

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. III.

APRIL, 1923.

No. 4.

The International Scapegoat.

PROF. W. H. T. DAU, St. Louis, Mo.

A view, rare in our bigotry-ridden and fanatical times, is propounded in the *Kristeligt Dagblad* of Kopenhagen (July 27, 1922) regarding the Jews. In an effort to apportion fairly the responsibility for the intolerable state of affairs which is distressing and perplexing the nations of the earth, a writer who signs himself E. C., offers for general consideration the following thoughts:—

Nearly everywhere in the world the bush (Ex. 2, 2) is blazing brightly: the blaze of anti-Semitism, or hatred of the Jews, is spreading and rising in ever higher and wilder flames around the Jewish people. In Germany anti-Semitism is burning everywhere, and the concealed fire blazed forth in the murder of the Jew Rathenau. In Russia the Soviet, spite of its Jewish leaders, has not been able to prevent the medieval pogroms, which during the last year have cost 150,000 Jews their lives, and all Jews and friends of the Jews are trembling with fear at the thought of what is going to happen to the Jewish masses in Russia when finally the Jew Trotzky will be overthrown. For if the slogan in 1905 was: Extinguish the revolution with the blood of the Jews! will the coming slogan not be: Drown Bolshevism in Jewish blood? In free America, where within a generation 2,500,000 Jewish fugitives have been granted asylum, hatred of the Jews is gathering ever-increasing force, just as in all those countries where the Jews are rapidly growing in numbers. It is no better in England. Even here in our home country in the North [Denmark], where Jews are among the most respected citizens, "the mountain-climbers on the Mont Blanc of toleration" are ever becoming fewer. Professor Rozniecki, who died recently, is certainly correct when, in his excellent book *The Jewish Problem*, he writes: "Suppose, now, that Kopenhagen were to shelter as many Jews as Warsaw, — that means in proportion to the number of its in-

BOOK REVIEW.

The Sotarion Publishing Co., Buffalo, N. Y.: —

1. **The Selah Song Book for Worship and Devotion in Church, School, Home.** English-German edition. Compiled by *Adolf T. Hanser*. 400 pages.

892 selections from the Scriptures for antiphonal reading and hymns for use by congregations that are partly English, partly German are here offered, many of them translations that have not been published before. The music accompanies the hymns. This, as far as we know, is the only large and systematic effort that has ever been made in the American Lutheran Church to merge a bilingual congregation in the singing part of the service.

2. **The Scripture Searcher.** A new quarterly to guide Christians to follow Christ's word: "Search the Scriptures!" etc. *Rev. William Dallmann*, Editor-in-chief.

3. **The Bible Hour.** The Quarterly of the Home Service Bible Lesson.

Die Bibelstunde. German companion publication of the foregoing. Both by *Rev. Adolf T. Hanser*, Editor.

The publication edited by *Rev. Dallmann* presents "The Life of Paul" from close reading of the Scriptures and from the domain of archeological research. The scenes of Paul's life are dramatically described. Chiefly, however, Paul is exhibited as the great apostolic teacher of Christianity.—The publications edited by *Rev. Hanser* present studies of selected portions of the Gospels. D.

The American Lutheran Publicity Bureau, 289 Fourth Ave., New York City, announces three timely six-page tracts: **Christ Crucified, Sanctification, and Mission Work.** D.

Johannes Herrmann, *Zwickau, Saxony*, announces a 16-page tract by *Prof. Dr. Otto Clemm* on **Die Entstehung der Lutherbibel**, and the **Open Letter** of *Rev. Clausen*, of *Todenbuettel*, to the Consistory of the *Landeskirche* of *Schleswig-Holstein* ("Gott laesst sich nicht spotten"). D.

The Abingdon Press, *New York, N. Y.*:—

Hebrew Life and Times. *Harold B. Hunting*. 188 pages.

This book purposes to be a popular presentation of Jewish history and life. As far as Jewish customs as well as social and economic conditions are concerned, the book presents much that is useful and interesting. However, from a religious point of view it is practically worthless, since in this respect it is entirely governed by the views of modern higher criticism. The supernatural in Israel's history, life, and religion has been everywhere removed, and nothing is left but a bare, commonplace record of every-day happenings. Of Christ the author says: "Here, in a nutshell, is what Jesus did: He helped men to believe in a God who loved all men as His children, whether rich or poor, learned or ignorant, Jews or Gentiles or Samaritans, even the bad as well as the good; for if they were bad, they needed His love to help them to be good. Jesus not only taught this idea of God through His spoken words; He helped men, through His deeds, to understand it. He lived that way, as the Son of such a God. He healed the sick. He fed the hungry. He ate and drank with outcasts. He was everybody's Friend." This passage sufficiently characterizes the religious tenor of the book. MUELLER.

Sunday-School Board, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn.:—
Evolution a Menace. *J. W. Porter, D. D., LL. D.*

This is a brief, but excellent confutation of the falsehoods of evolution, written in clear, popular style. We cheerfully recommend it to all pastors whose young people are in danger of being inoculated with the virus of evolution. MUELLER.

Suomalainen Tiedekatemia Kustantama, Helsingki: —

Die Entwicklung des Offenbarungsbegriffs seit Schleiermacher.
Dr. theol. Antti J. Pietilae. VII and 331 pages.

This treatise by a gifted adjunct to the University of Helsingfors takes in nearly all of Vol. X, Series B, of the Annals of the Finnish Academy of Sciences. It is preceded only by a brief essay on "Ideative Co-ordination" by Eino Kaila. — Dr. Pietilae's effort is really a survey of the tortuous windings through which the discussion of the "problem of revelation" has passed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In a brief introductory chapter he sketches the position which was taken on the origin of the Scriptures by the Reformers (Luther and Melancthon), the Orthodoxists (Flacius, Chemnitz, Selnecker, Aegidius Hunnius, Hafenreffer, Johann Schroeder, Leonhard Hutter, and chiefly Gerhard), the Pietists (chiefly Bengel), the Illuminists (Locke, Lessing, Spinoza, Thomasius, Semler, Behrdt, Nicolai), the Supranaturalists (Storr, Reinhardt), Kant, and Herder. The next chapter starts the treatise proper and is devoted to Schleiermacher. This is followed by a review of the mediating theologians, K. I. Nitzsch, Twesten, Rothe, Dorner, J. P. Lange, Hase, Martensen, and Schweizer. In the chapter on the "Speculative Theology" the author reviews the position of the speculative idealists, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, the speculative orthodoxists, Daub, and Marheineke, the "Hegelian Left": Strauss and Feuerbach, and the modern speculative theology of Biedermann, Pfeleiderer, and Lipsius. "The Old Faith" is presented in the next chapter, under these subdivisions: Theology of Repristination: Hengstenberg, Philippi; Biblicism: Beck, Kuebel; Erlangen Theology: von Hofmann, Thomasius, von Frank; Other Neo-orthodox Theologians: Kahnis, Luthardt, von Oettingen. Chapter 6 is devoted to Ritschl and his disciples: Kaftan, Haering, Herrmann, Reischle, Wendt, Stephan. The religio-historical school of Troeltsch is discussed in the next chapter, and this is followed by a discussion of the positive *Richtung* of Kaehler, Seeberg, Ihmels, Sieffert, Girgensohn, Scharling, Brusow, and the liberal *Richtung* of Goeranson, Krarup, Ordning. In a concluding chapter the author discusses the Presuppositions for a Greater Unity as regards the Revelation Issue, the Christian Certitude of Truth, the Revelation, the Bible, and Miracles. In sketching thus broadly the contents of the treatise, we have reproduced the author's own terminology, the aptness of which is, no doubt, subject to question at a number of points. *E. g.*, one may feel amused at seeing Kahnis classified as a neo-orthodox theologian. From a formal view-point the treatise is not without merit. It affords a fairly panoramic view of the author's chosen field of investigation and shows him to be very well acquainted, as a rule, with the multitude of publications that have a bearing on his subject. The student of the history of dogma can learn much from the author's arrangement of the successive stages of the Bible controversy that is the outstanding characteristic of the modern world. Moreover, Dr. Pietilae is an entertaining writer, employing a lucid style, apt phrasing, and rapid development of his argument or account. The absence of a good index for a treatise of this kind is to be regretted. — In his Preface the author expresses the fear that his treatise will be regarded as deficient in certain scientific

circles. "The spirit of Hegel is still inwrought in many minds to such an extent that men are dreaming about an inner necessity for the development of ideas, and hence demand that science must demonstrate the process of the development. However, I am not fortunate enough to be able to believe in such an inner necessity." This sounds reassuring; but the good impression is spoiled when the author proceeds: "I can only believe in the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the congregation and the Christian science of theology. There is, indeed, a development of ideas, but it does not take place *in abstracto*, not in a supersensual Platonic world, but in living personalities, who form their thoughts, from out of all the relations and influences of the time in which they live, in accordance with the peculiar character of their time and their personality. The bearers of the ideas are frequently individualistic to such an extent that they cannot be grouped according to general nomenclatures of the schools, least of all can the investigator point out their 'necessary' place in the process of development of the concept that is under investigation. Accordingly, one must be careful not to indulge in generalization and construing of history, and must stick exclusively to the final results of the mental labor, as they become distinct in the kaleidoscopic pell-mell of individual views. Thus it becomes apparent that there is in the world of religious thought after all a development and a rational—would that this term were not misunderstood!—progress; however, this is not a development of ideas by themselves, but a development of the personal religious life in the Spirit and of its reflex in science." (NB. "*deren Abspiegelung*," we take it, should be "*dessen Abspiegelung*.") This notion pervades the entire treatise. We are actually invited to view the confusion of ideas, the war of *Richtungen* in modern scientific theology as a work of the Holy Spirit. This modern strife of theological tongues becomes virtually a twentieth century Pentecostal charisma. In every one of our modern theological geniuses the same spirit of truth is struggling for individualistic expression. If any one can believe—really believe—this, he must have a heroic faith, a faith that taxes the average intelligence far more than the "literal faith," so much derided by scientific theologians, of those who put implicit trust in the very words of Scripture.—The author is dissatisfied with the old Lutheran position on the divine revelation through the Holy Scriptures. He credits the Reformation with having achieved "the new faith": all glory for the salvation of man belongs to God alone. But he holds that this divine monergism of Luther was not sufficiently developed in Luther. Luther, he says, continued to attach an overgreat value to the medieval views of God's being and to the current ontological conclusions regarding God's essence. Luther's position is also declared to be ambiguous; he is said to have seized with remarkable courage upon "a far-reaching principle when severing what is valuable in the Scriptures from what is worthless and rejecting entire books of the Bible as unworthy of an apostle." But when fighting the internal illumination of fanatics, the artificial interpretation of Scripture by the papists, and the rationalism of Zwingli and his followers, he "lacked faith" in his liberal principle, and "could do nothing better than seek shelter in the verbally revealed doctrine. In such instances the Bible, in his view, is again an inspired book in the

old sense of the word, handed down by the church-fathers, and he will not permit an iota of Scripture to be destroyed." In Luther's sacramental teaching the author finds a magical strain because Luther speaks of a distinct grace that is conveyed by means of the Sacrament and insists on the force of the term *est*. (pp. 2—7.) Whoever has read Luther much, and with care, cannot but wince under this presentation of Luther's attitude toward the Scriptures. The subject, it must be admitted, has its difficulties; but no one who values his reputation for scholarship is warranted in ascribing to Luther even temporarily the notion that he could supersede anything that is really Scripture. Even his remarks about James and Esther do not justify such an assertion. Luther was simply impressed with the doubts that had been raised about these books ages before him, and, besides, was resisting the Roman *magisterium fidei* in what he said. It is a favorite diversion of modern writers to sketch the growing independentism of Luther somewhat like this: First, he discards the authority of the Pope by appealing to a council; next, he demands that the decision of the council must be in harmony with the Scriptures; lastly, he insists that Scripture must agree with his own faith. Dr. Pietilae does not claim that Luther assumed an attitude of superiority over the Scriptures, except for a season, but he deplores that Luther did not definitely adopt and thoroughly apply this valuable "principle." Luther would have deprecated such a "principle" with all his heart. What Dr. Pietilae has said about Luther's relation to the Scriptures is altogether shallow and superficial, and this part of his treatise deserves to be thoroughly revised. — Melancthon fares even worse than Luther in the author's review. He faults Melancthon for having reduced the new faith of the Reformation to a system of "*reine Lehre*" (pure teaching), and of having made the divine revelation itself a doctrine of Christianity. He repeats, with palpable regret, Seeberg's remark about Melancthon: "He regarded it as a special mercy of God that we have the divine truth in a reliable book, and the real people of God are only where this book is accepted." He deplores the fact that through the ministry of Melancthon "*reine Lehre*" became a constituent element of the congregation of Christ, and the Church was made *ecclesia doctrix*. (p. 9 f.) To the influence of the *Præceptor Germaniæ* the author would attribute the rigid doctrinal correctness of the age of orthodoxism. "As the Church of that age, in administering discipline for the purpose of inculcating a better religion upon souls, resorted without scruple also to the application of so-called police force, so the men of science likewise loved simple, rectilinear formulas with which to overcome recalcitrants. There they stand, those much-reviled, yet venerable theses, self-conscious and ready for battle like a phalanx of soldiers 'at attention,' just as if religion had nothing to do with profound issues of life (*Lebenstiefen*), nor with unfathomable mysteries. Orthodoxy does not easily become helpless. Questions, as, *e. g.*, those regarding the Trinity, the two natures of Christ, the operations of the Holy Spirit, and eschatology, are treated with a precision and a plenitude of knowledge which might easily be regarded as immodest arrogance by a modern person. Orthodoxy knows everything, defines everything, forces everything into its formulas, coordinates all the fulness of the world of religious experience as an object of knowledge with the objects of external experience. In

a way, orthodoxy is afraid of reason; but as soon as reason has been theologized, there are no limits to its syllogistic inferences. In the entire domain of religion orthodoxy deports itself in such fashion that the remark of the Swedish chancellor Axel Oxenstjerna regarding a Swedish bishop of hierarchical tendencies may be applied to it: 'A piece of the mantle of St. Peter has fallen on him,'—so conscious of their aim and confidently the representatives of orthodoxy pursue their way." In the preface to his *Hutterus Redivivus* Karl Hase describes the same phenomenon, viewing it, however, from an immeasurably higher ground than Dr. Pietilae. He likens the doctrinal edifice of the old orthodox Lutheran dogmaticians to the grand old Gothic cathedrals of Germany, and declares: "Our age will never produce anything like that." What gave the system of orthodox Lutherans its precision and compactness was its strict adherence to Scripture. Their system was a grand attempt to exhaust what Scripture has said on any given doctrinal subject, and to exhibit its Scriptural relationships with other doctrines. They were imbued with the conviction of the infallibility of the Bible, and that made *them* seem infallible. Fidelity to the Scriptures will produce the same type of theologians in any age—men who, in the positions which they have taken, will stand firm as a rock. The unhappy alliance with the secular power into which the Church had entered in those days produced deplorable issues. But we do not think that the modern scientific theology, which has thrived wonderfully under state protection, has any stones to cast at the orthodox age on this score. It seems as if Dr. Pietilae must have felt that he wrote a tirade when he penned the sketch of orthodoxism which has been reproduced in the foregoing. For he continues: "And yet!—there are not many epochs in the history of the Church that can bear a comparison with orthodoxy in estimating religious values, in willing self-sacrifice in behalf of liberty of conscience as then understood, and in scientific clearness and consistency. The orthodoxists had inherited a treasure from the age of the Reformation, and this treasure they were resolved to preserve undiminished and to hand it on to posterity at any price. They were concerned about the safe deposit of the contents of the faith of the Reformation, about finding an infallible source of truth, and about analyzing and systematizing all that flows from this source. While engaged upon this task, these theologians acted with such piety and honesty that Haering is unquestionably right when he says in their praise that the roots of their theory—he is speaking of their doctrine of the Scriptures—reach far down into the sanctuary of faith. The orthodox theologians, though without a hierarchy, without any common external government, knew how to unite the Protestant Church by a spiritual force, *viz.*, by the Word of God revealed in the Bible. That was a glorious achievement at a time when the very existence of the Protestant Church was at stake." How does this well-deserved encomium harmonize with the scurrilous remarks about the orthodoxists which the author makes in the preceding paragraph? Are these remarks merely the devil's sop thrown to virtue and to one's conscience? It would seem so; for he continues at once the charge which he had interrupted, by saying: "Orthodoxy has pursued the thought of a revelation of doctrine to its last consequences. While seeking for a source of truth, it could not pass by Holy Scripture. In Scripture

Luther had found the way to justifying faith. Scripture was the only staunch wall against the papists and fanatics. Scripture was the means which God Himself had provided for originating and preserving faith in the congregation. Within the confines of Scripture everything was clear and plain; outside of it men were wandering after the witcheries of the imperialistic Roman hierarchy and an imagination that spurned all discipline. The inspired Scriptures, dictated by the Holy Ghost, were the final revelation, homogeneous in all its parts, which God had entrusted to the congregation for the benefit of all who believe. The doctrine of revelation became identical with the doctrine of Holy Scripture." This attitude of orthodox Lutheranism to the Scriptures the author deplures, as he deplures likewise the old Lutheran view that the holy writers were only *causae instrumentales*, "yea, amanuenses," of the Holy Spirit; that there was in the act of inspiration a *dictamen Spiritus Sancti*; that in His operation upon the human mind the Spirit must not be separated from the Word, etc. In this orthodox Lutheran view, he says, the Bible became "a doctetically conceived, heavenly book," which means, that the Bible of old Lutheranism was a phantastic, unreal product. — The author's remarks about Bengel breathe admiration for this scholar's work in behalf of the Bible. But the author's estimate of Bengel is built up chiefly out of the *Sixty Edifying Discourses on the Revelation of John* and J. Winkelmann's treatise *Die Offenbarung*. Bengel's *opus palmare*, the *Gnomon*, is referred to twice, and the reference is to remarks in the Preface. One of these references rests on a plain misunderstanding, to say the least. Dr. Pietilae imputes to Bengel the following view: "The Bible constitutes a finished, harmonious unit; however, being a record of the progressive economy of God, it must be historically understood." For evidence the author cites paragraphs I and III of the Preface to the *Gnomon*. Here is what Bengel says in the places cited: "I. The Word of the living God, which had governed the primitive patriarchs, was committed to writing in the age of Moses, who was followed by the other prophets. Subsequently those things which the Son of God preached, and the Paraclete spake through the apostles, were written down by the apostles and evangelists. These writings, taken together, are termed *Holy Scripture*; and bearing this title, they are themselves their own best eulogy. For it is because they contain God's words and are the Lord's Book that they are called *Holy Scripture*. 'The Word of our God,' exclaims the prophet, 'shall stand forever.' Is. 40, 8. 'Verily, I say unto you,' says the Savior Himself; 'Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law till all be fulfilled.' Matt. 5, 18. And again, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away.' Matt. 24, 35. The Scriptures, therefore, of the Old and New Testaments, form a most reliable and precious *system* of divine testimonies. For not only are the various writings, when considered separately, worthy of God, but they together exhibit one complete and harmonious body, unimpaired by excess or defects. They are the fountain of wisdom, which is preferred by those who have tasted it to all compositions of other men, however holy, experienced, devout, or wise. [Bengel's son Ernest here adds a note in the third edition of the *Gnomon*: "We may add: They who have not tasted it, prefer to it all compositions of mere men, however profane,

vain, wanton, or foolish. Ps. 53, 2. Hence their opposition to it."]

III. Myriads of annotations were not written in the Church of the Old Testament, although the light was more scanty then, nor did learned men think that the Church of the New Testament required to be immediately laden with such helps. Every book, when first published by a prophet or an apostle, bore in itself its own interpretation, as it referred to the existing state of things. The text, which was continually in the mouths of all and, diligently read by all, kept itself pure and intelligible. The saints were not busy with selecting the berries, as if the other parts were to be pruned away, nor with accumulating cumbrous commentaries. They had the SCRIPTURES. Those who were learned in the Old and New Testaments were at hand to teach the unlearned." It is simply inconceivable how Dr. Pietilae could read out of these statements the claim which he has set up that Bengel advocated the historic method of Bible interpretation. Nor does the following characterization of Bengel's interpretation come nearer to the truth: "All interpretation of Scripture must take its start from a view of the Bible as a whole (*Totalauffassung derselben*). The Bible must not be split into fragments for the purpose of using single sentences from it as proof-texts (*dicta probantia*) for the pure doctrine which has been previously fixed, but inversely we must take our start from the Bible, form a general conception of it; and not before we have done this may we say which is the true Christian doctrine." Dr. Pietilae could not have written this if he had taken the trouble to look into the *Gnomon*; for instance, into Bengel's interpretation of Christ's argument with Satan in Matt. 4, which is a veritable contest in *dicta probantia*, into Bengel's comment on "iota or tittle" in Matt. 5, 18, or on the difference between what Moses had said in the Law and what the scribes had made him say (Matt. 5), which, again, deals with the exact meaning of single Bible-texts; or on Christ's proof for immortality from a single text like Ex. 3, 6 in Matt. 22, 32; or on the point which Christ in Matt. 22, 42 ff. makes against the Pharisees from Ps. 110, 1; or on the force of Christ's remark in Luke 16, 30: "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them"; or on the Lord's answer in John 10, 35, which Bengel calls "a most firmly grounded axiom," etc., etc. — Throughout his treatise Dr. Pietilae insists on a distinction between revelation and Scripture that discounts the value of Scripture. Every sound Lutheran teacher knows this distinction and makes the proper use of it. But the proper use is not made when we say, as the author does: "I cannot but apply the name 'inspiration' to the original flaring up of the divine truth of life (*das grundlegende Aufleuchten der goettlichen Lebenswahrheit*) in the soul of a person now living and to number it with the real revelation. (Matt. 11, 25; 1 Cor. 2, 7—10.) True, there is a multitude of mediating agencies between us and the historic person of Jesus of Nazareth. There is, above all, the Bible; next, the Church with all its life, the living proclamation of the Gospel, the education which we have received, etc. All these matters approach us, to begin with, as a great manifestation of God, nor do we lack inspired interpretations of it [?]; but all this remains sealed to us until the living Spirit of God may speak His word to us. The experience that the light is *given*, which in its profoundest depths is inexplicable, must become a reality for us before we can be *certain* of our God.

The consciousness that the light was given by no means finds its sufficient explanation in the historical medium of communication (*das Bewusstsein des Gegebenseins findet in der geschichtlichen Vermittlung keineswegs seinen genuegenden Grund*). *An immediate operation of the divine Spirit must be added to the means of grace.*" (These italics ours.) (p. 311.) "The Bible itself, viewed as a whole, belongs to the original revelation. In some of its parts it consists of real monuments of the divine operation in the world, of words which have the value of facts and can be explained only as direct results of the influence of God on the bearers of the revelation. Other parts contain an original inspired interpretation of the manifestations of God and, as such, belong to the revelation proper. Furthermore, there are passages in which persons endowed with the Spirit in a general way present their personal opinions. A breath of the Spirit of revelation rests even on portions which, estimated from the view-point of the certainty of revelation, belong rather to the periphery." (p. 315.) These words, which fully characterize the author's personal attitude to the concept of revelation and to the Bible, lay before us the hopeless infatuation of modern scientific theology. It is of no avail for the author to cite texts like Matt. 11, 25 and 1 Cor. 2, 7—10 for his claim that there are revelations vouchsafed to men independently of the Word. The former text relates to what was revealed to the disciples under the tutelage of Christ, hence by the teaching of His Word, which Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum had spurned. The latter text is Paul's declaration of his and his brother apostles' inspiredness. (By the way, did not the author forget himself when he cited *dicta probantia*?) — We are confronted once more in this treatise with the appalling spiritual poverty and the overweening spiritual conceit that is typical of the scientific theology of to-day. The theory advocated by the modern theologians for explaining God's approach to men is fundamentally *Schwaermerei*. Whatever part of the divine and saving truth has entered the hearts of these men — and, God be praised! there is evidence that this has taken place — has entered by the medium of the Word, their Bible-training, etc., but not by a divine fiat flashing into their hearts without a mediating agency. Even these theologians feel the power of the Bible on their hearts, otherwise they could not, occasionally at least, speak of the Redeemer, the atonement, faith, and justification as they do. Dr. Pietilae, too, has expressed himself with remarkable clearness on these fundamentals of the faith that saves. There is in the Scriptures, as our old teachers used to say, both *inspiratio* and *respiratio*: the same truths which were conveyed to the holy writers by *inspiratio* are conveyed to the readers of their writings till the end of time by *respiratio*. The Bible is an indestructible and ever energetic deposit of divine truth and medium for begetting faith in the divine truth — even in scientific theologians. It is difficult to believe that many of these theologians really believe what they write. — We note a few of the more important errata in this treatise: p. 23, line 5, "bewahrt" should be "bewaehrt"; p. 42, l. 22, a comma should be placed after "formt"; p. 48, l. 12, "sezen" for "setzen"; p. 296, l. 21, "des" for "der"; p. 304, l. 19, "so" for "eo."