

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XII.

OCTOBER, 1908.

No. 4.

THE ANALOGY OF FAITH AND ROM. 12, 6.

The "analogy of faith" may be defined as the full and perfect agreement with one another, and especially with the central doctrine of the Christian religion, of all the various articles of the Christian faith as revealed to us in the Bible.

Certain of our opponents have declared, and stoutly maintain, that this harmonious relation between the various teachings of the Gospel is apparent to human reason, and that the enlightened intellect of the trained theologian, at least, can perceive the same. But this is an error. For while the Bible teaches, plainly and unmistakably, that there neither is nor can be any real antagonism between its various statements, since "all¹⁾ Scripture is given by inspiration of God," 2 Tim. 3, 16, and since "the Scripture," therefore, "cannot be broken," John 10, 35, not even in a single word,²⁾ yea, not in a single letter:³⁾ yet this selfsame Bible teaches with equal clearness and positiveness that human reason, *in its present fallen state*, is by no means able to discern in every instance the aforesaid harmony, not though it may boast an enlightenment equal to that of the Church's most learned apostle. "We know in part," says that distinguished man of God, 1 Cor. 13, 8. Our knowledge is fragmentary. And the way in which he arrived at the knowledge he did possess of things divine he describes in the following manner: "Casting down imaginations" (or reasonings, λογισμούς) "and every high thing that exalteth itself

1) Lit.: every scripture.

2) See the context.

3) See Gal. 3, 16: πνεύματι — πνεύμασι.

against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought" (*πᾶν λόγισμα*, every product of human reason, however enlightened!) "to the obedience of Christ," 2 Cor. 10, 5. We don't think it likely that any of us will soar any higher in theological learning and understanding than did Paul, especially since the Lord Himself has said to all the world: "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts," Is. 55, 8. 9. If the Lord's thoughts are as high above our thoughts as the heavens are above the earth, we can no more reach the Lord's thoughts with our thoughts than the earth can reach the heavens. Now God's thoughts and ways are declared to us nowhere if not in the Bible. And while it is incumbent upon us to seek to know His thoughts and understand His ways in as far as He has revealed them to us, and while, to this end, we are commanded to "search the Scriptures," John 5, 39, and encouraged to "meditate in the Law of the Lord day and night," Ps. 1, 2, yet we must not presume to go beyond God's revelation and try to search and find out what God has seen fit to conceal from us. God's thoughts and ways are not *all* declared to us in the Bible, and those that are declared are not fully explained. Hence we cannot fully comprehend them, we cannot see how all the various parts of His fragmentary revelation harmonize with one another. We must acknowledge a mystery here and adore it, not seek to search and find it out; as says the Apostle: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been His counselor? Or who hath first given to Him, and it shall be recompensed unto Him again? For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things: to whom be glory forever! Amen." Rom. 11, 33—36. The doctrine of the analogy of faith is itself an article of faith; it must be apprehended by faith, not *comprehended* by reason.

But does not the Bible itself admonish us: "Having . . . prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith" — ἔχοντες . . . προφητείαν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, Rom. 12, 6? Does not God expressly declare in this text that the various articles of the Christian faith, or doctrine, are in perfect harmony with one another, and that they whose business it is to interpret the Scriptures must be careful not to so interpret any part thereof as to destroy this harmony? And does it not follow from this, that a theologian, whose business it is to declare all the counsel of God, must be able in every instance to discern this harmonious relation? We shall have to answer this question in the affirmative, *IF* — *it can be shown that "faith" is here equivalent to doctrine, that "prophecy" means interpretation, and that "analogy" denotes a harmony which reason, the human λόγος, is able in every instance to discern.* — We are well aware of the fact that eminent Lutheran theologians have assumed that "faith" is here equivalent to doctrine of faith, and that "prophecy" is synonymous with interpretation; but we do not know of *one* genuine Lutheran theologian that gives or accepts the above definition of analogy. Gerhard defines the "rule of faith" as follows: "By 'rule of faith' we mean the *plain passages of Scripture* in which the articles of faith are set forth in plain and express terms." Gerhard further admonishes "that the rule of faith must be taken in its entirety, and that its various parts must not be placed in opposition to one another." (Gerhard's *Loci*: l. de interpretatione Script. sacr., § 75. Quoted in *Lehre und Wehre*, vol. 49, p. 322.) Compare the caution quoted in the same place: "Human reason must not be permitted to judge whether there be any contradiction in the articles of faith." Is not this a tacit admission, to say the very least, that human reason is not able to discern in every instance the harmony that prevails among the various teachings of the Gospel; that human reason is prone to find contradictions in the articles of faith? And the Book of Concord defines the "analogy of faith" thus: "The examples must be interpreted *according to the rule, i. e., according to the certain*

and clear Scriptures, not against the rule, or against the Scriptures." (Mueller, p. 284, § 60.) Genuine Lutheran theology takes no cognizance of a *rational* harmony, or unity, of the Scriptures. According to Lutheran theology, he who would know whether a certain doctrine be analogous to the faith must compare it with the several *sedes doctrinae* of that doctrine, *i. e.*, with all those passages of Holy Scripture in which that doctrine is set forth in clear and express terms; for these are the rule of faith.

But what is the meaning of our passage, Rom. 12, 6? What is the meaning of its principal terms: "faith," "prophecy," "proportion"—*πίστις, προφητεία, ἀναλογία*? Does this *dictum* really treat of what theologians call the "analogy of faith"? Has it any special bearing on the *interpretation* of the Scriptures, and does it set up a rule calculated to guard against *false interpretations*?—"*Scriptura scripturam interpretatur.*" To properly interpret the Scriptures we must view them in the light of the Scriptures. So with this present *dictum*. I. What, ACCORDING TO SCRIPTURE USAGE, is the meaning of *πίστις*, of *προφητεία*, of *ἀναλογία*? II. What light does the CONTEXT shed upon this verse?

Let us inquire into this matter.—To determine the *usus loquendi* of *πίστις* in the New Testament, we shall look up and examine all those passages in which *πίστις* occurs. This is not so arduous a task as it may seem at first sight. For though *πίστις* occurs several hundred times in the New Testament, there are extremely few cases in which there can be any doubt about its exact meaning. In 95 cases out of 100 *πίστις* manifestly denotes *personal, subjective faith*. And in the remaining five—well, to put it mildly, the subjective meaning of *πίστις* is entitled to the benefit of the doubt. To put it more strongly, we may say: It is a well-established principle of theological exegesis that words used in the Scriptures must be taken in their proper literal sense as long as we are not compelled by cogent reasons to depart from such sense and assume a figure of speech. Now, no one will dare dispute that "faith," in its

proper sense, denotes a *personal habitus*, and that, when the word is used in the sense of doctrine, *i. e.*, doctrine of faith, a figure of speech is employed. Now, does the New Testament ever employ this figure of speech in its use of the word *πίστις*? Is there anywhere in the canonical books of the New Testament where the word *πίστις* occurs any cogent reason for taking *πίστις* in the sense of doctrine? If not, we have no right to assume that such a figure is used, but must abide by the literal sense, or, at least, depart no farther from it than the Scriptures, the real *regula fidei*, compel us.

In pointing out the places where *πίστις* occurs in the New Testament we shall follow pretty closely the order observed in Wahl's *Clavis Novi Testamenti*, sub voce *πίστις*. In order to save time and space, passages in which the subjective meaning is obvious will merely be indicated; others will be printed in full,—or be indicated,—and accompanied by explanatory notes, references, etc.

1) Hebr. 11, 1 (we place this verse at the head of the list, because it gives a definition of "faith" as the word is generally understood); 2) Mark 11, 22; 3) Col. 2, 12; 4) 1 Pet. 1, 21; 5) Hebr. 6, 1; 6) 1 Thess. 1, 8; 7) Rom. 4, 5; 8) v. 9; 9) v. 11; 10) v. 12; 11) v. 13; 12) v. 14; 13) v. 16 (*bis*); 14) v. 19; 15) v. 20; 16) Gal. 3, 7 (compare the preceding verse); 17) v. 8; 18) v. 9; 19) v. 11; 20) v. 12; 21) v. 14; 22) v. 22; 23) v. 23: "But before faith came, we were kept under the Law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." Here, and likewise in v. 25, one is tempted, at first, to take *πίστις* figuratively, in the sense of gospel, or doctrine of faith. However, on mature deliberation, it will be seen that there is no cogent reason for so doing. a) In all the verses of this chapter already considered *πίστις* manifestly denotes personal faith. In vv. 24 and 26 such is again its obvious meaning. This being the case, we naturally assume that the apostle does not depart from what is his established custom in this chapter, in vv. 23 and 25; and we cling to this assumption as long as we are not compelled by other more

weighty considerations to relinquish it. Now, there are no such considerations; for b) in v. 23 *πίστις* occurs twice, and in the second instance it, or rather the thing designated by it, is represented as the object of revelation. Now, faith, as the *object* of revelation, is not the Gospel; for the Gospel is that revelation itself. Faith, as the object of revelation, is that personal, subjective thing which the objective Gospel inculcates. "Before faith came," and "the faith which should afterwards be revealed," are parallel expressions denoting the same thing. Faith *came* when it was *revealed*, when it was set forth in the Gospel revelation, when it was made the object of that clear, full revelation which we have in the Gospel of the New Testament. — 24) Gal. 3, 24; 25) v. 25 (see the above *ad* v. 23); 26) v. 26; 27) Hebr. 4, 2; 28) 6, 12; 29) 10, 22; 30) v. 39; 31) 12, 2; 32) 13, 7 (see Greek text); 33) 11, 3 (see context); 34) v. 4; 35) v. 5; 36) v. 6; 37) v. 7 (*bis*); 38) v. 8; 39) v. 9; 40) v. 11; 41) v. 13; 42) v. 17; 43) v. 20; 44) v. 21; 45) v. 22; 46) v. 23; 47) v. 24; 48) v. 27; 49) v. 28; 50) v. 29; 51) v. 30; 52) v. 31; 53) v. 39; 54) Matt. 17, 20; 55) Luke 17, 5; 56) v. 6; 57) Matt. 21, 21; 58) James 1, 6; 59) 5, 15; 60) Gal. 2, 16; 61) Eph. 4, 13; 62) Phil. 3, 9; 63) James 2, 1; 64) Rev. 2, 13: "Thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith." Here it is not impossible, of course, to interpret: hast not denied my doctrine, which is the doctrine of faith. But it is not necessary. *Mou* may be taken as the objective genitive, making the sense: thou hast not denied the faith (which is) in me. Cf. Gal. 2, 16: *διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* (cf. also John 15, 10 for this same genitive). 65) 14, 12; 66) Phil. 1, 27 (compare vv. 29. 30); 67) 2 Thess. 2, 13; 68) Col. 2, 5; 69) Acts 20, 21; 70) 24, 24; 71) 26, 18; 72) Philem., v. 5; 73) v. 6; 74) Col. 1, 4; 75) Eph. 1, 15; 76) 1 Tim. 3, 13; 77) 2 Tim. 3, 15; 78) Luke 18, 8; 79) 22, 32; 80) Acts 3, 16 (*bis*); 81) 14, 22; 82) 15, 9; 83) 6, 5; 84) 11, 24; 85) 14, 27: "opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles," thus giving them an opportunity to enter the faith, *i. e.*, to believe; 86) Acts

17, 31: *πίστιν παρασχὼν πᾶσιν ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν*. The English Bible has: "whereof" (*i. e.*, of the future judgment) "He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He raised Him (Christ) from the dead." Luther translates: "*und jedermann vorhaelt DEN GLAUBEN, nachdem,*" etc. Luther's translation is more literal, since *παρέχειν* means to offer, *darreichen*, *hinhalten*, *vorhalten*, and *πίστις* means faith, *Glaube*. The sense of Luther's translation is: God offers all men *faith*, *personal* assurance of the truth of the Gospel, which they ought all the more to accept, since God has already raised up Jesus from the dead. This translation being literal and agreeing very well with the context (see v. 30), is preferable to the English version. There certainly is no cogent reason for departing from the literal sense of *πίστις*. 87) Rom. 1, 8; 88) 1, 12; 89) 9, 30; 90) v. 32; 91) 10, 6; 92) v. 8; 93) v. 17; 94) 12, 3; 95) 1, 5: "for obedience to the faith among all nations." Here faith would seem to denote the Gospel, which demands faith as an act of obedience. But the Greek text reads: *εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν κτλ.*, and the most natural translation would be: "unto faith—obedience among all nations," *πίστεως* being *gen. epexeg.* Thus Luther translates: "*den Gehorsam DES GLAUBENS aufzurichten,*" etc. Compare: 96) 16, 26; 97) 1, 17 (*tris*); 98) Hebr. 10, 38; 99) 1 Cor. 2, 5; 100) 1 Cor. 12, 9; 101) 1 Cor. 13, 2; 102) v. 13; 103) 2 Cor. 1, 24; 104) 4, 13; 105) 5, 7; 106) 8, 7; 107) 10, 15; 108) 13, 5; 109) Gal. 6, 10. (The Christians are said to be "of the household of faith," because they are most closely *related*, *spiritually* related, *i. e.*, they not only profess a common doctrine, but *have* and *hold* such doctrine in a common *personal faith*. The same blood of faith courses through the spiritual veins of them all. Compare Rom. 1, 12.) 110) Gal. 3, 2: "This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the Law or by the hearing of faith?" The English translators seem to have taken *πίστεως* as the *gen. obj.* dependent upon *ἀκοῆς*, which they rendered: "hearing," and to have assumed that *πίστεως* here means the doctrine of faith,

the Gospel, as opposed to the Law. Grammatically this would not be incorrect, and theologically it would not be against "the analogy of faith," it would not be heresy. But considering it from the viewpoint of theological *exegesis*, we have an objection to offer. *ἄκοή*, which properly denotes either the act, or the sense, of hearing, clearly a personal, subjective thing, and is so used in the Scriptures (*e. g.*, 1 Cor. 12, 17; 2 Pet. 2, 8),—*ἄκοή* also denotes in the Bible, and elsewhere, *that which is heard*, *i. e.*, rumor, report; *e. g.* John 12, 38; Rom. 10, 16; Matt. 4, 24; 14, 1; 24, 6 *et al.* Hence it would be in keeping with Scripture usage to take it thus in the present instance: *ἄκοή* = report, preaching, or teaching. We have detected no such manifest usage with regard to *πίστις*. Hence we should prefer to assume with Luther⁴⁾ that *ἄκοή* is here used in an objective sense, in the sense of report, *Predigt*, while *πίστεως* denotes the subjective faith which that report or *Predigt* inculcates. Thus Wahl defines *ἄκοή πίστεως* here: *nuntius, i. e., institutio de fide*. 111) Gal. 3, 5; 112) 5, 5; 113) v. 6; 114) Eph. 2, 8; 115) 3, 17; 116) 4, 5; 117) 6, 16; 118) v. 23; 119) Phil. 2, 17; 120) Col. 1, 23; 121) 2, 7; 122) 1 Thess. 1, 3; 123) 3, 2; 124) v. 5; 125) v. 6; 126) v. 7; 127) v. 10; 128) 5, 8; 129) 2 Thess. 1, 3; 130) v. 4; 131) v. 11; 132) 1 Tim. 1, 4; 133) v. 5; 134) 2, 15; 135) 1 Tim. 1, 2; 136) James 2, 5; 137) 1 Tim. 4, 1 (compare 2 Tim. 3, 1—8, especially v. 8, in which the description culminates); 138) 2 Tim. 3, 8; 139) 1 Tim. 6, 12; 140) 2 Tim. 1, 5; 141) 2 Tim. 2, 18; 142) Tit. 1, 13; 143) 1, 4; 144) James 1, 3; 145) 1 Pet. 1, 5; 146) v. 7; 147) v. 9; 148) 2 Pet. 1, 1; 149) v. 5; 150) 1 John 5, 4; 151) Rom. 11, 20; 152) Acts 16, 5; 153) 2 Cor. 1, 24 (*bis*); 154) Tit. 2, 2; 155) 1 Pet. 5, 9; 156) 1 Tim. 1, 14; 157) 2 Tim. 1, 13; 158) 1 Tim. 1, 19 (*bis*); 159) 1 Tim. 6, 10; 160) v. 21; 161) 2 Thess. 3, 2; 162) Jude, v. 3: "Exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." We admit that the wording of this passage, especially in the relative clause, constitutes a

4) See Luther's translation: "durch die PREDIGT VOM GLAUBEN."

strong argument in favor of the objective meaning of *πίστις* in this place. However, we don't think it a conclusive proof. See v. 5 and the entire letter, which is a warning, not so much against heterodoxy as against *unbelief* and *ungodly living*. 163) Jude, v. 20; 164) 1 Tim. 3, 9; 165) 4, 6; 166) Acts 6, 7;⁵⁾ 167) Gal. 1, 23; 168) Phil. 1, 25; 169) James 2, 14 (*bis*); 170) v. 17; 171) v. 18 (*tris*); 172) v. 20; 173) v. 22 (*bis*); 174) v. 24; 175) v. 26; 176) Gal. 2, 20; 177) Eph. 3, 12; 178) Rom. 5, 1; 179) v. 2; 180) Rom. 3, 25; 181) v. 26; 182) v. 27. (Observe that "faith" and "works" are here contrasted, just as they are v. 28, and likewise "law" and "law." If anything here denotes the Gospel, it is "law" in the second instance, not faith.) 183) v. 28; 184) v. 30; 185) v. 31 (faith is the only source of real obedience to the Law); 186) Matt. 9, 2; 187) Mark 2, 5; 188) Luke 5, 20; 189) Matt. 9, 22; 190) Mark 5, 34; 191) 10, 52; 192) Luke 7, 50; 193) 8, 48; 194) 17, 19; 195) 18, 42; 196) Matt. 9, 29; 197) 15, 28; 198) Luke 8, 25; 199) Matt. 8, 10; 200) Luke 7, 9; 201) Mark 4, 40; 202) Acts 14, 9; 203) Rom. 14, 1; 204) v. 22; 205) v. 23; 206) Matt. 23, 23 (the "faith" here spoken of is faithfulness in keeping one's vows, clearly a subjective personal thing; compare the preceding context); 207) 1 Tim. 2, 7 (the meaning of *πίστις* here is fully brought out by the English translation); 208) Tit. 2, 10 ("fidelity"); 209) Rom. 3, 3 (the "faith of God" is one of God's attributes; see the following context); 210) 2 Thess. 3, 10; 211) Rev. 2, 19; 212) 13, 10; 213) Gal. 5, 22; 214) 1 Tim. 4, 12; 215) 6, 11; 216) 2 Tim. 2, 22; 217) 1 Tim. 5, 12. —

Thus we have examined every passage in the New Testament in which the word *πίστις* occurs, with one solitary exception, that of Rom. 12, 6, the passage we are seeking to understand. We have seen that in a very great majority of cases *πίστις* obviously denotes, and, if the afore-stated rule of exegesis counts for aught (that, in interpreting the Scriptures, words must be taken in their proper sense, unless there be cogent

5) In this and the two following passages faith is personified.

reasons for assuming that a figure of speech is employed), *πίστις* invariably denotes in the canonical books of the New Testament not the objective Gospel, or doctrine of faith, but *subjective, personal faith*. Such is the *usus loquendi generalis* of the New Testament, yea, — barring Rom. 12, 6 until its exact meaning shall have been determined, — the *usus loquendi universalis*. The *usus loquendi*, then, certainly does not compel us to assume a figurative meaning in the only remaining place where *πίστις* occurs. On the contrary, it speaks very loudly for the proper meaning. Let us therefore examine *πίστις* in this place in the light of its context. —

Rom. 12—16 is made up largely of exhortations and rules of conduct for Christians. Ch. 12, 3 ff. the Christian is told how to conduct himself toward the Church and toward his fellow-Christians, as may be seen from vv. 4. 5; also from the nature of the exhortations, vv. 6 ff. From vv. 3—6 a it will be seen, furthermore, that Christians ought, with becoming humility and modesty, to serve one another, every man with the gift he has received. This is the general scope of all these exhortations. Now, one such gift is the gift of *prophecy*, and thus we read v. 6: “Having then . . . prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith.” He truly serves his brethren with his gift of prophecy who prophesies according to the proportion, or analogy, of faith. Now what does “prophecy” mean? And what is the meaning of the phrase: “according to the *proportion*, or *ἀναλογία*, of faith”?

Leaving the meaning of *προφητεία* out of consideration for the present and bearing only in mind that in no other passage of the canonical books of the New Testament can *πίστις* be conclusively shown to have the meaning of doctrine, and that in this particular connection the Christians are exhorted to serve one another in all humility and modesty with their respective gifts, among which is the gift of prophecy, is it not more than likely that also in this place *πίστις* means, not doctrine of faith, but *faith*, personal, subjective faith? The thought seems somewhat strange and far-fetched: In order to serve the brethren,

let your prophesying be in harmony with the doctrine of faith, let it agree with the Scriptures. This thought suggests itself far more readily: In order to serve the brethren, prophesy unto their edification in the faith.

Now, what does *προφητεία* mean, and what is the import of *ἀναλογία*? Theologians of no mean repute have said that in the New Testament *προφητεία* frequently denotes *interpretation*, especially interpretation of what the prophets have written, and hence interpretation of the Scriptures in general; and they have so explained the word here: Having the gift of prophecy, *i. e.*, of interpretation, let us prophesy, *i. e.*, interpret, according to the proportion of faith. To support this assumption they appeal, *e. g.*, to 1 Cor. 14, where the words *προφητεία* and *προφητεύω* are used quite frequently. See vv. 1. 3. 4. 5. 6. 22. 24. 31. 39. Thus Calov writes in the *Biblia Illustrata*, commenting on Rom. 12, 6: "Not those prophets are meant that have immediate revelations, but those that interpret the Scriptures, as the word is taken 1 Cor. 14, 1. 3. 29. 32; 1 Tim. 4, 14; 2 Pet. 1, 20. For though it is not the business of these men to set forth new prophecies, or revelations, yet it is their business to investigate, bring out, and set forth the prophecies or revelations contained in the sacred writings. For there could be no rule laid down for those (first-named) prophets how they should prophesy, since they performed what they performed by immediate action of the Holy Spirit; but to these (= latter) prophets a norm is prescribed, to-wit, that they shall so interpret the Scriptures that their interpretation will be analogous to the faith."

Calov here *assumes* that the apostle's intention is, in Rom. 12, 6, to regulate the *contents* of the utterances of the "prophets," not the *how* and the *wherefore*, but the *what*. Proceeding on this assumption, he argues that prophets who have immediate revelations need no norm, or rule, to teach them how they shall prophesy, *i. e.*, what they shall say, since they speak by inspiration of the Holy Ghost. But they who *interpret the Scriptures* and whose business it, therefore, is to set forth the

meaning of what the prophets have written, and who may, therefore, themselves be called, in a sense, prophets—these people need a norm, or rule, to guide them *in what they say*, and to them such a rule is given, to-wit, that they prophesy according to the proportion of faith. This is Calov's assumption and argument. And this whole assumption and argument and all is based upon the further assumption that *πίστις* here means an objective statement of the faith, or doctrine, which may serve as a guide, or rule, for interpreters of the Bible. But we question the correctness of both of these assumptions, especially of the latter one, and hence the validity of the argument.

There is still another assumption in Calov's words, to-wit, that in the passage which he refers to, 1 Cor. 14, *προφητεία* is taken in the sense of interpretation. We question the correctness of this assumption also. We shall presently examine all the various passages in which the word *προφητεία* occurs, and see whether they furnish any conclusive evidence for such assumption. But first we would say this. The idea of interpretation is not foreign to the train of thought imbedded in 1 Cor. 14. It is referred to expressly no less than five times. The word *interpretation* occurs once (v. 26); *interpreter*, once (v. 28); *interpret*, thrice (vv. 5. 13. 27). But the original terms here used are not *προφητεία*, *προφήτης*, and *προφητεύω*, they are *ἑρμηνεία*, *διερμηνεύτης*, and two forms of *διερμηνεύειν*. No one disputes the correctness of the translations of these terms in the English Bible. True, the apostle does not in these places speak of the interpretation of the *Scriptures*, but of *tongues*, of foreign languages; but the same word is employed in the New Testament to denote interpretation of the *Scriptures* and particularly interpretation of the writings of the prophets: Luke 24, 47. Compare also Hebr. 5, 11. These considerations make it appear very doubtful whether *προφητεία*, anywhere in the *Scriptures*, and especially in 1 Cor. 14, has the meaning of interpretation. The *Scriptures* have a different word to express that idea. — But let us take up *προφητεία* itself.

The word *προφητεία* occurs in the New Testament nineteen times. 1) Matt. 13, 14 we read: "And in them is fulfilled the *prophecy* of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive." That *προφητεία* does not here mean *interpretation* is self-evident. 2) Rev. 11, 6: "These have power to shut heaven, that it rain not in the days of their *prophecy*." Compare v. 7: "And when they shall have finished their *testimony*," etc., and v. 3: "And I will give power unto my two *witnesses*, and they shall *prophesy*." It is manifest that *προφητεία* here does not mean *interpretation*. These "prophets" are engaged, not in interpreting the Scriptures, but in bearing witness, in giving testimony, of Christ. 3) Rev. 1, 3: "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear, the words of this *prophecy*, and keep those things which are written therein: *for the time is at hand*." Read this verse in connection with vv. 1, 2, and it will never occur to you that *προφητεία* here means *interpretation*. 4) Rev. 19, 10: "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of *prophecy*." Here the idea of *interpretation* is no more in evidence than it is in ch. 1, 3. 5) Rev. 22, 7: "Behold, I come quickly: blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the *prophecy* of this book." Another parallel to ch. 1, 3. Compare also ch. 22, 6. 6) Rev. 22, 10: "And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the *prophecy* of this book; for the time is at hand." Comment unnecessary. 7. 8) Rev. 22, 18. 19. No comment necessary. The predominant notion of *προφητεία* in all these places, with the possible exception of 11, 6, is that of the foretelling of future events. The Book of Revelation was written to show the servants of God "things which must shortly," *i. e.*, in the near future, "come to pass," ch. 1, 1. Therefore the words which are written in this book are "words of *prophecy*." 9. 10) 2 Pet. 1, 20. 21: "Knowing this first, that no *prophecy* of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the *prophecy* came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Calov, in the quotation given

above, appeals to 2 Pet. 1, 20 to show that *προφητεία* in the New Testament sometimes has the meaning of *interpretation*. Why, we fail to understand. In v. 19 the apostle speaks of "the more sure word of prophecy," τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον. This surely means: the word which the prophets have written in the Scriptures; it means the Old Testament. The Old Testament is here characterized as a word of prophecy. Compare v. 19 with vv. 20. 21. Now the Old Testament is a book of considerable size. The "word of prophecy" is made up of quite a number of individual prophetic utterances. Hence the apostle, v. 20, speaks of *πᾶσα προφητεία* = *every prophecy*, i. e., every prophetic utterance of Scripture. The only difference between *προφητικὸν λόγον* in v. 19 and *προφητεία γραφῆς*, v. 20, is that the former refers to the word of prophecy as a whole, while the latter refers to its several parts.

Now, what does the apostle say about the Old Testament prophecy? He says that "every prophecy of Scripture is not of any private interpretation;" Greek: ὅτι πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται; literally: that every prophecy of Scripture is not of one's own interpretation, i. e., one cannot of one's self interpret any prophetic utterance of Scripture. Why not? He tells us that v. 21: "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." As prophecy, every prophecy, *came* not by the will of man, but by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, so prophecy, every prophecy, cannot be *interpreted* by the will of man, but only by illumination of the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost, being the sole *Author* of the Scriptures, is likewise the sole authentic *interpreter* of the Scriptures. See Gerhard's *Loci*, vol. I, p. 237: "Argumentum apostoli tale est: Quod ab humana voluntate sive ab arbitrio humano non est profectum, illud etiam humano sive privato arbitrio non est explicandum. Scriptura sacra non est ab arbitrio humano profecta. Ergo non debet humano sive privato arbitrio explicari. Ulterius: Qui est Scripturae auctor principalis ac summus, qui sacras divinae veritatis tabulas per

prophetas et apostolos olim promulgavit ac publicavit, is etiam earum est interpretes summus et authenticus. Jam vero Spiritus sanctus est auctor Scripturae principalis summus. Ergo etiam est ejusdem interpretes authenticus.”⁶⁾

Now it is true, this same *truth* will be arrived at, if we take *προφητεία*, v. 20, in the sense of *interpretation*. But what compels us to put, or what justifies us in putting, that queer construction upon an innocent word? What sin has *προφητεία* committed that it should merit such a punishment? Look at the exegetical process one must go through in order to explain a few verses of Scripture which are in themselves so plain as not to require *any* explanation. Commenting on v. 20, the exegete tells us: “No prophecy of the Scripture,” *i. e.*, no *interpretation* of the Scripture, “is of any private interpretation.” “Hold!” you exclaim. “No interpretation of Scripture is of any private interpretation!” “What does that mean? Am I to understand that when a passage of Scripture has been interpreted, this *interpretation* must also be interpreted, though not by any *private* interpretation, and so on *ad infinitum*?” “No,” the exegete explains, “this statement merely means that whoso would interpret the Scriptures cannot interpret them by himself.” “Why not?” “Because ‘the prophecy *came* not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;’ therefore it cannot be *interpreted* by the will of man, *i. e.*, by any private interpretation, but solely by illumination of the Holy Ghost.” “Well, what does that mean?” you ask again. “Does that mean the *interpretation* ‘*came* not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake,’ *i. e.*, *interpreted*, ‘as they were moved

6) The Apostle argues thus: What was not brought forth by the will, or judgment, of man, must not be interpreted by man's private judgment. The Holy Scriptures were not brought forth by the judgment of man. Therefore they must not be interpreted by man's private judgment. Further: He who is the principal and supreme Author of the Scriptures, who of old promulgated and published the holy tables of divine truth by the prophets and apostles, He is also their supreme and authentic interpreter. But now the Holy Spirit is the principal and supreme Author of the Scriptures; consequently He is also their authentic interpreter.”

by the Holy Ghost?" "No," says the exegete, "it means, the *prophecy* came not," etc. "Well," you ask, "if 'prophecy,' *προφητεία*, means *prophecy* in v. 21 and 'word of prophecy' means *word of prophecy* in v. 19, why does it mean *interpretation* in v. 20?" How the exegete will answer this question we do not know. It will take considerable exegetical acumen, in our opinion, to find a satisfactory answer. The whole process reminds us of David trying to walk in Saul's armor, when a staff, a sling, and five smooth stones from the brook will answer the purpose full well and prove far more expedient to David. Besides, the rule of exegesis which we quoted at the beginning of this paper and on which Lutheran theologians have always laid the greatest stress, to-wit, that a word must be taken in its proper, native sense, unless there be cogent reasons for assuming a figurative sense, this rule applies to *προφητεία* as well as it does to *πίστις* or any other word; and the proper, native sense of *προφητεία* surely is not *interpretation of the Scriptures*.

11) 1 Thess. 5, 20: "Despise not *prophesyings*." We have seen this passage pointed to as an instance in which *προφητεία* is equivalent to interpretation, *i. e.*, of the Scriptures. According to the confession of such as advocate this meaning of *προφητεία*, the word would here be used in an improper sense, a thing we ought not to assume, unless there be stringent reasons for so doing. The *analogia fidei* does not compel us. We know of no exact parallel to this passage. And we see nothing in the context that would compel us. In the verse immediately preceding it says: "Quench not the Spirit;" and in the one immediately following we read: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." Now as for the "Spirit," v. 19, He is indeed a Spirit of prophecy. Compare Rev. 19, 10 with Acts 1, 8 and 2 Pet. 1, 19—21. But here prophecy manifestly does not denote interpretation of the Scriptures. See the list of passages from the Book of Revelation given above. — As for v. 21: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good," this does not compel us to interpret *προφητεία* (v. 20) as meaning

interpretation. For, granting that this injunction refers to *προφητεία*, v. 20, still it will not do to argue: "If *προφητεία* here signified speech inspired by the Holy Spirit, there would be no need of this caution: 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good;' for all would then be good and must *a priori* be so considered." We must bear in mind that the injunction is not given here to the prophets but to the hearers. Now the Christians in Berea, who heard the inspired apostles, are lauded in the Bible for searching the Scriptures whether these things were so, Acts 17, 11. We know that the divinely inspired apostles could not err in their teachings, neither could the divinely inspired prophets, as such. But we know that "many false prophets are gone out into the world," and even true prophets are known to have given false counsel. See 2 Sam. 7, 3 ff. Under such circumstances it surely was not superfluous to caution the Thessalonians to prove all things, even *προφητείαν*, properly so called, and to hold fast that which was good.— Besides, interpretation of the Scriptures, real interpretation, as distinguished from misinterpretation, is a gift of the Holy Ghost no less than prophecy is. And if Christians need to be cautioned to prove interpretations before accepting them, why not exercise the same caution with regard to prophecy? We see no cogent reason for waiving the proper sense of *προφητεία* for a figurative one.

Now let us consider the passages most commonly referred to as speaking of *προφητεία* in the sense of interpretation. They are 1 Cor. 12, 10; 13, 2. 8; 14, 6. 22. Is there any real need of abandoning the proper sense of *προφητεία* in these places and assuming the confessedly figurative meaning of interpretation?

In 1 Cor. 12 the apostle starts out by declaring that he is going to enlighten the Corinthians concerning spiritual gifts. In v. 4 he says: "There are diversities of gifts." In v. 7 he says these diverse gifts are "manifestations of the Spirit," *i. e.*, the Holy Spirit manifests Himself by these gifts, He is known and recognized by these gifts. Hence they must have

been extraordinary, miraculous gifts. And he that reads vv. 8—11, where these gifts are enumerated, is at once imbued with the notion that they were indeed miraculous gifts. The gift of *prophecy* is mentioned among them. The inference therefore is that *προφητεία* was a miraculous gift of the Spirit. Thus far, we believe, all are agreed. — But now, what sort of gift was prophecy? What did the exercise of this gift consist in? In the miraculous interpretation of the Scriptures, say some. Gerhard writes: “Quidam singulari Spiritus dono et illustratione Scripturas sacras interpretabantur, reconditos et abstrusos earum sensus proferendo, qui vaticinandi potestate interim non erant instructi. ‘Act. 13, 1: ‘Erant in ecclesia, quae erat Antiochiae, prophetae et doctores,’ in quibus Barnabas et Simon etc., ubi prophetae a doctoribus ordinariis distinguuntur ac proinde peculiarem ab illis ordinem constituisse intelliguntur. Huc referri potest 1 Cor. 14, 24, ubi *prophettare* significat speciali quadam Spiritus sancti revelatione Scripturas interpretari ac ‘prophetarum spiritus’ dicuntur ‘prophetis subjecti,’ v. 32, quia doctrina, quam adferunt prophetae Spiritu Dei afflati, ita debet institui ac proferri, ut serviat aedificationi fidelium.” (Gerhard’s *Loci* VI, p. 148.)⁷⁾

Matthew Henry writes, commenting on 1 Cor. 14: “As to prophesying, he orders, (1) That two or three only should speak at one meeting, v. 20, and this successively, not all at once: and the others should examine and judge what he delivered, that is, discern and determine concerning it, whether

7) “Some, by a singular gift and illumination of the Spirit, interpreted the Scriptures, setting forth their hidden and abstruse meanings, who, meanwhile, were not gifted with the ability to vaticinate. Acts 13, 1: ‘Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas and Simeon,’ etc., where the prophets are distinguished from the ordinary teachers and are therefore understood to have constituted a peculiar order, separate from the latter. Here we may also consider 1 Cor. 14, 24, where the verb *to prophesy* means, by a special revelation of the Holy Spirit to interpret the Scriptures, and ‘the spirits of the prophets’ are said to be ‘subject to the prophets,’ v. 32, because the doctrine which the prophets adduce, under the afflatus of the Spirit, must be so instituted and set forth as to serve to edify the believers.”

it were of divine inspiration or not. There might be false prophets, mere pretenders to divine inspiration; and the true prophets were to judge of these, and discern and discover who was divinely inspired, *and by such inspiration interpreted Scripture*,⁸⁾ and taught the church, and who was not; what was of divine inspiration and what was not. This seems to be the meaning of this rule. For where a prophet was known to be such and under the divine *afflatus*, he could not be judged; for this were to subject even the Holy Spirit to the judgment of men." (M. Henry, vol. VI, p. 1059.) Again *ad* v. 1 ff. Henry writes: "He directs them which spiritual gift to prefer, from a principle of charity: '*Desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy,*' or chiefly that you may prophesy. While they were in close pursuit of charity, and made this Christian disposition their chief scope, they might be zealous of spiritual gifts, be ambitious of them in some measure, but especially of prophesying, *that is, of interpreting Scripture.*" (L. c., p. 1056.) But where do these splendid men get this notion that *προφητεία* means inspired *interpretation*? From the text? From the context? We don't see how. Gerhard writes: "Nomen *προφήτης* deducitur vel *ἀπὸ τοῦ φάναι*, quia arcana per visiones illi apparebant, vel *παρὰ τὸ φαίνειν*, quia eventus insolitos populo denuntiabant, vel simpliciter a *πρόφημι*, praedico, quia prophetae non solum capita coelestis doctrinae proponebant, sed etiam de futuris vaticinia proferebant. Plato in Timaeo, f. 544, discernit prophetam a vate. De vate dicit, quod *arreptus numine oracula edat et futura denuntiet, qui tamen quid loquatur, non intelligat*; prophetam constituit *vatis interpretem*, qua ratione prophetis Veteris Testamenti non competeret appellatio vatum proprie accepta, cum ipsi quid loquerentur, probe intelligerint et aliis explicarent. Sed quod prophetae dicuntur vatum interpretes, illud accommodari potest ad significationem huius vocabuli apostolo Paulo usitatam, *qua etiam illi dicuntur prophetae, qui prophetarum et apostolorum*

8) Italics our own.

scripta explicant, quamvis futurorum revelatione et praedictione destituantur." (*Loci VI*, p. 12.)⁹⁾

But this last assertion, the all-important one, as regards our present purpose, Gerhard does not prove. It seems to us that they who define *προφητεία* as an extraordinary, miraculous gift of interpreting the Scriptures, as inspired interpretation, go a step too far in seeking to *specialize* where a *more general* statement would be better: not inspired *interpretation*, but inspired *speaking*, whether interpretative or otherwise, would seem to come nearer the mark. We are not sure that the several functions of the New Testament "prophets" can be exactly specified, but we respectfully submit the following as shedding some light on our subject.

That "prophecy" was indeed a miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit is fairly beyond dispute. In addition to what we have said on this score, compare 1 Cor. 13, 2. 8; 14, 1. 22. 29. 30; also Acts 2, 17. According to 1 Cor. 14, 30 the prophet speaks by revelation, and according to v. 22 prophecy is a sign, *σημεῖον*, even as tongues. (Compare the Greek text.) Under the extraordinary influence of the Spirit — *afflatus* — the prophet would speak what the Spirit revealed to him. The Spirit moved him to speak it. What did the Spirit reveal and move the prophet to speak? "Mysteries" and "knowledge," 1 Cor. 13, 2, the

9) The name prophet is derived either from *φάναι*, because hidden things appeared to him in visions, or from *φαίνειν*, because they foretold unwonted events to the people, or simply from *προφῆμι*, I predict, because the prophets not only propounded the chief articles of the heavenly doctrine, but also uttered predictions (concerning the future). Plato in Timaeus, f. 544, distinguishes the prophet from the *vates*. Of the *vates* he says that, *carried away by the Deity, he speaks oracles and foretells the future, although he does not understand what he is saying*; the prophet he makes *the interpreter of the vates*. According to this theory the name *vates* would not properly apply to the prophets of the Old Testament, since they understood full well what they said, and explained it to others. But that the prophets are called *interpreters*¹⁾ of the *vates*, this agrees with the meaning of this word that is common in the writings of Paul, where also they are called prophets who *explain*¹⁾ the writings of the prophets and apostles, though they be destitute of revelations and predictions regarding the future." [1) Italics our own.]

knowledge of hidden things. Where were these things hidden? In the Scriptures? We doubt not that some were hidden in the Scriptures, and that the prophets in speaking them interpreted the Scriptures; though we see no special statement anywhere to that effect. Much less do we find it recorded that these were the *only* mysteries they spoke. Nor do we see any reason to believe that the speaking of mysteries was the sole occupation of the prophets as such. For 1 Cor. 14, 3 it says: "He that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort." The prophets were not occupied with the clearing away of mysteries *only*, the prophets *spoke the Word of God*, both the written and the unwritten word. (Compare Acts 11, 27. 28; 21, 10. 11.) And it was as much their office to *comfort* and *exhort* as it was to enlighten and edify. THOSE PROPHETS WERE INSPIRED PREACHERS. We believe this definition covers the whole ground. Wahl defines *προφητεία* thus: 1) *sermo vel oratio afflatum divinum prodens*, i. e., *sermo sacro ardore prolatus et spectans ad alios nunc edocendos de rebus divinis, nunc adhortandos, nunc consolandos, hoher Geistesvortrag, begeisterter Ausspruch*; 2) *facultas sermones habendi afflatum divinum prodentes, die Fachigkeit, begeisterte Vortraege zu halten*; 3) *vaticinium, praedictio rerum futurarum*: a) *proprie*; b) *pro: augurium, laeta spes quam concepimus ἐπὶ τινι, i. e., de aliquo.*"¹⁰⁾

We find no statement, suggestion, or hint in the Scriptures that would lead us to identify *προφητεία* anywhere with *interpretation*. The fact that Plato defines *προφήτης* as *vates interpretis*, does not justify us in saying that the *προφήται* of the New

10) 1) Speech or discourse betraying a divine afflatus (inspiration), i. e., discourse delivered with holy ardor and looking now to the enlightenment, now to the exhortation, now to the consolation, of others with regard to things divine, *hoher Geistesvortrag*, inspired utterance; 2) the faculty of delivering discourses betraying a divine afflatus, the ability to deliver inspired discourses; 3) vaticination, prediction of future events: a) properly so taken; b) instead of: augury, cheerful hope which we have conceived ἐπὶ τινι, i. e., concerning someone. — As instances where *προφητεία* occurs in this third meaning Wahl points to 1 Tim. 1, 18; 4, 14; and we see no reasons to take exception.

Testament were *interpretes* of the Old Testament *vates*. For 1) the definition Plato gives of *vates* does not apply without limitation to the Old Testament prophets, and 2) the prophets of the New Testament have the title *προφῆται* in common with those of the Old. —

Now what is the meaning of *proportion*, *ἀναλογία*? *Ἀναλογία* is a *ῥησις λεγόμενον* with respect to the New Testament, occurring in this place only. However, the word is familiar enough in the classics both of Greece and of Rome. Julius Caesar wrote a book, or treatise, entitled *De Analogia*, in which he demanded in the interest of sound oratory and good Latin style that a systematic, theoretical study of grammar should form the basis of the study of oratory, that men should learn to speak and write correctly according to the established rules of grammar, and not, as Cicero and other orators would have it, by the reading of good books and the hearing of pure speakers. Cicero paraphrased the title of Caesar's work thus: *De ratione Latine loquendi*, "On the theory of speaking Latin." In another place he calls Caesar's method *ratio aut scientia*, "theory or science," as contrasted with his own practical method of *consuetudo*. In grammar analogy denoted uniformity or agreement in the formation of words attained by means of rational study and logical thinking, and in rhetoric and style it denoted uniformity in the presentation of ideas, acquired in the same manner. Georges in his Latin Dictionary defines *analogia*: exact proportion, the proportion between two or more things. In pure Latin: *comparatio proportiove*. Schenkl in his Greek Dictionary: corresponding or right relation, proportion, analogy, Pl.-Dem.-Cic., who would translate it *comparatio, proportio*. — *ἀναλογίζομαι*: to compute, consider, ponder, especially, to estimate or judge *after making a comparison*,¹¹⁾ to understand upon deliberation. — *ἀναλογισμός*: deliberation, consideration. — *Κατ' ἀναλογισμὸν* = *κατ' ἀναλογίαν*. (Dem.) *ἀναλόγισμά τινος πρὸς τί*: the act of holding one thing next to another to determine their mutual relation. — In a word: *ἀναλογία*, in the

11) Italics our own.

language of the classics, denotes conformity, proper relation, proportion.

In the New Testament *ἀναλογία* is, as we have said, a *ἀπαξ λεγόμενον*. However, the verb *ἀναλογίζομαι* occurs Hebr. 12, 3 in the sense of: consider, contemplate; and, according to the context, this considering or contemplating is to be done with a view to establishing the right relation between the Christian and Christ; the idea of relation, conformity, is implied. Then we find *παραλογίζομαι* Col. 2, 4: to deceive, to beguile by means of false reasoning. James 1, 22 we read: "Be ye doers of the Word and not hearers only, deceiving your own-selves." He, then, who reasons: I am a hearer of the Word, therefore I shall be saved, reasons falsely and thus deceives himself. The simple verb *λογίζομαι*, to reason, occurs in a multitude of places. *Ἀναλογία*, from *ἀνά* and *λόγος* or *λογίζομαι*, denotes the act (of the human mind, or *λόγος*) of contemplating, considering, weighing, deliberating, estimating, calculating, holding things that bear, or are intended to bear, a certain relation to each other, together, in order to compare them and ascertain their relation, or give them the proper relation, conformity, or proportion, one to another, so shape the one as to make it meet the requirements of the other.

Now let us recapitulate and draw the conclusions. *Πίστις*, in its proper native sense and according to Scripture usage, denotes, not objective doctrine, but subjective faith. *Προφητεία*, to all intents and purposes, denotes inspired speech, speech conceived and uttered under the special wonderful influence or afflatus of the Holy Spirit. And *ἀναλογία* denotes conformity to a given standard; hence *ἀναλογία πίστεως* = conformity to faith. Accordingly, the simplest, most natural, and most Scriptural interpretation of Rom. 12, 6, and especially, the one most agreeable to the context, would be: If any man have the gift of prophecy, *i. e.*, of speaking by inspiration or under the afflatus of the Holy Ghost, let him use this gift so as to meet the requirements of faith; let his prophecy be calculated to edify his hearers, to build them up, in the faith. — This inter-

pretation agrees with the context. V. 3 the Christian is told not to think more highly of himself than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith; not to make a vainglorious display of his gifts, but rather to be humble and modest and serve his brethren with his gifts, vv. 4. 5. Now the greatest service that one can possibly render his brethren, yea, the only real and lasting service, is to edify them in the faith. Thither all our efforts should be directed, that should be our standard and our goal in all that we do, or forbear to do, in our dealings with the brethren, that we edify them in the faith. So it was specially inculcated upon the prophets of the primitive Church to use their gift of prophecy for the edification of the brethren in the faith. (Compare 1 Cor. 14, 3. 29—31.) That was the purpose which prophecy was intended to serve, that was its divinely appointed use, and the apostle would have the prophets use their gift so that God's purpose would be achieved; he would not have them abuse their gift, but use it right.

The claim that this passage teaches that there is a *rational harmony* among the various articles of the Christian faith or *doctrine*, and that they whose business it is to *interpret the Scriptures* must be careful to so interpret as not to destroy this harmony—this claim cannot be substantiated by Scripture. It cannot be shown that *προφητεία*, anywhere in the Scriptures, denotes interpretation; neither can it be shown that *πίστις*, anywhere in the canonical books of the Bible, denotes doctrine; and as for the claim that *ἀναλογία πίστεως* denotes a harmony among the articles of faith that reason can discern, the Scriptures expressly deny that reason can see their harmony. Is. 55, 8. 9; 2 Cor. 10, 5; Col. 2, 4 (compare Luther's translation) v. 8. The Scriptures are not a logical unit. There is no *Lehrganzes* of Holy Writ that we can perceive; *ἐκ μέρους γινώσκομεν*, our knowledge is fragmentary, even as the Bible itself is fragmentary. The Bible admonishes us very frequently not to speak or teach anything contrary to the Word of God. But in so doing it never employs such words as these: See that your every doctrine harmonize with the *Lehrganzes*; but thus it

speaks: "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me," etc. — thus Paul to the preacher Timothy, 2 Tim. 1, 13. Again, 1 Tim. 6, 3: "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ," etc. — 1 Pet. 4, 11: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." The Scriptures are here characterized as being a collection of individual divine utterances, *λόγια*, not one continuous utterance. The very name Scriptures (plural) seems to indicate the same thing. See 2 Tim. 3, 15; John 5, 39; Acts 18, 24. 28 *et al.* The singular number *γραφή* denotes a verse or passage of Scripture: Luke 24, 27; John 20, 9; Acts 8, 32; coll. v. 35. The Scriptures are not *γραφή*, they are *γραφαί*. We meet with *πᾶσα γραφή*, every Scripture,¹²⁾ and with *πᾶσαι αἱ γραφαί*, all the Scriptures,¹³⁾ but with *πᾶσα ἡ γραφή*, in the sense of the whole Bible, *das Schriftganze*, never. The Bible is a collection of fragmentary revelations of the truth; the *whole* truth will be revealed to us in heaven. And while these fragments never contradict one another, — for in that case they could not be truth, — but are in profound harmony in the sight of God, yet this harmony is not everywhere apparent to human reason. Even what is revealed we know only in part, by reason of our sinful depravity; how, then, shall we have any knowledge of what is not revealed?

We close with the words of him to whom, under God, we are most indebted for the text these pages have sought to expound and who, even aside from the fact that he was an *inspired* apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ, probably had more knowledge of things sacred and things secular than any or all of our modern theologians: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! *How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been His counselor? Or who hath first given to Him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen.*"

Portland, Oreg.

J. A. RIMBACH.

12) 2 Tim. 3, 16.

13) Luke 24, 27.