

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIV.

JANUARY, 1910.

1073A  
05  
No. 1.

## THE OLD LUTHERAN VIEW OF WHAT CONSTITUTES THEOLOGY.

Beginning with Luther and extending to about the middle of the eighteenth century, Lutheran writers on the nature of theology are careful to segregate theology from philosophy, jurisprudence, and medicine, thus destroying the ancient academic *quadrige* of the universities. They assert that theology must be placed in a class by itself. The later dogmaticians discuss this matter in the Prolegomena of their works on systematic theology, usually in the first chapter, *de natura et constitutione theologiae*, or some kindred phrase. The earlier dogmaticians, before Hutter, have not felt the necessity of entering into an elaborate argument on what constitutes theology, but they express their mind on this question in connection with the various heads of doctrine which they present. Luther wrote no *Dogmatik*, yet Luther has more than any other writer of the Lutheran Church made plain the essential and characteristic features of theology. In the "Locis," "Systems," and "Compendis" of the later period we find merely in logical and precise form what Luther had expressed more or less casually.

The old Lutheran view insists, first of all, that theology is something in the theologian, "in the soul of the human being whom we call a theologian," and that the theologian earns his title to that name by possessing theology.<sup>1)</sup> This is a basic point in the old Lutheran view, and it deserves to be exhibited

1) Calov, *Isagoge ad ss. theol.*, I. 2, p. 201.

## BOOK REVIEW.

VOICE TRAINING FOR SPEAKERS. Objective and Subjective Voice. By *Charles Christian Morhart*. American Lutheran Publication Board, Pittsburg, Pa. 1909. 193 pages. Price, \$1.50; to ministers or in dozens, \$1.20; hundred, \$1.00, plus carriage.

The scope of Reverend Morhart's book extends beyond the requirements of speaking from the pulpit. It embraces every form of public speaking. It can apply to the pulpit speaker, that is, to the preacher, only in so far as the preacher may be viewed as a species of the genus public speaker. Reverend Morhart's book is not a book like Russell's *Pulpit Elocution*, which was written exclusively for the training of the human voice in the pulpit and for producing skillful pulpit deliverances. Besides occasional references to incidents, affairs, or conditions discovered among preachers, which are introduced for the sake of illustrating, we have found only one paragraph ("Bible and Hymn Reading," p. 175 ff.) that is designed solely for preachers. This absence of a specific and avowed design for the pulpit, in our opinion, constitutes a distinct merit of Reverend Morhart's book. While Russell's aim was to teach the pulpit functionary as such how he *must* speak, Reverend Morhart describes, in a general way, the physiological and the psychological side of the process of speaking, more especially of speaking in public, and leaves the preacher to choose his own lessons, and make his own applications.

Before discussing the contents of the Book and pointing out its other merits, we beg leave to submit a question of principle, *viz.*: Is it proper to group the pulpit speaker with others whose avocation it is to speak in public? Is not the pulpit speaker *sui generis*? Is the study of elocution, rhetoric, oratory a requisite for the efficient discharge of the preaching function? All these questions will be promptly negatived when the materials of pulpit speaking, the character of a pulpit speaker, and the inherent efficacy of the Word of God are taken into consideration. A pulpit discourse deals with the oracles of God as distinct from, and superior to, the knowledge and wisdom of men. A pulpit speaker is "an angel," *i. e.*, a messenger, "of God," who, for the time being, stands to his audience in the impersonal relation of interpreter of Another's will. And this Other has made His message self-acting, able to achieve His purpose independently of the personal efforts of His messenger.

(Is. 55, 10. 11.) Accordingly, if the study of elocution or rhetoric were urged from a belief that Scripture does not differ essentially from the literary productions of men, that a preacher is kith to the actor or forensic orator, and that human art is indispensable for attaining God's ends, elocution and rhetoric would have to be rejected by every believer in God's Word, be he preacher or layman. A gulf so wide as to defy all attempts at bridging it, should be fixed between the pulpit, on the one hand, and the stage, the platform, and—the stump, on the other.

Paul calls himself a preacher (1 Tim. 2, 7; 2 Tim. 1, 11), and Paul was scorned as a preacher. He recounts his experience at Corinth, thus: "Brethren, when I came to you, I came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom. . . . I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God," 1 Cor. 2, 1—5. He complains that his opponents had said of him: "His letters are weighty and powerful, but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech is contemptible," 2 Cor. 10, 10. He was aware that men were abroad trying "to beguile" his followers "with enticing speech" (Col. 2, 4: *πιδավολογία* = *oratio captiosa, sermo speciosus*; Wilke-Grimm). The situation at Corinth is especially worthy of study. The apostle felt that demands were made upon his oratorical powers by certain of his hearers, probably men of worldly culture, and that he could not comply with those demands without prostituting his calling, sacrificing his mission, and losing his self-respect. He had not been sent to furnish them an intellectual treat, an emotional feast, or to win their applause and admiration, but to wean them from their worldly notions and to win them for the despised Christ by the contemned preaching of the cross. In a choice like this, between bowing to the whimsical notions of a pampered egotism and obeying the Master's will, what loyal preacher would not act exactly as the apostle did? "The sole means to produce faith is a style of preaching which presents the great facts of redemption directly to the heart in their simple Divine energy, without the accessories of human science and art. In such preaching, God's Spirit and power can bear testimony, and glorify Christ, and bring to man's consciousness the greatness, and holiness, and wisdom, and glory of His redeeming love in such a manner as to qualify the heart for an exercise of faith. Wheresoever, on the contrary, human rhetoric with its artifices, and human philosophy with its speculations, are mingled up with Gospel truth, there some obstruction is offered to the operation

of the Divine power: there some purely human influence, such as the charm of style, or of fine reasoning, it may be, supersedes the Divine influence, and we fail of being drawn into the sphere of the truth itself 'as it is in Jesus;' there human selfishness and pride still have free scope. As the result we have, instead of a firm and lasting faith, only a feeble, sickly *opinion*, which is ever ready to yield to counter-influences, or to changed humors, or to new systems of thought; which does not carry in itself the life of man in Christ, or of Christ in man; which is not heavenly, but earthly, not deeply rooted, but superficial, and ever ready to vanish away. He who clearly perceives what faith is, and what is requisite for it, and what depends on it; who sees what barriers of every kind, especially of false culture and foolish pride, oppose themselves to it; who understands how the pure and artless preaching of Christ alone has power to awaken faith, and yet what prejudices there are against such preaching, and how little it is acceptable to men, especially to the highly educated classes, and to those who either practice or tolerate the grosser or more refined forms of wickedness, and how the whole life and being of a man strives against the truth which seeks to slay their selfishness and their sensuality, — a person who comprehends all this as he ought, will recognize and feel it to be a task transcending all human ability, and too difficult for him in the imperfection of his spiritual life, to go abroad into the world, especially into the circle of the refined and learned, as a simple preacher of Christ crucified, and there maintain his stand. The persons he there meets seek their satisfaction in art, and science, and learning; they take delight in luxury and sensual enjoyment; and the knowledge of this fact abates confidence, takes away boasting, begets diffidence, awakens anxiety, yea, bows a man to the dust with a sense of his own weakness. But for this very reason does he become all the more suitable an instrument for Christ. The more emptied he is of self, the more can God impart to him of His Spirit and power, and work in him and through him, the more will he be disposed to cherish a holy courage and confidence in God. With 'the foolishness of preaching' he will be ready to encounter a world full of obstacles, and find himself strong enough to overthrow all its bulwarks, while he will feel ashamed to resort to secular arts for gaining an entrance for himself. And the earnest endeavor of every one, through whom God achieves exploits, is to become just such a simple instrument of the Spirit in subduing the hearts of men through the Word of Truth, and winning them to Christ." (C. F. Kling in *Lange-Schaff Commentary* ad 1 Cor. 2, 1—5.) Truths like these seem trite; still, though uttered time and again, they have not been uttered once

too often. In proportion as we observe the preaching brotherhood of our day betraying a proneness to borrow from the secular orator or from the histrionic profession the arts and tricks of their craft, for the purpose of making their own efforts more impressive, and of catering to the hideously bad taste of men who have not grasped the difference between God's house and the theater or the lyceum, we should urge a searching study of the situation which confronted Paul at Corinth, and an unsparing application of the lessons which such study must yield.

One may grant the correctness of the views expressed, and yet feel that the subject has not been exhausted. There is another side. One-sided opinions are not only practically worthless, but also misleading, because they contain a dangerous fallacy. Judicious minds distinguish between the deed and the motive for the deed, between the use and abuse of a thing. Is this distinction applicable to the subject in hand? Has the Christian Church no use whatever for decorum, for rules of propriety, for art? Are boorishness, uncouthness, barbarism virtues? The matter need only be placed before us from this side to cause us to see the other extreme.

A defect of speech was one of the causes why Moses declined his commission to Pharaoh. "Moses said, O my Lord, I am not eloquent." Literally, as in the margin, 'a man of words.' 'Words do not come readily to my tongue when I attempt to speak; I have never been a fluent speaker, neither yesterday (*i. e.*, recently) nor the day before' (*i. e.*, formerly). Nor do I even find that I have become eloquent by divine inspiration since Thou spakest with me. Still I remain 'slow of speech' and 'slow of tongue.' A question is raised whether the mere difficulty of finding words and giving them utterance—a difficulty felt at first by almost every speaker—is here meant, or something further, as 'a natural impediment owing to defect in the organs of speech' (Kalisch), or a want of readiness, owing to disuse, in speaking the Hebrew language (Clarke). The latter suggestion is scarcely consistent with the ease and fluency with which Moses had carried on the conversation in Hebrew up to this point. The former is a possible meaning, though not a necessary one. According to a Jewish tradition, Moses had a difficulty in pronouncing the labials *b*, *v*, *m*, *ph*, *p*." (Rawlinson in *Pulpit Commentary* ad Ex. 4, 10.) Whatever may have been the fault in Moses' speech,—Stephen calls him "mighty in words,"—the reply which God made to him shows that God, too, was aware of it and ready to remedy it. He, the Author of speech, would have been with Moses' mouth; the peevishness of Moses caused a probable gift to be turned away from him, and "eloquent" Aaron was appointed

Moses' spokesman. Thus God acknowledged that pleasing utterance can be of service to Him in His work among men.

And to return to Paul, was his speech really so awkward? The impression which he made upon Festus would seem to indicate the opposite. For, while Paul's address on that occasion, no doubt, gathered its weight chiefly from the transcendent subject which he was discussing, still he must have spoken with a great amount of fervor and in well-chosen and well-uttered terms to create in the Roman governor, who was used to oratory, the impression that he spoke like one inspired. This is but a single instance. That we have in Scripture not a few specimens of true eloquence no one who has read the prophets and the Gospels and Acts will question. The fault about much of the talk we hear concerning elocution, etc., lies not in the claim that elocution may be consecrated, like other natural gifts and endeavors of men, to the service of God, but in the overt or implied assertion that without it no preacher can be a preacher.

The merit and usefulness of Rev. Morhart's book consists mainly in teaching the speaker how to utter words clearly, how to economize his strength, and how to avoid errors which do physical harm to his vocal organs and prematurely debilitate them. The author has divided his book into two parts: "Objective and Subjective Voice." On the meaning of this division he says: "The objective voice is intellectual, the subjective voice is emotional. The objective voice holds an audience especially by the power of the eye and the use of the various arts of speech; the subjective voice uses the emotions to arouse an audience to the highest pitch of emotional thought and feeling. An objective, didactic lecture is not more instructive than a book read by the fireside. Subjective work is soul-stirring, both in speech and action. Objective work reveals the mind; subjective work reveals the soul, and colors all words and actions with magnetic nerve power. . . . Objective work is nine-tenths words and one-tenth action; subjective work is one-tenth words and nine-tenths action." (p. 111.) We should look for lessons that can be studied with advantage by pulpit speakers mainly in the first part; in fact, all that we should ask to have imparted to divinity students, and to pastors who have need of such study, are the rules how to vocalize and enunciate well, and how to develop the power of a voice and to have perfect control of it. On these points there is much valuable advice offered in Rev. Morhart's pithy and axiomatic paragraphs and in his exercises for voice training. As we indicated before, the book will probably be studied by preachers on the eclectic

plan, as it was not written exclusively for preachers. During a recent visit at Concordia Seminary, the author, in a series of noon-lectures, indicated to our students the most necessary and beneficial exercises. They were few in number, but they contained all that was essential. The present book offers much more, and serves to make certain principles clearer, but few will be able to carry out regularly and persistently even half of the suggested exercises. Some might try, but would tire soon, and then would probably throw aside the entire subject as useless. This we should regret, and therefore should counsel: *Multum, non multa!* A few rules once mastered, until they have become a fixed and settled habit, are of greater definite benefit than many rules only half learned and not well remembered. — On one subject which the author has touched in the first part of his book, we wish especially to record our cordial unity of sentiment. Speaking of memory, he says: "The speaker should make persistent efforts to strengthen his memory. Even an obstinate memory will become good as soon as a few victories have been gained over it. Many a speaker who reads his addresses or uses notes because he thinks he has no memory would soon acquire a strong memory if he would heroically discard his notes and make a real effort to achieve success in remembering. We should never give up a task because it is hard to do." (p. 14.) A defective memory constitutes only one reason—in our opinion the most respectable one—why ministers read their sermons. Homiletic textbooks (Palmer, Vinet, Brooks, Hoyt) present the *pro* and *con* of the question: Should the preacher read his sermon? and virtually reach no conclusion beyond this: A preacher who can read better than speak *ex corde* had better read. There have been sermons spoken from memory that were wretchedly delivered, and sermons that were read well, with no pretense on the part of the preacher of doing anything else than reading. Again, sermons have been poorly read that could not remotely compare, as regards effectiveness, with sermons delivered from memory. Hence, when the test of actual experience in particular instances is applied to the question whether a preacher may read his sermon, one would probably be inclined to leave the decision in suspense. However, taking a broader view of the matter, inquiring into the history of preaching as a life calling and of the world's best preachers, and, last not least, consulting the sentiments of the hearers of sermons on this subject, we believe there will be a pretty large consensus of opinion that sermons should be spoken from memory, not read, and that reading should be restricted to cases of absolute necessity.

The second part of Reverend Morhart's book deals with the emotions and the dramatic effects which the human voice, accompanied by appropriate action of the limbs, is capable of producing. Despite Goethe's dictum: "Ein Komödiant kann einen Pfarrer lehren," we believe that in this part of the book the preacher will not find much that he could wish to make serviceable for his profession. Not that we would advocate a style of sermon-delivery which makes of the preacher a lifeless automaton who stands before his audience statuelike, perhaps with eyes closed, and recites his paragraphs in a soporific monotone. Such a style has been adopted and advocated to emphasize the fact that the preacher is merely God's speaking tube, and must do everything to detract attention from his person and to compel his audience to attend only to what he says. The preacher is, indeed, God's organ, but he is not a sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. He is a personal organ, and was chosen for this work for the very reason that he is a person possessing intelligence and will. Scripture speaks of the sermon as a testimony, a witness for Christ; it speaks of preachers as reasoning, opening, alleging, urging, pleading, beseeching, etc. All these things represent efforts which bring into play the speaker's emotions. But it is one thing for a preacher to let his heart flow freely and naturally into his discourse, to fill it with the genial warmth of his own joyous faith, rather than make a chilly presentation of abstract truths; and it is quite another thing to lay out beforehand a complete plan of attack upon the sensibilities of the audience, and to determine in advance at which point the hearers are to be startled, at which point calmed, when their loves are to be roused and when their aversions. These effects, whenever they are to be produced, are best attained without a studied effort. *Pectus facit theologum*, applies also to the theologian in the pulpit. When the preacher is full of his subject, sees through it from beginning to end, he will need no rules of art to teach him how to deliver himself of his burden. His own naturalness will be his highest art. If he does not master his subject, if he does not live and move and have his homiletic being in his text, no amount of elocution and dramatic action will suffice to mask his sad defects to an intelligent observer. His gestures will not be the measured strokes of a skilled and confident swimmer who knows he can cross the lake, because he has often swum across, but the frantic movements of a drowning man who has ventured into deep water though unable to swim. His naturalness a preacher should guard as a most valuable asset in the pulpit. He must never make a dummy of himself, draped in the garments that someone else has worn. Some set up



ideals and choose models whom they strive to copy. The finest ideal is to be just plainly yourself, and to cultivate those abilities with which the Creator has endowed you. However, naturalness does not legitimize mannerism. If a preacher has habituated himself to awkward movements in the pulpit, he might claim that they are become his second nature, but they are not his nature. He should put them off, and be thankful when they are pointed out to him. So far as Reverend Morhart's book performs this service of a faithful mentor it is to be commended.

In conclusion, we would say that the preaching of God's Word, being the noblest work in which man can engage, deserves, indeed, the intensest application and consummate preparation on the part of those who are engaged in it. Surely, it should never be done in slovenly fashion, also as regards the physical and external part. But that which, in general, produces a theologian—*oratio, meditatio, tentatio*—makes also a good preacher. Without these all rules for speaking are valueless; with these they are acceptable. It is well that persons looking to the ministry should be trained in speaking before an audience. If the Gospel message is delivered, like a king's letter, on a silver tray, all will agree that this is as it should be. The dignity of the vessel only comports with the dignity of its contents. But if there is no silver tray and none can be obtained, the Gospel message may still be delivered, and carry with it all its vitality and sweetness. Not unfrequently, an earnest preacher is weighed down with the consciousness of his defective delivery, and begins to doubt whether God's Word, as preached by him, can really exert its power. Such may draw some comfort from the following remarks: "Slowness of speech is a drawback on ministerial fitness, but not a disqualification. It is remarkable that both Moses, the great prophet of the First Covenant, and St. Paul, the 'chosen vessel' for the publication of the Second Covenant, were ineffective as speakers; not perhaps both 'in presence base,' but certainly both 'in speech contemptible,' 2 Cor. 10, 1. 10. Speakers and preachers should lay the lesson to heart, and learn not to be overproud of the gift of eloquence. A good gift it is, no doubt,—when sanctified, a great gift,—which may redound to God's honor and glory, and for which they should be duly thankful, but not a necessary gift. The men of action, the men that have done the greatest things, and left their mark most enduringly upon the world, have seldom been 'men of words.' Luther, indeed, was mighty in speech, and John Knox, and Whitefield, and (though less so) John Wesley, but not our own Cranmer, nor Melancthon, nor Anselm, nor Bishop Cosin, nor John Keble. In the secular sphere of statesmanship and

generalship the same principle holds even more decidedly. Demosthenes has to yield the palm to Alexander, Cicero to Caesar, Pym to Cromwell, the Abbé Siéyès to Napoleon. On the whole, it must be said that those who are great in deed are rarely great in speech. And without eloquence a man may do God good service in every walk of life, even as a minister." (Rawlinson in *Pulpit Commentary* ad Ex. 4, 1—17.) "Moses was doubtless right in what he said of his natural difficulty of speech. But his error lay I. in exaggerating the value of a gift of mere eloquence. . . . II. In forgetting that God knew of this infirmity when He called him to the work. God knew all about his slowness of speech, and yet had sent him on this mission. Did not this carry with it the promise that whatever help he needed would be graciously vouchsafed? God has a purpose in sometimes calling to His service men who seem destitute of the gifts—the outward gifts—needful for His work. 1. The work is more conspicuously His own. 2. His power is glorified in man's weakness. 3. The infirmity is often of advantage to the servant himself—keeping him humble, driving him to prayer, teaching him to rely on Divine grace, rousing him to effort, etc. (2 Cor. 12, 7—10.) Paul's . . . defects of speech only made the Divine power which resided in his utterance the more conspicuous. . . . Lips touched by Divine grace possess a simple, natural eloquence of their own, far excelling the attempts of studied oratory. Then there is the other fact, that gifts of speech are often latent till grace comes to evoke them. Moses' original awkwardness was no index to what, assisted by God's grace, he might ultimately have become, even as a speaker. His gift would probably have grown with the necessity. The greatest preachers of the Gospel, with Paul at their head, have not been men naturally eloquent. If they became so afterwards, it was grace that made them. Thus, we are told of Luther that at first he dared not enter the pulpit. 'Luther, who subsequently preached with so much power,—who gave a new direction, and a force and elevation never before attained, to the whole system of German preaching,—who is still the unparalleled master of all who hope to effect more by the internal demonstrativeness of a discourse than by its external ornamentation—this Luther was too humble, too modest, to take the place of a preacher. It was only at the solicitation of Staupitz that he finally consented to preach—at first in the oratory at the convent, and afterwards in church.' (Hagenbach.) Knox was equally diffident about the exercise of his gifts, and when an unexpected appeal was made to him, at the age of forty-two,—'the said John, abashed, burst forth in most abundant

tears, and withdrew himself to his chamber.' (Knox's History.) All may not be eloquent like these; but anyone possessed of earnest feeling and intense convictions, who is content to deliver a plain message with directness and simplicity, will be surprised at what God can sometimes make even of rude and unskilled lips." (James Orr, *ibidem*.)

We welcome Reverend Morhart's book as an aid to the aspirant for pulpit usefulness, and trust that a wise use will be made of it, and thus the author's painstaking labor will be given its noblest application.

JESUS UND DIE MODERNEN JESUSBILDER. Von Lic. Hermann Jordan. 1909. Verlag von Edwin Runge in Gross-Lichterfelde, Berlin. 115 pages. Price, M. 1.50.

The chief merit of this book lies in the precise classification and correct grouping of German antibiblical and unbiblical views of Jesus, and in the pertinent and concise criticism of each view. We have here a panorama of the speculative, eke scientific, Christology of Protestant theologians of Germany from David Strauss to Pfeleiderer, Haeckel, and Wrede, and of a few physicians and political economists who have tested the biblical portrait of Jesus by the rules of their profession. In ch. 3 the author reviews "The Mythical Jesus" of Strauss, Bruno Bauer, Kalthoff, William Benjamin Smith, and Jensen (Gilgamesch-Epos). In ch. 4 ("Der Kranke Jesus") the results of the psycho-pathological investigation into the character of Jesus are reviewed in their chief exponents: Emil Rasmussen, Georg Lomer, J. Naumann, Hermann Werner. Ch. 5 introduces "The Antiquated Jesus" as Friedrich Nietzsche, Eduard von Hartmann, and Ernst Haeckel have conceived and—hated Him. "The Buddhist-Ascetic Jesus" of Schopenhauer (Richard Wagner), Seydel, and Notovitsch is reviewed in ch. 6. Ch. 7 exhibits "The Social Jesus," resp. Jesus, the Socialist, as Friedrich Naumann, Adolf Stoecker, Emil Rosenow, Eugen Losinsky have been able to conjure Him up before their mind. Dr. Wunsch who has tried to prove Jesus a vegetarian is mentioned and answered with this group. "Jesus, the Ethico-Religious Leader," is the subject of ch. 8, and the authors reviewed are Rudolf Otto, Heinrich Weinel, Wilhelm Bousset, Adolf Julicher, William Wrede, W. von Schnehen, Otto Pfeleiderer. Adolf Harnack is mentioned in this connection, though only as a critic of the records of the life and acts of Jesus. It is a babel of voices that rises from this book, sometimes in fierce anger and detestation, sometimes in soft tones of persuasion; one speaker presents his case

in a cold, logical, merciless way, another clothes his arguments in poetic garb. Not two speakers say the same thing; together they represent a veritable camp of Ishmaelites: everybody's hand is against everybody. They are agreed, however, in one thing: they all deny the Jesus of Scripture. Negation is the bond of union among them. The account which Prof. Jordan has given in the chapters we have sketched is very interesting to every one who desires compact and exact information, in the lucid and captivating style of the modern theologians of Germany, on what cultured and intellectual Germany thinks—and causes other lands to think—of Christ.

In ch. 2 to 8 the author has discharged half of the task assumed in the title of his book: he has shown us "Die modernen Jesusbilder." In doing this he has acted partly as reporter, partly as critic. He has, however, agreed also to show us "Jesus," *i. e.*, to give us his own opinion of the Person whom he has held up to our view as the contradicted of men, "the sign that is spoken against." He does this in ch. 9: "Jesus," in which he declares that it is *historically* evident, 1) that Jesus regarded Himself as true man, 2) that He claimed to be more than man: "Den Menschen gegenüber fühlt er sich durchaus *als auf der Seite Gottes stehend.*" Beyond this the author declines to decide anything. Historical research and purely scientific perception do not exhaust all that may be known of Jesus. A rest remains, which can be approached and conquered only by faith. Faith, however, is a personal affair and belongs into the sphere of religious perception. When the historical evidence which we possess of Jesus is approached from "the presuppositions of Christian thought," it will be plain that in Jesus there is a union of the divine and the human, that in the incarnation the divine Power took on form in Jesus, and that through Jesus sinful men may enter into communion with God as their Father. Whether the author has personally taken this step of faith, it is not easy to determine. While apparently pleading for faith, he reserves the right to criticise the records of our faith, and it depends on the lengths to which his cherished right to criticise will carry him, whether he would be set down as a believer in the biblical God-man and the atonement. Moreover, it is difficult to understand how in a matter of this kind, which is essentially a mystery and known only by revelation, there can be "presuppositions of Christian thought." In ch. 2, "the 'Jesus of Holy Writ,'" a strange state of mind is exhibited. This chapter should really be grouped with that part of the book in which the author reproduces the portraits of Jesus which others have drawn, although the author asserts that the particular portrait

exhibited in this chapter is the least modern of all, in fact, is not modern at all. However, since in discussing this portrait the author has, to a large extent, bared his own theological mind and principles, we prefer to discuss this chapter in connection with his own view of Jesus. This chapter concerns us who hold to the plenary and verbal inspiration and to the efficacy of Scripture as the instrument through which the Spirit operates, creates faith, conveys the *testimonium Spiritus* to the reader. "As soon as we attempt," says Prof. Jordan, "to obtain a clear insight into the modern portraits of Jesus, we are at once met with the observation that we are surrounded by a bedlam of contradictory opinions. And it is at this point that, even in our modern time, there is presented to us a view which threatens to thwart all our efforts to produce scientifically a historic portrait of Jesus; for those holding this view undertake to sketch an exact and absolutely reliable portrait of Jesus from what they consider a firm and solid principle. I refer to the view which seeks to sketch a portrait of Jesus from the basic idea of the verbal inspiration, and which sets up this portrait as the true 'biblical' portrait of Jesus in opposition to the historic Jesus. It may be somewhat bold to speak of the portrait of Jesus, as verbal-inspirationists draw it, in a book bearing the title, 'Modern Portraits of Jesus;' for one has the impression that it is scarcely possible to find anything as unmodern as views which fall back on the verbal inspiration. However, while holding this opinion, we must not allow ourselves to be deceived in regard to the importance which is accorded to this view even in modern times, and in regard to the ominous influence which it is capable of exerting. Though this portrait of Jesus may appear to us full of contradictions and unhistorical, nevertheless, in the belief of Christian congregations particularly, it possesses an importance which it is hardly possible to overvalue. Accordingly, we shall have to speak first of this portrait of Jesus.

"Why engage in all this scientific labor on a life of Jesus, why burden minds with all this historico-critical ballast? Leave all this to philologists and historians; let them apply the scientific method to their 'secular' writings; the Bible is superior to all such scientific endeavors. In the last analysis, the valuation of the Bible must be on religious grounds, also the history which it narrates is altogether religious matter, and as such does not require to be viewed in a scientific and critical manner; yea, such a view must be altogether discarded. The Bible is the book which God gave to His people and to Christendom for their salvation, and for thousands of years this book has passed as absolutely true. Accordingly, we

have in Scripture the Word of God. God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost have equally bestowed their labor on this book, and have dictated their revelation to their believing penmen. Thus by divine providence a work has been produced which proclaims nothing but the pure and unadulterated truth. How could it be possible that the Word of God should contain an untruth? Accordingly, we have in our New Testament, particularly in the four Gospels, that portrait of Jesus which is the infallibly correct one, and which is modern and correct in the exact form in which it is presented in the Gospels, and does not admit of being tested by the hypercritical spirit of our time. In this very simple manner a portrait of Jesus is perfected which is held to be the correct one, because its authors simply elevate the contents of Scripture into the domain of history. As a rule, the designers fail to notice that what they are really drawing is a type of Jesus, perhaps that of the first three Gospels, or that of John. From their point of view it is sufficient that a matter has been stated in Scripture in one way or other. In this manner a portrait of Jesus is obtained for the traits of which the authors can at every point appeal to some inspired passage of Scripture, and that must suffice, of course; any opponent who dares to question the historical correctness of such a portrait of Jesus is either silenced by the citation of some passage of Scripture, or if he refuses to yield to the citation, is put aside as an unbeliever.

"This, then, is the fundamental view of the verbal inspiration, which, we regret to say, has exercised, and still exercises, such a strong influence even among our own Protestant people; which again and again seeks to check scientific labors and creates the impression that the opponents of Christianity will have an easy task in defeating such an unhistorical view of Christianity. True, these views are not always presented in the coarsest form, but are tempered in this respect or that. It is said that not every letter of Scripture is divinely inspired, but the idea, the particular statement, the account in general. While this claim is more moderate, still it is a worthless concession to the scientific view. For it is found that the dogma of the verbal inspiration is all the more firmly seated in the minds when points of decisive importance are reached, at which differences and historical difficulties arise. Fortunately, we have reached a state of affairs where we can say that the verbal inspiration no longer has any champions in our *scientific* life on the side of Protestantism and of a part of modern Catholicism. I could not name a single Protestant dogmatician or exegete

now living in our theological institutions who still maintains that dogma, that view. But it is all the more firmly rooted in the church and in the congregation, not only in the Catholic, but also in the Evangelical Church, which latter is still dragging this heritage of the orthodoxy of past ages with her. Far too often we still hear it voiced, with greater or less precision, in the instruction of catechumens and at school; for it is certainly easier to impart instruction according to the firm statutory canon of the verbal inspiration than according to the vitalized historical and religious view. . . . However, before offering our criticism, let us see first how our friends on the other side view matters. The Bible as a whole, they say, must be set apart from all other literature, hence, also the records of the life and person of Jesus. While in the entire domain of secular literature men exposed to errors and mistakes are the speakers, it is the inerrant, truthful God who speaks in this Book. He has put into the hearts of godly men what they were to write concerning Jesus, and thus the Gospels were dictated, as it were, to them as clerks; God guided the pen of the evangelists in the act of writing. Later there arose other godly men who connected the various writings, and thus the canon, the collection of our four Gospels, came into existence. In conclusion, there were still other learned and godly men who took care to have the original text of the Gospels preserved in pure and unadulterated form. This view may be presented in a finer form and in a pointed manner; so much, however, is clear in every case that if we choose to take this course, it is indeed needless to take cognizance of any other portraits of Jesus produced in modern times. For then everything is clear, all difficulties vanish. 'God is not a liar,' 'the Scriptures cannot be broken;' hence, if contradictions or errors are discovered in Scripture, the fault is in the person discovering them. In a book of this sort I read the following statement: 'If any doctrine of revelation appears unreasonable to you, you must forthwith assume that the fault is not in the revelation, but in your defective understanding of the same, and you must accord this honor to your God that you distrust your understanding rather than God.' Accordingly, we have in this entire view the typical identification of God, revelation, and Scripture! What remedy is there which those holding this view can apply to difficulties which will arise nevertheless? They adopt the method of harmonizing. If Luke and Matthew relate a story concerning Jesus, both in nearly the same words, however, differing in one point, their accounts are twisted until they are made to say the same thing, or the claim is set up that the event

occurred twice, the first time in this, the second time in that manner. — This process stands self-condemned; however, let us hear what grounds are adduced for this view which impresses us as a wonderfully foreign and medieval product. The advocates of this view usually render their task quite easy by stating that Scripture asserts these things concerning itself. For it is written: 'All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction,' etc.; or, 'Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' Of course, it is evident that this conclusion is fallacious, because Scripture itself is being appealed to as evidence to prove that Scripture is the unconditioned historical truth. This is arguing in a circle and proves nothing. Moreover, it can be shown that it is an erroneous view to believe that the biblical writers knew themselves to be merely the penmen of the Holy Spirit. On the contrary, *they* related what *they* thought and what *they* knew, what opinions *they* held regarding Jesus, and what *they* had heard about Him. They did this, indeed, with the intention of being strictly historical, but they laid no claim to absolute inerrancy. — However, the weightiest argument brought forward is this, that not only Paul, but also Jesus held the view of the inerrancy at least of the Old Testament, and that, consequently, this view must be extended so as to embrace the Gospels. This is not the place to enter upon a detailed presentation of the position which Jesus occupied over and against the Old Testament, because His position cannot be fully stated in two or three words. However, this much is quite certain that in the opinion of Jesus as well as of Paul this view was always considered valid: 'It is written in the Scriptures, therefore it is so,' notwithstanding the fact that owing to His peculiar consciousness Jesus has in some respects assumed a position of greater freedom over and against the Old Testament. Be this as it may, *even Jesus cannot, in this historical question, be a law to us in our modern world, forcing us to sacrifice our convictions in deference to His views, which must always be considered within the environments of His own time.* [Italics ours.] Jesus believed, amongst other things, that the Pentateuch was really written by Moses; His cosmology was certainly that of the old world, and He believed that the sun revolves around the earth; He expected the end of the world in a very short time, during the generation then living. In view of all these facts we cannot in any wise allow ourselves to be deceived so as to deny that *Jesus simply was in error on all these points.* [Italics ours.] Or we had better say: as regards His culture, and in a scientific and historical respect Jesus



was simply a child of His age. To follow Jesus in all these views would mean to drop back several thousands of years in our culture and knowledge, just as it would mean to misunderstand Jesus' free Gospel of mercy in its fundamental ideas if we were to deduce from Him a new law directing us what to think in a scientific and historical respect in our present age. Hence, the absolute signification of the formula: 'It is written' cannot be deduced even from Jesus so as to make it applicable to our time." Continuing, the author enters upon a discussion of the testimony of the Holy Spirit, which he acknowledges to be the only absolutely valid proof for the authority of Scripture. But he denies that this proof can be applied in historical research; he asserts that other writings, *e. g.*, Luther's, breathe the Spirit of God; he cites Luther's remark about the Epistle of James and the canon; he questions the conclusiveness of the testimony of the Spirit on the ground that it is limited to the twenty-seven canonical books of the New Testament, and that this canon was set up by men who might have decided in a different manner as to which books should go into the canon and which should be rejected. He adduces the many variant readings to show that if at one time there was an inspired text, that text no longer exists, and we are relying upon textual criticism, hence upon human labor, to furnish us the instrument by which the testimony of the Spirit is conveyed. And lastly, he claims outright that contradictions affecting the person and acts of Jesus exist in the four accounts which we have of His life, and that these differences cannot be composed.

In this manner the author has discharged the second obligation which he had assumed in the title of his book. His Jesus, then, is just as much the product of his own mind as the Jesus of the persons for whom he acted as reporter. Between the second and the ninth chapters of his book there is a yawning gap. How it is possible to present an historic Jesus after destroying the credibility and authority of the historical records of Jesus' life, and then to claim for this procedure that it is scientific, this passes comprehension. Apply this process to any or all other historic personages, events, conditions, and the result must be that nobody ever was what he claimed to be, or what others have claimed him to be; nothing ever happened as it is reported to have happened, and no state of affairs ever existed in the exact nature which contemporaries and chronologists have ascribed to it. The old worm-eaten objection of the *argumentum in circulo* is brought forward again in order to rob Scripture of the right which our secular courts accord to the lowest criminal,

*viz.*, that of testifying in his own behalf. There is not even a hint in this book that self-testimony is under certain conditions the highest and most valuable form of testimony, and that in the instance of Scripture it certainly must be valued very highly, as we have before us in the Bible a book the origin of which cannot be ascertained in an empirical way: its very assertion that it came into existence by a direct operation of God is just what we should expect this Book to say concerning itself. As to the testimony of the Spirit, if that is not possible because of the unreliable condition of the biblical records, how is the fact accounted for that this testimony has been received by men, and is a present-day fact which thousands gratefully witness? We have no doubt that Prof. Jordan would feel inclined to regard the people as enthusiasts who claim that they obtained their faith in the Bible from, and by means of, the Bible. The mission of the modern scientist appears to be to persuade men that their religious belief is an illusion in so far as it rests on an objective basis, a basis external to the believers themselves. In order to obtain the true contents of Scripture it must be studied from "the presuppositions of Christian thought." Science does not furnish these presuppositions; Scripture must not supply them; whence do they come, and what are they?

---

DER ANTICHRIST. Von *Lic. Dr. Hans Preuss*. 1909. Verlag von Edwin Runge in Gross-Lichterfelde, Berlin. 46 pages. Price, 50 Pf.

The author denies that there is in Scripture anything that could be called a "doctrine" of the Antichrist, resting on a direct and specific divine revelation and partaking of the character of a prophecy. (p. 13.) The Antichrist, or "the antichristian principle," in his view, is "the desire to be like God," which has again and again cropped out in the life of the race. Particular ages have had their particular antichrists: the early Christian Church regarded the imperial Roman government with its deified and worshiped emperors as the Antichrist; Luther declared the pope to be the Antichrist; the twentieth century inclines to the belief that the Social-Democracy in league with atheistic evolutionism will prove to be the Antichrist. (p. 45 f. 16.) The author connects the biblical statements concerning the Antichrist with Babylonian, Egyptian, and Grecian mythology. He represents Paul and John as having written to their congregations about conditions and events then existing or in process of forma-

tion; and the allegorical style, or the obscure language in which they wrote, he explains as a diplomatic act: they wished to secure their writings against confiscation by the government. — This pamphlet is one of a series ("Biblische Zeit- und Streitfragen") which aims at popularizing the results of modern scientific theological research. Lord, have mercy upon us!

---

BILDER AUS DEM HEILIGEN LANDE. Dargeboten von der Redaktion der *Abendschule*. St. Louis, Mo. 1909. 335 pages. Price, \$1.25.

This is a well-written and abundantly illustrated description of modern Palestine, rich in pertinent references to places, persons, and historical events in the Canaan of Bible story. It is not merely a book for pastime reading, but an aid to the better understanding and greater appreciation of many statements in Scripture for which the intelligent laymen of our Church who read their Bible closely will be grateful. Typographically and artistically the familiar charm which comes with the productions of the Louis Lange press is also on this book.

---

HOMILETISCHES REALLEXICON nebst *Index Rerum* von E. Eckhardt. G—Heft 12. Blair, Nebr. 1909.

(See THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, April, 1908.) The present installment carries the work forward from "Geburt Christi" to "Jüngstes Gericht." To cite only a few, it catalogues our literature on such important subjects as "Gefühl," "Geist," "Gemeinde," "Gemeindeglied," "Gemeindekonstitution," "Gemeindeversammlung," "Gemeinschaft" (of the Christians with Christ, and with one another, also synodical union and fellowship), "Genugtuung," "Gerechtigkeit."

---

WHY I AM A PROTESTANT. By *Martin S. Sommer*, Pastor of Grace Ev. Luth. Church, St. Louis, Mo. To be bought of the author, 3118 St. Louis Ave., at 5 cts. per copy, \$3.00 per hundred, postpaid.

The author discusses 1) the biblical meaning of the terms "protest" and "protestant;" 2) the application of this term to the followers of Luther; 3) the reasons why he is a Protestant. He alleges five reasons, as follows: "1. Because I protest against any

man, or any number of men, any bishop or Pope or church presuming to give me religious laws which God has not given me; 2. because I protest against any one requiring me to believe religious teaching which does not come from God; 3. because I protest against the Roman Catholic Church's cruelty and tyranny in dealing with those who refuse to submit to its authority; 4. because I love my country and its glorious blood-bought liberty; 5. because the Lord Jesus is coming to judge the quick and the dead." This little treatise contains a great deal of information in compact and popular form and is written in a lively style. We regret our inability to announce its appearance prior to the late Reformation festival. It deserves a wide circulation.

---

THE STUDENT'S HANDBOOK to the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church at Chicago, Ill. Revised to October, 1908. Chicago Lutheran Seminary Press. 1909. 93 pages. Price, 10 cts.; cloth, 25 cts.

The General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church conducts a theological seminary at Chicago. All information desired regarding its origin, government, courses of study, examinations, etc., is given in this book.

---

DIES UND DAS UND NOCH ETWAS. Von *Hermann H. Zage*. Verlag der Louis Lange Publishing Co., St. Louis, Mo. 222 pages. Price, \$1.25.

This is a collection of short stories, all breathing a healthy spirit. Reading matter of this kind should be placed in our homes. Pastor C. J. Otto Hanser, in a happy vein, introduces this book of the well-known author to the reader.

---

*Concordia Publishing House* announces the following publications:—

1. A TREATISE ON REASON AND ITS USE, especially in Matters of Religion, a doctrinal paper submitted by *Rev. Chr. Merkel* to the recent convention of the Atlantic District of the Missouri Synod. Price, 15 cts.
2. A TREATISE ON THE INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE, a doctrinal paper submitted by *Rev. E. Zapf* to the recent convention of the Illinois District of the Missouri Synod. Price, 20 cts.

3. A TREATISE ON PROVIDING A CHRISTIAN SCHOOLING FOR THE CHILDREN OF OUR CONGREGATIONS, a doctrinal paper submitted by *Rev. C. W. Nickels* to the Minnesota and Dakota District of the Missouri Synod. The same report contains *A Report of the Status of the Parochial Schools* in the Minnesota and Dakota District, furnished by *Teacher Martin Kirsch*, and a doctrinal paper by *Rev. H. Buegel* which answers the question: *What is the Present Status of Our Synod in Regard to Syncretism?* Price, 12 cts.
4. AMERIKANISCHER KALENDER FUER DEUTSCHE LUTHERANER auf das Jahr 1910. Price, 10 cts.
5. LUTHERAN ANNUAL for 1910. This is the English companion to the foregoing publication. Price, 10 cts.
6. LOBT GOTT, IHR CHRISTEN, ALLZUGLEICH. A German Order of Service for a Children's Service at Christmas. Compiled by *Wm. J. Schmidt*. Price, 5 cts.; dozen, 30 cts.; hundred, \$2.00, without carriage.
7. CONCORDIA PASTIME LIBRARY. Vol. 6: *Stories of the School Room*. Vol. 7: *Stories of the Farm*. Price, for each volume, 25 cts.; special price in quantities.

The *American Lutheran Publication Board* has sent us a good Christmas Program entitled, *The Wise Men from the East*, also designed for a Children's Service. Price, 5 cts.; dozen, 50 cts.; hundred, \$3.50, without carriage.

*Rev. W. Dallmann* sends us the third edition of his tract: *What Is Christianity?* (a refutation of Harnack's tract of like name); price, 5 cts.; also the fourth edition of his tract on *Mission Work*; price, 5 cts. The same author has published two mailing cards containing on the reverse side, the one, Luther's declaration at Worms, the other, Margrave George of Brandenburg's statement in what sense he calls himself a Lutheran.

All the above publications we can heartily commend. We call special attention to the two additions which the "Concordia Pastime Library" has received. The two well-printed and neatly bound volumes contain eleven short stories each, which are not only entertaining, but also instructive. We express the wish and the hope that the publishers will increase this Library at a more rapid rate than in late years.

From the *Augustana Book Concern* at Rock Island, Ill., we have received: *Augustana Synodens Referat*. Femtionde Arsmöte hallet i Red Wing, Minn., den 10.—16. Juni 1909. Over 300 pages. Contains transactions, committee reports, and statistics of the Swedish Lutheran Synod.