

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VI

OCTOBER 1908

NUMBER 4

HERMAN BAVINCK.

The Free Churches of Holland possess at the present moment in Dr. Abraham Kuyper and Dr. Herman Bavinck theologians of genius and of erudition worthy of the best traditions of the Reformed theology. In the autumn of 1898 Dr. Kuyper delivered at Princeton Seminary the L. P. Stone Lectures, and thus for the first time made his voice heard by an English-speaking audience. During the present month Dr. Bavinck is to deliver these Lectures. The circumstance seems worthy of notice; and the occasion seems to call for some introduction of Professor Bavinck to his American audience. The following account of the position he occupies and the work he has done in the churches and for the people of the Netherlands has been derived from an authentic source.—EDITORS.

The Reformed Church in the Netherlands underwent a great change in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Rationalism had already penetrated into the church and caused a tremendous upheaval; but it now made itself master of almost the whole of the church in the form of a moderate supranaturalism. Everywhere the old truths of atonement and regeneration were set aside in favor of new dogmas of the example of Jesus and of moral improvement. The hope was cherished that an end could be put to the old faith by means of official preaching, elementary education

THE FIRST QUESTION OF THE WESTMINSTER "SHORTER CATECHISM".

No catechism begins on a higher plane than the Westminster "Shorter Catechism". Its opening question, "What is the chief end of man?" with its answer, "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever",—the profound meaning of which Carlyle said grew to him ever fuller and richer with the years—sets the learner at once in his right relation to God. Withdrawing his eyes from himself, even from his own salvation, as the chief object of concern, it fixes them on God and His glory, and bids him seek his highest blessedness in Him.

The Shorter Catechism owes this elevated standpoint, of course, to the purity of its reflection of the Reformed consciousness. To others, the question of questions might be, What shall I do to be saved? and it is on this plane that many, or rather most, of the Catechisms even of the Reformation begin. There is a sort of spiritual utilitarianism, a divine euthumia, at work in this, which determines the whole point of view. Even the Heidelberg Catechism is not wholly free from this leaven. Taking its starting point from the longing for comfort, even though it be the highest comfort for life and death, it claims the attention of the pupil from the beginning for his own state, his own present unhappiness, his own possibilities of bliss. There may be some danger that the pupil should acquire the impression that God exists for his benefit. The Westminster Catechism cuts itself free at once from this entanglement with lower things and begins, as it centers and ends, under the illumination of the vision of God in His glory, to subserve which it finds to be the proper end of human as of all other existence, of salvation as of all other achievements. To it all things exist for God, unto whom as well

as from whom all things are; and the great question for each of us accordingly is, How can I glorify God and enjoy Him forever?

When we ask after the source of this question and answer, therefore, it is an adequate response to point simply to the Reformed consciousness. It is not merely in this place that this consciousness comes to peculiarly clear expression in the Westminster formularies, which the time and circumstances of their composition combined to make the most complete and perfect exposition of the Reformed mode of conception as yet given confessional expression. It is interesting, however, to go behind this general response and seek to trace the influences by which the literary form of this expression of the Reformed consciousness has been determined. If we ask after its source, in this sense, it is quite evident that we must say that its proximate source is the corresponding question and answer in the Larger Catechism, the preparation of which immediately preceded that of the Shorter Catechism, and a simple—and often most felicitous—condensation of which the Shorter Catechism, in its general structure and specific statements, is largely found to be. The question in the Larger Catechism takes the form, "What is the chief and highest end of man?" and the answer, correspondingly, "Man's chief and highest end is to glorify God, and fully to enjoy Him forever". This differs from the statement of the Shorter Catechism only by an expansion of the simple idea by means of phrases which, while meant to strengthen and enrich, perhaps rather weaken the effect—illustrating aptly Emerson's dictum concerning the fat and the sinew of speech.

The ultimate source of the declaration is almost as easily identified as its proximate source. This must undoubtedly be found in John Calvin, who, in his *Institutes* and in his *Catechisms* alike, placed this identical idea in the forefront of his instruction. One of the first duties to which Calvin addressed himself on coming to Geneva was to provide the Church there with a brief compend of religious truth, drawn

up on the basis of his *Institutes*, which had been published the year before. This compend was already in 1537 made public in its French form,¹ and it was rendered into Latin in the spring of the following year.² Its first section bears the heading: "That all men are born to know God";³ and its first paragraph runs as follows: "Since there is no one of men to be found, no matter how barbarous and altogether savage, who is not touched by some religious notion,⁴ it is clear that *we are all created to this end, that we should know the majesty of our Creator; and knowing Him, should hold Him in esteem, and honor Him with all fear, love and reverence.*"⁵ And its last paragraph runs as follows: "It is necessary, then, that *the principal care and solicitude of our life should be to seek God and to aspire to Him with all affection of heart and not to rest anywhere save in Him.*"⁶ However catechetical in intention, this document, it will be perceived, was not at all what we know as a catechism in form. It requires mention here, however, as the foundation-stone in the edifice of Reformed catechetics; although it was soon supplanted in Geneva itself by the document which has for three hundred and fifty years been known affectionately throughout the whole Reformed world as "Calvin's Catechism". This new formulary was published in French and Latin in 1545 and entered at once upon a world-wide mission. Translated

¹ *Instruction et Confession de Foy, dont on use en Leglise de Geneue.* (*Opp.* xxii, pp. 4 sq.)

² *Catechismus, sive Christianae Religionis Institutio ecclesiae Genevensis, etc.* (*Opp.* v, 313 sq.)

³ In the Latin: "born for religion."

⁴ Latin, "sense".

⁵ We have rendered the French: the Latin—which was more broadly known—runs as follows: "Quum nemo hominum reperiatur, quamlibet barbarus sit ac toto pectore efferatus, qui non aliquo afficiatur religionis sensu: nos in hunc finem creatos omnes esse constat, ut majestatem agnoscamus creatoris nostri, agnitam suspiciamus, omnique et timore, et amore, et reverentia colamus."

⁶ The Latin runs: Haec igitur praecipua vitae nostrae cura et sollicitudo sit oportet, Deum quaerere et ad eum omni animi studio aspirare, nec alibi nisi in ipso acquiescere.

into Italian, Spanish, English, German, Dacian-Roumanian, Hungarian, and even Greek and Hebrew (including German-Hebrew), it rapidly penetrated every corner of the Reformed world. At least thirteen editions of it in English had been printed before the Westminster Assembly convened. This is the way its opening questions stand in the old-English translation: "What is the principall and chief end of man's life? To know God. What moveth thee to say so? *Because He hath created us and placed us in this world to set foorth his glorie in us:* And it is good reason that we employ our whole life to his glorie, seeing he is the beginning and fountaine thereof. What is, then, *the chief felicitie of man? Even the self-same:* I meane to know God and to have his glorie shewed foorth in us. Why dostest thou call this man's chief felicitie? Because that without it, our condition or state were more miserable than the state of brute beastes. Hereby then we may evidently see that there can no such miserie come unto man, as not to live in the knowledge of God? That is most certaine. But what is the true and right knowledge of God? When a man so knoweth God, that he giveth him due honour (*sic*). Which is the way to honor (*sic*) God aright? It is to put our whole trust and confidence in him; to studie to serve him in obeying his wil; to call upon him in our necessities, seeking our salvation and all good thinges at his hand; and finally to acknowledge both with hearte and mouth that he is the lively fountaine of all goodnesse."⁷ Here the knowledge of God is presented as the chief end and highest good of man;⁸ and this knowledge of God is resolved into the glorification of God in us,⁹ which again is

⁷We have quoted from Dunlop's *Collection*, vol. II, 1722, pp. 141-2. The Catechism is printed also in Bonar's *Catechisms of the Scottish Reformation*, 1866. The French and Latin texts may be consulted in Calvin's *Opp.* vi, pp. 9 sq.

⁸Latin: *praecipuus finis*, and *summum bonum*. French: *la principale fin de la vie humaine*, and *le souverain bien des hommes*.

⁹Latin: *quo glorificetur in nobis*. French: *pour estre glorifie en nous*.

resolved into our trusting Him, appealing to Him, seeking salvation in Him and finding all good things in Him. That is as much as to say that we exist but to glorify and enjoy Him. What is common to both forms of Calvin's catechetical instruction is, thus, that they alike open with the declaration that men have been created for the very end of knowing God, and in knowing Him of glorifying Him, and in glorifying Him of finding their happiness in Him. Here is the root which has borne the fruit of the opening question of the Westminster Catechism.

The late Dr. A. F. Mitchell has, indeed, suggested that we may go behind even Calvin. "The first question or interrogation," he says,¹⁰ "which does not seem to have appeared in the former draft of the committee, is taken from the old English translation of Calvin's Catechism, 'What is the principal and chief end of man's life?'" But the source of the answer to this question he does not consider so simple. "The answer to this question," he suggests, "may be said to combine the answers to Question 3rd in the Catechisms of Calvin and Ames, 'To have His glory showed forth in us', and 'in the enjoying of God', and it may have been taken from them; or the first part may have been taken from Rogers, Ball, or Palmer, and the second from one of the earliest catechisms of the Swiss Reformation, viz., that of Leo Judae, published at Zürich before 1530". If this answer goes back to a period before 1530, it goes, of course, behind Calvin, the earliest of whose Catechisms was not published before 1537, and the first edition of whose *Institutes* itself not before 1536.

It is quite tempting indeed to refer it to Leo Judae's Latin Catechism, the citation from which given by Dr. Mitchell is strikingly like the Shorter Catechism definition. It runs as follows and Dr. Mitchell is fully justified in speaking of it as important in this connection: "Q. Tell me, please, for what end was man created? A. That we may recog-

¹⁰ *The Westminster Assembly*, etc. (Baird Lecture for 1882), ed. 2, Philadelphia, 1897, p. 432.

nize the majesty and goodness of God, the Creator, all good, all great, all wise; and finally enjoy Him forever."¹¹ But quite apart from the reference of the Shorter Catechism definition to this response as its source, Dr. Mitchell's dating is at fault. We do indeed owe to Leo Judae the first important Catechism produced by Reformed Switzerland. This was not, however, his Latin Catechism from which Dr. Mitchell quotes, but his Larger German Catechism,¹² which does not contain anything corresponding to these words. Nor was even it published "before 1530", but not before January, 1534,¹³ while the Shorter German Catechism (1541)¹⁴ followed upon the Latin Catechism and derives from it. The Latin Catechism¹⁵ was prepared for the use

¹¹ Q. Dic, sodes, ad quem finem homo creatus est? R. Ut optimi, maximi ac sapientissimi Dei Creatoris majestatem ac bonitatem agnoscamus, tandemque illo aeternum fruamur.

¹² *Catechismus. Christliche klare vnd einfalte ynleitung in den Willenn vnnnd in die Gnad Gottes, darinn nit nur die Jugend sunder ouch die Eltern vnderricht, wie sy jre kind in den gebotten Gottes, inn Christlichem glauben, vnd rechtem gebätt vnderwysen mögend. Geschriben durch Leonem Jude, diener des worts des Kilchen Zürich.*

¹³ It contains a preface by Bullinger, dated January 3, 1534. On Leo Judae's Catechisms see C. Pestalozzi (1860), in ix. 1 of *Hagenbach's Leben und ausgewählte Schriften der Väter und Begründer der reformirten Kirche*, 10, pp. 56 sq., with the relevant notes on pp. 101 sq.; M. A. Gooszen, *De Heidelbergische Catechismus. Textus Receptus met toelichtende Texten* (1890), pp. 35 sq.; A. Lang, *Der Heidelberger Katechismus und vier verwandte Katechismen* u. s. w. (1907), pp. xx sq.

¹⁴ *Der kürtzer Catechismus. Ein kurtze Christliche underwysung der jugend in erkanntnusz vnnnd gebotten Gottes, im glauben, im gebätt, und anderen notwendigen dingen, von den Dieneren desz worts zü Zürich gestelt in fragens wysz.—Getruckt zu Zürich by Augustin Friesz, im Jar als man zalt M. D. XLI.* It was prepared in accordance with a request from the Zurich Synod of October, 1534 (Pestalozzi, pp. 60 and 102), and although a long, is yet in comparison with the earlier Catechism, a brief document. A. Lang (pp. xxxii sq.) argues that it must have been published as early as 1535 and thus predates the Latin Catechism. But his reasons are not convincing and the phenomena appear to be best accounted for by assuming that both documents were in course of preparation simultaneously and influenced each other. The earliest known issue is from 1541.

¹⁵ *Catechismus. Brevissima Christianae formula, instituendae juventuti Tigurinae catechizandisque rudibus aptata, adeoque in communem*

of the youth in the Latin School at Zurich, and Leo Judae quite frankly explains, in a dedication prefixed to it addressed to Johannes Fries, the rector of that school, that he has freely used in compiling it, "certain *Institutes* of the Christian religion lately (*nuper*) composed by John Calvin", that is to say, Calvin's earlier Catechism, which was published under this title. On the strength of the word "lately" in this dedication, it has been usual to assign this Latin Catechism to 1538, or at latest 1539.¹⁶ There can be no question, therefore, that Leo Judae derives the sentence which Dr. Mitchell quotes from him from Calvin's first Catechism, which he here reduces to catechetical form¹⁷ and redacts to suit his purpose. What interests us most is to observe how, in doing so, he falls upon a form of words which was almost exactly repeated by the Westminster Divines a century later. For the rest, it is also interesting to observe how the same ideas appear in the Shorter German Catechism which was in preparation simultaneously with this Latin Catechism, although it seems not to have been published until a couple of years later. Here they are very much expanded, but preserve the same tone. The Catechism opens with the question, "Since thou art a rational creature, that is to say, a human being, tell me who made thee?" to which the answer is returned: "God made me." Then follows: "How and whereto?" "When I had no existence, He made me, out of goodness and grace, moved thereto by nothing but His unspeakable goodness, that I might be partaker of His great riches and all His goods."¹⁸

omnium piorum utilitatem excusa. Tiguri apud Christophorum Froloverum.

¹⁶ Pestalozzi, p. 103; Gooszen, p. 43; Lang, p. xxxii.

¹⁷ Leo Judae put it into the form of question and answer, which, it will be remembered, Calvin had not done (cf. Pestalozzi, p. 63). It will be borne in mind that the two German Catechisms appeared in German only: there was no Latin version of them (cf. Pestalozzi, p. 101).

¹⁸ Leermeister: Diewyl du ein vernünfftige creatur vnd geschöpfft, namlich ein mensh bist, so sag mir wär hat dich geschaffen? Kind: God hat mich geschaffen. (2) L.: Wie, und warzu? K.: Do ich nüt vun nienen was, hat er mich vsz siner güte vnd gnad erschaffen darzu

And after a lengthy and very beautiful exposition of what it is to be made in God's image, the question is returned to (Q. 7): "To what end did God make thee?—that thou shouldst be always here in this world?" and the answer is given: "The end for which man was created is God,—that he should learn to know Him, love Him alone above all things, and, after this time, enjoy Him forever, in eternal life. Wherefore I should with my heart rise above all creatures, and cling alone to God my Creator."¹⁹ Certainly, if Leo Judae rests on Calvin, he knows how to give the richest expression to the thoughts derived from Calvin, and quite justifies his own description of himself as a bee which, going from flower to flower, gathers the honey for himself. By this beautiful description of the destination of man we are prepared to arrive shortly (Q. 18) at this equally beautiful definition of God, which also has its roots in Calvin: Q. 18. "Tell me what is God?" A. "God is an inexpressible, inexhaustible fountain of all that is good. What we lack we should seek in Him alone; of what afflicts us we should complain to Him alone; to Him alone should we flee in all times of need, in Him alone should we seek help, comfort, shelter and defence. As He has promised to be our God, that is that He will give us all that is good and save us from all that is evil, we should hold and recognize Him as such and trust Him for it."²⁰

jn nüt bewegt hat dann sin vnuszsprächliche güte, dasz ich siner grossen ryctagen vnd aller siner güteren teilhafft wurde.

¹⁹ L.: Zu was end hat dich Gott geschaffen? solt du allweg hie syn in diser wält? K.: Das end darzu der mensch geschaffen ist, ist Gott, den sol er lernen erkennen, jn ob allen dingen allein lieben vnnnd jn nach diesem zyt in ewigem läben ewiglich niessen. Darumm sol ich alle creaturen mit dem herten überstygen, vnn Gott minem schöpffer allein anhangen.

²⁰ Gott ist ein vnuszsprächlicher vnerschöpflicher brunn alles guten. Was vns mangelt söllend wir by jm allein suchen: was vns truckt söllend wir jm allein klagen, zu jm allein söllend wir in allen nöten louffen, by jm allein söllend wir hilff, trost, schutz, vun schirm suchen. Wie er uns verheiszt er wölle vnser Gott syn, das ist, er wölle vns alles guts geben, und alles übels ledig machen, also söllern wir jn dafür haben vnn erkennen, vnd söllend jm des vertrauen, Psal. lxxxi, xci.

It is not to be imagined, of course, that these ideas were the invention of Calvin. They were the property of every Christian heart and especially of all who had learned in the school of Augustine—which is as much as to say of all the leaders of the Reformation movement, whether of high or of low degree. It could not be but that they should find some expression, therefore, apart from Calvin, and even before Calvin, in the numerous catechetical manuals which the new teachers prepared for the instruction of the people. We find, therefore, among the large number of catechisms which begin with questions bringing out what it is to be a Christian, now and then one which carries back the thought to creation itself and begins with making an effort to explain to the people what it is to be a creature of God. “A little book in questions and answers” was printed, for example, somewhere in the middle of the ’twenties (1522-1526), by a certain Petrus Schultz, possibly for the people of Lemgo—but we really know nothing of the man or his flock—which opens as follows: “What art thou? I am a creature. What is a creature? What is made out of nothing. Who made thee? He who is almighty and eternal. For what did He make thee? For His kingdom and to do His will.”²¹ About the same time—or a little later—a schoolmaster of Rothenburg, Valentin Ickelsamer by name, was printing beautiful dialogues for the instruction of children in the great art of knowing themselves and living worthily. One of these, a dialogue between Margaret and Anna, opens thus:²² “Margaret: What art thou? Anna: A rational creature of God, a human being. M.: How

²¹F. Cohrs, *Die evangelischen Katechismusversuche vor Luthers Enchiridion* (in the *Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica*, edited by Karl Kehrbach, vols. XX-XXIV), vol. II (XXI), 1900, p. 211. Cohrs says (p. 209): “Of no catechism do we know so little as of that of Petrus Schultz. We neither know anything certain of the life of the author . . . nor do we know anything of either when it was printed or where it was used.”

²²Cohrs, as cited, I (xx), pp. 138-9. Ickelsamer holds an honorable place in the history of German paedagogy. See Vogel, *Leben und Verdienste V. Ickelsamers*, Leipzig, 1894.

didst thou become a human being and come into existence? A.: God made me and placed a living soul in my flesh, that in this house of exile,²³ born on the earth, it might long after God its creator and apprehend Him".²⁴ Sometimes the two lines of thought are united, with more or less felicity. Thus no less a man than Johannes Brenz, in no less a book than that which has sometimes (though, of course, with only relative accuracy) been called "the first Protestant Catechism" — the *Fragestück des Christlichen Glaubens* of 1528, designed for young children, and hence called the *Catechismus Minor*—begins thus: "What art thou? According to the first birth, I am a rational creature or human being, made by God;²⁵ but according to the new birth, I am a Christian."²⁶ And this opening is almost exactly repeated in a later Catechism of Kaspar Gräter's (1537): "What art thou, my dear child? According to the first birth I am a rational creature or human being, made by God, but according to the new birth, I am a Christian";²⁷ as also, in a still later one by Johann Meckhart (*circa*, 1553 +): "What art thou, my child? According to the first birth, I am a rational creature, a human being, made by God, but according to the second²⁸ and new birth, I am a Christian."²⁹ In Bartholomeus Rosinus' *Short Questions and Answers*, printed in Regensburg in 1581, this double answer still stands, but is diverted from its original purpose and conformed in both elements to the current soteriological motive: "Dear child, what art thou? By reason of³⁰ the bodily birth, I am a condemned sinner, but

²³ Elends, 'exile' or 'misery'. Is there some Origenism here?

²⁴ sich nach Gott jrem schöpffer sehnen vnd jn erkennen solte.

²⁵ The close resemblance of this to the opening of Valentin Ikel-samer's dialogue should not pass unobserved.

²⁶ Cohrs, III, 146.

²⁷ Reu, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Katechismus-unterrichts*. Vol. I, 1904, p. 315. On Brenz and Gräter and the relation of their catechisms see also Cohrs, III. 130, II. 313, 316.

²⁸ *Andern*.

²⁹ Reu, p. 820.

³⁰ *Halben*.

by reason of the spiritual re-birth, I am a saved Christian."³¹ We may perhaps look upon this as a reminiscence of the old Brentzian formula, rephrased under the influence of the prevalent method of catechizing. Other examples of the mixture of the two motives may be found in the Catechisms of Kaspar Loener (1529) and Jacob Othmer (1532), in both of which the idea of the likeness of God is emphasized. The former of these begins as follows: "What art thou? I am a Christian man and a child of God. Whence is man? God made man out of the earth, after His image. How is man God's image? When he is righteous. What man, however, is righteous? He who does righteousness and avoids unrighteousness."³² The latter begins as follows: "What art thou? I am a human being. How dost thou know this? Thus, that I am unrighteous, a sinner and nothing worth. Who made thee? God the Almighty who made the heavens and earth and all things. How did He make thee? After His image. What is the image of God? It is righteousness, holiness, truth, eternal joy and blessedness."³³ Instances such as these of the utilization of the conception which dominates Calvin's Catechisms are clearly more interesting than significant. It may possibly be that Leo Judae knew some of these earlier efforts to prepare spiritual food for the babes of the flock. He was a very busy bee and ranged far for his honey: Bullinger, in the preface he prefixed to Leo Judae's earliest Catechism, tells us that "he did not despise the work of other true and learned servants in the Gospel of Christ"; and "made no shame of transcribing and adopting from them into his own what he found most suitable, as indeed not only the most learned of the ancient doctors did, but also the holy prophets". One would like to think he may have known the dialogues of Valentin Ickelsamer, and one can scarcely doubt that he knew the Smaller Catechism

³¹ Reu, p. 743.

³² Cohrs, III. 471.

³³ Reu, I. 362.

of Brenz: and if he knew them he may well have more or less drawn from them. But it is clear that his main source for these questions, not only in his Latin, but also in his Shorter German Catechism, was Calvin. And we can scarcely suppose Calvin, who obviously is going his own way, was influenced by these earlier manuals.

Calvin, then, it is evident, is the ultimate source of the opening question and answer of the Westminster Shorter Catechism. If Leo Judae is to come into consideration at all, it is only as an intermediary between Calvin and the Westminster formularies. Leo Judae is not, however, the only intermediary which must come into consideration when we begin to ask whether the language of the Westminster Catechisms may not be modified by some of Calvin's successors. There are, for example, the series of Catechisms which were published by John à Lasco in London, and which present very interesting modifications of Calvin's treatment of this topic. Three of these are of interest to us. The first was prepared by Laski for the Friesian Church as early as 1546, but was first printed, in Dutch, by Jan Utenhove, an elder of the Foreign Church of London, in 1551. The second—a much briefer one—was the production on Laski's model of another of Laski's London helpers, Marten Microen (Micronius), and was first printed, in Dutch, at London in 1552. The third, which was in effect an abridgment of the Catechism of 1551, was prepared for the Church at Embden and was first printed in the autumn of 1554, continuing in use until our own day.³⁴ The opening words of the first of these Catechisms,³⁵ which we may call the Friesian Catechism, run as follows: "Why has God created man and endowed him with such great gifts of understanding above all other

³⁴ For à Lasco's catechisms see Lang, pp. xxxix sq.; Goosgen, pp. 55 sq.

³⁵ *De Catechismus, oft Kinder leere, diemen te Londen, inde Duytsehe ghemeynte, is ghebruyekende . . . Ghedruct tot Londen, by Steven Myerdmán. An. 1551. Printed by A. Kuyper Joannis à Lasco Opera, etc., vol. II, 1866, pp. 340 sq.*

creatures? That he might learn to know aright his God and creator, love, fear, laud and praise Him and so become sharer in all His goods."³⁶ In the second, Micronius', or, as we may perhaps call it distinctively, the London Catechism,³⁷ they run: "Whereto hast thou been created by God and placed in the world? In order that my life long I may know and serve God according to the right teaching, and finally may live with Him in heaven forever."³⁸ And in the third, or, as we may call it, the Embden Catechism,³⁹ they run: "Whereto hast thou been created a man? That I should be an image of God, and should know, praise and serve my God and Creator."⁴⁰ What is most striking in these Catechisms is that in both of the forms which were issued in London for the use of the Dutch Church there—as in Leo Judae's Latin Catechism—the two items of glorifying and enjoying God are brought together: man is on earth primarily to know and serve God, but also to become partaker in His glory and to live with Him forever. It is clear that already by the middle of the sixteenth century there was a tradition growing up in the Catechetical manuals deriving from Calvin's fundamental statement to emphasize these two items: as indeed faithfulness to Calvin's statement required should be done. We need not feel surprise, then, that Dr. A. F. Mitchell⁴¹ is able to quote

³⁶ Kuyper, p. 355: Dat hi sijnen God ende Shepper recht soude leeren bekennen, beminnen, vreesen, louen, ende prijsen, ende alder sijnder goeden deelachtich wesen soude.

³⁷ *De Kleyne Catechismus, oft Kinder-leere der Duytscher Ghemeynte, van Londen, de welcke nu hier ende daer verstroyt is.—Gemaect door Marten Micron. . . . Ghedruckt by Gellium Ctematium, Anno 1559.* Printed by A. Lang, pp. 117 sq.

³⁸ Op dat ick God mijn leuen lanck, ten rechten leere kennen ende dienen: enn eyndelick met hem indem hemel leue in der eewicheyt.

³⁹ *Catechismus effte Kinderlehre, tho nütte der Jöget in Ostfriesslandt dorch de Deners des hilligen Godtlicken Wordes tho Embden. Appet korteste vernatet. Ghedruckt te Embden by? Anno MDLIV. Octob. 10.* It is printed by Kuyper, II, 495 sq.

⁴⁰ Kuyper, p. 501: Dat ick ein Bildt Godes scholde syn, unde mynen Godt unde Schepper scholde erkennen lauen ennde denen.

⁴¹ *Catechisms of the Second Reformation, etc., 1886, p. 3.*

Italian and Spanish examples the language of which comes very close indeed to that of the Westminster Catechisms. "To what end was man created?" is asked in the Italian one; and the answer is: "To know and love God and enjoy Him forever";⁴² and the Spanish answer is almost as striking.⁴³

We are naturally more interested, however, in the tradition as it manifested itself in England and Scotland, where, as we have seen, Calvin's Catechism was much used, and indeed in Scotland formed part of the recognized formularies of the Church. This tradition is very rich, and takes many variations upon itself in the hands of the several teachers who attempted to draw up manuals for the instruction of youth. In Scotland, from the Reformation down, there was in use in the grammar schools a *Summula Catechismi*, designed for the training in piety of the youths gathered there, which is supposed to have been the work of Andrew Simpson, master of the grammar school of Perth both before and after the Reformation and first Protestant minister of Dunbar.⁴⁴ Its opening questions run: "Who created man? God. How did He create him? Holy and sound and with dominion over the world. For what end was he created? To serve God."⁴⁵ Less richly the shorter form of John Craig's Catechism begins by asking: "What are we by nature?" and after answering: "The children of God's wrath", proceeds: "Were we thus created?" to respond: "No, for He made us in His own image."⁴⁶ The

⁴² "A che fine é creato l'huomo? Per conoscer, amar, et goder eternamente Deo—*Gagliardi*" (p. 3). *Gagliardi's Catechism* dates from the 16th century (Mitchell, *Catechisms*, p. xx).

⁴³ "Para servir a Dios en esta vida e despues della gozarle en la otra eternamente.—*Spanish*."

⁴⁴ It will be found perhaps in its best form in Dr. Bonar's *Catechisms of the Scottish Reformation*, 1866: and also in Dunlop's *Collection*, II, p. 378, cf. p. 14.

⁴⁵ *Quis hominem creavit? Deus. Qualem creavit eum? Sanctum et sanum, mundique dominum. In quem usus creatus est? Ut Deo inserviret.*

⁴⁶ Bonar, p. 275; Dunlop, II, p. 368.

essence of the matter, however, is still preserved there. The tradition of Andrew Simpson's manual, however, appears to dominate Scottish Catechetics: his method of putting things at least reasserts itself in the Westminster period in a couple of documents issued almost or quite with authority in the Scottish Church. "The A, B, C, or A Catechisme for yong children appoynted by act of the church and councill of Scotland To be learned in all families and Lector Schooles in the said Kingdome" seems to have first appeared in 1641. It opens thus: "Who made man? God. To what estate made he him? Perfectly holy in body and soul."⁴⁷ The "New Catechisme according to the Forme of the Kirk of Scotland"—which, as Dr. Mitchell says,⁴⁸ "was published in England just before the Assembly entered on this part of its labors"—that is, in 1644—"and (I can hardly doubt) in the hope that it might tend to facilitate them"—begins thus: "Who made the Heavins and the Earth, and all things contained in them? God. Whereof was man created? Of the earth. To what end was he made? To serve God."⁴⁹

The English tradition takes a slightly different form and keeps closer, on the whole, to Calvin's example. In most of the manuals which begin, after the fashion of Calvin's Catechisms and the best Reformed tradition, with the end of man's existence, the stress is laid on the glorifying of God: and when there is an addition to this it ordinarily takes the form of reference to the securing of salvation. Occasionally the soteriological motive seems to absorb all interest. Thus, for example, in Dr. William Whittaker's *Short Sum of Christianity delivered by way of Catechism* (London, 1630) we read: "What is the only thing whereto all our endeavors ought to be directed? To seek everlasting felicity or salvation in this life, that we may fully enjoy it in the life to come. What is salvation? Perfect happi-

⁴⁷ Mitchell, *Catechisms*, pp. 267 sq.

⁴⁸ P. xxxiv.

⁴⁹ Mitchell, pp. 277 sq.

ness of soul and body forever."⁵⁰ More frequently we have the glorification of God set forth alone as the end of all human existence. Thus, for example, in Dawson's *Short Questions and Answeres*, etc., of 1584, the opening question and answer are: "Wherefore hath God made, sanctified and preserved you? To seek His glory, Romans xi. 30"; and in a list of "Articles very necessarie to be knowne of all yong schollers of Christe's School" appended to "Certaine Necessarie Instructions meet to be taught the yonger sort before they come to be partakers of the Holy Communion", emanating obviously from the same Puritan circles, the first is "that the end of our creation is to glorify God". More striking still, considered as a forerunner of the Westminster Catechisms, are the first question and answer in another formulary published in London in 1584, under the title of: *The Ground of Christianity, composed in a dialogue between Paul and Titus, containing all the principall poyntes of our Salvation in Christ*. These run: "What is the chiefest duety of a Christian man in this life? The chiefest duety of man, and not of man onely, but of all the creatures in the world in their nature, is to set forth the glory of God." The very method of statement of the Westminster formularies is here.⁵¹ Later examples of the same mode of statement are provided by Paget's *Summe of Christian Religion* and Openshaw's *Summe of Christian Religion*: "Wherefore hath God made you? To seek His glory."⁵² When there is a double statement it is sometimes, to be sure, in the form given it by Thomas Sparks in his *A Brief and Short Catechism*, etc.: "To what end hath he made man? To the setting forth of his own glorie, and that man should serve him."⁵³ But more frequently, as we have said, at least in 17th century documents, the double statement draws together the glorifying of God and the salvation of the soul. One of the most influential of the Cate-

⁵⁰ Mitchell, p. lxxxii.

⁵¹ For all three of these instances, see Mitchell, p. lxxix.

⁵² Mitchell, p. 3.

⁵³ Mitchell, p. lxxix.

chisms of this type was undoubtedly the Short Catechism of John Ball, which was published in his early ministry and had reached its nineteenth impression in 1642. Its opening question and answer are: "What ought to be the chiefe and continuall care of every man in this life? To glorifie God and save his soul."⁵⁴ Similarly we read in William Syme's *Sweet Milk of Christian Doctrine* (1617): "What is the chief and principal end of our being, etc.? That we may glorify God, and work out our own salvation."⁵⁵ And again, in *A Short Catechism for Householders*, published in London, 1624: "What should be the chief desire and endeavor of every Christian in this life? To seek the glory

⁵⁴ Mitchell, p. 65. It is, no doubt, requisite to distinguish between Ball's *A Short Catechism containing the Principles of Religion*, and his larger manual, called *A Short Treatise, containing all the Principal Grounds of Christian Religion*. It is the latter which is perhaps commonly meant when "Ball's Catechism" is spoken of: but it is the former and briefer compend which is quoted here. The larger treatise, however, is simply the smaller one expanded. Incorporating the whole of the smaller one, it follows up each question with additional ones designed to develop more fully its contents. It therefore begins with the same question and answer: "What ought to be the chief and continual care of every man in this life? To glorifie God and save his soul." Then, after developing what is meant by God's glory, it is asked (in the seventh question), "What is it then to glorifie God?" and answered: "To glorifie God is inwardly in heart and outwardly in word and action to acknowledge God to be such an one as he hath revealed himself." Afterward (in the ninth question) it is asked: "What is it to take care of our salvation?" and answered: "To take care of our salvation is so to live here, that we may live with the Lord hereafter." In the next question the reasons why we should take care of our salvation are adduced, among which stand: "(6) The soul came from God, and is after a restlesse manner carried to seek and desire communion with God. (7) A desire to be happy is naturally planted in the heart of all men by God himself," and especially "(8) God is infinite in goodness, the highest of all things that are to be desired. Therefore we should earnestly set our affections upon things that are above and infinitely desire the enjoying of God's presence in heaven". It may be questioned whether we need to look beyond this larger form of Ball's Catechism to explain the language of the opening question of the Westminster Catechism and its answer. It is all here in substance. The tenth edition of this Catechism was published in 1635, the fifteenth in 1656.

⁵⁵ Mitchell, p. 3.

of God and to obtain happiness and salvation of his own soul."⁵⁶ No two Catechisms, probably, are of more significance for the preparation of the Westminster Catechisms than those of Herbert Palmer (ed. 1, 1640; ed. 4, 1644) and of Ezekiel Rogers (1642). The former of these was not only the work of that member of the Westminster Assembly who had most to do with its catechetical labors, but obviously supplied a starting point for them. And the latter, Dr. Mitchell thinks, is on the whole, in its general structure, most like the Westminster Shorter Catechism of all earlier manuals. Both belong to the class we have now under view. Palmer's begins: "What is a man's greatest businesse in this world? A man's greatest businesse in this world is to glorifie God and save his owne soul. How shall a man come to glorifie God and save his owne soul? They that will glorifie God and save their own souls must needs learn to know God and believe in him and serve him."⁵⁷ Here is again the very flavor of the Westminster Catechisms. Rogers' begins: "Wherefore hath God given to man a reasonable and an immortall soul? That he above all other creatures should seek God's glory and his own salvation. Where is he taught how this is to be done? In the Scriptures or Word of God."⁵⁸

There was tradition enough, then, beneath the Westminster divines as they sat down to frame the first question and answer of their Catechisms: and we cannot fail to see that they were floating on the bosom of this tradition. The tradition does not, however, quite account for their first question and answer. They must themselves be taken into consideration for that. The third question and answer of Calvin's Catechism was undoubtedly in their minds, and from it they no doubt directly derived the question. It would seem that they got the first half of the answer directly from Palmer. But the second half of his answer

⁵⁶ Mitchell, p. lxxxiv.

⁵⁷ Mitchell, p. 99.

⁵⁸ Mitchell, p. 55.

they improve on. Whence did they draw their improvement? From the third question of William Ames' Catechism: "in the enjoying of God",—as Dr. Mitchell thinks possible?⁵⁹ Or "from an Italian Catechism of the sixteenth century", as Dr. Mitchell thought worth suggesting in 1886?⁶⁰ Or from Leo Judae, as he thought more likely in 1897?⁶¹ Of the three suggestions the most plausible seems to us to be William Ames, whose work was certainly in the hands of the Divines, and may have suggested this heightening and broadening of the current: "and to save his soul." But, in any event, this heightening and broadening conception was already present in Calvin's Catechism, and it may very well be that there was no conscious dependence here on any intermediary, but the Westminster Divines simply did what Leo Judae, Gagliardi and Ames had done before them—found a felicitous brief expression for Calvin's thought. Or, if we must seek some intermediary between Calvin and the Westminster divines, it would seem enough to bear in mind that Ball's *A Short Treatise* was in the hands of all the members of the Assembly, and provided them with language which asserted it to be the chief duty of man "to glorify God" and "infinitely to desire the enjoyment of God's presence in heaven".

The peculiarity of this first question and answer of the Westminster Catechisms, it will be seen, is the felicity with which it brings to concise expression the whole Reformed conception of the significance of human life. We say the whole Reformed conception. For justice is not done that conception if we say merely that man's chief end is to glorify God. That certainly: and certainly that first. But according to the Reformed conception man exists not merely that God may be glorified in him, but that he may delight in this glorious God. It does justice to the subjective as well as to the objective side of the case. The Reformed con-

⁵⁹ *Baird Lecture*, ed. 2, p. 432: *Catechisms*, p. xx.

⁶⁰ *Catechisms*, p. xx, meaning Gagliardi: see above.

⁶¹ *Baird Lecture*, ed. 2, p. 632.

ception is not fully or fairly stated if it be so stated that it may seem to be satisfied with conceiving man merely as the object on which God manifests His glory—possibly even the passive object in and through which the Divine glory is secured. It conceives man also as the subject in which the gloriousness of God is perceived and delighted in. No man is truly Reformed in his thought, then, unless he conceives of man not merely as destined to be the instrument of the Divine glory, but also as destined to reflect the glory of God in his own consciousness, to exult in God: nay, unless he himself delights in God as the all-glorious One.

Read the great Reformed divines. The note of their work is exultation in God. How Calvin, for example, gloried and delighted in God! Every page rings with this note, the note of personal joy in the Almighty, known to be, not the all-wise merely, but the all-loving too. Take, for example, such a passage as the exposition of what true and undefiled religion is, which closes the second chapter of the First Book of the *Institutes*. He who comes really and truly to know God, we are here told, rejoices that God is the governor of all things, and flees to Him as his guardian and protector, putting his whole trust in Him. "Because he knows Him to be the author of all good things, whenever he is in distress or want, he flees at once to His protection, sure of His aid; because he is persuaded that He is good and merciful, he relies on Him with assured confidence, doubting not that in His clemency there is prepared a remedy for all his ills; because he recognizes Him as his Lord and Father, he is determined to acknowledge His government in everything, to revere His majesty, to promote His glory, to obey His mandates; because he perceives Him to be a just judge whose severity is armed for the punishment of iniquities, he keeps His tribunal always in view and in fear restrains himself from provoking His wrath. But he is not so terrified by the sense of His justice as to wish to withdraw from it, even were escape possible: he rather loves Him not less as the punisher of the wicked

than as the benefactor of the good, since he understands that it belongs to His glory not less that punishment should be visited upon the impious and abandoned than that the reward of eternal life should be conferred on the righteous. And moreover, it is not alone from dread of punishment that he restrains himself from sinning, but because he loves and reverences God as his Father, and honors and worships Him as his Lord, and even though there were no such thing as hell would abhor offending Him."

It is not, however, Calvin who first strikes this note, and there is another in whose thought God is even more constantly present—Calvin's master, Augustine. This is the burden, for example, of Augustine's *Confessions*, and its classical expression is to be found in that great sentence which sums up the whole of the *Confessions'* teaching: "Thou hast made us for Thyself, O Lord: and our heart is restless till it finds its rest in Thee." For there is nothing the soul can need which it cannot find in God. "Let God," he exhorts in another of those great sentences which stud his pages—"Let God be all in all to thee, for in Him is the entirety of all that thou lovest." And then, elaborating the idea, he proceeds: "God is all in all to thee: if thou dost hunger He is thy bread; if thou dost thirst He is thy drink; if thou art in darkness, He is thy light; . . . if thou art naked, He is thy garment of immortality, when this corruption shall put on incorruption and this mortal shall put on immortality."⁶² Delight in God, enjoyment of God—this⁶³ is the recurrent refrain of all Augustine's

⁶² *Tract.* 13 in *Ev. Johan.* 5: Totum sit tibi Deus, quia horum quae diligis totum tibi est.

⁶³ Cf. J. Martin, *St. Augustine*, p. 238: "To enjoy God, *frui Deo*, is an expression which Augustine adopted from the very beginning of his teaching. He employed it continually: he said 'The soul organizes its life in such a fashion as to be able to enjoy God: for it is thus that it is happy' (*De diversis Quest. lxxxiii* [388-395], Q xxx: Migne, vi. 20)." "The sense of *frui* is clear in itself: Augustine defines it thus: Quid enim est aliud quod dicimus frui, nisi praesto habere quod diliges (*De lib. arbitr.* I. iii. 4, Migne, I. 1312)." In the treatise *De Beata Vita*, II. 10, Migne, I. 964, he says that "the really happy man

speech of God: delight in God here, enjoyment of God forever.⁶⁴ Would he know the way of life,—in words which his great pupil was to repeat after him, he tells us we must come to know God and ourselves, God in His love that we may not despair, ourselves in our unworthiness that we may not be proud.⁶⁵ And would we knew what the goal is—what is that but the eternal enjoyment of this God of love? “When he who is good and faithful in these miseries shall have passed from this life to the blessed life, then will truly come to pass what is now wholly impossible—that a man may live as he will. For he will not will to live evilly in the midst of that felicity, nor will he will anything that

‘enjoys God’. The perfect satisfaction of souls, that is to say, the happy life, consists in knowing perfectly and devoutly by what we are led to the truth, what truth we should enjoy, and by what means we are joined to the sovereign mode”. Cf. Reuter, *Augustinische Studien* (1887), pp. 464-5, where also some criticisms are offered. In Augustine’s view, Reuter tells us, God is the transcendent *τέλος* not only for knowledge, but for all action. Ille omnis appetitionis finis (*De Civ. Dei*, X. iii.). As the “summum bonum” he is the sole “res” to be enjoyed: all else is to be used. “The things of the world have no end of their own; their end is realized through the overcoming of (independent) existence by means of man, standing between God and the world, to whom is given as his end the enjoyment of the ‘Res’ which God is.”

⁶⁴ Cf. E. Portalié (Vacant-Mangenot’s *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, I. 2454): “The other fathers have exalted the majesty of the power of the Creator. Augustine is the first to be ravished by the beauty of God; *ropiebor od Te decore Tuo* (*Confess.*, VII. xvii, 23). No man has ever written on this subject pages so inflamed. This beauty, ‘always old and always new’, inspires the enraptured flights of the *Soliloquies*, and the passionate cries of the *Confessions*. ‘Then saw I, in spirit, O my God, Thy invisible beauties in the visible things Thou has summoned from nothing’. And after contemplating them his soul preserves through life a glowing memory of love: ‘*redditur solitis non meum ferebom nisi amantem memoriom*’, etc. (*Confess.*, *ibid.*). To other minds the spectacle of the world reveals the *existence* of God; but for him, in this sublime appeal to all created things, it is on the beauty of God that he interrogates them. Their response is an invitation to love God: ‘but the heaven and the earth and all that in them is, lo! from every quarter they bid me love Thee’ (*Confess.*, X. xv. 8). And he adds that to interrogate them he has only to look upon them: their own beauty is their response.”

⁶⁵ *De Trinitate*, IV, 1, 2.

shall be lacking, nor shall there be anything lacking which he shall have willed. Whatever shall be loved will be present; and nothing will be longed for which shall not be there. Everything which will be there will be good, and the Supreme God will be the supreme good, and will be present for those to enjoy who love Him; and what is the most blessed thing of all is that it will be certain that it will be so forever."⁶⁶

The distinction of the opening question and answer of the Westminster Shorter Catechism is that it moves on this high plane and says all this in the compressed compass of a dozen felicitous words: "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever." Not to enjoy God, certainly, without glorifying Him, for how can He to whom glory inherently belongs be enjoyed without being glorified? But just as certainly not to glorify God without enjoying Him—for how can He whose glory is His perfections be glorified if He be not also enjoyed?

⁶⁶ *De Trinitate*, XIII. vii. 10.

Princeton.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.