

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

JANUARY 1836.

No. I.

J. Addison Alexander

- ART. I.—1. Ernesti Friderici Caroli Rosenmülleri *Scholia in Vetus Testamentum*. 20 vols. 8vo. Leipzig: 1788—1829.
2. *Handbuch der biblischen Alterthumskunde*. Von Ernst Friedrich Karl Rosenmüller Vols. I.—IV. Leipzig: 1828—1830.

THESE are the titles of the two most important works of the late Professor Rosenmüller, neither of which was finished when he died. The name of this writer is at present so familiar to the scholars of America, that a brief sketch of his life and writings cannot be utterly devoid of interest. To those who know what the life of a laborious German scholar is, we need not say that his biography will exhibit little more than a chronological list of his publications.

This distinguished orientalist and biblical critic is often called *the younger Rosenmüller*, in order to distinguish him from his father, who was also an eminent Professor in the same University, and a labourer of note in the same general field, though in another subdivision of it. John George Rosenmüller, the father, born in 1736, was successively Professor of Theology in three Universities, Erlangen, Giessen, Leipzig. His local reputation, as a preacher and an ecclesiastical functionary, was extremely high; but his

ART. VII.—*The Life of Michael Servetus.**

J. W. Allen and others

THE burning of Servetus has been the favourite theme of all the enemies of Calvin and Calvinism. When all other arguments have failed, this has been resorted to, as if even admitting all the allegations of his worst foes, the Reformer's doctrine were hereby in any degree invalidated. Papists, Errorists, and Infidels, have here joined their forces and united in the outcry against their common scourge. Thousands who have never gone to one historical source, or consulted one authentic document, have ventured to pronounce upon the case. In an affair, not only perplexing as to the extent and remoteness of the testimony, but difficult from its involving the nicest questions of jurisprudence, we find men totally ignorant of both the facts and the law, adventuring conclusive judgments. Learned authors have gone out of their way, in the midst of scientific disquisitions, to inform us that Calvin burned Servetus.† And among the ranks of all who dislike sound doctrine, the clenching argument, for these two hundred years and more, has been *Calvin burned Servetus*.

If, for the sake of argument, it should be conceded, that John Calvin did in very deed counsel, procure, and effect the execution of this wretched Spaniard, very little would be gained by those who are most interested in establishing the charge. For, as a mere historical incident, it is by no means solitary; it stands as one of a hundred parallel cases. The prominency which it has obtained, is due to the eminence of the actors, but chiefly to the enmity indulged towards the doctrines of the Reformer. If it were not for this, one might

* The authority most relied on in this discussion, after the original documents, is CHAUFFPIÉ's *Life of Servetus*, in his *Continuation of Bayle's "Dictionnaire Historique et Critique."* Amst. 1756. Mr. Gibbon found this memoir liberal enough for his views. It is right to say, that we have often rested in Chauffpié, as an ultimate authority, where his citations are from works beyond our reach. But recourse has been had, on the critical points, to every work accessible to us, and especially to the tracts and documents in CALVIN'S *Works*: "*Tractatus theol. contra Antitrinitarios. fol.*"—Our statements may be collated with the masterly investigation contained in WATERMAN'S "*Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Calvin.*" Hartford, 1813; unquestionably the best biography of the Reformer, as the learned and pious continuator of Milner seems to allow. Minor authorities are noted in the margin.

† See a ludicrous instance, in Dr. JOHN REDMAN COXE'S "*Inquiry into the Claims of Harvey, &c. to the Discovery of the Circulation of the Blood.*" Phil. 1834. p. 256, not in the text, but in the *index*.

well suppose, from the frequency, urgency, and heat, with which the charge is reiterated, that it was a signal, peculiar, and unparalleled phenomenon of persecuting intolerance; that it was opposed to the acknowledged principles of the age in which it took place; that it fell under the rebuke and detestation of all the victim's contemporaries; that so atrocious an act of cruelty was reprobated by the leading Papists, or certainly by the leading Reformers; that it was unexampled in the history of the Reformed Churches; that Germany, Switzerland, France, and England were pure from any similar enormity; and that it was the last flagrant eruption of a vindictive crater, long since extinct. Let it be repeated; even if it were true, that John Calvin did extend the torch to the injured Servetus, the foregoing suppositions might seem natural, when the fact is dwelt on, and rehearsed, by every stripling theologian who chooses to run a tilt with the shade of a hero, or every physician, lawyer, or declaimer whose tongue blisters at uttering the name of a Predestinarian.

Every student of history knows, that every one of these suppositions is a falsity; that the age was an age of persecution, in which the church, still retaining many scales of Popish prejudice, was purblind to the rights of conscience; that persecutions for heresy were universal, and punishment of heretics practised in the freest countries under heaven; that this deplorable event was in perfect agreement with the principles of the statesmen and theologians of that day; that when the humbling fact occurred, it was approved and upheld by the very reformers whom it is attempted to exalt above Calvin in this comparison, not excepting the gentle Melancthon; that similar executions, before and after, blacken the history of the Church in Germany, Switzerland, France, and even England. Moreover, every competent historian is informed that the excellent Cranmer lies under the same or worse imputations, and that a multitude of hapless men and women fell under the secular arm, for spiritual offences, before the principle of liberty of conscience was established.

The human mind comes slowly to the acknowledgment even of great and seemingly plain truths. And there is no one of the grand fundamental principles of our own enlightened age, which men were so slow to receive, as this of the rights of conscience. Hence—and let the remark be pondered in this investigation—never was it fully and distinctly recognised as a principle in any government, until the time of Roger Williams, and the settling of Rhode Island. And

when this good but eccentric man wrote against the bloody tenet of persecution for cause of conscience, it was one of the pilgrim race, it was John Cotton, of Boston, who published, in accordance with the spirit of the whole age, his "*Bloody Tenet washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb.*"

Were it then conclusively made out, that Calvin acted the part of a determined persecutor, while we should both lament and blame, as we do in the case of Cranmer and the Puritans, we should not be astonished; nor should we renounce the man or his system. To expect any thing else, would be to expect unparalleled exaltation above the age in which he lived. And while we do accord, as the Reformed Churches cheerfully accorded, to this wonderful servant of Christ, a great precedency among his brethren; while we stand amazed at the progress which one gigantic soul could make through the corruptions of Popery, and the corruptions of partial reform, to great purity and light, in doctrine and polity, and even political science; yet we esteem him human, and consequently imperfect, and freely grant that in some points he was involved in the same shadows with his coevals, and that one of these was the point in question.

Calvin and Servetus were both prominent men; hence the notoriety of the transaction. Of all living Protestants, there was none so much revered by his friends, or so much hated by his trembling opponents, as "the legislator of the Reformation." And of all the brood of heretics which infested the rising Church, the most dreaded was Michael Servetus. "He was," says the mild Coleridge, "a rabid enthusiast, and did every thing he could, in the way of insult and ribaldry, to provoke the feeling of the Christian Church."

It is our object in the sequel to give a fair statement of the facts in the case. Not to plead for persecution; not to vindicate this instance of it; not to exculpate Calvin from all participation in it; but to furnish the lover of truth with data from which to form a judgment; to stop the mouths of ignorant or malicious calumniators; and to show in what relation the reformer of Geneva stood to this transaction.

Michael Servetus was born at Villa Nueva, in Arragon, in 1509. He called himself Ville Neuve, or Villanovanus, from this place, but is said to have declared himself a native of Tudelle, in Navarre. At the age of fourteen, he is reported to have understood Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and to have been imbued with the knowledge of Philosophy, Mathema-

tics, and Scholastic Theology. M. Simon, however, says: "it is evident by this author's books, that it cost him a great deal of trouble to write in Latin;" and Servetus himself, in the second edition of a book, says, "Quod autem ita barbarus, confusus et incorrectus prior liber proderit, imperitiæ meæ, et typographi incuriæ adscribendum est." At the age of fifteen he went to Italy in the suite of Charles V., whom he saw crowned at Bologna. Just at this time the seeds of anti-trinitarian doctrine began to germinate in Italy. The Socini and their fellows were then rising. It is believed that Servetus, under these influences, adopted his peculiar tenets. The late learned Dr. M'Crie expresses his belief, that the anti-trinitarian opinions, which spread there so widely, were introduced into Italy by means of his writings.*

From Italy he went to Germany, and thence to Switzerland; and, at Basle, held a conference with Oecolampadius, with whom he disputed about the Trinity, in 1530. He then repaired to Strasburg, and conferred with Capito, and with Bucer. The latter was so far overcome with indignation at the impieties of Servetus, as to say from the pulpit, that he deserved to be put to death. Such was the error and blindness even of one who was surnamed the Moderate Reformer; an error and blindness caught from his Romish education. Before he left Basle, Servetus had prepared a book in which he attacked the orthodox faith, respecting the Trinity. This he left there in the hands of Conrad Rouss, a bookseller, who sent it to Hagenau, as it was a dangerous business to print it. The author followed his manuscript, and published it at the last named place in 1531. He published a second, of like contents, in 1532. The former of these was entitled "De Trinitatis Erroribus Libri Septem, per Michaelem Servetum, alias Reves, ab Arragonia Hispanum." Scarcely a copy is known to be extant. Mosheim says that both this and the dialogues are "barbaro dicendi genere conscripti."

The second work was entitled "Dialogorum de Trinitate Libri duo. De Justitia Regni Christi, Capitula Quatuor, per Michaelem Servetum, &c." In this he retracts all that he had said in the preceding; not as being false, but imperfectly, and carelessly, and ignorantly written.† These works were so largely circulated, especially in Italy, that, as late as 1539,

* Ref. in Italy, p. 151.

† Non quia falsa sunt, sed quia imperfecta, et tanquam a parvulo parvulis scripta. Nicéron. Mem. des hommes ill. ii. 235.

Melancthon felt himself bound to write a caveat against them to the senate of Venice. Servetus passed his time in Germany until 1533, but then, finding himself without adherents, and awkwardly situated, from his ignorance of the language, and particularly desirous of studying mathematics and medicine, he went to France. Here he sought notoriety both as a scholar and an author. He studied medicine at Paris, under the instruction of Sylvinus and Fernel, and was graduated Master of Arts and Doctor of Physic by the university. Beza relates that, in this city, as early as in 1534, Calvin opposed his doctrines.* After taking his degrees, Servetus professed mathematics in the Lombard college. During this period, he was preparing an edition of Ptolemy's Geography, and several medical works; being, meanwhile, in warm contests with the medical faculty. We next find him at Lyons, with Frelon, a publisher, whom he served as corrector of the press. After various excursions, he settled at Charlieu, and there practised medicine. Bolsec, the noted enemy and slanderer of Calvin, and who wrote a memoir for the mere purpose of blasting his character, accounts thus for Servetus's leaving his settlement: "This Servetus was arrogant and insolent, as those have affirmed who knew him at Charlieu, where he lodged with la Rivière, about the year 1540, but was forced to leave that place on account of his extravagancies."† From Charlieu he returned to Lyons. Here he fell in with Peter Palmer, archbishop of Vienne, followed him to his see, and enjoyed a harbour in his palace. While at Vienne, he worked at a revised edition of Pagnin's Bible, which he furnished with notes, abounding in crudity and pravity of doctrine. By the intervention of the printer, Frelon, he opened a correspondence with Calvin. The manner in which Servetus conducted himself in this, may be seen in the published letters.‡ Calvin chose to break off all communication with a man who treated him with perpetual arrogance, and, from this time, Servetus never ceased to vituperate and oppose the Reformer.

Servetus wrote a third work against the orthodox faith, and after several ineffectual attempts elsewhere, had it printed at Vienne, in 1553. This was his famous *Restitution of Christianity*. Attempts have been made to show that it was Calvin who caused information to be lodged against Ser-

* Beza Hist. des Ecc. Ref. T. 19.—Vit. Calv.

† Vie de Calv. p. 9, ed. 1664, apud Chauffpié.

‡ Opuscul. min. p. 517, ed. 1667.

vetus, with the ecclesiastical authorities. After a careful examination of the authorities, and a full citation of all the witnesses, on both sides, M. Chauffpié pronounces the charge to be wholly without proof. If it were true, it could show no more, than that Calvin did what no good citizen of that generation would have denied to be a praiseworthy act. That Calvin communicated the evidence on which this process was founded, he expressly denies. And this denial must be credited, for, as he says, it is utterly against every presumption that he could correspond with Cardinal Tournon, one of the chief persecutors of the Protestants, and, accordingly, his virulent foes, Maimbourg and Bolsec, never hint such a charge.* It is agreed, however, that process was instituted, and the issue was a sentence "that there was not as yet sufficient evidence for an imprisonment." On a second examination, the Inquisition seized his person, by a finesse; and by a finesse, quite as allowable, Servetus escaped from them, June 17, 1553, and betook himself to the Lyonnais. The process went on in his absence, and, according to the usual course of Popish trials, resulted in condemnation, and sentence that he should be burned alive in a slow fire. This was executed on his effigy and five bales of his books. The unfortunate author, after thus flying from Vienne, wandered in places where historians cannot trace him. If Calvin is to be credited, four months elapsed before he arrived at Geneva; where he was arrested, tried, condemned and executed. There is great diversity of statement in the different accounts, as to the length of time he remained at large, and the manner of his being apprehended. According to the most unfavourable report, he was discovered at divine worship, on the Lord's day, and his presence was made known to the magistracy by Calvin himself. That this was done, if done at all, from personal enmity rather than mistaken zeal for a code of laws against heresy which all the world then approved, is only asserted, can never be proved, is by no means probable, and will be rejected by impartial history as the conjecture of prejudice. Such writers as Gibbon and Roscoe have vented much bitter crimination on this pretended motive. We may ask, with a late eminent historian: "Is it not with justice that it has been surmised, that philosophers who, not only iniquitously resolve to try men of the sixteenth century by rules and principles scarcely admitted before the

* Senebier. I. 205. *Calv. Op.* viii. 517.

eighteenth, but greedily receive every calumny or insinuation that 'false witnesses' can utter against them, and indulge in the most extravagant invectives in setting forth their misdeeds, had they themselves happened to live three centuries back, would not have been content to smite only with the tongue or the pen, but would eagerly have grasped the sword or the torch?"*

We have conducted this brief narrative thus far, without any account of the opinions charged against this unhappy fugitive. As we approach the critical and final act of the sad drama, it becomes proper to state, calmly and from the best sources, the nature of those tenets which rendered him obnoxious to the laws. And let no one undertake to discuss this subject, who is so ignorant of history, as not to know, that in that day, and throughout Christendom, heresy, especially when joined with blasphemy, was a capital crime. In the noonday of civil and religious freedom, a child may detect the fallacy of the argument, that heresy, which slays the soul, should have as dire a penalty as murder, which slays only the body. But the Roman Catholic, the Protestant, and the Socinian, of the sixteenth century, assented to this argument.†

According to the standard of the times, Servetus was a heretic. The following sketch of his published opinions is very far below their enormity; for details are purposely omitted. The authorities may be seen at great length in the life of Servetus, by M. Chauffpié.

Such is the jumble of inconsistent crudities in the works of this writer, that it is impossible to refer his tenets to any existing title in the nomenclature of error. He was not a cool speculator, but a hasty enthusiast. At the same time he was furiously opposed to many of the doctrines always regarded as fundamental in the Church of Christ. It was not the favourite dogmas of Calvin, as some ignorantly or maliciously assert, which this heretic made it his business to impugn. It was not predestination, special grace, perseverance, or any of the tenets for which the Reformed Churches peculiarly contended, which were assaulted in his works. His shafts were

* SCOTT'S Continuation of Milner, vol. iii. 437.

† SOCINUS procured the death of *Francis David*, because the latter denied that Christ should be worshipped. See the whole account in CHAUFFPIÉ, note BB. also BI. BRIT. vol. iv. p. 66. MURDOCK'S MOSHEIM, Vol. iii. 269, n. (30). 275. And Servetus himself shows what was the opinion of the age, in his request of August 22d, 1553, in which he acknowledges, as we shall see, that heretics might be *banished*. CHAUFFP. ubi supra.

aimed at more vital parts; the very nature of God, the Trinity, the Incarnation, and similar foundations of our holy faith. He was at once a Pantheist, an Anti-trinitarian, and a Materialist.*

Not content with philosophizing about the personality of God, he maintained that God is the Universe, and that the Universe is God. According to him, God is the infinite ocean of substance—the essence of all things. Not only the devil is in God, as also depraved spirits—but hell is no other thing but God himself. As God is the principle and end of all things, so they return at last to him; and in going into eternal fire, demons shall go to God himself.†

But it was the doctrine of the Holy Trinity that he set himself chiefly to impugn. In his first book he was more cautious than in those which followed; the doctrine of the earliest was nearer to Sabellianism than to any thing else. We have the authority of the ministers of Zurich for saying that he often called the Trinity of the orthodox, “a triple monster, a three-headed Cerberus, imaginary gods, and, finally, visionary and three-headed devils;” that he reviled Athanasius and Augustin, as “*Trinitarians*, that is, *Atheists*.”‡ To enlarge upon his other errors and heresies, respecting the creation, the immortality of the soul, regeneration, &c., would be unnecessary. Our object is not to detail the vagaries of an enthusiast, whose works indicate a perversion of mind almost amounting to insanity. Still less is it our wish so to represent his pestiferous errors as to convey the idea that it was right to visit them with secular penalties and a cruel death. We reject the opinion, nor is it a merit in any one to do so at this time, when all reasonable Christians do the same. But we only mean to show that the tenets of Servetus were such, as might naturally lead even good men, in the twilight of religious liberty, to recognise the duty of surrendering him to the secular arm. That Calvin so thought, is not surprising, as we have the fullest evidence to make it probable that any one of the prominent men of the age,

* GUERIKE. Handb. d. allgemeiner Kirchengeschichte. II. p. 959.

† Some of his own expressions are: Ignis ille ab aeterno paratus est ipsemet Deus qui est ignis. Si hoc bene intellexisset Origenes, non dixisset daemones salvandos, eoquod essent ad suum principium redituri; redibunt quidem, et euntes in ignem ad ipsum Deum ibunt. Chauffpié, note W.

‡ For the propositions in full, see NATALIS ALEXANDRI Hist. Ecc. ix. 163, ed. Lucca. fol. 1734. CALVIN. Tract. Theol. p. 590. sqq. Also consult Epist. PHILIPPI MELANCTHONIS, p. 152, 708, 710, fol. Lond. 1642.

whether churchman or layman, whether Romanist or Protestant, would have held the same opinion.

Accordingly, as soon as Calvin discovered that Servetus was in the city, he used means to have him apprehended. The words of Calvin are: "He thought perhaps to pass through this city. Why he came hither is not known, but seeing that he was recognised, I thought it right that he should be detained."^{*} It was necessary that the prosecutor should be personally held in durance while the process was pending, and Calvin used the intervention of Nicholas de la Fontaine, a student belonging to his household. Great reproach has been cast on the reformer for this step, as if it had been his intention to shun the appearance of being active in the affair. But he declares most fully the contrary: "I declare frankly, that since, according to the law and custom of the city, none can be imprisoned for any crime without an accuser, or prior information, I have made it so, that a party should be found to accuse him; not denying but the action laid against him was drawn by my advice, in order to commence the process.[†]"

In our account of the trial we follow *Chauffpié*, in whose impartial statement are found abundant extracts, and references to authentic documents, of which most are beyond the reach of American students, and therefore need not be expressly cited. Servetus first appeared, August 14th, 1553. *La Fontaine* adduced in evidence the printed books, and a manuscript, which was owned by the author, though it had been several years lying in the hands of Calvin. On the 15th, the examination upon the same articles proceeded. On the 17th, *La Fontaine* and a certain German named *Calladon*, who was now associated with him in the prosecution, produced letters from *Oecolampadius* and passages from *Melancthon*, showing that Servetus had been condemned in Germany. They likewise cited further passages of a heretical character. On the 21st, he appeared again; and after the course of the ordinary investigations had proceeded, he conferred or disputed with Calvin on certain questions respecting the Trinity. This conference, however it may have been misrepresented, was not contrary to the prisoner's interest: indeed it should seem that his abettors complained that there was not sufficient license allowed for frequent disputations. The Judges then

^{*} *Calv. to Farel*, Oct. 27, 1553.

[†] *Declaratorie*, p. 11, apud *Chauffpié*.

ordered that the books which Servetus required for his answer should be bought at his expense, and that he should retain those which Calvin had cited. On the 22d, Servetus sent a letter to the syndics and council, entering a plea to their jurisdiction—maintaining that it was unchristian to institute a capital prosecution for religious opinion—declaring that the ancient doctrine allowed merely the banishment even of such as Arius himself—and praying that he might have an advocate. The reader, while he weeps over the prejudice which could disregard pleas so reasonable, will remember that even in England, long since the Reformation, prisoners have been denied counsel to plead their cause before a jury in any felony, whether it be capital, within the benefit of clergy, or a case of petit larceny.* On the 28th, new articles of accusation were brought forward, and among other offences, he was charged with the anabaptist error about the power of the magistrate. During these protracted investigations, he persisted in avowing his tenets, and his determination to avow them, unless he should be convinced. Even when charged with his indecent railings and dreadful blasphemies, he made no excuse: ‘I confess,’ said he, ‘I have written so; and when you shalt teach me otherwise, I will not only embrace it, but will kiss the ground you walk on.’ In the mean time, information had most unnecessarily and ungenerously been sent to Vienne, of the arrest of Servetus. On the last day of August, an officer from that city appeared before the council of Geneva, with a copy of their sentence, and a request that the prisoner should be remanded to them. It was left to his choice, and as was most natural, he rejected the harsh proposal, and pathetically besought that he might be judged by the magistrates of Geneva.

Hitherto, we find nothing in the conduct of Calvin inconsistent with the standard of belief and feeling at that day. It is melancholy to observe how this important circumstance is overlooked by those who, from a hasty induction of mistaken facts, attribute to personal malice the whole of his conduct. Let it never be forgotten, that the proceeding of a democratical city and a judicial council is one thing, and the ministerial and subordinate act of their pastor and teacher, another thing. And even though the latter might willingly appear in the case as prosecutor, witness, or expounder of theological opinions, we are not to charge him

* BLACKSTONE, vol. iv. p. 355, note 8.

with every enormity of the syndics and council; especially as it is matter of history, that the faction which was at that juncture dominant in the council of Geneva, was opposed to the Reformer.* Plainly unjust is it then to repeat, for the thousandth time, that we are at liberty to consider every act of that body as emanating from Calvin. This charge of vicious and vindictive interference has been repelled by several impartial historians. "Calvin," says M. la Roche, "never came into the court but when he was commanded, and there he did nothing but by the order of his master. Upon every emergency, it seems, they had recourse to divines; to consult with them, to confer with prisoners, to direct interrogations, to make extracts, examine answers, and many other things of this kind. I believe, in the station this pastor of Geneva was in, they were afraid of transgressing, if they did any thing without him—but why represent him as an impertinent hypocrite, who intruded himself by his office in this affair; or as an implacable enemy, who earnestly solicited Servetus's death?"† And here it is but fair to let the defamed Reformer speak a word for himself. The extract is from his French works as cited by la Chapelle: "I will not deny but that he was made prisoner upon my application. But after he was convicted of his heresies, every one knows that I did not in the least insist that he should be punished with death. And as to the truth of what I say, not only all good men will bear me witness, but I defy all malicious men to say it is not so. The proceeding has shown with what intention I did it. For when I, and my brethren, I mean all the ministers of the gospel, were called, it was not owing to us that he had not full liberty given him, of conferring and treating of the articles wherein he has erred, in an amicable manner with us."

It was on the first day of September that the judges again availed themselves of Calvin's aid in procuring an extract of offensive propositions, in the very words of Servetus.

* Even at the time Calvin complained that he was made responsible for every thing: "Quicquid a senatu nostro actum est, mihi passim ascribitur." The statement of the text will be confirmed by reference to SCOTT, vol. iii. p. 432, 439, 442, and WATERMAN'S Calvin, p. 124. In the ENCYCLOPÆDIA AMERICANA, Art. "Calvin," the compiler of a hasty and disingenuous sketch, without citing a single authority, pretends to give certain acts of the commonwealth, "to prove," forsooth, "the blind and fanatical zeal which he [Calvin] had infused into the magistracy of Geneva." As if the penal statutes against heresy had not been for ages a part of their code! See CHAUFFPIE, notes S, and Z. and LA CHAPELLE, Bib. Raisonn. vol. ii. p. 139, 141.

† CHAUFFPIE, note U.

These were thirty-eight in number. They were put into the author's hands, that he might answer, explain or retract. He wrote a reply; and this, in its turn, was answered by Calvin. The answer of Calvin was likewise delivered to Servetus, who made notes upon it. The reader who would pursue the subject into its lesser windings, may find all these documents among Calvin's *Opuscula*. A consultation of these will do more to show the virulence and headstrong fury of Servetus, than any second-hand statement. About a fortnight was spent in these proceedings. On the 15th, Servetus petitioned that his cause might be referred to the Council of Two Hundred; in which body, it should be observed, the sovereignty of the commonwealth resided. "It is believed," says the cautious *Chauffpié*, "that this request was suggested to him by Calvin's enemies, who contributed as much, and even more than he, to Servetus's destruction. Believing himself well supported, he observed no measures with Calvin or his judges. If he had had the least modesty or discretion, I doubt not but he might have brought himself off; but flattering himself with a triumph over Calvin, by the credit of the party which opposed this reformer, he was the victim of his pride and prejudice. This is the only way of explaining his constant conduct at Geneva; in all respects so different from his behaviour at Vienne."

The hopes of Servetus from the city faction must have been strong, as we find him, on the 22d of September, petitioning that Calvin should be punished as a calumniator. On the 10th of October, he made a new request, from which it appears that his situation in the prison was very miserable.

It is common to charge the persecution of Servetus upon Calvin alone, and the indiscriminating compilers of our biographical dictionaries, without adducing an authority, dogmatically declare that the Reformer of Geneva acted out his mere personal hatred. It is glaringly false. It is not for us to say, how much false fire mingled with the zeal of Calvin; but we are well-informed that not only he, but all Protestant Europe, looked upon it as the common cause of truth. From what has been already said, it is plain that the case was not precipitately issued. And at the point of time which our sketch has reached, the magistrates of Geneva determined to consult the Swiss Cantons. For this purpose they sent to them the "Restitution of Christianity," with Calvin's papers and the prisoner's answers; and requested the opinion of the Swiss theologians upon the subject. The unanimous reply

was, that the magistrates of Geneva ought to restrain Servetus, and to prevent the spread of his errors.

Painful as the conclusion is, it cannot be evaded, that the judgment of John Calvin was simply the judgment of all the Helvetic Christians; too nearly allied, alas! to the popish errors from which they had half escaped, but palliated by the circumstances. M. d'Alwoerden,* the great authority of Mr. Roscoe, in his hasty and petulant censures, pretends that Calvin kept back from the press all these letters except the one from Zurich. But the letters are happily extant to give triumphant refutation to the slander; and whoever reads them will conclude with La Chapelle, that "all the Churches of Switzerland agreed to punish Servetus capitally, since they all concurred in testifying their utmost abhorrence of his heresies, and requiring that this outrage should not be left unpunished."† Beza was, therefore, not falsifying, when he wrote that the issue was 'ex omnium enim Helveticarum ecclesiarum sententia.' The prisoner himself showed a degree of confidence in these authorities, by the appeal which he is known to have made to the Churches of Zurich, Schaffhausen, Berne, and Basle.

What were the replies of the Swiss magistrates to this reference from Geneva? Those of Zurich used these terms: "In confidence that you will not suffer the wicked intention of your said prisoner to go further, which is entirely contrary to the Christian religion, and gives great scandal and insult."‡ And the ministers, still more decisively: "The holy providence of God has now offered an occasion for cleaning you from the suspicion (i. e. of fostering heresy) of this evil; that is, if you shall be vigilant, and diligently take heed that the contagion of this poison spread no further. Which we doubt not your excellencies will effect."§ The magistrates of Schaffhausen, referred the question to their minis-

* "Historia Michaelis Serveti." Helmstadt, 1727. This work was written under the superintendence of Dr. MOSHEIM. Every reader of Maclaine's notes has learned to be on his guard against this learned man, whenever the question lies between the Lutherans and the Reformers.

† Bibl. Raison. t. 2. p. 173.

‡ CHAUFFE, note Y. and, as there cited, BI. ANGL. t. 2. p. 163.

§ Multa ergo fide et diligentia contra hunc opus esse judicamus, praesertim cum ecclesiae nostrae apud externos male audiant, quasi haereticae sint et haereticis foveant. Obtulit vero in praesenti saneta Dei Providentia occasionem repurgandi vos, simul ac nos a pravi mali hujus suspicione: si videlicet vigilantes fueritis, diligenterque caveritis ne veneni hujus contagio, per hunc serpat latius. Id quod facturos A. V. nil dubitamus. Inter. Ep. Calv.

ters, and sent the reply of the latter, which ends thus: "Nor do we doubt, but that of your remarkable wisdom, you will repress the attempts of this man, lest his blasphemies eat, as doth a canker, still more extensively into Christ's members. For to set aside his ravings by long argumentation—what would it be, but to rave with a madman."* The magistrates of Basle, proceeding in the same way, replied by their ministers: "But if he persevere incurably in the perverseness which he has conceived, let him, in pursuance of your duty and of the authority granted you by the Lord, be so coerced, that he may no longer be able to molest the Church of Christ, and lest the last things be worse than the first."† The magistrates of Bern wrote: "We beg of you, not doubting but you are thereto also inclined, that you will take proper measures, that sects and heresies as these are, or such like, be not sown in the Church of Jesus Christ, our only Saviour."‡

Such was the unanimous answer of the Swiss magistrates; and we think the fact worthy of repetition, as being very important in its bearing on the whole affair, that Servetus, after a protracted examination and defence before the senate, and after the consistory, or ministerial body, had laboured to confute and reclaim him, *appealed to the Swiss Churches*; and this, before the said consistory had given their official opinion, as to the question whether the positions, which the Senate considered as proved, amounted to heresy and blasphemy.§

On the 26th of October, sentence was pronounced, by which Servetus was condemned to be burned alive.

Calvin informs us, that Servetus, two hours before his death, sent for him, and asked his forgiveness. Calvin reminded him "with all mildness, that sixteen years before he had endeavoured, even at the risk of his own life, to reclaim him, and that it had not been through his fault that Servetus had not by repentance been restored to the friendship of all religious persons." He also endeavoured to have

* Neque dubitamus quin vos pro insigni prudentia vestra ipsius conatus repressuri sitis, ne blasphemiae ipsius tanquam cancer latius depascantur Christi membra. Nam longis rationibus avertere ipsius deliramenta; quid aliud esset quam cum insaniente insaniri?—ib.

† Verum si insanibilis in concepta semet perversitate perstet, sic pro officio vestro potestateque a Domino concessa coercatur, ne dare incommodum queat ecclesiae Christi, neve fiant novissima primis deteriora.—ib.

‡ BI. ANG. in CHAUFF. u. supra.

§ Waterman's Life of Calvin, 117.

the mode of execution changed to one less barbarous.* Chateillon (otherwise called Castellio and Castalio) a declared enemy of Calvin, accused him of having smiled when the heretic passed the window from which he was looking. There is no other alleged proof of this unlikely story. M. La Roche, who elsewhere deals harshly with Calvin, and treats this as a wretched calumny. Servetus was accompanied to the stake by Farel, and so far maintained his characteristic obstinacy, that he would scarcely allow Farel to ask the prayers of the people. Thus miserably perished this unfortunate and wicked man, by a cruel death, on the twenty-seventh day of October, 1553.

During the whole trial, the contumacy and recklessness of the prisoner were remarkable. Especially did he seem to make it his aim to irritate and sting his great opponent, Calvin. In the notes, already mentioned, which Servetus appended to Calvin's confutation of his arguments, he endeavours to goad the latter by every name of insult which could be foisted in. Cain, and Simon Magus. and Murderer, are ordinary terms, and, in the course of a few hundred lines, we have counted instances of the lie direct, *Mentiris*, to the number of forty-six.† Yet the replies of Calvin are comparatively mild. He deals with his opponent as if he scarcely thought him balanced in mind. And when sentence was pronounced, it is notorious that he used his influence with the judge to procure a mitigation of the punishment, but without effect.

Having now reached the close of the direct narrative, it only remains to ask, whether, on reviewing the transaction, there is reason to attribute to Calvin any motives of personal rancour; or any principles of action in the matter of persecution, which were not prevalent in his age. Torrents of obloquy have been poured upon his memory: sometimes by Unitarians, who naturally befriend this great Unitarian; sometimes by Papists, who forget that Calvin's sins were the mere sequelae of a distemper caught among themselves;‡ and

* Ep. Cal. Farello. 71. Opusc. viii. 511.

† As a specimen of his petulance, the Latin reader may take the following phrases:—*Jam pudet toties respondere bestialitati hominis—Ridiculus mus—Impudentissime—Monstrum horrendum—Tu teipsum non intelligis—Sycophanta imperitissime—Tu plusquam pessimus—Ignoras miser—Abusor futilis et impudens Deliras—O nebulonem excoecatissimum—Sceleratus—Simon Magus—Mentiris imo ab aeterno.*—TRACT. THEOL. p. 592, sqq.

‡ “The doctrine of non-toleration, which obtained in the sixteenth century among some Protestants, was that pernicious error which they imbibed in the

sometimes by Episcopalians, who know that for one Servetus, they can number many victims of the like misguided zeal, in their own borders.

We have, from the outset, conceded the cardinal fact, namely, that Calvin was instrumental in bringing Servetus to trial for heresy, and thus, if you please, to execution. But we shall ever maintain, that it is grossly unjust, without the shadow of proof, to charge this act to motives which are not charged in a multitude of similar instances. It was scarcely so much the fault of the man as of the age. At this time of day, a Protestant can scarcely picture to himself the horrid image raised in the mind of our forefathers by the name *Heretic*. A heretic was then, as M. la Chapelle well says, "a monster of horror, an emissary of hell, an enemy of God and man; this is the notion of common people among the Papists to this day. Judge, then, how they would talk of a heretic, when heretics were almost as rare in Europe as the Phoenix in Egypt. Did they consult the canon or the civil law, or theological standards? Heretics were excommunicated persons, poisoners of mankind, public pests, guilty of high treason against both human and divine governments, a treason capital in the first degree." These principles were assumed as self-evident, in parliaments, and courts of princes, by popes and republics. In the Reformation a sun had arisen on the world, but the mists and fogs of a long night still mantled the horizon. The doctrine of persecution was a papal innovation which lingered after theological errors had been dispersed. It was found in the laws of the empire, and in the fathers of the church, whose authority had scarcely yet been shaken. Hence, we can pity, even more than we blame, the inconsistency of the Protestants, who, escaping from persecution, became persecutors in their turn.

To every calm inquirer into the history of religious liberty, the injustice of singling out this case will appear most glaring. It is Calvin's tenets which exasperate the minds of his calumniators; else Servetus had lain in oblivion, along with Joan Bocher and George Van Parre. The great standing charge against Calvin is one which it is hard to answer, simply because it is without any proof. It is, that the Reformer was actuated by long-cherished resentment and private hate. M. Chauffié has the candour to admit, that even if this could be

church of Rome; and I believe I can say, without doing any injury to that church, that *she is in great measure answerable for the execution of Servetus.*"
—*Memoirs of Literature*, quoted by Scott.

proved, it would be a question whether he did not take advantage of the rigour of laws which he believed to be just. But it cannot be proved. "It is," as Mr. Scott observes, "unsupported, and even contrary to evidence, and is requisite to the solution of none of the phenomena of the case."

The opinion of Calvin is now seen to be erroneous, and the act which he approved is condemned as cruel. In this we heartily concur. But the opinion and the act were approved by those very reformers and divines whom it is pretended to bring into a most favourable comparison with the Reformer of Geneva. Let us lay open the truth on this point; it may be new to certain revilers, at least it may stop the mouth of presumptuous slander. *Bullinger*, the Reformer of Zurich, writes thus: "I do not see how it was possible to have spared Servetus, that most obstinate man, the very hydra of heresy." And in writing to the divines of Poland, he says, "All among us, in these churches, who preach Christ and true religion, consider as just the capital punishment of a blasphemous and incurable man, who derided and abused the whole system." *Peter Martyr* likewise expresses his opinion, that it was the duty of magistrates and princes to serve God by punishing heretics and blasphemers.* *Melancthon*, who is usually cited and honoured as the mildest of the reformers, thus speaks of this affair: "I affirm that your magistrates have acted justly, in putting to death a blasphemer, after a regular adjudication."† This should be weighed by all such anti-calvinists, as, in their addresses to the popular mind, try to play off the moderate Melancthon against the cruel Calvin. But it is lamentably true, that this is not a solitary effusion of Melancthon's feeling in regard to the point in hand. M. de la Chapelle cites another instance little known, from the history of one David George, in which it appears that a translator of George's work, in which the existence of the devil was denied, was threatened with prosecution and imprisonment by the Reformer himself.‡

Archbishop *Cranmer*, even setting aside his own example,

* Nam is auctoritate ac potestate sua, ita debet servire Domino, ut puniat eos qui adversantur. Quod nisi faciat, videtur assentiri blasphemis et haeticis; rex enim quum istos videt, et patitur, perinde facit, ac si illis adjungeret, et eorum flagitiis faveret.—P. MARTYR, Loc. Comm. cl. 4, c. 13, 581, ap. Chauffp.

† Affirmo etiam vestros magistratus juste fecisse, quod hominem blasphemum, re ordine judicata, interfecerunt.—Ep. Calv. Oct. 12, 1553.

‡ CHAUFFP. note BB.

held that Servetus ought to have suffered death. And Bishop *Hall*, gives his formal opinion, that in that transaction *Calvin did well approve himself to God's Church*.* This list of authorities might be greatly increased; but it is needless to exemplify further the prevalence of a sentiment, which dishonours the Christian Church, while it destroys the malicious sophistry of controvertists who would make one good man the scape goat of a whole generation. It is abundantly made out, therefore, that even if Calvin were responsible for the condemnation, specific sentence, and actual execution of a heretic—as we have shown he is not—he only shares this responsibility with Melancthon, Bullinger, Peter Martyr, Cranmer, Hall, and the leaders of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches.

The case might be safely left at this point; but we will go further, and evince by authentic records, that the instance was not singular. One might suppose from the angry zeal with which it has been blazoned as the sinister blot on the escutcheon of Calvinism, that this act of intolerance stands isolated, flaming forth with the horrors of a beacon on a hill. It is not so; all who have the smallest pretensions to historical erudition know that it is not so. There are noted examples of heretics being punished in different Protestant States. "Let persecution," we exclaim with M. *Chauffpié*, "be blamed, and let the execution of Servetus be condemned; we subscribe to the whole; but let us not make it peculiar in Calvin, to have been under the prejudices of his age."

More than sixty years after Calvin's death, we find the same judgment taking effect at Geneva, in the case of *Nicholas Antony*, who was burned for heresy, in 1632; in spite of the remonstrances of the ministers, who desired the execution to be suspended. Again, in 1652, by virtue of the same ecclesiastical code, though not on the same charge, one *Chauderon* was hanged for witchcraft. And we are only repeating the words of the liberal *Chauffpié*, Mr. *Gibbon's* "best" authority, when we say: "How many vexations have the Presbyterians suffered in England under the reign of James I., Charles I., and Charles II. I find, under the reign of the first, *Neal*, Bishop of Winchester, caused to be hanged one *Wightman*, a dogmatizer of that time; and that King, Bishop of London, condemned one *Legat* to be burnt for heresy;

* *Christian Moderation*, Book II. Sect. 14. Works, volume iii. p. 50, cited by *WATERMAN*.

who was executed in Smithfield. And Peter Gunter, of Prussia, a farrier by trade, was beheaded at Lubeck, in the month of October, 1687, by the consent of two Universities, because he would not own the divinity of Jesus Christ.”*

It is surprising that certain writers of the Episcopal denomination should have the effrontery, as they have sometimes had, to charge the death of Servetus on presbytery. This event has by some of them been attributed to the “gentle sway of presbytery.” This is very weak argument, and very desperate policy, not to dwell on its dishonesty. The nobler minds among prelatists have seen that common justice and the good faith of history alike repudiate the base insinuation; that the common cause of protestantism is wounded by it; and that this sort of argument, even if it should avail to tarnish presbytery, would overwhelm prelacy with contempt.† We reject it, and our cause needs it not. In the noted and prominent case of Cranmer, we scornfully reject it. The meanness of charging one good man with the sole offence, when all the age were in like condemnation, we shall condemn wherever we find it. And it is only as a specimen of impotent malice that we cite the following observation of a Mr. Le Bas, the compiler of a Life of Cranmer; an observation written as if to divert attention from the case of George Van Parre, which he had just related: “Every one knows that Servetus was burned, not merely as a heretic, but as a blasphemer; that the distinction might be sufficient to satisfy a man like Calvin may not be very surprising; for what is known of his vehement temper would almost justify the suspicion, that had he lived in the age of St. Dominic, he might have sat most conscientiously in the chair of the Inquisition.”‡ As if most studiously to cut off the wretched Calvin from all benefit of the plea he had just made for the archbishop. That plea, we acknowledge as valid and judicious. But we lament the ignoble prejudice which appended a gratuitous and false insinuation, against the man whom that very archbishop delighted to honour. Melancholy, indeed, but true it is, that Cranmer was concerned, at least as

* Chau ff. Servetus, note BB.

† If we except the case of Luther, perhaps the earliest toleration that was practised after popery had introduced the reign of persecution, was settled upon the basis of doctrines decidedly Calvinistic. We mean the decree of Berne, in November, 1534.—Scott, iii. p. 245.

‡ LE BAS'S Life of Cranmer, Vol. i. p. 272. Harper's Stereotype edition. See also a no less uncalled for taunt in HALLAM'S Const. History of England, vol. i. p. 131

much as Calvin ever was, in bringing to the stake not *one* blaspheming heretic, but not less than *four* persons, of whom two were simple women. This is recorded by such Episcopal historians as Strype, and Burnet, and Fox. He did it in his ignorance, and we may well weep over the story; but let no one who affects to weep, wipe away his tears to eject contumely upon a brother reformer, found in the same offence.

It was Cranmer, who "procured the death"—such are the very words—of Joan Bocher and George Van Parre; and who when the pious Edward VI. with tears hesitated to sign the death-warrants, added his own persuasions.* Even Mr. Le Bas says, with regard to Joan Bocher: "That he fully acquiesced in the proceeding, can hardly be doubted, if we are to credit the story so confidently told by his ardent admirer Fox, and not contradicted by any contemporary writer; namely, that all the importunity of the council could not prevail on Edward to set his hand to the warrant—that Cranmer, upon this, was desired to persuade him—that, even then, the merciful nature of that princely boy held out long against the application—and that, when at last, he yielded, he declared before God, that the guilt should rest on the head of his advisers."†

Let this suffice for the abuse of these events by Episcopalian writers. We are so far from accusing Episcopalians in general, of this disingenuousness, that we believe there are multitudes of the well-informed and sincere, whose sentiments are expressed by one of their own writers as follows: "So far was the *Church of England*, and *her chief divines* from countenancing that unbecoming and absurd treatment, with which the name of this eminent Protestant is now so frequently dishonoured, that it would be no difficult matter to prove that there is not a parallel instance upon record, of any single individual being equally and so unequivocally venerated, for the union of wisdom and piety, both in England, and by a large body of the foreign churches, as JOHN CALVIN."‡ To this we might add the able and learned arguments of the Rev. John Scott, of Hull, whose conclusions are in every point identical with our own.§

That the case is different in many of our popular historical works, and in the articles of biographical dictionaries, patched

* BURNET'S Hist. Ref. vol. II. 112. GILPIN'S Lives of Reformers. ii. 99.

† LE BAS'S Cranmer, vol. i. p. 270.

‡ Christian Observer, vol. ii. p. 142, 143.

§ SCOTT'S Continuation of Milner, vol. iii. passim.

up from these by mere compilers, will surprise no one who recollects that, in our day, history has too often fallen into the hands of sceptics. Roscoe makes it his especial care to vilify the reformers; we may safely leave his allegations to the triumphant answer of Mr. Waterman.* Gibbon, as we need scarcely say, found it to suit the purpose of his life to degrade the memory of a leading Christian. But, be it noted, that the authority chiefly relied on in the preceding details, and from whose truly cautious statements we have not seen occasion to vary in a single instance, is Chauffpié, the continuator of Bayle's Dictionary; whose narrative Gibbon pronounces "*the best account*" he had seen of the transaction.

Other writers, affected by no predilections in favour of presbytery, have had the patience to study, and the honesty to adjudicate, this perplexing case, with different results. Among these we name the late SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE; an independent thinker, a laborious reader of authorities, and a professed enemy of Calvinism. His opinion is as follows:

"What ground is there for throwing the odium of Servetus's death upon Calvin alone?—Why, the mild Malacthon wrote to Calvin expressly to testify his concurrence in the act, and, no doubt, he spoke the sense of the German reformers; the Swiss churches *advised* the punishment in formal letters, and I think there are letters from the English divines, approving Calvin's conduct! Before a man deals out the slang of the day, about the great leaders of the Reformation, he should learn to throw himself back to the age of the Reformation, when the two parties in the church were eagerly on the watch to fasten the charge of heresy on the other. Besides, if ever a poor fanatic thrust himself into the fire, it was Michael Servetus. He was a rabid enthusiast, and did every thing he could in the way of insult and ribaldry to provoke the feeling of the Christian Church. He called the Trinity *triceps monstrum et Cerberum quendam tripartitum*, and so on."†

This is sensible and just; and what might be expected from a philosopher and a scholar. For such an one, no declamation, without proof, will be sufficient. But the careless, the prejudiced, and the wicked, and especially those who hate the doctrine of special grace, and Calvin as its triumphant modern

* Life of Calvin, p. 122.

† Here is given the sentence cited above.

‡ Table Talk, p. 143. See also a fair discussion of the case in Sir DAVID BREWSTER'S Encyclopaedia, Art. "Calvin."

defender, will still avoid a laborious investigation, and repeat in wilful ignorance the refuted slanders of their predecessors. This rooted enmity to the theological system, called Calvinism, is the true source of the unjust invective against the Reformer's conduct in this affair. If not, why are the similar and even worse offences of other great men, altogether omitted, or, if not omitted, mentioned with every phrase of extenuation? It is Calvinism, it is the doctrine of Paul and of Augustin which has caused this peculiar exacerbation of zeal. And, after all, many seem to be ignorant of the history of this hateful scheme of opinions. It is acknowledged by Mr. John Scott, himself an Episcopalian, in the work already named, that Luther, Melancthon, and Zwingle, (at an earlier period of their lives, at least) held the doctrines of election and predestination, which have subsequently been denominated Calvinistic. "Nor did those high doctrines," says he, "originate with these persons. They held them in common with eminent writers who had preceded them, and were members of the Roman Catholic church; and they would, I apprehend, have been able to support some of their boldest positions by the authority of S. Augustine himself. Why, then, is all the odium of these obnoxious doctrines to be accumulated upon the devoted head of CALVIN, who had never been heard of in public life, even at the latest period referred to?"*

It is our confident expectation, that in proportion to the increase of biblical study, and the culture of mental philosophy among good men, there will be a return to these very doctrines; and that the works of Calvin (as we already see in Germany) will rise again in the estimation of the church; and that his character will be pondered, as one of the noblest models of the theologian, the expositor, and the reformer. When this day shall come, the calumnies of his foes will find their due level. And though no man will ever vindicate his opinion or his practice, in this instance, any more than the exploded whimsies of the astrologer or the alchemist, pious Christians will accord to him the praise of Bishop Andrews, that "he was an illustrious person, and never to be mentioned without a preface of the highest honour." Meanwhile, let the enemies of the Reformer's memory ponder the testimony of ARMINIUS himself. In a letter, only two days before his death, he says: "After the holy scriptures, I exhort the stu-

* Page 230.

dents to read the Commentaries of Calvin: for I tell them he is incomparable in the interpretation of scripture; and that his Commentaries ought to be held in greater estimation than all that is delivered to us in the writings of the ancient Christian fathers: so that, in a certain eminent spirit of prophecy, I give the pre-eminence to him beyond most others, indeed, beyond them all.”*

In closing this article, we are happy to be able to say that two elaborate memoirs of Calvin may soon be expected. One is understood to be preparing by Mr. Henry, pastor of a church in Berlin; and great pains have been taken to gain information from unpublished manuscripts and other documents existing at Geneva. The other biography is that which was left by the late lamented Dr. M’Crie, and which will be made ready for the press by one of his sons. From the biographer of Knox and Melvill, every thing which the case admits may be expected.

ART. VIII.—*Descriptive Catalogue of Books, and other Publications of the American Sunday School Union; designed for Sunday Schools, Juvenile, Family, and Parish Libraries, and for General Reading.* Philadelphia: 1835. pp. 119. *J. M. Alexander*

IF we could look with prophetic wisdom on the doings of our age we should probably regard it as the seed-time of the world’s history. Abstracting ourselves from those self-exalting views which flatter us as being in advance of former ages, we should still find cause to think that the tokens visible in things civil and ecclesiastical, portend a great revolution. Though we may deny that any such revolution is in progress; though the latter day glory has not dawned; though false religion and irreligion are still on their thrones; and though the Church is but a small portion of the world; it is, nevertheless most apparent, that we live in a period of significant action, an age of movement and progress. It is a time of preparation. As the advent of Christ was preceded by remarkable changes in nations, so it is not unlikely that

* Christian Observer for 1827, p. 622.—“Declaration of Arminius.” Ibid. 1807, p. 179. SCOTT’S Milner, iii. 496.