

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

Vol. I.

FEBRUARY, 1921.

No. 2.

A Series of Lenten Addresses.

Delivered at the American Theater, St. Louis, March 1—5, 1920.

REV. H. B. HEMMETER, Rochester, N. Y.

Jesus:

I. The Light of the World.

JOHN 8, 12.

Less than a hundred years ago one of the world's greatest thinkers is reported to have exclaimed upon his deathbed: More Light. He had lived in a so-called Christian country, had been reared in the Christian religion, and had made the customary professions of the Christian faith in his early youth. In the battle of life, however, with its passions and its emotions he had lost most of his Christian character, had delved deep into the Pyrean spring of human learning, and though admittedly one of the colossal minds of all ages, with a knowledge of earthly wisdom, of the ways, the feelings, and the experiences of men such as few men ever had, on his deathbed the great Goethe had to cry out for more light. In the presence of death he was enshrouded in darkness.

About four thousand years ago there lived in a far eastern country, among Gentile peoples, a man who is described in Sacred Writ as perfect and upright, one that feared God and eschewed evil. He had been blessed by God in family, in riches, in friends. But under a permissive providence of God all was taken from him, and with his own body wasting away with putrefying sores, and his own wife tilting him with the advice to "bless God and die," old Job is portrayed as lifting up his voice, and with a vision that transported his believing soul, is recorded to have exclaimed: "I know that my Redeemer liveth."

Nearly two thousand years ago there lived in Jerusalem, the

BOOK REVIEW.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis:—

1. **The Family Altar.** *Rev. F. W. Herzberger.* 375 pages. \$2.50.

A fine spirit of Christian cheerfulness and pastoral cordiality seems to us, from a partial perusal, to be a distinctive feature of these helps for the leader in family prayer in our hustling twentieth-century life, which demands that the "sweet hour of prayer" be reduced to two minutes and four and a half seconds, with a tendency to cut off the half second. With the majority of us it will be either a book like this, or nothing at all. So we are glad we have this book, and are assured that its good selection of texts and the appealing tone of the remarks on the texts will prove a spiritual blessing to our home-life. D.

2. **Select Songs for School and Home.** Compiled by *J. A. Theiss.* With an Introduction on the Rudiments of Music by *Karl Haase.* XVI and 229 pages. \$1.50.

We neither read our Bible, nor pray, nor join in singing Christian songs as we used to at our homes. Zion's children ought to be a band of singers. They are people that have a right to sing, and that have something to sing that is worth while. This book will aid our schools in the singing lesson, but by its aid we can also fill our homes with sweet melodies of grace and cheer. D.

Success Printing Co., St. Louis, has published a pretty number in its "Jesu Juengerschafts Serie": Nr. 5: **Pastor Frommholds Soehne.** D.

Geo. H. Doran Company, New York:—

- Contending for the Faith.** Essays in Constructive Criticism and Positive Apologetics. *Leander S. Keyser, D. D.* 351 pages. Cloth, 12mo. \$3.00, net.

Dr. Leander S. Keyser, Professor of Systematic Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, O. (Merger), has earned himself an enviable reputation by a series of volumes which have stirred up more than usual interest. Himself harassed with doubt in his earlier years, Dr. Keyser has become a vigorous defender of the faith "once delivered," which, also in the present volume, he vindicates with great thoroughness and convincing logic. The book contains fifteen chapters, in which the author grips the Higher Critics, and exposes their insidious sleights and cunning devices, showing how unfair, illogical, and illiberal are the claims by which destructive critics support their suppositions. There are chapters on The Nature and Need of Apologetics, A Liberal Critic's (Dr. S. R. Driver's) View of Biblical Inspiration, The Old Testament Religion: Revelation or Evolution? The Moral Character of the Old Testament Jehovah, The Jehovah of the Old Testament, The Book of Jonah: Fact or Fiction, Legend or History? Christ's Witness to the Old Testament, The Bible a Book of Religion—and More, Thoughts on the Incarnation, God, and Immortality, A Criticism on Evolution, and lastly, Scientific Theories that Challenge Faith. To these essays are added a comprehensive bibliography and a good, exhaustive index. In the above chapters the writer touches upon almost every vital doctrine of theology—The Holy

Trinity, Creation, Inspiration, Christ's Deity and Incarnation, Atonement, Miracles, etc., condensing in their comparatively narrow scope an immense amount of reading, research, and learning, and setting forth with remarkable clearness both thesis and antithesis. Throughout the essays are characterized by sound scholarship and literary excellence, although it goes without saying that one cannot subscribe to every statement made in the book. The author's estimate as regards the fruits of apologetics is perhaps too high. To say, "We are constrained to hold from our study of church history, that Christianity would long ago have perished from the earth, had not brave, stalwart, and competent defenders of the evangelical faith always arisen to stay the onslaughts of assailants" (p. 15), really places apologetics above the positive preaching of the Gospel, which is the true means by which the Savior keeps and spreads His Church on earth. On p. 108 sqq. the author himself admits that the very men who need apologetic literature most pay little attention to the works of conservative scholars, which bears out the historic fact that very few people are won for Christ "by refuting argument with stronger argument, matching scholarship with scholarship, and thus vindicating the Christian faith at the bar of reason" (p. 15). Also it requires more than the usual amount of intelligencé to find through the author's own views on evolution. On page 307 the author states: "We think that the simple Bible way is the most rational—that in six days or periods (*sic?*) God created and unfolded the universe to its present condition." Also the writer denounces the use of the word "evolution," since it has come to have "an indeterminate and overelastie use." (p. 302.) For "evolution" the word "development" is suggested, plus "creation" and "miracle." However, "Let the word 'development' stand to describe all the *gradual* processes that the divine Being employs in *carrying forward the movement of the creation.*" (Italics our own.) We ask, Which are the gradual processes that carry forward the movement of the creation? Again: "The word 'development' has not been used like 'evolution' to describe a forward movement merely by means of *resident forces*, and therefore can include *unfolding by means of such forces*, if God wills." Again: "But if there is teleology in nature, there must be a Mind back of nature which *pushes her forward along the line of progress.*" (p. 296.) Again: "We cannot and will not deny that in the *geological ages* there was a movement from the lower to the higher stages of existence. . . . That this general law of upward movement prevailed in the remote *prehistoric past* no one would be so foolish as to deny." (p. 306.) The author throughout the chapter denies the claims of "naturalistic evolution" by means of "resident forces" as unreasonable. Yet, while he, too, denounces the term "theistic evolution" as a contradiction, he states, "No one will deny that in *prehistoric times* there is evidence in both the Bible and science that the world *was being prepared progressively.*" (p. 306.) Is not this the precise view of mediating scholars who employ the term "theistic evolution"? Ought a brave, stalwart, and competent defender of the evangelical faith write such sentences and make such concessions in the very act of "defending the faith"?

However, while taking issue with the author on these points, the general and enthusiastic recommendations accorded Dr. Keyser's new

volume are well deserved. For pastors, teachers, and educated laymen who wish to acquaint themselves with the maneuvers of destructive critics, and who are looking for a straight, unqualified, and convincing refutation of their claims, the book in general will prove very serviceable. The almost universal dissemination of liberal views by means of dailies, periodicals, and other agencies of the press demands that at least those who teach the faith should know what insidious onslaughts are made by latitudinarian assailants, and they will thank the author for having given them so timely and needful a help.

MUELLER.

The Macmillan Company, New York:—

Theology as an Empirical Science. *Douglas Clyde Macintosh, Ph. D.*
270 pages.

The Dwight Professor of Theology in Yale University attempts in this volume to dislocate theology from its isolated position in the domain of human knowledge, to contribute towards the fulfilment of the hope of William James that empiricism associated with religion will begin a new era of religion, and to produce a theology that would win the approbation of Huxley because it "rests upon valid evidence and sound reasoning." His theological empiricist is "free from any bondage to external traditional authority." The crucial problems for a scientific theology which he seeks to solve are the following:—

(1) Is there *religious perception*, or something in the religious realm corresponding to perception, *viz.*, cognition of the divine as revealed within the field of human experience? (2) Is it possible to formulate, on this basis of the data made available in religious experience, *theological laws*, or generalizations as to what the Divine Being does on the fulfilment of certain discoverable conditions? (3) Can *theological theory* be constructed in a scientific manner upon the basis of these laws?

The process will develop as follows:—

The definitions with which an empirical science begins are very different from those which enter into abstract, deductive sciences. In the abstract or hypothetical sciences the definitions are complete from the beginning, and must be held unchanged throughout the whole process of deduction. The definitions in geometry, for example, are of this sort. In the empirical or inductive sciences, however, it is different. These proceed "from the vague whole to the definite whole." They construct their definitions *a posteriori*. The initial definitions are merely formal and provisional; they must be sufficient simply to mark off from all other objects the particular objects to be investigated, and it is the central aim of the science to learn from experience what further content to put within these preliminary formal definitions. Thus chemistry's initial definition of matter, biology's initial definition of life, psychology's initial definition of mind or consciousness, and sociology's initial definition of society need only be sufficiently explicit for the identification of the objects to be studied. The definition grows as the science proceeds; detailed knowledge of the object is the end, not the beginning, of the science. And it is not different in empirical theology. Here the most important definition is that of God. The science should begin with some formal definition of God, as the ultimate Object of religious dependence, or the Source of religious deliverance. Then it must proceed to find out from religious experience more particularly just what attributes and relations can be ascribed to that religious Object.

In addition, theology as an empirical science will assume, or presuppose, "as a working hypothesis to be tested by experiment and observation,"

anything of which man already has practical certainty, *e. g.*, 1. in general, the laws of thought and the assumptions common to all scientific investigations of an empirical sort, embracing also the pertinent and well-established results of other empirical sciences; 2. in particular, human free agency, the possibility of immortality, the fact of sin; 3. the element peculiar to theology: the existence of God. As a specimen of the operation of empiricism in theology we may take the concept of guilt.

Defining intention as the idea of all the consequences expected to follow from the act, and consented to, whether willingly or reluctantly, in deciding to perform it, it is easily seen that, other things being equal, guilt for a wrong action varies directly as the evil intention (EI) and inversely as the good intention (GI). Motive being the idea of the expected consequence for the sake of which the act is decided upon, guilt is seen to vary again directly as the evil motive (EM) and inversely as the good motive (GM). "Good" and "evil" in these instances are determined, of course, by means of the idea of the greatest possible genuine good, or well-being, of all persons. Sometimes there is little actual foresight of consequences, but if the action is wrong, the guilt varies directly as the possible foresight (PF), and also directly as the signs of the desirability (SD) of gaining further knowledge of consequences. In these two factors are included both the accessibility of the facts and the native sagacity of the agent. Again, if the wrong act is committed against good instincts (gi), or inherited impulses, the guilt is greater; if in accord with evil instincts (ei), it is, other things being equal, less. Similarly, if the wrong act is committed in opposition to the good mores (gm), or customary morality of the community, the doer is the more guilty on that account; if in harmony with the evil mores (em), he is the less guilty. Again, if the wrong deed is committed against good habits unconsciously formed (GHU), the guilt is greater; if in accord with evil habits unconsciously formed (EHU), it is less. But if committed in accord with evil habits consciously formed (EHC), or against good habits consciously formed (GHC), the case is somewhat ambiguous. Because he acts according to habit, he seems less guilty; but, because the habit was consciously formed, more guilty if the habit was bad, and deserving credit in the light of the past if the habit was good. The solution of the problem is found in deciding whether to judge the single *act*, or, as is now approved in scientific penology, to judge the *man* for this act, but in the light of his whole relevant record. In the former case, *i. e.*, judging the single act, we should have to say that the guilt was greater, according as there was a good habit, making it easier to avoid the wrong act; or that the guilt was less, according as there was an evil habit, making it hard to avoid the evil act. But in judging the man in the act instead of the act in its isolation we should have to say that the guilt was greater in view of the underlying evil habit having been consciously formed, but that it would have been less if it had taken place in spite of habitual good action in this connection in the past. There remains the social factor, or temptation, to be considered. Using the term broadly, so as to include social pressure, or temptation, toward good as well as toward evil, we should have to make the following distinctions: the guilt is greater according as the wrong act is committed against temptation toward good, if this social influence came unsought (GTU); but less, if in accord with temptation to evil, coming unsought (ETU). Again, having sought temptation to evil (ETS), leaves the man, judged for the act, but in the light of its antecedents, the more guilty; while having sought temptation to good (GTS) leaves the man, in view of his record, the less guilty. But if it be insisted that the final wrong act alone be judged in its isolation, we may say that the *additional* guilt incurred by one who yields to a temptation which he was previously induced, whether by inner or outer pressure, to seek, is less in view of this seeking. But in the case of one who commits the wrong by turning in the opposite direction to that in which he was going just before, when he was

seeking good social influences, the *additional* guilt incurred by the final act is greater by reason of this sudden lapse from good.

The results of our analysis of the chief factors that enter into guilt, or responsibility for wrong conduct, may then be set forth in the two following diagrams, the former of which represents the judgment to be passed upon the isolated wrong act, and the latter that to be passed upon the man as a whole, in view of this last wrong action. The numerator of the fraction represents in each case the factors according to which the guilt varies directly, and the denominator the factors according to which it varies inversely.

- $$(1) \frac{(EI) \cdot (EM) \cdot (PF) \cdot (SD) \cdot (gi) \cdot (gm) \cdot (GHU) \cdot (GIIC) \cdot (GTU) \cdot (GTS)}{(GI) \cdot (GM)} \quad \frac{(ei) \cdot (cm) \cdot (EHU) \cdot (EHC) \cdot (ETU) \cdot (ETS)}{(EI) \cdot (EM) \cdot (PF) \cdot (SD) \cdot (gi) \cdot (gm) \cdot (GHU) \cdot (EHC) \cdot (GTU) \cdot (ETS)}$$
- $$(2) \frac{(EI) \cdot (EM) \cdot (PF) \cdot (SD) \cdot (gi) \cdot (gm) \cdot (GHU) \cdot (EHC) \cdot (GTU) \cdot (ETS)}{(GI) \cdot (GM)} \quad \frac{(ei) \cdot (cm) \cdot (EHU) \cdot (GHC) \cdot (ETU) \cdot (GTS)}{(EI) \cdot (EM) \cdot (PF) \cdot (SD) \cdot (gi) \cdot (gm) \cdot (GHU) \cdot (EHC) \cdot (GTU) \cdot (ETS)}$$

The author has related his studies to such scientific theologians as Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Nietzsche, Kaftan, Wobbermin. His book shows plainly the unbridgeable gulf between the theology which starts with the *a priori* belief in the Bible as God's Word and makes its parole: *Ne ultra Scripturam!* and empiricism.

D.

A Reel of Rainbow. By F. W. Borcham. The Abingdon Press, Cincinnati, O. 207 pp., 5×7½. Price, \$1.75.

The eighteen essays of Rev. Borcham contained in this volume maintain the author's reputation for original and epigrammatic treatment of topics related to every-day life. Slight, gauze-like in texture, the beauty and richness of treatment carry the reader along, charming him with their exquisite style and their continual surprises in the way of application and illustration. Relying upon the reputation of the writer, the publishers have set an exorbitant price upon the book.

GRAEBNER.

The Religion of Judah. By John Bayne Ascham. The Abingdon Press, Cincinnati, O. 296 pp., 5×7½. Price, \$1.50; postage, 10 cts. extra.

What we remarked about the companion volume to this work, *The Religion of Israel*, applies to *The Religion of Judah*. It is a popularization of the results of negative Higher Criticism, intended for use in Bible Study classes. In spite of all that has been written in demonstration of the fallacies of the "documentary" hypothesis by Hommel, James Robertson, Cave, Urquhart, Sayce, the authors of *Lex Mosaica*, Redpath, Green, Hilprecht, Clay, Warfield, Robt. D. Wilson, Wiener, Bartlett, McGarvey, Orr, and many more, the late origin of Deuteronomy and of much else in the Mosaic legislation, of the Book of Daniel, of "Deutero-Isaiah," etc., are taken for granted, and the entire treatment of the subject matter rests upon an acceptance of the naturalistic reconstruction of the Old Testament books and teachings. All references for collateral reading are to critical works of the extreme negative school. A disheartening and destructive book, which calls to mind the words Is. 29, 16: "Surely your turning things upside down shall be esteemed as the potter's clay!"

GRAEBNER.

A Religious Revolution and Its Consequences. By John Horsch. Fundamental Truth Depot, Scottdale, Pa. 16 pp., 5¼×7¼. Price, 15 cts.

This is the first number in a series of pamphlets designed to give information concerning modern liberalism or the "new theology," more particu-

larly, to set forth the destructive tendencies and unreasonableness of the modern religious liberalism. The number before us gives promise of a valuable series. We hope that in the forthcoming numbers the author will continue to give volume and page for his quotations from the infidels who now are speaking for a great part of the Christian Church. The entire series of 21 numbers, treating such subjects as Inspiration, the Deity of Christ, the Social Gospel, Immortality, Evolutionism, will be sold to ministers direct for \$2.45.

GRAEBNER.

Edwin Runge, Berlin-Lichterfelde, Germany: —

Christliche Glaubenslehre. Von Ludwig Lemme. 2 vols. VI and 375, and IV and 343 pages; paper cover. M. 46.

Noting the existing "dogmatic confusion," which is worse than any that has occurred at any previous time, and is caused by the tension between the psychological and rational elements in the Christian religion, on the one hand, and the historical elements, on the other, the author designates the position occupied by himself in the dogmatic Babel: "Never have I adhered to any one school or regarded myself as belonging to one. However, no person can avoid a historic connection. And if this continuity is asked for in my instance, the names of J. A. Dorner and H. Martensen define the line which I am conscious of continuing, because I regard as indispensable for dogmatics the connection of the empiricism of faith and speculation represented by these two men, who were equally prominent in a religio-ethical and a scientific respect. I am, indeed, of the opinion that (under the influence of the idealistic philosophy, especially of Schelling) both were in error in telescoping both tasks (the ethico-religious and the scientific), and thus assigning to speculation a preponderating importance which does not belong to it. In the clear division of the two, both in dogmatics and apologetics, I behold the necessary systematic progress which must be achieved if elements of Christian theology that cannot be surrendered are not to be exposed to the danger of dying or at least of withering. In this respect I know myself to be of a kindred mind — though in an entirely independent manner — with Richard Rothe, who not only secured independence to practical religiousness over and against all dogmatism, but also demanded home rights in theology for speculation which cannot be abandoned at all as long as there are speculative dogmas. However, owing to his dependence upon Hegel's philosophy, he was on a wrong path in assigning to the speculative task the first place in the organism of the theological disciplines, and thereby placing theology in a false dependence upon metaphysical thought-operations. The first place belongs to the great reality of historical Christianity, as it gains religious form in the experience of faith; only in a secondary respect, and starting from this religious basis, the task of the thinker is directed to the end of certifying the absolutism of Christianity by proving the truth of the Christian conviction of faith. For, although I esteem philosophy highly, I champion decidedly the complete independence of theology from philosophy. Passing over Hofmann, who was under the strong influence of Schelling and the still stronger influence of Hegel, the Erlangen theology has endeavored to keep itself free from philosophical influences. It took over

from Schleiermacher the principle of the experience of faith, and made an attempt to work into it the speculative dogma, which, by virtue of this principle of Schleiermacher, was, and had to be, excluded. An impossible attempt!" etc. This self-characterization may not be very illuminating to us. (We ask forgiveness for our conceit, if we say it sounds better in English than in the original German.) The test of the author's dogmatic quality comes to us when we see his standpoint on distinct teachings, and as Lutherans we are interested to know how he relates himself to Luther and the Lutheran dogmaticians after Luther. To note this last relation first, the author asserts for Luther a far greater influence on systematic theology than he is usually credited with; justifying faith was with Luther the determining principle for all doctrines and the light in which they must be studied. But this, we are told, does not mean that in Luther's view everything sprang from justifying faith. Luther was standing on a basis of traditionalism rather than of justifying faith; he cast off such parts of tradition as contradicted his own religious experience and seemed to him contrary to reason. (p. 65.) Melancthon the author regards as an inferior dogmatician, because by the type of doctrine which he offered in the later editions of his *Loci* he led the way in making out of Lutheran Protestantism a didactic pastors' church (*eine lehrhafte Pastorenkirche*), and because he was intolerant, declaring even slight deviations in doctrine as hazards to salvation. (p. 66 f.) In the Era of Orthodoxy the author admires the exact learning and the intellectual feats of the dogmaticians, but scores the intellectualistic stubbornness shown in the fanatical insistence on doctrinal definitions of men like Calov. (p. 74.) We note a few doctrinal judgments of the author: "The doctrine of the verbal inspiration, that is, of the theory that the real author of the Holy Scriptures (*auctor primarius*) is the Holy Spirit (resp., the Triune God), while the writers (*amanuenses, tabelliones, notarii*) were, so to speak, merely the pens (*calami Spiritus S.*), has from a scientific standpoint been dispatched (*abgetan*) long ago: as equally contradictory to the doctrine of God and to psychology." (II, 148.) "The positive value of the doctrine of the two natures [in Christ] lies in the fact that by means of it there is guarded in Christology what is indispensable for maintaining salvation, *viz.*, that in Jesus Christ there must be a content essentially divine if He is to elevate men to a holy spirit-life, and that Jesus Christ must be true man in order to be of any value or benefit to men." (I, 346.) "A juridical *anti hemon*, such as the theory of the satisfaction and the doctrine of the substitutive punitive suffering [of Christ], is unknown to the New Testament, according to which Christ has done all and suffered all *hyper hemon*, hence, for our benefit. As regards the idea that Christ died in our place so that we do not have to die any more, the New Testament teaches the very opposite, namely, that in the death of Christ the death of all who believe in Him is included (2 Cor. 5, 14. 15)." (II, 25.) Lack of space forbids further notices. Throughout his treatise the author notes the Latin terminology of the old dogmaticians, and the extent of his reading is immense. He will have to be classified with the modernists, who still have a strong leaning, as they imagine, to positivism, though they have broken with the old orthodox theories, *e. g.*, of Philippi (cp. II, 25). D.