

alike, whether men oppose or aid. It filled him, he says, with religious awe in the contemplation. If we succeed in our war for liberty and union, new power will be added, even our enemies being judges, to the great democratic movement of the ages.

Is it not time for us to look upon this great movement in its ultimate relations to the kingdom of God, and more clearly to conceive what the coming of that kingdom implies?

It is God who is to reign. God is to be king over all the earth. The theory of a divine reign through hierarchies, leaving the people ignorant and passive, has had its full trial. The reign of God through free, intelligent, regenerated people, is to have its day. Is it not time thoroughly to understand the conditions of this great problem?

ARTICLE VI.

GEORGE CALIXTUS.¹

BY CHARLES M. MEAD, M.A., BERLIN, PRUSSIA.

THE first half of the seventeenth century was a period fruitful of abiding influence on the succeeding condition of Germany. The treaty of 1555, which conceded to the several states the management of their own ecclesiastical affairs — a concession of which the Protestants did, but the Roman Catholics did not, avail themselves — secured, indeed,

¹ The materials of this Article are taken from "George Calixtus und seine Zeit," by Professor Henke, of Marburg, Hessen-Cassel. In this work, consisting of two octavo volumes, the subject is presented with a master's hand, a view being given not only of Calixtus's life and labors, but also, as fully as the nature of the work admits, of the general political and ecclesiastical condition of Germany, particularly of Brunswick, during the period treated of. Without attempting any further analysis or criticism of Henke's work, we avail ourselves of it in composing the following sketch.

a temporary quiet; but the storm was only postponed, not averted. The immediate danger of a violent struggle between the two sections of the church passed away; but Germany lost in unity what the Protestants gained in immunity. The process of dissolution was further promoted by the incessant bickerings and conflicting claims of rival princes, more bitterly prosecuted now than ever before, because difference of religious belief was often added to the lust for power, and the decisions of the emperors themselves, not seldom determined by religious considerations more than by regard for inherent right, irritated more than they soothed. Above all, these tendencies to dissolution were busily and cunningly fostered by the other European powers. And finally, to all other causes at work was added the bitterness of opposition between the Lutheran and Reformed churches. Encouraged by the check which these intestine quarrels had put to the progress of the Reformation, itself awakened into a new life and freed from many of its worst failings, the papal church, acting more or less in concert with the German emperors, aspired to reconquer the lost ground. At the diet of 1608 the archduke Ferdinand, a Hannibal among the Jesuits, violating the wishes of the more pacific emperor Rudolph II., whom he there represented, secured the enactment of measures which impelled the Protestants to leave the diet and form a Union, headed by the Palatinate, while the Catholics formed the League, under the lead of the duke of Bavaria, a prince devoted to the emperor, but still more to Catholicism, and most of all to himself. The more remote result of the breach was the Thirty Years' War, whose movements seemed to be dictated by no plan and to promise no result except to subject Germany to the devastations of the armies of Wallenstein, Pappenheim, Tilly, and Gustavus Adolphus; the various changes depending on the varying policy of the discordant princes, each too weak to rely on himself, and hence leaning on the emperor, the king of Sweden, or the king of France, according as caprice, the chances of war, the prospects of per-

sonal aggrandizement, or the influence of religious convictions held sway. To the people, if not to the rulers, it was a religious war; but not only were Catholics opposed to Protestants, but each of these parties was afflicted with intestine dissensions, while among the Protestants not only were the Lutherans and the Reformed church at variance with each other, but even in each of these divisions, especially among the Lutherans, there was no concert, some siding with the emperor, others with the Swedes.

The duchy Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel suffered its full share of the devastations of the war. Duke Frederick Ulrich (1613-34), a weak and irresolute prince, at first took part with the Palatinate and the Hessians, but afterwards attempted to maintain a neutral position, which not being able to do, he was forced to throw himself successively into the arms of the king of Denmark, of the emperor, and of Gustavus Adolphus, and was thus compelled to see his land ravaged, in turn, by Swedes and Germans, by friends and foes alike, himself impotent to avert the disaster. After his death, a new division among its various dukes led to new complications, not only in the relations of Brunswick to the war in general, but in those of the rival dukes to each other. Duke August, who inherited the most of Frederick Ulrich's territory, was inclined to side with the emperor; but, irritated by breach of faith on the side of the latter, he allied himself with the Swedes, yet afterwards renewed his old allegiance, receiving as a reward, what his predecessors had long sought in vain, full possession of the city of Brunswick, which now became his capital instead of Wolfenbüttel. The treaty of Westphalia soon followed (1648), and the duchy began to resume its former prosperity.

It was during this period, and in this duchy, that George Calixtus flourished.

He was born in Medelbye, near Flensburg in Schleswig, Dec. 14, 1586. His father, in his student-years a pupil and always a warm admirer of Melancthon, served fifty years as pastor. George, studying partly at home.

partly at the gymnasium in Flensburg, finished his preparatory course in 1602, and in the spring of 1603 entered the University of Helmstädt, was made master of arts two years afterwards, and permitted to read private lectures. He did not devote himself specially to theology until 1607. Then, after making a short visit home, where he was somewhat inclined to remain as his father's colleague, he returned, in 1609, and resumed his lectures. Not seeing any prospect of a speedy appointment to a professorship, he undertook, in the same year, a journey for the purpose of enlarging his acquaintance with the men and the movements of the time. He visited Jena, Giessen, Frankfurt, Tübingen, Augsburg, and other cities, forming a personal acquaintance with many prominent theologians, and returned in May, 1610. He now resumed his lectures as Privat-docent, studying at the same time mathematics, medicine, and physics. A year later, he undertook another still greater journey, this time spending some months in Cologne among the Roman Catholics, passing somewhat hastily through Holland, visiting in England the distinguished Protestant Casaubon, and, on his return, the equally distinguished, though far from bigoted, Catholic de Thou, in Paris. After the death of duke Henry Julius he made another short stay in Schleswig, and then once more resumed his lectures in Helmstädt. Soon after, by a disputation at Hämelschenberg with the Jesuit Turrianus, undertaken for the sake of winning back from an inclination to popery the young knight Ludolph von Klencke, although unsuccessful in this object, he so increased his previous reputation for ability and scholarship, that, in spite of resolute opposition from many who distrusted his orthodoxy, or were jealous of his talents, he was installed as Professor Ordinarius of Theology, Jan. 18, 1615. In this position he remained until his death, March 19, 1656.

The University of Helmstädt in Brunswick, extinct since the beginning of the present century, was founded by duke Julius, in 1576, and named, after him, the Julius University. The auspices under which it was opened were good, and

the institution speedily assumed a commanding position among the German universities. It had one characteristic which at that period was not common to many others. Lutheran theologians had been, as a general rule, inclined to discourage the pursuit of classical and philosophical studies, almost verifying the charge of Erasmus: "Ubi cunq̄ue regnat Lutheranismus, ibi literarum est interitus." Helmstädt, at least soon after the foundation of the university, was the home of liberal culture. The most illustrious representatives of it were John Caselius, installed as Professor of Philosophy in 1589, remaining until his death in 1613; and Cornelius Martini, also Professor of Philosophy, installed 1592, only twenty-four years old, and likewise remaining in Helmstädt until his death, which took place in 1621. Caselius exercised a commanding influence. His remarkable acquaintance with ancient literature, with philosophy, and law, combined with a zeal for a broad culture, which yet did not interfere with a healthful devotion to the interests of the church, attracted, in spite of the opposition of bigots, a large attendance of students from all parts of Germany. Martini, called by his enemies the tyrant of the university, had been a pupil of Caselius in Rostock, and was a man of the same spirit. He devoted himself particularly to the study of Aristotle.

It is true that the theological faculty was not at first in full sympathy with these men. The most influential adviser of Julius at the foundation of the university was Chemnitz, one of the authors and most zealous advocates of the Formula Concordiæ; and the theologians in general looked with suspicion on philosophy and the humanists. The latter found a very bitter opponent in Basilius Sattler, court preacher and counsellor of the consistory. Still more violent was Hofmann, who however because he had allowed his violence to betray him into personal abuse of his colleagues, was removed from his professorship in 1588. The Corpus Julium, which the duke had ordained as the creed of the land, agreed essentially with the Formula Concordiæ, and there

seemed to be at first every prospect that the university would take sides with those at Wittenberg, Giessen, and others, not only against the Calvinists, but also against the Philippists. But having allowed his son, yet a mere child, to be chosen bishop of the Catholic chapter at Halberstädt, for the sake of the political advantage which he expected from the appointment, Julius displeased the most of the theologians, and being offended by their protestations, he broke not only with them, but with their theology. By diligent investigation it was found that the doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's body was not only not positively affirmed in the Corpus Julium, but that it was not unequivocally affirmed in the Formula Concordiae itself, to which most of the Brunswick clergy had subscribed; and it was declared by Julius and those among the theologians who sympathized with him that, as the doctrine was distinctly laid down only in the Apology of the Formula Concordiae, no one could be required to hold it. The result was, that the strict Lutherans lost their power. The professors, though Lutherans, and some of them of the strictest sect, were not pledged to the commonly-received Lutheran creed, and continued to hold a peculiar position.

Calixtus was a pupil and ardent admirer of both Caselius and Martini, especially of the latter, in whose house he lived many years, and with whom his intercourse was always intimate. He was a Lutheran, but was inflexibly opposed to the narrow-mindedness then so prevalent among that denomination. He rejected the doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's body, and in general belonged to the school of Melancthon, following this reformer in his love both of classical culture and of harmony among Christians. To describe his life in a word, we may say that he did little else than to fight theological battles in behalf of peace. His favorite idea, early cherished and never relinquished, was that the differences between the different bodies of Christians, not even excepting those that divided the Protestants from the Papists (he always jealously refused to allow to the latter an exclusive

right to the name of Catholics) were not sufficient to warrant the separations which had actually been produced. He maintained that all Christians are substantially agreed as to all the really fundamental articles of belief, and that differences on minor points might continue without involving any schism. Another favorite principle, kindred to this, was that, inasmuch as the early Christians cannot be supposed not to have been in the possession of truth enough to secure their salvation, we must assume that all the essential truths of Christianity are to be found stated in the works of the church Fathers. The tendency of this notion was to lead him, seemingly at least, to underrate the importance of the Reformation in a doctrinal point of view, while his avowed desire to see the open breach between Protestants and Catholics healed up, exposed him to the constant charge, from the side of the most ardent Protestants, of himself tending to Catholicism. Considering the extreme violence of the theological polemics of that century, it is not strange that such, and even worse, accusations were made. And, assailed with such fury by those whose creed most nearly resembled his own, and from whom he might have expected a more lenient treatment, it is also not strange that he did modify, as he grew older, the severity with which in his earlier works he attacked the papists, unable, as he was, to conceal from himself that Christianity was to be found among the latter as well as among his co-religionists. He did not believe that councils should attempt to exclude all free investigation and condemn all honest, even the slightest, variations from the standard symbols. He abominated the bigotry which led so many Lutherans not only jealously to guard against the inroads of heresy, but to deny even the possibility of salvation to all without the pale of the Lutheran church—a bigotry which went so far that some affirmed that the slightest variation in belief might be from the authoritative utterances of the adopted formula, so much the more dangerous, because the more insidious, the changes were, and therefore

so much the more earnestly to be condemned. He lamented, too, the obstinacy which led fellow Protestants to reject all pacific propositions, and welcome the dissolution of Germany rather than yield what might easily have been yielded without any real sacrifice.

Calixtus's labors were for the most part purely literary. After his inauguration as professor, his personal intercourse with his contemporaries was small. He seldom went away from Helmstädt. Even in the years 1625–28, when the university was virtually broken up by the war, he remained at his post, almost the only representative of the faculties, the others having sought refuge in Brunswick from the annoyances and burdens of the war, or secured places in other universities. But in 1633 he spent two or three months on a trip to Frauken, a Swedo-German duchy, newly formed out of parts of the bishoprics Würzburg and Bamberg, at the solicitation of duke Ernest, who had invited him to take up his residence in the land as the duke's theological adviser. This invitation he had declined, but yielded to the further request that he would at least come and assist in the organization of the schools and churches. On his return he became acquainted in Jena with John Gerhard, who upon thus learning the worth of Calixtus, found his previously strong prejudices against him to be quite unjustifiable, and ever afterwards cherished for him a genuine friendship. Calixtus also visited Schleswig once more, on the occasion of the death of a brother, in 1634. Furthermore, in the summer of 1645, he went to Thorn, in Poland, to take part in a disputation which had been ordered by king Wladislaus IV., for the sake of promoting harmony among the different religious parties in his kingdom. Foreigners, as well as Poles, were allowed to take part in it. Through the influence of his friend Fabricius of Danzig, attention was called to Calixtus as an eminently suitable person to be invited to the disputation, and, notwithstanding the opposition of the Lutheran zealots, Frederick William of Brandenburg, the great elector, himself attached to the Reformed confession,

sent a special request to Calixtus to come to Thorn. Already nearly sixty years old, so long a journey was to him then a great undertaking; but he could not refuse to lend a helping hand to whatever promised the furtherance of unity among Christians, and accordingly he accepted the invitation. Upon his arrival in Thorn, however, he found that through the intrigues of the uncompromising Lutherans, he was to be allowed no active part in the disputation. And although he was asked by the Reformed theologians to sit with them as an adviser, and was thus enabled to contribute much by his learning and his counsel, yet the unyielding bigotry of certain Lutherans, especially Hülsemann of Wittenburg and Calovius of Danzig, who really desired no union, the whole object of the movement was frustrated. The discussions were more private than public; the dissensions were widened, not healed. Near the end of November Calixtus returned, disheartened, to Helmstädt.

Turning to a more particular consideration of Calixtus's literary labors, we may divide them, in general, into those which were of a polemical character and those which were more purely scientific. Yet many of his most important theological treatises had more or less of a polemic tinge. The first-mentioned class may again be divided into those directed against Catholicism and those directed against Lutherans.

He wrote frequently in opposition to the papacy, beginning as early as when he was in Cologne, where he composed a *tractatus de missae sacrificio*, in opposition to the notion that the sacrifice for sin can be repeated. He also attacked various other errors of the papal church, as e.g. transubstantiation, ascription of canonical authority to the apocrypha, celibacy of the clergy, communion in one form, etc.; but his chief object in his polemic writings was not so much to show how far apart the Protestants and Catholics were, as rather to prove how unnecessary it was that they should be apart at all. This, however, could not be done by a

Protestant without protesting at least against the Catholic notion of the infallibility of the pope; and this dogma he did oppose with special earnestness. He insisted that the anti-christ told of in 2 Thess. ii. 3-8 is none other than the pope himself. With his vast knowledge of history, which enabled him to make his opponents refute one another, he dealt the pretensions of the Roman see many a heavy blow. But the confidence expressed in his earlier treatises, that the power of the pope was nearly at an end, was much shaken by the events of the subsequent war, and the increasing number of apostates from the Protestant to the Papal church. The case of Marcus Antonius de Dominis, a Jesuit scholar of no mean attainments in the languages and natural sciences, who had, in 1616, left the papacy, fled from Dalmatia, where he had been archbishop, to England, joined himself to the established church there, written several important works against Catholicism, but in 1622 returned to the Roman church, was suited to attract general attention. But Calixtus was more intimately affected by the apostasy of an acquaintance and former friend, Barthold Neuhaus. He had been licensed to deliver lectures in Helmstädt at the same time with Calixtus. In 1614 he wrote a treatise, in which, because he held that reason could prove the existence of God, he was declared to have contradicted 1 Cor. iii. 19; his work was condemned by Sattler, and he was forbidden to teach any longer. Though the order was afterwards modified, yet he received at this time, without doubt, the first impulse to go over, as he did in 1622, to popery. Neuhaus was not a man of great weight of character; and though after his apostasy he took special pains to draw Calixtus into a controversy, the latter long refused to yield to the solicitations. Nevertheless, after Neuhaus had issued, in 1632, a work against Protestantism, in which he insisted that Protestants, in order to be true to their principles, must find unequivocal biblical proof-texts for all their doctrines, in which, moreover, Calixtus and his colleague Horneius were particularly attacked and challenged, Calixtus

complied so far with the earnest advice of his friends that in 1634, when he published his *Theologia Moralis*, he added a *digression*, in which he considers Neuhaus's work; a digression, nevertheless, itself three times as long as the rest of the book. He here maintains that the Protestants, so far from absolutely rejecting the authority of men, hold that their principles are to be found in the patristic writings, and that this fact is an argument in their favor. He quotes from Catholic writers who acknowledge that the consent of the church Fathers is a sufficient authority. He then undertakes a proof of the correctness of the several Protestant doctrines, and invites the Catholics to do the same. But his irenic efforts met only with ridicule from Neuhaus. He had overrated the willingness of the Catholics to make a compromise with the Protestants. Neuhaus often afterwards renewed his attacks, manifesting all the peculiar zeal of a proselyte, and exhibiting a malicious pleasure at the divisions and misfortunes of his opponents, not seldom abusing Calixtus personally, although in fact retaining a deep respect for his once intimate friend. But Calixtus never replied to him directly. In 1638, Calixtus was especially aimed at in a work by the French Catholic, Verons, who issued a new edition of a work nearly twenty years old, called "*Methodes pour les Controverses.*" Verons commends Calixtus's position, that doctrines are to be proved from the scriptures and from the testimony of antiquity, but points out how different is the ground taken in the *Magdeburg Centuries*, and by the Protestants generally. He concedes that certainty may be attained in natural things by experience, or even by rational inferences, but contends that articles of faith cannot be thus established, and that therefore some authoritative standard must be had. Verons sent his work to Calixtus, inviting him, in the use of very complimentary expressions of regard, notwithstanding he had formerly spoken contemptuously of him, to join him in bringing about a true peace. But Calixtus would not reply to this, knowing that the cause of peace would be favored

by Verons only on condition that the Protestants should return and acknowledge again the supremacy of the pope.

In 1644 Calixtus was attacked by the Jesuit Ebermann, Professor of Theology at Mainz, in a production entitled "Anatomia Calixti," a work of much ability and ingenuity, in which it was argued that Calixtus's pacific projects were utterly impracticable unless all should consent to let Calixtus be the arbiter of all differences. Although the tone of Ebermann's work partook little of a conciliatory character, yet, as it came from a quarter from which, if the subject could be further discussed, more might be hoped than from debates with such men as Neuhaus, Calixtus determined to prepare a careful reply. With him, carefulness meant a thorough and even wearisome circumstantiality in the treatment of his theme from a historical point of view. He here insists, again, that the truths necessary to salvation are few, that they are all contained in the Apostles' Creed, and that this is accepted by all Christians. He argues, further, against the infallibility of the pope. Ebermann soon replied, showing that, though all might accept the Apostles' Creed, yet this effects no union, unless all agree in its interpretation; whereas, in fact, Protestants and Catholics do not agree in the explanation even of those few articles. After the failure of the disputation of Thorn, Ebermann issued another pamphlet, making sport of Calixtus's experience there, and derived from that a fresh argument in favor of the necessity of having an authoritative standard for the settlement of differences and difficulties.

As his end drew near, Calixtus was obliged to see, what he had long before feared and predicted, the apostasy of many prominent Protestants. In 1650, Christopher von Rantzau, a countryman and pupil of Calixtus, was in Rome, and, dazzled by the splendor of a Catholic celebration there, was inclined to apostatize. A long letter from Calixtus was insufficient to change his resolution. His reply, not lacking in expressions of the most sincere respect for Calixtus in particular, showed how sadly the narrow-minded and quarrelsome char-

acter of the Lutherans in general had disaffected many who had no other reason for leaving their society. Through Rantzau's influence, the young duke John Frederick of Brunswick was also converted to Catholicism. On him Calixtus was unable to exert a direct influence; but his colleague and former pupil, H. J. Blume, who was sent to Italy to keep the duke from going over, was himself converted. Furthermore, Ernest, youngest son of the landgrave Maurice of Hessen, became inclined to popery, in Vienna. Not being ready hastily to renounce Protestantism, he desired to hear a discussion on the subject by prominent theologians of both confessions. One was held at Frankfurt-on-the-Maine, in which Calixtus was invited to take part. He did so, but only in writing, not being able himself to go so far. But here, too, his efforts were fruitless.

Finally, in 1653, he was engaged in another and still more important attempt to prevent an apostasy to Rome. Queen Christiana of Sweden, daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, in whose court Italians, French, and Spaniards had taken the place of the less frivolous Dutch and Germans, began to waver in her attachment to the religion for which her father had fought. Before abandoning it, however, she sent to Calixtus a special request for the writings which the case of the duke Ernest had drawn from him. Of course he gladly complied with the request. But the result was as unsatisfactory as before. The queen, in 1654, gave up her crown, went secretly to Brussels, and in the year after at Innsbruck publicly connected herself with the Catholic church. In 1653 was held the diet at Regensburg, the last German diet. Great expectations were cherished that here, at last, the strife of arms being ended, some effective measures would be adopted for bringing about a real peace. Duke August had sent, as his representative, Schwartzkopf, Calixtus's brother-in-law and ardent friend. Von Boyneburg, the distinguished statesman of Mainz, who had gone over to Rome, yet continued to be a warm admirer of Calixtus, called the attention of many Catholics to him. The

emperor himself read some of his works, and seemed to be favorably disposed towards him. It was hoped that, on the basis of Calixtus's conciliatory views, some understanding might be reached, by which at least the hitherto incessant wranglings would be prevented. But the Catholics could trust no peace which did not involve the return of the Protestants to the pale of their church, and the strict Lutherans refused to stop denouncing the Helmstädtians; and so the diet which had promised so much accomplished nothing.

Calixtus's collisions with the rigid Lutherans began with the beginning of his professorship. His appointment itself was opposed by them. Sattler laid every obstacle in the way, but his efforts resulted only in securing the appointment of a young relative, Strube, a man after his own heart, to another professorship, and furthermore, the enactment of a provision according to which no professor could publish any theological work without its being first signed by all the faculty, and submitted to the censorship of the consistory. However, although some of Calixtus's colleagues, as Martini and Boethius, became thus involved in strife with the authorities, and others, as Neuhaus and Werdenhagen, left, or were driven from, their places, yet Calixtus himself prudently avoided a conflict. In 1616 he wrote a treatise, *de Immortalitate Animae et Resurrectione Mortuum*, and sent it to Wolfenbüttel to be examined by the consistory. From here it was sent to Giessen, to receive from the faculty of that university an opinion respecting its orthodoxy. One or two unimportant points were found in which Calixtus had dared to differ from Luther; it was also complained that he had used philosophical arguments in proving the soul's immortality, whereas he should have confined himself to the words of revelation. He was told that on condition of making a few changes he might publish the work. But he preferred to leave it, for the time being, unpublished. In 1619 appeared his *Epitome Theologiae*. It was published without his consent, at Goslar, the manuscripts of his hearers

having been used for the purpose. What was done could not be undone; but the consistory did what it could, sending the book to Giessen, where it received from the professor Balthasar Mentzer a severe criticism, which detected in the work various approaches towards Catholicism and Calvinism. Calixtus was also not neglected by the Saxon theologians. In 1621, Hoe von Hoeneegg, the court preacher and highest ecclesiastical officer of the elector John George I., assembled at Jena twelve theologians, whom he wished to constitute a sort of directory for the settlement of doctrinal and ecclesiastical difficulties. The meetings of this body were continued until 1628. At the first session, Calixtus and the Helmstädtians received a liberal share of attention. One member suggested that, as the innovators were not worthy to be refuted by any man of note, some young men should be sent to them and play with them, like a cat with a mouse; and it was at last resolved that, as it was not to be hoped that Calixtus and Martini could be silenced entirely, in future their heresies should be thoroughly refuted by young students, or each theologian should simply defend himself when attacked. One of the members of this council was the celebrated John Gerhard, and an earnest attempt was now made to secure him as a counterpoise to Calixtus in the university at Helmstädt. Martini died near the end of the year; Boethius and Fuchte, in 1622; the overthrow of the ministry of Streithorst removed some of the limits of Sattler's power; and it was desired to improve these circumstances by securing a check to the growing influence of Calixtus. Gerhard declined to come; but Michael Walther, a relative of his, who had been court preacher to the widowed duchess Elizabeth, and had taken an active part in the negotiations for the appointment of Gerhard, received it himself. In him, although he left his chair upon the breaking up of the university in 1627, Calixtus (or Calvinomixtus, as Walther generally called him) found a life-long enemy. In 1624, Sattler secured the appointment of a general consistory, which he intended to

make an effective barrier against the Philippists and philosophers; but his death, which occurred in the same year, took away the leading spirit of the stiff Lutheran party in Brunswick, so that thereafter Calixtus met with little opposition in his own country, and became the acknowledged and revered chief of the Brunswick theologians. In other lands, however, his supremacy was not so readily conceded. The university of Helmstädt, and Calixtus, as its most eminent representative, were looked upon by all zealous Lutherans with growing suspicion; in many universities the theological and philosophical faculties became divided on this very question, the former opposing, the latter defending Helmstädt. In the Netherlands, although Calixtus had, in the great Vossius and others, warm admirers, yet, as a scholar of Calixtus writes, it was "as if a second Sattler were living in Amsterdam." In Hamburg, writes the same man, "everything is venal, even the ecclesiastical offices; murders and debauchery are the order of the day; but the preachers busy themselves only in declaiming in favor of ubiquity; and whoever comes from the Helmstädt school has there at least no prospect of a settlement." In Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein, where the Formula Concordiae had never been adopted, Calixtus found more favor. He was about this time much encouraged by the efforts of John Duräus, the son of a Presbyterian clergyman of Edinburgh, banished by king James, himself pastor of a congregation in Elbing, in Poland, until that place was captured by Gustavus Adolphus. Encouraged by the Swedish king, and after his death by his chancellor Oxenstierna, also by the English ambassador at Stockholm, he spent the years 1632 and 1633 in travelling over Germany, endeavoring to awaken the Protestants to the importance of uniting themselves. Duke Frederick Ulrich encouraged the movement, and, the university being called on for its opinion, one was given, composed by Calixtus, heartily approving the project. A convention was actually held at Frankfurt-on-the-Maine, in the spring of 1634, for the purpose of dis-

cussing the measure ; but, like all other similar efforts, this fell to the ground. These strivings to promote peace received no countenance from the rigid Lutherans. Their plan for obtaining harmony was to root out everything that deviated from their creed.

In 1638, Stats Büscher, a pastor in Hanover, the author of several works written in defense of Lutheranism and the Ramistic philosophy, alarmed by the progress of Calixtinian principles, wrote a work which he was at first going to name "Abomination of Desolation in the Julius University," but finally called "Cryptopapismus Novae Theologiae Helmstadiensis." Here he subjects Calixtus's "Theologia Moralis" to a critical examination, finding in his views on the standard of orthodoxy, on original sin, on justification, on the authority of the pope, and on the mass, dangerous leanings towards Catholicism. In conclusion he exclaims: What will our religion become at last but a completely Babel-like confusion, a perfectly epicurean, heathenish, devilish mess, in which neither God nor religion will receive any more reverence !" He had designed to publish the work anonymously, but by some means was in this disappointed. Calixtus, sending a copy to duke George, of whom Büscher was a subject, characterizes it as "crowded with calumnies and lies," an expression rather more severe than he was wont to use, but almost justified by the unfairness with which Büscher had attempted to prove Calixtus a papist from a book written directly against popery. Upon being summoned by the duke to present himself, and answer for this attack, not only on Calixtus and the university, but also on the consistory, he evaded the summons, pleaded his fear that the consistory which was to try him could not be impartial, and, although a special commission was appointed, he still refused to obey, and fled to Harburg, where he issued pamphlets in self-defense. Calixtus, seeing the general interest which the case had awakened, even among the laymen, determined to prepare an elaborate reply to Büscher's book, and to write it in German, a language in which he always wrote with great

reluctance, and never without an urgent reason. He here replies at length to the charges made against him, and closes by showing that Büscher himself, though so zealous a stickler for confessional orthodoxy, dissents in several points from the authorized creeds. Just as the last sheets were going through the press, Büscher died, and no one else ever ventured on an answer to the work.

In 1641, a Saxon theologian, H. Höpfner of Leipsic, addressed to Calixtus a remonstrance against his views on the necessity of good works. These strictures applied also, and perhaps still more particularly, to the position of Calixtus's friend Horneius, who on this subject was accustomed to express himself still more decidedly than Calixtus. Höpfner's criticism was not public, and was respectful in its tone. Calixtus replied to it in a way of which he seems to have been fond, not in a special production for that purpose, but in a long excursus to a commentary on the latter part of the book of Genesis, connecting it with the story of Joseph's resistance to temptation. He illustrates the necessity of personal effort in order to salvation, by comparing faith to fire in a house, and resistance to temptation to the roof which prevents the rain from extinguishing the fire. The roof is not the cause of the fire, but it is a condition of its continuance; so grace in the heart is not received because of good works, but cannot be preserved without them; the works are not the *causa vera*, but are a *causa sine qua non*.

By the disputation at Thorn, already spoken of, the flames of controversy, which had for a while burned less fiercely, were fanned into new life. John Latermann, a young man and a pupil of Calixtus, had become professor in Königsberg, where, through a dissertation *de Aeterna Dei Praedestinatione* he became involved, in 1646, in a public dispute with his colleague Myslenta. The dispute attracted general attention. Latermann was considered only as a representative of the Calixtinian school. The opinions of theologians in all parts of Germany were solicited. Myslenta, in sending for the sentence of these men, indicates what

sort of an answer he would like to receive, when he mildly declares that from the time of Osiander, Satan has been disturbing the Prussian church; that he lately, in the form of a Calvinistic spirit has been scattering poison, and that he now has chosen as coadjutor of the Calvinists a Lutheran, Calixtus, whose emissary, Latermann, is carrying on the work of the devil in Königsberg.

The matter did not rest here. Pushed on by Jacob Weller, just called from Brunswick to Dresden as successor of Hoe von Hoenege, the three Saxon universities, Wittenberg, Leipsic, and Jena, sent an "Admonition" to Calixtus and Horneius, "an offensive document," says Calixtus, "though mixed with sweet words," urging on the Helmstädtians the necessity of adhering closely to the symbols of the church. Calixtus prepared a severe reply, telling the Saxons that he understood the grounds of their opposition to him, viz. dislike of liberal culture, and a poverty of mind which left them contented with one single composition, the Formula Concordiae, as the full and unimprovable expression of all theological knowledge. He exposed, moreover, their inconsistency and presumption in trying to set up as a rule of faith their opinions on questions not decided by the symbols, as also their littleness in magnifying insignificant matters and making hair-splitting distinctions. But to the charge that he is loosening the foundations of all evangelical doctrine, he nearly loses patience, and says that whoever affirms this is guilty of a base falsehood, and furthermore, that he will consider him a calumniator, defamer, and villain until the assertion is proved.

Hülsemann of Leipsic (whither he had in 1646 been called from Wittenberg), who had distinguished himself by his opposition to Calixtus at Thorn and had had a prominent part in getting up the admonition, was not a little alarmed by the tone of this reply. The mouse had displayed far less willingness to be played with than the cats had desired. He saw that, unless there was a clear retraction on one side or the other, the Helmstädtians would be irrecoverably lost

to the Lutheran church. Calixtus expressed himself ready to take back his charges on condition that the Saxons should themselves do the same with their admonition. Hülsemann replies in a very humble and deprecatory tone, appealing to Calixtus as a friend of peace not to adhere to such violent expressions against his own brothers in the faith. But Calixtus was not thus to be won over; conscious of having been unjustly accused, he refused to recede from his judgment until his abusers first retract their slander. Thus the breach was made complete. The Saxons, unwilling to undergo the humiliation of modifying their charge, had to set themselves about proving its truth. The fact was, that they were aiming to secure for themselves a supremacy over the Protestant part of Germany, which indeed they already had exercised to a certain extent, and which was further confirmed to them by the diet at Regensburg, but never embraced any authority in matters of faith.

The next year, 1648, in which peace was declared, was the most unpeaceful year of Calixtus's life. The opinions which Myslenta had collected concerning Latermann's dissertation (but which were directed against Helmstädt and Calixtus more than against Latermann, although the latter was never endorsed by his teacher), had been printed, and had now arrived in Helmstädt. A few were of a pacific tone, but the most were fierce against the "neutralism," "syncretism," "atheism," of the Helmstädtians. Especially so were those of Calovius of Danzig, and of Michael Walther, now general superintendent in Celle. These attacks aroused the resentment of the Helmstädtians. They sent an address to duke August, in which they implore him to defend his injured university; in this address, Calixtus, not content with pointing out the animus of his enemies and defending himself against attacks, himself assumes the aggressive, accusing the Wittenbergers, among other things, of holding that the vices enumerated in Gal. v. 19, and other places do not exclude one from heaven. This charge was founded on certain utterances of Hülsemann made against Hugo

Grotius, which, however, did not deserve the severe interpretation put upon them at this time, and at other times, by Calixtus. The duke's reply was favorable. All three of the dukes who now had an interest in the university came together. A second complaint was presented to them directed against Walther. They resolved that Calixtus and Horneius should prepare a reply to the Königsberg censures. Before this was completed, but too late to be noticed in it, appeared another formidable attack on Helmstädt, in the shape of a book entitled "Mysterium Syncretismi," by Dannhaver of Strassburg. In the autumn of 1648 Calixtus and Horneius completed their apology. But as Duke Frederick of Celle was attached to the Formula Concordiae, he could not quite approve the severity with which the professors had handled their accusers. The three courts agreed, however, to ask of the same men a special exposition of their views on five points which had occasioned the most criticism, viz. the authority of the primitive church, good works, the insufficiency of the Old Testament for the demonstration of the doctrine of the Trinity, the theophanies of the New Testament, and the efforts to promote unity among Christians. In this exposition Calixtus and Horneius were to refrain from all offensive charges. In the meanwhile duke Frederick died, and his successor Christian Louis was supposed to be more favorable to the Helmstädtians; earnest efforts were made by the latter to secure Walther's removal, but no change was made; and the statement concerning the five points, mild as its tone was, failed to meet the approbation of the three courts, and so the labor was in vain.

The storm now grew more furious. In Saxony the theologians were ordered to prepare an elaborate work, treating each article of faith separately, showing how far the Helmstädtians had wandered from the truth. This work gradually grew into the "Consensus Repetitus." The elector of Saxony, fully sympathizing with the theologians, sent an address to the dukes of Brunswick, not only protesting

against the innovations of Calixtus and his adherents, but intimating that Saxony, as the leader of Protestant Germany, ought to be obeyed. This attempt to usurp authority, which the political headship of Saxony by no means involved, excited the alarm and resentment of two of the dukes, but the third continued rather indifferent, and so no concerted action of the dukes could be effected. But the theologians continued the conflict; and, though Horneius died in September, 1649, and Calixtus, by reason of old age and a long experience of the fruitlessness of these quarrels, was reluctant now, single-handed, to carry on the strife, yet he could not avoid it. The Saxon elector's address, and a violent attack made on him by Weller shortly after, were, after considerable delay, officially communicated to him, and he was directed to prepare a reply. This he did at considerable length, in German. This was soon followed by renewed attacks from Hülsemann and Weller. Myslenta of Königsberg and Calovius of Danzig, also continued their opposition in the most bitter and uncompromising spirit. The Brunswick dukes began at length to consider what should be done to arrest the wrangling. At a conference called for that purpose, Schwartzkopf proposed that the three courts should write to that of Saxony, protesting against the attempted usurpation of the latter, furthermore that a general convention of the civil rulers should be held, and that, until then, the theologians on both sides should be ordered to keep still. This proposition prevailed; but the Saxon government not only did not accept it, but did not even reply to the Brunswick address at all. So through the years 1650 and 1651 the Saxons continued to fulminate with increased intensity, encouraged by the disposition of their government to support them and by the enforced silence of the Helmstädtians, bringing out at last, early in 1652, a statement of Helmstädt innovations, of which they enumerated and anathematized ninety-eight. In 1655, in the *Consensus Repetitus*, the number was reduced to eighty-eight. This work was designed to substantiate the charge

so much resented by Calixtus, that he had loosened the foundations of all evangelical doctrine, also to counteract the wide-spread and powerful influence of an elaborate production of Calixtus published in the autumn of 1651, entitled "George Calixtus's Refutation of the Unchristian Slanders with which Dr. Weller, court preacher of Saxony, has desired to soil him." This was the last controversial work which he published; though his opponents continued their assaults, he saw that a prolongation of the strife would be useless, since his enemies accused him of going too far in just those points in which he more or less distinctly felt that he had not gone far enough.

We give, in conclusion, a brief notice of some of Calixtus's most important theological works. The first one of considerable size was issued before he became professor. It was called "Disputationes de Praecipuis Religionis Christianae Capitibus," and is a wonderful work, as coming from a youth of twenty-four years. It consists of fifteen disputations. In each of these he states first, with great clearness and conciseness, the dogma and the difficulties attending it; secondly is given an historical account of the different views respecting it; thirdly, the Lutheran doctrine is stated and defended. Only in one point does he here distinctly reject the Lutheran view. Insisting on the logical principle that the joining of two abstract terms, of two predicates, can never produce a judgment, he declares that to say "humanity is deity" is just as senseless as to say "man is a lion." To Christ, as one person, as the God-man, he would ascribe human and divine attributes; but to identify the human and the divine, according to the strict Lutheran confessions, he pronounces absurd.

In 1619 appeared his *Epitome Theologiae*, which, as the name indicates, treats of the whole body of Christian doctrine. This is a still more important work than the other. Calixtus here draws the same distinction which afterwards Schleiermacher so much insisted on, between the contemplative and the practical sciences, assigning theology to the

latter. He divides his theme as follows: In every practical science it is to be inquired what is (1) the object to be aimed at; (2) the being who seeks this object; (3) the means to be used in gaining it. As preliminary to the discussion proper of these topics, he enters upon an investigation of the sources of human knowledge, drawing a sharp distinction between immediate knowledge and mediate knowledge, or that which is derived merely from an analysis of or inference from the immediate. Truth consists in the correctness of this derivation of the mediate from the immediate. The latter admits of no demonstration; it must be accepted as it stands. To this class belong the contents of the moral and religious sense. The truths of revelation serve as a complement of these, not conflicting with them, yet not derived from them by any discursive process. In the first section of the main part of the work Calixtus seeks to show that man knows through the immediate utterances of his moral sense that his true end is an eternal one; revelation only fills up this knowledge. The second section treats not only of man, the being appointed to this eternal destiny, but also of God. As to him, natural religion teaches his existence, spirituality, wisdom, and goodness; revelation tells further of the Son and the Holy Ghost. As to man, whatever belongs to philosophical knowledge, as also undecided free-will, mortality of the body, is to be called natural; whereas whatever revelation discloses as belonging to the original condition of man, i.e. knowledge of what we now know only through revelation, also undisturbed decision of the will in favor of the good, freedom of the body from pain, etc., — this is to be considered as a supernatural gift. Here, it will be noticed, Calixtus really adopts, in substance, the Tridentine doctrine, and in this one particular his critics had some pretense for charging him with agreeing with the Catholics. Yet it was no leaning to popery, but simply a natural inference from his view of the sources of human knowledge, which is discerned here. Human depravity, moreover, he pictures in a darker light

than the Catholics do. He ascribes it wholly to man; rejecting decidedly the doctrine that sin is to be ascribed to God as its author in any other sense than that he permits it. To guard more surely against this doctrine, Calixtus holds further the view that sin is of a privative nature, he being unable to see how anything which has a positive existence can be ascribed to any other creator than God. The third section treats of the work of redemption. The chief points are: Salvation is wholly an act of God's mercy. The infinite justice of God demanded an infinite merit in the sacrifice. Christ's merit was both active and passive. In him the Son of God assumed a human nature; of either nature of the God-man may be predicated, but only to a certain extent, attributes of both natures. Justification is conditioned on faith, and consists in the forgiveness of sins and the imputation of Christ's merit. Predestination to salvation is conditioned on foreknowledge of the faith of the elect. As, however, faith is itself an act transcending the natural powers of man and comes through the word of God, it is to be assumed that the Spirit conditions his working of the faith on the attentive heed given to the word. Baptism should, in the case of adults, be preceded by instruction, in order that their faith may flow from the hearing of the word; but children should be baptized early, in order that they may receive forgiveness and regeneration. At the Lord's supper faith is strengthened by partaking of the true body of Christ. But against the Catholics it is argued that the bread and wine are also really present, and that there is no real sacrifice in the case, since the notion of a sacrifice involves that of the slaying of a living being. He rejects the doctrine of the power of the clergy to bind and to loose, also the Catholic doctrine of the uncertainty of the state of grace, as well as the Calvinistic doctrine of perseverance. The church is, even as a visible church, one, holy, catholic, and apostolic; its constitution is monarchical, Christ being King; its members are divided into teachers and learners; the apostles have no successors: all bishops

are equal; laymen are to support the church according to their means, especially should Christian magistrates exercise a guardianship over its outward concerns; synods are the best guardians of purity of doctrine; factious heretics may be punished, but should not be put to death.

In 1628 appeared Calixtus's *Apparatus Theologicus*, a work designed as an introduction to theological studies. It consists of three parts: first, an encyclopedia, which lays down the position which theology occupies as a science, in which Calixtus insists on the importance of philology and philosophy, as the two wings without whose aid no great height in theological science can be attained; second, a history of the science, in which is given a summary of the theology of all the different denominations and periods of Christianity; third, methodology, directing how to study each dogma. This work, though incomplete and lacking in symmetry, is a monument of Calixtus's vast learning and rare power of analysis.

A year later he published an edition of Augustine's *de Doctrina Christiana*, and of the *Commonitorium* of Vincent of Lerinum, prefixing a long introduction in which he sets forth his views respecting the weight to be attached to the opinions of the church Fathers in the establishment of creeds. This was the occasion of much opposition and misrepresentation. For he here sets himself against the tendency of the Lutherans of his time to consider the symbols, not as being designed to select from the many doctrines found in the Bible the few which are most fundamental, but to consider rather all doctrines as alike essential, and the symbols as superadded to the Bible, and equally binding. The testimony of the patristic theologians he regards not as strictly authoritative, but as having a peculiar weight. By the stress which he laid on this point, he exposed himself to the charge of depreciating the importance of the Reformation, and so of favoring Catholicism; whereas in so far as he differed from his fellow Protestants he was rather hyper-protestant than otherwise, since he wished to dimin-

ish the number of dogmas and rites that should be held to be absolutely indispensable to Christianity, condemning the virtually papal tendency of the Protestants of his time to make their creeds as binding on their churches as the pope's decrees on the Roman Catholics.

Perhaps Calixtus's most important work is the *Theologia Moralis*, issued in 1634. This was, indeed, not the first treatise on this subject produced by a Lutheran; yet after Melanchthon, and his immediate pupils Chyträus, Hemming, and Von Eitzen, it had been so thoroughly neglected that many of Calixtus's contemporaries, narrowly confining themselves to purely dogmatic theology, regarded his work as a dangerous innovation. Calixtus does not carry out the distinction, begun by some of his predecessors, between dogmatics and ethics in general, but rather brings the two nearer together by making a sharp distinction between philosophical and theological ethics, the former being held as indeed separate not only from dogmatics, but from theology in general; the latter, however, which his work alone handles, being closely connected with the system of Christian doctrine. He treats it as a science concerned with the progress of sanctification in the believer. The work is divided into two parts; one treating of the regenerate man, the other, of the laws to which he is subject. The Christian, again, is considered both according to his internal and his external condition. As to the former (the one principally treated), there is recognized as characterizing every converted man a constant strife between the flesh and the spirit, only, as not in the unregenerate state, no sin can be committed with relish and approbation. The work of sanctification, carried on by the Spirit of God, must be considered in relation to the three faculties of the soul, the intellect, the will, and the desires. To the first belongs the conscience. That the conscience errs, is therefore to be attributed to the fact that the intellect is itself darkened by the fall; but no man errs in such a way as not to admit that the good ought to be done and the bad to be avoided. On the will Calixtus says little; on the desires

In treating of the moral law, he oversteps the limits set to his task, and enters the field of general ethics. The law, as the specially revealed will of God, is essentially the same as that given in the hearts of men, but is superadded to the latter by an act of grace, and serves to correct the errors into which men fall in deducing inferences from their immediate cognitions. The moral law, contained in the decalogue, is one from which God himself cannot absolve us. When we are unable to deduce the necessity of certain commands from first principles, these commands are called positive laws, of which, though man does not know the ground, yet God does. The question, what the highest moral principle is, Calixtus does not distinctly answer; he seems to treat as such simply the divine will. After discussing the positive commands of God, he considers human laws, insisting that their fitness to promote the general good should always be clear. Ecclesiastical and civil laws are then distinguished; the former are praised for their simplicity; in treating of the latter, the author loses himself in a consideration of the history of Roman law, occupying with this theme a fourth part of the whole work, if we consider as not exactly belonging to it the already mentioned digression directed against Neuhaus. It is easy to see that this work is too devoid of symmetry, and that the plan of it is itself too imperfectly carried out, to allow it to rank as a standard work. But it is exceedingly valuable, as containing the germ of much that has since been produced in the same department.

Calixtus wrote several treatises on eschatology. In one, *de Supremo Judicis*, published in 1635, he discusses at length the signs of Christ's second advent, the resurrection, the judgment, the new heaven and new earth, etc.; he holds in general to a strict interpretation of prophecy, yet is freer than most of his contemporaries. He rejects all chiliastic theories, though admitting some to be not heretical. Kindred to this work is that *de Bono Perfecte Summo*, published in 1643, in which the highest good is, with Aristotle, found in the *Seopía*; the more perfect the object of knowledge, the higher is the knowledge; to see God in the summit of

blessedness. The damned will know God only as an avenger, having no love for him; the risen bodies of the saved will retain, perhaps, the same faculties as they now have, but will be free from all disturbance; the bodies of the lost will be literally burned, and the punishment will be eternal. These two works may be considered as complementing an earlier one, published in 1627, *de Immortalitate Animae*, a work which he himself esteemed as the most complete and thorough of his monographs.

The last of Calixtus's larger treatises was the one *de Factis quae Deus cum Hominibus init*. It was issued in 1654. Here he discloses some similarity to the views of the Calvinists and Arminians; but the covenants, of which he makes two, the Adamic and the Christian, are considered less as eternally made between the Father and the Son, than as consisting of an established relation between God and man. Here, as in his other works, Calixtus undertakes a comprehensive historical discussion of his theme, including a history of the Jews and a thorough investigation of the significance of the ceremonial law. But he himself felt that the subject was not exhaustively handled.

We must omit even to name the many other treatises which Calixtus produced. Besides his numerous controversial writings, he wrote on almost all branches of theology, especially historical theology. His style is sometimes heavy; his works often lack clearness of plan; he attempts too much, and, finding the work growing on his hands, is often obliged to break off abruptly. But his learning, his industry, and the breadth of mind were remarkable. He was the Schleiermacher of his age. Not entirely free from prevailing prejudices and errors, yet he was vastly elevated above the most of his contemporaries — too far above them to be appreciated by them. The constant abuse to which he was subjected from his bigoted enemies, for no other crime than that of advocating charity and peace, and the singleness with which, in spite of this abuse, he constantly pursued his object, are an abiding evidence of his catholicity of mind and his purity of heart.