

Excerpt from: *The Judaizing Calvin: Sixteenth-Century Debates over the Messianic Psalms*, Prof. G. Sujin Pak, Oxford University Press, 2010, Chapter 5, pp. 103-111 and footnotes pp. 180-183

Aegidius Hunnius, “Calvinus iudaizans. Hoc est: Iudaicae glossae et corruptelae, quibus Iohannes Calvinus illustrissima scripturae sacrae loca & testimonia de gloriosa trinitate, deitate Christi, & Spiritus Sancti, cum primis autem vaticinia prophetarum de adventu messiae, nativitate eius, passione, resurrectione, ascensione in coelos & sessione ad dextram Dei, detestandum in modum corrumpere non exhorruit. Addita est est corruptelarum confutatio” (Witteberg, 1593)

Aegidius Hunnius, “Calvin the Judaizer: Judaistic Glosses and Corruptions by Which John Calvin Did Not Fear to Corrupt the Clearest Passages of Sacred Scripture and Its Witness to the Glorious Trinity, the Deity of Christ and the Holy Spirit, including the Predictions of the Prophets concerning the Coming of the Messiah, His Birth, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension to Heaven, and Session at the Right Hand of God, in a Detestable Fashion.”

Chapter 5

The Judaizing Calvin

The Debate of Hunnius and Pareus

Calvin’s emphasis on a Psalm’s primary meaning concerning David (and only secondarily concerning Christ) and his assertion of his own interpretation of a Psalm as more in keeping with its plain sense than that of the apostles themselves are two of the key issues that are at the heart of the Lutheran Aegidius Hunnius’s charges of judaizing against him. Hunnius time and again accuses Calvin of tearing the meaning of a Psalm away from the apostolic exegesis of it and arrogantly asserting his own personal authority not only over the patristic biblical interpretive tradition, but also above and beyond the authority of the apostles themselves. 1.

Likewise, Hunnius also disparages Calvin’s absence of employing these eight Psalms to teach the doctrines of the Trinity and the two natures of Christ. He writes that Calvin’s exegesis of these Psalms entangles the doctrines of the Trinity and the two natures of Christ in “his thorn bush of tricks.” 2. Thus, by not rendering the Christological reading as the primary sense and by denying the teachings of the Trinity and the two natures of Christ found in these Psalms, Hunnius believes Calvin covers these most clear prophecies with “Jewish perversions.” He contends that the end result of Calvin’s exegesis is to shatter and undermine the exegetical foundations of Christian teachings of the Trinity and the two natures of Christ and, more generally, the church’s Christological readings of the Old Testament. In these ways, says Hunnius, Calvin opens up Scripture to Jewish and Arian heresies. 3.

104 THE JUDAIZING CALVIN

Thus, I begin with some historical background to the debate between Aegidius Hunnius and Calvin’s defender David Pareus. Next, I explore Hunnius’s accusations against Calvin, especially as they appear in his critique of Calvin’s interpretation of these eight Psalms. Lastly, I turn to David Pareus’s defense of Calvin’s exegesis of the messianic Psalms. 4.

Introduction to the Debate of Hunnius and Pareus

John Calvin has certainly had his share of Lutheran critics. During his lifetime, most of his Lutheran detractors attacked his Eucharistic theology, including most significantly the criticisms of Joachim Westphal and Tilemann Hesshus. 5. The accusations of Aegidius Hunnius (1550-1603) against Calvin’s exegesis of Scripture appear after Calvin’s death; thus, the Reformed theologian David Pareus (1548-

1622) provides the formal rebuttal. Hunnius received his education from Württemberg and Tübingen. He began his career as a professor at the University of Marburg, but in 1592, he was called to Wittenberg. The central aim of his career was the restoration of Lutheran orthodoxy, which for him also crucially involved the fight against the growing presence of Calvinism in the electorate of Saxony, where he lived. Hence, Hunnius's treatises against Calvin were part of a larger program of reestablishing Lutheran orthodoxy and purifying Germany from what he saw as Calvinist contamination. David Pareus, on the other hand, was a student of Zacharias Ursinus in Heidelberg. Pareus spent most of his life as a pastor of various Reformed congregations in southern Germany and eventually finished the last two decades of his career as a teacher and the professor at the Collegium Sapientia in Heidelberg. Though he formally took the responsibility to confront Hunnius's accusations against Calvin, Pareus was by nature an irenicist who spent much of his career trying to find ways to unite Lutherans and the Reformed on such issues as the Lord's Supper.

The debate between Hunnius and Pareus begins with a 1589 treatise by Hunnius, in which he charges Calvin with undermining the exegetical foundations of the doctrine of the Trinity. 6. Although Hunnius recognizes that Calvin does believe in the doctrines of the Trinity and the deity of Christ (and therefore he is not actually an Arian), he contends that Calvin has rejected the patristic exegesis that has supported these dogmas and has, thus, "opened a window of opportunity for the corrupt theology of the Anti-Trinitarians," let alone that of the Arians and judaizers. 7. David Pareus defends Calvin against these accusations of Arianism and judaizing by pointing to his work against contemporary Anti-Trinitarians, such as Servetus, Alciati, and Blandrata. 8.

105 THE JUDAIZING CALVIN

Hunnus continues his attack on Calvin with a more thorough criticism of his exegesis in his 1593 treatise *Calvinus Iudaizans*, "The Judaizing Calvin," upon which this chapter focuses. In the *Calvinus Iudaizans*, Hunnius goes through the Old and New Testament passages traditionally used to support the doctrines of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ. 9. In each case, he cites direct quotations from Calvin's exegesis of these passages to take issue with what he sees as the ways Calvin undermines the Trinitarian and christological teachings contained in these scriptures. Thus, Hunnius aims to give solid proofs from Calvin's own exegesis for his contention that he weakens the exegetical foundations of the key Christian doctrines of Trinity and the divinity of Christ.

David Pareus responds two years later to Hunnius's treatise on the judaizing Calvin. Pareus takes issue with Hunnius's selective quotations of Calvin's exegesis of the biblical passages cited, arguing that he has deliberately left out other aspects of Calvin's exegesis—namely, the christological readings Calvin does give to these biblical verses. Furthermore, Pareus adds more examples of Calvin's exegesis to prove that in many cases, Calvin does maintain the traditional patristic reading of Scripture and upholds the doctrines of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ. 10.

Hunnus's Criticisms of Calvin's Exegesis

Hunnus begins his treatise on the judaizing Calvin by clarifying to Pareus that he has not accused and does not accuse Calvin of Arianism per se but, rather, of "offering an opportunity" and "opening a window" to lay a foundation for Arian impiety. Thus, he contends that Calvin distorts Scripture and drags it away from its genuine sense. Furthermore, decries Hunnius, Calvin not only "arrogantly looks down upon and mocks" the interpretations of the ancient and recent church fathers but also "in nothing does he inform himself of the sacred interpretations of the evangelists and apostles, badly mocking these and having no respect [for them]." 11. Hunnius proceeds first by pointing to biblical passages that the church fathers and the apostles interpret concerning the Trinity and that Calvin does not. Then he turns to biblical passages traditionally read concerning Christ's deity that Calvin does not apply in this way. Finally, he

turns to biblical texts traditionally read as prophecies of Christ's passion, resurrection, and ascension that Calvin does not employ in these ways.

106 THE JUDAIZING CALVIN

The Eclipse of Literal Prophecies of Christ and Apostolic Authority

Hunnius gives a lengthy exposition on Ps 2:7, "He said to me, 'You are my Son; today I have begotten you,'" to demonstrate that this verse must be read for the Trinitarian teachings it contains. His initial problem with Calvin's treatment of this verse is that Calvin first applies it literally to David and only secondarily to Christ—and this only via the type, by way of analogy and not by way of the literal sense. By applying this passage literally to David, argues Hunnius, Calvin renders unintelligible the apostles' interpretation in Acts 13:33 and Heb 1:5 of its plain sense as a literal prophecy of Christ. Hunnius points out that these New Testament passages reveal that the apostles understand the whole of Psalm 2 as David's prophecy of Christ's passion. Thus, he declares that Calvin departs from not only the authoritative and authentic apostolic exegesis of Ps 2:7 but also the mind of David himself and the whole apostolic church in general. Yet, even more deplorable in Hunnius's eyes is the fact that Calvin rejects the application of Ps 2:7 to the Trinitarian reading of Christ's eternal generation by the Father. He berates Calvin for his "singular audacity" in applying this passage to David as a son of God, rather than to Christ as the only begotten Son of God. "Therefore," asserts Hunnius, Calvin "is truly a Jew," for he "plucks" and "tears this Scripture from the apostles." 12.

Next, Hunnius turns to examine a set of biblical passages that the church fathers and apostles have traditionally interpreted concerning the deity of Christ, which include the interpretations of Ps 2:7, Ps 45:6-7, and Ps 68:18. The author of Hebrews uses both Ps 2:7 and Ps 45:6-7 to demonstrate the divinity of Christ. Thus, Heb 1:5, 6-9 reads (NRSV):

For to which of the angels did God ever say, "You are my Son; today I have begotten you"? [Ps 2:7]... Of the angels he says, "He makes his angels winds, and his servants flames of fire" [Ps 104:4]. But of the Son he says, "Your throne, O God, is forever and ever, and the righteous scepter is the scepter of your kingdom. You have loved righteousness and hated wickedness; therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness beyond your companions" [Ps 45:6-7].

The apostles state that in these passages the Spirit undoubtedly speaks concerning the Son, but Calvin writes that the simple and natural sense of Ps 45:6-7 concerns Solomon and that it concerns Christ only via the type and not under the literal sense. Consequently, Hunnius accuses Calvin of judaizing: "For the Jews clamor in this same sense as Calvin when he says this to be the simple and natural sense!" 13.

107 THE JUDAIZING CALVIN

Likewise, according to Hunnius, Calvin undermines the teachings of Christ's deity present in Ps 68:18. The Apostle Paul relates this verse to Christ in Eph 4, by which he declares Christ to be the same as the Lord in this Psalm, demonstrating the deity of Christ. Hunnius bemoans that Calvin "crucifies the brilliant predictions of the Prophets." Moreover, he accuses Calvin of arrogantly being his own teacher of Scripture by removing himself from the authority of apostolic exegesis. Even more to the point, Calvin has the audacity, says Hunnius, to criticize and correct the interpretation of the Apostle Paul when Calvin writes that "Paul *subtly bends* [deflectit]" Ps 68:18 toward Christ in Eph 4:8, implying that such a reading requires a "bending" of the passage away from its more natural sense. Again, he sees Calvin acquiescing to Jewish exegesis of this verse and undermining the scriptural foundations for Christ's deity. 14.

Hunnius next turns to Ps 8:4-6, which he sees as a literal prophecy of Christ's passion in accordance with the apostolic readings given of this text in Heb 2:6-8, I Cor 15:27, and Eph 1:22. Yet, instead of applying Ps 8:4-6 to Christ, Calvin "dares to twist" this passage and apply it to the excellence of humanity and to the dominion given to humanity over creation. Indeed, Calvin goes so far as to say that the excellence of humanity is such that it is "not far inferior to divine and heavenly glory." This, says Hunnius, is not only contrary to the apostles reading concerning Christ's *humiliation* but also contrary to the message of the Old Testament prophets themselves, who point not to the proximity of humanity's condition to the Divine, but to their distance from it. 15. In so doing, Calvin "gnaws away as with a dog's teeth the teaching of the Apostle Paul." And yet again Calvin asserts himself as a teacher of Scripture above the authority of Paul when he accuses the apostle of "dragging" [*trahit*] the meaning of Ps 8:4 to apply it to Christ's passion. 16. Thus, contends Hunnius, Calvin "plunders the plain sense" of these verses in the Psalms when he insists that the literal sense applies to the excellence of humanity and not to Christ:

Will the judgment of Calvin stand better than that of the apostles? If so, then when other articles of the Christian faith wish to be founded upon the Prophets, will the Prophets be seen not to explain them...but rather to *bend* [deflectit] them toward the sense, of which others in the Prophets have said is the true sense? If concerning the Prophets and their [the apostles'] words are considered to be embellished through *amplification*...if, furthermore, they [the apostles] are seen not so much as interpreting the Prophets' words but as accommodating them to some other thing through pious *deflection*

108 THE JUDAIZING CALVIN

[deflexion]...Well, even the Jews would not suffer the opening of so many thousands of cracks! 17.

In this way, Hunnius charges Calvin with separating the apostles' meaning from that of the prophets' meaning and, thus, threatening the very unity of the Testaments that Calvin claims to uphold.

After arguing for the literal sense of Ps 8:4-6 as a literal prophecy of Christ's passion, Hunnius turns to Calvin's interpretation of Psalm 22, which Christian tradition, the apostles, and the Gospels have undisputedly read in reference to the crucifixion of Christ. He demonstrates the multiple parallels between the Gospels' description of Christ's suffering during the crucifixion and Psalm 22. Thus, that Calvin should explain this Psalm first in reference to David is an atrocity in Hunnius's eyes. He views Calvin as a Jew, opposing Christ when he shatters these most basic prophecies and weakens the Christian interpretation of Psalm 22 before the Jews. Hunnius quotes Calvin's statement that David speaks of himself through the use of metaphors to bewail his condition and exclaims in the margins beside this quote, "Away with your metaphors!" Again, he disparages Calvin's "human invention" and blatant disregard for the interpretations of the evangelists and the apostles. Indeed, for him, Calvin is no better than a Jewish rabbi who devises ways to crucify Christ all over again. Finally, Hunnius quotes Calvin's exegesis of the John 19 account of Christ's crucifixion, in which Calvin writes that the evangelists *inappropriately drag* [*trahit*] Ps 22:18 to apply it to Christ, and thus they "neglect the figure and depart from the natural sense." At this, Hunnius can hardly contain his fury when he exclaims that Calvin not only exalts himself again over the authority of the evangelists and the apostles but also acts as their censor. In effect, fumes Hunnius, Calvin has accused the *evangelists*, rather than the Jews, of bending [deflexione] the meaning of this Psalm to an unnatural sense. 18.

Next Hunnius turns to Psalm 16 as a literal prophecy of Christ's resurrection, according to both the Apostle Peter (Acts 2:25-31) and the Apostle Paul (Acts 13:34-37). Indeed, both apostles explicitly write

that Ps 16:10 cannot be applied to David, in that David died and experienced corruption, and must be a prophecy of Christ's resurrection. Yet, Calvin proceeds to apply this passage to David nonetheless. 19. In response, Hunnius, using the terms Calvin employs in his criticisms of apostolic exegesis, sarcastically pronounces:

If Calvin was a servant of God, as his disciples proclaim of him, in no way could he have led others away from this one simple sense that the apostles set forth... You see with what tortuous *bending* [reflex] and serpentine circles this spirit of darkness *twists* [torqueat] itself so that this psalm is forced to be drawn away from the praise of Christ for which it is written. Therefore, he prefers to *drag* [trahere] the meaning to David in contradiction to Peter and Paul [who show] that David treated nothing of himself but entirely concerning Christ and his resurrection. 20.

109 THE JUDAIZING CALVIN

Thus, Calvin weakens all the strong prophecies of David and departs from apostolic authority. Indeed, Hunnius points out that Calvin even notes the apostles' readings of Ps 16:8-11 concerning Christ alone and exclaims, "If this is so, why does he apply it to the person of David?" Thus, if one follows Calvin, bellows Hunnius, the testimony of Psalm 16 can no longer be a refuge of Christian teaching; instead, it is filled with "Jewish treachery, wantonness, and tricks." 21.

Finally, Hunnius turns to Ps 68:18 and Ps 8:6 as literal prophecies of Christ's ascension, according to apostolic usage. He appeals to the Apostle Paul's use of Ps 68:18 in Eph 4:7-10 concerning Christ's ascension and condemns Calvin's application of it to David. 22. Having already pointed out Calvin's accusation that Paul *bends* the meaning of Ps 68:18 to apply it to Christ, he moves on to discuss Ps 8:6. The literal sense of this verse, in accordance with I Cor 16:25-27, Eph 1:20-22, and Heb 2:7-8, speaks of the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God and his dominion over all creatures, which occurs at Christ's ascension. Hunnius admits that Calvin does indeed "sprinkle some mentioning of Christ" into his exegesis of Ps 8:6, but far "too sparingly." More to the point, Calvin does not view this verse as prophecy. Hunnius is dissatisfied with the fact that Calvin will apply only the minor parts of Psalm 8 to Christ and instead narrates the whole of the Psalm as concerning the excellence of humanity. Thus, he concludes, "Attend to this, whoever you are, how much the most putrid glosses of Calvin depart from the minds of the holy apostles, who without doubt understand this Psalm more rightly and profoundly than a hundred Calvins and just as many Bezas or even more than all the foggy fuming of Pareus and all of these put together!" 23.

Hunnus not only is horrified at Calvin's departure from apostolic exegesis and traditional Christian readings of these texts but also accuses Calvin of wicked and clever subterfuge. He views Calvin as "sprinkling" his interpretations with references to Christ, as if to avoid accusation, and then going on to explain these passages much more fully concerning David. Hunnius labels these as "pure tricks," "deception," and a "game of cheating the church." Indeed, as a final proof of Calvin's artifices, he turns to Calvin's exegesis of Ps 110:1. Although Calvin does clearly state that Ps 110:4 ("You are a priest after the order of Melchizedek") does apply to none other than Christ, Hunnius

110 THE JUDAIZING CALVIN

contends that he sprinkles Ps 110:1 "with the soot of Jewish corruptions," for Calvin nonetheless applies this verse to David. The problem is that while the prior Christian exegetical tradition applies the whole of Psalm 110 to Christ, Calvin applies only a small portion of it. Thus, Hunnius believes that Calvin acts as a trickster when he claims to apply a Psalm to Christ, when in actuality he is picking and choosing what applies to Christ and what does not. 24.

Hunnius brings his charges against Calvin up another whole notch, though, when he points out that Ps 100:1 is *Jesus*' answer to the Pharisees' question about who is the Messiah and whose son he is. Hunnius scornfully writes that if Calvin had been standing beside the Pharisees, he would have answered that this verse could be understood concerning David, and indeed, in this way Calvin puts forth the Pharisees' inanities. But more to the point, *Jesus himself* sets the proper interpretation of this verse as concerning himself, as seen in Matt 22:41-46, Mk 12:35-37, and Lk 20:41-44. In applying Ps 110:1 to David, Calvin dares even to go against Christ, the true Interpreter! 25.

Hunnius's Charges against Calvin

In sum, Aegidius Hunnius's indictment against Calvin's exegesis of these Psalms amounts to four main charges. The first point of contention is the identification of the literal sense of these Psalms. Hunnius rightly points out that there is a long Christian exegetical tradition, guided by the New Testament usage of these Psalms, to identify their literal sense with the literal prophecies of Christ's deity, passion, resurrection, and ascension that they express. Calvin has time and again identified the literal sense of these Psalms with the meaning that pertains to David rather than with these prophecies of Christ. Though Calvin often does retain the christological reading of these Psalms in some way, he does so as a secondary figural or typological reading, in which he clearly states that these figural or typological readings are not the Psalm's "plain and simple" sense. Thus, Hunnius warns that Calvin's exegesis destabilizes clear testimonies of Christ's deity, passion, resurrection, and ascension. 26.

Second, Hunnius repeatedly accuses Calvin of arrogant disregard for apostolic authority in exegesis. He argues that Calvin removes the understandings of these Psalms from the interpretations given to them by the evangelists and apostles. Indeed, Calvin even claims the authority to censor the readings of the apostles and the evangelists when he alleges that they "drag" [trahit] or "bend" [deflectit] the sense to its application to Christ. On the contrary, says Hunnius, it is Calvin who bends [deflectit] the prophet's words for his own purposes and drags [trahit] the meaning away from the natural sense to his

111 THE JUDAIZING CALVIN

own interpretation. In a related move, then, Hunnius charges Calvin with "confusing and burying" the consensus of the church fathers on these passages—church fathers who rightly acknowledge apostolic authority and maintain the New Testament usage of these Psalms. 27.

As has been shown, Hunnius also implicates Calvin in practices of trickery and subterfuge. He paints Calvin as a crafty, devious, and deceitful exegete who is not completely honest or straightforward about the consequences of his exegesis. Hunnius intends to demonstrate for his audience the dangerous ramifications of Calvin's exegesis, namely, that it shatters the exegetical foundation of Christian teachings of Trinity and the deity of Christ, as well as christological prophecy in the Old Testament. 28. Hence, he judges Calvin to be "an angel of darkness, who comes forth from the abysmal pit to twist Scripture and destroy the grounds of defense of the Christian religion against Jewish and Arian adversaries." 29.

Finally, all of these charges culminate in Hunnius's charge of judaizing against Calvin. By denying the literal sense of these Psalms as prophecies of Christ, Calvin "bends the most sacred words from Christ to the gambling games of Jewish glosses." 30. When Calvin identifies the literal sense of these Psalms with their reading concerning the life of David, Calvin, says Hunnius, is reading like a Jew. When Calvin undermines the authority and power of apostolic readings of these Old Testament texts as prophecies of Christ and gives them a secondary or even a questionable status, then he—Hunnius contends—is promoting Jewish objectives. The deceitfulness and craftiness that Hunnius sees in Calvin's exegesis is, most unfortunately, very much in line with a long-standing medieval Christian depiction of Jews. Thus,

Calvin's exegesis has not just opened Christianity to the heresy of Arianism but exposed it to the greatest danger of all, according to Hunnius—namely, to a way of reading the Old Testament in which Christ is no longer the primary or central content.

NOTES

5. THE JUDAIZING CALVIN: THE DEBATE OF HUNNIUS AND PAREUS

1. Aegidius Hunnius, *Calvinus iudaizans. hoc est: Iudaicae Glossae et Corruptelae, quibus Iohannes Calvinus illustrissima Scripturae sacrae Loca & Testimonia de gloriosa Trinitate, Deitate Christi, & Spiritus Sancti, cum primis autem vaticinia prophetarum de adventu messiae, nativitate eius, passione, resurrectione, ascensione in coelos & sessione ad dextram Dei, detestandum in modum corrumpere non exhorruit. Addita est corruptelarum confutatio per Aegidium Hunnium* (Wittenberg, 1593).

2. Hunnius, 7.

3. Hunnius, 5-7, there 6. As a pertinent historical note, just four years prior to the publication of Calvin's Psalms commentary, Michael Servetus had been executed (1553) for his anti-Trinitarianism. Indeed, at this time Calvin was lecturing on the Psalms in Geneva. Calvin would not have imagined that he would be accused of undermining the doctrine of the Trinity. / Servetus executed because he accused Calvin of Judaizing

4. Interestingly enough, seven of the eight Psalms considered in this study play a central role in the case Hunnius is trying to make against Calvin. The only Psalm Hunnius does not use is Psalm 118. Two other Psalms (Ps 33:6 and Ps 68:18) are also employed in Hunnius's arguments against Calvin.

5. See the chapter by David Steinmetz, "Calvin and His Lutheran Critics," in *Calvin in Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995). 172-86. Calvin is seen as a Judaizer even by someone like Servetus, who accused him of creating a kind of "Jewish legalism." See Baron, "John Calvin and the Jews," in *Essential Papers on Judaism and Christianity in Conflict: From Late Antiquity to the Reformation*, ed. Jeremy Cohen (New York: New York University Press, 1991). 383-84. Lutherans also accused Calvin of Judaizing because of his more positive view of the law in the Christian life. See, for example, the brief comment made by Kraus, "Israel in the Theology of Calvin—Towards a New Approach to the Old Testament and Judaism," *Christian Jewish Relations* 22 (1989): 77. Louis Israel Newman writes about charges of Judaizing against Calvin from both Catholics and radical Protestants (*Jewish Influence on Christian Reform Movements*, Columbia University Oriental Studies 23 [New York: Columbia University Press, 1925], 384-96).

6. Aegidius Hunnius, *Articulus de Trinitate : per quaestiones et responsiones pertractatus solide et indubitatis testimoniis sacrarum literarum contra quasvis haereticorum veterum & recentium blasphemias strophas & corruptelas firmissime communitus*, Frnakfurt am Main: Johannes Spies, 1589).

7. See David Steinmetz, "The Judaizing Calvin," in *Die Patristik in der Bibelexegese des 16. Jahrhunderts*, ed. David C. Steinmetz and Robert Kolb, Wolfenbütteler Forschungen, Band 85 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999), 136.

8. See the reply of David Pareus in his *In Quartem Explicationum Catecheticae Partem, De Gratitudine, Praefatio, in Miscellanea Catechetica* (Johannes Tornaesius, 1622), 177-91, esp. 181. See also Steinmetz, 136-37.

9. Specifically, Hunnius attacks Calvin's exegesis of Gen 1, Gen 19:13, Gen 35:7, Ps 2:7-8, Ps 33:6, Ps 45:6-7, Ps 68:18, Mic 5:2, Is 6:3, Jn 10:30, Jn 14:10, Jn 17:21, 1 Jn 5:7, Col 1:15-16, Gen 3:15, Jer 31:22, Hag 2:6-7, Is 40:3, Deut 18:18-19, Is 61:1-2, Zech 9:9, Zech 13:7, Zech 11:12, Is 50:6, Ps 84:6, all of Psalm 22, Is 63:1-4, Is 43:25, Zech 9:11, Ps 16:8-10, Mic 2:13, Hos 6:2, Hos 13:14, Zech 14:4, and Ps 110:1. He also criticizes Calvin's exegesis of Ps 72:8 within the larger discussion of his exegesis of Zech 9:11.

10. David Pareus, *Libri duo: I. Calvinus Orthodoxus de Sacrosancta Trinitate: et de aeterna Christi Divinitate. II. Solida Exposita XXXIIX. Difficiliorum Scripturae Locorum et Oraculorum: de recta ratione applicandi Oracula Prophetica ad Christum : Oppositi Pseudocalvino Iudaizanti nuper à quodam emisso* (Neustadt: Matthaeus Harnisch, 1595).

11. Hunnius 4, 5, 6.

12. Hunnius 18, 19, 33, 23, there 22, 23.

13. Hunnius 30-32, there 32. See CO [Ioannis Calvini Opera Supersunt Omnia. 59 vols. Corpus Reformatorum. Vols. 29-88. Ed. G Baum, E. Cunitz, E Reuss. Brunswick and Berlin, 1863-1900] 31:451, 452-54. After first applying Ps 45:6-7 to **Solomon**, Calvin clearly states that this is the literal sense of the text and then moves on to show the comparison of Christ under the type of Solomon. Hunnius points out that the apostle warns those who ignore this testimony (Heb 2:1-4) and states, "I do not doubt that this applies to Calvin when he narrates the periscope of this Psalm concerning Solomon and this in a judaizing way" (Hunnius, 31).

14. Hunnius. 32-35, there 33. Hunnius calls him...a self-teacher of Scripture. For Calvin's exegesis, see CO 31:628.

15. Hunnius, 122-125, there 124. See CO 31:92. Here Hunnius cites Dan 4:35 and Is 40:17.

16. Hunnius, 125-26, there 125. Hunnius goes on to point out Calvin's further statements that the Apostle Paul drags [*trahit*] the meaning of Ps 8:4 to the debasement of Christ, just as the apostle also "deflects and "accommodates" the meanings of Deut 30:12 in Rom 10:5-7 and Ps 68 in Eph 4:8. See CO 31:93.

17. Hunnius, 127-28.

18. Hunnius, 131, 133, 134, there 133. Calvin writes on Ps 22:16-17 and Hunnius quotes: "If they object that David was never nailed to a cross, the answer is easy, namely, that in bewailing his condition, he has made use of a metaphor, declaring that he was not less afflicted by his enemies than the man who is suspended on a cross, having his hands and feet pierced through with nails. We will meet a little after with more of the same kind of metaphors." (CO 31:229; Hunnius, 132). Likewise, Calvin comments on Ps 22:18 and Hunnius quotes: "What follows in the next verse concerning his garments is metaphorical. It is as if he [David] had said that all his goods had become a pray to his enemies, even as conquerors are accustomed to plunder the vanquished or to divide the spoil among themselves by casting lots to determine the share that belongs to each" (CO 31:229; Hunnius, 132).

19. Hunnius, 146-48. Calvin comments on Ps 16:10 (and Hunnius quotes), "David entertains the undoubted assurance of eternal salvation, which freed him from all anxiety and fear. It is as if he had said, There will always be ready for me a way of escape from the grave, that I may not remain in corruption." (CO 31:156)

20. Hunnius, 149-50.

21. Hunnius, 151, 164-65.

22. Hunnius, 166. He writes, "Truly in this way Calvin weakens the citation of Psalm 68 with his wicked metaphors when he believes its sense to be characteristic of the things and history encompassed under David."

23. Hunnius, 170-74, there 174.

24. See Hunnius, 175-76, 176-77, 180-81. Of course, Hunnius points to the interpretations of Ps 110:1 concerning Christ in Heb 1:13, Matt 22:41-46, Mk 12:35-37, and Lk 20:41-44.

25. Hunnius, 178-79.

26. Hunnius, 181, 182-83, 183, 186.

27. Hunnius, 185-86, 187-88.

28. Hunnius, 182-83, 183, 186.

29. Hunnius, 181.

30. Hunnius, 185-86, 187-88.

<http://www.forgottenbooks.org/>

Dissertation Second.

CALVINUS JUDAIZANS AN ORTHODOXUS?

"Calvinus Judaizans" was the title of a work published at Wittemberg, A.D. 1595, by Aegidius Hunnius. It contained a sharp censure for applying to the temporal state and circumstances of the Jews those prophecies which were supposed to refer spiritually to the Christian Church. The year, however, did not pass away before David Pareus replied, under the title of "Calvinus Orthodoxus." And all who have perused his comments on this Prophet. must vindicate him from the charge of favoring Judaism, and applaud him for wisely neglecting all allegorical significations and mystical expositions. While it will be impossible to discuss the whole question of prophetic interpretation, it will be necessary to state some general views by which we thought to be guided.

The prophecies of the Old Testament were in many instances a divinely provided introduction to the events of the New. In them we may see the outlines of the process by which God was ever educating man for ultimate restoration to His image. They contain a suggestive method of destruction by palpable signs and wonders, which addressed the soul through their influence on the senses. Their value to the Jew was very different from that to the Christian. To the former they were the highest revelation attainable, while for us they do not reveal a single attribute or purpose of Deity which is not more fully made known through the Gospel dispensation. The Hebrew visions stand to us in the relation of porch to temple, and of dawn to day. They are to the Christ. tan a divine first lesson-book, and contain a series of condescending instructions suited to a low stage of religious and mental life. They were specially appropriate to the people to whom they were bestowed, and of a structure and material h:: accordance with the dispensation to which they ministered. They were prefigurative and preformative throughout. They were preparatory and thus far excellent, but not "chiefest of all" because not. permanent. Like the scaffolding, the growing blade, the finished portrait, they fail in comparison with the stately building, the ripened corn, the living person. Now Calvin avoids the extremes of the merely literal system and of the mystical allegories of the double sense. The former system treats the Old Testament as if it were all written at the same time, and every part of it addressed equally to all men. It excepts the ceremonial observances, and then considers that every sentence is reconcilable with all the rest by a spiritual process of traditionary reasoning. It is sternly opposed to all discrimination between the records of different eras; it admits of nothing gradual, variable, or local. Of the latter system we have an excellent example in the quotation just made from the comparison of Zuingle. He sees Christ and justification by faith everywhere. Not only must Hasmal -- a mere color -- be an emblem of the Son of God, but all who cannot receive this are branded as unenlightened. The truths which he has received through the gospel are so vividly impressed upon his soul and so thoroughly leaven his spirit, that he sees everything scriptural by this bright light of his inner man. His deficiency is of judgment, not of grace. The question thought not to be, what series of Christian doctrine can be grafted upon the cherubic emblem, but what truths it was intended to convey to the soul of the Prophet and the people, -- surely not those of the Augsburg Confession of Faith. We have to guard against a twofold error: on the one hand, a merely critical and rationalistic interpretation which never proceeds beyond the

surface; and, on the other, against a fanciful exposition of figurative language, as if in every case the doctrines, the graces, and the experiences of the New Covenant were intended to be revealed to Hebrew prophets.

Apposite, indeed, was the exclamation of the Jew, when he said of Ezekiel, "Doth he not speak parables?" He had to take a the and draw a city upon it; to shave his head, and divide the her into three significant parts; and the Jew might fairly ask, How is all this to benefit his soul? It could only do so by appealing to the spiritual principle in man's soul. As the Prophet must eat the roll, so we must to comprehend the meaning of divine emblems, that they may become to us the bread of life. There is a husk around many a spiritual fruit, and often times a stone within it, which seems devoid of nutriment; but still this is the way in which it pleases our heavenly Father to nourish us. All signs, emblems, and sacraments of any true religion are beneficial to us only when we spiritually perceive their inward and animating grace. All that is outward in form and ceremony and machinery is only the vehicle, not the substance, of our support as God's children, and our growth in his likeness. This foundation truth must be laid firmly as a bashes for every portion of the superstructure. The carnal mind never did and never can comprehend the things of the Spirit of God. The power of understanding the meaning must come from the same Deity who sends the vision. On this broad rock of truth we may build every sound interpretation of all the figurative language of Scripture. This principle we may gather from the way in which the early Christian writers explain the symbols of Holy Writ. St. Chrysostom, for instance, treats clearly the lesson we should learn from the seraph's taking the coal from the altar and touching the Prophet's lips with its hallowed fire.¹ St. Ambrose seems scarcely satisfied with the image -- bread of life: he must "eat life." "Whoso then," says he, "eateth life cannot die. How should he die whose food is life?"² "and this bread," he adds, "is the remission of sins." St. Augustine speaks of "angels feeding on the eternal word," and of "men eating angels' food."³ Language like this implies the struggle of the spiritual mind to express itself fully through the medium of carnal language; and what were the Shechinnah and the Seraphim, the Urim and the Thummim, the live goat and the slain goat, but symbols receiving all their significance from the Divine truths which they conveyed to the soul? The worship of the one God through the appointed Mediator was ever the same in its hidden essence, and ever must be, while it is ever varying in its, form, according to the divers needs of our frail humanity. It is flexible exceedingly to the eye and the ear, and[unchangeable only in its living spirit. All nature, organic and inorganic, has been used to illustrate it and communicate it, but this never has made, nor can make, the unseen visible. Still the question will recur, Where must we draw the line between the human and the divine in these prophetic visions? No man can draw such a line with accuracy except for himself. Let all who doubt this assertion try to divide mind from matter in the living man. Many have attempted it, and their failures remain to mark the narrow lib, its of their knowledge and the assumed regions of their ignorance. The matured Christian instincts of the cultivate worshipper will be every man's best guide under the promised teaching of the Holy Spirit. An infallible interpreter is not for us in the flesh; the interpreting Spirit must dwell within us, otherwise we shall see nothing but the outward aspect of the gorgeous vision. The inspiration within must harmonize with that without., which is not verbal but ideal. The heaven-wrought ideas of the Hebrew Prophets protect themselves.

We do not require either a verbal or literal theopneustia: the truths themselves by their own imperishableness defeat the mortality of the language with which they are associated. They

reverberate and percolate through all the pages of the mighty record; they hide themselves obscurely in one chapter only to emerge more clearly in another; they diverge in one book only to recombine in another; so that to the sympathizing soul Scripture is ever a self-sufficing interpreter. Hence we are not careful to defend Calvin's interpretations as faultless: theology as a science has advanced rapidly during three hundred years; and while some of his expositions have become antiquated, we still uphold him as "orthodoxus." The law of development operates in the moral as well as in the physical universe. "Draw a *cordon sanitaire*," says a modern reviewer, "against dandelion or thistle-down, and see if the armies of earth would suffice to interrupt this process of radiation, which yet is but the distribution of weeds. The secret implications of the truth have escaped at a thousand points in vast arches above our heads, rising high above the garden wall, and have sown the earth with memorials of the mystery which they envelop."⁴

A second principle which we must bear in mind is, that every prophetic revelation was expressly adapted to the capacity of its original recipients. The extrinsic agency is always transitory. We of later generations learn enough if we profit by the latent and permanent essence. Hence the interpretation of the cherubim by the four evangelists is utterly untenable: and all such suppositions are indexes of a state of mind wholly incompetent to unfold prophetic mysteries. The very occurrence of hundreds of crude guesses like this, implies the necessity of submitting the prophetic emblems to some general laws of exposition. The highest criticism and the profoundest scholarship should be applied to them, that we may at once ignore all traditions which are proved to be corruptions. These prophecies presuppose a moral responsibility in the people to whom they were addressed; and hence they were fitted to awaken this feeling when dormant, to frighten it when morbidly perverted, and to animate it when righteously sensitive. Calvin's assertion that the living creatures and the wheels imply that God by his angels guides the physical motions of the earth, the air, and the sea, (Ezekiel 1:21,) is altogether untenable. Revelation does not teach anything which human philosophy can discover. It manifests its whole aim and essence to be moral, lying in that region of our nature which is under the sway of the conscience, and the will rather than of the intellect. These emblematic visions appeal to the affections and aspirations of soul, to the energies of reverence and faith, of wonder and of love. They have to do with what is infinite and unseen, the immeasurable and the unattainable. Hence they are rather divine agencies for quickening, stimulating, and directing man's highest nature. They assist us towards attaining a true idea of God, they show us our own insignificant vileness and littleness, and suggest the possibility of an atonement of these two. They stir up our attention to the threatenings and the promises of an Invisible Person, which can influence us only by being believed, and enforce the commands of ineffable wisdom, which can benefit us only by being obeyed. They present to our thoughts the idea of condescending mediation, the infinitely holy condescending to purify and to abide with the morally unclean. They may further imply the general providence over the chosen race, as well as the special guidance of individuals; the molding into its preordained shape all their future history, and yet not sensibly controlling the will of agents left responsible for their every action. No discoveries of science can ever interfere with such an interpretation as this, and those who adopt it need never fear the necessity for changing it when the progress of physical knowledge must lead us to alter our views of other interpretations. It, belongs to a region of our nature completely separable from that which comprehends either the niceties of language, or the laws of the physical universe. There is a wide gulf, deep and impassable, between the moral and the intellectual departments of our nature. The imperfect state of physical science at the time of the Reformation is a sufficient apology for the

mistakes of reformers; but their ignorance is not pardonable in us. We need not Judaize, and yet we may be apt scholars in all Hebrew lore, and orthodox interpreters of the Sacred Word of the Most high.

¹ Hom. 5 section 3, and compare the Litany of St. James, Ass. Cod. Lit. 5:56.

² In Psalm 118. Lit. 18, see. 28, 48.

³ In Psalm 33 En. 1 section 6, and Psalm 78:26.

⁴ Review of "Vindication of Protestant Principles." -- Tait's Mag. page 758. 1847.
