antitr.*, i., 196, et seq. P. Henry, iii., 70.

² “ Quod licentiam dent scortandi et quidvis agendi ; nihil referre quid agant, servabuntur, nihil metuant.”—Farel to Calvin, Feb. 5th, 1555 (Trechsel, i., 199, note).

³ Ruchat, vi., 121.

the diary of Haller, the Bernese pastor, we find that Viret and the other ministers of Lausanne had complained of the minister of Vives-eaux for differing with them on the subject of predestination, on which he had published a book which they got the magistrates to suppress. And though the Bernese magistrates had given a general order that nothing more should be published on the subject, yet, says Haller, neither Viret nor Beza, who was then Greek professor at Lausanne, paid attention to it.¹ The edict, too, of the Bernese magistrates shows that the slanderous tongues were not all to be found among their subjects. The council and ministers of Geneva, however, were not, as we have said, content with the edict, and again pressed the Bernese for the punishment of the four persons before named, who were accordingly cited to appear at Berne in the following January. Here Zebédée and Lange denied that they had ever defamed the doctrine of the Genevese ministers, or treated them as heretics; but affirmed, on the contrary, that it was they who occasioned the scandal by blaming the Bernese, and by proposing things concerning the rites and ceremonies of the church, which tended to confusion rather than edification, although in themselves of no great importance. Bolsee asserted that since the prohibition of the Bernese government in the previous year, he had not spoken a word of Calvin or his colleagues. Foussalet also gave in a written answer, which, together with the rest, were dispatched to Geneva, with a letter, in which the Bernese expressed their regret at these scandals and divisions, which would not, they said, have occurred had the Genevese conformed to their rites, as they did at first. On the same day they wrote to all the classes of the Pays de Vaud, severely censuring those ministers who disputed with bitterness on the doctrines then agitated, or who pretended to introduce novelties, contrary to the Reformation of Berne, whether in doctrine, or in laws and discipline. In particular they censured those who followed "certain deep and subtle doctrines, opinions, and traditions of men, principally concerning divine predestination; a thing, say they, which appears to us unnecessary, and tending more to factions, sects, errors, and corruption, than to edification and comfort."²

It is plain from this mandate, which was, of course, directed against Viret, Beza, and the rest of Calvin's friends and followers in the Pays de Vaud, that the Bernese government was

¹ Haller's *Diary*, November, 1554, *Mus. Helv.*, ii., 105.

² Ruchat, vi., 122, et seq.

displeased at the pertinacity of the Genevese ministers. The allusion to the laws and discipline of the church of Berne has reference to the question of excommunication, on which the ministers of the Pays de Vaud were divided; Viret and those of Lausanne adopting the views of Calvin; while others followed the German theologians.¹ This part of the Bernese mandate gave such offense to some in the Pays de Vaud, and especially to certain Frenchmen settled there, who looked upon excommunication as a divine injunction, that they refused to receive the communion in their own parishes, but went for that purpose either to Geneva, or to some of the villages in the Genevese territory. This practice the Bernese council forbade, under severe penalties, by an edict dated on the 26th of January, 1555. As this edict was read from the pulpits, and placarded by the bailiffs, it was regarded by the people as an excommunication of the Genevese, and Calvin's name was execrated on all sides. Calvin thus disburdens his grief in a letter to Bullinger: "No sooner have we obtained a little quiet in Geneva, than the Bernese council absolves not only those who had denounced me for a heretic, but sends forth raging enemies against me and the church—nay, we are even accused as criminals. We have shown that we were always ready to render an account of ourselves, and have voluntarily made them our judges: but they will not hear us. Among other things they have forbidden their subjects, by public edicts, to take the communion with us. Wonder no longer at the barbarity of the Saxons, when the church is thus distracted out of hatred to a man who would have sacrificed his neck a hundred times to purchase peace. But nothing afflicts me more painfully than that by such signs God plainly foreshadows his wrath. Well, if it will appease their hungry wrath, let me be sent into a tedious exile. I pour this complaint into your bosom, in order that you may support me by your righteous prayers."²

As the Genevese were piqued at the edict in question, and were, moreover, but ill satisfied with the manner in which their complaints had been received, they dispatched, in March, 1555, a deputation to Berne, composed of one of the syndics, a member of the council, and two ministers, namely, Calvin³

¹ Ruchat, vi., p. 124.

² MS. Tig., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 71.

³ Calvin was accompanied on this occasion by Viret. "March 10th, Calvin and Viret were here. They had an action against Andrew Zebédée. Calvin also wished his doctrine of predestination to be confirmed by our council, but did not succeed."—Haller, *Diary, Mus. Helv.*, ii., 107.

and Raymond Chauvet, to demand justice against the four individuals who had been already accused. As the latter were not then at Berne, the council appointed the 3d of April for hearing the case, and cited them for that day. On this occasion Calvin called Perrin as a witness, who had been present when Zebédée uttered the words complained of at the wedding at Nyon : but he excused himself by saying that he had forgotten all about it.¹ After hearing both parties, the council of Berne pronounced a judgment, the chief aim of which was to settle matters amicably, although they substantially adhered to their former sentence.² They directed that all abuse and ill-feeling should be laid aside by both parties. They exhorted the Genevese deputies to take care that their ministers preached with modesty, and in a manner calculated to instruct without offending, and that they abstained in future from publishing books upon the impenetrable decrees of God ; a thing, they said, neither necessary nor edifying ; promising at the same time that they would give the like orders to their ministers in the Pays Romand. They declined passing any opinion upon Calvin's doctrine, and declared that they would not permit it to be discussed in their territories. They added, that they had learned from some letters of Calvin's, that he rejected Zwingli's doctrine of the sacraments, calling it false and pernicious ; a point which touched them nearly, as that doctrine had been received among them, and defended in the disputation of Berne.³ They said that they might have adopted proceedings against Calvin on this subject, but that, in order to give him a lesson of moderation, they would not do so. But they gave him to understand, that if they should hereafter find any books of his in their country, or any treatises against their Reformation, they would burn them ; and would punish any man who should speak or write against it in their territories.

Calvin and the Genevese deputation were not content with

¹ Trechsel, *Antitr.*, i., 201.

² Ruchat, vi., 127, et seq.

³ Ruchat, vi., 129, observes in a note, that the Bernese must have been misled on this point by some of Calvin's enemies, who wished to ruin him in their opinion. But the Bernese declare that they got their information from Calvin's own letters ; and indeed in one of his to Viret, still extant, he says : "I shall not interfere with your opinions about Zwingli's writings. I have never read all his works. Perhaps toward the end of his life he retouched and corrected what at first he had unwittingly written. But I remember what a profane opinion he holds on the subject of the sacraments in many of his writings."—MS. Goth., *apud* Schlosser, *Leben des P. Martyr*, p. 451. Indeed, though often loud in praise of Luther, Calvin seldom speaks well of Zwingli, whom he seems to have regarded as a sort of rival.

this decision, but requested the government of Berne to give a more detailed judgment, and particularly to express their opinion upon Calvin's doctrine. The latter had brought with him a paper containing a sort of confession of faith, and addressed the council in a speech, the main drift of which was to show that the same doctrine was preached at Geneva as at Bérne, namely, that of predestination; and he, therefore, requested the Bernese to find some means of instructing their subjects better in it, and thus of obviating the calumnies which were spread against them (the Genevese). He also requested that it might please them not to leave these calumnies unpunished; and that the edict forbidding people to go to Geneva to receive the sacrament might be drawn up in a clearer manner; since some malicious persons interpreted it as if it were a condemnation of the Genevese doctrine. To this the Bernese answered drily, that if the deputation did not like their sentence, they would not compel them to accept of it.¹

Of the persons cited, Zebédée denied that he had mentioned Calvin either in his books or sermons. Lange admitted having spoken of him in a conversation, on the subject of a passage in his treatise on predestination, which savored of heresy. It was to the effect that Christ had despaired upon the cross; and the error arose from his having translated the word *εὐλαβείας* by *præ metu*, instead of *præ reverentiâ*.² Calvin said, that it was an error of the press; which, however, from the nature of it, could hardly have been the case. The council would not admit this excuse, and held him responsible. Foussalet having been convicted of some verses in which Geneva was called a Sodom, the Bernese council condemned him to make the *amende honorable*; to acknowledge the Genevese to be good and honorable men and just governors; and afterward to be banished for life, allowing him only a fortnight to arrange his affairs. Another person named Pierrechon, who had likewise defamed the Genevese, was condemned to make reparation, and to be imprisoned for three days.³ Bolsec was also ordered to leave the territories of Berne.⁴

Bolsec's banishment was effected through the persevering hostility of Beza. For this purpose he made numerous journeys on foot to Geneva, Thonon, Berne, Orbe, and other places, to

¹ Trechsel, i., 203. P. Henry, iii., 73.

² See Haller, *Ephém.*, *Mus. Helv.*, ii., 121; Bolsec, *Vie de Calv.*, c. xxiv.

³ Ruchat, l. c.

⁴ Beza, *Vita Calv.*, anno 1555.

win over the principal persons, both lay and clerical, against Bolsec, and to uphold Calvin's doctrine; insomuch that he was accused of neglecting his duties as Greek professor at Lausanne, in the pursuit of these objects. During this period Beza fell sick, and Calvin felt the greatest apprehension of losing him. When he was somewhat recovered Calvin sent a horse to bring him to Geneva, and lodged him in his own house during his convalescence. "The zeal for the pure doctrine manifested by both," says the biographer of Beza, "would border on monkish superstition, did not one circumstance essentially distinguish it. While they stood upon the doctrine they spared no sacrifice to uphold and confirm the morality of those whom they did not consider as totally lost."¹ Beza was indefatigable in collecting evidence against Bolsec. No difficulties, no repulses, deterred him; till at length he succeeded in catching Bolsec in such assertions at Morges, as enabled him to procure his banishment by the Bernese council. "In proportion to the difficulties of his task," says Schlosser, "Beza displayed a *resolution and disinterestedness which showed a great soul*. He even said that, if the earth would not have him, heaven at least was open to him; that is, that he did not fear universal hatred, and banishment from Berne, provided he could forward the cause of truth."²

The Bernese appear to have acted on this occasion with their usual good temper and moderation. But Calvin was still dissatisfied, and addressed a remonstrance to the Bernese council, in which he says: "As much of the affair is connected with private hatred against myself, I wish to appear at Berne as a private person; but not I alone, but the whole Genevese church, as well as those of your clergy, with whom I agree, are condemned by your edict. You hold that no books should be written concerning the mysteries of God. But to what does that lead? Many in your territories blaspheme against predestination more than is allowed even among the Papists. I am aware that in the handling of this deep and incomprehensible mystery we ought to be moderate and humble; but if your Excellencies had seen my calumniated book, you would have perceived that its only aim is to repress the temerity of men, and to teach them to address the majesty of God with all reverence, and without giving the reins to curiosity. If one is determined to throw aside this doctrine, without any regard to modesty and humility, such a proceed-

¹ Schlosser, *Leben Bezas*, p. 49.

² *Ibid.*, p. 63.

ing amounts to an attempt to improve upon the Holy Ghost; and consequently we should strike out of the Scriptures what is revealed to us on the subject. I can not but wonder that I alone am attacked, when, if a comparison be made, it will appear that I have used much more modest language than most of the learned men of Germany who brought the gospel to light in our time. Wherefore I adjure you, according to the precept of our Lord Jesus Christ, to have no respect to persons; since, if my name and books were to perish, still the words of the Prophets and Apostles would remain untouched, from which I have taken the doctrine you condemn.”¹

Calvin added many more complaints in the same tone, and at the end of May again repaired to Berne, to endeavor to establish a better understanding. This, however, led to no result; and the Bernese council answered shortly that they would be troubled no more with a thing they had disposed of.²

At the same time that these bickerings were going on between Calvin and the ministers of Berne, the Genevese were earnestly endeavoring to renew their alliance with that city, which would expire in 1556. The Genevese proposed a perpetual fellow-citizenship, but the government of Berne seem to have received their proposals rather coolly.³ Yet at this time danger from without threatened both these republics. Emanuel Philibert, surnamed Ironhead, son of Charles, Duke of Savoy, who died in exile, in 1553, was using his utmost endeavors to recover his paternal inheritance; with which view he applied to the Emperor Charles V., who promised to reinstate him in the spring of 1555, and proposed at the same time to attack both Berne and Geneva. But Charles's war with the French king furnished him with sufficient employment without venturing into Switzerland; and the two cities escaped with a temporary alarm.⁴

Meanwhile Calvin's struggles with his enemies at Geneva were rapidly drawing to a crisis. The Libertine party continued to exhibit much violence, and to commit many disorders. On the 9th of January, 1555, a party of young people, after supper, and inflamed probably by wine, exclaimed that they must give the consistory something to do; and each seizing a lighted taper, made a sort of procession through the city, singing profane songs to psalm tunes, and deriding the

¹ Trechsel, i., 205, and MS. Gen. et Bern., May 4th, 1555, *apud* P. Henry iii., 75.

² Trechsel, l. c.

³ Ruchat, vi., 131.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 134.

members of the consistory. Some of them afterward went out of the town to a place called Coctinge; and returning on horseback, traversed some of the principal thoroughfares, and finally took up their station at the Pont d'Arve. Here they were seized, and one of them was afterward banished for a year.¹ Nevertheless a more favorable spirit toward Calvin had begun to manifest itself in the council of the Two Hundred, where the strength of his enemies chiefly lay; and this was assisted by the circumstance of Perrin's syndicate being now expired. On the 24th of January the question of excommunication was brought before that assembly for final decision. The point in dispute did not concern the right of excommunication itself, which was conceded on all hands; but turned only on what tribunal should determine on it in the last resort. Soon after Calvin's return, as it has been said, the general assembly of the people had invested the consistory with the absolute and uncontrolled power of excommunication; from which the Libertine party were endeavoring to establish a right of appeal to the ordinary council. They complained of the anomaly that there should be a tribunal in the state whose decrees the magistrates had not the power of reviewing. They described it as a sort of *imperium in imperio*; from which common sense dictated that the sovereign power should be lodged entirely with the government, as a guarantee for those liberties which they had so dearly bought; and they enforced these arguments by pointing to the tyranny exercised by the Popes, and other prelates, under a pretense of spiritual jurisdiction. The ministers were summoned before the Two Hundred on this occasion. Calvin was their spokesman, and represented the obligation that all were under to defer to the authority of Jesus Christ, the head of the Church, and to that of the Apostles, to whom he had given the power to bind and loose, as well as to teach the word, and to administer the sacraments. He insisted that the civil magistrates had no more power in these matters than the ministers had to attack the government and the secular jurisdiction. He argued that the ministers were commissioned to take care that the sacraments were not profaned; and that as they, like all other members of the state, were subject in all secular matters to the judgment of the council, so in like manner all greatness and power should bend the knee to the reign and

¹ See *Régistres*, quoted by P. Henry, iii., 370. Calvin has alluded to these struggles, as well as to his contests with the Bernese clergy, in his Preface to the Psalms.

gospel of Christ. He pointed out that this distinction had always been carefully observed by good kings, and that, in the Jewish theocracy, the right of sacrificing had been left to Aaron, and that David had not interfered with it. He showed that the Lord had always signally punished those who violated the established order ; as in the case of Uzzah, who was struck with death for having placed his hand upon the ark ; and of the king Uzziah, who was punished with leprosy for having entered the sanctuary, and touched the censer. With regard to any fear that the consistory should abuse its authority, that had been sufficiently provided for by the edicts ratified by the general assembly, and there was nothing to be apprehended so long as these were properly observed. And he concluded by observing that all liberty, without Jesus Christ, was but a miserable servitude. These arguments seem to have made a great impression ; and it was resolved by a majority that the edicts approved by the general assembly should remain inviolable. The consequence of this decision was that the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline remained wholly with the consistory.¹

This proceeding, however, only aggravated the anger and ill-feeling of the Libertines. They loudly demanded that preaching should be abolished, and the number of ministers reduced to two, who should merely read the text of Scripture from the pulpit, and teach the people the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. They asserted that so much interpretation was not only superfluous but dangerous ; and seizing on the remonstrance made by the Bernese to the deputies from Geneva on the subject of Calvin's doctrine of predestination, they said that so many books of commentaries ought not to be printed.²

The new syndics, who were favorable to Calvin, endeavored to repress these clamors, and even punished and imprisoned some of the Libertine party. In order the better to make head against them, the council resolved on admitting a considerable number of the French refugees to the rights of citizenship ; and, accordingly, in the spring, about fifty were received at once.³ An appeal was made to the Two Hundred against this step, who, however, confirmed the right of the little council to admit whom they pleased to citizenship, as they had always done.⁴ It can hardly be doubted that the

¹ Ruchat, vi., 133, et seq.

² *Ibid.*, vi., 136.

³ Calvin to Bullinger, Ep. 207, June 15th, 1555.

⁴ "Le grand Conseil confirme à MM. du petit Conseil le droit de faire

ordinary council was influenced in this step by Calvin ; a circumstance which shows that his power was again in the ascendant. The appeal against it was instigated by Ami Perrin and Peter Vandel, the leaders of the Libertine or Patriot party, and also members of the little council ; who even persuaded the lieutenant of police to appear, with his assessors, before the council, and to remonstrate with them, in the name of the people, against the reception of so large a number of aliens to the rights of citizenship. This was a very unbecoming step on the part of that officer ; especially as he endeavored to overawe the council by appearing at their doors attended by a great mob composed of sailors, fishermen, pastry-cooks, and the like.¹ But when the malcontents heard that the Two Hundred had confirmed the privileges of the ordinary council, as to the election of citizens, their fury knew no bounds. The previous day the leaders of the Libertine party had regaled their followers gratuitously. The feasting was kept up all day, Vandel providing the dinner, and Perrin the supper. Meanwhile the most sinister rumors were afloat, and appearances seemed to show that some violent outbreak was at hand. The more moderate of the Libertines wished, indeed, only to obtain a meeting of the general assembly, and to turn out the newly-admitted citizens. But the opinion of the more violent prevailed ; which was, to kill all the foreigners who had taken refuge at Geneva for the sake of religion, as well as those citizens who supported them ; and it was resolved that this execrable project should be carried out on the following Sunday, while the people were at church. Happily, however, the precipitation of some of the conspirators caused the plot to break out before it was ripe for execution, and thus caused its frustration. It was the custom at Geneva, after the watch was set, for one of the council to go round and examine the stations ; and this duty they took by turns. On the night in question it was the turn of a councilor named Baudichon to perform this duty. Baudichon was particularly obnoxious to the Libertines, not only because he protected the refugees, but because he had been elected into the council in the room of one of Perrin's party. As he was going his rounds, accompanied by two young men, somebody who had been struck by a stone, cried out that he was killed. Baudichon ran to the spot, where he was attacked by some

des bourgeois quand ils le trouveront à propos pour l'honneur et pour le bien de la ville, ainsi qu'ils l'ont toujours eu."—*Régistres*, 27 Mars, 1555. Grénius, *Fragmens Biographiques*.¹ Calvin, Ep. 207.

of the malcontents, who drew their swords, exclaiming, "Death to the traitor!" It seems probable that it was a concerted plan to draw Baudichon thither. The noise increasing, Aubert, one of the syndics, who happened to be near, hastened to the spot with his bâton of office, and ordered one of the rioters to be seized. In a moment he was surrounded by a whole band, exclaiming, "Kill the French traitor—the French are sacking the town!" In another quarter Vandel's wife raised the same cry. The whole city was filled with tumult and alarm. Every one ran for his arms without knowing why: though a report prevalent at that time, that the French king had ordered the Duke of Guise to take Geneva, probably served to give some coloring of probability to the cry raised by the insurgents. Perrin himself was on the spot, and under pretense of restoring order, endeavored to get possession of the syndical bâton, an emblem of power much revered at Geneva; but Aubert would not give it up. Perrin, however, succeeded in snatching the bâton from another of the syndics who was hastening to the scene of disturbance; but, according to Calvin,¹ a sort of religious awe had seized upon the rioters, who did not respond to his cries of encouragement. Indeed, Calvin's letter, in which he describes the tumult, seems rather exaggerated, and leaves the impression that after all the whole affair was little more than a casual street riot; though some undoubtedly would have been glad to avail themselves of it for more sinister purposes. The mob, however, with Perrin and Vandel at their head, proceeded to the house of Baudichon, and endeavored to raise a tumult by crying that it was full of armed Frenchmen; but the attempt failed through the cowardice of the assailants, who were frightened by the noise of an iron bar which fell upon the pavement. Vandel, seeing that his designs were frustrated, now employed himself in dispersing the mob; and the riot ended without bloodshed.² On the following day it was determined that the matter should be inquired into. The council met, and the syndics spent three days in examining witnesses. When their depositions were complete it was resolved to refer the matter to the council of Two Hundred, in order to avoid any suspicion of prejudice and oppression. In this latter assembly, Perrin, and several others who had taken part in the riot, had the audacity to take their places as judges; but on the reading of the depositions, when any member of the council appeared to be impli-

¹ Ep. 207.

² Spon, ii., 71, note e.

cated, he was immediately ordered to quit the house. Perrin, seeing that the affair was likely to take a serious turn, fled from Geneva, and was followed by Vandel, Berthelier, and some others. The Two Hundred again referred the case to the ordinary council, with a recommendation to make a severe example of the criminals. For a fortnight the fugitives were daily summoned by the public herald, by sound of trumpet; but they wrote to the council, refusing to appear, unless a public guarantee of safety were given to them. On the day appointed for their trial five of the fugitives were condemned. Before sentence was pronounced upon them, a general assembly was convened, in which their crimes were recited; and as they did not appear to purge themselves, their condemnation was of course confirmed. Four rioters who had been taken were executed on the 21st of May. They protested with their last breath that they were not privy to any treason or conspiracy; but that they had merely endeavored to prevent the making of so many citizens, and to protect the city from the dominion of foreigners.¹ Calvin, however, characterizes their confession as one which showed them to be too guilty to allow any chance of escape.² Sentence was pronounced by the council on Perrin and the other fugitives on the 3d of June. They were condemned to lose their heads, and to be quartered; Perrin, moreover, to have his hand chopped off, with which he had seized the bâton of the syndic. This sentence was executed on his effigy.³

Meanwhile he and his accomplices, having escaped to the territories of Berne, begged the mediation of that city in their favor. The Bernese accordingly wrote to Geneva, tendering their good offices for the pacification of these troubles; and on the 13th of June sent deputies with the same offer, who were also instructed to mention that Berne was willing to treat with Geneva respecting a renewal of the alliance. But even this bait did not allure the Genevese to retract their sentence on the mutineers.⁴ Calvin describes the Bernese deputies who came on their behalf as finding a united city, and the verdict against the fugitives universally acquiesced in.⁵

The history of this affair, even from Calvin's own pen, leaves the impression that the power of Perrin and his party was, after all, contemptible. His supporters in the ordinary council were few or none. In the council of Two Hundred,

¹ Ruchat, vi., 139.

² Ep. 207.

³ Spon, l. c.

⁴ Ruchat, vi., 140.

⁵ Ep. 207.

even though he seems to have tampered with the elections, he was in a minority, as appears from the ministers carrying their point respecting excommunication; and also from the expulsion and condemnation of Perrin himself by that body. That the Genevese people were not for him is shown by the almost ludicrous failure of his attempt at insurrection, as well as by the sentence passed upon him and his associates being confirmed by the general assembly. The whole business reads like a caricature of the Catilinarian conspiracy.

Calvin's proceedings were attributed by his opponents to feelings of personal hatred, and a desire of shedding their blood; and this charge has been revived by two modern historians—namely, by Galiffe, in his "*Notices Généalogiques*," and by Thourel, in his "History of Geneva." A recent biographer of Calvin has rested one of his main arguments against the truth of this charge on the assertion that such motives were not imputed to Calvin, even by the Libertines themselves.¹ But this author must have overlooked a passage in Calvin's own letter, where we find it stated that such an intention had been ascribed to him;² nay, Calvin was even accused of standing by while the prisoners were tortured, and of urging on the severest measures against them.³ The same writer endeavors to make it appear that the affair was a purely political one.⁴ But this is not consistent with the records of the trials, as cited by himself. The sentence on Philibert Berthelier recited that it was inflicted "*pour les crimes horribles et détestables de conspiration contre la sainte institution et réformation Chrestienne, et contre cette cité, bien public, et tranquillité d'icelle, &c.*" P. Berthelier saved himself by flight, but his brother Francis was apprehended, and was one of those who were executed. Now, the points on which he was convicted were four, viz., 1. That, like his brother, he wished to deprive the consistory of the right of excommunication, because it made Calvin a bishop and prince of Geneva; and that he had hoped that this opportunity

¹ "Endlich finde ich gegen die Anklage des Herrn Galiffe einen schlagenden Beweis dafür, dass Calvin keinesweges gegen diese Leute thätig war, in dem Umstand dass die Libertiner selbst durchaus nicht Calvin als ihren Verfolger anklagen."—P. Henry, iii., Beil. vii., p. 121.

² "I say nothing about myself, whom they have gratuitously taken for their enemy. For as to the shameless charge that I was compassing their death, it is too absurd to need any apology."—Ep. 207.

³ Trechsel, *Antitr.*, i., 205.

⁴ "Also hatte er (Calvin) kein kirchliches Interesse dabei zu verfechten."—P. Henry, iii., Beil. vii., p. 118. Yet he contradicts this himself a few sentences afterward: "Die Verurtheilten wollten die bestehende politische und religiöse Ordnung stürzen."

would be the means of banishing Calvin. 2. That he had opposed the reception of the new citizens, who would have had the majority in the great council. This was styled in the process *crimen læsæ majestatis*, or high treason. 3. That he had expressed himself loudly against the doctrine of the Reformation received at Geneva. 4. That he had instigated the lieutenant of police to his factious conduct, in opposing the citizenship of the French refugees.¹ Now, out of the four grounds here assigned for this sentence of death upon Francis Berthelier, it is remarkable that two are for attacks upon Calvin's doctrine and discipline, and for a desire to deprive him of his ecclesiastical power, and to drive him from Geneva. The other two are evidently mere pretenses. It could have been no treason to oppose the admission of the French refugees to the rights of citizenship, unless it were done in an illegal manner. Now it is true, as we have related, that the lieutenant of police, at the instigation of the Libertines, had attempted to overawe the council on that point; but we learn from Calvin himself, that the council had overlooked that attempt, and had dismissed the lieutenant himself, the chief actor in it, with a simple reprimand.² We can hardly, therefore, think that political views were the chief, much less the only motive for these executions, as Dr. Henry would have us to believe;³ and though Calvin may not have been actuated by any desire of personal vengeance, still we can not but look upon them as having been the result of his power, of the intimate connection which he had established between church and state, and of his determination to uphold his scheme of ecclesiastical discipline, without much regard to the means which he used for that purpose.

The Genevese confiscated the estates of the fugitives, made any proposition for their recall a capital offense, and ordered their wives to quit Geneva.⁴ The refugees were again permitted to carry arms; and on the 8th of September an edict was published for suppressing the office of captain-general, which had been held by Perrin.⁵ On the other side, the

¹ P. Henry, iii., Beil. vii., p. 120.

² "But because the council were of opinion that nothing should be done by arbitrary violence, they pardoned for the present a manifest conspiracy. The lieutenant was only reprimanded for having lent himself to those factious men in so unjust a cause."—Ep. 207.

³ "Obgleich in diesem Process viel von Reformation und kirchlichen Dingen die Rede ist, und derselbe dem Anschein nach einen kirchlich-religiösen Zweck hat, so war er doch *rein politisch*, und das Religiöse war nur *Aeusserliche*."—P. Henry, iii., Beil. vii., p. 122.

⁴ P. Henry, iii., 380.

⁵ Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

fugitives, under the protection of Berne, committed outrages on such citizens of Geneva as they found on the Bernese territories, and attacked Calvin and the Genevese council with all sorts of reproaches and calumnies.¹ All this tended to augment the ill-feeling which had been growing up between the two cities, although their mutual interests at this juncture demanded a renewal of the alliance which was about to expire. Calvin's stiffness presented the greatest obstacle to the accomplishment of this object; and Bullinger earnestly begged him to make concessions for the sake of peace.² The cantons of Zurich, Bâle, and Schaffhausen, exerted their mediation without effect. Berne authorized the exiles to make reprisals on Genevese citizens, as the government of Geneva refused to restore them to their estates. The bailiff of Ternier, in the jurisdiction of Berne, in whose province the fugitives had committed some violence on Genevese subjects, having been applied to by the procureur-général of Geneva for justice, even gave a sentence by which he liberated the exiles from the condemnation passed on them by the council of Geneva, and condemned the syndics, council, and people of that city, to make them reparation, to beg their pardon, and to pay the costs of the suit.³ This sentence caused much alarm and indignation at Geneva; but, on an appeal to Berne, it was superseded. At length, the victory gained by Emmanuel Philibert, Prince of Piémont, over Henry II., at St. Quentin, in August, 1557, which threatened both cities with danger, induced them to renew their alliance in the following November.⁴ During this interval of alarm, the Genevese having published on the 12th of October a permission for all foreigners who wished to do so to retire from their city, so far was any one from quitting it, that two days afterward nearly three hundred refugees were admitted as citizens.⁵

¹ Ruchat, vi., 141.

² Trechsel, i., 206.

³ Ruchat, vi., 190.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 228.

⁵ "On recoit trois-cents habitans le même matin, sçavoir, deux-cents Français, cinquante Anglais, vingt-cinq Italiens, quatre Espagnols, &c.; tellement que l'antichambre du Conseil ne les pouvoit tous contenir."—*Régistres*, 14 Oct., 1557. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

CHAPTER XII.

Controversy with the Lutherans—Attacks of Westphal—Calvin answers him—Calvin's Violence—Urges Melancthon to declare himself—Mission of Farel and Beza—Their Disingenuousness—Bullinger Offended—The Marian Exiles—"Troubles of Frankfort"—Lutheran Persecutions—Calvin visits Frankfort—Return of the Marian Exiles.

DURING these disputes with his enemies at home, and with the Bernese clergy, Calvin was also engaged in a controversy with some of the Lutheran divines on the subject of the eucharist. While he was residing at Strasburgh, the Lutherans had regarded him as belonging to their church; although in the confession which he had delivered in to the ministers of that city, in 1539, he had as little recognized a corporal presence in the eucharist as a merely symbolical one. The Swiss church had also suspected him of Lutheranism; but the Zurich *Consensus* in 1549 at once dissipated this feeling, and altered his position with regard to the Lutherans. In that confession it was taught that the bread and wine are signs, *with* which (but not *in, under, or through* them) the true body and blood of Christ are communicated to the faithful by a peculiar operation of the Holy Ghost. Thus, although the belief in the actual presence of Christ in His human nature, and in His reception through the mouth, and consequently the literal interpretation of the words of the institution, were rejected; yet this doctrine was not actually so much at variance with the Lutheran as it appeared to be. For Calvin's contained the following propositions: 1. Though the bread and wine are mere signs, they are not empty signs, but pledges of the thing signified. 2. The body of Christ is really and effectually present in the supper, but not locally and in substance, since His body is in heaven, and no body possesses ubiquity. 3. The body of Christ is actually received, and not merely in imagination, at the time when the bread is taken: and this through the operation of faith, in a mystical and hyper-physical manner. These, says Matthes,¹ are the chief points of Calvin's doctrine of the eucharist, as gradually developed in his different works; and the question arose whether

¹ *Leben Melancthons*, p. 341.

such a presence could be called a true and actual one? The more bigoted Lutherans maintained that it could not, and required an exact conformity with Luther's propositions.

In the Wittenberg Concordat of 1536, the Lutheran divines had, indeed, contented themselves with the general idea of a corporal presence, without deeming it essential to explain the manner of it. Nay, Melancthon, and some of the more moderate men of that church, seemed to be gradually inclining toward Calvin's view; and there was some prospect, since Luther's death, that all the Protestant churches would be ultimately united with regard to that sacrament.¹ In the year 1552, however, this tendency toward harmony was disturbed by Joachim Westphal, a Lutheran minister of Hamburgh, who published an attack upon the Zurich *Consensus* of Calvin and Bullinger.² In this book Westphal mooted the difficult question of the manner of the presence; and thus, by wishing to establish a dogmatical conclusion, put an end to all hopes of agreement. He was very severe and sarcastic upon the Zwinglians and Calvinists, and enumerated twenty-eight different interpretations of the words of the institution, made by the Sacramentaries, whereas the Lutherans had always been of one mind. He excited other doctors of his church to push the quarrel vigorously; and concluded with declaring that the blasphemies of the Sacramentaries deserved to be refuted by the rod of the magistrate rather than by the pen.

As neither Calvin, nor any of the Swiss ministers, noticed this performance, Westphal put forth another tract in the following year,³ in which he exhorted the Lutherans to defend their doctrine against the progress of Zwinglianism. John Stoltz, a theologian of Wittenberg, also published a "Defense of Luther," and thus the flame of controversy was lighted up again throughout Germany. The feeling thus excited soon discovered itself in an act of barbarity disgraceful to men professing to be Christians. In September, 1553, John A'Lasco, a noble Pole, and superintendent of the foreign Reformed churches in London, in order to avoid the persecution then breaking out in England, hired some vessels for the purpose of transporting himself, and one hundred and seventy-five other persons, to the continent. A'Lasco's vessel was driven, by

¹ P. Henry, iii., 298, et seq. Compare Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 170.

² The title of Westphal's book was, "*Farrago confusaneorum et inter se dissidentium Opinionum de Cœnâ Domini, ex Sacramentariorum Libris congesta.*"—Ruchat, vi., 6.

³ Entitled, "*Recta Fides de Cœnâ Domini,*" &c.—Ruchat, l. c.

stress of weather, into Elsinore ; but, though the storm was still raging, the Lutheran magistrates compelled him and his company to re-embark immediately, though all they asked was an asylum for the winter. They experienced no better reception in the German towns. Lubeck and Rostock refused to harbor them ; Hamburgh would only afford shelter to A'Lasco's children till the spring. At length the fugitives found refuge at Dantzic, and A'Lasco himself an honorable reception at Emden, from the Countess Anne of Oldenburgh.

Calvin was first informed of these cruelties by Peter Martyr, who was then at Strasburgh, in a letter dated in May, 1554. Calvin now determined to take up his pen against Westphal, who had made himself conspicuous in persecuting the fugitives, whom he styled "the devil's martyrs." In his second tract against Westphal, Calvin alludes to this subject as follows : "His outcry against the poor fugitives is a very evident mark of his cruelty. He has not contented himself with preventing them from finding shelter, and with obliging them to disperse in the midst of a very rigorous winter, when they begged to repose a little, and, as it were, to recover breath ; but, as far as lies in his power, would exterminate them from the world. But though pity and compassion aroused a just anger in me, with which, unless I had a heart harder than iron, I could not but be touched on seeing these strange calamities of my brethren ; yet I confess, nevertheless, that I have been deceived. I thought that some cause had been given to Westphal, and those of his sentiments, to be thus unreasonably hot : but I now see that our not approving of their conclusions suffices to incite them to a strange and barbarous cruelty against all of us indifferently ; and that they are bursting with such venomous pride against us, that they would rather have peace with the Turks, and brotherhood with the Papists, than any truce with us."¹

But, however indignant against Westphal, whose conduct had very naturally aroused his anger, Calvin did not at first enter into a direct and personal controversy with him, but rather made use of the occasion to reassert his doctrine respecting the Lord's Supper ; with which view he got Bullinger, and the other Swiss ministers, to unite with him in publishing a common manifesto, which may be regarded as a renewal and confirmation of the Zurich *Consensus*. In this work Calvin did not attack Westphal by name ; but he alluded to

¹ See the French tract, quoted by P. Henry, iii., 303, note.

him in several passages that could not be mistaken.¹ Calvin was apt to give way to temper in his controversies, and to treat his opponents with a coarseness which exceeded even the limits permitted by the manners of his time. As the book, however, was to be subscribed by Bullinger, the manuscript was sent to him for approval. Bullinger refused to put his name to it till some of these offensive allusions were struck out; and thus it was owing to him that it appeared clothed in more decent language.² In a letter to Bullinger on this subject, Calvin says: "I have corrected those things in my epistle which seemed too harshly spoken against Joachim. Yet I applied the term *nebulo* (rascal) to him in another sense than you suppose. I did not mean *criminal* or *furcifer*, but as the ancients spoke, a *worthless, skulking fellow*, or *tenebrio*. I have also expunged the epithet *beast*."³ This last was another pet term of Calvin's.

The work was published toward the close of 1554, preceded by an epistle thus amended, addressed to the faithful ministers of Christ at Zurich, Berne, Basle, Schaffhausen, and several other Swiss towns. A reprint of the work appeared the following year at Zurich, with a postscript by Bullinger. Calvin also published a French version of it, in order that the Genevese might be made acquainted with the merits of the question. The pith of its doctrine is contained in the following sentence: "Christ, therefore, is absent from us in body: but dwelling spiritually within us, so lifts us up toward heaven as to transfuse into us the vivifying power of his flesh, just as we are nourished by the vital heat of the sun, by means of its rays."⁴

Westphal published an answer to Calvin's work at Frankfurt, in which he again outrageously attacked A'Lasco and his brother exiles. Calvin hesitated whether he should reply. We find him writing to Farel (October 10th, 1555), as follows: "Westphal has published a virulent book against me, to which I know not whether I ought to reply. Some of my friends ask me to do so: when I shall have thoroughly read it, the Lord will give me counsel."⁵ The attacks made upon him on all sides by the Lutherans, and especially by Brenz, in his sermons at Wurtemberg, seem at length to have induced

¹ "And that nobody may consider the door of repentance to be shut against him, I will shortly allude to only one person, and that without mentioning his name."—*Consensio*, &c., *Opera*, viii., 651, B.

² *Leben Calvins*, iii., Beil. 117.

³ MS. Tig., Nov. 13th, 1554, *apud* P. Henry, iii., 307, note.

⁴ *Consensio*, &c., p. 658, A.

⁵ Ep. 216.

him to take up his pen; and in 1556 appeared his second work against Westphal, entitled, "A Second Defense of the Pious and Orthodox Faith concerning the Sacraments against the Calumnies of Joachim Westphal." This was answered in the following year, not only by Westphal himself, but by Schneff and some others; so that Calvin complained to Bullinger that the Lutherans seemed to have entered into a conspiracy to overwhelm them with books.¹ The controversy grew hotter as it proceeded. Calvin was again reproved by Bullinger for his virulence; and attempted to excuse himself by the haste in which his work was written, and by an attempt at a joke. In a letter to that pastor he says: "I see that I have been rather more vehement than I had intended, but, in some way or another, I forgot myself in dictating the book. If it should give offense I can at least testify that it was not *written* by me. But, joking apart, I hope it will be acceptable enough to you and to the rest of the brethren, not to stand in need of an excuse."²

A whole year for reflection did not produce any amendment in this respect. Calvin was again attacked, and again replied with still greater violence and coarseness.³ Even his friend Farel saw and lamented this failing. Though he approved of Calvin's defense of the *Consensus*, he advised him to confine himself to the *thing*, and to spare *persons*. He exhorted him not to be betrayed into the same violence as his opponents; by which he would afford an agreeable spectacle to their enemies, and offend those who, though they opposed him, were still his brethren.⁴ Calvin, however, seems to have considered that he was doing God an acceptable service by these virulent outbreaks, and by incurring the odium which they could not fail to draw down upon him. In a letter to Farel, in August, 1557, he says: "With regard to Westphal and the rest, it was difficult to follow your advice and be calm. You call those 'brothers,' who, if that name be offered to them by us, do not only reject, but execrate it. And how ridiculous should we appear in bandying the name of brother with those who look upon us as the worst of heretics!"⁵ And in another to Bullinger about the same time we find: "You shall judge how dexterously I have treated the Saxons. I have sent the book before it was complete,

¹ P. Henry, iii., 315.

² MS. Tig., Jan 23d, 1556, *Ibid.*, 317.

³ This was his "*Ultima Admonitio Joannis Calvini ad Ioachimum Westphalum*," &c., published in August, 1557.

⁴ Kuechhofer, ii., 130.

⁵ MS Gen, *apud* P. Henry, iii., 326.

rather than hold you in suspense. Though I know that I shall excite the hatred of them all, it will be no small consolation to me if, in the discharge of my duty, I shall at least gain your approbation. I have, indeed, not hesitated cheerfully and fearlessly to provoke the fury of those beasts against me, because I am confident that it will be pleasing to God!"¹

In reading such passages as these, we are almost overwhelmed with surprise, that a man of Calvin's intellect and learning could, in spite of the repeated admonitions of his best friends, have persevered in so utterly misinterpreting and perverting the mild and charitable precepts of the gospel. That, when unblinded by passion, he could see the fit and proper course, appears from other letters. Thus, writing to Schaling, a pastor of the church of Ratisbon, in April, 1557, he says: "It is, indeed, to be lamented, that we who profess the same gospel should be distracted by different opinions on the subject of the Lord's Supper, which ought to be the chief bond of union among us. But what is by far more atrocious, we contend with as much hostility as if we had no Christian connection; and the greater part of those who differ from us, I know not from what impulse, boil over as intemperately against us as if our religion were wholly different. As there was at first so much discrepancy on this subject, I do not wonder that Luther, who was of a vehement temper, was somewhat warmer than he ought to have been. But now when we are agreed as to the chief points, namely, for what purpose the Lord instituted sacraments; what is their proper use, efficacy, and dignity; and what the advantages they procure for us; the remaining articles of controversy might surely have been treated with more moderation. With regard to myself, after I had faithfully endeavored for fifteen years to frame my doctrine so as to avoid discord as much as an ingenuous profession of the truth would allow, the importunity of your countryman, Westphal, dragged me into an odious dispute. Yet I have diligently restrained whatever bitterness he extorted from me, lest he should involve others besides himself; and I will always take care that the churches shall not be torn and divided through my fault, nor that any one shall be injured by me, *unless he professedly attacks me.*"²

It is difficult to reconcile a passage like this with the declarations before quoted, or to consider it as sincere. The last avowal it contains is striking. After enumerating and dwell-

¹ MS. Tig, *Ibid*

² Ep. 236.

ing upon the causes and the blessings of peace, and lamenting the want of union as contrary to the spirit of Christianity, Calvin declares himself ready to renounce all these excellent precepts the moment he is *personally* attacked, and to descend into a contest of virulence and abuse with the first intemperate adversary that may assail him. Did it never occur to him that the conduct and example of a Christian minister may be at least as efficacious for good as the most methodical and elaborate arguments, or the choicest vituperation in the very best Latin? Did he always forget the Christian precept, to forgive our enemies, and to offer another cheek to those who smite us? In Westphal, however, Calvin had found his match in violence. He grew tired of the contest, and left Beza to finish it.

We have remarked that in this controversy the Lutheran church was itself divided; and that a considerable portion of it, at the head of which was Melancthon, inclined toward Calvin's views. That Reformer had, indeed, rejected the doctrine of the physical conjunction of the body of Christ with the sacramental bread, before he knew Calvin, as appears from some letters addressed to Schneff, Agricola, and Brenz, in the years 1534 and 1535.¹ When the controversy broke out afresh, Calvin earnestly pressed Melancthon to declare himself, but he kept aloof. In August, 1554, when Calvin was busy with his first work against Westphal, we find him writing to Melancthon as follows: "You see how ignorant and turbulent men are renewing in your parts the sacramental controversy, while the good lament and complain of the encouragement which your silence gives them; for notwithstanding the audacity natural to ignorance, there can be no doubt that, if you could make up your mind to avow your real sentiments more freely, you might, in some degree at least, put a stop to their violence. At the same time, I do not so far forget the condition of human nature, as not to note, and bid others note, what sort of men you have to deal with; how anxious and perplexed the disturbed state of affairs must render you, and by how many obstacles you must be impeded. Yet nothing can justify you in giving the reins, by means of your dissimulation, to those headstrong men who disturb and dissipate our churches; to say nothing of the preciousness to ourselves of an ingenuous profession of the true faith. You are aware that for more than thirty years the eyes of multitudes are fixed upon you, and that they would desire nothing

¹ See Matthes, *Leben Melancthons*, p. 349.

more than to obey you. Surely you are not ignorant that the ambiguous mode of teaching to which you too timidly confine yourself, causes many to remain in doubt. If you can not sincerely and truly profess what would be very useful to be known, you might at least endeavor to restrain the violence of those who create a causeless disturbance. What, I pray, do they wish? Luther professed, throughout his life, that all he contended for was the efficacy of the sacraments. Well, it is agreed that they are not empty symbols, but really impart what they typify: that in baptism the efficacy of the Holy Ghost is present, to cleanse and regenerate us; that the Lord's Supper is a spiritual feast, in which we are really fed with the body and blood of Christ. The cause, therefore, seems too promising than that the fear of odium should deter us from appeasing the strife raised by certain absurd persons; into whose broils, however, you can hardly avoid being dragged in the post which you occupy."¹

Although in this letter Calvin appears very desirous of obtaining the concurrence and co-operation of Melancthon, he speaks very slightly, not to say contemptuously, of him, in a letter addressed to Sleidan, on the very same day. In this he says, "How far I should congratulate myself on Philip's agreeing with me on one point I know not, when in the chief heads of doctrine he either sells himself to the philosophers and opposes the truth, or, lest he should excite the anger of certain persons against him, cunningly, or, at all events, disingenuously conceals his opinions."²

In the spring of 1555, we find Calvin again urging Melancthon on the same subject, and exhorting him to declare himself, without fearing either banishment or death.³ The object of this letter seems to have been to extract an opinion from Melancthon in writing; as Calvin mentions his work against Westphal, which had been subscribed by the Swiss churches, and states, that he was anxiously expecting Melancthon's opinion upon it. The latter, in a very short answer,⁴ purposely avoids the subject, and says that he shall write nothing concerning Calvin's opponents. Another letter of Calvin's in August of the same year, closes the correspondence.⁵ To this, Melancthon, who probably disliked his importunity, seems to have returned no answer, and their intercourse ceased for two years; for when Calvin next addressed him on the occasion of the diet of Worms, in August, 1557, he complained

¹ Ep. 179.² Ep. 183, Aug. 27th, 1554.³ Ep. 203.⁴ Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 205.⁵ Ep. 210.

that he had not heard from him for that space of time.¹ Melancthon, however, went to his grave without declaring himself.

It can hardly be doubted that Melancthon's example would have gone nigh to settle this controversy: and that had he openly avowed the sentiments he really entertained respecting the eucharist, he would have been followed by the greater part of the Lutheran church. In his last work against Westphal, Calvin wrote that he could be as little separated from Melancthon on this point as he could from his own heart.² On the other hand, Melancthon's silence gave the opposite party an opportunity to claim him for their own, for which purpose they collected passages out of his earlier writings; and Westphal gave out that he would prove to all the world that Melancthon, at all events during the lifetime of Luther, had never thought with the sacramentaries.³

Melancthon's conduct, by his own confession, proceeded from the fear of offending the court. "Had he followed the dictates of his own heart," says Matthes,⁴ "he would undoubtedly have declared for the Calvinistic view; but how could he venture upon this when the court deemed it a point of honor to have true Lutheran teachers?" To the electoral councilor, Ulrich Mordeisen, who had required him not to withhold his opinion any longer, he wrote in 1556: "I am confident that in this article your court will not tolerate the defense of the true doctrine. I would therefore rather not begin at all, than be ordered to lay aside what I had begun, to the prejudice of truth." This subserviency was the weak point of Melancthon's character, as he was himself fully sensible. Thus we find him writing to Christopher von Carlowitz, in 1548: "I am, perhaps, by nature of a somewhat servile disposition, and I have before endured an altogether unseemly servitude; as Luther more frequently obeyed his temperament, in which was no little contentiousness, than regarded his own dignity and the common good."⁵

Some occurrences of the year 1557, though rather out of their chronological order, may be mentioned here, as forming a sequel to the controversy just described. In the spring of that year, the Waldenses, in the valley of Angrogne, being

¹ "How it happens that you have not answered my letters for three whole years I know not."—Ep. 242. *Triennio* here must be either a slip of Calvin's, or a misprint for *biennio*.

² *Opera*, viii., 687, B.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Matthes, *Leben Melancthons*, p. 351.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 288, 289.

threatened with extirpation, appealed to their friends at Geneva and Neuchâtel for assistance. Farel and Beza undertook their cause; and after visiting Berne, Zurich, Schaffhausen, and Basle, which towns they persuaded to send embassies to the French court in favor of the persecuted Waldenses, proceeded to Montbelliard and Strasburgh, and thence into the electorate. Though every where well received, Farel and Beza could not help remarking some feeling of animosity toward them among the Lutherans, on account of Calvin's books, as well as some misgivings with regard to their orthodoxy on the subject of the sacraments. Diller, the elector's chaplain, seemed to accept what they said in explanation; but the elector himself was absent, and it was necessary that he should be satisfied. Farel and Beza referred to Calvin's "Institutes;" but as the elector required a more explicit declaration, they handed in a formal confession of faith. They were met with the same objections at the court of Duke Christopher of Wurtemberg, where they were given to understand that nothing could be done for the Waldenses, unless they produced the confession of that people concerning the Lord's Supper. In vain Farel and Beza affirmed that the Waldensian creed on that point was the same as that expressed in the *Consensus* of the Swiss churches. A German version of the confession of the Waldenses was produced, in which it was pointed out that they spoke too lightly on that sacred subject. Farel and Beza were also again invited to give in a confession; and the friendly reception which they had met with, the desire of saving the Waldenses, and the hope of making a step toward the union of the Swiss and Lutheran churches, induced them to comply. A confession was accordingly tendered, which purported to be agreeable to the principles of the Swiss and Savoyard churches, and to which they signed their names. It was much the same as that given to Diller, only drawn up with greater care; and it was briefly expressed, in order that it might be *explained* at some future opportunity. Words were employed which had not hitherto been used in the confessions of the Swiss churches, as *substantia* and *representandi*, but which Farel and Beza thought unobjectionable, and whose meaning they limited by other terms; but which were subsequently taken, and indeed very naturally, in their absolute sense. In short, it is plain that they had tampered with the Swiss confession: "But," says Kirchhofer, "as they were not acting in the name of the church, but only in their private capacity, they feared no danger, and still less wish-

ed to be false to the *Consensus*."¹ How two public ambassadors were acting only in a private capacity is not explained. They, themselves, however, thought that they had done a good thing; they fancied that they had brought over Duke Christopher, and that a union with the Lutherans would be easy. When Farel and Beza returned, *they said nothing of these confessions*, not even to Calvin. Shortly afterward, however, copies were sent both to Zurich and Geneva. Bullinger and the Zurich ministers were naturally indignant, and regarded the whole affair as a concerted scheme. When Farel heard of the anger of the Zurichers, he sent the confessions to Viret for examination, and afterward to Calvin; by whom they were entirely approved of. Calvin pardoned the silence of his friends;² and he and Beza sent letters of apology and explanation to Bullinger, in which the former maintained that the confessions were a true exposition of their faith; whereupon Bullinger charged him with having the duplicity of Bucer.³ Calvin wished a general synod to be called, to settle these differences, but this was opposed by Bullinger.

Beza, living under the jurisdiction of Berne, had more cause for alarm, since the Bernese disliked all such assumptions of personal authority as he had been guilty of: but Haller, the Bernese minister, was generous enough to express his dissatisfaction only to Bullinger. Yet, in a letter to that pastor, he could not help saying: "You see it is not without reason that I distrust the French ministers; they are crafty fellows, and infected with the spirit of Bucer."⁴

This breach can hardly be said to have been healed, when another occurred on the same subject in the very same year. Persecution had broken out in Paris against the Calvinists. A congregation which had assembled in the night-time, in the Rue St. Jacques, to celebrate the Lord's Supper, was surprised by the police, and many persons captured, among whom were ladies belonging to the families of the highest nobility. The fact of their assembling in the night-time was made a handle for the foulest calumnies, and witnesses were suborned to depose to circumstances which found belief among the credulous multitude. Twenty-one of the congregation were burned, by seven at a time.⁵ The Parisian Protestants sent their preacher, Carmel, and also Budé, into

¹ *Leben Farel's*, ii., 135.

² P. Henry, iii., 345.

³ Ruchat, vi., 205.

⁴ Kirchhofer, ii., 138.

⁵ Beza, *Vita Calv.*

Switzerland, to acquaint their friends there with their situation, and to beg their assistance and intercession.

Farel and Beza again undertook this mission. Accompanied by the Parisian deputies they visited Zurich, and succeeded in making peace with Bullinger. They thence proceeded to Berne, and prevailed upon the magistrates of that town, as they had likewise done at Zurich, to send an embassy to France in favor of the persecuted Protestants. Thence they proceeded to Strasburgh and Worms; at which latter place a diet was sitting for the purpose of adjusting religious differences. Farel tried to induce Calvin to attend this diet but he refused, though he wrote several letters to Melancthon, who took an active part in it.

Melancthon received the missionaries in the most friendly manner; but, as on the former occasion, a confession of faith was required of them before they could be recommended to the German princes. They accordingly handed in one which seems to make tolerably large concessions, but which did not satisfy the German theologians.¹ They thought that it contained only the doctrine of the Swiss churches, and demanded such a confession as the French prisoners themselves would make; and it was likewise mentioned that it was desirable that Farel and the other deputies should express their approval of the Confession of Augsburg. Beza declared his readiness to do so, provided the article on the eucharist were taken with Melancthon's explanation, viz.: "We follow the words of St. Paul; the bread is the communication of the body: that is, that when we take it, the Son of God is really present."² This, though rather obscure, was considered sufficiently satisfactory; and the German theologians gave the deputies a letter to the Duke of Wurtemberg, in which they said, among other things: "That they had never approved of secret assemblies, and especially these nocturnal ones, in which a great many men, women, and children, met in isolated

¹ It is in Ruchat, vi., 212, et seq. It states, among other things, that the symbols are not merely naked signs, but that the thing itself (*i. e.*, the body and blood of Christ) is truly and certainly joined with them, *whether they be proposed to the faithful or to the unfaithful* (mais que les symboles, par rapport à Dieu qui promet et qui offre, ont toujours la chose même véritablement et certainement jointe avec eux, soit qu'ils soient proposés aux fidèles, soit aux infidèles). This was certainly going beyond Calvin, who held that Christ's body was received only through faith.

² "Sequimur verba Pauli: Panis est *κοινωνία* corporis: *i. e.*, res illa, quam cum sumimus, Filius Dei vere adest."—Matthes, p. 362. Melancthon himself appears to have drawn up the confession of the deputies. See Schlosser, *Leben Bezas*, p. 76, note.

houses; that they had previously dissuaded these people from them, and told them it was better that every one should privately read and pray in his own house with his family and servants; exhorting them to teach the children their catechism, and establish other exercises of piety at home; and to endeavor as much as possible to take the sacraments in places where there were public and established churches; and, if they could not do so, to abstain altogether. However, as the mischief had been done, they had asked the deputies who had come to solicit an intercession for the prisoners, for a confession of faith; and, they continued, as this confession perfectly corresponds with ours—except that on one article they express themselves too obscurely (on which, however, they may be easily admonished in a legitimate synod)—we would not, in so cruel a persecution refuse them the consolation of interceding.”¹ Letters to the same purport were also addressed to the Elector Palatine, the Landgrave Philip, and to the Count Palatine. The French ministers, therefore, met with a tolerably easy success, considering the disputes which had recently been so violent; and that the high Lutheran party mustered in such strength at Worms, that Melancthon was forced to make many concessions, and even to reject in substance the Zwinglian doctrine, and to reprobate those who would not accept the Augsburg Confession.”²

These proceedings were a new rock of offense to Bullinger and the Zurichers. An angry correspondence ensued between Bullinger and Calvin, which seems to have lasted for a year or two, in which the former complained of Beza's having adopted the Lutheran confession, and charged Calvin himself with bad faith, in having introduced into the laws of the Genevese academy certain words not recognized by the Zurich *Consensus*. In answer to the former charge, Calvin pleaded the necessity of the case;³ to the latter he replied with some warmth and haughtiness. “The accusation,” he said, “of bad faith has inflicted a deeper wound. You complain that in our academic laws the word *substance* has been used, though it had been agreed that it should not be employed. What agreement you may have made for yourself I know not, but

¹ Ruchat, vi., 217.

² Matthes, p. 364, et seq. In a letter to Bullinger, in February, 1558, Calvin says: “The unhappy issue of the conference at Worms does not trouble me so much as Melancthon's levity is odious and vexatious to me.” MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 349.

³ See Calvin's letter to Bullinger, Dec. 10th, 1559, in Schlosser, *Leben Bezas*, Beil 299, et seq.

certainly this never escaped from me. But I did not object, forsooth, when you made such a proposal: as if many other ill-considered things were not said, which I should be sorry to mention. A false reproach is bitter; but to a free man domination is intolerable. I have not yet learned to speak servilely at the nod of another, nor will I henceforth begin. But that you might not be ignorant of what I shall constantly uphold, if perchance I be summoned to a conference, I have endeavored to explain the sum of my opinion, which I will change neither publicly nor privately. If my letter should seem an angry one, consider the provocation I have had; for I would rather have you for a judge than for an adversary."

To this paragraph of the letter Bullinger appended the following manuscript note: "If words like these occur in a private letter, and Calvin talks so bitterly out of a conference, what would he do in one? Is not this passage proof enough that we must not come into personal collision?"¹ Subsequently, however, this breach appears to have been healed; for in a letter to Bullinger, in May, 1560, we find Calvin expressing his intimate agreement with him, and remarking that there was nothing to be hoped for from "the apes of Luther."² Indeed Calvin's violent controversy with Westphal was pledge enough that he was not likely to adopt their views: and in another letter to an anonymous correspondent about the same time, he says: "Luther's apes—for he left but few imitators—unless one immediately agrees with them when they utter the name of Wittenberg, are raising great disturbances every where. When the *Consensus* of our church with that of Zurich was published, I had not the slightest apprehension that Westphal would make it an occasion of controversy. I was then compelled to embark in the contest, to tame the beast's ferocity. Afterward I was surprised to find that many were infected with the same fury. But I think that I have so exposed their ignorance, and their wicked calumnies, that all persons of common sense will despise their pride and vain boastings."³

Shortly after the breaking out of this controversy with Westphal, Calvin's mediation was sought to heal a breach in the church of the English exiles settled at Frankfort. As it was this breach which gave rise to the "Separation," and to the Puritan party afterward destined to figure so conspicu-

¹ See P. Henry, iii., Beil. 112. For *me non rectâ mente*, in that page, we should read, *me non reclamante*. See Schlosser, l. c., p. 302.

² *Leben Calvins*, iii., 351.

³ Ep. 292, April 22d, 1560.

ously in the civil, as well as in the ecclesiastical, history of England, it will be proper to detail the origin of it at some length.

The flight of John A'Lasco from the Marian persecution has been already mentioned. It is computed that on the same occasion upward of 800 Protestants left the shores of England for the continent, in the hope of finding an asylum either in Germany or Switzerland. In the northern towns of the former country they were, like A'Lasco, cruelly repulsed; so that whatever might have been the desire of Cranmer, and the other English Reformers, to unite with the Lutheran church, the feeling does not appear to have been reciprocated. In the southern parts of Germany, however, and especially in Switzerland, the exiles were kindly received, and allowed to establish churches.

In these offices of friendship and good-will the towns of Zurich and Basle, and the ministers Bullinger, Zanchy, Wolphius, and Gualter, particularly distinguished themselves. As a means of subsistence, the exiles in some places obtained permission to engage in the manufacture of English cloth;² but as they were for the most part men of education, some supported themselves by keeping school, some by writing books, and some by correcting the press. These last were principally attracted to Basle, the printers of which town had at that time the reputation of excelling all others; and the English refugees are said to have been esteemed by them as careful and diligent correctors of the press.⁵ Here John Fox, the martyrologist, superintended the press of Oporinus; and, at spare hours, began in Latin his ecclesiastical history, which he afterward published at home in English. He was too poor to keep a servant; yet, notwithstanding the attention he was thus compelled to pay to his domestic affairs, as well as his labors in the office of Oporinus, he wrote his history entirely with his own hand. Other distinguished literary characters among the exiles were John Knox, and his opponent Aylmer, afterward Bishop of London; who answered Knox's "First Blast of the Trumpet against the Regiment of Women," by his "Harborough for faithful subjects." At Basle were also William Turner, afterward Dean of Wells, and John Bale, the late Bishop of Ossory. The former, a man of a facetious turn, was the author of "A new Book of Spiritual Physic for divers Diseases of the Gentry and Nobility of England," and of the

¹ *Original Letters* (Parker Society), Part i., p. 167, note.

² Strype, *Cranmer*, i., 511.

“Hunting of the Romish Fox.” Bale has thus gratefully recorded the reports which he had received of the entertainment which the English exiles met with at Zurich: “They lived together,” he tells us, “in one house like a college of students. That Bullinger took a fatherly care of them, and that by the full consent of the citizens.” And he adds, “that those that were daily with him at Basil, related those ministers’ care, their trouble, and their paternal affection toward them, while they lived under the shadow of that city, covered against the heat of persecution with the love of the whole people. They related also to him the incredible munificence of the magistrates, who most liberally offered, by Bullinger, subsistence by provision of bread, corn, and wine, as much as might suffice to sustain thirteen or fourteen of them. But the English refusing to be so burdensome to them (having relief elsewhere), they of the city were sorry that some opportunity of gratifying them was wanting.”¹ Parkhurst, afterward bishop of Norwich, was among those who found shelter at Zurich; and having a turn for poetry in his youth, gave expression to his gratitude in some copies of Latin verses. Among them were the following lines, which he caused to be engraved on a rock near Zurich, and which his fellow-exiles subscribed with their names:

“Huic insculpserunt Angli sua nomina saxo
 Caram qui patriam deseruere suam:
 Deseruere suam patriam pro nomine Christi,
 Quos fovet ut cives urbs Tigurina suos.
 Urbs Tigurina piis tutum se præbet asylum
 O! dabitur grates quando referre pares!”

It is gratifying to think that the opportunity desired in the last line occurred sooner than might have been expected. After the return of the exiles to England, a correspondence was kept up for a considerable time between the chief of them and the Zurich divines, accompanied with a mutual interchange of kindly offices.²

This pleasing picture of Christian charity and brotherly love was, however, soon destined to be blotted and defaced. The very time of their misfortune and exile became the inappro-

¹ Strype, *Annals*, ii., Part i., p. 348.

² Strype, l. c., p. 337, says, that Gualter’s son, Rodolph, was supported at Oxford by Parkhurst, when bishop of Norwich. But from an account-book of Whitgift’s, when master of Trinity College, Cambridge, it appears that, though several sums were received from the bishops of York and London (Aylmer and Sandys) for Rodolph’s maintenance at that university, no mention is made of Parkhurst.—See Dr. Maitland, *Essays on the Reformation*, p. 44, note.

priate season of heart-burnings and quarrels among the English refugees. We have seen, in the case of Dr. Hooper, that the seeds of dissension had been already sown in the English church. There was a party that wished to carry the Reformation in England to a greater extent than Cranmer had done ; and it is even possible that Cranmer himself, seeing that it was his principle to pursue his reforms by slow and almost imperceptible steps, might, had Edward's life been spared, have brought the English establishment still nearer to the model of the foreign Reformed churches. Be this, however, as it may, it is certain that no inconsiderable party of English Protestants was desirous of further changes ; and the establishment of new churches in foreign lands seemed to them to offer a favorable opportunity for carrying their views into effect.

These feelings first manifested themselves among the English congregation settled at Frankfort. William Whittingham, afterward Dean of Durham, was one of its members ; a man of violent and extreme opinions, as is manifest not only from his having written a preface to Goodman's "wild book" against the lawfulness of women's government, but from the whole tenor of his conduct. Whittingham had been at Geneva, was acquainted with Calvin, and a great admirer of his discipline ; which he wished to introduce into the English church at Frankfort. It must be observed that Whittingham himself was, in all probability, the author of the only account which we possess of the dissensions to which this step gave rise, in a tract entitled "A brief Discourse of the Troubles begun at Frankfort in the year 1554."¹ This tract was not printed till more than twenty years after the events it records (viz., in 1575), when it was published to serve a party purpose ; and again, with the same design, in 1642.² It should, therefore, be received as the production of a warm partisan ; and is, too, written in so obscure and unmethodical a style, as frequently to make it difficult to follow the narrative. Inasmuch, however, as it contains several letters from the parties concerned in these disputes, it is a valuable record.

It appears from the statement of Whittingham, that he and his company arrived at Frankfort in June, 1554. Early in July, by the advice of Morello, a minister, and Castalio, an elder, of the French church established in that city, applica-

¹ See Professor M'Crie's reasons for this, in the preface to a recent reprint of the tract. Also the *Edinburgh Review* for April, 1847, No. lxxxv.

² See Strype, *Annals*, ii., Part i., p. 482.

tion was made by the English to the council of Frankfort, through John Glauburg, one of its most distinguished members, for liberty to have a place, or church, in which they might perform divine service in their own tongue. On the 14th of July this request was granted by the council, and the English were permitted to use the church occupied by the French congregation, upon alternate days, and on Sundays, at such hours as might be agreed upon. Whittingham asserts, however, that this liberty was granted on condition that, in order to avoid offense, the English should not dissent from the French, or Calvinistic congregation, in doctrine or ceremonies, and that they should approve and subscribe their confession of faith. But this part of his narrative is not very clear; for, in the same page, he represents the English as consulting among themselves "what order of service they should use:" adding, "for they were not so strictly bound, as was told them, by the magistrates, but if the one allowed of the other it was sufficient."¹ At length it was determined to adopt the English liturgy; only by general consent it was agreed that the congregation should not respond aloud; that the litany should be omitted; and that the surplice, and many other things in the church service, as well as in the ministration of the sacraments, which would seem strange in a Reformed church, should be laid aside.

Such was the motive assigned; but the true one discovers itself immediately afterward. "Then was it thought good among themselves," says our author, "that forthwith they should advertise their countrymen and brethren dispersed of this singular benefit, the like whereof could no where else as yet be obtained, and to persuade them (all worldly respects put apart) to repair thither, that they might altogether, with one mouth and one heart, both lament their former wickedness, and also be thankful to their merciful Father that He had given them such a church in a strange land, wherein they might hear God's word *truly* preached, the sacraments *rightly* ministered, and discipline used, *which in their own country could never be obtained.*"² With this view the Frankfort congregation wrote a circular letter, on the 2d of August, to the English settled at Strasburgh, Zurich, Wesel, Emden, and other places, inviting them to come to Frankfort and participate in the blessings which they had themselves procured.

That this letter was a proselyting one is evident. Not

¹ *A Brief Discourse, &c.*, p. 6 (Reprint, 1846)

² *Ibid.*, p. 7.

content with having obtained a mode of worship, suited to their own notions, Whittingham and his companions wished to make this an opportunity for bringing over the remainder of the English exiles to Calvinistic tenets. This is sufficiently manifest from the following passage in the circular: "You remember that before we have reasoned together in hope to obtain a church, and shall we now draw back as unmindful of God's providence, which hath procured us one free from all dregs of superstitious ceremonies?"¹ And again, from another sentence aimed against episcopacy: "As touching the point of preferment, we are persuaded thoroughly that it hath this meaning, that every man thought of himself modestly, humbly submitting himself to all men, unabling no man; for so much as you know that he which seeketh ambition, glory, advantage, or such like, is not moved with God's spirit, as witness the instructions that Christ our master gave to His disciples, who, laboring of like disease, were admonished that he which did excel among them should abase himself to his inferior: which malady St. Paul perceiving to infect like a canker, most diligently frameth his style, that he might not seem to prefer himself to others in the course of his ministry."² The real object, therefore, though somewhat disguised, was to innovate in the worship and discipline established in the English Protestant Church; for at all events the authority of the magistrates is not pleaded as hostile to that form in the other towns where English congregations were settled.

The majority of the refugees were, however, very well contented with King Edward's service-book, as appears from their answers to the Frankfort circular. Those at Strasburgh mistook, or pretended to mistake, the drift of Whittingham and his associates, and construed their letter as a request for one or two clergymen to come and take the government of the Frankfort congregation, instead of as a general invitation for all the exiles to settle there. The congregation at Zurich suspected that some other motives were concealed behind those put forth in the circular, and therefore in their answer observed: "If upon the receipt hereof, ye shall without cloak or forged pretense, but only to seek Christ, advertise us by your letter that our being there is so needful as ye have already signified, and that we may altogether serve and praise God as freely and as uprightly (whereof private letters received lately from Frankfort make us much to doubt), as the order last taken in the church of England permitteth and prescribeth (for we are

¹ *A Brief Discourse, &c.*, p. 9 (Reprint, 1846).

² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

fully determined to admit and use no other), then, about Easter next, for afore we can not, God prospering us, and no just cause or occasion to the contrary growing in the mean time whereby our intent may be defeated, with one consent we agree to join ourselves unto you, and most willingly to do such service there as our poor condition and calling doth permit.”¹

In answer to a second invitation from Frankfort, those of Zurich sent a letter to the same effect as the former one, and in order to come to a better understanding on the matter, dispatched Richard Chambers, one of their body, to confer with the congregation at Frankfort. But when Chambers found that they would not assure him the full use of the English book, he departed with a letter from Whittingham and his associates to that effect. Toward the end of November we again find Chambers at Frankfort; but this time charged with a letter from the English exiles at Strasburgh, and accompanied by Edward Grindal, afterward Bishop of London. In this letter the Strasburgh congregation expressed their intention of coming to Frankfort in the following February, but at the same time of exercising their religion “according to that godly order set forth and received in England,” not doubting the co-operation of those at Frankfort “in reducing the English church now begun there to the former perfection of the last had in England, so far as possibly can be attained, lest by much altering of the same we should seem to condemn the chief authors thereof, who, as they now suffer, so are they most ready to confirm that fact with their bloods,” &c. Grindal, in an interview with the Frankfort congregation, also declared that the intention of their coming was chiefly to establish the English liturgy: “not that they meant (as he said) to have it so strictly observed but that such ceremonies and things which the country could not bear might well be omitted, so that they might have the substance and the effect thereof.”² Hereupon John Knox (who had accepted an invitation to come to Frankfort from Geneva) and Whittingham asked Grindal and Chambers what they meant by “the substance of the book?” To which the latter replied that they had no commission to dispute; and in turn inquired what parts of the book the Frankfort congregation would admit? To which it was answered: “that what they could prove of that book to stand with God’s word, and the country permit, that should be granted them.” Grindal

¹ *A Brief Discourse, &c.*, p. 16 (Reprint, 1846).

² *Ibid.*, p. 23.

and Chambers returned to Strasburgh with a letter to this effect.

As in a subsequent letter those at Strasburgh declined to fix any certain time at which they would come to Frankfort, the congregation of the latter place determined to establish some certain order of service, and also to celebrate the communion : and at last it was decided that the order of Geneva should be adopted as "most godly and farthest off from superstition."¹ But Knox, being applied to, refused either to use that order, or to administer the communion, "till the learned men of Strasburgh, Zurich, Emden, &c., were made privy." Nor would he administer the communion according to the English service book : alleging that "there were things in it placed only by warrant of man's authority, and no ground in God's word for the same, and had also a long time very superstitiously in the mass been wickedly abused." But Knox offered to preach.

In the mean time Thomas Lever had arrived from Zurich, whom the congregation of Frankfort had elected for one of their ministers, together with Knox and Haddon. But when the Frankfort congregation found that he would not use the order of Geneva, but wanted to set up one of his own, they would not permit it. And fearing the further progress of this matter, Whittingham and Knox determined to arrest it by an appeal to Geneva ; for which purpose they drew up a description of the English service in Latin, and sent it to Calvin, requesting his judgment on it. In the letter to Calvin accompanying this document they declared "that some of their countrymen went about to force them to the same, and would admit no other, saying that it was an order most absolute, and that if ever they came into their country they would do their best to establish it again :"² an affirmation hardly decent or candid when we consider that the Frankfort congregation had been the first to endeavor to force their own views on the other churches.

Calvin replied to this application in a letter dated on the 18th of January, 1555.³ In this he laments the division which had arisen among the English exiles in the time of their adversity, as very unseasonable. He says that he does not blame the constancy of those who are drawn into a dis-

¹ *A Brief Discourse*, &c., p. 27 (Reprint, 1846).

² *Ibid.*, p. 28.

³ Ep. 200. It is translated in the *Brief Discourse*, p. 34, et seq. ; but some of the expressions are twisted to a meaning more favorable to the Frankfort congregation than the original warrants.

pute against their wills in defense of a just cause ; but that he deservedly condemns that pertinacity which delays and hinders the holy desire of forming a church.¹ But though in things indifferent, as outward rites, he (Calvin) was inclined to be easy and compliant, yet he did not think it expedient to yield on all occasions to the silly moroseness of those who will not depart from their ancient customs. In the English liturgy, such as it had been described to him, he perceived that there were many *bearable absurdities*: by which words he meant, that though there was not the purity that might be wished, yet that faults which could not be immediately corrected, were to be borne for a time, so long as they did not involve any open impiety. He thought that honest, grave, and learned ministers of Christ should so start from these beginnings as to proceed further and seek something purer, and more freed from rust. That if true religion had still flourished in England, something should have been corrected, and much laid aside. That now, when these beginnings were overthrown, when a church was to be established in another place, and when, therefore, it was free to choose anew that form which seemed best adapted to use and edification ; he could not understand what those meant who were so much delighted with the leavings of Popish dregs. They loved, forsooth, what they were accustomed to. But this was trifling and puerile ; besides, founding a new institution differed much from changing one. Though he would not have them immoderately stiff, if the infirmity of some would not permit them to proceed higher ; yet he desired others to be admonished not to be too self-satisfied in their ignorance, nor to retard the holy work by their pertinacity, nor to be too much carried away by a foolish rivalry. For what cause of quarrel had they except their shame of yielding to those who were better than themselves ? But he remarked, that he perhaps in vain addressed those who did not recognize his authority to give them advice. They were much deceived, he continued, if they feared any sinister reports in England as to their renouncing that religion for which they had quitted their country. Rather, a sincere and ingenuous profession would compel the faithful left there to

¹ By translating "*formandæ ecclesiæ studium*," by "the holye carefulness of *reforming* the church," the author of the tract converts this observation, which Calvin seems to have leveled merely against the pertinacity of the Frankfort congregation, which prevented them from forming a church, into a decided approbation of the views of Whittingham and his party.

weigh well into how deep an abyss they were fallen ; and that their downfall would wound them the more deeply when they perceived those abroad proceeding beyond that middle course, from which they themselves had been forced even to retrograde.

This letter was on the whole, as might indeed have been expected, favorable to the party of Whittingham and Knox, though Calvin does not bestow unqualified approbation on their conduct. It brought over to that party, however, several of those at Frankfort who were previously hesitating ; and, after much debate, it was decided that Knox, Whittingham, Gilby, Fox, and Cole, should draw up a service-book ; which they did after the fashion of that of Geneva. This book, however, did not give entire satisfaction, and Knox, Whittingham, Lever, and Parry were charged to alter and modify it ; which they did by adopting, among other changes, some parts of the English service-book. This new order was to be used till the end of the following April, and any disputes that might arise respecting it were to be referred to Calvin, Musculus, Martyr, Bullinger, and Viret.

Such was the posture of affairs when Dr. Richard Cox, accompanied by some other persons, arrived at Frankfort from England on the 13th of March. That eminent divine, who subsequently became bishop of Ely, had been King Edward's tutor, and one of Cranmer's chief coadjutors in preparing the liturgy published in that prince's reign : and, when he arrived at Frankfort, took immediate steps to restore its use among the congregation settled there. The author of the "Brief Discourse"¹ charges Dr. Cox and his companions with violent conduct in effecting this object ; with interrupting the order of the service by making their responses aloud, and with thrusting themselves by force into the pulpit and reading the litany. If such proceedings were really resorted to they can hardly be justified But—

" Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes ?"

Accusations like these come with a bad grace from men like Whittingham and Knox, who were not slow in retaliating. On the very same day that these disturbance are said to have occurred, Knox delivered a violent sermon, in which he reflected upon some of the opposite party as pluralists.² All was now tumult and confusion. Upon an appeal to the

¹ Page 38.

² *A Brief Discourse, &c.*, p. 39. *M'Crie's Life of Knox*, p. 91.

Councilor Glauburg, Whittingham's party seem to have been once more triumphant; but shortly afterward Dr. Cox and his followers discomfited them by procuring Knox's banishment from Frankfort. This they did by denouncing him to the magistrates of that city as the author of the book entitled "An Admonition to England;"¹ in which he had dissuaded the marriage of Queen Mary with the emperor's son, Philip, and compared Charles V. himself to Nero, for his cruelties toward the Protestants. All this was effected in a very short time; for Knox left Frankfort on the 26th of March. On the same day the magistrates of Frankfort intimated to Whittingham their resolution that King Edward's liturgy should be used in the English church, and forbade him to meddle to the contrary.²

Dr. Cox and his party deemed it expedient to acquaint Calvin with what had been done, which they did in a letter dated on the 5th of April, 1555, couched in terms of the greatest deference and respect.³ From this we learn, that, though they had been permitted by the magistrates to retain King Edward's liturgy, they, nevertheless, freely made many important concessions in favor of the more scrupulous portion of their brethren, by giving up "private baptisms, confirmation of children, saints' days, kneeling at the holy communion, the linen surplices of the ministers, crosses, and other things of the like character." And these things they laid aside, not as impure and papistical, but as being in themselves indifferent; on which account they did not wish to retain them to the offense of their brethren.

Calvin answered this letter on the 12th of June.⁴ He expressed his joy that matters had been brought to an amicable termination, but he would not allow that the things which had been abandoned were indifferent, and stigmatized them as popish dregs. He gave his opinion that Knox had not been piously nor fraternally dealt with; yet he would not renew the remembrance of these evils, but exhorted them to make

¹ In the *Brief Discourse* it is erroneously termed "An Admonition to Christians." The full title of the book is, "An Admonition of Christians concerning the present Troubles of England."

² *A Brief Discourse*, &c., p. 45.

³ A translation will be found in the *Original Letters*, second portion, p. 753 (Parker Society). Among the subscribers, besides Cox and others, were Becon, Sandys, Grindal, and Bale. Whittingham had previously acquainted Calvin with Knox's banishment, in a letter dated March 25th (*Ibid.*, p. 764).

⁴ Ep. 206. It is translated in the *Brief Discourse*, p. 51, et seq., but wrongly dated on the last of May. In the Lausanne edition it is wrongly addressed "*Coxo* et gregalibus," for "*Coxo*," &c.

amends to those who had been wounded by their conduct. And as he had advised those who were discontented to depart, several of Whittingham's party determined on that course; but before they went, addressed a letter to the congregation on the 27th of August, in which they demanded arbiters to settle the points in dispute, and denied that their departure could with propriety be termed a schism. But arbiters were peremptorily refused, and a warm debate ensued. Before the end of September, "the oppressed church" departed from Frankfort: Fox, with a few others, repairing to Basle, while Whittingham and the greater part of the remainder, went to Geneva.¹ Here they were courteously received by the magistrates, ministers, and people, and immediately chose Knox and Goodman for their pastors.² Such was the beginning of dissent, or "separation," in the English church.

On the 20th of September, Dr. Cox and his friends wrote a long letter in reply to that of Calvin just alluded to, which, they complain, had tended to encourage their opponents. They make a spirited remonstrance against Calvin's charge of being "unreasonably addicted to their country," which they speak of with a truly English feeling of patriotism. They observe that he said he could easily refute the reasons which they had alleged for not departing from the received form of worship; which they were not surprised at, as he had not heard these reasons stated by themselves, but from the mouths of their adversaries. They characterize the information he had received, that they had made no concessions, as "a barefaced and impudent falsehood;" and it is, indeed, refuted by a letter of Cole, one of Whittingham's adherents, in which we find it stated, "that without further reasoning they (that is, the Church party) permit me to my conscience as touching their ceremonies."³ They affirm that Calvin had also been deceived, by being informed that they used "lights and crosses;" for that they never had any. They remark that he "was entirely ignorant of almost all the circumstances of their case;" and that he "was right in restraining himself, or he would otherwise, as the mountebanks do, fight to no purpose against things which have no existence." They reprove him for lending his ears to their adversaries respecting the mode in which they had elected their ministers; his observations on which point were "a thunderbolt," but unfortunately missed

¹ See Whittingham's letter to Calvin, *Original Letters* (Parker Society), p. 766.

² *A Brief Discourse*, &c., p. 59.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 60

their object. They repel his insinuation that they had abused the leniency of the Frankfort council ; by which he at once assumed that they were lost to shame, and that the magistrates were stupid, and unworthy of their office. They next proceed to explain the affair of Knox's banishment ; and in this part it must be allowed that Dr. Cox and his friends seem rather too tender of Queen Mary's reputation. But they affirm that their motive for denouncing Knox was the danger which threatened the whole church of Frankfort, if they permitted him to remain among them after what he had written against Philip and his queen ; and that they had first of all privately recommended him to withdraw. They describe his book as having " added much oil to the flame of persecution in England ;" and state that, before it came out, not one of their brethren had suffered death. And they conclude their letter as follows : " You say that you have ' diligently admonished those who are minded to leave us, that their departure should not rend asunder the agreement of the brethren.' We wish that your wisdom had foreseen this, and that the authority of your letter had not given encouragement to the former quarrel before you had heard the other side of the question. We wish that your sagacity had anticipated what was the tendency of their designs, namely to open faction, to say nothing more. For they themselves now presume to write that they are ready to maintain the lawfulness of their secession from our church. We certainly hoped, when we wrote to you, that our reconciliation would have been lasting ; and your friend Whittingham, with all the rest of his party, except three or four, had given in his adhesion to our church. But oh ! like true Proteuses, they now make subterfuges, and shamefully desert us, under I know not what pretense. We know not whence this change of sentiment has arisen ; but we leave you to judge what opinion must be entertained of those persons who tell you that they leave the church solely on account of ceremonies which even they themselves dare no longer affirm to be ungodly, nor can prove to be at variance with the word of God, or in any way unprofitable. We pray God to bestow upon them a better mind ; and we earnestly entreat you no longer to mix yourself up in so hateful a business, lest some disparagement should arise to your reputation, which we desire should at all times be most honorable and holy." ¹ It is impossible not to be struck with the altered tone of this letter when compared with the preceding one ;

¹ See *Original Letters* (Parker Society), p. 755, et seq.

and it was, probably, from this time that many members of the Anglican church, seeing that Calvin had condemned them unheard, and sided with their opponents on an *ex parte* statement, began to feel less respect than formerly for his character.

How displeasing these attempts of Whittingham and his associates were to those who had assisted in bringing the Reformation in England to its completion under King Edward, appears from a letter addressed to Grindal, by Bishop Ridley, a little before his martyrdom. In this he says: "Alas! that our brother Knox could not bear with our Book of Common Prayer; matters against which, although I grant a man, as he is, of wit and learning, may find to make apparent reasons; but I suppose he can not be able soundly to disprove, by God's word, the reason he maketh against the litany; and the faults *per sanguinem et sudorem* he findeth in the same, I do marvel how he can or dare avouch them before the Englishmen that be with you. As for *private baptism*, it is not prescribed in the Book but where solemn baptism for lack of time and danger of death can not be had. What would he in that case should be done? Peradventure, he will say, It is better, then, to let them die without baptism. For this his *better*, what word hath he in Scripture? And if he have none, why will he not follow that that the sentence of the old ancient writers doth more allow? From whom to dissent without warrant of God's word, I can not think it any godly wisdom. And as for *purification of women*, I ween the word *purification* is changed, and it is called *thanksgiving*. Surely M. Knox is in my mind a man of much good learning, and of an earnest zeal. The Lord grant him to use them to his glory."¹

While the church of the English refugees at Frankfort was thus torn with intestine dissensions, with which also the French church established there was equally distracted, a common danger was impending over both. An imperial diet was held at Augsburg in 1555, at which, in the absence of Charles V., his brother Ferdinand, King of Hungary, presided. The object of this diet was to terminate the religious differences which distracted the empire; and an edict for that purpose was published on the 25th of September of that year. The only religious denominations, however, recognized by this diet, were the Roman Catholic and Lutheran; and by the second article of the edict, all who were not com-

¹ Strype, *Life of Grindal*, p. 28.

prised under one or the other of these confessions, were expressly excluded from the benefits of this religious peace.¹ This gave a new handle to the Lutherans to persecute the Calvinists and Sacramentaries. The refugees at Wesel became the objects of a bitter persecution, and even went in danger of their lives from the fury of the Lutherans; though Melancthon, whom the magistrates of Wesel consulted, recommended toleration; since Luther had required no more from the citizens of Augsburg and Strasburgh, than an acknowledgment of the substantial presence of Christ in the eucharist.² At Frankfort, through the moderation and good sense of the magistrates, the refugees were treated with more kindness and consideration; though the bitter quarrels which they fell into among themselves, respecting ceremonies and points of faith, rendered them hardly worthy of this leniency. These quarrels ran so high among the French congregation that they had almost come to blows in the church itself.³ In order to appease these dissensions among his countrymen, Calvin wrote to the council of Frankfort, as well as to the burgomaster Glauburg, on the last day of February, 1556,⁴ offering to go thither and confer amicably with their ministers. On this occasion, however, Calvin seems to have been actuated by the desire of upholding his own doctrines, as well as by that of establishing peace. In the previous year he had dedicated his "Harmony of the first three Gospels" to the Frankfort council, who had received it very graciously, and acknowledged it by a letter of thanks, and a present of fifty gold florins.⁵ Soon afterward, however, Joachim Westphal got his book against Calvin published at Frankfort; and, in a letter to the pastors of that city, dated on the 2d of March, 1556,⁶ Calvin says: "I had persuaded myself that we were thoroughly agreed (viz. on the subject of the sacraments), or that, if our doctrine was not precisely the same, there was, at all events, no such discrepancy as would occasion an odious dispute. It may be that the book I allude to (Westphal's) was published without your knowledge, and I certainly do not think that you gave it your approval. I do not mention this for the sake of expostulation; but, since at the same time a rumor has reached me that some of your college do not quite agree with me on the subject of the sacraments, I have thought it best to be beforehand, lest my

¹ Ruchat, vi., 153, et seq.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 160.

⁵ P. Henry, iii., 415.

² Mathes, *Leben Melan.*, p. 344.

⁴ See Ep. 223.

⁶ Ep. 224.

silence or dissimulation should occasion strife." He then repeats his offer of going to Frankfort, adding: "I am not so uneasy on my own account, as that you may not receive with sincere affection the foreign brethren to whom the Lord hath given a resting-place in your city; and who, I hear, are fearful of their tranquillity being disturbed by I know not what quarrels and vexations."

The Frankfort ministers returned a gentle answer, though they did not dissemble that they were not agreed with him as to the sacraments; but they promised that the churches should not be molested. Nevertheless they attacked, a little afterward, the French refugees on the subject of baptism, and even inveighed against Calvin himself, saying: "That after his example the French wished to impose laws upon others, and that he exercised a tyrannical authority at Geneva."¹ Calvin resented this accusation in a letter to Glauburg, calling it a detestable calumny, as his brother ministers would bear witness, who had never complained that he made his power too much felt; but, on the contrary, often reproached him with being too timid, and with not using freely enough that authority which they all allowed him."²

From the letter just referred to, Glauburg would seem to have dissuaded Calvin from coming to Frankfort; nevertheless he went thither toward the end of August. A little before his departure, he had been seized, while preaching, with a tertian ague, of so violent a description that he was forced to leave the pulpit. A report had even been spread that he was dead: intelligence which was received with such joy by the Papists at Noyon, that the canons celebrated a solemn thanksgiving.³ From this attack, however, though he was not in the habit of traveling much, he seems only to have gathered new strength for his journey. In order to spare Farel's age, whose zeal would have prompted him to accompany Calvin, the latter would not even take leave of him.⁴

John A'Lasco, at the instance of Sigismund Augustus, king of Poland, had endeavored, in the spring of the year, to effect an accommodation between the Lutheran and Reformed churches; but this attempt was frustrated by Brenz, who required that the Calvinists should sign the Confession of Augsburg, and recognize the doctrine of Christ's ubiquity, which A'Lasco pronounced absurd;⁵ and thus the breach

¹ Ruchat, vi., 162.

³ Beza, *Vita Calv.*, anno 1556.

⁶ P Henry, iii., 418.

² Ep. 229, June 24th, 1556.

⁴ Kirchofer, ii., 149.

had only been widened. Calvin, on his arrival, found that animosity ran very high, and soon perceived that mediation would be useless. "Satan has so fascinated the parties," he says, in a letter of Sept. 17th, "that there is not the slightest hope of concord."¹ Glauburg was desirous of arranging matters, but his efforts were frustrated through the violence of Valerandus Pollan, one of the French ministers, whom Calvin, in one of his letters, calls "a devil."

Calvin was so besieged the short time that he remained at Frankfort that he could scarcely find a leisure hour. A certain Justus Welsius occupied his time for two whole days in discussing the question of free will! Calvin preached and baptized in the church of the White Ladies, which had been conceded to the refugees; but he visited none of the Lutheran ministers. He returned to Geneva before the 12th of October, as it appears from the Registers that he thanked the council, on that day, for the herald whom they had ordered to escort him to Frankfort.² This last circumstance shows plainly in what high honor Calvin was held by the Genevese.

Yet, notwithstanding these disputes, the magistrates still permitted the French and English refugees to have their church at Frankfort; though they made them subscribe the Confession of Augsburg. The refugees seem to have been compelled to this step through the rashness of Valerandus Pollan; but they entered a reservation concerning the meaning of the word *substantially*, as applied to the eucharist.³ But, though thus delivered from the persecution of the Lutherans, dissension still continued to prevail in the English church; in which, however, Calvin does not seem to have interfered any further. On the accession of Elizabeth most of the English exiles returned to their own country. Before their departure, Whittingham and the chief of his party, who were now settled at Geneva, again addressed a circular to the different congregations under pretense of a reconciliation; the real object of which, however, evidently was that their own notions respecting ceremonies, and other disputed points,⁴ might be carried out in the church which was now about to be re-

¹ MS. Bern., *apud* P. Henry, *Ibid.*

² *Régistres*, *apud* P. Henry, iii., 417.

³ Calvin to Bullinger, August, 1557, MS. Tig., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 420.

⁴ See his letter in the *Brief Discourse*, p. 186, et seq., in which we find the following sentence: "For what can the Papist wish more than that we should dissent one from another, and, instead of preaching Jesus Christ and profitable doctrine, to contend one against another, *either for superfluous ceremonies, or other like trifles*, from the which God of His mercy hath delivered us?"

established in England. Thus, with characteristic obstinacy, the same minority of the exiled church which had been the occasion of these "troubles at Frankfort," persisted to the very last in endeavoring to thrust their views upon their brethren. Several of those at Geneva, and among them Knox and Whittingham, remained, however, at that place, in order to finish a translation of the Bible which they had begun. Whittingham and his companions took a formal leave of Geneva on the 30th of May, 1560, as appears from the following entry in the Registers, under that date: "William Whittingham, citizen, in his own name and that of his company, came to thank the magistrates for the kind treatment they had received in this city, and to state that they are required to return to their own country, in order to minister to the church there; but that they entreated their worships to regard them as humble servants of the republic, and promised that in every thing and every place, wherever they might have the means of doing service either to the state or to any inhabitants of this city, they would exert themselves to the utmost of their power. They requested, too, a certificate of their life and conversation during their residence in this city, and gave in a register of those of their countrymen who came to dwell therein, by way of a perpetual remembrance. It was decreed that they should have honorable license to depart, together with a testimonial of the satisfaction we have had in them; and that they be exhorted to pray for us, and to act in their turn toward foreigners as we have done to them; that they be always disposed to look with affection upon this city, and that those who are now citizens or subjects be still regarded as such for the time to come."¹

¹ *Original Letters* (Parker Society), p. 765.

CHAPTER XIII.

Revival of the Predestinarian Controversy—Calvin's Treatment of Castello—Italian Antitrinitarians—Gribaldo—Biandrata—Alciati—Gentile—Schools founded at Geneva—Dissensions in the Pays de Vaud—Viret and others banished—Farel's intemperate Zeal—Viret, Beza, and others, repair to Geneva—Farel's Marriage—Calvin's Illness—His Intercourse with England—Correspondence with Knox.

DURING this period Castello was suspected of an attempt to renew the predestinarian controversy, by getting a treatise on the subject printed secretly at Paris.¹ In a letter written in February, 1555, in which Calvin defends himself from the attacks of a certain M. de la Vau, at Basle, he mentions that whole quires of Castello's books, attacking his doctrine of predestination, had been condemned, and Castello himself, whom he styles a "fantastic person," forbidden to publish them, under pain of being beheaded.² Hence, apparently, the reason why Castello, if he was really the author of the treatise just mentioned—a charge which he constantly denied—had recourse to Paris to get it printed. The book was written in an insidious form, the author pretending to apply to Calvin for some explanations of his doctrine, in order that he might be able to defend it against the objections of opponents.³ Toward the conclusion, the author contrasted his own notions of the Supreme Being with those of Calvin. He described what he called Calvin's false God as slow to mercy, but quick to wrath; as having created a great portion of mankind merely for de-

¹ The title of this book was: "*Traité du vieil et du nouvel Homme, Conseil à la France désolée, Recueil Latin de certains Articles et Arguments extraits des Livres de M. I. Calvin*" (P. Henry, iii., 89, note).

² "Il allègue pour ses complices ung fantastique nommé Sebastian Castello, auquel il en conjoint deux aultres, qu'il dict estre lecteurs publiques à Basle. S'il prétend donner crédit à ses challans soubz ombre de la Ville, quelle mocquerie est ce de ne tenir compte de tous les ministres et pasteurs, et pareillement des docteurs en Théologie lesquels il congnoist estre divincts avec nous? Mais cependant il ne dict mot, qu'en la ville de Basle, des cayers des livres de son Castello, où il vouloit impugner nostre doctrine touchant la prédestination, ont esté condamnés, avec défense de les publier, sur peine de la teste."—See the letter in P. Henry, ii., Beil. 12.

³ See the preface, at the head of Calvin's answer (*Opera*, viii., 632, A.), where the tract is given with Calvin's answers *seriatim*. It consisted of propositions relating to predestination, selected from Calvin's work, with objections to them subjoined.

struction ; as not only having predestinated numbers to perdition themselves, but to be the cause of the reprobation of others ; as having appointed and willed, from all eternity, that they should sin of necessity, so that neither theft, nor adultery, nor murder, are committed but by His will and impulse : as having filled the heart of man with evil thoughts, not only permitting, but actually inspiring, them ; so that, when men live unrighteously, it is the act of God rather than their own, seeing that they can not act otherwise ; as having made Satan a liar ; so that it is not so much Satan himself as Calvin's God who is the author of lies, while he often speaks quite differently from what he thinks. But the God whom nature, reason, and Scripture reveal to us, is quite opposite to this. He is inclined to merey, and slow to anger ; he created man after his own image, placed him in Paradise, and bestowed upon him eternal life. This God, who desires the happiness of all mankind, and that none be lost, whose righteousness overflows against the power of sin, the light of whose justice shines upon all men, calls to us, "Come to me, ye that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." He inspires men with good and holy thoughts, frees them from the necessity of sinning into which their disobedience has cast them, and heals their troubles, so as never to refuse a blessing to those who ask for it. Now this God is come to destroy the works of the Calvinistic God, and to cast him out. Gods of such different natures produce sons that are totally dissimilar. On the one part these are pitiless, proud, wrathful, envious, blood-thirsty, calumnious, hypoeritical, having one thing in their heart and another on their tongue, intolerant, full of malice, seditious, quarrelsome, ambitious, covetous, loving luxury more than God, in a word, full of all the low and wicked affections with which their father inspires them : the other God, on the contrary, produces sons who are merciful, modest, gentle, benevolent, charitable, open, hating the shedding of blood, who speak out of the fullness of their hearts, patient, good-tempered, peace-makers, hating strife and quarrels, honorable, liberal, loving God more than the world ; in short, abounding with all the good dispositions with which their author fills them.

"The objectors to your doctrine," continued the author, "say that you, Calvin, and your disciples, bear the fruits of your God, and that most of you are quarrelsome, revengeful, unforgiving, and filled with the other vices which your God excites. When one answers that this is not the fault of the

doctrine, which is good, and produces not such men; they reply, that it must have that effect, since it is plain that many, after adopting the doctrine, immediately become wicked, though not so bad before; while, on the other hand, through Christ's teaching, men become better. Moreover, though you affirm yours to be the true doctrine, they say that they can not believe you. For since your God very often says one thing, and thinks and wills another, it is to be feared that you may imitate him, and deceive men in like manner. I myself," continues the writer, "was once taken with your doctrine; and though I did not quite understand it, I defended it, because I so much esteemed your authority, that it seemed to me forbidden even to think differently from you. But now, when I hear the objections of your adversaries, I know not what to reply." And he concluded by requesting Calvin, if he had any good arguments, to let him know them.¹

This book was answered by Calvin in 1557, and afterward by Beza.² Both replies are distinguished by their bitterness. Beza entered into the argument more in detail than Calvin; who was himself dissatisfied with his performance, and whose chief aim it was to free himself from the reproach of being a blasphemer.³ Calvin, in a letter on the subject to an anonymous correspondent, justifies the anger he had displayed in a manner which shows how deeply he had been wounded. "If I seem to you too severe," he says, "believe me that it is the result of necessity. Meanwhile you do not consider how much your own facility hurts the church, which is such that the wicked may do any thing with impunity, and which, confounding virtue and vice, makes no distinction between black and white. While that excellent man of yours tries to undermine the chief point of our salvation, he blushes not to utter the most detestable blasphemies, affirming that Calvin's God is a liar, a hypocrite, false-hearted, the author of all wickedness, the enemy of all that is right and proper, and worse than Satan himself. But why should I complain that you treat me unkindly? For I know that you mean nothing less than to approve of the foul and detestable barkings of that

¹ See the tract, "*De occultâ Dei Providentiâ*," *Opera*, viii., 645; also P. Henry, iii., Beil. 41, et seq., where an analysis of the book is given, with Beza's answers.

² The title of Calvin's reply is: "*Calumniæ Nebulonis cujusdam, quibus Odio gravare conatus est Doctrinam I. Calvini de occultâ Dei Providentiâ, et I. Calvini ad eandem Responsio*," Geneva, 1557. To this Calvin prefixed his former answer to Castellio's libel, by way of preface. Beza's answer (*Th. Bezae Vezelii Responsio ad Sycophontarum quorundam Calumnias*, &c) appeared the following year.

³ P. Henry, iii., 93

obscene dog. May the earth swallow me a thousand times rather than that I should not obey what the Spirit of God prescribes and dictates to me by the mouth of his prophets; that the opprobrium, namely, by which the majesty of God is wounded, should fall on my own head (Psalm lxix.). Yet you, while I am defending that cause which I can not desert without being a perfidious traitor, charge me with quarreling! I wish so thoughtless a word, for which I blush as being unworthy of a Christian, had never escaped from you. Surely if there is one drop of piety in us, such an indignity should excite our highest indignation; and, for my own part, I would in this case rather be furious than unmoved by anger."¹

Jealousy for God's honor is highly just and laudable; but there are passages in Calvin's work which betray rather the rancorous virulence of personal animosity than the holy warmth of religious zeal. Among other things he brought a charge of theft against Castellio, without thinking it worth while to ascertain whether there was any foundation for it.² Castellio's answer to this imputation is exceedingly touching. He pleads guilty to the charge of poverty, rendered all the more bitter by having a family of eight children to bring up; and states that being obliged to sit up of nights in order to complete his translation of the Scriptures, he had openly and in company with many others, repaired to the banks of a river that flows into the Rhine, in order to hook up some pieces of drift wood borne down by the stream, wherewith to make him a fire to warm his chamber. Such was the action which Calvin magnified into a theft! In allusion to such charges, Castellio, in the Defense which he published in answer to Calvin and Beza's books, reproaches them with snatching at all sorts of reports against their enemies, and putting them into the first work they published; a practice which they would not fail to repent of at last. He attributes Beza's ill-will toward him, to his having censured a book published by that writer under the name of "Passavantius." Calvin had also been mean enough to say that he had kept Castellio in his house at Strasburgh; but from the latter's answer it appears that he had lodged with him but for a week, when he

¹ Ep. 393.

² "I demand of you when a year or two ago you had a hook in your hand for carrying off some wood to warm your house, whether it was not your own will that drove you to the theft? If this alone suffices to your just damnation, that you knowingly and willingly sought a base and wicked gain by the loss of others, you are not at all absolved by exclaiming against necessity."—*De occultâ Dei Providentiâ, Opera*, viii., 644, B.

gave up his apartment to the valet of a Madame de Verger, who had come with her son to lodge with Calvin; and that he had afterward paid him for his board. Subsequently he had lived in Calvin's house gratuitously for a week, to attend upon the valet when he was sick. On the other hand he states that he had been serviceable to Calvin's family when he was at Ratisbon. The tone of Castellio's Defense forms a striking contrast to that of Calvin's book. Bayle remarks of the Appendix to it: "The sequel of this appendix contains some excellent admonitions; and it must be acknowledged that Castellio, call him heretic as long as you will, gave better examples of moderation in his writings than the orthodox persons who attacked him."¹ Indeed Calvin had poured out such foul and unchristian-like abuse, that Castellio tells us he had heard it doubted whether he could have written it. Among the choice epithets showered upon him were those of *blasphemer, slanderer, foul-mouthed dog, full of ignorance, bestiality, and impudence, impostor, impure corrupter of Scripture, vagabond, scurvy knave, &c.* After recounting all these vituperations, Castellio observes: "Nothing is so hidden that will not be discovered. Christ will not always hang between thieves: crucified truth will rise again at last. But you!—ought you not again and again to ponder what account you will be able to render to God for the many reproaches you have heaped on one for whom Christ died? Even were I as truly all these things as I really am not, yet it ill becomes so learned a man as yourself, the teacher of so many others, to degrade so excellent an intellect by so foul and sordid abuse." A noble reproof! and which must have been infinitely more cutting than any attempt at the same fashion of retaliation.

About the same time that this controversy with Castellio was going on, Geneva began to be troubled by Antitrinitarian doctrines, which had spread to a great extent among the Italians settled there. It has been already said that these exiles had been very busy in publishing libels and attacks upon Calvin after the affair of Servetus, of whom many of them were disciples. This tendency to Antitrinitarianism seemed in some degree natural to the speculative and subtle nature of the Italian mind, and appears to have been fostered among the small community settled at Geneva by their having a separate place of worship assigned to them, on account of their language. The first Italian congregation seems to have been

¹ See his *Dictionary*, art. *Castalion*, rem. G., sub fin.

formed there in 1542, and Bernardin Oechino was probably one of its three ministers. This church did not last long; but when Galeazzo Caraccioli, Marquis of Vico, settled at Geneva in 1551, to enjoy the free use of the religion he had adopted, it was revived.¹

Of this congregation Matteo Gribaldo, a professor of jurisprudence at Padua, was a member; who had bought the estate of Farges, in Gex, not far from Geneva, but in the territory of Berne; and who annually spent some portion of his time both at this villa and in Geneva. During the trial of Servetus, Gribaldo had openly expressed himself against the lawfulness of punishing men for errors in their religious sentiments, though at that time he concealed his real opinion respecting the doctrine of that heretic, except from his most intimate friends.

Having incurred the suspicion of the ecclesiastical authorities of his own country, Gribaldo abandoned Padua for good in the spring of 1555, and repaired to Tübingen; where, through the interest of Vergerio, he had procured from the Duke of Wurtemberg a professorship of jurisprudence.² Previously, however, to going thither, he paid a visit to Geneva; and on this occasion Calvin notified to him that he would give him an audience before his brother ministers, and three elders; or rather, in plain terms, he received a summons to appear before the consistory. Upon his entering, Calvin would not give him his hand; whereupon, in spite of Calvin's polite explanations that he could not do so till he knew that they were agreed as to principles of faith, Gribaldo suddenly left the room. Calvin now summoned him before the council, to be examined as to his religion; before which body Gribaldo expressed his surprise that he, who was welcome even to kings and emperors, should meet with such a reception from Calvin. Hereupon the latter remarked, that he was accustomed to hear even the lowest and most abject of the populace, and that he had refused the mark of respect in question to a jurisconsult like Gribaldo, only because he had discovered his perfidious conduct; adding, that if he had ingenuously professed himself a follower of Servetus, he would have heard him: but now that his dissimulation had been detected, he would have nothing to do with him. Gribaldo could not be brought to give any decided explanation of his opinions. He let fall some words, however, from which Calvin *inferred* the extent of his error, upon which he was order-

¹ Trechsel, ii., 280.

² Ruchat, vi., 198.

ed to leave the city ; and all the arguments he could advance, says Calvin, against the injustice of such a step, were refuted.¹

Gribaldo now proceeded to Tübingen, and on his way visited Bullinger at Zurich, by whom his profession of faith was considered satisfactory. His lectures at Tübingen obtained him much applause, and he was often consulted on important affairs by Duke Christopher of Wurtemberg. Calvin's eye, however, was still upon him ; and, in a letter to his old tutor, Melchior Wolmar, he advised him to be on his guard against Gribaldo. Beza also sent to Vergerio a proof of his principles, in his own handwriting ; and to Bullinger a confession of his, to compare with another which he had given to that minister. Other Swiss theologians, besides Bullinger, regarded Gribaldo in a more favorable light ; as Musculus, at Berne, who, in a letter to Zanchi, in April, 1556, describes him as " a man not only of first-rate legal attainments, but also excellently versed in the religion of Christ."²

But at length so many reports began to be spread respecting Gribaldo's heterodoxy, that Vergerio, who had recommended him to the Duke of Wurtemberg, began to be alarmed ; and, in order to relieve himself from what might become a dangerous position, denounced his former protégé to the duke, as harboring heretical opinions : whereupon Count George of Wurtemberg, a cousin of the duke's, wrote to Geneva for information respecting Gribaldo's conduct there, and was answered by Calvin in the letter already quoted.³

Gribaldo visited Switzerland as usual this year ; but, on his return from his estate at Farges, was wounded at Berne by a man of Gex, with whom he had a lawsuit, and was in consequence laid up in that city for several weeks. On his return to Tübingen the duke ordered him to be examined in his presence by the senate of the university respecting the heretical tenets imputed to him. Gribaldo at first attempted to equivocate ; but, being pressed for a decided declaration whether he agreed with the Athanasian creed, and the edict of Theodosius respecting the Trinity and Catholic faith, he asked for three weeks' time to consider of the matter. This interval, however, he made use of to escape to Farges, where his family commonly resided. At this place he was apprehended by the magistrates of Berne, at the instance of the Duke of Wurtemberg, in September, 1557. His papers were

¹ Ep. 238, and Calvin's letter to Zurkinden, MS. Bern, *apud* P. Henry, iii., Beil. 99.

² Trechsel, ii., 287.

³ Ep. 238, May 2d, 1557.

seized, which, besides Antitrinitarian heresies, contained many erroneous notions concerning the person of Christ. The Bernese were at first inclined to send him back to Tübingen, with a command not to return to their territories without a certificate from the Duke of Wurtemberg. Fearful of the duke's anger, Gribaldo undertook to do whatever was required of him; whereupon he was ordered to draw up with his own hand a confession, in which he renounced his errors respecting the Trinity, and acknowledged the truth of the Nicene and Athanasian creeds. He was, nevertheless, banished from the Bernese territories; but appealing for mercy, for the sake of his seven children, the sentence was revoked the following year.¹

Calvin regarded Gribaldo as the originator of those heresies which shortly afterward manifested themselves in the Italian church at Geneva.² The next who made himself conspicuous by them was George Biandrata, a native of Saluzzo. Biandrata had been brought up to the medical profession, and having gone to Poland, became surgeon to the queen, and subsequently to Queen Isabella of Hungary. Afterward he returned to Italy, and resided for some time at Pavia; but, becoming suspected by the inquisition, fled in 1557 to Geneva.³

Biandrata was naturally acute, but his learning was of no great depth. When first his tenets began to be unsettled by what he heard in the Italian congregation, he frequently consulted Calvin on the subject of his doubts, pretending to regard him as his preceptor: a disingenuous artifice often resorted to by the Unitarians of that period. He flattered Calvin by telling him that he could find satisfaction only in his writings, and that those of the German theologians distracted him. After consulting Calvin, he would pretend to go away satisfied with his answers; but would return the next day and ask the same questions over again, some of which were very acute and puzzling. At length he suggested to Calvin that, for the sake of pacifying the consciences of many, he should reject all that had been written by others. This monstrous proposition opened Calvin's eyes to the insidious nature of Biandrata's flattery, and he refused to have any thing more to do with him. Calvin describes his conduct in the following passage of a letter to Lismann:⁴ "Admonish the pious brethren what a monster G. Biandrata is, and what monstrous

¹ Trechsel, ii., 294, et seq.

² See his letter to P. Martyr, May 22d, 1558, Ep. 262.

³ Trechsel, ii., 53.

⁴ See Ep. 322.

doctrines he holds, that they may be on their guard against him before they find it out by experience. He used to flatter me most disgustingly, calling me his reverend father, and professing that he depended wholly on my authority: but I told him freely that I had always considered his countenance the index of a bad and disingenuous mind, and of a perverse disposition, from which nothing good could be hoped. He tried to circumvent me like a serpent, but God gave me strength to withstand his cunning."¹

Another of these Antitrinitarians was Gian Paolo Alciati, a Piedmontese, who had served in the army of Milan.² In short, heretical sentiments of this description had spread to such an extent among the Italian congregation, that in May, 1558, the presbyters of that church requested Calvin's assistance in extirpating them. Accordingly, the whole congregation being assembled before Calvin and two members of the council, the former addressed them, exhorting every one to express without reserve whatever opinions he might entertain, and promising that no punishment should follow on so doing. Upon this occasion Biandrata and Alciati made an open confession, in which the latter went so far as to say that he thought the Calvinists worshiped three devils, worse than all the idols of popedom.³ As a remedy for this evil, Calvin caused a confession of faith to be drawn up in Italian, in which Antitrinitarian tenets were renounced, and which all the Italian refugees were compelled to sign.

Biandrata retired to Berne, where his cause was espoused by Zurkinden, the town secretary; between whom and Calvin an angry correspondence afterward ensued. In 1558, Calvin published his short tract, entitled, "An Answer to the Questions of G. Biandrata."

The leaders of this party being thus exposed and removed, peace seemed for a while restored to the Italian congregation; but, unfortunately, its minister, Lattantio Ragnone, lacked the discretion necessary to preserve it, and denounced in a sermon some of those who had subscribed the before-mentioned confession as Arians, Servetians, Georgians (*i. e.*, followers of David Joris, or George), or any thing worse that he could think of. Stung by these reflections, one of the congregation, named Giovanne Valenti Gentile, had the boldness to declare himself openly. Gentile, a native of Coscenza, in Calabria, was a man of some acuteness and learning, and

¹ MS. Bern., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 280, note.

² Trechsel, ii., 310.

³ Ep. 322.

had formerly been a schoolmaster. He had been attracted to Geneva by Calvin's reputation, where he soon imbibed the tenets of Gribaldo and Biandrata. He seems, however, to have possessed more openness and candor than his teachers; and, on the occasion alluded to, affirmed that he felt it to be his duty not to conceal those opinions which God had revealed to him. As the presbytery seemed to have exhausted its means of coercion, the council of Geneva took up the affair, and Gentile was accused of perfidy in violating the confession he had subscribed; a charge which he could not deny, but contented himself with pleading his conscience.¹ In a letter to the Marquis Caraccioli (19th of July, 1558), Calvin mentions that Gentile had been imprisoned; that he had spread his doctrines in secret, which very nearly resembled those of Servetus, adding: "I do not know what will be the consequence, but the beginning causes me much vexation."²

From his dungeon Gentile addressed a letter, not to Calvin, whom he regarded as his personal enemy, but to three other ministers; namely, Michael Cop, Raimond Chauvet, and Louis Enoch, imploring their mediation and good offices between himself and Calvin. But Gentile must have been ill-acquainted with the nature of Calvin's power to suppose that any of the Genevese ministers would take up his cause against their spiritual head. The reply to his note was drawn up under the inspection of Calvin himself. Its tone was sharp and bitter. The prisoner was irritated, rather than convinced by it; and gave in another paper in which he repeated his former views, and in which he also memorialized the council against the arrogance and oppression of Calvin, who, he said, instead of refuting his objections, had answered only with reproaches and evasions. He also prayed for the assistance of counsel, and to be liberated on bail, that he might be able to prepare his defense without constraint or molestation.³ But his petition was disregarded; and he saw that it was necessary to alter his tone. The qualified recantation which he now made contained, however, an irony too plain to be mistaken, or overlooked. He declared, that as so many wise men had unanimously condemned his opinions, he admitted that it would be best to concur with them, even if they dreamed, than to trust his own waking thoughts;⁴ but at

¹ Trechsel, ii., 317. The facts of Gentile's case are related in Calvin, *Explicatio*, &c., *Opera*, viii., 569, Amst. ed.

² MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 284.

³ *Explicatio*, &c., p. 576, B.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 577, A.

the same time apologized for what he had said of Calvin. The tenor of this paper was not, however, calculated to satisfy either Calvin or the council; and it was referred to the consideration of five jurisconsults. Their opinion was for death by fire. But though the council commuted this sentence for a milder one, and condemned Gentile, on the 15th of August, 1558, to be beheaded; yet nevertheless the lawyers became alarmed at the severity of the judgment which they had pronounced, and which they had not anticipated would be capitally enforced. They accordingly begged a respite for Gentile, in order that it might be ascertained how far he had really changed his opinions; for though the irony of his retractation seemed to be very plain, it was, after all, nothing but an inference.¹ Gentile was now made aware of the danger of his position, and signed an unconditional recantation. Calvin and the ministers doubted its sincerity, but left the case in the hands of the civil magistrate. The council found him guilty of perjury in having violated the confession which he had signed, and of being a declared enemy to the church, and condemned him to make the *amende honorable*: that is, to be stripped to his shirt, and bare-headed and bare-footed, with a lighted torch in his hand, to beg pardon on his knees; to be led in that state through the principal thoroughfares, and with his own hand to burn what he had written.² This sentence was carried into execution on the 2d of September. Gentile was also forbidden to leave Geneva, and was required to give his parole not to do so; but no sooner was he free than he betook himself to his friend Gribaldo at Farges, where he also found Alciati and Biandrata.³

We shall here shortly pursue the remainder of Gentile's history, though the catastrophe of it scarcely belongs to this subject, as it occurred after Calvin's death. From Farges, Gentile went to Lyons, in the hope of finding employment, that city being then one of the principal book marts of Europe. Many Italian merchants resided there, particularly Luccese; from one of whom Gentile borrowed the works of the Fathers, and applied himself diligently to the study of them. The more ancient ones, as Ignatius, Justin, and Tertullian, seemed to him to confirm his views respecting the Trinity; but not

¹ Spon, ii., 80, note *g*. Trechsel, ii., 327.

² His sentence will be found at full length in P. Henry, iii., 288, note.

³ Trechsel, ii., 330, from whom the following account of Gentile is principally taken.

finding them supported by the later Fathers, as Augustin, Jerome, and Chrysostom, he began, with a vain self-confidence, to question their orthodoxy. The fruit of his studies appeared in a work called "*Antidota*;" in which, taking the chapter on the Trinity in Calvin's "Institutes" as a text-book, he sought to defend himself from the attacks and refutations of the Genevese ministers.

His health obliging him to seek a milder climate, Gentile repaired to Grenoble, where for some time he supported himself as a professor of jurisprudence, but becoming suspected by the inquisition, he found it prudent to return to Farges; though he had contrived to evade the immediate censures of that tribunal by pretending that his only aim was to oppose Calvin and the Reformed Church. At Farges he was apprehended, and imprisoned by the bailiff of Gex; but was dismissed on bail, having previously, at the instance of the clergy of that district, been required to give in a confession of faith. He now betook himself once more to Lyons, and shortly afterward his confession appeared in print. A preface was added, purporting to be from the printer, and addressed to the sons of the church, as well as two appendices; one consisting of forty theological protheses, and the other of the same number of "pious and learned remarks on the Athanasian creed."¹ The confession was dedicated to Wurstenberger, the bailiff of Gex, and professed to have been drawn up at his command, with the intention of making it appear to have been published with Wurstenberger's approval.² The work purported to be printed at Antwerp, though really printed at Lyons; but Gentile declared that he had not sanctioned its publication. He affirmed that he had communicated it to his friend Alciati, who had taken copies of it, one of which must have gotten into the hands of a printer, who published it with a preface: and there is reason to believe that this was really the case.³

It was in 1561 that the book appeared; and Calvin immediately answered it. His reply consisted of two tracts: one containing an account of Gentile's case, and the other a short refutation of his principles. In this latter, Calvin's aim seems rather to have been a *reductio ad absurdum* than a serious defense of the doctrines attacked.

The reports circulated about Gentile rendered him an object of suspicion to the inquisition of Lyons, as he had previously

¹ For these latter, see Trechsel, ii., Beil. 16. The former will be found subjoined to Calvin's tract.

² *Ibid.*, ii., 358.

³ Trechsel, ii., 336, note 2.

been to that of Grenoble ; but he again contrived to make it appear that his attacks were directed against Calvin, and not against the Trinity ; and after an imprisonment of fifty days he was dismissed. Still he felt his position insecure ; and at the invitation of Biandrata, who had been living for some years in Poland without molestation, he repaired thither in the summer of 1563, accompanied by Alciati.

A spirit of toleration had prevailed in Poland from the very beginning of the Reformation. Punishment for heresy was abandoned, though persecution still continued among the Roman Catholics. Prince Radzivill was the great protector of the Reformation in that country ; to whom Calvin, after his controversy with Westphal, transferred the dedication of his "Commentary on the Acts," which had been previously inscribed to Christian, King of Denmark.¹ Several letters addressed to the King of Poland, and to some of the Polish nobility, show the interest which Calvin took in the religious affairs of that country.² The tolerant spirit of its government rendered it, however, a convenient refuge for heretics of all kinds, and more particularly for the Antitrinitarians. Lælius Socinus, whom Calvin had at first recommended to Prince Radzivill with the greatest warmth, insidiously attempted to undermine his faith in the orthodox doctrine. The works of Servetus were much read in Poland ; but Peter Genesisius was the first who brought Antitrinitarian tenets into a system there. In 1556 he openly avowed them ; and their progress was so rapid as to threaten the very existence of the Reformed Church in that country.³ Before his death Calvin began to suspect the whole nation ; and one of his latest works was his "Admonition to the Polish Brethren."

Shortly after Calvin's death, however, religious affairs took a different turn in that kingdom. In the year 1566, an edict appeared against all Antitrinitarians and Anabaptists, and Gentile was obliged to fly. After visiting Moravia and Austria, he returned in the June of that year to Gex ; but his friend Gribaldo was no longer alive to receive him. He had been one of the victims of the plague, which visited Switzerland in 1564, and which, in that and the following year, carried off 38,000 persons. Wurstenberger was still bailiff of Gex ; and, with an infatuation scarcely credible, Gentile sent him a paper containing the programme and theses of a theological disputation, which he was desirous of holding by

¹ P. Henry, iii., 422.

² See Ep. 190, 218, 220, 222.

³ P. Henry, iii., 441.

his authority. The theses were three in number, on Gentile's favorite doctrines. They were accompanied with a challenge to all the theologians of France and Savoy to appear within a week at Gex, and defend Calvin's propositions against him on scriptural grounds: the penalty of death to await the vanquished party.¹ A singular proof either of his self-sufficiency, or of his fanaticism; unless, indeed, the shortness of the notice, and the dreadful penalty attached to defeat, do not rather bestow on the whole proceeding the air of a mere bravado.

Instead of complying with Gentile's request, Wurstenberger caused him to be apprehended, and referred his case to the Bernese government. On being pressed by the bailiff, Gentile acknowledged that it was without his sanction that he had dedicated his "Confession" to him; but he, at the same time, maintained that it had been printed without his own consent or knowledge.

After an imprisonment of five weeks, Gentile was conducted to Berne, where he arrived on the 19th of July, 1566. The hatred entertained by the Bernese toward Geneva, which might have been favorable to his cause, was counteracted by the reappearance of the Anabaptists in considerable numbers; with the errors of which fanatical and pestilent sect, Gentile himself was thought to be infected. Beza strenuously exerted himself to procure his condemnation, and with that view sent several papers and documents from Geneva, and even visited Berne in person; where he busied himself with informing the ministers of the disturbances raised by Gentile and his friends in Poland, of which they had previously been ignorant.²

The trial of Gentile commenced on the 5th of August. His different books and papers were produced against him, namely, his "*Antidota*," a Latin poem on the doctrine of the church respecting the Trinity, an Italian and Latin tract on Christ's humanity, and a copy of his printed Confession, addressed to the bailiff of Gex. He was charged, besides his heresies, with the many deceits and evasions to which he had resorted; and as he would not retract, but adhered firmly to his opinions, sentence of death was pronounced upon him, and he was beheaded on the 10th of September.³

¹ Trechsel, ii., 358.

² *Ibid.*, ii., 362, 369. Spon, ii., 85, et seq.

³ Such is the account of this affair given by Trechsel and Dr. Henry (iii., 290). But Minus Celsus, a contemporary, tells us that Gentile was not executed for heresy, but for returning to Berne, after having been banished on pain of death if he came back. See his *Disputatio*, p. 224, Christlingæ, 1577. Another of these Italian Antitrinitarians was Francis Stancarus, a native of Mantua, who also found refuge in Poland. Calvin's

But to return from this digression to the affairs of Calvin and Geneva. Since 1556, Calvin had been occupied with the design of founding a gymnasium or school at Geneva, and a college of theology; but the state was poor, and its quarrels with Berne diverted attention from home affairs. After the renewal of the Bernese alliance, however, the conjuncture seemed more favorable for carrying out Calvin's views; more especially as Bonnivard, the former prior of St. Victor, had left his whole estate toward the establishing of these foundations. The school, which, properly speaking, was only an enlargement of the former one, was accordingly founded in 1558, and consisted of seven classes.¹ The college was established in the following year. These institutions were under the immediate direction of the clergy, who chose the rector, as well as the professors and masters, subject, however, to the approval of the council. Calvin drew up a body of laws for the government of these institutions, and likewise set forth the articles of faith, which all the students were obliged to subscribe on their matriculation. The scholars were obliged to attend divine worship once every day, and thrice on Sundays. An hour was devoted to psalm-singing. In summer the classes began at six in the morning; in winter at seven. The schools were solemnly opened in St. Peter's church, on the 5th of June, 1559, in the presence of the magistrates, the principal inhabitants, and six hundred scholars. On this occasion Calvin made a speech in French on the utility of these institutions; Roset, the town secretary, read the laws and declared the rector; and after Beza, who was the person appointed to this last office, had delivered a Latin oration, the ceremony concluded with a prayer by Calvin. On the following day the classes were opened. Much time was devoted to the study of ancient languages and literature. The authors read were Virgil, Cicero, Ovid's Elegies, Cæsar, Isocrates, Livy, Xenophon, Polybius, Homer, Demosthenes, Horace, &c. A library was founded, to which Bonnivard bequeathed all his books, and to which Robert Stephens presented a copy of all the works that issued from his press. Yet so late as 1699, this library contained but 3000 volumes.² Calvin's auditors are said to have amounted to a thousand daily; and this school undoubtedly contributed to spread his

short tract, entitled, *Responsum ad Fratres Polonos*, is directed against his errors (June, 1560); and also the *Responsum Genevensis Ecclesie contra Stancarum*, Ep. 352.

¹ Ruchat, vi., 238.

² P. Henry, iii., 386.

doctrines in Germany, Holland, France, and England. He endeavored, as appears from his correspondence, to draw to it men the most renowned for their genius and learning; but he was not a little assisted in these endeavors to provide his school with suitable professors, by an occurrence which took place in the territories of Berne, just previous to the foundation of it, and to which we must now advert.

It has been already related that Calvin's doctrine of predestination had excited great difference of opinion, and bitter dissensions, in the Pays de Vaud; some declaring for Calvin, and others for the more moderate views of Melancthon and Bullinger. This doctrine became the theme of almost every sermon. The ministers attacked one another from the pulpits, each side consigning its opponents to everlasting perdition; nay, it even formed the common topic of conversation and dispute in barbers' shops and taverns.¹ In spite of the prohibitions of the Bernese government, and of the alliance renewed between that city and Geneva, these heart-burnings and quarrels still continued. Many, and indeed the most distinguished, of the ministers in the Pays de Vaud were thorough Calvinists. These men repeatedly complained to the government of Berne of the prohibition to preach on the subject of predestination; and also pressed eagerly and unceasingly for the introduction of excommunication, and of the Genevese discipline, to which the Bernese manifested a decided repugnance. At length the storm broke out in the classis of Thonon. In the spring of 1557, four ministers of that class who persisted in preaching the unmitigated doctrine of absolute decrees, thus setting the edicts of Berne at defiance, were deposed from the ministry. Upon this they proceeded to Berne to make their submissions, and ask forgiveness; but, though the class of Lausanne warmly seconded their request, the Bernese council refused to revoke their sentence. The four ministers then retired to Geneva, where, after some discussion, the council consented to give them an asylum.²

Viret, however, and the other ministers of Lausanne, were not damped by this example, nor by the threats of the Bernese government. On the 13th of March, accompanied by his two colleagues, he appeared before the Lausanne council of Sixty, to request them to come to a resolution on some articles which he had before proposed to the little council, for

¹ See Haller, *Diary, Mus. Helv.*, ii., 117.

² Ruchat, vi., 256.

the establishment of church discipline ; but the Sixty having signified their determination to adhere to the edicts of Berne, Viret, piqued at his ill-success, threatened that he would not administer the communion at the approaching festival of Easter. Hereupon some deputies of Berne, who were at Lausanne for the purpose of hearing appeals, begged the council of Sixty to use their best offices with Viret to induce him to alter his determination ; for that minister was still much respected at Berne, and they did not wish to see the matter carried to a disagreeable extremity.

Viret yielded to the representations of the council, especially as they contained some promises of amendment, and held out some hopes that fresh powers would be given to the consistory. And, indeed, in order to conciliate the Lausanne ministers, the council of Berne published an edict on the 27th of May, by which they commanded their bailiffs : 1st, To establish consistories in every parish, to watch over scandalous sinners ; whereas before, consistories had existed only in the towns. 2d, To appoint guards, or spies, to report disorders to the consistories ; which latter were to exhort and censure offenders, and in case of contumacy, to hand them over to the bailiffs for punishment, according to the exigency of the cases, and the laws provided. 3d, To furnish all the consistories with copies of these laws. 4th, To see that they were rigorously observed, and to spare nobody. At the same time the Bernese government wrote to the ministers of the classis of Lausanne, to inform them of what they had done for the amendment of discipline ; but absolutely refusing to grant them the power of excommunication, or of privately examining ignorant persons, or those suspected of heterodoxy.¹

Viret and his party fancying that they saw in these concessions a path opened to the complete attainment of their object, drew up a plan of discipline, and forwarded it to the seigneurs, or council of Berne, begging their approval of it ; but at the same time adding a threat that, if it was rejected, they would all demand their dismissal, and quit their churches : and in a letter which they sent with this document they complained of being forbidden to preach on predestination, and of the alienation of church property. This was a violent step. The council of Berne were naturally indignant at it, and cited twelve of the principal of Viret's party to appear at Berne on the 15th of August, to hear their final determination. Among those cited, besides Viret himself, were Beza,

¹ Ruchat, vi., 259.

then Greek professor at Lausanne, and two other professors, and two regents of the college.

This company appeared at Berne a day before the appointed time, when the council gave them a mild, and even polite answer to their application, but amounting in fact to a refusal. They reminded Viret and his friends that their conduct was not conformable to their oath and subscription on their appointment; they denied that their edicts forbade preaching on the subject of predestination, but merely the handling of that topic in an unedifying and scandalous manner; they stated that they were determined to abide by their Reformation, but allowed that faults might have been committed on both sides, which each should endeavor to amend; they promised to take care that the rules of the consistory should be more rigidly enforced, and that church property should be employed to reasonable and Christian uses; they said that they could not accept the project of reform which had been sent to them, and that if the ministers would abandon it, they would treat them as well as possible; but that if they persisted in their design, and preferred their dismissal, they would not hinder their departure.¹ And two days afterward they published an edict to the preceding effect.

On the 2d of November Viret and his colleagues summoned the other ministers of their class, and acquainted them with the answer of the Bernese council. It was resolved to write again to that government, and to press upon it the acceptance of the proposed discipline. Viret also wrote privately in his own name, declaring "that he could not administer the Lord's Supper in his church, on the ensuing festival of Christmas, on account of the vices and disorders which prevailed, unless their excellencies established better order; and begged them not to treat only with himself and his colleagues respecting the affair of excommunication, but to communicate with the churches of the other Reformed cantons."

In their answer to Viret's letter the council of Berne said, that they were very sorry to hear of the disorders that occurred at Lausanne; but they did not see that excommunication would furnish any remedy, on account of several inconveniences which would result from excluding persons from the communion. It could not be hoped that the church would ever be so perfect as to leave nothing to be wished for; but they knew of no better method of repressing these disorders than the exact observance of their laws, which they were

¹ Ruchat, vi. 261.

very sorry to see violated ; and stated, that if they knew the offenders, they would punish them according to their deserts. They concluded by exhorting Viret to continue in the exercise of his charge. To the general letter of the class they replied more dryly, but to the same effect.

Viret and his party still, however, persisted in their plans. Further communications took place between them and the government of Berne : but as the latter, though mild and temperate, remained inflexible, Viret resolved to carry out his threat of not administering the communion at Christmas ; and, under pretense of instructing the ignorant and reconciling those who had quarreled, got the magistrates of Lausanne to put it off for a week. The Bernese government was naturally much offended at Viret's thus flying in its face. Letters were despatched to Lausanne forbidding the Lord's Supper to be celebrated on the 1st of January, the day to which it had been adjourned ; and toward the end of that month three members of the Bernese council proceeded to Lausanne ; who, having assembled the class, announced that their excellencies had dismissed Viret, and his colleague Valier, for their disobedience, and for the innovation which they had recently ventured to make. Hereupon several other ministers demanded to be dismissed, the chief of whom were Beza, Augustin Marlorat, and Raimond Merlin, the Hebrew professor.¹ Several others who hesitated to conform to the edicts were subsequently dismissed, and some of the more violent banished. Viret and his colleagues went to Geneva toward the end of 1558. On the same occasion more than a thousand persons are said to have left Lausanne for that city, who were of opinion that by the late proceedings the word of God, as well as the church itself had been proscribed ; but when they afterward came to weigh the matter more maturely, says Haller, they repented of their rash counsel.² Many of these fugitives seem subsequently to have proceeded into France. The schools of Lausanne were altogether deserted by the professors.

Some of the ministers of the class of Lausanne now found themselves in an awkward predicament. They had been very zealous for the introduction of the Genevese discipline, yet they found it hard to give up their situations, and go into exile, in order to support their consistency ; and their embarrassment was increased by the variety of opinions which they

¹ Ruchat vi., 270.

² See his *Diary, Mus. Helv.*, ii., 125.

heard pronounced upon their conduct. In this perplexity they resolved to consult Calvin and Farel, and accordingly wrote to Geneva and to Neufchâtel. Calvin's answer is not extant; that of Farel, which is still in existence, is very characteristic of the intemperate zeal which distinguished him. He reproaches his correspondents with their stupidity in doubting for an instant that excommunication is the very essence of the ministry. To doubt of it, he represents, is to doubt whether Christ should be heard in the church, or whether we should receive what he has established. And as they had said that their perplexity was increased because they had no example of persons who had been in the same situation as themselves, he places before them that of the other ministers who had just been dismissed and banished; and roughly reproaches them with either stupidity or cowardice, in not marking this example, or in hesitating to follow it. He cites the case of the Levites of the ten tribes, who, when King Jeroboam erected the golden calves, and bade them adore those idols, left his kingdom and retired to that of Judah. He tells them that they should all leave the country rather than recognize any other head of the church than Jesus Christ, or receive other laws of discipline than this; that is to say, excommunication. He blames them for their inconstancy in being now so undecided and embarrassed, whereas, when they were in prison, they had all been animated with a true courage to sustain the privileges of the Lord. Lastly he tells them that the opinion of the brethren of Neufchâtel was, that they should remain in their churches, provided they were permitted to enforce the discipline in its full extent; that they should sound the praises of the ministers who had been dismissed, or who had demanded their dismissal, and not suffer them to be treated as deserters; but rather that they should proclaim from the pulpit that they had been unjustly expelled, and that in their persons a great wrong had been done to the churches; and that they should denounce the wolves and mercenaries who had intruded themselves into their places, &c.¹

On this letter Ruchat makes the following excellent remarks: "I do not wish," he says, "to enter thoroughly into this question, and to inquire whether excommunication be of divine or human origin; I shall content myself with observing that an attentive reader may have remarked, in the whole course of this history, that Calvin and Farel, though zealous

¹ Ruchat, vi., 279.

partisans of this species of discipline, and thoroughly persuaded of its divine origin, nevertheless kept up throughout their lives an intimate and brotherly correspondence with the pastors of different churches, both of Germany and Switzerland, in which excommunication was not received, and particularly with those of Zurich, and Bullinger, their chief. It may have been observed that Calvin himself, writing to Bullinger in 1553, acknowledged that there were many learned men, persons, too, of worth and piety, who rejected excommunication. We have seen that, in 1557, Farel, in a letter to the same pastor, expressed the greatest veneration and the most tender affection for the church and ministers of Zurich, whom he calls a very holy assembly; yet he was aware that excommunication was not recognized at that place. What can one say to this? It must necessarily be admitted either that they had two scales, and double weights, in warmly censuring the practice of Berne, even to the comparing of the laws of its reformation to the golden calves of Jeroboam, while they said nothing to the Zurichers, or rather, indeed, wheedled them (though I think I should wrong these great men in passing such a verdict on them); or we must allow that there was a good deal of weakness in their conduct—and who is the man that does not sometimes trip?—and that the dislike they had conceived against the Bernese had the effect of magnifying objects in their imagination. For if excommunication be an institution established by the word of Jesus Christ, like the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, these two great men ought equally to have regarded as heretic all the churches which rejected it, and to have broken off all commerce with them, as well with that of Zurich as with that of Berne. For would they have kept up any correspondence and brotherly intercourse with churches that rejected, for example, baptism or the Lord's Supper? I am quite sure they would not. But if they thought that they could conscientiously regard as brothers the pastors whom I have mentioned, and even testify for them the greatest attachment and most sincere veneration, they should have concluded that there is no such great harm in rejecting excommunication, and should not, consequently, have spoken in so disobliging a manner of the laws and reformation of Berne, nor have so harshly treated as wolves and mercenaries, the ministers who submitted to that code. For, in the most delicate cases of conscience, it is certain that the surest method should be followed, that is, the method which the mind most clearly discerns; and in the case in question,

it was doubtful (at least with many) if excommunication be of divine authority; while, on the other hand, it was clear and certain that the government would not allow of it. Was there any harm, then, in following the surest method, which was to obey the government?" Indeed, we may remark that it was chiefly the French ministers, as Calvin, Farel, Beza, and their admirers, who insisted so stoutly on the right of excommunication. The Swiss and German ministers, men of more sedate and moderate temper, found that they got on very well without it. But to return.

Viret, Beza, and the rest of the Lausanne fugitives were received with open arms by Calvin. Viret was admitted to his former office of minister of Geneva; but remained there only about two years, when he was called into France. Calvin not only made Beza his colleague in the ministry, but also, as before related, appointed him to the rectorship of the new academy; where he delivered lectures in theology in alternate weeks with Calvin. Anthony Chevalier was appointed professor of Hebrew; Francis Berauld of Greek; and John Tagaut of philosophy: so that the college of Geneva may be said to have been, in a great measure, founded on the ruins of that of Lausanne.¹ The state, however, was poor, and the pay of the professors small. After a while it became necessary to dismiss them for want of funds, and Beza seems to have undertaken their duties unassisted. Between the years 1580 and 1590 the school was supported by a subscription in England.²

Toward the end of 1558 it was heard with astonishment that Farel, who was then sixty-nine years of age, and who had lived to that advanced period of life in a state of celibacy, had married a young wife, the daughter of one Madame Torel, of Rouen, who had fled to Neufchâtel for the sake of religion, where she became Farel's housekeeper. The girl had been brought up in Farel's house—a circumstance which especially scandalized those who disapproved of his marriage.³ Farel communicated his intention to Calvin; who, perceiving that the business had proceeded too far to be arrested, advised his friend not to linger over it, but to complete the betrothal immediately, and, till the marriage was celebrated, to withdraw a little while, for the sake of decency. During this interval

¹ Ruchat, vi., 307.

² P. Henry, iii., 389. There is a letter extant from Beza to Sir Christopher Hatton, dated in October, 1582, in which he requests assistance. See Sir H. Nicolas, *Life of Hatton*, p. 273.

³ Ruchat, vi, 226.

of two months, Farel placed his intended bride in the house of P. Bolot, one of the French refugees at Neufchâtel. With a jargon peculiar to the elect, Farel, in his letter to Calvin, requested him to consider if any *edification* could be elicited from a step which he allowed that all must at least regard as an imprudent one.¹ The marriage was solemnized on the 20th of December. Calvin interceded with the clergy of Neufchâtel to pardon this little escapade in their aged pastor, on the score of thirty-six years of faithful service. In his letter to them he says: "I am in such perplexity that I know not how to address you. It is certain that our poor brother, Master William, has for once been so ill-advised, that we must all feel confounded with shame on his account. Half a year ago, the poor brother would have boldly asserted that he who, at so great an age, should marry so young a girl, should be shut up as a dotard."²

In October, 1558, Calvin was attacked with an intermittent fever; and, though he got rid of the disorder at the end of eight months, yet it left his naturally feeble constitution, exhausted as it was by continual study and labors of various kinds, in so reduced a state, that he never afterward recovered his former health.³ On the 19th of November, 1558, Calvin writes to Bullinger: "I am forbidden to leave my bedroom, and am thus compelled to neglect almost all my duties. These troubles are aggravated by the length of their duration, as there is very little hope of amendment till the winter shall be over."⁴ And in a letter to a French correspondent in February, 1559, he says: "It is now the fifth month since I have been laboring under a quartan ague, which has hitherto confined me to my chamber, as my body was attenuated, and my strength debilitated. A relaxation of the disorder now holds out a hope of recovery."⁵ But though, during this period, Calvin was compelled, by the advice of his physicians, and the remonstrances of his friends, to abstain from preaching and lecturing, he nevertheless spent his days, and sometimes his nights, in dictating letters to his numerous correspondents, and in proceeding on the works in which he was engaged. He was now preparing the third edition of his "Institutes," the last published by himself, which appeared both in Latin and French in 1559. He was also busy with another edition of his "Commentaries on Isaiah;" or rather, he was re-writing

¹ Ruchat, vii., App. 364.

² *Ibid.*, p. 365.

³ Beza, *Vita Calv.*, anno 1558.

⁴ MS. Tig., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 384.

⁵ MS. Bern., *Ibid.*

the entire work. Yet he was always complaining how hard it was to be idle; though, says Beza, we who were in health might have been thought idle in comparison of him.

This new edition of his "Commentaries on Isaiah," Calvin dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, who had recently succeeded to the English throne. From his sick bed he wrote a letter to Secretary Cecil, dated on the 29th of January, 1559, in which he adverts to the exhortations which he had addressed to Elizabeth, and admonishes Cecil himself to use his most earnest endeavors for the re-establishment of Protestantism, and for the abolition of all remnants of Popish superstition;¹ Elizabeth, however, regarded Calvin with suspicion and ill-will, for having spoken against the government of women in a conversation with Knox at Geneva. In another letter to Cecil in November, 1559, Calvin seeks to excuse himself, and to avert the queen's displeasure, as follows: "I certainly remarked ingenuously, that as the government of women was a deviation from the primary and genuine order of nature, it was to be considered, no less than slavery, as among the punishments inflicted on man's disobedience; but I added, that certain women had been sometimes so endowed, that the singular blessing which appeared in them plainly showed them to have been raised up by heavenly auspices; either because God, by such examples, wished to condemn the sloth and cowardice of men, or the better to show forth his glory. I cited Deborah, and added, that it was not in vain that God promised, by the mouth of Isaiah, that queens should be the nurses of the church. By which prerogative it is clear that they are discriminated from private women."²

But with whatever eye he may have been regarded by the queen, Calvin does not seem to have entirely forfeited the confidence of the English clergy. From a letter of his, written in May, 1560,³ to Grindal, then Bishop of London, it appears that the latter had consulted him respecting the choice of a pastor for the French church in London; and that Calvin had sent over Des Gallars to fill that office; a man with whom he was exceedingly intimate, and who sometimes served him in the capacity of amanuensis.⁴ This choice was highly approved of by the bishop.⁵

During the same period Calvin was in correspondence with

¹ See Ep. 275.

² MS. Bern., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 411, note.

³ Ep. 295.

⁴ Beza, l. c. It has been already mentioned that Des Gallars was the author of the "Ecclesiastical History" attributed to Beza.

⁵ P. Henry, iii., 410, note.

John Knox, who was employed in establishing the Reformed Church in Scotland on the Calvinistic model, both as to doctrine and discipline. Knox quitted Geneva in January, 1559, and on his departure was honored by having the freedom of the city conferred upon him: a privilege which Calvin himself did not attain till the end of that year.¹ We find a hasty letter from Knox to Calvin, dated on the 28th of August, 1559, in which he states that he is writing amid the thunder of French cannon, and requests Calvin to answer the two following questions: 1. Whether illegitimate children, and the offspring of Papists and excommunicated persons, should be admitted to baptism before the parents have repented, and submitted themselves to the church, or the children themselves are old enough to ask for baptism on their own account? 2. Whether monks and mass priests should be allowed to receive their revenues, who, although they confess their former errors, neither are, nor can be, of any service in the Reformed church? Knox himself negatived both these questions; for which, he says, he was deemed too severe, not only by the Papists, but even by some Protestants.²

Calvin's answer evinces moderation and good sense. He is of opinion that baptism should not be refused in the cases put, provided sponsors could be obtained. With regard to the latter question, he thinks that the persons alluded to should be treated with mildness and humanity; as it would be a hard case for those who had been entangled in the net of error through ignorance, and had spent a great portion of their lives in luxury and idleness, to be turned adrift without any means of procuring a livelihood.³ He seems, indeed, to have had some suspicions that Knox's zeal was too intolerant. From a subsequent letter to the Scotch reformer it would appear that he avoided mixing himself up too intimately with Knox's party: and though he could not but rejoice to see his own principles taking root and flourishing in Scotland, yet at the same time he cautioned Knox against intolerance. "In the matter of ceremonies," he observes, "I

¹ "Pluiseurs ministres et professeurs ont demandé et obtenu la Bourgeoisie, et à ce sujet il a été dit, que l'on prie, M. Calvin de l'accepter aussi. Il a beaucoup remercié de cet honneur en disant que s'il ne l'a pas demandé plutôt, c'étoit pour ne pas donner lieu à des soupçons auxquels il n'y a que trop de gens de portes."—*Régistres*, 25 Dec., 1559. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

² Calvin, *Œpp. et Resp.*, Ep. 283.

³ See Ep. 285, Nov. 8th, 1559.

trust that your rigor, though it must necessarily displease many, will yet be moderate. Care, indeed, must be taken to purge the church from all the defilements which flowed from error and superstition; and you must even sedulously endeavor that the mysteries of God be not polluted by absurd or insipid mixtures. But with this exception, some things, though not quite to be approved of, must, you know, be tolerated.”¹

¹ Ep. 305, April 23d, 1561.

CHAPTER XIV.

State of Religion in France—Persecution of the Protestants—Conspiracy of Amboise—Progress of Calvinism in France—Danger and Escape of Condé—Demand for Genevese Preachers—The Triumvirate—Conference of Poissy—The Queen favors the Huguenots—They preach in public—Edict of January—Apostasy of King Anthony—Massacre of Vassy—Beza remonstrates—Religious Wars—Battle of Dreux—Assassination of Guise—Peace of Orleans.

WE must now return for a while to the religious affairs of France, in which Calvin had always taken a deep interest, and in which he was now about to be called upon to play a more active part.

Although the severity of Francis I. toward the Protestants increased during the latter years of his reign, it was nevertheless kept in check by the influence of his sister Margaret, and of his mistress the Duchess d'Etampes. The accession of Henry II., in 1547, threatened the Reformed church with fresh and more vigorous persecution. Brutal and ignorant, Henry, nevertheless, like his predecessor, was governed by his mistress Diane de Poitiers, duchess of Valentinois, who was as hostile to the Protestants as the Duchess d'Etampes had been favorable. It was in his reign that the inquisition was first formally established in France, an edict for its erection having been brought into the parliament of Paris in 1558, at the same time that Henry announced the recovery of Calais. The cardinals of Lorraine, Bourbon, and Chatillon, were named grand inquisitors, with power to arrest, imprison, and put to death, persons of whatever rank suspected of heresy. Chatillon, however, was already a Protestant at heart.¹ The cardinal of Lorraine committed the power of inquiring into heresies to only one of the chambers of parliament; which showed such alacrity in condemning wretches to the flames, that it obtained the infamous name of *la chambre ardente*, or burning chamber.

Nevertheless the new opinions continued to spread and flourish during Henry's reign. Their followers became numerous, and distinguished themselves by wearing a red cap.

¹ Lacratelle, *Guerres de Rel.*, i., 81.

The first Protestant church at Paris was established in 1555;¹ and in May, 1559, a general synod was held, at which a confession of faith was drawn up, the same as was presented two years afterward by Beza to Charles IX., at the conference of Poissy. This was founded entirely on Calvin's principles, as laid down in his "Institutes," and which he had been able to carry out only imperfectly at Geneva.² The Reformed doctrines had particularly spread among the higher classes; and the Fauxbourg St. Germain had thence obtained the name of "the little Geneva."³ It has been already mentioned that in September, 1557, a congregation of 400 persons was surprised in the Rue St. Jaques, among whom were several court ladies, and even some attached to the person of the queen. The house was surrounded by the mob, and the adjoining houses illuminated, in order that none might escape in the dark. Many fought their way through the crowd, but more than 200 were arrested, some of whom were of the first quality. Catherine de Medicis herself is said to have shown symptoms of favoring the Protestants, and to have protected some of those taken on this occasion; in opposition, it has been conjectured, to the Duchess of Valentinois, her husband's mistress.⁴

The Protestants now numbered in their ranks some of the chief nobility of France, and even members of the royal family; as Anthony of Bourbon, king of Navarre, the first prince of the blood, and his brother Louis, prince of Condé; Admiral Coligny, and his brother d'Andelot, colonel of the French infantry; the Vidame de Chartres, the Baron de Jarnac, the Count of Rochfoucault, and others. The conversion of many of these, however, must be ascribed to other causes than conviction. Works of religious controversy were but little read in France; and with the exception of Coligny, and a few others, the French nobility had neither leisure nor inclination for such inquiries. Disgust at some real or imagined slight or injury at court was frequently the cause of a resort to Geneva. Something must also be attributed to fashion; a term which may seem strange when used with reference to one of the most precise and rigid forms of Christianity; but

¹ *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, i., 99. It was in this year that Villegagnon established a colony of Calvinists in the Brazils; the first, perhaps, ever founded from religious motives. See *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, i., 158. Nicéron, vol. xxii. Maimbourg, p. 100.

² See P. Henry, iii., 469. This confession, consisting of forty articles, is given at length in the *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, i., 173, et seq.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 231.

⁴ Lacratelle, *Guerres de Rel.*, i., 239.

which may be justified by the fact that the adoption of Calvinism did not produce any amelioration of morals among the higher classes in France, which remained as lax as ever.¹ The custom of psalm-singing, too, was not without its effect on a lively and susceptible nation; though in this case our imagination must not wander to the nasal melody of our own tabernacles. The psalms had been versified by Marot, the fashionable poet of the day, and were sung to favorite airs. Marot was proscribed by the Sorbonne, but his work created quite a rage; and an edition of it published at Lyons, in 1555, was even dedicated to the Cardinal of Lorraine.² Thus Marot's aspirations, in his Address to the ladies of France, were almost literally fulfilled:

"O bien heureux qui voir pourra
Fleurir le temps, que l'on orra,
Le laboureur à sa charrue,
Le charretier parmi la rue,
Et l'artisan en sa boutique
Avecques un Pseaume où Cantique
En son labeur se soulager," &c.

The *Pré aux clercs*, an open space of ground belonging to the University of Paris, was occupied by the Calvinists for their meetings; not, however, without some violent, and even bloody contests with the monks of the abbey of St. Victor, who endeavored to exclude them. On one occasion, in the year 1557, some Protestants assembled on this spot, began singing Marot's psalms, and were soon joined by an immense multitude. For several days afterward 5000 or 6000 persons, among whom were the King and Queen of Navarre, assembled every evening for the same purpose; nor would the parliament of Paris interfere to prevent them. D'Andelot, however, was arrested for having attended these meetings, and for having performed divine service at his house according to the Calvinistic method. During an angry examination by the king in person, D'Andelot was bold enough to assert that he regarded the mass as an execrable profanation. He was imprisoned, and deprived of his colonelcy; but the influence of his brother, the Cardinal de Chatillon, one of the inquisitors, prevented matters from being carried to extremity, although the Pope, Paul IV., pressed for his punishment; and he was liberated from prison on consenting to hear a mass, notwithstanding that he refused to renounce his religious opinions.³

Thus, on the whole, Protestantism had been steadily gain-

¹ Lacratelle, *Guerres de Rel.*, i., 325.

² *Ceuvres de Marot*, iv., 212.

³ *Hist. des Egl. Réf.*, i., 141.

ing ground in France during the reign of Henry II. ; and, toward its close, brighter prospects seemed to be opening on the followers of the Reformation. The king had even come to the resolution of dismissing the Duke of Guise and his brother the cardinal ; and in a *lit de justice* held on the 15th of June, 1559, the presidents Harlai, De Thou, and Seguier, openly condemned the persecutions which had been resorted to, on the ground of their impolicy.¹ But before the month had expired, Henry was wounded by the lance of Montgomery in a tournament, held to celebrate his sister's marriage with the son of the Duke of Savoy, and died a few days afterward of the injury. Francis II., the heir to the throne, was sixteen years of age, and therefore, by the laws of France, entitled to assume the reins of government ; but his delicate health and weakness of intellect rendered a regency necessary. The King of Navarre, as first prince of the blood, had the best pretensions to be regent ; and as the queen-mother herself had shown some favor to the Calvinists, and as the influence of the Duchess of Valentinois was now at an end, the hopes of that party were naturally raised to a high pitch. But these appearances were deceitful. Guise, and his brother the cardinal, in conjunction with the queen-mother, seized upon the government, while the young king, under pretense of ill-health, was kept a prisoner at Blois. The King of Navarre proceeded from Bearn to Paris, where the regency seemed to be awaiting him ; and promised the Reformed congregations, which he passed on his road, to promote their interests ; but on his arrival he was treated with many indignities, which he did not even make a show of resenting ; and after assisting at the coronation of the young king at Rheims, on the 18th of September, was dismissed on the pretext of conducting Francis's sister to her husband, the King of Spain.² Catherine de Medicis, under the influence of the Guises, now began to show an undisguised hostility toward the Protestants, who were pursued with the utmost rigor and cruelty. Paris presented the aspect of a city taken by assault. Bands of armed police, on foot and horseback, passed to and fro, conducting prisoners of all ages, sexes, and conditions. The Calvinists were forced to fly, leaving their houses and property at the mercy of the *sbirri*, or sergeants, of the Cardinal of Lorraine. Auctions of furniture were established at the corners of the streets, which were choked with wagons carrying off the spoil.

¹ *Hist. des Egl. Réf.*, i., 267. Laerabelle, *Guerres de Rel.*, i., 304.

² *Ibid.*, i., 226.

So great was the plunder, that the rich became suddenly poor, and the poor rich. One De Mouchy was appointed inquisitor, who assumed the name of Demochares. This man kept in pay an army of informers; and the most unscrupulous means were resorted to in order to inflame the minds of the populace, already sufficiently inclined that way, against the Calvinists. Witnesses were suborned to testify that they had surprised them in the commission of the most infamous debaucheries. Violence and fanaticism were openly encouraged, and the people allowed to erect crosses and rude statues in the streets, which they compelled the passengers to salute, and to support by contributions of money.¹ The fires of persecution were again lighted; and one of the first victims was Anne du Bourg, a clergyman of a good family in Auvergne, who was hanged and afterward burned, on the 22d of December, 1559.

Toward the end of that year the discontent excited by the conduct of the Guises gave birth to the formidable conspiracy of Amboise. Calvin was very generally accused of being its originator, and he himself admits that he was acquainted with it from the beginning; but affirms that he used all his endeavors, both publicly and privately, to prevent its execution.² Geoffroy de la Barre, or du Barry, Sieur de la Renaudie, a gentleman of Perigord, and chief mover in the plot, was well known to Calvin, and boasted to him at Geneva of having been appointed to conduct it. De la Barre was a man of broken fortunes, and ready for any desperate undertaking. Under his superintendence the plan of the conspiracy was concerted partly at Vendôme, the residence of the King of Navarre, and partly at La Ferté sous Jouare, that of the Prince of Condé. The object of it was to seize the Guises, and bring them to trial; and Condé had consented to join in it only on the condition that nothing should be attempted against the king, or royal family. One of the conspirators, a lawyer named Avenelles, becoming alarmed as the time for action approached, revealed the plot to a servant of the Cardinal of Lorraine. That prelate, so insolent and cruel in prosperity, and so prompt to shed the blood of others, was totally destitute of courage, and trembled at the sight of a naked sword. He was overwhelmed with terror at the news;

¹ *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, i., 233, et seq. Locratelle, i., 340.

² Calvin to Bullinger, Ep. 293. On the other hand some authors, as Basnage (*Hist. de la Rel. des Eglises Réf.*, ii., 196), have affirmed that it was concocted by Catherine de Medicis, to check the power of the Guises. But this seems highly improbable.

but the Duke of Guise, to whom fear was unknown, immediately adopted the most energetic methods to baffle the conspirators. The court was removed from Blois to Amboise, where the castle was secure against a *coup de main*. By a stroke as bold as it was politic Guise made his very enemies become surety for the king's safety. Some of the chief conspirators, including Coligny, and even Condé himself, were summoned to the monarch's defense. To Condé was intrusted the command of the castle of Amboise; and thus, though apparently placed in the post of honor, he was in reality a prisoner.

The conspirators, nevertheless, persisted in their enterprise; but their plans were again betrayed by a Captain Lignièrès.¹ De la Barre, while marching to join the Baron de Castelnau, who, with 300 men, had seized the castle of Noizai, was intercepted in the forest of Chateau Renaud, himself killed, and his troops dispersed. Castelnau capitulated; but being conducted to Amboise was arrested on entering the town. The Duke of Guise was now for the second time named lieutenant-general of the kingdom; and, at the instance of the Chancellor Olivier, proclaimed a general amnesty, provided the conspirators laid down their arms. A large body of them, however, ignorant, probably, of what had occurred, marched upon Amboise. Guise fell upon and routed them with dreadful slaughter. Condé himself was forced to fight against them. The amnesty was revoked, and at the instance of the Cardinal of Lorraine, the prisoners at Amboise, to the number of 1200, were put to death without trial or inquiry: only some of the leaders were reserved for torture, in order to get evidence against the Bourbon princes and the Colignys. The only name mentioned by them, however, was that of Condé; and after all the evidence possible had been extracted from them, they were executed in presence of the court. Condé being arrested and examined, contented himself with declaring that he had not conspired against the king; giving the lie to all who charged him with having done so, and offering to maintain his assertion by single combat. As a fitting termination to this strange affair, Guise proposed to become his second; but of course no accuser appeared, and Condé retired from court, meditating on schemes of vengeance.² It was after this conspiracy that the name of *Huguenots* was first applied to the

¹ Davila, i., 75.

² Davila, i., 65, et seq. Maimbourg, p. 127, et seq. Locratelle, *Guerres de Rel.*, i., 343, et seq.

Calvinists, the etymology of which has given rise to so many conjectures.¹

Such was the issue of the conspiracy of Amboise, which, instead of overthrowing the Guises, resulted, like all unsuccessful attempts of the same sort, only in strengthening their hands. Calvin was strongly suspected at court of having been privy to the whole affair. The king was advised to destroy Geneva, as the source of all these disturbances; and so strict a watch was kept upon Calvin, that the very words of a letter to a friend, in which he had given an account of the state of things in France, were repeated in the French privy council.²

Calvin's doctrines, indeed, were now making such a rapid progress in France as might well alarm the government. They were spreading in Poitou, Saintonge, Aquitaine, Languedoc, Provence, Dauphiné, and particularly in Normandy; where they flourished under the protection of Coligny, whose post of admiral gave him much influence in that province. Nearly thirty years before, however, the Reformation had gained so many adherents there, that it began to be called "little Germany."³ The Calvinists of Normandy used now to assemble in the open air, in bodies of three or four thousand.⁴ Even several of the French prelates were inclined toward Calvinistic tenets. In this alarming state of things it was deemed advisable to take some measures for the safety of the kingdom. The rigor of persecution was somewhat relaxed by the edict of Romorantin, by which all inquiries into heresy were intrusted to prelates alone, and all parliaments and judges expressly forbidden to meddle with the subject. An assembly of notables was summoned to meet at Fontainebleau on the 21st of August, 1560, to determine on what course should be taken. At this meeting, over which the young king presided, Admiral Coligny, with his brothers d'Andelot and Cardinal Chatillon, the Vidame de Chartres, and others, appeared on the Protestant side. They were escorted by a large body of cavalry. The King of Navarre, and the Prince of Condé, were invited, but refused to attend.⁵

Before the business of the day began, Coligny, to the surprise of the assembly, suddenly rose and presented a petition to the king from the Protestants of Normandy, praying that

¹ See Pasquier, *Recherches de la France*, livre viii., ch. lv., p. 857. *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, i., 269.

² Calvin to Sulzer, MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 476.

³ Bucer to Luther, Aug. 25th, 1530, *apud* Gerdesius, iv., 73.

⁴ Calvin, Ep. 300. Maimbourg, p. 135.

⁵ Davila, i., 89.

they might be allowed to meet for worship in the day-time, in order to avoid the suspicions and calumnies to which their nocturnal meetings exposed them: adding, that, if the king would permit him, he could get the petition signed by 50,000 men. He further complained of the mode in which the young king was brought up; his person being surrounded with guards, and he thus taught to look upon his subjects as enemies, when he should rather seek to live in their hearts and affections.¹ Charles de Marillac, Archbishop of Vienne, also made a long speech in favor of religious freedom, which he concluded by advising the calling of a national council.² The Duke of Guise and the cardinal displayed much violence on this occasion. When Coligny talked about getting his petition signed by 50,000 men, the former retorted: "And I will place myself at the head of 100,000, who will support the contrary with their blood."³ Yet, on the whole, the Catholic party was not averse to an assembly of French theologians, provided they confined their discussions to any practical abuses existing in the church, and meddled not with articles of faith. The result of the deliberations at Fontainebleau was, that the states should be assembled at Orleans in the following October.⁴

Shortly after this meeting, Jaques Sage, or Sague, a servant of the King of Navarre, was arrested on his road to Bearn. Suspicious papers were found upon him; and, being threatened with torture, he revealed a plot of the Prince of Condé's, to which the King of Navarre seemed partly to accede, to seize Paris by means of Marshal Montmorency, the constable's son, who was governor of it; to revolt Picardy, and raise the Huguenots; to depose the queen-mother and the Guises; to declare the young king under tutorship till the age of twenty-two; and to appoint as regents, the King of Navarre, the Prince of Condé, and the Constable Montmorency. The last, though a bigoted Catholic, was at this time hostile to the Guises, in consequence of some slights which he had received from them after the death of Henry II., and had retired from the court to his seat at Chantilly.

In consequence of this discovery, the Bourbon princes long hesitated as to whether they should attend the meeting of the states summoned at Orleans. At length, however, they resolved to go thither; but no sooner did they make their

¹ Calvin, Ep. 300.

² *Hist. des Églises Réf.*, i., 277. Maimbourg (p. 146) attributes this speech to Jean de Montluc, Bishop of Valence, who was also favorable to the Calvinists.

³ Pasquier, *Lettres*, livre iv.

⁴ Davila, i., 93.

appearance, than Condé was seized, put upon his trial, and ultimately condemned to lose his head. But from this fate he was rescued by the sudden and unexpected demise of Francis II., who expired after a short illness, on the 5th of December, 1560.

This event made a great change in the aspect of affairs. It was at first anticipated that it would annihilate the power of the Guises, which had been in a considerable degree founded on the marriage of the late king with their niece, Mary Stuart, afterward Queen of Scots. Moreover, Francis's brother, who now succeeded to the throne, with the title of Charles IX., was a boy of ten years of age, and it was thought that nothing could deprive the King of Navarre of his lawful claim to the regency. But the artful conduct of Catherine de Medicis, and the weak and spiritless character of King Anthony, soon dissipated all these anticipations. By the advice, it is said, of the Chancellor l'Hôpital, Catharine now adopted that policy of balancing one party by the other, by which she succeeded for some years in retaining the reins of government in her own hands. Anthony was induced to abandon his pretensions to the regency, by being admitted to some show of power, and made lieutenant-general of the kingdom. The Guises were still retained at court, whither also Montmorency, and others who had been disgraced, returned. The queen-mother herself exercised all the functions of the regency, without having been appointed to it by the states, or even formally assuming the title of regent.¹ This policy of Catherine's necessarily led her to give some encouragement to the Calvinists, and was perhaps one of the chief causes of the religious wars which ensued.

Yet soon after the accession of Charles IX., we find the queen-mother addressing a letter in his name to the council of Geneva, in which she represented the preachers sent forth from that city as the main cause of the troubles in France, and requested that they might be recalled. Upon receipt of this letter, the Genevese council summoned the ministers to their presence, and acquainted them with the charge which it contained. Calvin, who replied in the name of his brethren, said that they did indeed exhort the ministers whom they appointed, to do their duty, and to spread abroad the tidings of salvation; but he denied that they were the cause of the disturbances which prevailed in France, and affirmed that they had done all in their power to keep back those who had

¹ Anquetil, *Esprit de la Ligue*, i., 89.

been desirous of going to Amboise.¹ Geneva, however, was undoubtedly the chief magazine which supplied France with preachers. The following passage, in a letter from Calvin to Bullinger, shows the great demand that existed for them, and that the former was not always very scrupulous about the means which he used to supply it: "We are asked," says he, "for preachers on all sides; inquirers for them besiege my door, and contend for them with pious emulation. We are, however, quite exhausted; nay, we have lately been obliged to send such journeymen out of the booksellers' shops as possessed some slight tincture of learning and religious knowledge."² This fully corroborates a proclamation which appeared in the preceding reign, in which the troubles of France are ascribed to certain preachers sent from Geneva, for the most part mechanics, and men without any education.³ The warranty of being genuine Genevan seems to have counterbalanced these defects: just as a favorite mark or stamp often enables a tradesman to pass off a bad article. Another letter from a Genevese minister, named De Beaulieu, to Farel, also shows the extraordinary demand that existed at this time in France for preachers. "I can not express to you," the writer says, "what mercy God daily shows to our church. From several places, as Lyons, Nismes, Gap, Grasse, and from the neighborhoods of Orleans and Poitiers, persons are come hither demanding laborers for the new harvest. They are particularly pressing us from Tournon and the Agenois, and that, too, at the instance of their bishop; for in those parts more than three hundred parishes have abolished the mass, but are yet without a minister. The poor people cry out for hunger, but there is none to distribute to them the bread of life. It is extraordinary what multitudes attend Calvin's lectures; I should think more than a thousand daily. Viret is at work in the district of Nismes; Bolot has been sent to Mâcon-sur-Saone. I have heard it said that if from four to six thousand preachers could be sent, there would be room for them all."⁴

A flattering prospect, this, for Calvin! He was now, indeed, in the zenith of his influence and power. Not only had he triumphed over his domestic enemies, and obtained almost complete control over the little republic of Geneva, but Protestantism, modeled strictly after his own principles, seemed

¹ P. Henry, iii., 482.

² MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 483, May 24th, 1561.

³ "La plupart gens mécaniques, et de nulle littérature."—*Mémoires de Condé*, i., 9.

⁴ Ruchat, vi., p. 435. The letter is dated Oct. 3d, 1561.

on the point of prevailing throughout France. All this influence, too, he enjoyed without sharing in the dangers of the struggle; but sat at home like a sovereign, counseling his agents with his pen. The Reformed church at Paris numbered among its members some of the greatest men in France, and Calvin was invited to become its minister. But he knew how to appreciate the blessings of security and the charms of an almost absolute power; and it was, therefore, without much difficulty that he acceded to the council's request that he should remain at Geneva.

Catherine, in pursuance of her newly-adopted policy, began to treat secretly with the leaders of the Huguenots, and to show them some favor and affection; either with the view of keeping them quiet by inspiring them with false hopes, or by way of counterpoise to the power of the Guises, with whom, however, she never openly broke. By a decree of the 28th of January, 1561, all prisoners on account of religion were dismissed, and all proceedings instituted on that score abrogated; but at the same time, all controversies, as well as the use of abusive terms, such as *heretic* and *papist*, were forbidden, and all illegal meetings prohibited.¹ On the return of the young king from Rheims, where he had been consecrated on the 15th of May, 1561, Admiral Coligny presented to him the same petition which had caused such a sensation at Fontainebleau; and Catherine undertook that it should be referred to the parliament of Paris.

These proceedings on the part of the queen-mother caused a closer union among the Roman Catholic party. Jealousy toward the house of Lorraine had driven the Constable Montmorency to join the Bourbon princes, and the Chatillons, his nephews. But when he saw that the religion of the kingdom was seriously endangered by Catherine's conduct, he forgot his private animosities in his zeal for the Catholic faith, and, for the purpose of maintaining it, was induced to reconcile himself with the Guises. The Duchess of Valentinois, and the Marshal St. André, were the means of effecting this reconciliation. Expensive and prodigal, St. André had repaired his broken fortunes, in the reign of Henry II., by a share of the confiscated property of the Calvinists; and even Montmorency himself had participated in the same booty.² Thus a double motive operated on this bigoted old man, who trembled at once for his religion and for his property. It was early in 1561 that he entered into a league with the Duke of

¹ Davila, i., 138.

² Anquetil, i., 102.

Guise, and the Marshal St. André, for the purpose of supporting Roman Catholicism; and by way of solemn confirmation, the parties to it took the sacrament together on the Easter-day of that year.¹ The ramifications of this league, which obtained the name of *the Triumvirate*, extended however, beyond France. Philip II. of Spain was its declared head; and the Emperor of Germany, the Pope, and some of the Italian princes, engaged to give it their support. One of the first results obtained through its influence was the famous edict of July: which, though it protected the Huguenots from insult, and gave them an immunity for past offenses, yet, on the other hand, it forbade them the exercise of their religion, either in public or private, till a general council should have been called; and meanwhile declared the Rōman Catholic faith to be the only one permitted in the state. The Protestants, however, were strong enough to disregard this prohibition; and the court found it advisable to connive at their religious assemblies.

Coligny's indignation at these proceedings roused him to propose that the King of Navarre should be proclaimed regent in the place of the queen-mother. Alarmed at this step, the latter began to think seriously of effecting a reconciliation between the two religious parties. The demand of the Prince of Condé, and of the admiral, for a conference between the Calvinistic ministers and the prelates of France, a scheme which had been long in agitation, was now assented to by the Cardinal of Lorraine; and it was arranged that the meeting should be held at Poissy on the 10th of August. The cardinal may, perhaps, have been partly induced to take this step by Francis Baudouin, a jurisconsult of some eminence, who had once been a pupil of Calvin's but afterward became one of his bitterest opponents. This man had brought from Germany a book just published by George Cassander, containing proposals for the union of Romanists and Protestants, but of such a nature as rendered them wholly inadmissible by the latter. Baudouin, however, was patronized by the King of Navarre, who thought him just the man for the conjuncture, and introduced him to the queen-mother, and to the Cardinal of Lorraine.²

From various causes the conference was put off till the 9th

¹ Maimbourg. *Hist. du Calvinisme*, p. 196.

² Schlosser, *Leben des Th. de Beza*, p. 101. Maimbourg, p. 209. The title of Cassander's book was "*De Officio pii et publicæ Tranquillitatis vere amantis Viri in hoc Religionis Discidio*."

of September. The leaders of the Reformed party in France wished Calvin to attend it, and an application to that effect was made to the council of Geneva; but the latter would not permit Calvin to go unless hostages of the first rank were given for his safety.¹ The state of Calvin's health, too, at this period, made it unadvisable for him to undertake so long a journey; and the management of the conference was therefore intrusted to Beza. Before proceeding to Poissy, Beza went to Zurich, to persuade Peter Martyr, who was then residing at that place, to accompany him. Here also he came to an understanding with Bullinger as to the language he should use at the conference, as the latter had been displeased with his conduct at Worms. Beza set off for France without any safe-conduct, and arrived at St. Germain-en-Laye on the 23d of August. During his absence his duties at Geneva were undertaken by Calvin, and his salary was continued to his wife.²

Beza has described his reception at St. Germain, and the progress of the conference, in several letters to Calvin.³ The leaders of the Huguenot party, the King of Navarre, the Prince of Condé, and Coligny, as well as the Cardinals Bourbon and Chatillon, welcomed him warmly. On the day after his arrival he preached at the prince's hotel, to a numerous and distinguished audience. After supper, about nine o'clock, he was suddenly summoned to the chamber of the King of Navarre, where, to his great surprise, he found the queen-mother, surrounded by the Cardinals of Lorraine and Bourbon, Madame de Crussol, and others. Nothing disconcerted at this unexpected rencounter, Beza notified to the queen the cause of his coming, and expressed his desire to serve his country; to which Catherine graciously replied that it would afford her the greatest pleasure to see affairs settled on such a foundation as should secure peace and happiness to the kingdom. The Cardinal of Lorraine then addressed Beza, saying that he had made his acquaintance before from his writings, and exhorted him to use all his endeavors for the establishment of concord: adding, that he had now an opportunity to appease by his presence those tumults which, while absent, he had excited by his works. Hereupon Beza again declared his loyalty toward his king and country; and affirmed that even if it were

¹ P. Henry, iii., 499.

² "On donne les gages de M. de Bèze à sa femme, et on lui fait offrir ce dont il aura besoin quoique il soit absent."—*Régistres*, 11 Nov., 1561. Gré-nus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

³ See Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 309, et seq.

possible for a person of so small consideration as himself to create disturbance in so great a kingdom, yet that he had ever been averse to such a course, as his writings would testify, and as would be still further manifest in the course of the impending conference. Catherine then asked him if he had written any thing in French? Beza replied that he had published in that language a translation of the Psalms, and an answer to the "Confession of Faith" put forth by the Duke of Northumberland. Catherine was led to put this question because Beza had been denounced to her as the author of a libelous poem which had been circulated in France the year before; and he now, in the queen's presence, affirmed that he had had no hand in it. Catherine next inquired about Calvin's age, and state of health; after which the cardinal drew Beza into a long argument respecting the real presence in the eucharist; and then, after some gracious words addressed to Beza by the queen and by the cardinal, the party broke up. The latter afterward gave out that he had worsted Beza in argument; and a report was even spread at Poissy that he had converted him to the Romish faith.¹

The conference was opened on the 9th of September, in the refectory of the nuns of Poissy. The Reformed Church was represented on this occasion by twelve ministers and twenty-two deputies; making, with Peter Martyr, who arrived soon after Beza, thirty-five persons. Against them was arrayed all the splendor of the French court, and all the learning and authority of the French hierarchy. The young king presided, surrounded by the queen-mother, the King and Queen of Navarre, the Duke of Guise, the Cardinals of Lorraine, Tournon, Bourbon, d'Armignac, together with many bishops, prelates, doctors of the Sorbonne, and theologians convoked from the most celebrated universities of the kingdom.² The states met at Pontoise at the same time; and it required all the art of Catherine to prevent them from depriving her of the regency.

In every thing but learning Beza was probably better qualified than Calvin to conduct a conference of this description. His handsome person and noble bearing, his presence of mind and natural fluency of speech, qualified him admirably to treat with Catherine and her courtiers. With the theologians arrayed against him he was not so well fitted to cope. He had not, as we have seen, seriously applied himself to the study of divinity till after his arrival in Geneva in 1548, when he wanted time and opportunity to obtain a thorough mastery

¹ Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Epp. 309, 310.

² Davila, i., 151.

of the Fathers of the church, and of the theology of the schools ; and had, therefore, devoted himself in preference to the critical study of the Scriptures in their original languages.¹ He was himself painfully aware of his deficiency in patristic lore ; and in a letter addressed to Calvin from St. Germain before the opening of the conference, expressed his apprehension of not being able to unravel the webs of the veteran theological sophists whom he saw opposed to him, and of rebutting their quotations from the Fathers, in a manner that might not expose him to defeat before that august and learned audience.² On this head Calvin consoled him by observing that he would soon have Peter Martyr with him, the most learned of the Reformers. And as Calvin had never entertained the opinion that the conference would have any results of moment, he advised Beza to lay aside his apprehensions, and to take his word that the French prelates would never come to any serious disputation.³

The young king opened the conference with a short speech, in which he directed his chancellor to explain more at large to the meeting the reason of its being called together. The Cardinal of Tournon, who, as dean of the college of cardinals and primate of France, had the management of the debate, addressed the assembly after the chancellor, thanking the king for his speech ; after which the Reformed ministers were called in. Before he began his speech, Beza, together with the rest of the Calvinistic deputies, and such of the nobility as were inclined to their tenets, fell down upon his knees, and lifting up his hands toward heaven, pronounced the Lord's Prayer and the Protestant confession, concluding with a short prayer suited to the occasion.⁴ He then addressed the assembly in a long and labored speech, which was heard with silent attention till he came to the subject of the eucharist : but when he said, that, though the body of Christ is really partaken of in that sacrament, yet that the body is as far from the bread as heaven is from earth, a great sensation was excited among the prelates. They exclaimed that he had blasphemed ; and notwithstanding the king's presence, some made as if they would leave the hall. Cardinal Tournon demanded that he should be silenced, or that the clergy should be permitted to depart ; but this was not acceded to. The sitting was closed by a speech from that cardinal. On

¹ Schlosser, *Leben des Th. de Beza*, p. 28.

² Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 310.

⁴ Schlosser, p. 117, *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, i., 502, et. seq.

³ Ep. 313.

the following day Beza wrote a letter to the queen-mother, to explain what he had said about the eucharist. The next meeting was appointed for the 16th of September, when the Cardinal of Lorraine replied on two points; the eucharist, and the authority of the church. Claude Despence, the celebrated theologian, is said to have composed his speech for him, and sat behind him during its delivery as prompter.¹

After these two meetings the Roman Catholic party determined that the discussion should no longer be carried on before the king, nor in a public hall; but that twelve persons, selected from each side, should continue the conference in a private house. P. Martyr, who had not arrived in time for the public disputation, came to Poissy three days before the private one, which took place on the 24th of September. Beza addressed the meeting on this occasion, and was answered by Despence. When Beza was going to reply, a little White monk, named De Xaintes, interrupted him by a violent and abusive speech, in which he drew a parallel between the Protestant ministers and the Anabaptists, who pretended to be inspired by the Holy Ghost. Toward the close the Cardinal of Lorraine wanted to make the ministers sign a passage extracted from the "Confession of Wittenberg," acknowledging the real presence; and by way of enforcing his argument, produced a passage from Calvin's reply to Hesshus, in which the word *substantialiter* is used with regard to the eucharist. This was, however, a plain misapprehension of Calvin's views. At another discussion on the 26th of September, P. Martyr, not being well acquainted with French, addressed the meeting in Italian; but the Cardinal of Lorraine would not allow him to proceed in that language. Lainez, a Spaniard, and general of the Jesuits, spoke at this sitting, and protested altogether against the meeting, as unauthorized. His speech, which lasted an hour, was nothing but a heap of abuse. Yet it had the intended effect: for the conference was subsequently reduced to five managers on each side; and thus gradually dwindling away, it finally broke up on the 13th of October, and, as Calvin had predicted, without coming to any result.

Nevertheless, the conference of Poissy gave an impulse to the Reformed party in France. They took heart, and began to preach openly; nay, they even got possession of some churches; a proceeding which Calvin² seems to have disap-

¹ *Hist. des Egl. Réf.*, i., 525.

² "The occupation of the churches is odious to the king's council; nor indeed have I ever approved of the proceeding till some public settlement

proved of, as impolitic. The countenance shown them by Catherine herself helped to encourage them. A Catholic writer even considers it doubtful whether she may not have really felt some inclination toward their tenets at this time, through the influence of her confidantes, Jacqueline, Duchess of Montpensier, and Frances, Duchess of Usez, two declared Huguenots, who were continually speaking to her in favor of Calvin's reform : as well as by the example of Margaret and Jeanne, the two Queens of Navarre, and of Renée, Duchess of Ferrara, and Margaret, Duchess of Savoy.¹ From a letter of Catherine's to the Bishop of Rennes, she does not appear to have been very well satisfied with the conduct of her prelates at Poissy ; and even spoke but coldly of the speech of the Cardinal of Lorraine.² But, whatever may have been her real feelings, her conduct toward the Huguenots at this juncture, even if it was merely the effect of a temporizing policy, had the same influence in encouraging them as if it had been sincere.

Upon the dissolution of the assembly of Poissy, Beza prepared for his departure ; but the queen detained him, saying that he was a Frenchman, and that she stood in need of his assistance to quell, if possible, the disturbances which afflicted the kingdom.³ We find Calvin writing to him on the 21st of October, and expressing a wish for his speedy return, as he was himself too ill to undertake his duties at the school, which had now been neglected for a whole month.⁴ The council, too, seems to have been anxious for his presence, as not only the school, but the affairs of the church also were falling into disorder, for want of effectual superintendence.⁵ But when Calvin found that Beza might be of more use in France than at Geneva, he advised him to remain.⁶ The leaders of the Huguenots were also desirous of retaining Beza ; and in December we find the Queen of Navarre, Condé, and the admi-

should be come to, which I hope will be in a short time."—Calvin to Farel, Sept. 28th, 1561, *apud* P. Henry, iii., 519.

¹ Maimbourg, *Hist. du Calv.*, p. 190.

² "Que les ministres Reformés avoient présenté au colloque de Poissy leur confession de foi et leurs rémonstrances ou preuves ; qu'elle avoit espéré que Messieurs les Prélats y répondroient, mais qu'elle avoit attendu long temps sans voir d'autre réponse que celle du Cardinal de Lorraine, qui étoit fort prudente et catholique, dont son dit ambassadeur pourroit faire telle part à l'Empereur qu'il jugeroit à propos."—Basnage, *Eglises Réf.*, ii., 431.

³ Schlosser, p. 147.

⁴ Ep. 324.

⁵ See Calvin's letter to Beza, MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 521.

⁶ At this time Calvin corresponded with him under the assumed name of Passelius.

ral, soliciting and obtaining the consent of the council of Geneva, that he should be spared to them a few months longer, with a view to the advancement of religion.¹

Under these circumstances Calvinism seemed about to make a rapid progress in France. Beza obtained permission to preach in public; and on the day after Christmas-day, delivered two discourses to numerous congregations; one in the Fauxbourg St. Antoine, and the other in that of St. Marcel. D'Andelot, at the head of a numerous band, escorted Beza through the streets of Paris on these occasions; to the surprise of the Roman Catholics, who assembled in great numbers, but did not venture to make any opposition. They resolved, however, to get up a disturbance if the preaching was repeated. A day or two afterward a minister named Malot was appointed to deliver a sermon in the Fauxbourg St. Marcel. Beza had heard of the intention of the Catholics to make this an occasion for violence and riot, and had at first determined not to be present; but on hearing that a large congregation of Protestants had assembled, it appeared to him that his absence might be construed into a dereliction of duty. He therefore went, escorted, by command of the queen-mother, by the prefect of the watch and his men. Scarcely had Malot begun his discourse, when the priests in the neighboring church of St. Médard commenced ringing the bells with all their might, as if about to say vespers. One of Malot's congregation, who civilly requested them to desist, was run through the body with a partisan. This was the signal for a general affray. The priests sounded the tocsin to call the people to arms. After a desperate conflict, the Huguenots, led by the prefect of the watch, succeeded in taking the church by assault. Thirty six of the Roman Catholics were captured, and among them ten priests, most of whom had been wounded. They were conducted through the city to prison, amid a crowd of people who looked on quietly. On the following day there was another tumult in which several of the Romanists fell. In a letter to Calvin in which he describes these proceedings, Beza professes not to approve of them, but nevertheless gives God thanks for the victory.²

In January, 1562, there was another conference on a smaller scale at St. Germain's. On this occasion the Protestants were represented by Beza, Marlorat, Peruscel, Burbaste, and a minister of the Queen of Navarre. The chief person on the

¹ *Régistres*, 22 Dec., *apud* Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

² Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Ep. 329.

other side was the Cardinal of Tournon, who was supported by a great many doctors of the Sorbonne, Jesuits, &c. Catherine was present, with the cardinals and privy council. Like that of Poissy, however, this meeting led to no result. As there appeared no chance of agreement even on the first head of discussion, which regarded images, and which seemed to be the plainest, the queen-mother broke up the conference. Beza describes her as listening to these debates with the greatest patience, and as exhorting both sides to concord.¹

After the conference of Poissy, Catherine had been advised to call an assembly of notables, with a view to the publication of, at least, some provisional edict by which the religious troubles might be appeased. This step was violently opposed by the Guises and their party, who were perhaps fearful lest such an assembly might inquire into their former government. They insisted that the edict of July should remain in force: but when they found the queen resolute in calling this assembly, the Catholic leaders quitted the court in dudgeon, and retired to their country seats.² The assembly, composed of the presidents and counselors of the parliaments of France, met at St. Germain. The result of their deliberations was the famous decree known as the Edict of January, from its being dated on the 17th of that month, 1562.³ The Chancellor l'Hôpital has the credit of having carried its provisions, by his eloquence, which were in substance: That all the penalties contained in former edicts against the Protestants should be provisionally suspended, till the determination of a general council; that they should be permitted to have divine service during the day-time in the suburbs of towns, but not in the towns themselves; and that all magistrates should be directed not to interfere with them. On the other hand they were forbidden to come armed to their conventicles, gentlemen excepted, who had that privilege every where: they were commanded to evacuate the churches of which they had taken possession, and to restore all the ornaments and sacred utensils which they had despoiled: and they were also forbidden to oppose the collection of tithes, to levy troops, or to raise any contributions among themselves, except what might be necessary for the subsistence of their ministers.

By this edict the expectations of the Huguenots were raised to a very high pitch. After its promulgation Peter Ramus,

¹ Calvin, *Epp. et Resp.*, Epp. 331, 332.

² *Hist. des Églises Réf.*, i., 667.

³ Or 1561, style of France.

the celebrated opponent of the Aristotelian philosophy, overthrew at mid-day, in spite of its provisions, all the images in the chapel attached to the college of Presle, of which he was principal.¹ Even Calvin himself, who, as we have seen, had not been at all sanguine that any thing would be obtained from the French court, began to entertain hopes of the ultimate success of his cause. The liberty of preaching unmolested was indeed a most important concession; and it was not unnatural for him to expect that the errors of the old religion must speedily yield to the constant attacks of the Protestant ministers. Thus we find him writing to Sturm, in March, 1562: "If the liberty promised in this edict be maintained, Popedom must fall of its own accord."² But how short-sighted are the views even of the wisest men! The very measure which promised to bring about the triumph of Protestantism in France proved the immediate cause of the civil wars which followed; and which, after many years of bloodshed, resulted only in establishing the supremacy of the Roman Catholic faith.

In the nicely balanced state to which parties were now reduced in France, the fate of religion seemed in a great measure to hang on the conduct of one man—the King of Navarre. Weak, sensual, and wholly devoid of firmness and consistency of character, though not deficient in personal courage, the vacillating conduct of Anthony alternately excited the hopes and fears of both parties. From a letter of Calvin's to Bullinger, in May, 1561, we find that even then Calvin placed no reliance on that prince, though ostensibly a convert to his principles, and though his interests naturally made him an opponent of the Guises. In this letter Calvin says: "Faithless and inconstant, the King of Navarre is as slothful and flexible as he is liberal of his promises. Though he now and then discovers some sparks of manly resolution, which promise to burst into a flame, they soon become extinct. He is no more to be trusted than a prevaricator in a court of law. He is, moreover, a slave to his pleasures; and a certain matron (Catherine), skilled in such arts, has gotten him completely in her power, by means of one of her women. The story is known to the very boys. I have reprehended him for his conduct just as I should a private individual of my flock; and Beza has treated him quite as unceremoniously. But he thinks it a discharge in full for his conscience if he swal-

¹ Maimbourg, p. 249.

² MS Bern, *apud* P. Henry, iii., 523.

lows our objurgations patiently, and without falling into a passion."¹

The lady whom Catherine employed to subdue the King of Navarre was Mademoiselle la Beraudière, one of her maids of honor, whose knight he called himself. His attentions to this lady, after his wound at the siege of Rouen, are said to have been the cause of his death.² Catherine employed the same means of seduction with other leaders of both parties; and for this purpose chose her maids of honor, not merely for their personal charms, but also for their shrewdness and address. Condé, the Duke of Guise, and several others, were not proof against these arts: Coligny was almost the only one who resisted them successfully. Condé is said not to have abandoned one of his numerous mistresses, on account of his adopting the evangelical religion. He, like his brother Anthony, sometimes stood in need of admonitions from Geneva; but probably the more decided character of that prince, and his indispensableness to the Calvinistic cause, occasioned them to be administered with more reserve and gentleness. There is extant a joint letter of Calvin and Beza to Condé, in which his *foible* is handled very tenderly:³ and, indeed, Beza was not exactly the person to lecture on such a topic.

It was the aim of the Triumvirate to detach the King of Navarre from the Huguenot party, in which they at length succeeded. It would be difficult to assign Anthony's real motives for deserting the Calvinists. We can hardly believe that he was allured by the baits which the Triumvirate held out to him; one of which was the hand and kingdom of Mary, Queen of Scots, the niece of the Guises. Anthony could not accept this proposal without divorcing his wife, Jeanne d'Albret; and from this step, in spite of his licentiousness, either his love or his conscience deterred him. Another inducement offered was, that the King of Spain should give him the island of Sardinia, in place of his lost kingdom of Navarre.⁴ But if this was ever seriously proposed, it certainly never took effect. Roman Catholic writers assert, that he was dissatisfied with the arguments of the Protestant ministers at Poissy, and with the differences of

¹ MS. Bern., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 490.

² Lacratelle, ii., 103.

³ As in the following passage: "Nous n'estimons pas qu'il y ait du mal où Dieu ne soit directement offensé; mais qu'on orra dire que vous faites l'amour aux dames, cela est pour déroger beaucoup à votre autorité et réputation. Les bons en seront offensés, les malins en seront leur risée," &c.—MS. Par., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 496.

⁴ Davila, i., 156.

opinion manifested by them on points of faith and doctrine.¹ There does not seem to be any foundation for this assertion, or for thinking that his religious convictions, though never, perhaps, very strong, were actually shaken; for in his last moments he appears to have given tokens of the faith which apparently he had abandoned.² It is true, however, that he made the proceedings at Poissy a pretext for joining the Triumvirate, and ascribed his conversion to the eloquence of the Cardinal of Lorraine;³ though probably his real motive may have been jealousy of his brother Condé, who enjoyed the headship of the Huguenot party, to which Anthony thought himself entitled by priority of birth and rank. It may be, too, that the prospect of the throne, to which the delicate health of the royal children offered him no distant chance of succeeding, had some influence on his conduct; as, in such an event he might have found his religious principles embarrassing.

The news of Anthony's apostasy excited the deepest indignation at Geneva. As he had been persuaded, on his return to the Roman Catholic Church, to make a solemn declaration at Rome against the Reformed faith, Calvin reproved him with freedom and severity in a letter, of which the following may serve as a specimen: "Sire, if, in case any poor man of lowly condition pretends to consent that the name of God shall be blasphemed, religion insulted, and the poor church trodden under foot, he is made to confess that the word of truth is not in his mouth; what shall be done with you, sire, who are in such authority, honor, and station, if, flattery apart, you come to reckon with Him from whom you hold all? Truly it would be cowardice in me to connive in silence at that particular act which hath engendered so much scandal among people of all conditions: I mean, sire, that unhappy harangue made on your part at Rome, which makes those good men who have any zeal for God's glory, and for your majesty's good name, blush, weep, groan, and almost burst for grief. Truly, sire, you can not strive too much to incline your heart in a quite opposite direction, till so great a fault be expiated before God and man. Your enemies seem inclined, by printing such filth, to triumph in the odium you have incurred by it. You can not make any acceptable offering to God for your absolution. And what would it profit, though all the world should be given to you, when you

¹ Davila, i., 156.

² Lacratelle, ii., 103.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 40

do homage to him who has no power but for evil ?”¹ The Queen of Navarre, however, always remained firm in the Protestant faith. After the defection of her husband, whom Beza branded with the name of Julian, she retired into Bearn, where she brought up the young prince her son, afterward Henry IV., in the Reformed principles ; so that Calvin’s influence may be said to have extended to him.

The publication of the edict of January, and the apostasy of the King of Navarre, served to bring matters to a crisis. Condé had a strong force at his disposal in Paris ; and, in order to get rid of him, Anthony wrote to the Duke of Guise, who was at his seat at Joinville, to join him in the metropolis. Guise set off with two squadrons of horse, and followed by a numerous body of dependents. Unfortunately his road lay through Vassy. It was Sunday, the 1st of March, and a congregation of Protestants, to the number of 1000 or 1200, had assembled in a barn outside the town, as they were permitted to do by the edict, to celebrate the Lord’s Supper. The scene that ensued has been differently related. Roman Catholic writers affirm that some of Guise’s soldiers had strayed to the spot from curiosity ; that a tumult having ensued, Guise, attracted thither by the noise, was struck on the cheek by a stone flung by one of the congregation ; and that his followers, irritated by this insult to their chief, immediately fell upon the Huguenots.² But the suspicious fact will ever remain, of an armed body of men coming into sudden collision with a defenseless multitude engaged in their devotions, and therefore not likely to have been the aggressors. A dreadful slaughter ensued. Forty-four persons were killed outright, and one hundred and sixteen were wounded, many of whom died of the injuries they received. During this carnage, the Cardinal of Lorraine stood outside the barn. When it was over, the duke brought him a large book which had been found, and asked him what it was. On the cardinal replying that it was the Bible : “ What !” cried Guise, “ the Scriptures ? It is 1500 years since they were made ; and these books were printed only a year ago. *Par la mort Dieu, tout n’en vaut rien !*”³ Guise sent for the mayor of Vassy, and blamed him for allowing the Huguenots to assemble. The mayor pleaded the edict. “ Detestable edict !” cried the duke, drawing his sword, “ it is with *this* that I will break

¹ MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 490. Ruchat. vii., 390.

² Davila, i., 168.

³ *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, i., 725.

it."¹ From that moment the religious wars may be said to have commenced.

The Huguenots convened a meeting to consider of the conduct of the Guises, the violation of the edict, and the massacre of Vassy. Beza and another were deputed to remonstrate against these proceedings with Catherine, who was at that time, with the young king, at Monceaux, in La Brie. She received them graciously, and said she did not think that the Duke of Guise would persist in going to Paris. But the King of Navarre, who was present, flew into a violent rage, and charged the Huguenots with going armed to their conventicles. Beza replied that arms, in the hands of the wise, are guarantees of peace, and that the affair of Vassy showed how necessary they were for the church, unless other means were provided for its safety, to which he humbly supplicated the attention of the King of Navarre, in whom the church, up to that time, had reposed so much hope. The Cardinal of Ferrara, the Pope's legate, here interposed, and alluded to the riot at St. Médard; but Beza, who had been an eye-witness of that affair, silenced him by relating the real facts of it. Beza, continuing to demand justice against Guise, the King of Navarre declared that he should consider him who touched a finger of the duke's as committing an assault on his own body. Nothing daunted, however, Beza proceeded with his harangue. He represented that the way of justice was the way of God; that kings were the debtors of their subjects, and that to demand justice could not possibly be an injury to any body; and as the King of Navarre had excused Guise by alleging that he could not restrain the fury of his people, when they saw him attacked with stones, Beza, after representing that the duke might have contented himself with informing against those who had done so, concluded with these words; "It belongs, indeed, sire, to the church of God, in whose name I speak, to endure blows and not to give them. But may it please you also to remember, that it is an anvil that has worn out many a hammer."²

In spite of this bold speech, Beza got safely back to Paris, but his situation there now became exceedingly critical. Writing to Martyr, in March, 1562, Calvin says: "Through the perfidy and wickedness of Julian (*i. e.*, Anthony), Beza, with many others, was near being dragged to execution lately; but God

¹ Lacratelle, *Guerres de Rel.*, ii., 65.

² *Hist des Eglises Réf.*, ii., 3. For the original edition of which work the words just cited suggested a frontispiece.

miraculously frustrated this wicked attempt. And though that apostate hath called the Guises to court, to try the last and most desperate measures, yet our friend Beza hopes that these will not only be in vain, but that the church will gain such strength as to prevent its enemies from attempting any thing against it hereafter. The first conflicts, however, will be fearful."¹ Such were the hopes that animated the Calvinists.

Although Catherine had written to Guise to suspend his march upon Paris, he nevertheless entered that city at the head of his troops, on the 20th of March, accompanied by the constable, and the Marshal St. André. The Parisian populace, which had never regarded the Protestants with favor, received him with shouts of *Vive Guise!* and with every demonstration of joy. On the same afternoon Condé had gone to a house called Jerusalem, in the Faubourg St. Jaques, to hear a Huguenot sermon, and in returning through the city, followed by 700 or 800 horse, fell in with Guise and his troops. A collision was expected, but the two chiefs saluted one another, and passed on their way.² At this critical juncture, Condé committed two irretrievable errors. The first of these was his evacuation of Paris, by which he left that important place in the possession of his enemies. The second was, that, instead of seizing the persons of the king and of the queen-mother, as he might have done, he stopped short at Meaux, and contented himself with sending a message to Catherine, to know her pleasure. Guise's conduct was more stirring and decisive. No sooner had Condé quitted Paris, than he posted guards at all the gates, and began to levy troops in the city. With the concurrence of the King of Navarre, he forced Catherine and the young king to go to Melun, where they were lodged in the castle, which for a century had been used only as a prison; but after a short time they were brought to Paris. The constable secured the fidelity of that city, by deposing his son, Marshal Montmorency, from the governorship, which he intrusted to Cardinal Bourbon. For a few days after Guise's occupation of Paris, the Protestant worship was not entirely suppressed. But on the 5th of April the constable, at the head of 200 men, and followed by the mob, proceeded to the meeting-house called Jerusalem, near the Porte St. Jaques, where he vented his fury by overthrowing the pulpit, and burning the benches; and in the afternoon repeated the same conduct at a house outside the Porte St. Antoine. These ex-

¹ MS. Par., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 526.

² *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, ii., 4.

plots, which gained him the nick-name of "Captain *Brûle-Bancs*," were the signal for all sorts of license on the part of the populace, who pillaged and murdered the unfortunate Huguenots without mercy.¹

Meanwhile Condé had occupied Orleans. A civil war was now inevitable, and both parties prepared for it by manifestoes and declarations. On the 7th of April, Condé addressed letters to the different Huguenot congregations, requiring contributions of men and money; and on the following day published a proclamation, in which he notified that his only motive in taking up arms was to uphold the authority of the king and of his edicts, and to restore him to liberty. Many of the chief towns of France declared for the Huguenots, as Rouen, Dieppe, Havre de Grace, Angers, Potiers, Tours, Blois, and others; and among them the important city of Lyons; an event which the preaching of Viret had been very instrumental in producing.² Condé wrote to the Genevese to request their prayers for the success of his cause; and not only were these constantly offered up during the continuance of the war, but Condé's camp was plentifully supplied with ministers from Geneva.

Beza was the soul of the Calvinistic party. He caused a synod to assemble at Orleans on the 27th of April, which was attended by Condé, Coligny, and other leaders of the Huguenots. For this meeting Calvin himself drew up a confession of faith, to be presented, in the name of the French Reformed churches, to Charles V., who was at that time holding a diet at Frankfurt. At this synod appeared Calvin's old opponent Bolsec, who had once more taken it into his head to reconcile himself with the Reformed party; but finding matters not quite so tranquil as he expected, he again gave them the slip.³

An attempt was made to avert the impending war by an interview between the queen-mother and Condé, in which the latter insisted that the edict of January should be maintained, and that Guise, the constable, and the Marshal St. André, should retire to their homes: he, on his part, undertaking to do the like.⁴ But this and other attempts proved abortive. On the 27th of June, Condé returned to the Huguenot camp, and prepared for the approaching struggle.

It does not belong to this subject to detail the campaign that ensued. Three incidents chiefly served to bring it to a close: the death of the King of Navarre from a wound received at the siege of Rouen; the overthrow and capture of Condé

¹ *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, ii., 12.

² *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, ii., 34.

³ P. Henry, iii., 527.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ii., 77.

in the battle of Dreux, fought on the 19th of December, 1562; and shortly afterward, the assassination of the Duke of Guise by Poltrot.

On the eve of the battle of Dreux, Beza addressed and encouraged the soldiery; and during the actual conflict performed in the first ranks all the functions of an ensign.¹ The battle was obstinately contested for seven hours. The Marshal St. André was slain; and Condé and Montmorency, the generals of either side, taken prisoners. Misery, it is said, makes us acquainted with strange bed-fellows. Condé, after his capture, was led to the quarters of the Duke of Guise, in a village near the field of battle; and so wretched was the accommodation, that these two capital enemies not only dined at the same table, but shared the same bed: an incident which reminds us that the days of chivalry were not yet wholly departed. Though the overthrow of the Huguenots was complete, Coligny managed to save the remnant of the army by a well-conducted retreat upon Lyons.

At the beginning of the following year Guise laid siege to Orleans, into which town D'Andelot had thrown himself, and which the admiral was marching to relieve. The war might have been protracted for some time longer, when an unlooked for event removed the only obstacle to a peace. Guise, whom the victory of Dreux had placed in a position to dictate to the court, and who had extorted from Catherine the post of commandant-general of the king's armies, fell by the hands of an assassin on the 24th of February, 1563. He had been giving orders for an assault on the bridge of Orleans, to be made on the following day, and was returning to his quarters unarmed, when he was shot in the back by Poltrot, a gentleman of Angoumois.² He lingered for a few days without hope of recovery: the wound was deep, and the balls poisoned. On his death-bed Guise displayed all the qualities of a hero. He showed much anxiety to clear himself from the charge of having authorized the massacre at Vassy; and his last words were employed in recommending peace.

After the murder, Poltrot, in the agitation natural to a guilty conscience, lost his way; and after roaming about all night, in the morning fell in with some of Guise's troops, by whom he was captured. On being put to the torture, the assassin confessed his guilt; and named several of the Huguenot party, particularly Coligny and Beza, by whom he

¹ Schlosser, p. 169. Calvin to Bullinger, Jan. 16th, 1563, MS. Gen., *apud* P. Henry, iii., 533.

² Davila, i., 259.

affirmed that he had been incited to commit the crime. That the murder of Guise had been long contemplated by some of the Calvinists, appears from a letter of Calvin's to the Duchess of Ferrara; in which he says that, even before the war broke out, some resolute persons had determined on taking the duke's life, and had been diverted from their project only by his exhortations.¹ Calvin himself was in the habit of *praying for him*; but it was after a singular fashion. "And for myself," says he, in the letter just referred to, "though I have always besought God to have mercy on him, yet at the same time I have frequently desired that the Lord would lay his hand upon him, and deliver his church from him, if it was not his will to convert him."² In his examination Poltrot deposed that Beza, and another minister, had asked him if he was willing to take up his cross, as the Saviour had done for us; and told him that he would be the happiest man in the world if he would carry out the enterprise which the admiral had mentioned to him: for that he would deliver the world of a tyrant, and gain paradise by the deed. Beza denied rather happily that he could have used such words: saying that he was not so ill instructed in Scripture as to misapply it in the way imputed to him; and still less to say that men gain paradise by their works.³ He admits, however, having desired the death of Guise, like Calvin; and it appears that, when Orleans was closely pressed by the duke, Beza said, in one of his sermons, that he who should kill him in combat would perform an heroic action.⁴ Considering the many fanatical spirits that were then abroad, it may be left to casuists to decide how far such indirect hints differed from open exhortations to murder. At all events it is certain that the Calvinists openly rejoiced in the act, as a salutary and sacred one. They compared Poltrot to Judith; and Coligny offered up a solemn thanksgiving for Guise's death, which he scrupled not to avow that he regarded as one of the greatest blessings to the kingdom, to the church of God, and particularly to himself, and to his family.⁵ Such conduct and such avowals are but too striking instances of the rancor proverbially accompanying religious animosity; and they inspire still deeper feelings of horror and disgust, when we find them

¹ Ruchat, vii., 410.

² "Et de moy, combien que j'ay toujours prié Dieu de luy faire merci, si est-ce que j'ay souvent désiré que Dieu mit la main sur luy, pour en délivrer son église, s'il ne le vouloit convertir."—*Ibid.*

³ *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, ii., 299.

⁴ Schlosser, p. 170.

⁵ *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, ii., 309.

justified, in cold blood, by such a writer as Basnage, from the example of the Prophets and early Christians.¹ The conduct of the rough and unlettered Guise himself on a similar occasion, according to an anecdote related of him by Montaigne, on the authority of Anyot, presents us with an agreeable contrast. During the siege of Rouen a man was brought to him who had attempted his assassination. When Guise asked him his motives for the attempt, the man replied that he had been told it would be a work of piety. "I will show you, then," cried the duke, "how much gentler my religion is than yours. Yours prompts you to kill me without a hearing: mine commands me to pardon you, convicted as you are of having sought to slay me without a cause."²

But whatever share the Calvinists may have had in the assassination of Guise—and we have seen that they at all events desired it, and rejoiced at it—the act was in reality as impolitic, and as injurious to their cause, as it was detestable in itself. By his death, Catherine was delivered from a power she had always dreaded, and from the necessity of courting the opposite party in order to counterbalance it. She now sought to conciliate her prisoner Condé, who, weary of his long confinement, and eager to partake in the pleasures of the court was not backward in meeting her advances. It is said that she employed Baudouin, the hated opponent of Calvin and Beza, to preach indifferentism to him;³ but Condé's ambition was probably a stronger incentive to the conduct he adopted than the lectures of Baudouin. The death of his brother and of the Duke of Guise opened out to him a fair prospect of placing himself at the head of affairs; and in the absence of the admiral, and of Beza, Condé concluded a peace in which the interests of the Huguenots were almost entirely neglected. At first, indeed, he wished to make the edict of January the basis of the treaty; but the constable, with whom he negotiated it, at once rejected the proposition.⁴ The peace was signed at Orleans on the 12th of March, 1563; and on the 19th of the same month, appeared the edict of Amboise, regulating the exercise of religion among the Huguenots. The edict of January had allowed

¹ "S'il (Bèza) prioit afin que ce prince se convertit, où que le royaume en fût délivré, il avoit pour ses garans, les prophètes, les premiers Chrétiens, et les âmes des martyrs, qui sous l'autel de Dieu demandent: 'Quand sera-ce que tu vengeras nôtre sang de la main de ceux qui l'ont répandu?'" —*Hist. de la Religion des Eglises Réf.*, ii., 200.

² See Lacratelle, ii., 107.

³ P. Henry, iii., 535.

⁴ *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, ii., 278.

them to assemble for worship in any part of the kingdom, provided it was outside of towns; the present one restricted that privilege to those towns they held possession of on the 7th of March. It likewise placed restrictions on the exercise of their religion in rural districts; though, by way of compensation, a town was appointed in every bailiwick depending immediately on the parliaments, outside of which they were allowed to hold their conventicles.¹

Coligny arrived at Orleans on the 23d of March, after the peace had been concluded. When informed of its provisions, he expressed much displeasure, and pointed out, that, at the beginning of the war, the Triumvirate had offered to adopt the edict of January, provided that Paris were excepted from its operation. He affirmed that more churches had been ruined by this single stroke of the pen, than could have been overthrown in ten years by force of arms.² But the matter was now past remedying.

The peace of Orleans put an end to the first civil war, and Calvin did not live to see the second. Beza now returned to Geneva, where his presence was much required, as the ill state of Calvin's health prevented him from effectively discharging the extra duties which had devolved upon him.³ It appears from an entry in the Registers of Geneva, on the 7th of May, 1563, that Beza received the public thanks of the heads of the Calvinist party in France, for his services in that country.⁴

¹ The edict will be found, *Hist. des Eglises Réf.*, ii., p. 283.

² *Ibid.*, p. 335.

³ Schlosser, p. 176.

⁴ P. Henry, iii., 537.

CHAPTER XV.

Controversy with Baudouin—Tract against De Saconay—Answer to Hesshus—Calvin's last Illness—Interview with the Council—Exhortation to the Ministers—His Death—Will—Beza's Character of Calvin—Another Estimate—His Literary Merits—Conclusion.

THE two or three last years of Calvin's life were marked by those theological controversies which had characterized his literary career from its beginning. In the preceding chapter, there was occasion to mention the name of Baudouin (Balduinus) as one of his opponents. The history of Calvin's connection and dispute with that person was as follows :

After the death of his wife, Calvin's house became the resort of several young men, to whom he was in the habit of dictating his works and letters. Among these was François Baudouin, a native of Arras, in whom Calvin seems to have taken a peculiar interest. He asked him to his table, interested himself in his education, and admitted him to his library, where Baudouin had free access to all Calvin's books and papers. After talking of a journey to France, Baudouin suddenly disappeared from Geneva, and with him some of Calvin's papers, which he must have selected, in order to use them in the attack which he seems to have been already meditating. They consisted of letters from Bucer to Calvin, in which the latter was blamed in no measured terms.¹

In France, Baudouin, as already related, ingratiated himself with King Anthony, and it was by the command of that prince that he went into Germany, in order to consult with Cassander. The result was his presenting, at the conference of Poissy, Cassander's project for a union. This tract was printed at Basle, and Calvin immediately suspected that it was the production of Baudouin himself. In a letter to Beza at Poissy, dated on the 10th of September, 1561, Calvin says : "Snares are laid for you to set aside the discussion of the business in hand, and throw all into confusion. It is for this

¹ P. Henry, iii., 550. Baudouin affirmed that in one of these letters Bucer had said that Calvin knew no medium in his love or hatred. But this seems to have been an invention of Baudouin's, though Bucer undoubtedly reproached Calvin with his morosity.—See Calvin, *Responsio*, &c., *Opera*, viii., p. 315, B., and 318, A., Amst. ed.

purpose that little book was published at Basle, of which I suspect, nay, am almost certain, that Baudouin is the author. I should like to answer the scoundrel as he deserves; but I am overwhelmed with my private correspondence, and the little alacrity that remained to me is growing cold and feeble. Yet I will do what I can."¹ The result of this resolution was, that before the close of the year Calvin published his "Answer to a certain Trimming Mediator;"² a severe and caustic attack upon Baudouin, who, though he was not named in the book, was clearly pointed out as Calvin's former guest and assistant, and characterized as a cheat. Baudouin defended himself in the appendix to a work entitled "A Commentary on the Laws respecting Libel and Calumniators;" of which he now gave a new edition, and in which Calvin was loaded with abuse. To this, Calvin replied very bitterly in his "Answer to the Reproaches of Baudouin,"³ though it must be allowed that on this occasion such a tone was more than ordinarily justified by the conduct of his opponent. Yet he was himself perfectly aware that he had exceeded the bounds of moderation, and in a letter to Beza remarks: "Weariness makes me repent of the labor I have undertaken, and in reading my book you will perceive that I have been exacerbated by the indignities offered me. If I did not already compassionate your multifarious occupations, I should like to see the beast depicted by your pencil also."⁴ Baudouin, among other things, had reproached Calvin with the death of Servetus, to which he replies: "Perhaps Castellio obtained from him, as a pledge of friendship, that he should patronize the cause of Servetus. That man, indeed, suffered the penalty due to his heresies, but was it by my will? Certainly his arrogance destroyed him not less than his impiety. And what crime was it of mine if our council, at my exhortation, indeed, but in conformity with the opinion of several churches, took vengeance on his execrable blasphemies? Let Baudouin abuse me as long as he will, provided that, by the judgment of Melancthon, posterity owe me a debt of gratitude for having purged the church of so pernicious a monster."⁵ And a little further on, in answer to Baudouin's taunts, Calvin thus speaks of his way of life: "I will not enumerate the pleasures, conveniences, and riches I have renounced for Christ. I will only

¹ Ep. 313.

² *Calvini Responsio ad versipellem quemdam Mediatorem*; and also in French, *Réponse à un certain Moyenneur rusé*.

³ *Johannis Calvinii Responsio ad Balduini Convicia*, Geneva, 1562.

⁴ MS. Par., apud P. Henry, iii., 559.

⁵ *Responsio*, &c., p. 319, B.

say that, had I the disposition of Baudouin, it would not have been very difficult for me to procure those things, which he has always sought in vain, and which he now but too greedily gloats upon. But let that pass. Content with my humble fortune, my attention to frugality has prevented me from being a burden to any body. I remain tranquil in my station; and have even given up a part of the moderate salary assigned to me, instead of asking for any increase. I devote all my care, labor, and study, not only to the service of this church, to which I am peculiarly bound, but to the assistance of all the churches, by every means in my power. I so discharge my office of a teacher, that no ambition may appear in my extreme faithfulness and diligence. I devour numerous griefs, and endure the rudeness of many; but my liberty is uncontrolled by the power of any man. I do not indulge the great by flattery; I fear not to give offense; no prosperity has hitherto inflated me; while I have intrepidly borne the many severe storms by which I have been tossed, till by the singular mercy of God I emerged from them. I live affably with my equals, and endeavor faithfully to discharge my friendships."¹

Such was the picture which Calvin drew of his own life, many of the particulars of which can not be controverted; though it might, perhaps, have displayed better taste to have left them to be recounted by another. Baudouin rejoined: but Calvin had grown weary of the contest, and Beza now continued it for him, as Calvin had requested in the letter before cited. Beza's tract appeared at Geneva in 1563, under the title of "The Answer of Th. Beza to the Book of Fr. Baudouin, the Ecebolian Apostate." Beza gave him this name after Ecebolius, the ancient vicar of Bray, who changed his faith with every new emperor: no inappropriate appellation if indeed Baudouin, as is said, altered his religion no fewer than seven times.² This versatility, however, does not seem to have prejudiced him in the profession of the law. He possessed great talent as a juriconsult, and taught with much applause at Bourges, Strasburgh, Heidelberg, and Douay. Though Calvin prefixed a letter to Beza's Reply, in which he declared that he would take no further part in the dispute, yet Baudouin was determined to have the last word, and published a rejoinder.

About the same time Calvin wrote his "Gratulation to the Venerable Priest Dom. Gabriel de Saconay, Precentor of

¹ *Responsio*, &c., *Opera*, viii., 321, A.

² See Bayle, art. *Baudouin*.

Lyons." De Saconay had published a new edition of a part of Henry VIII.'s work against Luther on the "Seven Sacraments," which he accompanied with a vain and boastful preface, in which he reflected upon the nocturnal meetings of the Huguenots for prayer, and also reproached Beza with his want of chastity. According to Calvin's account, the conduct of De Saconay himself by no means afforded a pattern of that virtue; and the way in which Calvin exposed his amorous foibles shows that he was far from deficient in wit and humor when he chose to exert them. A tone of levity pervades the piece which puts it almost on a level with those *facetiae* of Poggio and others, with which it had been forbidden to defile the ears of the faithful of Geneva. Calvin's jokes, however, are intermixed with some grim reproofs; and the object of his chastisement is plainly told that, had he been one of his flock, his vices would long ago have rendered his carcase food for the crows.¹

A little before these tracts, which have been mentioned first as connected with the subject of the preceding chapter, Calvin had been again plunged into a controversy with the Lutheran zealots, on the subject of the eucharist. After his controversy with Westphal, the Saxon clergy, of the faction of Flaccius Illyricus, had even gone so far as to talk of excommunicating Calvin.² In 1559, this party procured from John Frederick, Elector of Saxony, a condemnation of the Zwinglian and Calvinistic doctrine respecting the Lord's Supper, to which, in October of that year, Melancthon published an answer, in which he showed that the Calvinistic theory could be refuted neither from Scripture, nor from the most ancient Fathers; but, on the other hand, with the timidity which always characterized him, he did not declare himself against the Lutheran view, but let both remain, as if they were not repugnant.³ Melancthon's death, which took place on the 19th of April, 1560, gave a new stimulus to the Flaccian, or bigoted Lutheran party, and especially to those of Jena. Shortly after that event they addressed a petition to John Frederick, in which they requested him to convoke a synod for the condemnation of the adiaphorists, the synergists, the Osiandrists, and sacramentaries. They demanded that none should be admitted to this synod who did not belong to the Confession of Augsburg, and that the Zwinglians should not

¹ *Gratulatio*, &c., *Opera*, viii., 321, B., Amst. ed.

² Calvin to Farel, *M.S. Gen.*, *apud* P. Henry, iii., 334.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 337, note.

only be excluded from it, but even anathematized.¹ Meanwhile Calvin was attacked by several of these, as he was wont to call them, apes of Luther. In his tract against Tileman Hesshus, he mentions, besides that person, Staphylus and Nicholas Gallus among his assailants. But of these the most violent, as well as the most able, was Hesshus, a man of a turbulent character, who is said to have been deposed no fewer than seven times from different offices that he held.² Calvin doubted for some time whether he should answer Hesshus's book, which appeared in 1560, and of which he seems to have got a copy from Bullinger. Writing to Caspar Olevianus, in November of that year, Calvin says: "I have begun, not without some disgust, to run over Tileman's book, which Bullinger sent to me. The loquacity of that brawler is too absurd to excite my anger, and I have not yet decided whether I shall answer him. I am weary of so many pamphlets, and shall certainly not think his follies worthy of many days' labor. But I have composed a brief analysis of this controversy, which will, perhaps, be shortly published."³

Calvin, however, answered Hesshus, and with his usual virulence, which neither age nor experience had moderated. At the beginning of his tract Calvin makes the following address to Melancthon: "O, Philip Melancthon! for it is to thee I appeal, who now livest with Christ in the bosom of God, where thou waitest for us till we be gathered with thee to a holy rest. A hundred times hast thou said, when, wearied with thy labors and oppressed by thy troubles, thou reposedst thy head familiarly on my breast, 'Would that I could die in this bosom!' Since then I have a thousand times wished that it had happened to us to be together; for certainly thou wouldst thus have had more courage for the contest, and been stronger to despise envy, and to count as nothing all false accusations. In this manner, too, the wickedness of many would have been restrained, who, from thy softness, as they called it, gathered audacity for their attacks."⁴

In some of his arguments in this tract, Calvin descends to a species of ribaldry, which, on so sacred a subject, strikes a modern reader as highly unbecoming. The following is an instance: "All these things we clearly testify, while Hesshus urges nothing but his mad dream, that the body of Christ is

¹ Ruchat, vi., 336.

² P. Henry, iii., 339.

³ Ep. 302. It seems to me doubtful whether Calvin had any thing to do with Ep. 304, which turns on the same subject.

⁴ *Opera*, viii., 724, A.

partaken of by the unfaithful, and yet hath no vivifying power! But if he thinks that there is no other method but philosophy, let him learn from a short syllogism:

“Whosoever observes not the analogy between the sign and the thing signified, is an unclean animal, or head of neat cattle.

“He who asserts that the bread is truly and properly the body of Christ, destroys the analogy between the sign and the thing signified.

“Wherefore, he who asserts that the bread is properly the body, is an unclean animal.

“And from this syllogism let him learn, even if there be no philosophy in the world, that still he is an impure beast!”¹

In this work Calvin thus expresses his doctrine respecting participation in the body of Christ. “Hesshus objects—If the body of Christ is in heaven, it is not therefore in the supper, but only a symbol. As if, forsooth, the supper were not, to the faithful worshipers of God, a heavenly action, or, as it were, a vehicle by which they may overpass the boundaries of the world. But what is this to Hesshus? who not only remains on earth, but drives his nose as far as he can into the mud.”²

We find, from a passage in this book, that Calvin’s followers had now obtained the name of *Calvinists*.³ In another place, Calvin piques himself on the number of the martyrs who had already fallen in defense of his principles: “Because,” he says, “Hesshus sees no method of escape, he breaks out into abuse, and makes me an Epicurean. What sort of disciples he dismisses from his school, there is no need to mention. Surely it is not from the sty of Epicurus that those men come forth who fearlessly offer up their lives as a sacrifice, in order that they may sanction with their very blood the institution of the holy supper. Six hundred martyrs will stand before God as advocates in the defense of my doctrine; and for the same cause three hundred thousand men are now venturing their lives.”⁴

Calvin concludes by remarking, that he shall hand over his opponent to Beza for the finishing stroke. That faithful disciple accordingly published two dialogues in the course of this year, viz., “*Κρεωφαγία*, or the Cyclops;” and “*Ὀνος συλλογίζόμενος*, or the Sophist;” the chief design of which was to purge Calvin from the calumnies with which Hesshus had assailed him.

¹ *Opera*, viii., p. 728, A.

² *Ibid.*, 731, B, & c.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 729, B.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 742, B.

The "Admonition to the Polish Brethren," published in 1563, which has been rarely mentioned, was among the last of Calvin's works. His life was now drawing to a close. He never thoroughly recovered from the quartan ague with which he had been attacked in 1558; and from that period his letters make constant mention of his bad state of health. Writing to Beza in October, 1561, he describes himself as suffering from a continual colic, accompanied with vomitings, sleeplessness, loss of appetite, and so great a dryness of the throat and palate, as made it difficult for him to dictate even a few words.¹ These gave way only to be succeeded by a headache, for which Calvin's remedy was fasting. We learn, on the authority of Beza, that for more than ten years he took but one meal a day; and occasionally he would altogether abstain from food for the space of six-and-thirty hours.² Though, in addition to these sufferings, he was, toward the close of 1561, tormented by the gout, so that he could not walk without support, yet he did not intermit his sermons, but was carried to church in his chair.³ His disorders went on increasing in severity, till, in the spring of 1564, they plainly threatened a fatal termination. His letter to the physicians of Montpellier, on the 8th of February in that year, contains a catalogue of some of the worst ills which can afflict humanity.⁴ In the summer of 1563, he had been attacked with nephritis. He went into the country for a cure, but was obliged to be carried on a couch, as he could not sit on horseback. On his return to Geneva he got out to walk, but had scarcely crept a mile, when weakness in the loins compelled him to desist. This was shortly afterward followed by the discharge of a stone from the bladder. In the same letter he complains of indigestion and spitting of blood.

Amid this complication of painful disorders, Calvin's literary industry did not forsake him. In a letter to Fretius, dated on the 30th of November, 1563, he describes himself as engaged in translating his "Commentary on the Pentateuch" into French; and as having also begun a commentary on Joshua, in which he had proceeded as far as the third chapter.⁵ This work he finished on his death-bed.

On the 6th of February, 1564, Calvin preached his last sermon. Although an asthma now prevented him from deliver-

¹ Ep. 323.

² Beza, *Vita Calv.*, anno 1564, from which the following account of Calvin's last days is chiefly taken.

³ Epp. 324, 325.

⁴ Ep. 343.

⁵ Ep. 342.

ing any continued discourse, he was still carried occasionally to church, and would now and then address a few words to the congregation; but after March he was obliged to abstain even from this.¹ All these ills he is represented as sustaining with the greatest fortitude and resignation. No complaints escaped his lips, except that sometimes, raising his eyes to heaven, he would exclaim: "How long, O Lord!" He followed the prescriptions of his physicians most implicitly; but he would not attend to any admonitions that he should relinquish his labors. When Beza attempted to persuade him to give up dictating, or, at all events, writing, he replied: "What! would you have the Lord find me idle?" The members of the consistory visited him on the 10th of March, and found him dressed, and sitting at a little table, on which he was accustomed to write. When Calvin perceived them, he leaned his head on one of his hands, as he was accustomed to do when meditating; and after a short silence, with a broken voice, but with a cheerful countenance, he said: "I thank you most heartily, my dearest brethren, for your care of me, and I hope that in a fortnight—which was the usual time for consistorial censures—I shall be among you for the last time. For I think about that time the Lord will reveal his will concerning me, and will take me to himself." He accordingly appeared in the consistory on the 24th of March; and after the sitting was over, observed, that he thought the Lord had granted him some delay. He then took up a French New Testament, and consulted those present on some passages. On the following day he felt the worse for this exertion. Nevertheless, on the 27th of March, he caused himself to be carried to the council-house, and, with the support of two friends, walked into the hall, where a new rector of the schools was to be presented to the council. Here, having bared his head, he returned thanks for the favors which he had received at the hands of the council, and that especially, in this his last illness, they had shown him such marked attention. On the 10th of March, the council had ordered every one to pray for Calvin's restoration; and on the 13th of the same month, sent him twenty-five crowns through his brother; which, however, Calvin refused to accept: alleging that as he was not in a condition to discharge his duties, he made it a point of conscience not to receive wages.² On taking leave of the council, he observed: "I feel this is the last time that I shall

¹ Beza, *Vita Calv.*, anno 1564.

² See Registers. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

appear in this place ;” and after pronouncing these few words with a faltering accent, bade farewell to all the members, who were overcome with grief. On the 2d of April, being Easter day, he was carried to church ; where he remained during the sermon, and afterward received the sacrament from the hands of Beza. He even joined in the hymn ; and though his voice was tremulous, his countenance, already touched by the hand of death, gave manifest tokens of joy and satisfaction. On the 25th of April he made his last will ; after which he sent to the syndics and council to intimate that he was desirous of once more addressing them in the council-house before he died, and hoped that he should be well enough to be carried thither on the morrow. Hereupon the council replied, that they would come to him instead ; and accordingly repaired to his house on the 26th of April.¹

After mutual salutations, and apologies on the part of Calvin to the council, for giving them the trouble of coming to his house, he observed that he had long desired this interview, but had put it off till the hour of his departure from the world became more apparent. “I thank your excellencies most heartily,” he continued, “for the honors with which you have loaded me, and which I have done little to deserve, as well as for your having often borne with my infirmities so patiently ; which I have always considered the greatest proof of your singular good-will toward me. Although in the discharge of my office I have had to endure many contests, and to sustain all kinds of attacks—for such must be the fate of the best of men—yet I know and acknowledge, that it has not been through any fault of yours. And I earnestly entreat you that, if at any time I have failed in my duty, you will have regard to my will rather than to my power. For I can truly declare, that I have been a sincere well-wisher to your state ; and though I may not have always succeeded in discharging all that my duty required of me, yet, as far as lay in my power, I have ever studied the public good. At the same time, I should hardly escape the charge of dissimulation, did I not express my conviction that the Lord hath been pleased sometimes to employ my services with effect. Still I must again and again beg of you to excuse me, that either in my public or private capacity, I have performed so little of what I ought

¹ Scott remarks (*Cont. of Milner*, iii., 479, note) that modern authors, feeling at a loss how to accommodate the whole senate, consisting of sixty or seventy persons, in a room of Calvin's house, have restricted the attendance to that of the four syndics. But we have seen that the little or ordinary council consisted of only twenty-five members.

to have done. I have also to acknowledge myself much indebted to you for the patience with which you have borne my vehemence, and which has sometimes, I confess it, been immoderate ; which sins of mine are, I trust, also pardoned by God. With regard to the doctrine which you have heard from my lips, I do here affirm, that I have taught the word of God with which I was intrusted, not vaguely and rashly, but purely and sincerely : whose anger would otherwise, I know, as surely impend over my head at this moment, as I am confident that my labors in teaching have not been displeasing to him. And this I am the more inclined to testify before God and you, because I doubt not that Satan, as is his custom, will stir up wicked, light, and giddy men, to corrupt the pure doctrine which you have heard from me."

Then, after adverting to the great benefits which they had received at the hands of God, he continued : " I am the best judge from how many and what exceeding great dangers the hand of an almighty and merciful God hath delivered you. Consider the station which you now hold, and whether your affairs be prosperous or adverse, let it be ever before your eyes that it is he alone who strengthens cities and states, and who in that respect demands the worship of mankind. Bear in mind that David, amid all his greatness, testifies to us that he fell when he thought himself most secure, and indeed never to rise again, had not God, with wonderful goodness, stretched forth his hand to him. What, then, shall become of us puny men, when he fell who was so powerful and so strong ? Truly, great humility is needful for you, that you may walk carefully, reverencing God, and trusting to his safeguard alone, in the confident hope that with his help you will stand firm, as indeed you have often experienced, though your safety and preservation should depend as it were upon a single thread. If, then, your affairs be prosperous, be not puffed up like the profane, but rather give thanks to God with an humble heart ; if, on the contrary, adversity should threaten you, and even destruction surround you on every side, yet still put your trust in him who is able to raise even the dead ; yea, rather think that God thus awakens you, in order that you may learn more and more to look toward him alone. And if you wish this republic to remain stable, look again and again that the sacred judgment-seat on which he hath placed you be not defiled. For he alone is the great God, King of kings, and Lord of lords ; who will honor them who honor him, and cast down his contemners into the dust. Worship him, therefore, ac-

ording to his precepts, and ponder these things ever more and more; for we are always far enough from performing what our duty requires. I know your minds and characters, and that you all stand in need of exhortation. Even among those who excel, there is none in whom much is not wanting. Let every one, then, examine himself, and ask the Lord for those things in which he finds himself deficient. We see what vices reign in most of the councils of the world. Some are lukewarm, and neglect the public good to follow their own interests; some indulge their private passions; some use not the excellent gifts with which God hath endowed them, in a fitting manner: others are ostentatious, and with a certain confidence, require that the rest should conform to their opinions. I exhort the aged not to envy younger men, whom they may see that the Lord hath adorned with gifts; and the young that they be modest, and free from all elation. Let not one interfere with another. Avoid enmities, and all those private grudges and animosities which have averted many from the true course in governing a state. These things you will avoid, if each of you confine himself to his own province, and faithfully administer that department of the government with which he is intrusted. In deciding civil causes, let nothing, I beseech you, be done out of private favor or enmity. Let none pervert justice by covert practices, nor hinder the due course of law by partiality: in a word, let none depart from what is just and right. Should any sinister affection tempt any of you, let him constantly resist it, and looking up to Him who placed him on the bench, pray for his Holy Spirit. I have now done, except that I must again request your pardon for my infirmities, which I here confess and acknowledge, before God and his angels, as well as before your excellencies."

Such, according to Beza, was the speech which Calvin addressed to the members of the council on this occasion. Some allowances should, perhaps, be made for a little rhetorical exaggeration on the part of that writer; for it is hardly probable that Calvin, who now found it painful to dictate even a few words, should have had strength to deliver so long an oration. Nevertheless, we may assume that the substance and tenor of his address are faithfully reported; and they show what an authority he exercised over the members of the council, and with what reverence they looked up to him as their spiritual father. After he had finished his speech Calvin addressed a prayer to God to fill them more and more with His gifts, and to govern them by His Holy Spirit for the safety of

the whole republic. Then, shaking hands with each member, he dismissed them; who departed from him, says Beza, with tears, as from their common parent.

At Calvin's request all the Genevese ministers assembled at his house on the 28th of April, when he thus addressed them: "After my death, persevere, brethren, in this work, and be not cast down; for the Lord will preserve this state and church against the threats of their enemies. Let all dissensions be banished from among you, and embrace one another with mutual charity. Think continually on what you owe this church, in which God hath placed you, and suffer nothing to withdraw you from it. Otherwise it were easy for some who are weary of it to slip out; but such will discover that it is impossible to deceive the Lord. When I first came to this city the gospel had, indeed, been announced; but things were in a most unsettled state, as if, forsooth, Christianity had wholly consisted in the overthrow of idolatry; and many were the wicked from whom I suffered the most unworthy treatment. But the Lord our God strengthened me, who am by nature any thing but bold—I state the matter as it really is—so that I yielded to none of their attempts. Afterward I returned hither from Strasburgh, having undertaken the vocation most unwillingly, for it seemed to me that it would be fruitless. The work appeared to be full of great and manifold difficulties, and I knew not what the Lord had determined; but as I proceeded I perceived that the Lord had really blessed my labors. Do ye, therefore, persevere in the same vocation; uphold the discipline that has been established, and take care at the same time that the people be retained in obedience to the doctrine; for there are some wicked and contumacious ones among them. I leave things in no bad state; wherefore you will be the more culpable in the sight of God if, through your remissness, they should be overthrown. I declare to you, my brethren, that I have always lived with you, and now depart from you, in the bonds of the truest and most sincere charity; but if ever during this my illness you should have found me too morose, I ask your pardon, and return you my hearty thanks for having borne my burthen when I was sick." With these words he shook hands with all the ministers, who departed from him with sad feelings and moistened eyes.

Viret was at too great a distance to attend Calvin's death-bed; but on the 2d of May he received a letter from Farel, who, in spite of his age and infirm health, announced his intention of coming to take leave of him. The short letter in

which Calvin dissuaded him from this design seems to have been the last which he ever wrote. It is the following: "Farewell, my best and truest brother! and since it is God's will that you remain behind me in the world, live mindful of our friendship: which, as it was useful to the church of God, so the fruit of it awaits us in heaven. Pray do not fatigue yourself on my account. It is with difficulty I draw my breath, and expect that every moment will be my last. It is enough that I live and die for Christ, who is the reward of his followers both in life and death. Again, farewell with my brethren. Geneva, 2d of May, 1564." Nevertheless, Farel persisted in his resolution, and, after an interview with Calvin, returned to Neuchâtel on the next day. In August of the following year, Farel himself sank into the grave, at the advanced age of seventy-six.¹

The days that remained to him Calvin spent in almost continual prayer, and in ejaculating sentences from the Scriptures; and though his voice was broken by asthma, his eyes retained their brightness to the last. During this time, if all who wished to see him had been admitted, his doors must have been kept constantly open both day and night; but, as he felt a difficulty in speaking, he requested that people would rather pray for him than endeavor to visit him. He even told Beza, whom he always saw with pleasure, that he felt a scruple in being a hindrance, however slight, to his usual occupations. So chary was he, says Beza, of the time which he knew was spent in the service of the church, and even over-scrupulous of being ever so little a burden to his friends. Thus he lingered on till the 19th of May; on which day the Genevese ministers were accustomed to meet in consistory for censures, and afterward to dine together; as there would be a communion at Pentecost, which happened two days after. On this occasion Calvin allowed the dinner to be held at his house, and even caused himself to be carried into the dinner-room from his bed-chamber, which adjoined. Here addressing the company he said: "This is the last time I shall meet you at table:" words which made a sad impression on them. He then offered up a prayer and took a little food; during dinner discoursing as cheerfully as might be under the circumstances. Before the repast was quite finished Calvin caused himself to be carried back to his bed-room; and on taking leave, said, with a smiling countenance: "This wall will not hinder my being present with you in mind, though absent in body."

¹ Kirchhofer, *Leben Farel's*, ii., 165.

From that time he never rose from his bed. On the 27th of May, the day on which he died, he seemed to speak with less difficulty ; but this was a last effort of expiring nature. About eight o'clock in the evening manifest signs of approaching dissolution appeared. Beza had not long quitted him ; but though he immediately returned on being apprized of the change, it was too late. He found Calvin dead, apparently without a struggle, as he rather bore the appearance of having fallen into a deep sleep.

On that night and the following day, says Beza, Geneva seemed plunged in universal mourning. The state had to regret the loss of one of its wisest citizens ; the church its pastor ; the academy its teacher ; while private persons felt as if deprived of a common parent and comforter. Many of the citizens, and even several foreigners, among whom was the Queen of England's ambassador to France, desired to view his body. At first they were admitted ; but as this might have appeared too great an indulgence of the public curiosity, his friends, in order to avoid calumny, caused his remains to be inclosed early on the following day, which was Sunday, in a coffin : and at two o'clock in the afternoon, the body, followed by the council, the ministers, the professors of the college, and great numbers of the citizens, who showed every mark of grief, was carried to the cemetery of Plainpalais ; where it was interred, by Calvin's own directions, without any extraordinary pomp, and without so much as a stone to mark the place where it lay. Beza, however, honored his memory with the following copy of Latin verses, which he calls *Parentalia* :

“ Romæ ruentis terror ille maximus,
 Quem mortuum lugent boni, horrescunt mali,
 Ipsa a quo potuit virtutem discere Virtus—
 Cur adeo exiguo ignotoque in cespite clausus
 Calvinus lateat rogas ?
 Calvinum assidue comitata Modestia vivum
 Hoc tumulo manibus condidit ipsa suis.
 O te beatum cespitem tanto hospite !
 O cui invidere cuncta possint marmora !”

On the 8th of June all the ministers and professors appeared before the council and represented that Calvin had made them some excellent exhortations to concord among themselves, and obedience to the magistrates ; the observance of which, they said, was the only method to avoid feeling, so sharply as they had hitherto done, the loss of that great servant of God. The council replied that they still much regretted the loss of that

great man, on whom God had bestowed such excellent gifts, and impressed a character of so much majesty.¹

Calvin's will, which, as we have said, was made on the 25th of April, begins with a long preamble, in which he gives thanks to God for having rescued him from idolatry, and made him a minister of the gospel; and expresses a sense of his own sinfulness and unworthiness, and of the coldness of his zeal: in which last self-accusation, however, neither his friends nor his enemies will be ready to agree. The whole value of his estate, after making as good an estimate as he could of his furniture and library, amounted only to 255 gold crowns. He constituted his brother Anthony his nominal heir, in trust for his own children; requesting Anthony himself to be satisfied with a silver salver. Samuel and John, his brother's sons, were to receive, after their father's death, 40 gold crowns each; his daughters, Ann, Susan, and Dorothy, 30 gold crowns each; and to his other nephew, David, he left only 25, "on account of his levity and petulance." He gave ten gold crowns to the schools; the same sum to the hospital for poor refugees; and another ten to the daughter of Charles Constans, a cousin. If his estate showed any surplus it was to be distributed in the same rateable proportion between his nephews and nieces; not excluding David, "if by the blessing of God he should amend his conduct." He appointed his brother and Laurence Normandie his executors. The will is witnessed by the following persons: Theodore de Bèze, Raymond Chauvet, Michael Cop, Louis Enoch, Nicholas Colladon, Jaques des Bordes, and Henry Scrimger, professor of arts, all citizens of Geneva.²

It might seem an injustice toward Calvin's character, if Beza's ample and labored account, or rather panegyric of it, were not inserted here. From a long and intimate acquaintance with him, Beza had better opportunities than almost any other person of becoming acquainted with his virtues and his failings. At the same time we must remember that he owed all that he was to Calvin, to whom during his lifetime he displayed the greatest devotion, not to say subserviency, taking up his quarrels as if they were his own, and sparing no personal exertions in the pursuit of them; that after Calvin's death he succeeded to his post of chief minister at Geneva; and that he had thus every motive, both of public

¹ Registers. Grénus, *Fragmens Biographiques*.

² The will is given at length in Beza's *Life of Calvin*, and in P. Henry, iii., Beil. 15.

interest and private affection, to represent the bright side of his teacher's character.

"Calvin," says Beza, "was of middling stature, of a pale and dark complexion; his eyes, which betokened the sagacity of his intellect, retained their brilliancy to the last. In conformity with his singular modesty, he observed in his dress a just medium between over-nicety and slovenliness; in like manner with regard to his diet, as he was far removed from luxury, so on the other hand his frugality was decent. He ate but little, and for many years together took but one meal a day, alleging his bad digestion. He gave but little time to sleep. His memory was almost incredible, insomuch that he would immediately recognize persons whom he had seen but once, and that many years previously. When employed in dictating, he could resume the thread of his discourse without being prompted, after having been interrupted for several hours; and though overwhelmed with business, he never forgot any thing appertaining to his office. His judgment was so exact, that it often bore the appearance of prophecy; nor do I remember an instance of any one having been misled who followed his advice. He was sparing of his words, and despised what is called eloquence. Yet he was any thing but an unskillful writer; and though his works are more voluminous than those of any author in the memory of ourselves or of our fathers, yet no theologian has yet existed whose style is characterized by greater purity, force, and judgment. His youthful studies, and a natural acuteness of intellect, strengthened by the habit of dictating, made him never at a loss for weighty and apposite language, and he wrote very much as he spoke. Retaining to the last the doctrine which he had taught in his youth, he had no retractations to make; a thing that can be affirmed of but few theologians of our age.

"Though naturally grave, yet in society nobody was more cheerful. He was very tolerant of those vices which spring from the natural infirmity of men; so that he neither shamed nor frightened the weaker brethren by importunate reprehension, nor on the other hand nourished their faults by connivance or flattery. He was as great an enemy of adulation, pretense, and dishonesty, particularly where religion was concerned, as he was a sincere friend of truth, simplicity, and candor. From temperament he was somewhat prone to anger, a failing which was increased by the laborious life he led. Yet the spirit of God had taught him so to govern his wrath, that no expression unworthy of a good man ever fell from his lips;

and much less did he proceed to greater extremities: nor indeed was he easily excited to anger, except when religion was in question, or when he had to deal with the obstinate.

“That so many virtues, both public and private, should have so numerous enemies, will surprise no one who has read the history of those men who, even among heathen nations, have been eminent for their love of what seemed to them to be virtue: far less, then, should it excite our wonder that so unflinching an asserter of the sound doctrine, so constant a follower of purity of life, should have been so rancorously opposed both at home and abroad. We should rather be astonished how one man was able, like a sort of Christian Hercules, to overcome so many monsters by the use of that strong club, the word of God. The numerous adversaries raised up against him by Satan—among whom were none but those who had also declared war against religion and probity—were but so many trophies of victory which the Lord granted to his servant. By them Calvin was painted as a heretic; as if, forsooth, Christ himself had not been reproached with the same appellation, and that, too, by the priests. It is true that the Genevese banished him; but they also recalled him; and what was the fate of the Apostles, of Athanasius, of Chrysostom?

“Many other reproaches are heaped upon him, but of what kind? He was ambitious, forsooth; nay, he even aimed at establishing a new papacy: this is the charge brought against a man who preferred this method of life, this republic, in a word, this church, which I may truly call the very workshop of poverty, before every thing else! Or is he charged with avarice? When all his goods, his library included, which fetched a good price, scarcely amounted to three hundred gold crowns. So that he himself spoke no less truly than appropriately when, in refuting this most shameful calumny, he observed: ‘If I can not persuade certain persons during my lifetime that I am no lover of money, at least it will be proved at my death.’ The council can testify that though his stipend was very slender, he was so far from being discontented with it that he pertinaciously refused any increase.

“Others reproach him with his brother Anthony’s getting divorced from his first wife, on account of adultery. But what would they have said, had he continued to cherish an adulteress? And if the disgrace of this shameless woman is to fall upon him, what will become of Jacob, of David, nay, of the very family of the Son of God, who himself plainly

noted one of them as devil? The many proofs he has left of his labors show how much he indulged in luxury and pleasure. Some scruple not to affirm, and even to write, that he reigned supreme at Geneva, both in church and state, and even sat in the judgment-seat. Others have a story how he got a living man to represent a corpse, in order to raise him from the dead: which is as rank a falsehood as to call him the Pope of Rome, as that rhapsodist of the Sorbonne, Claude Despençe, dared to give out in a most calumnious book. But what can shame such men? Charges like these stand in no need of refutation either with those who knew this great man when living, or with that judicious portion of posterity that shall estimate his character by his writings.

“Having here faithfully recorded the history of his earthly career, of which I have been an eye-witness for the space of sixteen years, I think myself well entitled to affirm, that in him was proposed for the imitation of us all a most beautiful example of a truly Christian life and death; and one which it may be as easy to calumniate as it would be difficult to follow.”

Beza, in his French Life, adds a few other particulars of Calvin's habits. His weak digestion, and want of appetite, caused him to seek something more delicate than the ordinary fare which appeared at table. Sometimes in the middle of the day he would suck an egg and take a glass of wine. He would occasionally join his intimate friends in a game of quoits, or *la def*, or some other pastime not forbidden by the laws. But this occurred very seldom; for he was generally occupied the whole day in writing or studying: except that, after dinner, he would walk about his room for a quarter of an hour, or perhaps half an hour, if he had any body to keep him company.¹

That Calvin was in some respects a really great man, and that the eloquent panegyric of his friend and disciple Beza contains much that is true, will hardly be denied. In any circumstances, his wonderful abilities and extensive learning would have made him a shining light among the doctors of the Reformation; an accidental, or, as his friends and followers would say, a providential and predestinated visit to Geneva, made him the head of a numerous and powerful sect. Naturally deficient in that courage which forms so prominent a trait in Luther's character, and which prompted him to beard kings and emperors face to face, Calvin arrived at Gen-

¹ *Vie de Calv.*, p. 145, et seq., Genève, 1663.

eva at a time when the rough and initiatory work of Reform had already been accomplished by his bolder and more active friend Farel. Some peculiar circumstances in the political condition of that place favored the views which he seems to have formed very shortly after his arrival. By the extent of its territory, and the number of its population, a small city; by its natural and artificial strength, and by its Swiss alliances, an independent state, secure from the attacks of its powerful neighbors: by its laws and institutions a republic tending toward an oligarchy; and by the enthusiasm of a new religion, which had helped to establish its civil liberties, disposed to bow its neck to the yoke of the gospel; Geneva offered every facility to a master mind like Calvin's, which had conceived the idea of establishing a theocracy, of which he himself was to be the oracle, the prophet, and the dictator; and from which, as from a common center, his peculiar opinions were to spread in successive and still expanding circles through the rest of Europe. The tact and skill, the fortitude, the consistency of purpose, and energy of will, which he displayed in carrying out his design, are worthy of all admiration. Attacked, menaced, banished, he carries with him and elaborates his favorite scheme. In the years of his exile his eye still reverts to the little Goshen which he had marked out for his experiment. His addresses to the Genevese church are still those of a pastor to his congregation; he still throws his shield over them, to protect them from the insidious attacks of Rome. The anticipated hour of recall arrives. It is now Calvin's turn to make conditions. Geneva woos him back; but the insulted pastor is not to be so lightly won. He professes repugnance to return to a city which his own writings show to have been the incessant object of his thoughts. At last he consents; but the return which he concedes as a favor strengthens his hands to carry out his views. The preceding narrative has already shown how, from that time to the hour of his death, his care and labor were constantly directed to the consolidation of his power, and to the development of his scheme of ecclesiastical polity. In these objects he was so successful that it may be safely affirmed that none of the Reformers, not even Luther himself, attained to so absolute and extensive an influence.

It may be said that the preceding sketch presents us with the lineaments of a successful political chief, as much as with those of the founder of a great religious sect; and it may be inquired whether we should consider Calvin's aims to have

been directed by personal ambition, or by zeal for God's honor and glory. Two objects so different seem utterly incompatible. We can not serve both God and Mammon; we can not seek at once to promote our own aggrandizement and that of God's kingdom. That, in order to be acceptable to the Divine Being, the feeling of religion must be pure and unmixed, can not for a moment be questioned; yet the heart of man is a complicated piece of mechanism, and the results which it shows are seldom the effect of unmixed motives. Many are the hidden springs and wheels—hidden, very frequently, even from ourselves—which by their combined movements contribute to regulate our conduct. That a man who devoted himself so ardently to the study of divinity as Calvin did, and who labored with such industry and warmth to defend and propagate the Reformation, should have been influenced solely by the hope of attaining reputation and power by these means, is scarcely credible; while, on the other hand, there are parts of his conduct which it would be difficult to refer to purely religious motives. An irritable pride is one of the salient traits of his character. Of this the preceding narrative has recorded many striking instances. This feeling particularly betrayed itself where Calvin's literary reputation, or his authority as a teacher, was concerned; for these were the instruments of his power and influence. He loved Castellio till their views began to clash, and then he pursued him with the most unrelenting malignity. Though acquainted with the views of Socinus and the other Italian Antitrinitarians, he tolerated those heretics so long as they flattered him; but when he discovered that this flattery was a mere cloak and pretense, his indignation knew no bounds. Nay, he even endured and corresponded with Servetus, the arch-heretic of them all, till he found himself ridiculed and abused by the Spaniard, and then he formed the resolution of putting him to death; a design which he cherished for seven years, and which he effected the moment it was in his power to do so: and that in spite of the mild and tolerant principles which his understanding, when calm and unruffled, had led him deliberately to lay down. Other instances of the same feeling, but exercised on a minor scale, and on more ignoble victims, will occur to the reader, and especially the case of Pierre Ameaux. But though on a minor scale they do not the less, but rather more clearly, betray the dominant passion. Beza admits Calvin's proneness to anger, which, however, is sometimes more correctly characterized by Calvin himself by the name of morosity. And

indeed not only the preceding instances of his conduct, but the spirit and tenor of the greater part of his controversial tracts, show that a man may be a profound theologian, and yet not comprehend the true spirit of Christianity.

That Calvin's mode of life was frugal and temperate, and that he was untainted with the mean passion of avarice, may be readily admitted. The last, indeed, is peculiarly the vice of little minds; and it may be safely affirmed, that no man of really enlarged understanding, and commanding genius, ever loved money merely for its own sake. Calvin's ambition was of a different kind. He rather sought to leave his name and principles to posterity, than a few thousand dollars, more or less, to his heirs.

Beza's remarks on Calvin's intellectual qualities will admit of no dispute. On this ground both his friends and opponents are agreed; and in the writings of the latter will be found many tributes to his genius and learning. The president De Thou characterizes him as endowed with a strong and acute understanding, and with admirable powers of expression.¹ Davila says of him that he was a man of great, but restless, mind, of wonderful eloquence, and of extensive and varied erudition.² And Florimond de Rémond, in his "History of the Birth, Progress, and Decline of this Century," observes: "Calvin showed from his youth that he was not carried away by sensual pleasures. In a dry and attenuated body he preserved a green and vigorous mind, prompt at repartee, and bold in attack. He fasted much even in his youth, either for the sake of his health and to get rid of the headache which continually afflicted him, or to keep his mind in better order for writing and studying, and to improve his memory."³

Calvin's style, both in Latin and French, is remarkable for force, clearness, and facility. Like all men of truly deep thought, he never leaves his reader at a loss for his meaning. It is only the pretenders to profundity who puzzle by reflections which they have not the power to develop clearly in their own minds. His Latin style is not marked by unnecessary *verbiage*, merely for the sake of rounding a period, nor by any affectation of Ciceronian purity, the besetting snare of the writers of that age: and if it be truly remarked that the best test of modern Latin is that it should be read with facility and pleasure by

¹ "Acri vir ac vehementi ingenio, et admirabili facundiâ præditus."—*Hist.*, lib. xxxvi., anno 1564.

² "Uomo di grande, ma d'inquieto ingegno, di maravigliosa facondia, e di varia e moltiplice erudizione."—*Guerre Civ. di Francia*, lib. i., p. 59.

³ Liv. vii., c. 10, quoted by P. Henry, i., Beil. 19.

a scholar, Calvin's may be pronounced excellent. There is hardly, perhaps, a sentence in his works that requires to be read twice in order to be understood. The admirable way in which he used his mother tongue is best testified by his countrymen. Pasquier remarks that he had enriched the French language with numberless beautiful turns.¹ The Abbé d'Artigny observes that he knew the turn and genius of the French tongue better than any man of his age.² And Bossuet draws the following parallel between him and Luther: "Let us then yield to Calvin, since he is so desirous of it, the glory of having written as well as any man of his age; nay, let us even place him, if you will, above Luther: for though Luther had a more lively and original turn of mind, Calvin, though inferior in genius, seemed to carry off the palm by study. In oral discourse Luther triumphed; but Calvin's pen was more correct, especially in Latin, and his style, which was more severe, was also more connected and refined. Both excelled in speaking their native tongue, and both possessed an extraordinary vehemence."³ To these testimonies might be added that of D'Alembert, and other more modern writers.

Calvin was a fair Greek scholar; though in this branch of learning he was undoubtedly surpassed by some of his contemporaries. His knowledge of Hebrew is said to have been only moderate.⁴

The merits of Calvin as a commentator have been universally recognized; even by those opposed to some of his peculiar views. On this subject Father Simon says: "Calvin had a very elevated mind; and had he been less obstinate, and not engrossed by the desire of making himself the head of a party, his labors might have been useful to the church. There is in his 'Commentaries on Scripture' something which at once pleases us; and as he had devoted much time to the study of mankind, his works abound with a touching morality, which he also endeavors to render just and conformable to his text."⁵ Bishop Horsley, and other divines of the English church, have also cheerfully acknowledged Calvin's merits in this department of sacred literature; the magnitude of his labors in

¹ "Car aussi étoit il homme bien escrivant tant en Latin que François, et auquel nostre langue Française est grandement redevable pour l'avoir enrichie d'une infinité de beaux traits: et à la mienne volonté que c'eust été en meilleur subject."—*Recherches de la France*, lib. viii., c. lv., p. 858.

² *Nouveaux Mémoires*, &c., ii., 71.

³ *Hist. des Variations*, &c., ix., 319.

⁴ See Schrökh, *Reform. Geschichte*, ii., 205, and the *Scaligeriana prima*, quoted by P. Henry, i., Beil. 18.

⁵ *Hist. Critique du Vieux Test.*, quoted by P. Henry, i., Beil. 19.

which may be estimated from the fact of their filling seven out of the nine folio volumes which constitute his works.

In his "Commentaries," the peculiar doctrines which mark his system of theology occur, of course, in a scattered manner, as the occasion of his text may call them forth. But before he had commenced any of his exegetical works, of which that on Paul's Epistle to the Romans, published in 1539, was the first, he had already arranged his scheme of divinity, and published the results of it in his "Institutes." This work bears the impress of an independent and comprehensive study of Scripture; from which, aided by the works of the Fathers, and especially of St. Augustin, Calvin built up his system; which deserves the praise of originality rather for the coherence and symmetry with which it is arranged, and which show it to be the work of a single mind, than for any novelty in the views which it develops. The doctrine of predestination, which is generally regarded as that which principally characterizes Calvin, is in fact that of St. Augustin, and even of most of the Reformers, though they did not carry it to such a rigorous extent as he. Probably his best claim to originality, with regard to any single part of his doctrine, rests on that of the Lord's Supper.

I have thus endeavored to represent the life of Calvin impartially, neither concealing his virtues nor exaggerating his faults. The terms of unqualified and extravagant admiration in which some of his recent biographers speak of him, seem to me to be neither consistent with facts, nor of wholesome example. This unbounded veneration for remarkable men—this hero-worship—is a sign rather of weakness than of strength. A mind that suffers itself to be dazzled by some brilliant qualities, is unable to take that steady view which is necessary to the just estimation of a character; and in viewing the leaders of great religious movements, this seems to me to be particularly dangerous. It is to be hoped that the days of persecution and intolerance are gone, never to return; but if ever they are to be revived, it is such a spirit that will lead to them. A lapse of three centuries has afforded time enough to mellow opinions; and this should be essentially the age of impartiality and moderation.

APPENDIX.

I.

THE fullest account of Servetus will be found in Mosheim's "*Geschichte des berühmten Spanischen Artzes M. Serveto*," forming the second volume of his "*Ketzer-Geschichte*," 4to, Helmstadt, 1748. Mosheim had long been collecting materials for a life of Servetus, but not finding leisure or opportunity to use them, intrusted them to M. Allvoerden, who had been his pupil, and who was desirous of trying his skill on some historical subject. Allvoerden's work, which was not a masterpiece, was severely handled by Armand de la Chapelle, the pastor of the French congregation at the Hague, in a periodical publication entitled "*Bibliothèque Raisonnée des Ouvrages des Savans de l'Europe*," vol. i. This induced Mosheim to write his book, which he drew up with the greatest care, from the materials which he then possessed, and which consisted chiefly of the *procès* of Servetus at Geneva. The recent publication of the original documents by M. Rilliet (*Relation du Procès Criminel intenté à Genève à M. Servet*, Genève, 1844) shows that the extracts used by Mosheim were authentic. (See P. Henry, iii., 102.) Shortly afterward, Mosheim obtained some fresh materials in an abstract from the trial of Servetus at Vienne, furnished to him by a French ecclesiastic. The additional information thus conveyed, and which led him, in some cases, to modify and alter his views, he published in his "*Neue Nachrichten*," Helmstadt, 4to, 1750. This tract is appended to his "*Geschichte*." The Abbé d'Artigny had also obtained the same materials from Vienne, and published them, before Mosheim's second work appeared, in the "*Nouveaux Mémoires d'Histoire, de Critique, et de Littérature*," tom. ii., 1749. The Abbé, however, frequently draws on his imagination, and states circumstances as facts, which are not borne out by the evidence. Besides these works, the reader may consult the "*Bibliothèque Anglaise*," tom. ii.; the account of Servetus in Chauffepied's "Dictionary; and particularly Trechsel's "*Antitrinitarier*," b. i.; and Dr. Henry's "*Leben Calvins*," b. iii. These documents and authorities are often at variance. In the account in the text, I have selected the circumstances which seemed most probable.

II.

Calvin's letter to Frellon. (See the Appendix to Mosheim's "*Neue Nachrichten.*")

SEIGNEUR JEHAN,

Pourceque vos lettres dernières me furent apportées sur mon partement je n'eus pas le loisir de faire réponse à ce qui estoit enclos dedans. Depuis mon retour, au premier loisir que j'ay eu, j'ay bien voulu satisfaire à votre désir, non pas que j'aye grand espoir de profiter guères envers un tel homme, selon que je le vois disposé : mais afin d'essayer encore s'il y aura quelque moyen de le réduire, qui sera quand Dieu aura si bien besogné en luy, qu'il devienne tout aultre. Pourcequ'il m'avoit escrit, d'un ton si superbe, je luy ay bien voulu rabattre un petit de son orgueil, parlant à luy plus durement que ma coûtume ne porte. Mais je ne l'ay pu faire aultrement. Car je vous assure qu'il n'y a leçon qui luy soit plus nécessaire que d'apprendre humilité. Mais nous y devons aussi tenir la main. Si Dieu nous faict cette grace à luy et à nous que la presente response luy profite, j'auray de quoi me réjouir. S'il poursuit d'un tel style comme il a faict maintenant, vous perdrez temps à me plus solliciter à travailler envers luy, car j'ay d'aultres affaires qui me pressent de plus près. Et ferois conscience de m'y plus occuper, ne doubtant pas que ce ne fust un Sathan pour me distraire des aultres lectures plus utiles. Et pourtant je vous pryé de vous contenter de ce que j'en ay faict, si vous n'y voyez meilleur ordre. Sur quoi après m'estre de bon cœur re-commandé à vous, je pryé nostre bon Dieu vous avoir en sa garde.

Votre serviteur et entier amy,

CHARLES D'ESPEVILLE.

Ce 13 Février, 1546.

A Sire Jehan Frellon, Marchand Libraire, demeurant à Lyon, en la rue Mercière, Enseigne de l'Escu de Coulogne.

III.

As Calvin's letter to Farel mentioned in the text is not inserted in the ordinary collections of his correspondence, it is reprinted here from P. Henry, iii., Beilagen, p. 65. It will also be found in Audin, *Vie de Calvin*, ii. 314, note.

CALVINUS FARELLO.

DE fratribus quieto nunc animo eris post acceptas Claudii literas. Nuncius qui attulerat, cum a concione redirem post horam nonam, rogavit an meæ essent paratæ. Negavi: sed jussi ut domi meæ pranderet cum uxore (eram enim ipse invitatus a Macrino); statim a prandio adfuturum me promisi, ut paucis responderem. Non venit: sed momento se proripuit, ut stuperem tam subito discessu. Et tamen visus mihi fuerat juvenis alioqui non malus. Utinam cogitent fratres, sibi omnes difficultates ita expediri Dei manu, quo citius festinent. Non oportuit cessare Israelitas, cum patefactus illis esset

exitus, quin mox ad fugam se accingerent. Hoc fuisset epistolæ argumentum, nisi me nuncius fefellisset, verum ultro eos ardere confido. Nunc venio ad vestra certamina. Si quid adhuc molestiæ vobis improbi facessant cum istæ literæ venient, breviter complexus sum quænam agendi ratio mihi placeat. Velim autem primum agi vivâ voce: deinde, hoc scriptum aut simile tradi. Ridebitis forte quod nihil nisi vulgare proferam: cum a me reconditum aliquid et sublime expectaveritis. At ego me vestrâ opinione obstringi nolo, neque etiam æquum est. Malui tamen ineptus esse ita scribendo quam tacendo committere ut preces vestras a me neglectas putaretis. Si rationibus et hac legitima viâ nihil fuerit effectum, clam apud Bernates agendum erit ne feram illam ex caveâ emittant. De sædere non satis assequor mentem tuam: nisi quod suspicor, quo Bernates auxilio vobis sint, te ad aliquam conjunctionem animum adjicere: ut quemadmodum jure civitatis libertatem populi tuentur, ita honesto aliquo titulo tueantur ministros in officio suo. Si id est non improbo: modo memineritis ad hæc extraordinaria remedia tunc demum esse confugiendum, ubi ultimæ necessitatis est excusatio. Deinde ut omnes cautiones adhibeatis, ne quid in posterum vobis noceat, semel fuisse adjutos: ac pactionis nunc transactæ magis vos pœniteat, quam pristinæ servitutis. Marcurtius certe jam locum sibi despondit. Fratrum enim consensum nihil se morari prædicat, quia a magistratu et populo expetitur, nec fremere in te dubitat. Denique cum ante tempus malitiam animi sui prodat, machinis omnibus repellendus est, ne emergat in locum unde efficere quod minatur possit. De iis qui sub præsidii specie perpetuam dominationis sedem figere hic volebant, rumores sinamus in utramque partem vagari. Civiliter et placide occursum est eorum impudentiæ, ita ut eos sui pigere debeat. Spero quieturos. Nostris quantum possum suadeo ut securi dormiant. *Servetus nuper ad me scripsit, ac literis adjunxit longum volumen suorum deliriorum cum thrasonicâ jactantiâ, me stupenda et hactenus inaudita visurum. Si mihi placeat, huc se venturum recipit. Sed nolo fidem meam interponere. Namsi venerit, modo valeat mea auctoritas, vivum exire nunquam patiar.*

Jam elapsi sunt ultra quindecim dies ex quo cartularius (P. Ameaux) in carcere tenetur: propterea quod tanta protervia domi suæ inter cœnandum adversum me debacchatus est, ut constet non fuisse tunc mentis compotem. Ego dissimulanter tuli, nisi quod testatus sum iudicibus, mihi nequaquam gratum fore si cum eo summo jure ageretur. Volui eum invisere. Senatus decreto prohibitus fuit aditus. Et tamen boni quidam viri scilicet, me crudelitatis insimulant, quod tam pertinaciter meas injurias ulciscar. Rogatus sum ab ejus amicis, ut deprecatoris partes susciperem. Facturum me negavi, nisi his duabus exceptionibus: ne qua suspicio in me resideret, atque ut Christi honor maneret salvus. Jam defunctus sum. Expecto quid Senatus pronunciet. Vale frater et amice integerrime, cum sororibus, nostri omnes vos salutant. Fratribus dices plurimam salutem meo et symmistarum nomine. Deus vobis semper ac vestris faustis laboribus benedicat.

JOANNES CALVINUS TUUS.

Genevæ, idibus Februar., 1546.

IV.

TRIE'S FIRST LETTER TO ARNEYS.

MONSIEUR MON COUSIN,

Je vous mercie bien fort de tant de belles remontrances qu'avez faictes, et ne doute point que vous, n'y procediez de bonne amitié quand vous taschez à me réduire au lieu dont je suis party. D'autant que je ne suis homme versé aux lettres comme vous, je me déporte de satisfaire aux poinets et articles que vous m'alléguez. Tant y a qu'en la cognoissance que Dieu m' a donné, j'auroys de quoy répondre, car, Dieu mercy, je ne suis pas si mal fondé que je ne sache que l'église a Jesu Christ pour son chef, dont elle ne peut être separée, et qu'elle n' a vie ni salut, et que du tout elle ne peut consister, qu'en la vérité de Dieu, qui est contenue en l'écriture sainte. Parquoy tout ce que vous me pourriez alléguer de l'église je le tiendrai pour phantosme, sinon que Jesu Christ y préside, comme ayant toute autorité, et que la parole de Dieu y regne comme le fondement et substance : sans cela toutes vos formalités ne sont rien. Je vous prie de penser (*sic*) la liberté dont je use envers vous, qui n'est point seulement pour mayntenir ma cause mais aussi de vous donner occasion de penser mieux à vous. Mais pour le faire court, je me suis ébay comment vous m'osez reprocher entre aultres choses que nous n' avons nulle discipline ecclésiastique ny ordre, et que ceux qui nous enseignent ont introduit une licence pour mettre confusion partout ; et cependant je vois (Dieu mercy) que les vices sont mieux corrigés de par de ça que ne sont pas en toutes vos Officialités. Et quant à la doctrine, et ce qui concerne la religion, combien qu'il y ait plus grande liberté que entre nous, néanmoins l'on ne souffrira pas que le nom de Dieu soit blasphémé, et que l'on sème les doctrines et mauvaises opinions que cela ne soit reprimé. Et je vous puis alléguer un exemple qui est à votre grande confusion, puisque il le faut dire. C'est que l'on soutient de par de là un hérétique, qui mérite bien d'être bruslé partout ou il sera. Quand je vous parle d'hérétique j'entends un homme qui sera condamné des papistes aultant que de nous, où de moins qui le doit être. Car combien que nous soyons différens en beaucoup de choses, si avons vous commun que en une seule essence de Dieu il y a trois personnes, et que le père a engendré son fils, qui est sa sagesse éternelle, de tout temps, et qu'il a eu sa vertu éternelle qui est son St. Esprit. Or quand un homme dira que la Ternité laquelle nous tenons est un Cerberus et monstre d'enfer, et desgorgera toutes les villainies possibles de penser contre tout ce que l'écriture nous enseigne de la génération éternelle du fils de Dieu, et que le St. Esprit est la vertu du père et du fils, et se moquera à gueule déployée de tout ce que les anciens docteurs en ont dit, je vous pryé en quel lieu et estime l'aurez vous ? Je dis ceci pour obvier à toute replique que vous me pourriez faire que vous ne tiendrez point par dol pour erreur ce que nous disons être tel ; ce que je vous dis non seulement vous confesserez être erreur mais hérésie détestable, qui est pour abolir toute Chrestieneté. Il fault que je parle franchement. Quelle honte est ce que l'on fasse mourir ceux qui diront qu'il

ne faut invoquer qu'un seul Dieu au nom de Jesu Christ, qu'il n'y a aultre satisfaction que celle qui a été faite en la mort et passion de J. Christ, qu'il n' y a aultre purgatoire qu'en son sang, qu'il n'y a aultre service agréable a Dieu que celui qu'il commande et approuve par sa parole, que toutes peintures et images que les hommes contrefont sont autant d'idoles qui profanent sa Majesté, qu'on doit garder les sacrements à tel usage qu'il a été ordonné de Jesu Christ. Voire, et qu'on ne se contente pas de faire mourir telles gens d'une simple mort, mais qu'on les brusle cruellement. Cependant voilà qui nommera Jesu Christ idole, qui détruira tous les fondemens de la foi, qui amassera toutes les rêveries des hérétiques anciens, qui même condamnera le baptisme des petits enfans, l'appellant inventions diaboliques; et celui-là aura la vogue entre vous, et le supportera-t-on comme s'il n'avoit point failly? Je vous prie où est votre zèle que vous pretendez, et où est la police de cette belle hiérarchie que vous magnifiez tant? L'homme dont je vous parle a été condamné en toutez les églises lesquelles vous reprouvez; cependant il est souffert entre vous, voire jusqu' à y faire imprimer ses livres, qui sont si pleins de blasphèmes qu'il il ne faut point que j'en die plus. C'est un Espagnol Portugallois nommé Michael Servetus de son propre nom, mais il se nomme Villeneuve à présent, faisant le médecin. Il a demeuré quelque temps a Lyon, maintenant il se tient a Vienne, où le livre dont je parle a été imprimé par un quidam qui a là dressé imprimerie, nommé Balthazard Arnoullet. Et afin que vous ne pensiez que je en parle à crédit, je vous envoie la première feuille pour enseigne. Vous dictes que les livres qui ne contiennent aultres choses sinon qu'il se faut tenir à la pure simplicité de l'Escriture sainte, empoisonnent le monde, et si viennent d'ailleurs vous ne les pouvez souffrir; cependant vous couvez là les poisons qui sont pour anéantir l'Escriture sainte et même tout ce que vous tenez de Chrestieneté. Je me suis quasi oublié en vous recitant cet exemple, car j'ay été quatre fois plus long, que je ne pensois; mais l'enormité du cas me fait passer mesure, et voilà qui sera cause que je ne vous feray plus longs propos sur les aultres matières. Comme aussi de fait il me semble qu'il n'est pas grand besoin que je vous réponde sur chacun article; seulement je vous prieray d'entrer un peu plus profond en votre conscience pour vous juger vous même, afin que quand il faudra venir devant le grand Juge vous ne soyez pas condamné. Car pour le dire en ung mot, nous n'avons aultre débat sinon que nous demandons que Dieu soit écouté. Parquoy faisant fin à la présente, je le prieray qu'il vous donne oreilles pour ouïr, et cœur pour obeïr. Cependant qu'il vous ait en sa sainte garde, me recommandant de bien bon cœur à votre bonne grace, et de Mons. mon Cousin, votre frère.

De Genève, ce 26 Février.

TRIE'S SECOND LETTER TO ARNEYS.

MONSIEUR MON COUSIN,

Quand je vous écrivis la lettre que vous avez communiquée à ceux qui y étoient taxés de nonchalance je ne pensois point que la chose dut venir si avant. Seulement mon intention étoit de vous remontrer

quel est le beau zèle et dévotion de ceux qui se disent piliers de l'église, bien qu'ils souffrent tel désordre au milieu d'eux, et cependant persecutent si durement les pauvres Chrétiens qui désirent de suivre Dieu en simplicité. Pour ce que l'exemple étoit notable, et que j'én étois averti, il me sembla que l'occasion s'offroit d'en toucher en mes lettres selon la matière que je traitois. Or puisque vous avez déclaré ce que j'avais entendu écrire privement à vous seul, Dieu veuille pour le mieux que cela profite à purger la Chrétieneté de telles ordures, voyre de pestes si mortelles. S'ils ont tant bon vouloir de s'y employer comme vous le dites, il me semble que la chose n'y est pas trop difficile, encore que ne vous puisse fournir pour le present de ce que vous demandez, assavoir du livre imprimé; car je vous mettrai en main plus pour vous convaincre, assavoir, deux douzaines de pièces écrites de celui dont il est question, où une partie de ses hérésies est contenue. Si on lui mettoit au devant le livre imprimé il le pourroit rénier, ce qu'il ne pourra faire de son écriture. Parquoy les gens que vous dites ayant la chose toute prouvée n'auront nulle excuse s'ils dissimulent plus, où diffèrent à y pourvoir. Tout le reste est bien par deça, tant le gros livre que les autres traités écrits de la même main de l'auteur; mais je vous confesserai une chose, que j'ai eu grande peine à retirer ce que je vous envoie de M. Calvin; non pas qu'il ne désire que tels blasphèmes exécrables ne soient reprimés, mais pour ce qu'il lui semble que son devoir est, quant à lui qui n'a point de glaive de justice, de convaincre plutôt les hérésies par doctrine, que de les poursuivre par tel moyen; mais je l'ai tant importuné lui remontrant le reproche de légèreté qui m'en pourroit avenir s'il ne m'aidoit, qu'en la fin, il s'est accordé à me bailler ce que verrez. Au reste j'espère bien, quand le cas se demèneroit à bon escient par delà, avec le temps recouvrer de lui une rame de papier où environ, qui est ce que le galand a fait imprimer. Mais il me semble que pour cette heure vous êtes garni d'assez bon gaige, et qu'il n'est jà mystère d'avoir plus pour se saisir de sa personne et lui faire son procès. Quand de ma part je prie Dieu qu'il lui plaise ouvrir les yeux à ceux qui discourent si mal, afin qu'ils apprennent de mieux juger du désir duquel nous sommes mus. Et pour ce qu'il semble bien par vôtre lettre que vous ne voulez plus entrer au propos que vous m'aviez tenu par çidevant, je m'en déporte aussi pour ne vous point fâcher, espérant néanmoins que Dieu en la fin vous fera bien sentir que je n'ai point pris à la volée le parti que je tiens. Me recommandant à vôtre bonne grace, priant Dieu vous tenir en la sienne.

De Genève, ce 26 Mars.

TRIE'S THIRD LETTER TO ARNEYS.

MONSIEUR MON COUSIN,

J'espère que j'aurai en part satisfait à ce que me demandez vous envoyant la main de celui qui a composé le livre, et même en le dernière epistre que vous avez reçu vous trouverez ce qu'il déclare de son nom, lequel il avoit déguisé; car il s'excuse de ce qu'il s'est fait nommer Villeneuve, combien que son nom soit *Servetus alias Reves*, disant qu'il a pris son nom de la ville dont il est natif. Au reste je

vous tiendrai promesse, au plaisir de Dieu, que si besoin fait je vous fournirai les traités lesquels il a fait imprimer, et écrits de sa main aussi bien que les épîtres. J'eusse déjà mis peine de les rétirer s'ils eussent été en cette ville, mais ils sont à Lausanne il y a deux ans. Si M. Calvin les eût eu, je crois pour ce qu'ils valent qu'il les eût bientôt renvoyés à l'auteur; mais pour ce qu'il les avoit adressés aussi bien à d'autres, ceux là les ont retenu. Même à ce que j'ai autrefois entendu, le dit sieur ayant suffisamment répondu pour contenter un homme raisonnable, voyant que celà ne profitoit rien envers un tel ouvrage, ne daigna jamais lire le reste, pour ce qu'il étoit déjà trop battu des sottés rêveries et du babil que l'autre ne fait que réitérer, ayant toujours même chanson. Ei afin que vous entendiez que ce n'est pas d'aujourd'hui que ce malheureux s'efforce de troubler l'Eglise, tachant de mener les ignorans en une même confusion avec lui, il y a 24 (ans) passés qu'on l'a rejetté et chassé des principales églises d'Allemagne, et s'il se fût trouvé au lieu jamais il n'en fût parti. Entre les épîtres d'Æcolampade, la 1^{ère}, et la 2^{de} s'adressent à luy avec tel titre que lui appartient, *Serveto Hispano neganti Christum esse Dei Filium, consubstantialem Patri*. Mélancthon en parle aussi en quelques passages. Mais me semble que vous avez la preuve assez aisée, par ce que je vous ai déjà envoyé pour enfoncer plus avant, voire pour commencer le tout. Quant à l'imprimeur je ne vous mande pas les indices par lesquels nous avons entendu que c'étoit Balthasar Arnoullet et Guillaume Guérout, son beau frère; mais tant y a que nous en sommes bien assuré; et de fait il ne pourra pas le nier. Il est bien possible que c'aura été aux dépens de l'auteur, et que lui aura rétiré les copies en sa main; mais si trouverez vous que l'impression est sortie de la boutique que je vous nomme. Pour ce que le messager demande être dépêché bientôt, m'ayant toutes fois présenté vos lettres bien tard, de peur comme je crois d'être sollicité à bien faire, je vous ai fait cette réponse en brief, parquoy je vous prie excuser la hativeté. Il me semble que j'avois omis de vous écrire qu'après que vous auriez fait des épîtres, qu'il vous plût ne les égarer afin de les me renvoyer. Qui sera l'endroit où je ferai fin à la présente, me recommandant toujours à votre bonne grace, etc.

De Genève, ce dernier Mars.