

Prof. J.W. Hofmeyr
Extraordinary Professor,
Department of Church
History, University
of the Free State,
South Africa.
jinhof@mweb.co.za

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/actat.v36i2.2>
ISSN 1015-8758 (Print)
ISSN 2309-9089 (Online)

Acta Theologica 2016
36(2):19-48

© UV/UFS



JOHANNES HOORNBEECK, A MONUMENTAL 17TH CENTURY DUTCH THEOLOGIAN: CONTINUITIES IN HIS THINKING ON DOCTRINE AND LIFE

ABSTRACT

In this article on the 17th-century Johannes Hoornbeeck, the initial focus is on the Further Reformation of which Hoornbeeck was a representative. The focus then switches to Hoornbeeck himself: the story of his life, of his written legacy and of Hoornbeeck as a 17th-century theologian and representative of the Further Reformation. This first article focuses especially on his contributions in the field of practical theology and homiletics, polemics and pastoral theology. In a later article, the focus will move to his contributions as a systematic theologian, as an historian, as a missiologist, and as a socially engaged theologian with an irenic and ecumenical orientation, in spite of him being a strong polemicist. Though some aspects related to scholasticism are already raised in the current article, a further and deeper analysis of scholastic aspects in his thinking will be highlighted in the second article.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is fitting to focus on some continuities with regard to the Reformation and Further Reformation, and more specifically to the reformation of doctrine and life in different times and contexts. Already in 1992, the Dutch theologian K. Runia (1992:42) very aptly described this continuity in the following vein:

Aan het einde van de 16de en het begin van de 17de eeuw zijn verschillende leiding-gevende figuren van mening dat de Reformatie van de 16de eeuw niet "af" is, en dat wel naar twee kanten: die van het zedelijk handelen en die van het innerlijk leven. Te veel mensen die de gereformeerde religie hebben aangenomen, leven een werelds en oppervlakkig leven. In de geschriften van de eerste leiders van de Nadere Reformatie [Further Reformmation, JWH] vinden we dan ook een dubbele nadruk: op de levensheiligeing en op de werking van de Geest in het innerlijk.

He continues by saying that the Further Reformation did not fall from heaven: it had links with Puritanism in England and Scotland, and with Pietism in Germany. This era can, in some ways, also be regarded as the beginning of the idea of individualism in the Western World.

In studying Johannes Hoornbeeck as a representative of the Further Reformation, the prime focus of this article is, therefore, on the Further Reformation, in defining it as a subdivision of the Post-Reformation period. The Further Reformation implied (after the period of the Reformation and Orthodoxy) a so-called "radical" reformation and even something of a correction, in the sense that it boils down to the "reformation of doctrine and life". Possible other ways of defining it is the "further reformation of church, state and society in word and deed" or a movement in the Dutch Reformed Church in the 17th and 18th centuries: in the absence of a living faith the personal experience of faith and godliness were made matters of central importance (Brienen 1989).

The theological dimensions of this specific trend of spirituality or, to put it differently, the walking with God, have definitely not yet been fully uncovered or disclosed. Aspects such as its links to patristic, scholastic and reformed theology still need far more attention. All of this will, it is hoped, contribute to encourage further studies and research in the particular field of the Further Reformation, and more specifically in its early or classical phase.

Hoornbeeck himself was part of the Voetian circle based in mid-17th-century Utrecht. This circle was the nuclear grouping within the classical phase of the Further Reformation. Some of the prime players in this group were Voetius, Hoornbeeck, Essenius, Amesius, and Nethenus (Van der Linde 1954).

The relevance and importance of Post-Reformation Theology and within it also Further Reformation Theology lie in the fact that it mainly formed the basis of Modern Orthodoxy and Evangelical Theology of later centuries (Brienen et al. 1993:17-23).

Besides the brief focus on the Further Reformation, I also wish to focus on the life of Johannes Hoornbeeck (1617-1666). The question is raised as to whether he was indeed a monumental figure in the Further Reformation. This article specifically focuses on Hoornbeeck as the practical theologian and homiletic, the polemicist and then the pastor. I will discuss some of the essential aspects of Hoornbeeck's contribution, as contained in his publications on these topics, after which I wish to explore some possible continuities in his thinking and indicate the scriptural character and relevance of Hoornbeeck's contributions.

2. MORE COMPREHENSIVE AND CHALLENGING BIOGRAPHIES

In our times, the need for producing more comprehensive biographies that attend to deeper issues rather than provide plain narrative biographies, is constantly growing. Various challenges will, however, have to be met in this exercise.

A first challenge is to have a clear understanding of the prevailing context in which a specific person lived and worked. The period of the so-called Further Reformation, of which Johannes Hoornbeeck was a representative and part, is a very interesting one, but it also requires a deeper understanding in order to fully place it within 17th-century Post-Reformation studies. The seeking of some balance between Christian belief and Christian life or witness in this period of time provides a better understanding not only of the broader background but also of the immediate context in which the Further Reformation developed as a fairly important theological offspring and effect of Reformed Orthodoxy.

In addition to detailed biographical information, a second major challenge is getting an overview of the oeuvre of a person in as much as it applies and has a bearing on a comprehensive biography.

An interesting aspect of producing more comprehensive and exciting biographies is the challenge of producing a psychobiography. This boils down to studying the uniqueness of a personality, his/her psychological development, and the humanity of a certain personality. However, one must be careful not to only indicate psychological aspects in the development of a certain personality; many other factors such as genetics, context and opportunities also play a role in the complex making of a person into what s/he happens to be.

Another challenge for the writer of any comprehensive biography is that of objectivity. I cannot explain objectivity better than one of the great scholars of 17th-century Post-Reformation studies, the American Richard Muller:

Objectivity arises out of a willingness to let the materials of history speak in their own terms while the historian, at the same time, exercises a combination of critical judgment and careful restraint. (O)bjectivity is not measured by a canon of absolute truth; it arises as a standard of the relationship between data and its interpretation (Bradley & Muller 1995:49).

A last challenge is that of somehow producing an intellectual biography. The essence of such a biography is that it forsakes the need for only basic chronological structure, but rather develops a narrative of a life through the conceptual analysis of the person's motives and beliefs within the world of ideas.

It can sometimes easily be forgotten that ideas are the actions and instruments of real people, whose identities and whose lives cannot be reduced to a set of abstract principles. It is also true of the church that it trades in ideas, that even blood has been spilled over ideas, and that historians of the church must inevitably take ideas with the utmost seriousness. The development of, for instance, Reformed orthodoxy is the result of a complex interplay of intellectual and material factors. There is, of course, the inherited linguistic and conceptual tradition of past doctrine, which brings with it its own logical and rhetorical conventions. But then there are philosophical traditions, pedagogical methods, library holdings to consider. In addition to these, we might add the social context, the shifting sands of social psychology, the personal experiences of particular individual thinkers, and the networks of formal and informal personal relationships that existed in every different context (Trueman 2013:xxvii-xxviii).

It is in harmony with some of the above challenges that I now wish to describe and evaluate the life, work and contribution of Johannes Hoornbeeck, a representative of the 17th-century Further Reformation.

3. THE STORY OF HOORNBEECK'S LIFE

In this next subsection, the focus will be on Johannes Hoornbeeck and some aspects of his biography. The first subdivision will provide some insight into the pre-academic teaching phase of his life and work. In the second subdivision, the focus will more specifically be on the academic teaching phase of his life. This in itself will be subdivided into the Utrecht and Leiden subsections (Hofmeyr 1975:36-44).

Some of the deeper questions one can ask in a biographical survey such as this of Hoornbeeck include, for instance: How did the prevailing context influence Hoornbeeck. The realisation of a balance between Christian belief and Christian life can be very helpful in this respect. It will, however, be difficult to establish a psychobiography of Hoornbeeck. Especially the challenge of coming to some conclusions on his psychological development will not be easy, because sources in terms of his childhood, his schooling and his relations both in family and friendship contexts are, to a large extent, lacking. To eventually develop an intellectual biography of Hoornbeeck is possibly the most challenging undertaking: it calls for an analysis of the person's motives and beliefs within the context of ideas.

Hoornbeeck was indeed something of a monumental figure. Even the beautiful painting of him done in 1645 by his fellow Haarlemmer, the artist and great master Frans Hals, reflects his greatness and his learnedness. For the proper understanding of Hoornbeeck as a monumental figure, it is essential to focus not only on his theology, but also on his life and work (Brienen 2008:9-19, 83-85).

Hoornbeeck was born during the so-called "Twaalfjarig bestand" or truce of the "Eighty Years War" (Dutch Revolt) (1568-1648) in the Northern Netherlands and Europe. At the end of the 16th century, the colonial power Spain had a glorious century behind it, but a difficult future ahead with much resistance against its rule. Due to financial bankruptcy, the Spanish had little capability of reacting to these forces of resistance such as the so-called Dutch Revolt. The Dutch fought for the freedom of religion and progressively rejected the idea of being ruled by a colonial force and by the Spanish king. The Dutch also refused to recognise Margaret of Parma, the Governess of the Low Countries. Under the great Dutch landowner, William the Silent, the rebellion slowly developed into a war. In spite of a truce between 1610-1622, the period when Hoornbeeck was born, the lengthy war again resumed. While the Thirty Years War was concurrently fought in Central Europe (1618-1648), the Dutch were ultimately victorious in the Eighty Years War by putting the Spanish immersion to an end in the Dutch territories, after many years of conflict and fighting.

The exact date of Hoornbeeck's birth is 4 November 1617 in the well-known Dutch city of Haarlem. He was born as the oldest son to Tobias Hoornbeeck (also born in Haarlem in 1588 and Janneke (or Jacqueline) Baerts (born in 1596 in Wesel). Tobias was a wealthy businessman and merchant who belonged to an original Flemish family who fled their Flemish motherland on account of religious persecution in 1548. Johannes, the eldest of nine children in this marriage, was christened on 22 November 1617. At the age of six, he was already studying Latin and, at thirteen, he

was quite knowledgeable in the classical field. On account of his youth, he continued his preparatory education in his home city of Haarlem for a further two years.

Hereafter, Hoornbeeck enrolled, most probably on 15 April 1633, as a theological student at the well-known University of Leiden, where he was educated by, among others, Claudio Salmasius in Classics, Daniel Heisius in Literature, Constantin l'Empereur and Jacob Gotius in Eastern Languages, Franco Burgerdijk in Philosophy, as well as Antonius Thysius and Antonius Walaeus in Religious Studies and Homiletics. Under the influence of his professor in Old Eastern Languages, he developed an interest in the Jewish people as well as in the relationship between the church and Israel. In these years, Hoornbeeck, influenced by Walaeus, presumably experienced his first interest in missionary work. Two years later, in 1635, Hoornbeeck was forced to leave Leiden on account of a plague epidemic. He went to Utrecht where he came into contact with Gisbertus Voetius, and continued attending lectures by the latter until September 1635 when he returned to Leiden. The epidemic had ended there.

After the death of his father in February 1637, Hoornbeeck returned to Haarlem. He stopped his studies provisionally, while staying with his mother and siblings in their family home. After successfully completing his preparatory examination in 1638, he was declared a candidate for the ministry. On 1 March 1639, he was ordained as a minister in the "Dutch congregation under the Cross" at Mülheim on the Rhine, near Cologne in Germany. On account of problems caused primarily by Roman Catholics, he was forced to return to The Netherlands after ministering in Mülheim for five years.

During his ministry in Mülheim, Hoornbeeck most probably continued with his studies, and graduated with a doctorate in Religious Studies, under the guidance of Professor De Maets, on 21 December 1643. On 19 February 1644, he received a calling to Maastricht, in the south of The Netherlands, and, on 3 March, to Graft, in the north of The Netherlands. He accepted the invitation to Maastricht, but before he could depart for Maastricht, he was offered a professorial position in Theology at the Utrecht Hogeschool, as the successor to Schotanus who passed away on 6 April 1644. In the meantime, on 15 May 1644, he was also offered a professorship in Theology at the Illustere School at Harderwyk. He eventually chose the former and departed for Utrecht on 4 July. On his arrival, he was welcomed with a Greek poem by Antonius Aemilius. On 6 July 1644, Hoornbeeck held his inaugural address, titled *Oratio inauguralis ad susceptionem Professionis de Studio SS Theologiae*, in which he spoke about theological studies in the wider sense. He presented a complete exposition of the areas that

should be studied along with the original languages. Five areas should receive attention, namely the Word, dogmatics, controversy, church law, and church history. Regarding, for instance, controversy, which was most probably his major field of specialisation, he took to task the widest regard: not only must the truth be protected against false doctrine and heresy, but piety must be protected against the inundation of vice and crime and concealed of open atheism, as well as against hypocrisy and the power of evil, and then also passionately and ardently.

Herewith the Utrecht period of Hoornbeeck's academic career started and would continue until 1654. For Hoornbeeck, to confess and to witness was a challenge or in some ways to fight a battle, and this shaped him into, for instance, a polemicist. In scanning the list of his written works, one realises how often the term "controversy", or synonyms thereof, appears in the titles of his books. Hoornbeeck's 17th-century biographer, D Stuartus, rightly declared shortly after Hoornbeeck's death that he actively practised polemics.

On 27 July 1645, Hoornbeeck, besides being a professor, was ordained as an elder, as was normally the case, and, on 25 October 1645, as a minister in Utrecht. Despite some objections regarding the simultaneous management of the different offices, he discharged the tasks with great dedication.

In Utrecht, Hoornbeeck belonged to the prominent followers of Voetius and, along with Essenijs, he belonged to the best scholars and eventually colleagues of Voetius. Voetius himself mentioned Hoornbeeck frequently in his writings. Hoornbeeck, the diligent scholar, became the enthusiastic colleague with whom Voetius remained in a spiritual unity for over ten years. As former student and friend of Voetius, he simultaneously adhered to Calvinism and, more specifically, to Calvinist Orthodoxy. He remained a true follower of Voetius in his diligence for the *praxis pietatis* or practical faith. He was also a scholar of great format: he mastered thirteen languages, as well as modern languages such as Hebrew, Greek, Chaldean, Arabic, and Syrian. In this respect, Hoornbeeck was exceptionally well equipped for his task as polemicist, church historian, and exegete.

On account of his efficiency therein, the interpretation of the Old Testament was Hoornbeeck's first commission at Utrecht. With the declaration of the seventh chapter of the *Cum digressione ad controversias Judaicas*, Hoornbeeck started his lectures at Utrecht. These lectures were enlivened by a strong pastoral tendency. In addition, Hoornbeeck was gifted with an exceptional historical aptitude and interest. Although there was yet no question of official lectures in church history, Hoornbeeck paid a great deal of attention to the subject by addressing various historical themes.

His ten years of service in Utrecht were happy years. In the spring of 1650, he married Anna Bernard, the daughter of a businessman from Amsterdam, and they had two sons (Isaac and Hendrik Emilius) and a daughter (Anna). Hoornbeeck was also highly regarded and well known to the so-called leadership of the Northern Netherlands, the House of Orange. Together with Voetius, they defended the Reformed faith and the further realisation of the early or first phase of the Further Reformation. Hoornbeeck disputed the lack of truth with, among others, the Remonstrants, the Socinians, and the Coccejans.

In 1653, Hoornbeeck was invited to move to the University of Leiden, but both Voetius and the local Church Council wanted him to remain in Utrecht. He moved to Leiden in 1654 only after a long period of serious consideration. He gave his inaugural lecture in Leiden on 9 July 1654. He was also very active in academia and in church circles. This period of his life was often characterised by various theological disputes and by physical weaknesses due to illness. While his body was suffering from kidney stones and gout in the foot, he got involved in various disputes, and with some of his colleagues such as Heidanus and Coccejus. These conflicts were about a somewhat stricter adherence to the Sabbath and the Sunday as a day of rest, and some of the rationalistic Cartesian trends in the Faculty of Theology at Leiden. These painful experiences diminished his physical strength and he eventually passed away on Sunday 1 September 1666. He was buried in grave 106 in the so-called Middle Church section of the Peters Church in Leiden.

As was the norm with such an event, a colleague normally delivered a funeral oration. Initially, Coccejus was invited, but he declined. Eventually, Heidanus was willing to deliver the oration. However, a copy of his funeral oration could not be found in the Special Collections Library of the Leiden University library. This was most probably due to the fact that Hoornbeeck's stint at Leiden was characterised by a level of conflict. Only two references to Hoornbeeck's death and the payment of his salary to his wife could be traced in the Special Collections Library.

It is important to realise that Hoornbeeck was not only an ivory tower academic, but he also had a deep spiritual awareness and commitment. In addition, he also felt close to the injustices of those in society who were abused by public systems and practices. An excellent example of this is his sharp criticism of the unrealistic high interest rates of the so-called Lombardian Loan Bank of Utrecht, run by the City Council of Utrecht in the 1640s. He even delivered a sermon on this issue in Utrecht on Sunday 21 January 1646, based on Sunday 42's question and answer in the Heidelberg

Catechism. In spite of the City Council's dissatisfaction with Hoornbeeck's resistance against this practice, the Loan Bank closed shortly afterwards.

In concluding this biographical overview of the life of Johannes Hoornbeeck (sometimes spelled Hoornbeek or Horenbeek), it is clear that the prevailing socio-economic, philosophical and theological contexts did indeed very markedly influence him. At that time, Dutch society experienced the so-called Golden Age, which meant that, in many respects, the society was at the peak of its development. Furthermore, one did manage to reflect, in a limited way, on Hoornbeeck's relationships with family, friends and colleagues, although it is difficult to really gauge, for instance, his childhood psychological development. It is only when one analyses his thinking that one fully understands his motives and beliefs.

4. STORY OF HOORNBEECK'S WRITTEN LEGACY

Our focus at this stage will refer to some of the most important publications in the amazingly extensive oeuvre of Hoornbeeck in as much as it applies to the specific focus of this article, that is on Hoornbeeck as a practical theologian and homiletic, on Hoornbeeck as a polemicist, and on Hoornbeeck as a pastoral theologian. The productivity of this brilliant theologian during a relatively short life-span was bewilderingly high. This impression is confirmed when a fleeting survey is made of his nearly forty publications, some of which are exceptionally comprehensive. I will only list his most important publications that are relevant to the focus of this article and that are subdivided in his periods of service at the Dutch universities of Utrecht and Leiden.

4.1 The Utrecht period

Some of the major publications, with the above specific focus on this period of Hoornbeeck's life and career, include the following. The focus of these publications ranges from his inaugural lecture through to polemical works against the Roman Catholics, the Schwenkfeldians, and the Socinians. These publications also include some spiritual literature such as, for instance, on spiritual desertions and the *ars moriendi* or the 'art of dying'. The publications are listed in chronological order according to dates of publication (Hofmeyr 1975:223-224):

- a. *Disputationes XIV Anti-Judaicae (Utrecht, 1644.)*
- b. *Oratio Inauguralis de Studio S Theologiae (Utrecht, 1644).*
- c. *Disputationes Theologicae de Ratione Concionandi (Utrecht, 1645).*

Hofmeyr Hoornbeeck, a monumental 17th century Dutch theologian

- d. *De Paradoxis et heterodoxis Weigelianis Commentarius, ubi et de Swencfeldo, aliisque similis indolis* (Utrecht, 1646).
- e. *Gisbertus Voetii Disputaty van geesteliche verlatingen, uit de Latynse tale in onse Nederlantse overgezet, voortgezet door Johannes Hoornbeeck* (Utrecht, 1646).
- f. *Korte en naardere verdediginge van de waarde Kerk, gestelt tegen den Schryver van de Paepsche Kerk onde de naam van Christophorus van Ouwerkerck* (Utrecht, 1649).
- g. *Overtuigde vermeteheid van Christophorus van Ouwerkerck in zijn verlore proces* (Utrecht, 1650).
- h. *Examen Bullae Papalis Innocentii X qua Pacem Germaniae abrogare nititur. Accedunt Bullae Urbani VIII de suppressione Jesuitissarum de cultu imaginum et de Festis* (Utrecht, 1652).
- i. *Socinianismus confutatus* (Utrecht, 1650, 1662, 1664).
- j. *Euthanasia, ofte wel sterven; waer in veel voorbeelden der stervenden en hun laatsten doodtspreuken verhaald worden* (Utrecht, 1651).
- k. *Summa Controversiarum Religionis cum Infidelibus, Haereticis, Schismaticis* (Utrecht, 1653).

4.2 The Leiden period

Some of the major publications in this period of Hoornbeeck's life and career are listed below. The focus of these publications ranges from various polemical works against colleagues and different outsiders about, for instance, the understanding of the Sabbath or Sunday as a day of rest, and to subjects such as Cartesianism. He even made time to attend to the science of Practical Theology and, although this is not actually relevant right now, he also prepared a publication on the Conversion of the Indians, with whom the Dutch East and West India Company came into contact. The publications are listed in chronological order according to dates of publication (Hofmeyr 1975:224-226):

- a. *De observando a Christianis praecepto Decalogi quarto die Dominico* (Leiden, 1659).
- b. *Heyliginghe van Godts name en dagh, ende van de onderhoudinghe van des Heeren daghs-heyliginghe* (Leiden, 1655).
- c. *Nader bewysinghe van des Heeren-daghs-heyliginghe* (Leiden, 1659).

- d. *Sondag Rust-dagh des Heeren ende daarin getoont conciliaty van verscheide disputen dienaangaande* (Leiden, 1659).
- e. *Epistolae ad Johannem Duraeum Scoto-Britannum, qua respondetur Examini Johannis Beverley de Independentissimo, addita est Independentium in Anglia cofessio* (Leiden, 1660).
- f. *Id cum Jacobi Usserii Disputationes de reducendo Episcopatu ad formam regiminis Synodici* (Utrecht, 1661).
- g. *Van de Oorsprongh der Arminiaensche nieuwigheden* (Schoonhoven, 1662).
- h. *Dissertatio de Veterum Concionibus* (Utrecht, 1663a).
- i. *Berigt van de Sabbath* (Utrecht 1663b).
- j. *Theologica Practica, Accessit ejusdem Irenicum, de studio Pacis atque Concordiae, et Oratio de Prudentia, II Partes* (Utrecht, 1663-1666).
- k. *Disputationem Theologicarum Anti-Sociniarum compendium* (Utrecht, 1666).

The question is often raised as to the differences between the Utrecht and Leiden periods in Hoornbeeck's life and, more especially, his work. In essence, it boils down to the fact that, in Utrecht, which was known as the academic hub of the Further Reformation, he was mainly involved in the further building of a reformed ethos in doctrine and life in an academic framework. During this period, he published various textbooks such as in polemics, systematic theology, and homiletics. He placed a strong historical emphasis in all of this. On the other hand, this period in Leiden was far more overshadowed by conflict and tension. He had some clear views on the celebration of the Sunday and the Sabbath over against the opinions of Coccejus and Heidanus; on the Coccejan federal and covenant theology; on some aspects of Cartesian thinking, and on Arminianism, Brownism and Socinianism. Therefore, the Utrecht period can be regarded as one of positive creativity, and the Leiden period as one of defence and polemics.

5. THE STORY ABOUT HOORNBEECK AS A THEOLOGIAN IN THREE DIFFERENT FIELDS

In terms of Hoornbeeck's theological contribution, I will now, in this first of two articles, primarily focus on three important areas of his theology, namely Practical Theology and Homiletics, Polemics, and Pastoral Theology. I wish to focus on the essential aspects of the Biblical scholar Hoornbeeck's

contribution as contained in his publications on the above subjects, in order to explore the continuities and discontinuities with the literature of the Middle Ages and the Reformation, and to indicate the relevance of Hoornbeeck's thinking.

5.1 Hoornbeeck, the practical theologian and homiletic

It is now important to focus on Hoornbeeck's views on Practical Theology as a theological subdiscipline, and then to move on to his views on Homiletics.

According to some scholars, the history of Protestant practical theology begins with Schleiermacher's

surpassing of the literature providing guidance for the ministry by the understanding of practical theology as the theory of leading the Church. One however does not need to doubt Schleiermacher's significance for the modern history of practical theology to regret the implied neglect of the earlier history of *theologia practica*. There was indeed such an earlier history (Goudriaan 2013:443).

One of Professor Voetius' most prominent and talented students was our very same Johannes Hoornbeeck. Relatively soon after his student years, he became a colleague of Voetius and a professor at the University of Utrecht, prior to joining the University of Leiden some years later. During his years at Leiden University, he published the first volume of the *Theologia Practica* (1663). The second volume followed in 1666, the year in which Hoornbeeck passed away. The intended third volume never appeared due to his death.

Hoornbeeck's inaugural lecture at Utrecht was about the study of theology in general.

In it he described a number of subjects that a student of theology had to deal with successively: philosophy and literature, Biblical exegesis, doctrinal theology, controversial theology, ecclesiastical law, and church history. Practical theology is [however (JWH)] not a specific subject here (Goudriaan 2013:449).

He indicates that doctrinal theology is strictly inseparable from praxis: nothing is fully known and understood if the corresponding praxis is not simultaneously observed (Hoornbeeck 1644:12-13). However, he did publish a separate *Theologia Practica*, but it cannot be considered a practical theology textbook as one would think about it in our times. It is in many ways rather a spiritual ethical document with an ascetic emphasis.

The first volume of Hoornbeeck's *Theologia Practica* deals with what he called "the general matters of the Christian life". This can, according to him, be summarised in five points, namely repentance for sin; the necessary conversion by the grace of the Holy Spirit; faith in Christ; holiness of life, and the firm consolation of the soul against all evils. Hoornbeeck's amazing knowledge of his predecessors and of extensive literature is once again obvious when he refers, among many others, to Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, Augustine, Bernard of Clairvaux, Anselm, and Willem Teellinck.

It must be added that, although the sequence of the chapters of the first volume of Hoornbeeck's *Theologia Practica* does not correspond neatly to the above five aspects, the essential issue is that the Christian life is the focal point around which several books and chapters are placed. "If God, predestination, creation, and providence are discussed, and if Christ, his birth, passion and resurrection, ascension, and celestial glory are dealt with, dogmatic topics are considered as related to the life of the Christian" (Goudriaan 2013:449).

In Volume Two, Book 8, Hoornbeeck addressed the general duties that are connected with the state of grace, followed by an exposition on the specific duties towards God (Book 9) and towards one's neighbour (Book 10). In this second volume, he announced an exposition on the various conditions of life and death. However, as mentioned earlier, Volume Three was never published.

Hoornbeeck's *Theologia Practica* is a theology that is related to Christian life. This fascinating publication has ethical, dogmatic and ascetic dimensions.

In contrast to Voetius' broad definition of "theologia practica", ecclesiastical law and homiletics are left out in Hoornbeeck's concept. On the other hand, the dogmatic dimensions that Voetius left out of practical theology [are], to some degree, brought into it (Goudriaan 2013:450).

In broad terms it has to be added that this period of thinking in terms of practical theology shows that moral theology and, to some extent, ascetics were dominant components of the early "theologica practica". Voetius' broader vision of adding church polity and homiletics did not find a following with Hoornbeeck.

For the purpose of the current article, I will now more specifically focus on the structure and the essential aspects of Hoornbeeck's thoughts on preaching. Although true Reformed preaching, with its strong emphasis on Scriptures, already became a reality in the mid-16th century and some

publications on the theory and art of preaching saw the light later in the 16th century and onwards, it was Hoornbeeck who published the first comprehensive homiletic textbook in Dutch after the Reformation.

In 1645, he published the *Disputationes theologicae de Ratione Concionandi*, or translated as “Theological theses on the method of preaching” (Brienen 2008:27). It was the first homiletic textbook in the Reformed world after the Reformation. Once again, Hoornbeeck displays his immense knowledge of theological literature and its exponents throughout the centuries: the names of Augustine, Gregory the Great, John Chrysostom, Bernard of Clairvaux, William Ames and many others appear regularly in this book. In this publication, six disputations were handled between 4 October 1645 and 13 July 1646. In 1663, Hoornbeeck published a shorter essay in Leiden on preaching by some earlier theologians (*Dissertatio de Veterum Concionibus*), in which he mentions many church fathers and authors from the Middle Ages.

In my discussion of Hoornbeeck’s homiletic views, I will follow Brienen quite closely because of his major research on Hoornbeeck’s Homiletics. Brienen provides not only a translation of this book from Latin into Dutch, but also an extensive introduction to, and commentary on it (Brienen 2009).

Hoornbeeck’s *Homiletica* consists of six disputations or parts. In Part One, he starts with his definition of a sermon. To him, a sermon is a holy activity, giving an exposition of Scriptures and an application for the congregation for their upliftment. It is important to notice that both explication and application form an inherent part of the sermon. Central in all of this is the word of God. Furthermore, only a person committed to God can deliver the sermon commendably. Besides many texts from Scriptures, Hoornbeeck also quotes many patristic and medieval pastors. The preaching also needs to uplift the listener in the doctrine of truth and in the practice of piety (*in doctrina veritatis et in praxi pietatis*).

In Part Two, Hoornbeeck focuses on the format of the sermon and the adding of an introduction. In the format of the sermon, the focus is on the style of, or approach to the sermon, whether it is, for instance, logical or rhetorical. Next, the focus is on the text itself. With regard to the introduction to the sermon, there are different possibilities such as a theological or a contextual approach.

In Part Three, he attends to the theme of the sermon. Hoornbeeck differentiates between a main theme and some subthemes, all of this based on the analysis of the biblical text.

In Part Four, the focus is on the explication of the text and the elements of teaching. This implies a focus on both the text itself and the theme of the text. The first entails literary exegesis, while the second implies the topic at issue. All of this forms the basis for paraphrasing the information collected into a sermon as a whole.

In Part Five, the interest moves to the usefulness of the sermon, in other words its application. In his opinion, it must be both specific and practical, in a doctrinal but also practical way. Typical of that period are the so-called *signa* or distinctives among believers, which implies their level of commitment. Hoornbeeck, however, is cautioning his readers to handle this type of classification with great care. He finally addresses the conclusion of the sermon, and the best way to approach this is by means of a doxology: praise be to God!

In Part Six, Hoornbeeck attends to the delivery of the sermon, namely the final preparation and the delivery or preaching of the sermon. Both the verbal presentation of the sermon (if possible, from memory once it has been internalised) and the non-verbal communication are crucial.

Other opinions were held in the course of history on Hoornbeeck's publications on homiletics. One good example is that of Hoekstra who, for instance, already earlier in 1926, regarded the *Tractatus* to be the first complete book on Homiletics in the Dutch context. Even the church historian Van Itterzon called it the first original homiletic publication which was already published in 1645. They also regarded it to be a good example of Reformed Homiletics, in terms of both the point of departure and its Reformed vision. In Hoekstra's opinion, Hoornbeeck did not succeed enough in divorcing his thinking on homiletics from his scholastic inclination or pattern of thinking (Brienen 2009:257-259).

Very typical of Hoornbeeck's thinking on homiletics is the fact that he goes into very great detail on the so-called *documenta* or teachings. Hoornbeeck gave a separate and independent position to the *documenta* between the *explication* (the exposition) and the *applicatio* (the application). He regarded the *documenta* as a very important and even dominating factor for the application of the text or homily. The *documenta* can be regarded as the fruit of the exegesis of the text, which are then formulated in general values and terms, and applied as practices (*usus*) in the context of the listener. This implies that the application is not directly linked to the explication, but that it is linked to, and dependent on the teachings deduced from the explication.

Hoornbeeck did indeed produce the first truly reformed and complete homiletical textbook in Dutch after the Reformation. He also constantly

emphasised the prime focus of any good sermon, namely Scriptures. It must, however, be stated that he sometimes tended to be somewhat too doctrinal and didactical, with hardly any pneumatological dimension in his preaching. He sometimes made too much of the so-called classification in *distinctives* or *signa*. In that respect, it carries a typical scholastic approach. Finally, one cannot underestimate his influence as a very able homiletic of his times.

5.2 Hoornbeeck, the polemicist

It is important to realise that Hoornbeeck was possibly best known for his contributions in the field of polemics. Having focused on that topic earlier in my career in an academic dissertation on Hoornbeeck as a polemicist (*Johannes Hoornbeeck as polemikus*) (Hofmeyr 1975), I will now suffice with only some of the most essential aspects.

It is first of all important to describe the nature and character of 17th-century polemics, an area in church and theology at the time that proved to be fairly prominent. From an initial overview, it is evident that the Reformed, Lutheran and Roman Catholic polemics can be clearly distinguished in terms of attitude and style. The most important Reformed polemicists in this period were Chamier, Alting, and Hoornbeeck. Leading Lutheran polemicists included Chemnitz, Gerhard, and Calov. Of the Roman Catholics, Bellarminus contributed the most, already in an early stage of 17th-century polemics.

It is also important to briefly state that polemics was very much part of 17th-century Post-Reformation theology and Reformed theology. The field of controversy theology was a well-known and fully accepted part of theological activity and enterprise at that time. In addition, in the Further Reformation theological tradition, polemics was not totally out of place, although it had somewhat more of a tolerant and irenic side to it. All Hoornbeeck's polemic publications bear witness to a certain mildness of approach. Besides his publications on polemics, Hoornbeeck also published works on the unity of the church and on irenics.

As is clear from an overview of Hoornbeeck's most important works, the attention paid to the field of polemics proves to be a major interest in his life and work. I will now focus on his main polemical publication which, on good grounds, can be described as his *magnum opus*, namely the *Summa Controversiarum Religionis* (1653). This publication saw a number of different editions and aroused wide interest and comment.

The *Summa* itself is preceded by a *Dedicatio* and *Dissertatio*. In the *Dedicatio*, Hoornbeeck dedicates his main work to Petrus Molinaeus of

Sedan. This implies a high veneration for the abilities of this prominent French theologian, but it is also a good reflection of the person and works of Molinaeus. The *Dissertatio* presents a broad outline of the fundamentals of Hoornbeeck's polemics in the *Summa*. It is, however, not only a way of introducing the *Summa*, but it can be viewed as a yardstick he sets himself for his polemics. In this way, the *Summa* can be properly assessed and judged against his own yardstick and standards.

Hoornbeeck conducts polemics with three different groupings or sections, namely the *Infidels* (Unbelievers), the *Heretics*, and the *Schismatics*. In each case, Hoornbeeck provides an historical background, followed by a summary of the subject matter as well as an analytical and systematic interpretation. Under the *Infidels*, Hoornbeeck includes the Heathen, the Jews, and the Muslims (Mohammedans as he calls them). Under the *Heretics*, he includes the Papists, the Anabaptists, the Libertines, the Enthusiasts, and the Socinians. Under the *Schismatics*, he takes into account the Remonstrants, the Lutherans, the Brownists, and the Greek Orthodox.

The sources Hoornbeeck used in his polemics reveal how extremely well read he was. He first of all linked up very closely with patristic literature and frequently followed the Augustinian line of thought. He further revealed many links with scholastic, pre-Reformation and Reformation literature. As far as the structure of his polemics is concerned, there are clear indications of a formal implementation of a scholastic framework. Even elements of scholastic content are fairly obvious.

The centrality of Scripture was also very important to Hoornbeeck in his polemics. In line with other reformed scholars, Hoornbeeck argued for a uniform authority of the text over against the attempts of the Arminians, Episcopius, Grotius, and Socinus to argue levels of truth and authority in the text of Scripture. Episcopius held the revelation of the Old Testament to be inferior to that of the New Testament, while Socinus argued that, on minor issues and points of little importance, the biblical authors could and did err. The Orthodox response to these arguments was directed to the preservation of the entire canon. That, according to Hoornbeeck, was the faith of the Reformed churches, as taught in the Belgic Confession. Muller (2003:307) indicates that Hoornbeeck

goes on, in a highly polemical vein that approaches closer to the stereotype of orthodoxy than either its positive doctrinal statements or its exegetical works, to list eight arguments leading to the conclusion that Scripture contains no "disagreements or contradictions".

Muller (2003:308) concludes these eight arguments by stating that Hoornbeeck

is able to cite passages from Socinus and his followers that speak of the authority and integrity of Scripture: such self-contradiction is a final argument against their teaching!

In order to draw some conclusions on Hoornbeeck as a polemicist, the following points are crucial. Hoornbeeck proves to be exceptionally well read, but also a prolific writer himself. It is clear from his thoughts and writings that he linked up very closely with patristic literature, on the one hand, and that he also linked up with the post-Reformation and Scholastic literature, on the other. It can be stated that, as far as the structure of his polemics is concerned, there are clear indications of a formal implementation of a scholastic framework.

Hoornbeeck approaches polemics with both an extremely well-informed doctrinal background and a very sharp historical consciousness. He also knows many of the undercurrents that played a role in different contexts and developments. His knowledge of many languages (among others, Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, Syrian, English, German, French, Spanish, and Italian) was also a major advantage in his extremely learned and well read argumentation.

As indicated earlier, polemics was very much part and parcel of the 17th-century ecclesiastical and theological scene. Hoornbeeck, however, was not overly rigid and without tolerance or understanding in his polemics. This calls for further research in order to draw a comprehensive comparison of Hoornbeeck's approach to the Infidels, the Heretics, and the Schismatics. A specific ascending order is apparent in Hoornbeeck's polemic insofar as the different groupings under discussion are associated with the Reformed faith and doctrine. According to him, the Infidels stand furthest from the Reformed faith, whereas the Greeks, the Brownists, and the Lutherans are standing far closer to the Reformed faith.

Hoornbeeck's polemics bear witness to a certain mildness of approach. Besides his polemical publications and as the "unofficial official" polemicist of the Further Reformation, he also published books on the unity of the church and on irenics.

5.3 Hoornbeeck, the pastoral theologian

In my attempt to focus on Hoornbeeck the pastor, it is not so much an emphasis on his practical ministry, but one on his theoretical thinking as a pastoral theologian. I will, therefore, focus primarily on two of Hoornbeeck's major publications in the field of pastoral theology.

I first wish to analyse his perspectives on the topic of the so-called “spiritual desertions” (*geestelijke verlatingen*), as understood in the 17th century. I will, in this process, briefly compare Hoornbeeck’s views on spiritual desertion with those of his teacher and later colleague Voetius, so as to develop a better understanding of the phenomenon.

Hoornbeeck’s publication *Spiritual desertions* (*Geestelijke verlatingen*) (Voetius & Hoornbeeck 1646) was first published in Dutch in 1646. As regards the outline of this book, a shorter first part was written by Voetius and a longer section by Hoornbeeck. This book was originally written because of the biblical admonition to some to rejoice in the Lord and to live victoriously, over against those who feel totally deserted with many fears and anxieties because of spiritual abandonment. This was, according to Hoornbeeck, a theme worth being treated by many authors,

because the ancients have said little about the topic other than under the general heading of “Difficulties” or “Trials and Temptations” (Voetius & Hoornbeeck 2003:57).

Voetius focused more on a description of spiritual desertion, whereas Hoornbeeck’s goal was to write a pastoral guide that would console or inspire the reader when s/he experiences despondency as in Psalms 22 and 55. He indicates very many elements and aspects of consolation, of which the most important is the grace of the Gospel:

Die vertroostingen moet de ziel overdenken en bepeinzen, daarbij moet ze stil staan. Die moet men met kracht voorhouden aan de ziel, welke men vertroosten wil. En dit is niet het minst als eenne groote vertroosting te beschouwen, dat wij een Trooster hebben (Voetius & Hoornbeeck 1898:165-168).

It is now useful to reflect briefly on Voetius’ contribution to the book. Voetius initially explains a pathology or a description of symptoms, and then a therapy or exposition on how to overcome these. Thirdly, he addresses some further issues on spiritual desertion.

For Voetius, spiritual desertion is an inner cross or spiritual sorrow and trial, as a result of which one fails to feel one’s heart’s delight in God and in divine things. He next creates distinctions in terms of different terms or concepts. Temptation is either human, diabolical or divine. Spiritual abandonment is when God tests us by withdrawing from us the sense of his consoling grace and fatherly favour. For him, divine desertion differentiates between whether it is in relation to the wicked or in relation to the elect.

He then discusses the different causes of spiritual desertion. First, it is God who, in his fatherly way, sends and governs the abandonments; secondly, the lack of clear appropriation by faith (*geloofzekerheid* in the original Dutch) (JWH); thirdly, internal causes such as ignorance and lack of skill in spiritual matters, and, finally, external causes such as not rightly discerning and appropriating the events in Scripture. Voetius next writes about secondary matters in terms of aspects that always, frequently or sometimes accompany spiritual desertion. He then lists these three categories: aversion to, or non-acceptance of consolation; poverty, disease, adversity, persecution, depression, and physical weakness; demonic possession, horrors, and torments by Satan also in people sleeping, suicide, etc. Voetius then provides various remedies:

First, all the hindrances and causes that intensify this evil must be removed; second, we must avoid and reject all false remedies; finally we must take up and use the right remedies (Voetius & Hoornbeeck 2003:46ff.).

Hoornbeeck now defines and introduces the matter of spiritual desertion. In his opinion, spiritual desertion must be defined as a heaviness in the soul about spiritual matters:

[T]here is nothing new in the fact ... that different authors write about one and the same subject, especially when its importance is such that the judgement and considerations of many people are required; the difficulty of this subject and the necessity of instructing others, particularly our students who are in training for the ministry of the church and the care of souls, are reason enough for us to write on the subject (Voetius & Hoornbeeck 2003:57-58).

Hoornbeeck then discusses abandonment as a whole. Its cause can often be viewed as sin or the lack of exercising the faith, from which often flows unbelief and disobedience. With regard to difficulties for the abandoned soul, he identifies the fact that the evil primarily strikes the soul and the soul's salvation. He continues by stating that spiritual conflict is a constant and vehement conflict with God himself, with the devil, with people and with the self.

With regard to the effects of desertion, he identifies the following: the soul laments and pitifully groans; the soul desires and hopes for refreshing from the Lord, and the soul searches for a blessed outcome. With reference to the purpose of desertion, Hoornbeeck indicates that it is to test us, to effect in us a greater aversion to, and hatred of sin, to humble us and to kindle in us, in a special way, the value of his grace which is manifested in different ways. In answering the question as to how the soul

must conduct itself, he replies that it is essentially to bring comfort or to speak to one's heart. Four different goals must be borne in mind: to soften and decrease the evil, to strengthen the heart and to give good courage, to take away evil if possible, and to bring joy and spiritual gladness.

Hoornbeeck then turns to the believer him-/herself who is in need of comfort. One must remember that this person is a child of God and that s/he is in the state of God's grace. His advice is the following: to manifest remorse, to take heed of your sins that grieve and oppress you; to manifest faith, it is clearly a sign of grace that you esteem grace highly and that you have a craving for God's grace; to manifest conversion is a proof of divine grace in the soul when it hates and shuns sin, and when one can discern in this soul a great desire for many Christian virtues. Along with these trials, the grace of God, faith and salvation are possible and present: this implies the perseverance of the saints.

Hoornbeeck then discusses the comforts themselves that flow from the following sources. First, they flow from the nature and purpose of these spiritual trials, which implies that everybody carries a cross, that it is not total abandonment from God, that only God's children are affected, that all believers have these trials in common, that these trials sometimes do not last long, and that these trials can sometimes be very helpful. Secondly, they flow from God as He reveals himself to these tried persons, which implies that the trials are not outside God's will, that we comfort ourselves in God, and that it flows from God's wisdom, goodness and mercy. Thirdly, they flow from the grace of the gospel towards these tried persons, which implies that Christ has called us to his knowledge, that He has granted us justification and that He has adopted us as his children. Against these comforts, the assailed soul has mainly two objections, namely they are not for me and they do not help me.

Hoornbeeck next asks how the soul can be delivered or, to put it differently, what are the means that the soul can use against the trials. He responds by indicating those things against which the soul must be on guard. They are either evil and wrong or they obstruct the good means; he then indicates that one has to be on guard during the time of trial, that one does not neglect the exercise of one's calling and regular worship. In terms of those aspects that precede the means and that should be used, he lists the following: a thorough examination of oneself and of one's sins; a renewed pious and frank confession of one's sins; a firm intention to live strictly and godly, and to strive for a thorough knowledge of religion. In terms of the good means, he identifies contentment, patience, faith, hope, waiting, seeking, stirring up to take hold of Christ, and companionship with the pious. Finally, prayer

should contain a presentation of, and a complaint about evil, a desire for the good, and the reasons to move to God for deliverance.

The struggling soul, however, has the following objections to the above issues: I have not been helped in spite of my efforts; I am finished and beyond hope; be that as it may, I am still afraid; I am afraid that it will become so bad that I will go insane, and what if I were to die. Hoornbeeck then comes to the final section and conclusion: "We have spoken of the nature of spiritual trials, of the comfort and of the help to come out of those. Now we want to speak of the deliverance itself and end with that" (Voetius & Hoornbeeck 2003:165).

The question remains as to how one must judge Hoornbeeck and Voetius on spiritual desertions (*geestelijke verlatingen*). Robert Burton, an English-born medical doctor and theologian was a contemporary of Voetius and Hoornbeeck. Already since the Middle Ages there developed a great interest in spiritual desertion. In his major work on spiritual desertion, *The anatomy of melancholy* (1621), Burton collected many different perspectives over the course of many centuries, and especially since the Middle Ages. However, Burton was, for instance, quite harsh in his judgement on melancholy. He called the feelings and emotions of the depressed person sinful. Such a person must be converted from this sin. Voetius and Hoornbeeck, on the other hand, were definitely more tolerant and milder in their judgement. They rather prefer to focus on the great consolation that the Lord will never desert man, because He does not desert that with which He has started.

In a second major part of my overview on Hoornbeeck as a pastoral theologian, I now wish to focus on Hoornbeeck's perspectives on *Euthanasia* or *Ars Moriendi* (the art of dying well from a Christian perspective). Quite often talking and thinking about death is, for many different people or in many different contexts, still a taboo. In the Middle Ages, the issue of death was a different issue. There even existed a separate literary genre about death and preparation for death in the Middle Ages that remained popular in the early modern era. It was, therefore, in the 17th century, differently understood from what one would have expected. There was a need at that time for pastoral care for the dying, but also a need for some or other theoretical foundation for it.

I will now briefly compare the views of Hoornbeeck on dying well with those of his teacher and later colleague Voetius, so as to, once again, develop a better understanding of the phenomenon as a whole (Borghuis 2008:17-21). Voetius focuses on the art of dying well in his broadly known publication *Ta Asketika sive exercitia pietatis*. According to Voetius, *euthanasia* consists of two elements, namely the beneficial preparation for

death and the practice of dying itself. The preparation, in its turn, consists of two parts, namely the things to do during one's lifetime or the art of living well (*ars bene vivendi*) and, secondly, the personal equipment and the preparation for dying, including the drafting of one's will, etc. According to Voetius, the dying find consolation in meditating on the Person of Christ and the richness of his salvational work. He adds that God's promises give courage and perspective to the dying Christian. On the other hand, Voetius also focuses on temptations for the dying. He states that dying people are tempted by the devil in two different ways: on the one hand, the devil seduces us to rely on our own good works. On the other hand, he tries to bring us to despair on account of our sins, or with the temptations of the world or those of the flesh. The above temptations include that we have to leave the earth, and our home, wife, children, friends and possessions, or otherwise endure heavy pain or a painful deathbed. Finally, Voetius comes with the consolation and affirmation that in all these things we as believers are more than conquerors through Him who loves us (Rom. 8:37).

When it comes to Hoornbeeck, it is worth to briefly reflect on how others earlier in the Christian tradition thought about *ars moriendi* (Hoek 2009:1-2). All along, *euthanasia* among Christians was viewed as the fruit of a life with the Lord. In the Middle Ages, *ars moriendi* was regarded, as for instance Anselmus described it, to be the experience of the hour of dying and the dramatic battle to save the soul from eternal flames in hell. From the 15th century, books about pastoral care for the dying were widely distributed. The many epidemics caused innumerable deaths virtually on a daily basis. Therefore, these books gained great popularity. To Luther, it was understood that the Christian may view death as a new birth. The comforting image of Christ will prevail over against the terrifying images of death, sins and hell. Although Calvin never wrote a specific treatise on the art of dying, he viewed the life of a Christian as a life of battle, pilgrimage and hope in this world.

Other representatives of the Further Reformation who raised some perspectives on *euthanasia* were Spranckhuysen and Saldenus (Hoek 2009:2-5). Although Spranckhuysen's spiritual and pastoral approach shows some Platonic influences, his instructions appear to be thoroughly catholic in content and are clearly directed to practical piety. In the case of Saldenus, the desire for heaven is a constitutive feature of piety and a clearly distinguishing mark of Christian life.

In his treatise, Hoornbeeck gives many examples of the last words of dying believers, the so-called *emortalalia*, far more than those of his colleague Voetius. This was a well-known genre in the 17th century. "Thanatography" was considered to be an important complement of biographical writing.

Adversaries are often reported to die full of anxiety and compunction, while the spiritual biography reaches its climax in the exemplary dying of the hero as a “good practice”. Hoornbeeck refers to many different dying believers who knew the art of *ars moriendi* and who had no fear for death. He refers to people such as Augustine, Tertullian, Cyprian, Bernard of Clairvaux, Zwingly, Luther, Calvin, Bucer, Knox, Ursinus, and Guido de Bres.

Voetius suggested various pastoral questions for the pastor visiting a dying person. One can imagine that Hoornbeeck as a close friend and colleague could have asked similar questions such as, for instance, does he confess and deplore his sins; does he subject himself totally to the will of God, and is he desiring and even praying to go back to the house of the Lord, his Father.

In conclusion, it is clear that, for instance, Voetius and Hoornbeeck do not ignore or disagree with the essential unity between body and soul. Death must not be regarded as a taboo. In light of the gospel, it is always important to confront our mortality. To Voetius and Hoornbeeck, the reality of the eventual resurrection can in no way whatsoever be denied.

6. THE STORY OF HOORNBEECK AS A 17TH-CENTURY THEOLOGIAN AND A TRUE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE FURTHER REFORMATION

In this section of the article, I will focus on some concluding remarks related to the theological dimensions and emphases of Hoornbeeck's specific brand of Further Reformation theology. In this, but more specifically in the next article, I will compare his theology and his contribution specifically to that of his earlier professor and later colleague Voetius. At this stage, it appears that Hoornbeeck's thinking was possibly more principled, dogmatic and historical compared to Voetius' more historical and practical mindedness. Voetius felt strongly about combining piety with science. I will draw some preliminary conclusions about the uniqueness of Hoornbeeck's theology. I will, only in the next article, draw some final conclusions and make some final assessments.

During his years of teaching at Utrecht, Voetius taught some very promising young theologians such as Hoornbeeck, Essenijs, and Nethenus. Together with them and various others, he established Utrecht as the academic hub of the Further Reformation and especially of the early or first classical phase of this theological movement (Op't Hof 2005:14-36).

The Voetians were generally regarded as being a Calvinist orthodox group who rejected liberal tendencies in theology, as well as Cartesianism in science and philosophy, but who led society towards a somewhat godlier lifestyle.

It is not yet clear whether Hoornbeeck's theology is similar to that of Voetius, not a means to an end, but rather a practical science or even practical theology, as Beck (2007) so clearly showed in his magistral study of Voetius. In many ways, Voetius was strongly standing in line with Duns Scotus. For Voetius, his practical theology consisted of moral theology, ascetics, discipline, and missiology. Voetius never published on systematic theology. With Hoornbeeck it is somewhat different in the sense that, in 1653, shortly before he left for Leiden, he published a collection of theological perspectives on doctrine by the most prominent authors of his time, entitled *Institutiones theologicae ex optimis auctoribus concinnatae*. Though it was not very original in content, it eventually replaced the *Overview of the purest theology* or *Synopsis Purioris Theologicae* (1625).

In terms of Hoornbeeck's philosophical background, it is interesting to note that he is in favour of an Eclectic (or common) Philosophy. This position is largely in line with Voetius himself.

In trying to gauge Hoornbeeck's theological position in terms of 17th-century thinking, it is worth referring to Hoornbeeck's very first biographer, namely D. Stuartus from 1744. In this instance, I am using Stuartus's 17th-century Dutch, so as not to lose any nuance of Stuartus's argumentation, but also for the sake of conscientising us to 17th-century Dutch (Stuartus 1744:153-155).

Den Lof van regtzinnigheit is hem van niemand bewist. Nieuwe dingen in de Godsdienst, waren by hem verdagt. In bespiegelende verschillen, koos hy het waarschynelykste, en in betrachtende de veiligste zyde. Onder de strenge Godeleerde was hy gematigt, en onder de gematigde, gestreng. Hy omhelsde de naauwst gezette gevoelens, dog verdedigde die zeer gematigt. Hy gaf zig zelfs geene Vryheid, maar aan andere zeer veel toe, tot behoudenis van de vrede, verdragende, 't geen hy dog niet konde veranderen, als het maar eenigzints verdragelyk was.

De nieuwe Philosophi verwierp hy niet, in dingen die enkel wysgerig, en natuirkundig zyn, de wedersydse verschillen daar omtrent horde hy gewillig, maar hy wilde niet, dat men onder voorwendzel van een nieuwe, Philosophi, eene nieuwe Theologi zoude invoeren, die tegen Gods word strydig was.

Het was alleen de waarheit, die hy niet alleen in de Godeleerdheit, en wysgeerte; maar in zyn gansche leven, en verkeering oeffende. Hy

was ongeveinst vaan gemoed, hadde eene natuurlyke opregtigheit, en eene evengelyke vryheit om zyn gemoed open te leggen. Nooit sprak hy iets uit gunst, of uit vreed, en schikte zyne redenen niet om iemand te streelen. De waarheit ging hem boven al ter herte, en om die voort te zetten, zogt hy alle eerlyke middelen.

Hy was edelmoedig, en grootmoedig van gemoed, hy overdagt grote dingen, dog niet met verzuym, van de kleine, welke hy zig niet onweerdig oordeelde, een groot gemoed strekt zig tot alle dingen uit. Onder de grooten toonde hy zig groot, en verheven, onder de middelmatigen gemakkelyk en gematigt, ja alle waren by hem even hoog geagt, om dat niets by hem groot was, als den groten God.

He concludes:

De bedroefde staat der Kerke, door Europa, haar ongeziene gedaante, de verstrooide Vergaderingen, en de scheiding en scheuring der gelovigen, zag jy met veel smerte, gelyk ook de ketteryen, de afvaligheden, de aanwassende godloosheid en vrygeestery, etc.

The above clearly provides some insight into Hoornbeeck's perspectives on faith and science, an issue that will be expanded on in the next article.

Scholasticism was an important factor in the thoughts of the Middle Ages as well as in the centuries to come. Even in the Post-Reformation period, Scholasticism came increasingly into focus. Earlier on, scholasticism was viewed and understood in Protestant circles in a somewhat less positive way. Post-Reformation theology, however, does not imply a negative appreciation of medieval scholasticism.

In the Middle Ages, Scholasticism was deeply tied with the schools of its time. The scholastic method initially consisted in the *lectio-meditatio-quaestio* as well as the *disputatio*. It is worth reflecting on how the well-known specialist on Reformed Scholasticism Willem van Asselt together with Antoon Vos saw the role of scholasticism after the Middle Ages. It was understood not so much as a method, but rather as a particular content, and scholastic theology as the theology taught at the medieval schools (Van Asselt 2011:66-67).

In studying Voetius' theology, it is clear that his theology is possibly a departure from Thomas Aquinas' thoughts, who defined theology as a speculative discipline. An interesting finding, however, in the theological thoughts of Voetius is the fact that there is a clearer link between the Scottish medieval philosopher Duns Scotus and Voetius himself. In his study of Voetius, Beck (2007) aligns himself in various places with the so-called positive school, arguing for a continuity between some of the major Reformation thinkers

and the reformed orthodox theologians, on the one hand, and between some of the major theologians of the medieval period such as Aquinas and Duns Scotus and those of the Reformation and of reformed orthodoxy, on the other. Naturally, there are major differences in their methodology and content, but there remains a long and common tradition between them of *fides quaerens intellectum*. Beck, however, cautions the reader to call Voetius a full Scotian, but he does indicate that the structure of Voetius' doctrine of God, for instance, is prepared by Augustine and Anselm as well as a continuous line of thought from for instance Bonaventura, Heinrich von Gent and Duns Scotus.

7. SOME CONCLUSIONS

I now suffice to provide some preliminary impressions and conclusions of Hoornbeeck as a theologian in respect of his homiletics, polemics and pastoral theology. In all of this he was extremely well read and informed. I believe that he can be regarded as a very able practical theologian, homiletic, polemicist and a person with a strong theoretical understanding of pastoral issues (Brienen 2008:114-120; Hofmeyr 1989:16-32).

7.1 Was he monumental?

I believe that he was indeed a monumental figure in, and even after his time. In terms of his structures of thinking, he was a typical Protestant Scholastic in continuity with aspects of medieval scholasticism as well as with his peers Voetius, Essenijs and Nethenus, on the one hand, and most probably in discontinuity with some pre-Reformation thinking with special reference to some aspects of Cartesianism, on the other. I not only concur with Beck about Voetius' view on Scriptures, but I also wish to combine that with what I believe Hoornbeeck's view on Scriptures happened to be:

Zij [JWH] zijn geen biblicist(en) maar ook geen rationalist(en). In tegenstelling tot de socinianen duidt (zij) [JWH] de Schrift aan als primair kennisbeginsel van de christelijke theologie. De rede is daarentegen als zodanig niet normerend voor het geloof en geen zelfstandige bron van kennis. Geloofsinhouden hebben dus geen bewijs van de rede nodig (Beck 2007:515).

7.2 Was he original?

Though he may not have been as original as Voetius, I believe that Hoornbeeck was probably the most original of the early or classical phase of the Further Reformation. It is clear from his writings that he was not an uncritical follower of Voetius, and that he could be considered somewhat

unique in combining some elements of the Reformed Orthodoxy with Further Reformation.

7.3 Was he influential and relevant?

Hoornbeeck was indeed influential. It can be stated that he most probably united systematics, history and practice into a whole, which made him not only unique, but also influential. Hoornbeeck exerted some immediate influences. H. Witsius, in particular, took over a great deal from Hoornbeeck's historical capabilities and practical attitude (Goudriaan 2013:452-453). Hoornbeeck influenced two other possible immediate figures, namely W. van Eenhoorn and D. Knibbe, in the field of homiletics and in terms of literature on the "art of dying". In the next article, I shall discuss whether Hoornbeeck greatly influenced his colleagues at Utrecht and Leiden, or whether they influenced him. However, in this respect, one can consider Voetius, Essenijs, Nethenius, and Amesius in Utrecht, and Heidanus, Coccejus, and others in Leiden. A great deal of research still needs to be done in terms of an extensive reception history of Hoornbeeck and his works. However, even in our postmodern times, much of his biblical thinking, as well as the issue of finding a balance between the focus on Christian doctrine and Christian life are still very relevant to realising a theology and a church that has not lost touch with the essentials.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BECK, A.

2007. Gisbertus Voetius (1589-1676): Sein Theologieverständnis und seine Gotteslehre. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Utrecht.

BORGHUIS, B.

2008. Hoornbeeck en Voetius: De actuele betekenis van de ars moriendi bij Hoornbeeck en Voetius voor de pastorale praktijk. Ongepubliseerde Masterscriptie. Utrecht.

BRADLEY, J.E. & MULLER, R.A.

1995. *Church history: An introduction*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans.

BRIENEN, T.

2008. *Johannes Hoornbeeck (1617-1666): Eminent geleerde en pastoraal theoloog*. Kampen: De Groot Goudriaan.

2009. *De eerste Nederlandse homiletiek van Johannes Hoornbeeck*. Vertaald en ingeleid door T. Brienen. Kampen: De Groot Goudriaan.

BRIENEN, T. (RED.)

1989. *De Nadere Reformatie en het gereformeerde piëtisme*. 's-Gravenhage: Boekencentrum.

- BRIENEN, T., EXALTO, K., GRAAFLAND, C., LOONSTRA, B. & VAN 'T SPIJKER, W.
1993. *Theologische aspecten van de Nadere Reformatie*. Zoetermeer: Uitgeverij Boekencentrum.
- BURTON, R.
1621. *The anatomy of melancholy*. London: CleBon.
- GOUDRIAAN, A.
2013. *Theologia Practica: The diverse meanings of a subject of early modern academic writing*. In: J.J. Ballor, D.S. Sytsma & J. Zuidema, (ed.), *Church and school in early modern Protestantism. (Studies in honor of Richard A. Muller on the maturation of a theological tradition)* (Leiden: Brill), pp. 439-452.
- HOEK, J.
2009. *De actualiteit van klassiek-gereformeerde stervensbegeleiding*. Utrecht: PThU Boeket.
- HOFMEYR, J.W.
1975. *Johannes Hoornbeeck as polemikus*. Kampen: J.H. Kok.
1989. *Die Nederlandse Nadere Reformatie en sy invloed op twee kontinente*. Pretoria: Universiteit van Suid-Afrika.
- HOORNBEECK, J.
1644. *Oratio Inauguralis de Studio S Theologiae*. Utrecht.
1645. *Disputationes Theologicae de Ratione Concionandi*. Utrecht.
1651. *Euthanasia, ofte wel sterven; waer in veel voorbeelden der stervenden en hun laatsten doodtspreuken verhaald worden*. Utrecht.
1653. *Summa Controversiarum Religionis cum Infidelibus, Haereticis, Schismaticis*. Utrecht.
1663a. *Dissertatio de Veterum Concionibus*. Utrecht.
1663b. *Theologica Practica, Accessit ejusdem Irenicum, de studio Pacis atque Concordiae, et Oratio de Prudentia, II Partes*. Utrecht.
- MULLER, R.
2003. *Post-Reformation reformed dogmatics: The rise and development of Reformed Orthodoxy, circa 1520 to circa 1725. Volume 2. Holy Scripture: The cognitive foundation of theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- OP 'T HOF, W.J.
2005. *Het gereformeerd piëtisme*. Houten: Den Hertog.
- RUNIA, K.
1992. *Notities over spiritualiteit*. Kampen: J.H. Kok.

Hofmeyr Hoornbeeck, a monumental 17th century Dutch theologian

STUARTUS, D.

1744. Levensbeschrijving van den vermaarden Johannes Hoornbeek. In: W. van Effenhoorn, *Euthanasia ofte welsterven. Deel I* (Amsterdam: Douci en Vieroot), pp. 139-162.

TRUEMAN, C.R.

2013. Introduction: The dogma is not necessarily the drama. In: J.J. Ballor, D.S. Sytsma & J. Zuidema, (ed.), *Church and school in early modern Protestantism. (Studies in honor of Richard A. Muller on the maturing of a theological tradition)* (Leiden: Brill), pp. 396-418.

VAN ASSELT, W.

2011. *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books.

VAN DER LINDE, S.

1954. De betekenis van de Nadere Reformatie voor kerk en theologie. *Kerk en Theologie* 5(1):215-225.

VOETIUS, G. & HOORNBEECK, J.

1646. *Gisbertus Voetii Disputaty van geesteliche verlatingen, uit de Latynse tale in onse Nederlantse overgezet, voortgezet door Johannes Hoornbeeck, Utrecht.*

1898. Eene Disputatie van Gisbertus Voetius over geestelijke verlatingen, voortgezet door Johannes Hoornbeek. Utrecht: Tractaat-genootschap Filippus.

2003. *Spiritual desertion*. Translated by J. Vriend & H. Boonstra. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

<i>Keywords</i>	<i>Trefwoorde</i>
Hoornbeeck	Hoornbeeck
Voetius	Voetius
Further Reformation	Nadere Reformasie
Practical theology	Praktiese teologie