

THE
A M E R I C A N
PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. III.—JULY, 1863.

ART. I.—THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

By PROFESSOR PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.

THE Heidelberg Catechism,* whose three hundredth anniversary has been so widely celebrated this year in Europe and America, was first published A.D. 1563, under the title: *Catechism, or Christian Instruction, as given in the Churches and Schools of the Palatinate*. It belongs to the Reformed, as distinguished from the Lutheran confessions, though it shows traces of the influence of Melancthon. The reformation was introduced into the Palatinate under the Elector Frederick II, in 1546, in the spirit of a moderate Lutheranism. Under Otho Henry, 1556–1559, Heidelberg was the centre of violent doctrinal controversies between the Lutherans and the Calvinists. The Elector Frederick III, surnamed the Pious, who reigned from 1559 to 1576, openly espoused the reformed confession. He was one of the most wise, earnest, and devout princes of the reformation century. Under his influence was drawn up the Heidelberg Catechism.

* The official editions bear date 1563, 1585, 1684, 1724. An American Tercentenary edition will soon be issued in three languages. The most important sources for its history are in the works of Alting, Struve, Wundt, and Planck: and in the special treatises of Van Alpen 1800, Leissen 1846, Vierordt 1847, Sudhoff 1862, Schotel 1863.

I. Ursinus and Olevianus.

The preparation of the Catechism was assigned by the prince to two young, and at that time as yet little known theologians, one of whom, Ursinus, was twenty-eight, the other, Olevianus, only twenty-six years of age. The selection seemed hazardous, but was fully justified by the result. The work combines the warmth of first love with the light of solid knowledge, the fresh inspiration of youth with the deep experience of riper age. The history of that period furnishes yet other spirits that had early come to maturity; as Melancthon, who in his sixteenth year wrote a Greek grammar, and in his twenty-fourth year produced the first evangelical Lutheran dogmatic (the *Loci Theologici*), and Calvin, who in his twenty-sixth year published his celebrated *Institutis*, which have scarcely since been excelled.

Ursinus and *Olevianus* are the authors, and the theological and ecclesiastical defenders of the Heidelberg Catechism, as Frederick III was its originator, confessor, and civil representative. Both belong to the reformers of the second generation. They were no pioneers, no creative geniuses, able to lay foundations, like Luther and Calvin; but they had power to build up and carry through what was begun. Their mission was not so much to plant as to water, and the Lord has richly blessed their faithful labors. They had this advantage, that the fundamental doctrines of the evangelical reformation had already been brought up from the mines of God's word into the clear light of day, and were able to gather in the rich harvest which had been sown during the previous forty years. Both are fathers and confessors of the German Reformed church, who, on account of their faith, suffered deposition and banishment, and at last attained a blessed death in their faith. Both were Germans by birth and education, but had at the same time, by travelling and personal observation, made themselves well acquainted with the Reformed church of France and Switzerland, and those of their leaders who were still living, and were on this account also well qualified to set forth in a formulary the doctrinal views of the German Reformed church. Besides, Ursinus was educated prevalingly under the personal lead of the German Melancthon, Olevianus under the influence of the French Calvin. They breathed into their mutual work the inwardness and geniality of the Wittenberger, and the earnestness and fire of the Genevan reformer, and avoided as well the pliability of the first as the rugged severity of the last. Ursinus was more of a theologian and

professor, Olevianus more of a preacher and practical churchman ; but both were one heart and one soul, and reciprocally complemented each other. Both exceeded themselves in the Catechism, which casts all their other works deeply into the shade. In the preparation of it they were inspired by the spirit of the German Reformed church, and they laid into it not so much their individual views as the faith of the entire communion which they served as organs. There is no contradiction here. The Catechism is a true expression of the convictions of its authors ; but it communicates only so much of these as is in harmony with the public faith of the church, and observes a certain reticence or reservation and moderation on such doctrines (as the *two-fold* predestination), which belong rather to scientific theology and private conviction than to a public church-confession and the instruction of youth. Hence, also, the Catechism has not borrowed its name from its authors, and thousands of reformed Christians have learned it to their comfort in life and in death without knowing their names or any thing of the circumstances of their lives.

ZACHARIUS URSINUS,* the principal author and chief defender of the Heidelberg Catechism by word and pen, was born of poor but worthy parents in Breslau, the principal city of the Prussian province Silesia, July eighteenth, 1534. His father, Andrew Bear, was at that time deacon in the Magdalen church, and later became professor of theology in the Elizabethan School in that place. Ursinus early manifested superior gifts, and was prepared in his sixteenth year to enter the University. He studied, supported by stipends from his native town, nearly seven years (from 1550 to 1557) in Wittenberg, this birthplace of the German reformation, under Melancthon, and became one of the most confidential pupils and friends of this reformer and "teacher of Germany". He accompanied him to the religious conference at Worms in 1557, and from there he made with him, together with Peucer, Hubert, Languet, and other friends, an excursion to Heidelberg, where he was later to find his sphere of activity, and supply the place of his honored teacher. For Melancthon, as has already been remarked, had received a second call to Heidelberg as professor of theology, and felt no small inclination to accept it. "Conflicting thoughts", he wrote on the fifth of April, 1557, to the Councillor of the Elector Otto Henry,†

* His name originally was Bear, which, according to the custom of his time, he translated into the corresponding Latin name Ursinus. So the name of Lupulus was originally *Wöllein* ; Ecolampadius, Hausschein ; Melancthon, Schwartzerd, etc.

† Compare Corpus Reform. vol. ix, p. 127, and Dr. Carl Schmidt's learned bio-

“enter my mind; I do not desire new, and withal strange labors; I know that in Heidelberg, where persons of all nations, French, Netherlanders, and others reside, there must reign a great variety of opinions and schemes; it is, to be sure, my fatherland, and excellent and learned men are found there, whose fellowship would be agreeable to me; but I can hardly make up my mind to emigrate. On the other hand, at Heidelberg I would have greater liberty, and could more conveniently confute the Flavians” (that is, the intolerant and exclusive ultra-Lutherans). From this letter, as well as from other documents, we may clearly see to which side of the controversy, which a few years later furnished occasion for the preparation of the Heidelberg Catechism, he inclined. The struggle of conflicting feelings and inclinations were decided by his prince, who held him firmly in Wittenberg. Instead of this, however, he paid a visit to the University of his beloved fatherland, in company with the above-named friends and pupils, during the diet at Worms, to assist in organizing it on an evangelical basis.

Those were joyful and festal days which Melancthon and his friends passed in the romantic city of Heidelberg. When he arrived there, October twenty-second, 1557, all the professors and students went out to meet him in solemn procession. Professor Posthius greeted him with an address and a Latin poem. The Elector invited him to his table in the renowned castle. On the twenty-fourth a great feast was prepared in honor of him in the Sapienz building. The venerable, modest, and retired man was overwhelmed with demonstrations of honor. But this festal joy was darkened by the intelligence of the death of his wife, who had already died on the thirteenth of October, in Wittenberg. His friend Camerarius, who was to bring him the intelligence in person, arrived in Heidelberg on the twenty-seventh, but deferred communicating the intelligence till the following day, when he opened the matter to him during a walk in the garden of the castle. Melancthon listened to the sad message with deep and painful feelings, but in pious composure raised his eyes to heaven, whither his faithful companion had preceded him, and uttered only the few but significant and touching words: “Farewell! Soon shall I follow thee!”*

graphy of Philip Melancthon, Elberfeld, 1861, p. 618. This work of Professor Schmidt in Strasburg ought to be translated into English, since we have as yet nothing able on Melancthon in the English language. Melancthon belongs to all churches of the reformation, and is a bond of union between them.

* Compare Dr. C. Schmidt, a. a. b. p. 618, *et seq.*

Ursinus, now provided by Melancthon with a very honorable Latin testimonial, in which he is represented as a "highly gifted, learned, pious, agreeable youth, endeared to all honorable men", made a learned journey to Switzerland and France. There he became personally acquainted with the leaders of the Reformed church who were still living, especially with Bullinger and Peter Martyr in Zurich, with Calvin and Beza in Geneva. Calvin (who died 1564) presented him with his writings, and recorded in them with his own hand his prayer for a blessing upon the young friend. This journey enlarged his spiritual views, and decided his preference for the Reformed church. The vacillating position of Melancthon between Lutheranism and Calvinism could thenceforward no more satisfy him, even though he was allied to his venerable teacher in mildness and love of peace, and continued to regard him with great respect and love to the end of his life.

When he, in 1556, returned to Wittenberg, he was met by a call to the office of rector in the Elizabethan Gymnasium in Breslau, which, from love and gratitude to his native city, he accepted. Yet two years afterwards, he of his own accord resigned this position from love of peace, on account of the violent sacramental controversy between the Lutherans and Philippists of that place. During the strife he wrote his first work, "Theses on the Doctrine of the Sacraments", in regard to which Melancthon, shortly before his death, expressed the judgment: "Ursinus's learning I have known, it is true; but as regards knowledge in such things, I have never before been acquainted with any thing so brilliant."

After an honorable farewell, Ursinus left the second time for Zurich in October, 1560, which now, after the death of Melancthon (April, 1560), which had meanwhile occurred, had become more endeared to him than Wittenberg itself. At that time he wrote to his uncle: "Not reluctantly do I leave my fatherland if it will not endure the truth, which I cannot with a good conscience give up. Were my best teacher, Melancthon, still alive, I would go nowhere else than to him. As he is now dead, I will go to the Zurichers. There are pious, learned, great men with whom I am firmly resolved to spend my life. God will provide for the rest." That God, to whose guidance he intrusted himself with implicit confidence, had however appointed him to a field of labor different from Switzerland.

As early as 1561, Ursinus was called from Zurich to Heidelberg. Frederick III desired to draw Peter Martyr, whom he

held in high honor, from Zurich to his University; but on account of advanced age he declined the invitation, and recommended in place of himself young Ursinus, who was admirably suited for the post, and labored with good effect. In the following year (August twenty-eighth, 1562) he was promoted to the honor of Doctor. He delivered lectures on dogmatics in the University, and was at the same time principal of the so-called Sapienz College, a preacher-seminary, founded by Otto Henry, enlarged by Frederick III so as to take in seventy pupils, and which stood in intimate connection with the University. This college, with a small salary, gave him so much labor and weariness, that he sometimes, in spells of hypochondria, called it his "tread-mill", or "martyr-chamber". He had a desire in 1571 to accept an honorable call to the theological school at Lausanne; but the prince would not accept his resignation. He married only in 1574, in which state he lived happily, and had one son born to him. His pupils were devoted to him with much love and enthusiasm.

In this position he labored with unwearied industry, notwithstanding increasing infirmities, till the death of Frederick III, 1576, when by his Lutheran son and successor, Ludwig VI, he was, on account of his reformed faith, together with six hundred steadfast reformed ministers, deposed and directed to leave the country. Still he found a place of refuge in the small district of country belonging to the Palsgrave John Casimir, on the left bank of the Rhine. Under his auspices he, with other banished Heidelberg theologians, founded and conducted the high-school at Neustadt, on the Hardt, the so-called *Casimirianum*, which had so speedily sprung up since 1578, and continued his activity in theological teaching by word and pen to the time of his death. His last works were an explanation of the prophecy of Isaiah, and a defence of the reformed doctrine against the attacks of the Lutheran form of concord. In the full power of manhood, aged forty-eight years, he died in the triumphs of a joyful faith, March sixth, 1583—the same year in which Casimir, the younger son of Frederick III, came in possession of the government, called back the banished ministers, and restored the reformed confession in the Palatinate. His pupil and colleague, Franz Junius, delivered a Latin funeral discourse full of the warmest admiration and affection.

Ursinus was a man of thorough classical, theological, and philosophical learning, of poetic talent, distinguished teaching gifts, simple, modest, and attractive character, and deep evangelical piety. He made the best use of his time, having

placed above the door of his study the inscription: "Friend, when thou visitest me, be brief, or depart, or assist me in my labor".* He avoided all useless words. The excellent first question of the Catechism is characteristic of his piety, as also his declaration that he would not take a hundred thousand worlds for the blessed certainty of belonging to Jesus Christ. He exceeded the reformed theologians of his time; and in the Heidelberg Catechism he has far exceeded himself. His other works, collected by his pupil David Pareus, at first appeared anonymously, or in the name of the faculty of Heidelberg, or as gathered after his death from notes taken by others. The most important of these is his extensive Latin commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism (*Corpus Doctrinæ Orthodoxæ*), of which there are also a number of English translations,† and a popular German abstract.‡ In his epitaph in the church at Neustadt he is pronounced, "a great theologian, a vanquisher of false doctrines concerning the Person of Christ and the Lord's Supper, an acute philosopher, a wise man, and a strict teacher of youth".

CASPER OLEVIANUS,§ the son of a baker, was born August 10th, 1536, in Treves, the city of "the holy coat of Christ", on the borders of France, and studied the ancient languages and law in the Universities of Paris, Bourges, and Orléans. When he, at Bourges, by a heroic venture, endeavored to save from drowning in the river Loire, or according to others in the Eure, the son of the same Frederick III who afterwards called him into his service, and thereby greatly endangered his own life, he vowed to devote himself to the Lord with all that he was and possessed. He now studied theology in Geneva under Calvin and Beza, and in Zurich under Bullinger and Peter Martyr. He enjoyed thus, like his later colleague Ursinus, the great advantage of the personal instruction and communion of the most celebrated founders and leaders of the Reformed church.

In 1559 he began his reformatory activity as a fearless preacher of the pure Gospel in his native city, Treves. On one occasion a Roman priest endeavored to interfere with his

‡ * "Amice, quisquis huc venis, aut agita paucis, aut obi, aut me laborantem adjuva."

† The latest English edition is by Rev. W. Willard, in Columbus, Ohio, 1859, on the basis of the translation of Dr. J. Parry, with an Introduction by Dr. Nevin.

‡ Dr. Zac. Ursinus's Introduction to Christian Instruction, etc. An Abstract of his *Corpus Doctrinæ Orthodoxæ*. With a Preface by Lie. E. W. Krummacher. Duisburg, 1863.

§ So called from Olewig, a village near Treves, from which his father sprang. So Göbel contends, without giving any authorities.

preaching, and in so doing excited his hearers to such a degree that they were willing to lay violent hands on him; then Olevianus, with his characteristic magnanimity, took him by the hand and led him out of the church, that he might receive no injury. The half of the inhabitants had already been won over to the evangelical doctrines when he was persecuted by the Bishop, and, together with the two burgomasters of the city and nine others who shared in the same views, was cast into prison. After ten weeks, however, through the mediation of the Protestant princes, especially of Frederick III, who felt himself gratefully indebted to him, he was delivered from prison, and called by the last, in 1560 (one year before Ursinus), to the University of Heidelberg as professor, first of philosophy, and afterwards of theology. Later he resigned his professorship into the hands of Ursinus, and labored as court preacher and church counsellor.

At the accession of Ludwig VI, in 1576, Olevianus, like Ursinus, as a steadfast confessor of the reformed doctrine, was also deposed and driven away. He followed a call to Basleberg, and in 1584 went as preacher to Herborn. In his last sickness he only rightly learned to know, as he said, the greatness of sin and the greatness of the majesty of God, and often prayed: "Could I only soon return home to my Lord; I long to depart and to be with Christ". He died in Herborn, February twenty-fifth, 1587, in peace, after he had replied to the question of a friend whether he was certain of his salvation, by laying his hand upon his heart and uttering the triumphant word of faith, "Certissimus!" that is, "perfectly certain". Theodore Beza, the patriarch of the Reformed church, who outlived the rest, mourns his death in a Latin poem full of deep grief and enthusiastic praise, erecting for him thus an honorable memorial.*

Olevianus was less learned than Ursinus, and his exegetical, dogmatical, and homiletical works are not very important for scientific theology; but they are popular, true-hearted, full of energy and unction. Perhaps the best is his catechetical work on the covenant of grace. He regarded the covenant of grace as the key to the true understanding of the Bible, and thus became the precursor of Coccejus and Lampe, who further developed the federal or covenant theology. His principal

* The beginning of the poem is as follows:

Eheu, quibus suspiriis,	Doloribus p̄eres meis,
Eheu, quibus te lachrymis,	Questus modosque flebiles
<i>Oleviane</i> planxero?	Non pectus hoc siggesserit,
Nam dotibus pases tuis,	Non istud os effuderit.

strength, however, lay in his practical talent for the pulpit and church government, in which he exceeded Ursinus, and complemented him. In all ecclesiastical matters he was the confidential and influential counsellor of Frederick III, with whom he became associated through a singular providence.

He was unwearied in his labors to introduce into the Palatinate the Presbyterial and Synodical form of church government and a strict church discipline, after the pattern of the congregation of Geneva in its blooming period, which was also by the Scotch reformer Knox so much admired, and in accordance with the clearly expressed principles of the Heidelberg Catechism itself, Question 82-55, and for this purpose early secured the advice of Calvin. This matter, also, lay very near the heart of the prince, of Ursinus, and of all foreign Calvinists. But the practical carrying out of it succeeded only very imperfectly, and was much hindered, especially through the professor of medicine, Thomas Erastus, who was an advocate of the government of the church by the state, and an opponent of excommunication.* To this day the government and discipline, and the self-dependence of the church therewith connected, is far less developed in the German churches than it is in other Reformed churches, especially in Holland, Scotland, and North America. The intimate union of church and state in the Palatinate, and in Germany generally, was an almost insurmountable obstacle. For the victory of strict church discipline and national presbyterial and congregational government, with lay representation, is at the same time, at least in extensive countries (the old Calvinistic Geneva forms an exception on account of its small compass), a victory of the self-dependent free-churchdom and popular churchdom over state-churchdom. In relation to self-government, the German Reformed church in the United States has a great advantage over the mother church in Germany and Switzerland, where the church is still under guardianship of the state.

II. The Preparation and Ecclesiastical Approval of the Catechism.

Intrusted with the preparation of a new Catechism, Ursinus and Olevianus first jointly collected the material from the catechetical literature of the Reformed church, especially of Swit-

* Hence the technical English term Erastianism, which is very much the same as Cæsaropapismus, and the teaching indicates that the political ruler of the land is at the same time the ecclesiastical ruler, or the chief Bishop of his subjects. Eras-

zerland,* which was even at that time very rich. The mother country of the Reformed church has, therefore, at least indirectly, had share in the origination of the Heidelberg Catechism, even as both its authors also completed their education in Zurich and Geneva. They made most use of the Catechism of Geneva by Calvin, and the Catechism of De Lasky allied to it.† Then each one prepared a sketch or draft as preparatory work, Olevianus following the leading idea of the covenant of grace, Ursinus following the Calvinistic division of the material into five principal parts: of faith, law, prayer, word of God, and sacrament. Ursinus wrote two catechisms in the Latin language; a larger one (with the title, *Catechesis, hoc est, Rudimenta Religionis Christianæ*), and a smaller (*Catechesis Minor*), an abridgment of the first.

On the basis of these careful preparations, which had been laid before the Prince and received his approval, originated the present Heidelberg Catechism. It is however with all its affinity with its predecessors an independent creation. This is plainly seen in the division and design of the whole, as well as in the single questions, which show a great advance on the drafts.‡ The final preparation was the work of both

tus was a Swiss by birth, and a Zwinglian as respects the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. He died in Basel as professor of ethics in 1583. He was a man of much spirit and learning, and one of the first among the learned who declared himself in opposition to the superstition of astrology and alchymy.

* So Olevianus wrote to Bullinger in Zurich.

† The affinity of the Heidelberg Catechism with those of Calvin and De Lasky, which, however, does not take away from the first any of its independent value, has been especially shown by Leisen and Sudhoff. Calvin's Catechism appeared first in 1536, then entirely reconstructed and divided into questions and answers, in 1541, in French, and in 1545 in Latin, and was afterwards also translated into Spanish, Italian, English, Greek, and Hebrew. In its improved form it is found in Calvin's works (Amsterdam edition, tom. viii, pp. 11-37), and in Niemeyer's and Böckel's collection of the Reformed Confessions. Lasky's Catechism appeared in 1553. John Lasky (de Lasco) was a Polish nobleman who connected himself with the Swiss reformation, and labored partly in England (under Edward VI), partly in the Netherlands and Germany, and at last in Poland, where he introduced the reformation. He died in 1560.

‡ Compare for instance the much admired first question in the Catechism with the first question in the preparatory work of Ursinus, and the great advance will at once be seen. In the Larger Catechism-draft of Ursinus (comp. Sudhoff, Theolog. Handb., etc., p. 477) the first question and answer are as follows:

Quam habes firmam in vita et morte consolationem?

Quod a Deo ad imaginem ejus et vitam æternam sum conditus et postquam hanc volens in Adamo amiseram, Deus ex immensa et gratuita misericordia me recepit in fœdus gratiæ suæ, et propter obedientiam et mortem Filii sui misit in carnem donat mihi credenti justitiam et vitam æternam: atque hoc fœdus suum in corde meo per per Spiritum suum ad imaginem Dei me reformantem et clamantem in me *Abba Pater*, et per verbum suum et signa hujus fœderis visibilia obseignavit.

In the Smaller Catechism of Ursinus the first question and answer run more briefly and simplified thus:

Quæ tua est consolatio quæ tam in morte quam in vita cor tuum se sustentat?

theologians under the constant coöperation of Frederick III. Ursinus has always properly been regarded as the principal author, as he was afterwards also its chief defender and interpreter. Still it would appear that the nervous German style, the division into three parts (as distinguished from the five parts in the Catechism of Calvin, and the smaller one of Ursinus) and the genial warmth and unction of the whole work, come chiefly from Olevianus.* In any case, however, as has already been remarked, the work is far better than all the private writings of both theologians. It was produced under the influence of a spirit which was higher, deeper, and more comprehensive than their own spirit.

Augusti expresses his astonishment that the Catechism should have been finished in a few months, and yet manifest in its construction "so few traces of haste, and so many perfections".† But its authors may probably have labored on it a whole year or more; and they entered upon their work, as we have seen, with much forecast and conscientiousness. Then, also, that was a period of religious inspiration and creative activity, and very fruitful in catechetical books of instruction. The Catechisms of Luther, Brentz, Leo Judä, Bullinger, Ecolampadius, Calvin, and De Lasky had preceded, and nearly the same time the Catechism of the Roman church was also prepared. Such preparatory works served the authors a good purpose. The principal doctrines of evangelical Protestantism had been already substantially wrought out, and needed only a calm, clear presentation and combination.

When the work was finished, the Prince, in December, 1562, convened a general Synod at Heidelberg, composed of the superintendents and most prominent ministers of the Palatinate, who were conscientiously to examine and prove the Catechism according to God's word. According to Van Alpen the adoption of it was unanimous. But according to the reports of the opposite party (Baldwin, Hesshus, Flacius Illyr-

Quod omnia peccata mea Deus mihi propter Christum remisit, vitamque æternam donavit in qua ipsum perpetuo celebrem.

Calvin's Catechism begins with the question: What is the chief end of human life? ("Quis humanæ vitæ præcipuus est finis?") from which originated the first question of the Westminster Catechism: "What is the *chief end* of man?" The first question of the Heidelberg Catechism on the *only* comfort of man in life and in death, is, among all these preparatory attempts, by far the best.

* So think Hundeshagen and Sudhoff. The last is especially zealous for the honor of Olevianus in opposition to the frequent overestimate placed on the services of Ursinus in the preparation of the Catechism.

† A Historical and Critical Introduction to the two Principal Catechisms of the Evangelical Church, 1824, p. 100.

icus and others) there was a small minority who brought in manifold objections to it, but were outvoted. The last is more likely, and does not derogate in the least from the value of the Catechism. No good work, no new idea, no true advance can succeed without the fiery ordeal of contradiction and persecution. This belongs throughout to the militant character of the Church in this world, and to the following of Christ and his Apostles. Besides, the Catechism was required to pass through the strongest opposition after its adoption and introduction, and was bitterly persecuted from various directions, but victoriously endured the trial.

By its adoption by the representatives of the church of the Palatinate, the Catechism acquired, before its publication, a churchly character, and was thus in a position to fulfil its mission as a guide of public religious instruction in Church and school.

III. Its Publication—The Preface of the Elector—The most important Editions of the Catechism—The Eightieth Question.

After its approval by the Synod, the Catechism was for the first time printed and published, by order of the Elector in 1563, with the title: "CATECHISMUS, OR CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTION, as it is conducted in the churches and schools of the Electoral Palatinate. Printed in the Electoral city, Heidelberg, by John Mayer, 1563, 8." The preface is dated January 19, 1563. From this, however, we cannot conclude that the Catechism appeared on that day; no doubt a few months passed before it was printed and bound, so that it was more likely published in the Spring of 1563.

The Preface is published in the name of the Elector Frederick III, and was most likely also written by him; it speaks in an appropriate and worthy manner of the occasion and object of the Catechism. In it the Elector wishes to all "superintendents, pastors, preachers, officers in churches and schools", grace and greeting, and makes known to them that he, by virtue of his high office, and to promote the temporal and eternal welfare of his subjects on the basis of the sincere fear of God, and knowledge of his saving word, has, "by the counsel and aid of our entire Theological Faculty here, and all superintendents and most prominent ministers, prepared summary of instruction, or Catechism of our Christian religion from the word of God, both in the German and Latin language, that hereafter not only the youth in the churches and schools may be religiously instructed in such Christian

doctrine in a uniform manner, but also that the ministers and school-masters may have a sure and abiding form and measure as to the way in which they should conduct the instruction of the young, and not daily introduce changes according to their own mind, or ever deviate into perverse doctrines". Finally he exhorts and enjoins upon them gratefully to receive this catechism, to use it diligently in churches and schools, to teach and live according to it, with the firm assurance that Almighty God will also bless such good instruction from his word, to the improvement of their lives, and the promotion of their temporal and eternal welfare.

This Preface, though written in a somewhat loose, antiquated German style, breathes an excellent Christian spirit, and falls in very appropriately with the object of the work.

This first edition is now of course very rare; however, the younger Dr. Niemeyer, of Halle, in his Collection of the Symbolical Books of the Reformed Church,* has given it word for word, in the old style of writing, together with the preface of the Elector, (including the eightieth question), and thus rendered it accessible to learned readers. It has a number of peculiarities. The questions and answers are not yet separated and numbered; the division into Lord's days is wholly wanting, and the proof-texts are few in number, and the chapters only are referred to,† as the division into verses was not yet in use. Yet these are all unimportant differences, pertaining only to the form and not to the contents.

More important on the other hand is the deviation in the famous eightieth question, at the close of which the Romish Mass is called "a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry".

According to the common view, which has been repeated ever since the time of Alting, the eightieth question was not contained in the first edition, but was first included in the second edition, except only the clause "and an accursed idolatry", and then introduced in full in the third edition by order of Frederick III., as a counter-blast to the anathema of the Council of Trent.‡ The same authors commonly distinguish

* *Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis publicarum.* Edidit Dr. H. A. Niemeyer: Lipsiæ, 1840, pp. 390-427. Bökel, in his edition of the Reformed Symbols, gives the Catechism in modern German. Both give the Elector's preface in full, the first in the original, the other in the modern style.

† For instance in the first question are cited: "a) Rom. 14. b) 1 Cor. 6. c) 1 Cor. 3. d) 1 Pet. 1. e) John 1 and 2. f) 1 John 3. g) John 6. h) Math. 10. Luke 21. i) Rom. 8. k) 2 Cor. 1. Eph. 1. Rom. 8. l) Rom. 8."

‡ So Alting, Struve, Van Alpen, Augusti, Nienäcker, Niemeyer (*Præf. lxii. sq.*), Sudhoff (who repeats this error four times), etc. The whole mistake comes from

three different editions of the whole Catechism as having appeared in the year 1563, and explain the circumstance that the first two editions are so rare, by the supposition that the Elector had called in and suppressed them.

But this view seems to rest in an error. We hold that the eightieth question was contained in the first edition with the exception of the offensive last clause, which was added by order of the Elector in part in the second printing, and entire in the third. There were therefore not three different *editions*, but merely two later *reprints of one page*, namely, folio 55, on which the eightieth question is found; so that the last reprints of the year 1563 which contain the offensive addition, and at the same time a closing remark on the last page, are in other respects precisely alike. This closing remark is as follows: "What in the first printing (not edition) was overlooked, as especially folio 55, is now added by order of his Electoral Grace, 1563".

My reasons for this view, to which Dr. Ullman* and Dr. Nevin† also incline, are the following: 1. The eightieth question, with the exception only of this last clause, is altogether inoffensive, and also complete without it; containing a worthy and calm statement of the difference between the Romish Mass and the evangelical Lord's Supper. 2. D. L. Wundt affirms on his own observation, that in existing copies of the first edition the eightieth question is found with the exception of the offensive close: "*So that the mass at bottom is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry*".‡ 3. The still existing copies of the so-called third edition of 1563, as the reprint of Niemeyer, are not at all designated as of a third edition, and so far as I can see, differ in nothing except on folio 55, and the above quoted closing remarks referring to this page.§

Alting, who expresses himself ambiguously, and it has then without being carefully examined perpetuated itself in later works on the Catechism.

* In his contribution to the Ter-centenary Commemoration of the Heidelberg Catechism, which will appear in the memorial volume.

† In his Historical and Critical Introduction to the large Ter-centenary edition of the Catechism, which will also appear during this year. At least I have so understood Dr. Nevin in a conversation on the subject. Earlier he held the common view.

‡ Magazine for Palatinate Church History; vol. ii, p. 112, et seq.

§ Köcher even, who had before him an edition of 1563, find it remarkable, that no trace of a deviation is found anywhere else, and that no one makes mention before Alting of a *third* edition of 1563. So also Augusti, p. 115. The reprint of the edition of 1563 in Niemeyer in his Collect. Conf. Reform., which I have used as the basis of my edition, gives the eightieth question in full, and yet has exactly the same title as the other copies, without being called the second or third edition.

4. It is in itself in the highest degree improbable that a book at *that* time, when the mass of the people could not read, and consequently the reading of Bibles and catechisms was confined to a small circle, should in one year have passed through three editions. Hence also we meet with no trace of a new edition till 1571, thus eight years after the edition of 1563.

In any case it must be admitted that the *last clause* of the eightieth question, from "*So that the mass*" to "*idolatry*", is no original constituent part of the Heidelberg Catechism, and has so far no original synodical sanction. It is certainly a well-meant, but still arbitrary and unwise addition of the Elector, who in this instance suffered himself to be carried away by the intolerant spirit of the age. It was a sharp Protestant reply to the surprising anathemas of the Roman Catholic Council of Trent, which just about that time, namely, December 4th, 1563, closed its sessions; and its introduction is easily explained, and in a great measure excusable in the light of this provocation, as also by the polemical spirit of the times. But—whether true or untrue, whether righteous or unrighteous, as against the Catholics—it in either case is in disharmony with the otherwise moderate and peaceful tone of the Catechism, and has been the means of drawing upon it much unnecessary persecution from the side of the Jesuits, and even for a time placed it under the formal Electoral ban in the Palatinate. Meanwhile this polemical addition to the eightieth question has passed over into all subsequent editions of the Catechism, and must therefore also be retained in future, or at best merely be distinguished from the original text by brackets.

Cotemporaneously with the German edition of 1563, which is of course the original edition,* appeared also a Latin translation, which was prepared according to the Electoral direction, by John Lagus, a minister, and the teacher Lambert Pithopäus, who had been called from Deventer to Heidelberg as teacher in 1562.

In the same year there appeared also an order of church government and Agenda, which was however revised and improved in 1585, when the Reformed church of the Palatinate was restored under John Casimir. It is far less important than the Catechism, and has never attracted the same attention, or been so widely received.

* H. Altig (cited by Nienäcker) makes, in regard to this point, the important remark: "Authentica est sola editio Germanica, in qua omnia non rotundiora modo, sed etiam *εμφατικώτερα* sunt. Ei proxima est versio Latina a Josua Lago et Lamberto Pithopæo adornata publiceque approbata."

The German was again reprinted in 1571,* then anew in 1573; and in this third edition (according to others the fifth) the Scripture proof-texts are for the first time indicated by references to the verses.† The number of proof-texts is here also increased, and the division of the questions into fifty-two Lord's days, after the manner of Calvin's Catechism (which, however, counts fifty-eight Lord's days) is introduced, as the Catechism was to be explained to the people every Sunday, in the afternoon sermons. It were well if this venerable reformed custom of having catechetical discourses, or a catechetical exercise with the children, in connection with the afternoon or evening service, were again revived.

A larger German edition, with the proof-texts printed out in full, with a table of domestic duties, and a number of liturgical and apologetical supplements appeared in 1595 in Neustadt on the Hardt. It is regarded as the best of the older editions, and agrees in size with the Latin edition of 1585.

The so-called Small Catechism first appeared in 1585, contemporaneously with the revised Agenda. It is an abstract of the large one, and was not designed to supersede this, but only to simplify it and render it more popular; since, as Prince Casimir says in his preface, some questions in the large Catechism are rather long for the youth, and might also be too difficult for the common people. A beautiful edition of this small Catechism appeared in 1610; but it never attained the same authority as the large one. Other abstracts, which appeared in later times, have had only a local and passing significance.

The large Catechism has since then been republished unnumbered times, separately, and in connection with Reformed Church Agenda, liturgies, hymn books, and other books of devotion. S. Van Alpen, in whose work, however, are numerous errors, speaks even of half a million of *editions* which had appeared in Germany alone, previous to the year 1800.‡ This is however incredible, as at this rate there would have been over two thousand editions each year. Perhaps he may have meant that many *copies*, in which case, however, his estimate would have been too low, as there were doubtless many millions of copies published. It has been often remark-

* Niemeyer calls this edition *quarta* editio under the mistaken supposition that there were three editions of 1563. According to our view it was the second edition.

† Hence, according to the testimony of Van Alpen and Niemeyer, this edition of 1573, contains on the title page this addition: "Now newly printed *with the addition of the verses*".

‡ *History, etc.*, p. 284.

ed, that with the exception of the Bible and the Pilgrim's Progress, no book has been so often republished as the Heidelberg Catechism. But doubtless the *Imitation of Christ*, by Thomas à Kempis, and the small Catechism of Luther, do not fall behind it in this respect.

It is remarkable that with all this there has been as yet no critical edition, unless it be that of Niemeyer, which is, however, a mere reprint of the edition of 1563.* Hence much confusion has crept into the text, and especially into the proof-texts. This want, it is hoped, will now be met by the edition for the publication of which provision has been made by the German Reformed church of America in connection with the Ter-Centenary Commemoration, and other projected editions in Germany.

IV. Reception and Circulation.

The Heidelberg Catechism was so true an outgrowth of the genius of the German Reformed church, and corresponded so well with the needs of this confession, that it not only found favor in the Palatinate, for which country it was originally designed, and where it was introduced by the civil authority, but also found admission, and came more or less into use in various other reformed lands in and out of Germany, especially in East Friesland, Zurich, Cleve, Berg, in Mark, in Wapenthal, in Brandenburg, in Eastern and Western Prussia, in the Electorate of Hesse, in Anhalt, and in the free imperial cities; also in a number of Swiss cantons, where the Catechisms of Bullinger or Calvin had not already been introduced; and finally in Poland and Hungary, in Holland and in Belgium. In the Netherlands it was early approved, recommended, and clothed with symbolical authority, by Synod of Wesel, 1568, then again by a national Synod at Dortrecht, in 1574, and finally by the great Synod of Dortrecht, 1618; and since at the Synod of Dortrecht, delegates were present from all the Reformed churches of the Continent, and also from England, the Heidelberg Catechism there received a kind of general authority for the entire Reformed confession.

* Dr. Augusti (Preface, p. viii) applies the words of St. Hieronymus spoken of the Bible, "Tot sunt exemplari, quot codices, et unisquisque pro arbitrio suo vel addidit, vel subtraxit, quod ei visum est", also to the editions of the Lutheran and Heidelberg Catechism, and adds: "The matter is of such importance that a critical edition of both Catechisms would be a very meritorious work". Some late editions, as that of Mess and Sudhoff, especially the last, lay claim, it is true, to critical care, but have many mistakes and arbitrary changes in the text, and selection of proof-texts. Sudhoff falls into an error in the very first question, in putting "Einziger Trost" for "einiger Trost."

It was, for the Reformed church of Holland, of far more practical significance than the more rigorous Calvinistic Dortrecht Articles, because it was taught in all the schools, and explained to the people every Sunday from the pulpits. Its use contributed no little to the world-historical significance of this remarkable country, redeemed from the sea, which not only in the history of trade, but also of civil and religious freedom, of theology, science, and art, occupies an honorable position in later history.

In France, England, and Scotland, the Heidelberg Catechism could not, it is true, supplant their own, and partly older catechisms, but it was very highly esteemed, and a number of times translated into French and English. Beside the English translation at present in use, there were many older ones; for instance, one by Henry Parry, Bishop of Worcester, which, together with the commentary of Ursinus, appeared in Oxford, 1601, and then in London, 1633, and which has lately been republished by Dr. Steiner.* In the Reformed church of Scotland the Heidelberg Catechism appears to have been for some time in use; for in a collection of authorized church-books, which appeared at Edinburgh, 1719-20, in two volumes;† the Heidelberg Catechism is included with the remark, "Translated into English and printed for the use of the church of Scotland", notwithstanding the Westminster Catechisms of 1648 had at that time already been a long while in use.

From Holland and Germany the Catechism came also to America, and still continues to be the symbolical book of the Dutch and German Reformed churches in the United States. As the Dutch, as early as 1609, and hence before the Puritans (1620), Presbyterians and Lutherans, settled in the new world on the banks of the Hudson, on the island of Manhattan, where since has arisen the world-renowned city of New York, the Heidelberg Catechism, next to that of the Episcopal church (since 1607), is the oldest Catechism used in the American Protestant church. It is worthy of notice, that the German Reformed church of America, which has only during the last twenty years awoken to a powerful self-consciousness and theological life, will doubtless commemorate the three hundredth

* In the *Mercersburg Review*, and also separately printed in Chambersburg, Pa., 1860. The English translations have been made from the Latin translation, and are therefore in many respects incorrect.

† With the title: A Collection of Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Directions, Books of Discipline, etc., of public authority in the Church of Scotland; together with all the acts of Assembly which are standing rules concerning the doctrine, worship, government and discipline of the Church of Scotland. By W. Dulop, 2 vol. 8vo., Edinburgh, 1719-20.

anniversary of the existence of the Heidelberg Catechism with more earnestness, zeal, and effect than the mother church in Europe, where, during the age of so-called illumination, it has been in many countries dislodged by modern spiritless and lifeless rationalistic catechisms.

The Heidelberg Catechism has not only been translated into all modern European languages, but also into a number of Asiatic languages and dialects (*e. g.*, those of Arabia, Malay, Senegal), as also into Latin and Greek (into ancient Greek by Sylburg in Heidelberg, 1597, into modern Greek in Leyden, 1648), and into Hebrew. In a larger measure than any other catechism has it received the Pentecostal gift of speaking in tongues.

In like manner has it been unnumbered times explained in sermons and commentaries. Whole libraries have been written upon it, especially in Holland. The commentaries most valued are those of Zacharius Ursinus in Latin (also translated into English, French, and German), of John Coccejus, John d'Outreim, Simon Van Alpen, and Carl Sudhoff. The largest number of commentaries, sermons, and controversial writings, appeared in Holland, Heidelberg, Neustadt on the Hardt, Bremen, Herborn, Frankfort on the Main, Hanau, and Halle.

Among all catechisms there is none, even Luther's smaller catechism not excepted, which has been so widely circulated, so much used, so often translated, explained, attacked and defended, and which can show such a rich and romantic history, as the Heidelberg Catechism. The ground of all this is to be found in its inherent worth.

V. Theology of the Heidelberg Catechism.

The Heidelberg Catechism, in the very beginning, introduces us at once into the living centre of practical evangelical Christianity, teaching us the secret of all true comfort and peace, the true art of living and dying happily. Thus the first question contains the theme or fundamental thought of the whole book: Christ is mine in all that I need, and I am his in body and soul, in life and death, in time and eternity. No catechism presents such an introduction, so rich in thought, so evangelically practical, and full of comfort. By many authors has this first question been pronounced a true pearl in catechetical literature. "Never, perhaps", says Dr. Nevin, "have the substance and worth of the Christian salvation, as a whole, been more comprehensively, forcibly, and touchingly presented, in so small a compass".

The second question presents the division of the Catechism,

which consists of three parts: The *misery* of man, his *redemption*, and the *gratitude* due to God for such redemption. The first part is prevailingly negative, awakening the sense of sin by means of the sum of the law in its essence, as requiring supreme love towards God and man. The second part presents the objects of faith in the form of facts, on the basis of the Apostles' Creed, including also the doctrine of the Holy Sacraments, not as separate doctrines, but as integral parts of the system of faith. The third part is ethical, unfolding the new life of obedience, from the truly evangelical standpoint of gratitude and reciprocal love, following the decalogue, which Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil. The third part closes with the Lord's prayer, as the expression of gratitude in the form of devotion.

The theology of the Heidelberg Catechism is, first of all, throughout, *biblical*; that is, it is based, not on the fallible traditions of men, but on the infallible word of God. Nearly every question is fortified by Scripture passages, which, as a general thing, are selected with much tact and great wisdom, although in these, from the stand-point of later exegesis, improvements might of course in some cases be made. The Heidelberg Catechism was the first which bound itself in this way to the word of God. It exhibits in this particular an important advance in catechetical literature. The smaller Lutheran and the Calvinistic catechisms are, it is true, also biblical in their contents, but not in their form, since, in the original editions, there are scarcely any Scripture passages cited. Later editions, especially of the Lutheran Catechism, have for the most part supplied this want, which, however, always necessarily involves an analysis and enlargement. At present, it is required of every good catechism, that it be at the same time a book of Scripture texts. A bare citation of Scripture passages does, of course, not answer. Many new catechisms teem with Scripture texts, and are nevertheless lean, sterile, dry, cold and dead. Every thing here depends on the selection of the proper passages, and on harmony with the spirit of the Holy Scriptures. It must be said of the Heidelberg Catechism, that it breathes throughout the spirit of the Bible, and is a stream from this pure fountain. Whoever assails it in any essential point, assails divine revelation itself. Hence also Frederick, at the German Diet, 1566, said his catechism was supported by marginal texts in such a manner that it must stand incontrovertible.

The theology of the Catechism is, further, *evangelical reformed*, that is to say, it belongs to the reformed type of doc-

trine, in contradistinction from the Greek Catholic, the Roman Catholic, and the evangelical Lutheran types. The reformed type is, however, not the product of a single man, but the product of the combined work of Zwingli, Ecolampadius, Calvin, Bullinger, Beza, and other reformers of the first and second generation, and hence owes something to each of them, but is at the same time independent of all. The reformed confession is the church of the pure word, of free grace, and of the free congregation; it assumes various forms under the influence of different nationalities, and in different countries in which it found a home; but its fundamental doctrines are the same in all its symbols.

In the Heidelberg Catechism the genius of the *German* branch of the Reformed church is developed and expressed. This stands mediating between the Lutheran and strictly Reformed confession, extends its hands to both, and works in upon both. It is the mildest form of Calvinism, and betrays the influence of the conciliatory Melancthonian spirit. Strictly, it is neither Zwinglian nor Calvinistic, nor yet Melancthonian; not even Ursinian or Olivianian; it rises above these human names and conceptions of doctrine, even though it has learned something from them all; and, like the bee, it has drawn honey from various flowers. It possesses Calvin's power and depth without his severity, Melancthon's inwardness and warmth without his indecision, Zwingli's simplicity and clearness without his cool considerateness and fear of the mystical.

In connection with this must be mentioned, as a still further advantage, its theological and pedagogical *wisdom* and *moderation*. Although not originally designed, like Luther's smaller Catechism, merely for the instruction of children, but also intended to hold the place of a confessional book, it nevertheless eschews all narrow-hearted confessional severity and sharp corners. Its few polemical questions* are kept within the bounds of dignity and moderation, with the single exception of the later addition to the eightieth question, directed against the Roman Mass, for which, however, Frederick III, and not its authors, is responsible. Other symbolical books of the sixteenth century contain expressions still more severe against the Roman church. In general, the Heidelberg Catechism breathes a mild, conciliatory, and friendly, in one word, a truly Christian spirit. This fact is only the more to be appre-

* Question 80 against the adoration of saints, question 48 against the later Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity, question 80 against the Roman mass, questions 97 and 98 against the use of images.

ciated when we remember that it was composed at a time when the "rage of the theologians", from which Melancthon so ardently longed to be relieved, had changed the entire Protestant church of Germany, and also the city and university of Heidelberg, into a battle-field, where not only Romanists and Protestants, but also Lutherans and Calvinists, contended in the most bitter and uncharitable manner.*

As regards more especially the relation of the Catechism to the peculiar doctrines of *Calvinism*, it here manifests the same moderation and pedagogical wisdom. In this respect it is more nearly allied to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England than to any other reformed symbol.

In its doctrine of the *Lord's Supper*, it follows Calvin decidedly, finds, namely, as did also Melancthon, in his approved edition of the Augsburg Confession, and was still more inclined to do in his later years, a medium course between Zwingli and Luther, and seeks to unite the truth of both, whilst it sets forth the Lord's Supper as a memorial of the crucified Christ, and at the same time as a feast of living union with the exalted and invisibly present God-man, though only for the participation of believers. This doctrine is also at this day the reigning one among believing Christians of the Lutheran and Evangelical Union churches, and would be so still more largely, were it not that Luther's name and authority still attaches many pious and learned adherents to his theory that Christ's body and blood are truly present *in, with, and under* bread and wine, and are received with the *mouth* by *all* communicants, by the unbelieving and unworthy, as well as by the believing—although, of course, with opposite results.

* Even Brentz, the worthy reformer of Württemberg, and, after the death of Melancthon, the principal representative of the Lutheran church, said, in a work against Bullinger in 1564, "The devil seeks through Calvinism nothing less than to smuggle into the church heathenism, Talmudism, and Mohammedanism". Comp. Hartmann, Johannes Brentz, p. 252. This intolerant sect spirit also early took possession of catechetical literature in the Lutheran church, even though Luther's Smaller Catechism is entirely free from polemics. Thus, there were, for instance, hyper-Lutheran catechisms at the close of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries, containing the following questions and answers: "What do you hold in regard to the God of the Calvinists? Ans. God protect us against such a roaring ox!" Ques. "Do you truly believe that the accursed Calvinistic heretics, instead of the living God, teach and worship the veritable devil?" Ans. "Yes, this I believe from the bottom of my heart!" There was also a book written, in which it is shown "clearly and solidly that the Calvinistic heretics hold 666 principles (the apocalyptic number), in common with the Turks!" I quote from memory, but have in my home (in Mercersburg) the evidence of these, and similarly curious specimens from the history of religious bigotry, the spirit of which has not yet altogether died out, although it may have changed in form.

On the other hand, in relation to Calvin's doctrine of *predestination*, which always found in Germany and Switzerland only isolated advocates, and which never entered into the general consciousness of the church, the Catechism manifests a wise prudence and reserve, which is the more significant, since both its authors (as in general all the reformers, even Luther and Zwingli, and at first also Melancthon) were themselves convinced of the scripturalness of this doctrine, and inclined even toward the Supralapsarian system. They were here manifestly governed by a proper tact, and felt that this mystery belongs rather to the sphere of scientific theology, and of private views, than to the religious instruction of the young, and popular instruction generally, or to the public confession of the congregation. In questions 1, 31, 53 and 54, the Catechism, it is true, takes occasion to teach the positive side of predestination, namely, *the election of the children of God to holiness and salvation in Christ*, in an uncaptious, biblical, and practical manner, as a source of comfort and ground of thankfulness; but it utters not a word of a *double predestination*, and an eternal decree of *reprobation* or *damnation*, in reference to a part of the human race; rather it teaches expressly, in question 37, the universality of the divine grace in Christ, who "sustained in body and soul the wrath of God against the sins of all mankind", which has given much trouble to the Calvinistic particularists, who hold that Christ died only for the elect. The Catechism teaches that believers are saved alone through the grace of God, whilst unbelievers are lost by their own fault. It cuts the roots of all Pelagianism and self-righteousness, without falling into the other extreme of making God responsible for evil. It holds, like the holy Scripture itself, on the one hand the unconditional sovereignty of God, which has foreseen and predetermined all things from eternity, and which works in us to will and to do, and on the other hand the responsibility of man, who is no blind machine, but an intelligent and moral, and consequently a free being. In the present state of knowledge, it is not possible fully to harmonize these apparently contradictory propositions; they are like two limbs of a large tree, whose mutual trunk stands under water, and is hidden from our view. In God, however, they are reconciled, and we shall understand this unity and harmony when once that which is in part shall cease, and we shall see face to face. The Catechism is, therefore, neither Calvinistic nor anti-Calvinistic, but leaves the conscience free in regard to this deep and difficult mystery, whilst the articles of the Dortrecht Synod and the Westminster Confession, in

clear words, teach the double predestination of Calvinism, and thus place upon it the stamp of ecclesiastical authority.

This freedom of the Catechism from rigid systems and scholastic theories is a great advantage, and makes a progress in theological investigation possible without the least prejudice to faithfulness toward the ecclesiastical confession. Hence it is that the latest and most prominent German theologians of reformed origin, as Schleiermacher (the greatest theological genius since Calvin, but who stands in the transition from rationalism to the newly awakened faith), Ullman, Bähr, Hundeshagen, Schenkel, Hagenbach, Ebrard, Lange, Herzog, Krummacher, and others,* have, without any violence or inconsistency with the genius of the church of their fathers, united themselves with the positive union movement, and labor hand in hand with the moderate theologians of Lutheran origin, as Neander (who was moreover an Israelite, but baptized in the Lutheran church in Hamburg), Nitsch, Twesten, Julius Müller, Olshausen, Tholuck, Lücke, Rothe, Liebner, Dorner, etc., for the upbuilding of the later evangelical theology, who, on account of their catholic spirit and learned worth, have exerted such a mighty and steadily growing influence upon the Protestant churches of France, Holland, England, Scotland and America. The Melancthonian spirit of the Lutheran church and the German reformed spirit of the Heidelberg Catechism, as they were originally closely affiliated, have, in the nineteenth century commingled in the *evangelical union theory*, and what God has joined together let not man put asunder.

The theology of the Heidelberg Catechism is *practically edifying*. It speaks throughout the language of living experi-

* We must, therefore, resist as well Heppé as Sudhoff, when the first saddles upon the Catechism an anti-Calvinistic Melancthonianism, and the second, on the contrary, a rigid Calvinism. If it were *anti-Calvinistic*, the strictly Calvinistic Synod of Dortrecht would not have sanctioned it; were it rigidly *Calvinistic*, it would not have gained favor among the Melancthonians of Germany. Dr. Nevin (originally a Presbyterian, Old School) has presented the true view in regard to this point, in the following language: "The knotty points of Calvinism, as they have been called, are not brought forward as necessary objects of orthodox belief one way or the other. Only in such form could the Catechism have gained such universal credit and authority. . . . It has sometimes been made an objection to the Catechism, that it is not sufficiently definite and explicit on some of these hard points of Calvinism. But we should consider this to be rather one of its highest recommendations. For children particularly, such excursions into the territory of metaphysics, in the name of religious instruction, are ever to be deprecated and deplored. But we may go further and say that they are wholly out of character in any church confession or creed. No church has a right to incorporate them in any way into its basis of ecclesiastical communion. In any case an extensive, complicated creed must be regarded as a great evil." *History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism*, pp. 131 and 132.

ence. It is the confession of the believing, well-grounded, graciously assured Christian, to whom nothing is holier and more precious than his Saviour. This warm, confiding, cheerful confession, is laid into the mouth of the catechumen, that it may continuously present itself before him as ideal. Even if he does not at first understand it, it nevertheless sinks into his heart like Scripture texts or verses of hymns, to take root and bear fruit at a later period. Christianity is nowhere apprehended and presented merely as abstract doctrine, but, as in the New Testament itself, as fact, power, and life. The Catechism has proceeded from deep theological study, but at the same time also from fervent prayer and living experience. It has received the baptism of spirit and fire from above. It has the unction of the Holy Ghost. A fresh enthusiasm of faith breathes in it, from the first question to the last. It addresses itself not merely to the head and the memory, but also to the heart and conscience. It is, in the best sense of the word, subjective, and brings the contents of faith into personal contact with the catechumen. It is as edifying and consoling, as it is instructive for old and young. It has become at once the book of devotion and prayer for the congregation. This is well known to reformed pastors of earlier and later times.

In proof of this, I present a very striking example which has just come to my knowledge, connected with the church of the Holy Ghost in Heidelberg, where Olevianus, one of the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism, was once pastor. Dr. Plitt, formerly pastor of that congregation, now Professor of Theology in Bonn, relates of his pastoral experience that he there met "not a few aged men and women whose eyes glistened when, in times of sickness, their thoughts were directed to the first question of the Catechism. Most of them still knew it by heart, having committed it to memory in the years of their childhood. Many said that as children they had never properly understood this question, and that they found great labor in learning it by heart, but now they thanked God that they knew it, and prayed it to their comfort and edification. The later generation, which had no longer been brought up under the Heidelberg Catechism, had no such an anchor in similar circumstances. But the aged, who in their youth had become familiar with the treasures of the Heidelberg Catechism, had passed through many vicissitudes of time, without having their inward peaceful trust affected by them. They stood on ground which could not be moved."*

* From an article on the Significance of the Heidelberg Catechism in the Reformed Church, in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1863, No. I, pp. 24 and 25.

With the excellent contents of the Catechism corresponds finally its pithy, clear, sincere, and popular German *style*. In this particular it is, to say the least, only exceeded by the smaller Catechism of Luther, that great master of edifying popular language. Dr. Plitt calls the language of the Catechism "exceedingly beautiful", and remarks very appropriately: "The Catechism speaks the language of *faith*, even of living, personal faith. What it says comes from the heart, and therefore also reaches the heart. It speaks the language of *life*. This concrete and throughout intuitive language of life—where is it more perfectly spoken than in the Holy Scriptures? From it has the Catechism learned it; and hence every one finds in it what he needs—not only the child, but also the adult and the aged; not only the uneducated and the unlearned, but also the most fully educated and learned. The Catechism speaks the language of clear *precision*." We may add: It speaks the language of *devotion* and *prayer*, or of communion with God, in language which is much less subject to change than the language of every day life, used in the intercourse of men; and thus it speaks to us with true power and unction, as from ancient times. The verse here applies: "The mortal have many languages, the immortal only one".*

ART. II.—THE ARISTOTLIAN AND THE MODERN PLACE OF
MAN IN ZOOLOGY.

By Prof. C. M. DEWEY, Rochester, New York.

THE rank of man in zoölogy has a higher interest as science advances, and as its moral aspects are better understood. In a previous article,† the great division of animals, by Aristotle, into *Enaima* and *Anaima*, the blooded and bloodless, the *red-blooded* and *white-blooded*, of modern times, was noticed. This corresponds to the Vertebrata and Invertebrata of Lamarck, as stated by Professor Agassiz: Essay, p. 96. But, though Aristotle followed no definite system in his excellent descriptions of animals, he saw obvious structural differences and recorded them. Thus, the division, Mammalia of Linnaeus, he had named Zoötoka,‡ *viviparous*, as it actually is,

* Πολλὰ μὲν θνητοῖς γλώτται, μία δ' ἀθανάτοισιν.

† AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, vol. iv, p. 680.

‡ Prof. Owen on Mammalia, Sill. Jour. vol. xxv, p. 15, 1858, and Owen's Vol. on Mammalia, pp. 103, 8vo, London, 1859.