

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. III.

APRIL, 1899.

NO. 2.

Doctrinal Theology.

COSMOLOGY.

(Continued.)

ANTHROPOLOGY.

God created man in his own image.¹⁾ The creation of man was a part, the closing part, of the six days' work of creation. On the day of which the inspired record says, "And the evening and the morning was the sixth day,"²⁾ God, according to the same account, created man.³⁾ Man is not a product of spontaneous generation, not a result of a long continued process of evolution, but a distinct work of God, made at a definite period of time, and not a rudimentary work, but a complete and finished work.⁴⁾ This work of God was from that first day of its existence *man*, not a cell, a microbe, a saurian, an ape, but man, created according to the will and counsel of God. It was the triune God who said, "*Let us make MAN*,"⁵⁾ and God created MAN.⁶⁾ As the human individual, even in its embryonic state is at all times essentially human, so the human race never passed through a state of brute existence or through

1) Gen. 1, 27: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

2) Gen. 1, 31.

3) Gen. 1, 27.

4) Gen. 2, 1. 2.

5) Gen. 1, 26.

6) Gen. 1, 27.

Theological Review.

Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology by *Revere Franklin Weidner, D. D., LL. D.* Part I. *Introduction and exegetical theology.* Second edition, entirely rewritten. Fleming H. Revell Company. Chicago, New York, Toronto.—296 pages, bound. Price, \$1.50.

All the various methods which may be pursued in the scientific exhibition of mental or material realities of whatever kind may be reduced to two. The one is the analytical method, which proceeds from the concrete or historical quantities, from facts or other concrete objects, and arrives at the abstract or rational quantities, ideas, principles, and laws. The other is the synthetical method, which proceeds from rational or abstract quantities, ideas, principles, and laws, and arrives at an exhibition of concrete or historical quantities, arranged and rated according to such principles. These two methods may be variously combined, but can never be identified. The analytical process can never be synthetical, nor can the synthetical process ever be analytical in the same case and in the same respect. Neither can it be said that the one method were more eminently scientific than the other, though either method, or both of them, may be very unscientifically handled. Thus it is equally unscientific to base a system of ethics upon a false definition of the law as it is to construct a system of ethics from an apparatus of texts which do not contain law but gospel. In the former case the synthetical method, in the latter, the analytical method would be bunglingly employed.

That the synthetical method is generally preferred in many scientific works is due not to a more scientific character of the method, but to the fact that a synthetical treatise generally presupposes extensive analytical investigation and construction, processes which have led to the formation

of concepts and the establishment of laws and principles, from which the synthetical exhibition of the subject in hand may properly proceed. It is on the adequacy of these concepts and the correctness of these principles that the synthetical development of the subject to be thus exhibited must chiefly depend. And here lies the fundamental weakness of Dr. Weidner's work. Being in the main synthetical in plan and execution, its very first requisite ought to have been an adequate notion of theology laid down in a precise definition. But this is precisely what we fail to find anywhere in this book. The opening section of the work, it is true, proceeds from a "definition of the science," stating that "Theological Encyclopaedia is that branch of theological science itself which presents a summary view of what is embraced in theological knowledge."¹) But this definition, which, by the way, is wrong, both as to the genus and to the specific difference, is theoretically and practically worthless in the absence of a correct, precise and complete definition of "theological science itself," and a careful and repeated perusal of the work has failed to reveal to us what the author really means by "theological science." In the opening paragraph of Part I, treating of "General Theological Encyclopaedia," he tells us that "theology, like law and medicine, is a positive or applied science."²) But here again we are left in the dark as to the question, what a "positive or applied science" may be. In the quotations from Bain and Cave various statements are made concerning science, but nowhere do we find a definition of science or of positive or applied science. Again, Part II, treating of "Special Theological Encyclopaedia or of Exegetical Theology," apparently proceeds from a definition of exegetical theology which is promised by the heading of § 40, "Definition and Problem of Exegetical Theology;"³) but that promise is not made good in the paragraph, which says,

1) p. 17.

2) p. 71.

3) p. 112.

in part, what exegetical theology *comprises*, but not what exegetical theology *is*. The purported "definition" is, in fact, no definition at all, giving neither the genus nor the true specific difference of the notion to be defined. And thus throughout the entire work the author persistently neglects to give us in a concise and complete statement what the various realities, successively taken up for consideration, really and truly are. In this respect even Raebiger (not Raebinger, as he is registered by our author throughout), whose theological positions are generally wrong, deserves favorable mention for having brief and pithy definitions of his concepts as he develops them in his *Theologik*. The defect we have pointed out as running through the entire work of Dr. Weidner imparts to the book a vagueness which is all the more conspicuous in a treatise which should rather excel in clearness and pointedness as a student's Vademecum through the essentials of theology.

This lack of precision and definiteness also appears in various details of the work. Thus the paragraphs on the significance of doctrine in religion, in Christianity and in Protestantism¹⁾ are far from doing justice to the subject, the relation of Christianity to Judaism and Heathenism and the relation of Lutheranism and Calvinism, which is not only that of more or less, but that of truth and error. The reader may judge for himself as we give these paragraphs *in extenso*.

§ 11. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DOCTRINE IN RELIGION.

"If the teaching office is the highest spiritual trainer of mankind, it follows that only a religion which has a body of doctrine, and consequently has the office of teachers, can correspond to the idea of religion in its highest form.

"Religion has been regarded by recent writers as having manifested itself in three generic forms 1) of Law, 2) of Art, and 3) of Doctrine. *Law* defines duty without inspiring the love which impels

1) §§ 11, 12, and 13.

man to duty. It lays stress upon unconditional obedience and the consequent recompense, but it knows nothing of unconstrained love and enthusiasm. It is deficient in that it does not provide for the free exercise of the religious disposition. *Art* may inspire love, but the love it inspires is too vague to direct the mind definitely toward the supreme object of love, and yet more too vague to connect the heart with it. The moral element is entirely subordinate, and is not even desired to become prominent, for fear that it might injure the purpose of art. Art is deficient in not possessing the strict principles and the impelling power of the ethical. *Doctrine* supplies the truth, which moulds the mind, kindles the heart, and directs the will. It embraces Law and Art, relieves them of their one-sidedness, supplies what they lack, and directs them to their highest aims.

§ 12. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DOCTRINE IN CHRISTIANITY.

"The preceding section may be historically illustrated by the Jewish, Heathen, and Christian religions.

"Judaism was pre-eminently the religion of law, Classic Heathenism the religion of art, Christianity has unfolded itself in a faith or system of doctrine. Christ is the teacher, the Apostles were teachers, the ministry is a teaching office.

"We might express the parallels and antitheses of these three different religious systems, in their relation of these three elements of law, art, and doctrine thus:

"*Judaism* and *Heathenism* compared stand thus related,—Judaism has more law, more doctrine, Heathenism more art.

"*Christianity* and *Judaism* compared stand thus,—equal in law, Christianity has more art and more doctrine.

"Compared with *Heathenism* Christianity has more law, more doctrine, equal art.

"Heathenism exhausts its strength in the effort to construct a thoughtful and frequently artistic *Symbolism*, seeking to represent in concrete form to the senses its religious spirit. Nowhere in heathendom does the human spirit rise above natural conceptions. In the figures of his gods the heathen beholds simply the form of his own being. Heathenism is extravagant in ceremonial manipulations and changeless customs, but indifferent about moral manifestations, and unconcerned about the eternal nature of things. The great importance of Socrates consists in this, that he turned the attention of philosophy away from nature and toward man, and that he aroused reflection upon moral and religious questions (*Hagenbach*).

§ 13. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DOCTRINE IN PROTESTANTISM.

"The gauge of doctrine is the gauge of Christianity. Doctrine is more prominent in Protestantism than in Romanism, because Protestantism is more Christian than Romanism.

"Comparing *Protestantism* and *Romanism*, Protestantism has less positive law, more moral law, more doctrine; Romanism has more art.

"Comparing *Lutheranism* and *Calvinism*, Lutheranism has less positive law, equal in moral law, more art, more doctrine.

"The Lutheran Reformation in Germany bore predominantly the character of reaction against the Judaism that had intruded into the Church, while the Reformation in Switzerland (*the Reformed*) was chiefly a reaction against paganism.

"As pure Christianity conditions its elements of *law* and *art*, by its highest element which is *doctrine*, the *ministry* in its true function in the Protestant Church aims primarily at teaching men." pp. 38 ff.

This will never do. Heathenism is not the religion of art, but the religion of false gods or of the devils,¹⁾ and it is a disparagement of Christianity to say that "compared with Heathenism Christianity has more law, more doctrine, equal art," and a debasement of Protestantism to say that "comparing Protestantism and Romanism, Protestantism has less positive law, more moral law, more doctrine; Romanism has more art."

We do not know whether this misconception of the true nature of the true religion and the various false religions has influenced the author in his estimate of certain works catalogued in his synopsis of theological literature under the various heads of his book. But certain estimates put on certain works certainly strike us as remarkable in a Lutheran hand-book of theological Encyclopaedia. Thus the book on pastoral rule by Gregory the Great is lifted into relief by the following comment: "The work deserves careful study, being one of the best of its kind, useful for all

1) 1 Cor. 10, 20: "I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God."

times.”¹⁾ The truth is that Gregory’s *Regula Pastoralis* indeed deserves careful study, not so much as a work “bearing on theological Encyclopaedia,” but as the mediaeval text-book of pastoral theology, exhibiting a veritable caricature of a Christian pastor and affording for all times a testimony to the base counterfeit which antichristian Rome has for many centuries palmed off upon Christianity and the world for the religion and doctrine of Christ and his apostles. Another caricature of Christian theology, Schleiermacher’s “Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums,” is also very inadequately dealt with by quotations from Hagenbach and Schaff.²⁾ The entire book of Schleiermacher hardly contains a single theological statement which does not propose or imply a fundamental error. The estimate of Spener as a theologian is also misleading. Spener did not “revive the spirit of the Reformation;”³⁾ on the contrary he, though unwillingly and unwittingly, contributed largely toward a movement which was un-Lutheran in principle and rapidly drifted away both from the formal and the material principle of the Reformation.

But more serious than all the grievances which we have hitherto stated are the objections which we must raise against Dr. Weidner’s theological position in one of the fundamental points of Christian theology. The definition of the Bible given in § 41 of the “Brief System of Hermeneutics” is:

“The Bible is a collection of original and primary documents, either of a directly religious character, or pertaining to a history of religion.”⁴⁾

Again, in § 145 he says:

THE TWO ELEMENTS AND THE TWO FACTORS IN THE BIBLE.

“The Bible contains two elements—a divine and a human. The writers expressly assert that the Holy Spirit spake by them (Matt. 10: 20; Acts 2: 4; 2 Pet. 1: 21), and at the same time assert

1) p. 22.

2) p. 25.

3) p. 24.

4) p. 113.

as expressly that they spoke and wrote as independent writers (John 12: 38, 39, 41; Gal. 5: 2; etc.), and each author has his own manner of expressing his thoughts. These facts prove the existence of two factors, whose mysterious union produced the Holy Scriptures. These two factors are the Holy Spirit and the minds of the sacred writers." ¹⁾

The definition of inspiration given in §.140 is:

"Inspiration is that act of God by which he preserved man from error in proclaiming the will of God by word of mouth, or in committing to writing the original Scriptures." ²⁾

In §§ 126 and 127 the author contrasts the "false views held by many at the present day," and one of which he terms mechanical inspiration, which, he says, was the "view of the older dogmaticians," with what he considers "the true method of answering the question." Not only in justice, but with sincere pleasure we offset these quotations and references by the following statements of our author:

"The sacred writings are inspired, and their inspiration is *plenary*. The Bible as a whole is the Word of God, so that in every part of Scripture there is both infallible truth and divine authority." ³⁾

And again:

"The Bible is the Word of God, and not simply contains the Word of God."

But statements as these, true and enjoyable as they are in themselves, lose much of their value by being bound up with such things as we have pointed out above. The definitions of the Bible and of inspiration quoted are thoroughly inadequate, and the "view of the older dogmaticians" classed with "the false views held by many at the present day," cannot but raise serious doubts as to the true import of the author's words when he speaks of plenary inspiration as a truly Lutheran theologian would speak.

1) p. 260.

2) p. 259.

3) p. 251.

There are other things in this book to which we would take exception; but since a complete enumeration of them would require more space than the present occasion will permit, we proceed to what affords us more pleasure than what we have deemed it our duty to say in the preceding paragraphs.

In pointing out the merits of the book we would mention in the first place the synopsis of theological literature appended to the various chapters throughout the work. These catalogues, though, as a few specimens quoted above may have shown, not always reliable in the descriptions and estimates of the works recommended, are very rich, especially in works published in the English language, originals or translations. The "Brief system of general biblical Hermeneutics" embodied in the work, being an outline of Cellèrier, contains much that is commendable. The paragraphs on Textual Criticism, §§ 73 and 74, are as good as anything we have found on the subject in the same limited compass. The paragraphs on higher criticism on the Old Testament and the higher Criticism of the New Testament, §§ 68 and 69, may find a place here in full.

§ 68. THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

"There are three scholars which in various ways have contributed largely to the development of the negative critical views regarding the Old Testament. The first was the Roman Catholic, Richard Simon (1638—1712), who expressed independent views, especially concerning the composition of the Pentateuch; the second was John Semler (*d.* 1791), who, although of a religious and sincere character, was carried away by the spirit of the age, and introduced the accommodation theory, so popular in the present day, which tries to explain the Bible from the notions and prejudices of the times, and thus became the real Father of German rationalism; and the third was J. G. Eichhorn (*d.* 1827), who on account of his *Historical Introduction* to the Bible, has sometimes been called the founder of Higher Criticism. These in turn were followed by Gesenius (*d.* 1842) and Ewald (*d.* 1875), among whose followers, with more or less independence, we may mention such scholars as Hitzig,

Lagarde, Dillmann, Diestel, Merx, Stade, Siegfried, Wellhausen, Cornill, Kautsch, and others of Germany; W. Robertson Smith, Cheyne, Driver, and others of Europe; and Briggs, and others of America. All the articles on Old Testament subjects in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* have been written by negative critics, and the first volume of the English edition of Smith's *Bible Dictionary* has also been rewritten in the interest of negative Higher Criticism. Dr. Schaff says (§ 114): 'This school has revolutionized the traditional opinions and the origin and composition of the Pentateuch (or Hexateuch, including Joshua), the authorship of the great part of Isaiah (especially the exilic Deutero-Isaiah from chapters 40—66), of Daniel, of the Davidic Psalms, and the Solomonian writings. The doubts and objections of older scholars have been fortified, systematized, and an attempt made to reconstruct the entire history and literature of the Old Testament. . . . But a reaction similar to that in the Tübingen School will no doubt take place on those difficult and complicated problems, and has already begun in the line of the search after the older sources from which the various documents of the Pentateuch are derived.'

"But these theories have not as yet been established,—they are in fact nothing but speculations. We grant that there has been a most remarkable display of minute scholarship on the part of these negative critics, in the discussion of words and phrases in which they have often lost themselves,—but after all, the most of it is mere fanciful conceit. A scientific presentation of their marvelously complicated theories, divergent as they are, is to most thoughtful persons, a sufficient answer, and a demonstration of their falsity. In nearly all cases their analysis is subjective and opinionated and rests upon certain preconceived views which have no settled and sure basis. For several years this negative school has been making rapid progress, but the tide of battle is turning in Germany, in England, and in this country. We need but refer to the labors of Zahn, Rupprecht, and the writers in the *Beweis des Glaubens*, in Germany,—to the works of Cave, Douglas, Ellicott, Girdlestone, Leathes, Sayce, and Lias, in Great Britain,—and to the writings of Green and Bissell, in this country.

§ 69. THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

"Three different methods have been employed in time past to eliminate the divine and supernatural from the New Testament. 1.) The first method is that of the German rationalists, like Eichhorn, Paulus and others, who sought to explain all the miracles by

natural causes. 2) The second method employed by Voltaire and scoffers of that class, was to deny the trustworthiness of the writings by questioning the good faith of the writers, imputing to them hypocrisy and deceit. 3) The third method is that known as the method of Higher Criticism, in which the critics denied that the New Testament books were written by the persons whose names they bear. Baur (*d.* 1860) and his followers of the New Tübingen School (Zeller, Schwegler, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, etc.) deny the genuineness of all the New Testament writings, with the exception of Revelation, and the Epistles to the Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Romans—treating the rest as forgeries of the second century, resulting from a bitter struggle between the Pauline and the Petrine parties. These rationalistic critics criticise the received views of the New Testament with the utmost freedom, and reject all the traditions of the Church as to the authorship and dates of the several books. Generally speaking, their criticism is not based so much upon the matter of the book, as upon *details of language*, and upon the critic's own theory as to the *use of words*. The later scholars of the Tübingen School, however, now concede the genuineness of all but three or four of the Pauline Epistles (excluding Hebrews), and reject the three Pastoral Epistles mainly because they cannot be easily located in the known life of Paul, and because they seem to indicate a post-Pauline state of the church government and of heresy. Strauss (Baur's pupil) turned his criticism upon the Gospels, and endeavored to revolutionize the Gospel History, but only gave stimulus to the rich modern literature on the life of Christ. The relation which the three Synoptical Gospels bear to one another has given rise to the widest difference of opinion, and the Synoptical problem is by no means definitely settled, although the writer adopts the view that all three Evangelists drew from a common source, which constitutes the foundation of our first three Gospels, and that this source was the oral teaching of the Apostles, which on account of its sincerity and simplicity, immediately received a fixed form. There are strong reasons for supposing that of the three Synoptists, Mark exhibits the oral tradition of the official life of our Lord in its earliest extant form, reflecting the fresh and impulsive temper of Peter. The fact that the first (Matthew) and the third Gospels (Luke) are two writings which are altogether independent of each other is of the greatest consequence in the further investigation of the sources of the Synoptists.

"The Johannean authorship of the fourth Gospel is still in dispute among the negative critics, but the history of this discussion

is very interesting, and teaches a good lesson to modern critics. Fifty years ago DeWette very tersely expressed the general result of the higher criticism of his day when he said: 'In N. T. criticism nothing is so firmly established as that the Apostle John, if he be the author of the Gospel and the Epistles, did not write the Apocalypse; or if the latter be his work, that he cannot be the author of the other writings.' The School of Schleiermacher ascribed the Gospel and the Epistles to the Apostle John, but denied his authorship of the Apocalypse, and this view prevailed generally fifty years ago. Then the opposite view gained the ascendancy among the Higher Critics, the view of the Tübingen School, that the Apocalypse was a genuine Johannean production, but that John was not the author of the Gospel and the Epistles. And so the change of base among the negative critics will go on—the tide has its ebb and flow.

"*Schaff* (114, 115): 'There is scarcely a book in the Bible which has not been subjected to the dissecting-knife of the most searching criticism, such as would disprove the genuineness of almost any ancient book. . . . Truth will slowly but surely make its way through the wilderness of conflicting hypotheses. . . . The immense labor of Christian scholarship cannot be lost, and must accrue at last to the advantage of the Church. . . . The Bible need not fear the closest scrutiny. The critics will die, but the Bible will remain—the Book of books for all ages.' " pp. 170 ff.

As a curiosity in a work on *Theological Encyclopaedia* we give the Doctor's remarks on the use of tobacco.

"In regard to the use of *tobacco* it may be said: a) that in any case, and to any man, the excessive use of it is reprehensible. b) Many use it to whom it certainly brings no benefit—if it has any good in it, it has none for them. c) If there be feebleness of constitution—lack of vital stamina—the use of tobacco is likely to be very pernicious, if not fatal. d) If, on looking at the whole matter, there is fixed in your mind the slightest doubt of the propriety of this practice, avoid it wholly. Whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we should do it unto the Lord, and to his glory. (1 Cor. 10: 31.)" p. 60.

A. G.

The clerical life. *A Series of letters to ministers by John Watson, D. D., Prof. Marcus Dods, D. D., Prin. T. C. Edwards, D. D., Prof. James Denney, D. D., T. H. Darlow, M. A., T. G. Selby, W. Robertson Nicoll, L. L. D., J. T. Stoddard. New York, Dodd, Mead, and Company. 149—151 Fifth Avenue. 1898. VIII and 257 pages. Price, \$1.25.*

Juvenal's satires were not, by their author, intended for historical essays; and yet the study of Roman society and its ways is largely indebted to these penpictures, while it is highly probable that the author's purpose of exercising an elevating influence on the morals of his day was not achieved, and we are not sure whether such really was the poet's purpose, or whether he simply meant to offer pungent amusement to the reading public of his time. The same might, *mutatis mutandis*, be said of one of the most brilliant satires of all times, Erasmus' *Laus Stultitiæ*.—These *Letters to Ministers* are also a literary treat, a symposium of essays in epistolary form, wherein the mirror is held up to the faces and figures of various categories of modern preachers. It is not probable that these *Letters* will work a reform among those classes of preachers; they are highly instructive reading in a way probably not intended by the authors. They not only exhibit existing types of ministers which many Christians fortunately have never seen or heard, but the reproof and correction which they administer is of a nature which shows that the epistlers themselves have not brought to their task the proper notion of "the clerical life," and that the minister who would amend his ways according to their prescriptions would still be found deplorably wanting if weighed in the balance of St. Paul's Pastoral and other Epistles.

A few specimens may serve as an inducement to some of our readers to procure this interesting picture gallery.

Here is an extract from the letter *To a Minister whose Sermons last an Hour*:—

Among the charms of your sermons is their wealth of quotation and anecdote. My wife believes that you have learned by heart nearly the whole English poetry. My eldest son points out that your extracts are invariably taken from the "Thousand and One Gems," but, even if he is right, immense labour would be required to commit them to memory. Longfellow, who appears to be your favourite poet, is mine and my wife's as well and we never hear a verse from "The Psalm of Life" without a thrill of satisfaction. We like your habit of repeating the same anecdote in different sermons. This helps to stamp the lesson on the memory, and it must be a poor tale that will not bear retelling. Yet people complain of your extracts and your stories. Only last Wednesday one of the deacons said we might suppose, from your anecdotes about the Royal Family, that the Queen is constantly engaged in presenting Bibles to savage chieftains. — P. 47.

From the epistle *To a minister who has no Theology in his Sermons* we quote the following passage:

If you are not too angry, I will add one thing more. As a Christian minister it is your business to preach God to men. I have noticed in you and in other men who share your sympathies a certain want in this respect. You rather pride yourself on your knowledge of human nature, on your skill, won largely from the study of literature (and not to be won at all, as you tell me, from the study of catechisms), to read the heart and hold the mirror up to it: this is one of your great powers as a preacher. I grant it, but I should rather call it by another name. When you call it a great power, you mistake diagnosis—not always of the deepest—for therapeutics. What a preacher needs more even than the knowledge of man is the knowledge of God. Without this, his ability to read the heart is the gift of the dramatist or novel-writer, not of the evangelist. Jesus knew what was in man, but that was not His gospel. He knew the Father. It is a serious thing to say, and I would not say it without feeling my responsibility, that your preaching has more of man than of God in it, and that it is evangelically ineffective for that reason. Think about God, what He is, what He has done, what He has promised to man; think out what is involved in the Incarnation, in the Atonement, in Christ's return as Judge; think of it all as a revelation of God, not merely as a ministry to man, and say, We praise Thee,

O Lord, propter magnam tuam gloriam. These ancient words remind one of another thing also, which you interesting non-theological preachers are apt to overlook to your own and the common loss; viz., that the Christian Church has a mind, a language, and a style of its own, our part in which is lost unless we know theology to some extent both as a history and a science. — P. 62 ff.

The Minister who regards himself a Prophet of Criticism gets, aside of some concessions to which he is not entitled, such roastings as these:—

You wandered four days and part of two nights through a sandy desert of documents in order to prove that Moses could not have written Deuteronomy, and have received on an average six letters a day ever since from aggrieved members of your congregation, lamenting your fall, besides one from "A Well-wisher," pointing out kindly but firmly that an avowed atheist is hardly a fit person to be the minister of a Christian congregation. It does seem as if justice were indeed blind which crowns pious laziness with favour and thrusts honest work into the pillory, and I quite understand that you are tempted to regard religious opinion with contempt, especially if it be orthodox. — P. 106 f.

We are overrun with prophets nowadays and grotesque missions; but perhaps the most amazing prophet that ever claimed to have a mission from God is the preacher who arises to dispel the myth of the Davidic Psalms, or explain the difference between the Jehovist and Elohist documents? Where would this poor world be if that voice were silent? "Behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people!" May it not be that you are taking yourself too seriously, and that you might abandon this high walk without treachery to conscience? You have read a fair number of books, and you have a just estimate of your abilities, but one may conclude, without offence, that you are not a critic at first hand or an expert scholar. If you were, it would be necessary for you to resign your charge without delay, both for the sake of scholarship and your congregation. As you are not, it is worth your serious consideration whether you are justified in hindering your general practice by semi-amateur specialism. Unload any useful Bible criticism in your classes, and let the pulpit go free. Why should you forfeit the power of your preaching to be a sixth-rate Biblical critic?

My belief is that you are largely influenced in this unfortunate effort by the fact that a handful of skeptical people sit in your church. They are not five per cent of the congregation, but their pres-

ence makes you self-conscious and serves to deflect your thought. Something especially liberal and intellectual must be placed before this company, and you have gone hunting in the wastes of criticism for their food. Are you perfectly certain that this class will be carried captive by a Bible you treat ostentatiously as ancient literature, or that after hard brain work during the week they hunger for new problems on Sunday? Could they not read Kuenen for themselves, if this be their soul's desire, and is it not possible that they have come to you for guidance and stimulus in the spiritual life? May it not have been the soul of the Bible that has attracted these aliens, and you have dissected its body for their edification? They came for bread, although they did not say so, and, with the best intentions in the world, you have offered them a stone.—Pp. 111 ff.

A. G.

Teologisk Tidsskrift. *Redigeret af Prof. H. G. Stub. Decorah, Iowa. Lutheran Publishing House. 1899.*

The only regret we feel at the appearance of this new theological quarterly is caused by the conviction that what our esteemed friend and brother, Prof. H. G. Stub, is here doing ought to have been done long ago. The Norwegian Synod, of which the editor of this new publication has for many years been a member, is a body which comprises not only a sufficient number of ministers and educated laymen to support a periodical of this kind besides the synodical organ intended for the people at large, but also contains a number of able theologians of profound learning and ample experience and highly qualified for theological literary work. A theological quarterly or monthly might have rendered very efficient services to the Synod and its members in times of long continued controversies on fundamental points of Lutheran doctrine and contributed largely toward united efforts in behalf of a cause which was well worthy of the best endeavors of all those therein concerned. But better late than never. Though the day of *Norwegian* Lutheranism is doubtless declining and its shadows are lengthen-

ing eastward, its sun has not yet touched the Western horizon and its rays are still sufficiently bright to enable hundreds and perhaps thousands of Norwegian Lutherans in this country to enjoy the exhibition of sound Lutheran doctrine in a Norwegian publication. Besides, our Norwegian brethren certainly owe a large unpaid debt to those who have remained in the mother country across the seas, and it may be hoped that their testimony may find open ears and hearts and a ready response where the cradles of the fathers of Norwegian Lutheranism in America and many of their children have stood years ago.

The banner which is unfurled and wafted to the breezes in the first issue of the *Teologisk Tidsskrift* is that of the Lutheran church, the doctrine of the apostles and prophets and of the Lutheran symbols without limitation or curtailment. The chief end and aim of its editor and contributors, as announced in the preface of this first volume, is to champion the cause of sound doctrine as drawn from the fountain of the unerring and infallible word of God, the holy Scriptures, against all the onslaughts of modern Gnosticism sailing under the flag of Christian theology. The titles of the articles contained in the first issue of 64 pages are: "Preface," pp. 1—15. "Not two but one record of creation," pp. 15—25. "The Danish pastor Rasmus Jensen, the first Lutheran preacher in America," pp. 26—41. "An important chapter in Baptist history," pp. 42—49. "From what year does the public literary activity of Luther date?" pp. 49—52. "English Hymnology," pp. 53—56. "Reviews," pp. 63 and 64. The *Tidsskrift* is published in four issues annually of 64 pages each, at the price of \$1.00 per annum, at the Lutheran Publishing House, Decorah, Iowa.

A. G.
