# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

1073-1

Vol. V.

JANUARY 1901.

No. 1.

# Doctrinal Theology.

### SOTERIOLOGY.

#### BAPTISM.

Ritual applications of water to purify persons and things were common among the Jews, and these purifications were called baptisms, βαπτισμοί, in the idiom employed in the New Testament. The epistle to the Hebrews refers to these various baptisms, διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς,1) and St. Mark speaks of the Pharisees and their habit of baptizing themselves2) before eating, and of their baptisms of cups, and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables.3) Of such applications of water the Mosaic law said: This is the law, when a man dieth in a tent: all that come into the tent, and all that is in the tent, shall be unclean seven days. And every open vessel which hath no covering bound upon it, is unclean. And whosoever toucheth one that is slain with a sword in the open fields, or a dead body, or a bone of a man, or a grave, shall be unclean seven days. And for an unclean person they shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel: and a clean person shall take hyssop and dip it in the water, and sprinkle it upon the tent, and upon all the vessels, and upon

<sup>1)</sup> Hebr. 9, 10.

<sup>2)</sup> έὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται.

<sup>3)</sup> βαπτισμούς ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστών καὶ χαλκίων καὶ κλινών.

## Historical Theology.

### A SPECIMEN OF MODERN HISTORIOGRAPHY.

In a modern work on the history of preaching, 1) we find, under title of degeneration of preaching, the following statement: "Frederick Balduin (in his idea dispositionum biblicarum, Wittenberg, 1623) enumerates 7 genera of sermons, which Nicolaus Rebhan (concionator, Jena, 1625) raises to 25, John Förster to 26 (methodi concionandi viginti sex, Wittenberg, 1638), and John Benedict Carpzov (Hodegeticum, Lipsiae, 1656) even to 100."2) In Richard Rothe's work, History of Preaching, from the earliest times to Schleiermacher,3) we read: "Fr. Balduin mentioned seven different methods, his colleague, John Förster, twenty-six, Rebhan, twenty-five, and the inventive genius, the elder John B. Carpzov, succeeded in actually figuring out a hun-In the first edition of Herzog's Real-Encyclopaedie, Tholuck, in an article on this man Carpzov, says: "Even more famous—or should we say, infamous—he became through his homiletical instruction, which raises the

<sup>1)</sup> Geschichte und Theorie der Predigt und der Seelsorge, von Dr. Th. Harnack, Erlangen, 1878.

<sup>2)</sup> Friedrich Balduin führt (in seiner idea dispositionum biblicarum, Wittenberg 1623) schon 7 Predigtgattungen auf, die von Nikolaus Rebhan (concionator, Jena 1625) auf 25, von Johann Förster auf 26 (methodi concionandi viginti sex, Wittenberg 1638) und von Johann Benedict Carpzov (Hodegeticum, Lipsiae 1656) gar auf 100 erhoben werden. Ibid. p. 129.

<sup>3)</sup> Dr. Richard Rothe's Geschichte der Predigt, von den Anfängen bis auf Schleiermacher. Bremen, 1881.

<sup>4)</sup> Friedrich Balduin gab schon sieben verschiedene Methoden an, sein College Joh. Förster sechsundzwanzig, Rebhan fünfundzwanzig, und der erfinderische Joh. Ben. Carpzov d. ä. brachte deren richtig hundert heraus. Ibid. p. 379.

number of methods of disposition to 100." In his Abriss der gesammten Kirchengeschichte,<sup>2</sup>) Herzog refers to the same subject and says: "There was, also, a multitude of methods for preaching; the incipient preachers were more than happy when they had stored away in their heads the hundred methods of preaching which a theologian of high standing had set up, the Methods of Wittenberg, of Leipzig, etc."

In a later edition of the Real-Encyclopaedie, by Herzog-Plitt-Hauck, the article on the history of preaching, which was postponed to the last volume, to give the author time for the greatest thoroughness, mentions the Carpzovs and says: "The elder, John Benedict, Prof. and Archdeacon at Leipzig, † 1657, known especially as a hairsplitting homilete by the 100 methods of his Hodegeticum." Zeller's Theologisches Handwörterbuch has this on the author of the Hodegeticum: "Carpzov. 1) John Benedict I... Homiletical instruction with 100 methods of disposition." In Zöckler's Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften, we are informed: "The renowned Leipzig theologian John Benedict Carpzov († 1657) in his Hodegeticum... olim pro collegio concionatorio conceptum... Lips. 1656. finally made the hundred complete."

<sup>1)</sup> Berühmter noch — oder sollen wir sagen berüchtigter — ist er durch seine homiletische Anweisung geworden, welche die Dispositionsmethoden auf 100 bringt. Vol. II, p. 585.

<sup>2)</sup> Erlangen, 1882.

<sup>3)</sup> Es gab auch eine Menge Methoden zu predigen; die angehenden Prediger waren überglücklich, wenn sie in ihren Köpfen die hundert Methoden des Predigens, welche ein angesehener Theologe aufgestellt hatte: die Methoden von Wittenberg, von Leipzig u. a., aufgespeichert hatten. Vol. III, p. 461.

<sup>4)</sup> Der Aeltere, Joh. Benedict, Prof. und Archidiak. in Leipzig, † 1657, besonders als haarspaltender Homiletiker durch die 100 Methoden seines Hodegeticum bekannt. Vol. 18, p. 535.

<sup>5)</sup> Carpzov. 1) Johann Benedict I... Homiletische Anweisung mit 100 Dispositionsmethoden. Vol. I, p. 286.

<sup>6)</sup> Der berühmte Leipziger Theologe Joh. Benedict Carpzov († 1657) brachte in seinem Hodegeticum . . . olim pro collegio concionatorio conceptum . . . Lips. 1656 endlich das HUNDERT voll. Vol. IV, p. 290.

This may suffice to show that the elder John Benedict Carpzov with his round hundred of homiletical methods has become a veritable *enfant terrible* in German historical theology, and from the unanimity of the witnesses and the expert testimony of specialists recorded against him it would seem that he must stand convicted of the atrocity laid to his charge.

Yet even an orthodox theologian must not be condemned without a hearing, and it is no more than just that we should, also in this case, hear what the defendant has to say in his own behalf and against what appears to be hearsay evidence. And if the *corpus delicti* itself can be produced in court, let it be produced.

We have before us a copy of the *Hodegeticum*. It is a small octavo volume, of which the first part, covering 60 pages, is the work of the elder John Benedict Carpzov, the defendant in the case. In the paragraph in which he speaks of the *Methods* of preaching he says:

Methodus est vel Analytica vel Synthetica. Ana-LYTICA in ordinatione et explicatione textus occupatur, textum in suas partes resolvit, earum verba ac phrases explicat, quid Spiritus Sanctus illis velit, indicat ac doctrinas inde fluentes subnectit. Synthetica ex textu ejusque scopo certum Locum communem instar argumenti seligit, quem certo modo tractat, argumentis non tantum insitis, sed etiam aliunde assumtis; i. e., "Method is either analytical or synthetical. The analytical method is occupied with the arrangement and explanation of the text, resolves the text into its parts, explains the words and phrases thereof, states what the Holy Spirit would say thereby, and subjoins the doctrines flowing therefrom. The synthetical method selects from the text and its scope a certain general topic as a subject, which it treats in a certain way, with arguments not only lying in the text, but also taken from elsewhere."1)

<sup>1)</sup> Hodeg. p. 15.

Here we have two methods, the analytical and the synthetical. Of these he says:

Et ad hanc Methodum sive ANALYTICAM sive SYNTHE-TICAM omnes conciones debent referri, 1) i. e., "And to this method, the analytical, or the synthetical, all sermons must be referred."

And again:

Propositio in METHODO ANALYTICA non aliud est, quam argumentum textus brevibus et perspicuis verbis significatum et indicatum, v. g. Textus in festo Nativ. agit de Nativitate Christi, cujus historia per partes suas ibi explicatur. In METHODO vero Synthetica est Locus communis, ad quem totus textus tota sua circumferencia suum respectum habet;²) i. e., "The theme in the analytical method is nothing else than the subject of the text stated and indicated in brief and plain words, as, f. ex., the text for Christmas day treats of the birth of Christ, the history of which is there set forth part after part. In the synthetical method, however, it is a commonplace, a general topic, to which the text in its whole compass has reference."

And thus, throughout the whole *Hodegeticum*, the venerable author knows of these two methods, *Methodus Analytica* and *Methodus Synthetica*, and of no more.<sup>3)</sup>

But where are our historians? And where did they find the ninety-eight methods which they have booked against the elder Carpzov over and beyond the two recorded in his book? That is and probably will remain their secret. But if we may venture a conjecture, which, we think, will not go far out of the way, it is this, that one of them thought he had found them in a book published by a son of the elder John Benedict Carpzov and comprising a later edition of the Hodegeticum of the elder Carpzov and certain additions by the younger John Benedict Carpzov which make

<sup>1)</sup> Hodeg. p. 18. 2) Ibid. p. 24 f. 3) Vid. pp. 25, 26, 27, 29, 32, 35, 36, 41, 42.

up the contents of the greater part of the volume. This second part of the book has a separate title page, according to which its contents are: Monita Hodegetico jungenda, de concionum dispositione, dispositionumque variatione, quibus simul memb. I. aphor. X. hodegetici, de Methodo, illustratur. In a preface to his Monita, written amid the noise of the autumnal fair of 1674, the son announces an explanation of what is said on Method in a certain division of his father's *Hodegeticum*. Of course, he does not say that he had found his venerable father sadly deficient in the number and variety of his methods and deemed it a duty and a pleasure to add ninety-eight to his father's two. On the contrary, in one of the 28 Aphorismi which follow the preface, he says: Etsi igitur praeter DUAS METHODOS . . . alia non datur, dantur tamen plures concionis de uno textu habendae dispositiones, quarum unaquaeque vel analyticam, vel syntheticam methodum sequitur; 1) i. e., "Although besides the two methods . . . there is no other, yet there are more dispositions of a sermon to be held on one text, each of which follows either the analytical or the synthetical method." In another Aphorism he says: Haec est regula: Si Dispositio prior fuerit in Methodo analytica, alia formetur juxta Methodum syntheticam; 2) i. e., "The rule is this: If the former disposition was according to the analytical method, then let the other be formed according to the synthetical method." The son, thus, stubbornly refuses to recognize more methods than the father did, two, and even expressly states that every sermon will follow either the one or the other. only this, but he even proceeds to prove or exemplify what he has said in his Aphorisms by a series of Dispositions, or skeletons for a hundred sermons on the same text, Ps. 14, 7. The first of these is headed, Dispositio naturalis secundum methodum analyticam, i. e., "a natural disposition after the

<sup>1)</sup> Aphorism IV, p. 66.

<sup>2)</sup> Aphor. XXIII, p. 71 f.

analytical method,"1) and the hundredth, Dispositio schematica in methodo analytica.2) Others, as the LXXIIX and LXXX, are in methodo synthetica.3) And, lest Method and Disposition be confounded, he points out the difference between the two. Having, in the II Aphorism defined Dispositio as idonea partium Concionis collocatio,4) i. e., "the proper arrangement of the parts of a sermon," he says in the III Aphorism: Differt a Methodo, 5) i. e., "It differs from Method." Yet, in spite of all this, the bell-wether of our historians was bound to blunder and mistake the Centuria Dispositionum<sup>6</sup>) of the younger J. B. Carpzov for a hundred Methods of the elder J. B. Carpzov, and all the rest tumbled after him. This is the only way we can account for the bugbear which is paraded by our modern theologians wherever, in their histories, encyclopedias, biographies, etc., they find an opportunity of exhibiting to a wondering public a gruesome specimen of the genus theologus orthodoxus communis. A. G.

<sup>1)</sup> Aphor. p. 82.

<sup>2)</sup> P. 263.

<sup>3)</sup> Pp. 218. 222.

<sup>4)</sup> P. 65.

<sup>5)</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6)</sup> P. 73.