



Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY



PRESENTED BY

Jr. Henry J. Gehlen

BR 307 .G6

Good, James I. 1850-1924.

The Reformed Reformation

The Reformed Reformation

BY

REV. PROF. JAMES I. GOOD, D. D., LL. D.

Professor of Reformed Church History in
Central Theological Seminary

Author of "Famous Reformers of the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches," "Famous Women of the Reformed Church," "Famous Missionaries of the Reformed Church," "Famous Places of the Reformed Churches," "Origin and History of the Reformed Church of Germany," "History of the Reformed Church of Switzerland since the Reformation," "History of the Reformed Church in the United States," etc.

THE HEIDELBERG PRESS

1916

Entered, according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1916
by REV. JAMES I. GOOD, D. D., LL. D.
In the office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington

PRESS OF BERGER BROTHERS
PHILADELPHIA

PREFACE

This work has been published to meet a desire by some of the ministers of the Reformed Church for more material on the Reformed side of the Reformation, which they might use in the observance of the Quarto-centenary of the Reformation. We therefore give less space to the Lutheran side of the Reformation; especially as the material on that side of the Reformation is more abundant, and besides the Lutherans, to their credit be it said, have been exploiting Luther more than the Reformed have been doing for Zwingli or Calvin. Where we have treated of both sides of the Reformation, we have tried to give the Lutheran side fairly, but we have given the facts as they stand today. We have no desire to minimize Luther, but to give him all due credit for the greatness of his work. But Luther is not the whole of the Reformation and the Reformed should receive their fair recognition. We have also endeavored to utilize the latest discoveries in the history of the Reformation and also the latest publications of, and on, that period. This has placed somethings in a new light. The Reformed and Presbyterian Churches are especially interested in all this, as they have come directly from Zwingli through Calvin. And we trust that they will find this work helpful for the observance of this Anniversary. We only regret the shortness of time that we have had, in which to prepare it so as to get it out before 1917. And we regret our inability, on account of the war, to get to Zurich so as to get hold of more of the original sources, though our own large library on the Reformed Church of Switzerland has given much. That this book may have a share, however small, in making this Anniversary a great inspiration and blessing to our Churches is the wish of the author.

JAMES I. GOOD.

CONTENTS

BOOK I

WHO WAS THE FIRST REFORMER?

	PAGE
CHAPTER I. Prof. James Lefevre of France.....	1
CHAPTER II. Who was the First Reformer, Luther or Zwingli?..	30
CHAPTER III. Harmony of the Lutheran and Reformed Reformations	69
CHAPTER IV. The Historical Development of Zwingli's Early Theology	91

BOOK II

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE REFORMED TO THE SPIRIT OF PROTESTANTISM

CHAPTER I. The Unfinished Lutheran Reformation and Its Significance to the Reformed	105
CHAPTER II. The Contribution of Zwingli to the Spirit of the Reformation	124
CHAPTER III. The Contribution of the Reformed to the Spirit of Protestantism	131
APPENDIX	144

The Reformed Reformation

BOOK I

Who was the First Reformer?

INTRODUCTORY.

The question who was the first Reformer is an old one. There has been a long debate between the Lutherans and the Reformed as to which of the Reformers was the first, Luther or Zwingli. This question seems a very simple one, but the answer is not by any means so simple, as we shall see. But first of all one thing is becoming prominent in the later researches about the history of the Reformation and that is, that before either Luther or Zwingli, there was another who was earlier, Prof. James Lefevre, of France. The tendency of modern research about the Reformation has been to go beyond the Reformers, back to their teachers as the sources of the Reformation. And of these on the Reformed side two stand out prominently, Prof. James Lefevre, of France, and Prof. Thomas Wyttenbach, of Basle.

CHAPTER I.

PROF. JAMES LEFEVRE.

In the study of the Reformers, historical research has been going back of the Reformers themselves to the study of their antecedents. And so a new phase of the Reformation has opened up. The value of these earlier men has so grown that one of them now looms up as the first Reformer, Prof. James Lefevre of Paris. Prof. Doumergue, who has written the latest and most elaborate biography of Calvin, makes Lefevre not only a forerunner of the Reformers as has been previously supposed, but he makes Lefevre to be himself a Reformer. The old controversy whether Luther or Zwingli was the first Reformer passes away, for Lefevre was before either of them. And as Lefevre founded the Reformed Church of France, the Reformed would seem to have the advantage in priority. Lefevre was truly a Reformer, for he aimed as did all the Reformers, at a reformation of the Catholic Church.

Hitherto he has appeared as a sort of a shadowy form, hovering about the beginning of the Reformation. But it has been becoming more clearly evident that he was one of the greatest, if not the greatest scholar just before the Reformation. Baird says: "To Lefevre belongs the honor of restoring letters to France." His eulogist, Scaevola de Saint-Marthe, has not exaggerated his merit, when, placing him in the front rank of the learned men whom he celebrates, he likens the Picard doctor:

"To a new sun rising from the Belgian coast to dissipate the fogs and darkness investing his native land and pour upon its youth the full beams of a purer learning. Lefevre confined his attention to no single branch of learning. He was equally proficient in mathematics, in astronomy, in Biblical literature and criticism. Brilliant attainments in so many departments were commended yet more to the admiration of beholders by a modest and unassuming deportment, by morals above re-

proach and by a disinterested nature in which there was no taint of avarice."

When Erasmus could say, "Among the thousands of the learned men of France, there is only one Lefevre," we can begin to realize the position that he held in the learned world. Reuchlin, one of his cotemporaries, wrote to him (1513), "Thou art the most philosophical of the philosophers." In 1517, Erasmus declared that "Lefevre was a man so pious, so good, so learned, having rendered such great service to learning and literature that he merited never to grow old." This last wish of Erasmus came as nearly being fulfilled as possible. Lefevre grew old until he became a centenarian, according to Doumergue. Compared with him Erasmus and Reuchlin, the two great humanists of that day, were as boys, for he was old enough to be their grandfather. Lefevre was teaching humanism before Erasmus ever knew humanism.

But his greatest glory was that he was the first to dethrone the scholastic theology of the Catholic Church which had come down from the middle ages. And this he did before Luther. Beza calls him "one of the noblest of men of earth, if one considers his learning, his piety, his generosity. For he was the one who by living voice and very learned writings had placed again in the university of Paris, mathematics and the true logic of Aristotle in place of the sophistry which before had reigned." Beza hails him as:

"The man who boldly began the revival of the pure religion of Jesus Christ; that just as in ancient times the school of Isocrates sent forth the best orators, so from the lecture room of the doctor of Etaples (Lefevre) issued many of the best men of the age and of the Church."

And so it develops that this man, who has hovered around the early history of the Reformation as a phantom, was a far greater force than has hitherto been supposed. It used to be said that "Erasmus laid the egg of the Reformation and Luther hatched it." But now it appears that Lefevre laid the egg of the Reformation even before Erasmus and that the Reformers hatched it. For he seems to have been the father of all the great Reformers of the first generation except Melancthon, who was especially influenced by his relative,

Reuchlin. For Lefevre influenced, either directly or indirectly, Luther, Zwingli, Farel and Lasco; and of them Luther and Farel directly. He therefore stands out as the leader of the thinkers of the age before the Reformation and the father of the Reformers. He might well be named the "Father of the Reformation."

Prof. James Lefevre was born,—ah, here comes the first surprise. The view formerly held was that he was born about 1455. But Doumergue places his birth about 1435 and very ably defends it in his "Life of Calvin." This date would make Lefevre a centenarian when he died. It would make him an old man (over 70) before the Reformation broke out. Indeed his efforts in the Reformation were made at a time in life when most men go into retirement. Yet at that age he entered into the thick of the battle. He has been criticized for not having done more for the Reformation; the wonder was, that in view of his great age, he did so much.

Not only the time when he was born is significant, but also the place. He was born at Étapes in Picardy in northeastern France. His real name was Faber and he has come down to us as Faber Stapulensis or Faber of Étapes. But he has been known to us in English mainly as Lefevre. Now it was from this very same district of Picardy that John Calvin later came. Indeed the Picards were noted as original thinkers and leaders, for to Lefevre and Calvin can be added a third Reformer—the great Reformer of philosophy in the Reformation—Peter Ramus. And other leaders, as Roussel, the eloquent preacher in the French Reformation; Olivetan, the great translator of the Bible into French; Vatable, Calvin's teacher of Hebrew, and Beda, the great opponent of Protestantism in the Reformation at Paris, all came from this district of Picardy.

Lefevre went from Picardy to Paris for his education. His great hindrance was the barbarous instruction he received, both in Picardy and Paris. But all sorts of obstacles melted away before his extraordinary mind. He struggled up into knowledge "like one clambering up the Rigi mountain to see the sun gilding the peaks of an Alpine range." But he kept on climbing and so got to the top of his profession.

The materials of his early life in the century before the Reformation are meagre. He not only studied at Paris but

improved himself by much travel, both in France and other countries, indeed is said to have traveled as far as Asia. About the year 1492 he took a journey to Italy. He visited Florence, Rome and Venice, where he studied Platonism and Aristotelianism and also the works of the mystics. In Italy he came into contact with Picus of Mirandola, who by his criticisms of the Romish Church, was one of the immediate forerunners of the Reformation. He then became professor of mathematics and philosophy in the college of Cardinal Lemorne at Paris. There he was greatly beloved by his pupils for his ability, piety, modesty and gentleness. But he was known far beyond his lecture room by his Latin translations of the Church Fathers and his Commentary on the Works of Aristotle. One of the studies that most influenced him was Greek. He first learned it from a fugitive from Sparta named George Hieronymus; who, about the middle of the 15th century, had been driven westward by the Turkish invasion of Constantinople.

But though the details of his life in that early period are lacking, its results were not. McCrie, one of the Church historians of Scotland, says "Lefevre merits the title of 'Father of French Literature,' not so much for the books he published as for the intellectual stimulus he gave to that age through his scholars. The greater part of the Frenchmen who distinguished themselves in the first part of the sixteenth century were either trained under him or in some way indebted to his instructions." That statement of McCrie's is borne out by the fact that the most distinguished men of the early part of the sixteenth century were his pupils. They were Briçonnet, later bishop of Meaux, one of the most influential churchmen of his age; Vatable, one of the finest teachers of Hebrew and later Calvin's teacher; Roussel, the confessor of Margaret, Queen of Navarre and sister of king Francis I of France, and others. Perhaps most eminent among his pupils was William Bude, who led king Francis I, who was the patron of humanism, to establish royal lectures in Paris, so that instruction might be given in Greek, Hebrew and mathematics, wholly in the spirit of the renaissance. This was done with such a zeal for the new learning of humanism as to rouse the hostility of the Sorbonne at Paris. Out of these royal

lectures grew later the College of France.

Lefevre's class room was the place where the seeds of the Reformation were very early sown. Out of it came William Farel, the fiery herald of Protestantism and the co-laborer of Calvin; Louis de Berquin, who was the first in France to give his life as a martyr to the new faith, and others. Reformers of other lands came into contact with Lefevre when they visited Paris, as Lasco of Poland. In fact, all the early Reformers of France grew out of his class room or through his influence. But perhaps greatest of all, as Beza says, was his attack on the scholastic theology that had ruled the universities. He denounced it as barbarism. His conflict with it and victory over it were the stepping stones to the Reformation.

In 1509 occurred an event destined to be epochal in his life. Though still professor, he went to live with bishop Briçonnet in the great monastery at St. Germain de Pres in Paris. There he lived as abbot for thirteen years. This close connection with Briçonnet, who had been his principal pupil, brought him into close contact with the court of France; especially as later, Roussel, another of his pupils, became confessor of Queen Margaret. It was through Lefevre that Queen Margaret, the "Esther of the French court," was converted to Evangelical views. Her brother, King Francis I, was favorable to humanism and hated alike the bigotry of the monks and the tyranny of the priests. It was owing to this close relationship of Lefevre to the French court, that he did not pay his life as a forfeit for his Evangelical views. Nothing but the royal protection ever permitted him to die a natural death in the midst of so much persecution as Protestantism suffered in France during his life.

The other important result of his entrance into this monastery was due to its large and important library. There he turned to study and especially to the study of the Bible; for the cloister library gave him much material. And this study of the Bible made him a Reformer. Though at least fifty years of age and probably seventy (according to Doumergue) he began to set aside profane studies and to search the Bible. The result of this was the publication of his first work on this subject—the Psalms, "Quintuplex Psalterium."

To show his importance, let us institute a comparison. One of the epoch-making events of the Reformation was the publication of the New Testament in Greek by Erasmus in 1516. Its great importance is shown by the fact that before its publication, scholars, if they wanted to get hold of the original Greek of the New Testament, had no way but to go to the Church Fathers and pick out here and there a verse of the New Testament. The Latin language had become the sacred language of the Catholic Church and this so completely, that it had crushed out the Greek. When therefore Erasmus' New Testament appeared, it did not take long for the Reformers to see the difference between it and the Romish Church of their day. Erasmus therefore very worthily acquired great fame from this publication. But pause a moment. Before Erasmus did so great a thing, Lefevre had long been at work on an effort just as important. As early as 1509, seven years before Erasmus had published his New Testament, Lefevre published the Psalms, which was only the beginning of his great work of Bible publication, far more extensive and influential than Erasmus, as we shall see. This work on the Psalms was in Latin. It contained five versions of the Psalms: 1. The Roman translation. 2. The Second Roman version—the Gallican. 3. The translation from the Hebrew by the early Church Father, Jerome. 4. The translation before Jerome. 5. Lefevre's own translation, with a critical and exegetical commentary. He published this work in order that students of the Bible might get new light and a deeper insight into the meaning of that sacred book by a comparison of the translations.

Now in doing this he began to depart from a great doctrine of the Catholics that the Vulgate was the sacred translation. But more significant than this is a remark that he makes in the book. In its preface he says "that all his studies in human knowledge (and he had been at them for perhaps a half a century) were only as darkness compared with the brilliant light revealed by the study of the Scriptures." He compared this study of divine things "to the exhalation of a perfume to whose sweetness the world has no equal." Thus somewhere about the time that Luther was making his first discovery of a Bible at Erfurt, Lefevre had

published the results of his study of the Bible. Lefevre was thus the Aurora—the daybreak of the Reformation, of which Wycklife had been the Morning Star.

And now comes a most interesting fact about this work of Lefevre's. It has been hitherto supposed that Lefevre was the father of the French Reformation, but it was not known that he affected the early Lutheran Reformation. Luther began his lectures on the Psalms at Wittenberg about 1512. What was the book that he used? It was none other than Lefevre's work on the Psalms, for Luther's copy of the work has been found, containing his own notes in it. An attempt has been made by German Church historians to make everything in the Reformation to be indebted to Luther—that every other Reformation came from the German Reformation. The attempt has been made to make Lefevre indebted to Luther. But this recent discovery has turned the tables completely. Lefevre was not indebted to Luther, but Luther to Lefevre and in two ways.

1. He used this work of Lefevre in his Lectures.

2. He used Lefevre's method of exegesis. Lefevre broke the way for a better exegesis than the exaggerated allegorizing method of the Catholics. Lefevre began to see that the Bible must be interpreted by itself and not according to the Church fathers or according to the allegorizing method in use before that time, by which each text had to have at least four ways of being interpreted: literal, allegorical, tropical, and analogical. He made a beginning of this new method in his work on the Psalms. True, it was only a beginning and he still was largely affected by the old allegorizing method. For he allegorized the Psalms somewhat and made them refer to Christ. Still he began the new method which he later improved. And this method Luther began adopting.

Another interesting fact about this book of Lefevre's is that a copy of it came into the library of Zwingli also. In our days, it is true, the mere presence of a book in a man's library does not count for much, because of the multitude of books that are published. But in those days, when books were scarce and very expensive, the owner would not put his money into a book unless he was really interested in it. The presence of a book in a library counted for much more in those

days than it would now. Thus the presence of heretical books in a man's library was then counted as proof positive that he was heretical. Remembering this, the presence of this book in Zwingli's library is significant. And what makes it more significant is the fact that Zwingli wrote his own notes on it in the pages of the book, showing that he studied it. And it doubtless began affecting his method of exegesis as he revealed it later by making the Bible its own interpreter.

If the year 1509 was an epochal one for Lefevre, the year 1512 was more significant and for two things: He published a new book and he got a new pupil.

The first was the publication of Lefevre's work on the Pauline Epistles. This is important, for Doumergue calls it "the first Protestant book," published five years before Luther's theses. And for that reason, he calls Lefevre "the first of the Reformers."

The second great event for Lefevre was that he got a new student in William Farel, one of the greatest of the Reformers and the co-laborer of Calvin. Farel so frequently referred in his writings to his association with Lefevre that these cast a very interesting sidelight into Lefevre's relation to the Reformation. So Lefevre was not only the first Protestant, but he also raised up the first great leader of French Protestantism, Farel.

William Farel was born at Gap and about 1509 went to Paris to study. He graduated there in 1517 and left that city in 1521 to follow Lefevre to Meaux. The descriptions he has left reveal very vividly Lefevre's life. His first description of Lefevre is as a strict Catholic when he first came to know him. He says:

"Prof. James Lefevre bowed down lower before the images than any other person I had seen in my life. He would stay for an immense time on his knees, praying and telling his beads before those images. And I would join him in doing so. I was delighted to have found such a man, slave as he was to the pope and believing those things (Farel was at that time a strict papist, 'more papistic than the pope himself,' he says) which are most detestable in popish idolatry."

But it was this same Lefevre who led Farel out of these superstitions to Christ. For Lefevre would frequently tell his

young disciple: "All things are gone wrong, dear William, and some day God will make all things new. You may perhaps see it." That prophecy came true. Farel not merely saw that day, but Lefevre also. And Lefevre would also denounce to him some of the evils of the Catholic Church. "How disagreeable," he says, "is it to see a bishop asking men to drink with him, gambling, rattling the dice, spending his time with hawks and dogs and in hunting, hallowing after rooks and deer and following after such company."

But important as was Farel's coming to him, his publication of his new work on the Pauline Epistles was equally important. It was a Latin translation of, and commentary on, the Letters of Paul. In it he enlarged upon what he had hinted at in his work on the Psalms in 1509. "This book," says Doumergue, "may in a certain sense be called the first Protestant book." This is because it was published five years before Luther's theses and for that reason may be called the first Protestant book. It makes Lefevre the first of the Reformers. In it he speaks of the necessity of a reformation in the Church. He says:

"The Church rather follows the examples of its leaders and is far removed from what it ought to be. The signs of the times foretell a new revival. And since God has opened new ways for the preaching of the Gospel through the discoveries and conquests of the Spaniards and Portugese in all parts of the world, we hope that he will also visit his Church and again lift her up from the humiliation into which she has fallen."

His favorite idea that "God would renew the world," so often expressed to Farel, appears in this work. "God in his great mercy," he says, will soon revive the expiring spark in the hearts of men so that faith and love and a purer worship will return. "Well, he was old enough to be a prophet and he proved to be a true prophet.

This book reveals Lefevre's independence of Rome in several important respects.

1. In the preface, contrary to the common Catholic tradition, which makes Jerome the early Church Father to be the author of the Vulgate, he took the position that Jerome was not the author of the Vulgate. Now to deny that Jerome was the

author of Vulgate version was going straight against the decree of the Catholic Church. He thus began an era of criticism, which ultimately led to a breach with the Romish Church. And he not only denied this to Jerome, but he began departing from the Vulgate, as he soon tried to correct it according to the Greek.

2. But more important and significant for Protestantism was his declaration for the authority of the Bible; and this supremacy of the Bible would logically interfere with the supremacy of the Church's authority. He boldly says:

"It is there (in the Bible) where the doctrine of Christ is found. And those who will study it, will draw water with joy from the Savior's spring." "Let us exalt Christ our king by studying him in the holy oracles. Let us not follow the precepts and dogmas of men, which have no foundation in the light that has shone from on high."

3. But more significant than either of these was his clear enunciation of the doctrine of justification by faith. He held that salvation was not of works, but was by grace—the free gift of God. He says:

"It is almost blasphemous to talk of the merit of works especially before God. For a merit does not seem to ask for grace, but to exact what is due: to attribute merit to works is to have the opinion of those who think that we can be justified by works, an error for which the Jews were particularly condemned. Therefore let us not speak of the merit of our works, which is very small indeed, rather worthless. And let us exalt the grace of God which is everything. One can attribute real merit to no one but Christ, who has deserved everything for us: But as for ourselves, let us acknowledge that we have no merit before God and hope in his grace." "But you say, has any one ever been justified without the works of the law, either written or natural? Yes, there have been such and without number. Who knows not that the penitent thief was justified by faith alone." "By works without faith it is impossible to be justified; by faith without works, it is possible."

"It is God alone who by His grace justifies unto everlasting life. There is a righteousness of works, there is a righteousness of grace: the one is earthly and passeth away, the other is heavenly and eternal: one is the shadow and the sign, the other, the light and the truth: one makes sin known

to us that we may escape death, the other reveals grace that we may obtain life."

When asked by his hearers in his lectures, "If we are not justified by works what is the use of performing them?" His answer was :

"Certainly, they are not in vain. If I hold a mirror to the sun, its image is reflected; the more I polish and clear it, the brighter is its reflection. But if I allow it to become tarnished, the splendor of the sun is dimmed. It is the same with justification (he really means sanctification) in those who lead an impure life."

His objectors answered, "Then St. James did not agree with St. Paul?" Lefevre's reply was :

"St. James says, in the first chapter, that *every* good and perfect gift cometh down from above. Can you deny that salvation is a good and perfect gift. It is true, works are a necessary sign of faith, just as breathing is a necessary sign of life. But a man breathes because he is alive. If he did not breathe, you would know that he is dead. A man is justified by faith, and works then follow as a necessity."

He does not stop here, but goes on to show how God could be just and yet deal with guilty sinners,—he could punish sin and yet spare the sinner. He said :

"Wonderful exchange, the Innocent One is condemned and the criminal acquitted, the Blessed One is cursed and he who is cursed is blessed, the life dies and the dead live, the glory is covered with shame and he who is put to shame is covered with glory. And all from God's free and sovereign love. Those who are saved are saved because God chose it—by grace, by the will of God, not by their own will. Our own choice, our own will, our own works are useless, it is the choice of God, that alone is the cause of our salvation. When we are converted, it is not conversion that makes us to be God's chosen people; but it is the grace, will and choice of God that makes us to be converted people. And not converted people only, God makes us to be members of the body of his Son so that we are filled with himself; for in Christ dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. Oh if men could but understand this privilege, how purely, how holily would they live. They would look upon all the glory of this world as dung. They would delight themselves in that glory which is hidden from the eyes of the flesh." "There is but one foundation, one object,

one head, Jesus Christ, blessed forevermore. Let us not call ourselves after Paul or Apollos or Peter. One is our Master, even Christ."

Thus Lefevre, says Doumergue, not only posits the two fundamental positions of Protestantism, the supremacy of Scripture and justification by faith; but he also attacks the bases of Catholicism. One of these was the magic of the sacraments. He says:

"The washing with material water in baptism does not justify us; but it is the sign of justification by faith in Christ: for the sensible symbols are the signs of things and divine infusions."

He also attacked the reality of the mass. He opposes the "opus operatum" in the Lord's Supper or the idea of sacrifice in the mass. In commenting on Hebrews where Christ satisfies for the sins of the whole world by his sacrifice alone, he says:

"That which is performed every day by the ministry of the priests is not so much repeated sacrifices as the remembrance and recollection of the one and only victim who was offered but once." "It is said every time that you do this 'do it in remembrance of me,' for he has satisfied for us all. And there are no other mysteries save in the presence of his body and blood. The remembrance of the divine sacrifice and satisfaction is beneficial to all and more acceptable to God than any other sacrifice of satisfaction unto the end of the world."

He thus denies transubstantiation, though he held to a real presence of Christ of some sort, which later reappeared in the spiritual theory of Christ's presence, formulated by his successor, Calvin.

In addition to attacking the sacraments, he also attacked:

1. The celibacy of the priests, saying of it that the Church had fallen into the snare of the devil.
2. Lent and the practise of fasting. Also tithes, monkery, etc. He says:

"There are men nowadays who teach a foolish godliness instead of Christ's doctrine. What does it profit me to fast new Lents or to pay my tithes? Why trust myself to formulas of prayer of unknown authors and leave aside the prescrip-

tions of the apostles. Why die in the cassock when one has lived his whole life in the secular habit? No such thing is ordered in Christ's doctrine. The balance may be more superstitious than religious. Let us therefore attach ourselves to Christ alone and to the doctrine of the apostles, for it is sufficient and it is first and paramount for salvation."

3. The use of the Latin language in the Catholic worship. He declared that most of the people prayed without understanding what they prayed and so they did not pray in the Spirit.

We thus see how Protestant this book is, for these were all of them sound Protestant positions and for that reason he could be called a Protestant. It was truly a remarkable book for its day. Its advanced ideas did not pass unnoticed by the Catholics, although at the time its true import and significance was not realized. There were several reasons for this:

1. One was that they were written in Latin and so reached only the learned.

2. The times were not ripe for such a book. The abuses of the indulgences had not become a scandal as five years later when Luther nailed up the theses.

3. Lefevre was a different sort of man from Luther. He has commonly been represented as a quiet, mystical sort of scholar. That is not exactly true. He could fight (as we shall see) when attacked. But he was not the polemist that Luther was. Luther was the offensive theologian, Lefevre the defensive. But he was not the quiet sort of man hitherto supposed, for he could hit back hard when attacked.

All these things prevented this book from creating the sensation later created by Luther, although this book was far more Protestant than Luther's theses, which had little of what is distinctively Protestant in them.

But what makes this book still more significant as a source of the Reformation, is that it has been discovered that Luther possessed a copy of it and used it in his lectures at the university at Wittenberg. He used it up to 1516 or 1517 when the New Testament of Erasmus came into his hands. Luther therefore was indebted to Lefevre. The German Church historians have labored to make all the rest of the

Reformation to be indebted to Luther. Zwingli, say Harnack and Loofs and Seeborg, got his ideas from Luther. We will answer this claim in regard to Zwingli elsewhere. They also claim that Lefevre was indebted to Luther.* But the recent discovery of Luther's copy of Lefevre's Commentary has proved that Luther utilized Lefevre. No, Lefevre stated the doctrine of justification in 1512 before Luther held to that doctrine. That doctrine was not formulated till the Reformation. And Lefevre's book was the only one in which that doctrine of justification by faith was first formulated. So Luther got its formulated statement from him. We thus see how Luther was indebted to Lefevre. Luther was not the first Reformer as the Germans claim, but Lefevre. Luther speaks highly of Lefevre for he later says he feared "Erasmus did not sufficiently promote the cause of Christ and the grace of God, in which he was more ignorant than Lefevre."

It has been objected by those who favor Luther, that Lefevre was not a Reformer, because he did not do something like burning the pope's bull as Luther did or write a work such as Calvin's "Institutes of Theology." Well there were others whom the world recognizes as Reformers besides Luther and Calvin and yet they did not burn a bull or write an Institutes. Neither Bullinger or Beza did any such things, yet they are rated as Reformers. Each man became a Reformer according to his own disposition and circumstances. There were different kinds of Reformers and Lefevre was one of them.

But again it is objected that Lefevre held to some Catholic doctrines. That is true, for when he published this work he seems still to have held to prayers to the saints and purgatory and did not attack the constitution of the Catholic Church. But neither was Luther a Protestant when he nailed the theses up at Wittenberg. He still held to the invocation of the saints and transubstantiation and other Romish doctrines. The truth seems to be that Lefevre was as much a Protestant in 1512 as Luther in 1517 and more so. Thus Farel, in 1522, says of Luther, that the gospel was hindered in France by the reading of Luther's earlier works, because they were not ex-

* Doumergue has ably answered this in his *Life of Calvin*, Vol. I, pages 542-555.

purgated from such Romanizing ideas as prayers to the saints, purgatory and transubstantiation.

Again some have objected to Lefevre's being a Reformer because he did not directly break off from Catholicism and come out squarely as a Protestant. Neither did Luther at first. He did not really break with the Catholic Church until it began to break with him. It forced the issue. We shall take up this special point about Lefevre later. Suffice it to say just now, that the charge of timidity that used to be made against Lefevre and which, it was said, kept him from leaving the Catholic Church, must now be revised in the light of what Prof. Doumergue has brought forth. Lefevre got into too many controversies after this to have been a timid man..

This doctrine of justification by free grace, taught in this book, he taught to Farel, who in later years wrote "Lefevre extricated me from the false opinion of human merits and taught me that everything came from grace, which I believed as soon as it was spoken." Farel also says "Lefevre turned me from the false thought that I could deserve anything of God." He said, "We have no merits at all. All is of grace or of God's pure mercy to those who deserve nothing. And this I believed as soon as it was told me."

We now come to the period when Lefevre shows his fighting mettle. The first controversy was a humanistic controversy in 1514 between the humanists and obscurantists. John Pfferkorn, a converted Jew, and Jacob Hochstratten, a Dominican inquisitor, had insisted on the banishment of the Jews and the destruction of their writings. The emperor Maximilian, to settle the controversy, finally required an opinion from Reuchlin. This great Humanist, who was the finest Hebraist of his day, with great ability defended Hebrew literature. Pfferkorn published Reuchlin's opinion with abusive comments, denounced him as a heretic and had him brought before the bishop of Spires for trial. The whole literary and theological world of that day was drawn into the contest. On the one side were the monks and on the other the humanists. Reuchlin was acquitted by the court. But the battle between the two parties continued to rage until Count Francis Von Sickingen forced the monks to pay the costs of prosecution and to

make an honorable reparation to Reuchlin. In this great controversy, the greatest just before the Reformation, where did Lefevre stand? Was he timid? Not at all. He boldly defended Reuchlin. Thus in a letter of August 30, 1514, he wrote to Reuchlin: "If you triumph, we triumph with you."

The next great controversy into which Lefevre entered was directly against Catholic ideas. It occurred in 1517, the very year Luther nailed up his theses. Lefevre ventured to battle with the Sorbonne at Paris. The previous year, he had published a second edition of his Commentary on Paul's Epistles, which contained so much about justification as we have seen. Now he also published another work on Mary Magdalene. This attacked a favorite view of the Catholics, indeed one that was incorporated in their liturgy for the Church Lessons set down for festival days. It thus had official sanction. It was that the three Marys of the New Testament, Mary Magdalene, Mary of Bethany, and Mary who anointed Jesus' feet, were one and the same person. Lefevre declared that they were not one but were three different persons. He discussed it as a mere academic question, but it raised a tremendous storm. The Sorbonne at Paris, led by Beda, loudly attacked it. The Franciscans, Carmelites, Dominicans vomited forth insults on the author of this heresy. They called him "stupid," "impious," "ignorant." A great polemical controversy arose. In this storm, what did Lefevre do? Did he do, as we have hitherto been led to believe (because he was such a timid character), be silent or recant? Not at all. He boldly replied to these attacks. Yes, he even went farther than before. He added another idea that seemed to them heretical. He declared that Anna, the husband of Mary, had not three husbands and three daughters as they believed, but one husband and one daughter. When warned by a friend that the publication of one of his books would expose him to the fire, he replied:

"I fear nothing. I do not believe there can be danger when we drive error from the minds of Christians in order to show them the truth. If some condemn me and my book to the fire, I will pray against the fire that the dew from heaven will put it out. I will forgive them."

These are not the words of a coward but of a martyr.

Thus a tremendous polemic grew around Lefevre. Repeated attacks on him were published. Replies were made to them by his friends as Clichtove and Agrippa of Nettesheim. To Beda, Lefevre's unpardonable offence was that he, a professor in the philosophical department of the university, should presume to investigate matters that belonged only to the doctors of theology of the Sorbonne. The bishop of Paris appealed to Fisher, the bishop of Rochester in England, who published two tracts against Lefevre and Clichtove. They responded and he replied. Thus there was a battle of books. But in it all Lefevre never lost his courage or proved the weakling he has hitherto been supposed to be. Farel, writing of this controversy, says: "Inasmuch as Master Faber had a great deal more learning than all the doctors of Paris, he was persecuted by them for that reason. And I began thereby to see the meanness of those doctors and esteemed them no longer as I had done." Great was the uproar among the students of the university as Lefevre taught his new doctrines. They began to occupy themselves almost as much with the doctrines of the Gospel as with their studies and comedies.

Finally the university of Paris on November 9, 1521, issued a decree that he was a heretic because he maintained that the three Marys were not one person. Thus six months after the university ordered Luther's books to be burned there, Lefevre was condemned. Luther's works since 1519 had been coming into France. Beda and the Sorbonne detested and feared Luther; but lo! they had a Luther in their midst in Lefevre. Beda wanted to bring Lefevre before parliament as a heretic. But just then the royal friendship of King Francis and Queen Margaret intervened for Lefevre and the process against him was stopped. Such was the storm that Lefevre raised and nothing saved him but the royal intervention. But meanwhile Lefevre had escaped from the power of his enemies. He had left Paris early in 1521 and gone to Meaux, about thirty miles from Paris, at the invitation of bishop Briçonnet, who had been one of his students. There he was safe.

During this controversy around him, Lefevre was also passing through a change within himself. At the beginning of 1519 he published the "Legends of the Saints" or the "Acts of the Martyrs." This was a collection of legends intended

for daily meditation of believers. The book was nothing but a collection of superstitions. He published the legends for January and February; but March came and no Legends appeared. Hardly had he begun the publication before he stopped it. Farel says, "Having heard the gross idolatry which belonged to the prayers of the saints and that their legends served as brimstone to kindle the fire, he gave it all up and betook himself to Scripture." Thus Lefevre cast away saints and saint-worship. Farel thus describes it: "One, for whom I thank God, spoke to me about worship,—that we should worship God alone,—no saints, no images, no angels—God alone." And thus Lefevre in 1519 in casting aside this doctrine, not only preceded Luther in justification by faith but also in giving up saint-worship, which Luther did not give up until about 1523.

At Meaux he found safety and rest. He found relief from the perpetual clamor at Paris against Luther and against his own doctrines. He also found congenial surroundings. The King's mother and Margaret, his sister, visited Meaux soon after he came there. Margaret declared that the King had entirely decided to let it be understood that the truth of God was not heresy. A few weeks later, she wrote that her mother and brother were more intent than ever on the reformation of the Church. Meanwhile Briçonnet prepared to reform his diocese. Lefevre, in 1523, was appointed by Briçonnet vicar-general of his diocese. Briçonnet invited the leaders of the *Évangélicaux*, Roussel, Farel and others, to labor in his diocese. They went everywhere preaching the gospel, Lefevre declared.

"Kings, princes, nobles, people, all nations should think and aspire after Christ alone. Every priest should resemble that archangel whom John saw in the Apocalypse, flying through the air, holding the everlasting Gospel in his hands and carrying it to every people, nation, tongue and king. Nations awake to the light of the Gospel and inhale the heavenly life. The Word of God is all sufficient. Of this Church it was written, "In this diocese an image of the renovated Church shines forth."

Lefevre, with several friends, was once engaged in conversation with some warm partizans of Rome. Lefevre, warming

up at the prospect he seemed to behold, exclaimed: "Already the gospel is winning the hearts of the nobles and of the common people alike. Soon it will spread all over France and cast down the inventions which the hand of man hath set up." "Then," angrily retorted De Roma, a Dominican monk. "Then I and others like me will join in preaching a crusade; and should the King tolerate the proclamation of the Gospel, we will drive him from his kingdom by means of his own subjects." Lefevre wrote to Farel, July 6, 1524:

"You can scarcely imagine with what ardor God is moving the minds of the simple in some places to embrace his Word since the books of the New Testament have been published in France, though you will justly lament that they have not been scattered more widely among the people. The attempt has been made to hinder the work under cover of the authority of parliament; but our most gracious King has become in this matter the defender of Christ's cause, declaring it to be his pleasure that his kingdom shall hear the Word of God freely and without hinderance in the language which it understands. At present throughout our entire diocese on feast-days and especially on Sunday, both the epistle and gospel are read to the people in the vernacular tongue and the parish priest adds a word of exhortation to the epistle or gospel or both at his discretion."

Lambert of Avignon also wrote hopefully, January 20, 1523, to the Elector of Saxony: "France is almost entirely in the Evangelical movement." A cotemporary, chronicling in 1526, said that Meaux was full of the false doctrine of Luther. He made the cause of all the trouble to be Lefevre, a priest and scholar, who rejected pictures from the Churches, forbade the use of holy water for the dead and denied the existence of purgatory.

And now begins to appear another great labor of Lefevre's, which revealed his Protestantism. Lefevre, says Doumergue, was not only the first Reformer but also the great *Biblical* Reformer,—that is, he was the first great translator of the Bible into the vernacular. His work on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles was followed in 1522 by his Commentary on the Gospels. In it he maintained "that the Word of God and not the doctrines of men point out the way of salvation. He prayed for a return to the pure faith of the Church of the

martyrs." In its preface he declared that "those, who forbid the common people to read the good news which the Lord commanded should be preached to every creature, would have to answer for their sin before his tribunal. Bishop Briçonnet had Lefevre's Bible translations printed for the education of the clergy in his diocese. But the Sorbonne at Paris placed them in the Index of heretical books and only through the mediation of the King was a farther investigation stopped. In 1525 Lefevre published his Commentary on the Catholic Epistles. In this he first uncovers the errors of the Vulgate.

At the request of the King and Queen Margaret and also of Briçonnet, he began a translation of the New Testament into the French language. This was made from the Vulgate and appeared in 1523 and the Psalms in 1525. By 1530 Lefevre had the whole Bible published in French. This was a great boon to the French, to whom the Bible had been a closed book. The learned might familiarize themselves with its contents by reading the Vulgate; but others, acquainted only with their mother tongue, were reduced to the necessity of using a rude version in which the text and glosses were intermingled in inextricable confusion and the Scriptures were made to countenance the most absurd abuses. But although they had had this earlier translation, Lefevre was the first to depart from the Vulgate, which the previous ones had closely followed. For although he translated from the Vulgate, he enriched it here and there by comparison with the Greek. His work in Bible translation was very remarkable,

1. In 1509 and 1534 a Latin translation of the Psalms;
2. A Latin Commentary on the New Testament, published three times;
3. A French translation of the New Testament, 1523;
4. A French translation of the Psalms, 1524 and 1528;
5. A French translation of the Old Testament in 1528;
6. A French translation of the whole Bible into French in 1530;
7. A French translation of the whole Bible with critical, marginal corrections in 1534.

When he began, he closely followed the Vulgate, as Wickliffe had done in his first translation into English. But more and more in his later works he introduced corrections from the

Greek and Hebrew until in 1534 he published the first real critical edition. This edition (1534 and also 1541) was considered so dangerous by the Catholics that it was prohibited in the Netherlands where it was published and by the Council of Trent, because it departed from the sacred text of the Vulgate. It was destroyed with great rigor by the Catholics. All this Bible translation was a magnificent undertaking, prompted by a fervent desire to promote the spiritual interests of his countrymen. Only one, who has the Protestant spirit and who believed in one of the fundamental principles of Protestantism which was denied by Romanism, namely, that the Bible must be placed in the hands of the common people in the vernacular, could ever have been lead to undertake such a great undertaking. Lefevre's translation was the basis of all later translations into French. It is worthy to rank with the translation of Luther, which it preceded by four years, and also with the Swiss Reformed translation of Zurich into German with which it synchronized.

In 1525 came the great test of Lefevre's life. Briçonnet, his bishop, had called down on himself the wrath of the Catholic authorities around him by his Evangelical reforms. Beda, the leader of Romanism, was especially active and it was of Beda that Erasmus once declared: "In one Beda there are 3,000 monks." In 1525 came the opportunity of the enemies of Protestantism. The king of France was defeated at Pavia and taken prisoner to Spain. In his absence, Romanism seized the opportunity. It introduced the inquisition into Paris. It took action against Briçonnet. The Protestants were the more helpless as Margaret, the king's sister, had also gone to Spain to visit Francis. Briçonnet did not have the moral courage to resist his superiors. On October, 1525, he issued a decree, at the order of parliament in Paris, condemning Luther's doctrines. Lefevre's translations were ordered to be burned. Lefevre was very awkwardly placed. But did he go back on his Evangelical views as Briçonnet did? He would have done so had he been the weakling he has been hitherto depicted by his biographers. No, he refused to recant his Evangelical views and go back to Romanism. Rather than do so, he fled to Germany in company with Roussel. They went to Strassburg where they were gladly received by its

Reformers, Bucer and Capito. He stayed with Capito. And there he would probably have stayed and become a Reformer just like his pupil Farel and like Calvin who came there later.

Now, if Lefevre had been the timid man he has been supposed to be, how did he get courage to flee. If he had given up his Protestantism as did Briçonnet, he would not have been worthy of being a Reformer; but just because he did not give it up, he was a Reformer. Contrast him with Erasmus, who while he attacked some of the errors of the Catholic Church, yet was always careful never to go too far. He always turned tail sufficiently to put himself under the aegis of Rome. Or to come nearer home, why did not Lefevre give up his Protestantism as did, at that time, his bosom friend and former defender, Clichtove. Rome would have received him back as it did Clichtove for a "slight recantation." Ah, Lefevre is more of a Reformer than he has been reputed to be.

But a fortunate providence led to his return to France. The King, Francis I, having returned to France from his imprisonment in Spain, recalled him to Paris. He gave him a position in the royal family as tutor of his children and as librarian of the chateaux of Blois, where he could continue his labors on the Bible. And when Lefevre came back to France at the King's invitation, was it on condition that he give up his Evangelical views? No, he came back holding them as clearly as before as we shall see when we come to his "Mass of Seven Points."

But his position at Paris was uncomfortable, indeed it became dangerous. The Catholics around him knew his Evangelical views. So Queen Margaret, the king's sister, came to his rescue. She wrote to her nephew, the grandmaster of Montmorency, "That good man, Lefevre, writes to me that he is uncomfortable at Blois, because the folks are trying to annoy him. For change of air he would willingly go to see a friend of his if such were the King's pleasure." The request was granted, for "the friend" mentioned was the Queen herself, for she had been, as we have seen, one of his early converts. As early as 1521 she read her Bible and had it explained to her by Lefevre. In 1527 he had rekindled her faith as he said to her, "Do not be afraid, the election of God is mighty." So Lefevre, for the rest of his life, was a resident

at her court at Nerac, where he was safe. There he concentrated his attention more and more on his publication of the Bible.

But the papal party did not despair of winning Lefevre back. A letter of the papal nuncio Aleander of December 30, 1531, has recently been exhumed in the Vatican records, which showed that there was correspondence between the heads of the papal Church about him. Aleander, in this letter, strongly expressed himself in favor of making the effort. He said:

“Lefevre’s ‘few errors’ had at first appeared to be of great moment, because they were published at a time when to change or correct the most insignificant syllable or a faulty translation of the Scriptures when approved by the Church, was an unheard of innovation. But by the time he now wrote, more important questions had come to arrest attention and the mere matter of re-translation without introducing un-sound doctrine seemed to be of little or no consequence. Let Lefevre but leave the heretical company, which he has kept and make but the least bit of retraction, respecting a few passages and the whole matter would be at once arranged.”

“But though this effort was thus talked of, nothing came out of it, probably because Lefevre was too firm in his Evangelical principles.

Just two years before Lefevre’s death, occurred two very significant events in his life. The first was the visit of Calvin to him. Calvin was staying at Angouleme with Du Tillet, not far from Nerac, and he visited Lefevre at Nerac in April, 1534. Calvin, like all French Protestants of that day, felt himself indebted to Lefevre. For although he had not been a pupil of Lefevre’s, yet it had been a pupil of Lefevre’s, Roussel, who seems to have exerted great influence over him at the crisis of his life, his conversion. It is a remarkable coincidence that just at the time that Lefevre had finished and published a better French version of the Scriptures than had before existed, there should come to him the young man, John Calvin, who was to reduce the doctrines of “Scripture to an orderly arrangement in his “Institutes of Theology.” When Calvin arrived at the chateaux and asked for Lefevre, they told him Lefevre was “a little bit of a man, as old as Herod, but as lively as gunpowder.” Beza says the aged man received the young man and looked upon him with pleasure,

prophesying that he would be an instrument for the establishment of the heavenly kingdom in France. Fl de Raemond completed the description of this interview thus: Lefevre left himself go over to the opinions of Calvin more than Roussel did. He desired him nevertheless to hold back, from the fear that he had that fervid spirit that might lead to disorder. Lefevre gave him in parting his advice that he should govern his opinions by those of Melancthon. In truth, Lefevre was in spirit the French Melancthon, mild, yet true to Protestantism. No wonder then he chose Melancthon as the model for Calvin to follow.

Lefevre told Calvin how the opposition of the Sorbonne had compelled him to take refuge in the south so as to escape the bloody hands of the doctors. Calvin was deeply impressed by Lefevre, whose white hair and broken-down appearance (he was about 99 years old) had about him a living force and meekness, a moral grandeur and heavenly brightness that charmed him. He urged Lefevre, whose idealistic views led him to frequently repeat, "There ought to be only one Church," to greater decision. Lefevre was moved and, weeping, said: "Alas, I know the truth, but I keep myself apart from those who confess it." Then wiping his eyes, he gave Calvin his benediction. Lefevre was also greatly impressed with Calvin. He had already sent forth one Reformer, Farel, with the words: "God will renew the face of the world and you will see it." Now he sends forth another Reformer in Calvin. He perceived that a greater than Farel was before him. "Young man," he said to him, "you will some day be a powerful instrument in the Lord's hand. The world will obstinately resist and everything will seem to conspire against the Son of God. But stand firm on that rock and many will be broken by it. God will make use of you to restore the kingdom of God in France." Such was the prophecy of the aged seer already breathing the air of eternity. It could hardly be expected that at that great age (99) he would go out with Calvin to new work. His confession of weakness then, can be somewhat condoned, when one remembers that such weakness often comes on the very aged. Old age naturally loves rest and Lefevre at his great age yielded to this peculiarity. But this scene was like the transferring of a spiritual sceptre. Just

as Elijah transferred his mission and power to Elisha when his mantle fell to earth from the fiery chariot in the skies, so Lefevre here transferred the spiritual leadership of the French Reformation to Calvin.

The second important event of that year (1534) was the "Mass of Seven Points." When Lefevre went back to France from Strassburg to live with King Francis I and Queen Margaret, was it on condition that he give up all his Evangelical views and customs? Not at all. He still retained them as strongly as ever. If he had not, he would have ceased to be a Reformer. But just because he retained them, he continued to be a Reformer, for he had suffered for them. In Margaret's court, her chaplain, Roussel, did not pray to the Virgin. And he celebrated the Lord's Supper at times after the Protestant fashion. By 1534 it is evident that these views were still held by the Reformers of Nerac. It is also revealed that they had not given up hope of gaining the king, and with him France, over to their views. For the "Mass of Seven Points" was the last attempt of Margaret to gain her brother, the king, over to Evangelical views. It was made in the autumn of 1534 when she visited him at Paris. But alas, because the placards against the mass had been posted up all over France, her brother was just then very angry against the Protestants. He replied to her proposal: "You want no Church and no sacraments." She replied that it was necessary at that time to unite the whole Church under one man, the bishop of Rome; but that the priests ought to be stripped of certain scholastic doctrines and superstitious practices that robbed the ritual of the Church of its primitive beauty. She hoped by thus taking advantage of the king's weak side—glory, to represent to him the glory he could get, by being an instrument to thus unite the Church. She then took from her pocket a paper that at her request Lefevre had drawn up for her before she left Nerac. It was a Confession of Faith known as the "Mass of Seven Points." Its contents were as follows: The priest will continue the mass, only

1. It will be a public communion (no private masses by priests alone).
2. He will not lift up the host before the congregation.
3. There will be no adoration of the host by the congre-

gation kneeling when it is lifted up.

4. The priests and the people will commune in both elements.

5. There will be no commemoration of Mary and the saints.

6. The communion will be celebrated with ordinary bread (and not with the wafer).

7. The priest, after breaking and eating, will distribute the remainder to the people.

To these seven points of the mass was added another, that the priests were to have the liberty to marry. One can see from these how Protestant Lefevre still was. He was farther than Luther was when he was first called a Protestant, because he denied the worship of Mary and the saints and would use bread instead of wafers. No wonder Francis I, after hearing the paper, said "And what is then left of the mass?" This incident throws a flood of light on Lefevre's last days. It gives a political significance to his conservatism. He hoped by it to at last gain the king and the court of France to Protestantism. It failed; but Lefevre's motive must be respected though this has been forgotten by historians.

Just before his death, Farel, who wanted help at Geneva to introduce the Gospel, wrote to him to come and aid him in his conflict with Romeanism. The venerable man shed tears and returned thanks for what he heard. But he declined Farel's invitation. This was natural for he was entirely too old to take part in a disputation as Farel desired. This has also been used against Lefevre to show that he was timid. Rather it should be remembered that by this time Lefevre had gotten to an age (being nearly one hundred years old) when people don't go into new things or go to new places to live; for old age is naturally opposed to change of abode. Old age loves a place to rest; and Lefevre, having found such a place, was but following the course of old age in preferring to stay there.

So he remained in his asylum until 1536, when he died, a centenarian. The following scene, just before his death, was told of him by Queen Margaret to Elector Frederick II of the Palatinate when he visited Paris in 1538. Frederick's secretary gives it thus:

“The excellent man, James Lefevre of Etaples in Picardy, who has been one of the most learned men of his day, seeing himself cruelly persecuted in Paris by the followers of Sorbonne, retired to Nerac, close to Margaret, Queen of Navarre, sister of King Francis I. That princess, who loved letters, received that excellent old man with joy and conversed with him often about many serious and noble affairs. One day, having planned to dine with him, she gathered together a number of learned persons. During the repast Lefevre appeared very sad and sometimes shed tears. The Queen, perceiving it, asked of him the cause, rallying him that he was causing a sadness instead of contributing to their recreation. ‘Alas, Madame,’ he replied to her, ‘How can I have the joy of contributing to those of others, being a wicked man on the earth.’ She replied, ‘What so great sin have you committed, you, who seem to have conducted before your evil age, a life so saintly and innocent?’ ‘Madame,’ he said, ‘I see myself at the age of 101 without having touched a woman and do not at all remember to have any fault of which my conscience is able to charge me. But I have one sin which I believe is not able to be expiated.’ The Queen having pressed him to discover himself to her. ‘Madame,’ said the old man, weeping. ‘How can I stand before the judgment seat of God? I have in all purity taught the Gospel of his Son to so many persons who have suffered death for it, while I have always sought to avoid it, and that at an age, when far from fearing it, I ought rather to have longed for it.’ The Queen, who was naturally eloquent and who was not ignorant of Scripture, at this made a beautiful discourse to him, showing by various examples how the same thing was attained by many good and holy persons who reigned with God in heaven. She added that because of some great sin which one found in himself, he ought not to despair of the mercy and goodness of God. Those who were at the table joined their consolations with those of the princess. The good old man was strengthened by them. ‘I shall not rest,’ said he, ‘until I have made my will before I go to God, for I believe that he calls me.’ Then casting his eyes to the Queen, he said, ‘Madame, I make you my heiress. I give my books to Mr. Roussel, and I give my clothes and all I possess to the poor. The rest I commend to God.’ The queen smilingly said, ‘But what of the inheritance remains to me?’ ‘Madame, the care of dividing my property to the poor.’ ‘I will do so,’ replied the queen, ‘and I swear to you that I will have more joy in that than if the King, my brother, would make me his heiress.’ Lefevre then appeared more joyful than he had yet been and said, ‘Madame, I have need of some repose.’ And to those at the table he said ‘Adieu.’ Then he laid himself on his bed and at the time when one imagined

that he slept, he passed to that better life without having given any signs of illness. After his death the queen gave him a magnificent funeral, desiring also that he be covered with marble which she had sculptured for him."

Fl. de Raemond recounts: "I remember to have seen formerly (in the Church at Nerac) his tomb and on it these words, 'I leave my body to the earth, my soul to God and all my goods to the poor.' These were the last words of Lefevre, dying." This testimony favors the authenticity of the last conversation between Lefevre and Margaret.

Such was the life, death and influence of Lefevre. He was the man who virtually made the Reformation, especially for France. He is just coming to his rights as the Father of the Reformers,—a Frenchman and Reformed, as is shown by the fact that out of him came the Reformed Church of France. The judgment of historians is coming back to what D'Aubigne wrote in 1541, "The Reformation did not come into France as an importation from abroad. It was born in French soil. It sprang up in Paris. It had its first roots in that university itself—that second great influence in Romish Christianity. The glory of having begun that work does not belong to Germany or to Switzerland, but to France." And Polenz, the historian of French Protestantism, says of him, "Already before 1512, at a time when Luther went to Rome on business for his Order and at an epoch when Zwingli had not commenced to apply himself with zeal to the Holy Scriptures and passed the Alps with the Confederates to fight for the pope, God raised up a little man, modest in birth and appearance, who lighted an Evangelical light in the solitude of his study."

The historical significance of Lefevre has not been noticed sufficiently. He represents the first step in the Reformation,—an attempted reformation in the Catholic Church. This at first was the aim of all the Reformers until driven out of that Church. But Lefevre's was the only movement where it really came into existence, if only for a short time. For five years at Meaux (1520-5) and later for about the same time at Nerac it had an existence. Lefevre preferred to remain in the Romish Church if he could, for he loved the idea of the unity of the Church. But if necessity came, he would leave the Church as he did in fleeing to Strassburg and worshipping for a time

with the Protestants. The historic significance of Fabrisianism, as Doumergue calls Lefevre and his followers, is that such a movement could not have continued existence—it must fail. The Romish Church would not allow herself to be reformed, she was too corrupt. Had Lefevre been younger or lived later he would soon have been forced out of the Catholic Church by the logic of events. The school of Lefevre was the first Protestant school, the only one that seemed to succeed within the Romish Church for a time. It should not be criticized as it has been. It occupies a very important place historically in the development of Protestantism. For out of Meaux came the first and bravest of the martyrs. And out of Nerac came the great Protestant queen, Jeanne D'Albret. And from Lefevre came Farel. But the hour had now come for this school to disappear. Rome, while temporarily allowing it, did not want it to continue. And with the death of Lefevre the Lefevre type of Protestantism passed away and the new type of Calvinism came. As Doumergue aptly puts it: "When Lefevre died, the age of Fabrisianism was over, the age of Calvinism was to begin." Nevertheless Lefevre and his school occupy an interesting and important place,—are an important link in the Reformation of which too little has been made. And Lefevre, little but grand old man in old age, fighting like a tiger against the scholastic theology at a time of life when men usually fold their sails to rest the remainder of their days, no wonder he at last was glad for a rest at Nerac. But he stands out in the early Reformation as a lonely yet grand figure, especially as we see those who read his books and caught his inspiration, Luther, Zwingli, Farel and Calvin, rally around him to reform the world.

CHAPTER II.

WHO WAS THE FIRST REFORMER, LUTHER OR ZWINGLI?

But even if Lefevre was the first of the Reformers (as we showed in our previous chapter) the question still remains, how about the two other Reformers, Luther and Zwingli, which of these was the earliest? This has been for a long while a bone of contention, especially between the Lutherans and the Reformed. It would seem to be an easy question to answer. But in reality it is quite difficult. For as soon as you ask it, you are confronted with another question, "What is it that makes a Reformer?" "What must he do in order to be a Reformer?" To this, three answers have been suggested, each of which alters the date sought for.

1. Did he become a Reformer when he was converted and *began preaching the Gospel?*

2. Or did he become a Reformer when he *threw off the papacy?*

3. Or did he become a Reformer when he virtually *completed the reformation in his city and country?*

From this it can be seen how difficult this question is. The reason why there has been so much controversy about it, has been because one writer meant one thing by a Reformer, and another meant another. And the problem becomes even more difficult in the light of recent research and especially since the publication of the works of the Reformers.

Let us take up the first for a moment, namely, that he became a Reformer when he first showed that he was converted. The answer to this will depend on what is meant by conversion. This is the more difficult in the case of both of these Reformers, because as their works are being discovered and published it is evident that the conversion of both was gradual. For years Luther seems to have been coming with increasing clearness to justification by faith and during those same years Zwingli was coming with increasing clearness to the doctrine of forgiveness through Christ and not through

the Virgin and saints. But how far in these doctrines must a person go, so that we can say he is converted? We today reply, until a man has a definite experience of forgiveness. But you can't apply that test to persons born in Catholicism, though that will do for Protestants. A few years ago in Italy, one of the leaders of the Waldensian Church told me that the Catholics are converted but not like Protestants. They did not go through our sense of conviction for sin; for they no longer have any conscience as the priest has been so long their conscience for them. We cannot then expect to apply our Protestant test to the Reformation. Nor could we, if we would. The experience of both Luther and Zwingli is not given us with sufficient fullness to enable us to so closely follow it. Thus, if belief in justification by faith makes a man a Reformer, then how was it with Luther? For though he advanced to that doctrine just after the theses of 1517, yet he still held on to Romish doctrines as purgatory and saint worship, etc. So that it is a really serious question to know when he was converted.

Again, take the second,—that a man becomes a Reformer when he throws off the papacy. Then the question arises whether that means, at the time he first attacks the papacy, or later when he entirely breaks with the pope.

Or take the third,—was a man a Reformer when he had reformed only his city? or did it also demand the reformation of his country?

There is a truth in each of these and we will consider all together in the discussion of this problem. We will try to show as we discuss the matter which—Luther or Zwingli—was first in each of these stages. We will first of all take up Zwingli's conversion and then Luther's.

A—THE CONVERSION OF ZWINGLI.

The conversion of Zwingli can be taken up in two ways. We can study it according to the *places* where he lived,* or we can study it according to the *persons* who influenced

* We have taken it up in this way in our Mission-Study book, "The Famous Reformers of the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches."

him. We believe that the latter is the more important method, for a man is more apt to be influenced by persons than by places. But we will endeavor to somewhat combine the two, giving however greater prominence to the influence of persons on him.

Zwingli's preparation to become a Reformer may be said to have passed through three periods:

1. The Churchly humanism.
2. The Evangelical humanism.
3. The Critical humanism.

1. The Churchly humanism. This influence came to him in his early school days. And here there were three different influences.

The first was that of his uncle Bartholomew Zwingli, who had been priest at Wildhaus when he was born, and who had there baptized him. This uncle later removed to Wesen and it was to his care that Zwingli's father committed the boy for his education. The uncle believed that humanism gave a more thorough education and so placed his nephew under its influences. How mighty is the influence of those who guide the education of the young. It is to this uncle that we owe it that Zwingli became a humanist and then a Reformer. The influence of this uncle on Zwingli, Stahelin compares to that of Staupitz on Luther. He died in 1513, before the Reformation broke out.

After young Ulric had learned all he could in his uncle's school at Wesen, he was sent by him to Basle where Binzli had an excellent school. Under his training Zwingli began revealing his special ability in debate and also in music. But Binzli was not a humanist, although later, as the successor of Zwingli's uncle at Wesen, he followed the steps of his distinguished pupil, Zwingli, into Protestantism. It was, however, at the next school that Zwingli attended, that he first came into contact with humanism. This was at the school in Bern under Lupulus or Wolflein. This was the first humanistic school founded in Switzerland,—whose curriculum and method of study followed after the humanists. Here, says Myconius, Zwingli was admitted to the sanctuary of the classics. But Lupulus was one of the conservative churchly humanists who would not break with the Catholic Church.

The truth is that there were different kinds of humanists. Just as today there are different kinds of modernists in the Catholic Church, critical, ethical or Evangelical; so there were differences among the humanists. Humanism prepared for the Reformation, only in different degrees, according to the type of humanist. There were:

1. The pagan humanists. These wanted the classic languages reintroduced but they had no interest in religion. Often they were rationalists as the humanists of Italy. Of this kind was much of the Renaissance which produced skepticism and Epicureanism, because culture was sought as an end in itself.

2. The conservative Churchly humanists, of whom Lupulus was one. They believed in utilizing whatever of good there was in humanism, but not to the extent of affecting their adherence to Catholicism. Thus Lupulus was a devout Catholic. He made pilgrimages yearly to Einsiedeln. After Zwingli had been under him at Bern he made a pilgrimage in 1520 to the Holy Land,—to the holy sepulchre at Jerusalem. He encouraged the sale of indulgences by the Dominicans. But he was a sincere man and finally, in 1524, broke with the past and became a valiant soldier for the Evangelical views. But at the time that Zwingli was under him, he was a conservative, Churchly humanist.

3. There was a third type of humanist,—the Critical. These went farther than the last type. They wanted a reformation in the Church; but they expected this reformation would come about through education,—that is, by the study of the classics. They spent their strength on a better education. They wanted no break with the Romish Church. They were philological, aesthetic humanists. Erasmus was one of this type.

4. Then there was a fourth class, the Evangelical. They wanted a reformation, but they did not believe it would come through education. It must have a deeper impulse than that. It could only come through a spiritual movement—a religious revival. They put religion into it. They wanted to use their knowledge of the classics mainly so as to get back to the Bible. They thus began setting up the Bible against the scholastic theology of their day. To this class belonged Lefevre, of whom

we have spoken and Wyttenbach of whom we shall speak. Luther also for a short time at first belonged to this class.

It is important to keep these different classes of humanists apart, for except the first, all of them appear in connection with Zwingli. And the failure to keep them apart has brought confusion into Reformation biographies and rendered much of them useless.

It is very evident that from so conservative a humanist as Lupulus, Zwingli would get no impulse toward reforms. Indeed Lupulus did not even try to protect Zwingli from the efforts of the Dominican monks to get him to join their Order. But Zwingli's uncle was more advanced than Lupulus and influenced his father to take him away from the influence of those monks, for he was more of the Erasmian type of humanist, who did not like lazy monks.

So Zwingli was sent to the university of Vienna at the age of 15. This university has hitherto been supposed to have been entirely conservative. But recent researches, as by Staehelin and others, reveal that humanism had its strong representatives in its faculty, especially in Prof. Conrad Celtes and Cuspianus. Celtes had reorganized the curriculum of the university. At Vienna Zwingli took the philosophical studies, according to Myconius, and so came under Celtes, so that Zwingli received a thorough training there according to humanistic ideals. It made classical studies an entrancing study. Thus Vadian, Zwingli's fellow-student, was so enamored with his Virgil that he took it to bed with him as a pillow. And Zwingli shows his great appreciation of this university by later sending students to it from Glarus, his first charge, rather than to Basle where he had also studied. He seems to have felt that the education was better at Vienna. At Vienna Zwingli seems to have been greatly broadened by the variety of his studies as in geography as well as in the classics. But what is most interesting to us is that Zwingli, in going to Vienna, passed from the conservative humanistic influence of Lupulus to the criticizing humanism of Celtes, who was like Erasmus in this respect. He railed at the superstitions of the clergy and reproached the priests with making their very sanctuaries the haunts of impurity. And yet Celtes was careful not to go too far and was, like Erasmus, rated as a good Catholic.

though liberal.

2. The Biblical humanism.

The second great influence that came into Zwingli's life came from a Biblical humanist, Prof. Thomas Wytttenbach of Basle. Most important for Zwingli was it that in 1502 at the age of eighteen he returned to Basle as teacher in the school of St. Martin and also to attend lectures in the university. Here it was that he met the man who planted in his young mind the seeds of the reformation. Here he at last met a Biblical humanist who was really more than a humanist, for he had already caught a glimpse of the Evangelical doctrine.

But as Zwingli came to Basle in 1502 and Wytttenbach did not begin lecturing at Basle until 1505, the question arises as to what Zwingli was doing in the meanwhile. We know he was teaching and also attending the university. But what was the condition of the university and where did it stand in relation to humanism? Humanism had had its representatives there. The great Reuchlin had taught there, but had left. And since the departure of the last humanist professor, Brandt, in 1500, scholasticism and conservatism had reigned supreme with their pedantries and empty formulas. But although there was conservatism in the university, in other things there was progress. Literature was progressive through the great printers at Basle, Amerbach and Frobenius. They were busy publishing the literature of humanism. It was this facility for printing at Basle that finally led Erasmus to locate there. These publications stirred the students of the university to new thought. Then, too, it looks as if there was a religious awakening in the Church at Basle, though Catholic. For a "Manual on Preaching and Pastoral Work" was published there (1503) the year after Zwingli came there, which was destined to have ultimately an important influence toward Protestantism. Its author was a priest there, John Surgant, who took the Protestant position that of all the duties of the minister, preaching was the most important. This was not in strict accord with the Catholic view, which made worship, especially the mass, the most important. This book not only emphasized preaching but also set up the Biblical over against the scholastic theology. It said, "the doctrines of philosophers and heathen contain truth and error mixed. The Catholic

teachers, however, sometimes weaken from the truth or allow room for doubt, for all men are liars. But the doctrines of the Bible rest on the truth of God which is infallible." Such was the teaching of this book. And we know that Zwingli was impressed by it, because many years after when he drew up his form of worship for the first Protestant Lord's Supper at Zurich, he somewhat followed Surgant's ideas. The impression made by this book on Zwingli was doubtless deepened by the order of the new bishop of Basle, Christopher of Utenheim, who called a meeting of the synod of Basle and ordered a law passed that each priest must preach the Gospel according to the Gospel Lesson that he read on Sunday. These movements towards greater experimental religion probably affected Zwingli.

As Wyttenbach did not come to Basle until 1505, in the last year of Zwingli's stay there, the question has come up as to Zwingli's theological views before Wyttenbach came there. On this two suggestions have been made.

1. That Zwingli was a devout Catholic until Wyttenbach came and that then Wyttenbach opened his eyes to the Evangelical truth as found in the Bible. This was the old view.

2. The other view is that Zwingli came to Basle already inclined to the newer views of humanism especially through the influence of Prof. Celtes and others. And that when he had to sit under the dry, useless sophistries of the scholastic professors of theology at the university of Basle, his liberal mind reacted against their narrowness and he inclined to greater extremes of liberalism. This is the view held by the later biographers of Zwingli as Stahelin. And it would seem to be proved by the testimony of Myconius, the first biographer of Zwingli, who says of him at Basle:

"Because the regular course of things demanded it, he paid diligent heed to theology in the scholastic form. What a waste of time it involved, since it was such a jumble of worldly wisdom, philosophy, God, inane loquacities, barbarities, vain glory and things of that description, that no sane doctrine could be reasonably hoped from it."

He also says that Zwingli while at Basle came under suspicion of heterodoxy, because he defended some of the theses of the Italian, John Picus of Mirandola, which had been con-

demned by the pope. Of this influence of Picus we will speak later.

One thing, however, is certain, that no matter which of these views is held, Wytttenbach became a profound influence in Zwingli's life. For Wytttenbach confirmed all the liberal tendencies that had been in Zwingli before. And he added to them others which made him the great teacher of Zwingli's reformatory views. Fortunate was it for Zwingli that he came under the tutelage of such a man so broadminded and yet so holy and spiritual.

As the life of Wytttenbach is comparatively unknown and his value in Reformation history is just beginning to be recognized, we will pause upon it. He was an humbler teacher than Lefevre, whose fame was recognized all over Europe. But though humble, he was Evangelical even before Lefevre, who as we have seen was Evangelical before either Luther or Zwingli. As early as 1506, twelve years before Lefevre, he taught at Basle the two fundamental doctrines of Protestantism, namely, (1) the supreme authority of Scripture and (2) salvation by Christ and not through Mary. And eleven years before either Luther or Zwingli denounced the evils of indulgences, he denounced them as a fraud and cheat. And like Luther at Wittenberg, he had a disputation about them at Basle in 1506. So that in Wytttenbach the Reformed had another Reformer beside Lefevre, who was before Luther. It may, however, be replied that there were others even before Wytttenbach, who, although in the Catholic Church, attacked indulgences. Thus John Wessels, one of the "Reformers before the Reformation," was imprisoned for teaching against indulgences. But we reply that Wessels and the others were of a different class from Wytttenbach. They were in no way directly connected with the Reformation. But Wytttenbach was very directly connected with it. His pupil was one of its founders. And he himself later became a Reformer also. For he later became the Reformer of Biel in Switzerland. If Luther was made a Reformer by nailing up the theses, then Wytttenbach was an earlier Reformer for he did the same thing at Basle in 1506.

Thomas Wytttenbach was born at Biel, a town west of Bern, in 1472. He was the son of the mayor of the town.

He studied diligently in the school in his native town and then went away to the universities to study for the priesthood. In 1496 he went to the university of Tübingen in southern Germany, where the learned Reuchlin, the leader with Erasmus of the humanists, taught. Reuchlin's Evangelical tendency was shown by the fact that in 1499, while at Stuttgart, he lectured to the monks of the neighboring monastery of Denkendorf on the art of preaching. This work was published in 1504 and it reveals its Evangelical tendency in urging the monks to become acquainted with the Bible. It is easy to see that the teachings of such a man would influence an earnest, pious student like Wyttenbach. The latter remained at Tübingen four years, taking the degree of Master of Arts in 1500. At Tübingen he also came under the influence of Paul Scriptor, who taught him that many of the things endorsed by the papacy would have to be set aside and that there was need of a renovation of theology from Scripture and the Church Fathers.

From Tübingen Wyttenbach went to Basle in November 26, 1505, where in the university he lectured on the great text-book of Catholicism at that time, the "Sentences of Lombard." But he also lectured on the New Testament, especially on Paul's Epistle to the Romans. He was thoroughly familiar with the classics, but to them he added a profound knowledge of the Bible. Out of the barren deserts of scholasticism, so destitute of water, it was his delight to lead his pupils to the living waters of God's Word. He was a man with a message for that age. And he soon gathered around him a set of earnest young men. Thus Leo Juda, who was studying medicine, was by him influenced to study theology. He afterward became Zwingli's great helper in the Reformation. Zwingli also, who seems before to have been somewhat undecided, having been captivated by humanism and in love with his teaching, now fully decided under Wyttenbach's inspiration to study theology. Capito and Pellican, later also Reformers, the former at Strassburg, the latter at Zurich, seem to have come in touch with Wyttenbach at that time more or less. Wyttenbach was therefore like Lefevre, though in a lesser degree, the father of Reformers. We have already mentioned four. And to them ought to be added Haller, the Reformer of Bern, who later at

Bern, was influenced by Wyttenbach to become a Reformer.

Leo Juda thus writes to the city council of Biel about Wyttenbach:

“From your city came forth this man, regarded by the most learned men of that age as a true phoenix on account of his many acquirements. Zwingli and I enjoyed his instructions in 1505. Under his guidance, from polite literature in which he was equally at home, we passed over into the more earnest study of the Bible. His sagacity discerned clearly beforehand the events of coming years, the overthrow of the papal doctrine of indulgences and other groundless dogmas, by which for many centuries Rome had held unthinking mankind in bondage. Whatever of thorough knowledge we possess, we owe it to him and must remain his debtors as long as we live.”

Pellican was there as teacher of theology to the Carmelite monks and he also aided the printers at Basle in their publications of the works of Augustine and Origin. He declared that at that time he gained from the study of the Church Fathers the first doubts about indulgences, purgatory, transubstantiation, confession and the power of the pope.

Wyttenbach later apologized to Zwingli that he had been at Basle a babbler of scholasticism and had caused him to waste his time on the trifles of sophistry.* Zwingli replied to him, June 15, 1523, consoling him that such teaching was due to the custom of the age and added that Wyttenbach's example had given encouragement to all noble spirits to free themselves from such fetters. What Wyttenbach refers to in his letter, we know not, unless it was that in lecturing on the Sentences of Lombard he naturally followed the scholastic method then in vogue. From the contents of that book he could hardly do otherwise. But in lecturing on Romans and the New Testament he seems to have corrected the sophistry of Lombard by the truths of the Bible. Wyttenbach pointed out to his students the great corruption of morals in the Church and attacked this and also held up the great doctrines of Scripture. He made Zwingli get hold of two fundamental

*The scholastic theologians would discuss such dogmas with their students, as whether after the resurrection eating and drinking were possible; or whether God's almighty power could have given his Son the shape of a stone and how a stone could preach and perform miracles. A fanatical Franciscan assured his hearers that Scotus had done as much for the Church as the apostle Paul.

doctrines of Protestantism:

1. The Supremacy of Scripture. Wyttenbach said to his students:

"The time is not far distant when the scholastic theology will be swept away and the old doctrine of the Church established in its room on the foundation of God's Word."

2. The second great doctrine was that Christ is the sole Redeemer from sin. In 1527 Zwingli says he had learned from Wyttenbach that:

"The death of Christ was the sole price of remission of sin and faith is the key that unlocks the treasury of that remission to the soul."

It is to be noticed that he gets at the Evangelical doctrines a little different from Lefevre or Luther. With him it is not Scripture and justification by faith as with them, but it is Scripture and the atonement of Christ.

As a result of this second doctrine, Zwingli was led to deny another Catholic doctrine that was then very prominent, namely, indulgences. For if Christ's death is the one sufficient ground of salvation, what need is there for such a thing as indulgences. Christ's death, and not indulgences, is the cause of forgiveness of sin. Zwingli thus wrote in 1523:

"At the beginning of 1519, none of us had ever heard of Luther except that he had published something against indulgences—a subject on which I did not require much enlightenment, because I had already been taught what a cheat and delusion indulgences were by my master and beloved teacher, Thomas Wyttenbach of Biel, who had held at Basle some time before, in my absence, a disputation on the subject."

Thus Wyttenbach, ten years before Luther, attacked the scholastic theology and prophesied the time was not far distant when it would be set aside and the old doctrines of the Bible and the early Church Fathers restored in its stead.

Wyttenbach did a great service to Zwingli at Basle. Zwingli had come, as we have seen, under the influence of humanism before Wyttenbach became his teacher. He could not help seeing the difference, yes often the contradiction, between the humanistic ideas and the scholastic theology. To his young mind there was such a contradiction between them

that they could not be harmonized. But Wytttenbach came into his mind with great power, by showing to him that there was a harmony, instead of a contradiction, between theology and humanism, that by making the Bible the sole authority, they were harmonized. Wytttenbach showed to him on the one hand, the usefulness of humanism for theology, in that it led to a scholarly examination of the original sources; and on the other hand, the usefulness of theology to humanism, to prevent it from becoming a useless and merely secular science. True theology was the application of humanism to the Bible. Wytttenbach communicated to Zwingli the impulse which led him to search the Bible in the original. This is shown by his later study of the Greek and later still of the Hebrew.

We thus see the tremendous influence of Wytttenbach on Zwingli. It was Wytttenbach who started Zwingli as a Reformer. He planted, as Leo Juda said, the seed thoughts that afterward came to harvest in the Reformation. His was the greatest influence that came into Zwingli's life, though it did not show its full power till ten years later.

Zwingli never forgot the impression that Wytttenbach had made on him, or the debt he owed to him. He always looked back on him as the greatest of his teachers. In 1521, in a letter to Haller, the Reformer of Bern, he sends greetings to Wytttenbach who was then with Haller at Bern. He calls him then "his dear preceptor." In 1527 he speaks of him as "the most learned and holiest of men." Wytttenbach continued in correspondence with Zwingli and in many a dark hour the latter was greatly strengthened by him. Of this correspondence only one letter has come down to us, a letter of June 15, 1523. Wytttenbach, though he had been Zwingli's teacher, yet now looked up to his pupil as the leader and desired to be taught about the Lord's Supper. Zwingli replied to his question; and still affectionately looking up to him as his old teacher, says: "I will gladly give you my opinion (about the Lord's Supper) not that you need it, but that when I am in error, you may correct me and bring me back." Zwingli then explains to his former teacher, the symbolical view of the Lord's Supper over against transubstantiation, which he attacks as he does baptismal regeneration. He held that in both sacraments, faith is necessary in order to bring blessing. He

emphasized the subjective side of the Lord's Supper over against the objective aspect of the Catholics.

Before leaving Wyttenbach, let us for a moment pause on his later life. He left Basle in 1507, a year after Zwingli left it. He went back to his native place, Biel, as priest. In 1515 he was called from Biel to Bern as priest. There he threw his life into the Reformation and joined the Reformed. He prepared Bern for the Reformation. For Haller, later the Reformer of Bern, and he lived together and Wyttenbach taught him what he had previously taught Zwingli. He thus helped to make Haller a Reformer and thus added another Reformer to the list of his students. In 1522, because he opposed the burning at Bern of the bull against Luther he left Bern and went back to Biel, his native place, to become its Reformer. There he began the Reformation by preaching mightily against indulgences. He declared that sin is not a thing to be bought. He also attacked the mass and the celibacy of the priests. He found strong support in his congregation, especially among his own relatives, one of whom, Squire Nicholas Wyttenbach, became his patron. Wyttenbach was one of the first priests to marry (1524). He thus defied ecclesiastical authority; and for it had to suffer many things. Many of the leading citizens of Biel refused any more to attend his services because he was married. They brought complaints against him before the Swiss Diet, which was at that time mainly Catholic. This diet sent a message to the town of Biel against him. The council of Biel then ordered all married priests and especially Wyttenbach away and took from them their financial support. Wyttenbach replied by saying that the marriage of priests was not forbidden by the Bible. He preached a month longer in the parish Church, but then had to leave it. He then preached in a chapel and later in the houses of those friendly to Evangelical religion. He had great crowds in the chapel. The city then compelled him to leave the parsonage and he lost its financial support. He therefore became very poor. But he kept up a gallant fight for the truth and many rallied around him. Finally he was at last compelled to leave Biel. He went to Bern. There, completely worn out by his privations and persecutions, he died in 1526 at the age of 54. He died just too soon. Had he lived a little over a year longer, until after

the Bern Conference made all that canton Protestant and Reformed, he would have had the joy of seeing that canton become Reformed and with it his city of Biel, for whom he had suffered so much. But his preaching and sufferings were not in vain. For a strong body of his followers at Biel formed the nucleus of the Protestant Church there, and to this day Biel honors his memory as its great Reformer.

Returning again to Zwingli, he left Basle for Glarus, his first charge, in 1506. There the teachings of Wyttenbach seem to have slumbered for a time. This was doubtless due to the novelty of his work as priest and to his many duties, for his parish was large, including one-third of the whole canton of Glarus. But when the first novelty of the priesthood began to wear off we find him revealing the impulse Wyttenbach had given him.

First of all he opened a humanist school at Glarus. Wyttenbach had revealed to him the humanistic methods of thorough scholarship. And as he loved teaching (he had been teaching at Basle for four years while studying at the university) he gathered around him some of the brightest young men of the leading families of Glarus. Some of them afterwards became famous as Tschudi. His pupils bear strong witness to Zwingli's rare ability as a teacher because he gave to them not only education but also inspiration.

2. He also shows Wyttenbach's influence by beginning at Glarus the study of the Greek language. As early as 1510 he had sought means to study it but was not able to really begin it until 1513. He wrote thus to Vadian, February 23, 1513:

"I am applying my ignorant self to the study of Greek and Latin. I do not know who has stirred me up to the study of Greek unless it is God. I do not do it on account of glory for I do not look for that. But I do it solely for the sake of sacred literature."

How often do great men thus feel that coming events are casting their shadows before, as they do things, the significance of which they do not at the time grasp?

In 1523 he related at the First Disputation at Zurich: "Ten years ago I began the study of Greek in order that I might learn the teaching of Christ from the original sources."

He studied Greek without a teacher and yet became so

proficient in it by the time he left Glarus that he could already read Lucian and the New Testament.

He also began the genuine study of the Bible while at Glarus. This, like those already mentioned, came from the inspiration given him by Wyttenbach. In 1522 he thus describes his mind at that time:

"In my younger days I was as much devoted to worldly knowledge as any of my age. And when seven or eight years ago, I gave myself up to the study of the Bible, I was completely under the power of the jarring philosophy and theology. But, led by the Scriptures and the Word of God, I was forced to the conclusion: you must leave them all alone and learn the meaning of the Word out of the Word itself. So I asked God to give me His light; and then the Scriptures began to be much more intelligible when I read them myself alone, than when I read much commentary and exposition of them. Do you not see that that was a sign that God was leading me? For I never could have come to such a conclusion by my own small understanding."

In these researches into the Bible he had already at Glarus noticed a difference between the Bible and Jerome. We thus see how far he had come at Glarus under the impulse given him by Wyttenbach years before.

But we remarked at the beginning of this chapter, that places as well as persons also have an influence; and before we leave Glarus, we must notice two local influences that came to him there and helped prepare him to become a Reformer.

The first was a *political* one. He had gone with the Swiss troops three times to Italy as their chaplain. This helped to open his eyes to the evils of the papacy. For there was an old proverb: "the nearer Rome, the worse Christian." Out of these experiences grew his opposition to the foreign mercenary military service of the Swiss. His sermon at Monza to the soldiers, exhorting them to fealty to their pledges, made for him a life-long friend of the later burgomaster of Zurich, Roust. He saw, too, that the pope, instead of trying to heal the dissensions between the nations, tried to intensify them so as to weaken his enemies. And although Zwingli did not break with the pope then, yet his political reaction against foreign service, even to the pope, prepared him for his later reaction against the pope religiously. It was the entering wedge for

further cleavage between the pope and himself later.

The second was a *liturgical* one and this came to him in two ways:

(A) The first came to him in Italy. He found while at Milan that the mass of that Church differed from the mass of his Church at Glarus in some particulars. Luther had also previously made the same discovery that the Ambrosian service at Milan differed from his mass at Wittenberg. It omitted intercession for the public magistrates. Zwingli reasoned thus about the matter:

“Either Ambrose, from whom this book came, made changes in the Roman mass without being visited with censure, or the Roman ritual had taken its shape since the time of Ambrose. In either case the liturgy was the work of men and subject to change.”

This disposed of the claim of the Catholics that their liturgy was the same at all times without variation.

(B) A second liturgical influence came to him from Switzerland. He says:

“It was while pastor at Glarus that I came across at Mollis, north of Glarus, an Obsequial,* which, although old, was complete. And there stood a Latin rubric which said, that immediately after the infant had been baptized, then shall the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper be administered to the child, *including the chalice containing the blood*. How long this practise was observed in the canton of Glarus I have not been able to find out, but surely it was not two hundred years since, in Mollis, the Lord’s Supper was administered in both kinds.”

He thus received his first Protestant impression about the Lord’s Supper, that the wine as well as the bread should be given to the laity.

We have thus followed the influence of Wyttenbach on Zwingli’s life up to nearly the close of his pastorate at Glarus. But now a new influence begins to tell upon him, the third in our list—the Erasmian. But before taking it up we might note that there is a third person beside Wyttenbach and Erasmus, who has been mentioned as having influenced Zwingli considerably, namely, John Picus of Mirandola, an Italian.

* That is a book for baptism, burial and benediction services.

This philosopher had some influence on him at Basle and later at Glarus. This is shown by Myconius' Biography, where he says that Zwingli, when at Basle (1502-6) "because he had not condemned the theses of John Picus of Mirandola, was secretly spoken of by certain blockheads as a heretic." But what the theses of Mirandola, that Zwingli refused to condemn, were, we do not know. Of the thirteen theses condemned, perhaps they may have been:

3. "That neither the cross of Christ, nor any image ought to be adored in the way of worship."

6. "It is possible for the body of Christ to be present at the altar without the conversion of the substance of the bread or the annihilation of the state of being bread." (Mirandola seems here to hold to the doctrine of remanence, for which Huss was condemned—that not all of the bread was changed into the body of Christ but that some of it remained bread. This was a lowering of the doctrine of transubstantiation.)

10. "That the words: 'This is my body,' uttered at the consecration of the bread are not to be taken as an actual fact, but merely as signficatory," that is, as a mere recital. (This, too, would lower the idea of transubstantiation, for the Catholic doctrine held that the utterance of these words performed the miracle of turning the bread into the body of Christ.)

But we do not know which of them he refused to condemn. All is in confusion, as is shown by the fact that Sigwart suggests two others of the theses as most likely to have appealed to Zwingli. The whole subject is so uncertain that we do not take Mirandola up as one of the great influences in Zwingli's life. The only sure inference that can be made about it is that of Myconius, that it shows that Zwingli was inclined to liberal views at Basle.

But Zwingli was more influenced by a nephew of Picus, John Francis Picus, who later influenced him toward election, etc. We must confess we do not understand why Calvinists of the Federal School have been so chary of Zwingli. Perhaps it was because of his low views of original sin where he speaks of it as a disease. But they can get election,—all they want and more,—out of Zwingli's sermon on Providence. Had Zwingli not been killed in middle life, he might have been able to somewhat co-ordinate these extremes of statement. On

election, providence, and some other points, Zwingli used language like that of the younger Picus.

III. THE CRITICAL HUMANISM.

The third humanistic influence came from Erasmus. Erasmus, like those of the first class, was a humanist; but while theirs was a Churchly humanism, his was a critical humanism. It also differed from Wyttenbach's in not being thoroughly Evangelical.

Erasmus was undoubtedly the most prominent of the later humanists. His publications had gained for him great fame all over Europe. Zwingli came into contact with him during his pastorate at Glarus. In the autumn of 1514 he received a letter from Erasmus, couched in terms of polite affection and great praise. When Erasmus, after his stay in England came to Basle in 1515, Zwingli visited him early in the spring of 1516. And after his return home to Glarus he wrote Erasmus a letter full of fulsome praise and also of thanks. To this Erasmus wrote a reply.* The influence of Erasmus is also shown by the fact that several of Erasmus' books have been found in Zwingli's library. Of these the most influential seems to have been Erasmus' "Handbook of the Christian Soldier." This was a popular handbook, describing the Christian life. It was first printed in 1503, but Zwingli's copy is of the year 1515, so that it probably came to him about the time of his association with Erasmus. This work tries to reduce religion to its simplicity so that it could be understood by every one. It also tried to emphasize the difference between true religion and a religion of mere outward forms and rites.

It was this work of Erasmus that led Zwingli to doubt the Catholic doctrine of intercession of the saints,—his first doctrinal doubt about Romanism. In it Erasmus represents men as perishing because they would not seek help in Christ alone. Zwingli says (1523):

"I shall not withhold from you, dear brethren in Christ Jesus, how it was that I arrived at the firm conviction that we need no other Mediator than Christ and that none but

* Both letters are given by Jackson in his *Life of Zwingli*, pages 78-81.

Christ alone can mediate between God and man. Eight or nine years ago I read a consolatory poem on the Lord Jesus, written by the profoundly learned Erasmus of Rotterdam, in which with many beautiful words, Jesus complains that men did not seek all good in him, so that he might be to them a fountain of good, a Saviour, comfort and treasure of the soul. So I reflected, well, if it is really so, why then should we seek help of any creature. And although I found other hymns or songs by the same Erasmus on St. Anna, St. Michael and others, in which he calls upon the saints of whom he wrote, as intercessors: still this fact could not deprive me of the knowledge that Christ was the only treasure of our poor souls. I began therefore to examine the Bible and the writings of the Fathers to find out if I could learn from them concerning the intercession of the saints. To be brief, I have not found it in the Bible. Thereupon I reflected: If that is so, why then do we seek help from any creature.”*

Of this work Zwingli wrote February 20, 1519:

“I do not ever remember to have received such fruit from a book of such compass. May God grant that this noble heart (Erasmus) may long beat for us, so that it regales us with so much sweet honey at the table of Christ.”

Thus at Glarus, Zwingli lost faith in one of the fundamental doctrines of the Romish Church, the intercession of the saints. Christ was the only mediator and the saints were not needed. But this idea of Erasmus was built on a previous idea that Wyttenbach had put into his mind and which had been slumbering there, namely, that sins are forgiven, not by the Virgin Mary, but by the ransom of Christ. It was Erasmus who roused in him the seed thought planted by Wyttenbach ten years before. “As iron sharpeneth iron,” so Erasmus sharpened Wyttenbach’s teaching. Together they made Zwingli a Reformer. How true what our Savior said: “One soweth and another reapeth.” Erasmus’ idea would not have been the spark to kindle the fire had not Wyttenbach laid the wood there. In the loom of any man’s life how marvelously the influences of different men are interwoven by the hand of God. Zwingli thus wrote in a letter:

“Thus have I taught. Yes it is true, why seek our help from the creature. Christ is the sole treasure of our poor

* See also Egli, page 35.

soul. Then searching for what the Scripture taught concerning the intercession of the saints I did not at all find it there. Therefore Jesus is the Source of every good. He is our only Saviour and our only hope."

Erasmus thus led Zwingli to give up saint-worship because not Biblical. Erasmus gave Zwingli the inspiration to this, but he stopped there. But Zwingli went beyond Erasmus. He carried out the logic of Erasmus' writings. Erasmus gave him the key, Zwingli unlocked the door with it. The old proverb used to be, "Erasmus laid the egg of the Reformation, but Luther hatched it." But this was far truer of Zwingli than of Luther. For Zwingli was far more closely associated with Erasmus than was Luther. For while Erasmus' influence on Luther was indirect, on Zwingli it was, as we see here, direct. So that the proverb ought to be changed to "Erasmus laid the egg of the reformation and Zwingli hatched it."

Such was the state of mind in which Zwingli left Glarus and went to Einsiedeln* to be preacher in the abbey. His old beliefs were beginning to crumble. The Scripture was becoming more and more the form by which he measured everything. Then just at that psychological moment, with his mind in that open condition, came in May, 1516, the greatest gift of Erasmus to him: "The Greek New Testament" of 1516. To understand how great a boon this was to him, it is to be remembered that there was no Greek Testament in circulation at that time,—the Latin, the sacred language of the Romish Church, had completely supplanted it. Zwingli, with his increasing knowledge of Greek, could get at the Greek New Testament only as its verses were scattered here and there through the works of Church Fathers. But now a book came to him enabling him to read the Greek Testament as a whole. It did not take him long, with his previous predilections to liberal views, to notice the difference between the Greek New Testament and the

* We might pause here to note the local influence that came to Zwingli at Einsiedeln after leaving Glarus. The quietness and seclusion of the place and the lack of pastoral duties gave him much time for study. The gross superstitions of the place seem to have produced in him a reaction against saint-worship. He also found there a circle of congenial spirits in Geroldseck, the administrator of the Abbey, Ochslin, and Zink, the papal chaplain.

Romish Church of his day. So great was his devotion to it, that in June and July, 1517, he copied all the Epistles of Paul in the Greek in a smaller form for his own private use, for the Erasmus' edition was a large, heavy folio work. This copy, as made by Zwingli, was called a "Paulinus," and is at present in the City Library at Zurich. But he did more than copy the Epistles of Paul. He committed whole Epistles to memory. This was later of great service to him when he got into public disputations with the Catholics. For he literally annihilated them out of the Word of God.

As we here leave Erasmus we will pause a moment to point out his later influence on Zwingli. Zwingli got from him his liberal views of sin and guilt. Also, according to Melancthon, it was Erasmus who gave him the first suggestion of the figurative interpretation of "is" in the phrase: "This is my body." All this liberalized his views over against the Catholics. It caused Zwingli and his Reformation to be more rational (but not rationalistic), while Luther emphasized the mystical especially in the sacraments. Later Zwingli visited Erasmus at Basle and in 1522 he invited him to come to Zurich. But Erasmus became estranged from Zwingli because he went so far beyond him in his reforms.

But while Erasmus thus influenced Zwingli, it was after all Wyttenbach who gave to his mind the mould in which his Reformation was born. The recent biographers of Zwingli treat him as if Erasmus was the main influence that led him toward the Reformation. They forget that Wyttenbach's influence was first and was the more powerful (Zwingli refers to it oftener.) And it differed from Erasmus in being a more spiritual influence. They have forgotten to note the difference between Erasmus the critical humanist and Wyttenbach the spiritual, religious humanist. For the two seed-thoughts that Wyttenbach had planted in his mind now came to fruition after he got this New Testament, namely, the supremacy of the Scriptures and the completeness of Christ's atonement. These two he had gotten from Wyttenbach before he knew Erasmus. And besides, he went farther than Erasmus. Erasmus had been willing to rouse the world by his criticisms of the Church, indeed he was willing to critically revise the text of Scripture; but he never came out boldly saying that the

Bible was the rule of faith. He emphasized Scripture over against a religion of outward rites, but he did not emphasize the Scripture over against the Church as an authority. He was too much of a time-server for that. He could say severe things against the Church, but he was careful never to attack her constitution or her authority. Just at this point Zwingli got his inspiration from Wyttenbach to go farther than Erasmus. He emphasized the Bible as the rule of faith and the atonement as the only source of our salvation. Erasmus suggested the doubt to Zwingli about the intercession of the saints, but he never went farther, as did Zwingli, who held that Christ is our only intercessor and we do not need the saints.

It is very interesting to note how these seed-thoughts of Wyttenbach come to harvest at Einsiedeln.

The first was the supremacy of Scripture. We have seen how this was growing in him as it did in Luther. In 1523 he thus speaks of himself at Einsiedeln:

“I began to preach the gospel of Christ in the year 1516 before any one in my locality had so much as heard of Luther. For I never left the pulpit without taking the words of the gospel in the mass service of the day and expounding them by means of Scripture.”

He thus began preaching on the Gospel as found in the pericopes or Scripture lessons:

“‘Study the Scriptures,’ he said, ‘and that you may better understand them, study Jerome. However, the time will soon come, with God’s help, when Jerome and others will be little esteemed by Christians, but only the Word of God.’”

Before he left Einsiedeln he wrote to Myconius that he expected to preach on the Gospel of Matthew, verse by verse, as he later did at Zurich.

The second seed-thought of Wyttenbach that came to harvest at Einsiedeln was his emphasis on the One Mediatorship of Christ. Erasmus only went so far as to say that Christ is love, but he never taught his completed atonement. As Bullinger in his “History of the Reformation” puts it:

“He preached the Gospel with all diligence at Einsiedeln and taught especially that Christ was the only Mediator to be prayed to and worshipped and not Mary the Virgin and

Mother of Jesus. This was by many unheard because unpleasant, but to others who were pious, it was acceptable. It is indeed a providence of God that he was permitted to preach at Einsiedeln where everything was so superstitious."

He seems to have preached Christ and his forgiveness at Einsiedeln, not so much polemically as positively; that is, he preached the salvation of Christ in its fullness, so that Mary and the saints were overshadowed and forgotten. He did not preach denunciations but the positive Gospel. But even this must have required tremendous moral courage on the part of Zwingli. For as Bullinger says, there was not a more superstitious place than Einsiedeln. Yet there in that Abbey, over whose door, according to tradition, was the sign: "Here sins are forgiven by the Virgin Mary," he preached that sins are forgiven by Christ. And in that abbey, whose greatest prize is the image of the Black Virgin said to have fallen from heaven and worshipped today by hundreds as an idol, he held up Christ, so white in his righteousness, over against the black Virgin. The world has admired Luther's bravery at Wittenberg and Worms, but it has forgotten to notice that here at Einsiedeln there was also bravery and heroism as Zwingli preached the new Gospel in the cradle of the old. No one would dare to do so today in that abbey. As a result, pilgrims, who came to the abbey to find forgiveness of sin through the Virgin, were led to forgiveness by faith in Jesus Christ.

Of his preaching there, we have two testimonies. One is by Hedio, who in a letter he wrote to Zwingli, November 5, 1519, speaks of Zwingli's sermon on Pentecost (1518) at Einsiedeln, when Zwingli preached on the story of the paralytic (Luke 5:17-26):

"I was greatly charmed by a discourse of yours, so elegant, learned and weighty, fluent, incisive and Evangelical, wholly such as recalled the energy of the old theologians, a discourse on the passage about the paralytic in Luke 5 at the Church of the Holy Virgin, at Einsiedeln, a year and a half ago, at the Pentecost season. That discourse, I say, so inflamed me that I began at once to feel a deep affection for Zwingli, to look up to and admire him."

The other is by the Humanist, Beatus Rhenanus of Basle, who wrote December 6, 1518:

"I know well that you and your companions support the pure doctrine of Christ, not according to the mutilation of the scholastics, but as shown in its truth and clearness by an Augustine, an Ambrose, a Cyprian and a Jerome. While the others bring forward their babbling about the power of the pope, of indulgences, of purgatory, of their invented miracles, of vows (of monkhood) or of hellish punishments. But you bring forth in your sermons the leading contents of the doctrine of Christ as if it were painted on a table, how Christ was sent by God to earth to teach us the will of the Father and to bring it about that the world with its riches, its honor, its dominion and power is despised and the heavenly Fatherland is sought with a whole heart. . . . For his life is the doctrine which stands out more prominently than anything that belong to men."

As a result of Zwingli's emphasis on the sole mediatorship of Christ, two other correlated doctrines appear.

The first was his opposition to indulgences. Samson came into the neighborhood of Einsiedeln preaching indulgences in the summer of 1518. Zwingli denounced them and so successfully that Samson went away. Later, Zwingli did the same at Zurich early in 1519 and by it started a movement that ultimately drove Samson and the indulgence business out of Switzerland. Zwingli says later (1523) that he did not get his opposition to indulgences from Luther for he said it was:

"A subject in which I did not require much enlightenment (by Luther) because I had been already taught what a cheat and delusion indulgences were by my master and beloved faithful teacher, Dr. Thomas Wytttenbach."

A letter has come down to us from Beatus Rhenanus, written by Zwingli from Basle, December 6, 1518. Rhenanus says: "I have laughed a great deal at the peddler of indulgences whom you depicted so vividly in your letter."

This remark has been exaggerated by Zwingli's later biographers as if it showed that Zwingli did not take the matter of indulgences seriously but merely as a joke. Thus Jackson says: "He had no appreciation of the enormity of the conduct of the pope in selling them." And some writers not very favorable to Zwingli have used it to point out that while Luther realized the deadly character of indulgences, Zwingli just joked about them. But we ask of them: If Zwingli took it merely as a joke and did not realize their enormity, how

was it that Samson was driven away from Einsiedeln, the very place in all Switzerland where he would have been apt to find support? Mere jokes don't produce such serious results. The cause they give is not sufficient to explain the results. And one, who goes to Einsiedeln today and sees its gross superstitions, will realize how hard it must have been to have produced such a result. Yet Zwingli did it and he could not have done it by mere frivolity. No, he himself endorses Wyttenbach's remarks that indulgences were a fraud and cheat and that makes them more than a joke.

Again this letter of Hedio's is in itself an answer to their inference. He says:

"For it does not escape me that you and those like you bring forth to the people the pure philosophy of Christ. . . . You, in preaching to your congregation, show the whole doctrine of Christ, briefly displayed as in a picture: how Christ was sent down to earth by God to teach us the will of the Father to show us that this world, i. e., riches, honor, authority, pleasure and all that kind of thing, are to be condemned so that the heavenly country can be sought with the whole heart, to teach us peace and concord, . . . to take away from us foolish affections, concerning country, parents, relatives, health and other possessions, to declare that poverty and disadvantages in this life are not real evils."

All this does not intimate the inference that has been drawn from it that Zwingli was merely joking about indulgences. But it shows that there was something deeper than jokes in his preaching on it.

We have thus seen how Zwingli's fundamental doctrines of the Scriptures and the atonement led to the denial of indulgences. There was also a second doctrine founded on them that was also discussed at Einsiedeln by Zwingli and his friends. It was that the Church must be reformed and that the papacy rested on a poor foundation. Capito, in 1536, in a letter from Strassburg to Builinger thus wrote:

"Before Luther became prominent Zwingli and I had come to an agreement that the pope must fall, as early as the time he lived at Einsiedeln." Zwingli too in a letter (1525) to Compar, state secretary of Uri, says:

"Eight years ago (1517) at Einsiedeln and then at Zurich, I often proved to the Lord Cardinal of Sion, that the whole

papacy rested on a false foundation and this always by appealing to Scripture. The noble Sir Diebold of Geroldseck (the head of the abbey), Master Francis Zink and Doctor Michael Sander, all three yet living, are my witnesses; and the above mentioned cardinal has frequently expressed himself to me in this way, 'If God restores me again to favor (he was at that time in disgrace with the pope), I will then willingly see the pride and falsehood of the Romish bishop exposed and corrected.'

Zwingli said to Pucci, the papal legate, of Switzerland:

"I will openly declare and before men still living, that ere dissension arose in the Church, I have both by word and deed witnessed to mighty cardinals, prelates and bishops of the errors in doctrine, which are abroad, and warned and counselled them to remove abuses or they themselves would perish in a more dreadful revolution."

Bullinger also says that at Einsiedeln Zwingli exhorted Hugo, bishop of Constance, to give freedom to preach the pure Word of God and to remove gross abuses and superstitions. He says that Zwingli made similar remarks to Cardinal Schinner, the papal legate in Switzerland. Stahelin has tried to throw discredit on these accounts which place Zwingli's Reformation so early. But in doing so he has to discredit Bullinger's testimony. Our reply to him is that Bullinger's testimony as a historian can not be discredited. We must confess that we would prefer believing the testimony of Bullinger, a cotemporary, to the theories of biographers and Church historians of nearly four hundred years later. Prof. Hagenbach used to answer such critics by "Is not the testimony of Bullinger sufficient." Something of this kind must have taken place or why did the pope appoint Zwingli one of his acolyte chaplains September 1, 1518. Besides Zwingli corroborates Bullinger's statements in his letter (1525) to Comper. For what Zwingli said was evidently enough to cause a stir as Rome began taking measures to offset it. It did not do so by fulminating a bull against him as it did against Luther. It did not dare do that, for the pope needed too badly the Swiss soldiers in his armies. While he tried to crush Luther by force, he tried to win Zwingli by favors. Antonio Pucci used his influence with the pope and on September 1, 1518, announced to Zwingli that the pope, in recog-

nition of his ability and learning, had made him an acolyte chaplain and released him from some ecclesiastical censures. This bid for Zwingli's favor seems later to have been followed by other overtures of much higher positions in the Romish Church. Zwingli bears witness to this in his Exposition of the Articles of the Disputation on January, 1523:

"I had for three years previously to 1520 been preaching the Gospel with earnestness, on which account I received from papal cardinals, priests and legates with whom the city abounded, many friendly and earnest counsels with threats and with promises of greater gifts and benefices."

Myconius says he asked Zink what the pope had offered to Zwingli. The reply was: "Everything except the papal chair."*

We therefore believe that Zwingli began his Reformation at Einsiedeln. True no open break occurred there between him and the pope. Nor did there for that matter occur with Luther so early when he nailed up the theses in 1517. But Zwingli was preaching the Protestant doctrines of the supremacy of Scripture and the full atonement of Christ. He uses a significant clause in his letter to Juda (December 17, 1518) urging him to become his successor at Einsiedeln. "The people here is single-minded and willing hears *Christ* preached to them." It is significant that at this great pilgrimage place of the Virgin Mary, Zwingli says not a word about her. But he speaks of *Christ*.

* The argument of Stahelin, that if Zwingli had been preaching the Protestant Gospel at Einsiedeln, he never could have been elected at Zurich, because Canon Hoffman the leader of the Catholic party would have opposed him, does not impress us deeply. For there are too many things to be taken into consideration. First of all it is to be remembered that the lines had not yet been drawn at that time between conservative Catholics and the humanists like Zwingli. Second and more important, so many of the higher Church officials above Canon Hoffman, even the bishop of Constance, were favorable to humanism or winked at it. It was this strong influence of humanism that compelled Samson to leave the diocese. And thirdly Stahelin seems to contradict himself, for on pages 128-9, he says that Hoffman declared (1523) that in his thirty years of preaching he had often attacked the abuses of popes and bishops. If Hoffman did this, it is not to be expected that he would object to the election of Zwingli even if the latter had already preached the Evangelical Gospel at Einsiedeln.

We can not therefore agree with some of the biographers of Zwingli that at Einsiedeln Zwingli was yet only a humanist. This theory is based mainly on a theory of Usteri who made an examination of Zwingli's notes in the books that belonged to him. He claimed that Zwingli changed his style of penmanship in 1519 and that relying on his penmanship his earlier notes were only humanistic and did not have in them the doctrines of grace. And Stahelin has followed Usteri here. Indeed some biographers place Zwingli's beginning of the Reformation as late as 1520 and 1521, and some of the German Lutherans as Tschackert place it as late as 1523. The Lutherans have seized on these admissions by Usteri and Stahelin to discredit Zwingli so as to help Luther. The Germans have always somewhat looked down on Zwingli because he was not a German and only a Swiss. Thus the case against Zwingli has been recently prejudiced by German Church historians. And their Lutheran bias has aided this.

The trouble with the opponents of Zwingli is that whenever it is asserted that Zwingli said he began the Reformation independently of Luther, yes before him in 1516, they declare that he said this through jealousy of Luther. Even Jackson echoes this. But let us look at this false charge for a moment. Zwingli shows his entire lack of jealousy of Luther:

1. By the fact that when Luther's writings first appeared, he highly commended that they be read. Thus he wrote to Stumpf at Basle, July 2, 1519: "Have the copies of H. Luther on the Lord's Prayer distributed everywhere, both in country and city among the unlearned people as well as among the priests." Does that look like jealousy? Other quotations of the same nature could be given.* Zwingli also had the publication of the pope's bann against Luther stayed for four months at Zurich. Does that look like jealousy? Can't a man say what he believes to be the truth, as Zwingli did, without being charged with being jealous?

2. The same kind of argument might be used against Luther that, because he spoke against Zwingli, he was perforce

* See Jackson, "Huldreich Zwingli," pages 139-143, for Zwingli's allusions to Luther.

jealous of him, which is not true. Then neither is this charge against Zwingli true. Zwingli did later, it is true, have a controversy with Luther on the Lord's Supper, but there was no jealousy on either side in it. It was with each a question of principle.

3. The basis of their argument against Zwingli is the theory that Zwingli was only a humanist at Einsiedeln. As to this, we would call attention to several facts in Zwingli's life which can not be explained by that theory.

(A) How does it come that Zwingli was preaching the ransom of Christ at Einsiedeln? No humanist ever did that. Humanists emphasized the Bible, though not in the full Protestant sense as the supreme guide over against the Romish Church as the supreme authority. But the doctrine of Christ's finished work, no humanist had ever gotten up to. Erasmus had emphasized Christ and made Christianity consist of love. But he never got up to Christ's complete atonement as the only ransom, or to Christ's sacrifice as all-sufficient over against the intercession of saints and angels as Zwingli did. This was an entirely new doctrine, that "Christ died once for all" (Hebrews 10:10.) Now since Zwingli preached this doctrine, as Bullinger says at Einsiedeln, he was more than a humanist—he was a Protestant.

2. How does it come about, if he were only a humanist, that Zwingli when he first came to Zurich began preaching on the Gospel at Matthew, verse by verse? No humanist would ever have undertaken so radical a change as to set aside the time-honored pericopes or Scripture-lessons that the Catholic Church had used for hundreds of years. The Romish service had become a hard and fast service of form. To deviate from it in the slightest degree was regarded as heresy. We have seen this in the case of Lefevre when he departed from the Romish calendar by saying there were three Marys instead of one. What a storm it brought about his head. Who ever heard of a humanist doing what Zwingli did in introducing such an innovation into the mass service at Zurich. The theory that Zwingli was only a humanist fails to account for this great change at Zurich at the very beginning of his ministry there. He must have been a Biblicist before that to have done it, that is, when he was at Einsiedeln. Indeed while yet at

Einsiedeln he said he would begin preaching thus.

But not only does the theory that he was only a humanist fail to account for what he did, but there are three sources which may throw light on this subject:

1. The hand-writing or notes in his books.
2. The testimony of his cotemporaries.
3. The testimony of Zwingli himself.

1. The first seems to us the least conclusive. For hand-writing is difficult at best to decipher. The theory of Usteri may be true, but it is at best only a theory perhaps to be set aside later by another theory. And even if it be true, the argument from silence is always a sort of inconclusive. For we never have all the books or writings or letters that were written; especially in Zwingli's case is this true. We do not know what Zwingli would have said if we had more of them. We must therefore conclude that of the three reasons, this is the least conclusive. And yet this is the only one upon which the theory, that he was only a humanist at Einsiedeln, rests. Besides if it be true it must be harmonized with the other proofs given below.

But the other two kinds of proofs are much more important and sure. The second proof is the testimony of his cotemporaries. Myconius, Zwingli's first biographer, places the beginning of the Swiss reformation at Einsiedeln. He says "Zwingli went to Einsiedeln because it gave him such a favorable opportunity to preach Christ and his truth." This, from what he says before, refers to the Evangelical Gospel. Bullinger says "that he preached the gospel with all diligence at Einsiedeln and especially taught that Christ is the only Mediator and that men should not pray to and worship Mary the pure Virgin and mother of God." Capito says Zwingli and I had an understanding that the pope must fall even as early as when he lived at Einsiedeln. Zwingli says in his letter to Compar (1523), "Eight years ago at Einsiedeln I showed to the Cardinal of Sion and later often with clear words that the whole papacy had a false foundation and that always out of the Word of God." The Bern Chronik says he preached the Gospel for three years at Einsiedeln. He must have preached it before 1519, for quite significant are his words as given by Myconius. "In 1518 he was asked by one of the

canons of Zurich whether he would be willing to preach the Word of God in Zurich." He replied, "Yes, for if the grace of Christ is proclaimed and received in so renowned a place, the rest of Switzerland will soon follow the example." The universal testimony of his contemporaries was that he began the Reformation at Einsiedeln.

3. But the greatest argument is the testimony of Zwingli himself. He certainly knew when he began it. He is the one who most of all ought to know about it. He universally placed it at Einsiedeln and not at Zurich. Three times he said he began it at Einsiedeln.* Jackson is right when he says that Zwingli dated his arrival at Evangelicalism while he was at Einsiedeln.† Certainly Zwingli knew better than German Lutheran historians or theorists like Usteri who lived nearly four hundred years later.

The truth is that those who make Zwingli only a humanist forget to note a peculiarity in his conversion. They say he was first a humanist and then a Protestant. But they forget to note a peculiarity in his conversion to which we have called attention, namely, that there were different kinds of humanists. Their theory might be true, if Zwingli had come only from Erasmus' influence to Protestantism. But they forget that he had first come under the strong Biblical, Evangelical influence of Wyttenbach before he had come under mere critical humanism under Erasmus. It was Wyttenbach's influence that made him a Reformer though Erasmus woke that up in him. But as we have seen, he quickly went beyond Erasmus, because he had had Wyttenbach before as his teacher. The Biblical humanist in his case came before the critical humanist. And that made him a Reformer earlier as at Einsiedeln than mere critical humanism would have done.

So then when was Zwingli converted and when did he preach the Gospel? He mentions two dates, 1516 and 1517. In his *Archeteles* (1522)‡ he says:

* Zwingli's Works, Schuler and Schulthess edition I 253, III 117, VII 186. We shall in a moment give these references.

† We are surprised that Jackson contradicts himself by placing it also in 1520.

‡ English Translation, Vol. I, 198, Preface.

“But now for about six years (1516) I have labored to the best of my ability with the talent entrusted to my keeping that when the Lord came and demanded his gain I might not slothfully bring forth forward with fear and shame the one idle talent.”

In his work against Luther (1527) he says:

“I thank my knowledge of the truth and contents of the Gospel the study of John and Augustine and above all the diligent reading of Paul for my knowledge of the truth and contents of the Gospel. This of Paul I copied eleven years ago with my own hands, while you, Luther have only begun to domineer since eight years (1519).”

2. Zwingli in his letter to Haller December 29, 1521, speaks of the work of Evangelical service “which I began five years ago” (1516).* There is also another reference to 1516 which we shall give in a moment.

The references that place it in 1517 are:

1. Zwingli in his letter to Compar (1525) says:

“I have often shown with clear words to the Cardinal of Zion eight years ago (1517) at Einsiedeln and later at Zurich that the whole papacy had a poor foundation and I did it always by the power of the Gospel.”

He must have felt that that year caused somewhat of a breach, for he said in 1520:†

“I had for three years previously been preaching the Gospel with earnestness,—on the other hand in 1517 I declined to receive the pension of fifty gulden,—I must confess my sin before God and all the world that before 1516 I hung mightly upon the pope.”

This is proved by the statements of Myconius and Bullinger. Myconius says (English Works of Zwingli, 7) :

“An opportunity was offered to remove to Einsiedeln, which for the time being seemed a sensible thing to do. The concourse of men from almost all parts of mankind, so celebrated was the name of the place, attracted him as it give such a favorable opportunity to preach Christ and his truth in regions varied

* Schuler and Schulthess Edition of Zwingli's Works, Vol. VII, 186.

† Schuler and Schulthess Edition of Zwingli's Works, I, 253.

and remote. Nor was his hope disappointed, for Christ began to be known more soundly."

Bullinger says:

"He preached the Gospel with all diligence also at Einsiedeln and especially taught that Christ the only Mediator and not Mary the Virgin and Mother of God should be prayed to and worshipped. This was a wonderful providence of God, that it was given to him to preach thus in Einsiedeln, which was such a superstitious place."

And his conversion must have occurred before 1518, for Beatus Rhenanus in 1518 speaks of Zwingli as one of "the teachers of Evangelical truth who had torn the mask of the scholastic theology off, because it sought to bring Christ under the rule of Aristotle."

How shall we harmonize these different dates given by Zwingli? Probably the best way to harmonize them is that he began preaching on the Gospel in the mass service in 1516 as he says in 1523:

"I began to preach the Gospel of Christ in the year 1516 before any one in my locality had so much as heard the name of Luther: for I never left the pulpit without taking the words of the gospel as used in the mass service of the day and expounding them by means of the Scriptures: although at first I relied much upon the Fathers as expositors and explainers."

But even that sort of Biblical preaching was a far advance on anything they had had before. Then we can place the second date (1517) as the time when he began to publicly preach the Gospel of free grace,—the atonement of Christ as the source of forgiveness and as the time when he began preaching Christ over against the Virgin as Bullinger says.

There is however one other date which is mentioned as the day when he preached this Gospel. It is the only specific date of it that has come down to us. Just as October 31, 1517, has come down as the date of Luther's nailing up of the theses. So has Pentecost, 1518, come down to the Reformed. For then Hedio says he heard him preach the Gospel. Zwingli then took for his text "the healing of the paralytic in Luke 5, in which is the significant verse: 'But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power to forgive sins.'" This date is, it is true, about six months later than Luther's theses, but then

as we shall see, Luther was then not yet a Protestant. We are inclined to place the beginning of Zwingli's preaching of the new doctrine of the Reformation near the close of 1517, about the time that Luther nailed up his theses.

B—THE CONVERSION OF LUTHER.

The conversion of Luther was according to tradition sudden. One tradition held that while climbing up the Sacred Stairs at Rome, he heard the voice saying: "The just shall live by faith." But this view has been given up. For Luther clearly showed his intense Romanism there: because he says he read mass ten times while there, and he even wished his father and mother were dead, so that he might be able to release them from purgatory by his penitential exercises. Besides this, his works, published after his visit to Rome, show that he had not come to justification by faith.

But later researches in Luther's life have led to the belief that his conversion was not sudden but gradual. Thus his early Lectures on the Psalms, 1513-5, have come to light. Also his Lectures on Romans, 1515-6, were first discovered in the Vatican Library at Rome and then in the library at Berlin. These have brought new revelations about his belief in that early period. His lectures on the Psalms show that he is beginning to use the humanists such as Lefevre and Reuchlin. After lecturing on the Psalms, he began to lecture on Romans. Here he at first follows Lefevre until Erasmus' New Testament came into his hands. These early works of Luther reveal two things:

1. First that the idea of justification by faith began to dawn in Luther's mind earlier than has been supposed. But it began only to dawn and then very gradually the light becomes clearer.

2. They reveal that he did not come to the full grasp of that doctrine until later than has been supposed.

We will quote two or the latest authorities about Luther in this period. One is Prof. Boedmer of Marburg University who says:*

"In the course of 1516 he overcomes his monkish views of

* "Luther in the Light of Recent Research," page 84.

humility and learns that humble submission to the will of God is not sufficient, but that there must be added thereto the glad trust in his mercy. Not until the turning of the year 1516-7 does he dare discard his pastoral doubts about the certainty of salvation; and his monkish aversion to the thought that a pious person may confidently count on the mercy of God without seeming to infringe on humility.* He had by this time (1515) begun his reformatory criticism of conditions of the Church. Only one thing he lacked, the clear recognition that the faithful Christian not only dared be sure of his salvation, but that he *must* be certain of it."

Prof. Henry Preserved Smith, the author of "Luther's Life and Letters," says:

"In his first lectures (1513-5) he no longer lays the whole emphasis on works as he apparently did in his first monastic years, but on the other hand he has not yet arrived at the *sola fides* (faith alone)."

But while Luther thus vacillated between justification by faith and justification by works, he had settled one point. He had discarded the Scholastic theology formulated by Aquinas and founded on Aristotle and had taken up Biblical Theology. And by the middle of 1517 he had succeeded in getting Biblical Theology into the university at Wittenberg.

Then came the thunder-clap in his theses against indulgences October 31, 1517. For this brave act Luther deserves great credit. But while he was thus gradually coming toward the light on justification by faith, he does not reveal it in these theses. This is granted by Lutheran writers. Thus the Lutheran editors of the excellent edition of Luther's Works, now being published in English, say so in their introduction to their translation of the Ninety-five Theses. They say:

"The word faith destined to become the watchword of the Reformation does not occur in them, the validity to forgive sins, especially in reserved cases, is admitted within limits and the question is simply: "What is virtue?"†

There is no clearer proof of this than Luther himself gives in the preface of the edition of his Works in 1545, when he wrote:

* Page 103.

† Vol. I, page 15.

“When I took up this matter against indulgences, I was so full and drunken, yea so besotted in papal doctrine, that out of my great zeal, I would gladly have been ready to see and help that murder should be done on all who would not be obedient and subject to the pope, even in his smallest word.”*

And in 1520 Luther wrote: “Some two years ago (1518) I wrote a little book on indulgences which I now deeply regret having published, for at that time I held that indulgences should not altogether be rejected, seeing that they were approved by the common consent of men.” This book, published a year after he nailed up the indulgence, shows that he believed in indulgences when he nailed up the theses.

For Protestant readers of these theses must be careful not to read into the theses their Protestant views; but to read them as a Catholic would or as one coming out of Catholicism like Luther would. We must disabuse our minds of our Protestant standpoint and view them from the Catholic standpoint from which Luther came. Thus, take for instance the first of these theses: “Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ when he said “Do penance.” Now Protestant translations have translated “do penance” by “repentance.” But the Protestant idea of repentance is not at all the idea here. It is the Catholic idea of doing penance. And this “doing something” was quite in accord with the Catholic doctrine of justification by works; for indulgences were based on that doctrine. “Luther,” says Koestlin, “up to 1517 saw no other light than that every one should confess to the priest, secure absolution and the intercession of the saints, which he justified against Huss and in his sermons he invoked the Virgin.”

What Luther was attacking in these theses was:

1. The *abuses* of the indulgences. He protested against the scandals of the traffic. This was his main objection. It was especially the money abuses that had roused Luther's indignation. The sale of indulgences in Germany had been farmed out by the pope to the Fuggers, the great bankers at Augsburg, and to the Archbishop at Mayence for a large royalty given to them for the sales. As we would say now, “the trusts had gotten hold of the business” and were perverting

* English Translation of Luther's Works, page 10.

it to their own ends.

2. What he especially attacked were *papal* abuses,* those indulgences that came from the pope and which really interfered with the indulgences given by the priests in their parishes. The sale of these papal indulgences took a great deal of money out of the hands of the German priests and princes because it was taken to Rome. It was depleting their coffers. That was the reason why some of them opposed the sale of indulgences. It was an important reason why Luther received so much support from the German princes. Thus Duke George of Saxony, though later an opponent of Luther, on account of this, was greatly pleased at Luther's checking the indulgence traffic.

Now from the standpoint of Protestantism, the opposite of indulgences is faith and not the papal pardons, which Luther attacked in these theses. It is faith over against justification by works, upon which the whole system of indulgences is built. And that is what Luther would have championed had he been a full Protestant. But not a word about faith does he interject anywhere in the theses. On the contrary he says (71) that "He who speaks against the truth of '*apostolic pardons*,' let him be anathema and accursed."

3. A third thing that Luther objected to in indulgences was that the power of indulgences extended into *purgatory*. He said that the papal power was only temporal and did not extend to purgatory,—indulgences were only for penalties imposed in this life. Therefore the pope's indulgences could not reach there as Tetzel had declared that

"Soon as the groschen in the casket rings
The troubled soul from purgatory springs."

But while Luther thus protested against the indulgences affecting purgatory, the theses reveal that he was a firm believer in purgatory.† But how, according to our Protestant conceptions, can one hold to justification by faith and yet believe in purgatory, which is built entirely on justification by works; for purgatory has to do with the arrears in works that the soul is in at death.

* Thus theses 5, 6, 33, 34, 38, 45, 48, 49, 75, 76 show this.

† Thus theses 11, 16, 17, 22, 25, 29, 35, 82, 84.

All honor to Luther for his courage in nailing up the theses, but it is evident that he was not a Protestant then and had not clearly come out to justification by faith. If we can believe what he says in his other works before and at that time he was oscillating between justification by works and justification by faith; but had not come out clearly enough to faith to boldly attack indulgences, which at its root was the denial of justification by works.

It is an interesting psychological problem to know how Luther could thus endorse the papal system of indulgences founded on justification by works and yet be coming out toward justification by faith. How he could hold them together at the same time seems contradictory to the Protestant. But it was not so to the Catholic mind. It can hold to contraries at the same time. For the Catholic faith is often a religion of contradictions. An explanation can easily be made of Luther's case, that he was here only followed his great Church Father and model, Augustine. Augustine held to two contradictory views of religion,—sacramentarianism and Evangelicalism,—that is, he held on the one hand to baptismal regeneration and on the other to election. According to the former, man's act (the priest's when he baptizes) saves; according to the latter, God's act saves, for he elects us out of his own good pleasure. Such compromises were common in Catholicism. This is shown by the act of the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century when it tried to decide between justification by works and justification by faith. It straddled the question and held to both. A Protestant asks how can that be done. Very easily said the Catholic Fathers of Trent. That council taught justification by faith (or as it calls it, by grace) at baptism, and by works after baptism. The Romish Church has ever been a Church of compromises. Remembering these things we can the more easily understand Luther's frame of mind at that time.

Such was Luther when he nailed up the theses—in a state of transition. No, it was not until 1518 that Luther came out to clearer views on justification by faith. In the spring of 1518 he went to Heidelberg to attend a convention of his Augustinian Order. While there he held a disputation on the subject of free-will. From this it is evident that he was com-

ing more clearly toward justification by faith. For the slavery of the will which he debated there was the foundation of justification. "But," as Koestlin says (*Theology of Luther I*, 285) "Luther developed his views of justification most fully in his Sermons 'Of the Threefold Righteousness' and 'Of the Twofold Righteousness.'" Those pamphlets appeared after the Disputation at Heidelberg, which was held in the spring of 1518. We can therefore place Luther's full declaration of justification by faith somewhere in the summer of 1518.

Having thus carefully studied the conversion of both Zwingli and Luther, we are now ready to answer the question which one was first, Luther or Zwingli. According to our first definition of a Reformer he became such when he had been converted and began preaching Evangelical doctrines. If that be the criterion, we have Zwingli preaching his Protestant doctrine of Christ's finished work as Mediator in 1517, probably in the autumn just about the time when Luther nailed his theses up at Wittenberg. But that was about six months or more before Luther came out clearly and decidedly on justification by faith in the summer of 1518. An additional proof of Zwingli's precedence is given by Hedio, who said that he heard Zwingli preach an Evangelical sermon on the text, "But the son of man has the power to forgive sin." This sermon was preached on Pentecost, 1518, which was before Luther published these sermons on justification by faith to which we referred. We therefore conclude that according to our first definition of a Reformer, Zwingli was before Luther, because he preached Christ's atonement before Luther did justification by faith. Besides Zwingli came out more fully than Luther, for the atonement is the basis of justification by faith. There Zwingli got down deeper than Luther, even to the *root* of the doctrine of justification, whereas Luther emphasized the *result* in justification. But both, thank God, came to the great first principles of our Protestant faith.

CHAPTER III.

HARMONY OF THE LUTHERAN AND REFORMED REFORMATIONS.

We have thus far followed the Reformation up to the time of the conversion of Luther and Zwingli. We propose to continue the study of their Reformation by placing their work at Wittenberg and at Zurich side by side. Harmonies of the four Gospels have greatly aided us in understanding the life of our Lord, why not harmonies of the Reformation to enable us to understand it better. As far as our knowledge goes, no such harmony has ever been attempted. We will therefore place the events at Zurich and Wittenberg side by side as they take place. In this way new light will be let into the subject. And we will be better able to study the progress of the Reformation step by step.

We will begin with the year 1519, as we have already virtually covered the ground up to that time. And the year 1519 is a good year to begin with; for on January 1 of that year Zwingli began his work at Zurich. And Luther also began his great public defenses by his debate at the Conference at Leipsic, 1519.

Luther had, as we have seen, come out on the subject of justification by faith as revealed in his sermons in 1518. He now begins to advance to another doctrine, namely, that of the Church and the papacy. In a letter of May 30, 1518, to the pope, he declared, that he still recognized the voice of the pope as the voice of God. But it was as the pope began attacking him, that he was led to greater clearness on that doctrine. His first appeal (October 10, 1518) is from a pope badly informed to a pope to be better informed. On November 28, 1518, he appealed from the pope to a council. This was not however considered heretical in those days, for only six months before, the university of Paris, which had always represented the liberal or Gallican Catholicism as by Gerson at the Council of Constance, appealed from the pope's decision to a council. At the beginning of 1519 he wrote to the pope

that the authority of the Church was superior to everything, save Jesus Christ.

Then came the Conference at Leipsic in the summer of 1519, where Eck most adroitly produced theses about the authority of the pope with a view of entangling Luther. And when in the discussion, Luther was there led to declare that some of the theses about Huss, which had been condemned by the Council of Constance in 1415, were true, Eck charged him with "the Hussite poison." That was where Eck wanted to get him. He at once denied that, in saying what he did, he denied the authority of a council. But he was soon to go a step farther and deny both popes and councils as the final authority and rely only on the Bible. Meanwhile though he was thus coming out from under papal authority, he still held to other papal doctrines, as in his "Instruction" in certain articles, he declares that prayers to the dead and purgatory were allowable. He also held to saint-worship and transubstantiation. As late as 1520 he ended his sermon with an Ave Maria. Before October 3, Melancthon had however published some theses against transubstantiation which was the next Romish doctrine to be attacked.

While this was going on at Wittenberg, what was going on at Zurich? There we notice first of all that the Reformation was proceeding along other lines. We find that Zwingli was doing, what Luther had not yet thought of doing, namely, making changes in the cultus or worship of the Church. Zwingli did not go any farther at first than simply to lay aside the pericopes and preach on whole books of the Bible at a time. But even that was a great step, for it broke the unchangeable order of the Catholic Church service. For no man had a right to do this without express permission from the bishop. By this step he uprooted the Catholic custom of centuries. Had he done as he had been doing before at Einsiedeln, preach upon the pericope of the Sabbath, it would not have been so revolutionary. But no, he was now so strongly imbued with the authority of Scripture, that parts of the Bible as in the pericopes, did not satisfy him, he must give the whole Bible to his people. And so he preached on the Gospel of Matthew, verse by verse. His preaching began to produce results, for he could by the end of the year write to Myconius

that more than 2,000 citizens of Zurich, one-third of the population, sympathized with him. Many looked upon him as "the Moses who would lead the people out of slavery."

Another significant event was his attack on indulgences. Soon after he came to Zurich, Samson came there selling indulgences. But so strongly did Zwingli oppose him, that he left not only Zurich but also Switzerland. When the plague broke out in the autumn he became sick unto death, indeed was reported dead. But he recovered. However his great illness deepened his piety and prepared him for the great work before him as Reformer. He composed a hymn in his illness.* Zwingli's statements in his letters are quite interesting as they reveal his progress in reformatory ideas. On March 9 he wrote to Beatus Rhenanus: "It (an oration) will please you immensely so full is it of slurs against the priests and silver-loving cardinals." On March 21 he wrote to him again: "It pained me that the man-pleaser, or if you prefer the cuckoo, is entertaining designs against the rising theology. The Lord will not save Judah when he trusts in his chariots and horses; but only when trusting in his mercy." On March 25 to Beatus he speaks of "the 'old womanish' business of Lent." And on June 7 he speaks against the adoration of saints and on December 31 he writes slightly of relics.

Zwingli had by this time advanced toward Protestantism on three points. Like Luther he held to the authority of Scripture. He also had come out on the finished atonement of Christ just as Luther had on justification by faith. He had not openly attacked the pope, for he had not been attacked by the pope as had been Luther. Still he had, even before Luther begun to doubt the papacy as at Einsiedeln. And he had come out against saint-worship to which Luther held several years longer.

1520.

The year 1520 was a great one for Luther and the Lutheran Reformation; for in it Luther published his two great Reformation treatises,—those trumpet voices of the new era. "The Luther of 1520," says Boehmer, Luther's latest biog-

* See my "Hymns of the Reformed Reformations."

rapher, "was indeed a different person from the Luther of the Ninety-five theses (1517). His aims were grander, his view much broader and clearer and his self-confidence vastly mightier." Before however issuing his two great appeals he, in February, got hold of a work by an Italian, Valla, which showed conclusively that the "Donation of Constantine," on which the papacy was founded, was a fiction and a fraud. This completed his denial of the power of the papacy. In his two pamphlets, Luther advanced to several new positions. He had first attacked indulgences and then the papacy. Now he attacked the priesthood and the sacraments and other errors of the papacy.

His first book was his "Appeal to the German Nobility," published in the summer. In it he says that the Romanists had surrounded themselves with three walls. The first was that they declare the spiritual to be above the temporal; and therefore the secular powers have no control over the clergy. The second was that the pope alone could expound Scriptures, which therefore could not be used against them. The third was that only a pope could call a council. Luther called for a trumpet, which like those which threw down the walls of Jericho, would destroy these walls. Over against the first, he declared that the Biblical doctrine of the priesthood of all believers destroyed any special privileges of the Catholic priesthood. Over against the second, he claimed that the Bible gave to each Christian the right of private judgment. After his destruction of the first two walls, the third was easily overthrown. He proved that the early councils of the church were called not by popes but by emperors; and he held that councils should not be fettered by the pope. In this work he also attacked the celibacy of the clergy and demanded the diminution of masses for the dead. He appealed to the German nobles that as the Romish hierarchy would not attempt to bring about needed reforms, they should do so, which right they had by virtue of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. "It was a political and social manifesto (having however a religious basis) to the German nobles to go forward and reform Germany."

This trumpet blast was shortly followed by another, "The Babylonish Captivity," published in October. In this he at-

tacked the sacramental system of the Catholic Church. He mentioned several captivities. The first was the withholding of the cup from the laity at the Lord's Supper; the second was transubstantiation; the third was making the mass a sacrifice. He reduced the number of sacraments from seven as among the Catholics to three, baptism, the Lord's Supper and penance, though he grants that the latter was not a full sacrament. He held that the sacraments were seals of God's forgiveness and that they were efficacious through faith. In his "Address to the German Nobility," he had dwelt on the external abuses in the state; in this "Babylonish Captivity," he treated of the internal errors of the Church.

This epochal year was brought to a close and a climax by a most heroic act,—his burning of the pope's bull on December 11. He defended this act by claiming that the bull taught the pope's absolute authority over the Bible, the Church and the Christian conscience. This act marked his formal breach with the papacy, for he burned not only the bull, but also the canon law, in which were the Decretals on which the papal system was supposed to rest.

But while Luther went so far in breaking with the pope, he was still Catholic in many of his customs. He was still saying the canonical prayers, which were required of the priest for each day. For he says, "he missed them sometimes for a week and so had to make up for lost time by saying them all together for a whole day, so that he had no time to eat or "drink." It seems strange that after he had come out to justification by faith, he should still continue to use these canonical prayers, as they were based on justification by works. Was he still relying on good works to save, when he so carefully goes to the trouble to make up for those that he had missed?

Turning from the Lutheran to the Zwinglian Reformation, we find that the year 1520 was a comparatively quiet one, compared with Luther's. And yet one can see clearly that the Reformation was steadily progressing among the people. Early in the year, Zwingli made an attack on the tithing system of the Catholic Church. This was a serious blow to the revenues of the cathedral. He says the provost of the cathedral declared that the tithes were of divine right. This Zwingli controverted publicly. The provost pled with Zwingli not

to furnish any more arms to the laity to use against the clergy. Quite significant of the way that Zwingli's preaching was taking hold of the people was the action of the city council, that the Scriptures should be preached,—“all priests and curates should freely and everywhere preach the Holy Gospels and the Epistles of the Holy Apostles, and they should only teach what they could prove and establish by the Word of God. As for the doctrines and commandments of men, they should let them alone.” This was the first action of a secular authority either at Wittenberg or Zurich, favorable to the Reformation. The Reformed on two points, it will be noticed as we pass along, were ahead of Luther's Reformation, in cultus and in secular action favorable to the Reformation.

But the most significant event of the year at Zurich was Zwingli's renunciation of his papal pension. At the beginning of the last chapter, we called attention to the different definitions of what constituted a Reformer. We later saw how both Luther and Zwingli became Reformers, according to the first definition, namely, when they began giving expression to the Evangelical faith, Zwingli in 1517 and Luther in 1518; Luther, to justification by faith and Zwingli, to the completed atonement and one mediatorship of Christ. We saw how according to that definition of a Reformer Zwingli was first.

We now come to the second definition there given of a Reformer, namely, that he was one who renounced publicly the papal yoke. Well, Zwingli did so in 1520 as he renounced the pension he had received from the pope. This was a pension that had first been given him in 1512-1513 of 50 gulden (\$20) yearly. This he used to buy books and it was greatly needed for he was poor. In 1517 he declined it, but they kept on sending it to him. He says:

“In 1517 I declined to receive the pension, which they gave me yearly (yes, they wanted to make it 100 gulden, but I would not hear to it). But they would not stop it until in 1520, I renounced it in writing. (I confess here my sin before God and all the world that before 1516 I hung mightily on the pope and considered it becoming for me to receive money from the papal treasury.) But when the Roman representative warned me not to preach against the pope, I told him in express and clear words that they had better not

believe that I would, on account of their money, suppress a syllable of truth."

Zink, the chaplain at Einsiedeln with Zwingli, says that Zwingli was never moved a finger's breadth from the Gospel by the favor of pope, emperor or noble; but always proclaimed the truth and preached it faithfully among the people. He said:

"I was present when the papal legate Pucci was frankly told by Zwingli that he could not for money advance the papal interests, but would preach and teach the truth to the people in the way that seemed best to him."

From all this it looks very much as if the papal pension was forced on him in the later years, very much as literature that we do not want is forced on us through the mails. It is also very clear that in 1517 he told them that he could not be bought by it and that when they sent it to him after that, they did it on their own responsibility. The whole thing was a trick to injure him as events proved.

This was Zwingli's final breach with the pope. It is an interesting coincidence that Luther and Zwingli both threw off the papal authority publicly in the same year (1520); Luther, by burning the pope's bull and Zwingli, by giving up the pope's pension. But if it be asked which of the two was the earlier in doing it, we again reply Zwingli; because Luther did not burn the pope's bull till very late in the year (December 11). It may perhaps be answered by the Lutherans that Luther was attacking the pope earlier than when he burned the bull. That is true, but Zwingli earlier than Luther, even while at Einsiedeln, had spoken against the papacy.

1521.

The year 1520 had been the great year of Luther's declaration of independence from the pope, the next year was a year of great confusion at Wittenberg. Early in that year (April) Luther, having been summoned to Worms before the German Diet, made there his great defense in which he refused to recant, closing with "Here I stand, God help me, Amen." This heroic act was followed by his arrest and captivity among friends at the Wartburg, where he spent his time in translating the New Testament and later in the year in writing

a pamphlet against the monks.

In his absence matters came into great confusion at Wittenberg, as Carlstadt became the leader there. Now Carlstadt has been too severely handled by the Lutheran Church historians because he attacked Luther who is their idol. His case has been prejudiced against him by them. But Carlstadt, although he had his faults (as we all have) and his eccentricities, is yet quite significant to the Reformed.

Andrew Bodenstein of Carlstadt, or Carlstadt, as he has become known to us, was a professor at the Wittenberg university, senior to Luther. He was a man of considerable ability and learning, so that a monk once called Luther "the greater light" at Wittenberg and Carlstadt the "lesser light" there. At first he had opposed Luther's change from the scholastic theology to the Biblical; but later he had followed him in doing the same. He then became the first defender of Luther as against Eck, which led on to the Leipsic Disputation in the summer of 1519.

In 1520, he had had a controversy with Luther, in which he took what was really the Reformed position on the inspiration and canonicity of the Bible. Luther in his "Resolutions" had given expression to a low estimate of the Epistle of James, because it seemed to him that James favored works rather than faith. Carlstadt took exception to this remark of Luther's. The truth was that Luther in doing so, held to what may be called the subjective theory of the canonicity of the books of the Bible,—that the canonicity of the different books depended on whether they were in agreement with what seemed to him to be the truth of Christianity. Carlstadt denied this and declared that the canonicity of a book depended on the decision of the Church and not on the whim of the individual. This view of Luther's, if carried out to its extreme, would lay open the way for the baldest rationalism and highest criticism by making the subjective the guide. Carlstadt inclined to what was the later Reformed view, especially Calvin's, who minimized the subjective authority of canonicity and emphasized the objective. Calvin held to a doctrine called the "Testimony of the Holy Spirit." But this was objective canonicity. For it held, not that we authenticated the books, but that they authenticated themselves to us,—were

self-authenticating,—they spoke to us by the Holy Spirit. It was not our subjective opinion of them, as Luther virtually held, that settled their canonicity. But it was their voice to us that did it. On this point Carlstadt was Reformed rather than Lutheran. And also in his separation of the Canonical books from the apocrypha, he was again Reformed and not Lutheran. This controversy however passed by and Carlstadt knew no difference between himself and Luther until 1522.

But this controversy in 1520 was only a prelude to, and prophecy of, the greater controversy in 1521. Carlstadt had gone to Copenhagen about the end of 1520 to aid the king of Denmark to introduce Protestantism into his university. When he came back to Wittenberg in the summer, he found that Luther was gone,—that he had been imprisoned in the Wartburg and that the Protestants had no leader; for Melancthon lacked the qualities of leadership as he was yet so young. Carlstadt's unquestioned ability gave him the elements of leadership and so he became the leader at Wittenberg and introduced a number of reforms. Some Lutherans, who criticize him for what he did there, ascribe it to jealousy of Luther. They make the same charge against Zwingli, so that it sometimes looks as if anybody who opposed Luther was jealous of him, a very foolish suggestion. But Carlstadt's reforms were on the one hand only the carrying out of what Luther had been preaching at Wittenberg. On the other hand, in some of them, Carlstadt went beyond Luther. What makes him especially interesting to us is that on a number of points he was Reformed; though at the time he did not know it. He did so because he felt that what he did was Scriptural.

When he arrived at Wittenberg, he found that a number of the people, as the result of Luther's preaching, demanded that the mass should be celebrated according to the New Testament by giving the cup to the laity and also that the monasteries should be abolished. His first attack, made a week after his arrival, was on the celibacy of the clergy. He then published (June 21) two important works against the celibacy of the clergy. Luther had granted that priests could marry, if they desired; but not that monks could do so. But Carlstadt went further and demanded that the congregations be served by only married priests. Carlstadt's attack on celibacy was

followed by his attack on another Catholic error,—the refusal of the communion cup to the laity. Here too he followed Luther, who as we have seen, had demanded it as in the “Babylonish Captivity.” But he went beyond Luther in declaring that to receive the communion without the cup was a sin. From these two, the celibacy and the cup, he went on to reforms in the worship that Luther had not yet attempted. And in doing so he became Reformed, though he knew it not. On October 17 he held a disputation in which he attacked the elevation of the host at the mass (this was really artolotry or idolatry of the bread), though he still held to the adoration of the host. Then he went further. He denied the necessity of observing Catholic fasts. He also attacked the use of pictures in the Churches. This too was a peculiarity of the Reformed rather than the Lutherans. He held that the second commandment prohibited the use of pictures and that it was as binding as the commandment against theft or adultery. Then he preached against the mass and he declared that if the Elector of Saxony compelled him to hold mass on New Year, it would be after the Protestant fashion. But he did not wait until New Year, for on Christmas (1521) he celebrated the mass, changing it to a Protestant ordinance. In doing so he made the following changes:

1. He omitted reading the parts of the mass that made it a sacrifice.

2. He gave the cup to the laity.

3. He let the laity take the bread and wine into their own hands, instead of himself putting them to their lips as is the Catholic custom.

4. He did not require them to come to the confessional before they came to the communion. Yes, he preached against it at that communion service.

5. He discarded the vestments and robes of the clergy at mass, calling them idolatrous and used the ordinary street dress.

Of these changes, the last three were specifically Reformed and not Lutheran.

The controversy over these innovations caused riots. Riots began on October 1 when Zwillig, an Augustinian monk, began preaching against the mass. On December 3 the priests,

who were celebrating mass in the parish church were stoned. About one-third of the monks in the Augustinian cloister left that monastery. These riots were dangerous enough, but there came another influence that made matters more dangerous,—the prophets from Zwickau arrived at Wittenberg in December. They claimed to have visions and revelations of God. They decried education so that the students began to leave the university. Carlstadt, though he tried to temper excesses, was somewhat led away by them. Meanwhile Luther at the Wartburg had become alarmed at the situation at Wittenberg. In December he secretly visited that town. But he found the situation not so threatening as he had feared. He laid the blame of the riots on the students and thought that the other troubles were mere temporary excitements. Thus the year 1521 at Wittenberg closed in the midst of storm and change.

Turning now to Zurich, we find that the year 1521 was a year of quiet, quite in contrast to Wittenberg. And yet the reforms already begun, were continuing their quiet progress. Zwingli speaks of preparing sermons against the worship of the saints. And though the year was quiet, yet it was a lull before a storm which broke out the next year. Just at the close of the year Canon Hoffman of the cathedral at Zurich, leader of the Catholic party there, brought complaint against Zwingli's preaching,—that it was unprofitable and unbecoming. He especially attacked Zwingli for attacking the monks from the pulpit. This Zwingli had done, because the monks, together with Hoffman, had been his principal opponents. Hoffman also complained of his preaching against the Virgin, degrading her from saintship and also of his attacks on the legends of the saints. We thus see that Zwingli, just as he had done before at Einsiedeln, preached against saint worship and now added to that, preaching against the monks and other errors of Rome. Luther had not yet gotten that far. He was still a monk and he held on to saints and saint-worship a year or two longer. Hoffman also charged that Zwingli had been preaching against purgatory, the authority of the pope and fasting, especially in Lent. Zwingli had long broken with the Catholic doctrine of the sacrament and preached against baptismal regeneration. All this

led to friction in the next year as we shall see. At the end of the year the ministers there took an action that was the beginning of a declaration of independence against the bishop of Constance, for the ministers of the canton declared that they would not pay their dues to the bishop. And the council promised to withhold it so long as the bishop did not tax the upper clergy. And so the year closed with a great controversy at Wittenberg and a threatened one at Zurich.

1522.

The year 1522 opened at Wittenberg with storm. The new innovations were creating friction. On St. Stephen's day, Carlstadt had a marriage ceremony for one of the ministers and also betrothed himself, Melancthon being present. On January 24 he secured the adoption by the city of Wittenberg of a Church Order. This was the first secular action taken there on religion (two years later than at Zurich, as we have seen). This Church Order cast pictures out of the Churches and forbade begging. Carlstadt had denounced pictures, declaring that they were forbidden by the second commandment and that their place was in the fire and not in the Church. So the Council decided to have the images removed from the parish Church. But before that was done, some of the citizens broke into the Church, tore them out, hewed them to pieces and burned them. On February 1 there was another riot and Carlstadt was forbidden to preach. Luther had disapproved of Carlstadt's demand that nuns and monks leave their convents. But he had supported the change of the mass to the Protestant Lord's Supper. He even approved of Carlstadt's marriage. But by the end of February he wrote a sharp letter to the people of Wittenberg in which he found fault with their compulsion—that they forced the new faith on those who still wanted the old. At the same time he congratulated the Elector on his remarkable collection of relics at Wittenberg and told him he would be back at Wittenberg to set matters right. This greatly alarmed the Elector, for he feared lest, if Luther left his secret asylum at the Wartburg, the emperor would seize him or would punish him (the Elector) for harboring a heretic. But Luther came nevertheless. He appeared in Wittenberg and preached March 9-16,

endeavoring to set things right again according to conservative ideas. Of all the changes made by Carlstadt, Luther retained only one. He still omitted that part of the mass which made it a sacrifice to God.

Now in all these changes, it is interesting to note that Carlstadt, though he did not know it, was yet making changes that were Reformed rather than Lutheran. Thus his custom of having the communicants receive the elements into their own hands was Reformed and not Lutheran. His attack on images and pictures was Reformed. His casting aside of vestments at communion was Reformed. In fact it is very remarkable, that what was really the first Reformed Lord's Supper was not celebrated at Zurich, but by Carlstadt at Wittenberg four years before Zwingli was able to introduce it at Zurich. It seems strange that the first Reformed Lord's Supper should take place in the cradle of Lutheranism at Wittenberg.

But Luther's restorations were so remarkable as to need special notice. When he returned he restored all the old Catholic customs except one as we have said. He restored the vestments and robes of the priests as the Catholics had them. He also restored their fasts and the use of the confessional. He rejected the new custom of giving the elements into the hands of the communicant and restored the former Catholic custom of laying them on the lips of the communicant. He retained pictures and images, because he said such things were too trifling to make a fuss about. And in spite of what he had said in his "Babylonish Captivity" about giving the cup to the laity, he had them give that up and he restored the Catholic rite of only one element. It is true that at a side-altar, an opportunity was given for those who desired to commune in both kinds. But the main official act was without the cup. He thus reintroduced the Catholic mode of communing and that in spite of the fact that most of the people went to the side-altar until finally the communion in one kind disappeared there a few years later. He restored the elevation of the host and retained the adoration of the host until 1543, only three years before his death. And in spite of his attack on the monks, he reassumed the monks' habit and continued wearing it for two years more. Luther also reintroduced the use

of the Latin language in the words of institution of the Lord's Supper. This was contrary to the Reformed custom.

Luther did all this for two reasons.

First he claimed that *cultus* was secondary to doctrine and therefore he placed less stress on it. He said that such things as the marriage of priests, cloister life, private confession and images in Churches might be tolerated. Only things that contradicted the Word of God as private masses and enforced confession were to be abolished.

Second he was opposed to an enforced religion on any one. The new faith and its rites were not to be forced on the people but must be accepted voluntarily. All must be done in an orderly way. Paul, he said, preached at Athens and the images fell though he never touched any of them.

Now while we would show all honor to Luther for his courage as shown in many ways, we are the more surprised that he revealed such weakness here. The Reformed might have been slow in changing Catholic rites before the times were ready for a change. But we do not know of a single Reformed who ever did what Luther did here,—restore a Romish rite after it had been given up, especially the Lord's Supper. The Reformed would never have done this. They would not have done it because they believed that *cultus* or the mode of worship was as important as doctrine; while to Luther these things were *adiaphora* or indifferent. The Reformed would not have done it because such things were matters of principle with them. They were not so to the Lutherans. The truth is the Reformed stuck closer to the Bible than Luther, for they would have in the worship only what was in the Bible.

Carlstadt, after Luther's return, quietly submitted to Luther's leadership. But the next year he went to Orlamunde near Wittenberg and became pastor there. There he introduced a number of changes in the worship just as he had done at Wittenberg; and in so doing made the service Reformed rather than Lutheran. All pictures, crucifixes, images and altars, together with vestments and robes were cast out, as was also the use of the Latin language. But Carlstadt was afterward compelled to leave Saxony and became a wanderer until 1534 when, after he had given up his association with the sects, he was made a Reformed professor of theology in

the university of Basle. There he died in 1541.

Turning now from Wittenberg to Zurich, we find that the year 1522 was a stormy one also. Soon after it opened, a great controversy arose about fasting in Lent. Zwingli had been preaching against fasting especially in Lent as there was no Scripture proof for it. Canon Hoffman of the cathedral, as we saw a few moments ago, had brought complaints against Zwingli in the previous December. Zwingli before Lent had publicly declared that Lent had no support in the Bible. He himself for the sake of prudence did not disobey the city law to observe Lent. The chief offender was Christopher Froschouer, the great printer of Zurich, who published Zwingli's works. (He printed so many Bibles that he was a whole Bible Society in himself.) He refused to fast in Lent and made a plea that he had so much printing to do before the book market at Frankford that it was necessary for him and his workmen to have meat. The city authorities cited Froschouer before them. Zwingli then defended Froschouer's course in a sermon, which he later published, entitled "Liberty Concerning Food." Froschouer defended himself before the council out of Scripture and the magistrates did not punish him, but ordered that Lenten fasts should be continued. The next year they repealed the law favoring Lent.

Zwingli, having begun with attacks on tithes and then on fasting, at last brought down on his head the wrath of his superiors in the Church. The bishop of Constance, in whose diocese Zurich was, now began an investigation. Hitherto these upper officials had either been lenient toward humanism, yes some of them favorable to it. But now the bishop sent a commission adverse to Zwingli to Zurich. They first brought the matter before the canons of the cathedral where Zwingli so ably answered them that they left the hall in confusion. Then they appealed to the smaller council in which the Catholics had the majority. This council refused to give Zwingli a hearing on the matter. Matters looked dark for the Reformed. Zwingli could do nothing more. His only resource was to God. So he betook himself to great and intense prayer for the night. And lo! when the great council met the next day, it out-voted the little council and ordered him to be present and reply. When the head of the bishop's

commission had finished his address, he, with the rest of his party, started to leave before Zwingli began speaking. But the Swiss love of fair-play led the council to compel them to stay and hear Zwingli. The council then reaffirmed its former position in favor of fasting. But it put on record an action unfavorable to the Catholics,—that the divine law was higher than the pope's. The bishop was dissatisfied with this for he sent letters to Zurich urging that heresy might be suppressed.

Up to the summer of 1522 Zwingli had been mainly attacking Romish doctrines, now he began attacking the Church regulations. He attacked the many saints' days and Catholic festivals. On June 19 he attacked Corpus Christi. He also attacked the monks and the mass and declared that the pope was only a temporal prince and not of divine appointment.

Then another step was taken favorable to Protestantism. This time it was the celibacy of the clergy that was attacked. In July two petitions were sent, one to the bishop of Constance, the other to the Swiss diet, asking that the clergy be permitted to marry. The one to the bishop was signed by Zwingli and ten other priests.

While these petitions against celibacy were being sent, another event occurred at Zurich that created an excitement. A prominent friar of the Franciscan Order arrived there, Lambert of Avignon. He had been influenced somewhat by Luther's writings, but was not yet in the clear. He preached four sermons in the Fraumünster Church, Zurich, in which he defended the worship of Mary and the saints. Zwingli, who was present, arose and called out: "Brother, you are in error." This led to an arrangement for a disputation between Lambert and Zwingli. It lasted four hours. Zwingli so pressed him out of the Bible that at last Lambert declared himself discomfited and said he would ever after pray to God alone and lay aside all mediators and rosaries. We thus see how Zwingli had broken on saint-worship with the Catholics even before Luther.

In August Zwingli published his reply to the charges made by his bishop against him in the spring. He named it "Arche-teles," which means "the first and the last," hoping that as this was his first attack on the bishop, it might be his last. It

taught the independence of the Christian from Church authority. It revealed how thoroughly Protestant Zwingli had become. It upheld the supremacy of the Bible and forgiveness of sins through the atonement of Christ. In it, he declared against the confessional, pictures in the Churches, the use of music, vocal and instrumental, in the Church service. He criticized Luther for approving of the confessional, purgatory and worship of the saints. On these points he was clearly ahead of Luther.

In September, Zwingli preached at the great anniversary of the Angelic Dedication at Einsiedeln. His theme was a twofold one, the supremacy of the Bible and faith in Christ as the Mediator instead of Mary. Thus the Reformation at Zurich was moving fast and gathering force as it advanced. A crisis came in November. Zwingli decided to resign as he declared he could no longer perform the duties of his office. He had become so opposed to the mass and other Catholic rites that they had become distasteful to him. But the council solved the difficult situation. It allowed him to resign and chose some one else, thus relieving him from his distasteful duties. Then so as to keep him, it created for him a new office, that of preacher. This act was very significant. It was in reality a declaration of independence from Rome, for it was the appointment of a minister by a secular power, without asking or waiting for the bishop to sanction it. Just at the close of the year came up also a controversy about pictures and images, to which we will refer in connection with 1523.

1523.

At Wittenberg very little of importance occurred. There seemed to be a calm after the storm of the previous year under Carlstadt. And there was also a lull before the Peasants' War which broke out the next year. Luther, together with Melancthon and others, was busy on his translation of the Old Testament. This was finally published in 1534, being preceded by the Reformed Bible published at Zurich in 1530. In this year he comes out against saint-worship by approving of the position of the Bohemian Brethren.

If we turn to Zurich we find that it was quite otherwise than quiet. This was the great year of the Zurich Reforma-

tion. On January 29 a great Conference was held in the city. Zwingli, just as Luther had done in 1517 at Wittenberg, now nailed up 67 theses. In them he attacked the whole range of Catholic doctrines, purgatory, the papacy, mass, intercession of saints, celibacy of clergy, etc. Faber, the vicar general of the diocese, was present. He declared that such matters should not come before such a conference called by the secular power, but before a council. Zwingli answered that the Bible was arbiter enough. Faber was pressed by Zwingli to produce proofs from Scripture for his doctrine, but he failed to do so. So the council took action that Zwingli should continue to preach the Gospel as long and as often as he wanted, and that all priests and ministers should preach nothing but what could be proved out of the Bible. It also forbade that they should call each other heretics. This was then a great victory for the Reformed, for it closed the mouths of their enemies against their calling them heretics and also opened their mouths to preach the Gospel everywhere.

The pope by this time had become alarmed at the progress of the Protestant movement in Switzerland. He sent his nuncio to Zurich with a friendly letter to Zwingli (January 23) to win him back to the Catholic Church. Myconius says that the pope urged Zink, the papal chaplain at Einsiedeln and a very close friend of Zwingli's, to try to win the latter back to Catholicism. Myconius states that he asked Zink what inducements the pope offered to Zwingli. Zink replied: "Everything but the papal chair." That meant that Rome would have been willing to have given Zwingli anything, even made him a cardinal in order to silence him. But he refused all such bribes.

On August 10 occurred the first baptism in German instead of Latin in the cathedral. On September 2 Zwingli began trying to make changes in the mass. He published his Canon of the Mass.* In it he enunciated his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, that it is a memorial feast where the thought of Christ's presence stirs us to greater service. He also proposed in it a substitute for the Latin prayers of the service.

* The canon of the mass was that part of the mass in which the words of institution occur.

Then another controversy arose, this time about images. Leo Juda, the new pastor of the St. Peter's Church at Zurich, preached on September 1 against images in the Churches. Zwingli had already been preaching on that subject at the cathedral, saying, that the images of the Virgin and the saints were idols and should be removed. Bolder spirits caught up these teachings. It happened that just then Hetzer published a pamphlet, "The Judgment of God Against Images." This led Claus Hottinger, a pious shoemaker, to cut down the great crucifix at Stadelhofen, one of the suburbs of Zurich. For this Hottinger and his helpers were cast into prison. Zwingli sympathized with them though he thought them overzealous. As a result of this controversy the council ordered that another Conference should be held on October 26 and that the subject of the disputation should be images and the mass. On the first day the subject of images was debated, on the last two days, the mass. The Catholic party had almost no defenders. The council decreed that images should be removed wherever it could be done without disturbance or wounding tender consciences.

Finally came the last act of the year and a very important one. Zwingli had on October 9 defended himself against the charge that he retained the Catholic ceremonies because he liked them. This he denied. Now Zwingli, Leo Juda and Engelhard, the three pastors at Zurich, delivered an opinion stating that they were ready to administer the Lord's Supper according to the Protestant fashion and also to have daily Bible readings instead of the mass. But the city council postponed this revision of the worship. Thus Zwingli was ready to complete his Reformation at Zurich as early as the end of 1523, though his wishes were not granted until more than a year later. And yet this was the year after Luther had restored the Catholic rites at Wittenberg. We thus see how the Reformed were leading the Lutherans both in the cultus and in the civil action favoring Protestantism which made the Reformation permanent.

1524.

During the year 1524, very little was occurring at Wittenberg. For they were kept busy by the Peasants' War which

was not suppressed until the next year. This insurrection had the same effect on Luther that the Carlstadt movement had, it made him more conservative. Against the Peasants he published his tract "Against the Heavenly Prophets." However one step of progress was taken. The German was introduced into the service at Wittenberg and the mass was given up in the castle Church there though it remained in the city Church.

But while comparatively little was being done at Wittenberg, Zurich was going forward with the Reformation. On January 19 the Catholic party, led by Canon Hoffman, made their last attempt to stop the Reformation. Hoffman appeared before the council and was asked if he and his friends would obey the orders of the council and preach according to the Bible. He refused and so was compelled to leave the city. This broke the power of the Catholic party. Now everything was becoming Protestant. The saints' days were no longer observed. The council permanently abolished the Whitmonday procession to Einsiedeln. The relics were taken out of the Churches. The ringing of Church-bells except for Church service was forbidden. Payment for the confessional and for masses for the dead, the blessing of the communion plate, holy water, candles and extreme unction were all set aside. Between July 2-17 all pictures, images, statues and other ornaments were quietly taken out of the Churches by the authorities. Only the statue of Charlemagne in the tower of the cathedral was permitted to remain, for they very highly honored him because he had given the ground for the cathedral. Besides they got over the difficulty by saying that Charlemagne was not a saint, which was probably true. This example of the churches in the city was followed by the churches throughout the canton. On December 3 the monasteries and convents were abolished at Zurich. So that by the close of the year nothing remained of the old worship but the mass. And it would have been abolished the year before if Zwingli and his sympathizers had their own way.

Perhaps the most startling announcement of the year was the public announcement of Zwingli's marriage on April 2. He had married in 1522, but had kept the matter secret for prudential reasons lest it might cripple his influence. Only a

few friends as Myconius knew of it. This has led some, especially Lutherans, to say that he had contracted a "clerical marriage" with her in 1522. Now this may be a convenient name to call it, but it raises more difficulties than it sets aside. Such a concubinage as had been allowed in the Catholic Church can not be harmonized with several facts. One is that Myconius speaks of Zwingli's wife as his "wife" three times in 1522. Again how could Myconius call her as he does in one of his letters his "Spouse in Christ," if she were merely a concubine. Again 1522 was the year when houses of ill-fame were cleaned out of Zurich at Zwingli's inspiration. How could that have been done if he were living in such concubinage. In a word, if Zwingli were immoral at that time, he would have been utterly unable to have carried through his reforms, especially as he had so many Catholic enemies right around him to watch every lapse of conduct. Clerical marriages might have been possible in the former days of Catholicism, but not with the awakened conscience of the Protestant Reformation. "If he erred," says Simpson in his "Life of Zwingli," "the error was one of judgment rather than infringement of moral law. With our imperfect knowledge of the problems and conditions involved, it behooves us to be very charitable in forming an opinion. Zwingli acted from conscientious motives with an eye to the interests of the kingdom of God." Christoffel, in his "Life of Zwingli," calls attention to the fact that notwithstanding his enemies were circulating the most absurd stories to vilify him, yet his marriage was not utilized by them as a subject for reproach. "In it," says Christoffel, "I not only find no censurable weakness but the same wise and temperate regard for the religious development of his congregation."

1525.

During this year, the Reformation at Wittenberg was almost at a standstill because of the Peasants' War. But at Zurich the year was marked by the completion of the Reformation. Zwingli and his party appeared before the city council on April 11 (Tuesday of Passion week) and asked for the abolition of the mass and the restoration of the Lord's Supper according to the New Testament. The council ordered it to take place on Thursday of Passion week (April 13). It

was a very simple service. Instead of the altar was a plain table, instead of the gold paten or chalice were wooden plates and cups. Both of the elements, the wine as well as the bread, were given to the people. They received them seated instead of kneeling as in the Catholic Church. There was no singing, its place being taken by the responsive reading of the Creed and the Gloria by the minister, the men and the women. All the service was in German instead of Latin. This completed the introduction of Protestantism. It was introduced, not in one church as at Wittenberg, but in all the city churches and in all the churches of the canton. This was not done in Wittenberg until 1526-7.

In thus completing the reformation, Zwingli was before Luther just as he was in 1517 and 1520. For Luther did not publish his German mass until the next year, 1526. And when one compared Zwingli's changes in the worship, they are much more radical than Luther's. For the Lutheran service at that time contained elements of Romanism. It then retained the pericopes, *Te Deum*, *Benedictus*, adoration of the host and chalices, also gowns, candles, altars and fast days. Zwingli's was more completely Protestant.

We thus see as we have passed along, that on some points the one Reformation was earlier, on some, the other. The Lutheran Reformation at first created greater sensation as it spread over a larger country as Germany. Had it been permitted to go on in that way it would have antedated the Reformed. But the reaction, caused by the Carlstadt episode and the Peasants' War, checked the progress of Lutheranism for a time so it almost stood still until 1526-7. Meanwhile the Reformed at Zurich had gone right on and were earlier in their reforms than Luther, especially in worship and government. Thus on all the definitions we have given of a Reformer, Zwingli preceded Luther. We therefore answer the question, Who was the first Reformer, Luther or Zwingli, by having thus proved that in each of these definitions of a Reformer, Zwingli preceded Luther. If being a Reformer meant conversion and preaching of Protestantism Zwingli was earlier than Luther in 1517; if it meant breaking with the pope, Zwingli was earlier in 1520; if it meant changing the services and introducing Protestantism into the city and country, Zwingli was earlier in 1525.

CHAPTER IV.

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ZWINGLI'S EARLY THEOLOGY.

The theology of Zwingli has been considered by a number of writers as Baur, Zeller and others. With most of them there is one fundamental fault,—the authors are not themselves orthodox; and that has warped their judgment. Baur and Zeller were Hegelians of the purest water and had little conception of what was orthodox theology, which they spurned. Some of Zwingli's biographers, not being orthodox, have made the same mistake. For it is to be remembered that Zwingli approached the Protestant views from the old standpoint of what is now called the traditional theology. Unless that is kept in mind (and neither Baur, Zeller or the others had any true appreciation of it) Zwingli's true position can not be understood as we shall see. Another fault to be found with these writers is that, in giving Zwingli's theological views, they dwell upon them as given in his later works rather than in his earlier. The gradual growth of Zwingli's views—his historical development, has not been sufficiently watched. We will find by examining Zwingli's standpoint thus that it will give a quite different perspective to his life and a truer estimate of him.

The first statement that we have of his departure from Romanism is during his first pastorate at Glarus. He there declared that he did not find the doctrine of the intercession of the saints in the Bible. "Christ," he says, "is the only treasure of our poor souls. Why do we seek help in the creature?"* The reason why he began to doubt this doctrine we have already adverted to in the previous chapter.† He got the suggestion as we saw there from Erasmus' "Handbook of the Christian Soldier."‡ This raised a doubt in his mind

* Egli "Schweizerische Reformation-Geschichte," page 35.

† See pages 47-48.

‡ For extracts from that book, see Emerton's "Erasmus," pages

about the doctrine of the invocation of the saints. But in doubting this doctrine he struck at one of the fundamental doctrines of Catholicism. For the whole Catholic system is built upon a system of mediators or intercessors between God and man with Mary and the saints at the top and the bishops and priests at the bottom. This system was an inheritance from the old Arian theory of aeons in the fourth century.

Zwingli's doubt led him to deny the invocation of the saints. At Einsiedeln he preached on the significant text, "The Son of Man hath power to forgive sins." Bullinger in his history says, as we have seen, "that Zwingli preached the Gospel with all diligence at Einsiedeln and especially taught that Christ is the only Mediator and that men should not pray to or worship the pure Virgin and Mother of God." And Stahelin grants that Zwingli's experiences at Einsiedeln made him attack the worship of the saints and the idleness of the monks. Zwingli's opposition to this doctrine appears again and again. On June 7, 1519, he wrote to Rhenanus that he would take a considerable quantity of Luther's works on the "Lord's Prayer," especially if he deals somewhat with the "adoration of the saints." In 1521 he speaks of preparing for the press some sermons on saint-worship and Haller, the Reformer of Bern, wrote to him that he was daily expecting to read Zwingli's sermon on the worship of the saints. One of Canon Hoffman's complaints against him was that he preached against saint-worship. In 1522, it again appears prominently in his debate with Lambert of Avignon which he thus describes in a letter to Rhenanus of July 30, 1522:

"You know that a certain Franciscan from France, whose name indeed is Franz, was here not many days since and had much conversation about the Scriptural basis of the saints and their intercession for us. He was not able to convince me by the aid of a single passage of Scripture that the saints do pray for us as he had with a great deal of assurance boasted he would do."

On September 17, 1522, he published a sermon on the "Perpetual Virginity of Mary" in which he held to her virginity and lauded her purity and faith, but he denied her intercession. Myconius says that when he debated with the Commission of the bishop of Constance in 1522, this was one of the doctrines

that he attacked. It comes out very prominently at the First Conference at Zurich in January 29, 1523. Among his 67 theses, the 20th says "God desires to give us all things in his name, whence it follows that outside of this life, we need no Mediator except himself." And in the discussion that came up on these theses there occurred an interesting episode. The defense on the Catholic side was very weak. Faber, the vicar-general, led it. Zwingli said:

"Now since my Lord vicar announces and publicly boasts of how he convinced the clergyman of Fislisbach (Wyss) by means of the divine Scriptures of the fact that one should pray to the dear saints and the mother of God, therefore that they are our mediators with God, I beg him, for the sake of God and of Christian love, to show me the place and the location, also the words of Scripture where it is written, that one should pray to the saints as mediators; so that if I have erred and err now, I may be better instructed; since there are here present Bibles in the Hebrew, Greek and Latin languages. These we will have examined, so that we may see whether it is the meaning of Scripture that the saints are to be prayed to as mediators."

The vicar made a long-winded reply without giving any Scripture passage as proof. Zwingli later again insisted that he give the passages on which he had brought back the priest of Fislisbach to the Catholic doctrine and added this sharp passage:

"For if such a custom began at the time of Gregory then it did not exist before; and if before that time men were Christians and were saved, though they did not hold to the intercession of the saints and perhaps knew little about it, then it follows that they did not sin, who believed in Christ alone and did not consider the intercession of the saints. For we really know from the Scriptures that Jesus Christ alone is the Mediator between us and God."

He then again after some digression, says to the vicar:

"I desire that you do not make use of bombastic speeches, which do not even bear upon my question, but as I have asked before, tell at once where is written in Scripture concerning the holy invocation and intercession of the Virgin Mary as you pretended you could show from Exodus, Baruch, &c."

But the vicar again turned it off by going into the marriage of priests, then a burning question. Again Zwingli

asked him to prove from Scripture where it is written concerning the invocation and intercession of saints. Then, finally the vicar quoted the text in Luke, 2nd chapter, where Elizabeth says to Mary, "Blessed is the body that has born thee and blessed the breasts which thou has sucked." But Zwingli quickly interrupted, "We are not asking concerning the holiness and dignity of Mary, but concerning her invocation and intercession." Then the vicar took offense at the interruption and helped himself out by sitting down and refused to say any more.

We thus see the prominence of this doctrine at that Conference.

In his Exposition of his Theses published July 14, 1523, this doctrine is prominent. After this First Conference in 1523, the subject came up again as iconoclasts began destroying the images in the Churches. This led, as we have seen, to the Second Conference at Zurich in October, 1523. At this Conference the subject of saint-worship took up the whole first day. Canon Hoffman tried to say something in defense of images but was silenced as he could give no Scripture proof. The proposition was then taken up, "The images are forbidden of God in Scripture. Therefore they should not be made or adored among Christians and they ought to be done away with." Leo Juda proved this proposition ably from Scripture. Conrad Smith of Kussnacht tried to weakly defend them, that the images were staffs and supports to the weak. Zwingli arose and said:

"God forbid. Had useless ministers and bishops zealously preached the Word of God instead of busying themselves with useless trumpery and mummery, it had not come to this, that the poor ignorant people, unacquainted with the Word, must learn Christ only through pictures on the wall or wooden figures."

We thus see in all this the prominence given by Zwingli to this doctrine.

Before leaving this doctrine, it ought to be noted that it is somewhat remarkable that Zwingli began his Protestantism at so superstitious a place as Einsiedeln which was erected to the worship of Mary. It is also remarkable that as Zwingli began his Reformation by strong opposition to saint-worship he should be called upon to end his life with it. For when

lying under the pear tree and dying on the battlefield at Cappel, he was advised by the Catholic soldiers who gathered around him, that if he could not speak or make confession, he should pray in his heart to the Mother of God and call upon the saints. But Zwingli shook his head against it.

Now while this doctrine has been appearing thus early in Zwingli's life, it is noticeable that alongside of it another doctrine has been becoming prominent, namely, the sole Mediatorship of Christ between God and us. Bullinger in the extract we have given says he preached at Einsiedeln, that Christ is the only Mediator. It is really the other side of the same doctrine of the invocation of the saints, namely, that they ought not to be prayed to since Christ is the only Mediator. Bullinger says that Zwingli in his first sermon at Zurich "praised God the Father and taught all men to trust in the Son of God, Jesus Christ, as the only Savior." Zwingli later, speaking of his first preaching at Zurich, after describing how he preached first on Matthew, then on Acts, Timothy, then on Peter's Epistles, says he went to Hebrews:

"In order to bring to the knowledge of the people the great benefit of the coming of Jesus Christ in its whole extent. Here they were to learn that Jesus Christ is the high priest and well have they learned it. They shall also learn that Christ as an offering, once made for all coming time, has alone justified them."

He again speaks of this doctrine in a letter of January 4, 1520: "Christ died once for our sins and now dies no more." (Romans 6:9.)

In the 67 theses of the Zurich Conference (1523) this doctrine is clearly stated in theses 2, 3, 50 and 51:

• 50. "God alone remits sins through Jesus Christ his son and our Lord."

51. "Whoever only assigns this to creatures detracts from the honor of God and gives it to him which is not God: this is real idolatry."

2. "The sum and substance of the Gospel is that our Lord Jesus Christ, the true Son of God, has made known to us the will of his heavenly Father and has with his innocence released us from death and reconciled God."

3. "Hence Christ is the only way to salvation for all who ever were, are and will be."

Again in 1523 in the Canon of the Mass, he again speaks of it as he says: "Christ offered once for all for us as the cause of forgiveness." He placed this against the idea of making the mass a sacrifice. In 1524, in a defence against the rumors that he had received his knowledge of the Bible from a Jew who lived in Winterthur and that he denied the divinity of Christ and his atoning death in his sermons, he again declares that "man finds the sure certainty of his salvation in the death of the living Son of God."

In his first compendium of theology his "True and False Religion" (1525) he devoted considerable space* to this doctrine. In his later life it again appears. For in the Confession which he sent to the Emperor of Germany at Augsburg (1530) he says:

"I know that there is no other victim for expiating crimes than Christ, for not even was Paul crucified for us, for there is no other name under the sun in which we must be saved than that of Christ. For this is the one sole Mediator between God and man, Christ Jesus."

And in his last theological work published posthumously, "Explanation of the Christian Faith," he says: "For the confirmation, satisfaction and atonement of our sins gained with God is only through Jesus Christ who has suffered for us." Other doctrines came in as he grew older, to broaden his theological system. But they all gathered around this early doctrine of his, the one mediatorship of Christ,—the ransom for sin,—Christ died once for all (Heb. 10:10).

Where did Zwingli get this fundamental doctrine? It came to him first as we have already seen from his great teacher, Prof. Thomas Wyttenbach, of Basle, who implanted in his mind in 1506 the great spiritual doctrine that "Christ was the ransom for sin." He says:† "the death of Christ was the sole price of remission of sins. Therefore faith is the key which unlocks to the soul the treasury of such remission." "Absolution," said Wyttenbach, "is a Romish cheat, the death of Christ is the only payment for sins."

That great doctrine of the atonement became the sheet

* Zwingli Works, Vol. III, pages 194-6.

† Opera III, 541.

anchor for Zwingli. It laid hold of him then and affected him ever afterward. It is specially prominent in his earlier thinking before he broadened out into whole systems of theology as in his "True and False Religion," where the number of other doctrines tends comparatively to throw this one more into the background. It was the belief in this doctrine that prepared the way to undermine his faith at Glarus in the intercession of saints. "If Christ was the only mediator and salvation, what was the need of the saints?" That was the logic of it. But he approached it Scripturally and ever after held it for that reason. He could not find saint-worship in Scripture, that settled the matter for him. As he meditated on it, it became more and more clear to him that Christ was the only Mediator; as he later says (indeed the phraseology is very significant) "Christ is the one only Mediator." He seems to have gotten this from the Epistle to the Hebrews, for its phraseology sticks in his mind—Christ died one for all. If Luther got his Gospel of justification from Galatians and Romans, Zwingli got his Gospel of atonement from Hebrews.

It was the same Gospel only the emphasis was different. Zwingli went down deeper than Luther to the basis and root of justification by faith, namely, the ransom of Christ. All justification is based on the atonement. It is not what we do, either by works, or by faith as Luther said, but it was what God does in Christ at his atonement, that saves us. Zwingli's views were therefore more definite and complete than Luther's. The text that seems to have most impressed him was Hebrews 10:14. He referred to this in the First Zurich Disputation of 1523, where he repeatedly quotes Hebrews. In answer to the vicar, he says:

"I say that you should prove from the Scriptures that the mass is a sacrifice, for as St. Paul says (1 Heb. 8: 12.25.26) Christ not more than once was sacrificed not by others' blood, but 'by his own blood he entered once into the holy place, &c.;' nor yet that he should offer himself often as the high priests in the Old Testament had to do for the sin of the people, for then Christ must have often suffered. Likewise St. Paul writes, (Heb. 10: 12.13) 'But this man after he had offered one sacrifice forever sat down on the right hand of God.' Likewise, 'for by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.' Likewise, 'by so much does

this sacrifice surpass the sacrifices in the Old Testament fulfilled by the high priest, by so much more powerful is this declared to be that it was sufficient once for the sins of all people." (Heb. 7:22-27.)

To this same source may be traced his early opposition, which appeared at Zurich against fasting. He had been preaching against Lenten fasts because not in the Bible. But the theological basis for it was, that fasts were supposed to be good works which saved us. And Zwingli was jealous for his master. "Christ saves and saves alone" was the keynote of his early preaching.

Again this emphasis on Christ as the great Mediator placed him in a peculiar position while he was at Einsiedeln. For there in the abbey was the Black Virgin,—there it was held that sins are forgiven by the Virgin, in whose honor the abbey had been built and who had consecrated it miraculously. But in spite of all that, Zwingli preached that sins were forgiven by the death of Christ and not by the Virgin Mary. No wonder his preaching created a sensation so that tradition has it that those who went away told those whom they met coming to the abbey the new gospel. And they turned away home and did not go to Einsiedeln. Now it must have required a tremendous moral heroism to have preached, right at the shrine of Mary at Einsiedeln, this Gospel of the forgiving Christ. It was like Paul defying Diana right at Ephesus and Daniel worshipping God in the face of the king's idolatrous edict. But Zwingli had the courage of a hero. He knew he was right. For he knew he was preaching the Bible. His clear humanistic mind had laid hold very clearly and strongly on the death of Christ.

This emphasis on the death of Christ explains his emphasis on another doctrine, which Zwingli made so prominent, namely the Memorial View of the Lord's Supper. As he began his theological Protestantism by so emphasizing the death of Christ, he naturally fell into the view that makes the Lord's Supper a memorial of Christ's death. For the Lord's Supper is complex in its significance. Now we have one element made prominent and now another by different Reformers and different Churches. Luther, especially after 1524, emphasized the relation of the communicant to Christ's *body* in the sacrament. Calvin, on the other

hand, emphasized the relation of the communicant to the *living* Christ,—the idea of communion by faith with God and with Christ in heaven through the Holy Ghost. Zwingli emphasized the relation of the communicant to the *death* of Christ,—the Lord's Supper was a memorial of his death. And who will deny the truth of this when Christ says: "This do in remembrance of me." In his 67 theses at Zurich he says: "Christ having sacrificed himself once, is to eternity a certain and valid sacrifice for the sins of all the faithful. It, therefore, follows that the mass is not a sacrifice."

Zwingli later broadened the scope of his theological system and the doctrine of the atonement does not occupy proportionably so prominent a place. But it is there either clearly stated or understood. One feels it pulsing under all the other doctrines—Christ died once for all. In his larger work, published 1525, his "True and False Religion" other doctrines come in to complete the system. Perhaps the change that took place is best given in his Confession to the Emperor of Germany (1530), where, after speaking of Christ as the sole Mediator between God and man he adds "Moreover God's election is manifest and remains firm: for whom he has elected before the foundation of the world, he has so elected as through his Son to receive Him unto Himself." Thus the atonement passes into election, which doctrine was further emphasized in his tract on "Providence." But in his last work "The Explanation of Faith," he returned to the atonement and the sole Mediatorship of Christ appears again.

We have thus dwelt on the early theological development of Zwingli, which made Christ's death fundamental. Our reason for doing so is that the later biographers of Zwingli, like the writers on his theology, have not been fully Evangelical. Stahelin is undoubtedly the best as he is the latest biographer of Zwingli, though he cannot be followed in all respects. But Stahelin would not be considered orthodox by us in America. He occupied the position of a Mediate in theology. He did not believe in the complete vicarious atonement of Christ in the sense that the Bible gives it, namely that it was substitutionary.

Christ took our place. The result is that he does not do justice to Zwingli on these points. The earlier biographers as Christoffel and others are better here. What is said of Stahelin is truer yet of the later Church historians who have taken up Zwingli's life. The recent attempt of the Ritschlian School on Germany, among them Harnack, has been to make Zwingli entirely dependent on Luther. And recent American biographies have simply echoed the Germans. But the Ritschlians fail to understand Zwingli, because they themselves are not Evangelical and cannot study him from his own standpoint. For they deny the absolute deity of Jesus and also as a result, his substitutionary atonement. For if Christ be not a God, he cannot make so great an atonement as was required. Therefore these writers, in summing up Zwingli's theological views, pass by Zwingli's doctrine of the ransom of Christ. It does not appeal to them. It has no place in their theology and so they do not see it in his. We, therefore, call attention to what the earlier Evangelical biographies of Zwingli made prominent, the great doctrine of the atonement.

There is one great Reformation lesson we need to learn at this anniversary, and that is that had Luther and Zwingli not emphasized Christ's atonement, there would probably have been no Reformation. It was Christ's death, and justification through it, that gave us the Reformation. The flabby sweet-scented doctrines of the New Theology of today would never produced such a sensation or lead to such results. It, therefore, behooves us on this anniversary of the Reformation to get back to the great doctrines of the Reformation, because there has always been tremendous power in them. They have the dynamic to shake the world. We of the Reformed need to get back to the doctrine of the supremacy of Scripture which he held together with Luther. We need to get back to his great doctrine that Christ is the ransom,—Christ's Mediatorship is sole and his work is complete. The theological cry was some time ago Back to Christ, we need to go farther and say "Back to Christ and Him Crucified," which was the centre of Paul's preaching. Nothing but the love of Christ, as revealed in his death, will ever conquer the world. The

more that Christ's atonement is given merely a moral significance, the less there is of love in it. It becomes merely ethical and fails to satisfy man's whole nature, especially the emotional and the more Christ's atonement is reduced to mere law by taking the vicariousness out of it or by making vicariousness the law of nature, so that Christ's death was purely natural and not supernatural, the more it is evacuated of love. Salvation is not by law, for Christ's atonement is the great exception to natural law. Love can only be revealed by grace,—by God's free *unmerited* forgiveness for the sake of the death of his Son, who took our place, dying in our stead. That old doctrine of the ransom of Christ's is the magnet that will draw the world to him as nothing else can do.

BOOK II.

The Contribution of the Reformed to the Spirit of
Protestantism.

CHAPTER I.

THE UNFINISHED LUTHERAN REFORMATION AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE TO THE REFORMED.

The Reformation of the sixteenth century especially concerns two Churches, the Reformed and the Lutheran. But as between them, what is their Reformation significance. The contrast between them is brought out in our topic, the unfinished Lutheran Reformation and its significance to the Reformed.

In speaking on this subject it is not our wish to detract from the character or credit that belongs to the Lutheran Church. Luther will ever stand out as one of the popular heroes of the Reformation. He had a dramatic way of doing things, that caused them to make an impression. And the Lutheran Church, that he founded, should be strongly praised for the tenacity with which she held to and defended his doctrine of justification by faith.

But the Lutheran Church was not the whole of the Reformation and we fear that some of its extreme admirers will on this 400th Anniversary of the Reformation treat the Reformation as if Luther and the Lutheran Church were the whole of it and make the anniversary wholly Lutheran. We believe that fair-minded Lutherans will not do this, though we fear that the Reformed side of the Reformation will be scantily passed by as of little significance to them. Some of them have never given credit to Zwingli or Calvin as generously as we have done to Luther. It is to correct this one-sided emphasis of theirs and to state the Reformed side of the Reformation in its full significance that we take up this subject.

The unfinished Reformation of the Lutheran Church,—this should not be held as too severe a reproach against them. For the Reformation, whether Lutheran or Reformed, is not entirely finished, even in our day. Thus the pietism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries came in

to add something to both the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. Each of these Churches has developed and will continue to do so, but we believe in harmony with their historic position and not away from it into a new theology. We simply want here to call attention to certain facts in the Reformation that show that the Reformed Reformation went farther than the Lutheran. That this is true is conceded by so great a Lutheran authority as the late Prof. Krauth, who named his book on the Lutheran Reformation, "The Conservative Reformation." The Lutherans were the conservatives and the Reformed were the progressives at that time. The Lutherans have charged us as Reformed with being radicals and even rationalistic: we return the charge by declaring their Reformation an unfinished one and that it remained for the Reformed to finish it. This unfinished Reformation of the Lutherans can be proved in three ways. It was unfinished in doctrine, worship and government. In all of these the Reformed went farther than the Lutheran.

The most evident of these three was in cultus or worship. Here the difference between the two Churches is perhaps most marked. The Lutheran Church treated many things as indifferent that the Reformed considered absolutely wrong. In fact, as has been suggested by Koestlin, the Lutherans of the Reformation did not place worship as quite on a level with doctrine. If that be true, then the difference was that the Reformed placed worship on a level with doctrine as to its importance. The two Churches seem to have looked at worship from different standpoints. D'Aubigne has well stated this thus,—the Lutherans cast out of the worship only those things that were forbidden by the Bible: the Reformed retained in the worship only those sanctioned by the Bible. Or we may state it in another way—the Lutherans used the Bible as a rule negatively and the Reformed positively.

As a result the Reformed went farther than the Lutherans, for there were a number of forms of worship that lay between the positive and negative application of the Bible as a rule. In saying that the Reformed went farther, we are not speaking of the iconoclastic Puritans, though

there was a great deal of Puritanism in the Reformed Church at the Reformation. And while we cannot defend all the extravagances of Puritanism, especially in relation to art, yet there is not much wonder that they went so far. If you and I had been worshipping an image of a saint and been praying to it for many years and would then find out that it was a fraud and cheat, that it could not hear our prayers and could not forgive sins, the revulsion would be apt to lead us unto extravagancies. I suspect you and I would have done the same thing. But I am not referring to the extreme iconoclasts. Even the conservative Reformed then went beyond the Lutherans in revising the forms of worship. And they did it because they had a different principle.

To prove the difference, it is only necessary to refer to some of the differences between the two Churches at the time of the Reformation. We are not speaking of the Lutheran Church at present as much as then, for the Lutherans since then have in many places accepted some of the more progressive reforms of the Reformed. Here were certain forms that the Lutherans then retained, which were eschewed by the Reformed. Thus at baptism they retained exorcism, christening or the making the sign of the cross, and lay-baptism. At the Lord's Supper, they retained the use of the wafer, while the Reformed used only bread and the latter insisted that the bread be broken as symbolic of Christ's broken body. The Lutherans also retained the adoration of the host. In the regular Lord's Day service, the Lutherans retained crosses and crucifixes, and sometimes lights and splendidly wrought robes like the Catholics. As late as 1536 the delegates from Strassburg were offended by the presence of pictures and candles and the elevation of the elements in the Lutheran Churches at Wittenberg. The Lutherans retained many saints' days, which were rejected by the Reformed as not being Scriptural. At the benediction, the minister made the sign of the cross. Some of these the Lutheran Church has later given up. To show the position of the Lutheran Church at that time we give the following. Luther in 1528 wrote to a friend:

"I condemn no ceremonies but those opposed to the Gospel. All others I retain intact in our Church. For the font

stands and baptism is administered with the same rites as before though the language used is the vernacular. I even leave the images undisturbed except those destroyed by the rioters before my return. We also celebrate mass in the customary vestments and forms, only adding certain German songs and substituting the vernacular in the words of consecration. I do not by any means want the Latin mass done away nor would I have permitted the use of German, had I not been compelled to. In short, I hate nobody worse than him who upsets free and harmless ceremonies and turns liberty into necessity."

Writing in 1539 to a Berlin clergyman who was troubled by the many Catholic ceremonies retained in the worship of the newly established Church of Brandenburg, he said:

"In God's name make your processions with a silver or gold cross and with cowl and mantle of velvet, satin or linen. And if your Lord the Elector does not find one hood or cassock enough, put on three as Aaron, the high priest, wore three richly adorned garments from which the priestly robes under the papacy got their name. And if his Electoral grace does not find one circuit or procession enough with its ringing and its singing, make seven as Joshua marched around Jericho with the children of Israel, shouting and blowing trumpets. And if your Lord the Margrave would enjoy it, let his Electoral grace leap and dance in front of the procession with harps, kettle-drums, cymbals and bells as David did before the ark when it was brought into the city of Jerusalem."

As late as 1541, he wrote to Chancellor Brueck

"Our services, God be praised, are so conducted as regards unessential things, that a layman from Italy or Spain not understanding German, would be compelled to say, on seeing our mass, choir, organs, bells and the like, that ours is a true papal Church, not at all or very little different from what he has in his own country."

And Melancthon wrote in the Augsburg Confession:*

"Our Churches are falsely accused of abolishing the mass, for the mass is retained on our part and celebrated with greatest reverence and almost all the ceremonies that are in use (in the Catholic Church) are preserved, saving that with the things sung in Latin, we mingle certain things sung in German in various parts of the service."

* Part II, 1.

And in a letter July 30, 1530, to the papal legate, he says: "A slight difference of rites seems to be the only cause of opposition to the concord (with the Catholics)."

The Reformed never talked that way. To them the abolition of these indifferent things was a matter of conscience because Scriptural. And they cast them all aside. All this only proves that the Reformed went much farther in worship or cultus than the Lutherans. They completed what the Lutherans left unfinished. *Protestant worship would be different today if the Reformed had not come into existence.*

We will now leave this point and go to Church government. Here too the Reformed went much farther than the Lutherans. Luther attempted in a measure to organize the Churches, when they came out of Catholicism, as in 1527-30. But he did not get very far before he stopped. When we compare his effort at organization with the farther advance of the Reformed, we see how Zwingli began, and Calvin and Lasco completed, the Reformed form of Church government. Government too with the Lutherans did not seem of so much importance as doctrine, for there seemed to be no necessary principle about it as the Lutherans in Scandinavia are Episcopal, and in Germany consistorial. They did not hold to the parity of the ministry as necessary and Scriptural as the Reformed did. Luther allowed the state to attend to the form of government. It might have any form it pleased except the Catholic. But not so with the Reformed. They went by a fixed principle,—a principle that is found in the New Testament,—the government must be presbyterial and autonomous. Koestlin, Luther's biographer, grants that Luther was not an organizer, for he says: "Luther's mission did not lie within the sphere of concrete practical organization."

We see then the difference between the Lutherans and the Reformed was, that the Lutherans left each prince organize his own church. Each prince in Germany appointed a consistory composed of councillors, some ministers, some laymen. Here appears the Erastianism of the Lutheran Church. The church instead of being autonomous as a true Reformed Church is, is dependent on the state. Even in the lowest form of Erastianism, that the congregation and not the prince has the right to call its own minister, yet that call must be confirmed by the

consistory of the prince. This was different from the Reformed. Zwingli, it is true, did not go as far as Calvin; but granted to the state certain rights in the Church. But Calvin declared that Church and state had different functions. Although he did not reach the full separation of Church and state at Geneva as there exists in the United States; yet he started an entering wedge that ultimately drove them asunder. But Luther halted before he got that far. Now in Churches that are Erastian there are two forms, a higher and a lower; in the one, the Church is above the state in authority; in the other, the state is above the Church. In the latter, when the Reformation was introduced, the state simply took the place of the bishops and lorded over the Church as before. This was true of some of the Reformed Churches in Switzerland, especially Bern. And also in some parts of Germany the consistorial form of government has been introduced into the Reformed Church. But this has been due to the Lutheran influences from the surrounding districts. This consistorial form of government was sometimes quite low, as it required only the presence of some official of the prince at the synod. But it generally was higher, namely that no action of the synod was final without the approval of the consistory. And as the Lutheran Churches generally had no synod, the consistory had all the authority in itself. But pure Reformed Church government gave all the authority to the synod or the Church, and not to the prince. Therefore in Church government, the Reformed went beyond the Lutheran and the Lutheran was incomplete. The Reformed went beyond, because they aimed to be Scriptural and only Scriptural.

There was also another difference between the Lutherans and the Reformed in Church government. The distinction we have just noticed was an external one—that is, external to the Church; for it dealt with the church's relation to the state. But there was also a difference between them internally,—within the Church. The Reformed held to representative Church government within the Church. This peculiarity grew out of the one we have just mentioned. Just because the Church was not governed by the state, but governed herself, she had to develop a self-government of her own. This she did by the representative method. The congregation had repre-

sentatives in the upper Church courts as consistory, classis, synod and general synod. To each the congregation elected elders. Each congregation was represented by elders. And in its own consistory it was represented by elders and deacons. This representative form of government has always been the peculiarity of the Reformed Church. It was this representative form of government that enabled the Reformed to be able to found republics.

We thus see the difference between the two churches in government. We in America are not apt to notice these differences because the Lutheran Churches here are not organized as they are in Germany where Church and state are united. Here, where no princes rule, there are no princes to appoint a consistory to govern them. So they have become, like the Reformed, self-governing. And they have taken on themselves either the congregational form of government, as in the General Synod, or a sort of presbyterial, as in the General Council.* Others have superintendents and some talk of a bishop. To show how this lack of complete organization in the Lutheran Church of Germany has hindered it, we will give an illustration given us by one of the leading Reformed ministers of Germany. About the year 1817 and later the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in different parts of Germany were united to form the Evangelical Church. In this union, while each was allowed to retain its creeds and customs, yet the church government was a compromise. At the top was placed the consistory taken from the Lutheran Church and at the bottom, the synod, taken from the Reformed. This led to the introduction of the presbyterial form of government into the Lutheran districts of Germany. This presbyterial form of government compelled all congregations to elect elders. And in doing so, a peculiar condition was revealed. In many of the Lutheran districts, they had great difficulty to find men enough to serve as elders. Why? Because the Lutheran Church had not, in all the centuries since the Reformation, been training up elders. Men had almost to be forced into the eldership so that the positions might be filled. Now this would never have happened in the Reformed Church. For the Reformed Church for hundreds

* But the General Council has not given to its vestrymen the power that the Reformed Churches do in their Church courts.

of years, ever since the Reformation, had been training up elders in its congregations. And what magnificent laymen as elders and leaders she has had; as in the Reformation, Vadian the Reformer of St. Gall, Admiral Coligny of France, Elector Frederick III of the Palatinate in Germany and William of Orange in Holland. All these things show that her Church government was therefore more complete than the Lutheran. The Reformed went beyond this unfinished organization of the Lutheran Church and fully organized themselves. They did it because they believed they found the presbyterial form of Church government in the New Testament where it speaks of elders and of the presbytery and where bishops and presbyters are translated from the same word. *It would have been a great loss to Protestantism if the Reformed Church organization had not come into existence.* For then Catholicism would have the more easily reconquered Protestantism.

Having thus shown that the Lutheran Church has been an unfinished Reformation on two points, cultus and government, we now take up the last point, and that is doctrine. We may surprise some when we say that the Lutheran Church did not complete her doctrine. This is not so familiar to us in America. Did we live in Germany, where the two Churches exist side by side, we would be more familiar with the doctrinal differences between the Lutherans and Reformed. Here the main difference is on the Lord's Supper, although in the German language there are also two differences in the use of the Lord's Prayer. The Lutheran, closely following the Latin of the Catholic Church, says "Father our" instead of "our father"; and the clause "deliver us from evil" is used by the Lutherans, while the Reformed use the phrase "deliver us from the evil one." In the Apostles' Creed, the Lutherans use the phrase "Christian Church," while the Reformed use "Catholic Church." But in Germany they are familiar with a whole line of differences between the two Churches, from the beginning of dogmatics—the doctrine of God, down to the end—the future state. Were we more fond of polemics than we are, we might be interested to note these differences all through the system of theology. Time fails to do this, but we will note two differences where the Lutherans failed to complete a doctrine and the Reformed completed it,—two instances where the Reformed went farther

than the Lutherans. The two doctrines referred to are the Lord's Supper and justification by faith.

We will take up the Lord's Supper first. The Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper holds that the body and blood of Christ are present "in, with and under" the elements, bread and wine. Other Churches call this consubstantiation, a name that is denied by the Lutherans. But when we come to study Luther's doctrine instead of the general Lutheran doctrine, we find a difference. We find that Luther differed at different times. There may be said to have been two Luthers, an early and a late one. The first was when he first came out against the Catholics and reacted against their doctrine of transubstantiation; the later period was when he was defining himself not against the Catholics but against the Sacramentarians, as he called the Reformed. Luther's controversies with Zwingli and the Reformed caused him to narrow down, and he hardened his views. In his early days Luther was broader in his sympathies. His views, as we shall see, inclined more toward the Reformed than later. The change occurs between 1523 and 1526. The Luther before that time is in some respects different from the Luther after it. In fact Luther's views in his development of the sacrament are an interesting study.

We get Luther's early views on the Lord's Supper in four of his works:

1. The Sermon on the Blessed Sacrament, 1519.
2. The Sermon on the New Testament, 1520.
3. The Treatise on the Babylonish Captivity of the Church, 1520.
4. The Abuse of the Mass, 1522.

Let us look at these different works.

The first extended statement of Luther's views on the Lord's Supper is in his "Treatise on the Blessed Sacrament" (1519). The great emphasis of this work is significant. He has not a word to say about the sacrifice in the mass, which was the Catholic view. But he has a great deal to say about faith and its necessity. Almost his first assertion is the quotation from Augustine, "Why preparest thou stomach and teeth? Only believe and thou hast already partaken of the sacrament." This phrase seems to be the clue to all the rest. The theme of the sermon is fellowship with the saints. It is divided into

three points—the sign, the significance of the sign and faith. And more than half of it is taken up with the third part—faith; for he says that on faith all depends. He says:

“It is not enough that you know the sacrament as a fellowship, &c., you must desire it and firmly believe that you have received it. You must not doubt that you have what the sacrament signifies, that is, that you are certain Christ and all his saints come to you, bringing all their virtues, sufferings and mercies to live, work, suffer and die for you and be wholly yours.”

He denies that the Lord's Supper is an “opus operatum,” that is, has virtue intrinsically in itself; but it is an “opus operantis,” that is, has not virtue in itself; for faith is necessary to make it efficacious.

“‘The sacrament is for us,’ he says, ‘a food, a bridge, a door, a ship, and a litter, on which and by which, we pass from this world into eternal life. Therefore all depends on faith.’”

The second treatise is his “Sermon on the New Testament.” Here the emphasis is somewhat different from the former treatise, for he emphasizes the presence of the spiritual body of Christ. But almost at the very beginning, he emphasizes the necessity of faith, as in Section 6, “Trust and faith is the beginning, the middle and end of all works and righteousness.” He defines the sacrament as

“The sign and seal of the testament in which Christ has bequeathed to us the remission of all sin and eternal life. The taste for the riches of Christ's testament comes by the faith which believes and is trusting the testament and promise. There are many saints who, like Paul and Hermit, remained for years in the desert without mass and yet were never without mass. ‘The reason was they had faith.’ When there is no faith there, no prayer helps nor the hearing of many masses.”

Especially striking is Luther's repeated assertion that faith, which leans on the Word and is the “principle part of the mass,” does not absolutely need a sacrament. He says:

“I can daily enjoy the sacrament in the mass, if only I keep before my eyes the testament, that is, the words and covenant of Christ and feed and strengthen my faith thereby.”

The third work in which he refers to the Lord's Supper is his “Babylonish Captivity.” His “Address to the Christian

Nobility of Germany" was his great brief on the rights of the laity. But this "Babylonish Captivity" was not written to the secular powers but to the Church. In it he takes up the Romish sacraments and handles them without gloves, showing how they blind the people and keep them in captivity. In this, at the beginning of the discussion of the Lord's Supper, he begins again with a reference to Augustine's dictum, "Believe and thou hast eaten." The first captivity is the incompleteness of the mass by withholding the cup from the laity. The second is transubstantiation. The third is that the mass is a sacrifice.

"The mass is a divine promise which can profit no one, intercede for no one and be communicated to no one, save him alone who believes with a faith of his own. For the mass, being the promise of God, is not fulfilled by praying, but only by believing."

Speaking of Judas he says (217), "It always remains the same sacrament and testament which works in the believer its own work, in the unbeliever, a strange work." Luther declared that the sacraments were mere signs of the forgiving love of God in Christ. Unless there was faith they could not help.

In 1523 Luther says:

"Faith, without which the outward reception is nothing, stands in this, that we firmly believe that Christ, God's son, stands for us and has taken all our sins upon his neck and is the eternal satisfaction for our sins and reconciles us before God to the Father. Who has faith belongs to this sacrament. Who stands in such faith belongs here and takes the sacrament as an assurance and sign or specification that he is sure of the divine promise and consent, that this bread is a comfort to the sorrowing, a medicine to the sick, life to the dying, bread to the hungry, and a rich treasure to all poor and needy."

All these quotations reveal Luther's early emphasis on faith or the subjective in the Lord's Supper. This was very different from his later emphasis on the objective or the presence of Christ's body in the elements of the Supper. Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper consisted of three parts:

1. The relation of the Supper to us, that is, our faith.
2. The relation of the Supper to our Lord,—the presence of his body.

3. The relation of the Supper to the Word of God.

In his early period he emphasized the first. We agree with Goebel in his admirable essay on Luther's early doctrine of the Lord's Supper (*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1843, page 357) that Luther's early doctrine of the Lord's Supper was quite different from his later doctrine. But we can not quite go as far as to say that it was virtually Reformed and that the Reformed could virtually accept Luther's early doctrine. For while the Reformed could thoroughly agree with Luther on his emphasis on faith in that sacrament, yet all the while he does not deny the real presence of Christ's body, indeed hints at its presence. And although he does not say as much about the sacramental use of the Word of God as he does later, yet it appears slightly in his early writings. But Goebel is right in saying that Carlstadt in his reformation at Wittenberg (while Luther was absent at the Wartburg) and which Luther so bitterly attacked, was really carrying out Luther's earlier teachings. Carlstadt's view was that Christ's death, and not the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, was the ground for forgiveness. Carlstadt cast aside, as we have seen, transubstantiation and consubstantiation, the elevation of the host and its adoration, the real presence, the specific sacramental activity and the distribution of the body and blood of Christ. It was the extremes to which Carlstadt went, that led Luther to react against his earlier positions. And from the time of his controversy with Carlstadt he became more and more conservative and more and more emphasized the other two elements of his doctrine, the presence of Christ's body and the power of the Word in the sacrament.

In order to understand the efficacy of the Lord's Supper, it is necessary to notice that there are three views about it. At one extreme is the view that the sacraments have efficacy in themselves, and that regardless of faith or the spiritual condition of the believer. This was the "opus operatum" theory of the Catholics. The water in baptism in itself cleanses without faith. And the bread and wine feed the soul without faith, because of their inherent efficacy.

At the other extreme is the subjective view of sacramental efficacy. This has been the Reformed view. The sacraments have no efficacy unless faith is present. It is this subjective

side that comes out in the early Zwinglian and the Calvinistic views. Zwingli's at first made it a memorial,—we were to remember Christ's death,—a subjective process. Calvin said that at the Supper we are to lift up our minds away from the elements up to heaven where Christ is and thus commune with him; also an intellectual and subjective process. The Reformed thus emphasized the subjective element. But that is just what Luther did in his earlier works. Faith to him was everything, as we have just seen. Thus far Luther was Reformed.

The reason why Luther so greatly emphasized faith in his earlier writings was probably due to his emphasis on justification by faith. His reaction against the Catholic doctrine of justification by works would naturally lead him to emphasize faith. If faith was so necessary for our salvation, it was also necessary for the sacrament. Luther shows this emphasis on faith, especially in his first work, to which we have referred. In his second, the emphasis on the Word begins to appear. Later Luther's emphasis was more on the presence of Christ's body. So we see that he finally accepted the third view, namely, that the efficacy of the sacrament lay not in the objective efficacy alone nor in the subjective state of the mind alone. His view was a compromise view—it was an objective-subjective view. The efficacy lay not in the elements themselves as according to the Catholic or objective view; but it lay in the presence of Christ's body, which however must be received by faith. He thus held on to objectivity (for Christ's body was objective to us). And he also held on to the subjective in demanding faith. So while the emphasis was laid in his earlier writings, as we have seen, on the subjective or faith; it is in his later writings laid on the presence of Christ's body rather than faith. It is to be remembered that the Lutherans after Luther's death split into two camps, the high Lutherans, holding to ubiquity and that the unworthy received Christ's body through the mouth.* And these claimed to be following Luther in holding to it. But this does not at all agree with his

* Westphal and his followers were not content with "vere" (true) and "substantialiter" (substantially) but they added "corporealiter" (corporeally), "dentaliter" (with the teeth), "gutturaliter" (through the throat) and "stomachaliter" (taken into the stomach).

earlier view, for then faith was the important element and was necessary. They followed Luther in his later views, as Melancthon and the Melancthonians followed his earlier views.

All this shows how far Luther got at last from his first position as given in the works that we have quoted. His controversy with Carlstadt led him as we have seen to react against these earlier views and his controversy with Zwingli and the Reformed led him more and more to react against the subjective view and to emphasize the "real presence" of Christ's body, as he calls it in the sacrament. His emphasis later, as at the Marburg Conference, was on "the Word" as used by the priest in the sentence "This is my body." In his growing emphasis on the power of the Word spoken at the Supper, he harks back to the magical idea of the Catholics, that those words "This is my body" performed the miracle of transubstantiation. We thus see that on the Lord's Supper, there was an different emphasis by the earlier and the later Luther. His earlier views would have largely harmonized with the Reformed for he emphasized the subjectivity of the sacrament, as did the Reformed. Very occasionally he speaks of the presence of Christ's body. And when Calvin later formulated the spiritual presence of Christ at the Supper, the only difference was that the Calvin made Christ's presence spiritual and Luther made it natural and material.

Now what is the significance of all this. It is that Luther in his early writings emphasized very much the subjective in faith. It is that the Reformed, and not the Lutheran, have continued what was the emphasis of Luther in his early works. The Reformed could have accepted Luther's first tract on the Supper (1519) except where he makes incidental reference to the prayers of the saints for us. But as far as the Lord's Supper is concerned, that tract is largely Reformed doctrine. Would that Luther had remained, where he stood at first, for then there would not have been the great and unfortunate division between the Lutherans and the Reformed.

And there is another significance about this. The reason why the Reformed later became victorious in large parts of Germany, as the Palatinate, Hesse, Anhalt, Lippe, Bremen, Northern Rhine, &c., was, that they continued the original Lutheranism. Where Lutheranism had not become polemic,

but had retained the original irenic spirit, there the Reformed doctrines found lodgment. We often say that the introduction of the Reformed doctrines into Germany was due to a reaction against the narrowness and bigotry of the later high Lutherans. But was it only a reaction? No, it was not only a reaction, it was a development. These low Lutherans felt the Reformed views were more nearly theirs of the early Lutheran Reformation than those of the high Lutherans. And so they accepted them. The significance of it all was this,—the Reformed continued Luther's earlier views in his emphasis on subjectivity in the sacrament. And the significance of it to us as Reformed and Presbyterians is that we are in the main propagating the original views of Luther. But we do not hold these views because they are Luther's; for the Reformed always refused to take any man's name as their own. But we do so because they are found in the New Testament and so have the authority of the Word of God behind them.

We have thus noticed the incompleteness of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper and we have seen how the Reformed have completed it in the Calvinistic doctrine of the spiritual presence of Christ at the Supper. We now pass on to take up another doctrine that Luther and the Lutherans left incomplete and that it remained for the Reformed to complete. It was no less a doctrine than the one that Luther said was the "standing or falling doctrine" of the Church,—the one that Luther and the Lutherans have always claimed to make central,—namely, justification by faith. One would think, from the emphasis they laid on it, that they had completed it, but they did not. And it remained for the Reformed to do so. Luther began teaching it and that was a great deal, but did not finish it. The Reformed went beyond him. Calvin virtually completed the doctrine. And this he did especially on two important points.*

The first of these additions to the Lutheran doctrine of justification is that the Lutheran doctrine did not lead to assur-

* For the suggestions of this subject I am indebted to Rev. Prof. A. Lang, D.D., of Halle, who delivered an address upon it at the meeting of the Reformed Alliance of Germany in 1913, and it was since published.

ance, the Reformed, did. Luther's lack of assurance is shown by the way in which he first laid hold of the doctrine. In his lectures on Romans 1515-1516, he is uncertain about salvation, although at times he has a belief in salvation by faith. Then he would fall back on works again. Even after he had come to justification by faith there is uncertainty. And this uncertainty at the beginning remained with him to some extent to the end. Thus he shows it in his Larger Catechism in the 6th petition, "Altho we obtain forgiveness of errors and peace of conscience, altho we have been cleansed in every way from sin, yet it is true in regard to our conduct, that today one stands, but tomorrow one falls." Luther followed Augustine very closely and Augustine with all his doctrine of election never rose up to full assurance, because he tried to tack his sacramentarianism on to it by means of baptism regeneration. Harnack says: "With all his horror of sin, Augustine had not experienced the horror of the uncertainty of salvation. Luther therefore thought that no one could be sure of salvation possessing assurance."

Luther never rose as did Calvin up to the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, which meant "once a saint, always a saint." The certainty that came from that idea, Luther did not have. He sought certainty in every way, especially in the objective gifts of God,—the Word and the sacraments. Very important to him was baptism. For by it, he thought God by an objective rite worked regeneration. And extremely important to him was the Lord's Supper, that pledge to him of forgiveness, because the body of Christ was in it, and the minister had said over it the magical words of institution. But these external rites could not produce absolute certainty of salvation. Luther held all the time to the idea of the strenuous life—the doing of everything possible in order to get assurance, yet never absolutely getting it. But the Reformed went farther. They had among their doctrines, one that gave them perfect assurance. It was the doctrine of election. They founded the assurance of faith not merely on an experience as did the Anabaptists, or on external rites (the sacraments and the Word) as did the Lutherans. But they founded it on the decree of God. They were in God's hand as clay in the hands of the potter. Election was sure, for with God nothing could

fail. Therefore they easily passed from justification to assurance, making assurance the last part of faith and so of justification. Now the doctrine of election is in these days not so popular as it once was; but it contains in it a truth that ought never to be forgotten, namely, that God, and not chance, is the foundation of everything. It may seem to some to be an over-emphasis on God. But that very emphasis on God gave it tremendous power and made it a tremendous comfort to God's people. They felt God could be implicitly trusted. What great saints this doctrine made. The Calvinists went into battle or persecution or death without fear, for they were "God's elect." And while the doctrine of election may be very much modified in our days, yet when the great truth that is in it is lost, namely, God's sovereignty and also his love, the world will be poorer and God's people more comfortless, for their great comfort of assurance is gone. It was this great doctrine of assurance of faith that has been the comfort of the Calvinist,—not the assurance of Wesleyanism that depends on feeling that may pass away, but the great assurance that we are God's because we are his elect. Historically therefore we say that the Reformed went beyond Luther in assurance in justification.

Then on another point the Reformed went beyond Luther on this doctrine. They ethicized justification, that is, they put into justification a moral element. It goes without saying that Calvin was the great Ethicist of the reformation. Though Calvin in his theology made so much of God's act in election, yet he demanded man's act in doing right. Here he also went beyond Luther. Luther in his intense opposition to justification by works so emphasized faith as to leave works out. He separated the doctrine of faith from what ought always to be connected with it, good works. He tended to place faith and works into juxtaposition with each other. He insisted on justification pure and simple. He did not place works at the beginning of justification as did the Catholics, nor did he place it at the end even by a synergism as did Melancthon. He was solafidian throughout, that it, by faith alone.

But with Calvin, justification always had in it an ethical element. Not that works saved us. In rejecting justification by works, he was at once with Luther. But while Luther said justification was by faith, Calvin said it was by God. They

meant the same thing, only Luther emphasized faith, and Calvin, God.

Again Luther most pronouncedly sets the law over against faith. Calvin did not set them over against each other, for faith included the law, that is, the observance of the law. He thus put an ethical element in faith. He was not so much afraid of works as Luther. He put them into the doctrine, not at the beginning as the Catholics, but at the end. Thus a man never could be justified if he were impure or unrighteous. There was an ethical necessity because faith was not complete without works. He thus did not separate faith and works as did Luther, but he put them together. Every act of justification implied an ethical element in it. It was just this ethical element that Calvin did not overlook in the doctrine. Calvin placed less value on subjective assurance, for he demanded the presence of good works as evidence of saving faith. The doctrine of the perseverance of the saints was not mere tenacity in holding on to God, but it was their consistent activities in the energies of the Christian life. This ethical peculiarity of the Reformed grew out of their doctrinal beliefs. They believed in election, but they believed that no man was elect unless his life as a whole was up to his election. They believed in justification, but it was not justification unless there was an ethical temper about the conversion.

On these two points therefore, on assurance and on the ethical, the Reformed went beyond the Lutherans on the subject of justification. They thus completed the Lutheran doctrine of justification.

Taking our whole subject together, Luther left matters incomplete on three points, cultus, doctrine and government. What a fortunate thing for the world and for Protestantism it was that the Reformed came in to complete what Luther began. Or putting it the other way, how unfortunate it would have been for the world and for Protestantism had the Reformation stopped with the Lutherans, and the Reformed side of the Reformation never had been born. The Reformation would have been like Ephraim "a cake not turned"—only half-baked. The influence of the Reformed side of the Reformation for purer worship, for higher morals, for better Church government would have been lost. It is therefore evident that much

as Lutheranism has done, a large part of the work of the Reformation was not Lutheran. And that part must not be forgotten in our glorification of Luther at this time. We rejoice in what Luther did, we admire his heroism. His failings are covered over by the greatness of his work, as ought to be the case with our judgment of each of the Reformers. But that does not blind us to the fact that if the Reformation had gone no farther than Lutheranism, there would have been a great loss to the Protestant world. If the worship of the Protestants had remained as in the early Lutheran Church of the Reformation, we would have altars and crucifixes in our Churches—the sign of the cross would be made at baptisms and in pronouncing the benediction. At the Lord's Supper there would be adoration of the elements. I am not speaking of the Lutheranism of today (which often under Reformed influence has sloughed off some of these Catholic superstitions).

Now such half measures never produced sturdiness of character. And that is what the Lutheran Reformation lacked often. We will give an illustration of the difference of this as between the Lutheran and the Reformed; and others might be given. In the days of the Reformation, there were two districts of the Palatinate. The larger part was the Lower Palatinate along the river Rhine whose capital was Heidelberg. The Upper Palatinate was several hundred miles to the south-east, whose capital was Amberg. The first named Palatinate was Reformed, the last named persistently refused to become Reformed and remained strictly Lutheran. Then what happened? In the awful Thirty Years' war in the early part of the seventeenth century, both Palatinates were overrun by the Catholic armies. When the war was over, there was no Lutheran Church in the Upper Palatinate, it had all gone clean over to the Catholics. But the Lower Palatinate was still Reformed and persistently refused during the war to become Catholic. It was easy for the Upper Palatinate to go back to Catholicism because there was so little difference in their rites. But the Reformed absolutely refused to do so. They were summoned before the city hall at Heidelberg and commanded to become Catholics. They declared they would give up their lands and emigrate elsewhere—yes, they would give up their lives; but they would not give up their Reformed faith.

CHAPTER II.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF ZWINGLI TO THE SPIRIT OF THE REFORMATION.*

There is what may be called a Spirit of the Reformation. This spirit of the Reformation differed from other ages. It differed from that of the Middle Ages before it. And it differed from the age after the Reformation and from the spirit of the present scientific age in which we live.

To this spirit of the Reformation, each nation and each Reformer made a contribution. The spirit of the Reformation is the combination of all these and more. Luther made his contribution to this Reformation spirit by his inspiration. So did Melancthon by his scholarship. Calvin contributed most to the permanent organization of the Reformation. Even the lesser Reformers as Beza and Viret and Lasco contributed their share. Tonight I take up the contribution that Zwingli made to this spirit of the Reformation.

Now before beginning this topic it will be necessary to clear the ground somewhat of things that all these Reformers held in common. Rev. Dr. Schaff has stated in his histories that there were three great Reformation doctrines, the supremacy of Scripture and justification by faith; and he later added, after he had gotten out from Mercersburg Theology, the priesthood of all believers. Now the first and last of these were peculiarities of both the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. Both Luther and Zwingli held to the authority of the Scriptures and the priesthood of all believers. The doctrine of justification was pre-eminently a Lutheran doctrine; and so of it we need not speak just now. But we can set aside these Reformation peculiarities that were common to all and take up the things

* This Chapter is an address delivered before the Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States, October 17, 1916. We have left it unchanged, which will explain why it repeats certain thoughts in the rest of this work.

in which Zwingli made his peculiar contribution to the spirit of the Reformation.

1. The first contribution he made was that he stands out as the *Political Reformer*. Have you ever noticed that he was a political Reformer before he became a religious Reformer. In his early ministry, in his first charge at Glarus, he already began opposing the foreign mercenary service of the Swiss soldiers who were fighting for other lands. This subject was forced upon him by the evils that came out of it in his own parish, for he had a habit of talking out on the evils of the day. It was his attacks on this foreign service that compelled him to leave Glarus, as the military party in his congregation began making things unpleasant for him. We thus see that his political activity came out early. And when later he became pastor at Zurich he pursued the same policy unflinchingly. It was through his efforts, his almost superhuman efforts (and this is often forgotten by those who study his life), that Zurich gave up sending its citizens away as soldiers. The difficulty of this act is shown by the fact that the other states of Switzerland favored doing so. Zurich stood alone for a while and all because of Zwingli.

Now Luther on this point is Zwingli's antipodes. He absolutely refused to countenance the use of the secular power by the Church. He held to the purely spiritual view of the Church, which meant that God would take care of his Church and the states should take care of themselves politically. Thus, especially over against Luther, Zwingli stands out as the great Political Reformer.

For this he has been most severely criticized. The Church histories have been full of this criticism. But we of the Reformed should remember that some part of this criticism has as its basis a narrow Lutheran bias which I am glad to say some Lutherans do not have. And this prejudice against Zwingli thus cultivated, has been helped on here by the spirit of America. For we in the United States have so strongly emphasized the separation of Church and state that any political activity has seemed objectionable to many.

Your speaker would however like to interpose a caveat just here about this. He is suspicious that if you or I were in the same position as Zwingli was in the Reformation, we would

probably do the same thing, or at least something very much like it. I suppose I am historically heretical for saying this. But for the fads of Church historians I pay little respect. What I want is truth. What I mean is that Zwingli has been over-criticized for his political activity. Remember that he lived in a republic. He had no power over him as Luther had in his prince, the Elector of Saxony, to attend to his politics for him. He was a prince himself as was every other citizen of a republic like Switzerland. Much of his political activity was due to the fact that he lived in a republic, while Luther lived in a monarchy. Then remember also too that Zurich was isolated from the other cantons politically for several years and just because through Zwingli she had become Protestant. It was an awful isolation. The Swiss diet was mainly Catholic and so against her. Nothing held that diet back from sending far larger armies than her's into her territory, except that some of the larger cantons as Basle, Bern and Schaffhausen were wavering because they were slowly becoming Reformed. Zurich was alone. Like her Lord, she was treading the wine-press alone. She had no friend in all the world at that time if the Catholic armies came against her. She was more fearfully isolated than ever Luther had been. She had not like Luther some prince to steal her away and hide her for a time in the Wartburg. Zurich stood alone, like Athanasius in the fourth century. "contra mundum," "Athanasius against the world." Now at such a crisis, when the life or death of a state is at stake, every man, especially in a republic, becomes a statesman. And so Zwingli became a political leader there. And especially so because the political situation was produced by his religious reforms. His opponents have triumphantly replied, "Yes, look at his death. His defeat and death at Cappel were a judgment on him for his entering into politics." And they quote triumphantly the saying of our Lord that "all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Not quite so fast, my friend. It needs to be remembered that our Lord also said that he "came not to send peace, but a sword." And remember also that those political leagues would have come anyhow. They lie in the genius of the Catholic Church which is one of the most political of powers. Remember too this special fact that the particular political policy that led to the death and

defeat of Zwingli was caused by Bern and not by Zurich. Zwingli had protested against it, yes, preached against it. And then Bern left Zurich in the lurch. So that his death was not a judgment on himself.

Perhaps this whole subject of political activity may be illuminated by what happened the next century. Has it ever occurred to you that there would probably never have been that awful Thirty Years' war, had Zwingli's plans for a political federation of Protestants been carried out. At least the Protestants would not have suffered as they did. If the Catholic powers had known that a strong and united political league of Protestants were ready to meet them in 1618 they would not have entered that war, out of which they came, even with such weak opposition by the Protestants, with such ignominy. Now what took place thus in that 17th century, Zwingli foresaw. And this led him to prepare for it, first by forming a league of the Protestant states of Switzerland and then with Strassburg and Hesse. It was simply a case of preparedness as we call it now. Permit me also to carry you a century farther. About 1688 the Catholics were ready to make a similar onslaught on the Protestants as they had made in 1618. They had a leader in Louis XIV. This is shown by their attitude. Louis XIV had ordered out of his land 500,000 Protestants. The Palatinate was overrun by the French. The Catholic powers were determined to win England back. But a little political event checked it all at the beginning. The Catholics were defeated at the battle of the Boyne. That put a quietus on their preparations all over Europe. They found that the Protestants were prepared Zwingli's political efforts were justifiable. His policy was one of preparedness, about which we hear so much now.

The practical lesson that can be drawn from this peculiarity of Zwingli is that the Church has a sphere in political life. We are not here referring to partisan politics. But whenever politics touch morals, the Church has a right to speak out, to take proper measures and to do that as quickly as possible before the forces of evil become entrenched. For she is the conservator of the morals of the nation. What Zwingli did here was even more accentuated by Calvin, who was the great municipal Reformer. He never waited for some circumlocutory route as some do now by which to denounce and crush evil.

Both Reformers went at the subject directly. And though our Church here is not so directly related to the state as was theirs, yet its duty is no less necessary; for the question has then become not one of politics but of morals. How the old Hebrew prophets spoke out on political questions. This emphasis of separation of Church and state forgets also to note a fact that while Church and state have different spheres, they have never entirely separated. Each enters the other's sphere, the state in the case of legal action: the Church in the case of moral action. Zwingli and Calvin are strong examples for the Reformed to take active part in all the great moral and social questions of the day. But Zwingli differed somewhat from Calvin here. Zwingli's activity was political as between states; Calvin's concerned his own city. Zwingli stands out for the activity of the Church in international relations. He is therefore the prophet and herald of the great movement born in our day and so greatly emphasized by this awful war, that the Golden Rule must not only be observed within nations, but between them. And it is the duty of the Church to speak in trumpet tones on this subject. Zwingli thus becomes the prophet of the "League of Nations to enforce Peace," of which we hear so much now. He like Erasmus was an ardent advocate of peace but he also believed in thorough preparedness for war. Zwingli thus assumes a new importance in the light of present events. The great political Reformer was the harbinger of these great international Reforms, in which the Church must nobly bear her part if they are ever to be carried through successfully—of that millennial day

"When the war drums beat no longer and the battle
flags are furled,
In the parliament of man, the federation of the
world."

2. The second contribution that Zwingli made to the spirit of the Reformation was that he was the *Humanistic or Intellectual Reformer*. Far be it from me to say that the other Reformations and other Reformers were not intellectual. They were. Luther was able, Melancthon, brilliant, Calvin, brainiest of all and yet also the most practical. But Zwingli brought a peculiar intellectual influence into the Reformation. This was

due to his humanism. Luther was the monk-Reformer, Zwingli the humanist-Reformer. The more I study Luther's life, the more I realize the limitations placed imposed on him by his early monkhood and the more I realize the broader, clearer spirit of Zwingli.

For Zwingli gained three great peculiarities from humanism. The first was as to the method of thought,—thoroughness. Humanism taught that it was necessary to go back to the sources and so went back to the Bible. The second was as to the expression of thought. Humanism taught clearness of expression over against the verbosity of language due to the hair-splittings of the scholastic theology. Perhaps a third ought also be added, namely, breadth of sympathy. Zwingli was the broadest of the Reformers. All this gave an intellectual aspect to the Zwinglian Reformation, over against the early Lutheran.

Now this prominence of the intellect was greatly needed at the time of the Reformation. For the Romanism of the Middle Ages had checked, yes, prostituted, the intellect. The Renaissance and humanism had been but the bursting of the coffin in which the Middle Ages had been trying to entomb the intellect. The Catholic Church by its doctrine of "fides implicita" (implicit faith) had served notice on the intellect that the Church could get along without it. And that Church by its doctrine of transubstantiation had virtually mocked at the intellect, by requiring it to believe in the Lord's Supper what three of our senses said was not so. It was time that the intellect should come to its own again. Humanism came to awaken it. And the Reformed Church then came to properly safeguard it in its rights. And so humanism and Zwingli made the intellect prominent. The result was that in that Reformation age, the Reformed emphasized education and everywhere founded universities and schools, more so in the Reformation than the Lutherans. I need but to refer to Herborn, Marburg and the three Dutch universities and the schools in France and Hungary. The Lutherans have later been catching up until they too have a splendid set of institutions.

But our Lutheran brethren, just because Zwingli gave the intellect its rights, have been charging us with rationalism. Our reply is that we are rational but not rationalistic. Zwingli was as orthodox as Luther on the great fundamentals of faith or

they never would have agreed as they did on all the 15 Articles at Marburg except the one on the Lord's Supper. The Reformed, like the Lutherans, grant much to faith, yet they believe that the rights of the reason must be respected. Their doctrine of the Lord's Supper is more rational. They believe as Scripture says that we must ever be ready to give a *reason* for the hope that is within us. Reason must never be hidden by mysticism, as was done by Luther at Marburg when the only answer he was able to give to Zwingli's argument on the Lord's Supper was to point to the words "This is my body" written in chalk on the table. The Lutheran Church has emphasized the mystical especially in the Lord's Supper, and we, the rational. And both should be combined and neither forgotten.

But while Zwingli made his important contribution of intellectualism to the spirit of the Reformation so needed then amid the superstitions of Rome, this intellectualism must never be placed over against the Bible and revelation as Rationalism does. To do so is to depart from the spirit of Zwingli. One of the most impressive and pathetic scenes occurred just a century ago at Zurich when, in the 300th Anniversary of the Reformation, old Antistes Hess, the head of the Church, over eighty years of age and tottering over the grave, seemed to renew his youth as he preached the Anniversary sermon and as Zwingli's successor declared that he was a Biblicist and not a rationalist and his successors in the Church should be like him.

3. I have time to refer to but one more contribution that Zwingli made to the spirit of the Reformation. And this has not been emphasized enough by the German Church historians because they have been so prevailingly Lutheran. They have looked at everything through Lutheran eyes. It is strange how Church historians will follow fads. And if one of them makes a mistake, those who come after him are apt to follow him blindly like sheep. For instance, Prof. Phillip Schaff, D.D., brought over with him from Germany the idea that there were two principles in the Reformation, the material principle which was justification by faith, and the formal which was the Scriptures. Is it not time that we correct this old worn-out, hind-most statement? We, with our practical minds today,

would put it the other way. It is the Bible that gives us the material, and justification is the form by which we work up that material. If justification is the material principle as they say, where does it get its material from, if not from the Bible? And where would the Bible get its formal principle, if justification were, as they say, the material; for there is little of justification in the Bible compared with other doctrines.

Well, take another fad of Church history. The great doctrine of the Reformation has been stated to be justification by faith. So it was for the Lutherans. But German Church historians (most of them Lutheran) have therefore presumed that that was true of the rest of the Reformation. This view has blinded their vision so that they have not recognized that Zwingli approached Protestantism from a different perspective. It is true, he believed in justification by faith. But it does not bulk so largely in his works. What was his peculiarity as a Reformer? Well, he held as did Luther to the Authority of Scripture. So that was not peculiar to him. But then he goes on to say that he got from his great teacher, Prof. Thomas Wyttenbach, at Basle, another fundamental thought. It was the Ransom of Christ. He states it in different ways, but it is always the same doctrine. "Christ is the sole Mediator, and therefore the Virgin and the saints are not needed." Or he states in that Christ died "once for all." But it is always the same doctrine,—Christ's finished work. Thus Bullinger in his history says, "He preached the Gospel with all diligence also at Einsiedeln and especially taught that Christ was the only Mediator and that Mary the Virgin and Mother of God should not be prayed to and worshipped." The third great peculiarity of Zwingli was that he stands out as the *Redemptive Reformer*.

Zwingli therefore had a different doctrine from Luther and yet not so different. These two doctrines of atonement and justification are related as indeed are all the doctrines of the Bible. For there may be said to be *three types* of the doctrine of justification: one, the metaphysical, which puts the justification back in the mind of God through election, the second, which is redemptive, placed it at the cross of Christ, and the third, which was experimental, placed it in connection with faith and works at conversion. Now the old Calvinists emphasized the first, and the Lutherans, the last. But Zwingli emphasized the

second. The redemptive element is present with him both in justification and in everything else. In fact as these doctrines are related, it is interesting to note that in this doctrine of justification Zwingli went deeper than Luther. He went down to the root of it, which was the atonement, while Luther looked only at the result—what we ordinarily mean by justification. For you can't have justification without the atonement, but you can have the atonement without justification. Yet while they are alike they are different. Of the two Christ's atonement is the greater doctrine.

And so the third great contribution that Zwingli made to the spirit of the Reformation was the great *Redemptive* element. It was the emphasis on Christ's death. And it was a great contribution then, for the Romish Church had made more of the judgment day than of Calvary, and more of the crucifix than of the Crucified.

So as this Reformation anniversary comes again, let us preach again the doctrine of Christ's atonement. Some of you perhaps do not believe it in the traditional sense that all believed it in the early Reformation and as Zwingli did, though to me his substitutionary atonement is the most precious of all comforts. But whether you believe it or not, historically that is how he began his Reformation. Some find the modern sociological altruistic explanation satisfactory,—that Christ's redemption is only sympathetic. Well preach it that way if you can't the other way. I prefer the old substitutionary atonement. But whatever you do, preach the atonement as one of the great doctrines of the Reformation. For that doctrine of infinite sympathy and love is the magnet that will draw the world to Christ. O that we might preach it with new power this Reformation year.

When time seems short and death is near,
 And I am pres't by doubt and fear,
 And sins, an overflowing tide,
 Assail my peace on every side,
 This thought my refuge still shall be,
 I know my Savior died for me.

His name is Jesus, and he died

For guilty sinners crucified ;
Content to die that he might win
Their ransom from the death of sin,
No sinner worse than I can be,
Therefore I know he died for me.

If grace were bought, I could not buy ;
If grace were coined, no wealth have I ;
By grace alone I draw my breath,
Held up from everlasting death.
Yet since I know that grace is free,
I know my Savior died for me.

I read God's holy word and find
Great truths that far transcend my mind,
And little do I know beside
Of thoughts so high, so deep and wide ;
This is my best theology,
I know my Savior died for me.

My faith is weak, but 'tis thy gift ;
Thou canst my helpless soul uplift,
And say, "Thy bonds of death are riven,
Thy sins by me are all forgiven,
And thou shalt live from guilt set free,
For I, thy Savior, died for thee."

—*Rev. Dr. Bethune.*

CHAPTER III.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE REFORMED SIDE OF THE REFORMATION TO THE SPIRIT OF PROTESTANTISM.

We have just spoken of the Spirit of the Reformation in the last chapter. But there is also a Spirit of Protestantism. Between these two there is this difference. The spirit of the Reformation was the spirit of the sixteenth century. The spirit of Protestantism is larger, for it takes in also the spirit of the three centuries since the Reformation. It may be called the twentieth century spirit. Take as an illustration of the difference, the growth of republics. Calvin in the Reformation at Geneva had a republic but it was an aristocratic one, an oligarchy. But the last three centuries have developed out of that great republics that are democracies. The spirit of Protestantism is therefore larger than that of the Reformation. And this spirit of Protestantism needs to be also considered in connection with the anniversary and that very carefully.

Each part of the Reformation gave its own peculiar contribution to Protestantism. All Protestants agreed on the supremacy of the Bible and the priesthood of all believers. The Lutherans emphasized justification by faith, the Reformed, the finished atonement of Christ. The Anabaptists gave their contribution in their emphasis on Church discipline and personal independence. Both the Lutherans and the Reformed emphasized education and produced a better idea of exegesis of Scripture than the Catholics.

Turning from these general different contributions to the spirit of Protestantism, we come to speak of the special contribution of the Reformed. And we mention

I, Liberty. Zwingli and Calvin are both very interesting characters to Americans because like us they were citizens of a republic. Anabaptism also emphasized liberty but it never resulted in permanent results, due to its extreme individualism. But the Reformed Church built up, according to historians as Ranke and Motley, great republics in Switzerland and the

United States and monarchies that are virtually republics as England and Holland. Even France, which so cruelly cast out the Calvinists at the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), has been compelled to accept Calvin's form of civil government and become a republic. It was the Genevan Bible that produced the Commonwealth in England. Civil and religious liberty have followed in the wake of Calvinism. Now Lutheranism has no such history to show. Her lands, Germany and Scandinavia, have produced no republics, although in this country the Lutherans have become strong adherents to our principles of liberty.

Now the cause of all this is not far to seek. There has always been an intimate relation between the government of the Church and that of the state. The Church is apt to reflect the government of the state and vice versa. Calvinistic Church government was more democratic than Lutheranism. Thus in the Lutheran Church, the prince was the head of the Church. That prince appointed consistories to rule the Church. These consistories were composed of ministers and laymen, but they held office only at the will of the prince. The prince also appointed superintendents. The appointment and the authority given to these came from the prince and not from the Church. But it was not so with the Reformed. Here the Church gave the authority. The people elected their pastors, and the congregations elected their elders and deacons. Each congregation was in itself a virtual republic. The Reformed, having thus learned to rule the Church, were able to rule the state, for they had learned in the congregation how to do it. King James I of England was right when he said that "Royalty and presbytery go not well together." He scented the battle from afar. The Reformed Church produced a class of people who were trained to rule themselves. They therefore held that they could call even king and rulers to account, if they were not ruling rightly and in the fear of God. This overthrew any "divine right of kings." It meant "the divine right of the people" to rule. Indeed they so learned to rule that they did not absolutely need kings and princes at all. And thus out of this republic in the congregation grew up the great national republics.

Now this was a remarkable and unexpected peculiarity

of the Reformed. Calvin, whether rightly or wrongly it is not the place here to discuss, has been greatly vilified for the execution of Servetus. And yet it was Calvin's successors who won for the world civil and religious liberty. Notice another unexpected and remarkable result. Calvinism has been declared to be the grave of man's free will because of its doctrine of election. And yet it was this very doctrine of election that has given the world the greatest number of men of free wills for producing liberty.

There is a twilight dawning on the world,
The herald of a full and perfect day,
When liberty's wide flag shall be unfurled,
And kings shall bow to her superior sway.

How priceless the boon of liberty is, it is impossible to describe. It is the most colossal, yes, celestial, of the gifts to man. And in the making of that liberty, the Reformed Churches have made the largest contribution and for it they can justly be proud.

2. The second great contribution of the Reformed to the spirit of Protestantism has been its Ethics. That Protestantism has a peculiar ethical quality and that its ethics are higher than Catholicism needs no proof because self-evident. But what gave to Protestantism its peculiar ethical quality? It was undoubtedly Calvinism. Now in saying this we do not wish to discredit the ethics of the Lutheran Church. For she too has taught ethics and her ethics were higher and brighter than those of the Catholics. But she has not emphasized ethics as strongly as the Reformed. The ethics of Protestantism have come mainly out of the Reformed.

To prove this we will give several historical examples. In the Reformation, why was it that the Hussites, who originally fraternized with Luther and the Lutherans, left them and went over to the Reformed side in the later Reformation? It was because Luther refused to introduce Church discipline, which with them was a matter of conscience. They therefore complained of the laxity of discipline in both the Churches and universities of the Lutherans. Now on the other side we see John Calvin as the great ethical Reformer of the Reformation.

His reforms at Geneva were undoubtedly severe but they made Geneva the "model city" of that age. Even Prof. Andrea, of Tübingen, one of the leaders of the Lutheran Church, was compelled to bear witness when on a visit to Geneva, that Lutheranism had no such city as that.

And what occurred in the Reformation has been the peculiarity of the Reformed ever since. Their ethical standards were higher. The Lutherans also taught ethics, but Prof. Schweitzer has proved in his able articles in the *Studien und Kritiken* many years ago, that as far as ethics was concerned, Protestantism had to depend mainly on the Reformed. They might be called Puritans and be laughed at by the world for their narrowness and bigotry, but as Puritans they were pure—pure in life. Take as an example the city of Bremen in northern Germany. Bremen became Reformed in the later Reformation. All around her except on the north, where was the sea, were Lutheran lands. But under the regulations due to Reformed influence in the city, the morals of Bremen were higher than those of the surrounding countries. And this was true up to the days of Church Union a century ago. Other examples might be given. But these are enough to show that the spirit of Protestantism that is ethical has come mainly out of the Reformed Church. The great moral uplift of the world that came through Protestantism was mainly due to the Reformed.

And today it is this ethical chord vibrating in Protestantism that needs to be recognized and heard. In these days when altruism and service—those higher ethical ideals in morality—are being stressed, where do these elements come from? They are here because of the Reformed. And the Reformed should be especially active in every department of reform, for they are but carrying out the spirit of the Reformation in doing so. In this day when men are demanding that the moral law and the golden rule be applied not only to city, state and nation but also to international relations, it is for the Calvinists to rise up and support these movements, for they come out of their fathers.

3. A third contribution that the Reformed have made to the spirit of Protestantism has been Pietism. This is an emphasis on experimental religion and tends to produce the great practical activities of the Church. For wherever there is pietism, there missions and charities abound. The pietism of Protes-

tantism came out of the Reformed Church. But we suppose we will be at once challenged by the Lutherans, who at once declare that the great Pietist of Germany was a Lutheran, Spener. But we place opposite German pietism as equally important in history the Puritanism of England, for Puritanism was at heart pietism. And we add to that the Puritanism of Holland. What great pietists they had in Holland in Prof. Voet and Lodenstein. All the pietists in the world do not come out of Germany. Nor was Spener's pietism the only pietism that was in Germany, for there was also a Reformed pietism there. There is also such a thing as a world-wide pietism, and in it the Reformed played the larger part. But let us pause a moment. Where did Spener get his pietism? He got it from the Reformed. It was the preaching of Labadie, the eloquent preacher of the Reformed Church of Geneva and the successor of Calvin, that led Spener to become a pietist. When Spener heard Labadie at Geneva, Labadie was not yet a separatist. He was a pietist within the Church, because Calvin had emphasized that, and Calvin had gotten it from Zwingli and his prophesyings at Zurich. And where for instance did Spener get his idea of prayer-meetings that he first introduced into Frankford? From the Reformed, who had always had the "ecclesiola in ecclesia" in the Church. And it was those prayer-meetings that gave permanence to Lutheran pietism. Why, Lutheran pietism would have been crushed in Germany but for the Reformed, who saved it to the Lutherans. When Spener was driven out of Saxony because of the persecutions of the orthodox Lutherans, where could he have gone, had not a Reformed prince, the Elector of Brandenburg, received him into his realm. Yes, the Elector did more. He founded for him and his school of Lutherans a university, the university of Halle, where they might be able to perpetuate themselves. Lutheran pietism in Germany owes its origin and permanence to the Reformed. It really looks as if the remark of Rev. H. J. Ruetenik, D.D., made to the writer many years ago is true. "Pietism," he said, "is germane to the Reformed Church but not to the Lutheran, to which it came, from the outside,—from the Reformed." Prof. Ebrard also says the same: "In the Lutheran Church, there lay no new birth at the basis of theology as there did in the Reformed, which led to personal

experience." Iken says: "We must consider pietism as an integral part of Reformed Church history." The pietists were not a *party* in the Reformed Church as in the Lutheran but a *part* of her inmost life and history.

Both the Lutherans and the Reformed emphasize the mystical. But with the Lutherans it was the mystical in the sacrament, with the Reformed the mystical in every relation of life. Perhaps the best illustration of pietism in the Reformed Church is found in the Heidelberg Catechism, its first answer, "What is thy only comfort in life and death? That I with body and soul am not my own but belong to my faithful Savior Jesus Christ." Its emphasis on personal experience is the finest flower in the garden of religious instruction in the Church. Therefore the richness of personal experience, which is so prominent a feature of Protestantism over against the mechanical and ceremonial of the Catholic Church, is due mainly to the Reformed.

And when we turn to the fruits of pietism in the missions and charities of the Church, the same thing is true. Lutheranism has done much for missions and has had some great missionaries, but the Reformed have done more. The Reformed sent out the first missionaries as to Brazil in 1557. And the Reformed entered the field of world-missions before the Lutherans. How they labored amid great difficulties in the East Indies in the seventeenth century when the Lutheran Church rejected missions so that Baron Von Welz had to go himself to South America (as no one else would go) and die for missions. The Lutheran Church, it is true, woke up in the eighteenth century and is now doing a great work. And as to other charities, we suppose no land is as full of them as Reformed Holland—the product of the Church. In the Dutch Churches the first of the three collections taken at each service always goes to the poor. As a result there are more charities in Holland than there are poor to fill them. But further proof is unnecessary, for in Germany it is a common saying that the Lutherans emphasize the passive and the Reformed emphasize the active.

And if we were to do as they do in Germany, count all Protestants who are not Lutheran as Reformed, the balance would be still heavier on the side of the Reformed. For there

they throw the Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, etc., in with the Reformed. And there is a truth in this. These other denominations are the outgrowth directly or indirectly of the Reformed. Congregationalism certainly came out of English Puritanism. Methodism is, for it came out of the Anglican Church, which in the Reformation had for its name the "Reformed Church of England," and whose priests today take oath to the Reformed Church of England. And as for the Baptists, they claim to come from the Anabaptists of the Reformation, but the relation is largely in the similarity of the names, Anabaptist and Baptist. For historically the first Baptist congregation came out of the Congregationalists in Britain in the seventeenth century, according to Prof. Whitsitt, late professor of the Baptist Church. If we therefore follow the German method and count all these as Reformed, it outweighs the Lutherans very greatly. The great religious activity of our present Protestant Church has undoubtedly come largely from the Reformed.

4. Education. The Reformed were always the leaders in Education. Here too the Lutheran Church has a splendid record. Protestantism always stands for the school as well as the Church, and in these educational movements the Reformed have had a large share. In the Reformation she founded the university of Herborn in Germany, three universities in Holland led by Leyden, the Carolinum at Zurich and the theological schools at Bern, Geneva and Lausanne, out of which grew the present universities. In France and Hungary she founded celebrated schools as Sedan and Debreczin. And the Reformed have ever kept in the van of education. And they not merely founded universities for the rich; but it was a Reformed pedagogue, Pestalozzi, who made education possible for all, even the poor; and thus laid the foundation for our modern universal education. They were also leaders in the founding of schools for girls. Thus the Reformed Church has had an enviable record in this greatest of all movements next to the Church.

5. Capitalism. A recent and interesting attempt has been made in Germany by Prof. Max Weber, of Heidelberg university, to show that capitalism also came from Calvinism. Prof. Weber's views have been finely summarized in the Con-

temporary Review for June and July, 1910, by Prof. Forsyth, from which I quote freely.

“By capitalism is not meant what we today mean by the capitalist over against labor. But capitalism means the system of the growth and the use of capital that has made the modern world.”

We must confess that when we first heard the proposition advanced that capitalism was the product of Calvinism, we shook our heads. Calvinism has already had enough sins charged to its account without having any more added. But we were somewhat relieved when we found that capitalism and not the modern capitalist was meant. We were somewhat surprised at the source of this suggestion, for it is not usual for an economist to praise a theologian or for the land of Luther to laud Calvin. But the more we considered it, the more we believed that there was a great truth in it. Calvinism, which was aiming to be a religious movement, has become a great economic force. Just as modern missions, intended to be only spiritual, has become a mighty world-wide sociological uplift, so it has been with Calvinism. And if Calvinism has produced liberty as we have seen, why should it not produce as great a boon in world-wide commercial supremacy?

For the facts of history seem to bear out the proposition of Prof. Weber. At and after the Reformation, when the Catholics drove out the Reformed, the latter found refuge in England, Holland, Switzerland and Brandenburg, now Prussia. They were largely of the great middle class and were mainly artisans. Great trades were built up by them in these lands. France found that she had impoverished herself to build up the nations that were her enemies. The countries that received these refugees prospered greatly. First Holland captured the commerce, and then England. Prussia owes her present position at the head of Germany largely to the coming of these refugees. Antwerp took the trade from the French ports. Spanish commerce on the other hand went down and decayed. Thus these refugees developed their business until, as Prof. Weber says, we have the mighty world movement of commercialism. For Calvinism gave that liberty that enabled capital and industry to develop and it also gave it the protection it needed to advance. Hence the genius of capitalism with its

free initiative and bold enterprise arose.

Prof. Weber also suggests a reason why all this grew out of the Reformed. He says:

“It is wrong to identify the genius of capitalism with the trades of capitalists. The genius of capitalism is not mere acquisition or greed,—the passion of getting and keeping. It has a normal power. It is the passion of production and enterprise—the passion of work that spends little on itself but delights to get at nature and use it for God. Calvinism transfigured work. It changed the mediaeval idea that work was a necessary evil and a mere means of living and made it the engine of God’s glory in the world. Our calling was not as with Luther, a sphere of modest accommodation to our station (Lutheranism), nor on the other hand a means of getting on (Secularism), but it was a problem to be solved, a book to be opened, an opportunity of doing something on an eternal scale with spirit and zest to the glory of God. It had an inward nisus that Lutheranism had not. Its ideal was not that of pious repose, but a life energy. Accept the evil situation, said Luther, may God mend all. Nay, said Calvin, but we must help him to mend all. Life’s work then becomes not a poor broken fragment, but the confident expression of an elect destiny. Our vocation is not an acquiescence but a conquest. Faith is not mere reliance but an energy. The leading idea of Calvinism is not compliance but action,—all under obedience to God. It not merely changed the heart of the world but the face of it. Put into the language of economics, this was ethical while it accumulated wealth. It opposed luxury and the careless enjoyment of what it owned. It cared more for work than enjoyment. It recognized stewardship rather than ownership. It discouraged consumption and developed production. It released production from the fetters of a traditionalist ethic or an egotistic enjoyment, especially in the matter of interest on money where Calvin took a position so enlightened compared with Luther’s traditional ethics. It was the ethic of a large and sacred utilitarianism.”

He thus speaks beautifully of the ethical character so common to all of Calvin’s influence—even in money-getting. He says:

“Calvin’s ethics branded the mere passion of possession as covetousness and mammonism. The spring of industry was the Christian passion of energy and world-mastery for the enhancement of the Christian passion, God’s kingdom and glory. Its final regard was to the will of God.”

But this great economist closes with a warning. He says:

“We come to the end of our age. We face another than a stage of capitalism. Capitalism has done its great and indispensable work in leading the social evolution. Capitalism now announces its own end in becoming dethroned in a plutocracy. And in becoming a plutocracy it has thrown aside the control of religion and warned it off of the economic sphere. Does labor promise to allow it a place any more effective? That is hard to answer. But no one will deny that alongside the element of labor in the economic sphere, there has arisen another principle in the religious,—the passion for souls,—a new respect for manhood in the sense of moral personality. We have seen that the Calvinistic ethic approached the world with a belief in its resources, in their destiny to be developed for the glory of God and in the duty of the elect above all others so to use them. This gave a tremendous religious impulse to the exploitation of the world by the most powerful characters.”

Prof. Weber in all this has given to us a very interesting discovery in history. His statements of the way in which Calvinism puts morals into business is unique, but true. We remember the couplet that has ever been associated with the Huguenots as describing their characteristics:

“Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control.
These alone lead to sovereign power.”

We also remember the illustration that is told of one of the noble family of Prussia after the Huguenot refugees had come there. The Elector of Brandenburg one day surprised his wife, the beautiful Electress Louisa Henrietta, in the act of giving some of the crown jewels into the hands of a stranger. In astonishment he asked her who the man was. She replied, “I do not know his name, but I know he is a Huguenot.” That was enough. A Huguenot’s word was as good as a bond. And there were no better specimens of Calvinism than those Huguenots. Prof. Weber’s warning against plutocracy is quite significant, but we believe that Calvinism will adjust itself to the demands of this new age with its controversy between capital and labor, because, as he says, it so emphasized the idea of stewardship rather than ownership. Calvinism can yet be a mighty power in the world by putting back of the Golden Rule, which is the motto of all Christians, the will and power of God’s sovereignty and God’s love, which have ever been the two pillars of Redemptive Calvinism.

APPENDIX

TOPICS SUITABLE FOR REFORMATION SERMONS OR ADDRESSES

1. GREAT CHARACTERS AMONG THE REFORMERS (their life, work, influence and example).

Lefevre, Zwingli,* Luther, Melancthon, Ecolampadius,* Haller,* Leo Juda,* Vadian,* Bullinger,* Bibliander (the Missionary Reformer),† Farel,* Calvin,* Viret,* Beza,* Bucer,* Lasco,* Ursinus* and Olevianus,* Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, Hamilton,* Wishart* and Knoz.*

2. PREPARATION FOR THE REFORMATION.

Erasmus, Lefevre, Brethren of Common Life, Reformers before the Reformation (Wyckliffe, Huss and Savonarola), Renaissance and Reformation.

3. GREAT LAYMEN OF THE REFORMATION.

Vadian (the Reformer of St. Gall),* Admiral Coligny, Prince William of Orange,* Elector Frederick III of the Palatinate,* Elector Frederick of Saxony, Landgrave Phillip of Hesse.

4. RELATIONS OF THE REFORMATION.

The Reformation and History (the Reformation, a World-wide Movement), The Reformation and Economics (or Society), The Reformation and Politics, The Reformation and Art, The Reformation and Literature, The Reformation and Science, The Reformation and Geography, The Reformation and Missions.†

5. GENERAL.

Lessons of the Reformation for our time, The sixteenth century and the twentieth century,—a contrast and a likeness, Great Prayers of the Reformation, Great Workers of the Reformation, Great Martyrs of the Reformation, The Gospel of the Reformation (four doctrines, Authority of Bible, Priesthood of all believers, Justification by faith (Luther), Ransom of Christ (Zwingli)), The Spirit of the Reformation (revival, self-denial, conscientiousness, activity, etc.), Symbols and Mottoes of the Reformation.‡

6. RESULTS OF THE REFORMATION.

Liberty (civil), liberty (religious), education, experimental religion, world-wide missions, world-wide business.

* See "Famous Reformers of the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches," by the author of this pamphlet.

† See "Outlook of Missions," December, 1916, and later numbers.

‡ See "Historical Decorations," by Rev. H. C. McCook, D.D. It can be gotten from the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pa.

All these books can be ordered of the Reformed Publication Board, Philadelphia, Pa., or the Central Publishing House, Cleveland, O.

BW1842 G643
The Reformed reformation

Princeton Theological Seminary Speer Library



1 1012 00030 5310