

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XVII.

APRIL, 1913.

No. 2.

Dr. GEORGE STOECKHARDT.¹⁾

I.

From the home-land of Luther two theologians have come who have prominently aided in the building up of the Lutheran Church in America in the nineteenth century. Their work has left on the particular organization with which they cast their lot an impress that will not soon be effaced, though in the onward rush of years the memory of their names and personalities may become dimmed.

Walther's work in the Missouri Synod was nearly done when Stoeckhardt arrived. Between the landing of the Stephanists and Stoeckhardt's election to the chair of Exegesis at Concordia Seminary there lies a full half century. The Missouri Synod's battle for existence among the older Lutheran bodies in America had been fought, its *raison d'être* established.

1) Born February 17, 1842, at Chemnitz, Saxony; preparatory education in a private *Lateinschule* at Tharandt; 1857—62 at *Fuerstenschule* at Meissen; 1862—66 studies theology at universities of Erlangen and Leipzig; 1866—70 tutor at Ladies' Seminary at Tharandt; 1870—71 assistant pastor at the German Lutheran Church des Billettes at Paris, and, temporarily, at the Sedan Hospital; 1871—73 private tutor in Old and New Testament Exegesis at University of Erlangen, and instructor at Gymnasium of that city; 1873—76 pastor of a state church at Planitz, near Zwickau, Saxony; 1876—78 pastor of the independent St. John's congregation of same city; 1878—1887 pastor of Holy Cross Church, St. Louis, and lecturer on Old and New Testament Exegesis at Concordia Seminary; 1887—1913 Professor of Old and New Testament Exegesis at Concordia Seminary; 1903 created Doctor of Divinity by the theological faculty of Luther Seminary, Hamline, Minn.; died January 9, 1913.

CURRENT EVENTS.

THE PORTRAIT OF DR. STOECKHARDT which accompanies this issue of the THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY as a frontispiece is the last photographic view we have of our sainted Doctor. It was taken by Schweig at St. Louis during the Easter holidays, 1912. There is another view—a three quarter pose—taken at the same time, which shows the Doctor seated in an armchair. If any of our readers should wish to obtain these photographs, Concordia Publishing House would, no doubt, endeavor to accommodate them.

PROF. WESSEL'S INSTALLMENT on the Proof-Texts had to be reserved until the next issue, on account of lack of space.

THE GENERAL SYNOD'S COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE reported at the late Convention at Washington, D. C., that it had received communications from leading men in the state-churches of Germany, to the following effect:—

“In the matter of the strivings towards Lutheran unity, *Dr. Bezzel*, the President of the Bavarian Church, writes that he is an opponent of all church union arising out of polite considerations rather than inner compulsion. Union and indifference often go together, when the union only touches the periphery and does not affect the center. ‘I rejoice, however,’ he says, ‘over all brotherly utterance and the spirit of harmony in defense of our holiest and best, in the earnestness of a really Lutheran ethics according to which each one learns his lesson and stands at his post, in order thereby to furnish the best contribution towards an effective united action which is finally to be presented by God and not man. Give the greetings of faith to our Lutheran congregations.’

“*Professor Tschackert* hopes that Lutherans in the United States may come to an understanding; that they may ‘cherish the things they hold in common, and put into the background the things they hold in distinction from one another.’ He calls for the re-presentation of the program of the seventeenth century—in essentials unity, in non-essentials charity, in all things liberty.

“‘Be assured,’ writes *Prof. Ihmels*, ‘that I follow eagerly all efforts at union among Lutherans, and I trust that there may be a *modus vivendi* in all the open questions now before the different sections of the Lutheran Church.’

“We note one distinct hope among these three different shades of men, the hope of Lutheran oneness in spiritual truth. When we come to consider the field of theology, with its lights and shadows

thrown on the Church's future, we are given a wholesome impression of life. *Dr. Theodore Kaftan* writes: 'Give greeting to Synod in such way as is proper. We live in a critical time in Germany. In reality, the question is at stake what belongs to the Evangelical Lutheran Church and what not. I hope our churches will have the grace to maintain themselves as churches of the Gospel. I do not look into the future entirely without confidence. From our university professors I hear that in the student circle there is again a more positive tendency. The positive position is firmer than the critics thought—and indispensable to Christianity. The naturalistic party seems to be receding. The alternative of the future is either the Bible Christ or no Christ. I wish a blessed progress to the business of General Synod.'

"*Professor Hauck* quotes some figures from Liberal sources, which give 53 positive and 54 non-positive professors of theology in the universities. He thinks it difficult to estimate, but holds the teaching force equally divided between Positives and Liberals. The universities exclusively critical, as Giessen, Jena, Strassburg, have relatively few students, while mixed and positive faculties have better hearings, as have Halle, Berlin, Tuebingen, Leipzig, and Erlangen. In theology the Positive movement is getting stronger. 'That time is over when it was thought a matter of science to reject as many of the New Testament writings as possible.' Critical judgment has led to more measured judgments. There is nothing by mere negation. Theology must do justice to religious facts. The difficulty lies not in theology, but in that the cultured folk has broken with Christian thought. The general literature is without the content of religion. It may be that the flood is not reached even yet. Professor Hauck says: 'Evangelical piety has no special elements from the Reformed Church, but as gained in the Bible and Smaller Catechism of Luther. Calvin is a stranger to it. Evangelical Lutheranism thereby has still its right and future, for there is to be counted one expression of the life. There is no ground for boasting, but less ground for trembling. Work is ahead. I wish the General Synod of America may be richly blest.' . . .

"*Dr. Wilhelm Hoelscher*, for many years editor of the *Allgemeine Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, says: 'The positive faith of the Church of the Augsburg Confession is so undeniably in the ascendancy that the by far greater part of the coming generation is joining the positive side. The Wellhausen school is returning to moderation, and closer union of positive professors recently organized assures their greater literary influence. All considered, we believe we may exclaim with confidence, 'Es will Fruehling werden'—'Spring is bound to come.'

To General Synod heartiest wishes, and I beg that the Lord may make you strong and efficient in Lutheran faith and confession, and a blessing to the whole Lutheran Church in America.' That letter was written on the 2d of March. Before it reached me, Dr. Hoelscher had passed to his reward, a great man of faith, full of years and honors. To him the spring had come. His warm well-wishes to us have thus special significance.

"The 'Allgemeine Lutherische Konferenz,' which is about to hold session in Uppsala, Sweden, should have the General Synod's careful attention. Bishop Von Scheele, its Swedish host; Professor Ihmels, its President, and other men of note assure its strong activity in Lutheran circles. It has a generous and true Lutheran intention and basis. Its constitutional purpose is 'the strengthening of the entire Evangelical Lutheran Church in all branches, offices, and activities, especially in representing and concerning the confessional pure teaching of the Gospel.'

"Dr. Ihmels, its President, declares, 'Our evolution is through and through of a positive nature, work and faith.'

"Secretary Huebner, of the Konferenz, insists that each member must ask himself, 'What can I, an individual, do that the Lutheran work of union may be more and more understood and furthered? What can I do that we Lutherans, true to our Confession, may close ranks in order that we may be stronger for the common tasks and problems which the necessity of the times lays upon us?' Dr. Bard insists that the Konferenz's 'highest aim is to include all who may band together about a Lutheran Confession.' There has just now appeared a leaflet entitled, 'A Confession and a Call in the Service of the Evangelical Lutheran Church,' whose aim is to urge a united Lutheranism through the Konferenz. We need to hold this great movement carefully and hopefully in mind.

"Letters have come to us telling the General Synod of the panicky effect upon the Liberals in Germany of *Dr. Rittelsmeyer's* confession of the helplessness of the modern theology in its practical efficiency, and of the glorious uprising all over Evangelical Germany against the attacks of Professor Drews, of Carlsruhe, on the personality of Jesus.

"*Pastor Jensen*, speaking of the advances of Inner Missions, notes that many pastors control a column of the Sunday papers for religious purposes, and hope to effect some good thereby. Dr. Ihmels, President of the Allgemeine Konferenz, writes further:

"'At this point I append a letter of strong interest from Prof. *M. Kaehler*, of Halle, a Nestor of German faith and evangelical fidelity. He writes:

““The sole condition of membership in the Allgemeine Evangelische Luth. Konferenz is that the applicant take his stand on the ground of the Lutheran Confession, and interest himself in the aims of our Conference. At the same time, the endeavor of the Conference is to draw into closer bonds of union the Lutherans in different lands, who recognize a bond of union among themselves in the Confession of the Church, to encourage their mutual communion, and by these very means strengthen them in the faith—and at the same time, it is desirous to contribute something towards the solving of the great Church-question of the present age, from the ground of this (Lutheran) Confession.

““All confessionally faithful Lutherans are cordially invited to the session of our Conference, which will be held there in the end of August and the beginning of September.

““What are the prospects of Positive Theology in Germany to-day? If Positive Theology is understood to be theology crediting Apostolic Christianity with the authority of revelation, *a large portion of the school of Albert Ritschl can and must be counted as positive theologians.* There are among these many who accept the critique of Wellhausen concerning the Old Testament. This critique has for two decades dominated the faculties almost exclusively, although at present some are turning away from his interpretation of Israel's history (at an earlier period Kittel in Leipzig, later Sellin in Vienna and Rostock). That Old Testament discussion, however, has made easy for many young theologians a turn to comparative religion and to a denial of any historical revelation. There is a group of theologians growing in numbers and influence; they follow the lines of work of the biblicists and confessional theologians without entirely rejecting the Biblical criticism of moderns. Three faculties (Erlangen, Rostock, Greifswald) are filled with only such men. Only in Giessen and in Jena this theology is not represented. In the four most frequented universities of Berlin, Leipzig, Tuebingen, and Halle, the positive teachers are very efficient. Here are many young theologians of the positive school teaching as sub-professors (*Privatdozenten*). Whosoever has the youth, he has the future. We have not yet lost the youth.

““A distinction has been made between those propagating the theology of the nineteenth century and those upholding ‘a modern Positive Theology,’ or ‘a modern theology of positive Christianity.’ In any case, the word positive implies historical revelation in Christ. These two parties insist on Biblical Christianity, but they emphasize the new tasks growing out of the modern movements, and the necessity of meeting modern thought and sentiment by a division and careful

presentation for the purpose of a mutual and friendly understanding. In stating these differences, we do not deal with opposing parties, but rather with shades of opinion. To-day no living man can afford to be entirely unmodern.

““The same holds true concerning comparative religion. Far from rejecting this study, Positive Theology merely rejects that phase of it which denies special revelation. The science of missions renders here valuable assistance; the work of missionaries has given us a real knowledge of the true character and essence of other religions, and thus has made comparisons possible.

““As to literature, Positive Theology is not without weekly and monthly periodicals, without learned collections and popular publications. The two works on New Testament Theology (published 1910) by Feine and by A. Schlatter (the author of a work on Dogmatics) are valuable assets of this theology in their discussion of critical theology, as well as in their original independence of historical conception and depth of historical research.

““The comprehensive Christian activities (not created or fostered by the State Church) commonly called Outer and Inner Mission, the endeavors which have been made to check the social evil, and the estrangement of the working classes from Christianity, — all these activities are carried on almost exclusively by adherents of Positive Theology in connection with its representatives in the university faculties and in the press. It is hard to believe that these efforts should be without results. In the many conferences where positive theologians work, Positive Theology does not yet show a Hippocratic face (*i. e.*, face of a dying man).

““Cause for alarm might be given by the small number of students of theology. But Positive Theology is confronted by this condition not more than its opponents. Moreover, this may be accounted for by the social conditions of Germany, and the wave movement of preference. Personally I have witnessed the high-water marks of 1860 and 1890, and the low ebb of 1880.

““Of theology and its prospects we can only speak wherever there is Christianity. Up to this time I do not at all consider the prospects of theology as bad — provided God grants His blessing. In stating this, it must be conceded that the majority of our compatriots are victims of dull indifference, and that the masses are in the clutches of Socialism. They reject any theology whatever unless it can be used to refute Christianity and all religion. Let us take courage in the thought that Christians always have conquered when in minority. You cannot include Jew and pagan in the Christian fold.

““The Berlin Congress for Free Christianity bore its name wrongly, for Jew and pagan were given equal right of speech. The name is due to the attitude of Liberal Theology towards the People's or State Church (this is different from the Chicago Congress). Its importance is slight. At present it is seriously considered whether we shall acknowledge a theology based upon individual religious sentiment and denying the value of historical Christianity. This congress makes it evident that Liberal Theology means religiosity without content, and that it has shrunk to a mood of the soul which might as well be atheistic. The liberal movement has not had the courage of forming new congregations; its historic claims are based upon the life and work of the Church of the Reformation. Compared with the Edinburgh Congress of Missions, this many-sided assemblage cannot hold its own. Rabbis and Kantian philosophers claim for liberal theology a return to Judaism. Their distinction of the Gospel of Jesus and the gospel about Jesus has no real meaning.

““To the theology of free Christianity engaging in the study of comparative religion for the sake of putting all religions on a level, the fact that, especially through the labors of Pietistic and Methodist Bible-Christianity, the nineteenth century has been a century of missions, may be opposed with strongest confidence. The evangelical missions evince the unity of Evangelical Protestantism and of the Lutheran Reformation. Its result in Edinburgh was a general agreement relative to the Pauline Gospel opposing the anti-Christian equalization of all religions. This sentiment of leveling has always been unproductive.

““Certainly an international union of any confession is of value and helpful in bringing about a union of the much-divided Protestant factions. Such combinations strengthen Positive Theology, and they are very desirable for Germans and Scandinavians. Equally desirable is an international and interconfessional union of all Biblical Protestants against militant ultramontaniam and against modern paganism, spreading rapidly over all Christianized countries.

““Halle A/S, April 11, 1911. DR. M. KAEHLER.””

“Dr. Gruetzmacher, of Rostock, a leader of the modern Positive Theology, writes as follows:

“TO THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES:

“In the unity of faith and confession, I herewith send you God-speed. In the homeland of the Reformation the conscious antagonism to Christianity continues, and especially that against the old Gospel.

This struggle grows constantly more decisive, both within and without the Church, but, on the other hand, those who wish to be positive Christians are also increasing. The need to unify the forces against this common foe grows constantly plainer, while each individual section of our Positive Christianity must maintain its own historical individuality.

“Especially does the Positive Theology make advance through the strong character of its scientific literary work, and through the independence and individuality of its thought, so that it gains an ever stronger influence. It is, indeed, true that even the opponents of Positive Christianity learn from our theological program, and, while silent about it, are often strongly influenced by it, and seek to protect themselves against extreme radicalism by its thought. Therefore, our American brothers may be assured that the faith of Luther in Germany, through the power of God, remains a mighty force in its thought and life.

“Lutheran thought still, as ever, accomplishes a great work. Yet, we, in Germany, also need the strengthening which may come to us directly from the faith and activity of the Lutheranism in America.

“The more we here in Germany discuss the possibility of a dissolution of Church and State, the more it is a comfort to us that there also in America with you Lutheranism has been able to find new forms in order to maintain and conserve the Church of the Reformation.

“We, too, will feed upon all the blessings and successes which God in His graciousness may grant you in America, and, therefore, we pray to Him that He may grant you all these things in richest measure for this convention of the General Synod.

“R. H. GRUETZMACHER, *Doctor Theologiae*,

“Prof. of Theology at the University of Rostock.

“The Day of the Ascension of Our Lord, 1911.”

TO THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTE for 1911; which has just left the government press, D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson, Professor of Natural History in University College, Dundee, has contributed an article inscribed, “Magnalia Naturae: or, The Greater Problems of Biology.” The article is a poser for evolutionists. Comparing the net results of ancient and modern biological research, the author says:—

“I do not for a moment suppose that the vast multitude of facts which Aristotle records were all, or even mostly, the fruit of his own immediate and independent observation. Before him were the Hippocratic and other schools of physicians and anatomists. Before

him there were nameless and forgotten Fabres, Roesels, Réaumurs, and Hubers, who observed the habits, the diet, and the habitations of the sand wasp or the mason bee; who traced out the little lives and discerned the vocal organs of grasshopper and cicada; and who, together with generations of bee-keeping peasants, gathered up the lore and wisdom of the bee. There were fisherman skilled in all the cunning of their craft, who discussed the wanderings of tunny and mackerel, swordfish or anchovy; who argued over the ages, the breeding places, and the food of this fish or that; who knew how the smooth dogfish breeds, two thousand years before Johannes Mueller; who saw how the male pipefish carries its young, before Cavolini; and who had found the nest of the nest-building rockfishes before Gerbe rediscovered it almost in our own day. There were curious students of the cuttle-fish (I sometimes imagine they may have been priests of that sea-born goddess to whom the creatures were sacred), who had diagnosed the species, recorded the habits, and dissected the anatomy of the group, even to the discovery of that strange hectocotylus arm that baffled Della Chiaje, Cuvier, and Koelliker, and that Vérany and Heinrich Mueller reexplained.

"All this varied learning Aristotle gathered up and wove into his great web. But every here and there, in words that are unmistakably the master's own, we hear him speak of what are still the great problems and even the hidden mysteries of our science; of such things as the nature of variation, of the struggle for existence, of specific and generic differentiation of form, of the origin of the tissues, the problems of heredity, the mystery of sex, of the phenomena of reproduction and growth, the characteristics of habit, instinct, and intelligence, and of the very meaning of life itself. Amid all the maze of concrete facts that century after century keeps adding to our store, these, and such as these, *remain the great mysteries of natural science*—the *magnalia naturae*, to borrow a great word from Bacon, who in his turn had borrowed it from St. Paul."

SPEAKING OF RECENT EFFORTS TO DISCOVER THE ORIGIN OF LIFE, the author says:—

"Driesch and Loeb and Roux are three among many men who have become eminent in this way in recent years, and their work we may take as typical of methods and aims such as those of which I speak. Driesch, both by careful experiment and by philosophic insight; Loeb, by his conception of the dynamics of the cell and by his marvelous demonstrations of chemical and mechanical fertilization; Roux, with his theory of autodetermination and by the labors of the school of *Entwickelungsmechanik* which he has founded,

have all in various ways, and from more or less different points of view, helped to reconstruct and readjust our ideas of the relations of embryological processes, and hence of the phenomenon of life itself, on the one hand, to physical causes (whether external to, or latent in, the mechanism of the cell), or, on the other, to *the ancient conception of a vital element, alien to the province of the physicist.*

"No small number of theories or hypotheses, that seemed for a time to have been established on ground as firm as that on which we tread, have been reopened in our day. The adequacy of natural selection to explain the whole of organic evolution has been assailed on many sides; the old fundamental subject of embryological debate between the evolutionists or preformationists (of the school of Malpighi, Haller, and Bonnet) and the advocates of epigenesis (the followers of Aristotle, of Harvéy, of Caspar Fr. Wolff, and of Von Baer) is now discussed again, in altered language, but as a pressing question of the hour; the very foundations of the cell theory have been scrutinized, to decide, for instance, whether the segmented ovum, or even the complete organism, be a colony of quasi-independent cells or a living unit in which cell differentiation is little more than a superficial phenomenon; the whole meaning, bearing, and philosophy of evolution has been discussed by Bergson, on a plane to which neither Darwin nor Spencer ever attained; and the hypothesis of a vital principle, or vital element, that had lain in the background for near a hundred years, has come into men's mouths as a very real and urgent question, *the greatest question for the biologist of all.*"

THE FIASCO OF BRAGGART EVOLUTIONISM is confessed in these words:—

"On the whole, I think it is very manifest that there is abroad on all sides a greater spirit of hesitation and caution than of old, and that the lessons of the philosopher have had their influence on our minds. We realize that *the problem of development is far harder than we had begun to let ourselves suppose*; that the problems of organogeny and phylogeny (as well as those of physiology) are not comparatively simple and well-nigh solved, but are of the most formidable complexity. And we would, most of us, confess with the learned author of *The Cell in Development and Inheritance* (Wilson) that *we are utterly ignorant of the manner in which the substance of the germ cell can so respond to the influence of the environment as to call forth an adaptive variation*; and again, that the gulf between the lowest forms of life and the inorganic world is as wide, if not wider, than it seemed a couple of generations ago."

THE AUTHOR CONCLUDES HIS PAPER with this significant statement:—

“With all the growth of knowledge, with all the help of all the sciences impinging on our own, it is yet manifest, I think, that the biologists of to-day are in no self-satisfied and exultant mood. The reasons that for a time contented a past generation call for reinquiry, and out of the old solutions new questions emerge, and the ultimate problems are as inscrutable as of old. *That which, above all things, we would explain baffles explanation*; and that the living organism is a living organism tends to reassert itself as the biologist’s fundamental conception and fact. Nor will even this concept serve us and suffice us when we approach the problems of consciousness and intelligence and the mystery of the reasoning soul; for these things are not for the biologist at all, but constitute the psychologist’s scientific domain.

“In wonderment, says Aristotle, does philosophy begin, and more than once he repeats the saying and more than once he rings the changes on the theme. Now, as in the beginning, wonderment and admiration are the portion of the biologist, as of all those who contemplate the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that in them is.

“And if wonderment springs, as again Aristotle tells us, from ignorance of the causes of things, it does not cease when we have traced and discovered the proximate causes, the physical causes, the efficient causes of our phenomena. *For behind and remote from physical causation lies the end, the final cause of the philosopher, the reason why, in the which are hidden the problems of organic harmony and autonomy, and the mysteries of apparent purpose, adaptation, fitness, and design.* Here, in the region of teleology, the plain rationalism that guided us through the physical facts and causes begins to disappoint us, and intuition, which is of close kin to faith, begins to make herself heard.

“And so it is that, as in wonderment does all philosophy begin, so in amazement does Plato teach us that all our philosophy comes to an end. Ever and anon, in presence of the *magnalia naturae*, we feel inclined to say with the poet,

*Ὀὐ γὰρ τι νῦν γε κἀχθὲς, ἀλλ’ ἀεί ποτε
Ζῶ ταῦτα, κοῦδεὶς οἶδεν ἔξ ὄτου φάνη.*

‘These things are not of to-day nor yesterday, but evermore, and no man knoweth whence they came.’

“I will not quote the noblest words of all that come into my mind, but only the lesser language of another of the greatest of the Greeks: ‘The ways of His thoughts are as paths in a wood thick with leaves, and one seeth through them but a little way.’”