

THE
THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY
JOURNAL.

VOLUME XI.

JANUARY, 1859.

NUMBER III.

ART. I.—DR. HICKOK'S RATIONAL COSMOLOGY.

RATIONAL COSMOLOGY; OR, THE ETERNAL PRINCIPLES AND THE NECESSARY LAWS OF THE UNIVERSE. By Lawrence P. Hickok, D.D., Union College. New York: D. Appleton & Company. 1858.

DR. HICKOK, it is known to the readers of the Journal, is an ardent disciple of the Kantian Psychology, which, on the one hand, denies to the mind the power of gaining any knowledge by its perceptive faculties, except that which is merely phenomenal, or takes place in that part of its consciousness which respects the action of the senses; and exhibits the external universe, therefore, as instead of a real exterior existence answering to the perceptions of sense, a mere series and combination of sense perceptions that exist only in the mind; and maintains on the other hand, that a knowledge of God and immaterial things is gained only by the reason, in contradistinction from the perceptive and logical powers, and affirms that the reason is able by a direct insight, independent of all means, to discern God, his will, and his agency, and the manner in which the universe known to the senses was called into existence; and

not their speaking it at that time and in the place in which they were then assembled.

The character of the two classes of actors in this scene was thus exhibited in the clearest light and in the boldest contrast. The priests and rulers displayed a daring impiety. With the full knowledge and conviction that a great miracle had been wrought by the apostles in the name of Christ, that was a proof that he was the Messiah, and that Peter and John were his ministers, they deliberately disowned him and rejected them, and undertook to prevent them from further preaching his word: and showed that no demonstration that they were God's messengers would deter them from opposing and persecuting them. Their resistance of God was direct and absolute. The apostles and disciples, on the other hand, exhibited an entire superiority to all selfish and sinister affections, and displayed an elevation of intelligence and wisdom, a rectitude, a fidelity, a fearlessness, a love of God, and a trust in him that were altogether beyond their unassisted nature, and such as could spring only from the power of the Holy Spirit.

ART. VI.—FORMULARIES OF THE CHURCH OF HOLLAND.

BY REV. JOHN FORSYTH, D.D.

DIE EVANGELISCHEN KIRCHEN ORDUNGEN DES SECHSIEHNTEN JAHRHUNDERTS. Von Dr. A. Ludwig Richter. Weimar. 2 Bd.

KORT HISTORISCH BERICHT VAN DE PUBLICKE SCHRIFTEN, RAKENDE DE LEER EN DIENST DER NEDERDUYTZE KERKEN—door J. Ens. Utregt.

THE formularies of doctrine, polity, and worship framed by the various branches of the Reformed Church have been of late years carefully collected. The labors of Niemeyer, Augusti, Richter, and others have brought these venerable, once rare documents, within the reach of all who care to examine them. If they were simply the relics of the past,

like some of the Anglican liturgies of the times of Edward and Elizabeth, which have furnished materials for later formularies, though they have ceased to be used as such themselves, they would be still interesting both to the divine and the historian. But they are more than relics of the piety of a by-gone age; they have a living value and influence as the symbols of doctrine, which, like their Divine Author, are the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. They were drawn up by men familiar with the Christian literature of the earlier centuries, as well as with holy Scripture—men filled with profoundest reverence for the word of God, and who deemed it a very serious and solemn business to prepare, in the form of Confession or Catechism, a statement of the grand verities of that word. Hence with all the boasted improvements in theology of these later days, few of the doctrinal propositions of these old formularies require modification; while in all the qualities which should distinguish such documents, they offer a very marked contrast when compared with many of the bald and ill-written church covenants and associational creeds of the present day.

These formularies deserve to be republished, and are worthy of study for the sake of the proofs they contain of the real unity of the Reformed Church on all the great points of faith and polity. She was not indeed organically one, like the church of Rome. The churches of France, Geneva, Holland, Scotland, recognised no common, central authority, no visible seat of unity. Each was, in this sense, independent of the other. Yet they were allied by bonds of intimate fellowship and sympathy. If one suffered, all suffered; if the peace and the purity of one were threatened by some noxious heresy, it was regarded and treated as a matter that concerned them all. They cheered each other while "under the cross," and welcomed each other's exiles; they borrowed from each other's creeds, and adopted each other's catechisms, and thus amid their circumstantial diversities, gave conclusive proof of their essential harmony.

We propose in this article to give a brief historical account of the formularies of the church of Holland,—formularies, which are not only regarded with affectionate veneration, as monuments of ancestral piety, by the Dutch

churches in Europe, America, Africa, and the islands of the East, but are still employed by them as the vehicles of instruction and devotion. These are the Catechism, the Confession of Faith, and the Liturgy.

The *Catechism* is that known as the Heidelberg or Palatine, one of the most precious productions of the Reformation, and one well worthy the place it has long held, and will long retain among the symbols of the Dutch churches. A "catalogue raisonné" of its numerous editions and translations, and of the various works to which it has given birth, would make a respectable volume. The defence of its "Innocence" long ago enlisted the zeal of the learned Lenfant, and more recently the "History of the Catechism and its Literature" has been written, with German exhaustiveness, by Van Alpen.*

A few words on the general subject of catechising and Catechisms, we trust, will not be deemed out of place, before proceeding with our special topic. The importance of this method of instruction is too obvious for argument, to those who attach any value to the knowledge of the great facts and doctrines of Revelation. It is *so* obvious that it must have suggested itself to Christian pastors and teachers in the earliest ages of the church, and to a greater or less extent must have been employed by them in training youth in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. From a very early period the *catechumens* constituted a distinct class, and received special instruction with a view to their being admitted to full communion in the church. The Catechetical Discourses of Cyril, of Jerusalem, were addressed to the young candidates of his pastoral charge, as we would call them; and Augustine wrote a work, *De Catechizandis Rudibus*, but it is plain, from his account of his own practice, that he himself had no catechism in our sense of the term: "Cum ante me catechizandum video eruditum, inertem, civum, peregrinum, divitem, pauperem, privatum, honora-

* Also by *Koecher*. *Katechet Gesch. der Ref. Kirchen, sonderlich der Schicksale des Heidelb. Katechismi*. Jena, 1756.

Ewald. *Etwas ueber Katechismen—und Ursin's und Luther's Katechism*. Heidelberg, 1816.

Augusti. *Einleitung in die beiden Haupt Katechismen der Evang. Kirche*. Elberfeld, 1824.

tum—illius aut illius gentis, illius aut illius ætatis aut sexus, ex illa aut illa secta, pro diversitate motus mei sermo ipse procedit.”* Among the works ascribed to Justin Martyr there is one entitled “Responiones ad Orthodoxos” (Ἀπε-
-ρίσεις), in the form of question and answer, on a great variety of topics, such as, e. g.: “Why are the orthodox fewer in number than not only Jews and Gentiles, but all heretics? If each man has an angel guardian, how did the angels discharge their ministry, in the time of the flood, when there were only eight souls on earth?” This, however, is not a catechism in our sense of the word, yet it makes a nearer approach to the form of one than any other patristic document of the earlier centuries that has come down to us.

The most remarkable catechetical work, and indeed the only one of any value, of a date prior to the Reformation, is one which was in use in the Waldensian church, from the 11th century. Monastier gives it in its original form, in his *Histoire de L'Eglise Vaudoise*, ii. 296, under the title of “Catechisme des Anciens Vaudois et Albigeois, de l'an 1100.” It is divided into eight chapters of very moderate length, the whole work extending only to ten pages.† It is, as the extract given in the note shows, a very simple manual, yet it brings out distinctly those grand vital truths of the gospel for which the Waldensian church witnessed so boldly and suffered so much and so long. The quickening influence of the Reformation was soon and mightily felt in this, as in every other branch of literature, and to it we are consequently indebted for all those admirable manuals, by the help of which so many generations of Christian youth have been imbued with the knowledge of divine truth. To

* De Cat. Rud., vi. 328.

† The following is Chapter I.—*Lo Barba.* Si tu fosse demanda qui sies tu? *Repond.* *L'Enfant.* Creatura de Dio rational e mortal. *Barba.* Per que Dio te a crea? *Enfant.* Afin que yo conaissa luy meseirne, e cola, e avent la gratia de luy meme, sia salva. *Barba.* En que ista la toa salu? *Enfant.* En tres vertus substantiala, de necessità pertinent a salu. *Barba.* Quas son aquellas? *Enfant.* Fe, esperança, e carità. *Barba.* Per que cosa proverás aizo? *Enfant.* L'Apostol scriv 1 Cor. xiii. a questas cosas pormanon, fe, esperança, e carità. *Barba.* Quod cosa ès fe? *Enfant.* Second l'Apostol Heb. xi. es una subsistentia de las cosas da esperar, e un argument de la non apparussent.

the Reformed church, however, belongs the special honor of having produced those catechisms which are best adapted to the work of catechetical instruction, which have acquired the widest renown, and have imbedded themselves most deeply in the affections of all who know and love the truth.

The Heidelberg Catechism,—“*liber celebratissimus*,” as Augusti justly calls it, was originally prepared for the use of the churches and schools of the Palatinate, by order of the pious Elector Frederic III. and was first published at Heidelberg, in January, 1563, in German, and soon after in a Latin version.* The theologians, says Lefant, who labored on this work, were Zachary Ursinus, Pione Boquin, Emanuel Tremellius, professors of divinity, and Casper Olevian, court preacher, and it was finally examined and approved by a synod held at Heidelberg, in 1562. The precise share which each of these distinguished men took in framing the catechism is uncertain; but it is generally understood that that of Ursinus was, as Eus says, “*Eersten en voornaamsten*.” Some materials for it may have been derived from the earlier catechisms of Calvin, Bullinger, and Micron, but the only one of that period which resembles the Heidelberg is that of Zurich, and which was probably copied from the former.

The earlier editions of the catechism were not divided into Lord's days, nor were there any Scripture proofs attached to the answers. These features date from 1573. Between the German and the Dutch versions there are some verbal differences of no very great moment, in the answers to the questions 18, 29, 36, 40, 48, 81, 83, 84, 89, 93, 94, and 103. But the most important matter of a textual sort is connected with the answer to the famous 80th question, “*What difference is there between the Lord's*

* *Alting's* account of it is as follows:—“*Catechismo opus erat duplici de causa, una, quod—Heshusius introduxisset catechismum Lutheri, privata auctoritate;—alii vero alios catechismos vel aliunde acceptos, vel a se conscriptos—quæ res perpetuas rixas dabat in Ecclesia. Altera erat, ut una et consentienti forma doctrinæ proponerentur per omnes Palatinatus ecclesias. Id negotii datum duobus theologis Oleviano et Ursino, 1562, tanquam Germanis et Germanice scribere doctis. Uterque in chartam conjecit ejus specimen. Olevianus populari declaratione *fœderis gratia*; Ursinus scripto duplici catechismo, majore pro provecioribus, minore pro junioribus. Ex utroque contracta est *Catechesis Palatina*. Hist. de Eccles. Palat. p. 81, 82.*

supper and the Popish mass?" This answer closes with the very emphatic statement that the mass "is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry." During the commotions excited by the Jesuits in the Palatinate, about 1685, a furious outcry was raised by them against the catechism on account of the 80th question and answer. It was even maintained that in the original edition no such question was to be found; that both it and the answer to it had been foisted in at a later day; without the sanction of Ursinus or of the Elector. The same charge, substantially, has been more recently made. That it is utterly groundless has been abundantly proved by Ens, Van Alpen, and others. It does, indeed, appear that in the first edition of 1563, the 80th question is wanting; but Ens says "that it is found in the second German edition of that same year, with the answer not quite so full as we now have it, and that it was introduced by authority of the Elector, I know, through my honored colleague, Hieronimus Van Alphen, who has often told me that he had seen a copy of this same edition of 1563; and that on the 55th page of it the question occurs, and the answer in these words: "The holy supper witnesses to us that we have full forgiveness of all our sins, by the only offering of Jesus Christ, which he once on the cross hath accomplished. But the mass teaches that the living and the dead have forgiveness, not through the sufferings of Christ, but that Christ is offered by the priest for the same; so then the mass at bottom is nothing else, *dan eene af godize verlochening der eenige offerhande en des lydens Jezu Christi.*" Then at the bottom of the page the following note is printed:—"What was left out of the first impression, e.g. what is found on p. 55, is there inserted by command of his Electoral Grace." Nothing can be more decisive than this.*

* *Alting*, p. 88, simply states the fact that the first edition did not contain the 80th question, but that it was inserted in the second edition, by the express command of the Elector, adding in a note *Exemplaria prima et secunda editionis id docent*. The fact is also implied in an account of an interview between the Elector and a Diet, at Augsburg, 1566. After a very bold and noble speech by the Elector, *Alting* adds, that no one present ventured to say a word, "except a bishop who muttered something about the mass, which the catechism, question 80, marked with a grave censure." P. 97.

When the Heidelberg Catechism was published by the Elector Palatine, the Netherlands were only in the first stages of that long agony which preceded their independence. Philip was still their recognised sovereign, and at this moment was doing his utmost to bring the Belgic provinces under the yoke of the Inquisition. The Reformed churches of those provinces were "under the cross,"—to use one of their own striking phrases;—their assemblies for worship were held at the risk of liberty and life; and multitudes of their members were forced into exile. Not a few of them sought refuge in the Palatinate, and for their use the catechism was translated into Dutch in 1563. Among these refugees was Peter Dathens, a man of apostolic zeal, and of singular eloquence. He had been a monk in the convent of Popperingen, in West Flanders, but brought out of darkness into light, he became one of the boldest professors and most successful preachers of the truth. Forced to leave the Netherlands, he was called to be court preacher at Heidelberg; but the moment that there was a lull in the storm of persecution he hastened back to Flanders, to renew his evangelistic labors, and with such a mighty eloquence did he speak that his congregation often numbered fifteen thousand. He was chosen president of the Synod held at Wesel, 1568, and of that at Dort, 1578. Towards the close of his life he removed to Elbing, in Prussia, where he died, February 19, 1590.

Dathens was a resident of the Palatinate where the Heidelberg Catechism was first published, and he was one of the chief agents in introducing it into the Belgic churches. He had prepared a metrical version of the Psalter for the use of these churches, which became very popular, and to this he appended the Dutch version of the Catechism. Of course, wherever the Psalter went the Catechism followed, and those who adopted the one would be sure to adopt the other.

The first formal recognition of the Heidelberg Catechism as one of the public doctrinal formularies of the Dutch Church, was in the first National Synod held at Wesel, 3rd November, 1668—just two hundred and ninety years ago. This was a memorable synod, whether we consider the circumstances under which it met, or the work it accomplished. It was in the first year of the administration of

the monster Alva, and near the beginning of that tremendous war which was waged for three generations, and out of which grew the Dutch Republic, that the venerable fathers of the Dutch Church assembled at Wesel. It was the year in which a sentence of the Holy Office condemned to death as heretics "all the inhabitants of the Netherlands"—a sentence confirmed by Philip, who ordered it to be carried into effect, without regard to age, sex, or condition*—a sentence which Alva was doing his utmost to execute. "Infinite numbers," says Brant (and they not of the religion neither), "that had been but once or twice to hear a sermon among the Reformed, were put to death for it. The gallows, the wheels, stakes, and trees, were laden with carcasses or limbs of such as had been hanged, beheaded, or roasted; so that the air was the common grave of the dead." Such were the circumstances under which the first National Synod met,† with a view to give organic shape to the hitherto scattered congregations of the Reformed in the Netherlands. And the platform of polity and discipline framed by the Synod of Wesel, 1568, has stood unimpaired from that day to this.

Among the *Acta Synodi* is the following in relation to *catechising*: "1. The custom of catechising, derived from the apostles and their disciples, should not be separated from the office of the ministry and prophecy, and therefore our judgment is that it should be maintained in the church. 2. In the Netherland Walloon churches the Geneva Catechism shall be used; in the Dutch churches the Heidelberg; yet we leave this matter free until a future synod. 3. Each congregation is free to fix the time of catechising according to circumstances. Let the method hitherto employed be retained; and let all diligence be used in the instruction of youth, so that they shall not only learn the syllables and words of the catechism, but also understand its meaning; and so not only have it impressed upon their memory, but also on their hearts. Therefore shall the catechist not only question the youth about the words, but also the matter itself; and in explaining it he shall employ language fami-

* Hoofd Neder Hist. iv. 157.

† The Acts of the Synod are fitly styled "Proceedings of the Assembly of the Netherland Churches, *die onder 't Cruys sitten.*"

liar and suited to the comprehension of children. Parents and teachers of schools shall seriously admonish and carefully instruct the young, at home and in school, and accustom them to find for themselves the scripture proofs of the doctrines they hear in the church. 4. Especially should the young be taught to maintain a serious deportment in the church and in other assemblies. And all who wish to be regarded as members of the church should bring their children to the catechising so soon as they are of proper age, that they may be early trained in the true doctrine and in piety. Such as refuse to do this, without doubt, deserve the censures of the church.”* Our limits will not allow us to notice the acts of the National Synod held at Dort, 1574, 1578, Middelberg, 1581, and Hague, 1586, on this subject. It may suffice to say that the earlier act of the Synod of Wesel was renewed, and ministers were required to expound the catechism on the afternoon of each Lord’s day.

Before passing from the subject of catechisms, it is proper to say that besides the Genevan, to which the Walloon churches adhered, there were other two, of an earlier date than the Heidelberg, in general use in the Dutch churches. One of these was the *Little Catechism*, drawn up by Martin Micron, for the use of the Dutch church in London, about 1550; the other is styled *Een Korte Onderzockinge des Geloofs*, and it continued to be printed in the Psalter many years after the adoption of the Heidelberg. The same doctrine is found in them all, but they differ in length, and in the arrangement of topics.†

The *Confession of Faith* is the next formulary which claims our notice. When the first Belgic Confession was published, the Reformed churches of the Netherlands were in the process of formation; they were “under the cross;” they had not yet assumed an organized form, and hence the

* The Acts of the Synod of Wesel are given in full by *Ena*, 252–287. Richter, ii. 810.

† The subject of catechising occupied a large share of the attention of the Synod of Dort, 1618, and the *Acta Synodi*, p. 28–39, contain ample details in regard to the catechetical methods in use in the various Reformed churches of Europe. During Session 17th, Polyander, Gomar, Faukel, Thys, Lydina, and Udemann, were appointed to draughts of Shorter Catechisms, and they afterwards, Session 177th, reported the Compendium which follows the Heidelberg in the Dutch Psalm Books.

important work of preparing a symbol of their common faith behooved to be done not by a synod, but by private hands. Hadrian Saravia, in a letter to Uytenbogart, says that the first Belgic Confession of 1562 was drawn up by Guido de Bres, Herman Modet, himself, and some others whose names are not given.* But he virtually admits that the credit of the work mainly belongs to Guido de Bres, by whom *illa primo fuit conscripta*; and it is possible that the only part which Saravia, Modet, and the others took in it, was to offer suggestions and criticisms. "If the name of an author," says Ens, p. 85, "should give authority to his writings, it seems to me that the merits of so great a man, so true a servant of Christ, and so steadfast a martyr (as de Bres), are alone sufficient to impart the highest consideration to our Netherland Confession." The name of *Guido de Bres* is one of those which deserve to be embalmed in the memory of the Dutch church, as the author of her earliest Confession, and as a "blood-witness" for Christ. He was one of the most zealous and successful evangelists in the Walloon branch of the church. Jacob van Loo, who was burnt at Reizel, in 1561, for the testimony of Jesus, a few days before his death, exhorted de Bres not to follow the example of those who, in times of danger, at once fled to a place of safety. Whether de Bres needed such an admonition, we know not, but it is certain that he acted in accordance with it. As the pastor of Valenciennes, he, and his colleague, De la Grange, stood at their post, unmoved by the perils which surrounded them during the siege of the town by a Popish army; and soon after its capture, resisting all the inducements held out to them to deny the faith, they sealed their testimony with their blood.†

* His words are—"Ego me illius Confessionis ex primis unum fuisse authoribus profiteor; sicut et H. Modet; nescis an plures sint superstitēs. Illa primo fuit conscripta Gallico sermone a Christi servo et martyre Guido de Brea. Sed antequam ederetur, ministris verbi Divini, quos potuit nancisci, illam communicavit; ut unius opus censi non debeat." The letter is dated "Canterbury, 18 Ap. 1612." Saravia was then a very old man. He was probably of Spanish extraction. After the erection of the university of Leyden he was appointed to one of the theological chairs. In consequence of some political difficulty, he retired to England about 1587, joined the Established church, and, at a very advanced age, died a prebend of Canterbury, 1612.

† Of these a full account is given in "De Historien der vromer Martyla-

Previous to 1562, the Reformed in Belgium, says *Venema* (Inst. Hist. Eccles. vii. 252), for the most part used the Formularies of Doctrine and Order of the Dutch churches in London, viz. a Confession and Large Catechism, translated out of the East Frisian dialect into Dutch, in 1553, by John Uytenhove; the Shorter Catechism of Micron; and the Form of Government, by John a Lasco, 1550. But, as their number increased throughout the Seventeen Provinces, all manner of calumnies were inculcated by their enemies, in regard both to their faith and their practice. To rebut these calumnies was one of the objects of de Bres and his associates in preparing this Confession. It was accordingly sent to the King, under the title of "A Confession of Faith generally maintained by the Believers dispersed throughout the Low Countries, who desire to live according to the Holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," accompanied by an admirable letter to his Majesty, which must have made an impression upon any heart not converted by bigotry into stone. We would gladly quote from it some passages, if our limits allowed. We only observe, that Philip is here assured that the number of these "Believers" exceeded 100,000, and that if they had been the turbulent rebels some represented them to be, they could soon involve their country in anarchy or civil war, or, deserting it *en masse*, convert it into a desert.

In those days, as we have before observed, men did not

ren," p. 328-345. In 1565 De Bres published three small treatises on "The Root, the Origin, and Foundation of the Anabaptists of our Day, with an ample Refutation of their Choicest Arguments." Two editions, in Dutch, were printed, one in 1589, the other in 1608.

Hernan Modet, whose name occurs as one of the authors of the Confession, was a native of Swolle, and originally a monk. Soon after his conversion, in 1545, he became pastor of the Reformed church of Aldenarde, in West Flanders, and was one of the first who preached in the fields, where thousands met to hear the gospel. He was accused of taking part in the unhappy iconoclastic outbreak at Antwerp, 1566, but, as appears from his vindication of himself, without reason. He was also charged with being one of the movers of the tumult at Antwerp, 1567, and at Maastricht, and a price was put upon his head by the governors of the Netherlands. After a pastorate of some years at Zierikzee, in Zealand, he was called to Utrecht in 1586, and in the following year was sent on a mission to England to secure the help of Elizabeth. During the last years of his life he was a deal mixed up with the politics of the period.

put forth creeds in the slap-dash style of later times ; and hence, before the publication of this Confession as a public symbol of doctrine, it was submitted to the examination of as many brethren as De Bres could reach—to Fabritius, Cooltyn, Dathens, Van der Heyden, and others ; it was also sent to Geneva for the inspection of the theologians of that city, and finally it was revised, somewhat abbreviated, and unanimously adopted by a Synod held at Antwerp in 1566. The Synod of Wesel enacted (iii. 8) that all ministers should be asked if they assented to the “doctrine publicly held by the churches, and which is contained in the Confession lately sent to the King of Spain.” The national Synod held at Embden, 1571, ordered all its members to subscribe the Confession of the Netherland churches ; and also the French Confession in testimony of the unity of the churches of the two countries. Accordingly, the national Synod of France, held at Vitry, 1583, reciprocated this act of brotherly confidence. Three deputies from the Netherlands attended the Synod at Vitry. “The Synod gave thanks to God for the good agreement and union between these churches in every thing pertaining to doctrine and good order ; and as this holy union and concord between the churches of France and those of the Netherlands seem to require that they should help each other, it is agreed that they mutually assist each other with ministers and other things, as their necessities demand and their means allow.”*

In the Synods held at Dort, 1574, 1578, and at Middle-berg, 1581, acts were passed requiring ministers, professors of theology, schoolmasters, elders, and deacons, to sign this Confession, and also that each consistory should possess a copy of it.

Dr. Bres, as a Walloon, would naturally look to France for helps and models, in preparing his Confession, and a comparison of it with the Gallic Confession, published in 1561, shows that he made large use of the latter. They differ in the number of their articles, the one having thirty-seven, the other forty, but they closely resemble each other, and in sundry articles both have the very same words. Between the years 1562 and 1618, numerous editions of the

* Aymon Synod de France, i 157, 158.

Belgic Confession were published in the Dutch, German, French, and Latin languages. And as the revision of the Confession was one of the objects of the famous Synod of Dort, 1618-19, these various editions were carefully collated by Festus Hommius, their textual discrepancies were noted, and the result of his labors was published by him in 1618, "in usum futuræ Synodi Nationalis." The Confession was subjected to a rigid scrutiny by the foreign theologians, as well as the Dutch members of the Synod. The articles were read seriatim, and all were asked to examine them "rigide probeque;" and then to declare freely and sincerely whether they found in them any doctrine not accordant with the word of God. Finally, in Sess. 145, 146, they are said to have approved "totum Confessionis argumentum."

Indeed, during the whole of that fierce controversy started by the Arminians, and by which the peace of church and state was so seriously disturbed, there was never a question about the meaning of this Confession. Its language on all the grand doctrines of theology is too plain to be misunderstood. There were no clauses of doubtful meaning behind which the Arminians could take refuge. Some of that party, who would have converted the church into the mere slave of the state, insisted that the Confession had never received the proper sanction of the civil authorities, and the whole Arminian faction vehemently urged that it should be revised. In this memorable controversy, there were unquestionably faults on both sides, but the Reformed church has had to bear a load of obloquy which she did not deserve, and the Arminians have enjoyed a degree of sympathy to which they were as little entitled.

The great mistake made in this dispute was, says Bilderdyk,* that these two questions were confounded, viz. "What is the doctrine of the church? and What is the true doctrine?" In civil society, when some *fait accompli* is under consideration, we ask what *is* the law; not, *is* the law *just*? So in the church with reference to her ministers, we say to them, if you cannot judge according to her received law, do not assume the office of judge; if you cannot teach her

* *Geschiederies der Vaderlands, viii.*

doctrines, do not become one of her ministers. You are free to withdraw from her communion. You are at perfect liberty to publish your opinions concerning the law and the doctrine of the society, if you choose to stay outside of it; but *if you come within* you must not judge contrary to its recognised law, nor preach against its received doctrine. Calvin and Luther charged the Romish church with holding errors, and withdrew from her fellowship. Arminius was at liberty to charge the Reformed church with holding errors, and if he had withdrawn from her fellowship, no one would have disturbed him, whatever hard things he said against the church; but he has no right to teach *in* the church and *for* the Reformed, doctrines which they rejected as false.

We have not space to notice, even cursorily, the events which preceded and produced the General Synod, or Council rather, of Dort—1618–19; and would only say that while the entire Confession appears to have been carefully re-examined, the Five Points on which the Arminians dissented from the church, engaged the chief attention of this venerable assembly. These were Predestination—Redemption—Depravity—Conversion—Perseverance of the Saints. The judgment of the Synod on each of these points, or the “Canons of the Synod of Dort,” is presented in the form of what a Scottish Presbyterian would call a Declaration and Testimony. First we have, in a series of propositions, an elaborate exhibition of the Scripture doctrine on the particular topic; and then the *Rejectio Errorum*, or an equally elaborate statement of the errors condemned and rejected by the Synod. These canons, ever since the Synod of Dort, have held a high place among the doctrinal symbols of the Dutch church, and the careful study of them will amply repay the candidate for the sacred office, to whatever branch of the church he may belong. They are, indeed, a noble contribution to scientific theology. Every cultivated and candid reader of these canons, let him belong to what school he may, will, we are sure, concur in the statement that the men who drew them up were masters in Israel, profoundly versed in the sacred science of theology, and in that sacred logic which consists in “reasoning out of the Scriptures.” Full justice has never yet been done to

this venerable Synod. Leydekker (in 1705) published a work which deserves to be better known than it is, entitled "The Honor of the National Synod of Dort maintained against the Accusations of G. Brant;" and more recently, Bilderdyk, the poet and historian, devoted a long chapter to the same subject in his "Geschiederies der Vaterlands;" but a candid and truthful history of the Synod of Dort, its antecedents, its doings, and its results, is yet to be written.

The *Liturgy* remains to be noticed. This includes the Prayers used on the Lord's Day, before and after sermon—the Form of administering Baptism, and the Lord's Supper—the Mode of Ordination—the Celebration of Marriage—the Visitation of the Sick—the Burial of the Dead.

In all the early Reformed churches of Scotland, France, Geneva, Netherlands, etc., liturgic forms were provided not only as helps for those ministers whose power of extemporaneous thought and speech was limited, but also for the sake of uniformity in public worship. These liturgies are vastly more simple in structure than the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, the pastors who used them were not, like the English priest, so hedged in by rubrics that personal discretion and adaptation to circumstances were impossible. Still, uniformity in worship, to a certain extent, was deemed to be essential to the good order of the church. "Those who reject all liturgies"—says Ens, p. 156—"and refuse to observe the established church customs, undermine church and state, as they found in the Arminian times." Such seems to have been the sentiment of the Dutch church, and hence she has ever held fast to the liturgic principle.

Previous to 1566 several liturgies were in use among the Reformed churches of the Netherlands, which though drawn up by different men, were, to a large extent, derived from a common source, viz. Calvin's Liturgy. Some of the materials of Calvin's Liturgy, Henry thinks were taken from the Missal, though Mr. Baird (*Entaxia*, p. 33), says that no trace of such a form as the "confession of sin" can there be found. This is no doubt so, and yet Dr. Henry's averment may be in the main true after all, and from some examination of the collections of Renaudot, and of Gerbert, we are inclined to believe it is true. But to return. The Walloons naturally adopted the liturgy of Calvin as their

own. Then we have the *Liturgia sacra* prepared by Polan for the Church of the Exiles at Strasburgh, printed in 1551. Next comes the *Liturgy of John à Lasco*, 1554, prepared for the Dutch churches in London, and which Ens says was "the oldest Liturgy of the Netherland Dutch churches." Finally there was the *Palatine Liturgy* which came into Holland in the wake of the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Psalter of Peter Dathens (1566), whom Ens styles the "over brenger" of it into the Netherland churches.

A minute comparison of these liturgies with the one in use in the Reformed Dutch church of our own country would be more tedious than profitable. We may, however, remark, that the forms of prayer to be used before and after sermon, before and after catechising, and which are now rarely if ever heard in the Dutch churches, do not agree with the corresponding form found in the London, nor with those in the Palatine liturgies, but seem to have been culled from them and the liturgy of Calvin. The form of baptism in the Americo-Dutch liturgy is in an abbreviated form of the Palatine office, but differs entirely from the London. The form for the administration of the Lord's Supper also differs widely from the London, while it is the exact counterpart of the Palatine.

In the order of public worship, as set forth in all these old liturgies, it is observable that what is sometimes called "the long prayer" came *after* the sermon. Perhaps the opposite usage that obtains now-a-days among us is the better one; but the ancient order had some features whose disappearance we regret. When the people had assembled the precentor began the service by uttering *clara voce* that ancient call to devotion, *Sursum corda—Leve le cueur—Heft op re hart—Lift up your hearts*;—he then read a chapter (in course), and gave out a psalm—during the singing of which, the minister entered the pulpit. Another custom which we earnestly wish to see revived, was the repetition of the apostle's creed by the whole congregation. In the Palatine churches this was done at the close of the afternoon service on each Lord's day, as well as in the communion service. In the London liturgy the creed followed the "long prayer," both on ordinary Sab-

baths and sacramental ones, which, by the way, were monthly.

There is another formulary whose history is not without interest, viz. the old psalter of Dathena. Though very indifferent as a translation, being a version of a version (Marot's French), and harsh in its rhyme, it held its place in the church until 1775, and was then supplanted by the new version not without great difficulty. In Zeeland the change occasioned a popular outbreak of so serious a kind that several of the ringleaders male and female were prosecuted, of whom seven were banished, and one was condemned to be executed.*

We cannot close without saying a word respecting *John à Lasco*, who, though by birth a Pole, has strong claims to be held in high esteem by the Dutch church. He belonged to one of the noblest families of Poland, was born in 1499, and from his childhood was destined for the church. After receiving the best education that his native land afforded, he travelled through Germany, Italy, Belgium, France, forming the acquaintance of the most eminent scholars and reformers of the day, particularly of Zwingle and Erasmus. Returning to Poland in 1526 with a strong bias for reform, he obtained various dignities in the church, and in 1529 was made Bishop of Vesprin. Seeing no hope of improvement in the Romish church, he resolved to quit Poland in 1537, in order to devote himself elsewhere to the cause of the Reformation. In 1540 he married at Mayence, and having soon after established himself at Embden, in East Friesland, was invited by Count Enno to superintend the reformation of the churches of that country. He encountered great difficulties but he met with a great success, and Embden became the radiating centre of reformed influences, and the mother of many churches. On the invitation of Cranmer he went to England in 1548, where he remained for six months as the guest of Cranmer at Lambeth palace, and became intimately acquainted with all the English reformers. Latimer, in a sermon before Edward VI., said:

* *Van Ipezen* of Campvere, a member of the commission that prepared the new version, published a full account of the whole business, including a full history of Christian Hymnology from the earliest times, under the title of *Kerkelyke Historee van het Psalm Gesang*. 2 vols. Amst. 1777.

“John à Lasco, a great learned man was here, and has gone his way. If it be for lack of entertainment, the more the pity.” He returned to England in 1550, and was made superintendent of the foreign Protestant church at London, composed of French, German, and Italians.

Here he remained until the accession of the Bloody Mary, when he and his church were forced to become wanderers again, 15th Sept. 1553. The little fleet were obliged, by stress of weather, to enter a Danish port, but the barbaric bigotry of the Lutherans would not allow the storm-tossed exiles to land. Lasco intended to settle in Friesland, but the growing influence of Lutheranism made the place irksome, and he removed to Franckfort, where he founded a Dutch church, whose confession and liturgy received the sanction of the senate. He returned to Poland in 1556, and until his death, on 8th January, 1560, he labored in his native land, as he had done so zealously elsewhere, to spread the knowledge of the gospel, and to remove the wretched dissensions between the Lutherans and the Reformed. Lasco was pre-eminently a lover of the truth and peace, yet he was not a latitudinarian, as his treatment of the Polish Socinians proved. In the various regions in which he lived during his chequered career, he seems to have won the warmest affection of those with whom he was brought into contact. Dryander, the Spanish reformer, uses language respecting him, that, to say the least, borders on the extravagant—“*insignes animi tui dotes quas pene divinas et agnosco et veneror, corporis majestatem vere heroicam, gravitatem vultus suavitate conjunctam, humanissimam morum facilitatem, liberalium omnium disciplinarum admirandam cognitionem, accuratam linguarum peritiam et copiam beatissimam, quibus omnibus divinitus donatus es præ cæteribus mortalibus.*”