

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. I.

AUGUST—SEPTEMBER, 1921.

Nos. 8 & 9.

The Vatican and Diplomatic Relationships.

PROF. TH. GRAEBNER, St. Louis, Mo.

There are at present thirty-one countries represented by embassies and legations at the Vatican, and the *New World* (Chicago, Roman Catholic) boasts that "the diplomatic influence of the Holy See is the greatest in the history of the Church"—a statement which can only refer to the extension of these diplomatic relationships and not to the exercise of actual temporal power involved. However, it must be conceded that the Curia has scored heavily during the political upheavals consequent upon the war. When France renews relations with the Vatican, — as now seems certain, — Italy alone, of all the principal countries of Europe, will be without a representative accredited to the Papal Court. A Catholic News Service dispatch of April 1 says:—

"The Vatican is in diplomatic relations not only with all of the great Catholic countries and most of the principal Protestant states of Europe, but has established at least semiofficial intercourse with Turkey, Japan, and China. All of the states which have arisen since the war — Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, and Jugo-Slavia — have exchanged diplomatic representatives with the Holy See. Every country in South America, most of the Central American republics, and Haiti and San Domingo have legations at the Vatican. Canada is represented by Great Britain, whose temporary representative has been made permanent."

The British envoy was sent to the Vatican five years ago on a mission which was intended to be "strictly temporary," its object being "to congratulate the Pope on his election [!] and to keep him informed respecting British policy during the war," as the press announcements read at the time. When no longer needed for this purpose, the representation was to come to an end. But it is two years and a half since the war ended, and the envoy is still at

BOOK REVIEW.

Mission Studies. *Edward Pfeiffer, D. D.* Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O. 469 pp., 5½×8. Third, revised and enlarged edition. \$2.50. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Professor Pfeiffer of Capital University (Ohio Synod) at Columbus offers valuable material to the student of missions, as can readily be seen from the table of contents: I. The Historical Background of the Missionary Enterprise; II. Missionary Principles in General, with Particular Application to Foreign Missions; III. Home and Inner Mission-work; IV. The Nurture of Missionary Life in the Home Church. In two appendices he

gives outlines of courses for mission study classes and reading circles, and a bibliography. We do not hesitate to say that the reading of Prof. Pfeiffer's book will be well worth the money and the time spent on it.

FRITZ.

A Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible, with Introduction to Old Testament Literature, a Pronouncing Dictionary of Scripture Proper Names, Tables of Weights and Measures, and an Index to the Entire Bible. *Rev. Robert Jamieson, D. D., Rev. A. R. Fausset, A. M., Rev. David Brown, D. D.* 1370 pages, large octavo. (George H. Doran Co., New York.) \$7.50. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The popular demand, apparently growing, for one-volume commentaries on the whole Bible has so far been supplied for English readers exclusively by British scholars of the Reformed type of theology, or of the modern school of negative Bible criticism. *Peake's Commentary* is the most radical in this class; *Dummelow's* is more conservative; and the present *J. F. & B.'s Commentary* is advertised as "a standard evangelical work." In its present form it is evidently a reprint, and the blurred and defective typography in places indicate that old plates have been used. Some of our readers probably remember this commentary in its original four-volume edition, for which Jamieson, of St. Paul's, Glasgow, Scotland, had treated Genesis to Esther; Fausset, of St. Cuthbert's, York, England, Job to Malachi; Brown, Professor of Theology at Aberdeen, Scotland, Matthew to Romans; and Fausset again, Corinthians to Revelation. This four-volume edition had such an immense sale that "the plates became literally worn out from the printing of so many editions." A later print in two large octavo volumes ran through many editions. "Now these two volumes have been combined in one by the employment of a very thin, but good quality of paper." The *J. F. & B. Commentary*, then, is not, like *Dummelow's* and *Peake's*, an entirely new work, written to meet present needs. Moreover, its composite authorship does not give it the absolute uniformity of its two British companion publications. However, this feature is the least disturbing of all in this book, as there exists a remarkable unity of sentiment and method among the three authors.

Nearly one-half of this commentary is devoted to the exposition of the New Testament (605 pages, to 726 for the Old Testament). The partiality thus shown for the New Testament has the best of reasons to commend it, and will be generally approved. In the Old Testament the treatment given to the Psalms (43 pages) is out of proportion to that given to Job (36 pages). 76 pages have been devoted to Isaiah, 60 to Jeremiah (including Lamentations), 52 to Ezekiel, and 28 to Daniel. All the minor prophets are treated on less than 100 pages.—In the New Testament there are 59 pages devoted to Matthew, 30 to Mark, 32 to Luke, 44 to John, 46 to Acts, 38 to Romans, 58 to Corinthians, 16 to Galatians, 17 to Ephesians, 9 to Philippians, 12 to Colossians, 15 to Thessalonians, 32 to the pastoral epistles, 1½ to Philemon, 42 to Hebrews, 11 to James, 24 to Peter, 14 to John, 4 to Jude, and 57 (!) to Revelation. This enumeration is no attempt to measure intellectual and spiritual values by mechanical units, but it is to enable our readers to form some opinion of the distribution of explana-

tory matter in this book, and relate that to their own experience of the amount of comment needed in specific instances. In a book of this kind space is an essential matter, and disproportion in this respect has the same effect as a false emphasis in speech.

Special pains have been taken with the introductory material, 32 pages of which have been devoted to the Old Testament, and 40 to the New. In the Old Testament section there are introductory articles given at the beginning of the volume to the Pentateuch and the historical books, to the poetical books, to the prophetic books, and to the prophets of the Restoration. Besides these, there are special introductions for each book from Job to Malachi. In the New Testament each book is given a special introduction. These 72 pages of introductions are an *isagogics in nuce*; they are marvels of condensation, each article packed full of facts, and pressed down. We note some of the judgments expressed: "The Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch is established by the concurring voices both of Jewish and Christian tradition; and their unanimous testimony is supported by the internal character and statements of the work itself. . . . But admitting that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, an important question arises as to whether the books which compose it have reached us in an authentic form; whether they exist genuine and entire as they came from the hand of their author. In answer to this question, it might be sufficient to state that, in the public and periodical rehearsals of the Law in the solemn religious assemblies of the people, implying the existence of numerous copies, provision was made for preserving the integrity of 'The Book of the Law.' But besides this, two remarkable facts, the one of which occurred before and the other after the captivity, afford conclusive evidence of the genuineness and authenticity of the Pentateuch. The first is the discovery in the reign of Josiah of the autograph copy which was deposited by Moses in the ark of the testimony, and the second is the schism of the Samaritans, who erected a temple on Mount Gerizim, and who, appealing to the Mosaic Law as the standard of their faith and worship equally with the Jews, watched with jealous care over every circumstance that could affect the purity of the Mosaic records. There is the strongest reason, then, for believing that the Pentateuch, as it exists now, is substantially the same as it came from the hands of Moses. The appearance of a later hand, it is true, is traceable in the narrative of the death of Moses at the close of Deuteronomy, and some few interpolations, such as inserting the altered names of places, may have been made by Ezra, who revised and corrected the version of the ancient Scriptures. But substantially the Pentateuch is the genuine work of Moses, and many who once impugned its claims to that character, and looked upon it as the production of a later age, have found themselves compelled, after a full and unprejudiced investigation of the subject, to proclaim their conviction that its authenticity is to be fully relied on. — The genuineness and authenticity of the Pentateuch being admitted, the inspiration and canonical authority of the work follow as a necessary consequence." (p. 5 f.) This is quite satisfactory; but it is necessary to examine at once what, in the view of the authors, constitutes inspiration. We turn to 2 Tim. 3, 16: "ALL SCRIPTURE — *Greek*, 'Every Scripture,' *i. e.*, Scripture in its every part. However, *English Version* is sustained, though the Greek article be wanting, by the

technical use of the term 'Scripture' being so notorious as not to need the article (cf. *Greek*, Eph. 3, 15; 2, 21). The *Greek* is never used of *writings* in general, but only of the sacred Scriptures. The position of the two *Greek* adjectives closely united by 'and,' forbids our taking the one as an epithet, the other as predicated and *translated* as ALFORD and ELLICOTT, 'Every Scripture given by inspiration of God is *also* profitable.' *Vulgate*, in the best MSS., favors *English Version*. Clearly the adjectives are so closely connected that as surely as one is a predicate, the other must be so too. ALFORD admits his *translation* to be harsh, though legitimate. It is better with *English Version* to take it in a construction legitimate, and at the same time *not harsh*. The *Greek* 'God-inspired' is found nowhere else. Most of the New Testament books were written when Paul wrote this his latest Epistle: so he includes in the clause, 'All Scripture is God-inspired,' not only the *Old Testament*, in which alone Timothy was taught when a child (v. 15), but the New Testament books according as they were recognized in the churches which had men gifted with 'discerning of spirits,' and so able to distinguish really inspired utterances, persons, and so their writings, from spurious. St. Paul means 'All Scripture is God-inspired *and therefore useful*'; because *we* see no utility in any words or portion of it, it does not follow that it is not God-inspired. It is *useful* because *God-inspired*, not *God-inspired* because useful. One reason for the article not being before the *Greek*, 'Scripture,' may be that, if it had, it might be supposed that it limited the sense to the *hiera grammata*, 'Holy Scriptures' (v. 15), of the *Old Testament*, whereas here the assertion is more general: 'all Scripture' (cf. *Greek*, 2 Pet. 1, 20). The *translation*, 'all Scripture that is God-inspired is also useful,' would imply that there is some *Scripture* which is not God-inspired. But this would exclude the appropriated sense of the word 'Scripture'; and who would need to be told that 'all divine Scripture is *useful*' ('profitable')? Heb. 4, 13 would, in ALFORD'S view, have to be rendered, 'All naked things are *also* open to the eyes of Him,' etc.: so also 1 Tim. 4, 4, which would be absurd. KNAPP well defines inspiration, 'An extraordinary divine agency upon teachers whilst giving instruction, whether oral or written, by which they were taught how and what they should speak or write' (cf. 2 Sam. 23, 1; Acts 4, 25; 2 Pet. 1, 21). The *inspiration* gives the divine *sanction* to all the words of Scripture, though those words be the utterances of the individual writer, and only in special cases *revealed* directly by God (1 Cor. 2, 13). *Inspiration* is here predicated of the *writings*, 'all Scripture,' not of the persons. The question is not *how* God has done it; it is as to the *word*, not the men who wrote it. What we must believe is that He *has* done it, and that all the sacred writings are everywhere inspired, though not all alike matter of special *revelation*; and that even the very *words* are stamped with Divine sanction, as Jesus used them (*ex. gr.*, in the temptation, and John 10, 34. 35) for deciding all questions of doctrine and practise. There are degrees of *revelation* in Scripture, but not of *inspiration*. The sacred writers did not even always know the full significance of their own God-inspired words (1 Pet. 1, 10—12). Verbal inspiration does not mean mechanical dictation, but 'all Scripture is (so) inspired by God,' that everything in it, its narratives, prophecies, citations, the whole — ideas, phrases, and words — are such as He saw fit to be there.

The *present condition* of the text is no ground for concluding against the *original text* being inspired, but is a reason why we should use all critical diligence to restore the original inspired text. Again, inspiration may be accompanied by revelation or not, but it is as much needed for writing *known* doctrines or facts authoritatively as for communicating *new* truths. [TREGELLES.] The omission here of the substantive verb is, I think, designed to mark that not only the Scripture *then* existing, but what was *still to be written till the canon should be completed*, is included as *God-inspired*." (p. 427.) This quotation, which serves at the same time as a fair sample of the form and quality of the comment, is so far superior to what one reads nowadays on this subject that one is inclined to condone the defects, such as the lack of distinction in Knapp's definition between inspiration as it applies to the spoken discourse and in their capacity as writers of God's Word, also the authors' dread of the much-travestied "dictation theory," and the omission of any remark on the *impulsus scribendi*.

The Christological standpoint of the authors can be fairly seen in their remarks on Phil. 2, 7: "MADE HIMSELF OF NO REPUTATION, AND . . . AND — rather as the *Greek*, 'Emptied Himself, taking upon Him the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.' The two latter clauses (there being no conjunctions, 'and — and,' in the *Greek*) expresses in what Christ's 'emptying of Himself' consists, *viz.*, in 'taking the form of a servant' (*note*, Heb. 10, 5; cf. Ex. 21, 5. 6 and Ps. 40, 6, proving that it was at the time when He assumed a *body*, He took 'the form of a servant'), and in order to explain *how* He took 'the form of a servant,' there is added, by 'being made in the likeness of men.' His subjection to the Law (Luke 2, 21; Gal. 4, 4) and to His parents (Luke 2, 51), His low state as a carpenter, and carpenter's reputed son (Matt. 13, 55; Mark 6, 3), His betrayal for the price of a bond-servant (Ex. 21, 32), and slavlike death to relieve us from the slavery of sin and death; finally and chiefly, *His servantlike dependence as man on God*, whilst His divinity was not outwardly manifested (Is. 49, 37), are all marks of His 'form as a servant.' This proves (1) He was in the form of a servant as soon as He was made man. (2) He was 'in the form of God' before He was 'in the form of a servant.' (3) He did as really subsist in the divine nature as in the form of a servant or in the nature of man. For He was as much 'in the form of God' as 'in the form of a servant'; and was so in the form of God as 'to be on an equality with God': He therefore could have been none other than God; for God saith, "To whom will ye liken Me and make Me equal" (Is. 46, 5)? [BISHOP PEARSON.] His *emptying Himself* presupposes His previous *plenitude of Godhead* (John 1, 14; Col. 1, 19; 2, 9). He remained full of this; yet He bore Himself as if He were *empty*." (p. 363.) This again is a quite satisfactory statement on the *kenosis*, except that one might wish to see it stated that while the incarnation and the humiliation coincide in point of time, they are not identical. Altogether one finds in this one-volume commentary so much gratifying, reliable, correct interpretation, tersely and succinctly expressed, that for quick use this volume is the best commentary for Christians that still occupy the old conservative orthodox position in matters of faith. As regards condensation of valuable information, the authors are very masters. — To add a few strictures to our foregoing remarks is all the more necessary

because of the generally trustworthy comments of the authors. Their remarks on the water-spirit baptism in John 3, 6 are weak. On John 6, on the sermon at the synagog at Capernaum, there occurs this remark: "(It should be added that although this discourse has nothing to do with the Sacrament of the Supper, the Sacrament has everything to do with it, as the *visible embodiment* of these figures, and, to the believing partaker, a *real*, yea, and the most lively and affecting participation of His flesh and blood, and nourishment thereby of the spiritual and eternal life, here below.)" (p. 140.) To the Reformed this statement is not satisfactory, but neither does the Lutheran see his way clear to endorse it because of the vagueness of the relation still assumed between this discourse of the Lord and the Sacrament of the Supper. In Col. 2, 16 the authors take a stand against the abrogation of the Old Testament Sabbath. (p. 378.) In Rev. 20 a reign of "Christ with His transfigured saints over men in the flesh" is taught, and the term "souls" in v. 5 is misinterpreted.— In conclusion, we note that the "Index to the Entire Bible," which is promised in the title of this book, is a sad misnomer. The "Index" is nothing but a running table of contents, — or has the "Index" been omitted?

D.

Personal Evangelism among Students. *George Stewart, Jr., and Henry B. Wright.* Association Press, 347 Madison Ave., New York. 79 pp., 6½×4½. \$1.00.

This booklet deals with the problem of the student, to whom, in a specific sense, may be applied Henry van Dyke's description of the boy, "our hardest problem and our brightest hope." The authors have in mind, not any special class of students, but all students. They mean to be helpful to these in an evangelical way. Members of college and university faculties will find some facts worth considering and some hints worth heeding in this booklet.

Speaking of academic freedom without supervision, the authors rightly say: "If students are left to themselves, the results are apt to be disastrous in the extreme. To allow men the enjoyment of new privileges with no understanding of their proper use is a hazardous experiment. The student, only recently freed from supervision [of the preparatory school], drinks long and deep of the new freedom, which he is too apt to regard as a right and not a responsibility." While the young men who are attending colleges and universities should not be treated as if they were still boys attending an elementary school, yet the very fact that they are students, who are to be trained by their instructors, demands that they should not be without supervision and guidance. "They yield with the certainty of gravitation to personal influence." In the hour of liberty heading towards license, there is but one form of guidance which students will accept. But this, if it be genuine, they rarely refuse. It is the contagion of another's personality working through the processes of friendship." "A class of students is essentially what its teachers and leaders are." Instructors and leaders in education should be able to say with Paul, the authors tell us: "Be ye imitators of me, even as I also am of Christ."

Many a young man has gone through a college or a university and has, to his own regret in later years, learned comparatively little because he did

not make use of the opportunities which were given him. Therefore it is well to be reminded that "hard, honest, consistent study is essential to the building of the best type of character on our school and college campuses. We fail to accomplish the task of propagating genuine Christianity as long as we justify habitual unfaithfulness in the main business of schools and colleges, namely, preparation for the classroom exercises."

Speaking of group consciousness, the authors say: "In contrast to individualism, students possess a gregariousness, a group consciousness, which one must also take into account. The power of tradition" — we speak of it as *usus* — "is upon nearly every one. Bad traditions are established as easily as good ones. In four years, a college generation, a bad tradition can be formed, and in nearly the same length of time a good tradition can become atrophied. One who would understand the life of a given college or school will do well to search into these inarticulate, informal, unconscious influences that exist in the *mores*. These are the principal governing factors. To sow ideas that take root in a college body and grow into tradition that makes for fairness and decency and justice on the campus, is one of the greatest contributions which one can make to the student life of to-day."

Any school is what its teacher makes of it. "The teacher is ultimately responsible for the final product of a school or college." "Let any one who is placed in a position of spiritual leadership examine himself, for his work will rarely result in anything higher than his own spiritual level."

FRTZ.

The Vacation Religious Day-School. Teacher's Manual of Principles and Programs. *Hazel Straight Stafford*. The Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Ave., New York. 160 pp., 8×5½. \$1.00; by mail, \$1.10.

In an editorial note printed in this book we are told that "back of the rapidly increasing popularity of the idea of the daily vacation school of religion are the convictions that — First: The Sunday-schools, because of their many limitations, cannot carry the full responsibility for the religious training of the children and youth of America. In addition to their highly important work there will be required a substantial program of week-day religious instruction. Secondly: The responsibility for this week-day religious instruction cannot rest upon the public school boards, but it does rest upon the churches of the community. Thirdly: In view of the constitutional provision for the separation of Church and State and of the guarantee of religious freedom to all, week-day religious instruction must be conducted, necessarily, upon a voluntary basis and without the use of public funds."

Very true. But why have these schools for week-day religious instruction periods only during vacation? It is better, of course, than to be satisfied merely with a Sunday-school. But, after all, can the Church supply the religious needs of the children with the Sunday-school plus the vacation religious day-school? Our Church has long ago answered this question by establishing its parochial schools, in which, besides the usual branches of learning which are taught in the public school, the Christian religion is daily taught throughout the whole school-year. Even Mrs. Stafford says that the vacation religious day-school, for which she has written her book,

"does not claim to be a panacea for all religious ills, neither the last word in religious education."

While we heartily agree both with the editor and with the author of the book that week-day religious instruction is a necessity, we cannot agree with them that the purpose of religious day-schools should be "*to instruct the children in fundamental religious values common to all denominations,*" nor can we agree that "if religious training is to be universal for our country, it must be organized and maintained *by all the churches acting together.*" With such a purpose in view, however, Mrs. Stafford has written her book of principles and programs for a vacation religious day-school. Mrs. Stafford proposes that a religion be taught which will satisfy the members of the various Protestant churches in a community. What kind of religion she has in mind we can learn from such a remark as this: "Care should be taken by the teacher to paint a vivid, attractive picture of Christ, the man hero, which will inspire the class with a new zeal to study His life. *Christ as a 'Man of Sorrows' does not appeal to young folk.* [Italics our own.] Christ as a 'Humorist,' 'Story-teller,' 'The Alert,' 'The Observer,' 'The Scourger,' makes a tremendous appeal." (p. 126.) We admit that Christ as the "Man of Sorrows" does not appeal to young folk nor to old folk, but the crucified Savior is *needed* by both young and old, for without Him there can be no salvation. A religion which leaves out Christ, the "Man of Sorrows," leaves out the very heart of the Christian religion and ceases to be the religion which alone can save man from sin, death, and hell. Mrs. Stafford's vacation-school religion is also characterized when, in her "Synthetic Survey of Biblical Material," p. 157, she classifies the story of the creation, of Adam and Eve, of the Garden of Eden, of Cain and Abel, of Noah, the ark, and the Flood as belonging to that period which she calls "the prehistoric period of legendary age."

In the preface Mrs. Stafford tells us that the establishment of an effective religious day-school for children was some years ago "a difficult work since the principle of interdenominational cooperation had not yet been concluded by the churches, and the idea of week-day religious instruction was deemed unnecessary, if not heretical." Now evidently the conditions have changed; the churches are beginning to admit that the children need more religious instruction than has until now been given them in the Sunday-school; but at the same time the sectarian churches have resorted to interdenominational cooperation, because they have become doctrinally indifferent and in not a few instances have cast to the winds, as far as they are concerned, the very fundamentals of Christianity. The latter condition is a very serious one, and we are sorry that an effort to give more religious instruction to the youth of the land, which in itself is laudable, is put into the service of a religion which is headed toward Unitarianism, if it has not already become such. The poor children who are to be brought up in the atmosphere of such a devitalized religion are to be pitied.

Daily lesson outlines are given in the book covering eight years of common school work and three years of high school work. FRITZ.