

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

1873 B

VOL. VII.

JANUARY 1903.

No. 1.

CHRISTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY.

INTRODUCTION.

Archaeology is a special department of history. But the word *archaeology* is not immediately derived from $\eta \alpha\rho\chi\eta$, *the beginning*, but from $\tau\alpha \alpha\rho\chi\alpha\iota\alpha$, *primitive things*, that which was peculiar to or characteristic of early days. Christian archaeology is not simply the history of early Christianity, but a topical exhibition or presentation of the institutions of the Christian church and the practices therewith connected as they appear to the student of primitive Christianity.¹⁾ Such institutions are the *churches* as constituted in local congregations, the *ministry*, *public worship*, *public benevolence*, *church discipline*, *missions*, *fellowship* and *co-operation among the churches*. Other subjects, as *preaching*, *baptism*, *the eucharist*, *Bible reading*, *prayer*, *sacred song*, *ordination*, *Christian burial*, *Christian education*, *marriage* and *the domestic relations*, *social relations*, *property*, are special topics, which come under their respective general heads. All these institutions and the observances, practices, and customs connected therewith, may also be considered from a doctrinal point of view. But Archaeology deals with them as historical subjects, not pointing out what they should be,

1) We have never been able to see sufficient reason why Christian Archaeology should restrict itself to a presentation of the history of Christian cult or public worship.

For nearly two decades a Revised Version of the English Bible has been before the English-speaking people. It is the product of the joint labors of two companies of English and American revisers. The Old Testament company spent fourteen, the New Testament company, ten years, over their task, the former having held nearly 800, the latter nearly 400 sittings. But the English University presses still sell more than ten times as many copies of the Authorized as of the Revised Version, and the Authorized Version, of which not less than three million copies are yearly poured forth from the English press, will probably for ever hold its place as the popular Bible of English-speaking Christendom.

A. G.

PARAGRAPHS ON VARIOUS TOPICS.

SUPERSTITION AND UNBELIEF.—St. Paul writes to the Romans: *When they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were they thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.* The truth of these words has been borne out by the history of all nations. When Israel turned its back upon the God of Abraham, it turned its face toward the idols of the heathen nations whom it hated and despised. When atheism and materialism prevailed throughout the Greek and Roman world, the ladies and gentlemen of Rome carried their money to the dark alleys and dens of Syrian sorcerers. When Christianity degenerated under the baneful influence of the papacy, the worship of saints and relics and images and wafers and vain imaginations without number took the place of Christian devotion. The ranks of Spiritists and Theosophists and occidental Buddhists are filled by raw and refined recruits from the infidel apostates of western Christianity to-day. People who “cannot persuade themselves” to believe the mysteries of divine revelation give credence

to the pretensions of fanatical swindlers. It is not the mysteriousness of Christianity which prevents the unbeliever from its acceptance.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM is taken to task by an English lawyer, Sir Robert Anderson, in his book, *Daniel in the critics' den*. In the Preface he says:—

“And here I should premise, what will be found more than once repeated in the sequel, that the enquiry involved in the Daniel controversy is essentially judicial. An experienced Judge with an intelligent jury—any tribunal, indeed, accustomed to sift and weigh conflicting testimony—would be better fitted to deal with it than a company of all the philologists of Christendom. The philologist's proper place is in the witness-chair. He can supply but a part, and that by no means the most important part, of the necessary evidence. And if a single well-ascertained fact be inconsistent with his theories, the fact must prevail. But this the specialist is proverbially slow to recognize. He is always apt to exaggerate the importance of his own testimony, and to betray impatience when evidence of another kind is allowed legitimate weight. And nowhere is this tendency more marked than among the critics.

“In the preface to his *Continuity of Scripture*, Lord Hatherley speaks of ‘the supposed evidence on which are based some very confident assertions of a self-styled “higher criticism.”’ And he adds, ‘Assuming the learning to be profound and accurate which has collected the material for much critical performance, the logic by which conclusions are deduced from these materials is frequently grievously at fault, and open to the judgment of all who may have been accustomed to sift and weigh evidence.’ My apology for this book is that I can claim a humble place in the category described in these concluding words. Long accustomed to deal with evidence in difficult and intricate inquiries, I have

set myself to investigate the genuineness of the Book of Daniel, and the results of my inquiry are here recorded.

“Lord Hatherley was not the only Lord Chancellor of our time to whom earnest thought and study brought a settled conviction of the Divine authority and absolute integrity of Holy Scripture. The two very great men who in turn succeeded him in that high office, though versed in the literature of the critics, held unflinchingly to the same conclusion. And while some, perhaps, would dismiss the judgment of men like Lord Cairns and Lord Selborne as being that of ‘mere laymen,’ sensible people the whole world over would accept their decision upon an intricate judicial question of this kind against that of all the pundits of Christendom.

“As regards my attitude towards criticism, I deprecate being misunderstood. Every book I have written gives proof of fearlessness in applying critical methods to the study of the Bible. But the Higher Criticism is a mere travesty of all true criticism. Secular writers are presumed to be trustworthy unless reason is found to discredit their testimony. But the Higher Criticism starts with the assumption that everything in Scripture needs to be confirmed by external evidence. It reeks of its evil origin in German infidelity. My indictment of it, therefore, is not that it is criticism, but that it is criticism of a low and spurious type, akin to that for which the baser sort of ‘Old Bailey’ practitioner is famed. True criticism seeks to elucidate the truth: the Higher Criticism aims at establishing prejudged results.”

“MODERN THEOLOGY.” This term is nowadays being employed by some “modern theologians” very much as a pickpocket mingling with the crowd in pursuit of the miscreant who has snatched a purse from a woman’s hand may join in the cry, “Stop thief!” while he is vigorously plying his trade and emptying pockets right and left. When the

Semi-Arians of the fourth century fought and condemned the Ultra-Arians of the Acacius and Aetius type, they were themselves Arians at heart and impugnors of the Nicene creed, and they knew it. When theologians who pervert theology into a speculative science decry "modern theology," they have in mind those radicals of their own clique who by their headlong recklessness endanger the ship in which the whole company is embarked. They would gladly, if they could, set those hotheads adrift with rations for three days or maroon them on some island in mid-ocean, and then scour the theological seas under false colors. But the prospects are that before long the radicals will turn the tables on them and have things their own way, making the half-measure men walk the plank at the sabre's point or cast their lot with the extremists and share the plunder or hang, as the outcome may be.

THE SUBSTITUTIVE ATONEMENT, or, the mediatorial sacrifice of Christ, "has," as Dr. Warfield says in the *Princeton Theological Review*, "retired well into the background. Probably the majority of those who hold the public ear, whether as academical or as popular religious guides, have definitely broken with it, and are commending to their audiences something other and, as they no doubt believe, something very much better. A tone of speech has even grown up regarding it which is not only scornful but positively abusive. There are no epithets too harsh to be applied to it, no invectives too intense to be poured out on it. An honored bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church tells us that 'the whole theory of substitutional punishment as a ground either of conditional or of unconditional pardon, is unethical, contradictory and subversive.' He may rightly claim to be speaking in this sweeping sentence with marked discretion and unwonted charity. To do justice to the hateful theme requires, it seems, the tumid turmoil and rushing rant of Dr. Farrar's rhetoric. Surely if hard words broke

bones, the doctrine of the substitutional sacrifice of the Son of God for the sin of man would long ago have been ground to powder.”

This is not a bit surprising in a rationalistic age, when Christianity is no longer looked upon by its most admired Doctors as a revealed religion in the full sense of the word, but as a product of speculative thought determining the intellectual and moral energies of man. Of course, the apostles and evangelists continue and will continue to preach *Christ CRUCIFIED*, but unto the Jews a stumbling block and unto the Greeks foolishness. And hence it is not surprising that the Jews and all the self-righteous should use hard language against this stumbling block and all the self-wise rant at this foolishness. Nor is it doubtful that there will be grinding between the parties, Christ crucified and his opponents. But when it shall come to sweeping up the powder, the stumbling block will still be there, whole and entire, and the powder will be on the other side. For *whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.*¹⁾

A. G.

1) Matt. 21, 44.
