

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

16733

VOL. XVIII.

JANUARY, 1914.

No. 1.

CURRENT EVENTS.

THE FOLLOWING CORRESPONDENCE is self-explanatory:—

Hon. W. Wilson, President.

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR:—

The Boston Pilot, a Roman Catholic paper, appearing in Boston, Mass., of May 10, 1913, reports that in the presence of fully six thousand soldiers and civilians, in the camp of the Second Division of the United States Army at Texas City, Tex., Sunday morning, April 27, the first military mass ever held in Texas was celebrated. That at the consecration a triple salute was fired by a detail from the Fourth Field Artillery.

We, the undersigned, solemnly and emphatically protest against such a violation of the Constitution of the United States, Article I of the Amendments, and we earnestly petition you that the abuses whereby the money, the influence, and the prestige of our Government are used to countenance and give a show of authority to any particular sect, be abolished; and that everywhere in the army, as all citizens have a right to expect, the separation of Church and State, which is one of the fundamental principles of our Government, be respected and acted upon; and that all officers and commanders be instructed that this separation must never be lost sight of, but must everywhere and always be upheld, and nothing done that would in any way prejudice its free operation.

Very respectfully yours,

The Lutheran Pastors of St. Louis, Mo.

J. J. BERTHIAL, *Chairman.*

RICHARD F. BAEHRE, *Secretary.*

MARTIN S. SOMMER, *Committee.*

P. S. A similar protest has been sent to the Secretary of War. St. Louis, Mo., September 24, 1913.

2087576

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
WASHINGTON.

October 29, 1913.

Reverend J. J. Bernthal, Chairman,
The Lutheran Pastors of St. Louis,
3118 St. Louis Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri.

SIR:—

Referring further to your letter of September 24, 1913, to the President, protesting against the alleged participation of troops of the Second Division in a military mass celebrated at Texas City, Tex., on April 27, 1913, I am directed by the Secretary of War to inform you that, upon investigation, the following are shown to be the facts in the case:

One of the Catholic chaplains of the Second Division, Texas City, requested authority for the Catholic clergy in that vicinity to celebrate field mass in front of Division Headquarters. This request was refused as tending to indicate that the services were of an official nature. Arrangements were made later by the chaplain to celebrate mass on the prairie in the rear of camp, but the troops of the division did not participate in an official capacity, and only a small proportion of the officers and men attended.

Very respectfully,

H. O. S. HEISTAND, *Adjutant-General.**ANOTHER EFFORT:—*

LETTER TO PRESIDENT WILSON.

The practice of the President and other high officials of our Government, who are not Catholics, attending the Pan-American Mass on Thanksgiving Day gives offense and umbrage to multitudes of loyal citizens, and gives a false show of preeminence to the Roman Catholic Church, which is exploited to the detriment of the fundamental principles of our Government. We respectfully, but earnestly petition you not to attend this mass.

THE LUTHERAN PASTORS OF ST. LOUIS.

St. Louis, Mo., November 25, 1913.

Press reports on Thanksgiving Day and the day after all affirmed, with more or less concealed satisfaction, that the President, the Secretary of State, the Supreme Justice, and a number of other officials had attended the Pan-American Mass. This means that our protests must be reiterated, and especially the disingenuous argument must be exposed in its fallaciousness, *viz.*, that the protesting parties offend against the principle of liberty of conscience.

THE VICISSITUDES to which the average editor is subject cannot dry up all the fountains of humor. Witness an editorial in *The St. Louis Times* for October 29:—

AN OFFENSIVE WORD.

Several readers of *The St. Louis Times* have written to us, remonstrating against the use of the adjective "jesuitical" in a recent editorial— the word having been employed to indicate objectionable qualities.

We are unwilling merely to hide behind the bulky volume known as Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, or behind the rule that many words have arbitrary meanings, and not the meanings which might fairly be supposed to spring from their antecedents and etymological foundation.

It is true that Webster defines the word jesuitical thus: designing; cunning; deceitful; crafty. But we do not believe we have fully stated our position when we have referred our friends to the dictionary.

Perhaps the dictionary needs revision. Logically, "jesuitical" should pertain to the Jesuits— who, characterized fully in English, are "Jesusites," or those who occupy a peculiarly intimate relation to the teachings of Jesus.

Certainly no intelligent individual would attribute to Jesus the qualities which Webster ascribes to the word "jesuitical."

We would not deliberately use any word which would be offensive to honest people, of course. We can only disclaim any intention of using the word in any sense save that in which Webster uses it, and reiterate the opinion that in this day of general education it might be well to revise the dictionary, to the end that words may be presented as meaning precisely what they would seem to mean, or what they ought to mean.—

The revision cannot stop at the dictionaries. What needs revision is history, and facts.

IN THE "NEW WORLD" (Catholic) for March 8, 1913, the following letter of the mother of a priest is published:—

Dear Friend— Bless, bless God, I am the mother of a priest. It was to you I wrote, twenty-five years ago, when the child was given me. I recall it; I was foolish with joy; I felt him living by my side; I stretched out my hand toward him. I touched him as he lay in his cradle as if to assure myself that I really possessed him.

Ah, what a distance between the toys of then and the events of

to-day, which lift up my soul and fill it with sentiments it has never known before. To-day, I am the mother of a priest!

Those hands that, when they were so small, I kissed with warmest love, those hands are consecrated; those fingers have touched God. The understanding that received enlightenment from me, and to which I taught life's aim, has developed, it is flooded with great truths; study and grace have made it surpass my own intelligence, and now, behold, it is consecrated to God. That body which I cared for and protected, which made me pass so many nights in tears, when sickness would rob me of my treasure — that body has become large and strong; behold, it is consecrated to God!

That body has become the servant of a priest's soul; it will fatigue itself in order to uplift the sinner, to instruct the ignorant, to give to each and every creature who asks and seeks of him, their God.

That heart, ah! heart so holy and so good, so true to me through all these years — that heart which trembled at contact with aught that was of earth; behold, it is the heart of the Lord's anointed! The only love that heart doth know we call by the sweet name of Charity.

My son! my son! It is I who know his nature, and what priceless treasures are concentrated in his character; they will be his safeguard against the world and against himself. When in the secrecy of his priestly work God may put in his path some faltering soul, he will know how to find words to lift up that soul and make it trust in the goodness of God.

Oh, yes! my child will do good, he will be according to God's heart, he will be all charity. Yes, yes! I am the mother of a priest, of a true priest!

What shall I tell you of yesterday's ceremonies? I was there, but I saw nothing save only him; when he knelt, when he stood upright, when he lay prostrate, when he arose, when he passed away so recollected from beneath the hand of the Bishop — a priest forever!

And this morning he said his first mass, in the little chapel of a humble convent, where pure and loving hands adorned the altar with lilies and roses, white and red; no pomp was there save the silent flowers and the modest love-lit candles; his server, a child, his congregation, I seemed alone — I, his mother and a few dear friends.

Ah! when they wish to paint the happiness of heaven, should they not try to picture the happiness of a mother who sees God descend at the voice of her son, to a mother lost in adoration so deep that she has forgotten the world, forgotten that she lives, and who gazes upon but two objects, God and her own son.

At a certain moment I heard him move as he bent down before the sacred host. I prayed no longer, or at least I know not what to call my emotions. Yes! it was the ecstasy of a Christian mother. I was saying thanks, my God, thanks forevermore. This priest, he was mine; it was I who formed him; his soul was lit up by mine. He is mine no longer, he belongs to Thee, O my God. Protect him from even the shadow of evil; he is the salt of the earth; keep him from being contaminated. My God, I love Thee, and I love him, I respect him, I venerate him; for he is Thy priest.

At the moment of communion the young server recites the *Confiteor*; the celebrant has turned around, he has raised his right hand, it is the absolution which descends upon his mother.

My poor child, a sob has escaped him; he takes the holy ciborium, he has come to me; my son, he brings me my God. What a moment! What a union! God, His priest, and I! Was I praying? In truth, I cannot tell. My being was wrapt in a peace that has no name. I was bathed in tears, tears of love and gratitude. I was saying in a low, subdued voice: "My God! My son!" Yes, for one who is a mother I believe this was a prayer.

Oh! I am too happy. I shall never again complain. In my life there have been beautiful days; this was the most beautiful of all, because unmingled with thoughts of earth. Adieu, I cannot write more, my tears flood this paper, they are the tears of my happiness.

A SADLY MISUNDERSTOOD MAN is Dr. William Benjamin Smith, Professor of Pure Mathematics at Tulane University. He has written a book on Christ, *Ecce Deus*. In a letter to the editor of *The Open Court* he complains that orthodox critics misapprehend his position regarding the divinity of Christ.

"There is nowhere to be found in all my writings a single sentence that asserts or hints that Jesus or Christ was mythical. On the contrary, I have repeatedly, in various places and at every opportunity and in the most emphatic terms, repudiated and repelled any such idea, no matter by whom put forward. My uniform contention has been that Jesus, the Christ, was, and is, divine, essential God, an Aspect or Person of the One Deity, and my favorite text, repeatedly quoted to express my view, is found in the great Pauline verse in Second Corinthians, 'The knowledge of the glory of God in (the) Person of Jesus Christ.' The Aspect, Character, or Person of God which constituted Jesus, the Christ, was, according to my uniform contention, the Aspect or Character or Person of Savior.

CHRIST'S REALITY.

"I have nowhere held or declared that Jesus Christ was a mere myth or a mere anything else, imagined by the disciples. On the contrary, I have everywhere affirmed His reality and divinity and substantial Godhead in the most explicit terms used by any critic since the birth of criticism. The whole of both my German books and of the American edition of *Ecce Deus* is directed with the utmost precision against the so-called higher critics, who have lavished learning and ability in the attempt to disprove this divinity and to explain the Jesus as a mere man, whose divinity was a mere imagination of His disciples.

"It is impossible for any one not to see this who reads my books intelligently, carefully, and dispassionately.

"The whole effort of my criticism has been to discover just what Protochristianity (primitive Christianity) really was. I have never, in a single line nor in a single word, sought to disprove or in any way to contest any teaching whatever of this Protochristianity. On the contrary, I have never failed to show all the genuine and ardent admiration for Protochristianity that was consistent with the attitude of an investigator."

THE OPEN COURT Publishing Co., in a prospectus, places Dr. Arthur Drews, the author of the *Christ Myth*, alongside of Dr. Smith. Drews denied the existence of Christ, and the critics commonly regard Smith as Drews's authority. Dr. T. K. Cheyne is of the opinion that both Smith and Drews are "right in the main," *i. e.*, in denying the existence of Christ, Windisch, in *Theol. Rundschau*, calls Smith "the most learned and keenest-witted among Drews's authorities and praises him for demonstrating the spuriousness of the Christ-passages in Josephus and Tacitus. S. Reinach, in *Revue Archéologique*, considers Smith "superior to all the German radicals as Renan was superior to Dupuis and to Voltaire." The *Theologische Literaturzeitung* has endorsed Smith's view of Protochristianity, "that it was a protest against idolatry, a crusade for monotheism." If Smith complains about being misapprehended by Protestant critics, he ought to make an outcry against his reviewers and against *The Open Court* who publishes his deprecatory letter and prints his and Drews's portrait alongside of each other, and announces his and Drews's book in the same prospectus.

A FRUIT OF HIS RAMBLES AND RESEARCHES during a summer vacation spent at Lake Geneva is offered by Dr. E. G. Sihler, of Columbia University, in the following:—

THE PRISONER OF CHILLON AND GENEVA.

In the diadem of exquisite Leman the castle of Chillon may be duly called the chief pearl. It is through the genius of Byron that it has gained for itself a firmly fixed place in *Weltliteratur*. Indeed, that dungeon of Gothic arches,—of which the rear nave is, as it were, fused with the stern rock itself,—that prison, as a classic locality, ranks with Elsinore, with the Rialto, with Holyrood, with the Tower of London, with the Wartburg. There are other castles in this fair and famous region,—Blonay, Chatelard, Nyon,—but none can be compared with that stout symbol of power and ofttime residence of the sovereigns of Savoy. Where the cathedral of Lausanne dominated the vineyards of that slope, down to the rippling blue waters of the lake, or where Gex nestles at the foot of the Jura, or where the Rhone in the shadows of the towering Dent du Midi empties its swift current in the placid basin of the lake, or where, at the further end, the peals of St. Peter's at Geneva once rang the vespers and matins for that industrious folk—in all this region, from Turin to the frontier of Bern, the Duke of Savoy ruled four hundred years ago. But his sovereignty was limited and cut short in very many ways. It was this feature in the complicated structure of his power which largely swayed, which in great measure determined, the fortunes of the prisoner of Chillon. The poem of which he is the theme, was written by Byron (1817) in a rapture of what we may call the idealization of Freedom, a poem penned with that fervor and fire in which his genius wrought so readily and so efficiently. But Byron's real knowledge of Bonivard at that time was of the slightest. He admitted so much himself in some notes appended to the publication of his verse.

Circumstances, in part a dreary succession of rainy days, induced me, in the summer of 1912, to devote some days to this subject in that section of the Library of Geneva which is specially set aside for manuscripts.

Here, too, is an important work of Bonivard, *Chroniques de Geneve*, printed in 1832 only, and much more adequately and carefully in 1867, but also his note-book of private studies, his lexicon of French-Latin-German, and other manuscripts were inspected by me. To these must be added some poems in French. Of these one is inscribed *Lamentations en la Captivité Chillonque*, without exception the most atrocious script I have ever endeavored to decipher.—To premise this briefly: the father of François de Bonivard died in peace, and, so far as we know, in the faith of the Roman Catholic

Church of his fathers. No younger (or older) brother shared our prisoner's misery, nor languished or wasted to death there.

François de Bonivard was born of a distinguished family of the aristocracy of Savoy at Seyssel on the Rhone, about forty miles southwest of Geneva, in 1493. A paternal uncle was abbot of the great and rich convent of Pignerol, west of Turin, and in 1515, or thereabouts, transferred to his nephew François the priory of St. Victor near Geneva, the site being incorporated in the modern city. This benefice then constituted the largest holding in the church, next to the see of Geneva itself. The young nobleman subsequently spent two years at Turin, the capital of Savoy, studying primarily jurisprudence, but also, as his later note-books show, the classics and philosophy, in the spirit and manner of Italian humanism then dominating the intellectual life of Europe. He had taken orders at the time when his uncle resigned that great preferment to him. Subsequently also he resided at Rome, evidently with the desire of mastering to some extent the canon law; for as a member of the hierarchic aristocracy, with large concerns of property and feudal power, this knowledge was quite essential to his future career. In the very first year of his priorate of St. Victor, Bonivard somehow was entangled in the anti-Savoy movement at Geneva, in which the citizen Philibert Berthelier was so prominent.

For several years Bonivard was deprived of his liberty by the Duke of Savoy, who held the *vidomnat* (*vice-dominatus*) of Geneva. When Bonivard, after several years (in 1521), regained his freedom, he found that the duke's influence had installed another prior at St. Victor. Now under the canon law, then in force, Bonivard held, and was justified in holding, this to be a sheer usurpation, which as spiritual and feudal lord of the extensive estates connected therewith he never failed to dispute and to claim the restitution of his own. According to Bonivard himself (who began to compose his *Chroniques de Geneve* in 1546, by order of the Council of Geneva, penning his work very carefully and slowly, consuming nine years at the task), according to the prior himself, it was Duke Charles himself who desired a quasi-personal control of St. Victor. Technically, the "vicedom" of Geneva had for his own suzerain the bishop of that city. But Duke Charles, in 1513, had caused to be invested with the see of Geneva John of Savoy, a mere creature of his own, with the understanding that the temporal sovereignty of the duke was to be completely and really established at Geneva. On the death of Bishop John there succeeded to the see Pierre de la Baume.

Meanwhile at Geneva there had been growing a distinctly re-

publican spirit, which developed into a polity of a city republic with four syndics (or mayors), a council of 60 and a council of 200, with legal or quasi-legal relations to bishop or duke, but ever striving for more complete autonomy and independence. In 1512, the syndics still had to swear allegiance to the duke. The latter, says Bonivard, sought the control of St. Victor, in order eventually to cannonade Geneva from that point. Cartigny, a few miles down the Rhone, was a village and castle subject to St. Victor. Here, too, some men-at-arms of the duke suddenly entered and took possession when it was undefended.

In the decade of 1520 to 1530 the republican spirit of Geneva steadily grew. In 1529, bitterness and hatred had reached such a point that Ponuoire, one of the duke's captains, was slain in his lodgings at Geneva when it was learned that he, with some men-at-arms, had actually dared to enter within the walls of the city at nightfall. Bonivard himself (*Chroniques de G.*, Vol. 2, p. 402) had been forbidden to enter any territory of Savoy, and held a slender pension from Geneva, which compelled him to dispense with all but one servant. As for the income from St. Victor, Geneva had determined to assign it to hospital purposes, and still even then there existed the other incumbent whom Bonivard always refers to as *mon adversaire*.

Now in 1530, Bonivard wished to visit his mother, who was ailing, and whom he had not seen in five years. He therefore secured a written document guaranteeing a safe-conduct to himself and four servants. In his absence, he says, he was slandered to the Council of Geneva, being charged with betraying Genevese secrets to the duke.

From Seyssel Bonivard went to Lausanne where he had a conference with the bishop. Meanwhile the Roman Catholic worship was still so firmly established at Geneva that punishment was meted out by the syndics to any citizen who would dare to eat meat in Lent. In the *Chroniques* there is not the slightest intimation of any impending introduction of the Reformation in Geneva. The movement toward autonomy or independence had as yet been purely a civic and secular movement. — At Lausanne, Bonivard told the bishop that he was willing to resign his claims to St. Victor and receive in return a pension of 400 ecus and also a sum to pay his debts. After leaving Lausanne, he moved about in various places in pursuing his concerns of income and future provision, the mending of which was his one concern.

On Ascension Day, 1530, he supped at "Mouldon" (Moudon), north of Lausanne, with a man of rank, and departed on the morrow

with a mounted servant furnished him by the Sieur Bellegarde. "But when we were at St. Catharine, at the foot of the Jura, lo, the captain of the castle at Chillon, by name Sir Anthony de Beaufort, seigneur of Biessez, with a steward of Thonon named Rosey, who were in ambush in the forest with a dozen or fifteen companions, sallied from ambush upon me. I was riding a mule and my guide a small cob. I said to him, 'Spur! spur!' And I spurred to save myself, and laid my hand upon my sword. My guide, instead of spurring forward, turned his horse and charged at me, and with his cutlass cut the cincture (belt) of my sword. And at this point these gentlefolk (*ces honnestes gens*) came up with me and made me prisoner in the name of *monsieur* [the Duke of Savoy]. Then they conveyed me pinioned to Chillon."

The first two years (1530—32) his manner of confinement was that of a man of rank; but the next four were the severe ones, when he was kept in close confinement in the lower dungeon; this change to severity was consequent upon a personal visit of the duke himself at Chillon. Bonivard says (*Chroniques* II, p. 413) that he knew not whether the change was due to a command of the duke or to the initiative of the commander of the castle, De Beaufort.

Meanwhile at Geneva the faction of the nobles had been largely reduced; many of them (the "Mamelukes" of popular parlance) were banished. The Genevese had in vain demanded the liberation of the Prior of St. Victor. Bonivard describes his lower prison as one whose floor (the bare, roughly smoothed rock) was lower than (the surface of) the lake, where he "had such good leisure" that, in walking to and fro, he finally made a pathway in the rock floor, "as though one had made it with a hammer." In the last period Beaufort received orders from the duke to apply certain forms of torture to Bonivard and to the other Genevese prisoners, and then they were to be examined on two points. The custom, Bonivard observes, had been to apply the torture *after* examination, but the duke had commanded a reversal of the process. But this, it seems, was never carried out, and for this reason — news even then had arrived that an army was coming from Bern. This was the infantry of that republic, which, in the preceding generations, had repeatedly overthrown the flower of Burgundian chivalry, and whom the feudalists of Central Europe held in awe. The decree of execution therefore which already had been received from Turin was not carried out, because the Bernese generalissimo, Hans Franz Naegeli, had sent word to Beaufort that he would hold the latter personally responsible for the safety of the prisoners. Cooperating with the besiegers from Bern was a flotilla

from Geneva commanded by François Faure. In due time Beaufort, facing the demolition of the stronghold or starvation, surrendered castle and prisoners. Thus Bonivard, in the main, owed his salvation to the republic of Bern. (The latter held Chillon from 1536 to 1798.) Later Bonivard was pensioned for life by the city of Geneva as a compensation for the loss of his priory, and again it seems to have been the insistence of Bern which caused a fair settlement. Incidentally Savoy lost all the north bank of the lake, and the entire *Pays de Vaud* (*Waadtland*) became a province of Bern and accepted the Reformed worship.

A word seems necessary as to the prisoners who had shared the dungeon of Bonivard, for it is here particularly that the poetic invention of Byron has run riot. Of these, by the by, Bonivard speaks much more freely in the *Chronicles* than of himself. One of these was a practitioner of canon law, Merle, who had once resided in Rome and was a good practitioner at that court, "which at that time had the sovereignty over Geneva." Later he lived in Vaud and was charged with murder by the civil authorities of Lausanne. Thereupon he was summoned to Rome, whither he refused to go, and so was excommunicated. Arrested at Fribourg, he was carried to Geneva, the cathedral chapter at Lausanne claiming "their subject" in vain. Tried and tortured at Geneva, he was condemned to death, but was reprieved, it seems, through the duke's influence and lodged at Chillon. Bonivard repeatedly refers to him as a kind of Barabbas. When the Bernese brought out the prisoners of Chillon, the others departed for home and freedom, but on Merle (who really had murdered his own *valet* for some money) sentence was pronounced both in French and German by a court-martial of the victorious Bernese, and he was beheaded.—The other prisoner of the lower prison was Mandolle, one of the two *Procureurs fiscales* in Geneva: the *Chronicles* of Bonivard are not clear as to the causes of his imprisonment, which originally seems to have been due to civic displeasure of, or charges made by, the nascent republic itself.

The remaining life of Bonivard was honorable and free from care through a pension which the state of Geneva really owed him for the secularization of St. Victor. He lived in a kind of routine alternately at Bern and Geneva. His manuscripts and books were bequeathed to Geneva and proved to be the nucleus, or beginning, of the very library which, now organically connected also with the University, lies opposite the Treille, the street ascending to old Geneva where are the reminders of Calvin, Beza, and Knox. Bonivard died in 1570.

It remains to cast a glimpse into this peaceful latter period of his life, the period of his Protestantism. I spent several afternoons at the library of Geneva in turning over his original note-books; my desire was to ascertain, in some measure, the precise character of his reading and higher concerns. These studies were partly theological and partly classical. The notes taken are almost always in Latin, rarely in French. He called one of the large books of extracts and notes "Florida." We shall first advert to theological matters. "Aug.(ustine) tomo 8. fol." [illegible]: "Ex Augustino lib. 1° cap. 4. . . . Errorem definire facilius acad. quam finire." "De Theodosio et Ambrosio." "Ex Matthia de Way, de Justificatione." "Hieronymus sic scripsit: Anathema sit, qui dicit deum impossibilia praecepisse. Seipsum interpretatur in dialogis contra Pelagianos." "Roma, tibi servi fuerant domini dominorum, servorum servi nunc tibi sunt domini." "Ex Erasmo de Coelibatu." "De lib(ero) arb(itrio). Libertas nulla vera est nisi beatorum et legi aeternae adhaerentium." "Ex Erasmo in Apologia adversus Hispanos: Aliud persuadere doctis, aliud subigere repugnantem." "Omnem movet lapidem qui studet vincere adversarium. Hieronymus aliter agendum censet cum rebellante, aliter cum eo qui postulat doceri." "Ex Rossello . . . 205, causa religionis iniuria non inferenda." "De Eclipsi in morte Christi." "Docti musulmani aut Christiani aut ἀθέοι [this is Bonivard's accent] moriuntur." "Qua ratione deus iussit Aegyptios spoliari." "Libertas credendi cuivis relinquenda." "Deus quod natura potuit, numquam extra eius limites producere voluit." "Qui deum non capiunt, mordicus patrum placita tutantur." "Quamobrem opes ecclesiis necessariae." "Quando Ignorantia excusat, de lib. arb. c. 22." "Quomodo avaricia omnium malorum radix." "Quomodo in Veteri testamento deus cum hominibus locutus sit." "De sermone domini in monte lib. 2°. Sicut omnes militantes accipiunt annonam et stipendium, sic omnes evangelizantes accipiunt victum et tegumentum. Sed non omnes propter salutem ecclesiae ministrant deo, sed propter stipendia et annonam." "De ver. relig. c. 98. Perfecta iustitia est, ut potius potiora et minus minora diligamus." "Sancti honorandi, non adorandi." "Aug. de civil. dei lib. 8. c. 50 qui philosophi cum christianis sentiant." On sheet 85: "Papa in terra deus est, ergo pingi debet in olla terrea." Sheet 86: "Curia Romana non curat ovem sine lana." "Dantes exaudit, non dantibus ostia claudit. [Hexameter.] Aurum Roma sitit, dantes amat; absque dativo accusativo Roma favere negat.— O monachi, vestri stomachi sunt pocula Bacchi [hexameter]; vos estis, deus est testis, tristissima pestis."—

We conclude these notes with some survey of his *classical* references. — “Cicero de Oratore. . . . Ex Scaligero. . . . Ex Aristotele ad Eudemum.” “Anaxagoras ambigentem quendam quare vivere potius quam non vivere expetendum esset, iussit caelum mundi que totius constitutionem et ordinem contueri.” “Ex *Theaeteto* (vel de Scientia) Platonis, Ex *Tymaeo* [so spelled] Platonis vel de Natura. Narratio Eri qui revixit” (from b. 10 of Plato’s *Republic*). In *Critia* (of Plato): “Chaos Platonici informem mundum vocant, mundum vero formatum chaos.” “Duplex furor in *Phaedro* [of Plato]. Ex *Theage*. [of Plato]; Ex *Cratyllo*; Ex *Gorgia*; Ex *Lysia*; De annulo *Gigis* [Ring of Gyges, by which he could make himself invisible], de *Legibus* [Plato]; Ex *Phaedro* de Pulchro, quid bellum, quid scditio, de *Rep.* V. 905; *Λογοδαίδαλος* Lysias et Gorgias verisimilia anteposuerunt, Ex *Phaedro* 313; Cicero . . . de la nature des dieux se moque,” etc., where Cicero expresses his dissent from the atomism and chance creation as taught by Epicurus, comparing this hypothesis with the assumption that the *Annals* of Ennius were the result of an accidental aggregation of letters. — The familiar reference of Demosthenes to a famous courtesan: *ὄν ὠροῦμαι μνησίων δραχμῶν μεταμέλειαν*, Demos. “Ex Budaco de Asse. 67. — Theophrastus antea Tyrtamus nominatus, ab Aristotele Theophrasti nomine donatus est.” “Solonis more tam diu discendum, quam diu vivendum.” “Zaleucus Locrensis filium execravit.” Aristoteles *De Anima* 226. Ex Pausania in *Phocicis*” (P. the Periegete, the last book).

On the whole we may sum up these observations thus: His favorite authors were Plato and Aristoteles, whom he read for current practical excerpts, partly for culture, but in greater measure for material truth, partly ethical, sometimes dialectical. Such excerpts found their way into discourse and into current literature. This was the latter generation of humanism, which through the mighty conflict of the Protestant Reformation had regained a primary valuation for Biblical revelation.

E. G. SILLER.

University Heights, New York. November 27, 1913.

PROF. LOOFS, of Halle-Wittenberg, lately was the lecturer on the Haskell Foundation at Oberlin, O. In six lectures he discussed the question: “What is the truth about Jesus Christ?” Of far greater merit than these lectures, now published in book form, is the review of the same by Dr. Warfield in the *Princeton Theological Review*. The reviewer sums up the Christology of the lecturer as follows:—

“It is only at the end of the volume, therefore, that we learn Loofs’s own Christological opinions; and they are given to us there less as the constitutive elements of his own Christology than as the residuum of the Christological discussion of recent years. ‘For us,’ says he (p. 236), ‘the three following thoughts, held out by these views, are the most valuable: first, that the historical person of Christ is looked upon as a human personality; secondly, that this personality, through an indwelling of God or His Spirit, which was unique both before and after, up to the end of all time, became the Son of God who reveals the Father and becomes also the beginner of a new mankind; and, thirdly, that in the future state of perfection a similar indwelling of God has to be realized, though in a copied and therefore secondary form, in all people whom Christ has redeemed.’ Here are just the familiar forms of right-wing Ritschlianism: Jesus Christ is only a man; but in this man God dwells uniquely, and by this unique indwelling of God He is made the Revelation of God and the Mediator of redemption; and the redeemed are to be brought in their measure into a relation to God similar to that in which He stood. When Loofs, then, speaks of Jesus’ being something more than man,—as he sometimes does in the course of his lectures,—it is this that he means: not that Jesus is in Himself more than a man, but that God dwells in Him more fully than He dwells in other men. ‘The conviction that God dwelt so perfectly in Jesus through his Spirit, as had never been the case before and never will be till the end of all time,’ he says, ‘does justice to what we know historically about Jesus, and may, at the same time, be regarded as satisfactorily expressing the unique position of Jesus, which is a certainty to faith.’ (p. 238—9). We know ‘historically’ that Jesus is a man. We are sure with ‘the certainty of faith’ that Jesus has in Him something more than we can find in other men. When we speak of Jesus as the man in whom God uniquely dwelt, we are doing justice to both facts. ‘It also,’ he even adds, ‘justifies our finding God in Christ when we pray to him’ (p. 239). That is to say, although He is only a man in whom God dwells in a measure superior to that in which He dwells in other men, we are justified, because we can thus find God ‘in Him,’ in praying to Him. What it means for God to dwell in Christ, and what it means to say it is by His Spirit that He dwells in Christ, and indeed what it means to speak at all of God’s ‘Spirit,’ remains meanwhile uncertain (p. 239). ‘My last refuge, therefore is,’ he says, ‘the term which Paul sharply emphasizes in the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, *the mystery of Christ*’ (p. 209). ‘We can

never penetrate so deep as to learn how God made Him what He was' (p. 241). This is Loofs's Christological standpoint."

All of which is a practical reminder to us to look well behind the terms employed by modern theologians in setting forth Scripture-concepts. These terms retain, to a great extent, the external appearance of Scriptural coinage and the Biblical mint-marks, but the divinely intended meaning of these terms having been discarded, they have become debased coin, though they are palmed off upon the unsuspecting as "the truth." The truth about this "truth" is that it does not tell the truth. The very term "truth" is become equivocal. For not the authentic declarations of Him who said: "I am the Truth," and: "For this came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth," but the biased views of right-wing Ritschlianism are the standard back of this "truth about Jesus Christ." To the lover of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus these lectures cannot but appear as a parody on truth, and a revelation of Ritschlian conceit. — Loofs's "last refuge," no doubt, will elicit a smile. When the modern theologian becomes reverent, and confesses himself awed by "mystery," he is most ludicrous. For all the world knows the habitual attitude of modern theology toward mystery, miracle, etc. But occasionally it becomes opportune even for modern theologians to acknowledge a mystery. Now, it is true, that "God manifest in the flesh" is "the mystery without controversy great." The mystery of the personality of Jesus Christ is a Scriptural concept. But this Scriptural concept is misused when revealed facts of the teaching of Scripture concerning Christ are embraced in the mystery, *e. g.*, the Two-Nature doctrine. To Prof. Loofs, Jesus Christ is a mystery for a different reason than to the common believer in the Biblical account of his theanthropic personality. We fully understand from Scripture the fact, but we are not told, in full and exact detail, the manner, of the existence of the eternal Logos in the likeness of sinful flesh. — The defection of Prof. Loofs from the nominally evangelical church Dr. Warfield has indicated as follows: —

"But from his standpoint Loofs is also bound to declare that the conviction of his Church that Jesus Christ is really (*realiter*) God as well as man is also untenable. He argues against this conviction in his fifth lecture, — on three grounds: first, 'rational logic' condemns it; secondly, it is not in accord with New Testament views; and thirdly, it is a product of Greek philosophy. Under the first of these heads he urges that the incarnation of only a single person of the Trinity is unthinkable, that it is meaningless to say God could become flesh, that incarnation of a person of the Trinity breaks up

the Trinity—if there be such a thing as a Trinity. Under the second head he pleads that the Scriptures know nothing of a Son of God before the incarnation; that they know nothing of the Trinity; that they give to Jesus a human, not divine, personality; that they attribute to Him a human development; and that they present Him as in organic connection with the human race. Under the third head he endeavors to trace the origin in the Church of the doctrines of the Trinity and the Two Natures of Christ as the product of philosophical thought impressing Greek conceptions upon the simple Christian facts.”
