

experience is not always vivid enough to enable its subject to escape from the meshes of argument so triumphantly as did that once blind man. This scholastic method destroys the "alls" of Scripture, and perplexes the student with modified totalities. What can he do with such texts as these: "God our Saviour who will have *all* men to be saved"; "The Living God who is the Saviour of *all* men, specially of those that believe"; "That was the true Light which lighteth *every* man that cometh into the world"? Language says one thing, logic another. The young minister shuts the book, and chooses some other text, lest, on the one hand, he should with his limitations offend the common sense of his hearers, or, on the other, with his declaration of God's all embracing love and of Christ's common grace, give to some heresy hunter the foundation for a false charge of universalism.

It is strange, seeing that modern science with all its discarding of antiquated authorities, is the offspring of Protestantism, that Protestants, with an open Bible ever before them, should be such slaves to old human systems, and perpetuate, to the nineteenth century, the ancient scholasticism. John Calvin was no doubt a good man and a great genius. He wrote his Institutes at the age of twenty-seven, after he had been three years a Protestant. He wrote the work as much to show the agreement as to fundamentals between Protestants and Catholics, as to set forth the points on which they differed, for it was at first an apology to Francis I. of France, and he knew very well that Francis would hand it over to the bishops. Calvin did not invent his system nor make original induction of it from the Bible. For the latter he had neither the time nor the proper training. A young man of twenty-seven, who had studied law until his twenty-fourth year, and whose theology was acquired at the Sorbonne, he could do little else than correct the existing systems founded on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, such as that of Aquinas, by reference to the comparatively few theological revisions of Luther and Zwingli. Luther and Calvin both professed to despise the theology of the schools, but that which they really despised was the dominant semi-Pelagianism of Duns Scotus. In manner as in matter they were largely scholastic, and Melancthon maintained that, as a theologian, his bosom friend of Wittenberg was injured by dialectics. Aquinas was an Augustinian, and