

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. I.

JULY 1897.

No. 3.

Doctrinal Theology.

BIBLIOLOGY.

(Continued.)

The Author of the Bible is God; not man under God; not man and God; but simply God. The Old Testament Scriptures are "the oracles of *God*."¹⁾ What Moses said in the Pentateuch was "the word of *God*."²⁾ The words of the Psalmist are words which "the *Holy Ghost* saith."³⁾ By that which is written in Jeremiah, the Prophet, "the *Holy Ghost* is a witness to us."⁴⁾ The things that Paul, the Apostle, writes to the Corinthians, "are the commandments of the *Lord*,"⁵⁾ even as what Isaiah wrote was spoken *by* the prophet, but "*of* the *Lord*,"⁶⁾ and *by* the mouth of His servant David, the *Lord God* said what we read in the Psalm.⁷⁾ In short, every part of Scripture is the *word of God* and can not be broken;⁸⁾ and "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God,"⁹⁾ not certain parts of Scripture, of

1) Rom. 3, 2.

2) Mark 7, 10. 13.

3) Heb. 3, 7. coll. Ps. 95, 7. 8.

4) Heb. 10, 15. 16. Cf. Jer. 31, 33. f.

5) 1 Cor. 14, 37.

6) Matt. 1, 22: τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου. Cf. Is. 7, 14.

7) Acts 4, 24 f. coll. Ps. 2, 1. 2.

8) John 10, 34. 35. coll. Ps. 82, 6.

9) 2 Tim. 3, 16.

Theological Review.

The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, *being an essay of the local history of Phrygia from the earliest times to the Turkish Conquest*, by W. M. RAMSAY, D. C. L., LL. D. Vol. I, Parts I and II. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1895 and 1897. 792 pages, bound in two parts; Price, Part I, \$6.00, Part II, \$6.00. Sold by G. P. Putnam's Sons, 27 W. 23 St., New York.

This is a scientific work of the highest order, based upon extensive original research by the most eminent living authority on the subject exhibited in these volumes, and embodying a wealth of historical and geographical information which will afford material to students and authors for many years to come. Of the work of accumulating these masses of knowledge, Dr. Ramsay says in the Preface of Part I:—

“Before I entered Asia Minor in May 1880, I had been pondering for months over the problems of its history; and since that time it has been my last thought as I fell asleep and my first on waking. Rarely has a space of five hours elapsed by day or by night in which some point of Phrygian antiquities or topography has not been occupying my mind. I have turned over each problem, attempted almost every possible combination, tried numberless changes from every point of view, and gradually month by month the subject has grown clearer. I have enjoyed the advantage of revisiting the country year after year till 1891, and testing the ideas and combinations that have been shaping themselves in my mind. In the later visits I have known what to look for, and where to look for it; and have often been able to guide the natives of the district to the spot I wanted (to their own great astonishment), pick up the evidence required, and pass on after a few minutes' stay. In those later visits it has often been brought home to me how much time was wasted on my earlier journeys through want of knowledge. If I criticise some mistakes and misconceptions of other travellers, I can do so because I have made the same errors myself; their misconceptions are old friends of mine, which have kept me company in long weary rides, which

have deluded me and lured me on to spend time and health in proving their real character.

Almost every village on the map of Phrygia, and many not on the map, rouse memories for me; one is the scene of some laughable adventure, one of some great disappointment, a third of a midnight ride, in a fourth we sawed away part of the floor of a mosque (with the connivance of the imam) to disclose an inscription, in a fifth some artful dodge had to be employed to win a copy from an unwilling owner of a 'written stone,' in all patience and work were needed. But after we had learned how to deal with the natives, and emancipated ourselves from dependence on a Greek servant, our experience has been, with rare exceptions, of great kindness and hospitality and pleasant intercourse with the peasantry. But wherever I have been, and whatever was my luck, my passion has been to look for traces of the past in the facts of the present, in the faces, manners, pronunciation, tales, and superstition of the people, as well as in the monuments of older days." pp. xii f.

The book is not a history or geography of Phrygia, but rather a series of local histories on a geographical basis. But no one who will in future write on subjects pertaining to Phrygian history or geography can afford to ignore what is here offered without exposing himself to censure. Though the material massed together on these pages was not collected by a theologian with theological interests and motives foremost in his mind, yet no future history of ancient Christianity will be what it might be and should be, unless it have drawn directly or indirectly from this bountiful source of information, although there are not a few things in the most important chapters of the work which call for the crucible. Of these chapters the author says:—

"Perhaps the most important part of this work will be found in the chapters on the early Christianity in the country. The questions that were agitating society, the currents of development, the transforming policy of the Roman government and the conservative resistance of the old religious hiera, the original co-operation of Pauline Christianity with the Roman policy, the later alliance between the empire and the native religions against the growing power of the Church, the steps by which the adherents of the new religion, beginning as members of the general society of the country, gradually

differentiated themselves from it and created a new form of society — all these topics will, it is hoped, receive elucidation, and a series of pre-Constantinian inscriptions, such as cannot be matched in any other country, will be arranged so as to throw light on the relations between the Christians and their non-Christian fellow-citizens." pp. xv f.

It is, therefore, not only in due regard to the character of our periodical and the interests of our readers, but also, according to the author's own estimate of his work, in keeping with the character of the latter, that our review will chiefly dwell on such features of the book as move along or touch upon theological lines, the more so, since these features are not restricted to particular chapters, but appear throughout the entire work as far as it now lies before the public. Thus in the first chapter, on the LYCOS VALLEY, our author says:—

"The Lycos valley and its cities acquired far more importance under Roman administration than they had under the Greek kings. The 'Eastern Highway' was a thoroughfare which might rank among the most important in the whole empire, and this valley was one of the four most important points on the Highway, along with Ephesus, Apameia and Caesareia-Mazaka. Especially in the diffusion of Christianity the Lycos valley played an important part. It is pointed out in *The Church in the Roman Empire* pp. 9, 365 f. how much the development of the Church was determined by the close inter-relation that was maintained between its separate parts. The Lycos valley was a centre of communication and a knot where many roads met and parted; and both Laodiceia and at a later date also Hierapolis ranked as metropolitan sees, partly on account of their apostolic origin, partly from their social and religious importance.

The interest of history in this period centres in the transforming and unifying process which the imperial policy carried out in the east. The Greek civilization had hitherto failed to touch the Phrygian people; it was almost confined to its own special settlements, the garrison-cities of the kings. The Roman system was not opposed to the Greek; it took into itself the language and the manners of Greece, and impressed these far more thoroughly on the native Anatolian population than the Greek governments had been able to do. Little or no attempt was made to naturalize the Latin language; but Greek was encouraged. Latin was used for a time in

Augustus' Pisidian colonies; but it soon died out in most of them. A feeble attempt was made to keep it up in official documents of the colonies, but the errors in the Latin legends even on coins show that it was only a curiosity, not a spoken tongue in most of them." pp. 11f.

The *second* Chapter contains the history and topography of LAODICEIA. We quote:—

"Laodiceia was one of the richest cities of Asia. It might say (as in the letter to the Church in Laodiceia), 'I am rich and have gotten riches, and have need of nothing.' The city, from its central position, naturally became a centre of banking and financial transactions. Cicero intended to cash his bills of exchange there (ad Fam. III 5: cp. II 17). Hence the letter to the Church says, 'I counsel thee to buy of me (not the gold of the bankers of Laodiceia, but) gold refined by fire that thou mayest become rich.' A brief account of the chief sources, of its wealth and the staple of its trade may be appropriately added here.

The territory is fertile; but under the Turkish occupation it has been allowed to pass to a large extent out of cultivation. The great marshes in the lower parts of the valley were doubtless drained and cultivated under the empire. . . .

It was, however, as a manufacturing, not as an agricultural, centre that Laodiceia became rich and great. A fine kind of wool, soft in texture and glossy black in color, grew on the Laodicean sheep; and the manufacture of fine cloth, carpets and various kinds of garments, was the chief occupation of the city. . . .

Each different kind of garment was woven in its proper shape and way; the tailor was of small importance in ancient times, for the weaver was also the shaper of the garment. The trade of Laodiceia, therefore, was a trade in garments, rather than in cloth (such as a modern woolen manufacture would produce); and hence the weavers are *ἀπλουργοί* (no. 8), and we find in an inscription (BCH 1887, p. 352) a seller of garments (*εἰματιοπώλης*). In reference to this trade, the letter to the Church in Laodiceia says, 'I counsel thee to buy of me (not the glossy black garments of Laodiceia, but) white garments that thou mayest clothe thyself' (Rev. III 18). pp. 39 ff.

The Jews who resided in considerable numbers at Laodiceia ranked probably as a separate people until A. D. 70, when all national rights were withdrawn from them. They are mentioned in a letter addressed by the government of Laodiceia to Gaius Rabirius in 48 or 45 B. C., and they had perhaps been introduced by Antiochus the great." p. 71.

About eleven miles E. S. E. of Laodiceia was COLOSSAI, the Phrygian city to which St. Paul sent Tychicus, the "beloved brother and faithful minister,"¹⁾ with an epistle to the Colossian church, of which Onesimus was a member.²⁾

"Colossai was situated on the south bank of the Lycos, on a rising ground that overhangs the river, at the point where it enters a deep and picturesque gorge, piercing the low broad ridge between the upper and the lower half of the Lycos valley (Ch. I, 3). The fortified acropolis was on the south bank; but the buildings and tombs extended far unto the north bank; and thus the gorge literally begins inside the city. Colossai was at one time the great city of south-western Phrygia, lying on the easy trade-route from Sardis to Kelainai (the later Apameia) and the southern part of the plateau in general. The change of road-system, and the foundation of Laodiceia proved its ruin. Though situated on the Eastern Highway, it was so near Laodiceia (11 miles distant) that both could not live on the trade of the road; and the situation of Laodiceia, as we have seen, was far more advantageous. Colossai had not, like Hierapolis, any great natural advantages to ensure its prosperity. It derived some importance from its fine wool, which rivaled that of Laodiceia; and it retained municipal independence. But whereas Colossai was 'a great city of Phrygia' in B. C. 480, and 'a populous city, prosperous and great' in 401, it decayed in proportion as Laodiceia prospered. In the time of Strabo it was 'a small town.' Pliny mentions it in a list of oppida celeberrima: but this list, which includes Celaenae, Andria, Carina, and other cities which had ceased to exist long before his time, is really an historical retrospect. He previously had given a list of all the important places, and he now adds, 'besides those already mentioned' (*praeter jam dicta*), a list of historically important names. Its coinage, struck solely under the Empire, is scanty and uninteresting, and it almost disappears from history. Christianity alone has preserved its memory in the Roman period." pp. 208 f.

From a later chapter we give the following information ON CHRISTIAN NAMES:—

"In some cases the sort of names used is almost the only indication of Christianity, e. g., Pascasia in Le Blant II p. 262. In this case M. Le Blant finds another proof of Christianity in the double

1) Col. 4, 7 f.

2) Col. 4, 9.

name *Oplatine Reticiae sive Pascasie*; but though it is certain that the Christians at baptism commonly took an additional name, and though the addition of a surname is far more the rule in Christian than in Pagan inscriptions, yet the custom was also not infrequent in non-Chr. society and is far from constituting in the East so sure a proof of Christianity as M. Le Blant finds it to be in the West. Except with the formula *ἐπίκλην* no. 400, the possession of an alternative name cannot be taken in Phrygia as a proof of Christian origin, unless it has the character of a distinctively Chr. baptismal name. There are, however, some names which were greatly favoured among the Christians, and others which were exclusively (or almost exclusively) Chr. The presence of several of the former, and even one of the latter, may be taken as justifying the hypothesis, that the inscr. is Chr.; and if, in addition, we find in the text some other sign of Christianity, or even some slight peculiarity that differs from the usual pagan style (as e. g. greater freedom regarding admission to the tomb no. 380), we may regard the hypothesis as raised to a much higher degree of probability.

When a pagan was converted he did not change his name publicly. To do so would have been to proclaim his change of religion, and such publicity was discouraged strongly by the Church. Hence the common pagan names continued to be used by the Chr. The use of obviously pagan names was proscribed at the Nicene Council A. D. 325, and biblical names were ordered to be given at baptism. Yet such names as *Mercurina*, *Jovina*, persisted much later; and names like *Phoebe*, *Nereus*, *Hermas*, or *Hermes*, etc., were consecrated in virtue of the early saints and martyrs who bore them, and escaped any such proscription.

Though in the pre-Constantinian period there had not yet been formed a distinctively Christian nomenclature, yet, even in the third century, the beginnings of a Christian system of names can be traced. Certain names were favoured, which, though common to the pagans, either conveyed a meaning that suited the new religion, or had been consecrated by some martyr, or in some other way pleased the Christians. Converts retained their old names; but they would favour Chr. names for their children. Hence we should expect to find in a family which had been Chr. for a generation or two a mixture of old family names with names of a more marked type. Lists have not been made, and cannot as yet be made usefully, for each district would vary. *Alexander* and *Zotikos* were evidently favourite names among the Eumenian and Apamean Chr., the former perhaps partly because of the Eumenian martyr, the latter because of its meaning. *Tatia* and *Ammia* are also very common in Eumeneia, and

the reason here probably is that they were names belonging to certain Chr. families.

Such names as Agape and Pistis are exclusively Christian, while Elpis and Eirene, though used among the pagans, became by adoption characteristically Christian. *Σωζομένη* and Redemptus seem obviously marked out as Christian; perhaps Agapomenos and Keleuomene, certainly Anastasios, Kyriakos (with its Latin by-form Quiriacus, Quiracos, Hyracius, etc.), and in the Latin-speaking provinces Renatus and Benedictus. None of these names occur often in Phrygia: Agape perhaps no. 270, Elpis 260, Irene 408, Agapomenos 357, Keleuomene 350, Anastasios 416, Kyriakos and Kyriake 421, Sozomenos 400. But the subject must be studied in the detailed comparison of inscr. in the *Appendices*.

The strictly Christian formations were at first only used as baptismal names (which at first seem, as a general rule, to have been treated as private and not engraved on the tombstone); but it is useful to glance at them, in order to detect the first traces of their appearance in the epitaphs.

The most remarkable class of names consisted of those which express self-depreciation, humility, and resignation to insult. The terms of contempt which were hurled at the Christians by the pagan populace, were accepted with a proud humility and adopted as personal names. Le Blant II pp. 66 f. quotes many examples of this class, such as Credula, Alogius, Alogia (springing from the charge of folly); Injurius, Calumniosus, Contumeliosus (the charge of disloyalty and impiety); Importunus, Exitiosus (the charge of bringing misfortune on the state); Foedulus, Foedula, Malus, Mala, Maliciosus, Pecus, Ima, Molesta, Praejectus, Projectus, Projecticius, Fugitivus, Stercorius, Stercus (general expressions of hatred and loathing). Among this class may be reckoned Asbolos no. 412, Amerimnos no. 465, Acholios 462, Keleuomene 350. Such names as Onesimos have something of the same character. Euphron and others approximate more to the pagan favourite names, which were selected as bright, joyous, and of good omen, in remarkable contrast to the self-abasement of this Christian class.

Names indicative of joy or victory, however, are very characteristic of the Christians. In Gaul and Italy Vincentius, Victor, Gaudentius, Gaudiosus, Hilaris, Hilaritas are widely used. Hence there is rarely found in the fourth or later centuries any indication of sorrow or mourning on sepulchral monuments. As Christianity established for itself a definite set of customs and forms, it encouraged the view that death was the end of exile from God and the birth into a happier life." pp. 491 ff.

Of the spread of Christianity in Phrygia before the Diocletian persecution, and of that effort to annihilate the church with one tremendous blow, we read:—

“It is certain that the Chr. were numerous in Phrygia even in the second century; and it may be assumed that their strength was known in a general way to the whole population. But their religion was forbidden, and any convicted Christian was put to death. Such was the theoretical principle; but in practice there was great laxity in carrying it out. Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus Pius practically ordered provincial governors not to observe Christians, unless their attention was called to them by a prosecutor, who formally accused them. But persecution in the Roman world could not be really effective, except where the government took the initiative, and sought out the Christians. In Rome there was no official prosecutor; rewards were given to volunteers who prosecuted successfully; and the carrying out of the laws in general was left to the private initiative. Where Christianity was very strong, it would probably be rarely possible to find any private person ready both to brave the feeling generally entertained in ancient times against all volunteer prosecutors (*delatores*), and to ‘incur the hatred of a united and energetic body like the Christians.’ The rarity of martyrs in Phrygia after the Antonine period (until the time of Diocletian) conspires with all other signs to show that the Church in Phrygia developed in peace and prosperity for more than a century before A. D. 303. There was a general indisposition among the officials and the pagans to begin any open actions against the Christians; and the Church, on its side, studied to use all the outward forms that would give legality, and to avoid anything which would tend to draw attention to it or to provoke prosecution. p. 501.

To judge from the proportion of epitaphs, the population of Eumeneia in the third century was in great part Christian. Of the 71 epitaphs classed as pagan or doubtful, only 11 are clearly marked as later than A. D. 215, and most of these are suspected of Christianity. (no 380). In the same period we possess 26 epitaphs that are certainly Christian. Three persons are mentioned as senators in the second century, and six in the third; the three are probably pagans, the six are Christians.

These facts show that Eumeneia was to a large extent a Christian city during the third century. Naturally we should expect that the predominance of the Christian element would be more marked in the second half of the century; for the more vigorous and resolute

character of the Christians would make them advance steadily in influence; and the lighter elements would be drawn after them. The coinage of the city continued to bear the old types; but that does not prove the city to be pagan. . . .

Further the inscriptions convey the impression that there was no violent break between Greek and Christian culture in Eumeneia. There is no sign of bitterness on either side. Even no. 232, which is distinctly anti-Christian, savors more of argument than of persecution; it seems to indicate deliberate choice of the better of two alternatives. The inscriptions bring before us a picture of rich and generous development, of concession, of liberality, in which people of diverse thoughts were practically reconciled in a single society. But they also show us Eumeneia as mainly a city of Christians. Nothing similar to this is known throughout the ancient world: Eumeneia stands before us as the earliest Christian city of which record remains, exemplifying the practical conciliation of two hostile religions in a peaceful and orderly city. pp. 502 f.

This outline which we have drawn of a Christian Eumeneia is in accordance with historical record. Eusebius mentions incidentally a city of Phrygia in which about A. D. 303 the entire population was Christian. Taken as a general expression, this may be accepted as quite trustworthy, confirmed as it is by archaeological evidence; and if one city was entirely governed by Christians, it is evident that the country in general must have been very strongly affected by the same religion.

Even a mere casual glance over the list of Christian inscriptions in the *Appendix* must suggest the question, 'Where are the post-Constantinian inscriptions?' At Eumeneia 26 Christian epitaphs certainly, and several others probably, belong to the third century, while only four can be classed to the fourth and succeeding centuries. The contrast between the rich intellectual and political life of the Christians in the third century and the inarticulate monotony of the many centuries that succeeded is painful: one recognizes in the numbers of our catalogue the signs of a great misfortune to the human race, the destruction of a vigorous and varied life.

Two facts stand out prominently with regard to this change. In the first place, it evidently did not happen by a gradual process. The inscriptions are arrested suddenly; and there are no examples of an intermediate class between the earlier and later. The time when the change occurred was the end of the third century, for no. 371 dates about 270 and no. 373 probably 290—300. As M. Cumont has pointed out, the reason for the change must lie in the great massacre by Diocletian and his coadjutors and successors A. D. 303—313.

In the second place, while it was a sudden calamity that arrested the development of this Christian city, the effects were permanent and irreparable. The life of the city was destroyed. Up till A. D. 300 we can recover some idea of its development, we can read even on its gravestones the signs of active thought and work. After 300 there is a blank, dotted with the names of an archdeacon and a few bishops present at councils, with one epitaph. To a certain extent the stagnation of a Byzantine period is due to those causes, which we have sketched in preceding pages, the over-centralization of government, the decay of municipal self-government, the indifference of the Imperial administration to the duty of educating the people. But these causes were acting during the third century, and yet thought was apparently more active and varied in the city during that century than ever before. There seems no adequate explanation of the obvious facts except in some great calamity, which destroyed the active and progressive section of the population, and gave free play to the forces that were making for stagnation and ignorance.

These considerations suggest that the persecution by Diocletian must have taken in Eumeneia the form of a thorough-going massacre; and a massacre cannot be thorough unless it is deliberately and carefully planned. This is in perfect agreement with what is recorded about the measures carried out under the sanction of Diocletian. It is an established fact that prosecution was no longer left to private initiative, but the Christians were actively sought out by the government in pursuance of a policy, resolved on after long deliberation, for exterminating the Christians and destroying their religion. To this end was directed all the power of a highly organized government, moved by a single will, commanding almost unlimited resources, for the space of ten years. The government took advantage of a marked philosophic revival, characterized by strong anti-Christian feeling; and employed for its own the power of a fervid emotion acting on men often of high and strongly religious motives. In the first two centuries of its history, Christianity had to deal with a decaying and spiritless paganism, but now it met a re-invigorated and desperate religion, educated and spiritualized in the conflict with the Christians. Inscr. 467 is a quaint and striking example of this spirit. In the *Acta* of Theodotus of Ancyra, we have an instance of the way in which the devoted fanaticism of such men made them convenient tools for carrying out the purposes of the government: the approach of the new governor of Galatia, and the announcement of his intentions struck terror into the hearts of the Christians: his name was Theotecnus, 'the child of God,' in which we recognize one of those by-names, which were assumed by

some of the philosophical reactionaries, in competition with the Christian confidence in their divine mission, and the Christian religious names assumed at baptism.

As an example of what took place in Phrygia, Eusebius mentions that the Christian city, which was alluded to in § 8, was burned to the ground with its people, even women and children, 'calling upon the God who is over all.' The exact circumstances are a little doubtful, for Lactantius is perhaps alluding to the same atrocity, when he speaks of whole people in Phrygia being burned along with their meeting-place; and Lactantius must here rank as the better authority, if they are describing the same incident. But it is only the blindness of uncritical prejudice, which sets aside such an incident merely because it is liable to become distorted or exaggerated in repetition. That is part of human nature. The essential fact is that the entire population of a city was destroyed by fire; and on that two excellent authorities are agreed. We must, of course, take the fact in its surroundings. We need have no doubt that the invariable choice was offered, compliance or death, and equally little doubt that many would in ordinary circumstances have chosen the former alternative; but it lies in human nature that the general spirit of a crowd exercises a powerful influence on the persons in it, and many, who, taken singly, would have shrunk from death, accepted it boldly when inspired by the courage of the whole mass. Lactantius' statement implies that the people had assembled at their church: this would in itself be an act of defiance of the Imperial government, and probably the less staunch adherents would not venture on such an extreme course.

Moreover, to one who has by the patient toil of years tracked out these Christian communities by their formula of appealing to 'the God,' it comes as one of those startling and convincing details of real life and truth, that the one thing recorded about the destroyed people is that they died 'appealing to the god over all.' Unconsciously Eusebius writes as the epitaph over the ashes of the destroyed people the words by which we have recognized the epitaphs which they themselves habitually composed.

Lactantius mentions that this was done by a governor, and no governor could have ventured on such an act, unless he had a full commission to exterminate the Christians. A general massacre, evidently, was deliberately planned by the central government, and carried out by suitable agents. While this case has been selected as an extreme example of barbarity on the one side and of steadfastness on the other, it must be taken as indicative of the policy

carried out everywhere. It may, perhaps, hereafter be proved that Eumeneia was the very city that suffered in this way; but, at any rate, the punishment was everywhere proportioned to the guilt, and Eumeneia, as being certainly more deeply infected than any of the surrounding cities, would be treated with proportionate severity as an example to the rest. We may confidently say that historical and archaeological evidence is agreed as to the fate of Eumeneia: the active and courageous element in the population was annihilated with fire and sword in the years following A. D. 303, and the development of the city was suddenly terminated.

While the government used the revival of anti-Christian fanaticism for its own purpose, and while the revival was a contributory cause of the massacre, the main reason that induced Diocletian to give a reluctant consent to it was certainly not fanaticism. . . . The Christians, as a whole, were necessarily desirous of change in the State policy: they were, as a rule, energetic as individuals and as a body, and therefore they naturally were opposed, whether consciously or not, to the centralized and paternal government policy, which more and more arrogated the right of ordering everything, managing everything, and thinking for everybody. That policy which ultimately ruined the Empire, was endangered by the growth of freedom and individuality among the Christians; and it resolved to destroy the opposing element. . . .

The massacre of Diocletian, by exterminating the most progressive party in the eastern cities, destroyed the last chance that the Empire had of regaining vitality and health; education had always been dependent on the vigour of municipal life, and henceforth it sickened and died; when the pagan philosophic reaction had spent its force, there was no power left to withstand the barbarizing anti-Grecian tendencies which some of the Christian party had always shown. Massacre then, as always, was proved to be not merely a crime and a stupendous folly, but also a terrible blow to the world, to civilization and humanity.

While Apameia shared in the development of Eumeneia, the inscriptions do not show the Christian party so triumphant, but they prove that it was numerous. As we have seen above (Ch. XI § 19) Apameia never obtained the titles and rank in the Imperial system that were granted to less important cities; and it is possible that the existence of so strong a Christian party in the city always exposed it to suspicion and dislike in the eyes of the central government, for, even when the Empire was not inclined to active prosecution, it was distrustful of the rising party.

If the preservation of inscriptions had been uniform over Phrygia it would be possible to draw many inferences from the comparative numbers of Christian documents found in the different districts. But historical circumstances have affected the numbers; and it is necessary to be very cautious in reasoning from them. Still, when we find in the Tschal district six post-Constantinian Chr. inscr. (402—407), and none earlier; and compare this with the numbers at Eumeneia (four and twenty-six or more) and Apameia (three and twelve or more), it seems safe to argue that the Tschal district remained pagan to a very much later date than the upper Maeander valley. The same inference might be drawn from other facts: new ideas and a new religion must have penetrated far more slowly into the uncivilized hill-country of Tschal apart from the great lines of intercourse, than into more educated districts like Apameia and Eumeneia. It is, I believe, safe to say that the Tschal district was little affected by Christianity before the fourth century.

In western Banaz-Ova, there is little evidence: inscr. are rare, and Chri. inscr. are unknown except in the extreme N. W. district (no. 441—444). It is therefore highly improbable that Christianity spread there very early; and the only pre-Constantinian inscr. (no. 444) belongs to the N. W. Phrygian class, which is broadly distinguished from the Eumenian and Apamean class. Hence we may fairly infer that early Christianity penetrated into this district from the north, while there is a belt of country separating the region thus affected from the region where the Eumenian formula was current.

The eastern Banaz-Ova (with Pepouza, Bria, Sebaste, and Akmonia) and the Glaukos valley, being in constant communication with the cities on the upper Maeander, participated in the spread of the new religion from that side. Here also we find few post-Constantinian and more early Chr. inscr. But these are the limits to N. and N. E.; and beyond this we reach a tract of country where Chr. inscr. earlier than Constantine are unknown, while later ones are numerous: see Ch. XVII § 3.

Toward E., evidence is too scanty. Pisidian Antioch shares in the Eumenian formula; but on the line of the great Highway through Paroreios Phrygia inscri. have perished in a larger proportion than elsewhere. The few Chr. inscr. that are found along that line are later than Constantine; and it would appear that Christianity did not penetrate in the earlier period along the great Highway much further to E. than Apameia. On the other hand, in S. E. Phrygia and the adjoining corner of Lycaonia, early Chr. inscr. are numer-

ous; and they are not of the Eumenian or Apamean type. Here we recognize a different influence.

These facts point distinctly to three separate lines of Christian influence in Phrygia during the early centuries. The first comes up the Maeander valley, and reaches on different lines as far as Akmonia, and the Pentapolis and Apameia and Pisidian Antioch, and Lake Askania: the second belongs to Lycaonia and the extreme S. E. district: the third belongs to the N. W. The spheres of these three influences are separated from each other by belts of country where early Chr. inscr. are non-existent, while in most cases late Chr. inscr. are comparatively numerous. It seems beyond question that the first line of influence spread from the Aegean coast lands, and that its ultimate source was in St. Paul's work in Ephesos (Acts XIX) and in the efforts of his coadjutors in the following years, while the second originated in the earlier Pauline Churches of Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch (Acts XIII, XIV).

Two facts require notice. (1) Pisidian Antioch has been classed epigraphically with the Maeander valley. But it is on the frontier between that and the S. E. group, and shared in both influences. (2) The Lycos valley shows no example of the Eumenean formula. But that district was one of the centres of administration, and greater privacy and concealment was necessary there. Moreover, it is clear that, for some reason, Christianity spread to a quite extraordinary extent in Eumeneia and Apameia.

South of the line just indicated, in the mountainous district of the southern frontier, no early Chr. inscr. occur. Aphrosidias is the only great centre, where we might have looked for an early establishment of the new religion; but for some reason it seems to have continued to be a great pagan centre till after the time of Constantine.

In the Lycos valley the early history of Christianity is very obscure. After the new religion was spread there by Timothy, Mark, Epaphras, and others, all record ends. The persecution of Domitian probably destroyed the thread of connection between the Church of 50—100 and that of later time. Some tradition, perhaps continuous, was preserved, for Theodoret mentions that the house of Philemon at Colossai was still shown in the first half of the fifth century; and if the works of Papias of Hierapolis had been preserved, probably some of the important facts about the Church of the Lycos valley would have been preserved. Little more than the names of few bishops and martyrs are known; and no *Acta* of any value connected with the valley or with S. W. Phrygia have been published." pp. 505 ff.

A highly interesting chapter treats of "THE JEWS IN PHRYGIA." The following excerpts will be appreciated by our readers:—

"Cicero mentions that Flaccus, propraetor of Asia in 62 B. C., would not allow the contributions, which were regularly sent to Jerusalem by the Jews, to go out of Asia, and seized the money that was collected for the purpose. At Apameia nearly 100 pounds weight of gold was taken and weighed before the praetor, at Laodiceia 20 pounds weight, an unknown amount at Adramyttion, and a little at Pergamos. But it is an error to state, as has frequently been done, that the 100 pounds had been contributed by the Jews of Apameia. It is clear that the sums seized had been brought to these great centres for export, and represented the contributions of large districts. Hence Cicero's statement proves only that there was a large Jewish population in Phrygia; and this is known from some other sources. But we may safely conclude that Apameia was one of their chief centres, for it united all the condition favourable to their commercial and financial genius. Further, comparing the amount at Apameia and Laodiceia, we infer that the Jews were far more numerous in Apameia and the cities connected with it than they were in the Laodiceian group; and the evidence of inscr. fully confirms this. Akmonia, Sebaste, Eumeneia, Apameia, Dokimion, Iconium, are the cities where we can identify Jewish inscriptions, legends and names. We cannot doubt that this large Jewish population exercised a great influence on the development of the district and of the cities; and we therefore proceed to investigate the traces of it in the inscr.

In no. 399 *bis* (third century) the law of the Jews is mentioned; and we recognize there (with M. S. Reinach), not the law of Moses, but a regulation agreed upon between the city and the Jewish community for the protection of Jewish graves. Before A. D. 70 the Jews constituted, according to Roman law, a separate self-administering community, 'the nation of the Jews' in Apameia; but after that date the separate existence of the Jews as a nation was terminated, and the law recognized no distinction between the Jews and other provincials (except in respect of religion). It is remarkable that the separate law of the Jews should have been recognized in Apameia near two centuries later.

Probably the Jewish community in Apameia is as old as the foundation of the city, (280—261 B. C.). The Seleucid kings used the Jews as an element of the colonies which they founded to strengthen their hold on Phrygia and other countries. Seleucus

Nicator granted the Jews the full rights of citizenship, equal to those of Macedonians and Greeks, in all the cities which he founded; and this may doubtless be taken as an example of the Seleucid policy, for the later kings guarded the privileges of these Jewish Katoikoi in spite of the jealousy of their fellow-citizens. For example, distribution of oil was made to all citizens at the public expense; but, as the Jews objected to oil made by the Gentiles, the gymnasiarchs were ordered to give them an equivalent in money, a right confirmed by Mucianus in Antioch 67—69 A. D. This and various other privileges were guaranteed to the Jewish Katoikoi; and the whole probably constituted the 'law of the Jews' in Apameia, no. 399 *bis*. Experience showed that the Jews were a useful and loyal part of the Seleucid colonies; and when Antiochus the Great desired to strengthen his cause in Phrygia and Lydia about 200 B. C., he brought 2000 Jewish families from Babylonia and settled them in the strongholds, granting them lands and guaranteeing them his favour in every way.

The fact that the Jewish Katoikoi were encouraged and favoured by the Seleucid kings proves that they maintained the interests of the dominant party against the native population. Thus they were an aristocratic faction in the Phrygian cities; and, though the Pergamenian policy differed, yet the Jews are not likely to have lost the position which they had gained. In the Roman period their success in so many suits before Roman officials, when their privileges were attacked, is a proof of their wealth and power; for under the Republic they who could bribe highest were always successful. Especially the favour of Dolabella was a mere matter of purchase.

In A. D. 70, they lost their separate and peculiar position before the Roman law. Advantage was taken of this by the cities of Antioch and Alexandria, which sought to deprive them also of citizenship; but Vespasian and Titus confirmed their rights as citizens. The action of these two cities formed a test case; and, if it had gone against the Jews, they would obviously have lost their citizenship in all similar cities. But it would appear from no. 499 *bis*, that they not merely retained their equality in citizenship at Apameia, but also some (probably almost all) of the peculiar privileges which they enjoyed beyond other citizens. These privileges were inseparable from their religion; and, as their religion was made legitimate (on the payment of a poll-tax), the privileges connected with it were recognized. Only the tax which they formerly sent to Jerusalem (safe transmission of which was guaranteed by many enactments) was now turned into a Roman tax.

It is very probable that the Jews would have a separate cemetery at Apameia; but the dearth of Jewish epitaphs is remarkable. Only one is known, no. 399 *bis*. But the Phrygian Jews seemed to have abandoned entirely the use of the Hebrew language and names; and it is impossible to identify them from their names alone. The language and tone of no. 315, 385, 394, suggests that they are Jewish or Jewish-Christian. pp. 667 ff.

On Apamean coins struck under Severus, Macrinus, and Philip, there appears (with slight variations in details) the same type of 'a chest or ark (*κιβωτός*) inscribed ΝΩΕ, floating on water: within it are two figures, and standing beside it a male and a female figure: on the top of the chest, a raven, and above a dove carrying an olive-branch.' M. Charles Lenormant has published a relief found in the Catacombs at Rome, 'which represents a scene identical in all points with the Apamean coin-type.' This type brings together two scenes of the tale of Noah: in one he with his wife is floating in the ark: in the other they are giving thanks on dry land after their preservation.

Reasons have been stated above for the belief that the coin-engravers used as their model a picture exhibited in a public place in the city, probably one of a series of illustrations of Apamean legends which adorned some public building, such as a stoa. Some time during the second century, probably, an artist represented the tale of Noah as an Apamean scene. In adapting the Hebrew tale in pictorial representation, the artist took as his model the form which Greek art had already given to the myth of Danae and Perseus or of Auge and Telephos. The ark was represented as a box like that in which Danae or Auge had floated across the sea; and Noah and his wife were shown twice, once in the box (like Auge on a coin of Elaea), raising their right hands towards heaven. pp. 669 ff.

If Alexander, who chose the Noah-type in the time of Philip, was a Jew, it would prove that the Phrygian Jews had degenerated greatly from the Jewish standard of religion; for he was a high-priest of the city (i. e. in the Imperial cultus). It seems, however, not impossible that this may have been the case. Dr. Schürer has shown to what superstitions the Jews of Thyatira had given way. In Cypros and in Ephesos, also, some Jews had abandoned themselves to the practice of magical arts, which was stringently forbidden by the Mosaic law. An Apamean Jew might therefore join in maintaining the loyal cultus, for the Roman Jews were always staunch Imperialists; and at Akmonia we find Jews acting as high-priests in the Imperial cultus.

Jewish inscr., certain or probable, are more numerous near Akmonia than all the rest of Phrygia put together; and they reveal

to us Jews of rank and influence. Among the Asian Jews women take an unusually prominent place; and foremost among them was an Akmonian lady, Julia Severa, whose dignity and rank are attested by many coins and inscriptions. Few persons in the whole province are mentioned in so many documents as Julia Severa; and hardly any Phrygian inscr. is more important than no. 559, from which we learn that she was a Jewess, for her origin seems to imply the Jewish origin of a number of other persons. The name Tyrronius found at Iconium, Akmonia and Sebaste, must be recognized as Jewish (no. 530, 559, 478 f.); and two families, bearing the names Julius Severus and Servenius Cornutus, connected both with Akmonia and Ancyra in Galatia, boasting of royal descent and intermarrying with one another, are probably also Jewish. pp. 672 f.

At Akmonia, and in Phrygia generally, Christians and Jews seem to have been in close relations, and it is often difficult to determine whether an inscr. is Jewish or Jewish-Christian (no. 411 f, 466, 563 f, 635). The relations were not always friendly (no. 232); but the same names and formulæ were used by both. In a Chr. inscr. 466, a form which has little of the Chr. character seems to spring from Judaism. But in this subject we depend rather on the general impression derived from the situation and from the inscription as a whole, than on definite single facts. . . .

The Phrygian Jews, many of whom had been brought from Babylonia about 200 B. C., are considered in the Talmud as the Ten Tribes; and it is said that the baths and wines of Phrygia had separated the Ten Tribes from their brethren. They lost connexion with their own land and people; they forgot their language; they did not participate in the philosophy and education of the Alexandrian Jews; and they were much more readily converted to Christianity, which is what the Talmud calls the separation from their brethren. We may then take the marriage of the Jewess Eunice at Lystra to a Greek, and the exemption of her Son Timotheus from the Mosaic law, as typical of a relaxation of the Jewish standard in Lycaonia and Phrygia and an approximation to the pagan population around them. This is confirmed by several indications in our inscr. Julia Severa was a high-priestess in the Imperial cultus, in association successively with her two husbands, no. 530, 550: so also was Servinia Cornuta, no. 551. The worship of Poppaea as Sebaste Eubosia seems to have been maintained by Jews, (no 530). Alexander, the high-priest at Apameia, was probably a Jew. . . .

The approximation between the Jews and the native population was not likely to be wholly on one side. The fascination which the

lofty morality and proud separation of the Jewish religion exercised on the Roman world is well known; and Phrygia was probably even more likely than other countries to come under that influence. In no. 232, according to our interpretation, there is an example of this Judaizing tendency; and though no other example can be given, we must remember that inscr. can rarely throw light on such movements of thought. But the tendency of Paul's Phrygian converts at Colossae, Iconium and Pisidian Antioch to lapse into Judaistic practices, and the multitudes that flocked to the synagogue at Antioch, show how strongly the Jews had affected the district. Moreover the position of the Jews in Apameia and Akmonia, and the facts related in § 2, could hardly have come about, unless the native population had come to some degree under Jewish influence.

These considerations lead up to the question as to the ultimate fate of the Phrygian Jews. Why do we never hear of them in later history? The answer must, I think, be, that they gradually became merged in the surrounding people. It may seem improbable that a large Jewish population should lose its separate character, and be swallowed up in a race which probably possessed lower intellectual power and vigour. But the separatism of the Jews is dependent on their religion; and the evidence of the Talmud is clear, that the Phrygian Jews failed to maintain their own peculiar religion, and thus were divided from their brethren. On the one hand they approximated to the Graeco-Roman civilization, were ardent supporters of the Imperial policy, and engaged in the Imperial cultus (at least in outward form, and that cultus was never more than an outward form); on the other hand they were probably to a large extent Christianized at an early period; and even those who had taken the Imperial side, and conformed to the State worship, were likely in the fourth century to continue the same conformity when Christianity had become the State religion. Thus the Phrygian Jews melted into the general Christian population." pp. 674 ff.

The reader must not, however, as he might with only these specimens before him, suppose the entire work to be what many of its chapters are, a smooth and steady current of historical composition. There are pages upon pages of inscriptions with critical comments, innumerable references to parallel literature ancient and modern, catalogues and tables of names and dates, descriptions of coins and figures, of slabs and structures and fragments of both, all of which

are more valuable to the student, though less palatable to the reader, of history and historical geography. There are also constructions and conjectures with which we and others may take issue, as, f. ex., when the author says:—

“In pursuance of this policy, the Christians put nothing in public documents, such as their epitaphs, which could be quoted as evidence of Christianity: if an official was mentioned, a title common to the pagans was used, as *episcopos* no. 362, perhaps *geraios* no. 361. 364. Jewish festivals were legal; and their names could therefore be used.” p. 501.

We beg leave to object that there is even in the remnants of the Phrygian epitaphs to-day ample material “which can be quoted as evidence of Christianity,” and that such titles as *episcopos* were simply the scriptural titles, and the Jewish names of festivals were current then as they were in later times by scriptural precedent, and not for the sake of expediency or dissimulation.—Our author further says:—

“It was necessary to keep up the forms of the established worship of the Emperors, for that cultus was ‘the keystone of the Imperial policy,’ and the maintenance of it was the test of loyalty: to the ancient mind ‘patriotism was another form of adherence to the national religion.’ Thus it was necessary for the city to keep up the forms, or to break with the Imperial government and proceed to extremes. How the State religion was maintained in practice, we are denied all evidence; how far some Christians might go in acceptance of the recognized Roman forms we need not speculate; opinion and conduct varied widely, and as is natural; some doubtless condemned what others justified as mere acceptance of outward forms of politeness. The courtesies of society and ordinary life as well as of municipal administration, had a non-Christian form; and a wise toleration will always permit great variety of opinion as to how far politeness might honestly be carried in accepting the ordinary practices. In the course of the following centuries the forms of politeness became Christianized; but the process was only beginning in the third century. Probably the same policy which placed on the gravestone an appeal to ‘the god,’ leaving the reader to understand in his own sense a term common to both Christians and Pagans, modified in similar slight ways many of the other forms of social and municipal life. But one thing we may take as certain: if Chris-

tians entered the Imperial service or the municipal career, some sacrifice of strictest principle was required of them, and as magistrates they had to comply with many non-Christian religious forms in a public way, for religion entered far more closely into the details of life in ancient times than it does in modern society and government. 'The simple fact that so many Christian senators at Eumeneia are known to us, shows that the spirit of accommodation ruled there.' pp. 503 f.

We hold that in these statements Dr. Ramsay has generalized to an unwarranted extent the practices of some nominal Christians of a type familiar from the writings of Tertullian and Cyprian and Hippolytus, or misinterpreted the adherence of the early Christians to the maxim of rendering unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's,¹⁾ and to the instructions given by St. Paul relative to the attitude of Christian converts toward their heathen surroundings.²⁾ The existence of mixed families alone is sufficient to account for many of the phenomena appearing in the remnants of those early days.

A. G.

IS THEOLOGY A SCIENCE?

Under this head the April issue of *The Lutheran Church Review* devotes eighteen pages of print to an acrimonious attack upon "Missouri," more especially upon the position occupied by the THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY and *Lehre und Wehre* as to the nature of Theology. We can in all candor state that when we wrote the first article of the QUARTERLY, in which we endeavored to answer the question, "What is Theology?" we never thought of such a thing as thereby picking a quarrel with the gentlemen of the General Council, and while we in no wise question the privilege

1) Matt. 22, 21.

2) 1 Cor. 10, 25—31. 7, 12 ff. al.

of any man to freely criticise what we have said or may in future say in public print, we deem it proper to record the fact that the first direct assault in the controversy which has now sprung up between the *Review* and the *QUARTERLY* came from the other side, and that with an air of pungency and virulence which was certainly not provoked by anything we have said in maintenance of the position assailed by our critic. Thus there was absolutely no cause given on our side for such thrusts as, "The Missouri writer, in sneering at the 'Christian consciousness,'"¹) etc., and, "We do not believe that the Holy Spirit has confined his work to only three points of power and purity, Christ and the Apostles, Luther, and the teaching of the Concordia Seminary."²) The "Missouri writer" has spoken of Christian consciousness in simple, sober earnest, and Concordia Seminary has never pretended to rank in a line with Christ and Luther as a point of power, but contents itself with sitting at the feet not only of the Master but also of the disciple on the same bench with others who may be willing to profit by their teaching.

Having placed on record the facts alluded to, we now proceed to give an airing to the article in the *Review* which claims our attention and that of our readers.

If our critic has made any thing at all clear to us, it is this, that he has made clear to himself neither what theology is nor what science is, and that he is in theory and practice a thoroughly unsound theologian.

In the first place, our critic labors under an alarming and bewildering confusion of notions concerning the nature of Theology. He calls the attention of his readers to the fact that we have given one only definition of Theology in our whole article, of which he says, "The definition is all right in its place."³) We would on our part call the attention

1) Luth. Ch. Rev. XVI, p. 321.

2) Ibid. p. 323.

3) Ibid. p. 321 N.

of *our* readers to the fact that our critic advances at least half a dozen of definitions, not one of which is all right in any place. We give the whole string in full:—

“Theology is the science of a saving faith. It is the ordered knowledge of faith.* To be a theologian a man must be well versed in the Scriptures, and in the ordered knowledge of Scripture.†

“As thus defined, Theology is the supremely practical science. It has to do with that out of which are the issues of eternal life and eternal death. It has to do with salvation, and with growth in grace and truth.

“Yet theology is something more than a solely practical science. Theology as a means is solely practical. But Theology is not solely a means. Theology is also an end. And here the definition of Theology, taken concretely, as ‘an intellectual habitude divinely given,’ etc., fails to embrace its fullest content. Theology is not a subjective grasp on the part of the human mind. Its matter is independent of the conditions of the human mind, and is not limited by the conceptions of the latter. It differs in this respect from every other science. It differs in being more of a science than all the others. Theology is the infinite wisdom of God Himself, wherein God knows Himself in Himself, and out of Himself, all things through Himself. Of this science man’s grasp or ‘intellectual habitude,’ even where ‘divinely given,’ is only in part (through a glass darkly). Of this science man’s practical wisdom, divinely given, is only a special application. The practical, that is Theology as a means to salvation, will dissolve and blossom finally into the larger eternal life.‡

“Theology is practical. Yet however practical, let it be remembered that it is also theoretical. It is God’s own Science. In its special practical application to a lost humanity, Theology is the science of a saving faith. In its special practical application to a redeemed humanity, it is the science of faith and knowledge.§ This is eternal life, to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent. In its larger application to a glorified humanity and to God Himself, Theology is the science of the Truth of God. Our

* Faith is knowledge. It is knowledge (partial) of a person, and confidence in that person based on the knowledge (partial) of Him.”

† A man may be well versed in the Scriptures without being a theologian.”

‡ We shall see him as he is.” 1 John 3:2.

§ Faith finally leads more and more into knowledge.”

Lord Jesus Christ was the exponent of Theology, both in these special practical applications and in its more general nature, as the Way, the Truth, and the Life." 1)

We have given this medley, notes and all, in justice to our critic. We mean to do him further justice by pointing out some of the details of his effort.

He begins with the statement, "Theology is the science of a saving faith." This definition is all wrong. That the genus is wrong, we shall show later on, when we shall endeavor to show that our critic is in the dark as to what science is. The specific difference is also wrong. For if theology is the science of a saving faith, there is no room for ethics in theology, unless you mix the works of the law into saving faith, which is even worse. In our critic's theology, according to this definition, there is no room for such chapters as *de peccato*, *de conjugio*, *de statu domestico*, *de magistratu politico*, and others, unless sin and matrimony and civil government be looked upon as being part and parcel of "saving faith." We might with equal and greater propriety define architecture as being the science of building churches.

Our critic's next definition of Theology is that "it is the ordered knowledge of faith"; and an asterisc points to the Note: "Faith *is* knowledge," etc., which would make the definition tantamount to: "Theology is the ordered knowledge of knowledge." We let this go on its merits without further remark for the present. But when our critic continues to state that Theology as thus defined "has to do with that out of which are the issues of eternal life and eternal death," we must say that the notion of the "issue of eternal death" being out of "saving faith" is a novelty to us and probably to others who had hitherto assumed the issue of eternal death to be out of sin and unbelief. 2)

1) Ibid. pp. 312 f.

2) Rom. 5, 12. 6, 23. Ezek. 18, 20, 26. 33, 18. Mark 16, 16.

In the approaches to his next definition of Theology, our critic tells us that Theology is not only practical, not only a means, but also an end, and that it differs from every other science in being more of a science than all the others. And of this "science" of Theology he says: "Theology is the infinite wisdom of God Himself, wherein God knows Himself in Himself, and out of Himself, all things through Himself. Of this science," etc. Here our critic in his efforts and zeal to make Theology a science, misses his mark and puts the scientific stamp on God himself, makes God's very essence a science! For "this science" whereof he speaks as of the "infinite wisdom of God Himself," etc., is in truth but the triune God himself, as Quenstedt correctly says: "*Archetypal* theology is not only *in* God, but is God *himself*." ¹⁾ And with Buddeus we say: "Is there anybody who, while we speak of theology, could think that we were speaking of God's own knowledge?" ²⁾ But our critic not only confounds ectypal theology and archetypal theology, but in stamping the latter, which is God's very essence, a science, places God in a line, though at the head of the line, with Philosophy and other sciences, and goes on to say that of "this science," God Himself, "man's practical wisdom, divinely given, is only a special application." Man's practical wisdom a special application of God! If this is scientific theology, it certainly differs from every other science; for in every other science there is at least some reason and sense.

Toward the close of the part of his article given in extenso above, our critic winds up with a cluster of definitions of theology which must be looked into before we proceed to discuss his notions of *science*. According to the first of these three definitions, Theology is once more "the

1) "Theologia *archetypa* est substantia et quoad rem ipsa infinita Dei essentia. . . . Theologia ἀρχέτυπος non solum *in* Deo est, sed est *ipse* Deus. . . . Nam Dei esse, scire et sapere idem sunt." Quenstedt, Theol. did. pol. P. I, c. 1, s. 1, th. 3. 4.

2) Budd. Inst. theol. dogm. p. 54.

science of saving faith." Our critic has told us this before, but we are now informed that this is theology only in a *special* practical application, viz., to a lost humanity. We are, however, further enlightened that in another special application, viz., to a redeemed humanity, theology is the "science of faith and knowledge." Above he has told us that "faith is knowledge." Here we have a science of faith and knowledge, and, to make confusion still more confused, we are told in a note that "faith finally leads more and more into knowledge." To cap the climax, Theology in still another special application is defined as "the science of the Truth of God," which would seem to indicate that in its former *special* applications our critic's Theology is *not* the science of the Truth of God, and we suspect the reader is inclined to believe it. If he is, we see no reason to correct him.

While, then, our critic is, on his own evidence, in the dark as to the nature of Theology, even of his own theology, we also fail to find in his utterances any well-defined notion of *Science*. The substitution of "ordered knowledge" in his second definition given above, for "science" in the first, might justify the supposition that "ordered knowledge" and "science" are to him synonymous or homonymous terms. This notion of "science" would make sciences of all the branches taught in an elementary school, and a scientist of every schoolboy. Now, if our critic were really satisfied with calling a schoolboy's knowledge of the Catechism "scientific theology," inasmuch as it is "ordered knowledge," we might be willing to leave him in the undisturbed enjoyment of his terminology. But in this case his attack upon our position would be a blind alarm. Our critic knows, and quotes us in evidence, that to us, also, theology, inasmuch as it is or comprises knowledge, is not without order, not "void of plan or principle."¹⁾

1) Luth. Ch. Rev. *ibid.* p. 316. cf. QUARTERLY p. 11.

Our critic knew or ought to have known that we have never absolutely repudiated the use of the term "science" in defining Theology; he again quotes us as saying that we decline the scientific character "claimed by modern theology,"¹⁾ and in the same article we had said: "Our theology is *not* a science in the modern sense of the term."²⁾ And, furthermore, we had quoted modern Theology in a manner to show that she too is not content with being called a science in some remote sense, but would be "a true science," a "science in the true sense of the word."³⁾ Now, modern science in general, and modern scientific theology especially, will not content itself with being merely "ordered knowledge." No one will deny that ordered knowledge may be obtained by ordered observation or perception. But "Science," says a modern scientist, "is universally found to be the result of *reflection* which has *emancipated* itself from sense-perception."⁴⁾ And: "Scientific knowledge is not derived from the senses, but from the understanding; it is produced, *not by perception*, but by *conceptual thought*,"⁵⁾ or, in other words, by speculation. "By science we understand that *independent* and *self-conscious* work of intelligence which seeks knowledge methodically for its own sake."⁶⁾ And therefore, scientific theology holds that "if Theology would truly comprehend itself, it must recognize itself as a single member in the great general organism of Science; but in this it cannot

1) Rev., p. 316. QUARTERLY p. 11.

2) QUARTERLY, p. 6.

3) QUARTERLY, p. 2.

4) F. Paulsen, Introduction to Philosophy, transl. by F. Thilly, 1895, p. 418. Or, according to the German original: Wissenschaft stellt sich überall dar als das Werk des von der sinnlichen Wahrnehmung sich emancipirenden Denkens. Paulsen, *Einleitung in die Philosophie*, p. 429.

5) Ibid. p. 416. Wissenschaftliche Erkenntniß kommt nicht aus den Sinnen, sondern aus dem Verstande; nicht durch die Wahrnehmung, sondern durch begriffliches Denken wird sie hervorgebracht. Paulsen, *Einleitung*, p. 427.

6) W. Windelbach, History of Philosophy, transl. by J. H. Tufts, 1893, p. 23.

succeed, unless it occupy a higher standpoint than the historical one as such. For the idea of Science cannot be discovered in its true nature otherwise than by way of speculation.”¹⁾ And, according to the same author, “Speculative thought in general is placed in contradistinction to empirico-reflective thought. Both differ inasmuch as the latter proceeds aposterioristically, the former, aprioristically, or, more precisely, aprioristico-constructively.”²⁾ And again, “Speculative thinking engenders its thoughts from out of itself;”³⁾ or, in other words, “Speculation proceeds from the supposition that all thoughts lie included in human consciousness and must only be drawn forth therefrom by its reflection on itself (by means of thought).”⁴⁾ And Rothe is only consistent when he says: “Speculation is not bound to adhere to the dogmas of its church. With them it knows itself to be on the same level; yea more, it knows it to be a distinct aspect of its tasks to continue the development of these dogmas. . . . Speculative theology must, according to its very notion, be heterodox, in a good sense of the term, of course. The deviation of the positions of speculative Theology from the dogmas of the church must consist only in the fact that the latter find in the former their true completion and are thereby carried beyond themselves

1) Will ferner die Theologie sich selbst wahrhaft begreifen, so muss sie sich selbst als ein einzelnes Glied in dem grossen Gesamtorganismus der Wissenschaft erkennen; dies kann ihr aber nicht gelingen, wofern sie nicht einen höheren Standpunkt betritt als den historischen als solchen. Denn die Idee der Wissenschaft ist in ihrer Wahrheit nicht anders zu entdecken als auf speculative Weise. *Rothe, Theol. Encyclopädie, 1880, p. 11.*

2) Das speculative Denken überhaupt steht dem empirisch reflectirenden gegenüber. Beide unterscheiden sich dadurch, dass dieses aposteriorisch verfährt, jenes apriorisch, näher apriorisch-constructiv. *Rothe, ibid. p. 15.*

3) Das speculative Denken erzeugt sich seine Gedanken aus sich selbst (dem Denken) heraus. *Rothe, ibid. p. 15.*

4) Die Speculation geht von der Voraussetzung aus, dass im menschlichen Bewusstsein alle Gedanken überhaupt beschlossen liegen und nur durch seine Selbstbesinnung über sich selbst (mittelst des Denkens) aus ihm hervorgezogen zu werden brauchen. *Rothe, ibid. p. 16.*

and dissolved.”¹⁾ We say, this is only consistent in the mouth of a modern scientific theologian, for, as Ritter says, “Science maintains the freedom of its thought,”²⁾ and Rothe would have us remember that “Theology is Theology precisely and *only* in the measure in which it is Science.”³⁾ But being science, Theology is in fact a special branch or province of Philosophy; “for,” says Paulsen, “we may say that ultimately all sciences have their common root in philosophy. If they are separated from this root they will wither, away.”⁴⁾ And, “as in the old proverb all roads lead to Rome, so all roads in science lead to philosophy.”⁵⁾ And again: “In this sense we may say, philosophy is the central fire, the sun, from which life-giving warmth radiates upon all sciences. The soil of investigation becomes arable only when warmed by these rays.”⁶⁾ Or, where Philosophy is considered in a narrower sense, not as the sum of all sciences, but as one of a number of general sciences, the relation of Theology is thus determined: “Since Christian theology as a science is . . . in its various branches . . . a *segment of so many general sciences*, which have their unity only by their relation to the clerical calling: it maintains an intimate communion and reciprocity with these sciences and continually draws from them nourishment and life. These are, beside the general classical education which it presupposes, especially 1) *Philology*, i. e., the knowledge

1) An die Dogmen ihrer Kirche ist die Speculation nicht gebunden. Mit ihnen weiss sie sich ebenbürtig, ja sie kennt es gerade als eine bestimmte Seite an ihren Aufgaben, dieselben weiter zu bilden. . . . Die speculative Theologie muss ihrem Begriff zufolge heterodox sein; aber freilich im guten Sinne des Worts. Die Abweichung der Sätze der speculativen Theologie von den kirchlichen Dogmen nämlich darf nur darin bestehen, dass diese in jenen ihre wahre Vollendung finden und eben hierdurch über sich selbst hinausgeführt und aufgelöst werden. *Rothe*, *ibid.* p. 21 f.

2) H. Ritter, *Encyclopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften*, Vol. III, p. 143.

3) Theologie ist die Theologie genau nur in dem Masse, in welchem sie Wissenschaft ist. *Ibid.* p. 12.

4) *Introd.* p. 39.

5) *Ibid.* p. 38.

6) *Ibid.* p. 40.

of the languages and customs of antiquity, together with Hermeneutics and Criticism, on which exegetical theology in its various branches, 2) general *History* of the world and of religion, on which historical theology, 3) *Philosophy* in its entire extent, with its history, on which systematic theology, is based.”¹⁾ And on this relation the science of theology depends for its well-being and success; for “a science that forgets its relation to philosophy or to the general unity of knowledge would, like a garden deprived of the sunlight, grow to leaf, and be without bloom and fruit.”²⁾ Weighed in this balance, orthodox Lutheran theology must, of course, be found wanting. Says Raebiger: “Although it disposes of the material thus received with that extraordinary erudition which we meet in the dogmatical works of Gerhard and Calov, yet it does not attain a *scientific* cognition of such material.”³⁾

But weighed in the balance of modern science, the theology of our critic, too, must be found wanting. Our critic’s theology, though that of a champion of theology as a science, is not scientific Theology. He says:

“The Scriptures are the only dominant and infallible source; and not merely the only infallible rule, but the only absolute rule. But they are not the only source.”⁴⁾

This, as some things quoted later on, is decidedly un-Lutheran. But it is also thoroughly unscientific. Modern scientific Theology knows of but *one* source of Theology, and that is *not* Scripture, but the “self-consciousness of the church” or the theologian’s own mind. Frank is consistent when he says: “It is our right to demand that nothing which is itself an object of cognition and lies without the cognizing subject be pointed out to us as a principle of

1) *Anweisung für Studierende der Theologie auf der vereinigten Friedrichs-Universität Halle-Wittenberg.* p. 15.

2) Paulsen introd. p. 41.

3) *Theologik*, p. 24.

4) Rev. p. 320 f.

cognition.”¹⁾ He quite consistently denies that Scripture is the source of Christian Ethics, when he says: “It is equally manifest that in this question as to the principle of cognition we can adduce *nothing which is objectively given*, as, f. ex., *the holy Scriptures* or the decrees of the church, but *solely* that moral self-consciousness which, by virtue of the existing realization of Christian moral life, resides in the congregation and, with the same, in the individuals therewith in membership connected.”²⁾ This is really and consistently scientific Theology in the modern sense of the term, while our critic’s Theology with its two sources, Scripture and “regenerate human consciousness,”³⁾ is neither Lutheran nor scientific, but sits down between two chairs while clamoring in defense of scientific Theology.

We have already in a passing way remarked that our critic exhibits himself not only as a decidedly unscientific, but also as a thoroughly unsound theologian. This we would now proceed to substantiate. He says:

“Without science in philology, science in criticism, science in archaeology, science in exegesis, science in sacred history, science in proving and arranging the meaning and truths, the whole revelation, in fact, would be unintelligible.”⁴⁾

Whatever this may be, it is certainly not Lutheran theology. It vindicates to science what antichristian Rome vindicates to the Pope. We hold that Scripture is a light having its brightness in itself. Our critic, in full accord

1) “Einmal dürfen wir wohl verlangen, dass man uns als Erkenntnisprincip Nichts bezeichnet, was selbst erst Gegenstand der Erkenntnis und ausserhalb des erkennenden Subjects gelegen ist.” *System der christlichen Sittlichkeit*, I. Hälfte, p. 82.

2) “Es liegt nun ebenso auf der Hand, dass wir bei dieser Frage nach dem Erkenntnisprincip nichts objectiv Gegebenes anführen können, etwa die h. Schrift oder die Decrete der Kirche, sondern lediglich dasjenige sittliche Selbstbewusstsein, welches auf Grund der jeweiligen Realisation des christlich-sittlichen Lebens der Gemeinde und mit ihr dem Einzelnen, gliedlich mit ihr Verbundenen innewohnt.” *Ibid.* p. 78.

3) *Rev.* p. 321.

4) *Rev.* p. 320.

with the Romanists, would make it a dark, unintelligible book which must, in order to be understood, be illuminated from without; or, as he says in another place,

"The saving truth is incased in a husk that needs to be opened by forms of scientific investigation."¹⁾

In this he is seconded by Ritter, who says: "The word of God, as to its essence, is dark, in order that we may in grappling with it learn to penetrate to clearness."²⁾ And yet St. Paul says that Timothy from a child *knew* the holy Scriptures.³⁾ Does he mean to say that Timothy was from a child equipped with "science in criticism, science in archaeology, science in exegesis," etc.? Or did Christ, when he exhorted the Jews to search the Scriptures,⁴⁾ thereby imply that they should first hear a course of scientific lectures on archaeology? And did the apostles direct their epistles to coteries of scientific critics and archaeologists, or to entire congregations? Was it an academy of science to whom St. Paul wrote: "Whereby, when ye read, ye may *understand* my knowledge in the mystery of Christ"?⁵⁾ Of course, there are those who read and do not understand what they read. We know how to account for this. "The light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not," says St. John.⁶⁾ But our critic lays the blame, at least in part, to the door of the light. He says:

"The Missouri position is in error because it virtually assumes that the truth is so clearly revealed in the Scripture that there is not even a possibility of doubt to the honest mind. This is simply not a fact. It is neither correct nor just to lay all the divergencies of modern scientific theology upon the ambitious strivings of men, and upon the need of bringing forth something new as a sole cause. Beyond question this is a leading and powerful factor, but were it

1) Ibid. p. 319.

2) Das Wort Gottes ist seinem Wesen nach dunkel, damit wir im Ringen mit ihm zur Klarheit durchdringen lernen. *Ritter*, Ibid. p. 619.

3) 2 Tim. 3, 15.

4) John 5, 39.

5) Eph. 3, 4.

6) John 1, 5.

entirely absent, the science of theology would not be free from divergencies of interpretation and teaching. There is something in the material to be revealed as well as in the intelligence that apprehends the revelation, which prevents equal clearness of vision throughout, and which produces many varieties of limitations. The reason and nature of this it is not necessary to touch on here, but the fact must be recognized. There is not one of the great doctrines so indisputably revealed in Scripture that no question about it can be raised. It is revealed step by step, and in the process of history, not absolutely."¹⁾

This is again Romanism pure and simple; it is subversive of all true Theology, leaving not one truth really and sufficiently revealed in Scripture, but looking and pointing to "the process of history" for the conclusive establishment of Christian doctrine. Scripture, according to our critic's view, is not sufficient to make any man "wise unto salvation" and "perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."²⁾ The Lutheran church in her confessions knows of but one source of Christian doctrine, holy Scripture.³⁾ But our critic says:

"The Missouri position . . . mistakes the Scripture, which is the only rule of faith, as the only source of religion. It confuses these two things. The Scriptures are the only dominant and infallible source; and not merely the only infallible rule, but the only absolute rule. But they are not the only source. The Word became incarnate in time and in history, and taught both the people and the apostles, and the Church began her preaching and use of the Word widely, long before the Word's Word was embodied in the Scripture. The Word has always been before, and in small part at least, outside of and beyond the Scriptures.

"Where then has this small part at least been lodged? In regenerate human consciousness. Where has it manifested itself? In regenerate human experience, which God does not despise, as much as some of His representatives have."⁴⁾

1) Rev. p. 326.

2) 2 Tim. 3, 15. 17.

3) M. pp. 76, 18. 85, 44. 45. 92, 34. 94, 39. 99, 70. 102, 83. 104, 89. 107, 107. 120, 67. 151, 268. 157, 26. 160, 35. 37. 161, 39. 40. 174, 49. 182, 83. 194, 45. 197, 60. 208, 13. 14. 17. 212, 37. 219, 76. al.

4) Rev. pp. 320 f.

In all this our critic is not a Lutheran theologian. Even his concession that the Scriptures are "the only absolute rule" is a fallacy, if his statement stands that "there is not one of the great doctrines so indisputably revealed in Scripture that no question about it can be raised." For if this be really the case, how can Scripture serve as an absolute rule with regard to any doctrine at all, being itself open to dispute?

It is equally unsound theology when, after another passing thrust at the "Missouri writer," our critic continues:

"Scripture itself shows that 'the answer to God's Word in human consciousness is a part of God's revelation to the world.' This is a fact in spite of what the Missouri writer says about Peter, Paul and John receiving the message, doctrine and words directly from the Holy Ghost. What the author says is true, and deserves to be *greatly emphasized* in these days. But it is not the whole truth. Both Paul's theology and John's progressed and developed in their consciousness, under direct teaching of the Holy Ghost and under the application of that teaching, as years went on."¹⁾

Of course, Scripture itself shows no such thing as that "the answer to God's Word in human consciousness is a part of God's revelation to the world," and our critic has not even made an effort to point out a single text to substantiate his statement. Thus also the progressive development of Paul's theology and John's in the consciousness of these apostles is a fiction of our critic's consciousness, and not a truth of Scripture.

But we must not weary the reader with an attempt at pointing out all the unsound statements embodied in our critic's essay. Our purpose is not now to show what manner of theology is voiced forth in the General Council and endorsed by the official organ of that body, the *Lutheran*, which stamps our critic's effort "unquestionably one of the ablest arraignments of Missouri ever printed in an

1) Ibid. p. 321 f.

English periodical.”¹⁾ Our attitude is not aggressive, but defensive, and if we have shown to the satisfaction of our readers that the attempt of our critic to champion the scientific character of theology is an utter failure and itself an exhibition of unsound, un-Lutheran, unscriptural, and unscientific theology, we have achieved our present purpose, as far as the main issue is concerned.

But while we have maintained and still maintain that Theology in the true sense of the word is not a science in the modern sense of the term, we deny the charge our critic lodges against us when he says:

“[Missouri] opposes itself to anything that makes the claim of a scientific character. Whether the science be false or true, seems to make no difference;”²⁾

and again:

“The grand mistake of Missouri, in this position, is the yielding up of science to anti-Christ in such a way, and in clearing her skirts of it as though it were a bad thing.”³⁾

Our critic asks:

“Will Missouri take the position that the book of nature is not here before the Christian’s eye to be read and studied? Will it take the position that it is not lawful to man to look into the stars and into the earth, and to investigate the wonders of God’s natural law? Will it say that this is unlawful, or at least so dangerous as not to be engaged in?”⁴⁾

We answer: No, not by any means. On the contrary, we deem it a high privilege of rational beings to study nature, God’s wondrous handiwork, to make the most extensive and intensive use of the microscope and the telescope, of qualitative and quantitative analysis, of induction and deduction, and other means and methods of investigation and construction in scientific work. The present writer is not ashamed to say that he has given years of study to the natural sciences, has been an instructor in Physics and

1) *Lutheran* vol. I, p. 473.

3) *Ibid.* p. 315.

2) *Rev.* p. 316.

4) *Ibid.* pp. 325.

Chemistry and Anatomy, and has lectured on sociological problems. Thus also in the curriculum of Concordia Seminary an extended course of philosophical lectures is provided for. We mention this to substantiate our denial of the charge that we are "yielding up science to anti-Christ," or that "Missouri sets itself against anything that makes the claim of a scientific character." We are even ready to defend Mr. Darwin against our critic who denies that the "Origin of Species" is "a work of science."¹) We say with Paulsen: "A man like Darwin, who makes the most careful and painstaking examination of facts, for whom nothing is too insignificant, but who traces their remotest relations and makes generalizations, we call a philosophical natural scientist."²) And when we claim with St. Paul that all things are ours, whether Paul or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world,³) we do not exclude even such men as Darwin and Spencer. We make use of lexica and grammars prepared by rationalists; we avail ourselves of the historical labors of the Tübingen school, and of the archaeological researches of Ramsay, who is in no sense a theologian. Yea, we are so far from "yielding up science to anti-Christ," that we lay Antichrist himself and his minions under contribution as sources of information. And all this while we are nevertheless and all the more mindful of the radical difference between Science and Theology. "Science," says a recent philosopher, "accustoms men to accept as true only what we perceive immediately, what is self-evident, or what admits of being proved, i. e., deduced from such immediate certainties."⁴) Theology, on the contrary, accustoms men to accept as theological truths only what God has taught us

1) Rev. p. 315, N.

2) *Intro. to Philos.*, p. 36.

3) 1 Cor. 3, 21 f.

4) Die Wissenschaft gewöhnt die Menschen daran, nur das als wahr anzunehmen, was wir unmittelbar gewahren, was von selbst einleuchtet, oder was sich beweisen, d. h. aus solchem unmittelbar Gewissen ableiten lässt. *Georg von Gizycki, Moralphilosophie, Leipzig, 1888, p. 458.*

mediately, by means of the written word, the Scriptures. If science is a system of truths derived from their proper source, *our* theology, *scriptural* theology, is truly scientific theology, and in this sense we do not object to having it so named, not *although*, but *because* true theology is not speculative, not scientific in that sense in which modern theology claims for itself a scientific character, but *simply scriptural*. And we would ask our critic to put himself to no further trouble or expense in his solicitude in behalf of Missouri's future because of our attitude toward "scientific theology."

A. G.

The God-Idea of the Ancients or Sex in Religion. By *Eliza Burt Gamble*. G. P. Putnam's Sons. New York and London. 1897. VII and 339 pages. Price: \$1.75.

This is a thoroughly bad book, and that it was written by a woman is a disgrace to the sex. That it has been written and published at all admits of no manner of excuse. The fundamental idea of the work is a despicable falsehood. There is in the entire book scarcely an argument which is not either a fallacy or a perversion of a truth, and the reasonings which are neither are not to the point. The authoress exhibits an abundant lack of all the peculiar qualifications requisite for theological research. Her theory of evolution is a failure *ab ovo* and a monster in its development. In fact, the whole work is a repugnant, nauseating monstrosity, which we should have refused to notice in these pages, were it not for a desire to enter our energetic testimony against a class of literary productions which must be numbered with the signs of the times, productions which deserve to be all the more conspicuously poison-labeled when they come with a stamp of respectability such as the imprint of a publishing house of high standing on both sides of the Atlantic would appear to be.

A. G.