

These class notes have not been reviewed or edited by Mr. N. Shepherd. They are solely my responsibility (D.A. Bratcher. Except for the section from the notes of C. Wisdom: pp. 69-73; 5/8/80). Therefore it is asked and required that these notes not be reproduced, in whole or in part, by any means whatsoever.

ST 523 THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM
Instructor - N. Shepherd

SPRING 1980

2-7-80

Reading and Course Requirements

1. Read Heidelberg Catechism.
2. Schaff, P. Creeds of Christendom Vol I: 245-53; III: 74-92
3. Schaff, P. Creeds of Christendom Vol I: 467-71; 529-54; 783-87
4. Thompson, B. (ed.) Essays on the Heidelberg Catechism
5. The Commentary of Dr. Z. Ursinus on the Heidelberg Catechism.
translated by G.W. Williard. ~~Vol. I: 1-16~~
6. Skilton, J. (ed) Scripture and Confession, article by N. Shepherd entitled "Scripture and Confession" (pp. 1-30)
7. Prepare a catechetical sermon on one of the Lord's Days.

Bibliography on the Heidelberg Catechism

A. Translations (German and Dutch immigrants are the main source).

1. Tercentenary Edition of 1863 from the German text.
(Chambersburg, PA: 1863, M. Kieffer and Co.) Found in
Schaff, P. Creeds of Christendom III: 307ff.
This is our main source of information. Out of this
time came many books and articles.
J. W. Nevin was on the committee that produced this translation.

The German Reformed Church no longer exists. Most of it united with the Evangelical Church to form the Evangelical and Reformed Church in about 1934, 1935. They united with the Congregationalists a few years ago to form the United Church of Christ.

But there is a remnant, the Eureka Classis of the Reformed Church in the U.S. It is constituted along ethnic lines, not territorial.

2. 400th Anniversary Ed. of 1962 from the German and Latin.
Commissioned in 1962, published in 1963. Can be found as an appendix in Cochrane, A. Reformed Confessions of the Sixteenth-Century (Phila.: Westminster Press; 1966).
3. The Psalter Hymnal (of the Christian Reformed Church) has an edition based on the Dutch text. Its format is not in prose but in a semi-poetic form. Also can be found in Ecumenical Creeds and Reformed Confessions.

B. Bibliographical Material

Klooster, F. "Recent Studies in the Heidelberg Catechism"
Calvin Theological Journal I: 73-77

Lists twenty-one titles between 1963-65 on the Catechism.

C. Titles on the Origin and Theological Character of the Heidelberg Catechism.

1. Heppie, H. History of German Protestantism: 1555-81 (Marburg, 1852), Four volumes, in German.

Written in the context of the Union movement; in the mid-nineteenth-century, to unite the Reformed and Lutheran in one body. The Evangelical Church was formed in the U.S. out of those who came from Europe.

Heppie sought to demonstrate the link between the Reformed and Lutheran confessional groupings in Germany.

Basic Thesis--Melanchthon is the theological teacher in Germany to at least 1555. Ecclesiastical separation began in 1560. By 1580 the Formula of Concord is published and the Lutheran/Reformed differences are distinct and pronounced. Heppes says that the Heidelberg Catechism is a Melanchthonian document rather than Calvinistic.

2. Gooszen, M.A. The Heidelberg Catechism, the Received Text, with Comparative Texts for Source-Critical Purposes (Leiden, 1890) in Dutch.

The first part is introductory--the origin and sources, the procedures of composition. Second part has received text and parallel texts from that period. As to its theological character--his thesis: the Catechism is principally dependent on Bullinger and is therefore Zwinglian.

Gooszen distinguishes in Calvin a soteriological/biblical stream and an intellectual/speculative stream. Bullinger and the Catechism represent the sot./bib. stream in Calvin.

3. Lang, A. The Heidelberg Catechism and four related catechisms with a historical-theological introduction (Leipzig, 1903) in German.

Similar to Gooszen in layout. Thesis--H.C. is Calvinistic in origin.

4. Hollweg, W. New Investigation into the history and doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism (Neuykirchener, 1961) in German. Had a second edition published in 1968 entitled New Investigations . . . Catechism, with additions.

Two Theses. 1) There are two catechisms by Beza which provide source material for the H.C. 2) Olevian could not have been responsible for the final form of the H.C., because he did not know enough German.

5. Masselink, E.J. The Heidelberg Story (Baker, 1964) Popular.

6. vanden Brink, B. The Dutch Confessional Writings in the Authentic texts with an introduction and comparative texts, second ed. (1976).

Contains text adopted by the Synod of Dordt in 1619.

7. Good, J.I. The Origin of the Reformed Church in Germany, 1520-1620 (Reading, Daniel Miller, 1897 [1891?], particularly chapters 1&2.

8. _____. History of the Reformed Church in Germany, 1620-1890. (7&8 are semi-popular)

9. _____. The Heidelberg Catechism in its Newest Light (Phila., 1914) His last work.

Preached in the Heidelberg Reformed Church (Broad near Olney). Also near Pennlyn-Bluebell and Skippack Pike in the Beems Reformed Church, the oldest German Reformed Church founded 1720 or 1725.

Good (= Guth) was the last prominent leader of the anti-liturgical party. Very conservative. Denied reprobation and limited atonement. Believed in the infallibility of the H.C. as strongly as that of Scripture. Wanted to prove that the H.C. was not Melanchthonian and that the German Reformed Church was not liturgical in character. Good lived 1850-1924.

10. Nevin, J.W. History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism (Chambersburg, PA, 1847). Also his work The Mystical Presence

(1846). Nevin was very strong on the sacraments and church life. Lived 1803-86.

In 1870 Presbyterian Church U.S.A. approved the use of the H.C. as an instructional tool for children.

The H.C. and Luther's ~~Smaller~~ Catechism is less definite but more expansive and suggestive. While the Westminster Shorter Catechism is characterized by brevity, terseness, and accuracy of definition beyond H.C. and L.S.C.

D. Commentaries in English

1. The Commentary of Dr. Z. Ursinus on the Heidelberg Catechism translated by G.W. Willard. ^{By D. Pareus (Eerdmans, out of print). 1954. Collected & edited}
Drawn from students lecture notes, as Ursinus regularly lectured through the H.C. We thus have a close approximation to Ursinus, but not first hand.
2. Theleman, O. An Aid to the Heidelberg Catechism (Douma of Grand Rapids, 1959).
3. Hoeksema, H. The Triple Knowledge (1970-72) [Reformed Free Publishing Assoc.]
Supralapsarian, no Common Grace.
4. Van Baalen, J.K. The Heritage of the Fathers (Eerdmans, 1948) "Most of these chapters are not sermons but present material for sermonizing."
5. VanTil, C. The Triumph of Grace (Class Syllabus, 1958)
Deals with the spirit of the H.C. not the text.

E. Commentaries in Dutch

1. Kuyper, A. E Voto Dordrechano (1904) Four volumes. "In accordance with the wish spoken at the Synod of Dordrecht."
2. Schilder, K. Heidelbergse Catechismus (1941-51)
Four or Five Volumes. Virtually a full dogmatics, Only got as far as Questions 27 and 28.
3. DeGraaf, The True Faith (Kampen, 1954).
Deals with Questions 1-20. Notes on Questions 21, 22 were synthesized by the editor.
4. Veldkamp, Children of the Sabbath (1948)
Two volumes. May come out in English.
5. Haitjema, Th.L. De Heidelbergse Catechismus (1962)
6. New Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism
Published by the "young turks" in the Reformed Church in the Netherlands. Deals with more contemporary problems.

F. Contemporary

1. Barth, K. The Heidelberg Catechism for Today. Too brief.
2. Perij, A.
In French. 1959 and 1962.
3. Bruggink, D. (ed). Guilt, Grace and Gratitude (Eerdmans, 1963)
By a series of Reformed Church in America authors.

G. Catechetical Sourcebooks

1. Torrance, T.F. The School of Faith (Harper and Brothers, 1959)
Has a 126-page introduction. Sets out his own Incarnational theology. Also has a translation of Calvin's Geneva Catechism. H.C. was authorized by the Church of Scotland in 1591. Surpassed by West. Sh. Cat. in 1648.
2. Cochrane, A. Reformed Confessions of the Sixteenth-Century. (Phila.: The Westminster Press, 1966).

Part I. The Origin and Literary Background of the Heidelberg Catechism

A. Primitive Protestant Catechism

- 1517-63 Catechisms are being developed.
- 1525 beginning of catechetical literature.
- 1529 Luther publishes his Smaller Catechism.

1. Basic Ideas of a Catechism

κατέχω -- "making yourself understood"

According to Arndt-Gingrich, instruction in religious things is its usage.

Acts 18:24-26 *καταχίανος* Basic instruction, not necessarily in depth; ignorant concerning baptism.

- a. The Socratic question and answer method is not of the essence of a catechism.

Note form of Council of Trent Catechism and Luther's Larger Catechisms.

Q & A method may be related ultimately to instances of baptism so as to elicit a confession (e.g. Apostles Creed). Catechisms are viewed as confessional documents (e.g. CRC, others).

- b. Not of essence of catechism to address it to children. Shift was from adult to children catechizing though not exclusively.

2. Catechetical Materials

What does it mean to confess "Jesus as Lord."?

As the Church reflects on this it formulates Creeds which then need to be explained, then catechisms arise. Eventually the catechisms have to be explained and also commentaries on the catechisms are produced. And we comment on the commentaries.

The Lord's Prayer and Apostle's Creed were the core of catechetical materials. In the thirteenth-century the sacrament of penance and confession of sin was added. Confession of sin made obligatory, in 1215, at least once per year.

Since lists of sins and virtues were drawn up the Ten Commandments were added. The Lenten season was the most convenient time to preach on the Decalogue, also the Lord's Prayer and the Apostle's Creed. The Ave Maria was added about the time catechetical preaching began.

In the Reformation the "Ave Maria" was set aside (but not entirely). Replaced by a discussion of the Sacraments. Done so, so as: 1) To distance Reformed and Roman Catholic views from one another; 2) To refute the Spiritualists and the Enthusiasts.

The basic elements of a catechism in the Reformed Church's were: Apostle's Creed, Decalogue, Lord's Prayer, Baptism and the Lord's Supper (cf. e.g. Luther's Smaller Catechism).

3. Some Reformed Catechisms (1525-29)

Earliest ones are not defined by any particular confessional characteristics. Produced in chart or tablet form. Of extant documents there is one from Zurich and one from Strasburg. The Zurich catechism has the Decalogue (according to the Romish pattern), a summary of the law in terms of the Two Love Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, Ave Maria (abridged, 1525), Apostle's Creed. The Strasburg Catechism has the abbreviated form of the Ten Commandments and an explanation of the Two Love Commandments.

J. Bader Dialog Book (1526)

The first two catechisms of an evangelical Church. No consideration given to the Lord's Prayer, but to others. That the Decalogue is not abbreviated is its distinctive (esp. the second commandment).

4. Luther's Smaller Catechism (1529)

He was very interested in catechetical instruction. In 1520 version had a short form of the Decalogue, the Apostle's Creed and Lord's Prayer.

Introduction--there are three things a man must know in order to be saved: 1. Law 2. Grace 3. Prayer

Decalogue Ap. Creed Lord's Prayer

Added Baptism, (Confession and Absolution, 1531), Lord's Supper.

Law in the H.C. is set out in terms of the Two Love Commandments. Then the exposition of the Decalogue is linked to prayer as an expression of gratitude.

Weaknesses of Luther's Sm. Cat.

- a. Decalogue is abbreviated.
- b. Apostle's Creed is expounded in only three questions
- c. Undue prominence is given to the Sacraments as they are made co-ordinate with Law and Grace.
- d. Addition of Absolution and Confession tends to become elevated and approaches a sacrament of penance-like view.

A. Lang says that at least five strains of catechisms in the Reformed Church develop from 1529-63. They are: The Strasburg and Zurich Catechisms (most influential ones), the Upper German (not too significant), the Genevan, and the **East** Friesian (á Lasco) Catechisms.

2-21-80

B. The Strasburg Catechisms

Catechism published in 1527, enlarged edition in 1529. Capito is listed as author of 1529 ed. (he came to Strasburg in 1523).

Catechism has a specifically Reformed form of the Lord's Prayer. "Vater unser" is now "Unser Vater".

A second manual in 1534 was also produced. Has more significance

for the future.

A Brief Scriptural Explanation--perhaps by Bucer. First Reformed Catechism done along lines of Luther's catechism.

No theological significance to the order of the articles, no structural unity. Apostles Creed (includes an explanation of the sacraments in the article on the Church), Decalogue, Lord's Prayer. A Compendium of Christian doctrine for beginners was added to it. Format is followed by Calvin and does have theological significance.

In 1537 a new catechism is published for popular use and may have some theological significance. Not much larger than the 1534 edition. Each section is summarized. Remained in use till 1550's during the Lutheranizing period. In 1543-edition, the 1537 text is abbreviated on the Sacraments. Omitted from the Apostles Creed and added to a section on the liturgy of the Church. Reformed liturgy begins in Strasburg.

What is Bucer's significance on the development of Reformed Catechisms?

1. Established the form of Reformed catechism elements after the pattern of Luther's Sm. Cat.--Faith, Law, Prayer.
2. In Luther's Catechism there is an explanation of each individual command and each petition of the Lord's Prayer. On the Apostle's Creed it is brief. With Bucer the Creed is broken down and the parts are explained. The size and complexity of catechisms grow.
3. A. Lang notes two features, orienting in character:
 - a. **Positive** limitation in the Catechism to what is ethically and religiously of value.
 - b. Continuing application of the material to life, e.g. "of what value is this to you".

M. Zell - produced three catechetical works. One each on the Decalogue, Apostle's Creed and Lord's Prayer.

Upper German Catechisms (bottom of Germany).

Not significant to the development of the H.C.

C. Zurich Catechisms

1. Leo Jude (Jüd)

Reformation began in 1520, completed in 1525. No music till 1597. Jude came to Zurich in 1523 and was Zwingli's assistant. After his death he was leader of the Swiss Church for awhile, but was opposed. Content to be Ballinger's assistant. Very religious man--Devotionally oriented, preacher and poet.

a. Larger Catechism, 1534

Clear dependence on Zwingli theologically, though no clear literary dependence. With respect to its form it is distinctive. It is in Q & A form but with the pupil asking questions. No other like catechism.

Questions serve often as a kind of verbal punctuation.

Has 100 Q's in 107 pages. Though some answers are several pages long (and one is 20 pages long).
Four main parts: 1) Consideration of the will of God--Exposition of the Decalogue. Introduced by a series of questions on the subject of the covenant, particularly on God's Covenant with Abraham.

Bullinger is the first to speak of the Covenant in Reformed circles. Though there is no reference to a Covenant of Works.
 Begins with Abrahamic Covenant as over against Anabaptist concept of a covenant e.g., when a group gathered together and covenanted with God. Done to protect infant baptism.
 Responsibilities in Covenant: Service to God--internally and externally (i.e., the Decalogue).

Gooszen says there is an attempt to make the covenant the unifying principle of the catechism. Probably not though. Serves more as introduction to the Law.

The Law is divided into two tables (1-4, 5-10) and discussed. Followed by a section on the Purpose of Law. What are the ways in which we are free from the Law? As a curse and a penalty, from its ceremonial elements. As to service it is binding.

2) The Grace of God. Defines Faith. Describes Justification by Faith. Expounds Apostles Creed (same in H.C.).

3) Prayer. How do we seek the Holy Spirit from God who engenders faith? (a) Demands of God; (b) What we receive from God; (c) How we seek it. Echoes structure of Luther's first attempt. Lord's Prayer expounded. Jude adds prayer to expand petitions.

4) Doctrine of the Sacraments and other Duties of Christians.

Jude's catechism is the most important Reformed Catechism between 1531 (death of Zwingli) and 1537 (publication of Calvin's Catechism).
 Graffman says it "Breathes a fresh, evangelical spirit." Lang notes that it is the first time a Reformed catechism enumerates the commandments in a Reformed way. (I.e., Anglicans and Lutherans join first and second.) The Jews had the introduction and first as the first commandment. Calvin felt this was a matter of indifference. But it was done so as the second commandment would get its own accent.

b. Smaller Catechism (1535)

The length and formal inadequacies of the Larger Cat. caused this to be written. It is smaller only in

relation to the Larger.

Text is shorter, went from 100 to 213 Q's.

Adds an appendix with 56 Q's to the 213, for the very young children.

Goes to, Teacher to student Q & A.

Content is the same. Covenant is a little more prominent. Q. 78 deals with the covenant in relation to grace and law.

c. 1538 Catechism, in Latin.

Written esp. for use in the schools. Shows an indebtedness to Calvin whose catechism was published in 1537.

Differs at one major point--does not teach (or deny) double predestination. Calvin follows this in his second catechism. Seems to be a certain amount of reticence towards reprobation in the catechisms.

Zurich Catechism assessed as a whole.

- 1) Reinforcing and establishing of main subjects of: Law, Faith, Prayer, Sacraments.
- 2) Reformed enumeration of Decalogue.
- 3) Further guidance is given with respect to scope of the material to be included in a catechism.

Materially this means:

- 1) Introduction of Covenant idea, without it being the unifying or controlling aspect.
- 2) Sustained emphasis on experiential side of the Faith--Justification, Law, Grace.
- 3) Well-defined Zwinglianism in the catechism. Feeds into the H.C. eventually.

2. H. Bullinger

Published Decades in 1552. Consisted of five series of ten sermons (1549-51) on catechetical materials. This is the most comprehensive of Bullinger's works. Filled a need for new catechetical materials due to theological advancement.

Compendium (1556)

Built on Decades. Published in German and in Latin. Consists of ten articles beside the usual elements. Adds a section on the doctrine of Scripture. Doctrine of Creation, Good Works, Death, End of all things. Thus moving in the direction of a more comprehensive doctrinal statement.

Catechism (1559)

Written for more adult-type persons. Has seven chapters instead of ten. Four devoted to standard elements:

Apostles Creed, Law, Prayer, Sacraments.

Three on Inspiration and Authority of Scripture, God as the true and living God of Scripture, and the Covenant (though not of structural significance.)

Sacraments are presented in a Zwinglian form, though

heading toward Calvin.

Has a tendency to become a kind of popular, Reformed dogmatics.

Has a direct connection with H.C. (published Jan. 1563). Distributed in Heidelberg that same month. May have even been in the thinking of Ursinus and Olevian. (Olevian was in Zurich in 1558 and 1559).

Summary: Almost a uniform tendency to deal with the main catechetical materials but also expands and diversifies on those materials. Main elements of catechisms are now explained more fully than Luther, which militates against the practicality.

(Question: To what extent ought polemical materials to be included in a catechism?

Are Q & A, as such, necessary to the essence of a catechism?

How is a catechism related to Confessional aspect?).

D. The Genevan Catechisms

1. John Calvin (died 1564).

First edition of the Institutes published in 1536, last edition in 1559.

The first edition could be seen as a catechism, being built around the Apostles Creed.

First Catechism published in 1537 in French (1538 in Latin). Form is that of a series of paragraphs rather than Q & A.

More theological in content. Dealt with the knowledge of God, constitution of man, estate of man, powers of pastors, government of the Church, and election and reprobation (given in full-orbed form).

Exiled to Strasburg (1538-41)

Second Genevan Catechism published in 1541 in French (oldest extant manuscript is 1545). In Latin, 1545.

Purpose: instruction of children (10-15 yr. old, according to T.F. Torrance. Thus they are catechized after being baptized and taking of Lord's Supper at age 10). Dedicated to the preachers of East Friesland. Set up in Q&A form.

Contained 373 Q's in four parts:

Part One--Apostles Creed, Q 1-130.

Part Two--Decalogue, Q 131-232.

Part Three--Lord's Prayer, Q. 233-95.

Part Four--Word and Sacrament, Q. 296-373.

French ed. of 1548 is divided into 55 sections: One for each Lord's Day, plus three for the principal Church festivals, e.g. Christmas, Easter, Pentecost.

Content of Catechism--Main feature is that it is a

unified presentation of the body of Reformed Theology tied together along thematic lines.

Opening Q.1 What is the chief end of human life?

A. To know God.

Q.6 What is the true and right knowledge of God?

A. When we know Him in order that we may *honor* Him.

Q.7 How do we know our God aright?

A. We put our reliance entirely on Him, by serving Him in obedience to His will, by calling upon Him in all our need, seeking salvation and every good thing in Him, and acknowledging with heart and mouth that all our good proceeds from Him.

This is the Theme of the Catechism. Each of the four parts refers back to this.

Sec. I.--How we honor God by relying on Him. The substance of its foundation is to know God in Jesus Christ. Apostles Creed is then expounded.

Sec. II.--How we honor God by serving Him. The rule is the law, i.e. the Decalogue.

Sec. III.--How we honor God by calling upon Him in all our need and seeking salvation and every good thing in Him. This leads to a discussion of Prayer and the Lord's Prayer as representative biblical instruction.

Sec. IV.--How we honor God or worship Him by acknowledging with heart and mouth that God is the author of all good so that we thereby honor Him. The rule is the praise and thanksgiving in Scripture.

Calvin's Catechism has its own unity; a structural unity, not simply the coherence of a doctrinal system. Luther's catechism had some. Coherence is that of the ordo salutis. Over and against this Calvin places the honor and worship of God in the foreground. First of all, by our reliance on Him--Faith and the Apostles Creed. Second, by serving Him as we rely on Him--Law. The accent thus shifts from the elenctic use of the law to its normative use. Bucer had this but it was not of structural significance. Also used in the H.C.

In 1536 ed. of Institutes law was in the First place. The major theological, polemical emphases are toned down. Thus more experiential in orientation. But later on the Institutes goes the other way somewhat.

2. Theodore Beza

Succeeded Calvin, taught till 1605.

Visited Heidelberg four times from 1557-59. His influence is especially seen by Hollweg.

Beza produced two catechisms:

a. In 1560 A Confession of the Christian Faith and a comparison of it with Papal heresies.

Consisted of seven chapters--Trinity, God the Father, Jesus Christ, Holy Spirit, Church, Final Judgement, a Brief Antithesis. Predestination has a major role,

- though it is omitted in the smaller catechism.
- b. In 1562 A Brief Confession of the Christian Faith Printed in Heidelberg. Holweg notes structural and content similarities. Main point of Holweg is that this Brief Confession provides the three-fold pattern of the H.C.-- Misery, Redemption, Gratitude.
- (1) The Holy Spirit works in us a knowledge of our sin and misery.
 - (2) The Holy Spirit makes known the grace of God in Jesus Christ, causes us to participate in it.
 - (3) Sanctification. Gratitude is used in H.C. because sanctification is used in Apostles' Creed.

Thesis of Rev is that the three divisions come from an anci? (=ancient?) Lutheran catechism of 1547 reprinted in 1558. Used Law, Gospel, Good Works. The terminology appears in the articles.

Shepherds' view is that the term or concept of "Gratitude" may have been drawn from Luther's Commentary on Galatians, 1535. Particularly the comments on 2:16. Faith alone justifies. Faith does not remain alone. Gratitude is not obligation but motivation for good works following faith (cf. H.C. #64).

2-28-80

E. Laskian, East Friesian or London Catechisms

London Cat. was the most influential on the H.C.

1. J. a Lasco--he either produced or greatly influenced the production. In 1542 he is at Emden as a Calvinistic reformer. In 1547 he went to London to work with a refugee congregation. In 1553 due to Mary he left and eventually returned to Poland. Produced a Calvinistic catechism in 1546 (translated in Dutch in 1551 by J. Utenhore) which was used in London. Had 250 Q's. Doctrine of Sacraments, spoken of as seals of communion with Christ, more than just signs--Gives three reasons for Sacraments in the Old and New Testaments:
 - a. Witnesses or Signs of God's grace to us.
 - b. Seals of our Union and Communion with Christ in His Church. Next question asks, But doesn't the Spirit do that? Answer,
 - c. Yes, but it is by Word and Sacrament.

No consensus among commentators on influence on H.C., though it is one of several. It was too large and detailed for children so...

2. Pastor M. Micron produced The Little Catechism in 1552. Not to supplant a Lasco but to shorten it or be a supplement to it. Had 134 questions under three topics:
 - a. Knowledge of God (leads to exposition of Law).
 - b. Power of the Law and Faith (leads to exposition of Apostles' Creed, with an additional section on the Marks of the Church and Discipline).
 - c. Prayer (exposition of the Lord's Prayer).

Micron preserves the practical aspect of à Lasco's catechism. Shifts in sacraments towards Zwinglian. Doesn't reduce them to mere signs, retains seals but as seals of the fruit of His death. Or seals of the objective truths of the Gospel, rather than seals of my participating in it. Most directly influential cat. on the H.C.

3. A Brief Investigation, 1553

Kuyper and consensus say à Lasco, some say Micron. Purpose was purely practical. Given to new members in London. Had to be learned and subscribed to. Done so as to resist heresies.

Consists of 41 Q's.

17 on the Holy Christian Church, its blessing, joys, marks, and sacraments.

Q.1 How are you assured in your heart that you are a member of the church of Christ?

A. From this, that the Holy Spirit witnesses to my spirit that I am a child of God the Father, through Jesus Christ His Son, and my high priest, who has purified me from my sins through the holy sacrifice of His body and the pouring out of His blood. Moreover, I feel that I am moved by the Spirit of God to obedience of the divine commands.

Also refers to Q. 22 and 23.

4. Catechism composed by a Group of Pastors at Emden, 1554 (according to title page).

Found that à Lasco's catechism was unusable at Emden. Reduced 250 Q's to 94.

à Lasco probably had some influence as he was at Emden then.

Doctrine of Sacraments is Calvinistic.

Some influences on the H.C. Used in Emden till 1888 when supplanted by the H.C.

F. The Heidelberg Catechism

1. Theologians of Heidelberg

(Geography Lesson--Heidelberg is located on the Necher River. It is the capital of the Palatinate. Palatinate is divided into two areas--Upper and Lower.

Upper Palatinate is the southern part of Germany from about Bavaria to the Czech border. Lower Palatinate is the area on both sides of the Rhine River.)

One of seven electorates in Germany. The largest and most wealthy. Ruled by a count or prince, who was also an elector in the Holy Roman Empire.

The Transition in Heidelberg

1508-1544 Ludwig V. is Elector of the Palatinate.

1518 Luther visits Heidelberg for a disputation at the Augustinian Convent.

1521 at the Diet of Worms (in the Lower Pal.) Luther gives his "Here I Stand" speech.

1544-1556 Freidrich II. is Elector

1546 first open expression of reformation arises, though slowly. Occurs on Jan. 3 when Protestant Communion

in both kinds is observed at Church of the Holy Ghost.

1555 Augustinian Convent opened as College of Wisdom, founded for study of Liberal Arts and Humanism.

1560 became a kind of seminary for the training of ministers.

1556-1559 Otto Heinrich is Elector

Reformation was of a mild Lutheranism or Melancthonism as crystallized in the Augsburg Confession, that is, in the Augsburg Variata (Melancthon's altered version of the Augsburg Confession of 1540.)

(1558 the Reformation of the Theological Faculty of the University was completed with the appointment of Hesshus, Boquinus, Einhorn.)

1559-1576 Friedrich III. is Elector.

Was born and raised Roman Catholic, became a Lutheran in 1556. Was mildly Lutheran when he became Elector.

Heidelberg Catechism published in 1563.

What brought the H.C. into existence?

During the reign of Heinrich ('56-'59) tensions were rising over the confessional stance of the Electorate. Which tensions broke loose after he died. Hesshus, an ardent Lutheran, found the worship too Romish in orientation. He had come to Heidelberg on Melancthon's suggestion, but began pressing for a more rigid Lutheran stance. This served to drive his fellow teachers into a more Calvinistic position.

He debated Klebitz (a Calvinist or Zwinglian).

The Elector interfered and asked for a written presentation from each, which he then sent off to Melancthon for arbitration. Conflict was as to the nature of the Lord's Supper and the nature of our communion with Christ.

Elector's plan was to cause peace but hostilities

erupted. Both men were fired and left in Sept. of '59. Einhorn left with Hesshus.

Thus only Boquinus is left, an outspoken Calvinist.

In Nov., of 1559 Melancthon's advice arrives--Resolution is to be by appeal to the biblical pattern in I. Cor.

10:16--"Is not the cup of blessing which we bless a sharing in the blood of Christ? Is not the bread which we break a sharing in the body of Christ?" Effect of advice was a move from Lutheran to Calvinistic position.

1560 a five-day disputation on the Lord's Supper was held. Elector becomes convinced of the Calvinist-Melancthon position (Nov. '59). Formula proposed by Melancthon is accepted. Lutherans are compelled to leave who cannot agree. City is reformed in 1560, 61. Organs are silenced for the next 100 years.

Friedrich claimed the protection of the Peace of Augsburg (1555), where each prince was to determine his regions' confessional position. He did not view his position as unfaithful to it.

Theological faculty now expanded in a Reformed manner. Tremellius appointed in Old Testament, Olevianus appointed in 1560, Ursinus in 1561, and Zanchius in 1568. The transition is complete to a strong predestinarianism with Zanchius. The arrival of the Marian exiles also helped move the city in a Reformed direction.

1576-83 Ludwig VI succeeds Friedrich as Elector. Reverts city back to a Lutheran stance, exiles the Reformed. The faculty moves to Neustadt, about 30 miles west. Casimer establishes a school for them.

1583-92 J. Casimer becomes Elector. Reestablishes Reformed faith and the theological faculty.

The Heidelberg Catechism was adopted in January of 1563. Friedrich called it "my catechism". He was not personally involved except for the addition of Q. 80. He also wrote the preface. Olevian wrote a letter to Calvin (4-3-1563) about the Catechism and sent along the Latin edition for his approval. He indicates his indebtedness to Swiss theology in a letter to Bullinger (4-14-1563).

While there is no definitive listing of who was involved in writing the Catechism, three men were key figures in its production.

Petrus Boquinus (?-1582)

Born in France, no known date of conversion. In 1542 he is at Strasburg as a theological lecturer. Left soon after to return to France. While there he flirted with Roman Catholicism (which caused problems later on). Returned to Strasburg soon. 1557 he is in Heidelberg as a professor at the University. 1576 he goes to Lausanne where he dies.

In 1561 he wrote An explanatory exegesis of the Divine and Human *κατακρίσεις* (170pp.). The first Reformed theology. The scope of the whole of Scripture is unfolded in terms of the communion, union of the Divine and Human. Done via the use of a Ramist chart.

Casparus Olevianus (1536-87)

After his conversion he preached in France but was driven out. Stayed in Geneva from '57-'59 with Farel and Calvin. Came to Heidelberg in 1560 as Director of the College of Wisdom. Simultaneously became Professor of Dogmatics at the University. Gave up the second position almost immediately for a pastorate.

In 1576 he went to Herborn during the Lutherani-
zing period. Did much writing there.
An Exposition of the Apostles Creed (ca.1578); two
books on The Substance of the Covenant of Grace be-
tween God and the Elect (1585)--Very Significant.

Zacharius Ursinus (1534-83)

Born in present day Poland. Studied at Wittenberg.
A devoted student of Melanchthon. Became Director
of the College of Wisdom in 1561. Assumed the Chair
of Dogmatics at the University from 1562-68. Suc-
ceeded by Zanchius in 1568 when he gave up his work
at the University. Stayed on as Rector of the Theo-
logical College. Went to Neustadt in 1576. Authored
many works of theological and exegetical value. Par-
ticularly, two catechisms which served as the basic
drafts for the H.C.

2. Ursinus: Summa Theologicae

Reformation began in Heidelberg in 1546. The Church
order was based on the altered Augsburg Confession
of 1540 and the Scriptures.

(Cp. the altered Augsburg Confession with Calvin's
Geneva Catechism, Q. 353 on the Lord's Supper.)

Two texts have catechetical significance at this
time:

- 1) The Examination for Ordinands-Melanchthon (in
German, 1552). Deals with the main points of Pro-
testant doctrine for Pastors.
- 2) Children's Catechism- J.Brenz. Written before
he went more rigidly Lutheran. Under the influ-
ence of Hesshus, Brenz' Catechism is suppressed.
A Brief and Orderly Summation of the Right and
and True Doctrine of the Holy and Christian Faith
was produced in 1540 (reprinted 1548), a Lutheran
catechism.

In August 1560 Heidelberg is consciously Reformed.
Friedrich wanted to give an accounting of his city's
views. Also saw the need for clarity and uniformity
in the educational structure of the city. Thus he
wanted texts to replace the above-mentioned texts.

A Catechism, the Whole of Theology set out in Ques-
tions and Answers: or containing the heads of the
Christian religion. Produced in 1561, 1562 (no date
given in sources).

Consisted of 323 Q's (47pp in length in Lang, cp.
with 61pp of Calvin's Catechism). Should not be seen
as a preliminary draft of the H.C. primarily. Ori-
ginally emerged in connection with his work at the
University or College of Wisdom.

In 1562 a Smaller Catechism, embracing the Christian
Faith with perspicuous brevity was produced.

Consisted of 108 Q's (18pp). Emerges in the context
of the H.C. composition. There are significant
points of comparison between the Summa and the Minor.

There are no documents comparable to these two to serve as immediate predecessors to the H.C. Also nothing is known of the actual course of the H.C. production.

The Summa is set out in four parts: FAITH-LAW-PRAYER-MINISTRY of the CHURCH (includes a treatment of the Sacraments).

The four parts are preceded by an introduction of 37 Q's. Its significance is in its purposing to demonstrate the necessity of the four main parts and their order. Thus for the first time since Calvin (in 1541) there is a concern for the unity of the catechism and the disposition of the catechetical materials.

Q.1-7 Our religion is true. It witnesses itself to be such in the heart and in the conscience. Shows man not only his chief goal but how to attain it.

Q.8-29 The chief end of man is to worship and serve God and this purpose was included in the covenant established at creation. The covenant is brought in at Q.10--Foedus; Foedus in creatione: Covenant in Creation.

The law of God tells us how the goal of man is to be reached. The substance of the law is to love God with all our heart, soul, and strength and our neighbor as ourselves (No elaboration on the Decalogue like the H.C.). Through the Fall into sin we now stand under the wrath of God.

Q.30-37 Since we are under the wrath of God our only comfort in life and in death is the Covenant of Grace (foedus gratuitum).

Q.31--Three elements in the Covenant:

- 1) A reconciliation obtained with God by the intercession of Christ, in which God first of all promises to be a propitious Father on account of Christ and to give eternal life to those that believe.
- 2) The Redeemed respond by accepting these benefits with true faith and by living as grateful and obedient sons.
- 3) Each side calls to witness this mutual promise with visible signs which we call sacraments.

This structure determines the sequence of the rest of the materials.

First- Faith (fides quæ- objective faith, the doctrine to be believed): the benefits of God's grace.

Second- Law and Prayer: has to do with man's commitment which is the second side of the covenant.

Third- Ministry of the Church: has to do with the doctrine of the sacraments as signs and seals of the covenant.

In each of the four elements we are referred back to the covenant and its structural significance.

Q.39 What is the sum of those things which the gospel sets before us to be believed, in order that we

may be partakers of the divine covenant?

A. They are comprehended in the Apostolic Symbol.

Q.148....

Q.149...

A. The law has to be preached to the unconverted before the gospel.

Q.150...

A. To the converted the law must be preached.

In this series note the Lutheranizing impact via Melanchthon on the elenctic use of the law. But also the Calvinistic use of the law as normative is present.

Q.224 ...

A. Prayer is among the chief elements of worship.

According to Lang, the leading characteristic of this catechism is the covenant.

Gooszen thus sees Bullinger as the major influence here.

Shepherd agrees but with two major reservations:

- 1) The concept of the Covenant is not entirely lacking in the other Reformers-- Bucer, Calvin, Melanchthon, Zwingli, Musculus (cf. G.Schrenk History of the Covenant Idea, in German)
- 2) Bullinger thinks only in terms of a Covenant of Grace (same for Calvin).

Ursinus is probably more indebted to Melanchthon, especially as he develops the covenant, rather than just the Swiss Reformed view. Also, especially as he develops the idea of a Covenant in creation. Melanchthon in his Loci Communes (first ed., 1521; last ed. 1558), has the idea of natural law. Seen as innate in man, as part of man.

The origin of the Commonplaces is in his lectures on the Epistle to the Romans ~~providing~~ a basic structure: LAW-GOSPEL. His note on 2:14 suggests natural law. Thus some evidence for Melanchthonian influence on Ursinus.

What purpose does the covenant structure serve?

Cf. p.2 of Ursinus Commentary...

"The doctrine of the Church..."

The concept of Covenant enables Ursinus to use natural law as normative, not just elenctic. The Covenant embraces the whole of Scripture as Law and Gospel.

3/6/80

a. Introduces Covenant concept

Purpose of Covenant structure, cf. Commentary.

Two parts in the doctrine of the Church--Law and Gospel.

He stresses the normative use of the law not the elenctic. Does so by appeal to the covenant.

Which embraces the whole of the Scripture as Law and Gospel.

Gospel is seen in terms of promise to believers. Law " " " the obligation that devolves upon them as believers. Law serves not merely those to be brought to Christ, but those in Christ. The normative aspect is accented by Faith being prior to Law in the order given. He shares this concern with Calvin. Calvin takes up Faith (Gospel) before Law. Cf. Q.7 (1541 ed.) Reliance upon God is coupled with service to God in obedience to His will- leads into Decalogue. Calvin does not introduce the covenant here, though Ursinus does. Does so with its two sides: Grace and Responsibility, corresponding to Law and Gospel. Law and Gospel are not set in opposition, but are brought together as two sides of the covenant, specifically the Covenant of Grace. This analogy of Covenant and two sides goes back to the Swiss Reformed. Cf. Jude's Smaller Catechism, Q.13 (1535).

The two sides are as follows:

The 1st element of covenant is that He will be his God and the God of his children forever. The 2nd element is that Abraham and his children would walk before Him diligently and be pious and devoted people.

Bullinger's Catechism # 24 (1559)

Q. What are the conditions or heads of that Covenant of God established with man?

A. Two chiefly- The one expounds how God wills to present Himself to us or what we may expect from Him or promise ourselves concerning Him. The other contains what He requires from us and what our task is.

Thus Ursinus accents the normative use of the Law in the context of his catechism. At the same time he does not deny the elenctic use of the Law. His answer is in terms of the Covenant in Creation, cf. Q.8 of Summa.

Q. What are the headings under which the whole of Christian obedience is contained?

A. Four.

Q.9 What are they?

A. The Decalogue- the substance of the divine law.
The Apostolic Symbol (Creed)- the substance of the Gospel.

The Lord's Prayer- the Invocation of God.

The Institution of the Ministry.

Q.10

A. That lex divina (divine law), is said to explain what sort of covenant God entered with men in creation and how man was to conduct himself in the service of God. That same lex divina that obtains before the Fall is republished in the Decalogue.

But in his exposition, he does so not in terms of

the Decalogue, but in terms of the two Love Commandments. Which leads to the doctrine of Sin.

Significance of the order in Q.9.

Would think that the order would structure the catechism as a whole. But instead, the elenctic use of the law is treated in the introduction with the treatment of the Covenant in Creation. Gospel is introduced in Q.30 in connection with the Covenant of Grace. The Covenant of Grace then structures the Four main elements of the Catechism. Rather than the Law/Gospel distinction of Lutheranism.

The Covenant is the structure that binds everything together. From the Lutherans, thru Melancthon, Ursinus gets the elenctic use of the law in the Law/Gospel distinction. Sets it out in terms of two covenants- Covenant in Creation-- Covenant of Grace.

Law (covenant in creation)/Gospel (covenant of grace).

The Covenant of Grace has two sides: Law & Grace. Derived from Jude, Bullinger, e.g., the Swiss Reformed.

Ursinus distinctive contribution is his extending of the Covenant back before the Fall into Sin and into Creation.

Covenant in Creation is used here. Towards the end of the 16th-century the Covenant of Works begins. Basis is laid for it.

Introduction of the Covenant of Grace (cp. Summa with the Wetminster Sh. Cat.).

In the Summa it is introduced from the perspective of Christian experience.

Q.1 What sure consolation do you have in life and death?

A. (Long answer)

Q.2. How do you know that such a covenant has been entered into with you by God?

A. Because I am truly a Christian.

WSC introduces the covenant as derived from the doctrine of God, (cp. Q.4 of Summa) leads to a discussion of the Unity and Trinity of God.

Q.12 What special act of providence did God exercise towards man, in the estate wherein he was created?

A. When God created man, He entered into a covenant of life with him, upon condition of perfect obedience;..... (Covenant of Works in WCF XII:2)

This covenant relation is added to man as a creature of God. Note "special act" in Q.12. Man is conceived of as created and then by way of a special act of providence he is brought into a Covenant relation with God, e.g. a Covenant of Life/Works. A covenant relation is superimposed on a natural

relation. It is different in Ursinus and the early Reformed. The covenant is given, is one, with his creation in the image of God. To be image is to be in covenant with God. You don't have first a natural relation and then a covenant relation added, but it is from the beginning. The doctrine of God is next, related to the exposition of the Apostles Creed. The WSC is more theological, the Summa more experiential.

b. Faith (first part, Q's.38-47)

Faith is kindled in the hearts of the elect by the Holy Spirit, who makes us living members of Christ and begets in us true love and a calling upon God.

Similar to that of the H.C., Q.21.--Faith is to assent firmly to every word of God passed on to us and a steadfast trust (ferma fiducia) by which individual persons determine that unto them ~~grace~~ grace been given by God, remission of sins, righteousness, and eternal life freely on account of the merit of Christ and through Him. Cp. Melancthon's Exam. for Ordinands: I believe that remission of sins not only to me but to others...

The Apostles Creed is dealt with in terms of three themes: Creation, Redemption, Sanctification. Followed by a treatment of the doctrine of Justification--After we believe all these things, what do we obtain by this faith, what good does it do for us?

The placement of Justification after the Creed is similar to Calvin and also in the H.C.

c. Law (second part)

At the beginning he unfolds the two uses of the law: Elencitic and Normative. Each commandment is then expounded

After this he takes up the relation of Justification and Good Works.

Q.214 Why is obedience required since we cannot be justified by it?

A. First that we may show our gratitude. Second, So that it may be clear that God is the enemy of Sin. Letting into His grace none but those who repent. Cp. WCF XV:2 (Of Repentance unto Life)

Next section is on Predestination. Reprobation is implied in Q's.216, 217.

Five Q's on Predestination. Lang comments that for the first time we have in a Reformed catechism. Predestination given an independent place. Virtually the same place as in the Institutes. Not as an appendage to the doctrine of God and the Decrees, but to the doctrine of salvation where it is offered as an explanation of why some do and some do not live unto God.

The last few questions are on Assurance.

Q.219...

You do not seek first some insight into your election whereby to obtain a warrant for faith. But by a simple embrace of the gospel, Jesus Christ, and that is how you know you are elect. It is a true faith by the testimony of the Holy Spirit and by its being a true conversion.

Cp. WCF.XIII on this.

- d. Prayer (third part- 40 Q's.)

Nothing distinctive.

- e. Ministry of the Church (fourth part)

Doctrine of the Word of God, Sacraments, and Church Discipline.

The Word and Sacraments are the means by which we are received into the Covenant of Grace and are kept there and are given the assurance of belonging. Use of the means does not deprive the Holy Spirit of His honor. The power and the efficacy are His, the Ministry is the means or instrument.

Q.272 What does the Spirit effect by the preaching of the Word?

A. One, He teaches what God has promised in His covenant and what He requires of us. Two, He persuades us more and more to believe in Him and to submit to Him.

Note Promise and Response--Covenant pattern.

Sacraments are set forth in a Reformed manner, as signs of the covenant between God and man and seals of the righteousness of faith.

Q.319 Who are to be admitted?

Answer brings out that the children of professing adults are to be recognized as believers by the Church.

On the question of what is to be done to those acting in an unworthy manner. They are to be disciplined. Has three concluding q's on Church discipline.

There is a clear dependence in the Summa Theologica, on Calvin, and the Swiss Reformed. Also on Melancthon and the Lutheran Reformation.

3. Catechesis Minor (cf. handout)

Begins with an introduction of six questions, asks about the nature of our comfort. Answer given in terms of forgiveness of sins and the gift of eternal life. All of which are known from the Scriptures. Set forth in: Our Misery; How we are set free; and Our Gratitude.

Part I very brief

Part II Escape from sin is in Jesus Christ through faith. What do I get?--C. Justification

D. Why the Spirit has worked faith in my heart.

THE CATECHESIS MINOR OF URSINUS IN OUTLINE - *N. SHEPHERD*
Spring 1980

Introduction (1 - 6)

I. Misery (7 - 9)

II. Deliverance (10 - 71)

A. Faith (10 - 12)

B. Content of Faith - The Creed (13 - 44)

1. The Trinity (13 - 16)

2. God the Father (17)

3. God the Son (18 - 38)

a. His names (18 - 22)

b. Humiliation (23 - 32)

c. Exaltation (33 - 38)

4. God the Holy Spirit (39 - 44)

C. Justification by Faith (45 - 48)

D. Election (49 - 52)

E. The Sacraments in General (53 - 56)

F. Baptism (57 - 63)

G. Lord's Supper (64 - 71)

III. Gratitude (72 - 108)

A. The Decalogue (72 - 95)

B. Prayer (96 - 108)

E. Explains why the Spirit kindles and nourishes faith.

G. The Lord's Supper concludes with an oblique reference to discipline.

Part III Decalogue introduced with the consideration that true faith must beget gratitude. Gratitude has two parts: Conversion (repentance), the fruit of which is good works; Prayer, the chief element of our gratitude, without which we do not have true faith.

- a. A New Disposition of materials in this Catechism
The Summa Th could not serve as a first draft for the H.C. because it was too long. Consultation on a new catechism was begun. All we have is the Catechesis Minor as a first draft. New arrangement of materials.

The concept or at least the language of the Covenant are absent. According to Lauderberg and Gooszen (cf. Schaff-Herzog) the reason for this is that it is the victim of an attempt to bring the doctrine of the sacrament more into line with the Augsburg Confession (the Variata). The prior commitment to the Augsburg Confession may have lead to this. Thought perhaps too dangerous, too Swiss or Zwinglian.

Two counter-reasons are given by Lang.

1) Both Ursinus and Olevianus deal with the Covenant in their later writings (cf. Olevian in 1585). The Church Order as adopted by Heidelberg in 1563 dealt extensively with the use of the covenant in the liturgical forms for Baptism and the observance of the Lord's Supper.

2) Concept lost because: the idea of a covenant in creation was so new it may have caused offense to his colleagues (psychologically this sounds good, possible). Also the Covenant of Grace concept could not be advanced in such a way as to account for both uses of the law.

Law retains its place after faith as a believers norm. Also have to be found prior to faith, for its elenctic use. But a new order is needed to structure these and thus the Misery, Redemption, Gratitude scheme is used to do this.

How is the Catechism to be structured?

Law is now to be introduced under the rubric of gratitude, cf. Q.72.

Prayer is now assimilated with law under gratitude, not independent. Prayer viewed in Summa Th as among the chief elements of worship of God. Only a short step to being the chief expression of gratitude. Carried over into the H.C., a Calvinistic motif.

Prefaced by a characteristically Lutheran motif, the Melancthonian contribution, that Law teaches

us to know our misery; and the Gospel teaches us to find grace through faith. The Lutheran motif is combined with a Calvinistic motif leading to a three-fold distinction

MISERY -- REDEMPTION -- GRATITUDE
 Law & Gospel//Grace & Covenant Response
 The structure is given in terms of the question--
 What does the Word of God teach? Ans.- Misery,
 Redemption, Gratitude.
 The weight of the Catechism is towards the Calvinistic aspect.

What of the Fourth Part of the Summa Th on Ministry?

It is added to section II on Redemption. Cf. Bucer who placed it next to the discussion of the Church and the Creed.

Exposition of the Creed is followed by a discussion of Justification, then Predestination (explains why all are not justified), followed by the section on the Sacraments.

The Sacraments are no longer the signs and seals of the two sides of the Covenant of Grace, but are introduced as the means by which the Holy Spirit strengthens faith. The sacraments are thus seen in a more Lutheran way than a Calvinistic.

b. Nature of the Abbreviation from the Summa to the Cat. Minor

Went from 323 to 188 Q's. Not a different document. Fewer theological subjects. No discussion of the divine image, the concept of God as such, the visible/invisible Church.

c. Theological Character.

More open to or embracive of some Lutheran motifs, but not opposed to Calvinistic motifs
 The structural similarities with Calvin's Geneva Catechism is lost. Perhaps more ecumenical in character.

Area of difference is in Soteriology.

The Summa Th. takes up the relation of Justification and Good Works in two places: at the end of the Creed and at the end of the Decalogue.

The Cat. Minor takes up Justification after the Creed, and Good Works at the end of the Decalogue. Thus Justification and Sanctification are more radically separated, more Lutheran. The integration of Faith and Justification with the New Life is lost.

The doctrine of Predestination is retained after Justification. Lang says the discussion of Predestination which issues in the question of assurance prevents Sanctification from being wholly

divorced from Justification.

Double Predestination is retained right after Justification. Ursinus speaks simply of a reprobate multitude. Emphasizes the comfort and motivation to duty found in the doctrine of Election. Thus a practical cast is given to Predestination.

View of the Sacraments remains Calvinistic. In the Lord's Supper a believer attains to a personal union with the whole, glorified Christ. Not physical but through the power of the Spirit and faith.

No major theological differences, except for the loss of the Covenant and its structure. The four changes are in a Lutheran direction.

4. Publication of the Heidelberg Catechism.

a. The first Three Editions.

No records of theologians deliberations on the H.C., except for minor exceptions. Put into final form in late 1562. Ecclesiastical approval given in Jan. 1563. Elector Friedrich ordered it printed and wrote the preface in Jan. 19, 1563. Available probably by Feb. for public use. Available in Latin by April (for Calvin).

Extant copies are rare. One was found in 1864, and one other since then (cf. G.W. Richards book for the 1864 copy).

First edition has a number of features worthy of mention. Q. & A. not numbered at all, nor divided into Lord's Days. The Proof-Texts mention only the chapter. The major difference is the complete absence of Q. 80. (as we know it).

1563 saw two more editions published. Perhaps even before April. The Latin edition was based on the 3rd edition probably. May have been reprinted with some modifications.

The Third Edition is called the Textus Receptus.

The Fourth Edition is the same as the Third, but is with the Church Order adopted in Nov. of 1563.

b. Q. 80 A polemical question against the Roman Catholics not against the Lutherans.

The Second ed. stresses the once-for-all passion and sacrifice of Christ. An "idolatrous denial" In the Third ed. "idolatry" is moved to the end of the answer--"accursed idolatry". Idolatry due to transubstantiation. Makes an image of God and worships it.

CRC translation calls it a "condemnable idolatry".

The question has a historical context. The Council of Trent met 1545-63. Its decisions were printed in 1564. It dealt with the Q. of the Presence in 1551 in the 13th session. Dealt with the Q. of the Mass in Dec. 1562 in the 22nd session.

Filtered through to Heidelberg. Concepts were directed against the Prot. doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Very unsparing in their anathemas. The Decrees were probably the cause of the addition of Q.80. Written by Olevianus. The Elector may have put in the "accursed idolatry". Also deals with the idea of our union with Christ in a powerful way. Not through the eating and drinking of the bread and wine, but through the power of the Holy Spirit.

c. Fourth Edition.

Dates Nov.15,1563. Heidelberg thus has a Reformed Catechism and has a Reformed Church Order (cf. Niesel).

Catechetical training is derived from Ex.12:13; Deut.4:6,11. Must be taught faith and repentance. Children are thought of, not as becoming Christians, but as growing up as Christians. This is why in the Church Order of Heidelberg, the Catechism is placed between the sections on Baptism and on the Lord's Supper.

Old R.C. put Confession between Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Confession was an infusion of grace through the bishop's laying on of hands.

The Heid. Cat. says catechetical training takes the place of Confession, i.e. the Word comes in place of the Sacrament (of Confession).

Cf. Institutes IV:19:13

Confession was used by Nevin and the Reformed Church in America, Eureka Classis-- virtually a public profession of faith, though some say it is more.

The Church Order made room *in* two ways for the catechism to enter the Church's life

1) Used in connection with the regular services (our morning worship). A section was read before each service, being completed in nine weeks.

H.C. was divided into nine Lectionary sections:

1-11; 12-28; 29-45; 46-58; 59-74; 75-85; 86-103;

104-115; 116-129; Selected Scriptures (directed to various social, economic groups, to help them understand their calling in life. Groups were the Civil authorities; Judges; Rulers and Subjects; Husbands, Wives and Parents; the Church, Servants, and Day-Laborers; Masters, Youths, Virgins, For everyone).

2) In the afternoon service a section was expounded. Also the young were called on to recite the answers by heart. Thus a bit more informal and instructional.

The 52 Lord's Days appear in Nov.1563. Calvin's Catechism was divided into 55 parts (3 for each of the Church festivals: Christmas, Easter, Pentecost).

The Reformed emphasis is on the Centrality of the Word, not necessarily the preaching of the Word. Must see the morning service as, in its totality, an exhibition of the Word--the Word read, the Word proclaimed, the Word responded to in praise and prayer.

Must conceive of the service, not in an intellectualistic pattern, but a covenant pattern, of grace (God's Words to us) and our response to God in terms of praise and prayer. Thus the second service can be different in emphasis.

3-13-80

d. Dutch Translations.

1563 in Emden. Did not displace á Lasco's catechism. Attained to confessional standing in the Dutch Church. The Synod of Dordt gave it its final status in 1618.

Petrus Datheenus (Pieter Datheen).

In 1563 he used the second German ed. for the Dutch ed. Used by the Dutch Congregations in the Palatinate. Republished in 1566 as an appendix to the metrical Psalms in Dutch (by Datheen, used today by a few). Became normative via the Synod of Dordt.

Q. & A. 103 is significant in the Dutch translation. Added "den Sabbath, dat is op", found in old CRC trans.

The Day of Rest is identified with the Sabbath of the Old Covenant very early in the Dutch Church. Thus it comes closer to the Westminster Confession. The new CRC trans. "festive day of rest" is a good translation of "fiertag" (German).

e. The Defense of the Heidelberg Catechism until 1566. Met with considerable opposition esp. from the Lutherans. The Elector was virtually isolated within his Empire by 1563.

Two points of basic opposition:

1) The doctrine of the Lord's Supper was viewed as Zwinglian.

2) The doctrine of the Two Natures of Christ.

Arose in connection with Q's 47 & 48.

Q. 47 seen as denying the communicatio idiomatum (not communio), thus denying ubiquity. Lutherans viewed this as only having a part of Christ here and thus not a whole Redeemer.

Q. 48 Christ's divinity is beyond the bounds of the humanity He has taken on, "extra naturam humanam" (extra Calvinisticum--outside the bounds of).

Union with Christ is by way of the Holy Spirit, not by way of the corporeal presence of Christ (however conceived). We are one flesh with the caro vivificum (life-giving flesh), but through the power of the Holy Spirit. His flesh is life-giving not because bound with Deity (cp. T. F. Torrance and Nevin) but by virtue of His office as our Mediator in His death and resurrection.

Ursinus has a major role in this--Apologete, Teacher, and Professor.

A Conference is called for at Maulbronn in 1564 due to increasing pressures on the Elector. Boquinus, Olevianus and Ursinus for the H.C. J.Andrae for the Lutherans. Conference is abortive but did clarify some things.

At the Diet of Augsburg in 1566. The Elector stressed 1) the Scripturality of the Heidelberg Catechism (built proof-texts into the structure of the H.C., in the margins); 2) the Church in Heidelberg is entitled to the protection of the Peace of Augsburg of 1555. Conclusion was that though there were some variations the Elector should not be deposed. Thus the right of the Reformed Church in Germany was established. It was nipped later but was restarted.

Heidelberg Catechism Course Outline

PART II: The Interpretation of the Heidelberg Catechism

Cf. N. Shepherd Outline of H.C.

The relationship between the HC and the WSC.

8 respects in which they differ:

1. Perspective-3; historical, theol., experiential
2. Underlying principle- more Puritan/Continent, a feel
3. Apostles Creed
4. Conception of the Church
5. Election
6. Form of Q. & A.
7. HC has something direct on social service. #'s 55, 86.
8. Along w/6 a difference of spirit

Heidelberg and Mercersburg

Sought to refute Puritanism from Finney to Hodge.

HC is a product of the life of the Church.

Hard points of Calvinism toned down

Sac's are Calv., not Zwing. or Luth. Sac's are preeminent in Nevin

HC has a liturgical character.

LORD'S DAY I: Qu.'s 1 & 2

1. The Concern of the Cat. w/Comfort

- a. It is concerned with comfort in the face of sin and death
- b. The concern with comfort as a point of contact.
- c. The character of comfort must not be sentimentalized
Comfort is power (A.K.), a process of reasoning (Urs)
- d. It is not that comfort necessitates evil but vice-versa

2. What is the source of that comfort?

~~JESUS CHRIST!~~

- a. The Cat is Theocentric.- the Glory of God, as Trinity
- b. " " Christocentric

It is Jesus who has satisfied and redeemed; who preserves; who assures and motivates me by His Spirit.

3. The Place of Comfort--JESUS CHRIST

Union w/Christ; property of Christ. Cf #'s 20, 32, 64, 76

- a. A New Orientation
- b. The Foundational Character of Union w/Christ

4. The Ground of Comfort

Union w/Christ is set out in terms of participation or communion w/Christ in His benefits

Benefits: Redemption and Preservation

Red: the definitive transition which is accomplished by Christ in His life; It is past w/ref to us

Pres: what Christ continues to do in the present

Note the emphasis on Cosmic Scope of Red. and Liberation

5. The Essence of Comfort

- a. It is assurance of eternal life
this is a vital element in the def. of faith.
- b. It is assurance of eternal life
- c. It is assurance of eternal life.
Q.1-assurance
Q.2-knowledge

and

J. The Mediator ~~of~~ the Covenant

The Covenant: a mutual contract. Not an impersonal thing between equal partners. Point is that of its being an arrangement of mutual promises and mutual obligations. Not just sheer sov'ty.

The Cov. could only be made by a mediator.

The cov.relation is built on the reconciliation wrought by the mediator

The Cov is one in substance (one God, one Mediator)

It is several (Old, New) in its administration.

The historical cov's agree:

1. God is thier author, Christ is their Mediator.
2. The promise of grace--Remission of sins, eternal life.
3. The conditions w/respect to us- Faith and Obedience.

The historical cov's disagree or differ:

1. Promises of temporal blessings
2. Circumstances of the promise of grace
3. Rites or signs added to the promise of grace.
4. Clearness
5. Gifts conferred.
6. Duration.
7. Obligation-Old: whole law. New: only the moral, use of Sac's.
8. Extent- Old: Church confined to the Jewish nation.
New: to ~~the~~ all nations.

For Ursinus none of the historical cov's exhibit a work's principle. A cov. is established on the basis of the work of the Mediator. And the blessings of the successive cov's are the promises ~~mg~~ of grace. And it is precisely in that context that there are conditions--Faith and Obedience.

Not as indicative of a works principle but as the manifestation of Faith.

LORD'S DAY VII

A. Q.20. Ingrafting into Christ by faith and accepting all His benefits is how we are saved. This is found'l. Doesn't appeal to Election, or to Faith only.

B. Q.21 What is true Faith?

1. It is a sure knowledge whereby I hold for truth all that God has revealed to us in His Word.
Faith entails knowledge of the Word of God-notitia
It is a knowledge whereby I hold for truth-assensus.
Not an implicit knowledge or having doubt mixed in.
It is a saving knowledge because coupled w/firm confidence.
2. It is a firm confidence, a hearty trust. ...
It is a trust that my sins have been forgiven...
Fiducia-trust.
Faithis fiducia coupled with notitia and assensus
It is fiducia defined as assurance. Thus assurance
is of the essence of faith, part of the definition.
The assurance here is the assurance of our Justif.
3. It is ~~sa~~ deep-rooted assurance created in us by the Holy Spirit through the gospel.
It is there in the Bible for me to read and the preacher to proclaim. I do not seize it on my own. The H.S. creates and works that trust and assurance in ~~me~~.

THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM IN OUTLINE

3/13/80

N. Shephard.

Introduction: My Only Comfort (1, 2)

I. The Knowledge of Sin and Misery (3-11)

- A. Sin Revealed by the Law (3-5)
- B. The Sinfulness of Man (6-8)
- C. The Punishment of Sin (9-11)

II. The Knowledge of Deliverance (12-85)

- A. The Mediator (12-19)
 - 1. The need for a Mediator (12-14)
 - 2. The kind of Mediator needed (15-17)
 - 3. The Mediator provided (18, 19)
- B. Faith in the Mediator (20, 21)
- C. The Content of Faith: Exposition of the Creed (22-58)
 - 1. Trinitarian division of the Creed (22-25)
 - 2. God the Father (26-28)
 - 3. God the Son (29-52)
 - a. The names of the Mediator (29-34)
 - (b. Conception and birth (35, 36)
 - ^{HUMILIATION} c. Suffering, death, and burial (37-44)
 - ^{EXALTATION} d. Exaltation (45-52)
 - 4. God the Holy Spirit (53-58)
- D. Justification by Faith (59-64)
- E. Faith Kindled and Confirmed (65-81)
 - 1. Word and sacraments (65)
 - 2. The sacraments in general (66-68)
 - 3. Baptism (69-74)
 - 4. The Lord's Supper (75-81)
- F. Faith and Unbelief: The Keys of the Kingdom (82-85)

III. The Knowledge of Gratitude (86-129)

- A. Good Works (86-115)
 - 1. The necessity of repentance (86-91)
 - 2. Exposition of the Decalogue (92-113)
 - 3. Motivation to obedience (114, 115)
- B. Prayer (116-129)
 - 1. The necessity of prayer (116-119)
 - 2. Exposition of the Lord's Prayer (120-129)

LORD'S DAY 2. Questions 3, 4, and 5.

A. Question 3

1. "Sin and misery" become "misery."
2. Proof texts.
3. The knowledge of sin is not a once-for-all knowledge.
4. The law does not function alone in giving a knowledge of sin.
5. Transition to Questions 4 and 5.

B. Question 4

1. Christ teaches us what the law requires of us.
2. The love commandments do not by-pass the Decalogue.
3. The law is covenant law or obligation.
4. The two love commandments are related as a first commandment and a second commandment.
5. The knowledge of sin is not the knowledge of particular sins, but of sin as such.
6. Love does not justify.

C. Question 5

1. The law gives a knowledge of sin and misery by comparison.
2. The question is: Can you live up to all this perfectly?
3. The tendency to hate God and my neighbor is natural.
4. The polar opposition of love and hatred.
5. The universal relevance of Question 5.

LORD'S DAY 3. Questions 6, 7, and 8.

A. Question 6

1. God is not blameworthy.
2. Creation is assumed.
3. Man is created good.
4. The purpose of man's creation.

B. Question 7

1. Man is responsible for his own corrupt nature.
2. The corruption of nature.
3. The guilt of Adam's sin.

C. Question 8

1. The totality of depravity.
2. A methodological error?
3. The freedom of the will.
4. Perfectionism not implied.

LORD'S DAY 4. Questions 9, 10, and 11.

A. Question 9

1. The problem of the justice of God.
2. The meaning of "man."
3. Robbed of these gifts.
4. The doctrine of the covenant.
 - a. Is the Adamic administration a covenant?
 - b. The image of God.
 - c. A faith/love/hope relation.
 - d. Creation and re-creation.

B. Question 10. The punishment of sin.

C. Question 11.

1. Mercy by way of justice.
2. The justice of God.
3. Mercy and Justice.

Part II: Interpretation of the Heidelberg Catechism
 Broad remarks on the H.C.

3/13/80

Three main parts: Misery, Deliverance, and Gratitude.
 Preceded by two introductory questions.
 Sets the tone with a concern with comfort in the face of death.
 Cp. Outline handout.

Part I. The Knowledge of Sin and Misery (3-11)

A. Sin revealed by the Law (3-5)

It is to be derived not from existential self-analysis but from revelation. Specifically the Two Love Commandments. But wouldn't the whole Ten Commandments be better? But these two go to the very heart, the very kernel. To be convicted in one point of the law is to be convicted in all points. Also the elenctic function of the Commandments does not drop out entirely cf. 115 first reason.

B. The Sinfulness of Man (6-8)

Man's present predicament. Not covered in the Apostle's Creed. Indicates a deficiency of the Apostle's Creed in this area as an adequate doctrinal statement.

C. The Punishment of Sin (9-11)

The Justice and Mercy of God. Accent is on the displeasure of God but also the justice of God.

Q. 11 grants, almost by concession, God's mercy. Mercy must not obscure Justice.

Part II. The Knowledge of Deliverance (12-85)

Connection of I. and II. is found in the notion of Justice.

A. The Mediator (12-19).

Description of Mediator. Q's 12-17 are regarded as the most rationalistic and speculative, thus the poorest. The character of the mediator being deduced from mercy and justice of God. Then asks who fits this. At long last the name of the Savior is given. If it were rationalistic then there would be no link between Q's 17 and 18. The order of 12-19 is not significant for its deductive speculation but rather, its significance is pedagogical. That is, to drive us out of ourselves and to Christ. The orientation of the questions is toward Q. 19. Thus Q. 19 is related to Q. 18. Some like Perij break at 18 (12-18 Justification by Grace; 19-25 Holy Trinity). But the Catechism breaks at 19 (Lord's Day 6).

B. Faith in the Mediator (20,21)

Serves as a prelude to the Apostles Creed. Q. 20 answered not in terms of the doctrine of election, but in terms of the response called forth by the revelation of the covenant, i.e. faith.

C. The Content of Faith: Exposition of the Creed (22-58)

Polemical questions throughout section and H.C. Q. 8 anti-Pelagian, Q. 65 anti-Anabaptist, Q. 80 anti-Roman Catholic, Q. 47-48 anti-Lutheran.

Frequently confronted with the questions as to the benefit of the doctrinal truths.

D. Justification by Faith (59-64)

Q. 59 most important benefit question.

Ends (Q. 64) with the indissoluble relation between justification by faith and sanctification. Instead of going on to the Decalogue it has an interlude on the Sacraments.

E. Faith Kindled and Confirmed (65-81)

Note parallelism between Baptism and the Lord's Supper. 69-75; 70-76; 74-80 (anti-Anabaptist and Roman Catholic. Does this mean, as Schaff and Nevin think, that Q. 80 was in the first edition?). This makes Q. 81 an appendage. But 75 and 81 are parallel. Leaves a 6-7 ratio.

F. Faith and Unbelief: The Keys of the Kingdom (82-85)

The Keys are two-fold; Preaching and Discipline or Preaching as the most elementary form of discipline.

Part III: The Knowledge of Gratitude (86-129)

A. Good Works (86-115)

Q. 115 leads into a consideration of prayer. Cp. WSC 98 with 115.

B. Prayer (116-29)

Focus on adoration in prayer is not in foreground as much as might be thought.

Q's 122ff no longer instructional in character but what does the petition mean?

The Relationship between the H.C. and the W.S.C.

Cp. article by J.I. Good in the Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society 1913 on the H.C. and its 350th Anniversary.

The WSC, Luther's Catechism and the H.C. are the only Protestant Catechisms of the first rank.

B.B. Warfield in the "Westminster Assembly and its Work" (Princeton Theo. Review, 1908) compares the first question of the WSC to that of the H.C.

Terms the H.C., Q. 1 a "spiritual utilitarianism". Divine euthymia (cheerfulness, contentment). Sees it as a kind of Reformed Pietism.

A bit too strong. Both documents present the fundamentals of the Calvinistic faith. The form, arrangement, emphasis is different but not the theology.

Eight respects in which they differ (from Good).

1. Difference in Perspective, three-

Historical--none given. Theological--WSC. Experiential--H.C. "The Peculiar Significance of the Publication of the H.C. in 1563" from The H.C. on its Newest Light.

Warfield accuses the H.C. of being hedonistic. But cp. ^{WSC} Q's 36-38 on benefits. Also the N.T. emphasis on "what shall it profit a man...", also I. Cor 10:33.

Conversely both are concerned with the glory of God--H.C.6.

J.I. Good rejoiced in the experientialism of the H.C. as over against intellectualism.

On Intellectualism vs. Experientialism note:

Barth--objectivity of the Word of God,

Bultmann--builds out of human experience thru existential self-analysis,

What causes Reformed thought to shatter into a rationalism or a pietism at the end of the 16th century? One reason is the anthropological vs. theological starting point. We start with "where is faith directed?" -- the intellect or the emotion? Which is the real man?

But the starting point can't be there. Cf. Cat. Minor of Ursinus Q. 3. What does the Word of God teach? Thus not "feeling" but what does God say?

This perspective comes into the H.C., cf. Q's 3, 19, 92, 118. You could call this objective/intellectual. But rather the Scriptural/Word. The Experiential/Personal comes out also in Q. 65. Thus it is not a question of feeling but a question of the work of the Holy Spirit. It is Word and Spirit not Intellect and Word. The Centrality of the Word.

WSC 3 The doctrinal perspective is indispensable.
29-31 indispensable work of the Spirit.

Need to set a biblical perspective, Word and Spirit, over against an Intellect/Experiential dichotomy. From this the ministry of the Church can rise and proceed to address the whole man. The question is "how do we facilitate?" not "which faculty?"

Thus the problem of the training of seminarians is answered. Not Academic vs. Practical. But the Bible as central addressing heart and head. Then work it out.

We don't want to cause a Lutheran/Calvinist dichotomy of Subjective/Intellectual. We need the Whole Word for the Whole Man.

2. Difference in underlying principle.
Two Covenants in WSC. Working out the Federal Theology of Cocceius. Cocceius elaborated a Covenant Theology on the basis of the succession of historical covenants (semi-Dispensational). Not quite like the WSC's Covenants of Life and Grace. Though Ursinus and Olevianus have the two covenants.
Not really a difference in underlying principle but have different feel. Cf. A. Kuyper's distinction: the difference is between Puritan and Continental, with reference to the mechanism of the Covenant (Puritan) and the organism of the Covenants (Continental). Useful. Kline and Berkhof have a more mechanism view. Covenant as a purely legal relation/communion of life.
3. Difference with respect to the Apostle's Creed. H.C. follows model of Luther's Catechism of 1529. WSC omits an exposition of the Creed. Attaches it to the end with Lord's Prayer and Decalogue.
Good says it's not in the WSC due to the rigidity of the Puritan divines. More probably due to Independents. Theological reason--Apostle's Creed is somewhat defective. Insufficient to the exposition of Reformed doctrine. WSC is free of Creed so as to give a more balanced view, of the ordo salutis.

4. Difference as to conception of the Church. WSC, 95 only in passing. Whole chapter in Confession. H.C. does develop an answer. According to Good, Presbyterians could accept this answer.
Ursinus has the Visible/Invisible distinction. H.C. does not have this. Schélder and others have capitalized on this--Call the distinction platonic. The real church is invisible, visible is a shadow. Tends to a depreciation of the visible Church. Makes the Church into an idea. But Jesus founded one Church, you can send letters to it, join it. The distinction is not necessarily platonic. Invisible has reference to God's decree. Must beware of a platonic attitude.
3/20/80
5. Doctrine of Election.
According to Good a difference in emphasis. Election functions more prominently in WSC, Q's 20,21; underlies the application of redemption. H.C. has it but only in passing cf. 52,54. Q54 has to do with the doctrine of the Church.

The H. C. may represent a difference in how the doctrine is to be understood in the congregation or how it functions in preaching. On the whole the German Reformed Church was more reserved in its enunciation of election than the Dutch. This being due to the H.C. being its only standard. Whereas the Dutch had the Belgic Confession and Canons of Dordt, 4/50.
6. Difference in the form of the Q and A. WSC is impersonal, uses 3rd or 1st person plural, answers tend to become theological statements.
H.C. sets up answer using 1st and 2nd person singular. Indicates warmth of tone.
But really it is a question of perspective ultimately. If you begin with election and only God knows the elect, then you must make a statement of general truth and this is left to the Spirit to apply it.
On the other hand the H.C. begins more with one's personal involvement in the truth. This is traced back to God's will. Thus not a fundamental theological problem but one of perspective. Shepherd does not hold that the WSC is less personal or that he is less involved in the truth. Nor that because the H.C. is personal that it is not a statement of doctrinal truth.
7. Closely allied is a difference of spirit.
H.C. more experiential, WSC more theological.
8. The H.C. has something to say directly concerning social service. Cp. Q's 55, 86. May be a bit overplayed. Not quite a social gospel as emergent in Good's time.

Conclusion

Good was ready to offer the WSC to the German Reformed Church, by way of the explanation in the Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith 1902. Contained election but not reprobation.

In 1870 the Presbyterian Church USA passed three resolutions concerning the H.C.

1. Regarded the Catechism as a compendium of Doctrine and Duty. Cp. WSC 3.

2. H.C. not commanded but could be used. Not a doctrinal standard.

3. An ecumenical statement.

Note--In 1895,96 the Old UPCNA and CRC were tending towards union. Ethnic factors and language caused it to break down. What would have happened? Fusing of Dutch Reformed thought and the Scottish Theology of the UPC and missions.

Heidelberg Catechism and Mercersburg

Mercersburg sought to refute Puritanism in all its forms from Charles Finney to Charles Hodge. Had a High Church, sacramentarian orientation. *Very open to 19th c. German theology.*

J. Nevin wrote on the H.C. in 1847. The H.C. should be seen as a product of the life of the Church. A catechism is not by one or a group of theologians. Life must go before a Creed and be poured into it. The Church is a manifestation of organic, divine life. For a creed to gain acceptance it must be the voice of the Church.

On the Apostles' Creed--it does not spring from the Bible. But its substance was already in the possession of the Church before the close of revelation. The Creed was in the Church itself, it is a precipitate of it.

Nevin also likes the fact that the hard points of Calvinism are not made definite and explicit, due to Melancthon's influence. Holds that the doctrinal position should be as large as that of the H.C. and may be wider.

Clearly anti-Pelagian, decrees are related only to providence, no reprobation or limited atonement. *Unresistable* grace and perseverance are not stressed. It was left to the Canons of Dordt to stress the other four points.

Nevin found the Sacraments in H.C. to be Calvinistic not Lutheran or Zwinglian. Taught the Real Presence, Christ is eaten. But it is a real, spiritual communion not simply symbolic. View of Baptism is significant. Baptism must be viewed as incorporating those baptized into the objective life of the church.

Nevin's orientation is anti-Puritan ^{but} and very pro-Sacraments and the Sacramental life of the Church. Thus, takes the place of the Covenant.

Nevin accents the liturgical character of the H.C., it functions in the life of the Church. WSC has a harder time at this.

Nevin accents the place of the H.C. in the life of the Church, focussing on the significance of liturgy. But he does not allow us to see it as to its significance for theology.

LORD'S DAYS I. Q's 1 and 2

A. Kuyper--Q. 1 does not intend to be expounded word for word, as a Dogmatics.

Yet the temptation is there, for a whole systematics is implied there. The point of Q. 1 is not to give us a compendium but a perspective on the Catechism as a whole--i.e., as Comfort, Consolation (*consolatio - Versus*).

Ursinus--the question of comfort is placed and treated first because it embodies the design and substance of the Catechism.

Shepherd on Q. 1 and 2

1. The Concern of the Catechism with Comfort

- a. It is concern with comfort in the face of sin and death.

This is set out in terms of the question itself.

Why does one need comfort in life?

Hoeksema--the comfort with which we are concerned is most properly, comfort in the face of death, which is an evil. "Life" is also death.

But this is not a biblical conception of life.. God made man a living creature and sustains him. Therefore we can't view continued living as an evil, but the grace of God which leads to repentance, Romans 2:4, e.g. Common Grace.

What the Bible calls good, H. Hoeksema calls evil. Comfort is needed because life is under the sentence of death. It is therefore comfort in the face of fear. Heb. 2:14,15.

So then Comfort is comfort in the face of death and life as it is headed toward death. Life under the sentence of death.

Heart of comfort is the assurance of eternal life. Life is the answer to death. Cf. Q's 52,57;58 on comfort in the face of everlasting death.

Not that life itself is evil, but life is shot through with death. Cp. Ursinus on this Q.--the mitigation of our grief.

There is a sensitivity in the H.C. reflecting life as lived in the sixteenth-century--Life was short and urgent--War, Epidemics, High Mortality, Death Itself. Sometimes we do not have this sensitivity.

- b. The concern with comfort as a point of contact.

Designed to arouse the catechuman's interest--the need for comfort is my need.

Question is--whether that concerns with comfort is a point of contact with modern man?

Depends on the point of view from which the need is diagnosed. External and Internal conditions are the ways in which man senses his needs. But a need which the natural man can diagnose he can also remedy it, find a potential cure. There is a sense of discomfort in society but also a boundless sense of optimism. The Existentialist says man can comfort himself even with death. Or at least man can comfort himself with ignorance--no one knows. Can't be any worse than here. We can address people where they are, answer that area, and then instruct them on their real needs. The point of the catechism is that we can't find a point of contact with modern man's own understanding of his problem. He does not know anything of sin or death as condemnation for sin. Thus the first question instructs us as to the nature of our misery.

A formal point of contact can be made by appeal to his needs, but we do less than full justice to the gospel as The Answer unless we see we must transform and transpose

his sense of need into a sense of guilt for sin and a fear of condemnation.

That is the purpose of Q's 3-11. It seeks to interpret man's need not by way of existential self-analysis but by way of appeal to revelation, the law of God. We must take men to the Law and the Prophets.

- c. The Character of Comfort may not be sentimentalized. No sentimental concept of need is in view, thus it is not a sickly comfort which is offered. Kuyper--comfort is power. Ursinus--it is a certain process of reasoning (*Kuyper & Hoeksema pick up on this*). There are good reasons for being discomforted. But there are better reasons for being comforted.

It is a good which is victorious over the evil--Hoeksema. Comfort is not a feeling or impression of well-being. A new life and world-view is given. The catechisms and confessions have a world and life view. Not just narrowly ecclesiastical.

Keep this "process of reasoning" in mind for Q. 2.

- d. It is not that comfort necessitates evil but vice-versa. This is the other side of "a" on Hoeksema. Hoeksema--Life is evil, death is good (the Bible says evil). Comfort is the goal, ie, salvation, for Hoeksema. Evil and even death are subservient and necessary. It is a means to an end and thus the end justifies the means. This is *theodicy* at the expense of seeing evil as it is. *Ursinus probably did not see it this way--Hoeksema.*

2. What is the source of that Comfort?

- a. The Catechism is theocentric.

Due to its concern with comfort some have thought it was anthropocentric. Cf. B.B. Warfield--"spiritual utilitarianism". For Warfield concern with soteriology can lead to anthropology.

K. Barth--a theology so oriented tends to a one-sided interest in man. He sees the H.C. as perhaps a forerunner of Schleiermacher.

It is true that the H.C. explains the truth from the viewpoint of the consciousness and the subjective experience of the believing Christian in the world. But this does not make it pejoratively anthropocentric. As Hoeksema notes, "it is surely not impossible to present a theocentric truth from the viewpoint of its being appropriated by the faith, and being experienced in the consciousness of the Christian."

A. Schweitzer--the Reformed Faith reached its acme in Schleiermacher, in the sense that, the Reformed Faith issues in the "feeling of absolute dependence" doctrine. But in Schleiermacher it is the "feeling" not the "dependence" that is the center. The catechism does not make man the criterion of truth.

This is why the second question asks "What must I know...?" Cp. Ursinus question--"What does the Scripture teach?"

Man stands in the light of God's revelation.

Concerning Warfield's characterization--thinks man is defining himself and his need. But the need is defined by God's law and punishment. Though the impression of God existing for my benefit is possible. But compare "That I belong, not to myself, but to..." This is not my benefit as supreme good but self-abandonment (which is the essence of faith). Thus Q. 1 is theocentric, or at least, God is not an afterthought.

In both man is viewed in relation to God. So neither his need nor his comfort are intelligible apart from this context. The doctrine of Creation also negatives the correlativity of God and man.

Other way in which the H.C. emphasizes its theocentric character.

Q's 6,86 the aim of our whole life.-- *the glory of God.*

Q. 99 on Third Commandment, God is to be glorified in all our words and works.

Q. 122 First petition of Lord's Prayer

Q. 128 Acknowledges the power of God to give us all good.

The repetition of that theme in the H.C. goes even beyond the WSC, Q. 1.

The concern of the H.C. is for our comfort but that in the context of the simultaneous knowledge of God and man, and the context of the glory of God as man's chief end. Thus the soteriology is theocentric.

G. Vos in Covenant in Reformed Theology, speaks of the orientation of the Reformation to the grace of God appropriated sola fide. He goes on to draw a distinction. What is it that drives the Reformed and Lutherans to the perspective of grace appropriated by faith alone? For Luther it was the thirst for peace and stability, for a restless conscience that could find no rest in Rome's salvation by works.

It was different with the Reformed. They felt the same necessity to leave the waves of Rome's salvation by works and stand on solid ground once again. But behind and beside this necessity there lay a deeper longing, a thirst for the glory of God that did not primarily meditate on its own peace.

The question is--where is the center of gravity?

For Lutherans the emphasis has always been on salvation, as such; the forgiveness of sins, thus anthropocentric. Not absolutely or necessarily, *though*.

The Reformed concern is theocentric, the glory of God.

Cf. WSC #1, Calvin's Cat. #1, and the H.C.; Comfort is found in God not man.

b. The H.C. is Christocentric

The first question is Trinitarian from one perspective.

The catechumen belongs to Christ, the Father takes account of the hairs of his head, the Holy Spirit gives assurance to men and moves them to good works. (Van Oosterzee Outline:

- a) The faithfulness of the Redeemer
- b) The love of the Father
- c) The witness of the Holy Spirit.

Corresponds broadly to Apostolic Benediction. Sounds good. But may not quite do justice.

The first question is Trinitarian but Christocentric specifically. I belong to Jesus: a) It is Jesus who has satisfied and redeemed. b) It is Jesus who preserves. c) It is Jesus who assures and motivates me by the Holy Spirit.

K. Barth--the H.C. is distinctively a theology of the Third Article, the Holy Spirit.

The H.C. is concerned with the application of redemption which is the sphere of the Spirit's operation. But still redemption in its accomplishment and application is Christocentric. What is the source of this comfort? Not anthropocentric, but it is God in Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit who is the source of this comfort.

Therefore it is Theocentric, Trinitarian and Christocentric.

3. The Place of Comfort (the heart of Q. 1)

Jesus Christ

Negatively--I am not my own. Positively--I belong to my faithful savior, Jesus Christ.

Notice, it is not the case that where we have comfort we have Jesus Christ. It is not that we discover Jesus where people are concerned and ministering so as to comfort. But, quite the opposite! Where we have Christ, there we have comfort--union with Christ. It is in that concept of union, that is brought to the fore of the Cat., that we see the difference between Lutheran confessionalism and Reformed.

Originally Lutherans focussed on the fact that comfort lies in the forgiveness of sins. This is essential to the Reformed but it is placed in the context of union with Christ. Giving scope to the multi-faceted character of our redemption. Doesn't reduce it to only forgiveness of sins (which is absolutely necessary!).

What does it mean to belong to the faithful Savior? It could be thought of simply as an extension of the idea of redemption from the power of the Devil. In ordinary speech we buy something and it is ours. We are redeemed from the Devil. Therefore we belong to Christ.

This may be involved. Cp. Ursinus--we are the property of Christ.

But we are His property in a distinctive way. Ursinus goes on to say--the substance of this comfort consists in this: that we are ingrafted into Christ by faith, that through Him we are reconciled to and beloved of God. That thus He may care for and save us eternally. We are "property" ingrafted into Christ. Cf. Q 20 on union with Christ. Also 32, 64, 76.

Union with Christ as foundational for our comfort.

Second, Jesus is our only comfort.

Being in Christ defines the sphere in which I enjoy whatever comfort I have. There is no comfort other than that in the sphere of Jesus.

Thus a definitive NO to every non-Christian religion. And also

to whatever is not of Christ in the Christian religion. A. Kuyper took off from this point with the "Principle of Antithesis"--the exclusiveness of the way of Christ. Dwelt on the point of antithesis between the Palingenesis and everything outside of it.

But we must also take into account Hoeksema's stress that the exclusiveness of this comfort as found in Christ is contradictory of Common Grace.

Hoeksema grants that there are many comforts in life and one at death in Christ. But he would not call the former grace. And thus, in effect there is comfort in Jesus Christ, and then, for Hoeksema, many comforts which have nothing at all to do with God. Seems an even more radical denial of the exclusive comfort in Christ, than the doctrine of Common Grace objected to. The point is that common grace (graces) and special grace are not related to each other as species of a single genus (i.e. Grace-special; Grace-common). But the difference is, is that whatever grace there is in the world must be seen as flowing to us by virtue of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, that is its source.

There is no grace that does not flow out of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ ultimately. And thus none that does not lead us back to Jesus Christ. Grace is designed to lead to repentance which is unto life in Jesus Christ.

Special grace appropriates redemption. It carries us beyond Common Grace.

A Believer has no comforts apart from the name of Jesus Christ. This is true with respect to Common and Special Grace.

What comforts an unbeliever has is by virtue of Christ but not in Christ. He is ungrateful. All grace is rooted ultimately in Jesus Christ's Death and Resurrection.

Thirdly.—A New Orientation.

I am not my own or the Devil's--I am Christ's and that is a totally new orientation.

Now there are times of little comfort and enjoyment in this life, Ps. 77. But there is always that sustaining truth of the new orientation. Not for our minds or spirit only, but I in body and soul, in the integrity of my being, am a member of Christ.

Kuyper works out the implications for art and science from this.

Fourthly.—The Foundational Character of Union with Christ.

The focus of our comfort is in union with Christ. But you notice how it is foundational for the appropriation of the benefits of redemption. Cf. Ursinus--"the substance of our comfort..."

This is a leading feature of Reformed Theology. Institutes III:1; Boquinus An Exegesis of the Divine and Human ~~KEIVVVV~~g; WSC. 30.

If this is central for understanding our redemption, then it is central for understanding the gospel in our preaching. It is in teaching this truth that the attitude is cultivated and aroused. Not that we convert and then teach them. But as we teach they realize. This must be taught. It doesn't happen on its own. Point to what God in Christ has done, not their responsibility.

4. The Ground of Comfort (JUST THE STRUCTURE)
(OF THE ANSWER)

4/3/80

Union with Christ is set out in terms of participation as Communion with Christ in His benefits. Cp. WEC, WSC. Benefits are: Redemption and Preservation.

Redemption relates in particular to the definitive transition which is accomplished by Christ in His life. It is past with reference to us.

Preservation relates to what Christ continues to do in the present. Christ maintains His work, watches over me.

Sometimes a ";" or a "." separates these benefits. On the one hand, Christ has satisfied and redeemed. On the other hand, Christ preserves me.

With respect to satisfaction and redemption as it has reference to me, it flows out of union with Christ. He has satisfied,

Satisfaction relates to our legal standing, e.g. Justification. Redemption is spoken of as redemption from the tyranny or power of the Devil, relates to our moral condition. As such what we call Definitive Sanctification.

Justification and Sanctification, accomplished by Christ in his experience, becomes the Satisfaction and Redemption for me by union with Christ. Both are essential for Life and Death.

This twin motif of Satisfaction and Liberation from tyranny is precisely the Death and Resurrection of Christ

Death--satisfaction for our sins,

Resurrection--liberated from the power of the devil.

Now if you see Satisfaction as directed in particular to forgiveness then you see how Justification relates, as spoken of here, pre-eminently in terms of forgiveness on the ground of the satisfaction of Christ's death and resurrection.

Note Heb. 10:16,17 Two things: "writing of the law on their hearts", which liberates us from the tyranny of the Devil.

"I will remember their sins ... no more"--that's forgiveness, also cf. Heb. 8:10-12.

Death to the old way of life, Coming alive in the new.

Note theology of the Heidelberg era.

Emphasis on Satisfaction and Freedom, also on Satisfaction and Liberation; Death and Resurrection.

Where you see this you note that the concept of imputation, of active obedience, is not so much in the foreground, in that way of speaking. Though it is not excluded or absent elsewhere. It is reflected elsewhere.

On the word Satisfaction, it also has an implied polemic against Roman Catholicism. While hazy, R. C. theology does not have a doctrine of substitutionary atonement, of satisfaction for my sins. Cf. Trent, Sixth Session on Justification.

Jesus merits grace because He went beyond what was necessary. Grace merited is deposited in the Church and dispensed in the sacramental system. And in that sense, Christ's death has atoning value. But this is not a precise doctrine of

substitutionary atonement.

But the H.C. does have it. This is the one side of our ground and comfort.

The other side is Jesus preserves us. Parallel to the redemption from the consequences and power of sin is preservation in that status to which we have been brought.

Veldkamp in Children of the Sabbath suggests that there is a movement from soul to body here. "Satisfaction for sin" is for the soul: "Hairs of head" for the body being preserved. Seems a bit superficial. Better it is a movement from past to present. The past is the past of Jesus Christ, His Death and Resurrection, my own past when united with Christ. The Present, even within it, all matters are embraced or cared for by the Father. Then surely all things are embraced by Him, even the evil. The place of comfort is in Jesus Christ, and the ground of our comfort is the work of Jesus Christ for us. Can not separate the person and work, Jesus in His office as mediator is our redeemer. Salvation is not by a deification process, God coming down in order to raise man up. The person of Christ comes with a view to His work, and the person doing this work is the ground of my comfort.

"The Power of the Devil"

Answer presupposes that we are by nature under the power of the Devil. The point is we are delivered from that power. Does not mean no more sin, cf. Q. 114.

But that the power of the Devil is broken. I am set free, liberated (e.g. Def. Sanct.). Definitive in the sense that you cannot go back behind that liberation in order to curse Christ (MURRAY).

And for that reason the believer's life is qualitatively different from that of unbelievers. Comfort is comfort in this life and it involves a rescue from sin and its consequences. And if we are mystified by the power of sin in this world, its probably because we do not reckon that power to be of Satan (cf. Eph. 6:14). His power is enormous. But we are delivered and freed from it. Thus you can say the H.C. has an eye for the cosmic scope of our struggle.

Redemption does not refer to a ransom paid to Satan. Satan has no independent power but is under God's authority. We are given over to Satan because of the judgement upon us. The consequence of sin pre-eminently is death. Not an arbitrary punishment. For death is the consequence of sin, because by death God destroys sin and the sinner. Therefore for Jesus to pay the penalty for sin at once destroys sin. Because the penalty for sin is its destruction. Note how intimately *Justification and Sanctification are. Can't isolate these benefits. Either in terms of the Author, the Executor, or in terms of the reality itself.

*relq-
ted

5. The Essence of our Comfort

Note last paragraph--assurance of eternal life. The previous paragraph gives what is objectively true as the ground of my comfort. What does this yield?--Assurance of eternal life.

a. It is assurance of eternal life.

Later on Faith is defined precisely in terms of that assurance. Cf. p. 18 of Ursinus "...comforting, consisting in assurance..." p. 19 "The substance of our comfort..."

- b. It is assurance of eternal life
Threat of death is taken away now. Comfort in life is that of eternal life. Not exclusively in the hereafter. It begins now with regeneration and never fades away. Thus a strong declaration of Perseverance of the Saints is present, contra Nevin. Though the word "perseverance" is not used.
Perseverance flows from the preserving of Christ--"Because I belong to Him..."
Perseverance is not described as a deduction from election "If elect can't be lost". It is a dynamic reality. It is preservation in union with Christ. Doesn't deny the ultimate rooting of the work of Christ in predestinating decree of God. But to speak of the decree at all you must approach it by way of your place in Jesus Christ.
- c. It is assurance of eternal life
The answer to sin and death is LIFE. Life as true, abundant and eternal is ours in the face of sin and death in life.
An eschatological perspective is introduced: Already/Not Yet. We live in expectancy with Joy.
Joy is the prevailing tone of life.
- d. Notice polemic orientation of answer in Calvinism vs. Lutheranism. But the remote background is the conflict with Rome. In R.C. soteriology, an uncertain future grounded in ignorance, is what you're given. Over against that, the Reformation, Q. 1 posits assurance grounded in knowledge. Assurance in Q. 1, knowledge Q. 2. Thus knowledge and assurance enter into the definition of faith (Q. 21).
The origin of the Reformation lies in Luther's experience of Angst. Thus soteriology is at the heart of the Reformation, soteriology which culminates in assurance. But the heart of Christianity is beyond that. It is the glory of God to which our salvation is subservient. So then the ground of comfort is in the work of Jesus Christ. The essence of comfort in the assurance that Christ's work ministers to us.

6. The Confirmation of Comfort

Assurance is the comfort we have. But even that assurance is assured to us, (cf. final sentences) *and in us*.

- a. By the Holy Spirit, Christ assures me. Reference is made to the testimony of the Holy Spirit. Another polemic against Rome. Rome had the absolution of a priest. Over against this, H.C. sets the testimony of the Holy Spirit. Cf. p. 20 of Ursinus "But I know..."
- b. To that we add the testimony of good works. Question-- Does "Holy Spirit" govern assurance, or assurance and whole-heartedly willing?
Not enough to make an exact determination. "Christ assures me by the Holy Spirit" and "Christ makes me willing", is all we know so far. Strictly speaking, good works are not offered here as confirmation of assurance. They simply flow from all that has preceded. But they do function in the broader context as a confirmation of our assurance. Ursinus, p. 20 "I know I have true faith because of the effects thereof..." Cf. Q's 86 and 87 as practical syllogism also Cat. M. Q. 2.

Problem arises whether practical syllogism of Q.^v87 does not draw us away from the sola fide of the Reformation. That is, what we excluded from Justification, are we now including in connection with assurance. So that in practice, or effect, are we not back to the same problem of Luther?

Must distinguish between the grounds of assurance and the confirmation or cultivation of assurance. The ground is Jesus Christ and His gospel. But cultivation is through faith as it comes to expression in its fruits. The Reformation sola fide does not and never was intended to jeopardize the indissoluble connection between faith and its fruits. Cf. Calvin.

7. Cultivation of Comfort--Q. 2

a. The relationship between Q's 1 and 2.

Kuyper-Q. 1., lets us see that whole picture from the top of the mountain, a comprehensive view. In what follows we descend into the valley to see the scenery closer by.

The three parts of the H.C. constitute an analysis of comfort. Which it does--the ground, confirmation of, and need of comfort. But Ursinus Cat. Minor, in Q. 3, made the idea of analysis suspect. It is actually the cultivation, not analysis, of comfort that is set forth. Comfort is assurance. Grounds are the facts given in part one of Q. 1.

Assurance is confirmed by the Spirit and the Spirit-wrought obedience of the believer.

Now we see it nourished, cultivated by working with these elements.

Ursinus--the design of the catechism is to lead us to the attainment of sure and solid comfort in life and death.

How can we cultivate the testimony of the Holy Spirit?

Cf. Q. 1 and 2 of Cat. Minor. The Holy Spirit testifies to this to my heart by the Word of God and the Sacraments, and by the beginning of obedience. It is not a secret revelation of some kind.

Thus you also need Q. 3 of Cat. Minor, which expands on Q. 2.

See too, that H.C., Q. 2 is concerned with cultivation.

First, the knowledge of misery.

Second, the knowledge of redemption--as I study the Word of God the Spirit testifies.

Third, the knowledge of Thankfulness--as I endeavor after righteousness I cultivate assurance.

Note the order of the H.C.: Apostles Creed--Sacraments--Law--Cultivate Assurance.

The relation of Q. 2 & 3 in Ursinus' Smaller Cat. does not reflect an intellectualizing, but how to cultivate.

Q.1 speaks of a personal relation to Christ--"That I belong...". Q.2 speaks of the knowledge of Faith. In this juxtaposition they can not be set over against one another or isolated either. This personal relation is entered into and cultivated through knowledge. No doctrine/life dilemma
Eschatological dimension-- Eternal Life. Includes implicitly the dimension of growth.

The educational purpose is not just enlightenment but union with Christ. Thus the Catechism is never finished.

b. The kind of knowledge which is needed.

There are the champions of ignorance-- R.C. implicit faith. But cf. Calvin Institutes III,ii.2--faith consists not in ignorance but in knowledge.

Some say--"knowledge puffs up", thus taking pride in their ignorance. Neither knowledge nor ignorance is less open to pride. There is a cognitive element in this faith and it must be reckoned with justly. Not simply learnedness but a holy understanding, e.g., Wisdom.

Ursinus--a process of reasoning.

It is a saving knowledge. It is a learning, a knowledge which corresponds to the fact that the instruction is of the Spirit, ultimately.

Hoeksema--"it is not a theology but a knowledge of God." A somewhat unfortunate statement. Some truth, but theology is not excluded. Theology is the orderly comprehension and presentation of the knowledge of God *to be* derived from nature, but pre-eminently from the Word of God.

c. The Knowledge of Misery.

We need to be taught this. By itself though, it does not minister to our *comfort*.

DeGraaf-- a reason for getting bogged down in misery is this: Our redemption is the gift of God and is worked out in us according to His sovereign will. So also, God works in us to *will* and *to do* of His good pleasure. Our responsibility (that of the preacher) is to work in us a sense of misery and need, in order to create the optimum conditions for the sovereign working of the Spirit (preparationism, from the Puritans).

Assuming the above is correct, the knowledge of misery is also divinely worked and not a human achievement.

All three (knowledge of misery, of redemption, of thankfulness) are necessary for our comfort, but all three are necessary simultaneously. We don't learn part of the catechism in order never to return to it. They do not replace one another in sequential order. Once this is seen, then within that sphere you can speak of a Spirit-worked preparationism. But at the same time a saving knowledge of our sin and misery is inevitably followed by a saving knowledge of redemption and then of thankfulness.

8. The Confession of Comfort

Nevin--in an infant mouth confession means: As he grows up he does so as part of the Church and is nourished by the life of the Church, which life is the life of Christ which is the projection of the life of God. A mystical conception of redemption--union with Christ through the sacramental ministry of the Church.

Next to Nevin place Barth. "I belong to Jesus Christ"--the whole is said here. But all men should repeat these words. The Christian community recites Q.1 on behalf of all men and invites them to join in the recitation.

H.Hoeksema--concerning the child who learns to recite the Heid.Cat.: A baptized child is considered to be a living member of the Church. God has forgiven us and our children all our sins. When we teach them to recite Q.1 that doesn't presuppose regeneration, because there is nothing in Q.1 of a presupposing. Only a certainty is in Q.1. But what about the "carnal" seed, the non-elect? The Cat. has nothing for them, "the others".

Hoeksema is similar to Nevin and Barth in that covenant youth must be able to recite Q.1 and mean it. But also in that there is no transition place from wrath to grace in human experience. Hoeksema says the elect youth are usually regenerated as infants. Thus no grace for the non-elect, no wrath for the elect

He differs from Nevin in that Nevin stresses sacramentalism, and the ministry of the Church. Whereas he stresses the doctrine of election. For Nevin sacramentalism and election are mutually exclusive. Hoeksema excludes some children from the Cat., or at least takes it away from them. Nevin would include all children in the church in the Catechism.

But all are similar in that there is no transition, No active ingredient, in the faith or acceptance. It is only a nourished conviction that something is true.

Another way of understanding how Q.1 fits into the mouths of the covenant youth of the Church.

In Q.1 it is the believing Christian who speaks and his speech is a confession of faith. We must teach them to recite it and mean it. Not by means of a universal election (Barth--If all are, I am), nor by means of a restricted election (Hoeksema). Because that brings election into the foreground, which is not warranted by the Catechism. An emphasis on election is not present here. Even on Hoeksema's presentation the child must preface his recitation with an "if". Otherwise we teach the non-elect to be hypocrites. It is also not by virtue of a sacramental union with Christ. But it is by way of a confession of faith. Not of an objective state of affairs which I am involved in apart from a stance of faith, but as a confession of faith.

So to teach Q.1 to children is in effect to teach them to lay hold of Jesus Christ and how to lay hold of Him for eternal life. The ground and source of comfort is in God. The ground of comfort is in Jesus Christ and His accomplishment. But that comfort which is wholly objective to me, to which I can add nothing (lest I then detract from it) is mine in the way of faith. Therefore you are inculcating faith in them. They thus recite it as a confession of faith, and not as an objective state of affairs which is true apart from faith.

Something parallel is seen in how we teach our children the Decalogue. When taught you do not do so as an objective statement of what God requires. But you are simultaneously teaching them to do the Commandments. The element of personal involvement is not excluded. We teach them to receive Christ and thus to recite the answer as a confession of their own faith. It is not: "this is the truth"

and now "Believe it", there is no separation. Thus we are teaching them to appropriate the truth. The recitation is a confession of their faith.

LORD'S DAY 2. Q's 3-5

Part I: Man's Misery

Question 3.

1st Observation: Sin and Misery become simply Misery.

According to Q.2 sin & misery, but in Q.3 = misery. The focus is on the consequence of sin, which is misery. Misery should not be construed to exclude sin.

Ursinus-- Misery embraces the evil of both guilt and punishment. That is, the evil of sin and depravity together with the liability to eternal condemnation.

The Law gives us the knowledge of both.

Cf. WSC.17-19 for both of the above points.

Nothing comparable in scope to the WSC in the HC. (Q.3 speaks of misery instead of sin.) But Part I concentrates on the knowledge of sin rather than its consequences. Q.'s 10 & 11 the consequences are explicit, but more in terms of the Justice of God. WSC has greater clarity and conciseness on misery arising from sin than the HC.

2nd Observation: Note the Proof-texts.

Romans 3:20 focuses on sin in distinction from misery.

Ursinus adds Deut.27:26 which has more of the misery idea.

New CRC version adds Romans 7:7-25 most often seen in Reformed theology as referring to the regenerate man. In contemporary theology as the unregenerate man viewed from the regenerate-state point of view (cp. Phil.3:2; Acts 26:5,9-11; cf. John 16:2). The passage is in any case relevant to the experience or the understanding of the converted man. That means in Part I, that the knowledge of sin and misery described is relevant to the believer. It is not knowledge that is only relevant to one stage of the pilgrimage.

3rd Observation: The knowledge of sin is not a once-for-all knowledge.

Some see conviction of sin as a prelude to conversion: you are convicted and then you are saved. It becomes impossible by this to see how you can return to the beginning of the Cat. as part of a yearly cycle.

But the Cat. is not to be construed in terms of a sequence or historical unfolding. Not an ordo salutis. Part I is not a stage to be passed through to which we never return. The Law is a source of the knowledge of our sin throughout our lives entirely. At conversion it is a distinct knowledge but is not necessarily an experiential knowledge in the fullest sense of the word. You are not a sinner in the same sense all across the board, as at conversion.

4th Observation: Knowledge of sin is a faith-knowledge.

It is from this depravity (the Adamic sin and all its consequences) that we are saved from. Children of the covenant may never have known that abyss (some do). Yet they serve Jesus Christ and love Him. Yet they must develop

a faith-knowledge of that abyss, no less intense than for their not having experienced it. This concept of faith-knowledge helps us to avoid the charge of presumption. As they learn Part I they attain by faith what others knew by experience. Cp. a Covenant child with C. Colson.

4/10/80

(Seems to have been a gap in tape borrowed from Wisdom/Bogedain)

The Gospel promulgates law, cf. Matt. 4:23,24. Matt. 5-7 an example of the Gospel of the Kingdom being preached. Corresponds formally to the gospel at Sinai. Conviction of sin does not come through the preaching of the Law only. It must be presented in the light of the whole counsel of God. The separation of law from gospel leads to legalism. Done to show the impossibility of our achieving it. Separating of the gospel from law leads to antinomianism. Evidenced in the idea once we get out of Part I we don't go back.

The whole of the HC must be understood as a confession of faith. Faith in its distinctive character comes out in Part II. But Parts I and II as parts of a confession of faith mean that Part I also belongs to the faith. Part III when speaking of our gratitude, thus also is tied to faith, the obedience of faith. Prayer at the end of Part III is prayers of faith.

- 5th Observation: The transition to the next two Q.'s 4 & 5.
 Q.4 tells us what Law is.
 Q.5 invites us to measure ourselves by the standard of the Law.

Question 4

1st Observation: Christ teaches us what the Law requires.

The point that Law does not function alone is reinforced here. Therefore the ministry of Christ is not to be construed as opposed to law in every sense. Q.4 appraises us of the continually binding character of the Law as asserted by Christ. It is a standard of righteousness for those who live under the New Covenant. Jesus is the interpreter of Moses for the Church of the New Covenant and of the Old Covenant Church. Law is imbedded in the gospel of Christ. Also gospel is imbedded in the Law and the Prophets of the O.T. The citation of the two Love Commandments shows that there is nothing in the Law and the Prophets that is not an expression of love.

2nd Observation: The Two Love Commandments are not cited so as to bypass the Decalogue.

The Decalogue could have been cited. The Lutherans would have. The Reformed rather accent the normative use of the Law as over against its elenctic use. But the Two simply repeat the Law of the Old Covenant, "in eine summa", in summary form, its substance: its sum and substance. The summary is not exclusively N.T., cf. Deut. 6:5; Lev. 19:18. The connection between the summary and the Decalogue is made clear in the Smaller Cat. Q.'s 4 & 7.

3rd Observation: The Law is Covenant Law or Obligation.

Must not overlook the basic point that what is required of us is love--love for God, love for our neighbors in His image. Our relation is a relation of love and love entails communion with God. At heart covenant is a love affair between God and His people, and among the people of God. The Father in heaven and a son. We have a Father in heaven and not a suzerain. A suzerain is a supreme lord to whom fealty is due, an overlord. But for us, God the Father is Lord and He is Father. Therefore there is no residual distance between God and His family. There is a distance between a suzerain and his vassals.

There is a difference between laws imposed by a suzerain and laws imposed by a Father. The Father calls for a response of love corresponding to His love. Therefore sin is not simply disobedience to a command. It's not like a refusal to pay tribute money. But at its base sin is the breaking of a love relationship with God. Cp. Husband and Wife, also James 2:10. Failure at one point breaks the relationship guarded by the Law.

Law calls for love. Law requires love. But Law does not give love. Its purpose is to make us love. But it is dependent on the flesh and thus it fails. The Gospel is that, what the Law couldn't do, God has done, cf. Romans 8:3. In 8:4 He has condemned sin in the flesh so that it (law) can be lived out, cf. 5:5.

Redemption does not bypass the Law. Law is not a cul-de-sac or dead-end. Nor does it have only a passing or elenctic use. But this law is fulfilled in us, Gal. 5:14. The N.T. then calls for love. No less true was the Old Covenant law. But the same has to be said with respect to the law in the O.T. Again, the summary is drawn from the O.T.

But the law, the Decalogue in particular, is often seen as a republication of the law given to Adam before the Fall. Therefore that law is a law of love, a Father-son relation. If so, then this has profound implications for how we perceive the Covenant of Works between God and Man. It is not the relation of Suzerain to vassal, but of Father to son.

4th Observation: The Two Commandments are related as a first and a second commandment.

The HC and the Scripture say this. The First Commandment cannot be divorced from faith in God. You can't love whom you can't trust. The Second Commandment makes visible and concrete what is entailed in the First. Obedience to it is faith working by love (Gal. 5:6). Cf. Matt 25:34ff; Ps. 51:4. A breakdown of love among neighbors breaks the bond with God.

5th Observation: The knowledge of sin inculcated is not knowledge of particular sins but a knowledge of sin as such. The structure of the Cat. leads away from dwelling on particular sins at this point. Better done at the Decalogue. The concern is with original sin not actual sin.

6th Observation: Love does not Justify.

Ursinus uses the question to polemicize against the R.C.

argument! I Corin.13 Love is greater than faith. Thus love justifies rather than faith.

Answer: points to comprehensiveness of the Love Commandments. It includes faith as well as our whole obedience. Goes on to say faith justifies not because it is a virtue but because it apprehends and appropriates the righteousness of Jesus Christ. Faith alone does this, that is its office. Love's office is not to do this.

Yet faith does not appear in isolation from love nor from the total transformation of regeneration because faith is comprehended in love. Thus he says Love comprehends faith as a virtue and also love springs from faith. Faith is the cause of all the other virtues.

Question 5

1st Observation: Law gives a knowledge of sin and misery by comparison.

Law does not give us a knowledge of sinfulness strictly speaking. It tells us what the righteousness of God is. But it functions to give us a knowledge of sin, as we compare ourselves (thoughts and actions) with the standard. The knowledge gained is only of benefit if we do not turn away from it, but do it (cf. James 1:23-25).

Knowledge of sin is of a piece with repentance. James 2: 22-25 is written to believers not unbelievers. As we look we cannot say Christ forgives and forgets.

The law of God tells me my sin and misery (Q.3), to love God and neighbor (Q.4), self-examination reveals I do not keep this law and therefore I am a sinner (Q.5) (the reverse of the practical syllogism in Ursinus commentary).

2nd Observation: Q. asks "can you live up...?" Not "have you?", or "are you...?".

But it goes beyond these and relates to the future. Failure is due to inability. It is not just actual transgressions that are in view, but native depravity. All pelagizing tendencies are rooted out.

3rd Observation: The tendency to hate God and neighbor is natural.

Natural-- does not refer to natural by virtue of creation (cf. Q.6). Rather the word is 'nascitur', to be born: by virtue of my birth. The hatred is inborn, by birth. Comes to expression by actual transgressions. The statement does not deny Q.1 Christ makes me wholeheartedly willing. Cf. Q.8 we are inclined to all manner of evil unless born-again. But it reflects on what is natural for us by virtue of the flesh. It does not reflect on what is true by virtue of the rebirth.

Can it be said of the believer that he hates God and his neighbor, that he has a natural tendency to do so?

Our identity as believers is established by virtue of the second birth not by virtue of the first birth. What is natural for us is now a love for God and our neighbor. We are not of the flesh but of the Spirit (Romans 8:7; Gal. 2:20). Our new identity is received by faith in Jesus Christ. It has to be believed. There are evidences in experience expressed by acts of love. But there are lingering evidences of the natural tendency, in Q.5.

But we don't try to balance them to see where the most evidence is. But live by faith in Jesus Christ, by faith in Him. This faith is belief in the new identity and is cultivated. So the new nature becomes even more evident. Psalm 51:4 "I sinned", is traced back to natural tendency (vs.5). Spoken by way of confession, not an excuse. David sins as a justified man. The continuity of pattern set forth by David in this act without repentance, leads to condemnation, cf. vs.16. David makes confession and appeals for forgiveness (vs.9), then a clean heart and a right Spirit (for transformation and new identity-- a plea of faith), Cf. Romans 8:6,13.

51:12 Joy of salvation to be restored is petitioned.

4th Observation: Polar opposition of love and hatred.

Sin is set forth here in terms of original sin, the natural tendency of the heart. If love is the summary of God's law, then hatred is the summary of my natural existence. No middle ground.

Proof-texts: Romans 8:7,8. CRC adds Titus 3:3. Also Ps.51.

5th Observation: The Universal Relevance of Answer 5.

"I"-- confession of sin. What I say all others must say. Cf. WSC.82.

The answer to Q.5 does not take time to reflect on the doctrine of common grace. Even if it would it would not tone down man's natural hatred of God and his neighbor.

LORD'S DAY 3. Q.'s 6-8.

Question 6.

1st Observation: God is not blameworthy.

6 following 5 shows that the division into Lord's Days is not natural to the HC. 6 builds on 5--"a native tendency". The question takes up an objection for escaping responsibility, cp. Ps.51:5. But is not God responsible for that native depravity and therefore I have an excuse?

Well, NO!, God created man good. In the following questions sin and corruption have their origin in man himself. No attempt to relate this to the decree here. Point is to impress us with OUR blameworthiness. When we acknowledge our fault then God takes the blame, Jesus takes it upon Himself, the full penalty of our sin. It is only as we, paradoxically, assume the full responsibility, that Jesus comforts us and takes all the blame. Comfort comes not through insight that somehow evil is embraced in the decree of God and serves an ultimately good purpose. But comfort comes as we assume the responsibility as taught in the word of faith, as we understand that Christ Himself has assumed that responsibility.

2nd Observation: Creation is assumed.

No reflection on creation in general or man's creation. Cf. Q.26 for some reflection.

3rd Observation: Man is created good.

Goodness is moral righteousness. Not a functional good. Cf. CRC proof-text Gen.1:31.

The idea is further spelled out in that man is created in the image of God. No image/likeness distinction here. No suggestion of man being morally neutral as image at crea-

tion and later becoming the likeness of God by way of moral achievement. No evolution of morality model here. Man does not earn or merit something that is not there at the beginning.

Image is defined in terms of true righteousness and holiness. Original Righteousness of Adam and Eve-- a conscious standing in a right relation to God. Neither developed in the course of time. They are so by nature. Righteousness and holiness are concreated. Proof-texts: Eph.4:24; Col. 3:10 re-creation is relevant to creation.

Ursinus expresses Lutheran ideas: 1) Angels are also in the image of God; 2) Man in the Fall became the image of Satan. Also, though not Lutheran, holds that sparks of the divine image remain in the fallen and unregenerate man.

No extensive interest in anthropology as such. No image in narrow/wide sense distinction. No interest in dominion.

4th Observation: Purpose of Man's Creation--Three-fold Office To know God--To love God--To live with God

Haitjema sees here a reflection of Prophet, Priest, King.
As Prophet-- man knows he is the beneficiary of revelation and makes God known.

As Priest-- he takes all that he has received and consecrates it to God in love.

As King-- he rules over what God has given him as viceregent.

Possible, could also see Faith, Love, Hope triad. Knowledge of God is a faith-knowledge, Love of God is a faith-love. To live with God is to have an eschatology of Hope.

Final clause:"for His praise in glory". Could be seen as modifying all three elements-- to know, to love, to live. Cf. the CRC version.

Could also refer to especially as reference to living with Him in eternal happiness and for His praise and glory.

Thus the thought is parallel to WSC.1.

Ursinus makes the glory of God the chief end of man, and the enjoyment of God one of the ends of man's existence.

Question 7.

1st Observation: Man is responsible for his own corrupt nature.

From the Fall and Disobedience. The Cat. speaks of the Fall and Disobedience (in and through disobedience). If left at the Fall some opening would be left. The disobedience of our first parents is the root of the problem. The historicity of the Fall is not problematic here, simply assumed.

Ursinus on the Fall. The cause of sin is in man not in God. God permitted the sin of Adam to occur. He is trying to bring the first sin into relation with God's sovereignty. Uses the category of "permission" to do it. God could have preserved man, could have prevented it. Cf. pp.35,51ff.

Conclusion-- not that God is the author of sin or responsible for it, because He could have prevented it or preserved him. But the conclusion is that God does not violate the nature with which He created man.

If you operate from an election perspective, you could deduce that God is responsible for sin in that He did not prevent or preserve man from falling into sin. But this is not Ursinus' perspective, which is the perspective of the Covenant--God deals with man as a responsible, decision-making, image-bearer, without surrendering His sovereignty. God is sovereign but He does not violate the nature with which He created man.

Often these two truths are viewed as conflicting, "How can He do both?" The Question is: "Who told us these truths are in conflict with one another?" Is that what the Bible teaches? Better it is the pagan mind. The pagan mind should not determine the agenda, though he should be answered.

Why did God permit sin? According to Ursinus,

- a) Show the weakness of the creature when not preserved by God (some latent Romanism here). Man is not naturally weak. He is good (cf. Q.6). Any weakness could only be a created weakness.
- b) To enable God to demonstrate His mercy in the salvation of some and His power and justice in the damnation of others (a supralapsarian view, probably via Beza). A dominant view.

2nd Observation: The Corruption of Nature.

A line must be drawn from what happened there and then to Adam & Eve to Me, here and now. The line of connection established by the line--"the fall has poisoned our nature". Poisoned--German/ Corrupt--Dutch.

Part I of the HC reflects on the knowledge of sin and the corrupt nature is brought into the foreground. The "I" of Q.5 has become the "Our" of Q.7. All men are sinners by being born in sin, not by imitation, not an exercise of will. Ursinus-- Infants are sinners, not by an exercise, but by an inclination of will.

Question-- If corrupt begets corrupt, then the regenerate should beget regenerate children? Not at all. Circumcised children do not later beget circumcised children. Redemption is wholly the immediate work of God.

3rd Observation: The Guilt of Adam's Sin.

The purpose of the HC and the logic of the argument leads to a focus on moral depravity. As far as the language of the HC goes, so goes the teaching of the HC. The only connection established between us and Adam & Eve is that of depravity. The matter of the guilt of Adam's sin is left out of view. No reflection on the doctrine of the Imputation of Adam's Sin. The WSC is fuller here, cf. Q.18. But this is not to say it is foreign to Ursinus, cf. Cat. Minor #25, "What is original sin? It is the guilt (reatus--the state or condition of an accused person)...

Original Righteousness has Two sides to it. Conformity of our nature to the law of God and the divine acceptance & approbation. Moral and forensic. It is interesting that Ursinus draws attention to the forensic aspect of original righteousness.

Original Sin-- consists in the exposure to eternal condemnation because of the Fall of our first parents and the

depravity of our nature. Forensic and moral.
The benefits of Christ are two-fold: forgiveness and renewal. Forensic and Transforming. Justification and Regeneration (ala Calvin).

Proof-texts-- Heb.8:10-12; 10:16,17; Romans 4:7.

What precisely is the guilt of Adam in view by Ursinus? Two sides to guilt: Guilt as liability to punishment; and as the sin itself. Ursinus at one point does not seem to rise above the idea of exposure to eternal condemnation, as well as depravity of nature. (Same as C.Hodge, J.Murray opposes Hodge here). It is not just the liability to punishment, but the sin itself that is imputed to us. No language of imputation in the HC or in Ursinus. On p.43 he deals with the question--Why are we punished for the sin of Adam? No imputation language. He does say: 1) All of us approve it and follow it, 2) Because the offense of Adam also is ours (we were in Adam--close), 3) Entire nature of Adam became guilty (Realism), 4) Adam was our representative (Federalism).

Imputation is not stressed in the HC or the Westminster Standards. The debate on Imputation has largely been an American Presbyterian problem.

4/17/80

Question 8.

1st Observation: The Totality of Depravity.

Q.8 relates directly to Q.5-- depravity of man, "corrupt". Q.8 carries it a bit further--"so corrupt". Corrupt, unable, inclined.

Depravity is in view not the imputation of Adam's sin. Original sin not actual sins.

In the answer there is also an "unless". Does this qualification offer a relief from a totally dark picture?

2nd Observation: A Methodological Error?

Thelemann--Is it methodologically in error to refer to regeneration in Q.8? Are we not jumping the gun? Just "Yes", is absolutely right. But we have a "Yes...Unless...?"

It is not a methodological error. The point is to provide a temporary relief for total depravity. The purpose is to underline depravity just as total.

The point is ~~is~~ that nothing short of a rebirth is required if we are to do anything good. There can be no reformation without regeneration. God's work in us is the only thing that can make the difference, we are so far gone. It is not an introduction of soteriology. So ~~one~~ ^{is} should not give an exposition of regeneration here, cf. Q.86.

Part II Redemption---ends with the forensic.

Part III begins with the transformational benefits.

The new birth here and later ~~are~~ ^{is} not to be seen in terms of the later formulations of regeneration, but in terms of Calvin's view of regeneration.

3rd Observation: The Freedom of the Will.

Ursinus has a long discussion of the freedom of the will. The issue is not "freedom" as over against "determinism", not a philosophical issue. But it is a practical question.

Can man return himself to God in the same way he separated himself. (Not the decrees.) NO!, He can't. Depravity severs us from redemption just as from any good.

4th Observation: Perfectionism not implied.

The "unless" does not mean that regeneration will put sin behind us altogether. Cf. Ursinus, p. 49--Original sin and actual sin remain in the regenerate. Also cp. Lord's Day 33, daily repentance.

Ursinus on Q. 8-- when the righteous sin they do not utterly perish. They are eventually brought to repentance. Spoken from an election perspective. But if they were to continue wilfully they would perish. Redemption is not guaranteed outside of Jesus Christ but in Jesus Christ. One cannot deduce their redemption from election and bypass Christ. Election is always election in Christ. And that is to say in the way of repentance, to which Christ calls us every time we sin. Sin is never innocuous.

LORD'S DAY 4. Q.'s. 9-11

A. Question 9.

1st Observation: The Problem of the Justice of God.

Q. 6 dealt with a possible complaint against God-- It is God's fault that man is evil. Answered.

Another complaint-- God is unjust in requiring of man what he can't do. That is, granting the depravity of man is not God's fault, is it not the case that the sinfulness of actual sin arises from an injustice on God's part.

An unwarranted complaint.

True we are unable. But we got ourselves in that predicament. Not created a sinner but good. Had ability but sinned. We must bear the consequence of that sin. Our present inability does not limit our responsibility. Not an abstract principle of justice for all times and places. It is grounded in the fact that in Adam we had it, but lost it. We are tempted by the Devil but that does not furnish us with an excuse any more than God does.

The problem lies in our own reckless, wanton disobedience (Q. 7 just "disobedience").

2nd Observation: The Meaning of "Man".

Some argue that the HC pulls a fast one here. "Man" means one thing in the Q. and another in the A. The Q. has man today in mind, ME. The A. is given in terms of Adam who was able. Thus the question is begged.

Answer-- It is the same man, i.e., mankind. There are different men: Adam, Dennis, Jack, etc. But it is the same "man". The answer presupposes a relation between the first man and us. Remember Ursinus' four-fold view of the relation (Imitation, Realism, Representation, Imputation).. In any case, In Adam we were created good (cf. Israel at Jordan). In faith we recognize this relation. MAN DID IT!

3rd Observation: Robbed of these gifts.

The gifts of righteousness and holiness, cf. Q. 6. Not a concession to Rome, a donum superadditum. They are concretized, we have nothing but what God has beneficently given us. Calvin II, ii. 12 natural gifts, supernatural gifts.

Both are "gifts". Sin results in the withdrawing of super-

natural gifts (Image in the narrow sense) and the corruption of the natural gifts (Image in the broader sense).

4th Observation: The Doctrine of the Covenant.

The HC does not make structural use of the Covenant category. Ursinus takes up the Covenant after Q.18 and prior to Q.19. He is concerned with the Covenant of Grace. He takes up the Covenant in Creation but it is not developed in the Summa Th., not mentioned in the Cat. Minor. Some remarks are needed. In Part I the organism of the Covenant is in view even if not the mechanism.

a) Is the Adamic Administration a Covenant?

Cf. Hosea 6:7 argument and that of the "elements" of the Covenant being present for other discussions. In Gen.2 God is spoken of by His Covenant name--Yahweh. The reason is God created Adam in covenant relation with Himself. Thus it is appropriate to find the Covenant here.

b) The Image of God.

And yet there is one important respect in which God and man are unlike. God cannot sin or lie, be unfaithful to Himself. This is not a limitation on His omnipotence. It is a manifestation of His excellence. It is an ethical impossibility rather than a metaphysical possibility. God could have created man without the ability to sin. If he would have been so, God would have been sovereign over him and hence a Lord. But He would not have had a friend, one with whom He could sustain a relationship of love and mutual fidelity. He would not have an image-bearer like Himself.

Sin would only be a metaphysical impossibility, a result of God's sovereignty. But man would not have been like God in that sin is an ethical impossibility. The love of man for God must not only be indefectable, just as God's love is, but must also be spontaneous, his answer to the spontaneous love of God for him and us.

The image of God is realized in the way of the Covenant. A relationship in which there is not only promise on one side and only obligation on the other; but one in which promise and obligation are on both sides. So that man's cannot sin (state to be brought to of non posse peccare) is to be a spontaneous and ethical can not.

c) A Faith/ Love/ Hope Relation.

There is an eschatology, a destiny in creation for man. There is hope for man in God. Love--cf. Q.6.

Faith and trust in God. Man is to receive and live by every word of God.

Original relationship is a Father and a Son, not an Employer and an Employee.

In relation to Q.9, it is man, the same man, who is in view. I am today held accountable to God in the same way as Adam for the same relationship to God.

I as redeemed have the same relation to God that Adam did before the Fall. By grace I am restored. It is always a faith relationship. Adam is, next to Jesus Christ, the just man who lives by faith.

d) Creation and re-creation.

In redemption God does not abandon what He has in view in the first creation. He does not abandon a works principle for the sake of establishing a grace principle. Rather God reaches His original goal, His sovereign and determinate purpose, in spite of sin and by way of redemption. That original goal is communion with God, communion between God and man.

The goal is not the happiness of man--Lutheranism.

The goal is the glory and honor of God through the spontaneous response of faith, hope, and love in man.

B. Question 10. The Punishment of Sin.

The questions of Part I have been concerned with the greatness of my sin. Now we have to turn to the evil of punishment, misery more specifically.

God is a just Judge. Two-fold punishment: begins now and extends into eternity.

Affliction is dealt with extensively by Ursinus.

Affliction of the Unrighteous--punishment of sin.

Affliction of the Righteous-- not punishment of sin or satisfaction for it, but the chastisement of a Father.

C. Question 11.

1st Observation: Mercy by way of Justice.

The final question of Part I paves the way for Part II.

Note connection. The purpose of the question is not to alleviate some of the misery by way of referring to mercy. In Q.'s 6 & 9 an attempt was made to relieve it by way of trying to blame God for the problem.

In Q.11 a final effort is made. God is merciful, but do not use His mercy to counter-balance His justice so as to escape His Justice. Mercy does not take the place of Justice. Justice can't be minimized by referring to mercy. It is in the way of justice that mercy will be realized. God does not bypass sin. He deals with it and punishes it. So Q.12 asks how can we escape this punishment? Answer is not by appeal to mercy apart from justice. Mercy is not a flaccid tolerance of evil in the HC.

So the movement in Q.11 is not from justice to mercy. But mercy is ours just in the context of the abiding justice of God. And it is this that calls for the long discussion of what kind of Mediator we need, in Q.'s 13-19.

2nd Observation: The Justice of God.

a) God is just in punishing sins. Q.10 just Judge.

b) His justice demands the punishment of sin. Sin is against His supreme majesty.

How the Heid.Cat. speaks of the Justice of God.

Q.10 God is a just Judge.

Q.11 God is just, His justice demands.

Q.16 God's justice demands something.

God's retributive justice is in view. For God to be just means He punishes sins.

Luther saw the justice or righteousness of God as being received by faith, by which we are saved from the punishment of God, through the forgiveness of sins, on the ground of the righteousness of Jesus Christ, which is ours as a gift.

This is not in view in the HC. Salvation is traced to the mercy of God not the justice. This brings us to a few remarks on...

3rd Observation: Mercy and Justice.

Their relation one to the other.

In spite of Luther's discovery Lutheran and Reformed found fairly early a way of speaking. Found in Ursinus' Comm., p.29 The purpose or goal for which man was created. The fourth end is: that God might manifest His mercy in the salvation of the elect, and His justice in the punishment of the wicked. (Echoes of Beza's chart.)

Echoes of Beza's Chart, (cf. pp.147,149 in H. Heppe Reformed Dogmatics);

Justice is manifested in Reprobation.

Mercy is manifested in Election.

It is very difficult on this scheme to see how the justice of God is involved in the saving work of God. But in Scripture, particularly in the Psalms, the justice of God is something to be desired by the godly, feared by the ungodly.

Justice and mercy are attributes of God. Must be known by way of revelation, how God reveals them.

The tendency was to abstract Justice and Mercy from God and to define them without reference to the revelation. Eventually justice and mercy define what God is and not vice-versa, or what He can and can not do. That's why they were capitalized--Justice and Mercy. Cf. Fisher's Marrow of Modern Divinity, the section on the eternal purpose of Grace. Justice and Mercy are personified and demand their rights. God serves as an umpire. Justice and Mercy decide what kind of Mediator is needed. God does the details.

The pattern of reasoning in the Marrow is not entirely foreign to that of the HC, Q.'s 12-19.

The problem is is that Justice and Mercy dictate to God what the character of the redemption is going to be. Justice demands a works principle in distinction from mercy. Mercy demands a grace principle in distinction from justice. Thus you have emerging a concept in which the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace are set over against one another as two mutually exclusive principles. Which is not Ursinus' view.

Justice and mercy cannot be defined abstractly. Can't deduce from them in and of themselves. Justice and mercy are key terms and must be defined Scripturally. Justice and Mercy are God's fidelity to His word and promise and ultimately to Himself (cf. Mark 9:8).

God's fidelity to His word in regards to the Sinner comes to expression as mercy to those who repent, because they are repentant by virtue of God's recreating them. It is mercy because repentance does not merit forgiveness in terms of some abstract concept of justice. Sin is forgiven because of the blood of Jesus Christ and for no other reason.

God's fidelity to His word, His justice, comes to expression as wrath against those who remain impenitent, and who

by their hostility are ultimately destroyed by God. Even before the Fall or Sin was on the scene God is just.. Sin is not a prerequisite for the manifestation of justice. Justice is not just God's punishment for sin so that there had to be sin in order that God could manifest His justice. God is just in all that He does.

The basic opposition in Scripture is between God and Satan not two principles with God in the middle. God saves the penitent and God condemns the wicked. Both are manifestations of His justice and righteousness. Cf. Psalm 1 esp. at the end.

LORD'S DAY 5 & 6 (taken together), Q.'s 12-19. P

A. Question 12.

Turns now to focus on man's deliverance. Note both the artificial nature of the Lord's Days and the ease of transition.

Q.11 focusses on the justice of God which demands the supreme punishment for sin-- eternal punishment of body and soul. Q.12 How can this punishment be escaped so as to return to God's favor?

Two points by way of answer: 1) Punishment can't be escaped in the strict sense of the word. The debt must be paid in full. Mercy is not experienced at the expense of justice. 2) Payment can be made either by ourselves in full or by another. If we have another do this we will be able to move from the sphere of punishment to the sphere of God's favor.

There is no escaping the punishment but conceivably we can move beyond it by paying it in full. The two possibilities (Me or Another) are considered in turn in Q.'s 13 & 14.

B. Question 13.

This is dismissed out of hand. No reason given.

Ursinus-- supreme penalty is eternal punishment and in the nature of the case it can never be paid in full. At least as far as man is concerned.

The second part of the answer cuts off obedience as replacing previous failure idea as being offered. Substitutionary obedience. NO!, for sin continues, The debt only increases.

C. Question 14.

CRC version offers two sets of proof-texts: Ezekiel 18:4, 20; and Hebrews 2:14-18.

Ezekiel-- the soul that sins it will die. In the light of this and the CRC translation of the Cat., the question is seen as focussing on "another", any at all. If so, then, we also cut off ourselves from redemption, cf. Q.12 either by ourselves or by another.

But Q.14 is not designed to negative "another". But the focus is on creature, can another creature?. If Ezek.18 is used with this then the point is that another man can't pay. But if another man is the point, then why does the HC make the point that the Mediator must be a man? Q.'s 15 & 16 insist on the humanity of the Mediator. Thus Q.14 "another man" view is wrong.

The point of Q.14 is that no "mere creature", neither ani-

mal nor angel. It affirms that God will not punish an animal or an angel for the debt man has incurred, cf. Q.16. The creature is set over against man in Q.14. The author's of the HC use Heb.2:14-18 for the proof-text to establish this. Animal sacrifices do not avail.

Two reasons for why another creature will not suffice:

1) 2:14a (cf. Q.16).

2) 2:14b

Creatures perish under the wrath of God.

Q.15 states positively what we have in 13 & 14.

4/24/80

D. Question 15.

The Payee, the Mediator and Deliverer (Redeemer)-- not just abstract reasoning but the biblical background is in view. Must be truly Human--no other creature (cp. Q.14). Must be truly righteous--owes no debt (cp. Q.13). Must be more powerful than all creatures, even perfectly righteous.

Only God Himself. By implication the Mediator must be God and man. Q.'s 16 & 17 expand on the theme. Serve as a repetition of 13 and 14.

E. Question 16.

The HC appeals to God's justice. Two things are demanded by God's justice: 1) Since man has sinned he must pay for it. 2) A sinner can not pay for the debt of another.

Therefore, only a righteous man can.

Well, How does God's justice demand all this?

Ursinus-- not so much from a principle of justice to then deduce from, but a series of Scriptures. From which the sinlessness and manhood of Jesus is made clear.

HC-- it is God's justice that demands this.

F. Question 17.

It is not God that suffers, but the God-man who suffers as to His human nature. Ursinus-- the human nature given to Christ gives Him the capacity to suffer. He bears the weight of God's anger in His humanity.

However the point is-- the humanity is able to bear suffering because supported by the divinity. Serves as a pointer to answer the question of how Christ could bear and exhaust the eternal wrath of God in three days.

G. Question 18.

The previous questions established the kind of Mediator needed. The HC doesn't ask the question--"is there such a Mediator?" But asks--"Who is the Mediator?" Not whether there is such, but what is his identity?

Twofold purpose for giving of Jesus Christ: 1) Complete deliverance, redemption. 2) Perfect righteousness. Sanctification and Justification.

Cp. Q.1 fully paid for all my sins and has set me free from the tyranny of the Devil.

H. Question 19.

Antecedent to "This" is not all of Q.'s 1-18. The precise identity of the Mediator is now in view. Answer-- the holy gospel tells me so.

Description of the Gospel: Doesn't begin with Matt., Mark,

Luke, and John. The Gospel began in paradise, includes the Mosaic dispensation. The Gospel was set out in all those dispensations of grace. Finally in the N.T. set forth as fulfilled.

With Q.19 we come full circle from Q.3:

Q. How do you come to know your misery?

A. The law of God tells me.

Q. How do you know your Redeemer?

A. The gospel tells me.

The Law is described by Christ, not by the Decalogue. (not excluded though). The unity of Scripture is demonstrated in this section.

I. The Methodology of Lord's Days 5 & 6.

This is generally recognized as the least admired portion of the Cat. Cf. H. Berkhof article (Essays on the Heidelberg Catechism) particularly pp.99-100. Berkhof shows how Anselm and the HC show the necessity of the Incarnation from the principle of justice. He also provides an answer to the charge of rationalism regarding the HC. The HC begins with the data of revelation, not reason. How else would we know about God's justice, mercy, and veracity? Thus the answer is based on Scripture itself.

Summary-- the process of reasoning is not legislative but pedagogical. Or, we are not saying what God had to do but what He has done. Not a matter of reason seeking faith but faith seeking reason.

Yet we can ask whether the starting point in Scripture is clear enough to the reader. Should not Part II have begun with the same sort of question as Part I? Basis of revelation is asserted in Q. Would have lost some of the fluidity of transition between Part I and II

Going back to Q.16. The nature of the objection is illustrated. What is God's Justice that requires that a man pay for a man's sins? What is the legitimacy of such a concept? Could we then argue that the O.T. sacrificial system was unjust, because it used animals? Or is the payment of the debt by the theanthropic man, Jesus Christ, unjust, because He is more than a man? Or if it's unjust for a creature to pay for the sin of man, is it not also unjust for one man to pay for the sins of another man?

Used as objections to the doctrine of Substitutionary Atonement. When you argue from justice, as such, then you can begin to raise questions which the catechized may ask. But if it is God's justice and not justice abstracted, then could it not be God's fidelity to His Word and Covenant, that is in view?

What does this justice, fidelity demand? Well, God does not destroy Adam, but redeems Adam and fallen mankind, John 3:16. A. Kuyper--it is not that some are saved and the world is lost, but the world is saved and some are lost. Mankind is saved through the Second Adam, though many are lost.

Redemption lets us realize that God does not allow sin to destroy His original creative purpose. God is faithful to His original purposes, His Covenant. God does not start with a new and different race of man. He redeems what He has made. God will have what He intended from the beginning.

God's faithfulness is demonstrated in His sovereignty, power, and grace. His justice demands it. Also it entails that in His fidelity to His creation God does not ignore or bypass the reality of sin and its consequences. He takes creation and the fall into sin seriously.

God in redemption does not sidestep the organism of His covenant, but inserts Himself into it, as the Redeemer to redeem, to rescue, and to restore it.

Thus the necessity of the Incarnation arises from the justice of God, His Justice. Note Ursinus' prooftexts. Not a chain of abstract reasoning. But it is the way in which He demonstrates His fidelity in punishing transgression and in providing redemption according to His eternal purpose.

J. The Mediator and the Covenant.

Read Ursinus at the conclusion to Q.18. Takes up the matter of the Covenant of God.

Why does reference to the Mediator lead to Covenant? The reconciliation is called a covenant. What is this Covenant? In general... "a mutual contract". (cp. criticisms of this by Murray and Shepherd) Yet we must be careful of an out-of-hand dismissal.

Mutual--does not mean equal parties here.

Contract-- not an impersonal contract-type in view.

You do not see or appreciate the Covenant if you do not see in it mutual promises and obligations, an arrangement.

The Covenant is not sheer sovereignty. But it establishes a relationship between God and man. It is a sovereignly established relationship. But one in which man must assume responsibility as a covenant partner of God.

Ursinus--Covenant could only be made by a Mediator. The idea of sovereignty is present. This controls his concept of mutual contract. The covenant relation is built on reconciliation wrought by the Mediator and must be understood in that sphere.

Ursinus-- Is this Covenant (Reconciliation) one or more? (not dealing with the Covenant in Creation here) It is one in substance. There is one God and one Mediator. Therefore the fathers were saved the same way we are. But with respect to the administration there is an Old and a New (cf. the language of the WCF).

Thus there arises the question--where do the historical covenants agree and where do they disagree?

Three ways of agreement: 1) God is their Author, Christ their Mediator. Thus sovereign establishment by God.

2) The promise of grace is the same under both. That is the remission of sins and eternal life. 3) In the condition with respect to ourselves--Faith and Obedience, Gen.17:1 Mk.1:15.

That wherein they differ: 1) Promises of temporal blessings. 2) Circumstances of the promise of grace. 3) Rites or signs added to the promise of grace. 4) Clearness. 5) Gifts conferred. 6) Duration. 7) Obligation: In the Old, bound to the whole law (moral/civil/ceremonial); in the New, only the Moral and to the use of the sacraments of Christ. 8) Extent-- In the Old: the Church was confined to the Jewish nation; In the New: all nations.

For Ursinus's work, none of the historical covenants exhibit a works principle. A covenant is established on the foundation of the work of the Mediator. And the blessings of the successive covenants are the promises of grace. Precisely in that context there are conditions: Faith and Obedience.

For Ursinus obedience is not indicative of a works principle, but is the manifestation of faith. The Mosaic Covenant is a covenant of grace. Not because it intrinsically or inherently represents a works principle which is an alternative way of salvation. But a way of salvation which we discover we can't go because we see how short we fall. And so we are driven to Jesus Christ as an escape from the works principle inherent in the Mosaic Covenant. Thus it becomes a covenant of grace by default. This is not what Ursinus means by the Mosaic Covenant being a covenant of grace. No hint of two ways of salvation. The Mediator is the same. The promises are the same-- righteousness and eternal life. The obligations are the same.

Why do we need a New Covenant if this is true? We need a New Covenant because we need a new Mediator. Thus the coming of the Mediator brings a new covenant.

LORD'S DAY 7 Q.'s 20-21.

A. Question 20.

Part I stressed the totality of depravity of all persons.. Now that a Mediator has been provided to restore what was lost in Adam, does it restore to the same extent? Are all saved through Christ just as all were lost through Adam? Haitjema sees the question as: whether there is a precise parallel between the method of condemnation and the method of redemption.

Perhaps not quite the intent of the question. But given the fact of condemnation does redemption go that far? Answer--NO!

Barth speaks here of the egoistic, narrow and stuffy atmosphere of Q.20. For Barth all are involved in redemption but haven't perceived it yet.

Q.20 clearly insists that there is a point of differentiation. Which is--only those ingrafted into Christ and accepting all His blessings are saved.

Note: the HC does not appeal to the doctrine of Election at this point (it could have). But the orientation is redemptive-historical. Or it could have been answered by the answer--Faith. This would have served as a link between 19 and 21. But instead, ingrafting and union with Christ is foundational to the Heid. Cat.

We are reminded of Q.1--Belonging to Christ. The parallel between Adam and Christ. The natural descendants of Adam--those in Adam are condemned in him.

But the descendants of Adam who are to be redeemed must be ingrafted into a new root, a new Adam. In Him they accept or receive all of Christ's benefits. Ingrafting is by faith. Faith is set forth as a bond of our union with Christ. Ursinus-- two bonds of union (vincula= chains): 1) Holy Spirit--God's side. 2) Faith--man's side. The focus is on the second in Q.20.

B. Question 21: What is True Faith?

No question is as well known as this except for Q.1.

1st Observation: True faith is a sure knowledge whereby I hold for truth all that God has revealed to us in His Word. The Old CRC is more faithful here. The New CRC is more objective (like the WSC).

Faith entails knowledge of the Word of God-- notitia. More than a bare knowledge. It is a certain, sure knowledge, no admixture of doubt. It is a knowledge whereby "I hold for truth"-- assensus, I assent. It is an explicit not an implicit knowledge. Not Church teaching but the Word of God. This knowledge is not a preliminary, non-saving knowledge. It is a saving knowledge because it is coupled with 'firm confidence': "Not only...But also..." The knowledge and conviction described here is not ascribable to the non-regenerate: "I hold for truth". Faith--- Knowledge--- Assent.

2nd Observation: True faith is a firm confidence, a hearty trust, a deep-rooted assurance.

It is a trust that my sins have been forgiven, that... It is fiducia, trust. It is fiducia coupled with notitia and assensus. It is fiducia defined as assurance. It is a faith that not only to others but to me... Thus assurance is of the essence of faith, part of its definition.

The assurance here is the assurance of our justification before God. Justification is God's declaration of forgiveness and acceptance, it is a declarative judgement. God's verdict of acceptance and forgiveness. "Made right" cf. II Corin. 5:21; Romans 5 καὶ ὁ ἵστανται (some transformational elements).

But where is that declaration made or rendered of which I am now sure? In Heaven's courtroom? But, we haven't been there! If it's there then I haven't heard it because I am not there!. What happened in the courtroom??? This leads to looking for evidences, doubts arise.

3rd Observation: It is a deep-rooted assurance created in me by the Holy Spirit.

Where am I declared righteous in the sight of God? IN THE GOSPEL!, through the Gospel!! I have read it, the minister declares it to me in the preaching. But I do not then seize upon it and apply it to myself. The Holy Spirit creates and works that trust and assurance in me.

Because of this, my faith does not effect my justification (it is wholly and exclusively grounded in Christ's work). It believes and rests in God's declaration of what Christ has done for me.

In His death and resurrection, that verdict is passed upon me. I hear and see it through the Gospel. That is the confidence the Holy Spirit creates in me. The gospel calls upon us to hear and believe the verdict pronounced in Scripture-- right there! If I don't hear it and don't believe it, then I have no part in it. It is not through the gospel apart from the work of the Spirit. Nor through the free-will of man being persuaded. It is not a mystical insight via the Spirit into the heavenly courtroom. But the Spirit taught me to believe what God says in His Word.

C. Questions 22 & 23.

Q.22

Why asked? The answer broadens the answer to Q.21 to everything in the Gospel. Also relates it to the first part of A.21.

What is True Faith? True Faith is a knowledge..

What do I know and hold for truth? Cf. the Apostles

Creed (focusses on Gospel which focusses in promise).

Beginning with Q.22 we have a further reflection on the first half of the definition of faith. "Deep assurance" in the second half is reflected on in Q.59. Moved from fides quae (what is to be believed) to what good does it do you?

Q.21 defines faith in its two parts: Knowledge, Deep-rooted assurance.

Q.22 everything which God reveals in His Word, as summarized in the Apostles Creed. Then the benefit of believing that in terms of the doctrine of Justification by Faith (after the exposition of the Creed).

Q.23 the text of the articles of the Apostles Creed-- Father, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit.

D. Compare the definition of faith here with that of the Westminster Standards.

Cp. WLC: Q.72....

The subject of faith is in the context of Justification.

The larger context is that of the ordo salutis. The order of the WLC is: Justification--Faith; Sanctification--Repentance.

In the WSC you have a different sequence of questions.

Faith and repentance are not taken up here in relation to the application of redemption. Reserved for the later part in connection with the duties that God requires of man. Cf.

Q.85 What does God require of man?....

Why? Don't know why the shift in emphasis.

What is justifying faith in the West. Larger Cat?

1) Justifying faith is a saving grace.

The idea is in the HC though not the words. That faith is wrought by the Spirit is in both.

On the expression "saving grace" cf. the proof-text given: Heb.10:39 "believe to the saving of the soul."

In the WLC Justifying faith is a grace which has as its goal the salvation of the soul. In the HC faith is the confidence that the end has been achieved.

2) Wrought in the heart by the Spirit and the Word of God.

The idea is the same in both documents. The HC differentiates between the remote causality of the Spirit and the proximate causality of the Word. The connection is spelled out. In the WLC both are joined.

3) Whereby he being convinced of his sin and misery.

Strictly speaking, it is the preparation for saving faith, not faith itself. In the HC it belongs to saving faith. The knowledge of sin and misery is a saving knowledge.

"Disability" of WLC is the same as that in HC Q.8.

- 4) the Believer not only assents to the promises of the gospel..
 "Assent" corresponds to "knowledge" in the HC. The object is not the extent of the written revelation, but the object is the focus of the revelation-- the gospel, the specific promise. Corresponds to Q.22 "I must believe all that is promised in the gospel".
 The main difference is that the WLC uses "assent" rather than "knowledge". But the relation of knowledge and assent is that of an act to a result. I assent and therefore know it, i.e., the truth of the Gospel. In the WLC faith is an act of assent, in the HC faith is the result of that act.
- 5) Both have the "not only assent" but also "receive and rest" sequence.
 Christ and His righteousness are the substance, the promise of the Gospel. In the WLC to "receive and rest upon" is contrasted with the "confidence that" of the HC. Contrast is that of action and result The WLC mentions the action but not the result. In the HC it is reversed. Not a contradiction but a matter of perspective.

5/1/80

WLC.Q.72 Faith assents to the truth of the Gospel and is coupled with trust in Jesus Christ yielding confidence-- An Act.

In the HC, not the action but the result is more in focus. Assent to the truth yields firm knowledge. Confidence and knowledge correspond.

Each has a different accent but are not fundamentally contradictory.

Some practical problems that stem from these differences. Where the focus is on the act of faith, you tend to see the application of redemption as a coming to a crisis of faith, the "moment" of conversion, transition. The problem comes in terms of assurance?--did I really? (the emphasis as such in the WLC)

Where the emphasis is on the assurance the people have, if it is not properly administered, it tends to the neglect of what is said on the WLC side. (the emphasis as such is that of the HC)

Thus the problems are those of Lack of Assurance or Presumption. Therefore both sides need each other.

- 6) Receive and rest for: Pardon, acceptation, and Salvation. All of which are found in the HC.

The HC and the WLC do not form stages of development from earlier to later. If there is a division perhaps it could be placed at Zanchius. Has fiducia in both senses: 1) Trusting in (active sense); 2) Confidence that. The Decrees of the Council of Trent have the former in mind in its Anathema's.

E. The Zurich Catechisms on Faith

- 1) The Larger Cat. of Jude (1534).
 Q.21 What is faith? A. Faith is a true and constant thing. Man hopes and trusts in the unseen God--this is faith.

Hope and trust are characterized as certain, sure, and fixed. Faith is later called a certain, clear, perfect, and fixed knowledge of God and hope in Him. At the end, faith is comprehended in two things: 1) the knowledge of God; 2) adhering to acknowledged good and fixedly trusting in it.

Margin-- faith clings only to God. By faith the pious man surrenders himself to God.

Last sentence-- those who have faith in God are undoubtedly assured in their hearts that God has forgiven their sin through Christ, and that the handwriting of ordinances is completely taken away.

Summary: Two elements in Faith-- Knowledge and Trust. The object is God. From Knowledge and Trust flow Assurance. And therefore that Knowledge and Trust cannot be defined by Assurance.

Faith is assent to God, i.e., knowledge and trust of Him. Accent is clinging and adhering. Closer to WLC than HC.

2) The Smaller Cat. of Jude (1538).

Its distinctive feature-- explicit appeal to Heb. 11 and its language. Faith is the unchanging, durable essence of those things for which man hopes, a sure comprehension of those things which man does not see, namely God and His benefits.

We are speaking of faith which clings to God. Faith stands fixedly on the promises of God and not on works. Though faith is never without works.

3) Bullinger's Catechism (1559).

Q.108 What is that faith of which you speak?

A. First it is the Christian faith including doctrine, rites, and duties. Faith in the objective sense (fides quae, believe that). Second, it is a firm and solid assent (assensus) of the Christian heart. Specifically to the Word of God. It believes (credit) all truth comprehended in the Holy Scriptures, and pre-eminently receives Christ as the truth of God. In Christ the believer lives and brings forth the works of life. Cp. WCF XIV:2 of Saving Faith.

Q.109 Why do you call faith a firm assent of the heart to the Word of God?

A. Because faith is not simply a cognition of the mind or a transient knowledge, rather it is a firm assent inhering in the heart, a sure, undoubted assent.

Q.111 What are those things which faith knows, and to which it assents with the heart?

A. The Word of God and those things which are announced by it. Christ in particular, first of all, Who is the purpose of the Law (scopus legis) and the Prophets and the Apostles.

The accent is on assent to the Word of God. But assent is differentiated from knowledge and bare cognition (i.e., common grace knowledge). It is a hearty assent. It is an assent which amounts to fiducia in the active sense of resting in.

Close to the WLC, part of Westminster's roots.

4) Calvin's Geneva Cat. (1541).

Concept of faith:

a) Reliance upon God honors God.

Q.7 How do we honor God aright?

A. We put our reliance entirely upon Him, by serving Him in obedience to His will, by calling upon Him in all our need, seeking salvation and every good thing in Him, and acknowledging with heart and mouth that all our good proceeds from Him.

"Reliance" is undoubtedly fiducia, in the active sense of trust, rather than a confidence.

This seems to place Calvin in the Swiss line, but...

b) Reliance is grounded in knowledge.

Q.9 How do we attain to this reliance?

A. Must know God as almighty and perfectly good.

Q.10 develops this-- Is this enough?

A. No, not by itself (Q.11).

Cf. Q.'s 11-12 Must be certain that He loves us, not that He loves.

Q.13 How do we know this?

A. By His Word..

His Word tells us God is good and that He is good to us. Double knowledge.

The same idea is in the Institutes of the Christian Religion. Cf. III.ii.7 We shall now have a full definition of faith, if we say that, it is a sure and firm knowledge of the divine favor towards us, founded on the truth of the free promise in Christ and revealed to our minds and sealed to our hearts by the Holy Spirit.

The first part is our present concern. The Knowledge spoken of is Assurance. Cp. III.ii.15 contra doubts in true faith. Faith is equivalent to confidence. Corresponds to the second part of the definition of true faith in the HC.

c) Such knowledge presupposes a previous persuasion concerning the Word of God.

"founded on the truth of a free promise..."

Cp. III.ii.6 for faith includes not just a knowledge that God is... but a perception of His will towards us... as ascertained from His Word.

The Word is objectively true we appropriate it by means of the Spirit's work. Thus we have a prior persuasion concerning the Word of God which imperceptibly passes over to a knowledge that God is favorable toward us.

The HC comes from Calvin. All have this aspect of knowledge. Calvin does not have the distinctive Swiss emphasis on faith in the active sense of receiving Christ and clinging to Him. It is not in the foreground in Calvin.

d) Faith in the active sense is the link between the previous persuasion of the truth of God and the knowledge of the divine favor towards us.

Cp. III.ii.16 The principle hinge on which faith turns, is this.... Not only true outside us, but also

in us. We make them ours by inwardly embracing them. Examples given in class: Romans 8:1; Hebrews 8:13.

Believing both aspects (true outside us and in us) is the work of faith. It inwardly embraces those promises.

You don't need to badger the congregation-- "Are you?", "Have you?". But you encourage them to take hold and believe them. Not on an intellectual, "take it or leave it" basis. Faith, living and active, stakes itself on these promises. James 2 and Abraham is the exemplar of this. Their action can only be seen as faith-action. It makes no sense as a work for merit. It is the obedience of faith.

III.ii.8 Faith embraces Christ as He is offered by the Father. Faith consists in the knowledge of Christ.

III.ii.7 Faith finds something in the Word to lean and rest upon.

In the Heid.Cat.

Faith as embracing Christ and His promises is present, though not in formal definition.

Q.76 Believing, Receiving, Accepting. Cp. Westminster.

Q.61 Faith receives and makes mine. Cp. Calvin.

On Q.20 cp. III.ii.30 on faith as ingrafting us into Christ.

5) Moments (Elements) in the Doctrine of Faith

1. Acquaintance with the Word of God.
2. Persuasion as to its objective truth.
3. Embracing of the promises of the Gospel.
4. Knowledge that the promises are true with respect to me.
5. Reliance upon God which honors God.

Turretin has about seven, with a reflex or two after that. Calvin focusses on #4. Westminster on #3.

Note Ursinus Summa Th., Q.37 the active sense is focussed on. In Q.38 the sense of assurance is focussed on.

LORD'S DAY 15 Q.37

We will focus on the Extent of the Atonement, operate from that perspective. The answer to Q.37 opens up on the aspect of suffering beyond that of the Apostles Creed and its focus.

First compare the Westminster Standards on the extent of the Atonement. The WSC. 25 "us"-- indefinite, vague. WLC. 44 "a reconciliation for the sins of His people"--definite. The WCF VIII:5 is very specific--" for all those whom the Father has given unto Him." Though no one section or question is given over to this topic. It is part of other topics.

A.C.Witmer Notes on the Heidelberg Catechism--" there is no room for the thought of a limited atonement. Redemption must be as broad as the ruin".

Does not imply a universal redemption or universalism. Objective redemption and the actualization are not co-extensive. Basic German Reformed view.

What shall we say?

A. Considerations favoring an understanding of the Atonement as universal in Extent.

- 1) The language of the Cat. admits to being interpreted as universal.
Does fine as it is. It does not say "sufficient for the sins of the whole human race" as the canons of the Synod of Dordt; Second Head, Article 3. Sufficient for all, did not expiate for all. The Remonstrance of 1610 said--sufficient for all and did expiate all. The Remonstrance argued that it was sufficient for all because it expiated for all. Dordt argued that it was sufficient for the expiation of all sins of all men. But the atonement was not designed to expiate all sins.
The HC goes beyond the Canons of Dordt formula--Christ has sustained the anger of God for the sins of the whole world.
- 2) Comments of Ursinus point to an Universal Atonement. Cf. his comments on Q.37 in the Commentary. He takes up an objection on p.215, #4. He has a golden opportunity to say only the elects' sins are satisfied for. Image you are left with is the atonement is sufficient for all but is beneficial only as God applies it to us in Justification and we to ourselves in Faith. The sufficiency of the atonement does not extend to the point of securing its application for all men. Dordt is otherwise: Second Head, Article 8.
There is some question as to whether this section of Ursinus is authentic. Not in all the editions. Rejects universal redemption. Limits the application of the atonement not its extent.
Summa Th., Q.86 Why was it necessary for Him to experience these torments?
A. Because the sins of all of us were cast upon Him. Therefore He felt the wrath of God, such as if He had committed all the sins of all men.
- 3) Language of previous Catechisms.
Larger Cat. of Jude-- through His death the whole world has again come alive. Death brought in through Adam is driven out. Uses Scriptural phrases also.
London Cat. of Micron-- the wrath of God against the sin of the human race is borne by Christ.
á Lasco (1546)-- Why did Jesus suffer and die?
Not on account of His own sin, but on account of our sin and the sin of the whole world. In order that He might by His own body, His holy, only and eternal sacrifice, take away sin and reconcile us with God.

Now this language does not require the teaching of an Universal Atonement. Any more than certain similar kinds of language in the Bible may be appealed to as teaching so.

B. Considerations which are opposed to an understanding of the Atonement as universal in extent.

- 1) The Proof-texts inserted by the Authors do not support a Universal Atonement.
I Peter 2:24. Isaiah 53:12. The choice of texts is not

guided by the question of the extent of the atonement, but the question of Substitution-- what evidence for Substitution is there?

Isa. 53:12 could be seen as limited: "many" as opposed to "all". It is questionable whether this was the intent of the authors. Also whether that was how the 16th-cent. understood the passage. Either way it does not limit the HC language.

But the point here is that other texts could have been used if the extent of the atonement was in view. One of which is used in a later section: "only atoning sacrifice". E.g., I John 2:2.

- 2) The focus of the Answer is on the fact that Christ's suffering is the only atoning sacrifice. Christ is the Only one, thus He is the only element relevant to any sacrifice for sin.
- 3) It is not the point of the HC that Christ sustained the wrath of God against all men, but the wrath which Christ has sustained was the wrath which rests on all men. The emphasis is on the extent of the wrath, not the extent of the atoning work.
A. Kuyper (E Voto Dordrechano)-- the elect as elect have no sin. And therefore the cat. rightly avoids speaking about Christ as bearing the wrath of God against the sin of the elect. It is not by virtue of their election that they have sin, but men have sin only as belonging to a sinful race. They participate in a sinful nature against which the wrath of God is directed.
Christ died for the elect, but the sin under which they lay, and lay judged, was the sin of the whole human race.

Ursinus does not make this point, but it is interesting.

- 4) The Heid. Cat. brings to the fore the Organic Unity of the Race.
Relates to the above.
Christ came as the Head of the Race, just as Adam was the head of the Race. And Christ has drawn to Himself the wrath of God that was directed against the human Race. Individually we experience the wrath of God. But the wrath of God we experience individually, is the wrath of God against the human Race. Individuals are viewed in their organic unity with the Race.
The point is not that Christ has sustained the wrath of God, one-for-one, but of the human Race.

C. Conclusion.

- 1) We are not required to understand the HC as teaching a Universal Atonement.
- 2) The HC does not seek to teach a limited atonement, any more than it seeks to teach a universal atonement. The question was not in view at this point.
- 3) The verse which are interpreted universally, must instead be interpreted redemptive- historically, as part of the progress of the revelation to the Gentiles.
- 4) Q.20 guards against a universal salvation interpretation. It was basically left to the Synod of Dordt to deal

with the question. There the accomplishment of redemption is defined as not wider than the application of redemption. Thus the Reformed Faith has come to a greater self-consciousness on the question as time has passed.

Notes derived from C. Wisdom's class notes.

5/8/80

The Doctrine of Election in the Heidelberg Catechism.

Introduction:

- 1) John Nevin's approach to Election.
 - a) His point is that the HC does not teach a supra-lapsarian view of the divine decrees.
 - b) The whole doctrine is passed over in silence.
 - c) The question of predestination is brought no closer than Q.20. Still less do we hear about absolute reprobation.
 - d) It may be said that Calvinistic points are at least involved in the system which it teaches, since it was accepted at the Synod of Dordt.
- 2) Does the HC teach Election or does it pass it over?
- 3) Thesis: Election is not expounded as an item of doctrine, as in WSC.20.
 - a) We do not get such a statement. The HC requires the presupposition of the doctrine of Election in no attenuated form.
 - b) The doctrine of Election is set over against the sacramental ministry of the Church by Nevin. The HC stresses the means of grace in the context of Election.
 - c) Election guarantees the application of redemption. Therefore the means are subordinate to the sovereign will of God. In the HC you have the means of grace mentioned in the context of election, epitomized in Q.54, when it says the Son of God gathers a community chosen for eternal life, gathered through His Spirit and Word. Spirit and Word are not set over against one another.

A. Election is implied in the HC teaching concerning the Eternal Counsel of God.

- 1) Harry Boer recently argued against reprobation by saying the Three Forms of Unity has no such comprehensive decree.
- 2) This however is the clear teaching of the HC-- the comprehensiveness of the eternal counsel of God.
- 3) "I believe in God Almighty"--Q.26. He upholds and rules them by His eternal counsel and providence.
 - a) The counsel of God lies behind His providence.
 - b) The counsel of God is eternal and comprehensive. "and everything in them", so it is that I derive special comfort as in Q.1.
- 4) This mention of the Counsel of God repeats an emphasis of the Summa Th.
 - a) Q.48-- deals with the same part of the Apostles Creed, "Why is the Father called Almighty?" Nothing occurs outside of His will and decree (decretum)

- b) Q.50-- Why do you add Creator of heaven and earth?
Because...
 - c) Q.17 of the Cat. Minor-- What do you believe concerning Eternal Father? According to the eternal decree of His will.
 - d) Q.52 of the Summa goes so far as to equate the counsel and providence of God. The immutable, most wise, and best counsel of God, according to which all things happen.
- 5) There is an explicit association between counsel and providence, and this counsel is to be understood as the decretum aeternum.
 - 6) With that we have a testimony to the comprehensiveness of God's counsel and decree.
 - a) HC speaks of heaven and earth and everything in them.
 - b) Therefore we can deduce from the comprehensiveness of the decree our salvation and therefore of the doctrine of Election.
 - c) Q.42 of the Summa--"What is God?", the last clauses: The Trinity creates and preserves and governs all creatures, and gathers them to Himself, an eternal Church in the human race, on account of His Son.
 - 7) The equation of counsel and providence in Q.42. The gathering of the Church is a particular act of providence, a reflection of God.
 - 8) It is that connection that is made by Ursinus in his Commentary, in which is found a full-orbed doctrine of Election and Reprobation. (pp.293-303 on Q.54)
 - a) In that section he equates counsel with providence of God as in the Summa Th.
 - b) He further relates (p.297) the counsel of God with Predestination. Predestination differs in relation to providence as species from genus.
 - c) We are compelled to conclude therefore, that the HC on the counsel of God implies Election unto salvation.
 1. Inclusion of election as part of counsel of God in the HC.
 2. The background documents give us insight into the meaning of counsel in the HC.
- B. Election is implied in Q.31, which speaks of the secret counsel and will of God for our deliverance--"Who perfectly reveals to us the secret counsel..."
- 1) Christ is our Chief Prophet and Teacher, and He perfectly reveals to us....
 - 2) This might seem to just refer to the plan of salvation broadly conceived as in I Corin.2:9-10-- the work of revelation would correspond to general work.
 - 3) This could also be interpreted as a reference to election which is revealed by our Chief Prophet and Teacher. The work of particular redemption being carried through in His work as Prophet.
 - 4) Q.61 of the Summa TH.--Why do you call Him a Prophet? Because He has opened to us the will of the Father to-

ward us, through the ministry of the Word and the ministry of the Spirit in our hearts.

- a) There the character of the revelation is modestly expressed, but is the ministry of the Word and Spirit in our hearts. That language is more appropriate to the application than the accomplishment of redemption.
 - b) It is the will of God toward us that is made known. It is an electing will, it is our election that has been revealed.
- 5) Q.110 of the Summa Th.-- What is the sanctification of the Elect?
- a) That the elect are taught by the Holy Spirit through the Gospel concerning the will of God toward them, and are regenerated.
 - b) They are taught of their election in the ministry of the Gospel concerning the will of God toward them.
 - c) This relates to Q.61 of the Summa Th., but Q.110 brings us further because it is clearly the elect that are taught concerning their election.
- 6) If this is the background of Q.31 (of the HC), then it carries an implied testimony to election. But in Q.31 it says the secret will of God is made known-- this is the practical value of the doctrine of election. The HC makes the doctrine not a threat to the religious life of the believer. The knowledge of election comes through Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the Gospel as it is appropriated by faith.
- 7) Ursinus in his Commentary (p.301):
- a) Election and Reprobation are known in general, but not in particular. We do not have an insight into the decree. There is a general revelation of election. "But of our knowledge of election we not only may, but must obtain it a posteriori from our conversion."
 - b) (P.296) We can not have comfort before the will of God is revealed to us. The effects in us are the last in a series, preceded by the revelation of Christ and the Holy Spirit. It is known by faith in the revelation of Jesus Christ.
 - c) So the whole Heidelberg presupposes Election.
- 8) Ursinus says, inasmuch as every man is invited to repent and believe in the Gospel, every man is required to believe in his own election; for how else could he believe in Jesus Christ? Otherwise you would have to charge God with lying!
- The caricature of election as stymying evangelism is far from the old writers. Our standing does not depend upon our wills

C. What the HC says of the Sovereign Operation of the Spirit implies election-- the origin of faith

1) The Summa Th. (Q.'s 217-219 Excursus on Election.)

a) Q.63--what is the Body of Christ?

The Son of God establishes and preserves the ministry of the Gospel and by it quickens and converts the elect.

- b) Q.38-- the Holy Spirit kindles faith in the Elect.
 - c) Q.'s 109-110 -- On the Holy Spirit: the Holy Spirit is the sanctifier of the Elect. Q.110-- the Holy Spirit ~~is~~ teaches the Elect of the will of God with respect to them. But the "means" are stressed. The use of means does not deny election.
 - d) Q.264-- the sacraments are instituted by Jesus Christ to strengthen the Elect.
 - e) Q.266-- Ministry
 - f) Q.267-- the means are the Holy Spirits' means to move the minds and hearts of God's Elect.
 - g) Q.224-- Prayer is necessary for salvation. God saves them who appeal to Him for mercy. The Elect can use prayer to this end.
 - h) --Sovereignty implies election.
- 2) The HC emphasis on the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit implies election.
- a) Q.54-- the Son of God active by His Spirit and Word gathers His Chosen.
 - b) Q.80-- by the Holy Spirit we are ingrafted into Jesus Christ (cp.Q.'s 20,21).
 - c) Q.74-- the Holy Spirit works faith.
 - d) Q.53-- deals with belief about the Holy Spirit. (parallel in Cat.Minor is Q.39; Q.'s 109-110 of the Summa) found between Q.52 & 54 which do both expressly mention election, it is not foreign to it. See Q.53 as referring to the operation of the Holy Spirit among the Elect. How can the Holy Spirit be seen as initiating faith without also determining with whom He will initiate faith?
 - e) Q.65-- Whence comes this faith? The Holy Spirit. Summa Th. Q.224.
 - f) Cp. Q.116 of the HC-- the necessity of prayer.

D. Conclusion to be drawn.

Many references to election in the Summa Th. occur where emphasis is on the sovereign work of the Holy Spirit. Why that conjunction? Because the two do not exclude one another. And that seems to require the doctrine in Q.54 and 53 by the force of the context. The accent in the HC on the Holy Spirit's sovereignty working with the means is seen in the Summa Th. and is the background for the HC.

Question 52. The Theme is that My Redeemer is Judge: "But shall take me and all His chosen ones".

- 1) Cf. Cat Minor Q.38-- "me with all the elect".
- 2) The comparable questions in the Summa Th. 102-103 do not use the expression the Elect at this point, but use "believers" or "us".
- 3) Why is elect retained in the HC? Not clear, they did not see fit to excise every explicit reference to election.
- 4) In 52 and 54 election is mentioned in the context of assurance. So election is the context in which the doctrines of assurance and perseverance flourish.

Question 54. Has no intention of blotting out every mention of Election.

Ursinus' Commentary, p.293--The doctrines of Election and Reprobation naturally grow out of the doctrine of the Church, not out of the doctrine of God as such. It flows out of what is known.

- 1) Election is of the Father.
The Son gathers by the Spirit--so if...
- 2) Election is of particular persons...
 - a) "a chosen communion"(gemeinde, German). Does this mean the Church rather than individuals? Not merely, it refers to elect men. Cf.Q.52 "the chosen ones". Q.54 "I am chosen to eternal life."
 - b) The Church is elect because I am elect.
Summa Th. Q.110-- an elect Church. Q.113 What is the Church? It is a company (coetus) of men who are chosen by God to eternal life.
 - c) The Church is God's elect people:
Breadth-- out of the whole human race.
Depth-- from the beginning to the end of the world.
 - d) To be sure Christ gathers, defends, preserves the Church, and I am a member of it. I am not baptized into a sect.
- 3) Election is unto eternal life.
 - a) Terceptenary Ed. translation: "into eternal life" position waters down election.
 - b) Other translation: "a congregation chosen for eternal life". And that explains the assurance of the last clause.
- 4) Election is unto the chief end of the Glory of God.
The chief use of the doctrine is that we might attribute all glory for our salvation to God.
- 5) Christ gathers the elect to be His Church.
 - a) Cat. Minor Q.40-- the elect are an assembly which can be seen and heard.
 - b) Is Christ then the Executor of the decree? Yes, but there is the language of ingrafting into Christ.
 - c) "Chosen in Christ"-- Ursinus says, "for He chose us not because we were, but that we might be blameless and holy. That we might be ingrafted into Christ Q.123 Summa)." He gathers the elect, ingrafted into Himself.
- 6) Election implies Reprobation.
 - a) Q.54--"out of the entire race..." That phrase could well have been omitted without disturbing the sense. The company of the race is larger numerically than the company of the elect. The organic unity from which the elect separate.
 - b) Reprobate: Cat. Minor Q.50-- reprobate multitude. Summa Th. Q.111 non-elect.
 - c) The idea of reprobation is in the immediate background of the HC and is required for an understanding.
 - d) Q.37 has "whole human race" with respect to the extent of the atonemnt.
 - e) Q.20-- Separation, and therefore reprobation is implied.
 - f) We do not derive comfort from the fact that there is no reprobation. We do derive comfort from the fact that there is election.-- G.C.Berkouwer "Doctrine of Election and Reprobation".
My only comfort in life and death is not that I have slain the terrible spectre of reprobation, so that I know it isn't there.

URSINUS ON FAITH

Summa Theologiae:

37. Does the gospel teach that the covenant of the grace of God pertains to all men?

He indeed calls all men to it, but none become partakers of it except those who embrace it and keep it, that is, those who with true faith receive Christ offered to them and his benefits.

38. What is faith?

It is to assent firmly [firmiter assentiri] to every word of God handed down to us; it is a firm trust [firma fiducia] by which individual persons [singuli] conclude that to them have been given by God remission of sins, righteousness, and eternal life, freely, on account of the merit of Christ, and through him; it is kindled [accensa] in the hearts of the elect by the Holy Spirit, making us living members of Christ and begetting in us true love and worship of God.

39. What is therefore the sum of those things which the gospel sets forth to be believed by us in order that we might become partakers of the divine covenant?

It is comprehended in the articles of faith or the Apostolic symbol.

Catechesis Minor:

11. Does that satisfaction of Christ help all men?

No, but only those who embrace it with true faith.

12. What is faith?

It is a firm assent [firmus assensus] by which we acknowledge that all things handed down to us in the word of God are true; and a sure trust [certa fiducia] kindled [accensa] by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the elect of God by which individual persons [singuli] conclude that remission of sins, righteousness, and eternal life have been given to them by God freely on account of the merit of Christ alone [solius Christi].
id est, not aduers

13. What is the sum of those things which a Christian ought to believe?

It is comprehended in the Apostolic symbol.

SOURCES FOR HEIDELBERG CATECHISM, LORD'S DAY ONE

Calvin, Genevan Catechism (1541/45)

1. What is the chief end of human life?

To know God.

2. Why do you say that?

Because He created us and placed us in this world to be glorified in us. And it is indeed right that our life, of which He Himself is the beginning, should be devoted to His glory.

3. What is the sovereign good of man?

The same thing.

4. Why do you hold that to be the sovereign good?

Because without it our condition is more miserable than that of brute-beasts.

5. Hence, then, we see that nothing worse can happen to a man than to live without God.

It is so.

6. What is the true and right knowledge of God?

When we know Him in order that we may honour Him.

7. How do we honour Him aright?

We put our reliance entirely on Him, by serving Him in obedience to His will, by calling upon Him in all our need, seeking salvation and every good thing in Him, and acknowledging with heart and mouth that all our good proceeds from Him.

Micron, The Little Catechism (1552)

1. For what purpose have you been created by God and placed in this world?

In order that I, my whole life long, might learn to know and to serve God, and finally live with Him in heaven forever.

Brief Investigation (1553)

1. How are you assured in your heart that you are a member of the church (gemeynte) of Christ?

From this, that the Holy Spirit witnesses to my Spirit that I am a child of God the Father, through Jesus Christ his son and my high priest, who has purified me from my sins through the holy sacrifice of his body and the pouring out of his blood. Moreover, I feel that I am moved by the Spirit of God to obedience of the divine commands.

Emden Catechism (1554)

1. For what purpose were you created a man?

That I should be an image of God, and should acknowledge, live unto, and serve my God and Creator.

2. For what purpose have you become a Christian?

That I, fallen into sin and death through the transgression of our first parents, and saved again through the satisfaction of Jesus Christ from sin and death, might be an heir of eternal life.

3. Whence are you assured that you are truly a Christian, and a partaker of such a benefit of Christ?

First through the witness of the Holy Spirit who gives testimony to my spirit through faith in Jesus Christ my high priest that I am a child of God. Secondly, from the will and the zeal which through the Spirit of God I feel in myself according to the inner man to serve God the Lord.

Bullinger, Catechism (1559)

13. What is then that main point which holy Scripture passes on and commends to us as the first and most important element of our religion?

God before all things does it commend to us, his true worship, and the salvation of the human race.

21. How did God principally declare his good will toward man?

In the promise, by which, having been moved by no merit of ours, but by his own native and mere goodness and grace, he promises to us extraordinarily good things both for the present and future life. For the divine promise is two-fold, since the one promise is of spiritual things and the other is of material things. The spiritual promise pertains to celestial matters and the good things of the future life, to the soul of man and its total restoration. And it has these principal promises: The seed of the woman will crush under heel the head of the serpent, etc. Similarly: In thy seed will all nations be blessed, etc. And again: And this is the covenant which I shall make with them; I shall be gracious with respect to their iniquities, and their sins I will remember no longer. Further, the material promise turns upon the temporal goods of the present life, which indeed are many and varied, as health, beauty, strength, faculties, and innumerable other things of this kind.

22. How, moreover, does Holy Scripture elsewhere explain to us this saving work of benevolence and friendship?

By the likeness of a pact or covenant. For as men are joined together by some most binding covenant, so God has united with men by an eternal covenant.

23. I ask you with what men?

With Adam the parent of us all, with Noah, and most significantly of all with Abraham and with all of his seed, that is, with all believing men of all ages and nations. Whence it is most clearly manifest that we are all confederate with God. And lest anyone doubt, the word of God is clear: I shall be your God, and of your seed after you throughout everlasting generations. Now the Apostle Paul announces distinctly that believers are the true seed of Abraham, as Romans 4 and Galatians 3 say.

24. Tell me, what are the conditions or heads of that covenant of God established with men?

Two, chiefly. The one expounds how God wills to present himself to us or what we may expect from him or promise ourselves concerning him. The other contains what He in turn requires from us, and what our task is.

25. Explain therefore to me, how God wills to present himself to men?

God wills to be ours not only communally or universally, but as it were particularly of each one: that is, he wills to be our fullness and sufficiency in whom undoubtedly we have all good things, most excellent and most abundant both for body and soul in the present and in the future: which things we ought to await and also seek from him alone, nor should we either await or demand them from other gods.

26. What in turn does God require from us and what is that duty of ours?

That we might freely acknowledge these things, and beyond that receive them with true faith and cling to this God confederate with us, with a sincere and pure heart. Therefore this is our task, that we depend upon him only and uniquely, that we hasten to him in all our needs, that we trust him, and revere him and love him as Father, Lord and our only Savior. Or as I would enunciate this same thing also in another way and more briefly: it is our duty to worship this God with legitimate service, and indeed him only, rejecting all other gods, since he alone suffices for men in whatever desires.

27. Explain here to me what seems to you to be the legitimate worship of God.

That which has reference to God himself alone, and finally the whole (of It) is arranged by men according to the norm or rule of the divine word. For worship undertaken according to our desires or will is illegitimate and false worship.

29. Those who continue standing firmly in this covenant of God, how are they commonly called?

Pious and covenanted, friends and allies of God.

30. Does this covenant then make us monks who alone up to this time have called themselves pious?

But they wrongly call themselves pious. For the reason that they are confederate with God they are called pious, because by this chain of piety they are bound, or connected, or fastened to God. Hence that religion itself receives a name, the word having been deduced from the chain of piety, that God fastens man to himself and binds him tightly with piety: because it is necessary for us to serve him as Lord and to submit to him as Father. Further, since the monks bind other lords and fathers fast to themselves, likewise other rules or forms of living, alien to the one heavenly Father and only rule of the word of God and besides that they proclaim strange vows to creatures, the noble word "pious" is hardly suitable to them. Surely as religion is the worship of the true God: so superstition is the worship of the false. Therefore they are superstitious who content neither with God alone nor with his one word and worship, worship many and false gods and indeed with a worship invented by the desire and will of man. They themselves are proclaimed in Scriptures both as adulterers and fornicators, and are condemned as faithless and profaners of the sacred covenant.

31. Is not this task of piety explained to us in Scripture by a way other than under the figure of a covenant?

It is indeed expounded by the law in which the heads of the covenant are more fully explained but only here and there systematically, and the true religion and the true worship of God are illuminated as elegantly as possible.

32. But since the law of nature is one thing, and the law of men another, and the law of God still another, of which law are you speaking to me?

Of the law of God, which is the express will of God, commanding those things which are holy or pleasing to God, and prohibiting the opposite.

Ursinus, Smaller Catechism (1562)

1. What is your comfort by which your heart nurtures itself both in death and in life?

That God has surely forgiven me all my sins on account of Christ, and has given (me) eternal life in which I may praise him forever.

2. Whence do you determine that?

The Holy Spirit testifies to this in my heart, by the word of God and sacraments, and by the beginnings of obedience toward God.

3. What does the word of God teach?

First, it shows to us our misery; then, how we are to be set free from it; and what thanksgiving we ought to offer to God for this freedom.

4. Whence do you know your misery?

From the divine law which is comprehended in the decalogue.

5. Whence do we learn the way of freedom?

From the gospel, or the articles of the Christian faith, and the sacraments.

6. Where are we instructed concerning the thanksgiving which we owe to God?

In the Decalogue, and doctrine of prayer to God.

7. What is the gist of the Decalogue?

Christ summarized it with these words in Matthew 22. Thou shalt love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul and with all your mind. This is the first and great commandment. The second, moreover, is like it: Thou shalt love your neighbor as yourself. On these two commandments the whole Law and Prophets hang. And concerning these commandments God said: Cursed is everyone who does not continue in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.

8. Are you able then to discharge all these things?

Not at all. For the first parents of the human race in Paradise, although they were righteous and holy, and were made such by God to be able to discharge these things, by wilful disobedience, deprived themselves and all their posterity of that Grace of God, so that now we are all born as sons of wrath: and unless we are renewed by the spirit of God, we cannot do anything except sin against God and our neighbor.

9. What is sin?

It is all ignorance and doubt concerning God: inclination either internal or external repugnant to the divine law: all of which things make us liable to the wrath of God and eternal death.

10. By what means are you able to escape eternal death?

By the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who was made man for my sake and satisfied for me the most perfect and severe justice of God by his passion and obedience: and merited for me eternal life: and has now begun it in me by his Spirit and will restore it perfectly after this life.

11. Does that satisfaction of Christ help all men?

No: But those only who embrace it with true faith.

12. What is faith?

It is a firm assent, by which we acknowledge that all things handed down to us in the word of God are true: and a sure trust kindled by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the elect of God: by which they personally are convinced that remission of sins, righteousness and eternal life has been given to them freely by God on account of the merit of Christ alone.

13. What is the summary of these things which a Christian ought to believe?

It is comprehended in the Apostles' Creed.

14. What is that?

I believe in God the Father Almighty, creator of heaven and earth. And in Jesus Christ, etc.

49. Whence arises that faith in men?

It is the gift of God which He by his Spirit works in our hearts.

50. How does it happen that this gift comes to you, rather than to the many who perish forever?

Because God chose me before the foundation of the world were laid to eternal life in Christ, and now has begotten (me) by the grace of his very own Spirit. Unless that had happened, such is the depravity of my nature that I, just as the reprobate multitude, would have perished, knowingly and willingly in my sins.

51. Does not this knowledge by which you declare yourself to be elect until eternal life render you secure and more negligent in the daily exercises of repentance?

By no means: Rather, it spurs me on to zeal for persevering and progressing in piety: seeing that without a true conversion to God, I cannot comfort myself with confidence in my own election: and the more certain I am of my own salvation, the more I desire to show myself thankful to God.

52. Are you not aroused to doubt concerning your salvation since you hear that none but the elect are saved by God?

Not in the least. But a solid comfort suffices for me in this respect in every temptation. If I desire to believe in and submit to God with a serious affection of the heart, I ought to conclude from this, as it were, most certain argument that I am in the number of those who have been elected to eternal life and therefore that I am never able to perish although my faith is weak.

Ursinus, Larger Catechism (1562)

1. What sure consolation do you have in life and death?

That I have been made by God in his image and for eternal life; and, after I had wilfully lost this in Adam, God out of his boundless and gracious mercy received me into the covenant of this grace, so that on account of the obedience and death of his Son sent in the flesh, he gives to me believing, righteousness and eternal life; and he has sealed this his covenant in my heart by his Spirit, and by his word and the visible signs of this covenant.

2. How do you know that such a covenant has been entered into with you by God?

Because I am truly a Christian.

3. Who would you say is truly a Christian?

One who has been ingrafted into Christ by true faith, and has been baptized into him.

4. Is, therefore, no religion true except the Christian religion?

None

5. For what reason do you assert this?

Because to this one alone does the Holy Spirit bear witness in the hearts of believers. This one alone holds forth sure freedom from sin and death. This one alone convinces consciences concerning its purity and truth. And finally this one alone has God confirmed since the beginning of the world by prodigious miracles, by true predictions of things to come, by preservation against all enemies, and by the blood of so many holy martyrs.