

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXX.—NO. 3.

JULY, MDCCCLXXIX.

ARTICLE I.

THE BRETHREN OF OUR LORD.

An interesting inquiry is suggested by the phrase, "The brethren of our Lord." Were they children of Joseph and Mary, our Lord's mother; or of Joseph by a former wife; or of Mary the wife of Cleopas, adopted by Joseph on the death of their father; or of Joseph by a Levirate marriage with the widow of his brother? For this last view few advocates have appeared, and these divided in opinion as to the person of the widow, whether Mary the wife of Cleopas or some unmentioned woman. Indeed the opinion is entirely based on suppositions, none of which can survive a critical examination.

Of the three others just given, the bulk of Patristic, Papal, and Protestant authorities favor the adoption of the third. Early authorities were divided between the first and second. Each has had distinguished advocates as well as the third during the last hundred years, within which period discussions on the subject of the inquiry have become more numerous and been distinguished by more zeal and ability than during any former period subsequent to the fourth century.

In prosecuting this inquiry, it becomes us to lay aside *à priori* considerations, traditions, and ecclesiastical dogmas, and examine with careful criticism those scriptures which formally or incidentally inform us respecting our Lord's parentage, birth, and house

leaping to the conclusion that the orthodox doctrine cannot be true because it is so awful. One thing appears evident, there has been *one Man* on earth who did appear to frame his whole life and nerve his energies in accordance with this solemn and dreadful view of human destiny. He seemed to live, and strive, and preach, and die, just as a good man should, who really believed the sinner's ruin to be everlasting. And this was the *one Man* who knew the truth by experience, because he came from the other world and returned to it. R. L. DABNEY.

ARTICLE IV.

CALVIN AND SERVETUS.

The relations which subsisted between these two celebrated persons, and the connection of the former with the latter's death, constitute one of the most interesting subjects of modern historical research. The first modern attempt to portray the life of Calvin, so far as we know, was one by a Genevese named Senebier, and the second, another by one Fischer—both simple biographical notices, very brief and meagre. Bretschneider also wrote a short memoir in the *Reformations-Almanach* on the *Genius and Character of Calvin*. In 1831-36 appeared *Genealogical Notices respecting Genevan families*, by J. A. Galiffe of Geneva, who "takes part against Calvin, though not very fairly and openly," says Dr. Paul Henry. In 1839 appeared the work of Trechsel in German, which Henry speaks of as expressly defending Calvin. During twenty years before and after this period Henry's "Life and Times of John Calvin" was in process of writing and publication. Dr. McCrie, it is said, was engaged at the time of his death on a "Life of the Reformer," but we are not informed if it was ever given to the public. Mignet, the author of a "History of the French Revolution," also wrote a work on "Calvin and the Reformation." In 1844 M. Rilliet de Candolle, who was, if we

mistake not, a Unitarian minister of Geneva, published his "Account of the Trial of Servetus." It appeared in the *Memoirs and Documents* put forth by the Genevan Society of History and Archæology. In 1848 M. Emile Saisset published his views of "The Prosecution and Death of Michael Servetus" in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Paris. In 1850 appeared a "Biography of Calvin," by Stähelin, a theologian of Basle, which gives even a fuller account than M. Saisset's articles, of the doctrines of Servetus, for which he had to suffer. Then in 1853 we get the *History of the Church* of Geneva, by Jean Gaberel; and in 1862, "*Calvin: his Life, Labors, and Writings*," by Rev. Felix Bungener, a Genevan pastor and an author of repute. In 1868 appears "Great Christians of France: St. Louis and Calvin," by the distinguished M. Guizot. Finally, Dr. Merle d'Aubigné, in eight volumes, has treated of *the Reformation in Europe in the time of Calvin*, and has given us very valuable information about the Reformer himself, but does not discourse at all upon his relations with Servetus. We must not close this list without mentioning that the Rev. Dr. Jules Bonnet, with the approbation of the French Government, explored its archives with great success and brought forth a large number of original letters of Calvin. They cover the period from 1528 to 1564, and have been translated into English from the Latin and French and published about 1858 by the Presbyterian Board at Philadelphia in four octavo volumes.

Guizot and Bungener, then, are the latest writers who have discussed the subject of this article. They are both Protestants. M. Saisset, Guizot tells us, is (or was) "a very distinguished philosopher of the contemporary French School"—he may or he may not be of the Roman Catholic Church. We propose to furnish our readers who may not have convenient access to the productions named with what we may be able to learn under the instructions especially of these three writers, respecting the great Genevese and his unhappy Spanish antagonist.

Let us begin by recurring to two new and daring ideas which Guizot says that Calvin introduced into the Reformation: the *first*, that Church and State were to be neither united nor separ-

ated, but only distinguished—they were two societies, two powers, each independent in its own domain, but combining in action and giving support to each other; the *second*, that the Church is not to be governed by “clergy,” but by elders, who are representatives chosen by the people. These elders were to constitute an ecclesiastical tribunal authorised to inspect continually and by discipline to control the life and morals of all members of the Church, and in extreme cases to have recourse to the civil power. Two bodies of elders are constituted, one called *The Venerable Company of Pastors*, who preached and administered the sacraments and also sat as members of the other body, called *The Consistory*. This second body was composed of twelve elders and six pastors (the popular element doubling the ministerial); and the election of members depended on a nomination by the Venerable Company and the choice of the Lesser Council and the confirmation of the Council of Two Hundred, both of which were political bodies. There was one more political body at Geneva, namely, the General Council, which consisted of all the citizens summoned to meet when needful by the ringing of the great bell. All these political councils existed at Geneva long before Calvin’s day. But the Reformer was not long there before he procured the passage of a law making it a crime for any one to summon this *mass meeting*, and thus he established and conserved popular freedom by confining authority to the hands of representatives of the people.

The French statesman concludes and declares that there was no ecclesiastical theocracy at Geneva in Calvin’s time. In all questions of faith and of religious or moral discipline the magistrates recognised the ministers and elders, but vigilantly resisted any extension of their power beyond due limits, controlled it within those limits, and even exercised due authority over these pastors themselves. Calvin unquestionably wielded great influence, yet even he was not beyond the reach of admonition by the magistrates. And he had enemies in Geneva—bitter enemies, who hated him with mortal hatred, seeking long and pertinaciously his overthrow and even his life. Two classes of these are to be especially named—both classes called *Libertines*: the one being local and

practical libertines, irreligious and immoral persons, both male and female, and the other an anti-Christian and Pantheistic sect who chose to be styled *Spiritual Libertines*. One class of these Libertines, or enemies of all restraint, are therefore sceptical, the other licentious, but both united eagerly against the Reformer. And it is Guizot's opinion that in his zeal for the proper regulation of morals and of conduct amongst the people, Calvin allowed himself to interfere with the rights of conscience and of personal liberty, and restricted individual responsibility within too narrow limits; and that in this way he furnished his foes with dangerous weapons against himself and prepared grave perils which he had afterwards to encounter.

Here let us turn to Bungener, who tells us of the "ecclesiastical ordinances" passed through the three political councils immediately on Calvin's return from exile, by which "the Christian State" sought "to make in the name of God such laws as might concur to the establishment and maintenance of the kingdom of God on earth." Amongst these is found a law requiring the pastors to assemble weekly for mutual instruction by Biblical exposition. "Should any difference as to doctrine arise, let them treat of it at first together; if that suffice not, let them call the elders; and if that suffice not, let the cause be brought before the magistrate to be set right." This was truly (as Bungener says) "a strange article"! It seemed to put the State over the Church as to doctrine itself. He views it as an expedient of the moment arising out of the need to consolidate at any cost an edifice that was to be assailed by so many storms. But perhaps, he says, it is not just to attribute this article to Calvin. The Council had at some length revised what Calvin and a commission acting with him had prepared, and its registers prove that their revision was not always in accordance with his views. And yet Bungener holds that the Reformer had very skilfully guarded the independence of the Church, although that was "sacrificed as it seemed in some articles, and compromised as a whole, by the very fact of the strict union between Church and State." He adds that "the Church's independence was cramped here and there, it is true, by inevitable contact with the political

power, but it was ever recognised and respected in its general features as an indestructible tradition"; and that "the Church of Geneva always had for *her* bishop—the company of pastors."

We are ready now to consider what Guizot says of the personal history and character of Servetus. He was born in the same year with Calvin, 1509, at Villanueva, a city of Arragon, Spain. He travelled through France, Germany, and Switzerland, and was strongly imbued with the novel opinions of the time. With him the Pope was "the most murderous of beasts," and Rome "the most shameless of harlots." Bungener says: "Hunted by the idea that the Reformers had stopped too soon, and that Christianity, in order to become true again, needed a restoration deeper and far more complete, he hoped to induce Calvin to place himself at the head of the work thus resumed." This was to "ask from him a declaration that till then he had only taught half a reformation." Guizot describes him as gifted with rapid insight, brilliant imagination, marvellous powers of acquisition, and wealth of novel theories, often rash, but sometimes ingenious and happy. Bungener says he blended in his studies law, physic, and divinity, and toiling like one of the sixteenth century, but daring as one of the eighteenth (he might better, we think, have said of the *nineteenth*), he pried into everything. In his first work against the Trinity and in the fifth book there is a passage which was unheeded by his contemporaries, but which contains the whole theory of the circulation of the blood. Guizot says that in Paris in 1534 he was both a student and a professor, giving and receiving lessons in medicine, mathematics, and astronomy, and turning his attention also to astrology. The extent and versatility of his powers attracted large audiences, but his exacting and quarrelsome temper soon embroiled him with the whole University, which distrusted his views and detested his person. He lacked modesty and was violent and abusive and full of presumptuous and arrogant self-complacence. He had previously published two books—the first "on the Errors of the Trinity," which Guizot says was vague and superficial, rash and violent, but written with vigor and a certain glitter of imagination and subtlety of thought. Both Catholics and Protestants received it with prompt and severe

disapproval. Almost immediately he published a second on the same subject, retracting the first, not as false, but crude and imperfect. In addition to attacks on the Trinity, this book disclosed a much more wild and impious pantheism than the first had done. It was the damage he did thus to his name in both Germany and Switzerland that drove him to Paris, where, as just mentioned, he quarrels with his associates. Leaving Paris he sojourns in different places, changing his name with every change of residence. At length in 1540 he settles at Vienne in Dauphiné for twelve years, under the name of Villeneuve, from his native city, enjoys high repute as a physician, and is in outward conformity a Roman Catholic. Dr. Henry says he lived there in the very palace of the Archbishop in perfect tranquillity, but as a hypocrite, for he submitted himself to all the practical requirements of the Church. Shortly before his death he remembered all this and expressed his shame to the magistrate at Geneva.

Bungener says that the movement at the head of which Servetus wished Calvin to stand was nothing short of "Anabaptist Pantheism—not Pantheism as in our day it is often taught or combated on the ground of social questions, but Pantheism as dogma," so that Calvin "clearly perceived in the system he proposed the very subversion of Christianity." Guizot refers to Stähelin as explaining that the fundamental principle of the whole book is the assertion of the one absolute and indivisible God and yet that God is all things and all things are God. M. Emile Saisset gives a more developed account of the doctrine of Servetus which yet is in full agreement with that of Stähelin—so Guizot declares. Bungener quotes what Servetus said at his trial in Geneva as setting forth his doctrine: "I have no doubt that this bench, this cupboard, and all that can be shown me, are the substance of God;" and when the objection was set before him by Calvin that then even the devil would be substantially God, he replied laughing, "Do you doubt it? All things are part and parcel of God." And Dr. Paul Henry tells us how, with a view of making the doctrine of the Incarnation appear ridiculous, he made blasphemous sport of holy things in words which, with

Henry, we grieve and tremble to copy, but which the truth of history bids us transcribe, and may the Holy One graciously forgive if we do wrong. He wrote thus: "If the angels in like manner were to take asses' bodies, you must allow that they would then be asses, and they would die in their asses' skins; they would be four-footed animals and would have long ears. So too you must allow that were you right, God himself might be an ass, the Holy Spirit a mule, and that He would die if the mule died. Oh the wondrously altered animal! Can we be surprised if the Turks think us more ridiculous than asses and mules?" There is, however, something even worse than this which Dr. Henry quotes from Servetus as follows, and again we say in pious horror of the blasphemy, may God forgive us if we do wrong even to refer to it: "He called the Persons of the Godhead inventions of the devil and the Triune Deity a hell-hound," or, as he otherwise expressed it, "a three-headed Cerberus."

In 1534 Calvin first met with Servetus in Paris. The latter had just published his first book upon the Trinity at Hagenau, and he had repaired to Basle and there sustained his views against *Æcolampadius*. Thence he went to Paris, declaring he would sustain them against Calvin. There is abundant evidence that Servetus regarded himself as a veritable Reformer—the last and greatest one. Evidently too he had strange fancies of his own, such as that somehow he stood connected with Michael the archangel whose name he bore. We have seen that he considered that the Reformers stopped short of the right point—he would inaugurate a very different kind of reformation (as Guizot says) from what was going on around him; or as Bungener expresses it, if the Reformers before him attacked only certain dogmas of the Church, he would aim at the very heart and soul of the Christian system. "I am neither Catholic nor Protestant," he said. And so he aspired to convert Calvin, and either destroy his influence, or else, as Bungener says, induce him to take the lead in this last and greatest reform. Accordingly he challenged Calvin to a public controversy at Paris, which challenge Calvin accepted and repaired to the appointed place at the set time. Servetus, however, for what reason it is not known, did not make his ap-

pearance. And Guizot suggests that there can be no doubt that some contempt for an adversary who had escaped in this manner from a contest was awakened in Calvin's mind. Subsequently Servetus writes many letters to the Reformer, who replies coldly but without acrimony. He gave him, says Guizot, wise and earnest advice, but was evidently careful not to enter into regular correspondence with him and anxious to avoid all appearance of intimacy, even as an opponent, with a man whom he did not esteem and whose views and ideas outraged all his own. To their common friend, Frelon, a bookseller of Lyons, he said, on the 13th February, 1546, the great lesson Servetus needed to learn was "humility, but it must come to him from the Spirit of God, not otherwise. . . . If God grants that favor to him and to us that the present answer turns to his profit, I shall have whereof to rejoice. If he persists in the same style as he has now done, you will lose time in asking me to bestow labor upon him, for I have other affairs which press upon me more closely. . . . And therefore I beg you to content yourself with what I have done in the matter, unless you see some better order to be taken therein." The Spaniard, however, continued to write, sending Calvin a great mass of his productions. He even expressed his wish to go to Geneva, but he required a safe-conduct and an invitation. But Henry, who states the fact, says Calvin would lend him no aid. And Guizot says that the Reformer was at length wearied out and replied thus: "Neither now nor at any future time will I mix myself up in any way with your wild dreams. Forgive me for speaking thus, but truth compels me to do so. I neither hate nor despise you; I do not wish to treat you harshly; but I must be made of iron if I could hear you rail against the doctrine of salvation and not be moved by it. Moreover, I have no time to concern myself any further with your plans and systems; all that I can say to you on this subject is contained in my 'Christian Institutes,' to which I must now refer you."

Servetus was deeply wounded by this language, which Guizot calls "haughty," and from this time forward there was an end of all direct correspondence on the part of Calvin. On the 13th of February, 1546, the same day that he writes as above to Frelon,

the Reformer pens his celebrated letter to Farel (Bungener by mistake says to *Viret*), in which, according to the translated letter in Bonnet's Vol. II., p. 33, he says: "Servetus lately wrote to me and coupled with his letter a long volume of his delirious fancies with the Thrasonic boast that I should see something astonishing and unheard of. He takes it upon him to come hither if it be agreeable to me. But I am unwilling to pledge my word for his safety; for if he shall come, I shall never permit him to depart alive, provided my authority be of any avail."

Dr. Paul Henry says "this was but an outbreak of anger, a threat uttered in passion." But he adds that the letter to Frelon of the same date expresses the kindly hope that his opponent might still be converted. This is true, but hardly consists with the imputation of passionate anger to the Reformer. His enemies, says Henry, have made the sentence referred to of vast importance for the want of grounds of accusation against him. They seem not to perceive that their complaint is unreasonable; for had Calvin really and in itself wished for the death of Servetus, he must have encouraged his coming to Geneva. It is incredible, continues Dr. Henry, how many fables have been founded on this expression—to what ravings even it has given occasion, and that up to the present time. And then he observes that Calvin in all simplicity always acknowledged that he thought Servetus deserved to die for his blasphemy. It appears to us therefore quite unnecessary, also unjust, to ascribe this declaration to passion. It was the Reformer's honest belief that a blasphemer ought to be put to death, and he expressed it coolly and calmly. And as Bullinger remarks, it is fundamentally better that this declaration was made beforehand than if he had acted towards his opponent with more circumspection, concealing from him what awaited him at Geneva. And further, there is manifest here the total absence of all personal animosity. This menace is made in 1546, a period in which the Spaniard showed him only great consideration and respect—indeed, almost admiring friendship. Calvin at that time could not have hated him personally, whatever may be charged on him afterwards, nor could this threat be other than a calm and solemn declaration of what he held that

duty would demand of him. Indeed, it appears to us that he may have honestly said even during the terrible trial seven years after, that, he had hated and did hate the errors—not the man. Whatever his faults, there were in Calvin no disguises. True to the spirit of his age and to the principles he holds and boldly professes, he is ready to sanction the execution of a blaspheming heretic, and so he gives him plainly to understand.

At length Servetus publishes his “*Christianismi Restitutio*,” which he expected to produce a greater social and religious revolution in Europe than the Reformation had done. But with mingled audacity and cowardice he does not declare himself its author. He procures the printing of it in secret in Vienne in the very diocese where he was living under the protection of the Archbishop. Eight hundred, some say one thousand copies, were struck off, and bales of them forwarded at once to Lyons, Châtillon, Frankfort, and Geneva. It was an octavo of 734 pages, says M. Saisset, and he adds that there appear to be extant now only two copies of this edition, one in the French National Library and the other in the Imperial Library of Vienna. The book bore no name either of author or printer, only the three initial letters of the name and country of Servetus were placed at the bottom of the last page: M. S. V.—Michael Servetus. Villanueva.

Lyons, says M. Guizot, was now the centre of Catholicism, and Geneva that of Protestantism; in both the book excited public indignation. Yet the people of Geneva marvelled that in a city like Lyons no steps were taken to stop the circulation of such a book and to discover and punish the author. Because, as M. Saisset mentions, Lyons had for its governor and archbishop the Cardinal Tournon, so celebrated for burning zeal against heretics, and by his side there dwelt Brother Matthew Ory, Inquisitor General of the Kingdom of France. Now there was a M. de Trie at Geneva, a French refugee and a zealous Protestant and follower of Calvin, who was in correspondence with a relative at Lyons, Antoine Arneys, who was an ardent Catholic. This latter accuses the Reformers of being without faith or discipline and of sanctioning the most unbridled licence. In his turn De Trie accuses the

Roman Catholic Church of inability to repress licence in her own domains and of indifference to it, and in proof he instances Servetus and his book recently printed at Vienne under the very eyes of the Archbishop. And then he substantiates his words by sending to his relative the title page, the index, and the first four pages of "the Restitutio." The Inquisitor, the Cardinal, and the Vicar General of the Archbishop of Vienne, take up the case, and Servetus is summoned for examination. After two hours, which interval those who upheld him acknowledged that he no doubt occupied in destroying all his dangerous papers, he appears, but puts in a denial that he held any heresy, and offered to have his apartments searched for any letters or other documents that could compromise him. Nothing of the sort was found. The printers also denied that they had ever seen the manuscript of the work of which four pages were shown them or that within two years past they had printed any work in octavo; and for proof they produced a list of their publications during that period. So the conclusion was reached that there was really no ground for any proceedings against the Spanish physician, Senor Villanueva.

But, Guizot says, the falsehood was rash and useless, and the reader may be disposed to add cowardly too. Too many, says Guizot, had been engaged in the production of the book; too many copies had been sent away; the initials M. S. V. pointed too plainly at the author; and Servetus himself had too often boasted of his work. The Cardinal and the Inquisitor apply to the source whence the first notification came for further light. They direct Arneys to write to De Trie for information and proofs. He sends some letters from Servetus to Calvin, which he was sure Servetus could not deny writing. But he tells Arneys that he had great difficulty in obtaining them from Calvin—"not that he does not desire to repress such execrable blasphemers, but that it seems to him that his part is, inasmuch as he does not bear the sword of justice, rather to confute heresy by sound doctrine than pursue it by other means"—and then he goes on to explain how he had prevailed over the Reformer's objections by pleading that, if he did not furnish him with these proofs, he, De Trie,

would be held guilty of having made reckless assertions. The effect of these proofs was the re-arrest of Servetus. The unhappy man was greatly troubled, and fell, says Guizot, into all kinds of strange and contradictory statements and denials. "If he had written these things, it was done heedlessly, by way of argument and without serious thought." "And then he is said (records the French statesman quoting from Dr. Paul Henry) to have burst into tears and uttered the most unexpected lie, denying that he was Servetus: 'I will tell you the whole truth. Twenty-five years ago when I was in Germany, a book by a certain Servetus, a Spaniard, was published at Aganou (Hagenau); I do not know where he was then living. When I entered into correspondence with Calvin, he charged me with being Servetus on account of the similarity of our views, and after that I assumed the character of Servetus.'" Upon this he was imprisoned, but he was treated with indulgence by the gaoler whose sick daughter he had cured, and was allowed to escape. For months there were no traces of him. Sentence was however pronounced against him by the Roman Catholic authorities at Vienne, and on the 17th of June he was condemned to be burnt alive.

M. Saisset is of the opinion that in all this affair De Trie was only a puppet in Calvin's hands, who dictated the letters which he wrote, and used him as an instrument for procuring the execution of his foe by the hands of the Roman Catholics. He says De Trie expatriated himself through religious zeal, but insinuates that "perhaps also this was necessitated by misfortunes in business." He speaks of him also as a "simple and uneducated person," though Paul Henry calls him "a noble Frenchman." Saisset says "the docile simplicity of William Trie and the fanatic zeal of Arneys were the two instruments which Calvin resolved to make use of to destroy his enemy." Accordingly the first letter written by M. de Trie to his friend at Lyons, Saisset maintains was "manifestly calculated with most adroit perfidy to induce Arneys to denounce" Servetus to the Inquisition. "Calvin (he says) denied all hand in this outrageous letter, but traces of him are to be seen throughout the whole of it, and it is to-day incontestable that he dictated it." His proofs are that Trie should

know that Servetus was the author of "Restitutio," and that he should also be acquainted with the contents of that book. The second letter of M. de Trie, written to his Lyons friend, Saisset maintains, was also dictated by Calvin, and he says: "Never did implacable hatred pursue its end by more tortuous paths." "Calvin (he says) shows himself in this letter more sagacious and more jealous than the very Inquisition." "He communicates to it documents it asked not for," and "at the same time he feigns to have had them extorted from him by a species of violence." And he thinks that in this "memorable letter the hypocrisy, the fanaticism, and the hatred (of Calvin) form a horrible assemblage."

These are very serious charges. M. Saisset no doubt believed them. But he offers no proof, though asserting that in this day they are incontestable. It does not appear to us very strange, if a bale of these books were sent to Geneva, that an intelligent and earnest Protestant sojourning there, like M. de Trie, should have seen and examined the book, and should have conversed with Calvin about it, and should have learned the source of it from him. These facts admitted, the rest is all plain and easy. He writes to his friend, defending the cause he has adopted from unjust accusations, and seeks with very proper zeal to turn the tables on him. Arneys feels the sting of the reproach against his Church and reports to the Inquisitor. Servetus denies and seems to disprove the charge, and De Trie finds himself in the position of a false accuser. With the plea that his good name is at stake he overcomes Calvin's scruples, declaring for him that he does not question the necessity of putting down the blasphemer, but that he is loth to undertake what does not devolve on him. All this seems to us very natural, and we can discover nothing tortuous, implacable, hypocritical, or fanatical about it. The letters of M. de Trie moreover impress our mind as in no respect characteristic of the Reformer, but as being just such letters as a converted Roman Catholic of education might be expected to write. But we have positive evidence to add to this negative sort. Modern jurisprudence allows every man to testify in his own behalf, and we can produce what Calvin himself said by way of self-defence.

Guizot tells us what he said as follows: "It is reported that I have contrived to have Servetus taken prisoner in the Papal dominions, that is at Vienne; and thereupon many say that I have not acted honorably in exposing him to the deadly enemies of the faith. There is no need to insist on very vigorously denying such a frivolous calumny, which will fall flat when I have said in one word that there is no truth in it." This appears to us to settle the question of fact. Guizot says well: "There are no errors or rather no vices with which it is so impossible to charge Calvin as with untruth and hypocrisy. During the whole course of his life he openly avowed his thoughts and acknowledged his actions; he left his native country forever and the country of his adoption for a long period, just because he was resolved to assert his opinions and to act according to his opinions." The French statesman says also that "it shows an extraordinary misapprehension of his character to imagine that this hesitation [that is, about giving to De Trie the evidence he sought for] was an act of hypocrisy and that the surrender of the papers was a piece of premeditated perfidy." No, Calvin's positive denial settles the question of fact—had he actually been the author of Servetus' arrest and rearrest, he never would have flinched one moment from acknowledging it: nay, he would from the very construction of his nature have openly declared and gloried in it. But, as Bungener says, "his enemies admit that the business was not conducted by him but by M. de Trie, who acted as his secretary. The question therefore is reduced to this—to know whether the secretary had orders to do what he did. Now we do not think that any man of good faith, at all acquainted with Calvin, can dare to suspect him of having said, 'It is not I,' if the culprit had been his agent."

But we have not heard the whole of Calvin's evidence. Bungener makes it plain, as he puts the case, that the Reformer is not chargeable even indirectly with laying a plot against Servetus. "It is a frivolous calumny," says the great, the candid, the honest Genevese, "there is no truth in it." Enough. His bitterest enemies ought to acknowledge that he never lies, and clearly he had in fact no hand in bringing Servetus before the Inquisition. That was the result of De Trie's simple-hearted efforts to rebut

the charges brought by Arneys against the Reformation. But now hear Bungener speak again: "Why speak of *culprit*?" And he proceeds to declare that Calvin did not think De Trie's conduct in any aspect blameworthy. And hear Calvin speak again, adding to what was quoted from him above these words, which must silence every doubt as touching the fact. "If (says he) the accusation were true, I would not deny it, and I do not think it would be at all discreditable to me." He felt, as Guizot says, a contempt for the untruth and cowardice practised by Servetus; he openly condemned him and his book from the very first; and he thought it was a right thing to prove Servetus the author of the blasphemies he had published and then denied; but in point of fact it was not true that he had caused his betrayal, and therefore he would not lie under the imputation.

Sentence against Servetus was pronounced by his Roman Catholic judges on the 17th June, 1553. He had been put into prison on the 5th April and had escaped on the 7th. No traces of him were found between that day and the middle of July. He appears to have wandered either in French or in Swiss territory, and when at a later period he was asked where he had intended to go after his escape from Vienne, he varied in his answers, sometimes naming Spain and at others Italy as his proposed place of refuge. But Guizot says: "I am inclined to believe that from the very first he intended to make his way to a much nearer spot." Accordingly on the 17th July, just one month after his fearful sentence at Vienne, alone and unknown he enters a little inn called the *Auberge de la Rose* on the banks of the lake at Geneva. He said that he wanted a boat to go across the lake so that he might go on to Zurich. He did not cross the lake, however, but stayed, says Guizot, for twenty-seven days at that place, greatly exciting the curiosity of his host, who asked him one day if he was married. "No," said Servetus, "there are plenty of women in the world without marrying."

Calvin afterwards said that he did not know how to account for the conduct of the Spaniard "unless he was seized by a fatal infatuation and rushed into danger." But Guizot thinks there is equally strong proof of premeditated design in this prolonged

visit. Precisely at this period the Reformer was in the thick of his contest with the Libertines on the subject of excommunication from the Lord's Supper, and at that very time they had some reason to expect a triumph. Ami Perrin, one of their leaders, was first Syndic. In the Council of the Two Hundred they were sure of a majority, and nearly sure of one in the Lesser Council, which possessed the executive power. And one of their party named Gueroult, who had been banished from Geneva but had just been brought back through the influence of the Libertines, was the corrector of the press to the printer Arnoullet at Vienne who had got out the *Restitutio*. Naturally he would be the medium between the Libertines and Servetus. Guizot finds no definite and positive proof of his intervention at this particular time, but is convinced, taking a comprehensive view of the whole case, that Servetus came to Geneva relying on the support of that powerful party, whilst the Libertines on their side expected efficacious help from him against Calvin.

But from the moment Calvin heard that Servetus was in Geneva, he appears not to have hesitated for one moment. Engaged in one fierce and perilous struggle, he instantly adds a second contest to the first. He aspires to gain a victory for Christianity over a Pantheistic visionary, and at the same time one for religion and morality over a licentious faction. He writes to one of the Syndics and demands the arrest of the Spaniard, and he is arrested on the 13th August, 1553. According to Genevan law there must be a formal accusation, and also a prosecutor who consents himself to be imprisoned and to hold himself criminally responsible for the truth of the charge. Calvin provided this prosecutor in the person of his secretary, Nicolas de la Fontaine, a French refugee. The first examination was held the day after the arrest, and the trial commenced on the 15th August. It lasted two months and thirteen days.

For the first fourteen or fifteen days, says Guizot, Servetus showed no lack either of moderation or skill, although both attack and defence were sharp and keen. He maintained the truth of the doctrines he had put forth, but was most anxious to show that they were not contrary to the Christian religion, that he had

never wished to separate himself from the Church, and that his aim was to restore Christianity, not to abolish it. The trial was soon transferred into a theological controversy, Calvin after the 17th August taking part directly in it. Servetus offered to shew Calvin his own errors and faults before the whole congregation, proving them by arguments drawn from the Sacred Scriptures. Calvin eagerly accepted this offer, declaring that he desired nothing so much as to conduct this trial in the church and before all the people. But the Council refused to let the case pass out of their hands, and especially as the friends of Servetus, more prudent than himself, were not willing, knowing how much more weight the Reformer's words would naturally carry with the people than the Spanish stranger.

The developments at the trial, Guizot tells us, both shocked and embarrassed the Council. Calvin had warm partisans and Servetus eager advocates and protectors, as the principal Libertine leaders, Ami Perrin and Berthelier. But there were, he says, impartial members of it, who were sorry to see Calvin take such a prominent part in the prosecution. These had moreover no desire to become judges in a trial for heresy. Yet they recognised the danger to Christianity from the Spaniard's Pantheism, and refused at any cost to appear to sanction it. And moreover they disliked and suspected Servetus. Sincere enough he was in his adherence to his own views, but they found him frivolous, vain, arrogant, irresolute, and worse than all, untruthful. He denied all connexion with the Libertines of Geneva or with even their agent Gueroult, who had corrected his book at Vienne. These obvious falsehoods withdrew from him all the confidence even of those magistrates who hesitated to condemn him. The majority of these judges, Guizot says, unquestionably desired to modify the character of the trial and make its personal animosity less apparent. They wished to appear the defenders of Christianity in general, and not any special theological system. And therefore they adjourned the trial several times, and put off the final decision as if dreading to pronounce it. Moreover, when by the advice of his supporters Servetus demanded that the principal Reformed churches in Switzerland—Schaffhausen, Berne, Zurich,

and Basle—should be consulted on his case, since on similar occasions they had always shown themselves far more moderate than Calvin, the Council granted the request and the Reformer did not oppose it.

But the time for procrastination at length passed away and the crisis of the two struggles going on in this little state arrived. With the instinct of the man of action, says Guizot, this was felt by Calvin, and on the 27th August, 1553, he utters from the pulpit the severest censures on the conduct of Servetus, and on the following Sunday, Sept. 3d, refuses to administer the communion to the leader of the Libertines, notwithstanding the requirements of the Council of State. The trial of Servetus suddenly changes its whole character. All moderation, all prudence is cast aside by the prisoner, who is led away by the hope of overwhelming an enemy now fiercely attacked and in danger elsewhere. Servetus becomes the violent accuser of Calvin, even to the demand for his death. The Reformer was in circumstances to feel the probability that this appeal might be a success. The Memoir of Servetus calling from the depths of his prison for Calvin to be likewise incarcerated and put on trial for his life, together with the answer which he gave to it, the Council decided to send to the Swiss churches. But they seem to have hesitated about submitting the case to the judgment of these colleagues. Should the Swiss churches not judge like Calvin, what was to be done? Should they judge like Calvin, it would become necessary to condemn Servetus; and amid their other Genevan disputes, says Bungener, the Council was not anxious to procure for Calvin a victory which might lead to more victories. The Reformer understood the situation perfectly well. His letters to Bullinger and Farel indicate his discouraged state of feeling. The possible absolution of Servetus appears to him the subversion of his work—of his moral and political work as well as of his religious work and the too certain indication that God no longer supports it. He goes so far as to hint that he might take his departure and abandon it all. So that instead of Calvin's being at this time all-powerful and dictating the sentence of Servetus, on the contrary, he had never been so nearly unable to do anything. Bullinger and Farel both

conjure him not to give way to these feelings and not to expose Geneva by his departure to the accomplishment of her ruin by her own hands. Farel boldly declares that the death of Servetus was indispensable, and that whoso said the contrary was a traitor or an imbecile. "I have always declared (said he) that I was ready to die if I had taught what was contrary to sound doctrine, and I cannot apply a different rule to others." So reasoned the stern spirit of the sixteenth century. The question of sincerity or of intentions is set aside—neither was possible in him who taught error. It was the Romish idea in all its rigidity but without its logic, for there can be no logic in this idea (as Bungener says well) unless the infallible tribunal is supposed. But this Romish idea is so deeply imbedded in the spirit of the age that we find even Servetus himself accepting it. In his Memoir to the Council he says he is "content to die if he does not succeed in confounding Calvin," and asks that Calvin may be "detained a prisoner like himself," and if proved guilty be put to death instead of him.

At length, on the 19th September, it is decided in the Council to apply for the opinions of Berne, Zurich, Basle, and Schaffhausen. On the 21st the necessary documents—the Memoir of Servetus and Calvin's answer, with other such papers—are dispatched. Three weeks elapse, and Servetus finding there is no answer, concludes that he has been misled as to his adversary's weakness. In prison, sick and forsaken by the Libertines who had urged him on, his passionate excitement gives place to dejection. To be a prisoner in the sixteenth century, says Bullinger, was horrible. Already on the 15th September he petitions the Council for some relief to his sufferings, and receiving no answer he again supplicates on the 10th October. His clothes are in rags, he is eaten up with filth, and the first cold of autumn torments him because he suffers from colic and other maladies. Is he exaggerating to excite sympathy? It is hard to understand how such could be the condition of a prisoner who had several of the Councillors and the First Syndic for his sworn friends, while the gaoler also, Claude Genève, was one of Perrin's confidants. However this may be, "the Council sent two of its members to

the prison with orders (says M. Rilliet*) to cause the necessary clothing to be given to the prisoner so as to remove the hardships of which he complained." This we get from M. Guizot.

Meantime, says Bungener, the fate of Servetus was decided, but out of Geneva. A messenger of State, commissioned to bring the answers of the Cantons, delivered them on the 18th October. Each of these answers was twofold—that of the Church or of the pastors, and that of the Government—in all eight. There was complete and awful unanimity. Servetus must die. Berne and Basle so indulgent two years ago to Bolsec, have now for Servetus none but expressions of their horror. All the answers, says Guizot, are cautious and guarded, though in different degrees, and all are sorrowful in their tone but unanimous in the nature of their advice. There can be no doubt (he adds) that they recommended severity. Here then, says Bungener, is the whole of Protestant Switzerland forming a jury and unanimously pronouncing a sentence of condemnation. No mention is made of extenuating circumstances, nor is there any solicitation either direct or indirect for pardon or indulgence, and yet all know that it is a question of life and death. The Council of Geneva could no longer hesitate; although meeting on the 23d October, they adjourn the decision to another meeting on the 26th. But it was felt that the whole of Protestant Christendom was demanding the death of the criminal. Several councillors, says Bungener, now perceived this, who till then had only seen in this affair a trial between the Spaniard in whom they felt but little interest and the Frenchman whom they did not like. They could henceforward therefore yield, not to Calvin, but to the whole body of Protestantism; and so the majority of the Council are decidedly against Servetus. Ami Perrin, however, is true to him, and first demands absolution pure and simple, which would have been the exile of Calvin and the final triumph of the Libertines. It was refused. He demanded then what had already been asked by Servetus, that the cause be brought before the Council of the Two Hundred. Calvin, says Bungener, had many enemies there,

*M. Rilliet de Cundolle, Unitarian minister at Geneva and author of a celebrated history of this trial.

and that Council was less bound by the previous advice of the Cantons. M. Saisset says that "in the Council of the Two Hundred the party hostile to Calvin was in the majority." He adds that Ami Perrin, "a second time defeated, next essayed to have the punishment made more tolerable, and that it appears that this was also the desire of Calvin, but that whether it was that the Council wished to follow the letter of the law which condemned heretics to the flames, or whether it was that they considered it an honor not to fall below the Catholic Inquisitors in point of severity, the more cruel opinion prevailed, and it was decided that Geneva also should have her *auto-da-fe*." And so, says Bungener, the Council still refused the reference to the other body, but "there is no one now who does not say, 'Would to God that Perrin had succeeded,' and we too say so with all the world." Yet, he says, it is not the less true that if the general state of affairs is admitted to have been such as we have described, the efforts of Perrin were neither those of a friend of the Reformation nor those of a wise politician, and to regret their failure may certainly be humane but it is also rather selfish. We think of ourselves and of the annoyance which this affair gives to us, and we make no account of the requirements of the moment misunderstood or betrayed by the Libertine magistrate. And Guizot remarks that at that period there was no hesitation on account of the atrocious torture of such a punishment and no scruple as to the right of inflicting it. Heresy was a crime and the stake its penalty. This was what Rome had taught mankind and what Protestantism had not yet untaught them. In that very year, 1553, at Lyons, not far from Geneva, several Reformers had suffered martyrdom, among them five young French students from the Theological Institute at Lausanne. And the Roman Catholic judges at Vienne had condemned Servetus to be burnt. Save for some scattered protests, says Guizot, which saved the honor of the human conscience, the burning of heretics was in the sixteenth century looked upon as the common right of Christianity.

But as to Calvin (remarks the French statesman), during the whole course of the trial he never had concealed his feeling of

what the sentence ought to be. On the 20th August after it had commenced he wrote to Farel: "I hope that he will be condemned to death, but I trust that there may be some mitigation of the frightful torture of the penalty." After the fulfilment of the sentence he wrote: "When Servetus had been convicted of heresy, I did not say a word concerning his execution; not only will all good men bear witness to this, but I authorise the bad to speak if they have any thing to say." On the 26th October, the very day on which sentence was passed, he writes to Farel: "Tomorrow he will be led to the stake. We made every effort to change the manner of his death, but in vain." These are Guizot's statements. "Observe (says Bungener) that he was not writing to some friend milder than himself in whose eyes he might wish to array himself with the semblance of humanity. The friend was Farel—more hostile to Servetus than was Calvin himself." Now why did the Council refuse this mitigation? Bungener answers, perhaps that they might not seem to adopt only in part the imperial canon law which recognises nothing but the stake for heresy; perhaps also (for we know that those who voted for the stake were not all Calvin's friends) not to give the Reformer a fresh victory by allowing him as it were the right to pardon or to mitigate.

But let us hear M. Saisset on this point: "Besides, it is just to say it, Calvin believed that one could do nothing more legitimate and useful than to choke the voice of heresy, and his sentiments on this subject were those of all the men of the sixteenth century, particularly of the principal Reformers. It is no doubt a contradiction on which it is not possible to insist too strongly, to see men whom they would have burnt at Rome as heretics assuming at Geneva the right to punish heresy with death—but this contradiction itself proves the perfect good faith of the Reformer. Led to the stake for the crime of impiety, they protested against the false application of the right, but never contested the right itself. Moreover they were influenced by a sort of horrible emulation to pursue heresy with as much zeal and to strike it with the same rigor as the Catholics. It was for them, Calvin especially, a point of honor. The legislator of the Reformation

was accused of destroying the principle of authority in religion : he gloried in showing to the world that in his hands this principle had not weakened. Everything concurred, then, to dispose Calvin to the most violent resolutions—vengeance, fanaticism, policy all ; add that he had gone too far to hesitate. Logician in hate as in everything else, he could not spare at Geneva him whom he had denounced at Vienne.”

Let us hear the same witness a little further. Speaking of the behavior of Servetus at the stake in yielding so far to the persuasions of Farel who attended him thither, as to recommend himself to the prayers of the people that each might pray with him and for him, the Reformer, it seems, had said that he did not know with what sort of conscience Servetus could do that, being what he was, for he had with his own hand written that the faith which reigned at Geneva was “diabolical, and that there was there neither God nor Church nor Christianity, because there they baptized little children.” “How then,” the Reformer had asked, “could he join in prayers with a people whose communion he should have fled from as holding it in horror?” Calvin had continued : “Servetus prayed as if he were in the very midst of the Church of God—in which he showed plainly that with him opinions were nothing. What is more, how came it to pass that he never said a word in defence of his doctrine? I ask you what it signifies that having liberty to say what he pleased, he made no confession neither on the one side nor on the other, no more than if he had been a block of wood? There was no danger of their cutting out his tongue; they had not gagged him; they had not forbidden him to say whatever seemed to him good.” All this Calvin wrote by way of denying that Servetus had any sense of religion or that his was “the death of a martyr.” M. Saisset says that never did theological fanaticism express itself in more coldly atrocious words, and at great length he pours out the most bitter reproaches on Calvin for the inhuman cruelty of these statements. “What! I would say to Calvin, it does not suffice you to take Servetus’s life, but you must also dishonor his death?” He admits it was right for Calvin to make war on the ideas of Servetus because he believed them false; right also to destroy his writings

because he held them dangerous; and that he should even lay violent hands on his person was a crime for which the age he lived in must share the responsibility. "But," says M. Saisset, "having smitten an unfortunate in his ideas, his books, and his life, at least have respect to his honor." We confess that this severity appears to us misplaced. On the one hand, as a martyr to truth, Servetus should have given when permitted some testimony to what he believed at the stake; on the other hand, as a sincere and consistent blasphemer of Christianity and reviler of Genevan Christians, he should not have asked for their prayers without some acknowledgment of his past errors. But M. Saisset will not admit anything of the kind, and goes so far as to insist on forcing Servetus into the true Church of God and excommunicating Calvin. His words are as follows: "This man who dies for an idea, these persons who pray with him and who touched with his sufferings endeavor to shorten them belong by the same title to God's Church. But you, Calvin, who denounce a personal adversary to the Catholic Inquisition, you who demand death where exile should have sufficed, you who preach against Servetus, he being absent and under the burden of capital condemnation, when you cap the climax of all these dark offences by undertaking to contest against evidence the good faith and sincerity of your enemy in order to travesty and dishonor his last moments, you do not belong at all, I dare affirm it in the name of that profound faith I have in an eternal principle of goodness and justice, you do not belong at all to the Church of God."

Yet M. Saisset has the candor to go on to say that however severely history should condemn Calvin in this matter, still it is not just to concentrate on him alone the responsibility for the stake at which Servetus was burnt. He says the Swiss churches contributed their influence in leading the Council at Geneva to pronounce sentence of death, and that the churches in Holland were not any more tolerant. He says, Melanchthon, the gentle Melanchthon, highly complimented Geneva and Calvin for what they did. Twenty years earlier (he adds) Œcolampadius, Capito, Zwingle, Bucer, all had held like views. "Such was the spirit (he continues) of this rude epoch. Catholics and Protestants,

nobody doubted that an error in religion was a punishable offence to be repressed by the magistrate. . . . Strange and terrible age when every thought might be a crime, when in the name of the gospel each party launched against all others anathemas and death." He proceeds to say that "Luther in the beginning of his career said, 'Why kill the false prophets when it would suffice to exile them?' but that encountering opposition his heart grew bitter and he also called for violence to succor truth." And so, he says, Calvin when he was himself a wanderer and in danger counselled mildness in repressing heresy, but that after the death of Servetus he wrote a book to establish the rights of the sword over error. So Beza maintained in the name of Protestantism the murderous doctrine. "In the next age Bossuet reaffirms it uncontradicted in the midst of a period of polish, of sweetness, and of light. To eradicate it two ages of philosophy have been required—Locke and Voltaire, Montesquieu and Rousseau, have been required; the French Revolution has been required."

So far M. Saisset. Bungener, referring to the many slanders against Calvin, says he has "even been reproached by some on account of the green wood of which the pile of Servetus was made in order they say that he might die a lingering death. Thus at the very moment when Calvin was asking for a milder form of death for Servetus, they would represent him as employed in rendering his tortures more cruel. Besides, what are they thinking of? Green wood was a favor, for the victim would be stifled before the flames reached him. All this discussion moreover reposes historically upon nothing. The documents which deserve to be believed make no mention of wood either green or dry; and the whole is only one of the thousand fables which blind hate has heaped around the name of Calvin. . . . Let us quit these details once for all. In vain are the horrors of this fatal day magnified; they will never equal those of so many days which had been witnessed already and which were yet to be witnessed—we will not say by Spain, whose soil is made up of human ashes—but by the Netherlands, by Austria, by England under her bloody Mary, and by France under her devout and dissolute kings. If Servetus had perished at Vienne, who would now have spoken of him? Who

would notice the luckless unit which is lost on the enormous total of the victims of Rome? What Romanist in the sixteenth century had the audacity or even the thought of reproaching Calvin or the Genevese for the death of Servetus? The tardy horror with which it inspires the Romanists of our day will never, do what they will, be aught else than a tribute of homage to the Reformation, for it is Romanism that is attacked and condemned when the Reformation is condemned for having inconsistently done once what Romanism did every day upon principle." Elsewhere he says: "It is a great anachronism to charge Calvin with this fault, as though it was his own and one with which his own age might have reproached him. Lament that he had an opportunity to commit it; blame him for having committed it with the bitter zeal which is always and in all things to be condemned; but to accuse him alone of it when all his friends, *including the mild Melancthon*, all his enemies with the exception of Castalio, but including Bolsec, and the whole sixteenth century in short, approved and in some sort committed it with him, is to sacrifice him to the ideas of the nineteenth century as Servetus was sacrificed to the ideas of the sixteenth. But when this sacrifice of Calvin is demanded by Romish writers, when those who testify so much horror before the stake of Servetus, experience none before the thirty or forty thousand fires kindled by the Church of Rome in the same century, we no longer ask where is justice, but where is the most common honesty and the most ordinary decency?"

M. Guizot says he does not think the Reformer ever felt any regret as to his own conduct during the trial. He believed in his duty to suppress heresy in this manner as sincerely as Servetus held to his opinions, and his most intimate friends sought not to soften but to confirm his severity. The most advanced advocates of freedom of opinion, Guizot says, did not go so far as to say that honest error could not be a crime. Servetus himself when charged with saying the soul is mortal, exclaimed that if he ever had he would condemn himself to death for it. Yet, says Guizot, amongst even the Calvinistic Reformers some were averse to the capital punishment of heretics, and would not tolerate the reproduction in their own body of the cruelty they protested against in the Church of Rome.

M. Guizot also says: "This celebrated trial has become a great historical event and I have followed its different stages with scrupulous care. I have endeavored to disentangle its philosophical, social, and political aspects, and to describe them accurately. I have been anxious truthfully to delineate the character, opinions, passions, and attitude of the two opponents. It was their tragical destiny to meet each other and to enter into mortal combat as the champions of two great causes. It is my profound conviction that Calvin's cause was the good one, that it was the cause of morality, of social order, and of civilisation. Servetus was the representative of a system false in itself, superficial under the pretence of science, and destructive alike of moral dignity in the individual and of moral order in human society. In their disastrous encounter, Calvin was conscientiously faithful to what he believed to be truth and duty; but he was hard, much more influenced by violent animosity than he imagined, and devoid alike of sympathy and generosity. Servetus was sincere and resolute in his conviction, but he was a frivolous, presumptuous, vain, and envious man, and capable in time of need of resorting both to artifice and untruth. In an age full of martyrs to religious liberty Servetus obtained the honor of being one of the few martyrs to intellectual liberty; whilst Calvin, who was undoubtedly one of those who did most towards the establishment of religious liberty, had the misfortune to ignore his adversary's right to liberty of belief."

What we have thus laid before our readers is a fair and truthful representation of the views of Guizot and Bungenèr on the one side, and of Saisset on the other. The great French statesman is the authority from whom we have quoted most largely. Of course it is not to be understood that we accept all his representations as perfectly just to Calvin. The Reformer's case is a better one in truth than Guizot makes it to appear. He admires Calvin, but with heavy discount. Evidently he hates the Calvinistic theology. But on this very ground his testimony will go further with many than if he were a Calvinist as well as a Protestant.

A few observations of our own will close this sketch.

1. The candid reader will regard the case of Calvin and Servetus in the light of a very desperate encounter. It was a life and death struggle, and that between giants. These two so wondrously endowed men were, through the infatuation that seemed to get possession of Servetus and through the force of circumstances, formally pitted against one another. Lælius Socinus, the uncle of Faustus Socinus, who became the father of Socinianism, held opinions very similar to those of Servetus, was a young man of great intellectual power, with a strong leaning towards philosophical speculation, and passed several years in Germany and Switzerland on friendly terms with Calvin and the other Reformers. There is a beautiful letter of Calvin in Jules Bonnet's collection, to which Guizot refers, written to his "dear Lælius," which shows with what affectionate earnestness and forbearing tenderness he could treat a youth who was, as Guizot states, "incessantly expressing doubts as to the divinity of Christ, the truth of redemption, expiation, original sin, and the majority of the Christian doctrines," to which the Reformer held so tenaciously. But in the case of Servetus, there was a trial of strength forced on Calvin by his antagonist. And yet we have no belief at all in the statement that the Reformer either had a personal hatred of the Spaniard or ever plotted against him. M. Saisset's monograph is disfigured with constant charges against Calvin of management and tricks. But that sort of blemishes never did attach to the character of the great Genevese. Committed by principles which he held sacred to certain course of conduct towards Servetus (some of those principles held by most good men at his day), he acted accordingly, and his conscience upheld and sustained him throughout.

2. The candid reader will also bear in mind, when judging Calvin and the other Reformers and also the Council of Geneva who condemned Servetus, how, by the very relations sustained by them to Rome, they were compelled to be stern and severe in dealing with Pantheistic unbelief and blasphemy. There stood their watchful adversary, ready at every moment to make capital for herself out of the least toleration by them of such errors. But in the account he gives of Calvin's book published the year

following the death of Servetus to demonstrate the lawfulness of the sword as against heretics, Bungener points out how different was Calvin's intolerance from that of Rome. The Reformer does not advocate the State's punishment of error as error, but only the punishment of the heretic when he becomes the disturber of society; and he always supposes the case where there has been really a disturbance, a shaking of the social foundations, and serious danger resulting both from the gravity of the error and the activity of the heretic. It is for a civil offence solely that he calls for the action of the magistrate. But according to the Romish idea, as realised in the Inquisition and by all the tribunals which judged under the influence of the Church, it was heresy and heresy in itself that was smitten—heresy in its obscurest adherents just as in its most renowned apostles—heresy whether rooted after and discovered in the depths of the conscience, or zealously and defiantly and dangerously proclaimed in sermons and books. And hence ensues an important practical consequence: the system advocated by the Reformer could not have extended to every heretic nor to every opinion reputed to be heretical, but to extreme cases only, where error was diffused that subverted Christianity. Thousands were put to death by the Papacy as Protestants; Calvin never proposed to put any one to death as a Romanist. The men he would *smite* were such as Gruet and Servetus, whom all Christendom would have smitten as he did. This was indeed to go too far; but history, as Bungener well says, must take note of these differences. The intolerance of Calvin could lead to the stake a very small number of victims; Romish intolerance was at that very moment immolating its thousands.

3. Let the candid reader also observe that every particle of the special interest attaching to the death of Servetus is that it was a Protestant *auto da fe*. Had the Spanish physician been burnt at Vienne, had he been one of the millions of Rome's victims, we had never heard his name. Geneva did take his mortal life, but gave him an immortal history and a deathless though not honorable name.

4. It is not a pleasant but an imperative duty to maintain that Servetus's name is not an honorable one. M. Saisset claims

that in denying the Trinity and the divinity of Jesus Christ and original sin he awakened and roused up Socinus; and that in composing a rational Christianity where every mystery becomes just a development of philosophy, he was the prelude of Malebranche and Kant and Schelling and Hegel and Schleiermacher and Strauss; and also that this courageous and hardy genius well knew all along the scope and reach of his daring enterprise. M. Saisset acknowledges that the "theology" of Servetus, "profound but subtle and refined, is fallen into oblivion," and that "his Neoplatonic philosophy is shipwrecked," but he declares that "what has not perished and cannot perish is the grand idea of a rational explanation of the Christian mysteries." He says: "It pertains to the nineteenth century to accomplish this magnificent enterprise, but the honor of having conceived of it and essayed to realise it, at the cost of his quiet and his life, will suffice to consecrate forever the name of Michael Servetus. He had a place amongst the martyrs of modern liberty, but it is just to mark out for him another not less glorious amongst philosophic theologians, amongst the forerunners of Rationalism." How far Socinians and Rationalists and the disciples of all the philosophers named by M. Saisset will consider it complimentary to be represented as the progeny of Servetus, it is not for us to judge. All we care to deny in M. Saisset's statement as given is that Servetus can be held to be the true originator of the idea of explaining the mysteries of Christianity. The French reviewer has forgotten the Gnostics and the Platonising Fathers of the early Church and the Schoolmen. But the special point we wish to make respects the moral character ascribed to Servetus. Does he really deserve to be counted a martyr to anything good or great who had no brave words to utter at the stake when called on to speak what he pleased in defence of what he believed? Did either his death or his life proclaim him courageous and hardy, or not rather vacillating, weak, and cowardly, though impulsive and rash? And what shall we say of his characteristic untruthfulness? Many a Christian, many a Protestant, has suffered all that Servetus had to endure without falsifying, as he did constantly. Christianity glories in her martyrs, not alone

for their courage, but their truth. If Rationalists or Socinians— if unbelief in any of its forms is prepared to glory with M. Saisset in poor Servetus, we bid them welcome to the honor and privilege with every advantage to their cause that can accrue.

5. Very high is the compliment paid to Protestant Christianity in our being required to defend John Calvin in this matter. Had he been a Roman Bishop, Archbishop, Cardinal or Pope, who had ever heard that he burnt Servetus? The world expects no better of Rome, but takes her as it finds her and as it reads of her in authentic history. She has long been addicted to burning men, and does not disown nor condemn any such act that she ever performed. Never is she heard excusing one of her innumerable martyr fires on the ground that it was an error of the age, for she claims infallibility and the world expects her to justify every abomination that stains her history. But men expect better things of Protestantism; and neither Calvin nor any other nor all its leaders lay claim to being above or beyond errors and mistakes. Nay, the immortal Genevese shall at any time and to any degree which justice demands be censured if only the glory of the true faith of the gospel may thereby be increased. For who then is Calvin, nay, who is even Paul and who is Apollos but ministers by whom we have believed? For we do not glory in men. For all things are ours and the Church's—whether Luther or Calvin or any other Reformer, whether the martyrs or confessors, whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas, all are ours, and we are Christ's and Christ is God's.

JOHN B. ADGER.