



# The Princeton Theological Review

## CONTENTS

Christianity's Finality and New Testament Teaching	337
CLARENCE BOUMA	
The Origin of the Regensburg Book	355
HASTINGS EELLS	
Wilhelm Herrmann's Systematic Theology	373
THOS. CARY JOHNSON	
Does the Roman Church Teach the Doctrine of Religious Persecution?	394
AN EX CATHOLIC PRIEST	
The Rule of Faith and Life	423
R. D. WILSON	
Reviews of Recent Literature	451
Survey of Periodical Literature	475

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS  
PRINCETON

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1928

# The Princeton Theological Review

EDITED FOR  
THE FACULTY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
BY  
OSWALD T. ALLIS

---

Each author is solely responsible for the views expressed in his article  
Notice of discontinuance must be sent to the Publishers; otherwise subscriptions will be continued  
Subscription rate, Two Dollars a year, single copies Sixty Cents  
Entered as Second Class Mail Matter at Princeton, N. J.

---

## BOOKS REVIEWED

ARMENTROUT, J. S., <i>Administering the Vacation Church School</i> ....	469
BAILLIE, D. M., <i>Faith in God and its Christian Consummation</i> ....	464
BATTENHOUSE, H. M., <i>The Bible Unlocked</i> .....	455
BILLEN, A. V., <i>The Old Latin Texts of the Hexateuch</i> .....	451
BRADFORD, G., <i>D. L. Moody, A Worker in Souls</i> .....	467
BURROUGHS, P. E., <i>Our Lord and Ours</i> .....	468
CHAMPION, J. B., <i>More Than Atonement</i> .....	466
KELLER, A., and STEWART, G., <i>Protestant Europe</i> .....	472
KLOTSCH, E. H., <i>An Outline of the History of Doctrines</i> .....	456
KÜNNETH, W., <i>Die Lehre von der Sünde</i> .....	459
MACARTNEY, C. E., <i>Of Them He Chose Twelve</i> .....	469
MACARTNEY, C. E., <i>Paul, the Man</i> .....	471
PURINTON, H. R., <i>The Achievement of Israel</i> .....	452
RADE, M., <i>Glaubenslehre</i> , Vol. II. 3, " <i>Vom Geist</i> ".....	457
SMITH, G. B., <i>Current Christian Thinking</i> .....	461
VERKUYL, G., <i>Qualifying Men for Church Work</i> .....	468

# The Princeton Theological Review

JULY, 1928

---

## CHRISTIANITY'S FINALITY AND NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING

Every intelligent adherent of Christianity sooner or later faces the question as to the truth, the uniqueness, and the finality of Christianity. We, Christians, have in most cases imbibed Christian ideas and followed Christian standards from infancy. Having been born into a Christian environment and having enjoyed a Christian training, we were led to accept the system of Christian truth and to adopt the Christian moral norm as true, final, and satisfying. Consequently, Christianity has practically from infancy been our standard of truth and of value.

But as we grow in intelligence we wish to know the reason why. We discover that Christianity is not the only religion in the world. We challenge ourselves as Christians. Such questions as these involuntarily force themselves upon us. If I were born in India from Hindu parents, would I not as resolutely hold that Hinduism is the only true and satisfying religion? Just what is there in Christianity that gives it a claim to the allegiance of man? Is there really anything fundamentally, unique, final, absolute about Christianity? Granted that Christianity is true and has value, is such truth and value relative or absolute? Are not perhaps all religions true and satisfying in a measure, the one more, the other less so, the only difference between them being one of degree? Does not possibly each racial group have the religion best adapted to it and serving its needs best, so that the question as to the finality of any religion ought not to be raised? Is Christianity perhaps the highest form of religious de-

velopment so far attained by humanity but destined, from the nature of the case, to be superseded by higher stages? If all religion is essentially a matter of search after God, what claim can any one religion make to the allegiance of all men?

In present-day religious thought, which has been so deeply influenced and determined by the historical method, this question of the finality of Christianity becomes doubly cogent. Since the days of the *Aufklärung*, and especially during the nineteenth century, the conflict between the historical study of religion and the standpoint which maintains the finality of Christianity occupies the very center of theological interest. Historical research ever tends in the direction of a certain relativism. The historian does not readily accept any phase of thought or practice as final. To him all is in a constant flux. History as such seems to have no norm. It speaks the language of growth, development, creativity, not of finality or absoluteness.

Until the nineteenth century the historical point of view did not come to prominence in theological thought. The historical approach was until that time quite subordinated to, if not entirely suppressed by, the dogmatic. The nineteenth century, however, became the age of historical research. From one point of view the entire change which has come over Christian theology in the previous century is the outcome of the general application of the canons of historical criticism to Christianity. The study of the non-Christian religions was begun in the eighteenth and came to full development in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This study was greatly stimulated and furthered by the increase in travel and intercourse between the nations. Countries heretofore closed to Western influence have been thrown open. Also the missionary enterprise has been a powerful factor in promoting this movement.

This historical standpoint and method applied to theology and the scientific study of religion has found its focal point and sphere of crystallization especially in the study of Com-

parative Religion. Not only the ethnic religions but also the religion of the Old Testament and Christianity itself were soon studied in accordance with the same historical method and its canons of criticism. To all this study of the world's religions, of which the religion of the Old Testament is held to be one and Christianity another, there has, moreover, been applied the hypothesis of the evolutionary development of all human life, religion included. All religions on the basis of this hypothesis are held to represent various stages in the evolutionary development of the religious instinct of the human race.

It is clear that this genetico-historical attitude and method, reinforced by the evolutionary hypothesis, as it prevails in theological study today, forces the question as to the uniqueness, the finality, and absoluteness of Christianity upon us as intelligent twentieth century Christians. In this way there arises what Ernst Troeltsch has characterized as the "fundamental conflict between the spirit of critical skepticism generated by the ceaseless flux and manifold contradictions within the sphere of history and the demand of the religious consciousness for certainty, for unity, and for peace."<sup>1</sup> Can any historical phase of religion possess finality? Can history offer a norm, a standard of religious truth and value? Can the absolute enter into history?

How deeply this question cuts into our Christian faith and practice is apparent. If we accept the standpoint that Christianity is not absolute, is not the final religion, but is to be viewed as essentially on a par with all other religions even though considered the most highly developed among them, the implications are far-reaching both for theological truth and for Christian conduct. If Christianity be not final, Christ is at best one of many religious prophets who have emerged in the religious evolution of the race. He may be ever so great a religious teacher, He is not the divine Saviour as claimed by the New Testament. Moreover, if Christianity

---

<sup>1</sup> Ernst Troeltsch, *Christian Thought*, London, 1923, p. 8.

be not absolute and final as the true and saving faith revealed by God, the nerve of the motive for the Christian missionary enterprise is cut. According to the Great Commission Christianity is intended to supersede all other religions because it is the only true and saving religion. But if the difference between Christianity and the ethnic faiths is only a relative one, the whole missionary enterprise is undermined or, if still carried on, it is placed on a radically different basis and inspired by an entirely new motive. The only motive left in that case for the Christianizing of the ethnic peoples is the desire to impart a higher stage of civilization to less developed races. It is not surprising that those non-Christian races who enjoy a relatively high and possibly ancient type of civilization raise the challenging question to missionary representatives of the gospel of a liberalized Christianity, why these should seek to impose their civilization upon them. It would appear that the cultured pagans easily have the better of the argument in this matter.

The need of the hour to set forth the meaning and implications of the finality of the Christian religion and to maintain it over against various hostile forces both within and without the bounds of historic Christianity is great indeed. Here is a basic apologetic task for the Christian theologian. Professor Mackenzie's words written fifteen years ago are becoming more true and significant every day:

No need of the hour is greater than that many attempts should be made to define or describe the Christian Faith as it confronts the great world with its claims and promises, its sense of universal authority, its assertion that in and through its own nature as a historical Fact and its own message as a Divine Fact, the will of God is dealing with the destiny of mankind. For the sake of the missionaries abroad and the ministry in Christian lands, for the sake of all who are called upon to support and promote in any way the work of converting the world to this one Faith, these attempts are of essential importance. We must be sure that our task is not the offspring of blind prejudice or Western pride. We cannot go on with it intelligently and earnestly unless we are in our own souls assured, not that Christianity is a better religion than any other, but that it is the absolute religion, the one final way in which God himself is concerned with the saving and perfecting of mankind.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> W. Douglas Mackenzie, *The Final Faith*, New York, 1912, Preface.



The problem of the finality of Christianity raises issues which carry us to the very foundations of our philosophical and theological assumptions. No one, for instance, can adequately deal with this problem who has no appreciation of the philosophical problem of the relation between historical fact and eternal, timeless, truth. The scope of the present article, however, excludes the discussion of any such phase of the problem. We limit ourselves to the discussion of the teaching of the New Testament on the subject. In view of the fact that it is becoming increasingly common for many Christian writers on the subject to interpret various New Testament passages as supporting a conception of Christianity which, according to the conviction of the present writer, does violence to the real character of the Christian faith, the task of interrogating the New Testament on this question of the finality of our faith is anything but superfluous. The import and value of this phase of the problem must be apparent to anyone who realizes that the final vindication of Christianity cannot be found outside of Christianity itself—its effects in history and, especially, its authoritative sources.

Throughout the New Testament the uniqueness, the *Einmaligkeit*, and the final character of Christ, His incarnation and atonement, are taught implicitly and explicitly both. This uniqueness and *Einmaligkeit* of God's revelation in Jesus Christ is also implied in the fact that Christ is presented as the goal and fulfilment of all Old Testament prophecy. This lends the religion based upon the New Testament a finality such as the Old Testament religion did not possess. Because of its anticipatory character the Old Testament revelation and the religion based upon it, though unique and exclusive as based upon special supernatural revelation, were not final.

Both Jesus and the apostles clearly taught the unique character, the *Einmaligkeit*, the absoluteness, the finality of the Christian faith because based upon the Christian revelation.

Three crucial passages for the teaching of Christ on the

subject are John xiv. 6, John x. 30, and Matthew xxviii. 18-20. In the first passage Christ teaches that He is the true and only living way to the Father. "I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father except through me." Christ not only has the true knowledge concerning the way, but He is that way. Through union with Him, one is in the way, knows the truth, and has the life. All this implies a unique and most singular relation of Christ to God. Though the prophets had spoken of the way, of truth, and of life, Jesus *is* the way, the truth, and the life.

Brace in his work, *The Unknown God*, tries to eviscerate this saying of Jesus in a fashion that seems to be popular in certain quarters. He proposes that the passage, "No one cometh unto the Father except through me," be interpreted to mean: "No one can come into union with God except through the spirit in me, through self-sacrifice and love."<sup>3</sup> But, if Jesus meant to say that "the way" was love, moral character, as exemplified in Himself, and not Himself as a unique divine being, the whole passage would be an utterance of the most intolerable kind of conceit, boastfulness, and egotism. The use of ἐγὼ and ἐμοῦ and their emphatic position in the text show what great emphasis Jesus is placing in this passage on Himself. The following verses strengthen this emphasis upon the uniqueness of Christ as a divine person. As a unique, divine person, one with the Father, He is the only way by which true life may be had.

That this oneness with the Father implies Jesus' deity is also clear from another Johannine passage. In x. 30 Jesus says: "I and the Father are one." Can this apply to mere spiritual affinity? The meaning of the statement is exhibited in the following verses. The Jews accuse him of blasphemy, claiming that with the above words He has made Himself God (x. 33). It should be noted that Jesus not only does not repudiate the inference made by His enemies from His words but clearly accepts the inference and defends it.

Another important passage for the teaching of Jesus on

<sup>3</sup> C. Loring Brace, *The Unknown God*, London, 1890, p. 302, Note 2.



the subject of the uniqueness of the Christian revelation for man's salvation is found in Matthew xxviii. 18-20. This great final commission of Christ to His disciples derives its entire meaning, force, and thrust from the universally valid and exclusively saving efficacy of the gospel of Christ. That this is the underlying assumption of the commission, so much so that it would lose all its meaning apart from this assumption, is apparent upon a careful interpretation of the passage and its context. It teaches that the basis for this commission is the universality of Christ's dominion. He has *all* authority in heaven and on earth. The content of the commission itself is also shot through with the assumption of the universality of Christ. They must disciple *all* nations. The gospel of Jesus Christ is by its very nature designed to supersede all other faiths. Again, note the strain of universality in the guarantee of divine aid in the fulfilment of this commission. "I am with you *all* the days unto the consummation of the age." Their task to bring the gospel has a universal scope, universal in space (all nations) and in time (all the days). The universal significance, the universal validity, and the universal need of the gospel of salvation is woven into the very fabric of this last commission of Christ to His disciples. Whoever would take Christ seriously, must take this claim to universality seriously.

Just as the unique and final character of the gospel of Christ is presupposed and affirmed in the great commission of Christ to His disciples, so it is repeatedly affirmed in the early apostolic preaching. This affirmation is the real point of Peter's pentecostal sermon recorded in Acts ii. 14-36. The same is true of Peter's address in Acts iii. 12-26, and likewise of his discourse before the sanhedrin as recorded in Acts iv. 8-12.

A very strong and solemn declaration as to the absolute uniqueness and exclusiveness of Christ as the way of salvation is found in the last-named discourse. It is Acts iv. 12: "And in none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men,

wherein we must be saved." One is impressed by the strong negations and the solemn emphasis of exclusion throughout the passage. The only God-designed way of salvation is Jesus Christ.

Another significant utterance of Peter is that addressed to Cornelius, the Roman, as recorded in Acts x. 34-35. Such a passage as this might on the surface be taken to militate against the claim of absolute uniqueness and finality for the Christian gospel. Peter is there reported as making the statement to Cornelius that God is no respecter of persons but that "in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him." This phrase is often superficially quoted as meaning that anyone who, guided by the light of general revelation, is religious and moral, is acceptable, pleasing to God, just as well as others are who, guided by the greater light of special revelation, have the full gospel of Christ.

This interpretation, however, is a distortion of the meaning of the passage. What is meant by "acceptable" (δεκτός) unto God? In every nation those who fear God and work righteousness are acceptable unto God in what sense? A careful exegesis makes clear that the acceptability of these people refers to them as candidates for the reception of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Peter is here militating not against the exclusiveness of the gospel, he is precisely asserting the exclusiveness and absolute uniqueness of that gospel by militating against the exclusiveness of the Jewish Christians who held that only Jews were entitled to the privileges of the gospel of Jesus. This claim to exclusiveness of the Jews had to be broken down. The great lesson that the early apostles themselves had to learn as they preached the gospel was that all special privileges of the Jews had been cancelled. The Old Testament teaching was that outside of the chosen nation there was no salvation, but the gospel of Christ is not to be restricted to any one nation. It is universal in its scope. It must be preached to all nations in accordance with Christ's final commission. The question in the mind of the early

Jewish Christians was whether the gospel should not be restricted to the Jews only.

Now what Peter asserts in the passage before us must be understood against that background. He states that the gospel is not for the Jews only but for all nations. This truth was the point of the teaching imparted to Peter by the vision at Joppa, which vision immediately preceded his coming to Caesarea and is closely connected with it. What God has cleansed, Peter should not call unclean (x. 9-16). Peter's going to Caesarea is the putting into practice of the lesson learned from this vision. The narrative clearly links up these two events. Peter so explains the meaning of the vision both at Cornelius' house (vs. 28) and at Jerusalem when later he is called to account for what he has done (xi. 1-18).

When Peter hence makes the statement that there are among the gentiles those that are acceptable to God, he means that they are acceptable candidates for the Christian church to whom the gospel should be preached as well as to the Jews. But what is the meaning and purpose of the reference to such persons as fearing God and working righteousness? This does not designate an acceptable ground for salvation alongside of Christ and His redemption, but the fear of God and the working of righteousness are recognized as psychologically suitable soil into which the seed of the gospel may be cast. People who are in earnest about their belief in God and who strive to live a life acceptable to Him, are psychologically especially fit to understand and appreciate the gospel of Jesus Christ. Special redemptive revelation does not destroy general revelation but is throughout based upon it. The thought of declaring men acceptable to God by reason of their fear of God and their good works, just as others are acceptable to God by reason of their faith in Jesus Christ, is hence foreign to this passage as it is foreign to the mind of the apostle Peter and to the whole genius of the New Testament.

That this acceptability to God is simply acceptability as possible believers or as candidates for the acceptance of the

gospel, is conclusively proved by the fact that Peter, after having made this statement, proceeds to preach the gospel of salvation in Christ to the very people of whom he has made this asseveration. Jesus' death, resurrection, and great commission constitute the content of his message (x. 36-43). He baptizes them not because they believed in God and did righteousness, but because they believed the gospel message and receive the Holy Ghost (x. 44-48). The angel told Cornelius that Peter would speak unto him "words, whereby thou shalt be saved" (xi. 14). The company in Cornelius' house received the Holy Ghost as the disciples themselves did "when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ" (xi. 17). And the judgment of the conference at Jerusalem on this whole problem was: "Then to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life" (xi. 18). All these statements clearly show how foreign to the whole narrative is the idea that the religious and moral sense of the best among the non-Christian nations can ever render them acceptable to God as such apart from the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Most of the passages discussed so far assert the uniqueness and finality of the gospel of Christ from the standpoint of the gospel itself. There are also a number of instructive New Testament passages which approach the question from the angle of the significance and the value of the ethnic religions with which early Christianity came into contact. A number of Pauline passages deal more especially with this angle of the problem, such as: Acts xiv. 15-17; Acts xvii. 22-31; Rom. i. 18-25; Rom. ii. 14-15; Eph. ii. 11-12. From the fact that these passages are written from the point of view of the appreciation of the ethnic religions it is not to be concluded that Paul in any way stresses the uniqueness and finality of the gospel of Christ less than, say, Peter does, and dwells rather on the positive value of the ethnic faiths in distinction from him. This is far from being the case. The fact that Paul does at times speak of the ethnic religions and that in terms of relative appreciation is readily accounted for by the fact that he, in distinction from Peter,

was the great missionary to the gentiles and consequently came into daily contact with ethnic religions. For the rest, the evaluation of the ethnic religions in a somewhat favorable light as found in the Pauline passages in Acts is in perfect harmony with the position maintained throughout the New Testament, Paul's writings and statements included, as to the uniqueness and absoluteness of the gospel of Christ.

Acts xiv. 15-17 is one of the New Testament passages in which we have a significant positive evaluation of the heathen religions as given by Paul, the first great missionary of our faith. A careful analysis of the passage shows it to contain the following teaching on the subject. (1) There is a revelation of God's goodness to all nations. "He left not himself without witness, doing good." (2) This revelation imparts natural good, such as rains, fertility, food, and gladness. (3) There is another, a more restricted or special, revelation, which until the coming of Christ was not offered to these nations. God "in the generations gone by suffered all the nations to walk in their own ways." (4) The content of this special revelation apparently is the gospel of Christ which demands repentance. "We bring you good tidings that you should turn from these vain things." (5) This special revelation and its demand is apparently the thing that matters in the estimation of Paul, whereas the truth of the general revelation of God to all men in nature is stated only as a concession and is made to serve merely as a connecting link for his gospel message.

Though God has remarkably revealed Himself to all nations in nature, the passage by no means implies that these nations therein have a true and adequate knowledge of God. On the contrary, it is clearly stated that these heathen, who enjoyed God's revelation in nature, were idolaters and needed to "turn from these vain things to the living God." That in this passage Paul says more of God's general revelation than of the special is readily accounted for from the situation. In speaking to these heathen he takes his point of departure in natural religion, proceeding pedagogically from



the known to the unknown. Further, it should be noted that the immediate occasion for these words was not found in his desire to preach the gospel but in his effort to restrain these heathen from making sacrifices to him and Barnabas, his companion. One should also observe that verses 21-23 of the same chapter imply that after this discourse based chiefly upon principles of natural theology they gave these Lycaonians further information concerning the revealed gospel of Jesus Christ.

Paul's address delivered to the Athenians on Mars' Hill is valuable for the subject under consideration by reason of its outspoken appreciation of features of Greek religion. The entire passage (Acts xvii. 22-31) is deserving of close study for a true understanding of the New Testament evaluation of ethnic religion.

The great apostle in this address appreciates and takes his point of departure in the general religious sense of the Athenians. It is worthy of note that his approach to the pagan Greek mind is not first of all one of condemnation but one of adaptation and relative appreciation. Though he had been provoked by their idolatry (vs. 16), he does not begin by denouncing but by appreciating their religious sense. The address throughout is marked by caution, moderation, tact. He quotes one of their poets (vs. 28). He takes his point of departure in the altar dedicated to the unknown god. His terminology throughout is such as would appeal to the Greek mind. He speaks well of their religious sense and links his message to this phenomenon in the words: "What therefore you unwittingly worship, this I set forth unto you." The word for worship (*εὐσεβείτε*) designates worship not *in malam* but *in bonam partem*. Significant in this connection is the expression: "Men of Athens, I perceive that in all things you are *ὡς δεισιδαιμον εστέροις*." This phrase is not to be translated "rather superstitious," but "very religious." The word means "divinity-fearing," and may be used with a more favorable or a more unfavorable connotation, as the case may be. In the favor-



able sense it would be translated "religious," "god-fearing"; in the unfavorable sense, "superstitious." Paul would hardly use the word here with the latter connotation. It would not fit into the situation nor would it be in keeping with the spirit of the rest of the discourse. Some hold that by using *δεισιδαιμονεστέρους* he used a word with a neutral meaning, wishing neither to offend nor to compliment the Athenians. This is possible, but also in that case the translation "religious" would be closer to the sense than that of "superstitious." The particle *ἢ* may be taken as a comparative, and in that case Paul says that he perceives they are "more religious" (i.e., than the other Greeks, since Athens had many temples). But also with this rendering the translation "religious" would seem to stand.

The apostle teaches further in this passage either by explicit statement or by implication that this religious sense is rooted in the fact that man is created in the image of God and is by virtue of this creation akin to God. Man is the "offspring" of God, bearing the divine image. God has made man in order that he might seek after, worship, and glorify his Maker. Man is hence a being with an ineradicable religious instinct. There is in him an urge to seek after God, "if haply they might feel after him and find him." The apostle characterizes the relationship between God and man in which this religious sense is rooted as one both of transcendence and of immanence. Paul had encountered two distinct philosophico-religious groups in Athens (vs. 18), the Epicureans and the Stoics. The former held to a distorted transcendence and the latter to a one-sided immanence. Over against this Paul sets forth the Biblical and theistic view of God's relation to His creatures as one that is both transcendent and immanent. God is the great Creator, who made the world (vs. 24a). He is Lord of heaven and earth (vs. 24b). He is the self-sufficient (vs. 25). That same God, however, is not far from us. In fact, we live, move, and exist in Him (vss. 27b, 28). The world is accordingly not a product of chance (Epicureans) nor of blind necessity (Stoics), but of

divine providence and design (vs. 26). In this twofold relationship of immanence as well as transcendence is rooted man's religious sense, his search for God.

This general religious sense, however, is also presented as perverted, darkened, and hence incapable of yielding true and saving knowledge of God. Though these heathen, as Paul recognizes, have a certain religious sense, this does not mean that they have an adequate knowledge of God. He practically tells them so in the expression, "what ye unwittingly worship" (vs. 23). Moreover he shows up the poverty of their image worship (vs. 29) and points out the true nature of God (vss. 24, 25, 29). Though Paul here links his message to the religious sense, the general knowledge of God, as found in the heathen mind, the conception of God which he sets forth is far above and beyond anything found in the pagan mind (vss. 24-26). He does not accept their view of God but corrects it. It would accordingly be a great mistake to suppose that by virtue of general revelation the Greek pagans had the same belief about God that Paul had and that they only needed to have the specific soteric teaching about Christ and His redemption brought to them in addition. Not only the true understanding of Christ and the way of salvation, but also the true understanding of God is had in the light of the New Testament revelation alone. The knowledge of God left in the heathen mind after the fall, though true insofar as it witnesses to the existence of God and to certain of His attributes, is an extremely perverted and distorted knowledge, full of error. That Paul recognizes an immanential relation subsisting also after the fall between God and man, does not at all imply that man in his present state, apart from supernatural revelation and regeneration, could have true and adequate knowledge of God. This is also suggested by the verb *ψηλαφήσαιαν*, "grope in the dark," "feel after," indicating that, though God be not far from His creatures, yet they grope after Him in their attempt to find Him. The heathen are blinded.

One more important truth which the apostle presents in

this famous address on Areopagus forms the capstone of his teaching on the relation of the Christian gospel to the ethnic religions. He maintains that the only adequate and the necessary revelation of Himself God has now offered in Jesus Christ. God has clearly revealed Himself apart from His revelation in nature. This revelation is a message that is brought by men commissioned for that special purpose *ἀπαγγέλλει* (vs. 30). This revelation deals with sin and repentance (vs. 30). It is a revelation unto judgment, a judgment that is coming and in which Jesus Christ, the same Jesus who is risen from the dead, will be the central figure. The basis for man's faith in this coming messianic judgment lies in the historical fact of Christ's resurrection (vs. 31c). *πίστιν παρασχὼν πᾶσιν ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν* is to be translated: "(God) having offered a guarantee (of this coming judgment) (i.e., as an objective basis for faith in this coming judgment) to all by raising him (i.e., the messianic judge, Christ) from the dead." From all these elements it appears that Paul speaks of a supernatural, historical revelation, not in any sense to be identified with God's general revelation in nature and man. And this is the revelation that is all-important. It must be brought to all men everywhere (vs. 30).

The question naturally suggests itself why the content of Paul's message in this passage is so predominantly of the natural theology type and contains so little that is explicit concerning Christ, His incarnation, death, and resurrection, and concerning sin, repentance, and salvation. Apart from the consideration mentioned above, that Paul adapts himself to his audience, it will materially aid us in answering this question to remember that in this address of Paul on Mars' Hill we have undoubtedly only the first part of his proposed message to the Athenians. Apparently his address was cut short. He was interrupted. Verse 32 informs us that when he mentioned the subject of the resurrection from the dead, some scoffed, and others said that they would hear him again. This can mean nothing else but that Paul never completed

his proposed address. Having already spoken of the truths of general revelation and having come to the messianic judgment, he was ready to take up the more specific positive elements of the New Testament gospel. But apparently he did not get beyond the messianic judgment. It seems to be contrary to sound interpretation of this passage to suppose that what we have in the verses 22-31 gives the complete message (or even a complete synopsis of the message) that Paul would have delivered had he been allowed the opportunity to complete his address.

After this discussion of the Pauline teaching as found in the book of Acts on the subject of Christianity's finality and uniqueness, we can dismiss the discussion of the Pauline epistles on the subject briefly. The entire structure of the Pauline type of New Testament teaching rests upon the great assumption of the absolute finality of the gospel of Christ. In 1 Cor. xv. the force of the whole argument establishing the certainty of the (future) resurrection of the believers from the indubitability of the fact of the (past) resurrection of Jesus Christ, rests upon the absolute uniqueness and the universal significance and efficacy of this great redemptive event: Christ's resurrection. This is also the presupposition of the cosmical significance of Christ as set forth in Colossians and Ephesians. For it should be remembered that this cosmical Christ in Paul's epistles is never viewed apart from the redeeming, the soteric Christ.

Especially the opening chapters of Romans offer us a definite conception of the finality of Christianity as contained in the Pauline epistles. The teaching there may be briefly summarized in the following statements. There is a revelation of God to all mankind (i. 19, 20, 21a). This general revelation is expressed both in nature (i.e., the physical world) and in man's moral consciousness (i. 19-20; ii. 14-15). As such it exhibits God in His divine power and in His holiness, the power to be adored by man, the divine holy will to be obeyed. This general revelation man, by reason of his corruption, not only cannot read properly, but he per-

verts it (i. 21-23, 25a, 18c). Mankind under this general revelation, though morally accountable ("without excuse"), is miserable and without hope. The divine displeasure rests upon him. Man's moral deterioration is the result of this (i. 20c, 18a, 24-27; cf. Eph. ii. 11-12). This condition renders another and more adequate revelation necessary, which revelation is found in Jesus Christ (i. 16-17; ii. 4; iii. 21-26). In the pre-Christian era the Jew enjoyed God's special redemptive revelation (iii. 1-2).

From the discussion of these New Testament passages there emerges a clear and definite teaching concerning the finality of the Christian revelation and the relative truth and value contained in the ethnic religions. Let us summarize this teaching in the following propositions:

All races and all men are religious.

All religions are the outcome of and are based upon divine revelation, but not all in the same sense nor in the same degree.

There is a general revelation, rooted in the divine-human relationship of creation, which all human beings as bearers of the divine image share, and which underlies all religions.

This general revelation has become impaired and distorted owing to man's fall into sin, so that his conception of God, of divine things, and of human duty and happiness, though not lost, has become impaired, distorted, full of error, and in its practical religious and moral expression mingled with sin.

The ethnic (or, non-Christian) religions are based upon this impaired and distorted general revelation, and as a consequence, though man's innate search for God comes to expression in them, and though they may contain elements of relative truth and goodness, they are fundamentally neither true nor satisfying (i.e., saving) but false.

Apart from these ethnic religions, essentially false, there is today and there ever has been the true religion, based upon that special supernatural, divine revelation which super-vened upon the general revelation distorted and impaired by man's fall into sin.



By reason of the abnormalcy of man's present state (in consequence of the fall) this special revelation bears necessarily a restorative and redemptive character.

This special, redemptive, supernatural revelation has passed through a progressive historical development in the Old Testament dispensation, a development having its goal and culmination in the incarnation and the atonement of Christ; the Old Testament phase of this history of revelation bears hence in relation to Christ and Christianity a preliminary, preparatory, anticipatory, and provisional character.

The revelation of God in the person and the work of Jesus Christ was necessarily unique, *einmalig*, and final, by reason of the fact that in Jesus Christ we have God become man for the supernatural redemption of the race. His person and His work, His teaching, His life, His death, and His resurrection—these, by reason of His deity and His perfect humanity, accomplished completely, finally, and once for all the redemption of man according to the divine purpose and promise.

Whenever this special, supernatural, redemptive revelation, objectively realized in Jesus Christ, His person and His work, is through faith subjectively appropriated by anyone, he enjoys the divine forgiveness of his sins and is restored to true knowledge of and fellowship with God through oneness with Christ; all of which is contingent upon the divine supernatural act of regeneration. Such a one is a believer, a true Christian. The company of such believers constitutes the Christian Church, and their Christ-centered religion is Christianity.

Christianity then is the one true, final, and absolute religion because it is rooted in, derives its meaning from, and is inspired by the unique, supernatural, *einmalig*, redemptive revelation of God in Jesus Christ, His person and His work, His incarnation, atonement, and resurrection. The uniqueness, *Einmaligkeit*, finality, and absoluteness of Jesus Christ and His redemption impart to Christianity its unique, *einmalig*, final, and absolute character.

*Grand Rapids, Mich.*

CLARENCE BOUMA.



## THE ORIGIN OF THE REGENSBURG BOOK

The Regensburg Book, so-called because it was first made public at the Diet of Regensburg, 1541, is one of the most important compromises in the history of the Christian Church and yet its origin has always been clouded in mystery. This mystery is no longer necessary, for within recent years original documents have been published which make it quite clear by whom the book was written, and under what circumstances.

In order to understand the importance of the Regensburg Book, it is necessary to review briefly the background of the German Reformation out of which it came. When the new emperor, Charles V, came to the throne in 1520, he faced a revolt in the church so formidable that it could not be ignored like most of the religious revolts of the preceding centuries. Something had to be done. Religious dissension was threatening the political unity of Germany. France, the Turks, and other enemies were advancing and Charles needed all the help which a united empire might afford him to resist them. Consequently, he resorted to drastic means to suppress the Lutheran revolt. First, he tried the method of force at the Diet of Worms, 1521; but force failed. The central authority was too weak, the Lutherans were too strong, and the enemies of the emperor kept him too busy outside the empire. When the second opportunity to deal with the problem came at the Diet of Augsburg, 1530, Charles added to force another solution; conviction. He commanded the Protestants to draw up a statement of their beliefs, and then had it officially refuted. But the rebels refused to be convinced. Although threats were added to arguments, they became more determined than ever, and Germany was divided and weakened by civil strife.

By 1538 the situation for Charles and the Catholics had become desperate. The Protestants, increasing rapidly in numbers, had organized the powerful Smalkald League. In 1534 they had reconquered the duchy of Württemberg, and

restored it to Ulrich, a rapacious noble, who robbed the church under the cloak of religious reform. Duke George of Saxony could not live many weeks longer, and was sure to be followed by his Protestant brother Henry. The Turks were threatening another invasion. Further attempts at force, therefore, would mean war, and worse than that, war against a superior foe. The Lutherans had developed a well-established theology which they refused to desert. Consequently there remained only one solution for the emperor, compromise; and this solution he decided to employ, still planning, however, to resort to force after he had weakened the Smalkald League by compromise and trickery.

Several reasons made it a good time for compromise, in addition to the fact that Charles was too weak to do anything else. The nationalists wanted peace, for only peace would keep Germany united and enable her to achieve nationalistic power. The nobles and the merchants had all kinds of selfish interests which made them quite ready to welcome a cheaper means than war of retaining their religious preferences. Among the clergy on both sides there was a numerous body of moderates who did not sympathize with the extremists and were willing to make peace by half-way measures. To these moderates peace was an end desirable in itself, for it meant a legal security under cover of which gains already made might be consolidated. Many Protestant clergymen saw that progress must be gradual, and the reformers should be content with half the pie rather than lose it by insisting upon having the whole. Moreover, there were two sides to this question of reform, and much injury had been wrought by going too fast and too far, as, for instance, in the matter of the confiscation of ecclesiastical property. Consequently, they welcomed peaceful overtures from the emperor, even though they did not fully trust him.

The first efforts at compromise were made not by Charles, but by the moderates in the Catholic party. Duke George of Saxony, feeling the hand of death laid upon him, sought, by

this means to mitigate the loss to his side which would come when his Protestant brother Henry would inherit the ducal throne. Through his chancellor George von Carlowitz he proposed a conference at Leipzig, where, on January 2, 1539, he met Melancthon and Brück from electoral Saxony, Bucer of Strasbourg and Feige from Hesse, and laid before them a drastic program by which Catholics and Protestants might lay aside their differences. No agreement was reached, but the olive branch was waved, thus opening a new period in the German Reformation when a series of religious colloquies attempted the daring, but impossible feat of reuniting Protestants and Catholics.<sup>1</sup> These colloquies were not insignificant failures, as often pictured by historians, but vitally important to the future of Germany, for by demonstrating the impossibility of peace, by failing to achieve a compromise, they decided that the next century of German history was to be a century of strife, not of nationalistic growth. When there seemed to be so many reasons why they should succeed, when the possibility of healing the schism was brightest, these colloquies marked both the high water mark of conciliation and also its end.

The conference at Leipzig was followed by another and larger one in the spring of 1539 at Frankfort. There the Protestants suffered a serious diplomatic defeat, but secured the promise of another colloquy.<sup>2</sup> This took place by the call

<sup>1</sup> On these special features of the Leipzig Conference see the following authorities: M. Lenz, *Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipps des Grossmüthigen von Hessen mit Bucer*, I, 53, et al.; *Corpus Reformatorum*, III, 621-622, 624, 628; E. L. Enders, *Dr. Martin Luther's Briefwechsel*, XIII, 269, note; M. Bucer, *Wider Auffrichtigung der Messen*, preface; M. Bucer, *Ein Christlich Bedenken*.

<sup>2</sup> O. Meinardus, "Die Verhandlungen des Schmalkaldischen Bundes Frankfurt 1539," *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, 1882, XXII, 607; "Thesaurus Baumianus," (a manuscript collection in the *Bibliothèque universitaire et regionale de Strasbourg*), XII, 23, 32, 45; A. Blätter, *Die Thätigkeit Melancthons bei den Unionsversuchen*, 1539-1541, Bern, 1899, p. 9; Enders, XII, 114, 134-137; *Corpus Reformatorum*, III, 650, 688-691, 698; T. Schiess, *Briefwechsel der Brüder Ambrosius und Thomas Blaurer 1509-1568*, Freiburg i. Br., 1908, 1909, 1912, II, 22,

of the emperor at Hagenau in June and July, 1540. A deadlock occurred even before the colloquy was opened, but the recess with which it closed called for yet another meeting of the same kind at Worms on October 28, 1540.<sup>3</sup>

The colloquy of Worms was a dismal failure so far as achieving a religious compromise was concerned. On November 25, the imperial minister Granvelle opened it with a speech in which he called the Protestants seditious.<sup>4</sup> On the next day the presidents submitted the mode of procedure,<sup>5</sup> but with this progress ceased, and for week after week the papal legate caused delay after delay.<sup>6</sup> It was at this juncture, when all hope of a compromise through official action was fast fading away; when something drastic had to be done, that the Regensburg Book had its birth. It arose chiefly out of the efforts of two leaders of the moderate party: John Gropper, the representative of Elector-Archbishop Hermann von Wied of Cologne, and Martin Bucer, the representative of the imperial city of Strasbourg.

Bucer and Gropper had first met at Hagenau in the preceding July, and had exchanged opinions on theology.<sup>7</sup> At Worms they continued their discussions on how concord and a reformation of the entire church might best be obtained. When the official colloquy had dragged on for weeks without even opening a discussion of theology, Gropper and the imperial secretary Gerhard Veltwyck suggested to Granvelle that the deadlock was unbreakable and the only way to accomplish anything was a private colloquy between themselves representing the Catholics, and Bucer and Capito, represent-

24; F. Hortleder, *Von den Ursachen des Teutschen Kriegs, 1546-1547*, I, cap. XXXII; M. Bucer, *Vom tag zu Hagenaw*, 1540.

<sup>3</sup> M. Bucer, *Von den einigen rechten wege*, 1545, p. 38; M. Bucer, *Vom tag zu Hagenaw*, Lij; E. Doumergue, *Calvin*, II, 605; Lenz, I, 222.

<sup>4</sup> Lenz, I, 244. The whole speech is printed in LePlat, *Monumentorum ad Historiam Concilii Tridentini . . . Collectio*, II, 683.

<sup>5</sup> J. G. Walch, *Dr. Martin Luther's Sämmtliche Schriften*, 1901, XVII, 417.

<sup>6</sup> Kurtz, *A History of the Christian Church*, II, 89.

<sup>7</sup> M. Bucer, *Von den einigen*, 56-62.

ing the Protestants.<sup>8</sup> On Monday, December 13, Granvelle summoned Bucer and his colleague Capito from Strasbourg to an interview,<sup>9</sup> and on the next day he officially proposed that Bucer, Capito, Gropper and Veltwyck should engage in a secret colloquy to attain the religious agreement which it was evident the public colloquy would not. Granvelle himself wanted it secret because many of the papists were so intent upon war that they would leave if they knew peaceful negotiations were carried on which might be successful.<sup>10</sup> The whole proposition was a complete surprise to Bucer and Capito. They hesitated to consent, for a successful secret colloquy would make the public colloquy a mere farce, and they were unwilling to assume so much authority. Before giving any decision, they secured a solemn promise from Granvelle that the secret colloquy would in no way interfere with the public colloquy, or undermine its authority, and that their participation would be kept absolutely secret.<sup>11</sup> Next the two re-

---

<sup>8</sup> M. Bucer, *Von den einigen*, 65; M. Bucer, *De Concilio et legitime*, 1545, p. 2.

<sup>9</sup> Lenz, I, 269.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 274.

<sup>11</sup> M. Bucer, *Von den einigen*, 66; M. Bucer, *De Concilio et legitime*, 2. As a result of an attempt by Bucer to lead a reformation of the diocese of Cologne in 1542-1543, he and Gropper became enemies and engaged in a polemic in which Gropper accused Bucer of having proposed the secret colloquy at Worms. Bucer replied that he and Capito were invited to it by Gropper and Veltwyck (M. Bucer, *De Concilio et legitime*, 2; H. Schaefer, *De Libri Ratisbonensis Origine*, 1870, p. 25. This rare dissertation by Schaefer is in the possession of Princeton Theological Seminary Library). Gulick's assertion that there is not enough evidence to tell which was right is unreliable, for Gulick has made no use of the most important evidence in the case, the letters published by Lenz (W. v. Gulick, *Johannes Gropper*, 1906, 70-73; Lenz, I, 269, ff.). Bucer's polemics, written for the public years afterward in the heat of controversy might lie open to the charge of partiality, but his letters, written before there was any thought of strife, and to the landgrave, whom he had no desire to deceive, are the most reliable evidence available. These letters show plainly that the invitation was issued by Granvelle and Veltwyck at Gropper's instigation, and that Bucer was heartily in sympathy with the idea. Three considerations make Bucer's explanation of the origin of the colloquy the only possible correct one. First, the secret colloquy was



formers consulted with Chancellor Feige of Hesse, and James Sturm, the magisterial representative of Strasbourg.<sup>12</sup> The statesmen were not favorably impressed, for, in spite of Granvelle's assurances, they believed that the success of such a secret colloquy would mean the failure of the public one. Bucer and Capito, they thought, had no right to take into their own hands the formulation of a theological agreement, and for that reason alone it would be unacceptable to the Protestants. Whatever its contents, they would be so insulted by such a procedure that they would oppose it. Bucer was displeased by their attitude, for the proposal was an exceedingly attractive one to him. He hated delays and felt perfectly equal to the task. Justifiably confident that the public colloquy would not amount to anything, and conscientiously convinced that he would be rendering a service to the cause of the Reformation, he decided to consent.<sup>13</sup>

Early the next morning, at six o'clock, Bucer went to Granvelle. The wily minister repeated the threats of war with which the emperor had gained so much ever since his coronation, and promised again that he would not let the secret colloquy be an injury in any way either to the public colloquy, or to the Protestant states, or to Bucer and Capito personally.

---

opposed to his policy of a public colloquy. Second, it is doubtful if any suggestion offered by Bucer to Granvelle would have been favorably received (*cf.* T. Wiedemann, *Dr. Johann Eck*, 1865, p. 312). Hergenröther states erroneously that the secret colloquy was arranged by the landgrave, as will be shown below (Hergenröther, *Handbuch der allgemeine Kirchengeschichte*, III, 438). Third, in every case, where there is no doubt as to what happened during the negotiations, the Catholics took the initiative.

<sup>12</sup> M. Bucer, *Von den einigen*, 65; M. Bucer, *De Concilio et legitime*, 2. Gropper joined in the secret colloquy because his lord, the Archbishop of Cologne had already begun a reformation of his diocese in which Gropper was the leader. Neither of them wanted this enterprise to go so far as a break with the church, and so they resorted to the plan of a compromise. If they could gain such a compromise, sanctioned by the diet, then they could retain the reforms already instituted and yet occupy a legal position. Otherwise they would have to retrench or else separate from the Roman Catholic Church (Schaefer, 40, ff.).

<sup>13</sup> Lenz, I, 274; *cf. ibid.*, I, 244, 256, 517; Blätter, 68.



Bucer in reply assured him that the Protestants did not seek strife but only a reformation. Though they would make no concessions on the chief doctrines, they would satisfactorily justify them, not only according to the Bible, but also according to the teaching of the Apostolic Church and the Fathers. He explained his attitude on ecclesiastical property, and suggested, since the Protestants insisted on a reformation and the pope absolutely refused it, that the emperor should take the lead. Though manifestly impossible, it was not such a foolish suggestion as it appeared, for why should the emperor desire a secret colloquy to formulate a doctrinal compromise unless he wished to conduct a reformation. The pope refused to undertake it, the Protestants threatened to do it by revolution, and the only other peaceful method was by imperial leadership. The difficulty, as Granvelle pointed out, was that in conducting a reformation Charles would arouse the antagonism of the Catholic princes, and bring upon the movement the suspicion of dynastic ambitions. Though the emperor could not lead a reformation publicly, something could be done privately, and for this reason, Granvelle said, a secret colloquy was desired. Bucer was thoroughly aware that the emperor and minister were only seeking to establish their power, but in order to gain religious unity it was worth while to run the risk, and he consented to join in the colloquy.<sup>14</sup>

The same day a trial conference was held, and a partial agreement reached. The public colloquy, on the other hand, went from bad to worse. The desirable Frankfort mode of procedure, demanded by the majority, was blocked by a minority of reactionaries. The latter group was so bitter and disagreeable that even Roman Catholics complained. An attempt to have the Protestant preachers dismissed was only thwarted by Granvelle's refusal to permit it. News of a persecution, not of common people, but of noblemen, in Besançon, gave a touch of reality to the rumors of war. It was not

---

<sup>14</sup> Lenz, I, 275-276.

strange, under these circumstances, that Bucer and Capito were convinced that the public colloquy was hopeless. When further secret conferences increased the hopes engendered by the first one, Bucer was forced to admit that this was apparently the only available way of reaching a peaceful religious agreement. Yet he was not satisfied to continue the secret colloquy on his own authority, for he had no right to represent the Protestant states in such an important way. From the unreliable Veltwyck he exacted the most solemn assurances that this was the only way in which the emperor knew how to avoid war, that he would give a written promise of secrecy with the emperor's seal, and that the negotiations should be revealed only to the Landgrave of Hesse. Because Bucer placed no reliance on these promises, he sought to protect himself by a similarly dishonorable method. He requested the landgrave to write him a letter, dated about, or before, December 10, 1540, authorizing him to enter into such negotiations for the promotion of a Christian colloquy, provided he did nothing contrary to the decisions adopted at Hagenau, or disadvantageous to the Protestant states. This letter he planned to show only to Feige and James Sturm, but to use it as a protection for himself in case the secret colloquy was discovered.

Though the landgrave was pleased with the secret colloquy and agreed that the public colloquy was in a hopeless state, he was just as unwilling as Bucer to assume the responsibility for the negotiations. He sent the commission which Bucer requested, but sought to throw the responsibility upon the Catholics by requiring Granvelle to send him a letter requesting the document. In a pessimistic way he reminded Bucer of the Scylla and Charybdis, Luther and the pope, between which any religious agreement must pass. In other words, it would be useless for the little group at Worms to formulate a compromise, however perfect, that the pope would not approve, for then no Catholic would accept it. Likewise without Luther's sanction such an agreement would be a mere

scrap of paper. There were only two solutions of this difficulty, he thought, one, to formulate an agreement attractive to so large a majority of influential persons that the approval of Luther or the pope, or both, could be disregarded. The other alternative was to gain the election of a "reforming" pope, relieved of all powers except those of an ordinary bishop. The first Bucer adopted, the latter, equally impossible policy, was advocated by the landgrave. He cautioned Bucer that in the secret colloquy he could speak only as an individual and not as a representative of the Protestant party. Moreover, that it would be useless to make a compromise on ecclesiastical property that would not be acceptable to the rapacious Duke Ulrich of Württemberg.<sup>16</sup>

The sessions of the secret colloquy were held in Groper's lodgings at convenient hours. In addition to an assurance of strict secrecy it was agreed that each one should present his own belief, and then state how he thought an agreement could be reached on it, but should not be bound by any such conciliatory statements.<sup>17</sup> Gropper proved to be the leader in conciliation, for he apparently accepted the dogma of justification by faith, granted the necessity of worthy, faithful pastors, and recognized that the liturgy of the church needed purification to adapt it to the needs of the people.<sup>18</sup> Bucer and Capito demanded, in addition to these things, the true dispensation of the sacraments and the establishment of schools; and, for their part, conceded that the German churches could reach a settlement only if these things were granted and established by a council.<sup>19</sup>

The continuation of the secret colloquy revealed a possibility of agreement on many of the chief doctrines where no agreement had been reached before. It also showed the irreconcilable attitude of the two parties on matters of practice,

---

<sup>15</sup> Lenz, I, 276-279.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 280-283.

<sup>17</sup> M. Bucer, *Von den einigen*, 65-66.

<sup>18</sup> M. Bucer, *De Concilio et legitime*, 2-3.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

for the papists demanded the permission of public masses, and masses without communicants. Though Bucer was forced to admit that his opponents acted at times as if they seriously desired a reformation, his common sense told him that they really desired aid against the Turks, and that to gain it they did not scruple to raise false anticipations in the hearts of the Protestants.<sup>20</sup>

Finally, during the last week of December, 1540, Gropper composed articles on justification, the sacraments, and ecclesiastical organization representing as nearly as possible the doctrine to which both sides would agree.<sup>21</sup> In addition the papists added a statement of four points on which they would make no concession. First, they demanded intercession of the saints, which they said was practised by the Apostolic Church and was not contrary to Scripture.<sup>22</sup> Second, they insisted upon prayers for the dead, because it was such an ancient usage. Third, auricular confession should be practised at least once a year, yet it need not be a minute narration nor made to a priest of unsuitable youth. Fourth, transsubstantiation and the reservation of the host ought to be allowed.<sup>23</sup>

On the other hand, Bucer and Capito put into writing, at the request of their opponents, the methods which they advocated to gain the support of both parties to the articles: namely, to send copies to the landgrave and the Elector of Brandenburg; to submit them to the emperor; at the coming Diet to have the Elector of Brandenburg lay them before the Elector of the Palatinate and the ecclesiastical electors; to

<sup>20</sup> Lenz, I, 286-287.

<sup>21</sup> M. Bucer, *Von den einigen*, 84.

<sup>22</sup> Gropper's account of the secret colloquy was published in his *Wahrhaftige Antwort*, 1545.

<sup>23</sup> Lenz, I, 288-290, 532-533; *Corpus Reformatorum*, IV, 94. These articles thus displaced the Leipzig Articles as the proposed formula for concord, but a comparison of the two shows that Bucer followed in general the same program. While the two formulas differ in arrangement they agree in details and the most important differences are explained by the fact that in one case Bucer was dealing with Witzel, and in the other with Gropper (L. Cardauns, *Zur Geschichte der Kirchlichen Unions- und Reformbestrebungen von 1538 bis 1542*, Rome, 1910, pp. 16-23).

discuss with pious people the four disputed points; to seek the appointment of favorable representatives to the next Diet; and to demand an agreement on doctrine and organization before a settlement on ceremonies and usages.<sup>24</sup> There was no discussion of ecclesiastical property,<sup>25</sup> the one question which was a greater obstacle to a compromise than any other.

The secret colloquy having achieved the formulation of a compromise, the next step was to gain for it sufficient backing to make it worth presenting publicly. This effort Bucer began by seeking the approval of his patron, Landgrave Philip of Hesse. At first, he planned to send the articles to the prince, with the request that he show them to his three trusted theologians, Melchior Adam, Pistorius and Lening, in order to secure their assent.<sup>26</sup> But, on December 31, 1540, Veltwyck advised him to go and gain the landgrave's approval personally. Although, as Bucer told him, Philip could only give his individual assent, still he was an important person, and without such an agreement, an understanding between the emperor and the prince would be impossible because of the pope's objections. Again the imperial secretary threatened that the emperor could not resist those who advised him to resort to war, unless some compromise was effected, and the landgrave's approval was the next step. Bucer, consequently consulted with Feige, planning that his approval should appear like a call from the landgrave; and then Sturm's assent could be gained without giving any reasons. Feige opposed the proposition. Bucer's absence would look suspicious, he said, and besides, what was the use of gaining the landgrave's approval when the other side would probably reject the negotiations. James Sturm agreed that Bucer should not leave Worms, especially because Granvelle had just proposed a more favorable mode of procedure to the presidents of the colloquy, and it was important for

---

<sup>24</sup> Lenz, I, 290.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 292.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 291.



Bucer to be present when the decision was rendered. At a conference with Granvelle on the next day, Bucer explained the matter and persuaded him to write to Philip. But Veltwyck insisted so strongly that Bucer must see the landgrave personally, that the reformer finally consented to make a hurried trip for that purpose. It was neither the desire to avoid war, nor to please the pope which made Veltwyck and Granvelle seek the landgrave's approval so ardently. They knew that the French were seeking an alliance with him, and in order to make Philip favor an alliance with the emperor instead, they offered this promise of a religious agreement. Naturally it made a strong appeal to the landgrave, for, if such an ecclesiastical compromise were effected, then an understanding with the emperor to protect his recent bigamy would not be an injury to the Reformation. In order to make the most of this opportunity, Veltwyck assured Bucer that the emperor was coming soon, and there was no time to waste.<sup>27</sup> Bucer understood their motives, but sought the landgrave's approval, because he hoped the compromise would make further alliances relatively unimportant.

When Bucer informed Philip by letter of these negotiations, the latter invited him to a conference at Rosbach, and instructed Feige to aid him to make the journey.<sup>28</sup> On Wednesday, January 5, 1541, Bucer left Worms, first sending ahead a message to the landgrave to meet him at Giessen, several miles nearer, in order that he might return to Worms on Sunday in time for the opening of the public colloquy on Monday morning.<sup>29</sup> On Friday they met at Giessen, and after Bucer had explained the articles to Philip in German, the prince gave him a written statement that he was "not displeased" with them. As for Granvelle's other request, that he promise to come to the Diet to meet soon in Regensburg, he gave no definite assurances, for his presence there was a com-

---

<sup>27</sup> Lenz, I, 297-300.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 304-305.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 308; *Corpus Reformatorum*, IV, 14.



modity that he was determined to sell at the highest possible price.<sup>30</sup> On the other hand, the emperor knew that Philip was desperately in need of protection and he used this exigency to gain his approval of a religious agreement, by which at the next Diet the Protestants might be decoyed into unwatchfulness and persuaded to give help against the Turks.

Bucer returned to Worms at 10 o'clock Sunday morning, January 9, 1541. That evening he had a conference with Granvelle, who was pleased with everything except a suggestion by Philip that the emperor make some concessions to Gulich to win the elector's favor. This plan he rejected completely. Again he insisted that Philip come to the Diet.<sup>31</sup>

The next prince to be approached was Elector Joachim of Brandenburg. On January 11, 1541, Bucer sent to him a copy of the articles, adding the misleading, though not strictly untruthful, explanation that the public colloquy was hopelessly monopolized by reactionary papists, and that the emperor perceived that the unity of Germany was impossible without ecclesiastical peace. This, he pointed out, was opposed by the pope. Consequently, certain princes and electors had commissioned their scholars to compose a statement of the articles in dispute, which had been confidentially shown to Bucer and Capito at Worms. They had agreed that it would be a good plan to submit this tentative compromise to an assembly of scholars who should revise it until it was generally acceptable. But before that was done it was necessary to gain the support of influential princes and electors for the plan, in order that the pope's inevitable opposition might be overcome. As in his earlier attempt at concord between the Protestants on the Lord's Supper, Bucer asserted that there were many misunderstandings which concealed the fact that both sides were nearer together than they thought. He requested Elector Joachim to inspect the articles and then send them to Luther for his secret investigation and judg-

---

<sup>30</sup> Lenz, I, 309.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 310.

ment, explaining to him that it offered a compromise by which many of the papists might be won to an agreement on the chief matters, and a means of persuading the princes to undertake a colloquy. He directed that Luther's opinion and the articles should be sent back to the Elector Joachim, and then by the latter to the landgrave, who would return them to Bucer. "This is the only way," he declared, "by which the favor of the lords and people may be won to help in a Christian agreement and reformation of the German nation at this time."<sup>32</sup> For Bucer the Worms Articles were a last resort, not an ideal.

Bucer's letter to Elector Joachim, enclosing a copy of the Worms Articles in Latin, was sent first to the landgrave about January 18, with the request that they be copied and then forwarded to the elector.<sup>33</sup> On February 4, 1541, Joachim sent them to Luther with a letter copied almost word for word from Bucer's.<sup>34</sup> Luther and Melancthon returned them with an unfavorable opinion and then Joachim sent them to the emperor with the information that there was great hope they would settle the controversy. Granvelle then laid them before Gropper, Contarini, Eck, and other Catholic theologians, who added various emendations and returned them to the emperor.<sup>35</sup> On the way back from Worms Bucer partially translated the Articles from Latin into German, as the landgrave had requested.<sup>36</sup> But he did not complete the task, and when he arrived in Strasbourg so many other things had to be done that he laid the Articles aside.<sup>37</sup>

The Diet of Regensburg was opened by the emperor on April 5, 1541, with the statement that its primary purpose was to attain religious unity, and, after that, to render aid against the Turks. As a means for attaining the first aim

<sup>32</sup> Lenz, I, 529-536, 311; Blätter, 58.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 312.

<sup>34</sup> Enders, XIII, 257; *cf.* Lenz, I, 535, II, 21.

<sup>35</sup> Schaefer, 50, ff.; Blätter, 58, ff.

<sup>36</sup> Lenz, I, 312; *cf. ibid.*, 305, 309.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 7.

he suggested a secret colloquy between three theologians from each side, who he nominated. The men he chose were Melanchthon, Bucer and Pistorius from the Protestants and Pflug, Eck and Gropper from the Catholics.<sup>38</sup> At their first discussion, on Wednesday, April 27, 1541, the emperor laid before the collocutors as a guide for their deliberations a set of articles which became known as the "Regensburg Book," or "Regensburg Interim."<sup>39</sup> This was a bolt out of a clear sky; a surprise to all except the few who were on the inside. Melanchthon was not only surprised but also offended, and gave his consent to use the formula only after all the others had.<sup>40</sup>

There was much speculation as to the origin and authorship of the pamphlet, although the emperor announced that it had been composed by certain pious men as a formula of concord,<sup>41</sup> and Granvelle declared that it had been composed by certain Belgian scholars who had died two years before.<sup>42</sup> This pretence deceived no one, for nearly everybody attributed it either to Gropper or Bucer.<sup>43</sup> Morone wrote to Rome that Gropper was generally regarded as the author,<sup>44</sup> and Eck wrote to Nausea, "Granvelle and Count von Manderschied have seen to it that Gropper wrote that book."<sup>45</sup> Later he

<sup>38</sup> *Corpus Reformatorum, Calvini Opera*, XI, 195; LePlat, III, 8; M. Bucer, *Alle Handlungen und Schrifften, 1541*, Bi, 12, 16; K. T. Hergang, *Das Religionsgespräch zu Regensburg, 1858*, p. 10. ff.; *Corpus Reformatorum*, IV, 156-163; 178-179; Walch, XVII, 578; Lenz, III, 18-19.

<sup>39</sup> M. Bucer, *Alle Handlungen*, 30b; T. Brieger, *De Formulae Concordiae Ratisbonensis origine atque indole, 1870*, p. 15. The text is printed in a number of places, among them the following; M. Bucer, *Alle Handlungen*, 31, ff., and its Latin edition, *Acta colloquii in comitiis imperii Ratisponae habiti, 1541*, Bi; C. W. Hering, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Reunionsversuche, 1836*, p. 50, ff.; Walch, XVII, 587; LePlat, III, 10; Blätter, 96.

<sup>40</sup> *Corpus Reformatorum*, IV, 253, 547; P. Vetter, *Die Religionsverhandlungen auf dem Reichstage zu Regensburg 1541, 1889*, p. 1.

<sup>41</sup> M. Bucer, *Alle Handlungen*, 30b.

<sup>42</sup> Schaefer, 12; J. Eck, *Apologia, 1542*, I, ii. Gulich falsely attributes this statement to the emperor (Gulich, 79).

<sup>43</sup> Gulich, 79-82.

<sup>44</sup> F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe des Cardinals Gasparo Contarini, 1881*, p. 178.

<sup>45</sup> Schaefer, 14.

asserted publicly that he knew the author was one of the collocutors because one of them steadfastly defended the book.<sup>46</sup> The fact that Eck did not at the same time name him shows that he had in mind Gropper, not Bucer, for he would have been only too glad to have cast the blame upon Bucer, but at that time he was defending Gropper and so he mentioned no names.

That Bucer at least had a part in the composition of the book was believed by Eck, Cochlaeus, Joachim, and others.<sup>47</sup> Melanchthon happened to see several pages in Bucer's hand, which he afterwards found corresponded with parts of the book, and suspected that his colleague was the author. His suspicions were increased when he learned that Bucer had given Musculus of Augsburg a manuscript to copy which also corresponded to sections of the book. On this basis he spread the report that Bucer was the author. As soon as the latter heard it, he at once remonstrated with Melanchthon, telling him that he was not the author of the book, but he had known about the plan and discussed it with Gropper with good intentions. The real authors, he said, were Gropper and Veltwyck. When the book was finished they had shown it to him and Capito, and when they were not opposed to it, Granvelle had sent it to the landgrave and Joachim, with Bucer's commendation.<sup>48</sup> Melanchthon, who was sincerely sorry that he had brought undeserved reproach upon Bucer, tried to retrieve his error. In the preface to his *Acta in Conventu Ratisbonae* he wrote a few months later, "Who may be the author of the book, I surely do not know,"<sup>49</sup> Luther condemned the colloquy as hopeless almost before it had begun,<sup>50</sup> and though he made no statement as to the author of the

<sup>46</sup> J. Eck, *Apologia*, I. ii.

<sup>47</sup> Schaefer, 17; J. Eck, *Apologia*, I. ii.

<sup>48</sup> *Corpus Reformatorum*, IV, 578-579; cf. *ibid.*, 475; Blätter, 59, n. 1.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 190, note; Schiess, II, 86. Yet on April 8, 1543, he wrote privately to the elector that "Gropper made the Regensburg Book" (*Corpus Reformatorum*, V, 88), and in many other places indicated the same opinion (Schaefer, 16).

<sup>50</sup> deWette, *Luther's Briefe*, V, 353.

Regensburg Book, he called it the most harmful writing ever composed.<sup>51</sup>

As a matter of fact the Regensburg Book was nothing more nor less than the Worms Articles, drawn up during the secret colloquy of Worms by Gropper with Bucer's suggestions, and emended by the landgrave and various scholars. But the secret of its origin was carefully guarded, and as yet the full story has never been told. Hergang ascertained the correct author about the middle of the nineteenth century,<sup>52</sup> but Schaefer was the first to prove the authorship of the Regensburg Book by contemporary testimony and then to show its identity with the Worms Articles by the similarity in contents and the history of the articles.<sup>53</sup> Lenz made a careful study of the text and its genealogy<sup>54</sup> and published Bucer's correspondence with the landgrave telling the story of the secret colloquy of Worms. In addition to their conclusive arguments with regard to the authorship of the book, it should be noted that the differences between the Leipzig and the Worms Articles is the difference between Witzel's and Gropper's beliefs, thus indicating Gropper as the author of the latter.<sup>55</sup> Bucer wrote to Ambrose Blaurer in October, "Nor am I the author of the book, and I wonder greatly why some still assert it, since Philip both in person and in letters, after he had inflicted this wound without cause, sought zealously to heal it."<sup>56</sup>

The Regensburg Book was a failure. Although the collocutors discussed it with great energy and the two sides came nearer an agreement than ever before or since, only a small part of it was accepted. Its importance lies not in its contents nor in what it accomplished but in what it failed to accomplish. When it appeared in 1541 there was a possibility

---

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 388.

<sup>52</sup> Hergang, 49, ff.

<sup>53</sup> Schaefer, *op. cit.*, see especially pp. 7, ff., 27, ff., 50.

<sup>54</sup> Lenz, III, 31, ff., 117; cf. *Corpus Reformatorum*, IV, 190.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Cardauns, 18, ff.

<sup>56</sup> Schiess, II, 86.

that the Reformation might merely be another temporary dispute like the papal schism. The failure of the Regensburg Book showed that this hope was vain, at least so far as Germany was concerned, and that agreement was impossible.

*Delaware, Ohio.*

HASTINGS EELLS.



## WILHELM HERRMANN'S SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY \*

Herrmann tells us that a systematic theology which aims at making explicit for the Christian what is given him in his faith, has two tasks: that it has to show (1) How a man is inwardly renewed through the experience he may have of the power of the Person of Jesus; (2) How the faith—grounded in this experience and determined by it as to content—expresses itself. He deals with these two tasks in order.

Under the second head he expounds according to his claim "the ideas which are the expression of the faith which knows itself sustained by the power of the personal life of Jesus." He informs us, however, that, following this path, we shall never obtain "a closed and entirely consistent system of ideas; for faith itself grows, it changes daily, if it is really alive (Rom. xii.2), and is continually producing ideas which are in a state of mutual tension."

With our Lord's adage, "By their fruits ye shall know them," in mind, we shall consider first the fruits of Herrmann's faith.

### I. THEOLOGY PROPER

Herrmann's theology proper is not adequately grounded. As to the evidences for believing in the existence, personality, and the attributes of God, he represents the evidences from the adaptation and order pervading the universe as unworthy of consideration, because, "we do not know the totality of things," and because, "we do not by any means always find in the world, as we know it, a purposeful order," but "are often oppressed with a sense of the meaningless events"; and because moreover, "if this argument were sound, it would prove the existence not of God: i.e., a Being of absolute wisdom and power,<sup>1</sup> but only a Being of wisdom

---

\* *Systematic Theology* by Wilhelm Herrmann. English translation by Michlem and Saunders.

<sup>1</sup> P. 71.

and power higher than our own." He represents the cosmological evidences for the being of God, as, of rational evidences, "alone worthy of serious refutation"; he says of it:

The cosmological proof starts from the fact that everything to which we can point is conditioned by other things. Had we, however, to imagine all things as thus conditioned, we should be unable in the end to ascribe existence in the full sense to anything whatsoever. We must therefore conceive the notion of a Reality distinct from this world, a Reality self-existent or absolute, on which all finite things depend, and from which they derive their share of reality. . . . Now it is perfectly true that science can only securely grasp the reality of things in time and space when they can be conceived in relation to an eternal Being. But in the work of science the eternal ground of all being is, as a matter of fact, never expressed in terms of God, but always in conceptions of law. In the attempt to substantiate the reality of a thing, the way of science is always to seek to make good the proposition that this thing is bound up with all other things in one uniform nature. The idea underlying the hypothesis—that of an all embracing law—is that which for science expresses the eternal ground of all that is in time and space.<sup>2</sup>

After disposing, in this easy way, of the evidences for the existence of God, and after passing more or less just criticism on the efforts of Eucken, Kaftan, Kant, and Schleiermacher to reach validly the truth of God's existence, Herrmann gives us his views of how it may be had—namely, through experience. He says:

The experience out of which religion may arise, then, is the realization on the part of any religious man that he has encountered a spiritual power in contact with which he has felt utterly humbled, yet at the same time uplifted to a real independent inner life. This is met with in ordinary life, when in the society of our fellows we experience in ourselves the awakening of reverence and trust.

If we have experienced the working of this power, through contact with which a life, which is life in truth, a real human life, arises in us, then we are in a position to settle the question whether God is a reality to us. It simply depends on whether we remain loyal to the truth, that is, whether we are prepared to treat the fact of such a power as what it really is for us. The moment we desire dependence upon it, and submit ourselves to it in reverence and trust, this spiritual power is really our soul's Lord. We can never again entirely forget the fact that we have met with a power which had not only an eternal sway over us, but subdued our hearts.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 22 and 23.

<sup>3</sup> P. 36.

(1) So far, we have been restating in a compendious way the method by which Herrmann supposes some men become possessed of the truth that God is a reality to them. "The method" seems to be by feeling, the cause of the feeling being "utterly humbling" and "utterly uplifting." The cause of the humbling and uplifting feeling is most vaguely grasped, apparently. It is described as putting us in a position "to settle the question whether God is a reality to us." There is no guarding here against the view that this "Reality to us," may be only subjective; and that corresponding to this Reality to us, there may be no substantially existing person or being. According to this view, only they who have this marvelous experience can possess the truth, "that God is a Reality to them." This contradicts the history of the human race and the views of men who teach in a manner far more convincing than Professor Herrmann. According to a great number of reliable historians there has been a widely prevailing belief amongst all nations in the existence of a supreme Deity, and among vast numbers in these nations who have in effect disclaimed any such experience as that described by Herrmann as conditioning the ability of a man "to settle the question as to whether God is a reality to him." Thousands and perhaps millions of men, who would disclaim any such phenomenal experience as Herrmann makes necessary to settle the question whether God is a reality to one, have believed in the existence of a Lord absolute of the universe. Paul teaches, in Rom. i.19-20: "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them: for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." These words of Paul for saneness of thought and for philosophic insight, are weightier than Herrmann's and they show amongst other things that men who have not religion, and are not even "religiously minded" ought to see that God exists and that He is of "eternal power and Godhead." In

discussing the existence of God, Herrmann treats both the Bible and the history of thought with scant respect.

(2) When about to cast away the cosmological argument for the existence of God, Herrmann states it in no very strong form—rather he misstates it—and then in order to break its force indulges in some curiously inept remarks as follows, “Now it is perfectly true that science can only securely grasp the reality of things in time and space when they can be conceived in relation to an eternal being. But in the work of science the eternal ground of all being is, as a matter of fact, never expressed in terms of God, but always in the conception of law.”

One must ask, “The law of what?” “Law” and “ground” are heterogeneous categories. “Law” properly expresses the mode in which a cause acts, or, if the cause be moral, the way in which it should act; whereas ground is but another name for cause, efficient cause. If science seeks the efficient cause of the universe regarded (as it properly is regarded) as a begun thing it must seek a somewhat in the category of force and ultimately in the category of Being. The philosopher having refuted pantheism, and the doctrine that the present world is “the product of an infinite series of events,” and having stated the cosmological argument correctly, may draw a conclusion of vast weight notwithstanding the cavil of Kant which that great thinker made because of his misapprehension or misstatement of the law of causality. The argument never has been successfully overthrown. Herrmann should recognize the fact.

(3) The teleological proof is of force notwithstanding Herrmann’s assertion that it is “scientifically a quite indefensible attempt to find a basis upon which to prove the existence of God.” He is following a widespread modern tradition in this assertion but a tradition itself “quite indefensible.” Let the argument be stated: Every phenomena must have an adequate cause; Adaptation and order pervade the universe; Therefore the cause of this ordered world, of this ordered begun thing, must be a thing of intelligence and

power of choice. Herrmann would object, indeed, that we do not know that order pervades the universe. But he will not deny that every advance in science as far as it teaches anything, shows that adaptation and order prevail in the heavens above and in the elements of the earth. Order is manifest to the naked eye, more widely manifest when telescope, or microscope is used. With every advance of science purpose becomes more manifest. We do not always know what the purpose in some creation is. The purpose of the spleen is not yet fully understood; but the man of science shows that he believes it has a purpose. If he did not, he would not labor to understand it. Granted that some events are meaningless to us, men of science think that meaninglessness to us is due to the imperfection of our insight. Professor Herrmann says, "Even if this teleological argument were sound, it would prove the existence not of God, i.e., of a being of absolute wisdom and power, but only of a being of wisdom and power higher than our own." Surely, however, this conclusion is unworthy. The being competent to bring about the order and adaptation displayed in this universe possesses wisdom and power not merely higher than Professor Herrmann and his followers possess, but indefinitely higher. He who contrived the order disclosed in the movement of the heavenly bodies, and in the combinations of the ultimate chemical elements, the adaptations observable in the eye, the ear, the hand, shows himself possessed of a wisdom and power so vast that no man who is not a supreme egotist dares to say that God's wisdom may not be infinite. And, if on other solid grounds absolute wisdom and power may be affirmed of the Creator of the universe, the adaptations and the order which pervade the universe, fall in with and support that truth in no mean way.

(4) A miraculously given revelation, and in particular, Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ, the Son of the living God settles the fact of the absolute wisdom and power of God.

The plausibilities of certain schools of false philosophy

and of rationalistic criticism had been adopted by not a few of the occupants of theological chairs in Germany, whence once the truth had been taught. Their teachings had occasioned confusion, dismay and rout; and, after a little, enthusiastic hostility to Bible truths on the part of many of their students. The Ritschlians, for whom Herrmann speaks had suffered the stampede, had retreated with the rout, but later made a stand. They found a much less tenable position, however, than that from which they were stampeded.

Herrmann's treatment of the attributes of God is meagre and unsatisfactory. He feels obliged to derive the knowledge of His attributes from the inexplicably produced Faith, which comes into being without a warrant. But according to Herrmann himself this faith is a most imperfect guide into the truth. Hear him,

But as trust in God produces in us the concept of His omnipotence, our idea of God's personality necessarily grows dim; for an almighty Being cannot possess either the knowledge or the will by which we recognize personal life. An omnipotent power is for us quite an inconceivable mystery. . . . Although the idea of omnipotence cannot be reconciled with our conception of personal life, we still see that the absolute confidence created in us implies both those ideas. It is when we consider the wonderful fact of that real life created and stirring in us that God Almighty is revealed to us as personal Spirit.<sup>4</sup>

To a man of common sense, a kind of sense by no means to be despised, it is clear that Herrmann needs to revise his view of the relation of omnipotence to knowledge, his view of the relation of personality to power, and needs to reconsider the historical grounds for believing that God exists and has certain attributes, instead of throwing himself on the "faith" about which he is probably self-deceived. Possibly, probably, he blindly calls on faith, as he defines it, to do more than it can do.

Amongst the divine attributes Herrmann gives little, if any, specific place to Justice. Hence we may look ultimately for a more or less vicious ethical system following this school.

---

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 97-98.



Herrmann's scheme is anti-trinitarian. He holds to the uni-personality of the Godhead. He says:

It is involved in the relationship to which our faith consciously owes its life, that we can perfectly picture to ourselves the God who redeems us in only these aspects. He is to us the Father to whom we may appeal with confidence of being heard. He is similarly Jesus' spiritual power working upon us. But He is also to us the Spirit who overcomes the overwhelming might of nature both in ourselves and in the fellowship of believers. The doctrine of the Trinity must always start from the fact that God reveals to us His single nature in this three-fold way (Economical Trinity).<sup>5</sup>

The Holy Spirit is simply the uni-personal God working in the life of the redeemed.<sup>6</sup> In other words the Holy Spirit is merely the name for God as He presents Himself in the life of redeemed humanity. Christ also is divine in that *in Him no less than in the Father* is the one personal Spirit who is God alone.

It may be a little difficult for the reader who has not read Herrmann to gather his view on the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit from what we have stated, though his own language has been freely used to set that view forth. His doctrine is that God is a uni-personal Spirit whose power works in Jesus Christ in a wonderful way, and who because He hears prayer, may with eminent propriety be called Father, and who as dwelling in the hearts of His people may be called the Holy Spirit.

Herrmann openly repudiates the Chalcedonian Christology: "The only Redeemer of God's elect is the Lord Jesus Christ, who being the eternal Son of God became man and so was and continueth to be God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever." According to Herrmann, satisfaction could be felt with this Chalcedonian conception

---

<sup>5</sup> P. 151. Cf. the statement on p. 148:

"The briefest expression for the nature of the Holy Spirit is this: God in us and Christ in us. The question therefore whether the Holy Spirit is to be thought of as personally living or as impersonal force indicates a complete failure to understand these conceptions of faith. The Holy Spirit is simply the living God present and working in us."

<sup>6</sup> Pp. 140 and 145.

only because of "the vague idea of redemption which, as early as Irenaeus, had driven off the field the Pauline Johannine recognition of the manner of our redemption through Christ." He says: "It had been forgotten therefore that Christian faith, if it treats Christ as God, must have before its eyes, without being able to comprehend it, a wonderful fact which it recognizes as the source and foundation of its own life."<sup>7</sup>

We are not concerned to vindicate the views of Irenaeus; but Herrmann's own view of the Pauline and Johannine view of the manner of our redemption through Christ is sadly defective. But, of that a word, later.

He makes much of the incomprehensibility of the doctrine of the Trinity; and yet he bases his whole doctrine on a faith incomprehensibly produced in the heart of the religiously minded person, and which in an incomprehensible manner determines everything else man is to believe. He also talks at times as if he had a most inadequate idea of the orthodox conception of the Trinity, or as if he were careless to a degree in presenting views which he wishes to overthrow. For instance, he talks as if "person" in the Godhead were in the thought of the orthodox, the precise analogue of person in the human sphere; whereas the intelligent orthodox think of the term "person" as applied to the subsistences in the Godhead because they are more nearly like personalities in the human sphere than any other modes of subsistences with which we can compare them. Our author is rather gifted in caricature. When he refers to Scripture for confirmation of his views, he has a faculty for selecting texts which superficially viewed seem to answer his purpose, and conveniently passes by masses of Scripture which run counter to the current of his teaching. On the whole he seems to flee Scripture unless it approves itself to his subjectivity. So much for Herrmann's theology proper.

---

<sup>7</sup> P. 142.

## II. ANTHROPOLOGY

Herrmann's anthropology is very imperfectly developed. He teaches by implication that only the Christian has any right to claim that he is at all akin to God. He says:

Our consciousness that we are akin to Him is therefore, always at the same time a consciousness that a transcendent life has begun in us.<sup>8</sup>

He also says:

The idea that man possesses a life akin to the divine is not derived from such a source by the piety of the Old Testament. This difference between the Old Testament and the New is linked with another. In Genesis the image of God is clearly understood as shown in the powers which man received at the creation. This idea persists in pre-Christian religion. On the other hand the saying of Jesus in Matt. v.45 shows that, in His view, what connects man with God is not a power inherent in man's nature but a task which is set before him. According to this saying man is to become God's child by the exercise of that pure charity which identifies itself with its object and is thus creative life.<sup>9</sup>

Herrmann also says:

The anthropological ideas which are to be found elsewhere in the Bible can play no part in Protestant dogmatics; for we are at a loss to see how their appearance in us should be the outcome of the faith created in us by the power of the person of Jesus.<sup>10</sup>

He holds that the human will is free. He says:

Necessarily, therefore, the consciousness of our free will arises in faith not from logical deductions, but from actual surrender to God's universal life-creating activity.<sup>11</sup>

That is, it arises in an experience.

With reference to man's immortality, he says:

The idea that after the death of the body the soul lives on as an intrinsically immortal entity, is not Biblical but Platonic, and it stands in opposition to the fact that the inner phenomena of consciousness, are in a manner beyond our ken, conditioned by the changes in the bodily organisms.<sup>12</sup>

As to the goal of man, he says:

If we become conscious of the reality of God through the awakening

---

<sup>8</sup> P. 89.

<sup>9</sup> P. 90.

<sup>10</sup> P. 91.

<sup>11</sup> P. 92.

<sup>12</sup> P. 94.

in us of pure confidence, that carries with it, too, a knowledge of the goal to which God would lead us. God will one day bring mankind to a perfect fellowship in which each individual will find inexhaustible tasks and infinite increase of personal life.<sup>13</sup>

If a man's anthropology is to be limited to truths derivable from and ratified by the trust wrought in regeneration and conversion—in regeneration even of a Biblical and not merely a Herrmann type—it must necessarily be inadequate. A regenerate mind is an illumined mind, but one in need of further light from without. It is absurd to limit the materials to be used in constructing anthropology in any such way. Certainly man has been conscious, indubitably conscious, of other experiences than conversion, and the appearance of trust in God. From these other experiences he ought to be able to learn somewhat of anthropology. There is a very respectable book, too, the Holy Scriptures, on which the author should have drawn. There is a consistency between the anthropology of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament. Herrmann seems to have only a superficial view of the Scriptures, and thinks that the anthropological ideas of the Old Testament can play "no part in Protestant dogmatics." Moreover, he appears to be unaware of the sonship of man as he comes from the hand of his Creator and, in distinction from that, the adoptive sonship of him who has believed on the Lord Jesus Christ. Bearing the distinction between these two kinds of sonship in mind and the difference between unfallen and fallen man, he will find little difficulty in seeing the propriety of the Old Testament representing the image of God as a part of man's original endowment, and the New Testament representing the image as restored in regeneration and sanctification.

His discussion of freedom is inadequate and faulty. He confuses the freedom of man as a moral agent with his ability for the good. He says that consciousness of freewill arises in faith from actual surrender to God's "life-creating

---

<sup>13</sup> P. 96.

activity." What God gives in this life-creating activity is ability for the good—for the choice of His service. Freedom which is essential to responsibility is never lost. The man of the world has it, as really as the saint of God.

He belittles the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, as held in the Old Testament as the unsophisticated students of the Old Testament have seen since the time of Christ, and as Christ saw, according to the record, Matt. xxii. 31-32; and he only feebly presents the New Testament evidence. An American professor of theology has written: whatever the Scriptures may be worth,

they unhesitatingly teach the immortality of man. This they do in four signal ways: (1) By fundamental assumption; the Bible is delivered to the world and issues all its instructions and warnings to man upon the idea that human life and history do not end with the grave; adopt for one moment the doctrine that death is final and how meaningless and silly the whole Bible becomes. (2) The Bible teaches the immortality of man by pictures, such as the translation of Enoch, the transfiguration on the mount, the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, the vision of Stephen, and the apocalyptic visions of the seer on Patmos; in these pictures the veil of the invisible world is drawn aside and we are allowed to look in upon some who died on earth, and behold them alive forever more. (3) The Bible teaches the immortality of man by dogmatic assertions, as in such declarations as 'This mortal must put on immortality.' (4) Finally the story of Christ, if it has a shred of truth in it, demonstrates the hope of immortality.<sup>14</sup>

These words give a much fairer representation of the character of Biblical teaching on the subject of immortality than do the words of Professor Herrmann.

As to what he says of man's goal, the goal to which God is moving him, Herrmann is vague and unconvincing. His teaching can not validly come out of his mere confidence in God, unless he has taken the measure of the Infinite in mind and heart. He also leaves much to be said. Compare intimations about the goal of a part of our sinful race intimated in John iii.36 and other such passages.

Herrmann is singularly unconvincing in his attempt to develop his doctrine out of his "faith," or "confidence," in God.

<sup>14</sup> See *The Christian's Hope* by Robert Alexander Webb, pp. 35-36.



## III. SIN AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

This head comes logically to be considered under the general head of anthropology; but for convenience it is given a separate consideration.

Herrmann says, of the initial form of sin:

To comprehend the origin of sin is impossible to us; yet we can and must make clear to ourselves the primary form of sin. The spiritual attitude in which unbelief and selfishness are as yet only implicit, but which is already in every case an indication of insincerity, is devotion to the pleasures of sense, or sloth. Under the rule of God there should be formed in us God's image, that is, the power of a love which through self-denial creates something new. This work of God is checked in us by slothful devotion to pleasures of sense.<sup>15</sup>

Herrmann makes the slothful devotion to the pleasures of sense to have been the incipient form of sin. This indicates that he has looked in the right direction at this point. "The fall of man occurred, apparently through a sin of omission, through man's failure to be everlastingly on the alert to do duty. Created with a duplex end, of doing duty, and being happy, and living in surroundings where every prospect pleased it was easy for man to find delight in sensuous impressions and to slide into slothful devotion to the pleasures of sense." It should be noted that Herrmann gives, in the latter part of the passage just quoted, a picture of the first man which is unhistorical. He pictures man as not originally created in the image of God, but as being in duty bound to work out in himself that image. In thus picturing man, he involves himself in a fanciful and false psychological view of "God's image." Like certain evolutionists he makes a thing evolve certain other things, the very potential bases of which are not found in that "which evolves them"—a claim that is self-contradictory. If man were not given, in his very constitution the image of God he could never evolve it. What is more, he runs counter to the word of God in Gen. i. 26-27, *et simil*, which, rationalistic critics to the contrary notwithstanding, is the testimony of a witness present and of absolute trustworthiness.

---

<sup>15</sup> P. 102.

Herrmann teaches also, that the term guilt is sometimes used of the sinner's relation to the power whom he has wronged in the civil sphere, which relation may be swept away by punishment; but he asserts that the "situation is entirely different when a man recognizes his actions as a transgression of the moral law, or of God's commandment." The moral consciousness which thus confirms the truth of the moral law carries within itself the inevitable necessity of self-condemnation, and thus forestalls the need of any external judgment. This sense of guilt felt by the moral consciousness is, however, still more intensified when we realize that our sin has caused an inward separation between us and those who are dear to us. This applies with special force to the relations between the religious man and his God.<sup>16</sup>

Through our sins, we all help to make the fellowship and organization of society sinful. All the members of society are responsible for the sin which thus arises. It is therefore corporate sin. . . . From the corporate sin of human society there issues also its inevitable inheritance. Every man is influenced by the corporate sins of earlier generations without the possibility of defense against it. For it is only through being brought up in human society that we become men. Now all education begins with a child's accepting the ideas and the behavior of the adult persons, but if these spiritual instruments of education have been spoiled by sin, we imbibe sin in the course of our education.<sup>17</sup>

These considerations bring home to the modern man the inevitable necessity of the inheritance of sin more forcibly than did the idea which has dominated the church since Augustine, though it is incapable of demonstration that sin is inherited by the mere fact of physical descent from parents.<sup>18</sup>

Every individual is inevitably bound to be sinful from the beginning of his conscious life, and is equally bound to condemn himself for his sin as soon as his knowledge of the moral law creates in him the consciousness of freedom. The incomprehensible thing in all this, however, is not the fact of the inheritance of corruption, but the freewill which, in spite of man's dependence upon sinful humanity, assumes responsibility for his disharmony with the moral law.<sup>19</sup>

The judgement or punishment of sin is executed in the earthly life of

---

<sup>16</sup> P. 105.

<sup>17</sup> Pp. 106-107.

<sup>18</sup> P. 106.

<sup>19</sup> Pp. 108f.

the sinner: (1) In the inward compulsion to condemn himself. (2) In the knowledge that it is impossible for him to deliver himself from sin through his own efforts. (3) In the way in which it reacts to his lot in life. The completed punishment of sin is fundamentally sin in its completion. Namely, a life actually lived for itself alone, or a life in utter isolation. Herein the tendency to selfishness, or to lovelessness arrives at its inevitable goal.<sup>20</sup>

In this group of quotations the position seems to be taken that the sinner's self-condemnation forestalls the need of any external punishment, but this position is no necessary inference from our own inner self-condemnation. If the sinner's conscience works correctly his self-condemnation for an evil act—if it recognizes that the act was wrong, and if it brings regret—this self-condemnation and regret by no means vindicate the law adequately. The law had a penalty. That penalty is not paid by the sinner's saying: "I have sinned." Suppose the sinner has murdered his brother, or has seduced his sister, or looted a bank, or betrayed a trust, his condemnation of himself for his sin is not a satisfaction for it. True, self-condemnation and confession were in order, but to confess is not to bring to life the slain brother or to restore to purity his sister, or to make good the injury inflicted by the stolen property. To condemn oneself is not to undo the dishonor done to God in the breaking of His moral law. If aught of punishment be involved in the sinner's self-condemnation, it is by no means the whole of that punishment. It is indeed a small part of it. Sin dishonors God. The sin of unbelief dishonors Him. "He that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life but the wrath of God abideth on him." Here is something outside the sinner, the wrath of God which must needs have expression. If Herrmann has respect for the Bible, the Bible shows that God's external wrath comes upon transgressors or on their substitute. It came on Cain, came on the antediluvians, came on the cities of the plain, came on Egypt, came on apostatizing Israel, over and over again. It is to come on all who have not been covered by

---

<sup>20</sup> Pp. 109f.

the blood of the substitute. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Death comes as judgment. God sends it now permissively now efficaciously. If He is immanent in, He is also transcendent to, man. If God be just He must see to it that some of His rational creatures shall be punished. Some are very wicked and repent not. Our argument is from Scripture, which Herrmann professes to have a measure of respect for.

There is also a good deal said about "inherited sin," but the discussion is all about sin, induced on occasion of birth, into sinful families, by education, so that we find ourselves in company with an author out of sympathy with Calvin, Augustine, Paul, John, and Christ—in company with one who has not a little in common with Pelagians, Unitarians *et id omne genus*.

In others of these quotations, Herrmann would substitute for the old distinction between potential guilt and actual guilt, that is, between ill desert for a wicked state or act, and doomedness to punishment by the ruler for that act—would substitute for this distinction the following: the guilt "which is the responsibility of a man for his wicked estate or act" and "the guilt which is the relation of the sinner to the power which he has wronged, which, if punished, is to be considered as removed." He seems to teach, as we have seen, that God never in any way punishes externally breaches of the moral law.

To hold any such views he must have cast away as unworthy large portions of Old and New Testament history and prophecy. He should read Isaiah, the fifty-first psalm, and the whole Old and the whole New Testament. True the most awful punishment of sin is the natural fruit of sin. God as ruler of the universe *ought* to punish sin. He provided in the very constitution of the human being and the world that the sinner shall reap as he sows.

Herrmann takes no note of God's laying all the guilt of sins of the Christian on Jesus Christ, of Christ's paying our penal indebtedness, thus, bearing away our doomedness to penalty.

On the whole his treatment of sin is inadequate and feeble and unscriptural.

#### IV. SOTERIOLOGY

In the earlier pages in his chapter on "The redemption through Jesus Christ," Professor Herrmann reviews briefly, and with more or less error, earlier efforts to set forth the doctrine of redemption, including Ritschl's which on the whole seems to please him most; and on Ritschl's effort he attempts what he regards as an improvement.

He teaches that Jesus Christ has the power to redeem us by personally convincing us that God will accept us. If He become our redeemer, Herrmann says:

We must have discovered in Him that one thing which awakens pure love and pure fear in us, or which can have complete sway over our soul. But our redemption by this experience of the power of Jesus always depends upon whether we ourselves desire deliverance from sin; for we remain in the power of sin, if we do not completely submit ourselves to the power that is manifested in Jesus, but try to withdraw ourselves from it. We recognize it to be the inevitable consequence of the sense of guilt that the sinner avoids all that brings God near him—God whose judgement he fears, hence the question arises how, in spite of this circumstance, it is possible for the power which touches us in the person of Jesus to unite us to God, or how we receive through Him the *προσ-αγωγήν πρὸς τὸν θεόν* (the access to God) to which Paul testifies (Rom. v. 2, Eph. ii.18, iii.12).<sup>21</sup>

It is the quiet power of His person which produces in certain sinners "profound penitence and therewith the courage to trust Him."<sup>22</sup>

It is to be noticed that our redemption is, according to this teacher, "*by an experience of the power of Jesus,*" by having "*discovered in Him that one thing* which awakens pure love and pure fear in us, or which has complete sway over our souls." It is to be noticed that "our redemption by this experience . . . always depends upon whether we ourselves desire deliverance from sin."

From these words it appears that in Herrmann's view salvation is synergistic, that God and man must work it

<sup>21</sup> Pp. 115f.

<sup>22</sup> Pp. 117f.



out together even in its initial stages. If he be correct, then the natural man cannot be spiritually dead, and Paul's talk of man's being dead in trespasses and in sins is an exaggeration; and Christ's teaching about the necessity of being born again, must be incorrect.

From these words it appears also that, in Herrmann's view, if the natural man needs regeneration, that regeneration must be by moral suasion. The Biblical view is that regeneration is by recreation. Once more it is clear from these words that Herrmann needs to make clear for himself the Biblical distinctions between regeneration, justification, and sanctification and between these graces and their fruits.

The confusion into which he frequently falls is almost inevitable unless he make and keep clearly before him these distinctions. That he cannot reach these distinctions merely by the use of his experience of the power of the person Jesus Christ is proof that he has endeavored the impracticable in trying to deduce the doctrines of the Christian religion out of this "experience of the power of the person Jesus."

Herrmann teaches that the forgiveness of sins may be obtained through the power of the person of Jesus; not by His satisfying divine justice but simply by His showing the infinitely loving character of God. He points to 2 Cor. v.18, "And all things are of God, Who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ," and asserts that the "work of Jesus is not to reconcile God, but the result of God's own working in order to reconcile sinners," that, in the second place, "it is a fundamental conception of Biblical piety that God's goodness comes to meet every sinner who would return to Him. . . . For Jesus Himself it must have been inconceivable that His work was necessary to effect a change in God's attitude to sinners."

Dr. Charles Hodge takes a much more tenable view of 2 Cor. v.18.

To reconcile is to remove enmity between parties at variance with each

other. In this case God is the reconciler. Man never makes reconciliation. It is what he experiences or embraces, not what he does. The enmity between God and man, the barrier which separated them is removed by the act of God. This is plain (1) Because it is said to be effected by Jesus Christ, that is, by His death. The death of Christ, however, is always represented as reconciling us to God as a sacrifice; the design and nature of sacrifice are to propitiate and not to reform. (2) In the parallel passage, Romans v. 9-10, "Being reconciled by the death of His son," is interchanged as equivalent with "being justified by His blood," which proves that the reconciliation intended consists in the satisfaction of the divine justice by the sacrifice of Christ. In this case our reconciliation to God is made the source and cause of our new creation, i.e., of our regeneration and holiness. God's reconciliation to us must precede our reconciliation to Him. This is the great Bible doctrine.<sup>23</sup>

According to Herrmann the willing surrender of His life to death by powers of evil was the means required by God of Jesus that He might bring help to sinful man, and the love of God displayed in this infinitely tender way brings at least some persons to Jesus in deep penitence. But unless the suffering of Jesus can be explained as demanded in justice of Him as the sinner's substitute, then God appears to be an unjust God.

Herrmann teaches in a sort of hazy fashion that "the power of the person of Jesus Christ" in working faith in us also works belief in Christ's resurrection from the dead and in His present exalted Lordship; both which teachings he holds are confirmed by the apostolic traditions. Here again he surrenders a strong historical position; he cannot logically establish the position he has chosen.

Herrmann has in his book a caption: "The Eternal Election of the Faithful." He says "that the believer knows himself to be eternally elected as indicated by Paul" (Rom. viii. 28-30). He follows this pertinent citation with remarks that weaken—though intended to strengthen the position. He guards against his being misunderstood by saying, "On the other hand, the doctrine of a double predestination which, following Rom. ix-xi, Luther and Calvin developed even more crudely than Augustine, has no basis in faith,

---

<sup>23</sup> Charles Hodge, *Commentary on II Corinthians*, in loco.

but is an attempt to solve a problem which does not arise from faith and for which faith has no solution." <sup>24</sup>

This is serious reflection on the Word of God as well as on three great uninspired thinkers. It is followed by a paragraph of confusion and assumption as to what Scripture is, and as to his ability to interpret it:

But the fact that the Bible contains such a development of thought as we find preeminently in Romans ix. 20-23 should also subserve our salvation, if it brings us to the question whether we are prepared to follow Scripture even in that which we can not understand to be a notion rooted in our faith. If we decide to do this, we are treating the Bible as a law book which requires from us external obedience. This is what the Roman church does. This is its loyalty to Scripture. But in reality this marks a falling away from the fundamental idea of Scripture; for a faith that repudiates such a law is thereby denied to be faith. There could be no grosser misuse of Scripture than this, for Scripture was given us for the awakening of faith, and so only is it a means to our salvation.<sup>25</sup>

Surely there is a great want of clarity of thought here. "Are we prepared to follow Scripture even in that which we cannot understand to be a notion rooted in our faith?" he asks. He leaves us to suppose that he means by faith, confidence or trust in God produced in us by the power of the person of Jesus. Certainly John Smith may not be able to see that trust in God would alone insure our belief in the vital union of believers and Christ, and that God may yet through inspired men teach us that such a union is possible.

We suppose Professor Herrmann would say, that there is no infallible teaching unless it be in his school! He has no warrant for most of his teaching save his subjective view. The Bible has a certain value, but a very limited value to him. He can not frame a convincing argument because his premises are too exclusively subjective.

If he wanted to make a stand for Christianity, he should have given himself to a vindication of the historical trustworthiness of the Bible, or a part of it. Instead he has built a fabric of dreams.

False philosophies, hostile to the supernatural, turned

---

<sup>24</sup> P. 134.

<sup>25</sup> P. 134.

rational critics into rationalistic, destructive critics. The destructive critics have terrorized schools of Christians here and there who would hold "Christianity" with the heart whether, or not, they could hold it with the head. One such school is that of the Ritschlians. For this school Herrmann has spoken. Necessarily he has shown but little of the real content of Christianity. Instead of this poor defense of "Christianity" or stand for what the Ritschlian thought he could hold, he should have gone back to the root of the matter, overthrown the false philosophy, trampled down the *false* higher criticism (there is, of course, a perfectly legitimate higher criticism), vindicated a historically trustworthy supernatural revelation of truth; and drawn the truth revealed in our Holy Scriptures forth into a system. A system so constructed, would probably be very like that drawn out by the great reformers; but notwithstanding its lack of amazing novelty, would have blessed the world as Ritschlianism never can.

Herrmann's Theology cannot be much in the way of theology. It has too little materials with which to build a theology—only what faith, confidence in God, gives. He may give the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments nominal places as quarries for materials, but before his subjective view the Scriptures are clipped away, or are metamorphosed until their authors would not recognize them. He rejects the doctrine of the Trinity found alike in the Romish, Greek Orthodox, and Protestant churches and in the Scriptures. He claims to hold an economic Trinity. He knows nothing of three personalities of the Godhead existing contemporaneously. God, he thinks, can function in three different ways and so functioning can be described as three-fold. He holds that the preexistence of Christ taught by John, by Paul, and by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews is merely the subjective conception of those worthies. He never seems to reflect that what they teach about those religious concepts which he shares with them may be merely subjective. He seems to have held with Ritschl, his master,

that the only real preexistence of Christ was in the foreknowledge and predestination of God. He teaches that man comes into existence without sin, that he becomes universally sinful owing to teaching and example; that he can justify himself by enrolling in the body of Christ, subjectively; but that what God is, what Christ, what the resurrection is, are of small importance; that Christianity is true if it corresponds to the needs of men and they believe it; that the feeling of personal worth demands that the world be worthy of it, etc., etc.

Is this Christianity or is it, even if ingenious, nevertheless a beggar's basket of dreams, perversions of Scripture, and empty assertions?

*Richmond, Va.*

THOS. CARY JOHNSON



## DOES THE ROMAN CHURCH TEACH THE DOCTRINE OF RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION?\*

There are three sources of authoritative teaching in the Roman communion, the pope, the bishops in a general council lawfully assembled, the bishops (and priests) in their character of theologians dispersed throughout the world. It is not absolutely necessary, therefore, that one should be able to produce a papal encyclical or canon or decree of a general council confirmed by the pope in order to prove that the Roman Church officially teaches the doctrine of religious persecution; it is only necessary to show that popes have issued persecuting bulls and that Roman theologians have taught the doctrine with more or less moral unanimity for centuries and have almost always put it in practice wherever they have had political power to do so. And as there is nothing of which Rome makes such capital as the continuity and permanency of her own doctrine, there can be no doubt of the permanency and official character of a doctrine which, prevailing in the days of Saints Augustine and Jerome, has continued in undiminished theoretical force and approval, down to our own time, in spite of the fact that under stress of particular circumstances some few Catholic priests and Catholic laymen have boldly repudiated every kind of persecution in the name of religion and conscience. Numbers of saints worshipped by the faithful in special masses dedicated to their honor by papal authority have taught the doctrine of religious persecution. Religious persecution is enshrined in the *Summa* of St. Thomas Aquinas and has not been eliminated from the English translation of that work made expressly for Protestants and lay-Catholics by the spiritual sons of St. Dominic. This fact is particularly arresting, namely, that the doctrine of religious persecution has been literally transferred from the Latin text of St.

---

\* This article is by the same author as the one on "The Roman Doctrine of the Sacrament of Penance" which appeared in the last issue of this REVIEW.

Thomas to an English equivalent, when we remember that Roman apologists try to empty the terms *persequar* and *impugnabo*<sup>1</sup> found in the oath taken by every Roman bishop at his consecration, of their persecuting content, assigning to them as they stand in the oath, only those meanings which fall short of physical punishments. We find, however, that *persequar* not only expresses the persecuting doctrine but is adopted from the persecuting Psalms and is inserted in the prayers of the Missal in the literal sense of inflicting physical suffering and even death. We find *persequar* in the Introit of the Mass in honor of St. Stephen, the proto-martyr, and in the Introit of the Mass of FERIA Sexta following Passion Sunday, and in the title or heading of the Post Communion Prayer, in the Introit of the Mass of FERIA Sexta following Passion Sunday, and in the title or heading of the Post Prayer, *Quaesumus*, for FERIA Quinta of the same week, and in the prayer against the persecutors of the Church for the second Sunday after Epiphany, and also in other places. One cannot accept that kind of apology in emptying a word of its primary meaning when we remember that the term has come down to us in the episcopal oath from the time when their lordships were veritable persecutors and therefore in the sense that it then had.

Incontestable historical evidence warns Protestants, not to accept by preference, much as charity would commend it to them, the milder meanings which Latin dictionaries also give to these terms. The law of self-preservation demands that Protestants never forget that eternal vigilance is the price which they must pay for liberty. Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to the pope, and to his successors, are to be followed up, assailed, attacked, and hunted down, as far as possible not merely by argument, logic and sweet reasonableness, and the truthful facts of history, but moreover, whenever and wherever it can be done consistently with the salvation of the state, the bishops must also use force. This is the only sane, wise, and rational interpretation to be placed upon the

---

<sup>1</sup> I am quoting the terms of the oath.

oath, for an ounce of fact is worth more than a mountain of assertion, or a volume of logic. We have only to look into the *Theologica Dogmatica et Moralis* used as a text-book in sixty-seven theological seminaries in France, to be convinced of the unwisdom of accepting a mild interpretation for the bishops' oath. From that text-book was read in the Parliament of France to the amazement of its members the following: "The Church has received from God the power to force or repress those who wander from the truth not only by spiritual penalties but also, by temporal ones. . . . These are prison, flagellation, torture, mutilation, death." Again: "If in a country the unity of Catholic faith reigns, the state must not neglect anything to drive away novelties of doctrines and sophistries. In such a state heresy is a public crime because everything which is done against the divine religion touches all the members of society."<sup>2</sup> "Toleration," said Froude, "is the genius of Protestantism," and Father Tom Burke answered him by saying: "I am not only a Catholic but a priest, not only a priest but a monk, not only a monk but a Dominican monk, and from out of the depths of my soul, I repel and repudiate the principles of religious persecution for any cause in any land." Father Burke did not live to see the public libraries of America containing on their shelves in an English text for the consumption of American Protestants the persecuting doctrines of his master, St. Thomas of Aquin, and the same developed at considerable length by a host of Roman professors, theologians, canonists and philosophers, and writers of tracts for Catholic Truth Societies, of whom the Knights of Columbus are the main support.

One might be impressed by the teaching on the supreme independent authority of church and state in the encyclical letters of Pope Leo XIII, were it not that when we look into Rome's approved text-books on theology, philosophy, and canon law, we find it there taught that the state ought to condemn in doctrine and morals whatever the Roman Church

<sup>2</sup> Bracqu, *France Under the Republic*.

condemns and approve only what the Church approves. We find it there taught that all teaching not in harmony with the teaching of the Roman Church, is an evil in itself, which the state can tolerate only to avoid greater evils. Wherever and whenever the state can conveniently prohibit such teaching it is bound to do so. We find it there taught that the gravest duty rests upon the state to make the Roman Catholic religion to be observed externally at least by all its citizens when doing so will not menace the welfare of the state itself. We find it there taught that liberty of conscience founded on the individual reason and judgment is an impious principle, self-contradictory, resting on political atheism, and is especially destructive to society. It is there taught that for Catholics to teach liberty of worship or liberty of conscience is both absurd and impious. It is there taught that the Church has the right of applying force. It is there taught that the Church enjoys temporal as distinct from spiritual power. It is there taught that the Church has external jurisdiction to inflict temporal punishment, because not the souls only, but also the bodies of the faithful, are under the jurisdiction of the Church, and because spiritual punishment alone is not sufficient to bring the unruly into obedience to her will. It is there taught that temporal punishment embraces fines, scourgings, tortures, imprisonment, and even death. It is there taught that the authority enjoyed by the Church in the Middle Ages and expressly or tacitly conceded by civil rulers is not revocable at the will of the civil power. And finally it is taught that all persons validly baptized, whensoever, and by whomsoever, even by a Jew or pagan acting in that capacity even unconsciously and unintentionally as ministers of the Roman Church, are thus made subjects of the pope, amenable both to his temporal and spiritual authority.

This doctrine universally taught all over the Roman communion essentially involves not only the spirit of persecution but persecution itself, in its worst forms, wherever the same is practicable. In the face of it, it is impossible for Protestants not to doubt whether the official Roman Church rec-

ognizes any such thing as liberty of conscience in the best and most orthodox sense. Persecuted heretics were people who, obeying the counsels of the apostle, were persuaded in their own minds of the truth of the doctrines which they held. They lived up to the light that was in them, were always prepared to embrace a higher and clearer light when that gift should be vouchsafed them, and died, loving God above all things, under the combined force of church and state. Who is there that does not know that Rome's theoretical doctrine of the supremacy of conscience has always been reduced to a nullity in practice so long as she has had political power. There is nothing to be gained by retorting this argument against the Protestant world, for the Protestant world (of sectism) has never laid claim to any of the exclusive attributes of the Roman Church, such as being the exclusive Kingdom of Christ, having exclusive authority as supreme and infallible teacher, having the exclusive treasury of all Christ's graces, exclusive administration of the same, exclusive rights to the guardianship and interpretation of the Bible, and so on.

Protestants remembering all these claims and examining them in the light of the history of the Roman communion in every country through the centuries, fail to find anywhere made manifest in the lives of Catholics, either in the past or present, the superiority of the Catholic over the Protestant religion. All history witnesses to the fact that the Catholic clergy of all grades were the real authors of all the persecutions which sullied the reigns of the wisest and best, as well as the worst of Catholic rulers. The history of the papacy itself, i.e., of the Court of Rome from the ninth to the eighteenth century inclusive, constitutes some of the most painful reading in all history. Decree after decree of intolerance and persecution issued from the Chair of Peter during that period which drenched the earth with the blood of martyrs. Buckle tells us that for one intolerant passage in Protestant theology it would be easy to point out twenty in Catholic theology.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Buckle, *History of Civilization*, p. 314.



If that was true when Buckle wrote, it is still more true today. There are now no writers in the Protestant churches corresponding, in their teaching on intolerance to heretics, to those in the Roman communion of recent date, such as Vincent and Perrone and Lepicier and Palma, and de Luca and Baudillart and Schraedar and Schneeman and Zigliara and Ryan and Knox. I am naming only a few and these men in the highest repute in their respective religious orders where the real spirit of Romanism is to be found, all of whom have written in our time and make known to us, with startling and amazing boldness, the intolerant and persecuting doctrines of their church. And let the reader not forget that the works in which these doctrines are taught are used as text-books in almost all seminaries where men are educated for the Roman priesthood. Their influence is seen even upon the minds of such Catholic lay-writers as O'Rahilly in Ireland, Hilaire Belloc and G. Elliot Anstruther in England, not to go to Europe, where there is an army of them. Professor O'Rahilly defends assassination in Ireland by appealing to the theological teaching of the Middle Ages. Hilaire Belloc<sup>4</sup> tells us with extreme nonchalance that all the evils of the present industrial system will "slowly indeed but effectually" disappear as soon as society will adopt the Roman system of doctrine and government "with its full consequences, conscious and sub-conscious, upon every human action and upon the framing of laws." He tells us that "the erection of society upon Catholic lines makes for the destruction of servitude in every form"; while Mr. Anstruther admits that the Inquisition was "a joint tribunal of Church and State," and that the Roman Church "has claimed and exercised the right to punish those who deliberately forsook her communion."<sup>5</sup> And Mr. Anstruther leaves his readers to reconcile that proposition with another assertion—"The Catholic Church is not and never has been a persecuting body. Persecution in history has characterized the

<sup>4</sup> *The Church and Socialism*, pp. 12-13.

<sup>5</sup> *Catholic Answers to Protestant Charges*, pp. 16-28.



official life of Catholic countries, the acts of Catholic kings, prelates, and individuals, but this is equally true of Protestant states and rulers."

The camouflage in those words of the pamphlet of the "Catholic Truth Society" is amazing. Protestants are asked to believe that the Roman Church was never a persecutor because possibly they cannot point to a canon of a General Council decreeing persecution and confirmed by the reigning and subsequent popes, even though one may truthfully charge the official life of Catholic countries, Catholic kings, prelates and individuals with persecution. Truly this must have been a consoling doctrine to the countless thousands who suffered from time to time. One can imagine them crying aloud in the midst of their agonies and asking the question: "What in the name of God is the use of an infallible pope enjoying the plenitude of jurisdiction over the whole Church if he cannot put an end to these fanatical bishops of his, who have corrupted kings, parliaments and peoples, by their false and wicked teaching? And why is the Holy Father silent in the midst of our sufferings? Has his silence no meaning for us, nor for them? Are we asked to be thankful to Providence and to his Holiness in our humble prayers because he has not come boldly out in an encyclical letter confirming the persecuting doctrine of his Catholic kings, parliaments, and peoples? What in the name of heaven would it have mattered to us if he had done so; and what did it matter to us that he did not do so, except that we had reason to believe from his silence that he was on the side of our enemies?"

But the "Catholic Truth Society" does not blush to say the Roman Church still claims that those who leave her from time to time, or who may possibly leave her at another Reformation tomorrow, are liable to any punishment including death in any manner, which the Church combining her forces with those of the state, may choose to inflict upon them. This is certainly a modest demand to be made upon Protestants by the "Catholic Truth Society."

The statements of writers like Belloc and Anstruther let us into the real, if sometimes, disguised purpose of the whole policy of the Court of Rome and its political and theological machinery. Times without number her theologians have said that they had no apology to offer for the Church's connection with the Inquisition in any country whatever. This attitude is the only consistent one for men to assume who hold that the Church has a temporal, as well as a spiritual sword, of divine right. It does not at all detract from the doctrine to say that the Church can only exercise the temporal sword when the state permits her. For the same people are the subjects both of the Church and of the state, and although these two powers are independent, so it is said, there can be no doubt whatever that if ever Hilaire Belloc's dream comes true, when the Church and state will again be a moral unit in their system of doctrine and government, there will be no place in such a state for the public profession of heresy. The distinction which some Roman casuists now make between those born or baptized into the Roman communion, and those born and baptized out of it, will then find no support whatever. Given the same conditions as in the past and the same results must follow from the same doctrines, for it would be folly to accept, in a matter of this nature, Macaulay's dictum, namely: We cannot conclude from a man's beliefs to a man's actions.

The intolerant and persecuting doctrines of Protestants have long since been repudiated by them in theory and in practice in almost every country of the world. But the intolerant and persecuting doctrines of the Roman Church not only have never officially been repudiated, nor even unofficially, except by a few brave individuals here and there among clergy and laity, but are proclaimed as vigorously as ever in our time with startling and amazing frankness.

When Catholics were struggling for emancipation in Great Britain it was the policy of the bishops to let Daniel O'Connell express himself at great public meetings as follows: "I owe it to my religion as a Catholic and a Christian, to my

country as an Irishman, to my feelings as a human being, to utterly denounce the abominable doctrines contained in the Notes of this edition of the Rhemish New Testament. I am a Catholic upon principle, but I would not remain a Catholic one hour longer if I thought it essential to believe it was lawful to murder Protestants, or that faith might be innocently broken with heretics."<sup>6</sup> Yet such were the doctrines to be deduced from the Notes to this Rhemish New Testament.

Now let it be remembered that the Notes to this Rhemish New Testament were the work of theologians and commentators who must be supposed to know the doctrines of the Roman Church much better than O'Connell did. They had moreover the *imprimatur* of those who were set up in the Church by the pope himself as the teachers of doctrine and the guardians of the morals of the people, and it cannot be denied that the doctrines contained in the persecuting Notes of the Rhemish New Testament were in perfect accord with the doctrine and practice of the Church in the past and with the doctrine of the Church in the present, as that doctrine is imbedded in the works of numbers of her approved theologians, canonists, and philosophers. That is what one would understand by the continuity and uniformity of doctrine in the same sense precisely as Roman Catholics understand the continuity and uniformity of the doctrine of the personal infallibility of the pope. Catholics admit that the personal infallibility of the pope was denied here and there all over the Church before A.D. 1870, but they hold that those who did so deny it, bishops, priests, and laymen, were unconscious heretics. Dollinger in a famous letter declared, that he had taught to his students for forty-seven years the personal *fallibility* of the popes in their capacity as doctors and pastors of all Christians.

It was the same with the doctrine of religious liberty, or the toleration of heretics. The Church never officially held or taught any doctrine of the toleration of heretics except as

<sup>6</sup> Speech of Dec. 4, 1817.

a matter of political expediency, and those who, like O'Connell and Father Tom Burke, denounced intolerance and the Inquisition, were unconsciously proclaiming a false doctrine. And the doctrine of political expediency we may indulgently express in Macaulay's words: "I (the Church of Rome) am in the right: You Protestant heretics are in the wrong. When you (Protestants) are the stronger you ought to tolerate me (the Church of Rome) for it is your duty to tolerate truth: but when I am the stronger I shall persecute you for it is my duty to persecute error." And in fact such is the gospel proclaimed to his countrymen almost in the same words by Louis Veuillot who was acclaimed as a great "leader" among the orthodox lay-folk of France. Was the late Joseph Chamberlain merely a religious bigot or playing the game of the politician when in his speech at Cardiff, Wales, July 6, 1886, he said: "The Protestant Church is founded upon the principles of toleration. . . . It admits the principle of religious equality. The Catholic Church by the necessity of the case is opposed to toleration and repudiates the doctrine of religious equality. Consequently, if the Catholic Church is anywhere in the majority it must try . . . to obtain supremacy."

The first generation of Protestants were born and educated in the Roman communion. In that communion they were of necessity influenced by the evils attaching to their religion. It was then that under the teaching of priests they learned to hate and persecute those whom they called witches and heretics. They unfortunately brought this and many other superstitions and unchristian doctrines out of the Roman communion when they formed themselves into Protestant or protesting churches and fiercely propagated them for a time amongst their followers. But the genius of Protestantism was antagonistic to their permanency and development and in time produced such clashing of minds, initiative, and independence of thought and investigation, that to these the world of today is indebted for freedom from religious persecution by law, and in theory, if not always in

practice, the recognition of individual liberty of conscience. Protestants hold to the principle that each one is bound to obey his enlightened reason, which means his conscience, and to believe what under its dictation, is to him the truth. But when the enlightened reason or conscience of the Catholic is in conflict with that of his Church which in any particular spot in the world may be represented to him by the local bishop, his only course is submission, or rejection of the papal communion. To stand by your conscience, when your judgment is in practice a very unpopular one, demands the highest degree of virtue, but it is a virtue which the Roman ecclesiastics have through the centuries punished with the utmost severity. Their doctrine was and still is, to crush conscience by force of law and punishment. That is the teaching contained in the works of all the modern theologians, canonists, and philosophers of the Roman Church herein before named.

The world is still staggering under the shock of this fearful code. The world of today is not supposed to be very honest in any department of life, and the memory left to it as a legacy from the past and still cherished by Roman theologians, is hardly calculated to make it otherwise. For centuries the utilitarian principle was employed by the Roman Church and state in defence of religious persecution. The poison of heresy must not be allowed to spread for the sake of the individual himself and for the sake of the body politic. The theologians and jurists of the Middle Ages, who were also clergy, made heresy and high treason equal crimes before the law, and then settled all penalties by their syllogisms. But what at once both amuses and astonishes intelligent Protestants is the character or quality, if I may so express it, of the arguments employed, all of them in many several books, by many different authors, exactly of a piece, and apparently fashioned to order. They are all dishing up to us in shameless fashion the same old vegetable of religious persecution, re-cooked and re-hashed, in, if possible, a worse form than it had in the Middle Ages. We are told that excommunication



is a greater punishment than death and if the greater may be inflicted so may the lesser. We are told that the death penalty is sometimes the only remedy, because men will not cease to think and to propagate their thoughts on religion, morals, and doctrine, by speech and writing; and as all that is contrary to the teaching of the Roman Church on faith and morals, a region of doctrine within which theologians include almost everything, therefore all those who pertinaciously propagate such opinions are worthy of the death penalty. If forgers were once punished with death, so should heretics, for heretics are forgers of God's word. If men were once put to death for adultery, so should heretics, for heretics break faith with God and that is worse than breaking faith with one's own wife. Heretics should be put to death to prevent their doing harm to the good and innocent, and so by the execution of a few, the many would be corrected and saved; and lastly out of charity to the heretics themselves, to prevent the accumulation of their sins by cutting short their lives; "for these," says Father Marianus de Luca, S.J., "being utterly obstinate would only become worse the longer they lived and would suffer still more excruciating torments in the flames of Hell."

St. Thomas, their "greatest theologian," says: "Heretics in Scripture are known and described under the terms, wolves, thieves, and sons of Satan." Now in those days thieves were hanged and we still pay bounty for the head of a wolf, and the sons of Satan are in hell fire; is it not therefore manifestly clear from God's holy word that heretics should be put to death in some form or other? Again, the Scriptures teach us that a heretic should be shunned after one or two admonitions, and what easier way of shunning him than by quickly putting him out into the other world from whose bourne no traveller returns.

But the modern Roman Jesuit professor does not stop there. To the plea that Protestants born of Protestant parents are not in the Roman Church, Father de Luca replies: "I answer that though heretics be not in the Church yet they



ought to be, and therefore they pertain thereunto as they pertain to the fold whence they have fled. . . . The Church has in fact decreed many penalties against heretics. . . including that of death which no man may escape who has been given over by the Church to the secular arm. To this penalty not only are those subject who, after the age of reason, have fallen away from the faith, but those also, who, once baptized and growing up in heresy, defend pertinaciously that which they have sucked in with their mother's milk."

In the presence of these statements it becomes impossible for Protestants any longer not to believe that a reactionary, ultramontane Catholicism does exist, whose ideal in spite of the encyclical letters of Leo XIII, on the independence and *sui juris* character of the state, is a universal empire, spiritually and politically representing, and ardently desiring, a combination with the civil state, and the rule of force and oppression in all matters not pleasing to the Church. And as a matter of fact that is the doctrine taught in the encyclicals, *Arcanum Divinae* and *Immortale Dei*. In the former we are told that "matters which affect the temporal as well as the spiritual power should . . . depend on the other which has in its charge the interests of heaven." And in the latter we are informed that it is the duty of the state to establish, when possible, Roman Catholicism as an exclusive religion. And what else could we consistently expect from a church, which, in her authorized Notes to Matt. xviii. 20, appended for the instruction of her own layfolk, has these words: "This is understood of such assemblies only as are gathered in the name and authority of Christ, and in the unity of the Church of Christ."<sup>7</sup> Here the claim is that the Church of Christ is the Roman Church exclusively, and the implication clearly is, that only assemblies in the Roman communion gathered together for worship have the promise that Christ will be in their midst. We should not therefore be surprised to find it taught in the encyclical on the Chris-

---

<sup>7</sup> See Catholic New Testament, imprimatur Archbp. Farley, New York, Dec. 8, 1905.

tian Constitution of States, that the state is bound to the "public profession of religion . . . not such religion as it may have a preference for but the religion which God enjoins and which certain and most clear marks show to be the only true religion." "Now," continues the encyclical letter, "it cannot be difficult to find out which is the true religion if only it be sought with an earnest and unbiased mind. . . . From all this it is evident that the only true religion is the one established by Jesus Christ Himself and which He committed to his Church to protect and to propagate. . . . The Church has the two-fold right of judging and of punishing. . . . A civil sovereignty is the surest safeguard of her independence. . . . The Almighty, therefore, has appointed the charge of the human race between two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil, the one being set over divine, and the other over human things. . . . There was once a time when states were governed by the principles of gospel teaching; then it was that the power and divine virtue of Christian wisdom had diffused itself throughout the laws, institutions and morals of the people, permeating all ranks and relations of civil society. Then, too, the religion instituted by Jesus Christ . . . flourished everywhere by the favor of princes and the legitimate protection of magistrates: and Church and state were happily united in concord and friendly intercourse of good offices. . . . A similar state of things would certainly have continued had the agreement of the two powers been lasting. More important results even might have been justly looked for had obedience waited upon the authority, teaching, and counsels of the Church, and had this submission been specially marked by greater and more unswerving loyalty. For that should be regarded in the light of an ever changeless law which Ivo of Chartres wrote to Pope Paschal II: 'When kingdom and priesthood are at one, in complete accord, the world is well ruled and the Church flourishes and brings forth abundant fruit. But when they are at variance not only small interests

prosper not, but even things of greatest moment fall into deplorable decay.' "

There can be no possible doubt of the meaning of this encyclical of Leo XIII. The Church here referred to, and the authority to which submission, obedience, and loyalty, are due, is the Roman official Church which means the pope and the papal curia, and the unswerving aim and purpose of the pope and his cardinals at all times is their supremacy over the state.

The state is bound to make public profession of the one true religion—the Roman. The state is bound to inquire concerning the many religions; which is the true one? The state is bound to prefer one religion to all the rest and that one religion the Roman. The state is bound to show to this one true religion, special favor. The state ought not to grant equal rights to every creed even so long as public order is not disturbed by any political form of religious belief. The pope denies that all questions that concern religion are to be referred to private judgment—denies that every one is to be free to follow whatever religion he prefers, or none at all, if he disapprove of all. The pope denies the right of liberty of expression of opinion regarding the practice or omission of divine worship. The pope maintains that the Roman Catholic religion should have superior rights in the state over every other religion. And in addition Leo XIII maintains that the *Mirari Vos* of Pope Gregory XVI taught also all the above doctrines.

Now honest Protestants contend that to a mind free from controversial quibbling the doctrine in this encyclical necessarily involves the spirit and the practice of religious intolerance. If the Catholic principle of private property and its inherent exclusive prerogatives necessarily involve the condemnation of the principle of Communism, the exclusive claims of the Roman religion necessarily involve the condemnation of all heresy, and, given the proper conditions under the Roman system, the condemnation of all heresy

involves at the same time the condemnation of all those who profess it.

The doctrine of those encyclicals and that of the *Syllabus* of Pius IX, is simply the continuity of the doctrine of the Roman Church from the days of Saints Augustine and Jerome and logically calls for the practice of the Inquisition. In fact Protestants commit a great mistake who do not see that there is an essential difference between religious liberty as understood by Protestants and as understood by Roman Catholics.

No pope, no Catholic Church. No Catholic Church, no true Christianity. No true Christianity, no true religion. The papacy is the keystone of the arch of the Christian temple. In that temple no one may determine truth of his own judgment; the pope, alone infallible, declares it, either directly and immediately, speaking by himself and for the whole Church, or speaking through the mouth and confirming the utterance of a general council, or the opinions of theologians throughout the Church. For those outside the temple there is no salvation except through invincible ignorance and repentance for sin rooted in the love of God above all things, and these two principles stand or fall together. As for those who, being enlightened and dwelling within the temple, go out, as did Renan and Father McCabe, for instance, under protestation of religious and conscientious convictions, there is no hope for such people, says Perrone, for they are in bad faith and are all damned; and Catholics under the system dare not stop to ask him, how and by what means he got this mysterious information. It is enough for them to know that the Church has officially spoken, or when the Church has not officially spoken, that the theologians with her approval, have said so. Therefore, all the Luthers, Cranmers, Calvins, Dollingers, Hyacinths, Lamennaises, Tyrrells, O'Keefes, and all other ex-priests, ex-nuns, and ex-Catholic lay-folk who were once Romanists, and are Romanists no longer, are all damned.

Let no one be shocked, this is the common belief among

Catholics, and from this belief, rooted in their hearts and nurtured by their religion, springs up their incessant persecution of all who leave their communion under the combined pressure of reason and conscience. It is not only their common belief, but is times without number expressed with complacency in their press. It has so engrafted itself upon their lives and got such a hold upon their hearts and rendered them such shameless prigs that they invariably see in the face of one whom they regard as an apostate—priest or layman—the brand of damnation in life, not to talk of his appearance after death. Go where you will all over the Catholic world the common remark of priest and layman in referring to a so-called apostate is: Hasn't he a most unhappy face? Isn't the mark of Cain, or Judas upon his brow? And so on.

All that is the result of the system. It has driven out of their inner lives all at once both the love and the fear of God. They are so utterly conscious of their own superior spiritual advantages in the Roman communion and of the security of the salvation of their souls, that they have become unconsciously, the very Pharisees whom Christ so scathingly denounced. They are always in a frame of mind, even when they have not for years troubled the priest at his throne in the "Confessional Box," to thank God that they are not as other men are. Why should these saints have any hesitation in saying that an apostate priest, or lay-Catholic is damned, and may be persecuted even to death? Such judgments are in fact a source of amusement to them. They afford them abundant topics of conversation and laughter. How can their souls be lost for is not Father Converse there to give them Absolution?

Protestants believe that Catholics are in many instances better than the spirit prevalent in their Church, and at the worst are what corruption of religion has made them. But the great bulk of cultured Protestants believe and even know that Catholics are lacking wholly in charity to those Catholics, lay and cleric, who, for the most part, as Protestants believe, leave the Roman Church in good faith, and that they



are lacking in this charity because their religion is herein defective. Protestants believe that Catholics are even positively hostile and malevolent to such people and that the continuous personal warfare which Catholic writers never cease to carry on against reformers of all kinds and of all times is almost demonstrative proof that the spirit which gave birth to the Inquisition, is still abiding in the Roman Church and affecting the minds and hearts of the great bulk of Roman Catholics. Protestants think they rightly and logically connect Catholic practice in this particular with Catholic doctrine. If Catholic priests and people, almost without exception, persecute every ex-priest and ex-nun and every converted lay-Catholic, man and woman, and their families and friends, Protestants believe that this is due to the Roman doctrine that no one can leave the Roman Church in good faith. If Protestants accepted that Roman principle they would be forced to admit that all the Reformers were rogues and hypocrites. But if it was possible for the Reformers to be honest men in their days, it must be equally possible for converted Catholics—priests and lay-folk—to be honest people in the present time. Protestants who believe the Roman congregation to be only one of the multitude of Christian sects and that too a very defective one, having no more Scriptural foundation or right than their own, would be as much justified in believing that those who went from Protestantism to Romanism were in bad faith as Romanists unhesitatingly affirm those of their own communion to be in, who become Protestants. But Protestants assimilating the religion of their New Testament do not believe that either party is justified in so thinking. Protestants are fully aware that not only Catholic priests baptized and educated in the Roman communion and renowned as scholars and educators, have left that Church and become Protestants, some of them, and agnostics others, but that a number of Protestant ministers have gone over to Rome and become priests, and later professing to have become utterly disillusioned, have returned again to the various Protestant bodies to which they for-



merly belonged. Shall Protestants be asked to believe that these men were hypocrites and double-minded, and therefore unstable in all their ways? And these things are happening all the time. There is a constant going over to and coming back from Rome. Shall those going over to Rome be classed as honest and those leaving or coming back from Rome be denounced as hypocrites? Protestants know that such judgments are positively forbidden by Christ; and therefore their conscience does not allow them to condemn converted Catholics. Why should not the arguments which appeal to Protestants and which not only keep them out of the Roman communion and put them on their guard against it but in some instances, make them positively hostile to it, appeal to Catholics of intelligence and honesty of purpose as well? They many times have appealed and successfully to such Catholics in the centuries gone, and why should any one think this to be impossible today? Or shall Protestants accept the doctrine of Roman theologians—that no Catholic can honestly leave the Roman communion for membership in a Protestant congregation? Shall you acknowledge a Catholic to be honest, if like Renan and Father McCabe he professes himself an agnostic, or an atheist, but dishonest and a scoundrel, if he become a member of some Protestant and Christian sect? But this is the persecuting attitude Romanists would have Protestants adopt, and which, unhappily, cunning and selfish Protestants very commonly do adopt. Their Protestantism has a marketable value; it is always measured in dollars and cents. Do these Protestants dare to pretend that Catholics may not, like Protestants, be also honestly affected by the same arguments which bring conviction to themselves?

But Catholic editors deny that Catholics are a persecuting sect. The trouble with such men is, whenever they are honest, that they are prejudiced and have a very limited experience and take refuge in their personal knowledge. But let those gentlemen not forget that Protestants are ubiquitous, are in the normal enjoyment of their senses and reason, and are therefore in a position to testify of what happens all over

the Roman communion. Rome let loose the forces of persecution centuries ago and science tells us that a force once let loose never ceases thereafter to produce its effects. Rome not only let loose the forces of persecution centuries ago but built up a system of theology and canon law to justify those forces; and that system of theology and canon law has engendered in the Roman communion a persecuting spirit which becomes quiescent under pressure of political and economic conditions but never goes to sleep and never ceases to watch its opportunities. Protestants can everywhere testify that wherever there is an ex-priest, however respectable he may be, he is persecuted either openly, or secretly, or in both ways directly and indirectly.

But however that may be, they are certain that while we are bidden in Scripture to mark the heretic and avoid him or have no communications with him in things divine, we are not only commanded not to persecute him, but on the contrary, to love him, serve him, and pray for him. And when Roman Catholics appeal to the persecutions levelled against them everywhere and from the beginning, first by Jews, then by Gentiles, next by schismatics and heretics of all kinds, as a proof that they are the dear children of God and constitute his true Church, the appeal might have force, if Protestants did not know that whenever and wherever these dear, persecuted children of God had sufficient political power, they persecuted every one of the persecutors in turn, and forgot the doctrine of owing no man anything save to love one another. As practised by Catholics love did work much ill to his neighbor and did not do unto others as Catholics wished that others should do unto them. And Protestants believe that this is very largely the spirit of Catholicism still. For that reason Protestants are convinced that eternal vigilance is the price of their liberty. And the reason why Protestants believe that this persecuting spirit still abides in the Church of Rome is because they see it in practice necessarily arising out of fundamental Roman Catholic theology.

Perrone was a leading Jesuit theologian in the Council

which decreed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. One of his works was written expressly for the common people whose title is, *Popular Catechism, Dealing with Protestantism*, and this work received official approbation in 1854. Here is a specimen from Chapter XV :

D. Can those who pass from the Catholic Church to Protestantism have this [excuse of] invincible ignorance?

R. The mere thought is absurd. . . . It is a contradiction and an impossibility that any Catholic should turn Protestant through honest motives.

D. Would you therefore say that no Catholic who turns Protestant can ever be saved?

R. I say that it is certain with the certainty of faith that all Catholics who turn to Protestantism are damned except those cases where a man repents sincerely before his death and abjures the errors he has professed. Except for such a case as this, it is an article of faith that all Catholics who become Protestants are damned immediately for all eternity.

D. Why do you say that this damnation is one of the certainties of faith?

R. Because it is a plain revelation of God.

I am sure it must be far less revolting to Protestants generally, to be told that an anthropoid ape is their physical ancestor than to be informed that they are the spiritual children of people now buried in hell. Yet according to this official doctrine of Perrone, all the Protestant Reformers, that is to say, the founders and builders of their denominations, and their millions of quondam Catholic followers, are in hell for all eternity.

Now how can any people accepting and assimilating these doctrines be expected to abstain from persecuting their neighbors whom they believe to be already marked with the brand of hell upon their souls, put there by a church's official teaching whose disciples believe it to be infallible? Is not such doctrine worse than sedition? Is it not calculated to engender the most profound hypocrisy and distrust and to disrupt the whole peace of the state? If it does not do so, is it not because Protestants are utterly ignorant of it, or because Catholic duplicity puts them asleep, or because they have no higher

interest in life than money and subordinate everything else to it?

Perrone and his Roman followers profess to know with the certainty of faith that Luther and his fellow Reformers are all in hell. But Lingard<sup>8</sup> the great Catholic historian tells us with what noble constancy "the Protestant martyrs suffered in Mary's reign under the cruel statute *De Haeretico Comburendo*." He says, that "though pardon was offered them to the last moment, they scorned to purchase their lives by feigning an assent to doctrines which they did not believe." Now let it be remembered that all of those martyrs had been baptized into the Roman fold and had conscientiously left it and died in agonies for their convictions. What is the value of Perrone's impious guesses in the face of that fact? Is it possible to doubt the integrity of the bishops, Hooper, Ridley, Latimer, and ever Cranmer at the last? For *if they believed in it* the salvation of their souls depended on their public profession of the Roman Catholic religion. But at the very moment when it was most essential for him to profess it Cranmer "recalled his former recantations, declaring that he had never changed his belief, and that his recantation had been wrung from him by the hope of life."<sup>9</sup> I do not envy the man who is bold enough to say that Cranmer and his brother-bishops chose to go straight into hell with their eyes wide open and with a consciousness of their privilege to go to heaven instead through the abounding mercy of Jesus Christ.

Truth lives by being tested and experienced as does whatever is good, and error dies by being found out as evil. Each may be forced to hide itself for a time under pressure of persecution but in the struggle for existence truth will eventually prevail over error, as Gamaliel well understood and foretold. Only in the domain of faith and morals as expounded

---

<sup>8</sup> Dom. Birt's *Lingard*, pp. 355, 356.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

by the Roman Church is there no choice between toleration of error and the expression of intellectual activity.

The Constitution of that ideal Christian-World-Empire started by Constantine with the pope as Lord of all lords was briefly summarized by Pope Nicholas V, October 11, 1451, as follows: "One of the principal articles of the Christian faith is the unity of the Church. The constitution of this unity is the existence of a unique and visible head representative of a great, eternal priest, whose throne is in heaven, and the obedience of all members of the Church to this unique head. Where two masters command there is no unity of empire. Outside the unity of the Church no salvation; every man not in the ark of Noah perished in the deluge."

Now the history of the papacy and the claims and deeds of the popes in deposing rulers and bestowing kingdoms at will clearly prove that the ideal of this constitution was not that of a spiritual kingdom only, for if so it would have been a new interpretation of papal documents.<sup>10</sup>

When Catholic barons and Catholic bishops wrung from a tyrant king of England the vaunted Magna Charta, Pope Innocent III rejected it in a bull of date, August 15, 1215, in the most vigorous language of thorough reprobation and condemnation, forbidding the king to observe it, or the barons and their accomplices to demand its observance, and all because the proud pope had not been consulted on the matter. Innocent X condemned the peace of Westphalia in 1648 because it secured to Protestants the free exercise of their religion and admission to civil offices, and the popes have condemned every constitution since then in every Catholic or so-called Catholic nation which has granted freedom of conscience, public worship, and freedom of the press, to its subjects. And no matter how Roman theological interpreters may attempt to explain or explain away papal encyclicals, Protestants are compelled in justice to themselves and as a matter of prudence and vigilance, to understand them only in that logical sense which will bring them into harmony

<sup>10</sup> See Jannsen, *Hist. Germ. People*, V. 2.



with the whole doctrine and political history of the papacy. Protestants must not forget that Paul IV, the year before Queen Elizabeth's accession to the throne, issued his bull, *Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio* "out of the plenitude of his apostolic power," declaring that all civil rulers were subject to his will, and would forfeit their dominions for heresy,—no other doctrine than that of the *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII. They will then be in a position to understand why Elizabeth for reasons of state and her own security, preferred ultimately the Protestant to the Roman Church. Some English Catholics and Seminarists professed to reconcile allegiance to Queen Elizabeth with their conscience, but they evidently did so, with a mental reservation, for the whole doctrine then taught by the entire school of theologians and canonists, made it certain with the certainty of faith, that any Christian prince who had openly or manifestly fallen away from the Catholic religion,<sup>11</sup> and wished to pervert others, *ipso facto*, by force of law divine and human, had lost all authority and dignity, and all this antecedently to any sentence of condemnation by the pope or other supreme power, and that his subjects were freed from all their oaths of allegiance and that they should and ought, whenever and wherever they had sufficient power to do so, to cast him out as an enemy and deserter of Christ, as an apostate and a heretic.<sup>12</sup> That too, is the meaning of the bull of Pius V as given by Gregory XIII. That bull was to be considered always in force against heretics but should only be binding on Catholics when due execution of it could be had. Let therefore Catholics be in sufficient numbers to control our armies, navies, congresses, and parliaments, and all the machinery of the Inquisition will once more be put in force, if Catholics obey the doctrine of their Church. The whole experience of Protestants everywhere reveals the fact that the conscience of Catholics responds to the teaching of the Church when the head of that Church and the rulers of the

<sup>11</sup> Alzog, *Church History*, V. 2, pp. 496-97.

<sup>12</sup> Hallam's *Constitutional History*, p. 115, note 2.



state are living in peace with each other. Voltaire tells us that the clergy were the authors of all the persecutions which sullied the reign of Louis XIV and history tells us that in the war between Prussia and Austria, which ended in Sadowa, French and Austrian ecclesiastics proclaimed to superstitious people that Austria must win for the Church must triumph over heretics.

The Inquisition at its roots was a spirit of hatred against heresy; and non-tolerance of heresy meant then and means now, non-tolerance of the heretic when the supreme will of the Church and that of the state are one, or in agreement, which is the aim today as since the days of Constantine; for the Curia which is the pope in operation, never swerves from its fundamental doctrine and purpose. The heretic will ever be a pestilential weed that must be dug up and rooted out of the gardens of the Church, which, in her purpose, is to be made coterminous with the state.

"The Church established by Christ as a perfect society is empowered to make laws and inflict penalty for their violation. Heresy not only violates her law, but strikes at her very life, unity of belief: and from the beginning the heretic had incurred all the penalties of the ecclesiastical courts. When Christianity became the religion of the Empire . . . the close alliance of Church and state made unity of faith essential, not only to the ecclesiastical organization but also to civil society. Heresy in consequence was a crime which secular rulers were bound in duty to punish." This is the doctrine of Rome laid down in the *American Catholic Encyclopedia*<sup>13</sup> and it means that heresy is to be punished by making the heretic an outlaw. This is precisely what will happen if ever Rome attains her ideal of Church and state.

And that we may have no doubt, who, or what, a heretic is, we are given the definition of St. Augustine in *De Civitate Dei*, xviii, approved by St. Thomas Aquinas in the *Summa Theologica*, namely: "Those are heretics who hold mischievous and erroneous opinions and when rebuked . . .

<sup>13</sup> Vol. VIII, p. 36, col. 1.

after a stubborn resistance, and refusing to mend their pernicious and deadly doctrines, persist in defending them." And St. Thomas tells us that pernicious and deadly doctrines are doctrines contrary to the dogmas of faith, and they may be so directly or indirectly, either by contradicting an article of faith or by denying matters the denial of which leads to the corruption of faith. What heretics intend, he tells us, is the corruption of the faith, and although they do protest the contrary and proclaim their zeal for the purity of doctrine, St. Thomas will give them no credit for any professed good intentions in order to cut away all ground for tolerating them. Whatever, if any, profit ensues to the Church from heresy, is outside the intention of the heretic and should in no way extenuate, palliate, or mitigate his crime, or its punishment, for it is not contrary to our Lord's command to "uproot heretics altogether from the earth by death whenever the cockle can be destroyed without destroying the wheat."

This holy doctor has no difficulty in getting over 1 Cor. v. 5, or 1 Cor. xi. 19, or 1 Cor. xiii., or 2 Tim. ii. 24-5. What a parody it all is upon the Sermon on the Mount and upon all other discourses of Christ contained in the New Testament and above all on the reports of His daily practice in all relations with obstinate heretics, and with all penitent sinners. Oh, those dear canonized saints of the Roman Church, supposed to have their natural intellects superabundantly aided by supernatural light! What a demonstration do they not present of the apparent impossibility of men rising above their environment and the spirit of the age in which they live and of the education they have received. One would suppose that their principles of hermeneutics would lead them to interpret bitter, harsh, or persecuting texts of Scripture, by the loving and tender appeal and promises contained in those of an opposite character. On the contrary these persecuting saints are continually telling us that "the good of the many is to be preferred to the good of the one," forgetting that in the New Testament the emphasis is always put on the one rather than on the many, as in Ephes. iv. 7; Gal. vi. 5;

1 Cor. iii. 8; Matt. xvi. 27; Rom. ii. 6; Colos. iii. 9, 13, and so on.

The teaching of St. Thomas is also that of the great controversialist, Bellarmine, who builds his arguments on Matt. xviii., on the decrees and laws of Roman emperors approved by the Church, on the laws of the Church herself, and on the testimony of the Fathers. Innocent III in the Fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215), decreed that heretics are everywhere to be sought out and handed over to the secular arm and that princes who refuse to exterminate them from their territories, are to be deposed, and their lands given to others who are more faithful. It is in fact beyond doubt that all the popes from Leo IX to Gregory XIII inclusive, a period of nearly five centuries, claimed the right to depose all civil, political rulers for cause of which the Church was judge, and pass their kingdoms on to others. This claim it was which constituted then, and still constitutes, the binding force of all laws against heretics. Every prince forfeited his crown to the pope, the vicar of Christ, by reason of his heresy. The later divine right of kings, assigned to them by Protestants, was then the divine right of the popes. Protestants are told even today under the patronage of the "Catholic Truth Society" with a degree of boldness almost surpassing belief that their lives are secured to them only because the children of the pope are wanting in physical and political power to destroy them. The distinction made by Mr. Anstruther between the official life of Catholic countries, the acts of Catholic kings, prelates, and individuals, and the Catholic Church itself, is only sophistry.<sup>14</sup> Has he never heard of the bull of Pope Urban II decreeing permission to kill an excommunicated person? Has he never heard that Innocent IV inserted in a bull of 1254, the cruel constitution of Frederick II, in particular the edict of Ravenna, and the Sicilian Constitution, *Inconsulitam Tunicam* which expressly decreed death by fire? And has he never heard that Clement IV and Nicholas IV and Calixtus III confirmed the decrees of Inno-

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Anstruther, as cited, p. 6.

cent? Has he never heard of the documents *Ad Abolendam*, *De Heretico Comburendo* and *Unam Sanctam*?<sup>15</sup> Has he never heard that Louis IX of France was scarcely fourteen years of age when papal legates practically compelled him to make a law decreeing death against heretics? Has he never heard that the unfortunate Louis XVI of France was forced by the ecclesiastics of his kingdom to take the following terrible oath against his own most loyal subjects: "I swear that I will apply myself most sincerely and with all my power to exterminate in all lands under my dominion the heretics particularly condemned by the Church."

Monks, priests, and confessors, had made it their business to poison the minds of kings, nobles and peasants against heretics, that is to say, against Protestants. Francis I of France declared he would cut off his right hand if it were a heretic, and advised Charles V to expel all Mohammedans from Spain. His son, Henry II made the extirpation of heretics his principal business and issued a circular to his parliaments and judicial tribunals commanding them to extirpate the Lutherans. Henry III was such an arch-enemy of Protestants that he was convinced he could not find a prouder grave than amidst the ruins of heresy. The great King Henry IV was murdered by an assassin, confessedly driven to do the dark deed by what he regarded as a religious impulse like those two men who murdered Sir Henry Wilson in our time and gloried in the deed, even after having made their confession to a priest.<sup>16</sup>

"No religion," says Turgot, "has the right to demand any other protection than liberty, and it loses its rights to this liberty, when its doctrines of worship are contrary to the interest of the state."

This proposition Catholic theologians will only admit on condition that it is conceded that no doctrine of the Catholic Church is contrary to the interest or welfare of the state.

<sup>15</sup> The bull *Unam Sanctam* is an exposition of the relations between Church and state, Alzog, V. 2, p. 624.

<sup>16</sup> The murderer of the President-elect in Mexico is another instance.

Protestant governments and Protestant peoples have never yet formally made this concession and so their *modus vivendi* when it is not open warfare is to keep silence and call it peace. It is only the peace of the volcano before it breaks forth upon a sleeping world.

What then is the difference between the policy of Protestant and Catholic countries? It is this: Protestant doctrine does not today as it once did, advocate union of Church and state, either as a doctrine or as a policy; while Roman theology does still advocate union of Church and state both as a doctrine and a policy of the Roman Church. Again, Protestant doctrine teaches absolute liberty of conscience in all matters not destructive of the state itself, for all citizens, irrespective of creed, class, or color. But the Roman Church has not only no such doctrine of absolute liberty of conscience in the premise but has formally condemned it in principle. The Roman system of doctrine and her claims as the only divinely appointed and infallible teacher of mankind in matters of doctrine and morals absolutely demand the condemnation of liberty of conscience in the Protestant sense. Many Roman documents are clear on that matter before the *Syllabus* of Pius IX; and the *Catholic Dictionary* (A.D. 1917) tells us that "the pope's power is limited by a multitude of previous definitions, due to his predecessors, to the councils, to the ordinary exercise of the Church's Magisterium, through the pastors (bishops) united to the Holy See."

Here then is where the Protestant world stands in relation to Rome; it is an outlaw and there is no reconciliation to be expected from any future pope except on his own terms, for he is bound hand and foot by the traditions, bulls, decrees, and definitions of his predecessors.

AN EX CATHOLIC PRIEST.

## THE RULE OF FAITH AND LIFE

There is no use of discussing the subject of a divinely-given rule of faith and life with one who really believes that there is no God. It is doubtful, however, if there is anyone in a Christian country so unreasonable as not to believe in a Creator and Upholder of the universe. And to one who believes in a Creator, the questions inevitably come: Can I know Him? How can I know Him? How much about Him can I know? Why did He make the universe, including mankind and me—with all my longings after perfection and immortality and Him?

The great Apostle in the second chapter of First Corinthians rightly argues from the analogy of man that no one can know the things of God save the Spirit of God that is in Him. Again, he agrees with Isaiah that "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit; for the Spirit searches all things, yea, the deep things of God." The Old Testament claims to contain a series of revelations from God and the whole New Testament is full of statements declaring that the Old Testament contains a reliable record of revelations of God and that all the Scriptures were inspired by Him. The Lord asserts that the Scriptures cannot be broken and Christianity rests upon this belief. All the Churches and Creeds of Christendom are based upon the supposition that the Scriptures are true.

In the present article, I shall consider some of the objective, or evidential, grounds for concluding that this opinion of the Church *semper et ubique et ab omnibus* is correct and especially that the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament are reasonably to be considered as a part of the God-given Rule of Faith and Life.<sup>1</sup>

And first, let us look at the reasonableness of this belief to one who acknowledges that there is a God and that He

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Westminster Confession*, Chap. I.



alone can reveal His will to us as a rule, or canon, of faith and life. It seems to me that it is no more than what we, in the case of men, call commonsense for God to provide that any revelation that He might make to the human race for all time to come would be correctly written and preserved. Just as you may be sure that a royal proclamation of King George of England, or a presidential proclamation, will be correctly published and transmitted to the persons for whom it is designed; so you may be sure, that God, when speaking to and through the prophets for the instruction and benefit of the whole human race, would see to it that what He had to say was correctly recorded and transmitted to that race. Further, it would inevitably follow that these records would at some time be collected in proper form and that this collection would be handed down in a sufficiently correct condition to those for whom it was intended. It is a surprising fact of history that not merely the Jewish people but, with possibly one exception, all branches of the Christian Church always and everywhere, have agreed in accepting all the books of our Hebrew Bible as constituting a part at least of the inspired word of God. This gives me great confidence in undertaking my task of defending the position that the right books were selected and handed down. And most of all do I undertake my task with a feeling of joy that I may do something at least to remove the doubts of honest believers in the teaching of the New Testament, when confronted with the assertion, said to be the result of scientific investigation, that the Old Testament is not what Christ and the Apostles thought it to be.

In this article, I shall restrict myself to a statement of some of the direct evidence calculated to show that the indirect evidence alleged by many critics of the Old Testament to prove that the completion of the Canon was not made till about A.D. 90 is inadequate. The evidence to be given bears especially upon seven allegations.

#### THE SEVEN ALLEGATIONS

I. That the Samaritans accepted as canonical the Pentateuch alone.

2. That the term "Law" being used at times in the New Testament and in Jewish writings to denote the whole Old Testament and the phrase "Law and Prophets" at other times, shows that there was a time when the Law constituted all of the Canon and later when it consisted of the Law and the Prophets alone.<sup>2</sup>

3. That several books in the present Bible were not written until after the time of Ezra and even as late as Maccabean times.

4. That the canonicity of certain books was not finally decided among the Jews till the Council of Jamnia about A.D. 90.

5. That the synagogue lessons were taken exclusively from the Law and the Prophets because the canonicity of the other books was not acknowledged when these lessons were selected.

6. That there are indications in the order of the books in both the Prophets and the third part of the Canon tending to show that these divisions of the Old Testament were formed gradually.

7. That the "three-fold division of the Canon itself affords a clue to the mode of its formation."<sup>3</sup>

#### DISCUSSION OF THE ALLEGATIONS

When and by whom the present divisions in the Old Testament Hebrew Bible were made, we do not know. We do know, however, that many of the books of the Old Testament were written centuries before their canonicity was generally acknowledged. The Church has always held that these books were canonical from the time that they were written and that their authority depends upon the fact that they were written by inspiration of God. They are a rule of faith and life for all men, whether these men accept them as such, or not. But, as to many of them, we are ignorant of their authors, the time when they were written, and the

<sup>2</sup> Cf. W. H. Green, *General Introduction to the Old Testament: The Canon* (1899), p. 100.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 22-25.

time when they were accepted. We do not know what were the divisions in the earliest collections, but we do know that there must have been divisions; because the whole Old Testament could not have been written on one portable leather or papyrus volume nor on less than numerous tablets. Whether these divisions were consciously made or commonly received, we do not know; nor, what was the number or order of the different books in these divisions. We do know, however, that in our Hebrew Bible, we have the books that were acknowledged by the Jews of the time of Christ as canonical and that Christ and the Apostles recognized the same canon of Holy Scripture.

This whole matter of the order and divisions of the books of the Old Testament might be considered one of minor importance, were it not for the fact that many critics write as if they knew when these divisions were made and the content of them, and are using this presumed knowledge to cast suspicion upon the date and reliability of many of the books. I think, therefore, that it may guard the faith of believers, if I state the main evidence on the ground of which I am convinced that the critics are wrong in their view as to the formation of the Canon of the Old Testament.

In the first place, the Bible itself is not so devoid of information on this subject, as some would have us conclude. Long before the time of Moses, Adam and Noah and Abraham had received commandments and visions from God that were the rule of their faith and life, and were handed down for the guidance and observation of future generations. The code of the Covenant was accepted by the people at Sinai<sup>4</sup> and the whole law at Shittim<sup>5</sup> and re-adopted at Shechem.<sup>6</sup> The books of Joshua,<sup>7</sup> Judges,<sup>8</sup> Samuel,<sup>9</sup> Kings,<sup>10</sup> and

<sup>4</sup> Ex. xx-xxiv.

<sup>5</sup> Num. xxv. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Josh. xxiv. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Josh. xxiv. 26.

<sup>8</sup> Jud. ii. 20.

<sup>9</sup> *Passim*. Cf. Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, p. 52.

<sup>10</sup> *Passim*. Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 53.

Nehemiah<sup>11</sup> show that the Law of Moses was accepted by the people of Israel and their only rule of faith and life. This rule was to be taught by fathers to their children<sup>12</sup> and by the priests to the people<sup>13</sup> and the king was expected to observe it.<sup>14</sup> The prophets, also, encouraged and emphasized the obligation and beneficent results of the keeping of the Law, and enforced their preaching by new messages of threatening and grace from the God of Abraham and Israel, and their messages were accepted by the faithful as the rule of their faith and life. Filled with the Spirit of Jehovah the poets and wise men of Israel wrote psalms and idylls and proverbs and philosophies of life in praise of God and of His law and in commendation of the godly life and condemnation of the wicked. What men were to believe concerning God and sin and death and judgment and the necessity of a God-wrought redemption was repeatedly and in many ways set forth; so that the Scriptures of "divine origin and excellence" and "inspired of God" were "profitable, for doctrine, for reproof, for correction and for instruction which is in righteousness." "At sundry times and in divers manners, God spake unto the fathers by the prophets" and what He spake was for them and their descendents a rule of faith and practice and life. God's law given at Sinai was the Magna Charta of Israel's rights and obligations. The Prophets and the other writings that were added to this law must be in harmony with it and must serve the purpose of showing its most profitable use and the danger of its neglect.

Such works written by men inspired by the Spirit of God needed no council, nor senate, of great men to cause their acceptance. The people of God themselves recognized the works of the prophets and wise men as a part of the infallible rule of faith and life which God designed for them; and by selection and elimination the present Canon of the Old Testament was formed under the special guidance of

---

<sup>11</sup> Neh. viii.

<sup>12</sup> Gen. xviii. 19, Ex. xiii. 11, Deut. vi. 20, *et al.*

<sup>13</sup> 2 Chron. xv. 3, xvii. 7-9.

<sup>14</sup> Deut. xvii. 18.

the prophets and the enlightening influence of the Spirit of God. The Jews have taught that a book to be canonical must be in harmony with the Law and have been written before the succession of the prophets ceased. This seems to be reasonable and, as far as anybody knows, it is agreeable to the evidence.

But, notwithstanding the fact that the critics admit there is no direct, nor explicit, evidence that any of the books were written after 400 B.C., nor that the divisions of the Canon recognized in our Hebrew Bible as Law, Prophets and Hagiographa (or Writings), were constituted and closed one after the other by enactment of some body of men in authority, they all persist in affirming that the Law was first officially declared to be canonical by Ezra and his contemporaries, the Prophetical Books, consisting of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve Minor Prophets by some unknown authority about 200 B.C., and all of the books at the council of Jamnia in A.D. 90. With all due deference to the learning of the leaders of these critics, it is my judgment that the *prima facie* evidence of the documents bearing upon the matter, as well as of the traditions of the Jews, is against the critics' affirmations and conclusions in reference to the origin and formation of the Old Testament Canon.

And, first of all, this judgment of mine is based upon the consideration that, in order to accept the allegations of the radical critics as correct, we will have to conclude that almost every document of the Old and New Testaments rests upon false assumptions and is itself a witness in favor of what should have been known to be false. It is only as we conceive of the Bible as written by the inspiration of God that we can speak of it as one book with a single author. If we believe that it is such a book, it would be impious, or blasphemous, for us to think that it was full of errors and misstatements as the critics allege. If on the other hand, we look at the human authors, we will find at least forty different men involved in a general accusation of forgery and

falsehood, or of a blameworthy and inexcusable assumption of a knowledge and piety which they did not possess. Besides, the men who wrote most of the Old Testament were not the mean and unknown and uneducated men of their day and generation. One author alone of all the writers of the Old Testament disclaims any special preparation for his work, except the call of God. Only two authors of books of the New Testament can possibly be charged with a lack of literary education; yet those two who wrote three of the smallest letters had been specially trained by the Lord Himself. But all the other authors, both of the Old Testament and of the New, had the finest education which the times afforded. God chose the brightest and the best to do His work of providing a divine library for the world of men in all time and in every land. Egypt furnished the adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter, trained in all the wisdom of that land of letters and arts, to be the mediator of the old covenant and the founder of the Israelitish government and religion. Assyria bowed before the threats of Jonah. Daniel was taught the letters and science of the Babylonians; and Mordecai, Ezra and Nehemiah were prime ministers of the kings of Persia. Isaiah and Jeremiah directed the policy of Judah. And what shall one say of Samuel, the king-maker, and of David, the sweet singer of Israel, and of Solomon in all his glory? And how can we depreciate John, the beloved, and Paul, the matchless proclaimer of the mysteries of God? And where in all history and literature can we find a body of writers who make the burden of their themes the highest thoughts and noblest deeds that ever entered the mind of man? Men of such character and intellect and high sense of sin and reverence for God can be safely trusted not to have been false in the solemn and reverent statements which they have made about the will of God and the duty of man.

Besides, we are met by the astounding and inexplicable fact, that Israelites and Christians alike, scribes, rabbis, Origen, Jerome, Eusebius, Calvin, Melancthon, Heng-



stenberg and scores of other scholars as learned and brilliant as any whom the critics can muster, have recognized these records as true and trustworthy.

And there are five great items of evidence that are existing today and which nobody can deny or fail to recognize which support the trustworthiness of the Bible. The first is the Jews. The second is the Christian Church. The third is the Bible itself. The fourth is the appeal which the Bible still makes to the millions of believers. And the fifth is the effect which it has produced and still produces on the peoples who have accepted the Bible and have tried to obey its precepts, to fear its God, and to follow in the footsteps of the strong Son of God whom it portrays.

When, then, we come to investigate these literary products, let us admit at least that we are coming in contact with the thoughts and descriptions of men who have never been surpassed in the exaltation of their ideals and in their fitness for their task. And, if we are Christians, let us not hesitate to adopt as true to fact the accounts of miracles and the prediction of future events, inasmuch as the whole Christian system is itself a miracle from the creation to the constitution of the new heavens and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.

Of course, we freely admit that, if the critics could *prove* that the books of the Old Testament are unreliable, we would be obliged to revise our views of it. But, we do not know of any valid proofs the critics have to offer. In our judgment the religions outside the Bible present no literature that can rival that of the Old Testament merely as literature; and when it comes to religion, they fail to satisfy us on the main points of what God is and what He requires of man. Further, the history of all other nations outside of Israel shows us that they were without the knowledge of the true God, except as they had derived this knowledge from Israel itself. Besides, in our opinion, the history of Egypt, Assyria, Babylon and Persia, so far as it is known, corrobo-

rates and harmonizes with the facts recorded on the sacred pages of the Bible.

Again, in the second place, not merely is the theory of the critics out of harmony with the *prima facie* evidence of the Scriptures themselves and, also, entirely unsupported by comparative religion and history; it is contrary, also, to the facts as revealed in the language in which the books of the Old Testament are written. This I have sufficiently and, I think, conclusively shown in three articles already published in this REVIEW. In the first of these,<sup>15</sup> I endeavored to show that the use of Aramaisms in the Old Testament literature corresponds exactly to what we would have expected, if the records are true. In the second,<sup>16</sup> I answered the objections to the *prima facie* and traditional account of the origin and age of the Old Testament documents so far as these are affected by the alleged presence in some of them of so-called New Hebrew words. In the third,<sup>17</sup> I took under consideration all the Egyptian, Babylonian, Persian and other foreign words and found that their occurrence in the literature of the Old Testament is such as we would have found only if that literature is historically correct as to the time and place of its origin.

In the third place, my readers must notice, that the canonical authority of a book of the Bible does not depend upon the time when all the books were collected into one. God made the books canonical, not man. But, neither does the canonical authority of a book depend upon the time at which it was acknowledged as such by the church at large. The failure of the Jewish church until A.D. 90 to acknowledge finally that Ezekiel and Ecclesiastes were canonical would not prove that they had not been a part of the Canon until that time. Much less would it show that these books had not been written before the first century A.D.

<sup>15</sup> "Aramaisms in the Old Testament" (Vol. XXIII, pp. 234-266).

<sup>16</sup> "Evidence in Hebrew Diction for the Dates of Documents" (Vol. XXV, pp. 353-88).

<sup>17</sup> "Foreign Words in the Old Testament as an Evidence of Historicity" (Vol. XXVI, pp. 177-247).

In the fourth place, let me refer my readers to my *Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*<sup>18</sup> and my articles on the Psalms in this REVIEW<sup>19</sup> for an answer to the assertions of the critics that several books of the Old Testament were written after the time of Ezra.

In the fifth place, the term "law" was used in two senses: to denote the whole rule of faith and life, i.e., the whole Canon of the Old Testament; and, also, in a narrower sense of the books of Moses alone. This double sense and use of the word "law" is true, also, of the words "prophets" and "scriptures." Since, therefore, every one of these was employed at times to denote a part and at times to denote the whole of the Old Testament, it is hard to see how the mention of one of them alone should have anything to do with the question of their order when taken together; much less how it could show which was written first and which last.

In the sixth place, we must remember that books consisting of folios, as ours do, did not come into existence until the second century A.D. Before that time, they were written on rolls (hence the word "volume"), or tablets, and every man's collection might be arranged by himself into what divisions and order he saw fit. This will be apparent from the evidence given under the next section.

Lastly, in proof that the order and divisions of the books were never fixed by law and that the age and authorship did not necessarily determine the position of a book in the Canon, but that they were arranged to suit the convenience or the whim of the owners or users, I present the evidence found in the ancient documents bearing on the case.<sup>20</sup>

I am aware that the fact that the Law of Moses always is put first is likely to seem to be against this statement. But

<sup>18</sup> *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament* (The Sunday School Times Co., 1926).

<sup>19</sup> "The Headings of the Psalms" (Vol. XXIV, pp. 1-37, 353-395).

<sup>20</sup> Most of the evidence from Greek and Latin sources given below will be found in my article, "The Book of Daniel and the Canon," in this REVIEW, Vol. XIII, pp. 352-408. In that article the lists of Jerome were inadvertently omitted.

it is not, for the good and sufficient reason that frequency of use as well as the fact that its contents are the natural and preliminary requirement for a correct understanding of all the other literature and history render its right to the first place a necessity for any principle of division. We shall find, however, that the order of books in this division is not always the same.

The order of the books in the Pentateuch is not mentioned in the Old or New Testaments, though the references to events recorded in Exodus succeed those mentioned in Genesis in the various psalms where they occur as they do in the speech of Stephen and in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews. No reference to any one of the five books by name and no order of the books occurs in any place until after the time of Christ.

It is a fact not dwelt upon by the critics that MS 124 of Kennicott gives the order of the books of the Law as Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Leviticus, Numbers; and that the list of Melito and that of Leontius give the order as Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, Deuteronomy. This is especially noteworthy in the case of Melito, who was bishop of Sardis in A.D. 180 and gives the earliest complete list of the books of the Old Testament that we possess; and further, because he expressly says that when he came East "he learned accurately the books of the Old Testament" and sent a list of the books to Onesimus who had "desired to have an accurate statement of the ancient books, as regards their number and their order." Thus, it is evident, that the order of the books of the Pentateuch was not fixed, seeing that, counting the usual order, there are three orders known from ancient documents.

The fact that both the Hebrew and Aramaic recensions of the Samaritan Pentateuch have the common order is, we think, decidedly in favor of its being the most original. For, whether the Samaritans received their copy of the Pentateuch in the time of the Assyrians<sup>21</sup> (seventh century B.C.)

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. 2 Kgs. xviii.

or in the time of Sanballat<sup>22</sup> (fifth century B.C.), it represents its condition centuries before any other source of information.

Ben Sira, in his great work *Ecclesiasticus*, speaks many times of the *Tora*, or Law; but he does not give the order of the books, nor even refer to a five-fold division of them. He cites his heroes of Israel in chronological order without regard to where they are described. His order of citation is, for the books outside the Law, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah and Chronicles, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Job (whom he calls a prophet), the Twelve (without defining who they were)<sup>23</sup> and Nehemiah. It is to be noted that he makes the order of the prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Job and the XII.

In the prologue to the translation of *Ecclesiasticus* into Greek, made by Ben Sira's grandson about 130 B.C., the latter three times speaks of three divisions of the Old Testament, as follows: the first division he three times calls "the Law"; the second division, three times, "the Prophets"; and the third division, first, "the other books which follow them"; secondly, "the other ancestral books"; thirdly, "the rest of the books." It is to be noticed that he does not give the name of anyone of the books, nor the number in any division, nor, the order, nor the time nor place of composition, nor, the time when they had been acknowledged as part of the Canon, nor why.

The First Book of Maccabees represents Mattathias, the father of the Maccabees as making a speech in 169 B.C., in which he calls "to remembrance the acts which their father did in their time." In his speech (ii. 49-61) he mentions in order the deeds of Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb, David, Elijah, Ananias, Azarias, Misael and Daniel.

---

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Nehemiah (*passim*).

<sup>23</sup> At this time, Jonah may have been a part of the book of Kings; or Zechariah and Malachi may have been counted as one; or Daniel may have been included among the Twelve, as the use of the word *comforted* (החלים, literally, to cause to dream, or "see dreams") might indicate.

It will be noted, that he follows the chronological order of the canonical books and that he seems to consider the accounts of the three children and of Daniel just as reliable as what is said about Abraham, David and Elias.

The Second Book of Maccabees, written in 124 B.C., tells of "the records and commentaries of Nehemiah and how, founding a library, he gathered together the books concerning the kings and the prophets and those of David and epistles of kings concerning votive offerings" (ii. 13). The Syriac translation says that he "collected and arranged in order these books." Unfortunately, the author of this book does not state what this order was nor what books were included in the various divisions. Counting the Law, which all of these divisions cite, this would make five divisions in all in the collection of Nehemiah: his books of "Kings" would include Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, and probably Chronicles, Esther and Ezra. "David" would probably be the Book of Psalms. "Prophets" might embrace Job and Daniel, so that Solomon's three books alone would be omitted from this collection.

Philo of Alexandria (1st cty. A.D.) says in his *De Vita Contemplativa* that the Therapeutae received "the Law and the oracles uttered by the prophets and the hymns and other (writings) by which knowledge and piety are augmented and perfected." Here are three, or possibly four, divisions, but no indication of the books in each division, nor of the order in which they were arranged, nor of their number, or names. The phrase, "the other" (writings, or books, or poems) by which "knowledge and piety are augmented and perfected" probably were the same as are meant by Josephus when he says, after mentioning the Law and the thirteen books of the Prophets, that the remaining four books contain "hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life."

In Luke xxiv. 44 the Lord speaks of those things that were written concerning Him "in the Law of Moses and in the Prophets and in the Psalms." There is no doubt from this statement that the Psalms might be put in a division



separate from the Law, or the Prophets. Nevertheless, there is no warrant elsewhere for supposing that "Psalms" was thought to be a suitable designation for a division containing Esther, Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles and Daniel. The word "Law" might include and often did include the prophets and all the other sacred literature, since it was all looked upon as canonical, that is, as a rule, or law, of faith and life. The word "Prophets" might be used for all the Old Testament and, as a matter of fact, was so used; for the Law was written by Moses, the greatest of the prophets, and it was a principle of the Jews that a book to be canonical had to have been composed by, or sanctioned by, a prophet. But, the word "Psalms" is never elsewhere used for the whole division; nor, anywhere else but here, as a possible heading of a third division. But, in view of the fact that Philo and Josephus use the synonym "Hymns" to denote the third division, let us wave this evidence aside as being hyper-critical. Remember, however, that neither Philo nor Josephus classed Esther, Ezra, Chronicles or Daniel under the heading "Hymns." Let us remember, also, that both Ben Sira expressly and Josephus by implication put Job among the Prophets and that the Lord speaks of "Daniel the prophet" and Josephus calls him the greatest of the prophets. The common-sense view, then, seems to be, that by "the Psalms" the Lord meant the same as we do when we use the designation. He probably singled them out from the "other writings," because they of all the books of the Old Testament say the most concerning Him and His kingdom. In conclusion, let it be noted, that this passage in Luke, while recognizing three divisions, does not give the order nor the number of the books in anyone of the divisions; nor does it mention the name of any book, except the Psalms.

In Luke xxiv. 27, we read that the Lord, "beginning from Moses and out of all the Prophets expounded in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." As "all the Scriptures" evidently means the whole Old Testament, it is most natural to suppose that "Law and Prophets" here denotes the

same; though it is fair to grant, that there is a possibility that other books in a third division may have been in the mind of the writer. However that may be, in John i. 45 we find Nathanael saying that Jesus of Nazareth was "he of whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets did write," mentioning only two divisions, Neither number, order, nor names of books are given in these two passages.

In Mt. xxiv. 15 a prediction is cited by the Lord as having been "spoken of by Daniel the prophet." In Mt. xiii. 55, the 78th Psalm which in the heading is called "a maschil of Asaph" is said by Matthew to have been spoken by "a prophet." In Acts ii. 29-36 David, as author of the 110th Psalm, is by Peter called a "prophet." In Mt. iii. 3, Isaiah; in Mt. xii. 39, Jonah; in Acts ii. 16, Joel; and in Mt. xxvii. 9, Jeremiah are respectively called "the prophet." From these passages, we see that Jesus and the Apostles, Matthew and Peter, designate Daniel, David and Asaph as "prophets," and this in formal addresses where they must have known that their audiences agreed with them in their use of the designation. This should teach us all to be careful about accepting, without any direct evidence in its favor, the assertion of the critics that the Prophetical, or second, division of the Old Testament Canon was closed about 200 B.C. For we see that writers, whose works are in what later constituted for the Jews the Hagiographa, or third part of the Old Testament, were cited in the first century A.D. as prophets just in the same manner as Isaiah, Jeremiah, Joel, and Jonah; and that the whole Old Testament was designated by Luke and by Nathanael (on the authority of John) as the Law and the Prophets.

This caution appears to be more necessary, when we come to consider the testimony of Josephus, our other great witness from the first century A.D. Josephus says, "We have only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past times, which are justly believed to be divine; and of them five belong to Moses . . . but as to the time from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes, king of Persia, who

reigned after Xerxes (i.e., from 466 to 424 B.C.), the prophets, who came after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life. It is true, our history has been written since Artaxerxes, very particularly, but hath not been esteemed of like authority with the former by our forefathers, because there hath not been an exact succession of prophets since that time; and how firmly we have given credit to those books of our own nation is evident by what we do; for during so many ages as have already passed, no one has been so bold as either to add anything to them or take anything from them."<sup>24</sup>

1. It will be seen that Josephus states expressly that the Jews of his time had only twenty-two books "justly believed to be divine." Of these, five constituted the Law, or first division. The four in the third division are said to "contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life." These are probably the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs. The thirteen books of the Prophets, or second division, would be Joshua, Judges (including Ruth), Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Isaiah, Jeremiah (including Lamentations), Ezekiel, Daniel and the Twelve Minor Prophets (all in one volume).

2. He limits the time in which the authors of the Prophetic Books lived by the year 424 B.C. when Artaxerxes I died.

3. He further limits the time at which the last of the Old Testament books was written by the "exact succession of the prophets," i.e., by the time of Malachi.

The greatest list from the second century A.D. is that of Melito, bishop of Sardis about A.D. 175 in his "catalogue of the books of the Old Testament which it is necessary to quote." We have two copies of this catalogue, one preserved in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius;<sup>25</sup> the other, in the

<sup>24</sup> *Contra Apion*, I. 8.

<sup>25</sup> IV. 26.

*Syriac Fragments* of Cureton. The list of books given by Melito in the Greek recension is as follows: Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, five books, Jesus Nave, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings, two of Chronicles, the Psalms of David, the Proverbs of Solomon (which also is Wisdom), Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job; of Prophets; Isaiah, Jeremiah, the XII, Daniel, Ezekiel, Esdras. The Syriac recension agrees with this, except that it speaks of "the book of Judges and Ruth," "the book of four Kings," "the book of two Chronicles."

Further, Melito, in his letter to Onesimus from which this list is taken, says in the former part of the letter: "Melito to his brother Onesimus, Greetings; since thou hast often, in thy zeal for the word, expressed a wish to have extracts made from the Law and the Prophets concerning the Saviour and concerning our entire faith, and hast also desired to have an accurate statement of the ancient books, as regards their number and their order, I have endeavored to perform the task. . . . Accordingly, when I went East and came to the place where these things were preached and done, I learned accurately the books of the Old Testament and sent them to thee as written below."

Notice, that this is the first attempt known to give the books of the Old Testament in their number and order. Notice, further, that Melito says that he endeavored "to make an accurate statement of the ancient books as regards their number and order." Again, he says that he went to the East, to the place where these things (recorded in the Old Testament books) were preached and done; and that he learned accurately the books of the Old Testament and sent them to Onesimus as given in the list.

Lastly, notice that this list contains at least four divisions: Law, Historical Books, Poetical Books and Prophetical Books, Esdras being counted as among the Prophets. If, however, we separate Esdras from the Prophets, it would be all alone in a fifth division. Job is placed among the Poetical books; Ruth and Chronicles, among the Historical; Daniel

and perhaps Esdras among the Prophetical. Numbers precedes Leviticus, and the order of the Prophets is Isaiah, Jeremiah, the XII, Daniel and Ezekiel.

The next witness we shall produce is Origen, who died in A.D. 254. He was the greatest critical scholar of the ancient Greek Church and certainly one of the most conversant with Hebrew. His list of the books in the Hebrew Bible is as follows: "Gen., Ex., Lev., Num., Deut., Joshua, Judges and Ruth (in one), Kings a-d, Chronicles a-b, Esdras a-b, Book of Psalms, Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Isaiah, Jeremiah with Lamentations and the Epistle in one, Daniel, Ezekiel, Job, Esther, and besides these is the Maccabees." Several features of this list are specifically important:

1. He certainly places Daniel among the Prophets and perhaps Job and Esther.

2. He seems to agree with Josephus in having four books of poetry, though he puts them into a different place.

3. He has no division corresponding to the Hagiographa, since he puts Ruth in with Judges and Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah (1 & 2 Esdras) along with the Former Prophets, or Historical works.

4. He adds Lamentations to Jeremiah, instead of putting it among the Hagiographa, or Megilloth.

5. Job and Esther, also, seem to be classed as Prophets instead of being put among the Hagiographa.

6. In short, he recognizes neither the divisions, nor the order, of books as given in any known Jewish list, or manuscript; yet, it is hard to see, how he can have been ignorant of the divisions and order existent among the Hebrews of his time, especially if these had been fixed by the authority of the Jewish Church.

Next, let us look at the testimony of Jerome, the greatest scholar of the early Latin Church and the author of the Latin Vulgate. Jerome wrote these lists about A.D. 400; but we know that he prepared himself for his work of translating by going to Palestine and studying Hebrew with the



best Hebrew scholars of his time. He has left us two lists. The first, in the letter to Paulinus, is as follows: Gen., Ex., Lev., Num., Deut., five books = Pentateuch; Job, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, David, Solomon, Esther, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah.

The second list, in the so-called *Prologus Galeatus*, is as follows: I. (Gen., Ex.), Lev., Num., Deut. = Books of Moses = *Thora*, Law; II. Joshua, Judges-Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the XII; III. Job, David, Solomon (Prov., Koheleth, Song), Daniel, Chronicles, Ezra, Esther—22 books; IV. Apocrypha: Wisdom of Solomon, Jesus ben Sirach, Judith, Tobias and Pastor, 1 Maccabees, 2 Maccabees.

Regarding these two lists the following points are to be noted:

1. The first list has five divisions, to wit: The Law (5 books); 6 Historical Books; 16 Prophetical Books; 2 (or by counting 3 for Solomon, 4) Poetical Books; and lastly 3 or 4 Historical Books. In the second list there are four divisions counting the Apocrypha.

2. Neither list agrees with Baba Bathra.

3. In the first list Job heads the second division: in the second list it heads the third.

4. In both lists Ruth follows Judges.

5. In the first list the order of Prophets is: The Twelve, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel. In the second list it is: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Twelve.

6. The fact that Daniel follows Ezekiel in the first list indicates that it is classed with the Prophets. Otherwise it must be regarded as standing by itself or grouped with the Poetical Books (David and Solomon). In the second list Daniel follows the Poetical Books.

7. Ecclesiastes and the Song are both ascribed to Solomon.

8. In both lists, Jerome evidently included Lamentations under Jeremiah.



The testimony of the four great Greek Uncials—Vaticanus (B), Alexandrinus (A), Sinaiticus (S) and Basiliano-Venetus (B-V)—of the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. is noteworthy:

1. All place Joshua immediately after Deuteronomy.
2. Judges and Ruth follow, but the Basiliano-Venetus reverses the order.
3. Next come Kings followed by Chronicles, but S reverses the order.
4. B, S and B-V put Esdras a & b next; but A puts them between Judith and Maccabees.
5. In S and B-V, Esdras b is followed by Esther; but in B and A, it is put after the Prophetical and before the Poetical Books.
6. The order of the Poetical Books may be represented in a table as follows:
 

B.	Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song, Job.
S.	Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song, Sirach, Job.
A.	Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song.
B-V.	Psalms (?), Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song, Sirach.
7. In all the MSS., the order of the Minor Prophets is the same, except that in B-V, Micah is placed after Jonah.
8. In all the MSS., Isaiah is put at the beginning of the list of Prophets and is always followed by Jeremiah.
9. Baruch is omitted from S, but occurs in the others immediately after Jeremiah.
10. In B, A and B-V, the list of Prophets ends with Ezekiel, Daniel.

When we recall that the version of the Law and the Prophets was certainly made before the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus was written (i.e., before 130 B.C.), it seems clear that the translator would have followed the divisions and order of books in the original, if these had already been fixed by the authorities of the Jews. For the sake of convenience in the services of the temple and synagogues, the Jews afterwards put together the Prophets from which selections were

read every Sabbath day; but there was no necessity for the Christians to make a fixed arrangement, since they made a like use of all the Scriptures in their services and esteemed them all alike. The Greek, Aramaic, Syriac and Latin versions from the Hebrew were all made by scholars who knew thoroughly the Hebrew language and laws; and yet, in none of these is there the slightest inkling that the divisions of the Old Testament were fixed by law when they were made, nor that the books were to be placed in a certain fixed order.

The testimony of the lists found in the works of the old Greek and Latin Fathers and in the decrees of the early Councils corroborates what we have just said with regard to the manuscripts of the Septuagint. From these lists we conclude:

1. That there were no fixed divisions recognized throughout the Church Universal, nor even in any particular Church. The divisions range from two to seven, four or five being the most common.

2. Melito and Leontius give the order for the Pentateuch as Gen., Ex., Num., Lev., Deut.

3. In the order for the other divisions *no two* MSS. are exactly alike.

4. They all place Daniel among the Prophets.

5. Job is found in 13 different places in 32 lists, ranging from immediately after Joshua to the last but one of all the books. It is put among the Former Prophets, Latter Prophets, the Poetical Books, the Historical Books, the Apocryphal Books, and sometimes apparently in a class by itself.

6. It is passing strange that no one of these great writers should ever apparently have heard of a fixed order and of the three fixed divisions alleged by modern critics to have been fixed among the Jews two centuries before the time of Christ.

We shall next consider the testimony of the Syriac manuscripts. It is generally held that the Peshitto Version was made about A.D. 200. The evidence presented in the accounts

of the early bishops of the Syrians edited by Professor Sachau of Berlin and published by the Prussian Academy<sup>27</sup> would favor an earlier date for this translation. But whatever its date, there is no doubt that it was made directly from the Hebrew text. We would expect it, then, to give the order and divisions of the books found in the Hebrew original from which it was translated, if the order and divisions had been fixed before the version was made. That this was not the case is shown conclusively by the following evidence which I have gleaned from the catalogues of the libraries of Oxford, Cambridge, the British Museum, and elsewhere.

1. Ebed Jesu:<sup>28</sup> Law, Josh., Jud., Sam., Kings, Chr., Ruth, Pss., Song, Eccus., Great Wisdom, Job, Is., Hos., Joel, Amos, Obad., Jonah, Mic., Na., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal., Jer., Ek., Dan., Judith, Est., Sus., Ezra, and Dan. the Less, and the Letter of Baruch, and the book of the Traditions of the Elders and that of Josephus the Writer. The Proverbs and Tales of the Sons of Samona and the books again of Macc. (3) and the Tale of Herod the King and the Book of the Second Destruction of Jerusalem through Titus, and the Book of Asyath the wife of the upright Joseph, the son of Jacob, and the Book of Tobias and Tobit the righteous Israelites.

2. Bar Hebraeus: (Cambridge Add. 2009) Law, Jos., Jud., Sam., Pss., Kings, Ez., Prov., Eccus., Ecc., Song, Wisdom, Ruth, Sus., Job, Is., XII, Jer., Ek., Dan., Bel and the Dragon. *id.* Brit. Mus. XLV.

3. Brit. Mus. MSS. V, VI, VII: Law, Jos., Jud., Sam., Kings, Wisdom, Koh., Ru., Song, Eccus., Job, Is., XII, Jer., Lam., Ek., Dan., Bel and the Dragon.

4. Bodleian, I (year 1627): Law, Job, Josh., Jud., Sam., Kings, Chron., Prov., Ecc., Song, Great Wisdom, Ru., Sus., Is., XII, Jer., 1 & 2 Bar., Ep. Jer., Ek., Dan., Bel and the Dragon, Est., Judith, Ezra, Eccus., 4 books of Macc., Esdras, Tobith.

<sup>27</sup> *Kgl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.* for 1919.

<sup>28</sup> According to Assemani (Cat. III. 5).

5. Bodleian, II: Same as last as far as Susanna; then Little book of Daniel, Est., Judith, Ezra, Ecclus, 4 of Macc., Esd. and Tobith, Is., XII, Jer., Lam., Ep. of Baruch, Ep. Jer., Ek., Dan., Bel and the Dragon.

6. British Mus., I: Same as Bodl. I except that 1st and 2nd Baruch are put at the end of all.

7. Brit. Mus., XVI: has the order Josh., Jud., Sam., Kings, Prov., Ecclus, Koh., Ru., Song, the righteous Job.

8. Cambridge, Oo 1. 7; Is., XII, Jer., Lam., Bar., Ek., Dan., Song of the Three Children, Sus., Bel and Dragon.

9. Cambridge, Oo 1. 10: Same as No. 7 above except begins with Judges.

10. Cambridge, Add. 1963: Same as No. 7 as far as Prov.; then Koh., Ru., Song, Ecclus., Job.

11. Cambridge, Add 1969: Jos., Jud., Ruth, Sam., Kings, Prov., Song, Ecclus, Job.

12. Cambridge, Buchanan MS: Pent., Job, Jos., Jud., Sam., Pss., Kings, Chron., Prov., Koh., Song, Wisdom, Is., Jer., Lam., 1 & 2 Bar., Ep. Jer., Ek., XII, Dan., Bel and Dragon, Ruth, Sus., Est., Judith, Ezra, Ecclus., 4 books of Macc., 1st Esd., Tobit.

13. Wilson MS. A manuscript in my possession begins with Is. xliii. 10 and continues: XII, (Hos., Joel, Amos, Ob., Jon., Mi., etc.), Jer., Lam., Prayer of Jer., Ezek.

14. Codex Florentinus has the order Lev., Num., Deut., Jos., Jud., Sam., Kings, Chron., Psalms.

15. Cambridge Ll. 2. 4 has the order: Is., XII, Jer., Lam., Ek., Dan., Song of Three Children, Bel and Dragon.

Codex Ambrosianus (at Milan): Pent., Job, Jos., Jud., Sam., Pss., Kings, Prov., Wisdom, Koh., Song, Is., Jer., Lam., Ep. Jer., 1 & 2 Bar., Ek., XII, Dan., Bel and Dragon, Ru., Sus., Est., Judith, Ecclus, Chr., Apoc. of Baruch, 1st Esd. (= 4th in Latin), Ezra, 5 books of Macc.

1. It will be seen that all of these documents put Daniel among the Prophets.

2. That most of the Jacobite MSS. put Job immediately after the Pentateuch.

3. That three of the most important witnesses—the Cambridge Buchanan MS., the Ambrosian Codex, and Bar Hebraeus—put the Psalms between Samuel and Kings.

4. That Isaiah is always placed first among the Prophets and that it is followed commonly by the XII.

5. That Chronicles is placed by some of the best witnesses immediately after Kings.

6. That the Ambrosian and Buchanan Manuscripts put all the books about women together and others have two or more together.

7. That there is no evidence outside the Pentateuch of any fixed division or order of books, such as would indicate that the version was made from a Hebrew Bible with fixed divisions and a definite order.

The next item of evidence, which we shall consider, is the testimony of Baba Bathra.<sup>29</sup> This tract is an extra-canonical part of the Mishna, written by some unknown author at an unknown date, somewhere between A.D. 200 and 850.<sup>30</sup> It contains among other matters a list of the Prophets and Hagio-grapha and a statement as to who wrote the books of the Old Testament. The list is as follows: "The Rabbis have taught the order of succession in the books of the Prophets runs thus: Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah and the Twelve. The order of succession in the Hagio-grapha is: Ruth, the Book of Psalms, Job and Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, and Lamentations, Daniel and the Book of Esther, Ezra and Chronicles." The statement about the authors is: "Moses wrote his own book and the chapter of Balaam and Job, Joshua wrote his own book and the last eight verses of the Pentateuch, Samuel wrote his own book and also Judges and Ruth. David wrote the Book of Psalms through the ten elders Adam, Melchisedek, Abraham, Moses, Heman, Juduthun, Asaph and the three sons of Korah. Jeremiah wrote his own book, as also the Kings and the Lamentations. Hezekiah and his company

<sup>29</sup> 14 b.

<sup>30</sup> Margoliouth puts it at the latter date.

wrote the books of Isaiah, Proverbs, Canticles and Ecclesiastes. The men of the Great Synagogue wrote Ezekiel, the twelve Minor Prophets, the book of Daniel and the book of Esther, Ezra wrote his own book a genealogy which belongs to the Chronicles."

1. It will be remarked that these two citations are from the same section of Baba Bathra. They are presumably by the same author and from the same time. But the author is not known nor the time specified.

2. The critics generally deny almost every statement of the second citation, thus impeaching the reliability of their witness as to the veracity of the first citation. Thus, they deny even the existence of the Great Synagogue. They deem absurd the authorship of Psalms by Adam, Melchisedek, *et al.* They reject the statement that Moses wrote Job, and that Hezekiah and his companions wrote Canticles and Ecclesiastes. Why, then, should they accept the statement as to the order of the books?

3. Especially noteworthy is it that there is no evidence to prove that the Jews in general followed this alleged teaching of the Rabbins with regard to the third division of the Old Testament; and it was certainly not considered obligatory with regard even to the second, inasmuch as about half of the manuscripts of Kennicott, which give the order of the Prophets, differ from the order given in Baba Bathra. If this section of Baba Bathra had been thought by the Jewish scribes to be genuine and binding, they would probably all have followed this order. The order of the books in the MSS. of Kennicott will bear out this statement. An examination of the lists of books given by him in his *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis lectionibus*, Vol. II, shows, in fact, that only 23 out of 40 lists which give all the books have the order of Baba Bathra both for the Pentateuch and the Prophets and that only two (Nos. 228 and 252) agree with Baba Bathra in the order of the books of the third division. Fourteen of the MSS. have in the Prophets the order Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel. The orders of books in



the Hagiographa in the 40 MSS. are almost as numerous as the MSS., making for the whole Old Testament 39 different orders out of a possible 40.

The last item of evidence to be now considered is the allegation that the closing of the second part of the present Old Testament Canon about 200 B.C. is proved by the fact that all of the Haftarothe, or lessons from the Prophets to be read on the Sabbath days, have been selected from the eight books now constituting the Prophets. The critics argue from this present content of the second part, as if it were always the same as now; and hence that Daniel was never among the Prophets. This is a stupendous *non sequitur*. For first, there is absolutely no evidence to show that the selections of the Scriptures outside the Law to be read every Sabbath day was fixed until long after the time of Christ. Wildeboer affirms that "the annual cycle was not adopted universally till the fourteenth century A.D."<sup>31</sup> Zunz and König say that Haftarothe were read from the time of the Maccabees on; and certainly, Luke iv. 17 and Acts xiii. 15 show that they were read in the first century A.D. But the passage in Acts speaks merely of "the reading of the Law and the Prophets" on the Sabbath day; and the selection which the Lord is said in Luke iv. 17 to have read is not found among the selections now read by the Jews. Thus, Bloch<sup>32</sup> finds only two references to the Haftarothe in the Talmud.<sup>33</sup> No copy of these selections is certainly of earlier date than the twelfth or thirteenth century. Büchler<sup>34</sup> mentions 62 Haftarothe which were used by the early Jews and Karaites, but are not among the ones now in use. No one knows that the early Jews did not have selections from Daniel.

2. The principles upon which the selections now in use were chosen are clearly shown in the prayers which precede the reading of them in the Synagogue. These prayers, or

<sup>31</sup> *Canon*, p. 8.

<sup>32</sup> *Studien zur Geschichte der Sammlung der althebräischen Literatur*, p. 57.

<sup>33</sup> *Megilla*, 24a, 25a.

<sup>34</sup> *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. VI.

blessings, show that the selections were meant to exalt the glories and privileges of the people of Israel. They turn about the words "Jehovah our God," Law, service, temple, Sabbath, Zion, Israel, Moses, David, Elijah, etc. They are and were meant to be, extremely nationalistic rather than universalistic, exclusive of the rights of the Gentiles rather than embracing all men in the promises to Adam and Abraham. An argument can be made from them as to the narrow views of the mediaeval Jews who determined the present selection, but not as to the age of a Biblical document written more than a thousand years before they were determined.

#### GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Summing up the evidence of the Jews of the early centuries up to A.D. 400, we conclude that the Law was closed as early as the time of Ezra at the latest, but that the other testimony including Ecclesiasticus, Jesus in Matthew and Luke, Josephus, Melito, Origen and the Greek and Syriac versions and lists and the Haptaroth is all in favor of a varying content and order and number of books for the other divisions of the Old Testament; that in the complete Hebrew MSS. listed by Kennicott the order and number of books in the Law is always the same, but that in the Prophets, while the number is the same, there are at least three orders; that in these same MSS., the order is the same as that in Baba Bathra in only two cases, making 39 orders in all out of a possible 40; that the MSS. in Syriac and in the Greek and its versions differ not merely from every known Hebrew original but also differ among themselves, so that no two are exactly alike in order or division and many of them not even in numbers; that Matthew and Josephus and Melito and the Syriac and Greek versions and one of the lists of Jerome all put Daniel among the prophets; that Ecclesiasticus and Josephus and many of the best of the Syriac MSS. put Job and Lamentations among the prophets, immediately after the Pentateuch; that the order of books in Melito, the oldest of the witnesses to give a list of the

books in order, puts Numbers before Leviticus; and that Ecclesiasticus, 2 Maccabees, the New Testament, Melito and Origen give from two to four different divisions, and the Greek and Latin sources from two to seven. We conclude, then, that the theory of the critics as to the three-fold divisions of the Old Testament and all the conclusions based upon the assumption of the same are without foundation in fact and evidence. The *prima facie* evidence of the books themselves and the traditional view of the Jews and of all the Christian Churches stand confirmed by the evidence in our possession; and thus, another attack upon the historicity of the Old Testament Scriptures should be eliminated from further serious consideration.

*Princeton.*

R. D. WILSON.

# REVIEWS OF RECENT LITERATURE

---

## EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY

*The Old Latin Texts of the Heptateuch.* By Rev. A. V. BILLEN, M.A., D.D., (Oxon.), Ph.D. (London), Headmaster of Ellesmere College, Shropshire, formerly Scholar of University College, Oxford. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1927, 8vo, pp. 234.

Dr. Billen has given us in the present volume the results of his studies of three well-known texts of the Old Latin Heptateuch: the Lyons Manuscript, the Munich Fragments of the Pentateuch, and the Würzburg Palimpsest. The four chapters deal with the following subjects; The Vocabulary of the Old Latin Heptateuch; The Relations of the MSS to the Quotations in the Fathers; The Greek Text Underlying the Old Latin Version; The Style of the MSS and their Place in the Old Latin Version. A rather lengthy List of Noteworthy Words in the Old Latin Heptateuch completes the volume.

Dr. Billen believes that these MSS are "apparently all of the fifth or sixth century, but of course represent Latin texts which were current before the Vulgate gained general acceptance in the West, that is to say rather in the fourth or (as will be shown in the case of one of them) in the third century A.D." (p. 1). Since this study is essentially a study of vocabulary, Dr. Billen has made extensive use of "word lists," both those already provided by Prof. Sanday and Prof. Burkitt, and others which he has made himself. "Such lists," he tells us, "have been made for use in the present work for each of the Old Latin MSS, and for the Heptateuch quotations of some of the Fathers; and on account of the extreme importance of Cyprian the list of words in his case was made for all his Biblical quotations and not for those from the Heptateuch only" (p. 3). The terms "African," "Cyprianic," and "primitive" are used as synonymous, while "late" and "European" are treated as nearly equivalent.

It is to be regretted that the problem is such a complicated one that satisfactory results could hardly be expected. The reader will be impressed with the fact that the text of the Itala early fell into such "inextricable confusion" (Schaff) that as Jerome said each codex was practically a law unto itself (*tot sunt exemplaria paene quot codices*). Regarding the Lyons MS, we are told by Dr. Billen that it "is far from homogeneous in its vocabulary and diction" (p. 7), that "not only the MS as a whole, but even two of the separate books (Lev. and Deut.) cannot be regarded as homogeneous throughout" (p. 13), and finally that "the general impression received in passing from one book of the MS to another is that the difference in the texts is as great as that which exists between any two of the Old Latin authorities" (pp. 15 f.).

Dr. Billen makes no claim that the conclusions which he reaches will prove final, but he expresses the hope that they will be found "incomplete rather than erroneous." His method seems to be a thoroughly sound one, and the labor expended upon the preparation of this volume must have been very great. We hope that Dr. Billen will continue his studies in this intricate but interesting field.

Princeton.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.

*The Achievement of Israel.* By HERBERT R. PURINTON, Professor of Biblical Literature and Religion in Bates College. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927. Pp. viii, 218.

Dr. Purinton belongs to that considerable group of teachers in schools, colleges and seminaries who have undertaken to popularize the conclusions of the at present dominant school of higher criticism, by preparing textbooks which can be used in institutions of various grades. To the orthodox reader who has some acquaintance with the literature of Criticism these books are far from satisfactory, indeed they are at times very irritating, reading. There are two reasons for this. The first is that the authors of these books quite generally proceed upon the assumption that the conclusions of the critics have been conclusively proved and are to be accepted as established fact. The bibliographies which they furnish the reader represent only the critical side, and it is customary to state that the J, E, D, P analysis of the Hexateuch, for example, is accepted by all scholars. The second reason is that these authors very often make positive statements which are not generally accepted even by the higher critics themselves. The author may justify his dogmatic presentation of matters which are in dispute not merely between conservative and higher critic but even among the critics themselves on the ground that these popular textbooks are no place for the discussion of technical matters. But all the same the reader who knows his Bible and who knows something of the precariousness of the foundations upon which the whole higher critical reconstruction of the Old Testament rests, and who is also aware of the differences of opinion which exist in critical circles, is constantly annoyed at the positiveness with which questionable theories are stated in the place of the plain and straightforward statements of the Scriptures themselves. A couple of examples will serve to illustrate what is meant.

Dr. Purinton like most of the critics has, to say the least, a low opinion of the pre-prophetic period in Israel. Thus he tells us: "It reminds us of the low state of civilization to read that when Elijah was in the desert at the time of his flight from Jezebel, Jehovah is said to have commanded him to anoint Jehu and Hazeel to carry out his purposes by deeds of violence" (p. 67). This statement is made at the conclusion of the chapter which deals with Jeroboam and carries the history of Northern Israel down to Ahab and Jezebel. The next chapter is entitled "Revolution and Reform." The first section bears the title "The Folly of Violence." There we are told that Elisha, the

successor to Elijah, "adopted strong tactics to do away with the powerful influence of Jezebel" and even went so far as to plan for a new king not only over Israel but also for the throne of Damascus. As an illustration of the ruthlessness of these early prophets the story of the murder of Benhadad is told in the following form:

The story of the conspiracy is told in two dramatic scenes, the first contained in II Kings 8:7-15. Elisha went to Damascus and took lodgings there. On hearing that the famous man of God was in the city, Ben-Hadad, the king of Syria, who was very ill, sent to him forty camels loaded with presents. Hazael, an officer of the king, was in charge of the gifts. When in the presence of the prophet, Hazael said: "My master wishes to know if he will recover from his illness." Elisha replied, "Tell your master that he will recover," and then, in a low voice, "but I know he will not, but you will be king in his stead." Then Elisha looked steadily at Hazael for a long time in silence. Hazael understood. He went back to the palace and put a wet cloth over the face of the king and choked him to death. Thus the first step of the programme was accomplished (pp. 69-70).

The only explanation, we do not say justification, of such an outrageous misinterpretation of a Biblical narrative the true meaning of which would seem to be perfectly obvious, is to be found apparently in the attempt of Dr. Purinton to paint as dark a picture as he can of the pre-prophetic period. This is intended to prepare the way for the introduction of Amos. Amos, we are told, was "the first of a galaxy of prophets that transformed the religion of the world. He announced two thoughts that have become the basis of civilization: there can be no true religion without high moral standards, and there is a God who enforces these standards" (p. 75). Now we cannot help wondering how, if Dr. Purinton is so ashamed of the violent measures used by Elijah and Elisha, he can speak in such enthusiastic terms of Amos. Certainly the eight denunciations with which the book of Amos begins are far from "pacifist" in their content and the woe pronounced upon Damascus by Amos is hardly less violent than that which was decreed through Elijah and Elisha. We are almost tempted to wonder whether Dr. Purinton had the text of the book of Kings before him in English, not to say Hebrew, when he wrote his account of Elisha's visit to Damascus, or whether, drawing largely on his imagination for his facts he was giving a free adaptation of it which would accord more fully with his idea of the development of the religious history of Israel than the one which has actually come down to us.

As an example of a dogmatic statement as to which the critics would differ among themselves we may cite the following: "One officer in David's court, the scribe Sheva, is noteworthy because he was a Babylonian" (p. 51). Anyone reading this statement would naturally suppose that the Old Testament record plainly states that Sheva was a Babylonian. But this is not the case. The nationality of Sheva is quite uncertain. The fact that his father's name is not given and that one of his sons has a foreign sounding name has been interpreted to mean that he was of foreign extraction. It has been argued that he may have been an Aramaean (cf. article "Shavsha" in the *Hastings* and the



*New Standard* dictionaries). On the other hand it has been conjectured that the name Sheva, which is assumed to be identical with Shavsha, may be Babylonian or possibly North Arabian (cf. article "Shavsha" in *Encyc. Bib.*) which raises the interesting question, according to Cheyne, which country influenced David most—Babylonia or North Arabia. It is clear that the critics are agreed only in this, that Sheva was a foreigner. That he was a Babylonian as Dr. Purinton asserts would seem to be, to say the least, far from certain. But why is the nationality of Sheva a matter of such interest to the critics and to Dr. Purinton? The reason has just been hinted at. Dr. Purinton states it as follows: "His business was to keep records of the affairs of the state. As a Babylonian he would be familiar with writing. Among the Hebrews writing was a new art. Until the tribes had united in support of David and had a central capital city, there was no Hebrew national spirit which found expression to any large extent in writing. Poems like Deborah's *Song* and David's *Lament* did not reach their final literary form before the time of Solomon. They were kept in memory or preserved in rough notes until the growth of the Hebrew language had furnished a finer medium of expression." Here we have the explanation, the real explanation, why Sheva must, in the opinion of the critics, have been a foreigner: the Israelites, even the royal court itself, must have been illiterate, as late as the time of David. The El Amarna letters prove conclusively that several centuries before the time of David the princelings of Palestine wrote letters in Babylonian script to the king of Egypt. Recently a sarcophagus has been discovered at Byblos (that of Achiram) with an inscription written in a well developed form of the old alphabet script (this inscription is dated by archaeologists in the thirteenth century, B.C.). Yet the critics are still holding on to their theory that writing was practically an unknown art in Israel before the first millennium B.C. If archaeology has proved anything, it has proved conclusively that the literary period among the nations of antiquity goes far back of even the patriarchal period in Israel. The critics no longer dare to deny that writing was known in the days of Moses. They even assert quite positively that no reputable critic ever maintained that position. But they still persist in asserting that Israel, this nation whose achievements in the field of religious literature fill them with admiration and amazement, could not even have adopted from their neighbors, Babylon or Egypt, by whom they are supposed to have been influenced in many ways, the art of writing until a date so late that a Babylonian or Aramaean ancestry for Sheva must be invented in order that King David may have records kept of the affairs of his kingdom.

In what we have said above we would not imply that Dr. Purinton has gone farther than many others in his reconstruction of the religious history of Israel. This little volume may be regarded as we have said as typical of the attempts which are being constantly made to popularize a theoretical reconstruction of the Old Testament along lines, which, however widely accepted they may be at present, are clearly out of harmony with the teachings of the Bible itself and are

being discredited more and more by scientific study and archaeological research.

Princeton.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.

*The Bible Unlocked: A Study of the History, Literature and Religious Teachings of the Bible.* By HENRY MARTIN BATTENHOUSE. New York and London: The Century Co. Pp. xiv, 553.

The publishers say this book is not primarily for scholars, but for amateurs and laymen, students, teachers, etc. The author says his aim is to furnish historical background, guide analysis, awaken desire, and lay the foundation for Bible study and appreciation.

The book claims to cover the entire Bible. It is very general and not a Bible study. The viewpoint is that of extreme critical conclusion. The Bible is "the product of the creative intelligence of religiously inspired writers." The oldest fragments of the Old Testament are dated from 1200 B.C. to 1000 B.C. The Hexateuch is a late compilation, presumably by Ezra (c. 400 B.C.), of J (850 B.C.), E (750 B.C.), D (shortly before 621) and P (about 450 B.C.). Isaiah is from several hands through several centuries. Daniel is placed about 168 B.C. The Pauline writings are from A.D. 50 to 64, Mk. c. 70, Matt. c. 80, Luke and the Acts after 80, and John c. 95; 2 Peter is dated c. A.D. 115,—hence not by Peter at all.

The book is not controversial, only because Dr. Battenhouse writes as though his views had been fully established. He writes "about" the Bible but fails to "unlock" any of its mysteries. He sees no difficulty in placing Abraham after 1500 B.C., Joseph c. 1350, and having the great people of Israel by 1200 B.C. When he deals with the text of the Bible, it is just to mention the narrative. He states that Israel was in Egypt 150 years. In a note he calls attention to the 400 years, as given in Scripture. The study of Samuel-Kings is a setting forth of the leading events. He does not appreciate the relationship of Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah to the two kingdoms. Nor does he grasp the religious significance of the writings of these prophets. He seems to believe that Israel's religion came from a later time and was credited as coming from an earlier. Even the Passover seems to be a late retrojection. 1 Esdras is followed instead of the Biblical Ezra. Ezra is placed a half century later than Nehemiah.

The author investigates everything outside of the Old Testament, speculates much, and yet finds little, seemingly, of God within it. In his chapters on Prophecy and on the Rise of Judaism, the revelation of God is submerged in the historical.

The study of the New Testament is so largely hit and miss, lacking in definiteness of conclusion and the fire of conviction that a review is scarcely possible. As in the Old Testament study, the author writes "about" the Bible. He writes on subjects. The life of Christ is divided into periods such as are usual. Yet the great events in His life do not have their rightful place. The study of the early life of Jesus is inadequate in every way. It is evident that Dr. Battenhouse does not believe in the Virgin Birth. The disciples, we are told, came to believe in His "divinity," as attested by "his perfect revelation of the nature and

character of God." "Its only adequate explanation lay in the field of the biological." The author's interpretation of the New Testament develops from this understanding. He speaks of the 'divinity' but not of the 'Deity' of Christ. "God had *chosen* him for a special and supreme sonship." He misinterprets Heb. iv. 15 when he says, "We learn that the divine character of Jesus was the outcome of victory over temptation . . ." instead of following his text which states that the victory was due to His character as "the Son of God" (vs. 14).

The miracles of the Old Testament play little part in this book. Moses, we read, saw in the "terrifying event" (the plagues) "a providential opportunity." Some considered the parting of the Red Sea as a "providential miracle," others as a "supernatural intervention." "Both interpretations are correct. The choice between them depends upon the experience and temperament of the individual reader." The quail and the wax of trees or tender lichens on stones for manna are described as providential appearances. Consequently we are not surprised to find the miracles in the New Testament practically omitted. Jesus, in the sight of the people is a divine healer, wonder-worker and miracle man. The writer seems to accept miracles, yet his descriptions detract from the Gospel narratives. He studiously evades such miracles as the raising of Lazarus. The real Messiah is lacking, as well as the atonement. The Synoptics, we are told, stress "the bodily resurrection of Christ," but Paul "committed himself" to the Platonic theory of a "spiritual resurrection or immortality."

The title of the book is a misnomer. It is no book for "amateurs and laymen." The reader needs to be well acquainted with the Bible and contemporaneous history. It lacks the accuracy of first hand investigation in the original languages. Cross references are insufficient and the index inadequate. It lacks definiteness of conclusion, and belongs with a class of books recently written that deal with the Bible as a human book. It neither unlocks the Bible nor is it faithful enough in dealing with the text to interpret it.

*Geneseo, Ill.*

WILLIS E. HOGG.

---

## HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

*An Outline of the History of Doctrines.* By E. H. KLOTSCHÉ, A.M., Ph.D., D.D. Professor of Exegesis and Symbolics in the Western Theological Seminary at Fremont, Nebraska. Burlington, Iowa: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1927. Pp. 261.

The History of Doctrine is a branch of Historical Theology. Works upon this subject are of a comparatively late date. The Ancient Church was productive of the contents of the doctrinal system but had a dogmatic rather than historical interest in the development of Christian doctrine. The Church of the Middle Ages merely received the transmitted doctrines as part of the belief of the Church and therefore had no real interest in writing the history of the development of religious thought.

During the Reformation, the controversies which arose tended to settle certain beliefs as the doctrines of the Church, but it was not till the middle of the seventeenth century that the first genuine attempt was made to give an account of the development of doctrine. This was done by the Jesuit scholar, Dionysius Petarius in his work: *De theologicis dogmatibus* (Paris, 1644-50). The *Magdeburg Centuries* attempted to give the history of the doctrines in dispute during the Reformation period. Since that time there have been many histories of the development of doctrine; some being confined to the history of a certain doctrine and others more general in their scope.

In the historical development of Christian doctrine there may be distinguished three chief periods parallel with those of Church History: (1) The origin and development of doctrine in the Patristic age; (2) Development of doctrine in the Scholastic period; (3) Development of doctrine through the Reformation and completion of doctrine in the post-Reformation period. Dr. Klotsche has given us a volume, brief and comprehensive for theological students, by the aid of which they will be able to gain a general view of the historical development of doctrine. It is very important that the student of theology and the minister in active service should be acquainted with the history of each doctrine and its development. The guidance of the Church requires a correct understanding of the state of doctrinal beliefs at the present time. But in all cases, the life of any age can only be understood by viewing it in its historical relations and developments. To know the errors and heresies of the past ages will enable the scholar to distinguish truth from error in the present time. The history of Christian doctrine thus conceived and studied will constitute one of the strongest defences of Christianity. A powerful statement is a powerful argument. But there is no statement of Christian truth more clear and convincing than that which is obtained in the gradual and connected belief of a doctrine by the Church, from century to century. Every history of doctrine will be stronger in its emphasis upon some phase of truth than any other. Thus some stress Nicene Trinitarianism, some the Augustinian anthropology and some the Anselmic soteriology, but on the whole the student of this branch of historical theology will be well repaid by a thorough acquaintance with the history of doctrines.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN MCKEE GEMMILL.

## SYSTEMATICAL THEOLOGY

*Glaubenslehre*. Vol. II, 3: "*Vom Geist*." Von MARTIN RADE. Gotha: Leopold Klotz Verlag, 1927, pp. 305.

This third book of Martin Rade "*On the Spirit*," concludes his Dogmatics or *Glaubenslehre*. He states in the Preface that he is more concerned with the subject matter (*Sache*) than with its "proof." There is a notable increase in fulness of treatment as compared with modern dogmatics since Schleiermacher, such for example as those of Kaftan,

Wendt, Luthardt, and Seeberg. In fact Rade repeats practically all of his theology this time from the standpoint of the Spirit.

The first volume treated of God; the second of Christ and His saving work (*Wohltat*), and the question remains—"What is there (i.e., for Christian faith) since God and Christ are (i.e., realities)?" and the answer is the Holy Spirit is here, transcendence becomes immanence.

With a wide outlook Rade expounds the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the dogma of the Church, in its hymns and liturgies, and in the Bible. This constitutes the first chapter. Rade then proceeds to treat of the Holy Spirit as "Teacher of Doctrine" (*Glaubenslehrer*), as "Preacher of the Word" and as "Creator of the Bible," as Founder of the Christian Church (*Gemeinde*), as the "Supporter of the Christian Life of Prayer," as the Revealer and Judge of sin, as the Cause of Righteousness (a chapter on the *Ordo Salutis*), as the Giver of a new world-view (Christian view of the world), and as the Spirit of hope (Christian Eschatology), a separate chapter being devoted to each of these topics.

To such an extent does Rade carry his idea of divine immanence that faith appears no longer as an act of the soul, but as the Holy Spirit in man. He says (p. 51) that "the theology of crisis" (Barth and his group), which asserts that faith is a "vacuum," leaves out of account its positive significance as the "saving and fulfilling power of the Holy Spirit" and "the wholly other" (*ganz andere*) thus becomes man's possession.

In this part of his work Rade gives no adequate exposition or criticism of Barth's views, and on his own part fails to do justice to the transcendent character of the Holy Spirit which is a chief characteristic of the Biblical doctrine on the Spirit.

The chapters on the Holy Spirit as "the Preacher of the Word" and "the Creator of the Bible," are occupied largely with Luther's views, but for a real understanding of the nature of the Word of God, we cannot derive much knowledge from Rade's treatment.

Much theological literature of recent years is passed over without comment. It is no fault of this book, however, that philosophical and non-theological literature is not dealt with, because Rade is intentionally writing a Christian Doctrine of Faith (*Glaubenslehre*).

The author's method of treatment is similar to that in his two former volumes. He is influenced strongly by Luther, but one is compelled to raise the question whether he does not look at Luther through spectacles prepared by Schleiermacher and Ritschl. Rade, though one of the older generation of Ritschlians, shows an eclectic tendency and an increasing independence of view over against an out and out "Ritschlian theology."

He has a wide acquaintance with recent and current theological opinion, but it is doubtful whether he fully comprehends it or comes to grips with it. We can readily imagine, for example, that Barth and



his friends would say that while Rade sometimes adopts their terminology, he does not fully understand what they mean.

In his discussion of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, Rade includes a treatment of sin, of miracles, and of eschatology, from the point of view which we have indicated.

The book is easy and pleasant to read, abounds in quotations from theological literature, but is not compact and systematic enough to constitute a satisfactory dogmatic treatise on the Holy Spirit.

Its fundamental defect, in our judgment, is its failure to draw the sharp Biblical distinction between the transcendent God the Holy Spirit and His effects in the human soul. Thus (p. 30) we are told that the Spirit is just personal fellowship (i.e., of man) with God, but later on the Spirit is identified with God. This is not the doctrine of the Bible nor of the Reformers who based their theology on the Bible as the Word of God. It shows a fatal deviation, caused apparently by Schleiermacher and Ritschl.

*Princeton.*

C. W. HODGE.

*Die Lehre von der Sünde dargestellt an dem Verhältnis der Lehre Sören Kierkegaards zur neuesten Theologie.* Von Lic. Dr. Walter Künneth. Gütersloh, 1927, Druck und Verlag, C. Bertelsmann. Pp. 274.

This monograph on the doctrine of sin is not an attempt to give the author's views or a constructive statement of the doctrine. It is an attempt to prepare the way for such a work by a critical analysis of the view of sin in the writings of Kierkegaard, and to estimate his influence on "the most recent" theology, i.e., the dialectic theology. By "dialectic theology" Künneth quite correctly does not mean exclusively the theology of Barth and his group, but includes such theologians as Karl Heim and Althaus. He sets forth clearly the protest of recent theology against the views of Schleiermacher and Ritschl on the questions of the nature and origin of sin, of the Fall and original sin, and the general problem of evil.

Künneth dissents from Schleiermacher and Ritschl, but cannot agree with "the newest theology," and in a few concluding pages, he sets forth very briefly the general lines along which he thinks the true statement of the doctrine should be made.

Künneth limits his investigation of the relation of Kierkegaard to the "newest theology" to the questions concerning sin. Kierkegaard had two apparently conflicting views of the nature of sin—"a spiritual, personal, and voluntaristic view," and a "metaphysical-cosmical" view. So also "the most recent theology" shows a similar two-fold view of sin, a "spiritual" and a "metaphysical" view. In Kierkegaard, however, the former view is dominant, whereas in "the newest theology," according to Künneth, the latter view predominates. This would seem to have as its consequence that the "dialectic" of Barth is logical and metaphysical, grounded in a cosmic dualism, whereas it seems to us that it is not theoretic, but practical and "existential," i.e., involved in the relation of faith to revelation. Barth expressly says that revelation is not "dialectic" but rather "our seeing it." So also Bultmann strongly emphasizes



this point in his articles in *Zwischen den Zeiten*. At this point we should also note that the term "*existentiel*" is used by Künneth to describe the metaphysical point of view, whereas in Bultmann and Brunner, it is used in the sense in which we have taken it.

Returning, however, to the doctrine of sin, Künneth's criticism is directed against the mingling of these two contradictory points of view in Kierkegaard, Barth, Brunner, Gogarten, and Heim. In this critical exposition, he is careful to discriminate between Barth and Gogarten on the one hand, and Heim on the other hand, and also to indicate the differences between Barth and Brunner, though the latter is in general assigned to the group with Barth. The "dialectic" or contradiction which Künneth finds in these theologians between sin as a voluntary act and sin as a racial condition—original sin, and which these theologians attribute to an "*Urfall*"—outside of our temporal history, Künneth seeks to solve. He rejects Ritschl's idea of a Kingdom of Sin, as essentially Pelagian. He rejects the idea of a timeless "*Urfall*" as an unreal abstraction. He rejects the Biblical-Reformation, and Romish doctrine of the historical Fall as demanding a "causal-mechanical" philosophy. He substitutes the view of a "universal spirit" of mankind, which somehow fell from allegiance to God, and in which Fall each individual somehow *voluntarily* partakes. Künneth's view appears to us to suffer from the fundamental difficulty of the old fashioned Realism, *i.e.*, it seeks a ground for personal responsibility in an act of which each individual is totally unconscious, and in which he had no voluntary part. Moreover the idea of the "universal spirit" of mankind (*Gesamtgeist*), is an abstraction and has no concrete existence. We do not, however, advocate the view of an *Urfall* in Barth's sense, but adhere to the view of federal responsibility which we believe to be the Biblical view, and we believe that Charles Hodge, to take but one example, in his *Commentary on Romans*, gives Paul's thought more adequately than does Barth in his *Römerbrief*.

Any adequate criticism of Barth, would have to expound clearly his view of *Urgeschichte*, which Künneth is mistaken in calling "super-history," for Barth in his *Dogmatik* expressly says that "super-historical" does not express his view of *Urgeschichte* which he took over from Blumhardt and modified.

This conception, so difficult to understand, leads, in our judgment, into the heart of the problem of Barth's position as far as it concerns the all-important question of the relation of the Christian Revelation to historical facts. We do not pretend fully to understand Barth on this point, but we think that Künneth has not grasped his meaning.

Finally, to return to the problem of sin, we do not believe that there is any solution of its three main problems. The ontological problem or the problem of the ultimate cause of sin, we believe to be unsolvable. Dualism and Pantheism explain sin away; they do not explain it. The psycho-genetic problem, how the first man, created good, ever sinned, is also an unsolvable problem. The dispensational or "teleological" prob-

lem as to why the good God decreed sin, we also regard an unsolvable problem. These problems are not solved for us by the Bible, and no "solutions" of human philosophy seem to us satisfactory. We are ready to go with the "newest theology" in calling sin irrational, but so much as is revealed in the Bible we believe is best expressed in the Biblical Reformation doctrine, especially as that doctrine has found expression in the Confessions of the Reformed Church.

Princeton.

C. W. HODGE.

*Current Christian Thinking.* By PROF. GERALD B. SMITH, Professor of Theology in the University of Chicago Divinity School. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1928. Price \$2.00. Pp. 205.

This little volume is popularly, clearly and compactly written, and affords a very direct and accessible means of getting quickly and easily to the heart—if there indeed be a heart—of the so-called Chicago position (which is, forsooth, that there should be no position, at least a stereotyped position). The book is a worthy representative of the pragmatizing theology and the religion of functional psychology and of experience, for which this school stands.

The University faculty is the most consistent and effective force for the promotion of general pragmatic psychology, ethics, and philosophy in the country. Professor Dewey founded the pragmatic school there, and Professors Tufts, Moore and others have continued the tradition with effect. It is natural that the Divinity School should carry out and champion this University tradition. And it has for years conspicuously done this in the persons of Professors George Burman Foster, that radical spirit (the author of *The Finality of the Christian Religion*), who was later expelled from the Divinity Faculty for his atheistical radicalism, E. S. Ames in the department of Psychology of Religion, Shirley Jackson Case, J. Merlin Powis Smith, Shailer Matthews, and Gerald Birney Smith.

Backed by a large University and great affluence, this faculty has made a definite impact upon American religious life and thought that has not diminished with time. The *Journal of Religion* is its literary organ. In fact it is greatly due to these external considerations of affluence, large faculty, effective personnel, and literature-producing power rather than inherent depth and impressiveness of thought that this type of American anti-philosophical affection has had its measure of recognition. It still remains to be seen whether this type of religion and theological thought is permanent and representative of that which it most moots and desires itself to be, modern American religious thinking, or whether it is not merely a moment in the dialectic of changing American religious opinion and sentiment, and destined, like a rising and ascendant star, to have its apogee and decline. Mere floods of literature and imposing external power are not adequate to prevent a school of thought from becoming effete, especially when its modes of conception are radically superficial. That which so assiduously canvasses "everyman," propagandizes the public, purports to be popular,

seeks the favor of the social consciousness, so studiously adapts its message to the same, and bends the towers of truth to human egoistic ends does not manifest those easily discernible earmarks of finality which make a man or movement prophetic.

This constituting the background and setting of the book, it is of further significance that the present volume is, as the preface states, one of a "series of handbooks" edited by Professors Shailer Matthews, T. H. Soares, and W. W. Charters, under the caption, *The University of Chicago Publications in Religious Education*, with the sub-title, *Handbooks of Ethics and Religion*. Cooperative or co-departmental literary production is a highly commendable method. Chicago is effectually employing it for phalanxing its attack upon colleges, seminaries, and the general reading public, to all of which the series is specifically addressed. The method employed in the series is the critical and the "historical," by which it is intended to avoid and discredit the normative traditionary and dogmatic method. "It is hoped," the joint authors conclude, "that the series will help to show that the method of experiment and criticism contributes to stronger religious faith and moral idealism."

The specific place of this book and author in the series is to discuss "some of the crucial issues presented to religious thinkers today." These issues are of an entirely different classification, it is contended, from those of the past several centuries, which were denominational or sectarian in nature. The strife between Calvinism, Arminianism and Pelagianism has become obsolete, and problems which cut cross-section wise across Protestant denominational lines have totally replaced them. The author declares these to be the problems of modern empirical science, of society and the social consciousness, the problems of religion and its psychological analysis as opposed to doctrinal problems, and the problems of historical criticism. Appealing for its support and following to the American populace, as Chicago theology characteristically does, the author does not attempt to deal with the theological movements of Europe.

The advantage which the work may be said to possess consists in (1) its exposition in lucid terms of radical modernism, (2) its touching in a fairly complete way on all of the very most important cruxes of theology in their bearing upon the issue between conservatism and radicalism, and (3) the useful bibliographical lists at the end of each chapter which give to those interested a survey of the recent literature—practically all modernistic—on the subjects discussed.

The following subjects are treated, I. *Roman Catholicism*, II. *The Significance of the Protestant Revolt*, III. *Modernism*. In this chapter Modernism is made virtually coterminous with scientific inquiry, discovery and method which arose with Galileo nearly a century after the Protestant Reformation. From the scientific viewpoint the author declares that "Catholicism and Protestantism alike . . . embody essentially medieval ways of thinking." The recollection of Celsus, Marcion, Arius, Pelagius and Julian may help to repulse the epithet "medieval" with

which Protestantism is so strangely execrated, and force the author to stamp Modernism in turn as *premedieval*. Modernism, after the manner of the above *usus loquendi*, may be said to "embody essentially *ANCIENT* ways of thinking." And to assert that Protestant theology was destroyed by scientific inquiry is to forget that scientific inquiry is not *per se* inimical to theology. It is the agnostic philosophical constructions put upon the laws and results of scientific inquiry by biased scientific minds which converts Science into a foe of theology instead of its ally. The question begging conception that Science is by nature irreconcilably anti-theological runs all through nearly every page of the book, and gives to all of the author's very trenchant positions their effect.

Again, the stock and favorite *non-sequitur* of scientific religious writers is virtually revamped (p. 36), that the Protestant theologians condemned the Copernican theory which ultimately became established fact, therefore all modern Protestant theologians who assume to controvert the more recent scientific theories of the day are trespassing on forbidden ground, and their statements null and void. The outworn appeal to this admitted limitation in the scientific knowledge of Luther and Calvin never seems to lose its place among liberal writers. "If it proves anything it proves that all conservative theological dogmas are invalid simply because the Bible *seemed* to teach that the sun goes around the earth" (which the Bible does not *teach*)—so the reasoning usually goes. Prof. Smith sharply excludes the Bible from the prerogative of having anything decisive to say about astronomy, geology, biology, and the other sciences: "The fact is that the modern world has ceased to look to the theologians for its interpretation of nature."

The critical historical method has likewise "set religious thinking to a considerable extent free from the requirement to conform to biblical norms" (p. 42). Similarly, Modernism is stated to conform to no authoritative creed. It is loyal to truth only in the reserved form of possessing the spirit of inquiry rather than any fixed content as the result of that inquiry, and of a willingness to constantly revise thinking. On the other hand it is distinguishable from radicalism the writer contends in that it positively adheres to "historic Christianity," an expression which is more conservative sounding than it really is. Viewed from the standpoint of "historic Christianity" as Luther and Calvin conceived it Prof. Smith's position is none less than that from which he seeks to differentiate himself by use of the deceptive term "historical Christianity," namely, radicalism. Radical he is and remains to all evangelical Christians.

Chapter IV, *The Catholic Church and Modernism* follows.

The treatment of *Fundamentalism*, Chapter V, is characterized by the familiar habit of such writers of assimilating Fundamentalism to the Roman Catholic Church in respect to one point which is rather unfairly selected out and made too much of, namely, authoritarianism and the religious duty of "accepting" and "submitting." To the Fundamentalist "accepting" and "submitting" to authority is not an *onus*: to the Modernist it is. To one it is an act of humiliation; to the other it

is not. There lies the real difference. For the Fundamentalist Fundamentalism is much more than, and other than this negatively put psychological attitude. "Submission" is a corruption for "love of the truth." It is therefore a constantly irritating injustice to have Fundamentalism so inveterately described from the viewpoint of only one, and that an external one, of its characteristics. The very terminology is offensive and prejudicial. Instead of "authoritarianism" Biblicism would better describe the characteristic of Fundamentalism. It is a further injustice to so invidiously compare this authoritarianism and "submission" to that of the Romish Church, with its *fides implicita* and stifling of the right of private judgment, without delineating with equal care, the big differences involved.

Chapter VI, on *The Appeal to Christian Experience*, brings into strong relief the pragmatic and subjectivistic turn of the author, who rejects all doctrines, from the Trinity and Angels to Miracles because they are not capable of being *experienced*. The question "whose experience is true and authoritative?" always mutinously raises its head in such theological empiricism, and the author dares to face it. Suffice it to say that the writer fails to give either a clear or a satisfactory answer to this question.

The remaining Chapters are VII, *The Appeal to Christ*, VIII, *The Theological Interpretation of the Natural World*, IX, *The Modern Quest for God*, X, *The Controversy Over Evolution*, in which the unbroken continuity of nature is set forth against opposing views as the only adequate theory for evolution, and XI, *The Spirit of Evangelical Christianity*.

Princeton.

F. D. JENKINS.

*Faith in God and its Christian Consummation.* By D. M. BAILLIE, M.A.  
Edinburgh: T. and T. Clarke. 1927. Price \$3.25.

The critical estimate of this book is to be gauged, in all fairness, by the self-stated admissions in the preface. Also, when any deep theme is approached in a spirit of modesty and humility the sharpness of criticism is removed if the development should fall short of the mark. "In putting forth my book I cannot but feel how inadequate it is to the greatness of its theme, especially in the second part, which is a little more than a groping after truth in the face of acute modern problems. But I venture to hope that the work may be useful to students as a guide through the mazes of controversy, and that it may be found to make some slight contribution at one or two points which are among the growing points of religious thought at the present time."

Thus the method is heuristic and the attitude that of one who regards the subject as a *problem*, with no necessarily certain or final solution. Such is the method adopted by modern science and philosophy which is divorced from Biblical and religious authority. But when, in Biblical and theological research this modern attitude becomes reduced to a "little more than a groping after truth in the face of modern problems" the attempt does not seem to commend itself to the theologically minded



reader's confidence at the very outset. To the systematic theologian, at least, this attitude is that of a theological experimenter or beginner still wrestling with the inductive method which constitutes the approach to the formulation of doctrines. The doctrine itself seems never to be definitely and securely arrived at. The characteristic of Revelation is the note of certainty in all of its teachings, no less in the doctrine of faith than in its other doctrines. But we do not here find this characteristic. The work partakes of the nature of a speculative investigation whose final conclusions seem colored and conditioned by the opinions of the many religio-philosophical theorists through or between whom the author in dialectic fashion steers his course. So it may justly be said that the method is inadequate, for it is patently the speculative one. It suffers the limitations of such.

A further criticism appears in the consideration that the author keeps the discussion confined to the religio-philosophical and religio-psychological spheres to the marked exclusion of Biblical theology and exegesis. Christian faith appears to be connected primarily with suffering and evil in their antithesis to good. While the author is quite balanced in his rejection of the contentions of modern psychology on the nature of faith (e.g., W. James' *Will to Believe*, etc.), he does not on the other hand fill it with enough objective content to lift it out of the realm of psychological analysis and religious speculation. Faith is rightly defined and qualified much more by the nature of the object on which it terminates than by the introspection of the believer's states of consciousness.

Had the writer discussed the Biblical data and kept subjective analysis to a greater extent out of consideration his constructive views would have been more certain and objective. But, he states in his preface, "discussion of the idea of revelation" is "excluded by the whole plan of the book." Both the idea of revelation and its teaching upon this high theme are irrespectfully glossed over. Of course, in Part II on "Christian Faith," where the self-alleged "groping after the truth" is enacted, particularly in its two chapters "Faith and the Historical Jesus" and "Faith and the Gospel of Jesus," the writer goes through the form of citing many texts (or shall we say pretexts). But neither the historical Jesus nor the Gospel of Jesus are found in their fulsomely expressed divinity and purity. Without either of them there can be no satisfactory conception of Christian faith. The conception of *fides salvifica* involves the elements of sin as guilt and power, Christ as a divine Mediator, justification as forensic, the testimony of the Holy Spirit, and the doctrine of prevenient grace. None of these, as a matter of fact, are found depicted in their integrity and purity. Christ Himself is not made the specific object of faith *par excellence*. The somewhat Ritschlianizing emphasis of God in Christ as opposed to Christ as God is made in speaking of the object of Christian faith.

The best part of the work is not therefore the constructive one (Part II particularly) where the writer embarks on a voyage of discovery for personal originality, but Part I where the various religio-psychological views are exploited and critically analyzed.



The variety of modern views introduced and discussed makes the work very interesting and informing and up-to-date. And the critique of the current generic theories of faith is at most points very balanced and helpful so long as we remember that it is merely the general psychological nature of faith that is before us for consideration in the author's treatment. This review and criticism of modern viewpoints, the negative rather than the positive treatment, will be found by the evangelical reader to be the most valuable part of the book.

The style is free, rather conversational, and easy to follow throughout.  
*Princeton.* F. D. JENKINS.

*More Than Atonement, A Study in Genetic Theology.* By JOHN B. CHAMPION, Professor of Christian Doctrine, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary. Harrisburg: The Evangelical Press. \$2.50 net.

More than ordinary interest attaches to this volume, which will generally be regarded as setting forth the doctrinal platform of the institution recently founded in Philadelphia to offset the drift to Modernism in the Northern Baptist Church—a school, it ought to be added, which has been growing by leaps and bounds. As might have been expected, the general presentation is profoundly evangelical. "To seek the origin of Christianity in modern ideas rather than in historic facts, would not be scientific procedure. Manifestly, the original facts are the originating facts" (p. 28). Salvation from sin is of course the central theme of the book, but this salvation is presented not so much as devised and offered by a sovereign God of infinite holiness and love, as flowing by inevitable necessity from the sacrificial nature of Jehovah, Who thus fulfils the highest possibilities of His being. Thus the fulfilment of the nature of God becomes the substance of Calvary's redemption.

In the development of this soteriological conception there appears much that is illuminating and instructive. Professor Champion's angle of approach has unquestionably been too much neglected. And the stressing of sacrifice in the Christian life as the outcome of the dawning and ever-deepening apprehension of the unutterable cost of redemption deserves the profoundest study. The treatment of sin, a vital point in any system, is decidedly satisfactory. And again and again the reader is surprised by flashes of deep insight, as in the handling of the sacrifice made by God in the giving of His only-begotten Son. Moreover, whatever value may be attached to the discussion of such themes as Christian Personality (growing, as they do, out of the application of the author's special presentation), one finds at least a wide acquaintance with philosophy and modern psychology.

The most serious defect of the book consists in the treatment of the forensic aspects of the Redeemer's work. His effecting of a representative righteousness is freely admitted, indeed almost overstressed; but He would seem to bear the sin of the world only in the sense that on Him, as the God-man, the murderous power of sin was exhaustively expended. Only in this sense was He identified with human sin; we are not to

think of Him as bearing the penalty imposed by an inexorable Lawgiver. But without referring to such special passages as Isaiah liii. 10 or 2 Corinthians v. 2, a large part of the evangelical family will feel that it is quite too late in the day to attempt to set aside the exegetical results of a long succession of the ablest scholars in Christendom in the interest of a real but subsidiary truth. One feels, too, that in less evangelical hands the side-stepping of our Lord's actual, if forensic, identification with the guilt of humanity would pretty certainly lend itself to the idea that atonement consists in the implantation of a new, sacrificial spirit—which would assuredly eviscerate and nullify the Gospel of Grace.

Nor can we follow Professor Champion in his references to the Kenosis. "Christ was living within the limits of the human way and capacity of apprehension. For this reason, He was no more omniscient about the infinite meaning, infinite purpose, infinite process going on and centering in His Cross, than He was omniscient about the program of the Parousia," etc. (p. 181). This takes us back to the old problem of the *οἶδεν* of Matt. xxiv. 36. Certainly if the Hiphil force of this verb, maintained by some, be admitted, the generally-accepted kenotic ignorance will have to be surrendered. At least, those disposed to disparage the idea of an occasional causative shading of *οἶδεν* would do well to consider John xix. 35. Will this passage with its *ἴνα* interpret at all without such shading?

In discussing the meaning of the name Jehovah, Professor Champion follows Davidson in translating it "I will be," and hence sees in it not ontology, but the promise of revelation. Both the LXX and the Vulgate, however, render "I am what I am" (the LXX *ὁ ὢν*). The American Revision, with its ample learning, gives this rendering the preference, while the notable Jewish Version of 1917 translates in the present, without offering any alternative. Doubtless eternity is the real thought contained in the Ineffable Name, with the consequent insuring of an eternal covenant.

*Lincoln University, Pa.*

EDWIN J. REINKE.

---

## PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

*D. L. Moody, A Worker in Souls.* By GAMALIEL BRADFORD. New York: George H. Doran Co. Cloth. 8vo. pp. 320. Price \$3.50 net.

This is a piece of brilliant biographical composition. Its fascination, its pungency, its color, its vividness have been widely recognized and justly praised. However, it is the product of one who had no personal acquaintance with the great evangelist, who does not accept his Gospel message, and who does not know the real secret of his extraordinary power.

The author, however, has worked with earnestness and patience. He has acquainted himself with all the facts to which he had access.

He has carefully read the printed sermons and addresses of Mr. Moody, and has studied the existing reports of his historic evangelistic campaigns. The very fact that he has so little sympathy with the message enhances the value of his frank and eloquent tribute to its appeal and its power. There is too something wistful in his attitude toward the mystery of the hidden sources of strength which alone can adequately explain the influence which Mr. Moody exerted on the men of his generation and is exerting still.

The book does not follow the usual method of biographies, and record the events of a life in the order of time. It consists of a series of sketches. There is a picture of "The Growth of a Soul," a statement of Mr. Moody's doctrinal beliefs, an analysis of his power as a preacher, a description of his singing associate, Mr. Sankey, and an estimate of the evangelist as a man, as a business organizer and as a "Molder of Souls." One cannot deny that there are passages in the book which appear flippant, irreverent, even offensive. However, the general effect upon the reader is an impression that the author has pictured a great man, whose career was mighty in its influence for good, as he addressed himself to the world's supreme need and labored with unparalleled success in bringing men to God.

*Princeton.*

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

*Qualifying Men for Church Work.* By GERRIT VERKUYL. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. Cloth. 12mo. pp. 204. Price \$1.50.

As in his volumes previously published Dr. Verkuyl gives in this volume a clear, simple and Scriptural treatment of the problem of securing a sufficiently well-equipped body of men who can serve as leaders in the work of the Christian Church. He deals with the demands which the present time is making for such leaders. He shows the vast undeveloped resources of the Christian Church. He specifies the qualities which are found in the leaders whose lives are recorded in Scripture. He then turns to the discovery and the instruction of Christian workers, showing that all real leadership must be turned in the direction of bringing men into a vital fellowship with Christ. Each one of the ten chapters closes with suggestions for private study and class work, the entire book being designed for the use of Sunday and week-day classes in local churches, and also for training schools and summer conferences.

*Princeton.*

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

*Our Lord and Ours.* By P. E. BURROUGHS. Nashville, Tenn.: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. 12mo. pp. 148.

This volume is a study in Christian stewardship. Its particular purpose is to consider the principles of stewardship in relation to the evangelization of the world. As a sub-title the author employs the phrase "Stewardship in Missions." It is a book which is especially designed for the use of Sabbath Schools. The writer is himself Secretary of the Department of Church Education of the Baptist Sunday

School Board. He deals with the problems of proportionate and systematic giving and with the questions involved in church finance. It is to a very large extent a book designed for use in the Southern Baptist denomination but embodies principles applicable to all Christians.

*Princeton.*

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

*Administering the Vacation Church School.* By J. S. ARMENTROUT. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. Cloth, 12mo. pp. 208. Price \$1.00 net.

The successful career of the Vacation Church School, formerly known as the Daily Vacation Bible School, makes any treatment of the subject interesting and valuable for ministers and Christian workers of the present day. The volume by Mr. Armentrout is of particular interest and helpfulness because of his careful study and exact knowledge of the subject which he treats. His position as Director of Leadership Training and formerly Director of Vacation Church Schools of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. has equipped him fully for the task he has here accomplished. He deals with the development of the Vacation Church School with its relation to the aims of religious education, with the place of worship, of knowledge and of Christian service in the development of character and then deals with the more practical problems of the organization, conduct, curriculum and equipment of the Vacation Church School. This volume is a text-book in the Standard Leadership Training Curriculum outlined and approved by the International Council of Religious Education. It will be found of great value to all who are concerned with this important phase of modern church work.

*Princeton.*

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

*Of Them He Chose Twelve.* By CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY, D.D. Philadelphia: Dorrance & Company. 1927. Pp. 181.

Dr. Macartney has written another fine book. It is a study of the Twelve Apostles, including also chapters on Paul and John the Baptist. Basing his statement on the sources, the author gives a brief and penetrating characterization of each of these men, showing their psychological characteristics, their historical significance, and drawing practical lessons from each of his studies.

On the publishers' paper cover we read: "Those to whom the Apostles are rather vague historical characters imprisoned within the covers of the Good Book will find this straightforward, human analysis of their different temperaments and characters both stimulating and provocative of further study. Dr. Macartney has the gift of warming his material into something vital and appealing and as we read of the lives and manners of this group who followed the Master we realize that human nature changes very little."

This statement about this book is true as far as it goes, but it misses the point of the book. It is not the fact that the author "has the gift of warming his material into something vital and appealing"—he undoubt-

edly has this—which gives the book its value, nor do these words express his purpose. The value of the book lies in the fact that the author does not content himself with historical and psychological matters, and has apparently little concern in “warming up his material into something vital,” but is deeply concerned with the message of the Apostles—the Divine *revelation* of which the Apostles were the organs and to which they bore witness. “If we know the Apostles better we shall be rewarded by knowing better Him, whom to know aright is Eternal Life”—so writes the author, stating in a sentence the purpose and main content of his book: Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ, Christ the Messiah as the eternal Son of God, the redemptive significance of the Cross, in a word the Gospel of salvation from sin, revealed by God to man. “God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son,”—here we have the theme of this book. And since this is the Word of God, no human mind or eloquence can make it “vital,” but only the Spirit of the living God. This author does, however, rise at times to eloquence, an eloquence born not only of conviction but of insight into the essence of the Gospel. We have space but for one instance, and with it we close. In the last chapter, the one on John the Baptist, after stating several of the sources of his power, Dr. Macartney adds as the last, the greatness of John’s message:

Shortly before His passion, Jesus went back to the Jordan country where He had been baptized by John and by the Holy Spirit. The disciples of John, now dead, gathered about Him and listened to Him and saw His miracles. This was their verdict, “John did no miracles.” He never stilled the tempest, nor opened the blind eyes, nor raised the dead—“but all things that John spake of this man were true.” What was it that John said about Jesus? Did he say, “Behold the man who did no sin and whose blameless life will leave the world a great example of how to live”? Did he say, “Behold the man, the carpenter’s son who never wrote a line save in the dust, and yet the man whose words have done more to temper and soften and regenerate mankind than all the sayings of the philosophers and all the books of the ages”? Did he say, “Behold the man whose birth will be the watershed of history, dividing it into two parts, Before Christ and After Christ”? Did he say, “Behold the man whose life shall be a fountain of compassion whence shall flow has brought life and immortality to light”? Did he say, “Behold the man who was in the world and yet not of it and who more than any other has brought life and immortality to life”? Did he say, “Behold the man whose death on the Cross will be the supreme example of that vicarious suffering which runs like a scarlet thread through all creation”? Was that what John said of Jesus? If so, oblivion’s sea had long ago swept over him. No, not that, but this, this which takes all that in, this which left out, Christianity is left out: “Behold, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world!”

It is that witness of John to Jesus that men today are trying to muffle and silence. The world will let you talk about Jesus as beautifully as you please. It will let you heap high the flowers of your eulogia, but there is one thing that the world cannot tolerate, and this is that you should say of Jesus what John said, “Behold, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world,” God’s eternal sacrifice for sin. Utter these words and you will find that the Cross hath still its ancient offense.



Leave them out and you will find that then has the offense of the Cross ceased. This is the question before the Church today: Shall the offense of the Cross cease? Shall the Gospel cease to be good news and become only good advice? Shall the Churches which have been entrusted with the Gospel become lighthouses whose light has been quenched, or, still worse, lighthouses which burn and flash with false lights which allure to destruction voyagers on the sea of life?

"Behold, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world!" Wherever that is left out Christianity is left out. Wherever it is spoken and honored there the Gospel is preached, whether from the incense-laden altars of Greek and Roman Churches or in the severe dignity of our Reformed Churches, or in a Gospel mission, or to the accompaniment of a bass drum on the street, or when at eventide a mother tells her little child of the love of God in Christ. Man is still a sinner, and still his great need is redemption from sin. Calvary has no successor, the Lamb of God has no substitute. He is the sinner's only hope. He is the power and glory of the Church here, and hereafter it is the Lamb of God, no longer upon the Cross but upon the throne of the universe, to whom redeemed sinners will pay their grateful homage.

These are not only eloquent but weighty words. Here is the center of the Gospel. Here is still the offense of the Cross. All of the so-called modern theories of the Atonement are but efforts to take away from the Cross its offense. The offense of the Cross has never ceased, and the cause of its offense has always been the same. The Greeks among modern men are still seeking human wisdom and the Jews among modern men are still seeking a legal righteousness, no matter how subtle or refined its form. But unto those who are effectually called, the preaching of Christ crucified for sin is still the power of God unto salvation.

We commend this book. God give the Church more preachers like this.  
*Princeton.* C. W. HODGE.

*Paul the Man.* His Life, His Message and His Ministry. By CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY, D.D. Author of "Putting on Immortality," "Twelve Great Questions About Christ," etc. New York, Chicago, London and Edinburgh: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1928.

This latest book, which Dr. Macartney has added to the notable series already bearing his name, deals with Paul the man, rather than with Paul's message. But unlike some recent books on the same subject it is written by one who not only admires the man but also has himself understood the message. No more important qualification could be found for a book on such a subject. Paulinism is greater than Paul. So Paul thought himself, and so they must think who would understand Paul.

It is refreshing, therefore, to read this simple and vivid account of Paul's life by a preacher who with at least as great power as any other man of our day is proclaiming to a lost and needy world the gospel of salvation that Paul was the chief instrument of God in giving to the Church. It is a noble figure of a man that stands out for us again in the pages of Dr. Macartney's book. We see the Apostle to the Gentiles in his physical weakness but also in his true greatness. By contrast with Roman governors and Jewish mobs, we obtain some impression of the moral grandeur of this greatest hero of the Faith. What is better still,



we come to understand anew that the true secret of Paul's life was found in the message that he was commissioned to proclaim.

Dr. Macartney is not concerned in this book to discuss mooted questions about the order of events in Paul's life or about the time and place and addresses of the Epistles. The outline that is here given is not altogether complete; we miss, for example, any mention, in the regular place in the narrative, of the "famine visit" of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, though that visit is later mentioned in the enumeration on p. 127. Sometimes one may hold a different opinion about disputed points. We are not so certain as Dr. Macartney is about the correctness of the South Galatian theory of the address of Galatians; and we hardly think that on that theory the date of the Epistle can be put so late as apparently Dr. Macartney puts it. We think that it would have been well to make a little plainer the sharp separation that undoubtedly existed between the Judaizers on the one hand and both Peter and James on the other. So the term "Judaic" and not the term "Judaistic" should have been used on p. 45, where the "Judaistic childhood" of the gospel is spoken of, though it is plain enough from the rest of the book that the infelicity there is one of terminology merely and not of thought. It might have been well also to distinguish a little more sharply between the law of Moses, which even in its ceremonial aspects Paul believed (and our author also unquestionably believes) was the law of God, from the misuse of that law in the new dispensation by the Judaizers.

But it would be unreasonable to demand completeness of discussion in a book such as this, which has admirably accomplished its true purpose. Dr. Macartney has here unquestionably helped to make the Apostle Paul a living figure for modern readers; the wonderful dramatic quality of the life of Paul is well brought out. We have exemplified in this book the noble simplicity of style which helps to make the author so powerful as a preacher. Thus when the account of the conversion of the jailer at Philippi is closed with the words: "At midnight this jailer was a lost pagan; in the morning he was in the Kingdom of Heaven," we feel that the true significance of the incident has been presented in the fewest possible words and with the greatest possible vividness and power. Or when we read on p. 136 that whereas those disciples at Ephesus "had not heard of the Holy Ghost, the disciples of today have heard of Him, and that is about all," we can well understand that under the preaching of Dr. Macartney men are "pricked in their hearts." Best of all, such writing as that which appears in this book does not try to be a substitute for the Bible, as do many books on Biblical characters today, but it will send men back again, with new interest and understanding, to the reading of the Word of God.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

*Protestant Europe: Its Crisis and Outlook.* By ADOLF KELLER, D.D., LL.D., and GEORGE STEWARD, PH.D., F.R.G.S. New York: George H. Doran Company. Pp. 371. Price \$3.50

This book consists of two parts: Part One under the caption of

"Europe's Cultural Maelstrom," treated in nineteen chapters, as follows: The Path of the Four Horsemen; The Roots of Continental Protestantism; The Antecedents of Present-Day Movements; Emerging Political Ideals; The Backwash of Industrialism; The Contemporary Cultural Turmoil; Continental Youth Movements; The Problem of the Nature of Continental Churches; Church versus State; The Free Churches of Europe; The Church and the People; Continental Missionary, Social and Temperance Work; The Church and Education; The Church and Labor; the Church and Peace Movements; The Changing Theological Front; The Relation of Protestant and Catholic Churches; The Problem of Minorities; Federative, Coordinating and Relief Movements.

Part Two under the caption of "The Scope of European Protestant Churches, treated under eight chapters, as follows: The Central Countries: Germany, Switzerland, Great Britain and Ireland; The Scandinavian Countries: Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Iceland; The Netherlands; The Latin Countries: France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Italy; The Old Hapsburg Territories: Czecho-Slovakia, Austria, Hungary; The Eastern Countries: Poland, The Baltic States, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, Russia; The Balkan Countries: Bulgaria, Greece, Albania, The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Rumania, Turkey. A valuable Bibliography and Index are added.

The names of the authors of this volume should furnish sufficient warrant of its value. Dr. Keller is an outstanding figure in the Protestant Churches of Europe. He was trained in the Universities of Basel, Geneva and Berlin. For three years he was Instructor in The International School in Cairo, and while there served as one of the pastors in a Protestant parish in that city. He holds a high rank as a student in Archaeology and was connected with an expedition commissioned to visit the Monastery of Ste. Catherine on Mount Sinai to study the Greek manuscripts in the famous Library where the Codex Sinaiticus was discovered in 1844 and 1859. He devoted some time also to the study of Coptic manuscripts in the Monasteries of the Western Desert. Dr. Keller returned to Switzerland in 1899 when he was elected Professor of Religious Education in the State College of Schaffhausen. Afterwards he was pastor of a Reformed Church in Geneva from which position he was called to the historic parish of St. Peter in Zurich. Meantime he had been recognized as the leading representative of the church unity movement in Europe. He is now the European Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches, and also directs the Social and Economic Federation of the Continuation Committee of the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work. In this capacity he edits a Quarterly Review in the interests of this movement.

Dr. George Stewart is the associate minister of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church of New York. He has travelled extensively in Europe and he has made a thorough study of the religious, social and economic situation. He is the author of several books. In this volume he embodies the results of his long study of the European Churches.

Since the War special interest has been developed in the subjects dis-

cussed in this volume. It is, however, the first book that has penetrated so deeply into the acute problems that European Protestantism is facing. Hitherto certain aspects of the situation have been discussed, but generally in a fugitive and fragmentary manner. Here is presented a treatment both encyclopaedic and thorough. To all who recognize and appreciate the fact that the historic Churches of Europe have given to America our Christianity not only but also our educational and civic institutions a book such as this is both timely and stimulating. It will also serve to direct with discrimination and effectiveness the missionary and relief movements in this country now enlisted in behalf of European Protestantism.

Special interest attaches to Chapter VI of Part One, pp. 129-156, on "The Changing Theological Front." The tendencies set in motion by the influence of Ritschlianism, the study of Comparative Religion, the Socio-Religious movement have developed what the writers call "The Theology of Crisis." "This movement of thought sprang up in Switzerland and Germany and is spreading like wildfire throughout the Continent. It is of immense importance because of the power and influence it is having especially over large sections of idealistic youth who fell frustrated by the devastating effects of the War. In it, the aversion of the present generation from the spirit which led to war, becomes a genuine spiritual revolution. The leaders of this movement are a small group of Reformed Swiss theologians, Professor Barth, now in Göttingen, Germany, Professor Brunner in Zurich, and Rev. Thurneysen. They are seconded on the German Lutheran side by Professors Gogarten of Jena and Bultmann in Marburg.

This so-called "Theology of Crisis" is healthy in that it has a theocentric influence and emphasizes salvation by faith alone. The effect is to focus effort on the preaching of the Gospel, to stress the spiritual rather than the ethical side of Christianity. It has marked and accelerated a swing away from prevailing rationalism.

Let it not be regarded as a stricture upon the value of the book that the reviewer feels called upon to direct attention to the fact that too little emphasis is given to the conservative position of many of the leaders in the Reformed Churches of Europe. There prevails in many quarters a consciousness of the subtle inroads that Modernism is making, and a valiant stand has been taken against it in many of the churches and educational institutions in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Transylvania, and Poland, as well as in some countries in western Europe. In the influential movements for union now under way there are not wanting courageous men in high position who suspect that the tendency to merge may carry with it also a corresponding tendency to minimize the place and power of the Reformed Theology throughout Europe. Should this be the case the loss resulting to Christianity would far outweigh what advantages might inhere in or result from organic union. But the day of such a consummation is too remote to justify present misgivings.

*Princeton.*

SYLVESTER WOODBRIDGE BEACH.

## PERIODICAL LITERATURE

*American Church Monthly*, New York, April: WILLIAM H. DUNPHY, Regal Power of the Papacy; FREDERICK S. ARNOLD, Folk-lore and Frazer; REGINALD TRIBE, Ideals of the Religious Life; BESSIE R. BURCHETT, Need of Church Schools; C. H. PALMER, Thomas Hardy and the Church; E. SINCLAIR HERTELL, A Little about William Blake. *The Same*, May: CLARENCE A. MANNING, Solovyev and Benson; C. H. PALMER, The Great Defeat; MARK BRUSSTAR, Streeter—Prophet of Youth; LATTI GRISWOLD, Pius II at Ancona. *The Same*, June: CLARENCE A. MANNING, The Religion of Leo Tolstoy; WALKER GWYNNE, The Exceptive Clauses in St. Matthew.

*American Journal of Philology*, Baltimore, April: JAMES HUTTON, First Idyl of Moschus in Imitations to the year 1800; KENNETH SCOTT, Deification of Demetrius Poliorcetes; FRANCIS A. WOODS, Greek Fish Names; ALBERT M. STURTEVANT, The suffix *-sc-* in Old Norse *Elska*.

*Anglican Theological Review*, Lancaster, April: LUTHER B. MOORE, Should the Present Canon on Divorce be altered?; CLIFFORD P. MOREHOUSE, English Church and State in the Feudal Anarchy; D. A. MCGREGOR, Contemporary Theories of Primitive Religion; FRANCIS J. HALL, The Study of Dogmatic Theology.

*Biblical Review*, New York, April: JOHN McNICOL, The Christianity of Pascal; A. McCAIG, Christ's Teaching concerning his own Death; EDGAR Y. MULLINS, Humanizing our Philosophy; S. D. CHOWN, The Springs of Evangelistic Power; E. G. SIHLER, Nero and the Primitive Christians.

*Bibliotheca Sacra*, St. Louis, April: A. H. BALDINGER, The Paramount Problem of Protestantism; A. S. BADGER, Life at Eighty-five; J. O. BUSWELL, JR., Conditional Immortality; H. J. FLOWERS, Christ's Doctrine of the Man and Sin; J. M. HANTZ, Our Lord's Divinity; HERBERT PARZEN, A Chapter of Israelitish History; G. H. ESTABROOKS, Natural and Supernatural.

*Canadian Journal of Religious Thought*, Toronto, March-April: G. S. BRETT, The Modern Mind and Modernism; F. G. VIAL, Language of the Gospels; E. A. DALE, Religious Purpose of the Aeneid; KATHLEEN MACKENZIE, Columba, Saint and Statesman. *The Same*, May-June: W. T. BROWN, The Meaning of Worship; SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Excavations in Palestine since the Great War; G. S. BRETT, Life in Eastern Lands; H. L. MACNEILL, Paul, the first Christian Protestant; S. P. ROSE, Good English in the Pulpit; H. W. WRIGHT, Experimentalism in Religion.

*Catholic Historical Review*, Washington, April: CLARENCE E. MARTIN, The American Judiciary and Religious Liberty; THOMAS J. SHAHAN, The Higher Education of the Catholic Clergy; EDWARD A. PACE, The Church and Scholasticism; JOHN J. BURKE, The Historical Attitude of the Church towards Nationalism; JOHN A. RYAN, Attitude of the Church toward Free Speech; MOORHOUSE F. X. MILLAR, Origin of Sound Democratic Principles in Catholic Tradition.

*Church Quarterly Review*, London, April: G. K. A. BELL, The Malines Conversations; H. MAURICE RELTON, The Incarnation and its Extension in Church and Sacraments; CLAUDE JENKINS, John Wyclif: the first Phase; W. O. E. OESTERLEY, Jewish Marriage in Ancient and Modern Times; FELIX HOPE, Asceticism.

*Congregational Quarterly*, London, April: EDWARD GRUBB, The Fact of Christian Unity; KENNETH A. SAUNDERS, A Plea for New Realism in Christology; RODERIC DUNKERLEY, The Earliest Christian Documents; E. GRIFFITH-JONES, God and Nature: a Reply; F. C. SPURR, Public Reading of Scripture Today.

*Crozer Quarterly*, Philadelphia, April: FREDERICK TRACY, Evolution and the Higher Life of Man; OLIVER W. ELSBREE, From West to East; CHARLES M. BOND, Religion and Education; STEWART G. COLE, Philosophical Support of Mysticism; R. E. E. HARKNESS, Story of the Christian Church.

*Expository Times*, Edinburgh, April: W. M. MACGREGOR, Sermon on Mount—The Beatitudes; ARTHUR S. PEAKE, Commentaries on Old and New Testament; R. C. GILLIE, Prophetic Vocation: a Comparison; J. W. JACK, New Light on Palestine. *The Same*, May: A. J. GOSSIP, Sermon on the Mount—The New Righteousness; F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, Latinity of the Pastorals; ARTHUR S. PEAKE, Commentaries on the Old and New Testaments, iii; R. W. STEWART, Newer Estimate of Judaism. *The Same*, June: ARTHUR S. PEAKE, Commentaries on the Old and New Testaments, iv; S. P. T. PRIDEAUX, A Plea for the Study of Theology; F. W. NORWOOD, Sermon on the Mount, iii; JOHN E. MACFADYEN, A German Estimate of Contemporary British Theology; K. L. STEVENSON, Origin of the Hebrews.

*Harvard Theological Review*, Cambridge, April: BENJAMIN W. BACON, Some "Western" Variants in the Text of Acts; WILLIAM H. P. HATCH, The Apostles in the New Testament and in the Ecclesiastical Tradition of Egypt.

*Homiletic Review*, New York, March: Do Parents Know their Children?; G. WALTER FISKE, Where Abraham went to Church; D. A. HARSHAW, Philosophy of the Negro Spiritual; THOMAS F. OPIE, The Preacher to the Theologian. *The Same*, April: WARD ADAIR, The new Brand of Immortality; ARTHUR S. PHELPS, Life and Art of Albrecht Dürer; Do Parents Know their Children? ii; REMBERT G. SMITH, Shall the Preacher regain his Power?; H. NORMAN SIBLEY, The Terrible Meek. *The Same*, May: WM. E. BRYCE, Can we believe in Miracles?; The Minister and his convictions; WM. C. CARL, The Organ in France and America today; CLYDE F. VANCE, Principles in the use of Illustrations; W. E. GRIFFITH, What the Church may learn from Masonry. *The Same*, June: O. F. DAVIS, The pastor and the child; FRED SMITH, The child in the morning worship; R. C. HALLOCK, The minister's health and how to edify it; FRED SMITH, The psychology required for the children's sermonet.

*Jewish Quarterly Review*, Philadelphia, April: SAMUEL SCHULMAN, Professor Moore's "Judaism"; CECIL ROTH, Sumptuary Laws of the



Community of Carpentras; SOLOMON L. SKOSS, The Arabic Commentary of 'Ali Ben Suleiman the Karaite of the book of Genesis.

*Journal of Religion*, Chicago, April: EUGENE W. LYMAN, Mysticism, Reason, and Social Idealism; E. BOYD BARRETT, Drama of Catholic Confession; CLIFFORD MANSHARDT, Converts or co-operation—a study of modern missions; HERBERT W. HINES, Development of the Psychology of Prophecy; VINCENT TAYLOR, The Synoptic Gospels and some recent British criticism; SHELBY V. McCASLAND, The Cult story of the Early Church.

*Journal of Theological Studies*, London, April: F. C. BURKITT, The Mandaeans; F. C. BURKITT, Notes on Ginza Rabba 174; W. TELFER, The form of a dove; W. E. BARNES, Masoretic reading of Isaiah 43:14; I. W. SLOTKI, Stichometry and text of the Great Hallel; F. C. BURKITT, The MSS of "Narsai of the Mysteries"; C. H. TURNER, Marcan Usage: notes critical and exegetical on the Second Gospel, ix.

*London Quarterly Review*, London, April: MARIE V. WILLIAMS, Religious Basis of Plato's Philosophy; S. G. DIMOND, Philosophy of Henrik Ibsen; H. REINHEIMER, World of colloids; LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD, Shelley's Hell complex; H. P. PALMER, Benefit of Clergy; ARTHUR B. BATEMAN, Rosetti, the Pre-Raphaelites, and a moral.

*Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Gettysburg and Philadelphia, April: PAUL SCHERER, Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth; JOHN ABERLY, Prayer; H. C. ALLEMAN, Prayer in the Old Testament; HENRY SCHAEFFER, Pastor's devotional study of the Bible; R. C. HORN, Rambles in the Greek New Testament; GEORGE DRACH, A new interpretation of types of New Testament teaching; C. H. KRAELING, Reitzenstein and the Mystery religions; J. A. W. HAAS, History or Revelation; C. M. JACOBS, Sources of Lutheran history; P. I. MORENTZ, Winning your Jewish neighbor.

*Missionary Review of the World*, New York, April: J. J. LUCAS, Fifty years of missions in India; HOWARD E. ANDERSON, At the holiest Hindu festival; ROBERT A. HUME, A missionary's motives today; ROBERT E. SPEER, Unclaimed areas for Christ, ii; JAY S. STOWELL, The crossroads church at the crossroads; WEBSTER E. BROWNING, Evangelical missions in Latin America. *The Same*, May: W. F. KRAUSHAAR, New Guinea Savages for Christ; The "One sheep" association of Japan; ROBERT H. GLOVER, What is the message of the Church?; India, the rudder of Asia; WM. MOYSER, Pandita Ramabai's Mukti Mission; N. W. TAYLOR, Religious freedom in Mexico. *The Same*, June: ROBERT E. SPEER, Christians of many nations at Jerusalem; DAVIDSON D. T. JABAVU, A South African view of the Council; AUGUSTINE RALLIA RAM, Voices from Jerusalem calling India; JOHN A. MACKAY, The meaning to Latin America; Call to prayer from Jerusalem; The Christian message to all men; JOHN M. SPRINGER, Wealth in Central Africa; ALTON B. JACOBS, Carey's influence continues.

*Monist*, Chicago, April: JOHN DEWEY, Social as a category; J. E. TURNER, Character of Reality; F. S. C. NORTHROP, Internal Inconsis-



tency in Aristotelian Logic; CHARNER M. PERRY, Language and Thought; L. L. BERNARD, Development of Methods in Sociology.

*Moslem World*, New York, April: SONIA HOWE, Charles de Foucauld explorer and knight-errant; D. A. CHOWDHURY, Islam in Bengal; PAUL W. HARRISON, Heart of our message; J. CHRISTY WILSON, The all-Persia church conference; PIERRE CRABITES, Islam, Personal Law and the Capitulations; CHARLES R. WATSON, Launching the Council for Western Asia and Northern Africa.

*New Church Life*, Lancaster, April: L. W. T. DAVID, The Word and the human Form; DONALD F. ROSE, Why I am a Swedenborgian; THEODORE PITCAIRN, Ultimate source of philosophic ideas. *The Same*, May: The Origin of Man—Four addresses. *The Same*, June: G. A. SEXTON, Divine Authority; F. W. ELPHICK, What constitutes heresy in the New Church?

*Open Court*, Chicago, April: LEWIS SPENCE, Papyri of Central America; M. WHITCOMB HESS, More about Space and Time in music; AXEL LUNDEBERG, System of Occidental Occultism; ROBERT S. WALKER, My environment. *The Same*, May: CARLYLE SUMMERBELL, Jesus and Götama; THOMAS D. ELIOT, Insanity, Relativity, and Group-formation; DALJIT SINGH SADHARIA, Future of Religion in Asia. *The Same*, June: WILFRID D. HAMLEY, Psychology of the Medicine Man; ROYAL G. HALL, Significance of John Dewey for Religious Interpretation; JOSEPH RATNER, Fundamentalism and the Doctrine of Evolution; ROBERT P. RICHARDSON, Faith of an Atheist; H. S. DARLINGTON, Was the Biblical manna an animal product?

*Review and Expositor*, Louisville, April: CHARLES S. FARRISS, The place of a Theological Seminary in a modern world of culture; W. J. MCGLOTHLIN, Reasons for courses in Bible and religious education in colleges; H. J. FLOWERS, The grace of God given to Paul—Ephesians 3:1-13; A. T. ROBERTSON, Dr. Broadus beginning Greek; A. L. VAIL, Meaning of the "Single eye" in the Gospels.

*Union Seminary Review*, Richmond, April: Best Books on Life and Letters of Paul; G. F. BELL, Reconstructing our belief; W. J. YOUNG, Message of Micah; A. L. LATHEM, The Summer Bible school; THORNTON WHALING, Religious character of Stonewall Jackson; MARSHALL B. WYATT, The Seminary and extension; C. O'N. MARTINDALE, Is Christianity supernatural?

*Yale Review*, New Haven, April: WILLARD L. SPERRY, Modern religion and American citizenship; T. H. MORGAN, What is Darwinism?; J. A. SPENDER, The Press and international affairs; JOHN SPARGO, Advance in the American labor movement; FREDERICK B. LUQUIENS, Spanish-American Literature; TUCKER BROOKE, Shakespeare's Study in culture and anarchy.

*Biblica*, Roma, April: K. PRÜMM, Herrscherkult und Neues Testament, (con.); L. G. DE FONESCA, Διαθήκη—Foedus an testamentum? (con.); P. JÖUN, Notes philologiques sur le texte hebreu de Josué; E. POWER, Church of St. Peter in Jerusalem in relation to House of Caiaphas and Sancta Sion; B. ALFRINK, Der letzte König von Babylon.

*Bilychnis*, Roma, Aprile: M. DE RUBRIS, La preparazione degli opuscoli azeqliani: "programma per l'opinione nazionale" ed "emancipazione degl'Israeliti"; L. LUZZATTO, Un filosofo del nazionalismo; G. PIOLI, Il congresso dei modernisti della Chiesa inglese; M. VINCIGUERRA, La elezioni in France e in Germania e le condizione dei cattolici. *The Same*, Maggio: G. PIOLI, William Blake arista dell'invisibile; P. CHIMINELLI, G. Savonarola nella coscienza dei posteria; E. OHLSEN, Nuovi orientamenti del protestantesimo.

*Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique*, Toulouse, Mars-Avril: HENRI BREMOND, Le Vigneron de Montmorency et l'École de l'oraison cordiale; LOUIS DESNOYERS, L'Etablissement de la Royauté en Israël.

*Ciencia Tomista, Salamanca*, Mayo-Junio: VICENTE BELTRÁN DE HEREDIA, El maestro Fray Domingo Bañez y la Inquisición española; M. CUERVO, El desco natural de ver a Dios y los fundamentos de la Apologetica inmanentista; SABINO ALONSO, Delegación "ab homine" y delegación "a jure" para oír confesiones de religiosas.

*Estudis Franciscians*, Barcelona, Abril-Juny: MIQUEL D'ESPLUGUES, El problema de l'ateisme; ROMAUD BIZZARRI, Della falsa originalità: ossia Arte, Religione e Filosofia; MICHAEL A NEUKIRSCH, Harmonia ac concordia quinque Systematum de concursu gratiae actualis cum libero arbitrio.

*Etudes Théologiques et Religieuses*, Montpellier, Mai-Juin: L. PERRIER, La préhistoire de la Palestine et la Bible; L. MAURY, Tommy Fallot (fin.); EDOUARD BRUSTON, La littérature sapientiale dans le livre de Job; FRANZ J. LEENHARDT, Remarques exégétique sur I Samuel 21:6; LÉON JAMES, Essai sur la Tradition.

*Foi et Vie*, Paris, Avril: PAUL DOUMERGUE, Succedanes ou adjuvants du Christianisme; E. HUGUENIN, La Fraternité entre les sexes; La crise des élites et les catholiques français; RENÉ JULIAN, Tradition et modernité dans l'art; G. LIENGME, Les lois psychologiques appliquées dans l'enseignement religieux, la prière, la prédication. *The Same*, Mai: EMIL DOUMERGUE, Le Vatican contre l'Action française et le facisme. *The Same*, Juin: L'Allemagne et la propagande de culture allemande; M. ARBOUSSE-BASTIDE, La Conférence oecuménique de Lausanne; PIERRE MIRABAUD, La Conférence de Jérusalem; G. DEBU, Quelques traits de la Conférence.

*Gereformeerde Theologisch Tijdschrift*, Aalten, April: C. BOUMA, Formgeschichte; A. J. FANOY, Het onderteekingsformulier van de Dienaren des Woords. *The Same*, Mei: C. BOUMA, De taal van Jezus en van de Rabbijnen; J. S. POST, De Christelijke Doop; H. A. BAKKER, Non Tali Auxilio. *The Same*, Juni: Verlags van de 17e Algemeene Vergadering van Vereeniging van Predikanten van de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland; H. A. BAKKER, Non Tali Auxilio.

*Nieuwe Theologische Studien*, Wageningen, April: W. J. AALDERS, Brunner's Mittler; J. DE ZWAAN, Neotestamentica; A. VAN VELDHUIZEN, De Württembergische Bibelanstalt en haar uitgaven. *The Same*, Mei: A. VAN VELDHUIZEN, Vogelboeken; G. VAN DER LEUW, Bericht over

de Godsdienstgeschiedenis; TH. L. W. VAN RAVESTEIJN, Voor onze Oudtestamentische studie.

*Onder Eigen Vaandel*, Wageningen, April: F. W. C. L. SCHULTE, Een teeken van's Heeren nabijheid; N. G. VELDHOEN, Simon de toovenaar; TH. L. HAITJEMA, De theologie van Gustaf Aulén; J. C. AALDERS, Het theologisch belang van het Assensch leergeschied; L. W. BAKHUIZEN VAN DEN BRINK, De groote Synode; A. H. DE HARTOG, Theologie des Woords?

*Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique*, Toulouse, Avril: Lettres inédites du P. Jean-Baptiste Saint-Jure; M. VILLER, Le xvii<sup>e</sup> siècle et l'origine des retraites spirituelles; F. CAVALLERA, Une controverse sur les grâces mystiques.

*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, Louvain, Avril: J. DUHR, Le *De Fide* de Bachiarus (fin.); L. VAN DER ESSEN, La situation religieuse de Pays-Bas en 1634.

*Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuse*, Strasbourg, Mars-Avril: MAURICE GOGUEL, Critique et Histoire: a propos de la vie de Jésus; G. VAN DER LEEUW, A propos de récentes études sur la structure de la mentalité primitive; PIERRE JANELLE, Le voyage de Martin Bucer et Paul Fagius de Strasbourg en Angleterre en 1549.

*Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques*, Paris, Avril: M. D. ROLAND-GOSSELIN, Le Sermon sur la montagne et la théologie thomiste; A. D. SERTILLANGES, Note sur la nature du mouvement d'après S. Thomas d'Aquin; P. AMIABLE, Les harmonies de la Cène et de la Croix.

*Scholastik*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 3:2: JOSEPH STIGLMAYR, Der sog. Dionysius Areopagita und Severus von Antiochen; AUGUST DENEFFE, Gehört die Himmelfahrt Mariä zum Glaubensschatz?; JOSEPH FRÖBES, Dynamische Psychologie.

*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, Innsbruck, 52:2: M. GRABMANN, Der Einfluss Alberts des Grossen auf das mittelalterliche Geistesleben, 1; J. SANTELER, Die Prädestination in den Römerbriefkommentaren des 13. Jahrhunderts; C. A. KNELLER, Die Bibelbulle Sixtus' V; K. GF. PREYSING, Echtheit und Bedeutung der dogmatischen Erklärung Zephyrins; C. BÖCKL, Wer ist der Mönch von Heilsbrunn?; N. PAULUS, Suarez über die Definierbarkeit der leiblichen Himmelfahrt Mariä; J. B. SCHUSTER, Das Prinzip der doppelten Kausalität und seine Anwendung auf die Norwehr.

*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, Tübingen, 9:2: FRIEDRICH TRAUB, Philosophischer und religiöser Wirklichkeitsbegriff; KARL THIEME, Zur Trinitätsfrage; KURT STAVENHAGEN, Die Idee des religiösen Wunders; R. F. MERKEL, Zum Problem eines neuen Sexualethos.

## D. L. MOODY: HIS MESSAGE *FOR* TODAY

By CHARLES R. ERDMAN, D.D., LL.D., New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1928. Pp. 156. Price, \$1.50.

"The substance of this volume was given in the form of lectures delivered on the Smyth Foundation at Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia, in March, 1928. It is a pleasure to acknowledge the honour conferred by the faculty of the seminary in their appointment to this lectureship; and further, it is desired to express deep appreciation for being permitted to present these lectures in this more permanent form."—(FOREWORD.)

## THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE GOSPELS

By J. RITCHIE SMITH, D.D., Professor of Homiletics in Princeton Theological Seminary. Author of "The Teaching of the Gospel of John"; "The Wall and the Gates." New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926.

"Throughout the entire volume one finds unmistakable evidences of broad and accurate scholarship, a courageous facing of difficulties and objections and a determination to think things through, a catholicity of spirit even where the widest differences of convictions enter, and a deep and vital devotion to Jesus Christ. It is with an inexpressible satisfaction one rises from the reading of such a work."—*The Presbyterian*.

## WHAT IS FAITH?

By J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D. New York: The Macmillan Company, Pp. 263. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

"If we had the resources we should provide a copy to every minister and lay preacher in the British Isles."—*The British Weekly*.

"Professor Machen has written a strong and courageous book . . ."—*Christian World* (London).

## CHRISTIANITY AND LIBERALISM

By J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923.

"This is a book that should be read by every thinking man, whether he calls himself a conservative or a liberal. While evidently the product of a thorough scholar, it is written throughout in simple, non-technical words."—S. G. Craig in *The Presbyterian*.

The Selected Writings  
of  
BENJAMIN BRECKINRIDGE  
WARFIELD

*Late Professor of Theology in Princeton  
Theological Seminary*

IN TEN VOLUMES

At the time of his death in 1921, the late Dr. Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield was the leading Calvinistic theologian in the English speaking world. An Editorial Committee proposes to publish through the Oxford University Press, in a series of volumes, Dr. Warfield's contribution to theological thought by reprinting the important articles which he contributed to the various Bible Dictionaries and Encyclopedias and to the theological reviews, especially *The Princeton Theological Review*.

The first volume, entitled *Revelation and Inspiration*, contains two articles on the Idea of Revelation, and a number of exegetical and critical articles on the Biblical idea of Inspiration and the grounds of belief in the plenary inspiration of Scripture.

The second volume will contain Dr. Warfield's major articles on several Biblical doctrines, such as The Trinity, Predestination, Faith, The Person of Christ, etc.

The third volume will comprise the historico-critical articles on the Person and Work of Christ.

Volumes four, five and six will contain articles on Historical Theology. They will include the articles on Augustine, Calvin, and The Westminster Confession. These articles are authoritative on their respective subjects.

The seventh and eighth volumes will contain the articles on Perfectionism.

There will be a ninth volume of miscellaneous articles and a tenth volume containing the most important of Dr. Warfield's book reviews.

Volume I, now ready, may be ordered through your bookseller, or direct from the publisher. It is bound in cloth, 8vo (9½x6¼), pp. xiii+456, price, \$3.00.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS  
AMERICAN BRANCH                      NEW YORK