



# SERVING A HIGHER ORDER? CALVIN AND THE REFORMATION OF GENEVA\*

## SERVINDO A UMA ORDEM SUPERIOR? CALVINO E A REFORMA DE GENEBRA

**Wim Janse**

Doutor em História pela Universität Münster (Alemanha). Atualmente é o diretor da Faculdade de Teologia da Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (Universidade Livre de Amsterdã), na Holanda.

E-mail: [w.janse@th.vu.nl](mailto:w.janse@th.vu.nl)

\* Este texto é a aula inaugural do primeiro semestre de 2009 do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ciências da Religião da Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie, em São Paulo, ministrada em 17 de março 2009.

## ABSTRACT

---

This text presents a study of John Calvin's role in the administration of the Consistory of Geneva. It also deals with the question of the famous *légende noire* (the black legend) of Jerome Bolsec, which still has its believers even today. The main question of this text is the one concerning how Church discipline was administered in Geneva during John Calvin's days.

## KEYWORDS

---

History of the Reformation; Consistory; Calvin studies; Geneva; Church discipline.

## RESUMO

---

Este texto apresenta um estudo do papel de João Calvino na administração do Consistório de Genebra. Trata também da questão da famosa *légende noire* (a lenda negra) de Jerome Bolse, que ainda hoje tem seus seguidores. A principal questão deste texto é a concernente a como a disciplina eclesiástica era administrada em Genebra no tempo de João Calvino.

## PALAVRAS-CHAVE

---

História da Reforma; Consistório; Estudos sobre Calvino; Genebra; Disciplina eclesiástica.

# 1. JOHN CALVIN'S ROLE IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE CONSISTORY OF GENEVA

---

I am taking you back to January 1545. Her name is Benoite, and she is married to Pierre. She is accused of blasphemy and adultery on a large scale. The blasphemy is that she has stated that all men are her husbands, because they all are her brothers in Christ, and one should always be ready to help a brother in Christ. According to Benoite, adultery is a form of Christian charity. Incest she views as the community of saints. She has also approached Calvin himself, married at the time. There is no need for torture: Benoite readily confesses to everything she is accused of. She is sentenced to death. In view of her obvious weak-mindedness the verdict is changed to life imprisonment, “unless she is moved by the grace of God to repent her sins”. Thus read the reports of the *Consistoire* (Consistory) and the *Petit Conseil* (the Small Council) of the Reformed Geneva of 1545. Until then Genevan law had prescribed that adulterers should be flogged and subsequently exiled, but Calvin defended death by stoning, in line with Old Testament custom.

The title of my speech is: “Serving a higher order? Calvin and the Reformation of Geneva”. There are two questions I would like to pose in this respect, and the first is: *what* higher order? Did Calvin see himself as serving God? The Gospel, or the Church? Or did he serve a political interest, the social order, a social-economic aim, power as such, or maybe even himself? The second question relates to the concept of serving: did Calvin serve the Genevan order or did he disrupt it, and did he restrict or even suffocate freedom of thought, conscience, and belief, by a religious regime?

Because every order has its dilemma. “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion”, the United Nations stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948, drawn up against the backdrop of the terrors of the Third Reich.

This right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

The view nowadays is that religious regimes are contrary to human rights, so that this particular type of order at the same time also implies the disorder of injustice. In the same way, the early-modern Spanish and Roman Inquisitions brought order. It is certainly true that in the Catholic Iberian peninsula and in Italy the Inquisition ensured religious and social order, and prevented much bloodshed: Spain and Italy had none of the gory religious wars that ravaged Germany and France, where there was no Inquisition. However, that same inquisition also brought the disorder of injustice and oppression; it did not serve a higher divine or church order but only assisted the preservation of the social, economical, and political order (read: the power) of a small ecclesiastical and administrative elite.

Of course, religious regimes are not the monopoly of medieval Catholicism or Islamic fundamentalism. My question today is whether Calvin, too, was part of such a regime? Or is that the *légende noire*, the “black legend” initiated by Jerome Bolsec that thanks to Stefan Zweig still has its believers today? It cannot be denied that it was not long before Protestant Reformers advised using the sword against their own followers, and that Protestant authorities actually used that sword and introduced a control machinery (complete with spies and Deep Throats) that was not so very different from the Catholic methods of combating heresy.

To give an example: the way in which Zwingli and the Zurich magistrate suppressed the Anabaptists – whose radicalism Zwingli himself had provoked – resembled an inquisition. Anabaptists were punished by being “baptised” again: they were sewn into a sack and thrown into the river Limmat, which flowed through Zurich. In the end, Zwingli served the *political* order. He saw the Anabaptists as social revolutionaries, whose refusal to accept oaths, taxes, and military service would overthrow the Swiss Confederacy, which was annually renewed by a renewed swearing of the original oath. Although

the Anabaptists were peace-loving people, the Canton Bern organized a veritable inquisition: Baptist hunters (*Täuferjäger*) tracked them down, evicted them from their farms, and sent them, sometimes by way of the torture chambers, to the galleys. By 1571 Bern had imposed 40 sentences of death to local Anabaptists alone. It was not until 1659 that Bern abolished capital punishment, only to then extradite the Anabaptists by the hundreds. So, did the Reformed cities of Zurich and Bern serve a higher, divine order, or the social-political order? Every order has its dilemma.

Of course, the Swiss Reformed were children of their time. The Frenchman John Calvin in Geneva was also a product of his century. Let me illustrate this by one example. As any other city, Geneva, too, was occasionally hit by the plague. Both Catholics and Protestants thought that the plague was a sentence from God, and was caused by people who had entered into a covenant with the devil in order to create as much mischief as possible: witches. I quote Calvin:

Recently a conspiracy has been discovered of men and women who for the past three years have been spreading the plague in city by means of I don't know what mixture of poisons. Fifteen women have been burned, several men have been put to death in an even more gruesome fashion, some of them have committed suicide in prison, and some 25 are still incarcerated, but still they persist in smearing door locks with their ointments (KINGDON, 1995, p. 12, 55).

Between January 1545 and March 1546, thirty-seven people were executed for allegedly spreading the plague. Calvin was not directly responsible, in fact did not have any say in it (he even pleaded for the poisoners not to be “tortured for too long”), Geneva did what was elsewhere considered normal – but Calvin did believe in this kind of witchery, and in this, however painful it is to note, he was a child of his time (SELDERHUIS, 2008, p. 178).

Anyway, let me start at the beginning. What order was served by Calvin's reforming actions in Geneva? Calvin had been appointed in Geneva in July 1536, two months after the Reformation had been officially adopted and the citizens had pledged an oath that they wanted to live according to God's

Word and law. But what exactly did this mean, “live according to God’s Word and law”? And how far should one go in this respect? For some, the departure of the bishop and the arrival of the Reformation meant the freedom to live one’s own life, freed from the clerical yoke. Anti-clericalism in Geneva was rampant. Before 1536, Geneva numbered around 400 clergy among its 10,000 inhabitants; immediately afterwards this figure went down by 97.5% to ten ministers (SELDERHUIS, 2008, p. 72). To Calvin, it was crystal clear what ‘living according to God’s Word and law’ meant. His precipitate actions (he was not yet 30) resulted in his exile from Geneva, but when three years later the city council asked him to return, Calvin, not surprisingly, agreed on condition that he be allowed to realize “living according to God’s Word and law” by introducing a church order and a consistory. Within two months after Calvin’s return to Geneva in 1541 the *Consistoire* had been established.

As in other Protestant cities, the Consistory, in its function as *Ehegericht* (marriage court), initially had only marriages and illegal sexual relations under its jurisdiction. However, the Genevan Consistory went much further and extended its ambitions to include the overall moral supervision of the entire population. Whereas an early church rule stated: *De intimis ecclesia non iudicat* (“The Church does not judge someone’s inner self”), the Consistory exercised church discipline over everybody’s life, actions, and thoughts. It was not only church goers but all inhabitants of the city who were expected to live “according to God’s Word and law”. Anybody who did not, could count on being summoned to the Consistory, which met for three to four hours every Thursday. In the first two years of its existence alone more than 1,100 individuals were called to the Consistory.

Who were the people summoned to the Consistory? And for what? What exactly was the Consistory’s competence? What punishments were meted out?

*Who?* The defendants came from all parts of the population: nobility, asylum seekers, patricians, merchants, administrators, labourers, journeymen, domestics, a remarkably high number of women, in short, a true cross section of the population.

*Why?* It was often the Consistory itself that brought charges. Complaints included: women's absence from church (during weekday services they had to stay home and look after their husbands' business when he was on a business trip; on Sundays they had to look after the children); disruption of the service (for instance by urinating, vomiting or breaking wind in church when drunk); inadequate knowledge of the Lord's Prayer and the Creed; secretly attending a Mass outside Geneva; praying for the dead, to the saints, and to the Virgin Mary; fasting on Fridays; observing the Catholic feast days; using the rosary; and – very often – domestic violence. According to the Consistory a husband had the right to beat his wife, albeit in moderation; in one instance the Consistory admonished a man to chastise his wife more forcefully, in order to make her fulfil her duties; someone who beat his wife so hard that she lost an eye was told to be more clement in the future, but the wife had to appear in court and was given to understand that she and her husband should live together in peace.

*What was the competence of the Consistory?* The Consistory claimed the rights to admonish, reconcile, excommunicate and banish (from church and city, since these coincided). This last right was also claimed by the secular authorities, but Calvin won this battle in 1555, and the right to excommunicate went from the magistrate to the church. Incidentally, from that moment the number of excommunications increased explosively: from 80 per year in 1556 it went up to 300 per year in 1559; in 1568 (after Calvin's death) 681 church members were excommunicated, which amounts to 12 excommunications per Consistory session (!). The Consistory also had the right to refer defendants to the Small Council, the executive council and 'court of justice' of the city.

*What punishments did people risk?* After receiving the worst ecclesiastical penalty (excommunication) those found guilty were handed over to the magistrate, who could then choose from the following sentences: public humiliation (offenders had to publicly ask for forgiveness, dressed in robes and mitre, for instance on the church steps, where all churchgoers passed), imprisonment, exile, corporeal punishment (flogging), or the death sentence (on the gallows, by garrotting,

by decapitation; the pyre was used for heretics, drowning for adulterous women). The body was usually left at the place of execution to the shame of visible decomposition. The population was expected and encouraged to attend executions.

Calvin was present at almost all Consistory meetings (sitting at the corner of the preacher's pew, across from the pew of the elders, who were public servants) and was usually the official who pronounced the admonition. So – the question still remains which order was served by Calvin's actions.

I will first give you three examples, from 1548, of cases that were referred to the Consistory and for which an admonition by Calvin was deemed sufficient punishment. The first case is set in the street, the second in a house, the third in a bedroom.

Jean Frochet, a young tailor, was sent to the Consistory by the burgomaster on an accusation of illegal loitering. Calvin told him: "A young man should live chastely and quietly and serve his father and mother, instead of roaming the streets drinking in the company of spongers" (JANSE, 1996, p. 15). Frochet was told to mend his ways, to return to work, and behave in a Christian fashion towards his parents.

Hat maker Marquet and his wife were summoned to appear because of a domestic quarrel. Marquet hit her with a whip because she would not listen to his order that she should not go and gossip with Mrs. Phocasse and so neglect her housekeeping. Mrs. Marquet said that she never heard any such order, and that she was hit so hard that she is now quite ill. Marquet doubted this; when he came to Phocasse's house to look for his wife one evening he was apparently expected, as somebody threw water on his head. Calvin told him that a Christian should not treat his wife like that, and warned her not to visit Phocasse's wife if her husband does not want her to.

Third case. Françoise de Caleygn was summoned because of improper conduct with a dog. After the death of her baby, which she had been breastfeeding, breast engorgement had caused such a fever and terrible pains that in order to relieve the pain she had nursed a young puppy. Calvin told her that "it is scandalous and contrary to all common decency to give to dogs what is meant for children" (KINGDON, 1995, p. 40) and added more Christian admonitions. Calvin might



have hinted here at Matthew (7:6): “Do not give dogs what is sacred”; however, he could have known about mastitis, as he himself and his wife had lost a child (a son) shortly after birth.

Usually a caution sufficed, which reflects the important part played by public opinion in the safeguarding of social discipline in sixteenth-century society. Sometimes, however, an admonition was not enough and more severe measures were called for. In cases when a breach of the law or a crime was suspected the church member in question deserved a worldly sentence, and was handed over by the Consistory to the Small Council, which served as a tribunal. In order to obtain a confession the court had the right to use torture. The most common form of torture was the *estrapade* or strappado: the accused’s hands and feet were tied behind the back, the trussed body attached to a rope and raised in the air with a pulley, then dropped just short of the floor, which caused agonizing pain in the arms and legs and often dislocated shoulders and other joints. For a lesser form of torture use was made of *grésillons*, iron grills attached to the hands and wrists somewhat like thumbscrews, which were twisted to cause terrible pain. Admissions made under torture had to be acknowledged as true by the accused after the torture was over. Anybody who weathered the ordeal was released (KINGDON, 1995, p. 25-26).

Three examples of this; the first an accusation of adultery. On 27 September 1548 Calvin appeared before the Consistory, totally upset about the rumours concerning adultery by his sister-in-law Anne, who lived in Calvin’s house – Calvin shared the large rectory with his brother Antoine and his family. The previous Sunday afternoon, while Calvin was preaching, she had let in a lover; on another occasion this man had broken into the rectory at night and entered Anne’s bedroom. Both went to prison, but the case did end in an admonition after all. Anne had to kneel down for her husband and brother-in-law (John) and ask for forgiveness. Seven years later, however, she was again accused, this time of over-familiarity with an employee from her husband’s shop, Pierre “the hunchback”. Eleven cross-examinations by Consistory and Small Council followed, two of which under torture. Since adultery took place in secret, the accusations were only

circumstantial evidence, and it was better that the accused herself confessed. However, in spite of *grésillons* and probably *estrapade* Anne did not admit to anything. Thus, she escaped the death sentence and was exiled from the city; Antoine Calvin was granted a divorce, and both remarried.

As I said earlier, Calvin defended capital punishment, referring to the stoning of adulterers in the Old Testament. Before capital punishment was instituted by law in 1566, six executions for adultery had already taken place since 1560. I will only briefly mention here a particularly harrowing case, about a woman innkeeper – in that period about synonymous with “prostitute”. The interrogations by the court show that it had all begun while living as a girl in her father’s house; after twenty years of several marriages and prostitution, and after a three-week trial under torture by strappado, she was sentenced to drowning. Eleven of her male partners got off lightly, with no more than a short spell in prison, sometimes no more than one day. Her husband quickly recovered from the shock of her death and remarried within two months.

Finally, the first execution on the charge of adultery: the case of Anne le Moine, married, and her manservant Antoine. Within a little more than a week they were jailed and put to death, on the accusations of her adultery with her servant, and his attempted assault and rape of her teen-age daughter Esther. Repeated application of the *estrapade* led to a full and detailed confession, which should not be repeated in this room. The court ordained the death sentence for both of them, to be carried out the very next day. Since the municipal executioner happened to be ill, it was decided to borrow an executioner from elsewhere rather than considering delay. The sentence read that Anne would be “bound and let out of the city down Corraterie Street and there to be drowned and submerged in the water of the Rhone River”, while Antoine was to be

[...] bound and led to the place of Champel [the public execution ground] and there to have the head cut from above the shoulders in the usual way, and your head attached to the gallows and your body hung from it, so that your souls be separated from your bodies (KINGDON, 1995, p. 119-123).

The question is: What order did Calvin serve in his Genevan Reformation? Was he the new bishop imposed on Geneva when the Catholic bishop had been packed off? Or was he the dictator after all who turned the city into a theocratic police state, the tyrant that many authors make him out to be? Today I am going to challenge this view. Of course, Calvin could be severe, harsh, and in particular hot-headed – which bothered himself most. Invective was *bon ton* in the sixteenth century, and Calvin was no different from his colleagues in that especially from the pulpit he could really rave and rant: wedding guests who had been dancing – among whom the chairman of the Consistory, one of the burgomasters – he attacked in a sermon as “animals” and “pimps” (*ruffians*) (NAPHY, 1994, p. 97), which provoked a storm of protest that disrupted the service. About the local politicians Calvin thundered from the pulpit: “Look at those in authority, see how they only serve themselves. Where has justice gone? All you see is arrogance. The only thing they care about is pomp and circumstance.” They are a bunch of gutless bastards, exploiting the people (SELDERHUIS, 2008, p. 259). Also in his written diatribes against the strictly orthodox Lutherans he could be quite decided. Calvin did see himself as an Old-Testament prophet.

However, anybody who thinks that Calvin established a religious regime in order to serve his own authoritarian and social-political ends is wrong, for more than one reason. I will mention four.

1. Calvin did not initiate the policy I just sketched, but jumped on a moving train in Geneva. The idea of an “ideal Christian city” (as Christian as possible) was certainly older than Calvin. Before his arrival Geneva had already decided to adopt “imperial” (Roman) law and cleanse the city: gambling during mass was not allowed, dancing in the streets was forbidden, as were card playing and throwing dice during church services and after 9 pm; citizens were required to report their neighbours in case of any suspicion of misdemeanour. Religion was the foundation of society. Maintaining one single religious view and uniform norms served the stability of that foundation, and hence the stability of the well-ordered community. Geneva was an important transit station in the goods trade

between Northern Italy and Western Europe. Genevan *municipal* policy served the social order, mutual peace and quiet, and especially economic prosperity. William Farel and Calvin did not invent this policy, but found it in place in Geneva.

2. Calvin had a lot less to say in Geneva than many people think. True, he did have a lot of broadcasting time – from the pulpit, not from the steps of the Town Hall. People often forget that the Reformations in the South German and especially the Swiss cities – what is called the “urban reformations” – were “urban events” (A. G. Dickens) and “magisterial reformations”, which were implemented not by ardent preachers with their Reformation message, but by city councils with their own civic aspirations. Differences in priorities between reforming churchmen and urban reforming politicians often caused serious problems (CAMERON, 1991, p. 211). In Geneva, too, politicians had seized the opportunity to take over ecclesiastical power and the authority over the church during the religious climate change between 1533 and 1536. Ministers had no say in the Genevan city council. The *Ordonnances ecclésiastiques* (Calvin’s 1541 church order) explicitly stated that the preachers have no civil jurisdiction whatsoever, and only wield the spiritual sword that is the Word of God. Calvin was not the ruthless and absolute ruler in a sort of Reformed German Democratic Republic (SELDERHUIS, 2008, 153-154, 164). He was the most prominent preacher in a city where the politicians (who were not exactly pro-Calvin) took all decisions, also in church matters. In Geneva, it was the city magistrate who proclaimed the *Ordonnances ecclésiastiques*, opening with:

In the name of the Almighty God. We, the burgomasters, the Great and the Small Councils, gathered together with our people at the sound of the trumpet and the tolling of the great bell, according to our ancient customs [...] (SELDERHUIS, 2008, p. 154).

The Consistory was no court of law, but a merely advisory organ that settled disputes, without the authority to impose actual punishments.

3. Calvin did not initiate Genevan policy; he had little to say in it; and, thirdly, neither was he the unworldly and reclusive ascetic we see sketched in the ubiquitous caricatures. We should not allow our image of Calvin to be clouded by impressions, correct or not, derived from English Puritans, German and Dutch Pietists, and other third- or fourth-generation Calvinists.

Calvin was not opposed to the *stage*, i.e., public theatre, not even when about biblical history, not even when taking place on a Sunday, not even when church services had to be moved to accommodate performances. Calvin was actually more broad-minded on this topic than some of his colleagues, and it was not Calvin but the city magistrate who finally called a halt to theatre performances after unrest in the city. For school children Calvin thought drama classes an excellent part of their education (DANKBAAR, s. d., p. 132). As regards dancing, Calvin considered this “an invitation to Satan” and the gateway to adultery (38th sermon on Deuteronomy; Selderhuis, 194), but dancing had already been forbidden before Calvin’s arrival in Geneva, although he managed to tighten the rules about it even further.

*Sundays* were intended for church attendance and, in the afternoon, to go out into the country, to go sailing on Lake Geneva, or walk in the mountains. Calvin himself started a midweek holiday on a Sunday afternoon. Calvin did a lot of letter writing on Sundays, and it was not Calvin who abolished Christmas and other feast days but the city magistrate.

As a true Frenchman Calvin of course drank *wine*. It was actually part of his salary. With his appointment the city council granted him 1,623 bottles per year, which amounts to 31 per week, that is more than four a day (LINDBERG, 1996, p. 261) – but we should bear in mind that there was no tap water available at the time.

*Finery*: in the *Institutes* Calvin sings the praises of beautiful clothes, as he also praises the scent of flowers and the beauty of gold and silver:

Away with the inhuman philosophy that allows all things created to be used only for utilitarian purposes. In this way it deprives us not only of the acceptable use of divine gifts, but also of the use of our senses; this philosophy can only exist by making people into blocks (DANKBAAR, s. d., p. 133).

The fact that Calvin was in favour of *luxury laws* and was disgusted by excessive eating and drinking (a large dinner consisted of more than ten courses, and the elite certainly knew how to eat) had everything to do with the large number of fugitives that sought shelter within the Genevan walls. At times the city contained more refugees than native inhabitants. All those mouths needed to be fed, and then there was also the poor rural population. Hence Calvin's "moderation"; what is more, luxury laws had already been in force before Calvin arrived, as they were in Bern, Zurich, Strasbourg, and elsewhere.

4. So, firstly, Calvin did not initiate Genevan policy; secondly, he had little say in it; thirdly, he was not a caricature of an ascetic – but, finally, first and foremost Calvin actually did want to serve the biblical order, God's order, the order that honours God and results in the well-being of the people. "To live according to God's Word and law", that was the oath sworn by Geneva ... just as after the exodus from Egypt and the trek through the desert, when entering the Promised Land, at the foot of Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim the people of Israel again committed themselves to God's law (Deuteronomy 27). Calvin called Catholic France "Egypt", which meant: get out from there, stay away from anything that smells of Rome. In his sermons Calvin spoke about Geneva as if it were the Promised Land; not implying that it had been realized there, but that the Reformed, just as the Israelites in Canaan, would squander their liberation from Catholicism if they did not mend their ways (SELDERHUIS, 2008, p. 265). This was the reason that Calvin stressed the crucial role of the law, after the Gospel, in the safeguarding of that liberation. Calvinism was a product of the city, and it has been said of Calvin that he practised a progressive social policy. That may be so, but he acted in the spirit of the book of Deuteronomy,

with its extensive rules against poverty, “false weights” and economic fraud, and the prescriptions for cleanliness, hygiene, honesty, and security.

Calvin, for instance (DANKBAAR, s. d., p. 134-135), as advisor to the city council (he was a barrister), allowed a moderate interest on borrowed capital, to a maximum of 6%, but he fulminated against extortionate interest and considered asking interest from the poor totally unacceptable. “Christ was not a tailor”, Calvin told the elite who dressed according to the latest fashions and so aroused the jealousy of the poor and the penniless fugitives (SELDERHUIS, 2008, p. 290). Calvin had prices checked. Cheating in business was punishable by a fine, or worse, as for instance the tailor who had measured the cloth for a customer a few centimetres short, the butcher who had sold meat at more than the fixed price, and the doctor who charged too much for a visit, found to their cost. Begging was forbidden. In order to provide unemployment relief small textile companies were established. Calvin himself went and tested the work of a dentist – only then did the man receive permission to practise his profession in the city. Streets were required to be kept clean (just as Israel’s encampment). It was forbidden to light a fire in a house without a chimney, and chimneys were to be swept regularly. On Calvin’s advice windows and balconies were fitted with bars, for the security of children; this regulation was literally taken from Deuteronomy (22:8).

---

## 2. CONSIDERATIONS

It is evident to me that Calvin saw himself as serving the higher order of the biblical, liberated, true life. He could not become a tyrant even if he wanted to – circumstances simply did not permit it. For most of his career he had to struggle, through constant teaching and preaching, to maintain the authority of the guidelines that in 1536 the citizens had sworn to follow: God’s Word and law. Equally evident is that at the same time the city council served the social, economic, and political order of the city and to this end also used the church. In church-historical jargon this is called “social disciplining”,

or, for the period after 1560, “confessionalization”. In this arrangement the church contributed to the consolidation of the state. The government strengthened its grip on the population through the social control exercised by the church via schools – another priority of Calvin’s –, poor relief, and church discipline. Culturally, Calvin’s descendants in this way were even to contribute to the establishment of a Calvinist (popular) identity. Was that what Calvin wanted? Certainly not. Although not without vanity, as he himself admitted, he was not out to acquire power and authority for himself.

The ambivalent or even outright negative image that many have of Calvin today has everything to do with the double agents in Geneva: besides Calvin and the church there were above all the city magistrates, in whose service the preachers and the Consistory stood. They served different aims, but partly ended up in the same place. The Reformer Calvin served the *gloria Dei* and aimed for the liberated life that was pleasing to God and conformed to His intentions. The magistrate served the social-political and economic order of Geneva. In the context of sixteenth-century Geneva the effects of these two aims were not that far apart; even though what we see four centuries later is especially the dilemma inherent in the order that Calvin and the city authorities looked for, each in their own way.

## REFERENCES

---

CAMERON, E. *The European reformation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

DANKBAAR, W. F. *Calvijn, zijn weg and werk*. Nijkerk: van den Broeke, [s. d.].

JANSE, W. “In dienst van een hogere orde: de Inquisitie”, lecture in the Studium Generale series “Het dilemma van de orde” of Leiden University. 20 Feb. 1996. Mimeografado.

KINGDON, R. M. *Adultery and divorce in Calvin’s Geneva*. Cambridge: Harvard, 1995.



LINDBERG, C. *The European reformations*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.

NAPHY, W. G. *Calvin and the consolidation of the Genevan Reformation*. Manchester, New York: University Press, 1994.

SELDERHUIS, H. J. *Calvijn een mens*. Kampen: Kok, 2008.