

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE
MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK
THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. XII

July, 1941

No. 7

CONTENTS

	Page
Verbal Inspiration — a Stumbling-Block to the Jews and Foolishness to the Greeks. Th. Engelder	481
Sermon Study for Fourth Sunday after Trinity. Th. Laetsch	510
The Lutheran Pastor as Teacher. P. E. Kretzmann	523
Outlines on the Wuerttemberg Gospel Selections	528
Miscellanea	535
Theological Observer.—Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches	543
Book Review.—Literatur	554

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein *weiden*, also dass er die Schafe unterweise, wie sie rechte Christen sollen sein, sondern auch daneben den *Wolffen wehren*, dass sie die Schafe nicht angreifen und mit falscher Lehre verfuerehen und Irrtum einfuehren.

Luther

Es ist kein Ding, das die Leute mehr bei der Kirche behaelt denn die gute Predigt.— *Apologie, Art. 24*

If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? — *1 Cor. 14:8*

Published for the
Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.



ARCHIVES

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. XII

JULY, 1941

No. 7

Verbal Inspiration — a Stumbling-Block to the Jews and Foolishness to the Greeks

(Continued)

Dr. Pieper says: "The objections to the verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture do not manifest great ingenuity or mental acumen, but the very opposite." When men set out to criticize God's Word, "they lose their common sense and become utterly unreasonable and illogical." (*What Is Christianity?* P. 243.) On the other hand, Dr. Edwin Lewis speaks of "the incredible fatuity on the part of the literalist, who insists on the 'absolute inerrancy' of Scripture" (*A Philosophy of the Christian Revelation*, p. 55), and Dr. G. A. Buttrick declares that "the avowal of the literal infallibility of Scripture, held to its last logic, would risk a trip to the insane asylum." (See CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY, XII, p. 223.) Who is right? It is the purpose of this and the following articles to show that those who uphold the thesis that Scripture is in conflict with history, other sciences, and even with itself are in conflict with sound reason. The Modernists and the moderns claim that, when once the mind is scientifically trained, it detects a host of errors in the Bible. It will not be hard to demonstrate that, the better a mind is scientifically and logically trained, the more it marvels at the fatuity displayed by the critics of the Bible.⁵⁰⁾

50) The faith of the Christian does not need such a demonstration. But the moderns need it. When one who imagines that the rejection of Verbal Inspiration is required and justified by reason realizes that all his objections are unreasonable, he will approach Scripture with a more chastened spirit. It will shatter his self-confidence to find that on his own principles, on the application of common sense, his position is untenable. So we are not now asking him for the *sacrificium intellectus*. Leave that to the believer as a believer. All that we ask of the objector is the *usus intellectus*. We want him, for the purpose of the present articles, to use it to the full. — The present discussion will be of some use, too, for the believer. His own flesh makes the same objections, and his carnal pride of reason needs the same treatment.

The list of "historical errors in the Bible" does not speak well for the historical acumen of its compilers. It evidences a vast amount of historical misinformation. And the misinformation dispensed by the historical critics of the Bible is due to the fact that they have not learned the first principles underlying the science of history. When they took that course, the professor warned them against undertaking to pass final judgment on any historical matter unless they had full knowledge of all the facts in the case. He commits a historical crime who decides historical questions on the basis of partial information. A mind which is scientifically trained shuns hasty, premature judgments. The professor also warned them against the vice of partiality. Unless a man is ready to make use of all the historical material at his disposal, he cannot qualify as a historian or historical critic. He has no right to pick and choose from the sources at his own good pleasure. These and similar rules and canons are dictated by common sense.

Most of the "historical mistakes" are mistakes of the critics. The critics spoke without full knowledge of the subject. In plain language, the items in question are due to ignorance. Consequently the list has a queer appearance. As the list looks today, every other item is marked "Delete!" The earlier critics have been corrected by scholars of a later day, and the later critics are hard put to find new mistakes — or try to salvage some of the old items — in order to give a respectable length to the list. They used to say that Moses could not have been the author of the Pentateuch as we have it because at the time when it purports to have been written people could not write. This item has been deleted. "It was not long ago that certain 'progressives' were wont to affirm boldly that there never was any such person as Moses, because no mention of him can be found in other records; and, anyway, allowing that there was such a man, he couldn't possibly have written the Pentateuch because the art of writing was unknown in his time. Then along came a man with a spade, and, digging among the ruins of Tel-el-Amarna, he unearthed a whole library of correspondence" dating from the time of the Exodus. (D. J. Burrell, *Why I Believe the Bible*, p. 61.)⁵¹ "Thus, while von Bohlen pictures an alphabetical ancient world and scoffs at the notion of literary activity in the Mosaic era (a position shared also by Reuss, Dillmann, and others), the modern verdict, which rests on a definite historical basis, is not only this affirma-

51) We read on page 187: "Suffice it here to say that not a single record of the slightest importance in the Pentateuch or other historical books of Scripture has ever been successfully impugned, while, on the contrary, the researches of the archeologists are continually verifying them."

tion: 'It is probable that at the time of the Amarna letters' (the fourteenth century, or the time of Moses) 'the usual mode of writing in Syria, Phenicia, and Palestine was the alphabetic' (*Am. Journal of Archeology*, Jan., 1926), but also the unavoidable conclusion that the real origin of alphabetic writing lies in the dim past, too far anterior to Moses to be dated definitely." (CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY, 4, p. 179.)

All right, Moses could write. But he had no right to speak of Abraham and Amraphel, etc., as historical figures. This item, too, has been blue-penciled, and the censor is recognized among the higher critics of today as a high authority — *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, edited by Bishop Charles Gore and others (1929): "With the introduction of Abraham we touch real history and are able to compare the narratives of Genesis with Babylonian and Egyptian records. . . . The identification of 'Amraphel, king of Shinar,' *i. e.*, Babylon, with Hammurabi, the sixth king of the first Babylonian dynasty, who reigned c. 2123-2081 B. C., gives us an approximate date for Abraham's migration from Babylon. . . . There is no reason to doubt the existence of the patriarchs (Abraham, Jacob, Israel) as historic personages." (P. 38.) So item two also was the result of a premature judgment, given by an immature historian.

Item three. Its father declared that "an alliance between Egypt and the Hittites was as improbable as would be one at the present time between England and the Choctaws." "But, alas for the overconfident critic, recent investigations have shown, not only that such an alliance was natural but that it actually occurred." (The writer quotes from monuments of Egypt and the Tel-el-Amarna tablets): "There has been brought to light a Hittite empire in Asia Minor, with central power and vassal dependencies round about and with treaty rights on equal terms with the greatest nations of antiquity, thus making the Hittite power a third great power with Babylonia and Egypt." (*The Fundamentals*, II, pp. 15, 32.)

Next we have the *cause célèbre* based on Luke 2:1, 2. Here the critics were absolutely sure of their case. This census is a fiction! And Quirinius never governed Syria during the life of Herod! Luke committed a historical crime. "Twisten, the learned rector of the university at Berlin, whom, for his labors and reputation in other respects, we honor, quotes this passage and that of the blind men at Jericho as showing that we throw ourselves into inextricable difficulties in our endeavor to explain them. . . . These cases are among those which the adversaries of a plenary inspiration have seemed to regard as the most insurmountable." (L. Gaussen, *Theopneustia*, p. 208, 210.) All the evidence was

against Luke, insisted the prosecutor. The *Proceedings of the Western District of 1865*, page 31, after stating that "not a single Bible statement concerning secular matters has been proved false," goes on to say: "But there remained one passage which could not be straightened out, the passage stating that Cyrenius was governor of Syria at the time of the birth of Christ, for by all accounts he held that position at a later date. The unbelievers were already shouting in glee and telling us: Don't you see that you have a no-account Bible?" But new evidence came in on that point: "A few years ago it was discovered that Cyrenius was governor of Syria twice, and again the Bible won out." Do we have to go into particulars? We shall take at random C. E. Lindberg's summary: "By the investigations of Ramsay and others it has been proved that there was a periodical census system in the Roman Empire. . . . If the first census began 8—7 B. C., it was slow in materializing on account of the situation in Syria and Palestine. . . . A series of inscriptions bearing on the career of Quirinius proves that he was governor of Syria in the first census and governor and procurator in the second, Acts 5:37. The modern findings in stone and papyri vindicate the accurateness of the Gospel of Luke." (*Christian Dogmatics*, p. 392.) Chapter XXVI of G. A. Barton's *Archeology and the Bible* gives some pertinent papyri and concludes: "So far as the new material goes, it confirms the narrative of Luke."⁵²⁾

Our *Synodalbericht* continues: "Eine andere Schwierigkeit,

52) Why, the Sunday-school children know all about this. W. T. Ellis, in his lessons published in the daily press, told them in the lesson for Dec. 25, 1927, that Caesar Augustus himself is a witness for Luke. He quotes from an inscription in a temple in Ancyra (Angora), the *Monumentum Ancyranum*: "In my sixth consulship I carried out a census of the Roman people. . . . A second time, in the consulship of C. Censorius and C. Asinius, I completed a lustrum [or census] without the help of a colleague invested with the consular imperium. At this second lustrum 4,233,000 Roman citizens were entered on the rolls." (This was the Christmas census, and the date was about B. C. 8, as we know by the names of the consuls.) "A third time (A. D. 14) I completed a lustrum. . . ." The case against Luke has been thrown out of court. The expert for the prosecution was compelled to make this declaration: "The outcome of the whole controversy is that no one is entitled to laugh at Luke's statement (or perhaps we should say, the statement of the document he quotes), even if it be not perfectly accurately worded." (Bishop Gore's *Commentary*.) The laughter in the court-room of which the *Synodalbericht* spoke suddenly subsided. This attack on the veracity of the Bible historian, again, was due to lack of information. — Always bear in mind that even when this corroborative testimony was not available, the case of Luke was not in doubt. This additional material shuts the mouth of the prosecution, but it was never needed by the believer. If we should meet a case where the Biblical writer is not "confirmed" by the historian or scientist or is contradicted by him, we know that the Bible is right and the objector wrong — in every case.

die sich merkwuerdig fein geloest hat. Apostelgeschichte 13 wird naemlich erzaehlt, dass Paulus den Landvogt auf der Insel Cypren bekehrt habe. Nun fanden aber die Gelehrten heraus, dass sich der Kaiser Augustus diese Insel zur eigenen Verwaltung vorbehalten hatte, dass also da kein Landvogt sein konnte. Lange schien die Sache zur Freude der Unglaebigen unerklaerlich. Aber man fand auf einmal eine alte Silbermuenze, auf der stand in der Mitte 'Cyprische Landmuenze' und am Rande herum 'Geschlagen unter dem Landvogt Comenius Proclus'. Und noch ein wenig spaeter fand man auch bei einem alten griechischen Geschichtschreiber die Nachricht, dass schon Kaiser Augustus die Insel wieder an den Senat zur Besetzung durch einen Landvogt abgegeben habe. Darum lasse sich doch niemand verblueffen, wenn die Unglaebigen mit solchen Ungenauigkeiten und Widerspruechen der Schrift prahlen; denn besieht man sie beim Licht, so beweisen sie sich als nicht vorhanden".⁵³⁾ Put Gore's liberal *Commentary* on the stand. "Cyprus was a senatorial province. Therefore the title of proconsul is correct. An inscription bearing the words 'when Paulus was proconsul' has been found in the island." Verdict for Luke.

The critics have not yet conceded that their black-list is mistaken in every case. Some of them persist in charging the Biblical historians with mistakes on the unreasonable principle that in the case of a conflict between a sacred and a secular historian the latter is always right. They will even maintain their charge in the face of abundant historical evidence to the contrary. The critics used to poke fun at Daniel for making Belshazzar the last ruler of Babylon. The last king, they said, was Nabonidus, and no historian mentions Belshazzar. In answer to this the *Lutheran School Journal*, Nov., 1936, page 108, quotes from Urquhart's *Archeology's Solution of Old Testament Puzzles* this inscription made by

53) Let us repeat this in English: "The sixth class of difficulties are those that arise from our defective knowledge of the history, geography, and usages of Bible times. We have an illustration of this in Acts 13:7. Here Luke speaks of 'the deputy,' or, more accurately, 'the proconsul' [see Revised Version]. The ruler of an imperial province was called a 'propraetor,' of a senatorial province a 'proconsul.' Up to a comparatively recent date, according to the best information we had, Cyprus was an imperial province, and therefore its ruler would be a 'propraetor,' but Luke calls him a 'proconsul.' This certainly seems like a clear case of error on Luke's part, and even conservative commentators in former days felt forced to admit that Luke was in slight error, and the destructive critics were delighted to find this 'mistake.' But further and more thorough investigation has brought to light the fact that just at the time of which Luke wrote the Senate had made an exchange with the emperor whereby Cyprus had become a senatorial province and therefore its ruler a 'proconsul,' and Luke was exactly and minutely correct, after all, and the very 'scholarly' literary critics were themselves in error in their criticism. The mistake was theirs and not Luke's." (R. A. Torrey, *Is the Bible the Inerrant Word of God?* P. 81.)

Nabonidus: "As for me, Nabonidus, king of Babylon, from sin against thee, the great Divinity, save me; and a life of remote days give as a gift; and as for Belshazzar, the eldest son, the offspring of my heart, the fear of thy great Divinity cause thou to exist in his heart and let not sin possess him that he be satisfied with fulness of life." It can no longer be asserted that Daniel invented Belshazzar. And why should Daniel have been proclaimed "the *third* ruler in the kingdom" (Dan. 5:29)? Because Nabonidus was the ruler, his son the coruler, and so Daniel was given the next highest position. It is very simple. But the critics will not have it so. They now assert that no tablets have been dated in Belshazzar's reign. And the monuments do not say that Belshazzar was slain at the taking of Babylon. Prof. Joseph D. Wilson rightly says: "That is a quibble unworthy of the scholar who makes it." (*Fundamentals*, 7, p. 96.) And it is unworthy of Gore's *Commentary* to say definitely and positively: "No Belshazzar was king of Babylon so far as is known. . . . The evidence at present available is against his ever having reigned." Since when does the rule hold that unless a historical writer is corroborated by another historical writer, his account may be ignored?⁵⁴⁾

"Further," says Gore's *Commentary*, "Darius the Mede is an entirely unknown person, and history allows no place for him. Cyrus was the immediate successor of Nabonidus, and no other supreme ruler is known." We shall say that Darius the Mede is a well-known figure. The historian Daniel has made him known to us. Let Baumgaertel, Best, De Witt, and Gore keep on saying: "Einen 'Mede' Darius hat es nicht gegeben," we shall keep on telling them: Darius the Mede did rule over Babylon. We shall not say that he was "the *supreme* ruler," "an independent king." Daniel does not say so. A mind scientifically trained would not have written into Gore's *Commentary*: "Darius the Mede: an unknown figure, possibly by confusion with Gobryas or Ugbaru, the general of Cyrus, who occupied the city and slew the king's son. . . . The writer evidently thought of Darius as an independent king, reigning before Cyrus and presumably for some length of

54) Gore's *Commentary* ignores not only the statements of the historian Daniel but also the evidence from secular sources. Barton's *Archeology and the Bible* has devoted chapter XVIII to this matter. It gives us the inscription of Nabuna'id quoted above and extracts from two tablets from Erech recently published. "It was customary for Babylonians, in confirming a contract, to swear by the name of the reigning king, and one of these tablets contains a contract dated in the twelfth year of Nabuna'id, in which a man bound himself by the oath of Nabuna'id, king of Babylon, and of Belshazzar, the king's son. As Belshazzar is here associated with the king, he must have been slightly lower in rank and power than the king himself." See also *Journal of the A. L. Conference*, Aug., 1940, p. 531, and *C. T. M.*, III, p. 215.

time," "as supreme ruler." Daniel does not call him an *independent* king. And why use the term "by confusion with Gobryas"? Why not say: Darius, known in secular history as Gobryas? There is a great lack of historical objectivity in these historical critics. One trained in the science of history will write in this strain: "He has not been identified with certainty but was probably sovereign of the Babylonian empire *ad interim* until Cyrus, who was pressing his conquests, was ready to assume the duties of king of Babylon." (Davis's *Dictionary of the Bible*.) — "The writer evidently thought of Darius as reigning for some length of time." Anything wrong about that? Barton's *Archeology* says: "The second tablet shows that in the fourth year of Cambyses [*i. e.*, 524 B. C.] Gobryas was still governor of Babylon. If he is the man who in Daniel is called Darius the Mede, he exercised the powers of governor in Babylon for a considerable number of years." — It is puerile, not worthy of an adult historian, to operate with the rule that whenever a person mentioned in the Bible cannot be absolutely identified with a person mentioned by a secular historian, the Biblical statement is subject to doubt.

Another item which some refuse to delete from the black-list is that concerning the first husband of Herodias. Gore's *Commentary* persists in rating Josephus higher than the evangelists. "It is simplest to suppose that Mark or his informant confused Herodias's husband and son-in-law." (On Mark 6:17.) What we have said on this item in the preceding article is all that we are going to say.

We are of course not going to take notice of all the historical "mistakes" on the black-list. We must not waste Concordia Publishing House paper. But just to show to what lengths the critics have gone in order to get a long list, we should like to cite one more example. Bruno Bauer, the skeptic and scoffer, denies "the reliability of Luke's gospel on the ground that it makes a ruler a contemporary of Jesus who had died half a century before. Lysanias, tetrarch of Abilene, has been murdered 34 years before the birth of Christ. 'Da der Evangelist fuer die vierte Tetrarchie keinen andern Namen ausfindig zu machen weiss, so nennt er frischweg Lysanias, ohne dass es ihm einfiele, danach zu fragen, ob dieser Lysanias noch lebte' (Weisse.) . . . 'In spaeteren Zeiten noch,' sagt Strauss (*Leben Jesu*, I, 375), 'war Abilene von dem letzten Herrscher der fruerehen Dynastie ἡ Λυσανίου zubenannt, aus welchem Umstande der Evangelist den Schluss zog, dass es auch damals noch einen Herrscher dieses Namens gegeben habe.'" (*Kritik der Evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker*, I, p. 130.) — Man is able to doubt and deny anything. Why, the late Nathanael Schmidt of Cornell University

made this statement: "It may be affirmed that we have no absolute contemporary evidence preserved in its original form that Jesus ever lived." (See S. M. Zwemer, *The Glory of the Manger*, p. 42.) And if the canon of the historical critics is right (that the historical statements of the Bible need corroboration from secular sources), men like Professor Schmidt can no longer assume that Jesus was a historical personage. Characterizing these and similar objections, H. M'Intosh applies the terms "culpable ignorance or intellectual density," "paltry puerilities and most jejune ideas," "mental opacity," etc. (*Is Christ Infallible and the Bible True?* Pp. 292, 312, 454, etc.)

These same terms apply to the list dealing with the alleged blunders in natural science. The ants of Prov. 6:8 may serve as a sample case. (See page 245 above.) The scientific skeptic said (1) that ants are carnivorous and so could not store up "meat"; it would spoil. And (2) they do not house grains for future use; Solomon mistook the white cocoon of the ant pupae for such grains. We hate to waste our paper, but in order to put these scientific blunderers in their place, we submit the following. *International Critical Commentary*: "As to the industrial habit spoken of in the verse, the latest authorities hold that some species of ants are granivorous and store up food." *Encyclopedia Britannica*: "Ants exhibit a great variety of food preference: many are carnivorous, others feed upon nectar and honey-dew; some gather in seeds, etc., and some live on fungi which they cultivate. . . . Certain ants resort to collecting, and feeding upon, plant seeds. These harvesting ants collect, husk, and store the seeds in special granaries."⁵⁵ *The Pulpit Commentary* reaches the conclusion: "Hence writers who were ignorant of ants beyond those of their own country have been presumptuous enough to deny the accuracy of Solomon's statement." This is but a sample case. And it fits

55) Additional authorities: Avebury, *Ants, Bees, and Wasps*, p. 61: "Forel asserts that *Atta structor* allows the seeds in its granaries to commence the process of germination for the sake of the sugar." Wheeler, *Ants*, p. 258 f.: "The ancient peoples were undoubtedly familiar with the granivorous habits of these ants (*Messor barbarus* and *Messor structor*) and probably also with those of the third species, *Messor arenarius*. To them refer many allusions in the writings of Solomon and the Mishna, etc. . . . The entomologists of the early portion of the last century, however, failing to find any harvesters among the ants of temperate Europe, began to doubt or even to deny their existence. . . . All doubt was removed by Moggridge's excellent work in 1871 and 1872. . . . He opened the nests of these ants and studied their granaries. . . ." *The Pulpit Commentary* offers a lot of additional material. For instance: "The late Professor Darwin states of the agricultural ant of Texas, which in many features resembles the ant of Palestine, that it not only stores its food but prepares the soil for the crops, keeps the ground free from weeds, and finally reaps the harvest (*Journal of the Linnaean Society*, Vol. 1, No. 21, p. 27.)"

most cases in the black-list — the objections are based on plain ignorance and clamant with the presumptuous cock-sureness of the smatterer. — Give science a chance! Let the scientist put himself in possession of all the facts in the case, and science will catch up with Scripture.

Periodically the critics set up a great hullabaloo about the multitude of quails mentioned Num. 11:31, 32. Back around 1886 “an infidel paper in Boston devoted a column of ridicule to the ‘quail story.’” (A. T. Pierson, *Many Infallible Proofs*, p. 180.) Last year a suit was brought against Rev. Harry Rimmer who had offered \$1,000 to any one proving a scientific error in the Bible. The plaintiffs — a group of freethinkers — attempted to prove that the story of the quails involved a scientific impossibility. We are wondering what law of nature was broken by that occurrence. The question is not whether the quails have the habit of appearing in such incredible numbers. No army on the march would expect that once a month some species of bird, obeying a law implanted in this species, would relieve the commissary department of its usual duties. Our infidels will have to take the story as Moses relates it, and Moses describes it as a miracle. So our objectors will have to prove that science has discovered a law which makes it impossible for God to have sent this great number of quails to Israel in its need. Of course, there is nothing in nature to tie the hands of the Lord. — The Boston paper, to give point to its ridicule, “estimated the bushels of quail piled up over the country, showing that each of the 6,000,000 Israelites would have 2,888,643 bushels of quail per month, or 69,629 bushels for a meal.” That is rather pointless since Moses does not state that the Israelites devoured all the quails. A great many indeed they did eat, so many that it came out at their nostrils and it was loathsome unto them, v. 20. But Moses does not say that God forced them to eat all the birds He sent. Please read v. 32! And the story of the miraculous fall of the manna will help you to understand how God managed this affair. Where is the scientific impossibility? The court that heard the evidence the freethinkers of our day had to offer — their experts were Dr. John Haynes Holmes and Dr. Charles Francis Potter — decided in favor of the defendant.⁵⁶⁾

We could wish that the Ingersolls might have their day in

56) We do not know just what evidence the defendant offered. Perhaps he pointed out, with A. T. Pierson, that “the Bible does not say any such a thing as that they were piled two cubits high over a territory forty miles broad; it simply means that the wind which brought them from the sea swept them within reach of about three feet above the ground. If you should say you saw a flock of birds as high as a church spire, even an infidel would ridicule any one for

court who say, "The Bible is not inspired in natural history. For it says (Lev. 11:5) that the rabbit and the hare chew the cud. But they do not." Are you sure? In the first place, the animals mentioned are not yet *absolutely* identified. Davis's *Dictionary of the Bible* will only go so far as to say that the "coney," *shaphan*, is *probably* the rock-badger. As to the "hare," *arnebeth*, the consensus of opinion is that it is an animal like our hare. But might not the *arnebeth* be an extinct species? However, let that go. Let the *arnebeth* be a common hare. And Ingersoll insists that according to the zoologists the hare does not chew the cud. So we ask, in the second place, what does "chewing the cud" mean? It does not mean that the animal performing that operation must have the complex stomach, which is four-chambered, of the true ruminants. Our zoologists use the term "true ruminants" to designate the animals that have a four-chambered stomach, but they classify as ruminants also those whose stomach is imperfectly four-parted, and also those whose stomach is three-parted. And we claim the privilege, with Moses, of classifying as cud-chewers also those animals which, let their stomach be what it will, chew their food a second time. And the hare is such an animal.

Ingersoll and those on his side assert that the zoologists deny that. And so we make our third point: It is not true that "the zoologists," all zoologists, are on Ingersoll's side. Reputable zoologists are on Moses' side. "Selbst noch Linné hat den Hasen [hare, *arnebeth*] unter die Wiederkaeuer gerechnet." (Daechsel's *Bibelwerk*.) Professor Ruetimeyer of Basel, according to Bettex "einer der ersten Wiederkaeuerkenner Europas," cited also by the *Encyclopedia Britannica* as an authority in mammalogy, stated: "Dass der Hase wiederkaeut, ist mir nicht neu. Nur mache ich darauf aufmerksam, dass in der heutigen anatomischen und embryologischen Klassifikation die Sitte des Wiederkaeuens nicht als Einteilungsgrund allein massgebend ist." (*Die Bibel Gottes Wort*, p. 141.)⁵⁷—The judge trying Ingersoll's case would have a hard time deciding in his favor.

supposing they were packed so high." Or he may have insisted that "the text does not say that the quails were heaped up exactly two days' journey in every direction. It does not say that they were heaped up two cubits high on a level throughout that area. Every student of Hebrew will agree that the words simply denote a piling up of birds to two cubits high, and such piles were found within approximately that distance about the camp." (See *CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY*, XI, p. 210.) The thing is not so ridiculous as the freethinkers make themselves believe. But leave that aside; they must prove that God could not have performed this miracle. Their plea that science does not recognize miracles will be answered next month, when we take up the chapter of the fatuity of "higher science."

57) Another authority quoted by Pastor F. C. Pasche in this connection: "The Hebrew word does not imply having a ruminant stomach

And if the judge decided in his favor? He might do that; he might be swayed by the consideration that there is a preponderance of expert testimony on Ingersoll's side. We readily admit that most zoologists deny that the hare chews the cud. But that would not affect us deeply. Why, even if all naturalists were in conflict with Moses, we would insist that the animal mentioned in Lev. 11:6 does perform the operation there predicated of it. The fathers did not lose a moment's sleep when the secular authorities did not seem to agree with Luke in the matter of the census. Neither would we, even if the judge ruled out the testimony of Ruetimeyer and of the professor at that State university. — Ingersoll and the other critics may have a lot of learning on their side; their fatuity consists in their harboring the idea that their learning could make the Christian doubt the truthfulness of any word of God.

What is wrong with the astronomical phenomena recorded Josh. 10:12 ff. and 2 Kings 20:9 ff.? Paine and Ingersoll, Harnack, Fosdick, and the archbishop of York tell us these things could not have happened, and the Bible, which records them, cannot claim plenary inspiration. What is the scientific error involved? The thing is most amusing. Ingersoll, for instance: "I don't believe that the man who wrote that knew that the earth was turning on its axis at the rate of a thousand miles an hour, because if he did, he would have understood the immensity of heat that would have been generated by stopping the world. It has been calculated by one of the best mathematicians and astronomers that to stop the world would cause as much heat as it would take to burn a lump of solid coal three times as big as the globe." (*Lectures*, p. 283.) And another catastrophe would have resulted: "It has been said in Germany: 'The most fearless methodist will feel constrained to own that in the system of our globe, were the sun to stop for an instant, or were the earth's motion to be slackened, bel-

but simply rechew, or masticate." (See *Lehre u. Wehre*, 69, p. 188.) Jenks and Warne, *Comprehensive Commentary*: "Arnebeth. That this is the hare is confirmed by the cognate languages. That it chews the cud is proved beyond all doubt. See Michaelis and Linnaeus. Although it wants the four stomachs peculiar to cleft-hoof cattle, yet it returns the food, once chewed, into its mouth by the esophagus, since its stomach has several little cells, divided by partitions, from which the food, while it is too hard, is repelled." Dr. P. E. Kretzmann states: "Careful scientists, even distinguished biologists, such as one at a leading State university whose lectures I attended, have admitted that our knowledge of certain mammals in this class would not warrant our declaring the statement of Lev. 11:6 untrue. While mammals of this class do not have the digestive apparatus of those that chew the cud, there is evidently a process of total or partial regurgitation, together with a second chewing of the food, which fully substantiates the statement found in Scripture. It is not a mere *semblance* of chewing the cud with which we are dealing but an actual chewing of food previously swallowed."

ligerent armies, and all that is on the earth's surface, would be swept away like chaff before the wind." (See Gaussen, *op. cit.*, p. 246.) Gaussen answers: "The fact is far from being absurd; it is only miraculous."⁵⁸ If these things happened at all, they happened as Joshua tells you, because God directly intervened. And if God had a hand in it, He certainly knew how to provide against the dire consequences Ingersoll and the others fear. Gaussen is not wrong in calling the objection absurd.

If Ingersoll and Harnack should reply that we are wrong there, that miracles do not occur, we shall have to tell them that we agreed to discuss here only the "scientific impossibilities" involved. We are here dealing with common, every-day, honest science. If they want to switch the discussion over to higher science, we shall be at their service next month.

All right, they say, let us remain in the domain of common science, physical science, and the Bible is wrong because science teaches that the earth rotates on its axis, etc., and Josh. 10:13 should have stated: "And the earth stood still." — Wrong again! Copernicanism indeed teaches that; but everybody except the sciolists knows that the system of Copernicus is based on a — hypothesis. The argument that Scripture is not inspired because of its alleged conflict with some hypothetical assumption has a most flimsy basis. And there is no reason in the world why we should decree that Joshua employed phenomenal and not scientific language. His statement "And the sun stood still" is not in conflict with any established fact of science.⁵⁹

58) He adds a section to show that the objection is in error. Even by the laws of physics the belligerent armies would not have been "swept away as if by a tempest." Look it up if you care to.

59) Some of us think that if we don't hem and haw about Joshua's language, we'll lose our scientific standing. Dr. A. L. Graebner did not think so. "The present writer happens to have devoted three of the best years of his life chiefly and assiduously to the study of physical sciences and has been in touch with these sciences for many more years. But if he has profited anything by these sciences, it is, besides a few other things, a habit of speaking with more modesty on certain scientific topics than the college sophomore who knows all about them. . . . And he has learned to rate, not only from a theological but also from a scientific point of view, such assertions as this, that 'the Missouri Church holds that the Bible teaches the Ptolemaic astronomy.' We do not know whether the writers of the *Lutheran* would be bold enough to assert that the General Council held the Copernican theory. But we do know that, considering the elements which constitute a synod, there is no synod on the face of the earth which would not stultify itself if it voted an endorsement of the Copernican or any other system of astronomy." (*Theological Quarterly*, VI, p. 40.) Dr. G. Stoeckhardt is not afraid to "ask: Is the Copernican system, under which the earth revolves around the sun, really an established fact, which no man in his senses, at least no astronomer and mathematician, may challenge?" (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 32, p. 314.) We are not going to rate Dr. Pieper as a back number because he writes:

Then there is the story of Jonah and the whale. Paine made sport of it. Pastor Fosdick, like Paine, ridicules it. Pastor Cadman calls it a "fish story." And Prof. W. H. Dunphy runs a close second to Paine when he protests against "the notion that we must accept 'the credibility of the whole of Judges and the edibility of the whole of Jonah' as revealed truths. Fortunately the Holy Catholic Church of Christ has never committed herself to any such absurdity." (*The Living Church*, Feb. 18, 1933.) However, men who object to this Biblical story in the name of science do not know much about natural science. "There are many skeptics today who are so densely ignorant of matters clearly understood by many Sunday-school children that they are still harping, in the name of 'scholarship,' on this supposed error in the Bible. One of the most popular of 'modernist' preachers trotted this out in an address last October 23, 1921." (R. A. Torrey, *op. cit.*, p. 78.) In the first place, the Bible does not say that a "whale" swallowed Jonah. It was a "great fish," "a sea-monster." And Sunday-school children know that the tarpon, for instance, can swallow a man. There was a tarpon caught weighing 30,000 pounds, and it had in its stomach, whole, one fish weighing 1,500 pounds, besides a large octopus. (See *Lutheran Church Herald*, Sept. 16, 1930.) In the second place, the whale, too, can swallow a man, if it is the right kind of whale, the sperm-whale, "which can swallow two men at one gulp without a struggle" (*The Living Church*, Apr. 5, 1930), and, in the third place, a man swallowed by a whale was found in its stomach unconscious but alive after two days (*Princeton Review*, October, 1927); and, in the fourth place, a certain whaler "learned from observation that the great sperm-whale has power to empty his stomach voluntarily" (*The Living Church*, March 22, 1930).

We know, of course, that the whale or any other sea-monster is not in the habit of putting in its appearance at the time and at

"We should always bear in mind and let others remind us of it that our human knowledge concerning astronomical matters is, from the nature of the case, very limited since we are unable to take a position outside of the globe, needed for a full survey. The geographer Daniel, himself a Copernican, declared: 'All cosmic systems ever proposed are not based on experience, for this would require a position beyond the earth, but on deductions and combinations. All of them therefore are and remain hypotheses.'" (*Chr. Dogmatik*, I, p. 577.) When Oberkonsistorialrat Twesten characterized this position as due to "stubborn stupidity," "Borniertheit" (*l. c.*), he lost the calm balance of the mature scientist. — Let us bear in mind, too, that Joshua is charged with a scientific error not so much on the basis of the teaching of Copernicanism but because of the basic statement that daylight lasted twenty-four hours? Even if Joshua had been a Copernican and had written: "And the earth stood still" (the *pedantic* Copernican would have employed that phraseology), Ingersoll and Fosdick would object with the same vehemence.

the place called for by some exigency, of swallowing the man, and vomiting him out, at the right time and place — and keeping him alive for three days. “Diese Historie des Jonas ist so gross, dass sie fast unglaublich ist und ungereimter [scheint] als irgendeine Fabel der Dichter. Wenn es nicht in der Bibel waere, wuerde ich es durchaus als eine Luege verlachen. Denn wenn man ihm will nachdenken, wie er drei Tage in dem grossen Bauch des Wal-fisches gewesen sei, da er doch in drei Stunden verdaut, Fleisch und Blut des Walfisches haette werden sollen.” (Luther, XXII, p.1424.)⁶⁰ “Wenn es nicht in der Bibel waere!” Professor Dunphy and Thomas Paine and Professor Horine, all of whom believe that there is an almighty God, have reached the summit of absurdity when they ridicule the story of Jonah as an absurdity. — This objection, in all its phases, reminds one of the man who tried to do business the other day with counterfeit Confederate money.

Prof. R. T. Stamm charges St. Paul with an arboricultural error. Do we have to go into that? Another professor, who was a confirmed infidel, triumphantly asked: “How about that cytological error that Paul the Apostle made in the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians?” Read the fine answer given him by one of the students, Harry Rimmer. (*The Harmony of Science and Scripture*, p. 109 ff.) Ingersoll gloats over the biometrical blunder committed by Moses. “The Jewish people stayed in Egypt 215 years. How many did they have when they went to Egypt? Seventy. How many were they at the end of 215 years? Three millions, for there were 600,000 men of war. Is there a minister in the city of Chicago that will testify to his own idiocy by claiming that they could have increased to three millions by that time?” (*Lectures: “Mistakes of Moses,”* p. 291 f.) The ministers of Chicago are not so idiotic as to accept Ingersoll’s false premise. They accept the figures which Moses gives. Israel sojourned in Egypt 430 years. See Ex. 12:40. That gives us eight generations, allowing a little

60) One can hardly trust one’s eyes when one reads in an article written by Prof. John W. Horine in the *Lutheran*, March 18, 1937, these words: “Jonah 2:1-9. The writer of this remark is frank to say that he cannot accept as matter of fact the literal statement that Jonah in the fish’s belly — in that smelly, suffocating place — had the clearness of mind to order his thoughts and compose the metrical lines of this Hebrew psalm. And there is another difficulty, thus stated by the outspoken Luther: ‘It [the story of Jonah] is exaggerated beyond the possibility of belief. If it were not in the Bible, I would laugh at it. For how could Jonah remain in the belly of the whale three days when he would have been digested in three hours.’ . . . The book is considered to be not literal history but parable or allegory.” In all fairness Professor Horine should have added: While I cannot believe this story because of its absurdity, Luther believed it in spite of its absurdity.

more than 50 years for a generation. "Even if we allow, to be conservative, but four sons for each family, the seventh generation would have numbered 835,584 males." (W. Arndt, *Bible Difficulties*, p. 53.) Nothing idiotic about that computation. And we are going to allow more than four sons for each family. "The children of Israel were fruitful and increased abundantly and multiplied and waxed exceeding mighty, and the land was filled with them," Ex. 1:7.

We conclude this section with L. Boettner's statement: "Today scarcely a shred of the old list remains. . . . Not so much as one single error has been *definitely proved* to exist anywhere in the Bible. . . . There is every reason for believing that with additional knowledge they, too, will be cleared up." (*The Inspiration of the Scriptures*, p. 50.) And if some are never in this life cleared up, that will not keep the Christian from dying in good spirits.

The men who prepared the list of "unfulfilled prophecies" did not know their Bible well. Let us examine two samples. Fr. Baumgaertel and C. H. Dodd declare that Ezekiel withdrew his forecast of the fall of Tyre. Ezek. 26 and 29. (See page 253 above.) Hear Dr. Th. Laetsch's statement: "In Ezek. 26 the fate of Tyre is foretold in three sections. a) Vv. 3-6 in general, 'many nations': complete destruction without indicating time or person. b) Vv. 7-14, a destruction by Nebuchadnezzar is prophesied. Note, however, the change from 'he,' v. 8, to 'they,' v. 12, and 'I,' vv. 13, 14, which indicates that others will finish what Nebuchadnezzar began. c) Vv. 15-21. The final complete destruction at which 'the isles shake,' v. 15; again no time or person is named. Where is the proof that Nebuchadnezzar did not take Tyre after the thirteen years' siege? In Ezek. 29:17-20 the Lord does not promise 'Ersatz' for an enforced withdrawal but wages for services rendered by Nebuchadnezzar in the destruction of Tyre. Either the riches of Tyre had been destroyed, or else they were insufficient reward for Nebuchadnezzar's service. Besides, how could Ezekiel withdraw in the tenth year (29:1) a prophecy spoken in the eleventh year (26:1)? Finally, Tyre's later restoration had been prophesied already by Isaiah, chap. 23:15-28, one hundred and fifty years before Ezekiel's prophecy." For one thing, these men have no conception of the prophetic perspective. (See further CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY, I, p. 115.)

Second sample. Thomas Paine: "God is a deceiver, Jer. 20:5, 7." Paine was only a layman, and an unbeliever at that. But C. H. Dodd repeats it. "Jeremiah at one time wondered if he had really been deceived, Jer. 20:7." (*The Authority of the Bible*, p. 15.) Dodd is professor of exegesis at Oxford. Have they not studied

their Moffatt? "Eternal One, Thou didst persuade me, and I let myself be persuaded," Jer. 20:7. We once heard a man on the street-corner scoff at Matt. 9:17. Does age, he said, contribute to the fragility of glass bottles? He and Paine and Dodd did not study the original.

The charge of "misquotations" is based (a) on the assumption that quotations must give the *ipsissima verba* of the author quoted. No such rule obtains in the realm of literature. Unless the writer declares that he is quoting verbatim, he is quoting correctly if he gives the true sense of the text. The discrepancy-hunters are quick to charge the apostles for their manner of applying statements from the Old Testament⁶¹⁾ with a lapse of memory or with plain ignorance. But all fair-minded men will agree with Luther in saying that as long as the meaning of the text is faithfully reproduced, the charge of misquoting must not be raised.⁶²⁾

The substitution of "A body hast Thou prepared for me" in Heb. 10:5 for "Mine ears hast Thou opened" in Ps. 40:6 does not alter the sense. "Bei beiden Fassungen ist der *Gehorsam* das von Gott geforderte Opfer; nur tritt an die Stelle des Ohres als des Organs zur *Aufnahme des goettlichen Willens* der Leib als das Organ zur *Erfuellung desselben*." (Riggenbach, in *Zahn's Commentary*.) "The Hebrew means literally: 'Mine ears hast Thou bored,' an allusion to the custom of pinning a slave to the door-post of his master by an awl driven through his ear, in token of his complete subjection. The sense of the verse is therefore given in the epistle: 'Thou hast made me Thine in body and soul—lo, I come to do Thy will.'" (A. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, p. 110.) Would you charge the scribes with misquoting Micah 5:2: "Though thou be little among the thousands of Judah" by letting the prophet say: "Thou Bethlehem art not the least among the princes of Juda" (Matt. 2:6)? The evangelist does not raise that charge against them. They reproduced very exactly the sense of Micah's statement: Bethlehem apparently the least, but because of the

61) "The deviations in form from the wording of the Old Testament text are of various kinds. In some cases the New Testament writers have *expanded* the Old Testament text (e. g., Is. 61:1; Luke 4:18), in many cases *contracted* it (Is. 8:22; 9:1; Matt. 4:15), in some instances the order of sentences has been *inverted* (Hos. 2:23; Rom. 9:25), frequently several passages are *blended into one* (Jer. 32:6 ff.; Zech. 11:12, 13; Matt. 27:9)." (Pieper, *Chr. Dogm.*, I, p. 298.)

62) Luther: "You must know, first, that the evangelists are not concerned about citing every last word of the prophets; they are content with retaining the *sense* and showing the fulfilment. . . . We shall later on see again and again that the evangelist adduces the prophet in a somewhat altered form, but always without prejudice to the sense and meaning." (XI, p. 12.)

great Ruler arising out of it the greatest. (See Stoeckhardt, *Lehre u. Wehre*, 30, p. 164.)⁶³⁾

The charge of "misquotations" is due (b) to the critics' ignorance of the true situation. The outstanding fact in the case is that the Holy Ghost is the Author of Scripture, of the New Testament as well as of the Old Testament; and when He through the apostles quotes the prophets, He is quoting Himself. The Liberals of course do not admit this. But that does not change the fact. And we cannot help it that on account of their ignorance the form of the Old Testament quotations constitutes a stumbling-block to them. But they should, in common fairness, not expect us, who know better, to rail with them against the alleged ineptitude and ignorance of the apostles. "They forget," says James M. Gray, "that in the Scriptures we are dealing not so much with different authors as with one Divine Author. It is a principle in ordinary literature that an author may quote himself as he pleases and give a different turn to an expression here and there as a changed condition of affairs renders it necessary or desirable. Shall we deny this privilege to the Holy Spirit?" (*The Fundamentals*, III, p. 33.)⁶⁴⁾ "Strange hallucination this! As if the same truth could not be expressed in somewhat different words; as if God could not alter or add to, modify or use a part of, give fresh application to, or light on, His own earlier Word! . . . The flimsiness and untenableness of the other reasons given for such criticism (the alleged inexact quotations) only show how unscientific and unreasonable their methods are and how easily, when it suits their theories, they accept and use as proof what no sensible man would accept or act on in common life." (M'Intosh, *op. cit.*, pp. 314, 635, 689.) The ultraliberals, of course, will not admit the force of this argument. We are not responsible for their ignorance as to the authorship of Scripture. And the conservative Liberals,

63) Would you charge us with misquoting Moeller: "Verbalinspiration!" *Jeder Theologe schaudert bei dem Wort ordentlich zusammen,* by translating: "Verbal Inspiration!" The bare word sets *our* theologians a-trembling"?

64) Dr. Pieper expresses and unfolds these same thoughts, pp. 297 to 303. They are Scriptural thoughts. 1 Pet. 1:10-12! The same Holy Spirit who spoke through the prophets spoke through the apostles, and He may quote Himself as He pleases, express the same truth in different phraseology, omit or add words, etc. He may even take over translations from the Septuagint which might have seemed faulty to us and thus make them an authorized translation, expressing the true sense. At first glance—and the critics seldom get beyond the first glance—undue liberties were taken when Is. 61:1 was expanded in Luke 4:18 and "body" (Septuagint translation) substituted for "eyes" in Heb. 10:5. The simple "explanation for this treatment, often so bold, of the wording of the Old Testament passages in the New Testament" (Pieper), is this: the Holy Ghost is, as Luther expresses it, making "a new text," explaining the meaning of the old text.

who profess that Scripture is inspired of God, are enmeshed in a hopeless self-contradiction.

The charge of "misquotations" is based (c) on the assumption that the apostles were rather ignorant theologians. Bishop Gore assumes that. "The writers of the New Testament often positively give the texts meanings which they cannot bear. I would ask any one to consider St. Paul's arguments in Gal. 3:16 and in Rom. 3:11-18 and in Rom. 9:25. Is it possible to maintain that the particular texts which St. Paul cites really, when legitimately interpreted, support his argument? . . . Can we say that the texts cited in Matt. 2:15-18 are legitimate proofs?" (*The Doctrine of the Infallible Book*, p. 29.)⁶⁵ Let the reader look up, for instance, Rom. 3:11-18 and wonder at the acumen of the critic. — We are glad to see that Gore does not include H. L. Willett's charge of wilful misquotation (see page 254 above) in his list.

Will the critics (d) deny to the Holy Spirit the right to elucidate in the New Testament what He said in the Old Testament? to reveal to the apostles and through the apostles that certain texts of the Old Testament carried a meaning which we should not have discovered without His interpretation? He does not give these texts a new meaning. The Holy Ghost, in quoting Himself, never corrects Himself. Human authors sometimes refer to earlier statements of theirs in order to modify or retract them. The Holy Ghost never.⁶⁶ But He certainly may *unfold* to us the meaning of a certain text. Critics like Gore would do well to realize that the Holy Ghost has a better understanding of the texts quoted Rom. 9:25 and Matt. 2:15-18 than they. Yes, He knows better than Hosea himself what Hos. 11:1 meant. And no doubt Matthew would not have interpreted it as he did of his own knowledge. Dr. Gore is virtually — though he does not realize it — accusing the Holy Spirit of perverting His own words.⁶⁷

In some instances (e) the alleged misquotation is no quotation at all. The words "And gave gifts unto men" in Eph. 4:8 may well be the apostle's own words. See Stoeckhardt, *Epheser-Kommentar*, p. 191.

Our list operates (f) on the principle that, when we cannot

65) Gore even believes that "*inspiration*" did not safeguard the apostles against a stupid misinterpretation of Scripture. "Their inspiration did not make them unerring in their interpretation of particular texts. They used them in a way which we should call quite uncritical; and we do not want to feel ourselves bound by their methods."

66) The language of M'Intosh, Grey, and others is not always correct. They speak of the "progress of truth" in a way as though certain *truths* have been superseded.

67) We ask our readers to reread, in this connection, Dr. G. Stoeckhardt's series on "Weissagung und Erfuellung," *Lehre u. Wehre*, 30, p. 42 ff.; 31, p. 220 ff.

account for a certain statement of the writer, the writer must have made a mistake. The critics would not want to father this principle in this bald form, but they are applying it when they give Matt. 27:9 a prominent place on the black-list. "Spoken by Jeremy." Why, it was spoken by Zechariah (11:13)! — Go easy! In the first place, Matthew is quoting Zechariah. But he is *also* quoting Jeremiah! See Jer. 32:6-15. Then, why does he not name both? We shall say, in the second place, that we do not know the answer. "Some have thought that the words quoted were originally spoken by Jeremiah, or that they were taken from a lost writing of Jeremiah (Origen), or that an oral statement of Jeremiah had been handed down and accepted by Matthew (Calov), or the abbreviation of the name of Zechariah had been mistaken for the abbreviated name of Jeremiah (Flacius),⁶⁸ or the evangelist suffered a lapse of memory (Augustine, Meyer, Keil, and most Moderns)." (Stoeckhardt, *Lehre u. Wehre*, 31, p. 272.) Stoeckhardt proceeds: "These explanations are pure conjectures, and are, in part, in conflict with the Scriptural concept of Inspiration. Instead of exhausting ourselves with vague guesses, it would have been better to confess a *non liquet* and let it go at that." We are willing to confess that we cannot explain why Matthew did not name both prophets. But go easy! Do not be guilty of unscientific haste. Your lack of information does not prove Matthew wrong.

Finally the critics do not see that this free manner of quoting from the Old Testament is (g) a strong proof for Inspiration; merely a rational argument indeed, but we are here arguing on the basis of reason. If the apostles had been writing purely as human writers, they would not have dared to take such liberties with the quoted texts, to make additions of their own, for instance, and to offer the result as a statement of the prophet. It is impossible for us to conceive of the apostles, acting as human writers only, as too indolent to look up the text and get the exact wording. "We are of the opinion that even human reason, if it be reasonable, must refrain from explaining the deviations of New Testament quotations from the Old Testament text by assuming 'mistakes' or 'slips of memory' in the holy writers. There is but one explanation: the Holy Ghost is speaking through the apostles and 'taking liberties' with His own word." (Pieper, *op. cit.*, p. 302.)

The list of "contradictions" is a sorry affair. Its compilers operate with a number of hermeneutical laws which are outlawed by reason and common sense. And they disregard the principles

68) See Gaussen, *op. cit.*, 217: "The copyist, having noticed on the margin the letters Zov, mistook them for Iov."

of interpretation established by reason and observed by sane interpreters.

They have (a) set up the queer rule that diversities in the accounts of the same event or fact constitute a contradiction. Paine finds that "not any two of these writers agree in reciting, *exactly in the same words*, the inscription on the cross," and the Episcopalian rector repeats it and cries out: "What, then, of verbal inspiration?" (See page 257 above.) The *Lutheran Witness*, 43, p. 185, comments: "Is this not evincing a superficiality which almost beggars description? . . . The shallowness of the modern critic!" If one evangelist gives a fuller account of the inscription than the others, are the others wrong? Gore's *New Commentary* does not find any contradiction here but has no right to say that the fuller form in John 19:19 "is probably the most correct." No, all four are absolutely correct. Accounts of the same event must not differ in the details? If the managing editor should establish such a rule, all of his reporters would go on a strike. A. Strong, quoting from the *Princeton Review*: "One newspaper says: President Hayes attended the Bennington centennial; another newspaper says: the President and Mrs. Hayes; a third: the President and his cabinet; a fourth: the President, Mrs. Hayes, and the majority of his cabinet." (*Systematic Theology*, p. 108.)

N. E. Best asks us "to note the differences between the recital of the Ten Commandments in Ex. 20 and Deut. 5." We have read the two recitals, noted the differences, but were unable to find contradictions. We have also read the article "What was Written on the Two Tables of the Covenant — a Study of the Methods of Modern Critics" in *CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY*, 9, p. 746 ff., and noted other follies committed by Goethe and the other critics in this matter. — Kahnis applies rule *a* to the fourfold account of the words of institution of the Lord's Supper. We object. We insist that the Lord *did* say: "This is My blood of the new testament," Matt. 26:28, and that He *did* say: "This cup is the new testament in My blood," Luke 22:20. And He could say both without contradicting Himself. Read Pieper, *Chr. Dog.*, III, p. 408 ff. — Rule *a* is responsible for many of the alleged contradictions found by Celsus, Paine, Lessing, and modern theologians in the accounts of Christ's resurrection and of His appearances to His disciples. Read *Lehre u. Wehre*, 39, p. 198 ff., and 32, p. 321: "Es gehoert wahrlich nicht viel Verstand dazu, um sofort bei Lektion und Betrachtung der vier evangelischen Auferstehungsberichte zu begreifen, dass gar leicht das eine, was der eine Evangelist mittheilt, unbeschadet des andern, was der andere berichtet, sich habe zutragen koennen." See also *CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY*, XI, 661 f. —

Better operate with Augustine's rule: "*Locutiones variae, sed non contrariae; diversae, sed non adversae.*"

Can you believe that men would operate with the absurd rule (b) that, when one evangelist fails to mention a fact mentioned by another evangelist, he is *correcting* this second evangelist? Mark 2:26 mentions Abiathar. "Matthew and Luke both correct Mark at this point by omitting the name. Neither of them thought that Mark was 'errorless.'" (Dr. H. C. Alleman's) Manifesto. See p. 257 above.) That has no basis whatever in reason.⁶⁹ Gore's *Commentary* takes the reasonable view. "That Matthew and Luke agree in omitting the note of time is not in the least likely to be due to their detection of the supposed error." In his *Doctrine of the Infallible Book*, however, Bishop Gore forsakes the reasonable view. Why does the fourth gospel record things not treated by the synoptic gospels? "The evangelists plainly differ in details quite freely; and one purpose of the fourth gospel appears to be *tacitly to correct* the earlier tradition in important respects. . . . Criticism seems to be tending steadily to reaffirm that where the writer of the fourth gospel seems deliberately to correct the tradition of the earlier evangelists, his correction should be treated with the highest respect." (Pp. 40, 45.) Name some of these corrections? Fr. Buechsel speaks of "divergencies, unreliable records," in the gospels, but he names only this one "contradiction": "The preexistence of Jesus is clearly taught in John's gospel. . . . However, the synoptic gospels say nothing about it. This *disagreement of the record* therefore permits us," etc. (*Die Offenbarung Gottes*, p. 10.) Now, the earlier gospels do teach the preexistence of Jesus. See Matt. 1:20-23; 16:13-17; 22:42-45. But even if they did not, do they *deny* it?

The "conflicting creation accounts" of Paine and Ingersoll belong in this category. Here is the latest variety of this item. "We recently had a contender who objected to the doctrine of inspiration . . . because there were two accounts of creation and that they were in vital conflict with each other. In the second chapter the woman is mentioned, in a separate and conflicting story of creation, differing altogether from the account in chapter one. We pointed out to him that his error was a lack of intelligent reading of the text. . . . The second chapter of Genesis is but an *addition to the details* of the first chapter. . . . How marvelously this illustrates the ability of the keen mentality that would contradict the Book that God has written!" (Harry Rimmer, *Modern Science and the Genesis Record*, p. 350.)

69) Dr. Graebner: "Dr. Alleman is arguing from a premise quite generally condemned by the text-books of logic — an argument *e silentio*." (CONC. THEOL. MTHLY., XI, p. 886.)

Applying rule b, Bruno Bauer points out that according to Luke 2 Joseph and Mary returned to Nazareth because that was their home town; but from Matt. 2 it appears "dass Joseph erst durch eine Engelsbotschaft nach Galilaea und Nazareth gewiesen wird. Der Widerspruch ist so hart, wie er nur sein kann." (*Op. cit.*, I, p. 120.) We do not like this rule. We would not want to be forced to charge Bauer and the others with not knowing or denying all those things which their books do not relate. Better stick to Augustine's rule: "You must most carefully guard against finding contradictions between the holy evangelists in the fact that one often relates what the others do not relate or that one is silent on matters which the others tell." Supplementing an account is not correcting or contradicting it.

Rule c: When similar events are recorded in the gospels, you are usually safe in assuming that such an event occurred only once; but somehow or other the writer or writers made two events out of it. We read, for instance, that Christ cleansed the Temple twice. But the critical schools say it occurred only once, and so there is a contradiction between the synoptists, who place the event at the end of Christ's public ministry, and the fourth gospel, which places it at the beginning. Gore's *Commentary* is rather cautious: "Conceivably the incident happened twice." But it blandly adds: "More probably they are two records of one event." (On John 2:13-22.) Our commentary is not bothered by the consideration that this would involve a contradiction. We do not know why *The Expositor's Greek Testament* should add to the statement "The synoptic gospels insert a similar incident at the close of Christ's ministry" the words: "And there alone," nor why the statement "It is easy to find reasons for such action either at the beginning or at the close of the ministry" should be accompanied by the insinuation: "On the whole it seems more appropriate at the beginning." B. Weiss is outspoken: "Die abstrakte Moeglichkeit, dass derselbe Vorfall sich am Ende der Laufbahn Jesu wiederholt, . . . kann in der Tat wissenschaftlich nicht in Betracht kommen. Die Annahme, dass die synoptische Ueberlieferung, die ueberhaupt nur *eine* Festreise Jesu erzaehlt, den unvergesslichen Vorfall irrtuemlich in diese versetzt habe, ist so einleuchtend." (On John 2:17.) The *Daily News* which reported a police raid on the gambling joints in 1940 and a similar one, by the same captain, against the same joints, in 1941, would not like to be told that it is ignorant of rule c. — Luther: "Es kann auch wohl sein, dass der Herr solches mehr denn einmal getan hat." (VII:1781.)

Did Jesus feed a multitude miraculously on two occasions? See rule c. Gaussen lists this case under the heading "Another Source of Precipitate Judgment" and speaks of the "utmost rash-

ness . . . whereby people have imagined that the facts they read of were identically the same." And then he hears them railing at Scripture for the resulting contradiction: "What! In the one, five thousand men fed with five loaves; in the other, four thousand men fed with seven loaves! What disagreement!" (*Op. cit.*, p. 234.) Hear D. F. Strauss: Die Sache ist so "zu erklæaren, dass der Verfasser unsers ersten Evangeliums dieselbe Geschichte in verschiedenem Zusammenhang vorfand, um dieser Abweichungen willen die doppelte Erzæhlung derselben Geschichte fuer zwei Geschichten nahm und arglos nebeneinander stellte." (*Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 227.)

Bruno Bauer charges St. Matthew with breaking rule c in making the Pharisees demand a sign from Jesus twice, Matt. 12:39 and 16:1. The thing could have occurred only once! He concludes his investigation thus: "Lassen wir aber das abstrakte *Raesonnement*, es habe dasselbe mehrere Male 'geschehen koennen.' . . . Es ist ueber allem Zweifel erhaben, dass der Schriftsteller, der frei aus der idealen Anschauung ein geschichtliches Ganzes schafft, sich nicht wiederholt." (*Op. cit.*, II, p. 391.) — We stick to the old axiom: *Distingue tempora et concordabit Scriptura*.

A lot of contradictions are fabricated by insisting (d) that in a given case the two writers recording the same event are both observing a chronological order, leaving out of consideration that one of them may have, and has, chosen the topical arrangement or some other logical sequence. In this easy way A. W. Dieckhoff (Rostock), a noted discrepancy-hunter, has bagged quite a number of contradictions in the field of the synoptic gospels, seven of which are examined in *Lehre u. Wehre*, 39, p. 32 ff. For example, since in the story of the temptation of Christ, as told by Matthew and by Luke, the last two temptations are not listed in the same sequence, there is a glaring contradiction — if both writers wrote chronologically. As it happens, "Luke is not reporting the temptations in their historical order. . . . He follows the order of places: desert, mountain, Temple." (Lanski, on Luke 4:1-13.)⁷⁰⁾

Augustine, Luther, and Chemnitz insist that the evangelists do not bind themselves to the chronological order but "anticipate and recapitulate" on occasion. Most modern exegetes agree that they combine the chronological and topical order. But Dieckhoff protests against that. He will not grant the evangelists the privileges of secular historians. Well, he can appeal to Bruno Bauer as

70) Lanski, on Luke 4:16: "By starting with this incident, Luke abandons the chronological order from the very start, so that we cannot depend on him for the exact sequence of events. He is concerned more with the inner significance and connection of what he presents than with the order of time, although in a general way he also adheres to that."

authority. Bauer quotes Augustine's rule: "What is related at a later place did not necessarily occur later. The evangelist may certainly supplement any of his previous statements," and ridicules it in his ribald way: "Luft! Luft! Wir kommen um!" (*Op. cit.*, I, p. 277.) — We repeat: *Distingue tempora et concordabit Scriptura!* Luther: "The evangelists do not observe the same order; what one places first the other sometimes brings later." (VII:1781.)

In addition to this, the contradictionists fail to observe certain rules and laws which are based on reason and are recognized by all thinking men. Rule 1 is: A real contradiction occurs only where the same thing is asserted and denied of the same object with reference to the same time and place and under the same relation. The high-school sophomore has learned that it involves no contradiction to say that man is mortal and that man is immortal. Man is mortal with respect to his body, immortal with respect to his soul. When Dr. H. E. Fosdick found a contradiction between Eccl. 3:19 ("Death befalleth man and beast") and 1 Cor. 15:53-55 ("This mortal must put on immortality"), he forgot rule 1. — The devout Bible-readers, says J. M. Gibson, find "this strong and very definite declaration: 'A man hath no preeminence over the beast,' Eccl. 3:19. They turn to a more familiar place and read: 'Fear not; ye are of more value than many sparrows.' Are they troubled? Not at all. How do they settle it? By the exercise of higher criticism." (*The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture*, p. 182.) They do nothing of the kind. They do not discard one of the two statements. They settle the matter by applying rule 1. — 1 Cor. 10:8 states that 23,000 fell in the plague. Num. 25:9 states 24,000 died in the plague. And Professor Volck (Dorpat) notes down: Another contradiction! Rule 1 asks him: Is the same *time* involved? Paul says they fell in *one* day. Moses does not say that. (See Pieper, *op. cit.*, I, p. 295 f.)

Examine Dr. H. L. Willett's contradiction, page 255 f. above. "Moses wrote the words of the Law, Ex. 24:4; 34:28; Deut. 31:24." Right (in part). "Jahve Himself wrote them, Ex. 31:18." Right again. But entirely wrong, since the "same object" of Rule 1 is overlooked. The Lord wrote the words of the Decalog, and He wrote them on stone tablets. Moses wrote the words of Ex. 20:22-26 and "the judgments," Ex. 21:1 ff., and wrote them in a book. — We said: Right, *in part*, because Willett's reference to Ex. 34:28 is entirely wrong. "He wrote upon the tables" does not refer to Moses but to the Lord. See v. 1 and Deut. 10:1-4. Moses ought to know whom he meant in Ex. 34:28.

The contradiction discovered by Thomas Paine and Dr. Buttrick ("The Lord moved David to number Israel and Judah," 2 Sam. 24:1, and Satan provoked David to do it 1 Chron. 21:1),

ignores the provision of Rule 1, that the same thing must be asserted and denied. It is asserted that the Lord moved David. 1 Chron. 21:1 does not deny that, and *vice-versa*.⁷¹⁾

It gets worse and worse. They fabricate contradictions by *inventing* one of the two "contradictory" statements. Willett (p. 257 f. above) finds the Book of Jonah opposed "to the narrower nationalism of Ezekiel." Paine found the same contradiction. Paine and Willett *invented* "the partiality of the Creator for one nation." — Rule 1 pronounces the peddling of "contradictions" of this kind a swindle. That is Dr. Pieper's phrase (*Op. cit.*, p. 296.)

In common fairness the contradictionists should (2) reckon with the possibility that some of their alleged contradictions may be due to mistakes made by the copyists. They make much of these variant readings (as being destructive of the reliability of the Bible). Then let us, too, make something of these mistakes. Luther thus accounts, for instance, for the seeming contradiction between Acts 13:20 and 1 Kings 6:1: "The Greek text is corrupted through an error of the copyist, which could easily occur by his writing τετρακοσίοις for τριακοσίοις." (XIV:600.) Thus also Beza. In another connection Luther says: "Or perhaps the copyists erred." (XIV:491.)⁷²⁾ There is no need to adopt Luther's conjecture of an error of the copyist in our passage. A number of other solutions have been offered.⁷³⁾ But our purpose was to show that as long as the possibility of an error on the part of the copyists in a given case remains, no real contradiction can be established.

That brings up Rule 3. Unless you can show conclusively that the solutions of the seeming contradictions which present themselves are absolutely impossible, you have no right to assume a real contradiction. In the words of the Broadus-Robertson *Harmony of the Gospels*, p. 232: "In explaining a difficulty, it is always to be remembered that even a possible explanation is sufficient to meet the objector. If several possible explanations are suggested,

71) For further information consult *Does the Bible Contradict Itself?*, p. 40: "God permitted Satan to influence David in such a way that he proudly ordered a census. . . . God punishes evil-doing by permitting sin to beget sin. . . . He withdrew His hand and let the devil have access to the heart of David."

72) See CONC. THEOL. MTHLY., 2, p. 679 ff.: "*Schreibfehler in den Buechern Samuels*", for instance, on 1 Sam. 13:1: "Saul reigned one year." Probably the numeral dropped out. Thus also R. V.: "Saul was [forty] years old when he began to reign." Note: "The number is lacking in the Hebrew text and is supplied conjecturally."

73) One is given in *Lehre u. Wehre*, 67, p. 149: "It is possible that Paul begins the 450 years with the exodus. Add to the time of the judges the forty years under Moses, the five under Joshua, and the thirty-eight under Samuel, and we get 352+45+38=435 years, 'about (ὧς) 450 years.'"

it becomes all the more unreasonable for one to contend that the discrepancy is irreconcilable. It is a work of supererogation to proceed to show that this or that explanation is the real solution of the problem. Sometimes, owing to new light, this might be possible, but it is never necessary. And by reason of the meager information we have on many points in the Gospel narrative, it may always be impossible in various cases to present a solution satisfactory in every point. The harmonist has done his duty if he can show a reasonable explanation of the problem before him."

Take the case of the healing of the blind men at Jericho, Matt. 20:29 ff., Mark 10:46 ff., and Luke 18:35 ff. Oberkonsistorialrat Twesten, rector of the university at Berlin, names this and the matter of the census taken under Cyrenius as the two cases presenting insurmountable difficulties. De Witt names as the first difficulty the "two blind men" and "a certain blind man." (See page 256 above.) That comes under Rule 4, which calls for the exercise of common sense. If two blind men were healed, one blind man was healed. The evangelist does not say: Only one was healed. "Das ist ja gar kein Widerspruch, sondern nur eine Vervollstaendigung. . . . Hier ist eben nicht Subtraktion, sondern nur Addition anzuwenden." (*Proc. West. Dist.*, 1865, p. 45.) Second difficulty: "The healing took place as Jesus *went out* from Jericho; as He *drew nigh* to that city." Here we have, to be sure, a real difficulty. But several solutions present themselves. (1) "The older harmonists assumed that there were two miracles: that one blind man was healed at the entrance and two at the departure of Christ." (*Lange-Schaff Commentary*.) Or (2) the Lord might have kept blind Bartimaeus waiting till the next day to test him. And Luke anticipated the result by a prolepsis not uncommon in Scripture. See Luke 3:19—23. We have, in Scripture and in secular histories, *anticipation* and *recapitulation*. (*Lange-Schaff*.)⁷⁴⁾

The seeming contradiction between Mark 2:26 (Abiathar) and 1 Sam. 21:1 (Ahimelech) also presents difficulties. But a solution is possible. A. Hovey: "Some suppose that Abiathar was already assistant to his father at the time of David's visit and was present

74) A. Hovey, *An American Commentary*, mentions another possibility (3): the healing occurred at a point between the old and the new city and so could be described as occurring either when He went out from Jericho or drew near. Hovey says that these explanations seem labored, but adds: "Either explanation is entirely possible. It will not do to say that the accounts are irreconcilable and therefore involve inaccuracy. . . . The present example and a few others would probably be plain if we knew some slight circumstances not mentioned." And, says *The Expositor's Bible* (Gospel of St. Matthew): "How small must be the minds or how strong the prejudices of those who find support for their unbelief in discrepancies of which this is acknowledged to be one of the gravest examples!"

when he came." Luther: "Sie waren zu *einer* Zeit Priester." (See *Weimar-Bibel*.) Or: "The two names Ahimelech and Abiathar were borne by the father as well as the son." (Lenski, on our passage.) — This is more reasonable than the solution offered by the contradictionists: "It may be a pure slip of memory on the part of the evangelist" (Gore's *Commentary*), *i. e.*, Mark was a slipshod writer, who either did not report Jesus correctly or did not take time to consult his copy of 1 Samuel.

The discrepancy-hunters find irreconcilable contradictions between statements of Stephen and the Old Testament record. (See page 256 above.) For instance, Stephen names Sychem as a burial-place, Acts 7:16, and the Old Testament, they say, names Hebron in this connection. Here is *one* solution of the alleged contradiction, and Rule 3 calls for only one possible solution: "Stephen, and with him St. Luke, tells us that the *brothers* of Joseph were buried in Sychem. He thus *supplements* the story of the Old Testament. . . . The further item that Abraham bought land in Sychem from the sons of Hemor is also to be regarded as a supplement to the Old Testament record." (Dr. Stoeckhardt, in *Lehre u. Wehre*, 32, p. 318.) Can the critics prove, as required by Rule 3, that this assumption involves an impossibility? — The fuss made by the critics over Acts 7:4 would stop if they would quit assuming that Abraham was the first-born son of Terah. They cannot prove it. He may have been the youngest son. Particulars are given in *Lehre u. Wehre*, 70, p. 183 f., and in THEOL. MONTHLY, 4, p. 33 ff.: "Some Difficulties in the Speech of Stephen, Acts 7." More than two "discrepancies" are there discussed and disposed of.

We insist that Rule 3 be applied. "The irreconcilability must be demonstrated not only not reconcilable with our present knowledge, but necessarily and essentially irreconcilable." (M'Intosh, *op. cit.*, p. 636.) "So long as the proof is not furnished that the two reports are in direct opposition, the demand made by the scientific theology of our day that an absolute contradiction be acknowledged is nothing less than a scientific swindle." (Pieper, *op. cit.*, p. 296.)

What to do in case no solution offers itself? Canon 4: Refrain from hasty judgments; exercise scientific caution, moderation, and sobriety. Can the statement of Mark 15:25 "It was the third hour, and they crucified Him" be reconciled with the statement of John 19:14"? One solution is that Mark employs the Jewish way of reckoning the time of day, indicating nine o'clock in the morning, while John uses the Roman computation of time and so tells us that the trial of Jesus began at six o'clock. That seems a satisfactory solution. But here is a commentator (Lutheran, strictly conservative) who declares: "No solution has yet been found." Similarly Jerome pronounced the difficulty connected with Acts 7:4

a *questio indissolubilis*. What should we do if we found ourselves in such a case? Dr. Walther says: "When our old Christian theologians were confronted with a difficulty which they could not solve, they humbly doffed their little doctor's hat, bowed before Holy Scripture, and declared: This difficulty will be fully solved, if not before, then certainly in heaven." (*Lehre u Wehre*, 57, p. 157.) And the mature scientist, be he a Christian or a non-Christian, takes the same general position; whether he meets difficulties in astronomy or in the Bible, he does not settle the matter in a moment but defers his final judgment. He unhesitatingly subscribes to Torrey's formulation of Canon 4: "Let us deal with any difficulty we meet in the Bible [or in any sphere of human study] with that humility that becomes all persons of such limited understanding as we all are. Recognize the limitations of your own mind and knowledge and do not for a moment imagine that there is no solution just because you have found none. There is, in all probability, a very simple solution, even when you can find no solution at all." (*Op. cit.*, p. 69.) — The Lutheran exegete we quoted above took that position: "We may not always be able to clear up that difficulty because of our ignorance, but one thing is certain — the Scriptures are inerrant in every case." (Lenski, on Mark 2:26 and John 19:14.)

Rule 5: Exercise your common sense! If Professor Baumgaertel had done that, he would not have read into the text Gen. 7:17 that the Flood *lasted* only forty days. It took forty days for the Flood to reach its crest. — Paine: "The reason given for keeping the seventh day is, according to Exodus, that 'God rested on the seventh day'; but according to Deuteronomy, that it was the day on which the children of Israel came out of Egypt." (*Age of Reason*, I, p. 120.) N. R. Best seconds Paine. But why could not the Sabbath be made to commemorate both events? Best exercises his common sense when he states: "It may be held that God named both reasons." (*Inspiration*, p. 73.) But he loses it when he concludes: "The form in which we have the Ten Commandments cannot possibly be shown to be inerrant." — Best further declares that a great amount of labor would have to be spent to explain how it happened that King Saul did not recognize David. (See page 256 above.) He goes on to say that we are "spending hours" at the task. Jamieson-Fausset-Brown spent two minutes at it: "The growth of the beard and other changes on a now full-grown youth prevented the king from recognizing his former favorite minstrel."

Ingersoll finds himself unable to harmonize the genealogies of Christ. "Is it not wonderful that Luke and Matthew do not agree on a single name of Christ's ancestors for thirty-seven generations?"

The Rev. L. A. Lambert (Catholic) reminds Ingersoll and others of Rule 5 in these words: "It is wonderful only to those who are ignorant of the fact that Matthew gives the ancestors of Joseph, while Luke gives the ancestors of Mary, the mother of God. Are your ancestors on your mother's side all Ingersolls? Must your maternal and paternal ancestors necessarily have the same name? A careful study of Christian writers on these subjects would save you a great deal of ignorant blundering." (*Notes on Ingersoll*, p. 159 f.)—Bishop Gore: "If our Lord had announced the Trinitarian formula, as is recorded in Matt. 28:19, so explicitly, it is hard to believe that it could have made so little impression on the earliest preaching and practice as recorded in the Acts." (*Op. cit.*, p. 41.) Better study Pieper, *Chr. Dog.*, III, p. 297 f. and 303 f. He points out "the logical absurdities" on which Gore's statement is based. When Gore records that he baptized such and such a person, does he have to record that he baptized "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost"?

Professor Dieckhoff declared that no man can harmonize the statement recorded Mark 14:30: "Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny Me thrice" with that recorded by the other evangelists: "This night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny Me thrice." Professor Stoeckhardt asked him to apply his knowledge of ornithology. "Einem von Gott ihnen eingepflanzten Instinkt zufolge pflegten die Haehne im Altertum und pflegen die Haehne auch heute noch, in der Neuen Welt wie in der Alten Welt, doch wohl sicherlich auch in Mecklenburg, kurz ehe der Morgen graut, ein lautes Geschrei anzustimmen." These cocks also crow at midnight, as Stoeckhardt tells us; but when men say that they will do this or that "before the cock crows," they have in mind the *gallicinium matutinum*, the ἀλεκτοροφωνία κατεξοχήν, which announces the break of day. (See *Lehre u. Wehre*, 39, p. 134 ff.) "Before the cock crow thou shalt deny Me thrice" refers to the *gallicinium matutinum*, and so everybody (except Dieckhoff and his party) understood this statement. In no wise do the three evangelists deny that the cock crowed twice before Peter's three-fold denial. Only they do not record the *two* cock-crowings. It was sufficient that Mark recorded that. Gore's *Commentary* agrees with Stoeckhardt: "The second cock-crowing is mentioned as a note of time in various classical writers. Aristophanes, Cicero, Juvenal, Animianus Marcellinus, are cited. [Stoeckhardt cites additional ones.] It was this second cock-crowing, somewhere about 3 to 4 A. M., which was technically known as *gallicinium*."—"Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing?" (Matt. 10:29.) How, then, could the same Lord say: "Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings?" (Luke 12:6.) He should have given the latter price as two and

a half farthings. Yes, indeed, "some have fancied a contradiction here," Harry Rimmer tells us. And he asks the contradictionists to exercise their common sense: "In our modern markets apples may be five cents apiece, but at the same time sell six for twenty-five cents." (*Modern Science*, p. 303 f.)

Other contradictionists complain: Saul's companions heard the voice (Acts 9:7), and they did not hear the voice (Acts 22:9)! Poor Luke! But Luke knew his Greek. They did not hear τὴν φωνήν, but they did hear τῆς φωνῆς. They heard the sound, but did not hear the words and did not get the sense of the sound. (See Lenski, *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, etc.) — B. Bauer knows his Greek, but that does not keep him from the discrepancy-hunt. Luke 7:2 uses the term "servant," δούλος, Matt. 8:6 the term "servant," παῖς. Bauer: The Greek word παῖς means both son and servant." Good! But: "Das Kategorische aber, wie der Hauptmann sagt: 'Mein Knabe,' das Dringende und Flehende seiner Bitte um Hilfe beweist, dass Matthaueus von uns verlangt, wir sollen an den Sohn des Mannes denken." (*Op. cit.*, II, p. 26.) And there's your contradiction, as plain as day! — We wish Bauer would exercise common sense and not imagine that his readers will not notice at once that his sole interest in the matter is to find a contradiction. His common sense should have told him that his readers are in possession of common intelligence. — It's a most unscientific swindle.

Epiphanius of old († 407) said of the discrepancy-hunters of his day that they "are not sound in the faith, or else they are weak intellectually." The level of intelligence has not risen since then. — The fatuity displayed in this branch of human knowledge is so great that it calls for additional chapters.

(To be continued)

TH. ENGELDER



Sermon Study for Fourth Sunday after Trinity

Acts 4:1-12

When Jesus had foretold His suffering and death, Peter had rebuked Him, saying: "Be it far from Thee, Lord; this shall not be unto Thee." Jesus had reprimanded him and told him and His disciples that the way to glory was the way of the cross, Matt. 16:21-23. In a similar manner John had been told that truth that was so hard to grasp for every Jew, that the kingdom of God was not a temporal but a spiritual one and that membership involved suffering and tribulation, Matt. 20:20-29. In our text we see both men willing to testify no longer of a Messiah according to their