John Calvin, Theologian in Exile

Dr. Justo L. González

The González Lecture Series
Princeton Theological Seminary
Princeton, New Jersey
October 14, 2016

John Calvin, Theologian in Exile

The purpose of these lectures is to look anew at the Reformation of the Sixteenth century, and to do so from our own perspective as Latinos and Latinas. This is a process that was begun some time ago, and which is also expressed in the book being presented at these lectures, *Our 95 Theses: Five Hundred Years after the Reformation*. It is also part of a task several of us have undertaken, to reread and reinterpret history from our own perspective.

That perspective includes several dimensions. One of these, the most commonly used, is the category of mestizaje, brought forth by Virgilio Elizondo in this book *Galilean Journey* and employed by most Latino and Latina theologians. This is the category I employ in my recent book *Augustine the Mestizo*, trying to see the presence of Augustine's African mother and Roman father in his entire thought, from his early struggles before his conversion to his late works after the fall of Rome.

When it comes to the Protestant Reformation, however, it is difficult to apply the category of mestizaje. The Catholic Reformation coincided with Iberian colonial expansion, and therefore looking at mestizaje in that context is quite helpful. But the Protestant Reformation took place in the heart of Western Europe, where whatever mestizaje there was would be less noticeable.

There is, however, another dimension of Latino experience that may be quite helpful in a rereading of the Protestant Reformation, particularly among the Anabaptist and the Reformed. This is the category of exile.

Exile is the context of many Latina and Latino experiences in the US. We tend to limit

that word to those who have come fleeing dictatorial regimes, particularly regimes our government does not like. Thus, in recent decades those coming from Cuba, Nicaragua or Venezuela have been considered exiles, while those coming from Mexico, Guatemala and El Salvador have been considered "economic refugees." But from the perspective of those who have crossed the borders for whatever reason, we are all exiles. No matter whether you came fleeing a firing squad or famine and squalor, you miss your land. You may not like what is going on there. But you still miss it, and in that sense, you are an exile.

And, even if you were born in this country, even if your ancestors have been here for countless generations, if you live in one of the many areas where people of your color and culture are made to feel alien, in a sense you are an exile in your own land —with the added pain that you have no other land to yearn for. You may not have crossed any borders, but still, you have the experience that David Maldonado so aptly calls "Crossing Guadalupe Street."

So, as I considered the theme of these lectures, I decided I would focus on the experience of exile, and how this shaped the theology of at least some of the reformers. More specifically, I would focus on Calvin as an exile, and how this may have shaped his theology.

At first, it would seem that everyone knew that Calvin was an exile. If you go on the Internet and search for "Calvin," "exile," you will find thousands of references. But, significantly, most of these have to do with his three years of exile from Geneva, mostly in Strasbourg, and very few seem even to remember that even in Geneva Calvin was an exile, for he was French. Calvin felt it necessary to leave Paris in 1533, after a famous and controversial sermon by Nicolas Cop, rector of the university —a sermon in which Calvin had a hand. After a series of

wanderings, he settled first in Basel and then, in 1536, in Geneva, where he spent most of the rest of his life. Although we rightly associate his name with Geneva, the fact is that he was an exile and a foreigner in the city, and that it was not until 1559, five years before his death, that he finally became a citizen of Geneva.

We tend to think that because he was French, and the Genevans spoke French, Calvin would feel quite at home in Geneva. But any exile knows that, even when the language and many customs are the same, there are differences. To this day, the French joke about the slow pace of life in Switzerland. Throughout Calvin's life there were many instances in which he seemed to lose patience with the pace at which the government moved. To this must have been added many other details. Among other things, one might even say that he had to learn again how to count, for once you got past 69 the names of the numbers were not the same that he had learned as a child.

Calvin was an exile and knew the pain of exile. As is the case with most exiles today, he pined for his native land, but he was also pined because that land was not what he thought it ought to be. This may be seen in the letter which he placed at the beginning of his very first edition of the *Institutes*, addressed to the king of France. The feelings he expresses there are shared by most exiles today:

> And do not think that I am preparing my own personal defense, thereby to return safely to my native land. Even though I regard my country with as much natural affection as becomes me, as things now stand I do not much regret being excluded.[1]

Any exile in this twenty-first century will immediately understand the feeling behind

[1] *Inst.*, Prefatory Address to King Francis, 2. (LCC, 1:11).

Calvin's words as he comments on the calling of Abram in Genesis 12. While most commentators stress Abraham's faith, Calvin also stresses the pain his obedience required. Abram, Calvin says, "had been, up to that time, settled in his nest, having his affairs settled, and living quietly and tranquilly among his relatives." And this is the reason why ....

> Moses, in other places so concise, here expresses a plain and easy matter in three different forms of speech. But [here] the case is otherwise. For since exile is in itself sorrowful, and the sweetness of their native land still holds nearly all men bound to itself, God strenuously persists in his command to leave the country, for the purpose of thoroughly penetrating the mind of Abram. If he had said a single word, "Leave thy country," this indeed would not lightly have pained his mind; but Abram is still more deeply affected, when he hears that he must renounce his kindred and his father's house.[2]

These words were written in 1564, shortly before his death, and Calvin still seems to be longing for his native land. Indeed, Calvin was never at home in Geneva. Other refugees who came for a shorter time made glowing comments about the city that Calvin had shaped. John Knox, the Scottish reformer, declared: "In other places, I confess Christ to be truly preached; but manners and religion so sincerely performed I have not yet seen in any other place."[3] Yet Calvin himself on his deathbed would still consider Geneva "a perverse and unhappy nation".[4]

Eight years earlier Theodore de Bèze or Beza, another Frenchman whom Calvin had known for years and who had been working for the Reformation in Lausanne, settled in Geneva, where he would eventually become Calvin's successor. Beza too still felt the pain of exile. A stanza in one of his poems while in Lausanne says:

> Adieu, France! Adieu!
> Qui êtes le lieu

[2] *Comm. on Jeremiah*, 12.1 (pp. 342, 343).
[3] (Monter, p. 186) Dated in 1556.
[4] Quoted in Hirzel, 4. Lettres, 2:576.

Qui premièrement
Au monde me vîtes,
Et premier ouîtes
Mon gémissement.[5]

[Fare ye well, my France! Fare ye well!
The land that first my eyes did see,
The land where first the world heard me.]

And then he goes on to say, as could say many of today's exiles in this very land, that he willingly dies away from his native land, which has become the abode of murderers.

But it was not only Calvin and Beza who were exiled in Geneva. One of the constant causes of friction between Calvin and many native Genevans was his insistence on the need to provide hospitality to exiles. This was no inconsequential matter, for what began as a trickle in 1523 became a flood thirty years later. The time came when there were more exiles in Geneva than native citizens. As happens in such cases, the latter complained that the refugees were taking their jobs and straining their resources, that the money that some refugees brought with them were making them masters of the city, that the culture of the city would be inexorably destroyed, and that Geneva itself would decline. (Allow me to add, parenthetically, that in this they were proven wrong, for scholars agree that the influx of skilled laborers, merchants, and people with the daring spirit required to leave one's land to venture into the unknown were partly responsible for Geneva's outstanding prosperity by the end of the century. The capital that the émigrés brought with them, and the skilled labor of others among the immigrants, soon resulted in a flourishing textile industry whose exports became one of the two main

[5] Auguste Bernus, *Théodore de Bèze à Lausanne* (Lausanne: Georges Bridel & Cie., 1900), 57.

sources of income for the city. The other was publishing, which flourished by combining capital and skilled labor with the numerous works by Calvin and other exiles that the rest of Protestant Europe was eager to read.)

Still, one can understand the resentment of many native Genevans. In claiming their independence, they had rid themselves of the Savoyard nobility, and now they found themselves surrounded by exile nobility —mostly French and Italian— and the major sources of income in the hands of immigrants. By mid-century, every single pastor in Geneva was foreign born. Most of them were French, but there were also English, Italian, and Spanish churches led by pastors of those nationalities. (The pastor of the Spanish church was Juan Pérez de Pineda, also known for his work translating the New Testament and the Psalms into Spanish. Casiodoro de Reina, famous for his translation of the entire Bible, also resided in Geneva until the dogmatic strictures of the city made him leave it shaking the dust of his feet and declaring that Geneva had become a new Rome.) When the Academy of Geneva was founded, and during its first years, only one of its professors was a Genevan by birth. Lists of physicians, lawyers, printers, and textile manufacturers, as well as of those claiming titles of nobility, were overwhelmingly French and Italian.

Furthermore, as is often the case, the influx of religious refugees also opened the way for others with more mixed motives. And, as could be expected, there were even some who infiltrated the city as spies, in some cases hoping to place Geneva once again under Catholic and Savoyan rule.

Many native Genevans were also unhappy that many of these exiles, by conspiring to

change things in France, were putting the city itself in jeopardy. Although there were several other instances, this became particularly apparent in 1560, when the Conspiracy of Amboise was discovered, which hoped to abduct the King Henry II of France, and to capture or kill several of his main supporters. The wars of religion that followed shortly thereafter put Geneva in serious jeopardy, and many Genevans blamed the extremist immigrants for these events. But by then Calvin and his party had the city firmly under control, for five years earlier Genevan Protestant patriot Ami Perrin, a leader of the party that Calvin called "Libertines," who sought to oust Calvin and his supporters by force of arms, was defeated and exiled from the city.

The defeat of Perrin in 1555 was a great setback for the anti-immigration party. Until then, the city did not encourage immigrants to become citizens, but now the policy began to change, and by 1560 laws were passed forcing some immigrants to become citizens. Calvin himself had officially become a Genevan citizen a year earlier.

Still, the resistance to the influence of immigrants and their descendants continued, particularly in the realm of politics and government. It was not until 1559 that the first son of an immigrant was allowed to sit in the Council of Two Hundred, a legislative body clearly subjected to the Small Council. And it was only 35 years later, in 1594 —long after Calvin's death— that the first son of an immigrant sat in the Small Council, which was the real seat of political power.

Calvin disagreed with the anti-immigration party, not on the basis that the flood of refugees would eventually bring greater prosperity —to which he paid little attention—, but simply on the basis of Christian duty. Commenting on the passage in Hebrews about those who entertained angels unawares, he says:

> He is not only speaking about the right of hospitality which used to be practiced among the rich, but rather he is giving orders that the poor and the needy are to be received since at that time many were refugees from their homes for the Name of Christ. To add additional commendation for this kind of duty, he says that angels have sometimes been entertained by those who thought they were receiving men. I have no doubt that he is thinking of Abraham and Lot. . . . If anyone objects that this was an unusual occurrence, I have a ready answer in the fact that we receive not only angels but Christ himself when we receive the poor in His Name.[6]

In the *Institutes*, Calvin connects the hospitality and support that are to be given to the foreigner and the needy with the doctrines of God's grace and of the divine image in humankind, and he seems to be referring particularly to religious refugees, in whom he says that this divine image "is most carefully to be noted." On this basis, he commends:

> Therefore, we have no reason to refuse any who come before us needing our help. If we say that he is a stranger, the Lord has stamped on him a sign that we know [the image of God]. . . . If we allege that he is contemptible and worthless, the Lord responds by showing us that he has honored him by making his own image to shine in him. If we say that we owe him nothing, the Lord tells us that he has brought him before us so that in him we may see the many benefits that we owe to him. If we say that he is unworthy that we take even a step in his behalf, the image of God which we are to see in him is quite worthy that we give for it all that we are and have. Even when it is someone who not only is worthless, but also has insulted and injured us, this is not reason enough for us to cease loving, pleasing, and serving him.[7]

And, in words that remind us of the comments of Pope Francis about a certain politician, Calvin goes so far as to say that "those who attack foreigners, and who even use that word as an insult are clearly showing that they are not to be counted among the children of God and are as removed from his church as are dogs and pigs."[8]

*****

[6] *Comm. On Hebrews*, 13.2 (pp. 205-4).
[7] *Inst.* 3.7.6.
[8] CO 53:270.

But it is not enough to say that Calvin, himself an exile, defended others who were also exiles, and for similar reasons. Even though Calvin's experience as an exile, and his struggles in defense of other exiles, elicit clear echoes of present-day experiences and struggles, from our perspective as reflective Christians there is another question that is probably just as important, or perhaps even more so. This question is, is it possible to discern the impact on Calvin's theology of his condition as an exile, even beyond his explicit statements on exile and immigration?

In response to that question, the first possible example that comes to mind is Calvin's insistence on the role of the Law of God for the ordering of society. Obviously, what we have here is a matter of different emphases, and not one of absolute disagreement, but historians and theologians have long pointed to the difference between Luther and Calvin in this regard. When Luther speaks of "the Law," he is not usually referring to the Old Testament, or to the Law of Moses, but rather to the Word of God, be it in the Old or in the New Testament, whenever it serves to show the depth of human sin and the need for the Gospel. There is also, as he says in his *Commentary on Galatians*, a "civil use of the Law, which is valid for the restraint of the uncivilized."[9] Once one has received the Gospel, the Law still provides guidance for the believer. But, always fearful of a return to justification by the works of the Law, Luther did not emphasize this point. Thus understood, there is a dialectical and constant relationship between law and Gospel —or, as some would say later, between God's NO and God's YES. In contrast, when Calvin speaks of "the Law'' he usually means the commandments of God as they appear in what he

[9] LW 26:275.

calls “the books of Moses,” as well as in the rest of the Old Testament. While the Gospel certainly surpasses the Law, it does not abrogate it in any sense. The Law, both moral and ceremonial, was a promise, like a pedagogue leading to Christ. Now that the Gospel has fulfilled what they promised, the ceremonial aspects of the Law are no longer binding; but the moral Law still is. Calvin agrees with Luther that the Law has been given also for the proper ordering of society. Like Luther, he would say that Christians ought to obey civil authority. Even tyrants ought to be obeyed, for their authority comes from God. But he then makes a notable exception. In the very last paragraph of the *Institutes* he wrote words that would change the course of human history:

> But in that obedience which we have shown to be due the authority of rulers, we are always to make this exception, indeed, to observe it as primary, that such obedience is never to lead us away from obedience to him, to whose will all desires of all kings ought to be subject, to whose decrees all their commandments ought to yield, to whose majesty their scepters ought to be submitted. . . . And how absurd would it be that in satisfying men you should incur the displeasure of him for whose pleasure you obey men themselves! The Lord, therefore, is the King of Kings, who, when he has opened his sacred mouth, must alone be heard, before and above all men; next to him we are subject to those men who are in authority over us, but only in him. If they command anything against him, let it go unesteemed.[10]

These words would soon make royal scepters fall, crowned heads topple, and new nations be born. Even though often forgotten when Calvinists were actually in power, these words resounded throughout much of the history of the Reformed tradition. Their echoes may be heard in the Barmen Declaration of 1934.

On the other hand, the insistence that there is a Law of God above every human law

[10] *Inst.* 4.20.32 (LCC 2:1520).

means that there is no place for anarchy. Even when a human government has been toppled for good reason, there is still the Law of God that must be obeyed. (One wonders if Calvin would have said that revolutions are sometimes necessary, but that they must always be conducted decently and in order!)

Obviously, there are many reasons why Calvin took his well-known stance in relation to the Law of God and its function in the civil order, and those reasons must be taken into account in any fuller discussion of Calvin's views regarding the Law. But I would suggest that one of those many reasons was precisely the fact that he was an exile.

This may be clearly seen in his *Commentary on Daniel*, which begins with a dedication to believers in France in which Calvin expresses both his condition as an exile and the responsibility he feels for his native country. He says:

> Although I have been absent these six-and-twenty years . . . from that native land which I own in common with yourselves, and whose agreeable climate attracts many foreigners . . . yet it would in no way be pleasing or desirable to me to dwell in a region from which the Truth of God, pure Religion, and the doctrine of eternal salvation are banished, and the very kingdom of Christ laid prostrate! Hence I have no desire to return to it; yet it would be neither in accordance with human nor divine obligation to forget the people from which I am sprung, and to put away all regard for their welfare.[11]

And then, commenting on Daniel's refusal to obey the king, Calvin goes on to say:

> Since, therefore, Daniel could not obey the king's edict without denying God, . . . he did not transgress against the king. . .. The fear of God ought to precede, that kings may obtain their authority. For if anyone begins his reverence of an earthly prince by rejecting that of God, he will act preposterously, since it is a complete perversion of the order of nature. Then let God be feared in the first place, and earthly princes will obtain their authority if only God shines forth. . .. For earthly princes lay aside their power when they rise up against God, and are unworthy of

[11] *Comm. on Daniel*, Dedicatory epistle (p. lxiv).

being reckoned in the number of mankind.[12]

Calvin knew by experience that kings could be tyrants, and that the church could also fall into the hands of tyrants. This was the reason why he began developing what eventually became the Presbyterian form of government. On the political side, that was the reason why he left France. In Geneva, he constantly fought with a civil government of which he and other exiles like him could never be part. In such circumstances, the law of the land is relativized. In France, Francis I cannot have the last word. And in Geneva, the Small Council cannot have the last word. The last word belongs to God alone, and the exile and the excluded can always have recourse to its authority.

Quite often theologians and other academicians cannot understand why the Latino Christian community puts so much store on Scripture, and I would suggest that one reason is that the authority of Scripture, reaching beyond the authority of local governments and local customs and prejudices, provides a point of support for those who must live as aliens in an alien land —or, even worse, as aliens in their own land.

A second well-known difference between Luther and Calvin has to do with their understanding of communion. In most textbooks —including my own— Calvin's understanding of communion is discussed in terms of how Christ is present in it. Posing the question in this manner, a spectrum of Protestant views is commonly drawn, with Luther at one end, Zwingli at another, and Calvin someplace in between. While there is a measure of truth in this, it tends to obscure Calvin's particular perspective on the matter. Luther, Roman Catholics, and Zwingli

[12] *Comm. on Daniel*, 3.22 (Lecture xxx).

debated how Christ comes to be present at communion. Calvin deals with this question in a different way. On the one hand, his conviction that the resurrected Jesus is still fully human will not allow him to think in terms of the body of the resurrected Jesus enjoying a ubiquity that it did not before the resurrection. As he says, "Let nothing inappropriate to human nature be ascribed to his body, as happens when it is said either to be infinite or to be put in a number of places at once."[13] On the other hand, he is convinced that Christ is really and literally present in communion. This is why it is often said that for Calvin the presence of Christ in communion is real but spiritual.

But this bypasses what may be the most striking note in Calvin's eucharistic doctrine. For him it is not so much a matter of Christ coming to us in communion, as it is of our being taken to his presence in a proleptic prefiguration of the heavenly banquet. He says:

> But greatly mistaken are those who conceive no presence of flesh in the Supper unless it lies in the bread. For thus they leave nothing to the secret working of the Spirit, which unites Christ himself to us. To them Christ does not seem present unless he comes down to us. As though, if he should lift us to himself, we should not just as much enjoy his presence! The question is therefore only in the manner, for they place Christ in the bread, while we do not think it is lawful for us to drag him down from heaven. Let our readers decide which one is more correct. Only away with that calumny that Christ is removed from his Supper unless he lies hidden under the covering of bread! For since this mystery is heavenly, there is no need to draw Christ to earth that he may be joined to us.[14]

Since this takes place by the virtue or power of the Holy Spirit, Calvin's view is often called "virtualism".

While in this case again there are many reasons why Calvin follows this particular path, I venture to suggest that we may gain new perspectives on Calvin's virtualism by looking at it

[13] *Inst.* 4.17.19. (LCC 2:1382).
[14] *Inst.* 4.17.31 (LCC 2:1403).

from the perspective of exile. Luther and Zwingli seem to be at opposite ends of the spectrum. But they do have in common the fact that they are both at home —Luther in Saxony, Zwingli in Zürich. Therefore, while they differ as to how Christ comes to be present at communion, they are both satisfied with a view of communion in which Christ comes down to where the congregation is —in one case in Wittenberg, and in the other in Zürich, in one case physically, and in another symbolically. Calvin would say, as I have just quoted, that "to them Christ does not seem present unless he comes down to us." Calvin is very much engaged with the congregation in Geneva, but Geneva is not his home. In a sense, France is his home; but the France for which he yearns does not actually exist, and in the actual France he probably would be even less at home than he is in Geneva—which is why we find in his writings the repeated assertion that, while he still loves France, he would rather not live there. So, to him is it not enough to say that Christ comes to the gathered congregation in Geneva or in Wittenberg. Christ certainly does that. But what is most important is that, by the power or virtue of the Holy Spirit, the Genevan congregation is taken up to heaven, to eat with congregations in France, and in Wittenberg, and elsewhere. Calvin, the exile who does not feel at home in Geneva and who no longer has a home in France, is taken to his heavenly home together with believers from Zürich, Wittenberg, and Paris. And this is not an individualistic experience, as when one says that one meets Christ in the eucharistic celebration. On the contrary, what is envisioned here is the banquet of all the people of God.

All of this leads us to a third characteristic of Calvin's thought that may be related to his condition as an exile. This is his international perspective. For a number of reasons, the

Protestant reformers —including Calvin— did not have much of a sense of missionary responsibility to the rest of the world. Calvin agreed with Luther, that the commandment to go and preach the gospel to all nations was given to the apostles, was fulfilled by them, and is no longer the calling of Christians. In this context, there is a wide difference between Protestant reformers such as Luther and Calvin and Catholic reformers such as Loyola and Las Casas. But still, within Protestantism itself, Calvin was noted for his international interests and connections. This was due in part to his humanist background, which provided him with a number of contacts in other lands even before he became known as a Reformer. While both Luther and Calvin emphasized the importance of the vernacular, both were exceptionally gifted in their own vernaculars, and both wrote many of their works in Latin, there is no doubt that Luther preferred to write in the language of his home and his immediate surroundings, while Calvin preferred to write in Latin, and used French mostly in his correspondence and in his dealings with the authorities in Geneva. He published his *Institutes* in Latin in 1536, and the French edition only five years later. After that, he published succeeding editions first in Latin and then in French —the last editions being the Latin one in 1559, and the French in 1560. This was not a matter of intellectual snobbery. He wrote in Latin, and he lectured in Latin, because Latin was the lingua franca of Europe at his time. True, nobody actually spoke Latin as a means of daily communication; but if anyone wished to communicate with others from other lands, this had to be done in Latin. As an exile in Geneva, Calvin could make do with French. But first in his contacts with other theologians, then in his new exile in Strasbourg, and finally back in Geneva when the city was flooded by exiles not only from France, but also from Italy, Germany, England,

Scotland, and Spain, he needed to communicate with them in Latin. This was more so the case since many of these exiles had come to Geneva having heard of him and seeking to learn from him. Calvin, an exile, found himself leading the church in a city of exiles. While there were in the city congregations for each language group, Calvin's lectures and treatises had to be given and written in the only language most of them had in common, Latin.

Within that international context, in which most found themselves in disagreement with the government and the laws of their own native countries, Calvin's emphasis on the universal and permanent validity of the Law of God, and of its supremacy over every human law, found welcoming ears. And his understanding of communion as taking believers beyond the confines of their local congregations, and to the very presence of God, helped bind together people of very different cultures who had converged in Geneva, and also kept each of them in connection with their kindred who still remained in their various native lands.

Calvin the exile gathered around himself a community of exiles. This community in turn kept close ties with parallel communities in other places, such as Frankfort, Strasbourg, and Venice. And it also helped spread Calvin's thought and influence throughout Europe. English exiles during the reign of Mary Tudor returned under Elizabeth, and eventually gave the Church of England its markedly Calvinistic flavor. The story of John Knox and the Scottish reformation is well known. Something similar happened in the Netherlands. Less known is the story of the contingent of Spanish Hieronymite friars who left their convent in Santiponce, near Seville, to gather a year later in Geneva, and whose impact is seen to this day in the translation of the Bible produced by one of them (Casidoro de Reina) and reedited by another (Cipriano de

Valera). When Bernardino Ochino, the vicar-general of the Capuchin friars in Italy, was converted to Protestantism, he fled to Geneva, and for a while became a close associate of Calvin.

Calvin the exile had developed a theological outlook that resonated with the experience of other exiles, and then these exiles and their descendants spread Calvin's influence throughout the world.

Having said this, and as I come to the end of my allotted time, questions remain in at least two directions. The first of these is the historical direction. All I have done here today is make some probes into specific elements of Calvin's theology. Thus, the question still remains: What would be the result of a thorough re-reading of all of Calvin from the perspective of exile? That I leave simply as a question for more devoted Calvin scholars, or for a possible doctoral student seeking a dissertation topic.

The other question is quite different, and it is in fact a series of questions: If Calvin's theology is a theology of exile, how does that theology appeal to the millions of today's exiles? What can those millions bring to the reinterpretation of Calvin's theology for our day? If Calvin's reformation is a reformation by exiles and for exiles, what will be the role in the Reformation of the twenty-first century of those whose identity is linked with crossing borders, or with crossing Guadalupe Street? These are questions to which we must be attentive, but which only the future will answer.

Having said all this, I must end by making mine a few words of Calvin at the end of one of his lectures on Jeremiah: "I now so quickly pass over things worthy of longer explanation. . ..

But I cannot proceed further, for the clock strikes."[15]

[15] *Comm. on Jeremiah* 31.33 (Lecture cxxiii).