

Monergism

Herman Bavinck

The Doctrine of

Revelation

Monergism

Herman Bavinck

The Doctrine of

Revelation

The Doctrine of Revelation

Principium externum

by Herman Bavinck

Table of Contents

1. GENERAL REVELATION

-- A. Concept of revelation.

-- B. General and special revelation

-- C. Inadequacy of general revelation.

-- D. Value of general revelation.

2. SPECIAL REVELATION

-- A. Means of special revelation.

-- B. Concept of special revelation.

-- C. Revelation and Supranaturalism.

-- D. The special Revelation and Naturalism

3. THE HOLY SCRIPTURES

- A. Revelation and Scripture.
- B. The doctrine of inspiration.
- C. The inspiration according to the Scriptures.
- D. Concept of inspiration.
- E. Objections to inspiration.

4. PROPERTIES OF SCRIPTURE

- A. The properties of Scripture in general.
- B. The authority of Scripture.
- C. The necessity of Scripture.
- D. The clarity of Scripture.
- E. The sufficiency of Scripture.

Disclaimer Concerning Copyright

1. GENERAL REVELATION.

A. Concept of revelation.

1. Religion, examined in its essence and origin, leads itself to the concept of revelation. The history of religions makes us know this concept as the necessary correlate of all religion. The philosophy of religion can no longer pass over this concept in silence. But the way in which revelation is understood in theology and philosophy is not always in harmony with the concept itself. The concept of revelation brings with it a certain content, which must be recognized in its truth in order to continue to speak of revelation. It may not be used as a flag that covers a false charge. In the first place, revelation is a thoroughly religious concept; it is not philosophy but religion, not reason but history that offer it to us. Science and philosophy must therefore be denied the right to define this concept a priori and to tailor to it the historical and religious phenomena which are summarized under the name of revelation. It goes without saying that philosophical systems such as pan-theism and materialism cannot recognize this concept in its true sense. In these systems there is no place for revelation. Both are by virtue of their principle incapable of judging the value of revelation and thus also of judging the religion to which it is inextricably bound. If -God does not exist and, as Feuerbach says in *Wesen des Christenthums*, 2nd ed. 401, the secret of theology is anthropology, then religion and revelation are automatically judged and nothing but a hallucination of the human mind. And similarly, pan-theism, by its very nature, cannot attribute any reality to revelation. If God and man are one in substance, a relation of man to God, as established in religion, is no longer possible. Religion is then at best the coming to self-awareness of God in mankind, the return of the Absolute to Himself in human consciousness. Revelation can here be nothing else than a name for religion in mankind, seen from its objective side. Thus says e. g. Ed. von Hartmann, *Religionsphilosophie* II 71, 75 u. s. w., that revelation objectively and faith subjectively are one and the same act, understood from the divine and from the human side. There is then no external, objective revelation. Revelation is nothing but the living and working of God in every human being. Leaving aside the question whether there is any truth in this, and whether objective revelation must not subjectively complete itself in the illusion, it is

nevertheless clear that revelation according to the idea which religion and the history of religions make known to us, is hereby entirely lost. Religion is always a relation of man to a divine person, whose objective and real existence is beyond doubt for the religious consciousness. As soon as man begins to doubt the distinct and independent existence of the object of his worship, his religion is finished. This relation of mankind to God in religion is of an ethical nature (supra note 193). Religion is not a physical or metaphysical community of God and man, as is so often said. It does not exist in a unity of being, a unio or communio physica of mankind with God. It is not the substance of man, and does not constitute his being, his *essentia*. Religion always presupposes that God and man, although related, are nevertheless distinct. And religion itself does not exist in a relation of God to man, for God has no religion, but in a relation of man to God. This relationship is of course not physical, metaphysical, *realis*, but ethical, moral in nature. It consists in that man knows and loves God and lives for Him, Denzinger, *Vier Bücher von der religiösen Erkenntniss*, Würzburg 1856 I S. 1-10. Hoekstra, *Wis. Religious Theory I* 57 v. 64. Religion does presuppose that God and man are related to each other and in a good sense also in community with each other, but is itself not two-sided but one-sided. However closely religion and revelation may be connected, they are still two; they are not two sides of the same thing, but are essentially and objectively different from one another. Just as the eye and the light, the ear and the sound, the logos within us and the logos outside us are related and yet distinct, so it is with religion and revelation. It is the same in the religious field as in any other field. We come into the world naked and bring nothing with us. We receive all our food, both in the spiritual and in the natural sense, from outside. And also in religion the contents come to us from outside by means of revelation.

2. Revelation, as this term is used in religion, and taken here in its broadest sense, is all action emanating from God to bring mankind into that peculiar relationship with Him which is indicated by the name of religion. It is important, first of all, to understand this

revelation always and everywhere as an action, an act of God. God never does anything unconsciously; He does everything with a thought and has a purpose in everything. Revelation is never an unconscious emanation, an involuntary appearance of God in His works; but always a conscious, free, active making Himself known to mankind. Religion and revelation both rest by their nature on the foundation of theism, i.e. on the belief that God and man are not separate but distinct. In strong terms, revelation always presupposes that there are two worlds, a supernatural and a natural one, a heavenly and an earthly one. And revelation is any effect that emanates from the other unseen world into this visible world, to make man think of the things that are above. The ways and forms in which God reveals Himself can differ, just as one human being can make Himself known to another in different ways. God can reveal Himself directly and immediately; and He can do so by ordinary or extraordinary means. These forms are, in a certain sense, of secondary, if not instructional, significance. But always the revelation, whether it comes to us in an ordinary or in an extraordinary way, is an act of God. Whoever understands it in this way is in principle a supranaturalist; he may or may not accept the possibility of a miracle. The question of naturalism and supranaturalism is not first decided at the time of so-called supernatural revelation, but in fact already here at the entrance, at the concept of revelation in the general sense. Deism is untenable. There is only a choice between theism and pantheism (materialism). Pantheism has no revelation and therefore no religion. Theism is naturally supranaturalistic, not in the his-torical sense of the word, but in the sense that it recognizes an *ordo supra hanc naturam* and assumes an operation of the outside world in it. Religion, revelation, supranaturalism, theism stand and fall with each other. The purpose of revelation is no other than to awaken and cultivate religion in the man. Everything that serves this purpose is revelation in the true sense. Revelation coincides with all God's works of nature and grace. It encompasses the whole of creation and re-creation. Everything that exists and happens is a means for the pious to lead them to God. The usual definitions that Revelation consists of the communication

of doctrine or life, etc., already appear to be much too narrow in this case. It is God's purpose in His revelation to place man in a religious relationship to Him. Religion, however, embraces mankind with all his faculties and powers. In revelation God approaches man as a whole, to win him completely for His service of love. Revelation cannot aim to place man in a religious relationship with God. Mankind is one whole. It is the object of God's love. Revelation's ultimate goal, therefore, is to make mankind itself as a single whole into a kingdom, a people of God. Revelation is not an isolated historical fact. It is a system of acts of God, beginning with creation and ending in the new heaven and the new earth. It is instruction, education, guidance, government, renewal, forgiveness, etc., all of these things together. Revelation is everything that God does to recreate mankind in His image and likeness.

B. General and special revelation.

3. Christian theology soon came to make a significant distinction in this revelation. On the one hand, the coherence and harmony of the Christian religion and the Pagan religion, of theology and philosophy, could not be wholly denied; and on the other hand, Christianity was a separate and distinct religion, differing in every respect from the Pagans. Thus one was led to the distinction between the *revelatio* (*religio, theologia*) *naturalis* and *supernaturalis*. As a matter of fact, it is already found among the oldest church fathers. Justinus Martyr speaks of an *αν&ρωπειος διδασκαλία*, which is obtained by *το ἐμφυτον παντι γενε! ἀνίλρωπων σπέρμα του λογον* and of a *γνωσις και 'εωρια*, which only through Christ becomes our portion, *Apol. II 8, 10, 13*. Tertullian has a separate treatise the *testimonio animae*, and speaks of a knowledge of God from the works of creation, and of another more complete through men filled with God's Spirit, *Apolog. II c. 18*. Irenaeus speaks more—many times in the same sense, *adv. haer. II c. 6, 9, 28. III 25. IV 6*. Augustine recognizes a revelation of God in nature, *de Gen. ad. litt. 4, 32, de civ. Dei 8, 11 sq. 19, 1 etc.*, but puts next to the *ratio* the *auctoritas*, the *fides*, *c. Acad. 3,20 the util. cred. 11*, which alone leads to the true

knowledge of God, Conf. 5,5, 7,26, de civ. 10,29. By Damascenus, de fide orthod. I. c. 1 sq. this distinction already bears the character of a dogma. The later division of the *theologia naturalis* into *insita* and *acquisita* is also to be found already with the oldest church writers. Tertullian appeals to the inner witness of the soul and to the contemplation of God's works. Augustine says explicitly that God can be known from the visible, de Gen. ad. litt. 4,32 but points especially to self-awareness and self-knowledge as the way to eternal truth, de vera relig. 72, the mag. 38, the trin. 4,1. Damascenus, de fide orth. I c. 1 and 3, already clearly juxtaposes the innate and the acquired knowledge of God. The boundaries between the two types of revelation were not so readily demarcated. For a long time people still tried to prove the Christian dogmata from nature and reason. Augustine tried to prove the Trinity, the Trin. lib. 9-15, Anselmus in his *Cur deus homo* the *menschen*-genesis and satisfaction, Albertus Magnus, cf. Stöckl, *Philos. des M. A.* II. 384 f., and Thomas, S. c. Gent. II. 15 sq. prove the creation *aposteriori*. Raymund de Sabunde went furthest in this respect, who in his *Liber naturae sive creaturarum*, later erroneously called *Theologia naturalis* (ed. by J. Sighart, Solisbaci, 1852 without the prologue, which was condemned in 1595) attempted to build up the whole of Christian doctrine from the nature of man, without the aid of Scripture and tradition and avoiding the scholastic method. But this rational argumentation was only an aid that came after; the dogmata were fixed *apriori* on the basis of revelation; *adjuvantur in fide invisibilium per ea, quae facta sunt*, Lombardus, Sent. I dist. 3, 6. cf. 2, 1. Furthermore, the knowledge that could be obtained from nature was limited to a few *articuli mixti*, which concentrated on the three concepts of God, virtue and immortality, Thomas, S. c. Gent. Lib. 1-3. The distinction between the *theol. naturalis* and *supernaturalis*, however, became more and more rigid in scholasticism and passed into an absolute opposition. By natural revelation some strictly scientific knowledge of God and divine matters could be obtained, Thomas, S. Theol. II 2 qu. 1 art. 5, cf. Bellarminus, Controv. IV p. 277 sq. Thomas is so firmly convinced of this, that he raises the question, whether in that case the acceptance of these truths known from nature does not lose

all its merit. Believing is only meritorious, if it is not knowing but a taking for true on authority, an act of reason *ex motu voluntatis motae per gratiam*, *ib. II 2 qu. 2 art. 9*. The answer to that question is, that knowing indeed diminishes the *ratio fidei*; but still the *ratio caritatis* always remains in the believer, i. e. the disposition to accept what is known as true also again and again on God's authority, *ib. II 2 qu. 2 art. 10*; and this disposition, to believe the *articuli mixti* on authority, remains always necessary because of special circumstances (see later under N° 7). To this knowledge of nature and reason the knowledge of the mysteries has now been added by supernatural revelation, but this rests solely on authority and is and remains from beginning to end a matter of faith. The mysteries of Christianity belong to an order, which is not accidental, because of sin, but which is, of course, supernatural to every man, even to sinless men, and even to the angels, and therefore can never be known except by revelation. This peculiar Roman doctrine will be discussed in more detail in connection with special revelation. But here it should already be noted that knowing and believing, *ratio* and *auctoritas*, natural and supernatural revelation, all coexist in a dualistic way with Rome. Thus, on the one hand, Rome recognizes the right of rationalism in the realm of natural revelation and condemns excessive supranaturalism, which even in the *articuli mixti* considers no knowledge possible except through revelation. On the other hand, it upholds supranaturalism in the field of the mysteries as strictly as possible and condemns all rationalism which, *apriori* or *aposteriori* in the dogmata, seeks to escape authority and faith and to turn them into knowledge. It rejects both Tertullian and Origen and condemns both the traditionalism of de Bonald and the rationalism of Hermes (cf. above page 94). The Roman Church confesses, according to the *Vaticanum*, *sess. Ill Const. Dogm. de fide cath. cap. 2*, *Deum... natural! humanae rationis lumine e rebus creatis certo cognosci posse*, but that it has pleased God, *alia, eaque supernaturali via, se ipsum ac aeterna voluntatis decreta humano generi revelare*.

4. The Reformation has adopted this distinction of *revelatio naturalis* and *supernaturalis* and yet has given it, in principle, an entirely different meaning. The Reformers did accept a revelation of God in nature. But mankind's intellect had been so darkened by sin that he could not rightly know and understand this revelation either. It was therefore necessary that God should include in special revelation those truths which are in themselves discernible from nature; and that man should first be enlightened by God's Spirit in order to perceive God again in nature. In order to understand the general revelation of God in nature, man objectively needed special revelation in Scripture, which Calvin compared to spectacles, and subjectively man needed the eye of faith to see God in the works of His hands. Equally important was the change made by the Reformation in the concept of supernatural revelation. It was not in the first place supernatural for that reason, since it belonged to a different order and was beyond the understanding of sinful man and of angels; but it was supernatural above all because it far exceeded the thoughts and desires of sinful, fallen man, as will be shown later. With the Reformers, therefore, the *theologia naturalis* lost its rational independence. It was not treated separately but included in the Christian doctrine, Zwingli, *Comm. de vera et falsa relig.* Op. ed. Schuier et Schulthess III 156 sq. Calvin, *Inst.* I c. 1-5. Polanus, *Synt. Theol.* I cap. 10. Martyr, *Loci Comm.* loc. 2 etc. But several causes were there, which prevented this reformatory principle from its development and full application. There was *excessus*, *overstrain*, on the one side. Anabaptism rejected the *ordo naturalis* entirely and sought in a revolutionary way to establish a kingdom of heaven on earth. The Socinians rejected the *theologia naturalis* entirely, and derived all knowledge of God from revelation, *Catech. Racov.* qu. 46-49. Fock, *Der Socin.* 307 f. Luther, by his opposition to the scholastic doctrine, *naturalia mansisse integra*, went so far as to forbid Aristotle, reason, and philosophy in *theologicis* all right to speak and to call *Vernunft* in religious things *stock-, star- und gar blind*, Köstlin, *Luther's Theology* II 287 f. Luthardt, *Ethik Luthers*, 14 f. Strauss, *Glaubenslehre* I 311f. The strict Lutherans followed the Master; and the *Formula Concordiae*, though recognizing that

humana ratio seu intellectus naturalis hominis obscuram aliquam notitiae illius scintillulam reliquam habet, quod sit Deus, et particulam aliquam legis tenet, II Pars. Sol. Part. II. de lib. arb., J. T. Muller, Die symb. Bücher der ev. luth. K. 5th Aufl. 1882 S. 589, nevertheless lays such one-sided emphasis on the darkness and impotence of the natural man in matters of religion, that the coherence and connection of the special with the general revelation is entirely broken; man in rebus spiritualibus et ad conversionem aut regenerationem is nothing more than a lapis, truncus aut limus, ib. with Müller S. 594.

The reaction against this could not fail to be noticed. In Anabaptism and Socinianism excessive supranaturalism turned into rationalism. Luther was forced to make a sharp distinction between the spiritual and the temporal, the heavenly and the earthly, the eternal and the temporal, Köstlin, Luther's Theol II 244 f., because he could not deny reason all insight and judgment. And following in his footsteps, the Lutheran theologians made a distinction between duo hemisphaeria, quorum unum inferius, alterum superius ; in earthly things reason is still free and capable of much good, here it is to a certain extent independent of faith, Schmid, Dogm. der ev. luth. K. 192 f. Even Calvin, though in a much more favorable condition than Luther with his doctrine of gratia communis, could not always overcome the old dualistic opposition of revelatio naturalis and supernaturalis, Inst. II, 2, 12, 13. It seemed that it did not always have to be led by faith, but that it was free and independent in an area, albeit still so small and undifferentiated. With this right, granted to her or at least not seriously challenged, she has profited; gradually she has extended her power. First in civil affairs, then in science, later in philosophy, and finally also in theology, she elevated herself next to and against faith. Alsted published a Theol. naturalis 1615 separately, and counted as its contents seven dogmata: deus est, super omnia diligendus, honeste vivendum est, quod tibi non vis fieri alteri ne feceris, suum cuique tribuendum est, nemo laedendus est, plus est in bono communi positum quam in particulari, cf. Praecognita 1623 p. 37-114. Many Geref. theologians followed this example, especially

when the philosophy of Cartesius gained influence, Doedes, *Inl. to the doctrine of God*, 2nd ed. 1880 p. 200 f. Through English deism and German rationalism the *theologia naturalis* or *rationalis* increased in power and prestige to such an extent, that it rejected the *theologia revelata* as entirely unnecessary. Herbert of Cherbury 1581-1648, gave to the *religio naturalis* five articles as content: *esse deum summum, coli debere, virtutem pietatem- que esse praecipuas partes cultus divini, dolendum esse ob peccata ab iisque resipiscendum, dari ex bonitate justitiaque divina praemium vel poenam turn in hac vita turn post hanc vitam*, Lechler, *Gesch. des engl. Deismus* 42. But after she had banned the *theologia revelata*, she in turn was also judged herself. Kant argued in his critique of pure reason that it is limited to sensory phenomena and cannot penetrate either the transcendental or the supernatural. The history of religions showed that no single religion was sufficient to satisfy the *revelatio naturalis*, that there was no *religio naturalis* anywhere and that all religions were positive. And the criticism of Scripture undermined the *revelatio supernaturalis* and erased the boundaries between it and the *revelatio naturalis*. Thus the conviction became general that, in order to obtain some knowledge of God, one had to take a path other than that of reason and scientific proof, namely, that of faith, of moral experience, or of phantasy. *Theologia* and *religio naturalis*, and with them also the *revelatio naturalis*, lost their value. The proofs of God's existence, the soul, immortality, were given up and banned from dogmatics. Pierson, *Eene levens-bouwing* 83, even said that education in the *theol. naturalis* at state colleges was a waste of the nation's money. Nevertheless, in the law on higher education it has been included again under the name of history of the doctrine of God and of philosophy of religion. Prof. Doedes rejected it in his *Encyclopaedia*, 190 ff, but actually treated it again in his *Introduction to the Doctrine of God*, 2nd ed. 1880 and *The Doctrine of God* 1871. Everything indicates, as will be shown in the *locus de Deo*, that the evidence for God's existence is rising in value again. The good idea, which lies in the old *theologia naturalis*, is gradually being better recognized.

5. Although Scripture has the concept of a fixed order of nature, it makes no distinction in its revelation between the natural and the supernatural. She uses the same words for both, e.g. $\eta\gamma$, $\varphi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\tau$ and $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\chi\alpha\lambda\upsilon\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\nu$ also for the *revelatio naturalis* Job 12: 22, 33: 16, 36: 10 ; Rom. 1: 18, 19. Nösgen, *Beweis des Glaubens*, Nov. 1890 S. 416-417 therefore wrongly objects to giving the revelation of God in nature the name of revelation. Actually, from the point of view of Scripture, all revelation, including that in nature, is supernatural. The word itself does not imply anything about the way in which something is revealed, but only that something which was hidden is brought to light. In the religious sphere it indicates that God has an independent life, distinct from nature, and that in one way or another He can appear from His hiddenness to reasonable creatures. Therefore, in a real sense, only those who recognize the supranatural, an *ordo supra hanc naturam*, can speak of revelation; and everyone who uses the word in this sense is in principle a supranaturalist, even if he only accepts revelation in the natural way. The distinction between *revelatio naturalis* and *supernaturalis* does not derive from the action of God which is manifested in one and the other revelation, but from the manner in which that revelation occurs, namely, *per* or *praeter hanc naturam*. In origin all revelation is supranatural. God always works John 5: 17. That working of God began outwardly with creation. The creation is the first revelation of God, the beginning and basis of all subsequent revelation. The biblical concept of revelation is rooted in that of creation, Oehler, *Theol. des A. T.* 1882 S. 21. Through creation, God first came out before creatures and revealed Himself to creatures. When God creates the world through His Word and makes it alive through His Spirit, therein already lie the foundations of all subsequent revelations. But the creation is immediately followed by providence. This too is an omnipotent and omnipresent power and act of God. All that is and is done is a work of God in the true sense, and for the pious a revelation of His virtues and perfections. This is how the Scriptures view nature and history. Creation, maintenance and government are one powerful, ongoing revelation of God. No poetry of nature has surpassed or equalled that of Israel, Pierson, Geestel.

Ancestors I Israel p. 389 f. Everything in nature speaks to the pious of God. The heavens tell of God's glory, the firmament of His hands work. God's voice is on the great waters. That voice breaks the cedars, in the thunder, roars in the stormy wind. The light is his garment, the sky his curtain, the clouds his chariot. His breath creates and renews the earth. He rains and gives sunshine over the righteous and the unrighteous. Praise and glory, rain and drought, fruitful and unfruitful years, and all things are not given to the believer by chance but by God's fatherly hand. The natural and historical view of Scripture is religious and therefore supranatural.

For Scripture even religion and supernatural revelation are closely related. It tells of such revelation not only after, but also before the fall. The relationship between God and man in the status integritatis is described as a personal relationship. God speaks to man Gen. 1:28-30, gives him a commandment he could not know by nature Gen. 2:16 and adds as if by his own hand the woman to help him, Gen. 2 vs. 22. Also the foedus operum is not in the sense of a foedus naturae, that it arises naturally from man's natural disposition, but is a fruit of supernatural revelation. And since the foedus operum is nothing but the form of religion in man created in God's image who had not yet attained the highest, it can be said that Scripture cannot conceive of pure religion without revelatio supernaturalis. The supernatural does not conflict with man's nature, nor with the nature of the creatures; it belongs, so to speak, to man's nature. Man is the image of God and related to God, and through religion he stands in direct relation to God. The nature of this relationship implies that God is both objectively and subjectively public to man, created in His image. There is no religion without tradition, dogma, and worship; and these are all interwoven with the concept of revelation. All religions, therefore, are positive and rely not only on natural but always on real or perceived supernatural revelation. And all human beings by nature recognize the supranatural. Naturalism, like atheism, is a philosophical invention, but it has no support in human nature. As long as religion is part of man's nature, man will also be and remain a supranaturalist. Every believer, of whatever

orientation, may be a naturalist with his head, but he is a supranaturalist with his heart. Whoever wants to banish the supranatural from religion, i.e. from prayer, from fellowship with God, kills religion itself. For religion presupposes real kinship and communion with God and is supranaturalist in heart and soul. It is inseparable from the belief that God is supra-natural and that He can do with her as He pleases, that He makes the natural order subservient to the moral order, the riches of the world to the kingdom of heaven, physis to ethos. It has therefore been rightly said that the prayer for a pure heart is as supranaturalistic as that for a healthy body (Pierson). The theist, who wants to be a true theist and yet disputes the supernatural revelation, is by no means finished with this denial. He must either return to deism or pantheism, or he must advance and also accept the possibility of supernatural revelation. There is no religio naturalis. The rationalis-tic trilogy is untenable. The only true contradiction of the recognition of the supranatural is therefore not ratio-nalistic deism, but naturalism, i.e. the belief that there is no other higher power than that which is present in the present order of nature 'and manifests itself. But then all right to believe in the triumph of the good, in the final triumph of the kingdom of God, in the power of the moral world order, also falls away. For the good, the true, the moral order, the kingdom of God, are things that have no power of their own to be realized. The hope that mankind will bring them into being and succumb to the power of truth is disappointed every day by experience. Only then is their triumph assured, when God is a personal, omnipotent being and can lead all creation, despite all opposition, to His intended goal. Religion, morality, the recognition of a destiny for humanity and the world, the belief in the triumph of the good, the theistic world view, the belief in a personal God are all inextricably linked to supranaturalism. The idea of God and of religion involves that of revelation. Pierson , God's miracle power and our spiritual life 1867 bl. 10 v. 36 v. James Orr, The Christian view of God and the world, Edinb. 1893 p. 60 etc. 91 etc. Cf. Rauwenhoff, Wijsbeg. v. godsd. 530 v.

6. Supernatural revelation, however, is not to be identified with immediate revelation. The distinction between indirect and immediate revelation has always been taken in a different sense. In the past every revelation was called direct, which came to the recipient himself without an intermediary; and indirect, which was transmitted to others by angels or men, Witsius, Misc. Sacral. Insofar as revelation came to the prophets and apostles in person, but only came to us through their writings, the former could be contrasted with the latter as *revelatio immediata*. With the rationalist and modern theologians these terms have often received an entirely different meaning, thereby increasing the confusion in the understanding of revelation, Rothe, zur Dogm. 55 f. 64 f. Nitzsch, Lehrb. der ev. Dogm. 163 f. In the strict sense there is no immediate revelation, either in nature or in grace. God always makes use of a means, either taken from the creatures or freely chosen, by which He reveals Himself to mankind. By signs and symbols He makes them feel His opposition; by deeds He proclaims His virtues; by speech and language He makes His will and thought known to them. Even when He reveals Himself to the conscious mind through His Spirit, this revelation always takes place organically and therefore through the intermediary way. The distance between Creator and creature is far too great for man to perceive God directly. *Finitum non est capax infiniti*. Whether there will be a *visio Dei per essentiam* in the status gloriae, can only be examined later. But in this dispensation all revelation is indirect. As God is and speaks in Himself, He cannot be seen or understood by any creature. Revelation is therefore always an act of grace; in it God descends to His creature, which is made in His image. All revelation is anthropomorphism, a certain incarnation of God. It always takes place in certain forms, in certain modes. In the *revelatio naturalis*, His divine and eternal thoughts are deposited in the creatures in a creaturely manner, so that they can be understood by the thinking man. And in the *revelatio supernaturalis* He binds Himself to space and time, adopts human language and speech, and makes use of creaturely means, Gen. 1:28, 2:16ff, 21ff, 3:8ff. And through these mediums man heard and understood God just as well and just as clearly, as nti the devout hear God's speech

throughout the whole of nature. As little impossible and deceiving as the revelation of God in nature and history is for the believer, it is also supernatural revelation, in which God makes use of unusual means, but to which He also opens the eyes in a special way. Natural and supernatural revelation go together in the status integritatis according to the teaching of Scripture. They are not opposites but complement each other. They are both indirect and bound up with certain forms and means. They are both based on the idea that God in grace bows down to man and becomes like him. And they both have these modes, that God makes his presence felt, his voice heard and his works seen. From the beginning God revealed Himself to mankind through appearance, word and deed.

It is remarkable that the sin which entered the world through the first man does not change the very fact of revelation. God continues to reveal Himself; He does not withdraw. First of all, throughout Scripture we are taught a *revelatio naturalis*. God's revelation began in creation and continues in the maintenance and government of all things. He reveals Himself in the nature surrounding us; in it He displays His eternal power and divinity, and in blessings and judgments proves alternately His goodness and His wrath, Job 36, 37. Ps. 29, 33:5, 65, 67:7, 90, 104, 107, 145, 147. Isa. 59 : 17-19. Mt. 5 : 45. Rom. 1 : 18. Acts 14 : 16. He reveals Himself in the history of nations and persons Deut. 32:8. Ps. 33:10, 67:5, 115:16. Spr. 8:15, 16. Hd. 17 : 26. Rom. 13 : 1. He also reveals Himself in the heart and conscience of every man Job 32:8, 33:4. Prov 20:27. John 1:3-5, 9, 10. Rom 2:14, 15, 8:16. This revelation of God is general, in itself perceptible and understandable to every human being. Nature and history are the book of God's omnipotence and wisdom, of His goodness and justice. All peoples have recognized this revelation to a certain extent. Even idolatry supposes that God's *δυνάμις* and *Σεισθής* are revealed in the creatures. Many a sage, naturalist and historian has spoken strikingly of this revelation of God, e.g. Xenophon, Memor. I 4, 5. Cicero, de nat. deor. II 2, de divinat.'II 72. Zöckler, Gottes Zeugen im Reich der Natur, 2 Th. Gütersloh 1881.' By Christian theology this general revelation has at all times been

unanimously adopted and defended, Iren. adv. haer. II 6. Tertull. de testim. animae, adv. Marc. I 10. August, de civ. Dei 8 : 9 sq. 19:1, de trin. 4 : 20 etc. Joh. Damasc. de fide orthodox. I c. 1 and 3. Thomas, S. c. Gent. lib. 1-3. S. Theol. I qu. 2 etc., cf. further H. Denzinger, Vier Bücher von der relig. Erk. II S. 27-45. Especially by the Geref. theologians this general revelation was maintained and highly esteemed, Calv. Inst. I c. 4 and cf. further Schweizer, Gl. der ev. K. I 241 f. Heppe, Dogm. der ev. ref. K. S. 1 f. Scholten, Leer der Herv. Kerk I 4 304- 326. Doedes, Introduction to the Doctrine of God 2nd dr. bl. 107-252.

But according to Scripture, this general revelation is not strictly speaking only natural, but also contains supernatural elements. The revelation, which takes place immediately after the fall, has a supranatural character, Genesis 3:8 f., and becomes the property of mankind by tradition. The original knowledge and service of God will remain for a long time in a more or less pure state. Cain is given grace for law; he even becomes the father of a generation that begins culture, Gen. 4. The covenant established with Noah after the flood, and in him with all new mankind, is a covenant of nature and yet no longer natural, but the fruit of unmerited supernatural grace, Gen 8:21, 22, 9:1-17. Scripture often mentions the wonders that God wrought before the eyes of the Gentiles, in Egypt, Canaan, Babylon, etc., and the supernatural revelations that fell upon non-Israelites, Gen. 20, 30, 40, 41. Richt. 7. Dan. 2:4 etc. An operation of supernatural forces in the pagan world is neither impossible nor even improbable. There may be truth in the appeal to revelations, which is common to all religions. And conversely, not everything that belongs to the area of special grace is supernatural in a strict sense. There are entire periods in the history of Israel, many days and years in the life of Jesus, and likewise in the life of the apostles, in which no supernatural revelation takes place and yet which form an important part of the historia revelationis. When Jesus preaches the gospel to the poor, this is of no less importance than when He heals the sick and raises the dead. His death, which seems natural, is of no less importance than his supernatural birth. Therefore the

distinction between natural and supernatural revelation is not identical with that between general and special. To indicate the two kinds of revelation, which underlie the pagan religions and the religion of Scripture, the latter distinction is preferable to the former.

C. Inadequacy of general revelation.

7. This *revelatio generalis*, however, is insufficient for several reasons. In this, too, all Christian theologians are unanimous. Irenaeus *adv. haeres.* 2, 28 argues against the Gnostics the limited nature of human knowledge. Justinus Martyr, *Dial.* c. Tryph., introduction, Tertullian, *de an. c.* 1. Lactantius, *Instit. div.* 3, 1. 4, 1. Arnobius, *adv. nat.* 1, 38. II, 6. paint the weakness of reason in very strong colors. Augustine does not deny that even among the pagans there is some truth with which Christians can profit, *de doct. chr.* 2, 60. It can teach few and only a little, *de trin.* 13, 12. *the civ.* 12, 20. *the util. cred.* 10, 24. She knows the goal, but not the way that leads to the goal, *Conf.* 5, 5. 7, 26. *de civ.* 10, 29. Often she leads astray and submerges truth in iniquity, *de trin.* 13, 24, does not seek it in a pious way, *Conf.* 5, 4, lacks the love necessary for the knowledge of truth, *de civ.* 9, 20, is prevented by her own *superbia* from the knowledge of truth, for only *humilitas* is the way to life, *de civ.* 2, 7. Thomas S. *Theol.* I qu. 1 art. 1. S. c. *Gent.* I, 4. argues the necessity of revelation even for the *articuli mixti* known by reason. The Roman church has clearly expressed the *insufficiencia* of *theol. nat.* in the preface to the *Catech. Romanus*, and in the *Vaticanum sess.* 3 cap. 2 *de revelatione*, and can. 2,2-4. And the Protest, theologians judged this *insufficiencia* of general revelation no differently, *Calv. Inst.* I. 5 § 11 sq. and cap. 6. Heidegger, *Corpus Theol.* I § 9-13. Trigland, *Antapologia* cap. 17. Owen, *Θεολογούμενα* I cap. 6. Turret. *Theol. Elenct.* I qu. 4. Moor, *Comm.* in *Marckii Comp.* I 61 39. The sufficiency of general revelation and the *religio naturalis* built upon it, was in earlier times only taught by the Pelagians, who accepted three different ways to salvation, namely, the *lex naturae*, *lex Mosis* and *lex Christi*. There were also always some theologians in the Christian Church who were more favorable to the Heydians and who believed in the possibility of

their salvation, such as Justin, Clemens Alex. Erasmus, Zwingli etc. cf. Vossius, *Historia Pelag.* 1655 p. 383 sq. But with these, this belief was not usually based on the doctrine of the sufficiency of general revelation, but on the supposition that God also worked with His special grace among the Gentiles, either in or after this life. On the other hand, the perfect sufficiency of general revelation and of natural religion was taught in the 18th century by deists and rationalists such as Cherbury, Tindal, Collins, Rousseau, Kant, etc. Litt. at Lechler, *Gesch. des engl. Deïsmus* 1841 and art. *Deïsmus* in Herzog2. Bretschneider, *System. Entw. aller in der Dogm. vork. Begriffe* 1841 S. 35 f. Clarisse, *Encycl.* 1835 p. 405 sq. Doedes, *Inlei-ding tot de Leer van God* 1880 bl. 197 v.

About the insufficiency of general revelation there can be hardly any doubt. In the first place, it is evident from the fact that this revelation at best gives us some knowledge of God's existence and of some of His attributes, such as goodness and justice; but it leaves us completely ignorant of the person of Christ, who alone is the way to the Father, Mt. 11:27. John 14:6, 17:3. Acts 4:12. General revelation, therefore, is inadequate for man as a sinner; it knows of no grace and forgiveness; sometimes it is even a revelation of wrath, Rom. 1:20. Grace and forgiveness, which should be the essence of religion, is an act of will, not of nature and necessity. General revelation can, at best, make some truths known, but it brings no facts, no history, and therefore changes nothing in being. It enlightens consciousness somewhat and curbs sin, but it does not recreate the nature of mankind and the world. It can instill fear, but not trust and love, Shedd, *Dogm. Theol.* I 66, 218. In the second place, the knowledge which general revelation can provide is not only slight and insufficient, but it is also uncertain, always mixed with error, and for the vast majority of people unattainable. The history of philosophy has been a history of systems that break down one another; it ended with the Greeks in skepticism, in the Middle Ages in nominalism, and now in agnosticism. The truths most essential to religion, the existence and nature of God, the origin and destiny of mankind and the world, sin and forgiveness, reward and punishment, have been

alternately taught and opposed. In philosophy, no satisfactory certainty can be obtained about all these questions. Cicero, *Tusc.* 1,5 therefore rightly asks: *ex philosophis nonne optimus et gravissimus quisque confitetur multa se ignorare, multa sibi etiam atque etiam esse discenda?* But even though some thinkers came to some true and pure knowledge, it was still mixed with all kinds of error. Every philosophical system has its gaps and defects. Plato, whose system, according to Augustine, *Civ.* 8,5 is the closest to Christianity, defends the abandonment of weak children, paedophilia, the union of women, etc. Even in morality there is a great deal of error. Even in morality there is great difference and uncertainty; *vérité en de^a des Pyrenées, erreur au dela* (Pascal). *Nescio quomodo nihil tam absurde dici potest, quod non dicatur ab aliquo philosophorum*, *Cic. de divin.* 2,58. And even if the philosophers had possessed the cleanest and purest doctrine, they would still have lacked the authority to introduce it among the people. In practice, therefore, they often reverted to popular beliefs and morals; or they withdrew with an *Odi profanum vulgus et arceo* from the people in high places. Their mutual struggle and the contrast between their teaching and life weakened their influence. And even if all this had not been the case, the doctrine of the sages could never have become or remained the religion of the people, because in matters of religion an intellectual clericalism and a scientific hierarchy are intolerable. That is why Thomas was absolutely right when he said that even in those truths which general revelation makes known to us, revelation and authority are still necessary, because that knowledge is suitable for only a few, would require too long a period of research and would still remain imperfect and uncertain, *S. Theol.* I qu. 1 art. 1 art. 1, II 2 qu. 2 art. 4. *S. contra Gent.* 1,4. In the third place the inadequacy of natural revelation is clearly shown by the fact, that no people have been satisfied with the so-called *religio naturalis*. The general religion of the Deists, the moral Vernunftreligion of Kant, the *pietas* and *obedientia* of Spinoza, are all nothing but pure abstractions, which never existed in reality. Even if Herbert's five articles or Kant's rationalist trilogy had been completely certain and scientifically provable, they would still have been incapable of founding a religion,

a church. For religion is something essentially different from science; it has a different source and basis. The eighteenth century could find pleasure in such truths of reason and vain abstractions. The nineteenth century with its historical sense soon realized that such a *religio naturalis* did not and cannot exist anywhere. It is now generally agreed that all religions are positive and based on revelation, Schleiermacher, *Glaub.* § 10 Zusatz. Ritschl, *Rechtf. u. Vers.* III² 4, 500. Id. *ünterricht in der christl. Religion* S. 20. Frank, *System der chr. Wahrheit.* I² 512 f. Doedes, *Encyclo- paedie* 190,191. W. Bender, *Zur Geschichte der Emancipation dér natürl. Theol.*, *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.* 1883 S. 529-592. R. Rüttschi, *Die Lehre von der natürlichen Religion u. vom Naturrecht*, *Jahrb. 1. prot. Theol.* 1884 S. 1-48. Hoekstra, *Wijsg. Godsd.* I 19 v.

D. Value of general revelation.

8. With this, however, general revelation has not lost its value and significance. First of all, it has great significance for the heathen world. It is the solid and lasting basis of pagan religions. The Holy Scriptures pronounce a severe judgment on Ethnicism and explain its origin by the apostasy from the pure knowledge of God. This knowledge, which was originally the property of man, continued to have an effect for a time, *Gen.* 4:3. 8:20, and the creation revealed God's eternal power and divinity, *Rom.* 1:20. But mankind, bewildered in his thoughts and darkened in his heart, has not glorified or thanked God, knowing Him as God. In addition, the confusion of speech and the dispersion of the people of *Gen.* 11 certainly had a great influence on the development of polytheism, *Orig. c. Cels V. Aug. de civ. Dei* 16 : 6. Schelling, *Einleitung in die philos. der Mythologie* I 94 f. Delitzsch, *Comm, on Gen. 11.* Auberlen, *The divine revelation* I 187 f. Fabri, *Die Entstehung des Heidenthums und die Aufgabe der Heidenmission* 1859. *Herzog* 2 12 : 108. The Hebr. *עַם*, the crowd, nation, connected by descent and language, next to *אֶל* the people connected by unity of government also points to this. The word has a national and at the same time an ethical-religious meaning, just like *lat. pagani* and *us pagans*. The

unity of God and thus the purity of religion was lost in the division of mankind into peoples. Each people got its own, national god. And once the notion of the unity and absoluteness of God was lost, other powers besides that one national god could gradually be recognised and worshipped as gods; the idea of the divine became impure and declining; the various natural powers came to the fore and increased in importance; the boundary between the divine and the creaturely was erased; and religion could even degenerate into animism and feticism, into witchcraft and magic. According to Scripture, the character of pagan religions is idolatry. The heathen gods are idols, they do not exist, they are lies and vanity Isa. 41:29, 42:17, 46: 1 v. Jer. 2: 28. Ps. 106 : 28. Acts 14 : 15 , 19 : 26. Gal. 4:8. 1 Cor. 8 : 5. In those religions even a daemonic power operates Deut. 82 : 17. Ps. 106 : 28. 1 Cor. 10 : 20 v. Apoc. 9 : 20. The condition of the heathen world outside of the revelation to Israel, outside of Christ, is described as darkness Isa. 9:1, 60:2. Luk. 1:79. Joh. 1:5. Ei. 4:18, as storminess Hd. 17:30. 1 Petr 1:14. Rom 1 : 18 v.; as imagined vain wisdom 1 Cor. 1: 18 v., 2:6, 3:19 v.; as sin and iniquity Rom 1:24 v., 3:9 v.

The pagan world, in its origin, character, and destiny, is a daunting problem. In itself the solution which Scripture gives to it is not only not absurd, but it even commends itself by its simplicity and its naturalness. Yet philosophy, both historical and religious, has not been satisfied with that solution and has proposed another view which is diametrically opposed to that of Scripture. It is true that the exaltation of the childlike condition of the people, as it was customary in the last century, no longer meets with approval. But the theory of evolution, which now serves as an explanation, is equally at variance with Scripture. Just as natural science seeks to deduce the living from the inanimate, the organic from the inorganic, man from animal, the conscious from the unconscious, the superior from the inferior, so the religious science of the new age seeks to explain religion from an earlier religiousless state and pure religion from the primitive forms of feticism, animism, etc. D. Hume has already begun this in his Natural history of religion. With Hegel it fitted

completely into the framework of his pantheistic philosophy, Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Religion 1832. And since then it has found more and more dissemination and defence, Buckle, History of civilization in England 1858. AV. E. H. Lecky, History of the rise and influence of the spirit of rationalism in Europe 1865. E. B. Tylor, Researches into the early history of mankind and the development of civilization 2d ed. 1870. Id. Primitive Culture 1872. Sir John Lubbock, Prehistoric times as illustrated by ancient remains and the manners and customs of modern savages 1865. Id. The origin of civilization and the primitive condition of man 1870. H. Spencer, The principles of sociology 1876-'82. E. von Hellwald, Kulturgeschichte in ihrer natürlichen Entwicklung bis zur Gegenwart, 3e Aufl. 1883. O. Caspari, Die Urgeschichte der Menschheit mit Rücksicht auf die natürliche Entwicklung des frühesten Geisteslebens 1873. G. Roskoff, Das Religionswesen der rohesten Natrvölker 1880. Ed. von Hartmann, Religionsphilosophie, Leipzig. O. Pfeleiderer, Religionsphilos. auf geschichtl. Grundlage, 2e Aufl. 1883-84. H. Siebeck, Lehrb. der Religionsphilosophie 1893. A. Reville, Prolégomènes de l'histoire des religions, Paris 1881. C. P. Tiele, The place v. d. godsd. of natural peoples in the history of religion 1873. Id. On the laws of the development of religion, Theol. Tijdschr. 1874. Id. Gesch. v. d. godsd. 1876 etc. However generally accepted this doctrine of evolution may be, in any case it does not yet have a higher rank than that of a hypothesis. But it does not explain the phenomena. In natural science it still comes up against the facts of life, consciousness, speech, language, will, etc. And in religious science the origin and essence, the truth and value of religion continue to be protested against. That the nature peoples represent the original state of mankind, that feticism and animism are the oldest forms of religion, and that the first men were equal to children or savages, are opinions that lack sufficient foundation and therefore meet with more and more contradiction. Schelling, in his Philosophie der Mythologie und Offenbarung, accepted a relative monotheism as original. Max Muller recognizes a so-called henotheism as a primitive religion, Vorlesungen über Ursprung und Entwicklung der Religion S. 292 f.

Deutsche Rundschau Sept. 1878. Cf. Rauwenhoff, Wijsb. v. d. godsd. 95 v. 191 v. and Hoekstra, Wijsg. Godsd. 146 v. Also the opinion, that the different religions are successive moments in one process of development, is much less probable than the one, which she holds for degenerations of one kind, Kahler, Wiss, der chr. Lehre I 185. The doctrine of Scripture on the origin and the essence of Ethnicism is therefore still more or less definitely defended by Lüken, Die Einheit des Menschengeschlechts und dessen Ausbreitung über die ganze Erde 1845. Doedes, The application of the theory of development not to be recommended for the gesch. der godsd. 1874.

E. L. Fischer, Heidenthum und Offenbarung 1878. Zöckler, Die Lehre vom Urstand des Menschen, Gütersloh 1879. Id. Art. Polytheismus in Herzog2. Lenormant, Les origines de l'histoire d'après la Bible et les traditions des peuples orientaux, 3 vols. 1880-84. Diestel, der Monoth. des Heidenthums, Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol. 1860 s. 669-759. A. Tholuck, Der sittliche Charakter des Heidenthums 3[®] Aufl., Werke VIII 1865 s. 1 - 91. J. N. Sepp, Das Heidenthum und dessen Bedeutung für das Christenthum, 3 Theile Regensburg 1853. C. Pesch, Gott und Götter. Eine Studie zur vergleichenden Religionswissenschaft. Frei-burg 1890. Formby-Krieg, Der Monothelismus der Offenbarung und das Heidenthum. Mainz 1880. Ebrard, Apologetik, 2nd Aufl. Gütersloh 1878-80. II 521 f. Vigouroux, La Bible et les découvertes modernes en Palestine, en Egypt et en Assyrie, 4 vols. James Orr, The Christian view of God and the world, Edinburgh, Elliot 1893 p. 141, 193, 431, 466, 501. S. H. Kellogg, The genesis and growth of religion, New-York and London 1892. Cf. Ch. de la Saussaye, Lehrb. der Rel. gesch. S. 7 f. 23 f.

9. But, however strictly the Scriptures may judge the character of paganism, the very general revelation which they teach enables and entitles us to recognize all the elements of truth which are also present in pagan religions. The study of religions used to be exclusively in the service of dogmatics and apologetics. The founders of religions, like Muhammed, were simply held to be impostors, enemies of God, accomplices of the devil. Cf. Dr. Snouck Hurgronje,

De Islam. Gids 1886 II 239 v. But since those religions have become more accurately known, this explanation has turned out to be untenable; it was in conflict with both history and psychology. According to the Holy Scriptures there is also among the heathen a revelation of God, an illumination of the Logos, an operation of God's Spirit, Gen. 6:17, 7:15. Ps. 33:6, 104:30, 139 vs. 2. Job 32:8. Eccles. 3:19. Spr. 8:22 v. Mal. 1:11, 14. John 1:9. Rom. 2 : 14. Gal. 4 : 1-3. Acts 14 : 16, 17; 17 v. 22-30. Many church fathers, Just. Martyr, Apol. 1:47, Clemens Alex. Strom. I 7 e. a. assumed an activity of the Logos in the pagan world. Augustine speaks several times very unfavourably of the pagans, but yet also recognizes that they saw the truth in shadow, de civ. 19.1 de trin. 4.20, that the truth was not completely hidden to them, de civ. 8:11 f. and that we therefore must do our profit with the truth in pagan philosophy and must appropriate it, de doct. chr. 2.60. Non usque adeo in anima humana imago Dei terrenorum affectuum labe detrita est, ut nulla in ea vel ut lineamenta ex-trema remanserint, unde merito dici possit, etiam in ipsa impie- tate vitae suae facere aliqua legis vel sapere, de spir. et. litt. c. 27.28. Also many non-reines acknowledge much truth, Retract. I c. 4. Thomas not only says , that mankind as a reasonable being, without supernatural grace, can know the veritates naturales, S. Theol. I 2 qu. 109 art. 1, but also testifies II 2 qu. 172 art. 6, that it is impossible esse aliquam cognitionem quae totaliter sit falsa, absque admixtione alicujus veritatis, and in doing so invokes the words of Beda and Augustine: nulla falsa est doctrina, quae non aliquando aliqua vera falsis intermisceat. The Reformed were even better off by their doctrine of gratia communis. This protected them on the one hand from the error of Pelagianism, which taught the sufficientia of the theol. naturalis and linked salvation to the maintenance of the lex naturae; but on the other hand it enabled them to recognize all the true and beautiful and good things that were also present in the pagan world. Science, art, moral, domestic, social life, etc. were derived from that gratia communis and recognized and praised with gratitude, Calv. Inst. II, 2. § 12 v. II 3. § 3 v. Zanchius, Opera VIII 646 sq. Wttewrongel, Christ. Household I 288-299. Witsius, Oec. foed. III 12. § 52. Id. Twist of the Lord with his vineyard cap. 19. turret. Theol.

El. 10:5. Vossius, Hist. Pelag. 3:3. Pfanner, Systema Theol. Gentilis cap. 22 § 33. Trigland, Antapologia cap. 17. Moor, Comm, in Marckii Comp. IV 826-829. Cf. my speech on The General Grace, Kampen 1894. Usually this working of the gratia communis was seen in the moral and intellectual, social and political life, but less often in the religions. Then only some religio naturalis, insita and acquisita were mentioned, but the connection between these and the religions was not demonstrated. The religions were derived from deception or daemonic influences. But not only in science and art, in morals and law, but also in religions, there is an operation of God's Spirit and of His general grace. Calvin rightly spoke of a semen religionis, a sensus divinitatis, Inst. I, 3, 1-3. I, 4, 1. II, 2, 18. For the founders of religion were not deceivers and not the instruments of Satan, but men of religious training who had a vocation for their time and for their people, and who exercised a favorable influence on the lives of the nations. The various religions, however much they may have been mixed up in error, have, to a certain extent, satisfied religious needs and brought comfort in the sorrows of life. Not only cries of despair, but also tones of confidence, hope, resignation, peace, submission, patience, etc., come to us from the pagan world. All the elements and forms that are essential to religion, the concept of God, guilt, the need for salvation, sacrifice, priesthood, temple, worship, prayer, etc., are corrupted but nevertheless appear in pagan religions. Even unconscious prophecies and striking expectations of a better and purer religion are not lacking here and there. Therefore Christianity is not only antithetical to paganism; it is also its fulfillment. Christianity is the true but therefore also the highest and purest religion; it is the truth of all religions. What in Ethnicism is caricature, here is the living original. What is semblance there is being here. What is sought there is found here. Christianity is the explanation of Ethnicism. Christ is the Promised One of Israel and the Wish of all the Gentiles. Israel and the church are elected for the benefit of mankind. In Abraham's seed all the generations of the earth are blessed. Apart from the above-mentioned works by Fabri, Sepp, Tholuck and others, see also Clemens Alex. Strom. 1, 1. 4, 5. 6, 8. Coh. ad gentes § 6. Orig. c. Cels. 4, 4. Ritschl, Rechtf. u. Vers. Ill2

184. Philippi, Kirchl. Gl. I 2. Beck, Einleitung in das Syst. der christl. Lehre 2nd Aufl. 1870 S. 45 f. Saussaye in mine Theol. by Prof. Dr. Ch. d. 1. S. bl. 31 v. 46 v. 83 v. V. von Strauss und Torney, Das unbewusst Weissagende im vorchristl. Heidenthum (Zeitfr. des christl. Volkslebens VIII). "Staudenmaier, Encycl. der theol. Wiss. 1835 § 428 f. Nitzsch, Lehrb. der ev. Dogm. 134 f. Kuyper, Encycl. Ill 445 v. 563 v.

10. But the *revelatio generalis* has significance not only for the pagan world, but also still in and for the Christian religion. Its value, however, does not lie in the fact that it provides us with a *theologia* or *religio naturalis*, a moralistic Vernunft- glauben, which in itself would be sufficient and could do without all that is positive in religion. Such a *religio naturalis* is not found anywhere and is also not possible. Nor is it the intention of the *revelatio generalis* that the Christian should draw from it his first knowledge of God, the world and mankind, in order to supplement it later with the knowledge of Christ. Ritschl and his followers present it as if the dogmatist in the *loei de Deo* and *de homine* would take the material only from the *revelatio generalis*, and then draw the dot for the next *loei* first from the Holy Scriptures. The dogmatist would then first stand outside and in front of the Christian faith, and then with the later dogmata take his position in that faith, Ritschl, *Rechtf. u. Vers.* III 2 4. But this has not been the method of Reformation dogmatics at least in the beginning. When the Christian professes his faith in God the Father, the Almighty, Creator of the heavens and the earth, then that is Christian faith in the full sense. And the dogmatist does not first divest himself of this faith in order to formulate a reasonable doctrine about God and man from general revelation and to supplement it later with the revelation in Christ. But he draws his knowledge solely from the *revelatio specialis*, i.e. from the Holy Scriptures. This is his *principium unicum*. But he does not limit this special revelation to the person of Christ, as is found in some parts of Scripture, e.g., in the Synoptics. Gospels or only in the Sermon on the Mount. The entire Revelation, which is summarized in Scripture, is a *revelatio specialis*, which comes to us in Christ. Christ is the center and content of all that special revelation, which begins in

Paradise and is completed in the Apocalypse. The special revelation has now recognized and appreciated the general one, and has even taken it over and assimilated it, as it were. And so does the Christian, so does the dogmatist. He stands in the Christian faith, in the *revelatio specialis* and sees nature and history from there. And now he discovers traces there of the same God, whom he got to know as his Father in Christ. Precisely as a Christian, through faith, he sees the revelation of God in nature much better and more clearly than he was able to perceive it before. Psychic man does not understand the word of God in nature and in history. He searches the entire universe without finding God. But the Christian, armed with the spectacles of the Holy Scriptures, R. de Sabunde, *Theol. Natur. in den Prologus*, Calvin, *Inst. I 6, 1, 16* sees God in everything and everything in God. That is why we find in Scripture a poetry of nature and a view of history, such as is found nowhere else. With his Christian confession, the believer thus also finds himself in the world; he is no stranger to it, and sees no other power reigning there than the one he calls upon in Christ as his Father. By that general revelation he feels at home in the world; it is God's fatherly hand, from which all things in the natural also belong to him.

In that general revelation he also has a solid ground on which he can meet all non-Christians. He has the same basis in common with them. Because of his Christian faith he may occupy an isolated position, he may not be able to prove his beliefs to others; in the General Revelation he nevertheless has a point of contact with all those who bear the name of man. Just as the classical propaedeutic lays a common foundation for all men of science, so the general revelation holds all people together despite all religious differences. Subjectively, for the believer, God's knowledge from nature is superior to that from Scripture. We are all born into a certain positive religion. Only the eye of faith sees God in creation; again, only the pure in heart see God. But objectively nature precedes grace, the *revelatio generalis* precedes the *revelatio specialis*. *Gratia praesupponit naturam*. The denial that the *religio* and *theologia naturalis* are sufficient and have an independent existence of their

own, does not diminish the fact that from creation, from nature and history, from the heart and conscience, there comes a word of God to every human being. No one can escape the power of the *revelatio generalis*. Religion belongs to the essence of mankind. The idea and existence of God, the spiritual independence and eternal destiny of man, the origin and purpose of the world, the moral world order and its ultimate triumph are problems which leave no room for rest in the human mind. The metaphysical desire cannot be suppressed. Philosophy always seeks to satisfy it. It is the *revelatio generalis* which keeps this need alive. It prevents man from becoming an animal. It binds him to the supernatural world. It maintains in him the awareness that he is created in God's image and finds no rest except in God. The *revelatio generalis* preserves humanity until and unless it is found and restored by Christ. In this sense the *theologia naturalis* was rightly called a *praeambula fidei*, a divine preparation and education for Christianity. The general revelation is the basis on which the particular one rises.

And finally, the rich significance of general revelation is expressed in the fact that it keeps nature and grace, creation and transformation, the world of reality and the world of truth, in indissoluble connection with one another. Without the General Revelation, the particular revelation loses its coherence with the whole of cosmic being and life. Then the link between the kingdom of nature and the kingdom of heaven is missing. Anyone who denies the *revelatio generalis* through critical philosophy makes a futile effort to regain what he has lost through practical imagination or phantasy. He has lost the support for his faith. Religious life stands apart from ordinary human existence; the image of God becomes a *donum superadditum*; religion becomes, as with the Soci-nians, alien to human nature; Christianity becomes a sectarian phenomenon and is robbed of its catholicity; grace is hostile to nature. It is then consistent to assume, together with the ethical moderns, a radical separation between the power of good and the power of nature. *Ethos* and *physis* are totally separated. The world of *Wirklichkeit* and that of *Werthe* have nothing to do with each other. In principle, Parsism, Manichaeism is

renewed. On the other hand, the *revelatio generalis* maintains the unity of nature and grace, of the world and kingdom of God, of the natural and moral order, of creation and re-creation, of physis and ethos, of virtue and happiness, of holiness and salvation, and in all this the unity of the divine Being. It is one and the same God, who in general revelation leaves himself untouched to anyone and who in special revelation makes himself known as a God of grace. Thus, general and special revelation affect each other. *Praemisit Deus naturam magis- streetcar, submissurus et prophetiam, quo facilius credas prophetiae discipulus naturae* (Tertullian). *Natura praecedit gratiam, gratia perficit naturam. Ratio perficitur a fide, tides supponit natural"*. Cf. Hofstede de Groot, *Institutio theol. nat.* ed. 4. 1861. Scholten, *Leer der Herv. Kerk*, 4th dr. I bl. 270 v. Kuyper, *Nat. God- knowledge, From the Word III*. Voigt, *Fund. dogm.* 172 f.

2. SPECIAL REVELATION.

A. Means of special revelation.

1. History teaches, that no religion has enough of general revelation. The Christian religion, too, appeals to special revelation. Scripture is the book of revelatio specialis. The words by which it expresses the concept of revelation are mainly these: הלא discover, ni. be discovered, show up, appear, be revealed, Gen. 35:7; 1 Sam. 2:27, 3:21; Isa. 53:1, 56 : 1; Hos 7 : 1, etc. האך seeing, ni. being seen, appearing, shining, Gen. 12:7, 17:1, 18:1, etc.; ?י knowing, ni. pi. hi. hithp. making known, teaching, Num. 12:6; ἐπιφαινειν appearing Lu. 1:79; Tit. 1:11; subst. επιφάνεια, appearance, especially of Christ in His Second Coming 2 Thess. 2:8; 1 Tim. 6:14; 2 Tim. 4:1; Tit. 2:13; 2 Tim. 1:10 of Christ's first coming; εμφανι- ζειν public, make visible, pass, show up, appear Mt. 27:53; Jn. 14:21, 22; γνωριζειν make known Luk. 2:15; Bom. 9:22; Eph. 3:3, 5, 10; ὀηλονν make known 1 Pet. 1:11; 2 Pet. 1:14; ὀεικνναι show John 5:20; λαλειν speak Heb. 1:1, 2:2, 5:5; especially also ἀποκαλπτειν and φανερονν. Both words are not to be distinguished as subjective, internal illumination and objective, external display or disclosure, as Scholten, L. H. K. 4th ed. I 165 v. 299. Dogm. Christ. Initia I 26 sq. thought; for ἀποκαλπτειν is several times used of objective revelation Luke 17:30; Rom. 1:17, 18, 8:18; Eph. 3:5; 2 Thess. 2:3, 6, 8; 1 Pet. 1:5, 5:1. Nor does the distinction lie in that φανερονν denotes the general revelation of God in nature, and ἀποκαλπτειν the special revelation of grace, Neander, Gesch. der Pflanzung und Leitung der christl. Kirche durch die Apostel, 5te Aufl. Gotha, Perthes 1862 S. 131 f. because φατερονν is many times used of the special revelation Joh. 17:6; Kom. 16:26; Col. 1:26; 1 Tim. 3:16; 2 Tim. 1 : 10, etc.; and ἀπποχαλπτειν comes Rom. 1 :

18 also occurs of the general revelation. A constant difference in the use of both words is difficult to point out in the N. T. But

etymologically ἀποχαλνπτειν indicates the removal of the cover by which an object was hidden, and φανεροννν the making public of a thing that was hidden or unknown. The former therefore emphasizes the removal of the obstacle which prevented the knowledge of the hidden; the mysterious character of that which was hitherto unknown; and the divine act which removed that veil and made the mystery understood. The second word indicates in general that something, which was hidden and unknown, has now become public and has entered into the light. Αποχαλυψις removes the cause by which something was hidden; φανερωσις discloses the thing itself. Hence it is that φανερωσις is always used of objective revelation, ἀποχαλυψις of both objective and subjective revelation; that φανερωσις more often than not denotes both general and particular revelation, but ἀποχαλνψις most always the particular and only once or twice the general. And both words are again so different from γνωριζειν and ὀηλουτ, that the first two bring things into the light, bring them under observation, and the last two as a result of that now also make them the contents of our thinking consciousness. Cf. Dr. F. G. B. van Bell, Disput, theol. de patefactionis christianae indole ex vocabulis φαν. et ἀποχ. in libris N. T. efficienda 1849. Niermeyer, Guide 1850 I 109-149. Rauwenhoff, The independence of the Christian 1857. Cramer, Jaarb. v. law. Theol. 1870 bl. 1-70. Cremer, Wörterbuch s. v. Herzog² 12, 654. Voigt, Fundamentaldogm. 201 f. Van Leeuwen, Prol, of Bijb. Godg. 41 v.

The Christian religion thus corresponds to all historical religions in that it relies on revelation. But the similarity extends even further, to the forms and ways in which revelation takes place. All means of revelation can be reduced to three. First, religious faith desires a God who is near and not far (John 17:27); it was therefore convinced at all times of the appearance of the gods in one form or another, under one sign or another, in one place or another. Holy places, holy times, holy images exist in almost every religion. The gods are not equal to men and do not live on equal terms with them; the profane domain is separated from the sacred; but the gods nevertheless live with and among men in certain places, in special objects, and communicate

their blessing at certain times. Idolatry, understood in the broadest sense, is born of the need for a God close at hand, Ch. de la Saussaye, *Lehrb. der Rel. gesch.* I 54 f. 114 f. In the second place, all religions have the belief that the gods in one way or another reveal their thoughts and their will, either through human beings as their organs, such as soothsayers, oracles, dreamers, death seekers, spiritists, etc., or artificially and externally through the stars, the flight of birds, the entrails of sacrificial animals, the play of the flame, the lines of the hand, the accidental opening and folding of a book, etc, μαντική, divinatio. Nemo vir magnus sine afflatu divino unquam fuit, Cic. de nat. deor. 2, 66, cf. Cicero de divinatione, Plutarchus, de defectu oraculorum, A. Bouché - Le clercq, *Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité*, 4 vols. 1879-82. Saussaye t. a. p. 93 f. And finally, in all religions there is the belief in special intervention and help from the gods in times of need; magic is widespread, i. e. the art by which people with mysterious means, holy words, formulas, amulets, potions, etc. make the divine power available to them and produce miraculous effects, Ennemoser, *Gesch. der Magie*, 2nd Aufl. Leipzig 1844. Alfr. Maury, *La magie et l'astrologie dans l'antiquité et au moyen- age* 1860. Lenormant, *Les sciences occultes en Asie*, 2 vols. 1874-'75. Saussaye ib. Theophany, manticism and magic are the ways through which all revelation comes to mankind. This general religious belief in appearance, prophecy and miracles is certainly not, at any rate not exclusively, explained by deceit or demonstration, nor by ignorance of the natural order, but is a necessary element in all religion. The religious need seeks satisfaction; and where it does not find it in a real revelation of God encountered, it seeks it in the way of ἐς.

It seeks it in the way of ἐπιλορηῦκεια. It employs those mysterious forces in man himself or outside him in nature, which can bring him into contact with a supernatural world. Superstition is the bastard form of true religion. Superstition is the caricature of the πίστις. The present-day phenomena of spiritism, theosophy, telepathy, magnetism, hypnotism, etc., are proof of this, and perhaps also demonstrate that in the so-called night side of human nature lie

forces which can work out a more direct rapport with a supernatural world and in any case sufficiently explain the belief in such a rapport, without the hypothesis of deliberate deception, etc. There are more things in heaven and earth, than are dreamt of in your philosophy (Shakespeare). Cf. article Modern Superstition in Tijdspiegel Jan. 1895. Scripture does not seem to deny all reality to such phenomena, Gen. 41:8; Ex. 7:8; Deut. 13:1, 2; Mt. 7:22, 24:24;

2 Thess. 2:9; 2 Tim. 3:8; Apoc. 13:13-15. But the religion in O. and N. T. definitely wants to have nothing in common with all these religious phenomena. It is opposed to them in principle. It neither recognizes nor tolerates them, it firmly forbids them Lev. 19:26, 31, 20:27; Num. 23:23; Deut. 18:10, 11; Acts 8:9, 13:6, 16:16, 19:13 f.; Gal. 5:20; Apoc. 21:8, 22:15. Prophets and apostles strongly object to being placed on a par with the heathen soothsayers and magicians. There may sometimes, e.g. in the appearances to the patriarchs, be agreement in form, but there is a difference in essence. Theophany, mantis, magic, as well as sacrifice, temple, priesthood, cult, etc., are essential elements in religion. They are therefore found in all religions, including that of Israel, and in Christianity. The Christian religion also has its sacrifice, Ephesians 5:2, its priest, Hebrews 7, its temple, 1 Cor.

3:16, etc. The difference between Christianity and other religions does not lie in the absence of all these necessary elements of religion, but in the fact that everything that occurs in paganism in caricature has become a shadow and image in Israel, and a true, spiritual reality here. This explains why Israel's religion, on the one hand, has so much in common with pagan religions in its form, circumcision, sacrifice, tabernacle, priesthood, etc., and, on the other, is fundamentally different from them, so that the Messiah arose only from Israel. This difference in principle lies in the fact that in the Holy Scriptures the initiative in religion is not taken by man, but by God. In the heathen religions it is man who seeks God, Dd. 17:27; he tries in every way to make God come down to him, and draws him down to the dust, Bom. 1:23; he tries to obtain power over God by all

kinds of means. But in Scripture it is always God who seeks man. He creates him in His own image. He calls him after the fall. He saves Noah. He elects Abraham. He gives Israel His laws. He calls and empowers the prophets. He sends his Son. He sets apart the apostles. He judges the living and the dead. Ethnicism teaches us to know man in his restlessness, in his misery, in his discontent, and also in his noble aspirations, in his eternal needs; man both in his poverty and his wealth, in his weakness and in his strength; Ethnicism bears its noblest fruit in humanism. But the Scriptures teach us to know God in His coming to and seeking of man, in His mercy and grace, in His right and love. But theophany, prophecy and miracle are also here the means by which God reveals himself and gives himself to mankind, Oehler, über das Verhältniss der alt. Prophetie zur heidn. Mantik 1861. Id. Alt. Theologie 1882 S. 29 f. 753 f. Tholuck, Die Propheten u. ihre Weissagungen 1860 § 1. Staudenmaier, Encycl. § 231 f. § 271 f. Schultz, Alt. Theologie, 4th Aufl. Gottingen 1889 S. 226 f.

2. Theophany (Angelophanie, Christophanie). More than once in Scripture there is mention of an appearance of God; sometimes without any further description, Gen. 12:7, 17:1, 22, 26: 2, 24, 35:9; Ex. 6:2. cf. also Gen. 11:5; Ex. 4:24, 12: 12, 23, 17:6; Num. 23: 4, 16; 1 Sam. 3:21; 2 Sam. 5:24; but elsewhere in the dream, Gen. 20:3, 28:12 v. 31 vs. 24 ; 1 Kings 3:5, 9:2 ; or also in the prophetic vision , 1 Kings 22:19 v. Isa 6. Ezek. 1:4 v., 3:12 v., 8:4 v., 10 :1 v., 43 : 2 v., 44:4; Am. 7:7, 9:1; Dan. 7:9 v. Luk. 2:9; 2 Pet. 1:17; and more frequently still in clouds of smoke' and fire as signs of His presence; so to Abraham. Gen. 15:17 v., to Moses, Ex. 3:2, 33 : 18 v., on Sinai, Ex. 19 : 9, 16 v., 24 : 16, cf. vs. 9-11, Deut. 5:23, 9 : 15 ; Heb. 12 : 28, over the people, Ex. 13 : 21 v., 14 :19-24, 40 v. 38 ; Num. 9 : 21, 14 : 14 ; Deut. 1 : 33; Neh. 9 : 12, 19 ; Ps. 78:14, over the tabernacle, Ex. 33:9, 40:34 v. Lev. 9:23; Num. 9:15-23, 11:17, 25, 12:5, 17:7, 20:6; Deut. 31:15; Ps. 99:7; Isa. 4:5, and in the holy of holies Ex. 25:8, 22, 29:45, 46; Lev. 16:2, 26:11, 12; Num. These appearances do not imply the physicality of God, Ex. 20:4, 33:20; Deut. 4:12, 15, but are sensible signs by which His presence becomes known, just as the Holy Spirit on Pentecost

made Himself known through wind and fire. Nor is this an emanation of this cloud from the divine Being, but a presence of God manifested in creaturely forms. In these signs the divine glory, כבוד , êo'Sa is manifested, Ex. 16:20, 24:17; Lev. 9:6, 23, 24; Num. 14:10, 16:19, 20:6; and therefore this glory is also described as a consuming fire Ex. 24:7; Lev. 9:23, 24 and as a cloud 1 Kings 8:10, 11; Isa. 6:4. But God does not only appear in impersonal signs; He also visits His people in personal beings. Surrounded and served by many thousands of angels Isa. 6:2, 6, He sends them to this earth in human form, to make known His word and will. They already appear in Genesis 18, 19, 28:12, 32:1, 2; Deut. 33:2; Job 33:23; 1 Kings 13:18 and according to Acts 7:53; Gal. 3:19 they also served during the legislation, but they are mediators of revelation especially after the Exile, Dan. 8:13, 9:11, 10:5; Zech. 1:7-6:5. Still more frequently they appear in the N. Test; so are present at the birth of Jesus, Mt. 1 : 20, 2 :13, 19 Lu. 1:11, 2:9, each time in His life. John 1:52 ; Mt. 4:6, at his sufferings, Mt. 26:53; Luke 22:43, at his resurrection and ascension, Mt. 28:2, 5; Luke 24:23; John 20:12; Acts 1:10. In the history of the apostles they occur several times, Acts 5:19, 8:26, 10:3, 11:13, 12:7, 23:9, 27:23; Apoc. 22 vs. 6, 16. And at his return Christ is accompanied by the angels Mt. 16:27, 25:31; Mk. 8:38; Luke 9:26; 1 Thess.3 : 13 etc. Among all these emissaries of God, the מלאך יהוה occupies a special place. He appears to Hagar, Gen. 16: 6-13, 21:17-20; to Abraham, Gen. 18, 19,22, 24:7,40; to Jacob, Gen. 28:13-17, 31:11-13, 32:24-30 cf. Hos. 12 : 4; Gen. 48 : 15, 16; to and at the time of Moses, Ex. 3 : 2 v. 13 : 21, 14 : 19, 23 : 20-23, 32 : 34, 33 : 2 v. cf. Num. 20 : 16; Isa. 63 : 8, 9, and further Jos. 5 : 13, 14; Richt. 6 : 11-24, 13:2-23. This Malak Jhvh is not an inauthentic symbol, nor also a created angel, but a personal, adaequal revelation and appearance of God, distinguished from Him, Ex. 23 : 20-23, 33 : 14 v.; Isa. 63 : 8, 9, and yet not Him one in name Gen. 16 : 13, 31 : 13, 32 : 28, 30, 48 : 15, 16; Ex. 3 : 2 v., 23:21; Richt. 13:1, 2; in power Gen. 16:10, 11, 21: 18, 18:14, 18; Ex. 14:21; Richt. 6:21; in redemption and blessing, Gen. 48:16; Ex. 3:8, 23:20; Isa. 63:8, 9; in worship and honor, Gen. 18:3, 22: 12; Ex. 23: 21. After the redemption from Egypt, the Malak Jhvh steps back. God dwells among his people in the temple 1 Kings 8 : 10

v.; 2 Chron. 7 : 1 v.; Ps. 68:17, 74:2, 132:13 v., 135:21. Thence goes forth the soul's desire of Israel's pious, Ps. 27:4, 42, 43, 48, 50, 63 : 3, 65, 84, 122, 137. But this theophany is imperfect. God does not dwell in a house made with hands 1 Kings 8:27; Jer. 7:4; Mich. 3:11; Hd. 7:48, 17:24. In the holy of holies only the high priest was allowed to enter once a year. The theophany in the O. T. does not yet reach its end and purpose. Therefore another and more glorious coming of God to his people is expected, both for redemption and for judgment, Ps. 50:3, 96:13; Isa. 2:21, 30:27, 40 v. passim. Mich. 1:3, 4:7; Zeph. 3:8; Joel 3:17; Zech. 2:10 v.; 14:9. The Angel of the covenant appears again in prophecy Zech. 1:8-12, 3; and shall come to his temple Mal. 3:1. The theophany reaches its climax in Christ, who is the *a/yeJoc, Joi'a, εἰκὼν, λογὸς, υἱὸς τοῦ ἰκσὸν*, in whom God is fully revealed and fully given, Mt. 11:27 ; John 1:14; 14:9; Col. 1:15, 2:19, etc. Through Him and the Spirit whom He sends, God's dwelling among and in His people is already now becoming a true, spiritual reality John 14:23; Rom 8:9, 11; 2 Cor 6:16. The church is the house of God, the temple of the Holy Spirit, Mt. 18:20; 1 Cor. 3:16, 6:19;

Eph. 2:21. But even this indwelling of God in the church of Christ is not yet the last and highest. It will reach its full realization only in the New Jerusalem. Then the tabernacle of God will be with men, and He will dwell with them, and they will be His people, and God Himself will be with them and their God. They shall see his face, and his name shall be on their foreheads, Mt. 5:8; 1 Cor. 15:28; 1 John 3:2; Rev. 21:3; 22 : 4. Cf. art. Theophany and Schechina in Herzog2. Art. Wolken- u. Feuersaule in Winer, Bibl. Realwört. Trip, Die Theophanien in den Geschichtsbüchern des A. T. Leiden 1858 and the litt. cited there. Schultz, Altt. Theol. 4th Aufi. 1889 S. 507 f. Oehler, Altt. Theol. 2te Aufi. 1882 S. 195 f. Smend, Lehrb. der altt. Religionsgeschichte 1893 S, 42 f. Weber, System der altsynag. palastin. Theologie, Leipzig 1880 S. 179 f. Cremer, Wörterb. s. v. *δο'ξα*. Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychol. 2nd Aufi. 1861 S. 49 f. Keerl, Die Lehre des N. T. von der Herrlichkeit Gottes. Basel 1863. Van Leeuwen, Bijb. Godg. 72 v.

3. Prophecy. By prophecy we mean the communication of God's thoughts to mankind. Often the name of inspiration is used for this; and to that extent also more correct, as the concept of prophecy is broader than that of inspiration and also includes the proclamation of these thoughts to others. But inspiration, on the basis of 2 Tim. 3 : 16, is used especially of the described revelation. And the word prophecy was formerly several times used in our sense, Thomas, S. Theol. II 2 qu. It also includes receiving the thoughts of God, because a prophet alone is one who proclaims God's word. And it expresses better than inspiration the intention of God with which He communicates His thoughts, namely, that man himself be a prophet, a proclaimer of His virtues. Now the thoughts of God which are communicated in prophecy may relate to the past, as in the historical books of Scripture, or to the present, or to the future. But always prophecy sets God's thoughts against those of men, His truth against their lies, His wisdom against their foolishness. This communication of God's thoughts to mankind can take place in various ways according to Scripture. Sometimes God himself speaks audibly, in human voice and language, Gen. 2:16, 3:8-19, 4:6-16, 6:13, 9:1, 8 v., 32:26 v.; Ex. 19:9 v.; Num. 7:89; Deut. 5:4; 1 Sam. 3:3 v.; Mt. 3:17, 17:5; Jn. 12:28, 29. In many places God is presented as speaking, without any further description of the manner in which this speaking took place, whether external or internal, in dream or vision, etc. The confidentiality of this speaking is of the utmost importance. The confidentiality of God's speaking is bestowed on Moses, who was not frightened nor fell down when God spoke to him, but with whom God spoke from mouth to mouth, and dealt as a friend with his friend, Num. 12:6-8; Ex. 33:11, 34:29; Deut. 5:5, 18:15, 18; 2 Cor. 3:7; Gal. 3:19; Heb. 3:5. Cf. Thomas S. Theol. II 2 qu. 174 art. 4. Witsius, de proph. Episcopius, Instit. Theol. III 2. The Jews later spoke of a Bath-Kol, a heavenly voice, by which God revealed himself; but this stood lower than the former prophecy, and had come after the spirit of prophecy had ceased, Weber, System der altsyn. pal. Theol. 187, Herzog 2, 130. But God often joins these lower forms in the communication of his thoughts, under which also among the pagans the gods were thought to make their will known. There is then an

almost complete agreement in the form. These include fate, the Urim and Thummim, the dream and the vision. Fate was used on many occasions, on the Day of Atonement Lev. 16:9, in dividing the land, Jos. 13:6, 14:2 etc., Neh. 11:1; of the Levite cities, Jos. 21:4; of spoils Joel 3:3; Nah. 3 : 10; Ob. 11; of garments, Mt. 27 : 35; Jn. 19:23; in deciding difficult cases, Jos. 7; 1 Sam. 14:42; Spr. 16 : 33, 18 : 18; Jon. 1:7; in election to an office, 1 Sam. 10:19; Hd. 1:26; 1 Chron. 24:5; Lu. 1:9, etc.; also the judgment of God, Num. 5 : 11-31 may be counted among them, Herzog² 8 762. The Urim and Thummim, LXX ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ἀληθεία, *Vuig, doctrina et veritas, light and right*, occur 7 times Ex. 28:30; Lev. 8:8; Num. 27:21; Deut. 33 : 8;

The ü. and Th. are not identical with the 12 precious stones on the breastplate of the high priests, as Josephus Ant. III, 8, 9 and many after him think, but were according to Ex. 28:30 and Lev. 8:8. 28 : 30 and Lev. 8 : 8 objects, which were hidden in the breastplate, Philo, Vita Mosis 3. But how they made God's will known, by glittering of the stones, by a voice, by inspiration, etc., and also what they consisted of, in two stones with the tetragrammaton, or in statuettes, or in a necklace made of precious stones, or in stones to draw lots, is completely unknown. The latter opinion has received support in modern times in the text of 1 Sam. 14:41 changed by Thenius 1842 to the LXX. The ü. and Th. would then have been lots with yes and no and are also used in Richt. 1:1, 20:18; 1 Sam. 22:10, 15, 23:6, 9-11, 30:7 v.; 2 Sam. 2:1, 5 : 19, 23. But therewith are answers, not of yes and no, but of long description and digression Richt. 20:27; 1 Sam. 30:7 v.; 2 Sam. 5:23, 21:1; Direct. 1:1, 20:18; 2 Sam. 2:1, especially 1 Sam. 10:22b ; 2 Sam. 5:23; 1 Chron. 14:14, do not explain well. The U. and Th. be- hath, however, certainly belonged to the same category of revelation as destiny; they occur especially in the time of Solomon, and then seem to give way to prophecy proper. Cf. art. U. and Th. in Herzog². Winer Realwört. Riehm, Wörterb. Keil, Archaeol. § 35. De Wette-Rabiger, Archaeol. S. 281 f. Oehler, Altt. Th. S. 334 f. Schultz, Altt. Th. 257 f. Dosker, Presbyt. and Ref. Rev. Oct. 1892 p. 717 etc.

Next, dreams occur in the Holy Scriptures as a means of revelation. They were held for this purpose throughout all antiquity, Homer, Od. 19: 560 v. II. 1: 63, 2 :22, 56. Aris- toteles, περί της να!) ἕπνον μαντικής. Cicero, de divinatione 1 : 29. Philo, de somniis, etc. Herzog² 15 : 733. And still many attach great value to dreams, Splittgerber, Schlaf und Tod, 2nd Aufl. 1881 I 66-205. Now it was known at all times, that dreams were also very deceiving. Homer Od. 19: 560 v. Arist. t. a. p., and also the H. S. repeatedly points out the vainness of dreams Ps. 73 : 20; Job 20 : 28; Isa. 29 : 7; Eccles. 5:2, 6; Sirach 31 : 1 v., 34: 1 v.; and attributes them often to the false prophets Jer. 23:25, 29:8; Mich. 3:6; Zech. 10: 2. Yet God constantly uses dreams to make His will known, Num. 12:6; Deut. 13:1-6; 1 Sam. 28:6, 15; Joel 2:28 f.; they occur to Israelites, but also several times to non-Israelites Gen. 20, 31, 40 41; Richt. 7 ; Dan. 2, 4 and contain either a word, an announcement of God, Gen. 20:3, 31:9, 24; Matt. 1:20, 2:12, 19, 22, 27:19; or a representation of fantasy, which then needs explanation several times Gen. 28. 37 : 5, 40 :5, 41 : 15; Richt. 7 : 13; Dan. 2, 4. Litter, by Herzog² 15 : 734. G. E. W. de Wijn, The dreams in and outside the Bible 1858. Witsius, de proph. I cap. 5.

With the dream the vision is related Gen. 15 : 1, 11; 20:7; Num. 12:6. Already the names אה'-- , חזה , הביא and perhaps also -צ by which the prophet is called, Kuenen, The Prophets 1 49, 51 v. 97. Id. Godsd. v. Isr. I 212. Id. Hist. Cr. Ond. II² 5 v. König, Der Offenbarungsbegriff I 71 f. Delitzsch, Genesis⁸ 634. Schultz, Altt. Th. 239. Smend, Lehrb. 79 f., and the names חזה-c and חזר- for the prophetic sight truly indicate, that vision was a not uncommon means of revelation. But these words have often lost their original meaning and are also used when there is no actual vision, 1 Sam. 3:15; Isa. 1:1; Ob. 1; Nah. 1:1, etc. Visions are repeatedly mentioned and described in Scripture, from Genesis down to the Apoc. Gen. 15 ;1, 46:2; Num. 12 : 6, 22 : 3, 24 : 3 ; 1 Kings 22: 17-23; Isa. 6, 21 :6; Jer. 1:24; Ezek. 1-3, 8-11, 40; Dan. 1:17, 2:19, 7, 8, 10; Amos 7-9; Zech. 1-6; Matt. 2:13, 19; Luk. 1:22, 24:23; Acts 7:55, 9:3, 10:3, 10, 16:9, 22:17, 26:19; 1 Cor. 12-14; 2 Cor. 12:1; Apoc. 1 : 10, etc. The vision was often accompanied by a certain spirit-exaltation. Music, dance and ecstasy go together;

prophecy and poetry are related, 1 Sam. 10:5 v., 19:20-24; 2 Kings 3:15; 1 Chr. 25:1, 25; 2 Chr. 29:30. When the hand of the Lord falls upon the prophets, Isa. 8:11; Ezek. 3 :14, 11 : 5 or the Spirit comes upon them, they many a time enter into a state of rapture Num. 24:3; 2 Kings. 9:11; Jer. 29:26; Hos. 9:5, and fall to the ground Num. 24:3, 15, 16; 1 Sam. 19:24; Ezek. 1:28, 3:23, 43:3; Dan. 10:8-10; Acts 9:4; Apoc. 1 :17, 11:16, 22:8. In this state the thoughts of God are given to them to see or hear in symbolic form. In images and visions His counsel is revealed to them Jer. 1:13 ff, 24:1 ff; Am. 7-9; Zech. 1-6; Apoc., etc.; especially concerning the future, Num. 23 ff; 1 Kings 22:17; 2 Kings 5:26, 8:11 ff; Jer. 4:23 ff, 14:18; Ezek. 8; Am. 7, etc.; and all kinds of other things. They also hear all kinds of voices and sounds in this state, 1 Kings 18:41; 2 Kings 6:32; Isa 6:3, 8; Jer 21:10, 49:14; Ezek 1:24, 28, 2:2, 3:12; Apoc 7:4, 9:16, 14:2, 19:1, 21 :3, 22:8, etc. Even they are taken up and moved in spirit, Ezek. 3:12 v., 8:3, 43:1; Dan. 8:2; Matt. 4:5, 8; Acts 9:10, 10. 11, 22:17, 23:11, 27:23; 2 Cor. 12:2; Apoc. 1:9, 12, 4:1, 12:18. Daniel, after receiving a vision, was insane for several days, 7:28, 8:27. Yet the ecstasy in which the recipients of revelation often found themselves was not a state in which consciousness was wholly or partially suppressed. Such was the state, in which the Greek *μάντεις* gave their divine pronouncements, Tholuck, *Die Propheten* u. s. w. 64 f. s. w. 64 f. And Philo, *Quis rer. div. heres*, Just. Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph*, c. 135; Goh. *ad Graecos* c. 37. Athenagoras, *Leg. pro Christ*, c. 8. Tertul. *adv. Mare.* 4, 22 and in newer times Hengstenberg in the first edition of his *Christol. des A. T.* III. 2. 158 f. have already conceived the ecstasy of the prophets in this way. But these receive visions not in a sleeping but in a waking state, not only in solitude, but also in the presence of others, Ezek. 8:1. Under the vision they remain conscious of themselves, see, hear, think, speak, ask and answer Ex. 4-6, 32:7 f.; Isa. 6; Jer. 1; Ezek. 4-6 etc. and later they remember everything and communicate it accurately, König, *Der Offenbarungsbegriff*, I 160 f. II 83 f. Kuenen, *De propeten* I 96 f. Oehler, *Alt. Theol.* § 207 f. Orelli in *Herzog* 16 : 724. Therefore most theologians considered the psychic condition of the prophets under vision to be a self-conscious, spiritual perception, an *alienatio mentis a sensibus corporis*, and not

an alienatio a mente; e.g. by Orig. de princ. III, 3, 4, August, ad Simplic. II qu. 1. Thomas, S. Theol. II 2 qu. 175. Witsius, de proph. 1 c. 4. Buddeus, Inst. theol. dogm. I, 2, 5 and in newer times by Havernick and Keil in their introduction to the O. T. Oehler, Alt. Theol. § 210. Tholuck, Die Propheten S. 64 f. Kueper, Das Profetenthum des Alten Bundes S. 51 f. Orelli at Herzog2 16, 724. König, Offenb. II 132 f. Only König, in order to maintain objectivity, has added the peculiar opinion that all visions were externally, physically and sensually perceptible. Indeed, many apparitions such as Genesis 18, 32, Exodus 3, 19, etc., can be considered objective according to the authors' intentions. There is a difference between theophany and vision. Yet the visions mentioned above, 1 Kings 22:17ff; Isa 6; Jer 1; Ezek 1-3; Dan; Amos 7-9; Zech 1-6, etc., are certainly internal and spiritual. Many are of such a nature that they cannot be sensually imagined and perceived. Koenig goes too far if he makes the external aspects of revelation the basis of its objectivity and truth, and cannot conceive of any influence of God's Spirit in the mind of man except through the external senses. He forgets that there are also hallucinations of sight and hearing, that the external as such does not exclude self-deception, and that therefore the certainty of revelation is not sufficiently proved by its external character alone, Orelli at Herzog2 16: 724 f. Kuenen H. C. O. II2 13. Van Leeuwen, Bijb. Godg. 62 v. Borchert, Die Visionen der Propheten, Stud. u. Krit. 1895, 2tes Heft.

The last form of revelation is internal illumination. Hengstenberg, Christol. des A. T. III2 2 S. 158 cf. also Kueper, Das Proph. 53 f. held that ecstasy was the ordinary state in which the prophet was at the receiving of the revelation. But this opinion has been rejected by many, a.o. by Riehm, Mess. Weissagung2 S. 15 f. König, Der Off. begriff 11 48 f. 83 f. 132 f. disputed and now generally rejected.

Ecstasy is not the rule, but the exception, Kuenen, Prof. I 98. Most revelations to the prophets also in the O. T. took place without any vision, e.g., in Isaiah, Hagg., Mal., Ob., Nah., Hab., Jerem., Ezek. It is true that the word "face" is often used for the speech of God, but this

occurs also where nothing is seen Isa. 1:1, 2:1; Amos 1:1; Hab. 1:1, 2:1; 1 Sam. 3:15; Ob. 1 ; Nah. 1 :1 etc. The revelation then takes place internally by the Spirit, as the Spirit of revelation. Well has König, *Der Off. I* 104 f. 141 f. 155 f., has asserted that the Spirit is not the principle of revelation but only principle of illumination, i. e., that Yahveh reveals but only makes the Spirit subjectively receptive to that revelation; König came to this, because he wanted to hand-harbor the objectivity and externality of revelation and bind the subjective Spirit to the objective word of Yahveh. But Num. 11:25-29; Deut. 34 : 9. 1 Sam. 10 : 6, 19 : 20 f. ; 2 Sam. 23 : 2; 1 Kings 22 : 24; 1 Chron. 12 : 18, 28 : 12; 2 Chron. 15 :1, 20 : 14 v., 24 : 20; Neh. 9 : 30; Isa. 11 : 1, 30 : 1, 42 : 1, 48 : 16, 59 : 21, 61:1, 63:10ff, Ezek. 2:2, 3:24, 8:3, 11:5, 24; Micah 3:8; Hos. 9:7; Joel 2:28; Zech. 7:12, are not exclusively understood as a formal, sub-jective empowerment of the Spirit; they clearly teach that the prophets did not speak only through but from the Spirit, that prophecy came from the Spirit in them. There was also an activity of the Spirit that subjectively enabled the prophet, but this is not the only one; it cannot be separated from the other revelatory activity in the way that König does, and on König's point of view, where revelation is entirely external, it is unnecessary. And the spirit of lie 1 Kings 22: 22 clearly teaches that the Spirit is source of the word, Rev 2 16:721. Jewish theology saw in the Spirit not only the source of illumination, but also of revelation and prophecy. Weber, *System der altsyn. pal. Theol.* 184-187. The N. Test, declares just as clearly, that the O. T. prophets spoke out of and through the Spirit of God, Rev. 28 : 25; 1 Pet. 1: 11; 2 Pet. 1:21. There is, however, a difference in the manner in which the Holy Spirit communicates the inner revelation in the Old and New Testament. In the O. T. the Holy Spirit descends upon a person from above and moment by moment. He comes upon the prophets, Num. 24:2; 1 Sam. 19:20, 23; 2 Chr. 15:1, 20:14; becomes skillful over them, Richt. 14 : 19, 15 : 14; 1 Sam. 10 : 6; falls on them, Ez. 11 : 5; puts on them like a garment, Richt. 6:34; 1 Chr. 12:18; the hand, i. e. the power of the Lord seizes them, Isa. 8:11; Ez. 1:3, 3:22, 8:1, 37:1, 40:1. In the face of this working of the Spirit, the prophets are therefore most passive; they are silent, fall to the ground,

dismayed, and for a time are in an abnormal, ecstatic condition. The Spirit of prophecy is not yet the permanent possession of the prophets; there is still separation and distance between them; and the position of the prophets is still separate from the people. The whole of prophecy is still imperfect. Therefore it also looks ahead and expects a prophet on whom the Spirit of the Lord will rest Deut. 18:18; Isa. 11:2, 61:1; yes, it foretells the fulfilment of Moses' wish that all the Lord's people may be prophets Num. 11:29; and it testifies to a future dwelling of God's Spirit in all the Lord's children, Isa. 32:15, 44:3, 59:21; Joel 2:28; Ez. 11:19, 36:27,39:29. In the N. T. the highest, the only, the true prophet appears. As Logos he is the full and complete revelation of God, John 1:1 v. 18, 14:9, 17:6; Col. 2:9. He receives no revelation from above or outside, but is Himself the source of prophecy. The Holy Spirit does not come upon Him or fall upon Him. He dwells in him without measure John 3:34. By that Spirit He is received, by that Spirit He speaks, acts, lives and dies, Mt 3:16, 12:28; Luke 1:17, 2:27, 4:1, 14, 18; Rom 1:4; Heb 9:14. And that Spirit He gives to His disciples, not only as the Spirit of regeneration and sanctification but also as the Spirit of revelation and illumination, Mk. 13:11; Lu. 12:12; Jn. 14:17, 15:26, 16:13, 20:22; Rev. 2:4, 6:10, 8:29, 10:19, 11 v. 12, 13:2, 18:5, 21:4; 1 Cor. 2:12 v.; 12:7 11.

11. By that Spirit special persons are still qualified for the office of prophet, Rom. 12:7; 1 Cor. 14:3; Eph. 2:20, 3:5 etc. Also prophecy itself is not lacking in the N.T., Mt. 24; Acts 20:23, 21:8; 1 Cor. 15; 2 Thess. 2. Apoc. But all believers have the anointing of the Spirit, 1 Jn 2:20; and have been taught by the Lord, Mt 11:25-27; Jn 6:45. All are prophets who proclaim the virtues of the Lord, Acts 2:17ff; 1 Pet. 2:9. Prophecy as a special gift will be nullified, 1 Cor. 13:8. In the new Jerusalem the name of God will be on all foreheads. Lying is completely excluded, Apoc. 21 : 27, 22 : 4, 15. Literature on the prophets and prophecy by Schultz Altt. Theol. 4th Aufl. 213 f; and further König, Der Offenbarungsbegriff des A. T. Leipzig, Hinrichs 1882. Kuenen, Hist. crit. Research, 2nd ed. 1889 II bl. 1 v. Smend, Lehrbuch der altt. Religions- gesch. 1893. S. 79 f. Kuyper, Encycl. II

362 v. 429 v. C. H. Cornill, Der israel. Prophetismus, Strassburg 1894.

4. Miracles. Just as man, besides his appearance and his word, also makes himself known by his deeds, so God reveals himself not only by his words but also by his works. Word and deed are closely related. God's word is an act, Ps. 33:9; and His doing is a speech, Ps. 19:2, 29:3; Isa. 28:26. Both, word and deed, seal each other in creation as well as in re-creation. Generally speaking, the word precedes as a promise or a threat, but it contains the deed as a seed within it. His word does not return empty, but does what pleases Him, Isa. 55:10, 11. The words by which in Scripture the deeds, the works of God, are indicated, differ. According to their outward appearance they are פּפּלאַרַת Ex. 3:20, 34:10; Ps. 71:17; פּלאַ Ex. 15:11; Isa. 25/1'. insignia, ingentia, or רַה־הִים Ex. 4:21, 7:19; Ps. 105:5, splendidum quid, both gr. τέρατα, something special, unusual, distinguished from ordinary events. They are called תּבדּוֹת Deut. 3:24; Ps. 21:14, 54:3, 66:7, ὄνταμεις, בַּיְנוֹב־יב Ps. 8:7, 19:2, 103:22; Isa. 5:19 or בּלִילִית; Ps. 9 : 12/77 :13 ἔργα μεγαλεία, for the great, divine power, which reveals itself in them. Above all, they are also called אוֹתוֹת Ex. 3 : 12, 12 : 13, etc., because they are a proof and sign of the contradiction of God. The works of God are first of all to be seen in His creation and maintenance. All God's works are victorious. Also the works of nature are often called miracles in Scripture, Ps. 77 : 13, 97 : 3, 98 : 1 107 : 24, 139 : 14. From this, however, it must not be inferred, as Scholten did in *Supra-naturalism in connection with the Bible, Christianity and Protestantism in Leiden 1867*, p. 9 f., that Scripture makes no distinction between nature and miracles. Certainly, the idea that a miracle would be contrary to the laws of nature and therefore impossible, does not arise. Rather, all Scripture is based on the belief that nothing is too miraculous for God, Genesis 18:14; Deut. 8:3ff; Mt. 19:26. But that is not why there is a lack of distinction between the ordinary order of nature and the extraordinary acts of God. The O. T. knows a fixed order of nature, ordinances which apply to heaven and earth, which are fixed in the order of the Lord, Gen. 1:26, 28, 8:22; Ps. 104:5, 9, 119:90, 91, 148:6;

Eccles. 1:10; Job 38:10 f.; Jer. 5:24, 31:25 f., 33:20, 25. And the N. T. makes an equally clear distinction, Mt. 8:27, 9:5, 24,33, 13:54; Luk. 5:9, 7:16,8:53; Jn. 3:2, 9:32, etc. Miracles are a בריאת a creation, something new, never otherwise seen, Ex. 34:10; Num. 16:30. The facts, which are mentioned in the H. S. as miracles, are still regarded by us as miracles; as to the qualification of such facts there is no difference, Cf. Herzog² 17:360. Pierson, God's miracle-power and our spiritual life 1867 bl. 10 v. Gloatz in Stud. u. Krit. 1886, 3tes Heft S. 403 f. W. Bender, Der Wunder- begriff des N. T. Frankf. 1871 S. 100 f. Schultz, Altt. Theol. 077 f. Further, Scripture does acknowledge, that also outside of revelation unusual forces may work and unusual things may happen, Ex. 7:11, 22, 8:7, 18, 9:11; Mt. 24: 24; Apoc. 13: 13 v.; thus a sign or miracle is not in itself sufficient to seal a prophet, Deut. 13:1-3. Yet it is Israel's God alone who works miracles, Ps. 72: 18, 77: 15, 86: 10, 136: 4. Sometimes He accomplishes these miracles directly Himself; sometimes He makes use of men or angels. But always it is God who does them. His ὀνομα is manifested in them, Luke 5:17, 14:19; Mk. 7:34; Luke 11:20; John 3:2, 5:19ff, 10:25, 32; Acts 2:22, 4:10. It is the Spirit of the Lord who works them, Mt. 12:28; Acts 10:38.

The miracles have their beginning and their foundation in the creation and maintenance of all things, which is a continual work and miracle of God, Ps. 33:6, 9; John 5:17. All that is done has its last ground in the will and power of God. Nothing can resist Him. He does with the host of the heavens according to His will, Isa 55:8 v. Ps 115:3. This power and freedom of God is preached by nature, Jer. 5:22, 10:12, 14:22, 27 ;5; Isa. 40:12, 50:2,3; Ps. 33:13-17, 104; Job 5:9 v., 9:4 v., etc. but comes out especially in the history of His people, Deut. 10:21, 11:3, 26:8, 29:2, 32 :12 v.; Ps. 66 : 5 v., 74: 13 v., 77 : 15 v., 78:4 v., 135 : 8 v.; Isa. 51:2, 9; Jer. 32 :20 v.; Acts 7 : 2 v. In this history "the miracles especially occur. They occur for different purposes. Mt. 8:32, 21 :19 ; Hd. 13 : 11, etc. Then, to save and redeem God's people, to bring salvation and healing, like the plagues in Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea, the miracles in the desert, the healings of Jesus. More than once they also have the direct or

indirect intention of confirming the mission of the prophets, the truth of their word, and thus faith in their testimony, Ex. 4: 1-9; Deut. 13: 1 ff; Richt. 6 : 37 v.; 1 Sam. 12:16 v.; 1 Kings 17:24; 2 Kings 1:10, 20:8; Isa. 7:11, etc.; Mt. 14:33; Luke 5 ; 24; John 2:11, 3:2, 5:36, 6:14, 7:31, 9:16, 10:38, 12:37; Acts 2:22, 10:38, etc. Prophecy and miracle-working go together. All the prophets and also the apostles have the consciousness of being able to do miracles. Moses was also great in his miracles, Ex. 5-15; Deut. 34:10-12. His sin once consisted in doubting God's miracle power, Num. 20:10 v. Around Elijah and Elisha a cycle of miracles is growing, 1 Kings 17-2 Kings 13. With the later prophets miracles do not occupy such a large place anymore. They often make use of so-called symbolic acts, in order to confirm their prophecy and, as it were, to realize it initially, 1 Kings 11:29-39, 20:35 ff, 22 : 11 ; Isa. 7:3, 8:1, 20:2 v., 21:6, 30:8; Jer. 13, 16, 18, 19, 25 : 15, 27, 28 : 10 v., 32 :6, 43 : 8; Ezek. 4:5, 6:11, 7 : 23, 12:3, 17:1; Hos. 1-3; para. 21 : 10 v., Schultz, *Altt. Theol.* 250 f. Smend, *Lehrb. der altt. Rel. Gesch.* 88. König, *Der Offenbarungsbegriff* II 111 f. Yet even of them miracles are still recounted and they have the conviction, to be able to do miracles, Isa. 7:11, 16:14, 21:16, 38:7 cf. 2 Kings 20; Jer. 22:12, 30, 28:16, 29 : 22, 36 : 30, 37 : 7 v.; Dan. 1-6. But all these miracles in the O. T. have not worked an elevation, a renewal of nature. They have had their effect. They have by turns punished and blessed mankind, and in any case preserved it from destruction. They have created in Israel a people of its own, redeemed it from the servitude of Egypt, kept it from merging with the Gentiles, and protected it as the people of God against the oppressive power of nature. But they were momentary, passed away, diminished in effect, and forgotten. Life took its usual course. Nature seemed to triumph. Then the prophecy raised its voice and said that Israel could not perish and perish in the natural life of the Gentiles. God will come again to his people in greater glory. God will not forget His covenant, which is an everlasting covenant, Ps 89:1-5; Isa 54:10. With that coming of God the old time will pass into the new. That is the turning point in world history. It is the יום יהודה, the Day of the Lord, when He will reveal His Lordship and display His miraculous power. God then gives signs in the sky, Am. 8:8 f.; Joel 2: 30. All

nature, heaven and earth, will be moved, Am. 9:5; Isa. 13:10, 13, 24:18-20, 34:1-5; Joel 2:2, 10, 3 : 15 ; Mich. 1 : 3 v.; Hab. 3 : 3 v.; Nah. 1 : 4 v.: Ezek. 31 :15 v., 32 : 7 v.. 38 : 19 v. The judgment will be on the wicked, Isa. 24 : 16 v. etc. but it will also purify and deliver. God will save his people by his miracles, Isa. 9:3, 10:24 v., 11 : 15 v., 43: 16-21, 52 : 10, 62 : 8. He does something new on the earth, Isa. 43: 19, brings Israel back from the dead, Ezek. 37: 12-14, and makes it share in a fullness of spiritual and material blessings. Forgiveness of sins, holiness, a new covenant, Isa. 44:21-23, 43:25; Ezek. 36:25-28; Jer. 31:31 v.; Zech. 14:20. 21, but also peace, security, prosperity will be his portion.... Even nature will be transformed into a paradise, Hos. 2 :17 v.; Joel 3 : 18; Jer. 31 : 6, 12-14; Isa. 11 : 6-8, 65 : 25; Ezek. 34:29, 36:29 v.; Zech. 8:12. There is to be a new heaven and a new earth, and the former things shall be thought of no more, Isa. 65 : 17 , 66 : 22. This Yom Jhvh, this אֵלֶּם תְּבֵא, αἰὼν μελλῶν, in contrast with the "כִּי־: --, αἰὼν ὄντος, has, according to the representation of Scripture, dawned with the N. Test. The coming of Christ is the turning point of time. A new cycle of miracles groups itself around His person. He himself is the absolute miracle, descended from above and yet the true, perfect man. In Him, in principle, creation is restored, lifted up from its fall to its former glory. His miracles are σημεῖα of the presence of God, evidence of the Messianic age, Mt 11:3-5, 12:28; Luke 13:16, part of His Messianic work. In Christ a divine δυναμις appears, which is stronger than all the consuming and destructive power of sin. He attacks this power, not only in the periphery, by curing illnesses and diseases and performing all kinds of miracles; but He penetrates into its center, breaks it and conquers it. His incarnation and satisfaction, His resurrection and ascension are the great acts of God's redemption. They are the fundamental restoration of the kingdom of glory. These acts of salvation are not just means to reveal something, but they are the revelation of God Himself. The miracle here becomes history, and history itself is a miracle. The person and work of Christ is the central revelation of God; all other revelation is grouped around it. But also after Jesus' passing, his miracle power continues in the disciples, Mt. 10; Mk. 16:18; Luke 8. And not only in the Acts are

many miracles recounted, 2:43, 3:5, 5:12-16, 6:8, 8:6, 7, 13, 9:34, 40, 13:11, 14:3, 16 :18, 19:11, 20:10, 28:5, 8: but Paul also gives evidence of this miracle power of the apostles, Rom. 15:18, 19; 1 Cor. 12:9, 10; 2 Cor. 12:12; Gal. 3:5, cf. Heb. 2:4. For a time this miracle power continues in the church. But it ceases, when Christianity is established and the church is the object, in which God glorifies the wonders of his grace, Aug. de civ. 22 :8, de util. cred. 16, de vera relig 25. The spiritual miracles are those in which God now reveals his power and his glory, Luther at Köstlin, Luther's Theol. II 249 v. 341 v. Scholten, L. H. K. I 143. Yet the Scriptures point towards a future, in which the miracle will again do its work. The αἰὼν μελλῶν will first take place in the new heaven and the new earth, where righteousness dwells. Then the miracle has become nature. Ethos and physis are reconciled. The kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world are one, Op. 21-22. Cf. Oehler Theol. des A. T. 1882 S. 210 f. Schultz, Alt. Theol. 270 f. 534 f. 577 f. Smend, Lehrb. der Alt. Rel. Gesch. 88 f. W. Bender, Der Wunderbegriff des N. T. Erankf. a/M. 1871. Ph. Schaff, Jesus Christ, the miracle of history 1867. Neander, Gesch. der Pflanzung u. Leitung der Chr. K. 5e Aufl. 1862 S. 49 f. 154 f. 336 f. Tholuck, Vermischte Schriften, Hamh. 1839 I 28 f.

B. Concept of special revelation.

5. The system of revelation, which Scripture makes known to us, has been too much misunderstood and neglected in Christian theology. Only in recent times has the concept and essence of revelation become the subject of deeper study. In the past, no need was felt for this. Between Christians and pagans the possibility of revelation was not in dispute. The only controversy was over the truth of this revelation, which was taught in the O. and N. Test. And this was argued by the apologists against the attacks of Celsus and Porphyrius on all kinds of grounds. Incidentally, the thoughts on revelation came down to this scheme: God can only be known by God. All knowledge and service of God therefore rests on revelation from Him. But the revelation of God in nature and history is insufficient. Therefore a special revelation is needed, which reaches its climax in

Christ, Har- nack, Lehrb. der Dogmengesch. I 2 420 f. 436 f. 453 f. The following theologians, especially the scholastics, took great care in defining and describing the relationship between nature and revelation, knowledge and faith, philosophy and theology, but they did not consider the concept of revelation and only mentioned it in passing, cf. Thomas S. Theol. I qu. 57 art. 5 ad 3. II 2 qu. 2 art. 6. III qu. 55 art. 3. The Protest, theologians also paid too little attention to this concept. They immediately identified revelation with the Scriptures, and did not entirely escape the abstract supranaturalistic and one-sided intellectualistic conception which had gradually been formed of them in theology. Cf. Gerhard, Loci Theol. I § 12. Calovius, Isagoge ad theol. p. 101 sq. 142 sq. Polanus, Synt. Theol. VI 9. Maresius, Syst. Theol. 1 § 15 sq. Heidegger, Corpus Theol. XII 46. Socinianism drove this supernatural and intellectual understanding of revelation to the forefront, Fock, Der Socin. 296 f. 314 f. Remonstrantism had essentially the same conception, Limborch, Theol. Christ. II 9, 18. Between rationalism and supranaturalism there was no difference in the concept of revelation; for both it consisted in an external communication of doctrine. It was not surprising, and also fully deserved, that such a concept of revelation could not withstand the criticism of deism and rationalism. What was the religious value of a revelation which gave nothing but some rational truth, which might later have been found by reason itself? Yet it turned out that the concept of revelation had been discarded all too soon. Religion and revelation showed a much closer relationship upon deeper historical and philosophical investigation than had previously been thought. Thus the concept of revelation came to be honored again in the newer theology and philosophy and various attempts at reconstruction were tried.

Hamann, Claudius, Lavater, Herder, Jacobi, and others pointed out the relationship between religion and art and related revelation to inspiration by genius. The concept of revelation was extended to the point that everything became revelation. Religion, poetry, philosophy, history, language are different expressions of the same original life. *Omnia divina et humana omnia*. And in the midst of all

these revelations stands Christ; to Him everything points, around Him everything groups, Ehrenfeuchter, Christenthum und moderne Weltanschauung, Gottingen 1876 S. 243 f. Also Schleiermacher, Glaub. § 10, 13 definitely rejected the rationalistic doctrine of revelation. He sought its propriety not in the supernatural character it possesses or not, but in the newness and originality with which a person or an event appears in history. Revelation is therefore related to poetic and heroic inspiration, and in fact consists of awakening new, original disorders of religious feeling. Schleiermacher prepared this conception of revelation, which allows it to exist not in the communication of doctrine but of life. Rothe, Zur Dogmatik 1862 S. 55-120, has the same idea about revelation as inspiration, but he also assumes as the constitutive element of revelation an external, historical manifestation, so that the internal revelation, inspiration, is not magical and mechanical. The peculiarities of the concept of revelation among the theologians, who more or less follow Schleiermacher, consist above all in this: revelation is to be distinguished from theopneustia, from the Holy Scriptures; Scripture is not to be distinguished from theology, but from theology. Revelation is a religious, and even more a soteriological, concept, related but not identical with genius, poetry, and heroism; it is the correlate of religion alone; It is not a doctrine about all kinds of physical, historical and metaphysical things, but only a religious-ethical truth; it is a sharing of life, a self-communication of God; it is not strictly supernatural, but truly natural and human; finally, it is not only external (manifestation), but also internal and spiritual (inspiration). There are still differences as to the beginning, extent, and end of revelation, but in the main this is the view found in Nitzsch, System der chr. Lehre § 22. Twisten I 341 f. Martensen § 11, 12. Lange I § 56 f. Dorner I 56.9 f. Frank, System der chr. Wahrheit 2e Aufl. II 8 f. Kahler, Wiss, der chr. Lehre I 192 f. Saussaye, Mine Theology 35 v. Gunning and Saussaye, The Ethical Principle 21 v. etc. But not only Schleiermacher and his school have revived the concept of revelation, but also Schelling and Hegel have tried the same in their own way. Through them rationalism acquired a speculative character. They did not try to destroy the Christian revelation by a

criticism of reason, but they sought speculatively to trace the deep idea which underlies it and all Christian dogmata, and in doing so they set themselves as speculative rationalists against the vulgar rationalists of earlier times. According to Schelling in his first period, the whole world was the self-revelation of God. Nature is the visible spirit, spirit the invisible nature. The essence of God becomes known to mankind through all of nature, but especially through the development of the human spirit in art, religion and science. And so Hegel also taught that God does not reveal Himself to man through a passing event [in time], but He reveals Himself in man himself, and becomes conscious of Himself in man. And this becoming conscious of God in man, is man's knowing of God, is religion, *Keligiensphilosophie* 1832 I 29. II158. *Encyclop.* S. 576. Revelation for Hegel therefore equals the necessary self-revelation, with the self-consciousness of the Absolute in the human spirit; the history of religions is the history of the coming to self of the Absolute in the human consciousness, and reaches its climax in Christianity, which expresses the unity of God and man. This idea of revelation as the self-communication of God to each and every human being is connected in the main with that conception of revelation which we find in Marheineke, *Grundlehren der chr.* § 206. Rosenkranz, *Encycl. der theol. Wiss.* 2nd Aufl. 1845 S. 1 f. Erdmann, *Glauben und Wissen* 1837. Strauss, *Glaubenslehre* § 19. Feuerbach, *Wesen des Christ.* 2nd Ausg. S. 174. Biedermann, *Chr. Dogm.* I 264 f. Pfeleiderer, *Grundriss* § 16. Lipsius, *Dogm.* § 52, *Philos. und Religion* 1885 S. 266 f. Scholten, *Initia*, ed. 2. p. 26-39. L. H. K. I 165 v. 233,299. Common to these is the denial of the supernatural character of revelation, but otherwise there are great differences as to content, extent and manner. The peculiarity of this conception lies in the fact that very little value is attached to the distinction between natural and supernatural revelation, that emphasis is placed on the positive character of every religion and on the historical, external nature of revelation, and that for Christianity this historical revelation is found above all or even exclusively in the person of Christ. u. *Vers.* III3 190 f. 599 f. Kaftan, *Wesen der chr. Religion* 171 f. 295 f. Herrmann, *Der Begriff der Offenbarung* Giessen 1887. G. v. Schulthess-Rettberg, *Der Gedanke*

einer göttlichen Offenbarung, Zurich 1893. Nietzsche, Lehrbuch der ev. Dogm. s. 131 f. Cf. the Groninger school here in the country, Hofstede de Groot, De Groninger Godgeleerden in hunne eigenigheid 42 v.

A clear and lucid understanding of revelation is still lacking in dogmatics. There is a difference of opinion among the theologians concerning everything that is considered in this understanding. Perhaps there is a boundary to be drawn between those who accept supernatural revelation and those who accept only natural revelation. But even then the question arises whether the supernatural character of revelation lies in the manner in which it came to us, or in the newness and originality of its contents (Schleiermacher). Furthermore, how does supernatural revelation differ from natural revelation in nature and history, especially from religious, poetic, heroic inspiration, which is also found outside Christianity and is so often associated with Christian revelation (Hamann, Herder, Jacobi, Schleiermacher)? Where is this supernatural revelation to be found, also in the religions of the heathen, or only in Israel, or even exclusively, in the person of Christ (Schleiermacher, Ritschl)? How far does it extend after Christ, is it limited to him, or is the working of the Holy Spirit in rebirth, conversion, etc. also to be counted under the concept of revelation (Frank)? Is its impact primarily knowledge, so that it enlightens the mind (Hegel, Biedermann, Scholten), or is it primarily mystical in nature, an impact on the mind, an awakening, a revival of the emotions (Schleiermacher, Lipsius, Opzoomer, Ethics)? Is the external, the historical, the manifestation, either in nature (Hegel, Scholten), or in history (Schelling, Ritschl), or especially as a miracle (Rothe) the main point of revelation, or does the centre of gravity lie in the subject in the self-revelation of the absolute Spirit, of God, to mankind (Biedermann, Lipsius)?

6. The revelation which Scripture makes known to us does not consist of a few disjointed words and facts, but is one historical and organic whole, a mighty world-managing and world-renewing system of acts of God. She acts, as we saw, in three forms, theophany,

prophecy and miracle, שכינה, כב"ה; and בריה. But these three do not stand apart from each other; they form one whole and together aim at one goal. Already through the *revelatio generalis* God does not leave man untouched; He reveals Himself in nature and history, He speaks in heart and conscience; He works miracles of power. The *revelatio generalis* may also be called revelation. For in a broad sense revelation is all action that emanates from God to place man in a religious relationship to Him. But through sin another form of revelation becomes necessary, one which, although in many ways related to the *revelatio generalis*, is essentially different from it in form and content. It is addressed to fallen mankind and must therefore be a revelation of grace. The *revelatio specialis* is God's seeking of and coming to mankind. He must now reveal Himself and speak and work in such a way that mankind is renewed in His image. That is why God comes to man in a human way. The incarnation of man is the central fact in the *revelatio specialis*, which spreads light over all its area. Already in the creation God makes himself like man. But in the re-creation He becomes man and enters into our situation. And this incarnation, which is the actual content of the *revelatio specialis*, already began in a certain sense immediately after the fall. The special revelation of God enters into history and forms a history that continues through the ages. It assumes such a historical character because mankind itself, to whom it is addressed, exists only in historical form. It leads its life, follows its course, walks with it through time until the end. It goes back deep into the life of creation, joins in with providence and makes its light shine through the prism of human persons, situations and events. She uses all the character and individuality, all the aptitude and gift, which are given in creation. She wraps herself in the forms of type and shadow, of image and symbol, of art and poetry, of letter form and chronicle. She adopts in religion the customs found in other religions, such as circumcision and sacrifice, temple and priesthood. She even considers fate, dreams and visions not too small to be used as instruments. The divine descends so deeply into the human that the boundaries between revelation and pseudo-religion seem to be

erased. Godspeech and oracle, prophecy and mantra, miracle and magic seem to approach each other.

And yet it is another heart that beats in Israel's religion. The peripheral and atomistic view appeals to such facts of resemblance between the religion of Scripture and the religions of the nations, but it does not explain the revelation in its character and significance, and in the end it does not know what to do with Scripture. Therefore, this view must give way to the central and organic one, which allows the light to shine from the center to the outer perimeter. And that center is the Incarnation of God. It is He who descends in the *revelatio specialis* and makes Himself equal to men. The subject of special revelation is actually the Logos, the Malak Jhvh, the Christ. He is the mediator of creation, John 1:3; Col. 1:15, but also of re-creation. Του γαρ δια της ίδιας πρόνοιας και διακοσμησεως τωι; όλων διδάσκοντος περι του Πατρος, αντου ην και την αυτην διδασκαλιαν ανανεισαι, Athan. de incarn. c. 14. Cf. Iren. adv. haer. IV 6. He is the subject of revelation also already in the O. Test, the angel of the covenant, who led Israel, Ex. 14 : 19, 23 : 20, 32 :34, 33 : 2; Isa. 63 : 8, 9, the content of prophecy John 5.-39; 1 Pet. 1:11; Apoc. 19 : 10. By theophany, prophecy and miracle He prepares His coming in the flesh. The O. Test, revelation is the history of the coming Christ. Theophany, prophecy and miracle end with Him. In Christ they fall together. He is the revelation, the word, the power of God. He shows us the Father, declares His name, accomplishes His work. The Incarnation is the conclusion, the goal and the end both of Israel's history, and also the center of all history, *Bis hierher und von daher geht die Geschichte* (Joh. von Müller). *Die incarnation is the Centralwunder; es ist das Wunder aller Wunder, da das Göttliche unmittelbar mit dem Menschlichen sich berührt*, Ranke, *Weltgeschichte VIII* 72.

When the revelation of God in Christ, in his person and work, has appeared and been described in Scripture, a different dispensation begins. The Holy Spirit began to dwell in the church; with that the character of the times was changed. The αἰών οἴτος passed into the

αιών μελλών. Just as in the first period everything was prepared for Christ, so now everything is derived from Him. Then Christ was formed as the head of the church, now the church is formed as the body of Christ. Then the Word, the Holy Scriptures, was finished, now it is being worked out. Yet this dispensation also has its place in the system of revelation. The revelation has been continued, though modified, according to the nature of the dispensation. Revelation, as signifying and producing the Christ, has reached its end. For Christ is there, His work is accomplished, and His word is finished. New, constitutive elements of the *revelatio specialis* can no longer become. The question is therefore of minor importance whether the gift of prophecy and miracles still continues in the Christian Church. The testimonies of the Church Fathers are so numerous and powerful, that for the oldest times this question can hardly be answered in the negative. 178. Voetius, *Disp. II* 1002 sq. Gerhard, *Loci*, loc. 22 sectio 11. Dr, C. Middleton, *A free inquiry into the miraculous powers, which are supposed to have subsisted in the Christian Church.* 3 ed. Lond. 1749. Tholuck, *Ueber die wunder der Hath. Kirche*, Verm. Schriften I 28-148. J. H. Newman, *Two essays on scripture miracles and on ecclesiastical*, 2 ed. Lond. 1870. H. Muller, *Natur und Wunder*, Strassb. 1892 S. 182. But though these gifts have remained, the content of this *revelatio specialis*, which is concentrated in Christ and set down in Scripture, is not made richer by them; and if, according to the thought of Augustine, the *civ. 22, 8*, the *util. cred. 16*, the *vera relig. 25* are reduced and ceased, that revelation is not made poorer by it. However, in a certain sense, the *revelatio specialis* in Christ still continues in this dispensation. Although all prophecy in the Christian Church has ceased and all miracles in the actual sense have passed, the Church itself is from moment to moment the product of revelation. The spiritual miracles continue. God's grace in Christ is glorified in enlightenment and regeneration, in faith and conversion, in sanctification and regeneration. Christ is mediator; His concern is the church; He came to renew the world and to recreate mankind in the image of God. The *revelatio specialis* finds its purpose in bringing about a new order of things. And that is why, in a modified form, i.e. in a spiritual sense, it is still continuing today.

It finds its resting point only in the epiphany of Christ, in the new heaven and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

Revelation according to Scripture is thus a historical process, an organic system, an ongoing divine action to break the power of sin, to establish His kingdom, to restore the cosmos, to ἀνακεφαλαιώσῃ τῶν πάντων ἐν Χριστῷ, Eph. 1:10. Τῇ theophany God sets Himself again as the one and true God against the idols of man's own adornment; in prophecy He places His thought as the truth against the lie of Satan, and in miracle He demonstrates His divine power against all works of iniquity. In Revelation, God posits and upholds His I against all non-I, and despite all opposition brings it to general recognition and to complete triumph. The whole of Revelation is therefore soteriological. It proceeds from Christ, both in O. and in N. T. But soteriological in the sense of Scripture, not in a religious-ethical sense, as if Revelation contained only religious and ethical truth; much less in an intellectual sense, as if Revelation existed only in doctrine. But it is soteriological in the scriptural sense, i.e., that the content of Revelation is not doctrine or life or mental attainment, but that it is all these things together, a divine work, a world of thoughts and deeds, an *ordo gratiae*, which combats and conquers the *ordo peccati* in all fields. The purpose of Revelation is not only to teach man and enlighten his mind (rationalism), to make him practice virtue (moralism), to cultivate religious emotions in him (mysticism). But the purpose of God's revelation extends much further and wider. It is none other than to remove mankind, humanity, the world from the power of sin, and to cause the name of God to shine forth in all creation. Sin has corrupted and destroyed everything, intellect and will, ethical and physical world. And that is why it is mankind and the whole cosmos, whose salvation and restoration God is concerned about with His revelation. Soteriological, then, is certainly God's Revelation, but the object of that σωτήρια is the cosmos, and not only the ethical or the will to the exclusion of the intellect, and not only the psychic to the exclusion of the somatic and physical, but all together. For God hath decreed all

under sin that He might be merciful to all, Rom. 5 : 15 v., 11 : 32 ; Gal. 3 : 22.

C. Revelation and Supranaturalism.

7. This organic conception of revelation has been misunderstood in two ways in the Christian Church, both by supranaturalism and by naturalism (rationalism). In the face of both, therefore, it needs to be further elucidated and upheld. First, in the face of supranaturalism, which arose especially in Rome and then continued in various directions within Protestantism. Although Scripture distinguishes between the ordinary course of events and extraordinary works of God, it does not yet make the distinction between natural and supernatural. This only occurs with the church fathers. The special revelation is identified with the supernatural and set against the natural. Clemens Alex., Strom. 2, 2 already speaks of υπερφυσῆς ὑ-εωρια, which one obtains by faith. Chrysostomus, Hom. 36 in Gen, calls the miracles υπερ φυσιν and φύσει μειζονα. Ambrose , de mysteriis c. 9. contrasts gratia, miraculum, mysterium with the ordo naturae. John Damascene speaks several times of the miracles, such as the reception of Christ, the Eucharist etc. as ὑπερ φυσιν, ὑπερ λογον και έννοιαν, de fide orthod. IV 12-15. Cf. Denzinger, Vier Bücher von der relig. Erk. I 82 f. Since then the distinction of natural and super-natural has gained acceptance and citizenship throughout Christian theology. Without doubt this distinction also has a right to exist. Scripture may not express it in so many words; yet it recognizes an ordinary order of nature and thereby acts and works, which have their cause only in the power of God. Revelation in Scripture supposes that there is another, higher and better world than this nature, and that therefore there is an ordo rerum supra hanc naturam. The concepts of natural and supernatural must therefore be clearly defined. Nature, from nasci, becoming, designates in general that which develops without external power or influence, only according to its internal forces and laws. Nature is then even opposed to art, education, culture, history, which do not arise spontaneously, but are brought about by human intervention.

But the concept of nature is further extended to the whole cosmos, in so far as it moves and develops not from without but from within, through immanent forces and according to its own inherent laws. Supernatural then is anything which exceeds the powers of *natura creata* and has its cause not in the creatures but in the omnipotence of God. In this sense, special revelation was understood in Christian theology. Taken as a whole, it had its origin in a special act of God, which had revealed itself not in the ordinary course of nature but in its own, distinct order of things. A further distinction was made between the supernatural in the absolute sense, when something exceeds the power of all creation, and the supernatural in the relative sense, when. It exceeds the power of a certain cause in the given circumstances; and also between the supernatural *quoad substantiam*, if the fact itself is supernatural, e.g. the raising of a dead person, and the supernatural *quoad modum*, if only the way of doing it is supernatural, e.g. the healing of an invalid without means, Thomas, S. c. Gent. III 101.. Even in these distinctions no danger lay in themselves. They must even be defended against a philosophy which denies or weakens the supernatural. The expression supernatural is n. 1. in later theology and philosophy

18 philosophy is often understood in a very modified sense, and alternately equated with the supernatural (Kant), the free (Fichte), the unknown (Spinoza, Wegscheider), the new and original (Schleiermacher), the religious-ethical, the spiritual (Sausseye), etc. But such a modification of the supernatural is not enough to justify a change in theology. But such a modification of the fixed and clear meaning of a word leads to misunderstanding. If by supernatural one means nothing other than the supernatural, the ethical, etc., it is better to avoid the term. And the confusion becomes even greater if one mixes up the natural and the supernatural and then gives this fusion the name of the spiritual, the divine, etc. The term nature encompasses all creation. The concept of nature encompasses everything created, not only matter and substance, but also soul and spirit; not only physical but also psychological, religious and ethical life, insofar as it arises naturally from the human disposition; not

only visible, but also unseen, supernatural things. The supernatural is not identical with the original, the genius, the free, the religious, the ethical, etc., but is the clear and definite name only for that which cannot be explained by the forces and by the laws of created things. So far, the distinction between the natural and the supernatural, which has appeared in Christian theology, is perfectly correct, definite, clear, and cutting off all confusion. Except as stated above, special revelation, in its three forms of theophany, prophecy and miracle, is supernatural in the strict sense.

But in Christian theology the concept of the supernatural gradually became more narrowly defined. It was distinguished from creation on the one hand and from the spiritual miracles of rebirth on the other. The first distinction was made because the supernatural does not exist for God, but only for us, and presupposes the ordinary order brought into being by creation. The supernatural can only be spoken of if nature already exists beforehand. And on the other hand, rebirth, forgiveness, sanctification, unio mystica, etc., although considered to be direct acts of God, were not considered to be supernatural revelation, because they were not uncommon and rare, but in the Church belonged to the ordinary *ordo rerum*. The church itself is supranatural but still not a miracle. The supernatural and the miracle are also distinguished. All the supernatural is not a miracle, but vice versa. Miracles are not only supernatural, but also unusual and rare events in nature or grace. They occur not only *praeter ordinem naturae alicujus particularis*, but *praeter ordinem totius naturae creatae*. Angels and devils cannot actually do miracles, but only such things as seem to us to be desirable and take place *praeter ordinem naturae creatae nobis notae*, Thomas, *S. Theol.* I qu. 110 art. 4. *S. c. Gent.* I 6. III 112. Voetius, *Disp.* II. 973 sq. Thomas speaks not only of miracles *praeter* and *supra*, but also *contra naturam*, qu. *de miraculis*, art. 2 ad 3, Muller, *Natur u. Wunder*, Strass- burg 1892 S. 145. And Voetius said, that miracles though they are not *contra naturam universalem sed supra et praeter eam*, yet could also sometimes be *contra naturam aliquam particularem*, *Disp.* II 973, cf. Gerhard, *Loci Comm.* Loc. 22 § 271 sq. And miracles thus had the

following signs: *opus immediatum Dei, supra omnem naturam, in sensus incurrens, rarum, ad confirmationem veritatis*, Voetius, *ib.* II 965. Gerhard, *ib.* loc. 22 § 271. Now however much good there might be in these provisions and distinctions made by the scholastics, they brought with them no small danger. On the one hand, special revelation was separated from creation and nature; although it was recognized that supernatural revelation had not only taken place now but also before the fall, Calovius, *Isag. ad theol.* p. 49, and therefore could not in itself be contrary to nature, this was not considered. On the other hand, special revelation was contrasted with spiritual miracles, the works of grace, which constantly take place in the church of Christ and thus are isolated from re-creation and grace. Thus special revelation came to stand entirely on its own, unrelated to nature and history. Its historical and organic character was misunderstood. It did not enter into the world and humanity, but continued to hover outside and above them. It was finally conceived as a doctrine, as a proclamation of misunderstood and incomprehensible mysteries, the truth of which was confirmed by miracles. She was and remained, in a word, a *donum superadditum* of the cosmos.

8. In Rome this supranaturalistic and dualistic system was consistently worked out. In God there are two concepts of man, his nature and destiny. Man in *puris naturalibus*, without the image of God, as he actually still is after the fall, can have a pure knowledge of God through his works, can serve and fear Him and be in a normal, in itself good servant relationship to Him, can practice all the natural virtues, even the natural love of God, and can thus attain a certain state of happiness in this life and in the next. If he does not get that far, it is his own fault and is due to the fact that he did not use, or used badly, the natural powers he was given. But God wants to give mankind a higher, supernatural, heavenly destination. To this end, He must grant man *dona superaddita* both before and after the fall. He must give him a supernatural grace, through which he can know and love God in a different, better, higher way, practice better and higher virtues, and reach a higher destination. That higher

knowledge consists in tides; that higher love in caritas; those higher virtues are the theological, faith, hope, love, which are essentially distinguished from the virtutes cardinales (intellectuales et morales); and that higher destination consists in the childhood of God, the birth of God, the unio mystica, the communion with the divine nature, the θ-ωσ "ς, the deificatio, the visio Dei, etc. This doctrine is already prepared in some statements of the Church Fathers, yet it was first developed by the scholastics, especially by Halesius, Summa universae Theol. II qu. 91 m. 1. a. 3. Bonaventura, Breviloquium V cap. 1. Thomas disp. de verit. qu. 27. S. Theol. I 2. qu. 62 art. 1. In the struggle against Bajus and Jan- senius it was ecclesiastically established, Denzinger, Enchir. symbol, et definit. num. 882 sq. and expressly pronounced by the Vatican, Sess. Ill cap. 2 : revelatio absolute necessaria dicenda est, - - quia Deus infinita bonitate sua ordinavit hominem ad finem supernaturalem, ad participanda sc. bona divina, quae humanae mentis intelligentiam superant, appealing to 1 Cor. 2 : 9. Cf. Canones II 3. Kleutgen, Theol. der Vorzeit, 2nd Aufl. 1872 II s 3-151. Denzinger, Vier Bücher von der relig. Erk. I 105 f. II 75 f. Scheeben, Handb. der kath. Dogm. II 1878 S. 240 f. Id. Natur u. Gnade Mainz 1861. Schazler, Natur u. Gnade. Oswald, Religiöse Urgeschichte der Menschheit 28 Aufl. 1887 § 1 f.

Now it must be recognized that the difference in the situation before and after the fall does not lie in revelation as such. There was supernatural revelation also in paradise, Gen. 1:28 f.; 2:16 f.; it did not become necessary through sin. Even in the status integritatis there was a revelation of grace, because also then the relation of love, in which God placed himself with mankind, was a demonstration of unrestrained goodness. What sin has made necessary, therefore, is not revelation in itself, but the particular content of revelation, which is the gratia specialis, the revelation of God in Christ, the ενσαρκωσις του Θεου. Revelation of God has been necessary also for the religion in the status integritatis. But the religio Christiana is based on a special, particular revelation. This is what Paul has in mind when he speaks in 1 Cor. 2 vs. 4-16 of the wisdom of God, which has always been hidden and has not ascended into the heart of man. Rome itself

cannot deny this, unless it accepts the doctrine that, supposing God wished to grant man a *finis supernaturalis*, the whole supranatural order which now exists in the incarnation, the Church, the sacraments, would also have been necessary without and apart from sin. This, however, would have completely destroyed the soteriological character of Revelation, deprived the Fall of its significance, and caused no change at all in sin. The doctrine of the *finis supernaturalis* has therefore always met with much controversy in the Roman Church, with Bajus, Jansenius, Hirscher, Hermes, Günther; but it is closely connected with the whole Roman system, which is not built on the religious opposition of sin and grace, but on the difference in degrees of goodness, on the classification of creatures and virtues, on hierarchy in a physical and ethical sense. The Reformation, however, had only one idea, only one conception of mankind, namely, that of the image of God, and this applied to all people. If that image in the narrow sense is lost, then the whole of human nature is violated, and man can no longer have a religion or an ethos that corresponds to God's requirement and his own idea. Then his religion and his virtue, however beautiful they may seem, are nevertheless rotten at the root. There is no *religio naturalis*. All religions have become superstitions. But that is why the *religio Christiana* is also essentially one with the *religio vera* in the status *integritatis*. The Reformed pushed this so far that they said that also Adam had had the knowledge of the Trinity and the faith, that also then the Logos had been mediator, not *reconciliationis* but *unionis*, that also then the Holy Spirit was the author of all virtue and power, etc. The true thought was that God's will was not arbitrary, alternately forming this and that idea of man; that man's conception, the nature of God's image, and therefore *religio* must be one. And from this it finally followed that revelation was necessary not absolutely but relatively, not *quoad substantiam* but *quoad modum*. The *religio* is one before and after the fall; that it is *Christiana*, however, has become necessary through sin. The *religio Christiana* is a means, not an end; Christ is a means, but the end is *ὁ &εο; τα παντα εν παυιν*, 1 Cor. 15: 28.

With this it is now further given, that revelation cannot stand absolutely opposed to nature. With Bome there is quantitative opposition; the religio naturalis is essentially different from the religio supernaturalis; both stand side by side; they are two entirely different concepts, two completely distinct sys- tances and orders; the ordo gratiae raises itself high above the order naturae. But the Reformation has transformed this quantitative opposition into a qualitative one. Revelation is not opposed to nature, but opposed to sin. This is the power that revelation seeks to break, but nature restores and completes it. Creation itself is already revelation. There was revelation before the fall. Revelation is still there in all the works of God's hands in nature and history. His eternal power and divinity are understood and seen through the creatures. Analogies of prophecy and miracle also exist outside the revelatio specialis. The inspiration of heroes and artists, the miraculous powers that sometimes come to light, can serve to clarify and confirm the facts of revelation mentioned in Scripture. Even the magic and mantis in the pagan religions are phenomena which, as caricatures, still show a resemblance to the original image in Revelation.

Yes, this reverts to nature as it were, joins in and prepares for it. The gratia communis points to the gratia specialis, and the latter engages it. Natura commendat gratiam, gratia emendat natura. Even creation itself is built up on redemption lines, Orr, The Christian view of God and the world, p. 323. See further my speech on De algemeene Genade, Kampen 1894.

D. The special Revelation and Naturalism

9. The fundamental fight against revelation only began in the newer philosophy. Spinoza still retains the word revelation and even considers it necessary, Tract, theol.-polit. cap. 15, 27, but he understands by it nothing else than that the simple-minded cannot find the true religion, the word of God, by the light of reason, but must accept it on authority, ib. cap. 15, 44. cap. 4, 22-37. For the rest, Spinoza recognizes no revelation in the actual sense; all decreta Dei

are aeternae veritates and identical with the leges naturae, *ib.* cap. 4, 37; 3, 8; 6, 9, etc.; prophecy and miracle were subjected to sharp criticism and clarified in a natural way, *ib.* cap. 1-6. This criticism was continued by deism and rationalism. But rationalism can appear in different forms and changes meaning each time, cf. Kant, *Religion innerhalb usw.* ed. Rosenkranz S. 185. Wegscheider, *Instit. Theol.* § 7 d. § 11 -12. Bretschneider, *Syst. Entw. aller in der Dogm. vork. Begriffe*, § 34. Nietzsche, *Lehrb. der ev. Dogm.* S. 141 f. In the first place, rationalism is the term used to designate those who accept supernatural revelation, but entrust reason with the decision concerning the authenticity and meaning of that revelation; many Cartesian theologians, such as Roell, Wolzogen, G. W. Duker, and others, belonged to this group. W. Duker, and also Leibniz, Wolff, etc. Subsequently, rationalism is the name for the opinion which still considers supernatural revelation possible, but only of such truths which reason could have found sooner or later anyway. Revelation is then only temporarily and accidentally necessary; it serves only to prepare and educate for the general society of the Vernunftreligion; it only provides more quickly and easily what reason would otherwise have attained by a longer and more difficult path. Such is the concept of revelation with Lessing, *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts* 1780, Fichte, *Versuch einer Kritik aller Offenbarung* 1792, and Kant, *Religion usw.* 1793. In the third place, rationalism is known as that theology which denies all supernatural revelation, but nevertheless assumes that God, by special arrangements of His Providence, has equipped persons and paved ways which can bring mankind to a better and purer knowledge of religious truth. Of these, Wegscheider is the foremost representative, *Instit. theol.* I § 12 p. 58, and furthermore Röhr, Henke, Gabler, Paulus, Gesenius, etc. And finally the name of rationalism is also given to that direction, which since the middle of the 17th century has been called naturalism, in England deism, and also atheism, materialism, and which denying all revelation, held the *religio naturalis* to be perfectly sufficient. To these belong Spinoza, Lud. Meyer, Voltaire, Rousseau, Reimarus, Nicolai, etc.

The arguments of this rationalism against revelation boil down to this: Revelation is first of all impossible from the side of God, because it would imply that God was changeable, that His creation was imperfect and faulty and therefore in need of improvement; and that He Himself, otherwise a *Deus otiosus*, only worked when He works in an extraordinary way. Furthermore, revelation is also impossible from the side of the world, because science has discovered more and more that it is always and everywhere governed by an unbreakable system of laws, which leaves no room for a supernatural intervention of God; science departs from this causal connection of things and cannot do otherwise; Supranaturalism makes science impossible, puts arbitrariness in place of rule; as science has progressed, all phenomena have lost their supranatural character; there is even no right to regard a phenomenon as supranatural, contrary to all experience. *Le surnaturel serait le surdivin*. Next, revelation, even if it had occurred, would be unrecognizable and unprovable for the recipient himself and even more so for those who live after him: how can it ever be determined that a prophecy or a miracle comes from God and not, for example, from the devil? What makes a revelation recognizable to the one who receives it and to those who live later? There are no such criteria. Those who accept revelation believe only on human authority and depend on men for the highest and most important things. *Que d'hommes entre Dieu et moi!* And finally, revelation conflicts with human reason; for whatever one may say, all revelation that is *supra rationem* is therefore also *contra rationem*, it suppresses reason and leads to foolishness; but moreover, if revelation communicates something that is *supra rationem*, it can never be assimilated and assimilated and always remains as a misunderstood mystery outside our consciousness; And if it communicates something that reason itself could have found, it is unnecessary, at best only providing sooner and lighter what would otherwise have been obtained anyway, and needlessly robbing reason of its power and energy. Cf. Wegscheider, *Instit. theol.* § 10-12. Bretschneider, *Hand- buch der Dogm.* 4th Aufl. I 188-329. Nitzsch, *Lehrb. der ev. Dogm.* 141 f. 165.

10. Revelation, which is laid down in the Scriptures, is a difficult fact for anyone who denies it. For even those who dispute its possibility and reality must still strive for an explanation of its historical origin. It did not arise from deception, nor did religion. The belief in revelation is not something arbitrary or accidental, which only occurs here or there under special circumstances, but is essentially inherent to all religion. The question of revelation is not as simple as rationalism sometimes imagined. This is immediately evident from the fact that all attempts from the naturalistic side to explain the biblical miracles in a natural way have failed so far. If the revelation, in all its forms, of theophany, prophecy and miracle, is not really supernatural, but only originates from God in the sense that all human activity has its final cause in Him; then one is forced to resort either to the so-called material or to the formal interpretation of the miracle stories.

That is, one can leave the facts untouched up to a certain point and take them for truth; one then seeks to explain these facts from the ignorance of the people concerning natural causes and from the religious need to attribute everything directly to God, Spinoza, Tract. theol. pol. cap. 1 and 6. Hase, Dogm. § Leben Jesu § 15. Strauss, Glaub. I 280. Scholten, Supranat. in connection with Bible, Christ, and Prot. 1867, p. 8 v.; or one explains them physically from unknown natural forces, Kant, Religion ed. Rosenkranz 101. Morus, Epitome Theol. Christ, p. 23. Schweizer, Glaub. der ev. ref. K. 1 324 f.; or psychologically from a special virtuosity, to feel the future ahead, Bretschneider, Dogm. I S. 300; Hase, Dogm. § 137, and to cure the sick without means, Weisse, Philos. Dogm. I S. 115. Ammon, Gesch. des Lebens Jesu 248.; or teleologically from such an arrangement and ordering of the physical and psychical forces lying in nature, that they bring about an unusual result and urge recognition of God's providence and belief in the preacher, Wegscheider, Inst. Theol. § 48. Bretschneider, Dogm. I 314. Or, on the other hand, one can look for a solution in the formal or genetic explanation, i. e. in a special interpretation of the messages concerning the revelation; one then calls to the aid of the Oriental

representation and interpretation, and the accommodation of Jesus and the apostles according to popular conceptions, cf. Bretschneider, Syst. Entw. aller in der Dogm. vork. Begriffe, 4th Aufl. S. 135 f. Herzog² art. Accommodation; or one seeks counsel from the allegorical, Woolston, Discourses on the miracles of our Saviour 1727; or from the natural, Paul of Heidelberg, Philol.-krit. u. histor. Commentar über das N. T. 1800-1804. Leben Jesu 1828. Exeg. Handbuch über die 3 ersten Evang. 1830-33; or to the mythical, Eichhorn, Gabler, G. L. Bauer, Strauss, Leben Jesu 1835; or to the symbolic explanation, A. D. Loman, Gids Febr. 1884. Cf. Wegscheider, Instit. Theol. s. 214. Bretschneider, System. Entw. S. 248 f. Denzinger, Vier Bücher von der relig. Erkenntniss II 156 f. 335 f. 405 f.

But all these explanations have had little success. Scripture cannot be interpreted in a naturalistic or rationalistic way. The very facts of revelation which Scripture communicates to us stand in the way of all such attempts. For, while it is true that the revelation contained in Scripture bears many similarities in form to that invoked by other religions, it is also opposed to it in principle, it draws a clear distinction between it and itself, and it consciously and with complete assurance attributes its origin solely to an extraordinary working of God. Scripture forbids all divination and sorcery, Num. 19:16, 31, 20:6, 27; Dent. 18:10 v.; Isa. 8:9; Jer. 27:9; Rev. 8:9 v., 13:8 v., 19:13; Apoc. 21:8, 22:15. Prophets and apostles want nothing to do with this. They are diametrically opposed to it and do not follow artfully concocted fables, 2 Pet. 1:16. Prophecy was not brought about by the will of man, but by the Holy Spirit who moved the prophets, 2 Pet. 1:21; 1 Cor. 2:11, 12. The clear self-consciousness, which we find everywhere in the prophets, and the perfectly clear self-witness, which accompanies revelation everywhere in Scripture, offer an insurmountable stumbling block to naturalistic wrkification. Also the psychological method Strauss, Glaub. I 77. Kuenen, The Prophets I 106 v., cannot do justice to this self-consciousness and self-witness of prophets and apostles, indeed of Christ Himself. It may be gratefully acknowledged that the modern

conception of Revelation no longer thinks for a moment to hold the prophets and apostles to be deliberate deceivers. But still it cannot escape the conclusion that all these men were poor deceivers and erring in good faith because they relied on a supposed revelation and acted with an imagined divine authority. The question is not raised as if Revelation only contained certain facts, whose interpretation it leaves to our understanding. But it casts its own peculiar light on these facts; it has, so to speak, its own reflection and its own theory about them. In the revelation of Scripture word and fact, prophecy and miracle, always go hand in hand. Both are necessary in order that both consciousness and being may be transformed and that the whole cosmos may be redeemed from sin. The light needs the reality and the reality needs the light, to produce - - - the beautiful creation of His grace. To apply the Kantian phraseology to a higher subject, without God's acts the words would be empty, without His words the acts would be blind, Dr. Vos, The idea of biblical theology as a science and as a theol. discipline, New-York, Randolph and Co. 1894 p. 15. See also Kuyper, From the Word I 1873 bl. 69-160. Both, word and fact, are so intimately woven together in revelation, that the one cannot be accepted or rejected without the other. Every attempt to explain the facts of revelation in a naturalistic way has thus far always ended with the recognition that between the supranatural world view of Scripture and that of the naturalists there is a deep chasm and reconciliation is impossible. The professor Scholtën provided a striking example of this. First he took the pronouncements of the Johannine Jesus as truth. Then he tried to explain those statements according to his changed insights, and to make the exegesis subservient to his heterodox dogmatics. And finally in 1864 he openly acknowledged that the world view of the fourth evangelist was different from his own. The Gospel of John 1864 p. III-VI. Every negative direction finally recognizes that the revelation of Scripture is still most purely understood and represented in Orthodoxy. Radicalism leaves Scripture for what it is and has rejected Revelation. This reduces the question to its deepest principle. Whether or not revelation is acknowledged is decided by our entire outlook on life and the world. It is not historical criticism

but self-criticism, not science but faith, not the head but the heart that is decisive. Out of the heart also comes madness, Mk. 2:22. Our thinking is rooted in our being. Operari sequitur esse (Schopenhauer). Was für eine Philosophie man wähle, hängt davon ab, was für ein Mensch man ist. Unser Denksystem ist oft nur die Geschichte unseres Herzens (Fichte). That the recognition or non-recognition of revelation in the last instance is a question of faith is sufficiently demonstrated by the fact that neither the supernaturalistic nor the naturalistic view is capable of eliminating all difficulties or resolving all objections. The naturalistic view seems to be strong when it takes a few miracle stories in isolation from the whole; but that whole itself, the system of Revelation and in it the person of Christ remain for it an unsolvable riddle and a stumbling block. Conversely, supernatural consideration has not yet succeeded in integrating all the particular facts and words of Revelation into the order of the whole. But here is the agreement with Revelation as a whole, the understanding of its system, the conception of its powerful harmony. Were the recognition of Revelation a philosophical proposition, it would be of relatively little weight. But there is a deep religious interest involved. Religion itself is connected with revelation. Whoever abandons revelation, loses the religion which is built upon it. The revelation of Scripture and the religion of Scripture stand and fall with each other.

11. The world view which stands opposed to that of Scripture and must in principle combat all revelation, may best be called monism. Monism, both in its pantheistic and in its materialistic form, aims to reduce all forces, substances and laws that exist in nature to a single force, substance and law. Materialism assumes only qualitatively equal atoms, which everywhere and always work according to the same mechanical laws and, by connection and separation, cause all things and phenomena to come into being and to perish. Pantheism, likewise, recognizes nothing but a single substance, which is the same in all creatures and everywhere changes and is transformed according to the same logical laws. Both are animated by the same urge, the urge and desire for unity, which is characteristic of the

human spirit. But whereas materialism seeks to find the unity of matter and law, which prevails in the physical world, in all other phenomena, historical, psychological, religious, ethical, etc., and thus to make all sciences natural sciences; pantheism seeks to explain all phenomena, including physical phenomena, by the spirit and to transform all sciences into spiritual sciences. Both are naturalism, insofar as they perhaps make room for the supernatural, but in any case not for the supernatural, and for science and art, for religion and morals, this cosmos, the diesseits, is sufficient, Strauss, *Der alte u. der neue Glaube*, 2e Aufl. I 211 f. E. Haeckel, *Der Monismus als Band zwischen Religion und Wissenschaft*, 6e Aufl. Konrad Dieterich, *Philosophie u. Naturwissenschaft, ihr neuestes Bündniss und die monistische Weltanschauung*, 2tus Ausg. Freiburg 1885. Dr. M. L. Stern, *Philosophischer und naturwissenschaftlicher Monism* 11s. T. Pesch, *Die grossen Weltrathsel*, 2nd Aufi. Herder, Freiburg IT 8 f. Stöckl, *Lehrbuch der Philos.* IT 1887 S. 117 f. Schanz, *Apologie des Christ.* 1 1887 S. 249 f. The world view of Scripture and of all Christian theology is an entirely different one. It is not monism but theism, not naturalistic but supra-naturalistic. According to this theistic world view there is a multiplicity of substances, forces and substances and laws. It does not seek to exchange the distinctions between God and the world, mind and matter, psychic and physical, ethical and religious phenomena, etc., but to discover the harmony which holds all things together and binds them together, and which is the result of the creative idea of God. Not univocity or uniformity, but unity in diversity is the goal of its efforts. In spite of all the pretensions of monism, this theistic world view has right and reason to exist. After all, monism has not succeeded in reducing all forces and substances and laws to a single one. Materialism comes up against psychological phenomena (Du Bois Reymond, *Die sieben Weltrathsel*), and pantheism cannot find the transition from thinking to being and does not know what to do with the multitude. Being itself is a mystery, a miracle. The fact that there is something, and from where it is, compels the thinking mind to wonder, and this is therefore rightly called the beginning of philosophy. And the more this being is thought about, the more the wonder increases, because

within the circle of being, of the cosmos, we see various forces at work, in the mechanical, vegetative, animal, psychic world, and also in the religious and ethical, aesthetic and logical phenomena. Creation shows us an ascending order. The laws of the maintenance of force, of causality and continuity (*natura non facit saltus*) are interpreted and abused in the service of monism. But nevertheless, forces appear in nature which cannot be explained by the lower ones. Already in mechanical nature, causality prevails only in a hypothetical sense. Similar causes have similar effects, but only under similar circumstances. In the organic, a force occurs that does not come from the inorganic. Schon das Thier ist ein Wunder gegen die vegetabilische Natur und noch mehr der Geist gegen das Leben, gegen die bloss empfindende Natur, Hegel, Philos, der Rel., Werke XII 256. In the mind, in the will, in religion, morality, art, science, law, history, there are forces at work which differ essentially from the mechanical ones. The attempt to explain all these phenomena mechanically has so far proved futile. The spiritual sciences have hitherto retained their independent place. Dilthey, *Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften* 1 1883 S. 5 f. Drummond, *Das Naturgesetz in der Geisteswelt*, Aus dem Engl. Leipzig 1886 S. 18 f. Though unhappy, must Prof. Land, *Introduction to the Wisb.* 328 nevertheless recognize, that for the time being science is compelled to remain dualistic and even pluralistic.

Each of these forces works according to its own nature, according to its own law and in its own way. The forces differ, and so do their actions and the manner in which they work. The idea of natural law has only gradually emerged. In earlier times the term *lex naturae* was understood to mean an ethical rule that was known by nature. Later this term was transferred to nature in a very improper sense, because no one has prescribed these laws to nature and no one is in a position to obey or violate them. That is why there is still a great difference in understanding and meaning of the laws of nature. In the 17th century God gave the laws of nature, in the 18th century nature itself did the same, and in the 19th century the individual scientists discovered them (Wundt). But that much is certain, that the so called laws of

nature themselves are not a force which governs the phenomena, but nothing more than a, often very inadequate and always fallible, description of the way in which the forces lying in nature work. A natural law only says that certain forces, under the same circumstances, work in the same way, Ed. Zeller, Vortrage, IIP Sammlung S. 194 f. Wundt, Philos. Studien III 195 f. IV 12 f. Hellwald, Culturgeschichte, 3e Aufl. I 32. Hartmann, Philos, des Unbewusst- ten, 9[®] Aufl. II 96. Lotze, Mikrokosmos, 4[®] Aufl. I 31 f. II 50 f. Ill 13 f. Art. Naturgesetz in Herzog². The regularity of phenomena is thus ultimately founded on the invariability of the various forces at work in nature and of the last elements or substances of which it is composed. The laws differ according to the differentiation of these elements and forces. The mechanical laws are different from the physical; the logical, again, from the ethical and aesthetic. 111 In the physical sense giving makes one poorer; in the ethical sense it makes one richer. The laws of nature, i. e. of the whole cosmos, of all creation, are therefore not a cordon around things, so that nothing can enter or leave them, but only a formula for the way in which, according to our perception, every force works according to its nature. All these elements and forces with their indwelling laws are, according to the theistic world view, maintained from moment to moment by God, who is the last and highest, intelligent and free causality of all things. As creatures, they have no substance in themselves. It is God's omnipresent and eternal power that sustains and governs all things. In Him, in His thought and in His government, lies the unity, the harmony, which holds all things together in the richest variety and binds them together and leads them to one goal. Through this there is unitas, mensura, ordo, numerus, modus, gradus, species in the creatures, as Augustine repeatedly says. Aliis dedit esse amplius, aliis minus, atque ita naturas essentialium gradibus ordinavit, August, de civ. 12, 2. God is present in everything. In Him all things live and move and are. Nature and history are His work. He is always working, John 5:17. Everything reveals God to us. His finger may be more clearly visible to us in some events than in others; the pure in heart see God in all His works. Miracles, then, are by no means necessary to make us

know God as Sustainer and Ruler of the universe. Everything is His act. Nothing happens without His will. He is present with His being in all things. And therefore everything is also a revelation, a word, a work of God.

12. A supernatural revelation is not at all inconsistent with such a world view. Nature does not exist independently of God for a single moment, but lives and moves in Him. All power which acts in it comes from Him and works according to the law He has laid down in it. God is not outside of nature and is not shut off from it by a fence of laws, but is present in it and carries it by the word of His power. He works from within and can bring about new forces which are different in nature and effect from the existing ones. And these higher forces do not nullify the lower ones, but nevertheless occupy their own place beside and facing them. The human spirit seeks at every moment to counteract the lower natural forces in their workings and to rule over them. The entire culture is a power through which man rules over nature. Art and science are a triumph of the spirit over matter. Similarly, in revelation, in prophecy and miracle, a new divine power appears which, although it has its own place in the cosmos, does not in any way conflict with the lower powers in its laws. There is no question of a so-called abrogation of the laws of nature by the miracles. There is no such thing as a *Durchlöcherung* of nature. Thomas already said: *quando Deus agit aliquid contra cursum naturae, non tollitur totus ordo universi, sed cursus qui est unius rei ad aliam, de pot. qu. 6 art. 1, at Muller, Natur und Wunder 133.* Yes even the *ordo causae ad suum effectum* is not destroyed; although the fire in the oven did not burn the three young men, in that fire the *ordo ad comburendum* remained. No change is made by the miracle in the forces which lie in nature, nor in the laws by which they operate. The only thing that happens in a miracle is that the working of the forces present in nature is suspended at a certain point, because another force enters, which works according to its own law and produces its own effect. Science therefore has nothing to fear from the supra-natural. But every science remains on its own terrain and does not allow itself the right to lay down the law

for the other. It is the right and duty of natural science to look for the natural causes of phenomena within its field. But it does not rule over philosophy when it investigates the origin and destiny of things. It also recognizes the right and independence of religion and theology, and does not undermine the basis on which they rest. For here religious motives for believing in a revelation come to the fore, about which natural science as such cannot judge. Even in the various sciences the goal is not unity but harmony.

19 harmony. Theology honours natural science, but makes its own claim to equal treatment. Each science remains on its own terrain. The erasure of boundaries has already caused too much confusion. It has also led Hume, Voltaire and Renan to claim that no miracle has ever been sufficiently observed and that constant experience cannot be overturned by a few testimonies. Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. LI says: nous ne disons pas, le miracle est impossible, nous disons, il n' y a pas eu jusqu'ici de miracle constaté, and refuses to believe in a miracle, as long as a committee of all kinds of scientific men, physiologists, chemists, etc., have not examined such a fact and after repeated experimentation have found it to be a miracle. With such a condition the miracle is a priori judged: for in the words of Scripture the opportunity for such an experiment is given neither to Renan nor to any of us. The miracles belong to history; and in history a different method applies than in physics. Here the experiment is at its place. But in history we must make do with witnesses. If, however, in the historical field the method of experimentation must be introduced and applied, there is not a single fact that can stand the test. Then all history is finished. Therefore, every science must remain in its own field and investigate according to its own nature. With the ear one cannot see, with the eye one cannot weigh, and with the experiment one cannot test revelation, Vigouroux, *Les livres saints et la critique rationaliste*, 3rd ed. 1890 I 73. II 294.

Furthermore, nature, the cosmos, is still far too much conceived as a machine, which is ready-made and is now driven by a single force and always moves according to a single law. Deism had this clumsy

idea, but it is still unconsciously shared by many and is used to combat revelation. But nature, the cosmos, is not a finished piece of work which now possesses a certain independence; but it is $\phi\nu\sigma\iota\varsigma$, natura in the real sense, it is always developing, it is in a continuous teleological development, it is being brought towards a divine destiny in successive periods. In such a conception of nature, once again, the miracles are perfectly in place. Hellwald says on the last page of his Kulturgeschichte, that all life on earth will one day pass into the eternal rest of death, and then ends with the comfortless words: Dann wird die Erde, ihrer Atmos- phäre und Lebewelt beraubt, in mondgleicher Verödung um die Sonne kreisen, wie zuvor, das Menschengeschlecht aber, seine Kultur, sein Ringen und Streben, seine Schöpfungen und Ideale sind gewesen. Wozu? Of course, in a system that ends with such an unanswered question, revelation and miracle would be nothing but an absurdity. But Scripture teaches us that revelation serves this purpose, to recreate the creation corrupted by sin into a kingdom of God. Here Revelation takes a perfectly proportioned and teleological place in the world plan, which God has formed and which He is realizing in the course of time. In this sense Augustine already said, *portentum fit non contra naturam sed contra quam est nota natura*, de civ. 21,8. c. Faustum 29,2. 26,3. The expression has often been interpreted in a wrong sense for the benefit of a theology that tried to understand miracles as the working of a force, which is naturally present in man or in nature or is also restored in him by rebirth or faith. This peculiar conception already appears in Philo and Neoplatonism, has then been echoed by several Christian theologians, Scotus Erigena, Paracelsus, Cornelius Agrippa, Böhme, Oetinger, cf. Denzinger, Vier Bücher von der relig. Erk. II. 182 f. 361 f. and is occasionally found in Vermittlungstheologie, Twisten, Vorles. I. 370 f. II. 171 f. Martensen, Dogm. § 16 f. Schleiermacher, Glaub. § 13,1 § 129. Sack, Apologetik S. 137 f. Lange, Philos. Dogm. § 64. Saussaye, Mine Theol. of Ch. d. 1. S. 36 f. Gunning, Glances into Revelation II 37 f. Revelation, inspiration and miracle then belong to the original disposition of human nature. It is true that this disposition has been weakened by sin, but it still appears in poetic and heroic inspiration,

in magnetism and other related phenomena. However, through ethical means, through union with God, through ascetic purification, through rebirth, etc., this disposition can be renewed and strengthened. So all believers are actually inspired and can perform miracles. *Si humana natura non peccaret eique, qui earn condiderat, immutabiliter adhaereret, profecto omni- potens esset, Erigena, de div. nat. 4,9.* Miracles are, according to Zimmer, *Ueber den allgem. Verfall des menschl. Geschlechts III n. 90 f., Zeichen des über die Herrschaft der Natur erhobenen Menschen, in welchem die Herrlichkeit des ersten Menschen- paares vor seiner Sünde dargestellt wird.* If the soul is directed toward God in love, says Böhme, *so mag sie Wunder machen, was sie will.* In a kindred sense, C. Bonnet, *Recherches philosophiques sur les preuves du christianisme, Geneva 1771,* showed prophecy and miracle to be prefigured in nature and to come about through the operation of ordinary natural forces. Some theologians of the last century therefore spoke of *rationes seminales, primordiales and radicales* of miracles. But this attempt to explain the miracles cannot be accepted. It confuses the natural with the supernatural, the supranatural with the religious-ethical and erases the boundaries between prophecy and mantra, miracle and magic, inspiration and illumination. The above expression of Augustine should not be explained in this way either. By the *natura nota* he means nature in our sense of the word. And with this in mind he even says that the miracle is *contra naturam*, as Thomas and Voetius did later (above bl. 275). But this same miracle has now from the beginning been incorporated by God into nature in the wider sense, i. e. into the destiny of things determined by God, into the divine plan of the world, F. Nitzsch, *Augustine's Lehre vom Wunder, Berlin 1865.* The same thought was later expressed by Leibniz, *Theodicée § 54. 207.* God has from the beginning included miracles in his world plan and brings them about in due time; the miracles are not to be explained *par les natures des choses créées, but des raisons d'un ordre supérieur a celui de la nature le portent a les faire.* According to Leibniz, therefore, the wonders are not *keimart*, potentially locked in the forces of nature, as Nitzsch, *Lehrb. der ev. Dogm. S. 146*

Leibniz explains, but are constitutive elements in the world plan of God. In this sense, miracles certainly belong to nature. They do not enter the existing cosmos from outside in order to disturb it, but they are included in the idea of the world itself and serve to restore and perfect fallen nature. Yes, even without sin there would have been room for prophecy and miracles in the world. The supernatural was not first made necessary by the fall. Not the revelation and the miracle in themselves, only the soteriological character, which both now bear, was caused by sin. In this respect even the miracle is not a strange element added to the fallen creation. Revelation and religion, prophecy and miracle, are not in themselves *dona superaddita*. They are perfectly natural, insofar as they belong to God's idea of the world and to the world plan which He is carrying out in spite of all opposition.

Nevertheless, Revelation constitutes an order of things which is distinct from the ordinary *ordo naturae*; a system of words and deeds of God which is itself governed by one principle and appears to us as an organic whole. Revelation is not an *einzelner Akt Gottes in der Zeit*, isolated from all of nature, Strauss, *Glaub. I 274*, but is a world of its own, distinct from nature and yet built upon it, related to it, destined for it. In this system of revelation, which begins in paradise and only ends in the parable, much remains obscure and unexplained. Main lines can be drawn. Both in the history of prophecies and of miracles there is order and progress. Revelation too has its own laws and regulations. It is the beautiful task of the *historia revelationis* to trace these, and to discover the system that lies hidden in its history. But there are still many facts, which are not yet understood in their real significance for and connection with the whole; many words and deeds, which cannot be brought under any rule. This is not surprising and may by no means be exploited as a ground for disbelief. The philosophy of nature and history has also not yet finished its work. It, too, faces *cruces* every moment, which it does not know how to explain. Nevertheless, no one doubts the unity of nature and the unity of history. Compared to these, Revelation is even in a favourable case. Its main lines are fixed. As it begins in

paradise and ends in the Parable, it forms a grand history, spreading light over the whole of nature and history and, according to the words of Augustinus, protecting the extraordinary from immoderation and the ordinary from the extraordinary (Muller, *Natur und Wunder* 180). But with it we find ourselves in a world that is led proudly towards all sinful power of restoration and perfection. Israel is the preparation, Christ the center, the Church the effect, fusion the crown - this is the cord that connects the facts of revelation.

That is why, in the final analysis, faith in special revelation is actually one with faith in a different and better world than this one. If this world, with its natural forces and laws, is the only one and the best, then we must make do with it. Then the *leges naturae* are equal to the *decreta Dei*; then this world is the Son, the Logos, the very image of God; then in the *ordo naturae*, in which we live, is already the full and adequate revelation of God's wisdom and power, of His goodness and holiness. What right, then, is there to expect that the *Dort* will nevertheless once become *Hier*, that the ideal will pass into reality, that good will triumph over evil, and that the *Welt der Werthe* will one day rule over the *Welt der Wirklichkeit*? Evolution will not get us there. *Nihil fit ex nihilo*. Out of this world there will be no paradise. What is not in it cannot come from it. If there is no *Jenseits*, no God who is above nature, no *ordo supernaturalis*, then sin, darkness and death have the last word. The revelation of Scripture makes us know another world of holiness and glory, which penetrates this fallen world, not only as doctrine but also as divine *ὄντα/ῶς*, as history, as reality, as a harmonic system of words and deeds together, and which lifts this world out of its fall and leads it from the *status peccati* through the *status gratiae* into the *status gloriae*. Revelation is God's coming to mankind to dwell with it forever. Literature about the miracles except the already mentioned: Köstlin, *Jahrb. f. deutsche Wiss.* 1864, 2tes Heft. S. 205-270 and art. *Wunder in Herzog* 2. Nietzsche, *Syst. der chr. Lehre* § 34. Twisten, *Vorles I.* 366 f. Martensen, *Dogm.* § 16 f. Lange, *Dogm. I* 471 f. Rothe, *Zur Dogm.* 80 f. Gloatz,

Ueber das Wunder, Stud. u. Kr. 1886, 3tes Heft. Dorner, Glaub. I 569 f. 583 f. Philippi, Kirchl. Glaub. I 25 f. Saussaye, Mine Theol. 36 v. Oosterzee, Dogm. I 205 f. Kuyper, Out of the Word II 69 f. III 114 f. Encycl. II 369 f. 446 f. Muller, Natur und Wunder, Strassburg, Herder 1892 and the there S. XV f. appended litt., Gondal, Le miracle, Paris, Roger et Chernoviz 1894.

3. THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

A. Revelation and Scripture.

1. The history of religions shows not only an intimate connection between religion and revelation, but further also between revelation and writing. Magical formulas, liturgical texts, ritual tracts, ceremonial laws, priestly documents, historical and mythological literature, etc., are found in the religious domain among all cultures. But in an even narrower sense, there is talk of sacred writings in religions. Many peoples also have a book or a collection of books, which have divine authority and serve as the rule of doctrine and life. These include the Shu-king of the Chinese, the Veda of the Indians, the Tripitaka of the Buddhists, the Avesta of the Persians, the Koran of the Mohammedans, the Old Testament of the Jews and the Bible of the Christians. Together these seven are referred to by Max Muller, Vorlesungen über den Ursprung der Religion 1880 S. 149 with the name of the book religions. This phenomenon alone indicates that revelation and writing cannot be in a casual, random relationship. Even the history of the teaching of the Koran offers remarkable parallels with that of the dogma of the Scriptures in the Christian church, M. Th. Houtsma, De strijd over het dogma in den Islam tot op El-Ash'ari, Leiden 1875 bl. 96 v. See further on the holy books Ch. de la Saussaye, Lehrb. der Rel. Gesch. I 137 f. Lamers, Wetenschap v. d. godsd. II 249 f. Max Müller, Theosophy or

psychological religion 1893. Lecture 2 : The value of the sacred books.

Now, first of all, thought and word, thought and speech, are intimately related to each other. They are not, however, identical, as Max Muller, *Vorlesungen über die Wissenschaft der Sprache* I 3e Aufl. 1875 S. 459, *Das Denken im Lichte der Sprache*, Leipzig 1888 S. 70-115 thinks; for there is also a thought, a consciousness, a realization, however unclear, without a word. *Homo enim nihil potest dicere, quod non etiam sentire possit; potest etiam aliquid sentire, quod dicere non possit*, Augustine, *Serm.* 117. c. 5. But the word is first and foremost the mature, self-sufficient and fully developed and therefore also the clear, lucid thought; an indispensable tool for conscious thought. Language is the soul of the nation, the keeper of the goods and treasures of mankind, the bond between men and peoples and generations, the one great tradition which unites the world of mankind, one in physic, also in consciousness. But just as the thought is embodied in the word, so the word is embodied in the writing. Language too is nothing but an organism of signs, but of audible signs. And the audible sign naturally seeks stability in the visible sign, in writing. Writing is actually the art of drawing, and occurs in this broad sense among all peoples, but has gradually developed from drawing and pictorial writing through word or conceptual writing into typescript. However refined and increased in accuracy, it is imperfect. Our thinking, says Augustine, the *trin.* 7, 4, the *doctr. christ.* 1, 6 remain behind the case, our thinking behind our speaking; and so also there is a great distance between word and writing. Sounds are always only approximated in visible signs. Thinking is richer than speaking, and speaking richer than writing. Yet writing is of great value and significance. Writing is the preserved, generalized, and honored word. It makes thought the property of those who are far from us and those who are after us, the common good of mankind. It paints the word and speaks to the eyes. It gives body and color to thought. Writing is the $\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\alpha(>\kappa\omega\ddot{\upsilon}1\varsigma$ of the word.

This is true in general. The Traditionalists, de Bonald, Lamennais, Bautain, certainly went too far when they said, that language came directly from God, that in language all the treasures of truth were preserved, and that mankind now partook of all truth out of and through language, tradition, Stöckl, *Lehrb. der neueren Philos.* I 406 f. But there is a good idea in it. And especially in the religious field, word and writing acquire a higher significance. Revelation in Christianity is a history. It consists of deeds, events that pass and soon belong to the past. It is an *actus transiens*, temporary, momentaneous even, and has this time form, this transient, in common with all earthly things. And yet it contains eternal thoughts, which were significant not only for the moment in which it took place and for the persons to whom it was addressed, but which are of value for all times and for all people. How can this apparent contradiction be reconciled? Because the strangeness of it has almost always been felt. Deism in England made it noteworthy. Herbert of Cherbury said that only such a revelation could be granted to us as was immediately ours; revelations received by others are to us mere history, tradition, and in history we can never get beyond probability, *de veritate* 1656 p. 288, Lechler, *Gesch. des engl. Deismus* 49. Hobbes similarly said, that a revelation, which others had received, could not be proved for us, *Leviathan* ch. 32. Locke made the same distinction between original and traditional revelation, *Essay concerning human understanding* TV ch. 18. Deism deduced that the *religio naturalis* was sufficient. It made a separation between fact and idea, the temporary and the eternal, *zufällige Geschichtswahrheiten* and *nothwendige Vernunftwahrheiten*. And the speculative rationalism of Hegel followed in the same footsteps; the idea does not pour itself out in a single individual.

Now this separation has turned out to be practically impossible. The separation of the idea from history is in Christianity, as in every other religion, nothing less than the loss of the idea itself. Lessing's thesis in his book *üeber den Beweis des Geistes und der Kraft: Zufällige Geschichtswahrheiten können der Beweis von nothwendigen Vernunftwahrheiten nie werden*, was very popular at

the time. But that can only be explained by the unhistorical sense and the concept of reason of the eighteenth century. The present century has forgotten how to fool with the necessary truths of reason and despise history. It has learned to understand history in its deeper sense and its eternal significance. If the facts of history were accidental, it would itself be an aggregate of isolated events, without order, without coherence, without plan. Then there would be no more history and its practice would be a vain and useless activity. And then it would follow that the history of revelation would lose all its value. But history is precisely the realization of God's thoughts, the working out of God's counsel over His creatures; in it there is unity, progress, order, logic. Such a conception of history was made possible only by Christianity. With the Greeks and Romans it is not found; there were only peoples, there was no humanity. Scripture, however, teaches us about the unity of the human race; it gives us the grand conception of a world history. And in this history it occupies the first and all-important place. The historical facts are therefore not accidental, and certainly not the history of Revelation. It is so necessary that without it the whole of history and mankind would fall apart. It is the bearer of God's thoughts; the apocalypse of God's purpose, which time and again filled the Apostle Paul with admiration and adoration; the *revelatio mysterii*, without which mankind wanders in the dark. And on the other hand, the *Vernunftwahrheiten* of which Lessing spoke are also anything but necessary. Kant's criticism has shown otherwise. Precisely with regard to these *nothwendige Vernunftwahrheiten* there is nowadays a generalised scepticism. So the relationship is just the opposite. The historical has been seen through in its eternal significance and the rational in its changeableness has come to light.

The fact is, therefore, that we inherit everything from our ancestors. We bring nothing into the world, 1 Tim. 6:7. Physically and psychically, intellectually and ethically, we are dependent on the world around us. And religiously it is no different. The revelation that exists in history cannot come to us otherwise than in the way of tradition, in the broadest sense. A question as to why this revelation

is not given to every human being, Rousseau in his profession de foi, and Strauss, Glaub. I. 268 f. is not really appropriate. It assumes that revelation contains nothing but doctrine and forgets that it is and must be history. The center of Revelation is the person of Christ. And Christ is a historical person; his incarnation, his suffering and death, his resurrection and ascension cannot be repeated. Yes, it belongs precisely to the ἐνβαρκωβίς that he enters history and lives in the form of time. He would not have been like us in everything if he had not submitted to time and space, to the law of becoming. Revelation, not as doctrine but as incarnation, cannot, of course, be anything other than history, i. e. falling into a certain time and being bound to a certain place. The incarnation is the unity of being, ἐγώ εἰμι, Jn 8:58, and becoming, ὁ ἀρχὴ ἐγένετο, Jn 1:14. Mankind is not an aggregate of individuals, but an organic whole, in which all live off each other. Revelation follows this law, the re-creation joins creation. Just as in every field we share in the goods of humanity by means of tradition, so it is in religion. That too belongs to the idea of the incarnation. It is itself an actus transiens, but through tradition it becomes the property and the blessing of all people. The fact that this revelation is still restricted to such a small group of people poses a difficult problem, which will have to be examined in greater detail later; but this fact, which is touching in itself, can never be a reason for rejection by those who know it. Many nations live in a state of crude barbarism. This, too, is according to the will and good pleasure of God. Yet it does not occur to anyone to despise the blessings of civilization for this reason. Rousseau was a fan of the natural man, but he remained silent in France.

2. The bearer of the ideal goods of mankind is language, and the σαρξ of language is writing. Here too God in revelation joins in. In order to enter fully into humanity and become its property, Revelation takes on the μορφή, the σχῆμα of Scripture. Scripture is the servant form of revelation. Yes, the central fact of revelation, η. 1. the incarnation, leads after- the Scriptures. In prophecy and miracle, revelation descends so low and so deep that it does not disregard even the lowest forms of human life, especially religious life, as a

means to an end. The Logos itself becomes not ἄνθρωπος only, but ὄντος, σαρξ. And so the word of revelation takes on the imperfect, imperfect form of writing. But only in this way does revelation become the good of mankind. The goal of revelation is not Christ; Christ is the center and means; the goal is that God may dwell in His creatures again and manifest His glory in the cosmos. Θεός τα πάντα εν πασιν. This, too, is in a certain sense an ἑνανθρωπησις τον !)εον , a humanity of God. And to achieve this goal, the word of revelation passes into writing. Thus Scripture too is a means and an instrument, not an end. It flows from the incarnation of God in Christ, and in a certain sense it is the continuation of that, the way by which Christ makes his home in his congregation; the praeparatio viae ad plenam inhabitationem Dei. But in this indwelling of God it also has its τέλος, its end and goal, 1 Cor. 15:28. Like all of revelation, it is also an actus transiens.

Thus the relation in which Scripture stands to Revelation becomes clear. The earlier theology almost completely absorbed revelation into theopneustics, into the gift of Scripture. It spoke of revelation only in passing, and interpreted it far too narrowly. It seemed as if nothing lay behind the Scriptures. And Scripture came to stand completely apart and isolated. It was not rooted in history. It looked as if it had suddenly fallen from the sky. The powerful conception of revelation as a history that begins with the fall and only ends in the parousia was almost entirely alien to it. This view is untenable. In most cases revelation precedes theosophy and is often separated from it by a long period of time. The revelation of God to the patriarchs, in the history of Israel, in the person of Christ was sometimes only described centuries and years later; and also the prophets and apostles often write down their revelations a considerable time after their reception, e.g. Jer. 25:13, 30:1, 36:2 ff. Furthermore, many persons like Elijah, Elisha, Thomas, Nathanael, etc. were revelators, who nevertheless never wrote a book that was recorded in the canon; others on the other hand did not receive any revelations and did not perform miracles, and yet brought them to us in writing, as e.g. the writers of many historical books. Furthermore,

revelation took place in various forms, dream, vision, etc., and meant the disclosure of something that was hidden; theopneustia was always an action of God's Spirit in the consciousness and was intended to guarantee the content of Scripture. The newer theology therefore rightly distinguished between revelation and Scripture. But it often fell into another extreme. It separated Scripture from Revelation so completely that it became nothing more than an accidental appendage, an arbitrary addition, a human certificate of Revelation, which may still be useful but is in any case unnecessary. This theme has been sung about in all sorts of variations. Not the letter but the Spirit, not the Scripture but the person of Christ, not the word but the fact is the principium of theology. And Lessing came to the well-known plea: O Luther, you great and holy man, you have delivered us from the yoke of the Pope, but who will deliver us from the yoke of the letter, of the paper Pope? This view is no less wrong and even more dangerous than the other. For revelation and theopneustics in many cases coincide completely. By no means everything that is described in Scripture was revealed beforehand, but came into consciousness during the writing itself, e.g., in the Psalms, the Epistles, etc. He who denies theopneustics and despises the Scriptures also loses a very large part of Revelation; he is left with nothing but human writings. Furthermore, even where revelation preceded description in fact or word, we know it only through the Holy Scriptures. We know literally nothing of the revelations of God under Israel and in Christ except from the Holy Scriptures. There is no other principium. With the Scriptures, therefore, falls the whole of revelation, including the person of Christ. Just because Revelation is history, there is no other way to know anything about it than the ordinary way of all history, which is Testimony. The testimony decides for our consciousness the reality of a fact. No communion with Christ but only through communion with the word of the apostles, John 17 : 20, 21; 1 John 1:3. Revelation exists for us, for the church of all ages, only in the form of the Holy Scriptures. And finally, as will appear later, theopneustia is a characteristic of the Scriptures, a proper and separate act of God in the production of Scripture, and therefore, to that extent, to be recognized and

honored as an act of revelation itself. Contempt or rejection of Scripture is thus not an innocent act with respect to human testimonies concerning revelation, but a denial of a particular act of God's revelation, and thus in principle a denial of all revelation.

So both directions are one-sided, both those which deny revelation for the sake of Scripture and those which deny Scripture for the sake of revelation. There the φατερωσις, here the &sonvsvffna does not come into its own. Over there one has Scripture without Scripture: over here one has Scripture without Scripture. There is a neglect of history, here a disdain for the word. The first direction lapses into orthodox intellectualism, the second runs the risk of anabaptist spiritualism. The correct view is that Scripture is neither identified with Revelation nor detached from it. Theopneustia is an element in revelation; a last act in which the revelation of God in Christ is concluded for this dispensation; in that sense, the end, the crown, the preservation and publication of revelation, medium, quo revelatio immediata mediata facta inque libros relata est, Baum-garten at Twesten, Vorles. über die Dogm. I 402.

3. Revelation, nevertheless, taken as a whole, has reached its end and purpose only in the parousia of Christ. But it falls into two great periods, into two distinct divisions (above page 270). The first dispensation was aimed at incorporating the full revelation of God and making it a part of the history of mankind. The whole of that oeconomy can be seen as God coming to his people, as seeking a tabernacle for Christ. It is thus predominantly a revelation of God in Christ. It has an objective character. It is characterized by extraordinary acts; theophany, prophecy and miracle are the ways through which God comes to his people. Christ is its subject. He is the Logos, who shines in the darkness, comes to his own, and becomes flesh in Jesus. The Holy Spirit was not yet there, since Christ was not yet glorified. In this dispensation the registration keeps pace with the revelation. Both grow from century to century. As revelation progresses, the Scriptures increase in size. When, in Christ, the full revelation of God has been given, theophany,

prophecy and miracle have reached their climax in Him, and the grace of God in Christ has appeared to all men, then, at the same time, the completion of Scripture is also there. Christ, in his person and work, has fully revealed the Father to us, and therefore that revelation is fully described in Scripture. Revelation has in a certain sense reached its end. The dispensation of the Son gives way to the dispensation of the Spirit. Objective revelation passes into subjective appropriation. In Christ, God created an organic center in the midst of history; from there, the circles in which the light of revelation shines are now drawn in ever-widening circles. The sun, rising, covers only a small area of the earth with its rays; standing in the zenith, it radiates over the whole earth. Israel was but an instrument of revelation; it has performed its service and falls away when it has brought forth the Christ, so far as the flesh is concerned; now the grace of God appears to all men. Revelation thus continues, but in other ways and forms. The Holy Spirit takes everything from Christ; He adds nothing new to Revelation. It is complete and therefore not open to increase. Christ is the Logos, full of grace and truth; His work is accomplished; the Father Himself rests in His labor. His work cannot be supplemented or increased by the good works of the saints; His word cannot be added to by tradition; His person cannot be added to by the Pope. In Christ, God has fully revealed and fully given Himself. That is why Scripture is complete; it is the perfect word of God. And yet, although in a different way, Revelation continues, for it has its ultimate goal not in Christ, who is the mediator, but in the new humanity, in the dwelling of God with His people. It continues in all its three forms of theophany, prophecy and miracle. God comes to and dwells in the church of Christ; wherever two or three are gathered in His name, He is in the midst. He works miracles always through; He renews her through regeneration, sanctification, and glorification; the spiritual miracles do not cease. God is always working. But that is not enough. Not only the world of being, but also that of consciousness must be renewed. In the Logos was the life but also the light of man; Christ is full of grace but also of truth; the revelation consisted in miracle but also in prophecy. Word and deed went together in the first dispensation; they also

accompany each other in the oeconomy of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit regenerates but also enlightens. But just as spiritual miracles do not add a new element to the objective facts of revelation, but are merely the working out of the miracle of God's grace wrought in Christ, so also prophecy in the church, the illumination of the Holy Spirit, is not a revelation of mysteries, but the application of the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, which are contained in Christ and are displayed in His word. And both these activities of the Holy Spirit go hand in hand in this dispensation. Prophecy and miracle, word and fact, illumination and government, Scripture and the Church accompany each other. Even today, revelation is not only teaching that enlightens the mind, but also a life that renews the heart. It is both together in unbreakable unity. The one-sidedness of intellectualism and mysticism is to be avoided, for both are a denial of the riches of Revelation. Because head and heart, the entire human being, must be renewed in his being and consciousness, revelation in this dispensation continues in Scripture and in the Church together. And both are in the closest relationship to each other. Scripture is the light of the Church; the Church is the life of Scripture. Outside the church the Scripture is a riddle, an annoyance. Without regeneration no one can know it. He who is not a partaker of its life cannot understand its meaning and opinion. And conversely, the life of the Church is a mystery if the Scriptures do not shed their light on it. The Scriptures explain the Church, and the Church verifies the Scriptures. In the Church the Scripture confirms and seals her revelation, and in the Scripture the Christian, the Church learns to understand herself, in her relation to God and the world, in her past and present and future.

That is why Scripture does not stand alone. It cannot be understood in a deistic way. It has its roots in a history of centuries and is the fruit of revelation among Israel and in Christ. But it is not a book from long ago that only connects us with people and events from the past. Scripture is not an arid story or an old chronicle, but it is the ever living, eternally youthful Word that God sends out to His people now and always. It is God's everlasting speech to us. It does not only

serve to make us historically aware of what has happened in the past. It does not even have the intention of providing us with a historical account according to the standard of fidelity required in other sciences. Scripture is a book of history; all that has been written before has been written for our learning, that we may have hope through patience and consolation of the Scriptures. The Scriptures were written by the Holy Spirit to serve Him in His guidance of the Church, in the perfection of the saints, and in the edification of the body of Christ. In them God comes daily to his people. In her, He speaks to His children, not from afar, but from close by. In her He reveals Himself from day to day to the faithful in the fullness of His grace and truth. Through her He works His miracles of mercy and faithfulness. Scripture is the permanent record between heaven and earth, between Christ and his church, between God and his children. It not only binds us to the past, it binds us to the living Lord in the heavens. She is the *viva vox Dei, epistola Dei omnipotentis ad suam creaturam*. Through the word God once created the world, through the word He upholds it; but through the word He also recreates it and prepares it for His dwelling. Theopneustia is therefore also a permanent characteristic of Scripture. It was not only theopneusted at the moment it was written down; it is theopneust. *Divinitus inspirata est scriptura, non solum dum scripta est Deo spirante per scriptores; sed etiam dum legitur Deo spirante per scripturam et scriptura ipsum spirante*, Bengel on 2 Tim. 3: 16. Proceeding from revelation, it is kept alive and made efficient by theopneustion. It is the Holy Spirit who upholds prophecy and miracle, scripture and church, and puts them in relation to each other, and who thus prepares the parable. For when both being and consciousness will be

20 completely renewed, then revelation has its end. Scripture will no longer be needed. Theopneustia will then be the portion of all God's children. They will all be taught by the Lord and serve Him in His temple. Prophecy and miracle have become nature, because God lives among His people.

B. The doctrine of inspiration.

4. The authority of the Holy Scriptures has been recognized by all Christian churches. There is no dogma, on which there is more unity, than that of the Holy Scriptures. The genesis of this belief in the Scriptures is no longer traceable. It exists as far back as we can go. In the late O. T. the authority of Yahveh's commandments and statutes, i. e. of the Torah and likewise of the prophets, is already established. Moses and the prophets have always been men of divine authority among Israel; their writings were immediately recognized as authoritative. The Jews built on them a doctrine of inspiration, as strict and exclusive as possible. The Torah stands first in the O. T. Scriptures; its contents are identical with divine Wisdom, the image of God, the daughter of God, the sufficient revelation of salvation, the highest good, the way of life, destined for all peoples. Had Israel not sinned, she would have been sufficient. But now the writings of the prophets have been added later to explain it. All these scriptures are divine, holy, rules of doctrine and life, and of infinite content. Nothing in them is superfluous; everything has meaning, every letter, every sign, even the shape and form of a letter, because everything comes from God. According to Philo, the migr. Abrahahae, and Josephus, Ant. 4, 6, 5. c. Ap. 1,7 the prophets were in a state of rapture and unconsciousness at the time of inspiration, which they compared with the pagan mantis and sometimes extended to others than the prophets, but the divine authority of the Scriptures is also unshakeable in their eyes. Only, in fact, this authority was again undermined by tradition. The Scriptures themselves were insufficient. In the view of the Jews, there was also an oral tradition, originating from God, handed down to the Scribes by Moses, Aaron, the elders, the prophets and the men of the great synagogue. It was finally laid down in the Mishna and Gemara, which has now been added to the norma normans as norma normata, and reconciled with Scripture by means of thirteen hermeneutical rules in particular, Zunz, Die gottesd. Vortrage der Juden 1832 S. 37 f. Weber, System der altsyn. pal. Theol. 1880. S. 14 1. 78 f. Schürer, Neutest. Zeitgeschichte, Leipzig. 1874. S. 437 f.

The Christian congregation now rejected the whole Jewish tradition with Jesus and the apostles, but still recognized from the beginning the divine authority of the O. T. Scriptures, Harnack, Dogm. gesch. I 39 f. 145 f. 244 f. The church has never been without a Bible. It received the O. Test, from the hand of the apostles at once with divine authority. From the beginning the Christian faith embraced the divine authority of the O. T. Clemens Romanus teaches the inspiration of the O. T. as clearly as possible. He calls the O. T. writings τα λόγια τον ἱεον, 1 Cor. 53, τας γραφας, τας ἀλη-ἴεις τας δια 71νεύματος τον ἅγιον, ib. 45, cites places from the O. T. with the formula: the Holy Spirit says, ib. 13 and says of the prophets: ο! λειτονργοι της χαριτος τον ὕ-εου δια πνευματος ἅγιον ελαλησαν ib. 8. He extends the inspiration also to the apostles, saying, that they went out μετὰ πληροφορίας πνευματος ἅγιον to preach, ib. 42, and that Paul wrote to the Corinthians πνευματικως, ib. 47. For the rest the apostles provide little material for the dogma of Scripture: the inspiration itself is certain, but there is still difference as to the extent and limits of inspiration; little is said of the N. T. writings, and apocrypha are sometimes quoted as canonical. The Apologists of the 2nd century, Justinus, Coh. ad Graecos c. 8. and Athenagoras, Leg. pro Christo cap. 7. compare the writers to a cithar, lyre, or flute, of which the divine πληκτρον availed itself as of an organ. The doctrine of the apostles is on a par with that of the prophets; as Abraham, so we believe τη φωνή τον θ-εον, τη δια 1:ε των αποστολών τον χριστόν λαλη&ειση παλιν και τη δια των προφητών κηρνη&ειση ημιν, Just. Dial. 119. The Gospels share in the same inspiration as the prophets, δια το τους παντας πνευματοφορους ἐνι πνευματι ἱεον λελαληκεναι, Theoph. ad Autol. 3 η. 12. With Irenaeus the full recognition of the inspiration of both Testaments is already present; Scripturae perfectae sunt, quippe a Deo et Spiritu ejus dictae, adv. haer. 2, 28., they have one author and one purpose, 4,9. And further the Holy Scriptures are cited by the Fathers of the Church as &εια γραφή, κυριακαι γραφαι, ἱεοπνευῶτοι γραφαι, coelestes literae, divinae voces, bibliotheca sancta, chirographum Dei, etc. The writers are called λειτουργοί της χαριτος του ἱεου, ὀργανα ὕ-ειας φωνής, ὕτομα ἱ)εον, πνευματοφοροι, χρι&τοφοροι, ἔμπνευῶεντες,

ὑεοφορουμενοι, Spiritu divino inundati, pleni, etc. The act of inspiration -is represented as driving, leading, etc., but especially often as dictating the Holy Spirit, Iren. 1. c. Aug. de cons. Evang. 1, 54; the scribes were the hands of the H. G., Aug. ib., they were not the auctores, but only scriptores, scribae; auctor of the H. Schrift is God alone, Isidorus Hisp. lib. 1. de offic. c. 12, by Dausch, Die Schrift-inspiration 1891 S. 87. Scripture is an epistola omnipotentis Dei ad suam creaturam, Aug. in Ps. 20. Serm. 2, 1. Greg. Magnus, Epist. 1. 4. ep. 31. There is nothing indifferent and nothing superfluous in it, but everything is full of divine wisdom; nihil enim vacuum, neque sine signo apud Deum, Iren. adv. haer. 4, 21, 3. Origen especially drove this strongly, saying, that there was not a tittle or an iota vain, that there was nothing in Scripture, quod non a plenitudine divinae majestatis descendat, Homil. 2. 21. 39 in Jerem. , and likewise Hieronymus, who said: singuli sermones. syllabae, apices, puncta in divinis scripturis plena sunt sensibus et spirant caelestia sacramenta. The Holy Scriptures were therefore without any defect, without any error, even in chronological, historical matters, Theoph. ad Autol. 23, Iren. adv. haer. 3,5. What the apostles wrote must be accepted as if Christ himself had written it, for they were as it were his hands, Aug. de cons. Evang. 1, 54. In his letter to Hieronymus he says he firmly believes that none of the canonical writers scribendo aliquid errasse. So if there is an error, non licet dicere: auctor hujus libri non tenuit veritatem sed: aut codex mendosus est, aut interpres erravit, aut tu non intelligis, c. Faust. But at the same time the self-confidence of the writers in their inspiration towards Montanism was accentuated as much as possible; prior research, distinction in development, use of sources and of the memory, difference in language and style were all emphasized by Iren. Orig. Euseb.

August. Hieron. etc.; even a difference in the mode of inspiration among O. and N. T., or also a difference in degree of inspiration according to the moral condition of the writers, was assumed by some, Novatianus, de trin. 4. Orig. c. Cels. 7. 4. But all this did not detract from the belief in the divine origin and the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures. These were generally established. The practical

use of Scripture in preaching, in the presentation of evidence, in the exegetical treatment, etc., proves this even more and more strongly than the isolated statements. The church in this first period was more concerned with the determination of the canon, than with the concept of inspiration, but understood the canon to be precisely *divinae scripturae*, Conc. Carth. 397 can. 47, and ascribed to them alone authority, Conc. Tolet. 447, cf. Denzinger, *Enchir. symb. et defin.* no. 49. 125. Joh. Delitzsch, *de inspir. scripturae s., quid statuerint patres apostolici et apologetae* sec. Lips. 1872. Hagenbach, *Dogm. Gesch.* § 31 f. Kudelbach, *Zeits. f. d. ges. luth. Theol. u. Kirclie* 1840. W. Rohnert, *Die Inspiration der H. S. u. ihre Bestreiter*, Leipz. 1889 S. 85 f. P. Dausch, *Die Schriftinspiration, eine bibl. geschichtl. Studie*, Freiburg 1891. S. 45 f. Koelling, *Die Lehre von der Theopneustie*, Breslau 1891. 84 f. Cramer, *Godgel. Contributions IV* 49-121. Dr. W. Sanday, *Inspiration, eight lectures on the early history and origin of the doctrine of biblical inspiration*, Bampton lectures 1893.

5. The theology of the Middle Ages stuck to the Church Fathers and did not develop the doctrine of inspiration. Joh. Damasc., *de fide orthod.* 4, 17 mentions Scripture only briefly and says that law and prophets, evangelists and apostles, pastors and teachers have spoken by the Holy Spirit; and therefore Scripture is theopneist. Erigena, *de div. nat.* I 66 sq. says, that in all things one must follow the authority of H. S. because *vera auctoritas rectae rationi non obsistit*, but also *omnis auctoritas, quae vera ratione non approbatur, infirma videtur esse*. Thomas does not treat the doctrine of Holy Scripture either as Lombardus does, but nevertheless gives his thought on inspiration in his doctrine on prophecy, *S. Theol.* II 2 qu. 171 sq. Prophecy is definitely a gift of the mind and consists firstly in *inspiratio*, i. e. in an *elevatio mentis ad percipienda divina*, which takes place *Spiritu Sancto movente*, and secondly in *revelatio*, worth-while the divine things are known, the darkness and ignorance are removed and the prophecy itself is completed, qu. Prophecy further consists in the gift of the *lumen propheticum*, by which divine things become visible, as well as natural things by the natural light of reason, *ib.* art. 2. But

this revelation differs; sometimes it takes place through the senses, sometimes through the imagination, and sometimes in a purely spiritual manner, as with Solomon and the apostles, *ib. qu. 173 art. 2*. Prophecy by *intellectualem visionem* is generally ranked higher than prophecy by *imaginariam visionem*; however, if the *lumen intellectuale* does not reveal supernatural things, but only allows the naturally knowable things to be known and judged in a divine manner, then such a *prophetia intellectualis* is ranked below the *visio imaginaria*, which reveals supernatural truth. The authors of the *hagiographa* often wrote about things that are recognizable by nature, and they then spoke *non quasi ex persona Dei, sed ex persona propria, cum adiutorio tamen divini luminis*. Thomas thus recognizes different modes and degrees of inspiration. He also says, *qu. 176 art. 1*, that the apostles received the gift of tongues in order to be able to preach the gospel to all nations, *sed quantum ad quaedam quae superadduntur humana arte ad ornatum et elegantiam locutionis, apostolus instructus erat in propria lingua, non autem in aliena*, and so also the apostles were sufficiently equipped with knowledge for their office, but did not know everything there is to know, e.g. *arithmetica*, etc. But no error or falsehood can occur in Scripture, *S. Theol. I qu. 32 art. 4. II 2 qu. 110 art. 4 ad 3*. The most extensive discussion of Scripture is given by Bonaventura in the prooemium for his *Breviloquium*, ed Freiburg 1881 p. 1-32: Scripture does not originate from human research, but from revelation of the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit. No one can know it except by faith, because Christ is its substance. She is *cor Dei, os Dei* (the Father), *lingua Dei* (the Son), *calamus Dei* (the Holy Ghost). Four things are of the Scriptures especially to be considered; her *latitudo*: she contains many parts, *O. and N. T.*, different kinds of books, legal, historical, prophetic, etc.; her *longitudo*: she describes all times from creation to the judgment day in the three ages of *lex naturae, lex scripta* and *lex gratiae* or in seven aetates; her *sublimitas*: she describes the different hierarchies, *ecclesiastica, angelica, divina*; her *profunditas*: she has a *multiplicitas mysticarum intelligentiarum*. However much the Holy Scriptures use different ways of speaking, they are always real, there is nothing untrue in them. For the Holy

Spirit, ejus auctor perfectissimus nihil potuit dicere falsum, nihil superfluum, nihil diminutum. That is why the reading and examination of the H. S. is so urgently needed; and for this purpose Bonaventura wrote his precious Breviloquium. In the Prologus for his Sententiae, Duns Scotus does introduce various grounds on which belief in the Holy Scriptures rests, such as prophecy, inner agreement, authenticity, miracles, etc., but he does not discuss the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. And for the rest we find little substance for the dogma of Scripture in scholasticism. No need was felt for a special treatment of the locus de S. Scr., since its authority was fixed and no one disputed it. She had in the Middle Ages, at least formally, an undisputed dominion. It was symbolically represented as the water of life, glorified in praise, venerated and worshipped like the image of Christ, written down in the most precious manner, illustrated, bound and displayed. It had an honored place at the councils, was kept as a relic, worn around the neck as an amulet, buried with the deceased, and used as the basis for oaths. And it was also read, studied, explained and translated much more than the Protestants later believed, Vigouroux, *Les livres saints et la critique rationaliste*, 3rd ed. I 226 s. Janssen, *Gesch. des deutschen Volkes*, I 48 f. Herzog² 3, 545 f. There was no opposition to Scripture. Also Abaelard, *Sic et Non*, ed. Henke et Lindenköhl, Marb. 1851 p. 10.11 does not say, that prophets and apostles erred in writing, but only, that they sometimes erred as persons, appealing to Gregory, who had acknowledged this also of Peter; the *gratia prophetiae* was sometimes taken away from them, that they might remain humble and acknowledge, that they received and possessed that Spirit of God, *qui mentiri vel falli nescit*, only as a gift. Neither is Agobard of Lyon an opponent of inspiration; only that he opposes Fredegis of Tours with a more organic view, which recognizes differences of language and style, grammatical deviations etc., Münscher - v. Coelln, *Dogm. Gesch.* II 1 S. 105. Ecclesiastically, the inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures was pronounced and recognized several times, Denzinger, *Enchir.* n. 296. 386. 367. 600.

6. The Trentine Council declared in sess. 4, that the truth is contained in the written books and unwritten traditions, which have been received from the mouth of Christ by the apostles, or have been handed down from hand to hand and have come to us by the same apostles, Spiritu Sancto dictante; and that therefore, after the example of the fathers, it is all the books of the Old and New Testament, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, and likewise the traditions ... tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas ... accepts and worships. The inspiration was here extended to the tradition, but still clearly pronounced from the H. S. as well. But among the Roman theologians there soon came great differences regarding the nature and extent of inspiration. Both the auctor utriusque testamenti and the dictare were interpreted differently. The theologians of the 16th century were generally still of the stricter persuasion of churchmen and scholastics. They were mostly followers of Augustine in the doctrine of grace, Jansenists, Augustinians and Dominicans. The most important among these are Melchior Canus, Loei theol. 1563, Bannez, Comment, in primam partem D. Thomae Lugd. 1788. Bajus and Jansenius, Billuart, Summa S. Thomae torn. 2. Wirceb. 1758, Rabaudy, Exerc. de Scriptura sacra, -in this century still Fernandez, diss. crit. theol. de verbal! S. Bibl. inspiratione, but also Jesuits, such as Tostatus, Costerus, Turrianus, Salmeron, Gregor de Valencia, De rebus fidei h. t. controv. Lugd. 1591 etc. These teach alien a positive effect of God's Spirit on the writers, which extended also to the singula verba. But soon a more lax direction emerged, and this among the Jesuits. In the year 1586 Lessius and Hamelius opened their lectures at the Jesuit College in Leuven, and there they defended among others the theses: 1° ut aliquis sit S. Scriptura, non est necessarium, singula ejus verba inspirata esse a Sp. S°. 2° non est necessarium, ut singulae veritates et sententiae sint immediate a Sp. S°. ipsi scriptori inspiratae. 39 liber aliquis (qualis forte est secundus Machabaeorum) humana industria sine assistentia Sp. S'. scriptus, si Sp. S's postea testetur, ibi nihil esse falsum, efficitur Scriptura sacra. Here word inspiration is rejected, the immediate inspiration also of many things, e.g. of history, which the writers knew, is considered

unnecessary, and even in some books an inspiratio subsequens or aposterior approbation of H. G., so named later by Bonfrerius, is considered sufficient. The faculties of Louvain and Douai condemned the theses, but others rejected this censorship, and the pope made no decision. The first two theses were widely accepted, but the third went too far and was adopted by few, o. a. by Bonfrerius, Frassenius, Richard Simon, Histoire critique du N. T. 1689 ch. 23, and in this century still by the bishop of Spiers, Haneberg, Gesch. der bibl. Offenbarung, 3rd Aufl. 1863. Another direction is represented by Mariana, Tract, varii VIII, El. du Pin, Dissert, préliminaire tom. I Paris 1701. J. Jahn, Introductio in libros Vet. Test. 1814 and conceives of inspiration as a -louter negative assistance des H. G., by which the writers were preserved from error. Both these directions held to the infallibility of Holy Scripture, but identified this factual result with the divine origin of Scripture. On the other hand, infallibility in matters which were not in the narrow sense religious-ethical was abandoned and inspiration limited to what was actually dogmatic-ethical by Erasmus, on Mt. 2, Ch. 10, and Apologia adv. monachos quosdam Hispanos, Abbé Le Noir, Lenormant, Les origines de l'histoire d'après la Bible Paris 1880, de Broglie, Langen in Bonn, Rohling, Natur und Offenbarung 1872. Related to this is the idea of Holden, doctor of the Sorbonne, in his Divinae fidei analysis 1770 and Chrismann, Regula fidei catholicae, who assumed that the truths of faith and morals were inspired by Scripture, but taught that the rest of Scripture was only assisted by the faithful. Of similar tendency is also the view in the Roman Tübinger school, whose representatives Drey, Apologetik 1838 S. 204 f. Kuhn, Einl. in die Dogmatik 1859 S. 9 f. Schanz, Apol. des Christ. II 318 f. etc. older influence of Schleiermacher, connected inspiration with the whole organism of revelation, and extended it in different degrees to the different parts of Scripture. Most Roman theologians after the Reformation take a middle course. On the one hand, they reject the lax inspiration which would have existed only in negative assistance or posterior approbation, because if all decisions of the councils were true, then everything was inspired. On the other hand they also deny the strict inspiration verbalis, according to which all things not only

maai- even all singula verba are dictated and inspired, because many things and words were known to the writers and therefore did not need to be inspired: the difference in language and style, the use of sources etc. also proves the incorrectness of verbal inspiration. An inspiratio realis is therefore sufficient, which is sometimes a revelation, sometimes an assistance. We find this theory in Bellarminus, de Verbo Dei. I c. 14. cf. de Cone. II c. 12. XII c. 14. C. a Lapide on 2 Tim. 3 : 16. de Theologia Wirceburgensis, disp. 1 cap. Marchini, de divinitate et canonicitate sacr. Bibl. Pars 1 art. 7. Liebermann, Instit. theol. ed. 8. 1857 I p. 385 sq. Perrone, Praelect. Theol. IX 1843 p. 66 sq. Heinrich, Dogm. I 382 f. Franzelin, Tractatus de div. Script. Kleutgen, Theol. der Vorzeit I 50. H. Denzinger, Vier Bücher von der relig. Erk. II 108 f. F. Schmid, de inspirationis Bibl. vi et ratione. Jansen, Praelect. theol. I 767 sq. See further on these different theories of inspiration Perrone ib. IX 58 sq. Jansen, ib. 762 sq. P. Dansch, Die Schriftinspiration 1891. S. 145 f. The Vaticanum, though it did not propose a particular theory, yet decidedly condemned that of the inspiratio subsequens and the mera assistentia, and, after repeating the Trentine decision, declared that the Church recognizes those books for sacred and canonical, not because they are sola industria humana concinnati, sua (i. i. of the church) deinde autoritate sint approbati; nor also, because they revelationem sine errore contineant; but therefore that they Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi ecclesiae traditi sunt. In can. 2, 4 the council calls the books divinitus inspiratos once more. In cap. 3 de fide it says, that fide divina et catholica ea omnia credenda sunt, quae in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito continentur. This decision leaves nothing to be desired in terms of clarity. The Roman Church understands inspiration as a positive influence of God's Spirit and upholds the infallibility of Scripture. And the encyclical of Leo XIII de studiis Scripturae sacrae IS Nov. 1893 was written in this same faith.

7. The Reformers accepted Scripture and its theopneustics as it had been handed down to them by the Church. Luther, from his soteriological point of view, occasionally judged some books, Esther,

Ezra, Neb., James, Jude, Rev. unfavourably and admitted minor inaccuracies, but on the other hand held to the inspiration in the strictest sense and extended it to the letters. Bretschneider, *Luther an unsere Zeit* 1817. Schenkel, *Das Wesen der Protest.* II 56 f. Köstlin, *Luther's Theology* II 246 f. W. Rohnert, *Was lehrt L. von der Insp. der H. Schrift.* Leipzig 1890. Fr. Pieper, *Luther's doctrine of inspiration*, *Presbyt. and Ref. Rev.* April 1893 p. 249-266. The Lutheran symbols have no separate article on Scripture, but presuppose its divine origin and authority throughout, *Conf. Aug. praef.* 8. art. 7. Art. Smale. II art. 2. 15. *Form. Cone. Pars I Epit. de comp, regula atque norma* 1. The Lutheran dogmatists, Melancthon in the *praefatio* for his *loci*, Chemnitz, *Examen Cone. Trid. Loe.* 1. Gerhard, *Loci Theol. loc.* 1. etc. all have the same view. Not first Quenstedt and Calovius, but already Gerhard calls the writers *Dei amanuenses*, *Christi manus et Spiritus Sancti tabelliones sive notarios*, *ib. loc.* 1. cap. 2 § 18. Later ones have only developed and applied the principle further, Heppel, *Dogmatik des deutschen Prot.* I. 207-257. Hase Hult. *Rediv.* § 38 f. Schmid, *Dogm. der ev. luth. K.* cap. 4. Rohnert, *Die Inspiration der H. Schrift* 169 f. Koelling, *Die Lehre von der Theopneustie* 1891. S. 212 f. Among the Reformed we find the same doctrine of Scripture. Zwingli often subordinates the external word to the internal, admits historical and chronological inaccuracies, and sometimes extends inspiration to heathen writers, Zeiler, *Das theol. System Zwingli's* 137 f. Chr. Sigwart, *Ulr. Zwingli* 45 f. But Calvin holds the Scriptures in a full and literal sense to be God's word, *Instit.* I. c. 7-8, *Comm. on 2 Tim. 3:16 and 2 Pet. 1:20*; he acknowledges the letter to the Hebrews, though not for Pauline, yet for canonical, and takes *Mt. 22 : 9, 23 : 25* to be an error, but not in the autographa, Cramer, *The Scripture of Calvin.* *Herald.* n°. 26 v. Moore, *Calvin's doctrine of holy Scripture*, *Presb. and Ref. Rev.* Jan. 1893 p. 49 etc. The *Gerref.* confessions have most an article on the Holy Scriptures and clearly pronounce its divine authority, *I Helv.* 1-3. *II Helv.* 1. 2. 13. *Gall.* 18. 5. *Belg.* 3. *Angl.* 6. *Scot.* 18 etc.; and the *Gerref.* theologians all take the same view without distinction, Ursinus, *Tract, theol.* 1584 p. 1-33. Zanchius, *Op.* VIII col. 319-451. Junius, *Theses Theol. cap.* 2. Polanus, *Synt. Theol.* i 15. *Synopsis*, disp. 2.

Voetius, Disp. Sei. I. 30 sq. etc. Cramer, The Roman Catholic and Old Prot. Schriftbeschou wing. Heraut n°. 26 v. Heppe, Dogm. der ev. ref. K. S. 9 f. Occasionally a feeble attempt at more organic consideration is discernible. The inspiration was not always in revelation, but, when it came to known matters, in assistia and directio ; the writers were not always passive, but sometimes active, so that they used their own reason, memory, judgment, style, but in such a way that they were nevertheless guided by H. G. and protected from error, Synopsis 3 : 7. Rivetus, Isag. seu introd. generalis ad Script. V. et N. T. cap. 2. Heidegger, Corpus Theol. loc. 2. § 33. 34, but even with this the divinity and infallibility of the Scriptures were not in the least impaired. The writers were not auctores, but scriptores, amanuenses, notarii, manus, calami Dei. The inspiration was not negative but always positive, an impulsus ad scribendum and ae suggestio rerum! et verborum. It communicated not only unknown but also already known things and words, for the writers had to know them precisely now and precisely in such a way, not only materialiter but also formaliter, not only humane but also divine, Schmid, Dogm. der ev. luth. K. 23, 24. Voetius, Disp. I 30. The inspiration extended to all chronol. histor. geogr. matters, to words, even to vocals and signs. J. Buxtorf, Tract, de punctorum origine, autiquitate et auctoritate 1648. Anticritica 1653. Alsted, Praecognita Theol. p. 276. Polanus, Synt. Theol. I p. 75. Voetius, Disp. I 34. Cons. Helv. art. 2. Barbarisms and solucisms were not accepted in the H. S. Difference of style was explained by the will of the H. G., who now and then wanted to write differently, Quenstedt and Hollaz at Rohnert, Die Inspir. der H. Schrift 205. 208. Winer, Grammatik des N. T. Sprachidioms, 6th Aufi. 11 f. Voetius ib. Gomarus, Op. 601. Materialiter, as regards letters, syllables and words, Scripture is e sensu creaturarum, but formaliter, as regards den sensus &εοπνευστοτ, male creaturis accensetur, cum sit mens, consilium, sapientia Dei. Hollaz, Exam. ed. Teller p. 992, at Dauschll2. 1111714 Nietzsche wrote in Gotha, according to Tholuck, Vermischte Schriften II 86, a dissertation on the question, whether the Holy Scriptures themselves were God.

8. But when the theory of inspiration, as with the Jews and the Mohammedans, had thus reached its ultimate conclusion, opposition arose from all sides. Even in early times there was no lack of criticism of Scripture. Jehoiakim burned the scroll of Baruch, Jer. 36. Apion summarized all the accusations made by the pagans against the Jews concerning circumcision, the prohibition of boar's meat, the exodus from Egypt, the sojourn in the desert, etc. Josephus, *contra Apionem*, J. G. Muller, *Des Flavius Josephus' Schrift gegen den Apion* 1877. The Gnostics, Manichaeans and their related sects in the Middle Ages tore the N. Test apart from the Old and attributed it to a lower god, the demiurge. Especially Marcion, in his *Antitheses*, and his disciples Apelles and Tatian, starting from the Pauline opposition of righteousness and grace, law and gospel, works and faith, flesh and spirit, directed their attack against the anthropomorphisms, the contradictions, the immorality of the Old Testament, and said that a God who is wrathful, repentant, vengeful, jealous, commands theft and lies, descends, gives a severe law, etc., cannot be the true God. They also pointed with fondness to the great difference between Christ, the true Messiah, and the Messiah, as the prophets expected him to be. Of the N. T. Marcion rejected all the writings except those of Luke and Paul, and corrupted even these by abridgment and interpolation, Tertullian, *adv. Marcionem*. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 42. Irenaeus, *adv. haer. passim*. Harnack, *Dogmengesch.* I 226 f. Celsus continued this battle in a sharp way and gave a sharp critique on the first chapters of Genesis, the creation days, the creation of mankind, the temptation, the fall, the flood, the ark, Babel's tower, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and furthermore on Jonah, Daniel, the supernatural birth of Jesus, the baptism, the resurrection, the miracles and accused Jesus and the apostles, for lack of a better explanation, of deceit. Porphyrius started the historical criticism of the books of the Bible; he contested the allegorical exegesis of the Old Testament, attributed the Pentateuch to Ezra, held Daniel to be a product of Antiochus' time and subjected many accounts in the Gospels to sharp criticism. Julian later made all these attacks against Scripture in his *Λογοὶ ἑναντίον τῶν Χριστιανῶν* once more renewed them. But with that, the end of the criticism of the

time had been reached. Scripture came to general and undisputed dominion; criticism was forgotten. She revived in the Renaissance, but was then for a time still subdued by the Reformation and the Roman Counter-Reformation. Later it rose again, in rationalism, deism and French philosophy. First it was directed more against the content of Scripture in the rational eighteenth century; then it was directed more against the authenticity of the writings in the historically-minded nineteenth century. Porphyrius replaced Celsus, Renan followed Voltaire, Paul of Heidelberg gave way to Strauss and Baur. But the result always remains the same, Scripture is a book of error and falsehood.

As a result of this criticism, many have changed the doctrine of inspiration. At first inspiration is still held to be a supernatural working of H. G. in writing, but limited to the religious-ethical; in chronological, historical, etc., it is weakened or denied, so that here greater or lesser errors may occur. The Word of God is to be distinguished from Holy Writ. This was already taught by the Socinians. The writers of the O. and N. T. have written *divino spiritu impulsio eoque dictante*, but the O. T. has only historical value, only the doctrine is directly inspired, in the rest a *leviter errare* is possible, Fock, *Der Socin.* 320 f. The Remonstrants took the same position. They acknowledge inspiration, Conf. art. 1, but admit, that the writers have sometimes expressed themselves less exact et *praecise*, Limborch, *Theol. Christ.* I c. 4 § 10, or have sometimes erred in the *circumstantiae tidae*, Episcopius, *Instit. Theol.* IV 1 cap. 4, or stronger still in the historical books neither needed nor received inspiration, H. Grotius, *Votum pro pace ecclesiae*, Clericus, with Dr. Cramer, *The geschied*, of the doctrine of inspiration in the last two centuries 1887. bl. 24. The same doctrine of inspiration we then find in S. J. Baumgarten, J. G. Töllner, Sender, Michaelis, Reinhard, *Dogm.* § 19. Vinke, *Theol. Christ. Dogm. Comp.* 1853 p. 53-57. Egeling, *Way of Salvation*, 3rd ed. II 612. etc. But this theory met with many objections. The separation between what is necessary for salvation and what is incidental to history is impossible, since doctrine and history are completely interwoven in Scripture. It does

not do justice to the consciousness of the writers, who by no means limit their authority to religious-ethical matters but extend it to the whole content of their writings. It is contrary to the use of Scripture by Jesus, the Apostles, and the entire Christian Church. This dualistic view therefore gave way to another, the dynamic one of Schleiermacher, *Christ. Gl.* § 128-132. It consists in transferring the theopneustic from the intellectual to the ethical. Inspiration is not primarily a property of Scripture but of the writers. These were born-again, holy men; they lived in the presence of Jesus, experienced his influence, lived in the holy circle of revelation and were thus renewed, also in their thinking and speaking. Inspiration is the habitual characteristic of writers. Their writings also share it; they too carry a new, holy character. But this inspiration of the writers is therefore not essential, but only gradually distinguished from that of all believers, for all believers are guided by the Holy Spirit. Nor is it to be understood mechanically, as if it were the part of the writers only occasionally and in some subjects. God's Word is not incorporated into Scripture mechanically, as a picture into a frame, but it permeates and animates all parts of Scripture, as the soul does all members of the body. However, not all parts of Scripture share this inspiration, this word of God, equally; the closer something is to the center of Revelation, the more it breathes the Spirit of God. Scripture is therefore at once a divine and a human book, on the one hand containing the highest truth and at the same time weak, fallible, imperfect; not revelation itself but the ear of revelation; not the word of God itself but a description of that word; imperfect in many respects, but still a sufficient instrument for us to attain a faultless knowledge of revelation. Finally, it is not Scripture, but the person of Christ, or Revelation in general, which is the principle of theology. Of course, this theory of inspiration is open to many modifications; theopneustics can be placed in a more or less intimate relationship to Revelation, the action of the Holy Spirit can be interpreted more or less positively, the possibility of error can be admitted to a greater or lesser extent. But the basic ideas remain the same; inspiration is in the first place a characteristic of the writers and then of their writings, it is not a momentary act or a special gift

of the Holy Spirit but a habitual characteristic, it works dynamically, so that the possibility of error is not excluded in all parts. This theory has almost completely replaced the old doctrine of inspiration. There are only a few theologians left who have not essentially adopted it. See Rothe, *Zur Dogm.* 121 f. Twisten, *Vorles.* I 401 f. Dorner, *Glaub.* I 620 f. Lange, *Dogm.* I § 76 f. Tholuck, art. *Inspir.* in Herzog1. Cremer, *id.* in Herzog2. Hofmann, *Weiss, u. Erf.* I 25 f. *Id.* *Schriftbeweis*, 2e Aufl. I 670 f. Ill 98 f. Beck, *Vorles. über christl. Glaub.* I 424-530, *Einleitung in das System der christl. Lehre*, 2e Aufl. § 82 f. Kalmis, *Luth. Dogm.* I 254-301. Erank, *Syst. der chr. Gewissheit* II 57 f. *Id.* *Syst. der chr. Wahrheit*, 2e Aufl. II. 409 f. Gess, *Die Inspiration der Helden der Bibel und der Schriften der Bibel*, Basel 1892. W. Volck, *Zur Lehre von der H. Schrift*, Dorpat 1885. Grau, *Bew. d. Glaubens* Juni 1890, S. 225 f. Zöckler, *Bew. d. Gl.* April 1892 S. 150 f. Kahler, *Wiss, der chr. Lehre*, 1884. S. 388 f. Kübel, *Leber den Lnterscheid zw. der posit, u. der liber. Richtung in der mod. Theol.* 2e Aufl. S. 216 f. Pareau et H. de Groot, *Comp. dogm. et apol. Christ.* 1848 p. 200 sq. H. de Groot, *De Gron. Godgel.* 1855 bl. 59 v. Saussaye, *Mine Theol. of Ch. d. 1.* S. 49-61. Roozemeyer, *Voices v. W. and Fri.* July 1891. Dr. Is. van Dijk, *Wrong use of the Bible* 1891. Daubanton, *The theopneustics of Holy Scripture* 1882. Oosterzee, *Dogmatics* § 35 v. *Id.* *Theopneustics* 1882. Doedes, *Doctrine of salvation* § 1-9. *Id.* *The Ned. Geloofsbel.* bl. 11-36. R. E. Horton, *Inspiration and the Bible* 4 ed. London 1889. C. Gore, *Lux mundi*, 13 ed. London 1892, p. 247. Farrar and others, *Inspiration, a clerical symposium*, 2 ed. London 1888. W. Gladden, *W110 wrote the Bible*, Boston, Hough-ton 1891. C. A. Briggs, *Inspiration and inerrancy, with papers upon biblical scholarship and inspiration by L. J. Evans and H. P. Smith, and an introduction by A. B. Bruce*, London 1891. J. de Witt, *Inspiration* 1893 etc. Ritschl and his school may also be mentioned here, in so far as they emphasize the objective revelation in Christ in contrast to conscious theology and in connection with it also try to make Scripture true, A. Eitschl, *Rechtf. u. Vers.* II2 9 f. W. Herrmann, *Die Be- deutung der Inspirationslehre für die ev. Kirche*, Halle 1882. Kaftan, *Wesen der christl. Rel.* 1881 S. 307 f. Nietzsche, *Lehrb. der ev. Dogm.* 212-252. E. Haupt, *Die*

Bedeutung der H. Schrift für den evang. Christian, Gutersloh 1891 etc. But this theory satisfies neither the church nor so-called science. The critical objections against Scripture do not apply to the periphery but to the very center of revelation. Therefore others have gone even further and denied inspiration as a supernatural working of God's Spirit. The Bible is a chance collection of human writings, written by men with a deep religious spirit and created among a people who may be called the people of religion. Of revelation and inspiration there is only a metaphorical sense. At the most there is a special guidance of God's general providence in the creation and collection of these writings. The inspiration is only gradually different from the religious inspiration, in which all pious people share, Spinoza, Tract, theol. polit. cap. Wegscheider, Instit. theol. § 13. Strauss, Glaub. I 136 f. Schweizer, Glaub. I 43 f. 179 f. Biedermann, Dogm. § 179- 208. Pfeiderer, Grundriss § 39 f. Lipsius, Dogm. § 179 f. Scholten, L.H.K. I 78 v. Yet it is remarkable that all these men continue to recognize to some extent the religious value of Scripture. They not only see in it a source for the knowledge of Israel and of early Christianity, but they also try to maintain it as a means of grace for the cultivation of the religious-ethical life, cf. Bruining, Theol. Tijdschr. Nov. 1894, p. 587 f. In this respect they differ favorably from all the radicals, who have completely done away with the Scriptures, have shaken off all piety for them, and have nothing left for them but ridicule and contempt. In the first centuries Celsus and Lucianus were the interpreters of this; towards the end of the Middle Ages the slander of the tres impostores was introduced; in the 18th century this hatred of Christianity was expressed by Voltaire, who from 1760 had no other name for Christianity than l'infame and since 1764 has mostly signed his letters with écrasez l'infame; and in this century this enmity against Christ and His Word has increased and grown.

Against all these more or less negative tendencies the inspiration of Scripture in a positive and full sense is still recognized and defended in this century, except by Roman theologians, by I. da Costa, On the Divine Instruction of the Holy Scriptures, edited by Rev. Eggestein,

Rott. Bredée 1884. Dr. A. Kuyper, De Schrift het woord Gods, Tiel 1870. Id. De hedend. Scripture criticism, Amst. 1881. Toorenenbergen, Bijdragen tot de verklaring, toetsing en ontwikkeling van de leer der Herv. Kerk, 1865, bl. 9 v. L. Gaussen, Theopneustie ou inspiration plénaire des S. Ecritures 1840. Id. Le Canon des S. Hon. 1860. J. H. Merle d'Aubigné, L'autorité des Ecritures 1850. A. de Gasparin, Les écoles du doute et l'école de la foi 1853. Philippi, Kirchl. Glaub. 3e Aufl. 1883 1 125 f. Vilmar, Dogm. herausgeg. von Piderit, Gutersloh 1874 I 91 f. W. Rohnert, Die Inspiration der H. Schrift u. ihre Bestreiter, Leipzig 1889. Koelling, Die Lehre von der Theo- pneustie, Breslau 1891. Henderson, Divine Inspiration 1836. Rob. Haldane, The verbal inspiration of the old and new test. Edinb. 1830. Th. H. Horne, An introduction to the critical study and knowledge of the holy scriptures, 2nd ed. London 1821 4 vols. vol. I. Eleazar Lord, The plenary inspiration of the holy Scripture, New-York 1858,'9. W. Lee, The inspiration of holy Scripture, its nature and proof. 3rd ed. Dublin 1864. Hodge, System. Theol. i 151. Shedd, Dogm. Theol. I 61 B. Warfield, The real problem of inspiration, Presb. and Ref. Rev. Apr. 1893 p. 177-221. W. E. Gladstone, The impregnable rock of holy Scripture, 2 ed. London 1892.

C. The inspiration according to the Scriptures.

9. The Old Testament provides the following important moments for the doctrine of inspiration: a) the prophets know themselves to be called by the Lord at a certain moment in their lives, Exod. 3; 1 Sam. 3; Isa. 6; Jer. 1; Ezek. 1-3; Am. 3:7, 8, 7:15. The calling often went against their own wishes and desires, Ex. 3; Jer. 20:7; Am. 3:8, but Yahveh has been too strong for them. The conviction among Israel was general, that the prophets were messengers of God, Jer. 26:5 , 7:15, begotten and sent by Him, Jer. 29:15 ; Deut. 18:15; Num. 11:29; 2 Chron. 36 : 15, His servants, 2 Kings 17 : 23, 21. : 10, 24:2 ; Ezra 9:11 ; Ps. 105:15 etc., standing before him, 1 Kings 17 : 1; 2 Kings 3 : 14, 5 : 16. b) They are aware, that Yahveh has spoken to them, and they have received from Him the revelation. He teaches them what

they shall speak, Ex. 2 : 12 ; Deut. 18 : 18, puts the words in their mouths, Num. 22 : 38, 23 : 5; Deut. 18 : 18, speaks to them, Hos. 1 : 2; Hab. 2 : 1; Zech. 1 : 9, 13, 2 : 2, 7, 4 : 1, 4, 11, 5 : 5, 10, 6 : 4; Num. 12 : 2, 8; 2 Sam. 23 : 2; 1 Kings 22 : 28. Especially the formula is used: thus saith the Lord, or: the word of the Lord came to me, or: word, divine speech, דבר: part, pass, the spoken word of Yahveh. All the Old Test. Scripture is full of this expression. Time and again prophetic speech is introduced by it. Yahveh is even introduced each time speaking in the first person, Jos. 24:2; Isa. 1:1, 2, 8:1, 11; Jer. 1 vs. 2, 4, 11, 2:1, 7:1 ; Ezek. 1:3, 2:1; Hos. 1:1; Joel 1:1; Am. 2:1 etc. Actually, it is Yahveh who speaks through them, 2 Sam. 23:1, 2, who speaks through their mouths, Ex. 4: 12, 15; Num. 23 : 5, through their service, Hagg. All their words are covered by the authority of Yahveh. c) This awareness is so clear and firm with the prophets, that they even indicate the place and time where Yahveh spoke to them and distinguish between times when He did and did not speak to them, Isa. 16:13, 14; Jer. 3:6, 13:3, 26:1, 27:1, 28 :1, 33:1, 34:1, 35:1, 36:1, 49:34; Ezek. 3:16, 8:1, 12:8 ; Hagg. 1:1 ; Zech. 1 : 1 etc. And in doing so this consciousness is so objective, that they clearly distinguish themselves from Yahveh; He speaks to them, Isa. 8 : 1, 51 : 16, 59 : 21; Jer. 1 : 9, 3 : 6, 5 : 14; Ez. 3 : 26 etc., and they listen with their ears and see with their eyes, Isa. 5:9, 6:8, 21:3, 10, 22:14, 28:22; Jer. 23:18, 49:14; Ezek. 2:8,3:10, 17,33:7,40:4, 44:5; Hab. 3:2, 16; 2 Sam. 7:27; Job 33:16, 36:10, and take in the words of Yahveh, Jer. 15:16; Ezek. 3:1-3. d) Hence they make a sharp contrast between what God has revealed to them and what comes from their own hearts, Num. 16:28, 24:13; 1 Kings 12:33; Neh. 6:8; Ps. 41:6, 7. They charge the false prophets precisely that these speak from their own hearts, Ezek 13 : 2, 3, 17; Jer 14 : 14, 23 : 16, 26; Isa 59 : 13, without being sent, Jer. 14:14, 29:9; Ezek. 13:6, so they are lying prophets, Jer. 23:32; Isa. 9:14; Jer. 14:14, 20:6, 23:21, 22, 26, 31, 36, 27:14; Ezek. 13:6 v.; Mic. 2:11; Zeph. 3:4; Zech. 10 : 2 and being soothsayers, Isa. 3:2; Mich. 3: 5 v. Zech. 10:2; Jer. 27:9, 29:8; Ezek. 13 : 9, 12, 21 : 26, 28, 34; Isa. 44: 25. König II 163-167. Herzog 2 16,726. e) The prophets are finally aware, speaking or writing, not their own word but the word of the Lord. Besides, the word was not

revealed to them for themselves, but for others. They had no freedom to hide it. They had to speak, Jer. 20:7, 9 ; Exod. 3, 4; Ezek. 3; Amos 3:8; Jonah, and thus did not speak according to human favor or calculation, Isa. 56:10; Mic. 3:5, 11. That is why they are prophets, speakers in Yahveh's name and of His word. And in this they know that they must give what they have received, Deut. 4:2, 12 : 32 ; Jer. 1: 7, 17, 26 :2, 42 : 4; Ezek. 3: 10. And from a similar urge the writing of the prophets may and must also be derived. The literal texts, where a command to write is given, are few, Ex. 17:14, 24:3, 4, 34:27; Num. 33:2; Deut. 4:2, 12:32, 31:19; Isa. 8:1, 30:8; Jer. 25:13, 30:1, 36:2, 24, 27-32; Ezek. 24:1; Dan. 12:4; Hab. 2:2, and apply only to a very small portion of the O. T. Scriptures. But the written record is a later, yet necessary stage in the history of prophecy. Many prophecies were certainly never spoken but were meant to be read and pondered. Most of them have been carefully, even artistically, edited and already show by their form that they were destined for writing. The recording of the divinatory statements was guided by the thought that Israel could no longer be saved by deeds, that now and in distant generations the service of Yahveh had to be carried on by word and reasonable conviction, Kuenen, Prof. I 74, II 345 f) They started writing because they wanted to address others than just those who could hear them. There would be nothing humiliating for the prophets if they had recorded the received word as literally as possible. But the revelation continued also in the moment of theopneustics and modified and completed the earlier revelation, and it was thus freely reproduced. But that is precisely why the prophets demand the same authority for their written word as for the spoken word. Even the interjections of the prophets between the actual words of Yahveh, e.g., Isa. 6, 10 : 24-12 : 6, 31 : 1-3, 32, or the working out of a word of Yahveh by the prophet, 52 : 7-12, 63 : 15-64 : 12, make no exception to this. The transition from the word of Jahveh to the word of the prophet and vice versa is often so sudden, and both are so intertwined e.g. Jer. 13:18 f., that separation is not possible. They have the same authority, Jer. 36:10, 11,25: 3. Isaiah calls 34: 16 his own recorded prophecies the Book of Yahveh. g) The prophets do not derive their revelation from the law. Although the

extent of the Torah cannot be determined from their writings, the prophecy presupposes a Torah. All prophets stand on the basis of a law; they and their opponents stand on a common foundation. They all presuppose a covenant made by God with Israel, a gracious election of Israel, Hos. 1:1-3, 6:7, 8:3; Jerem. 11 : 6 v., 14 : 21, 22 :9, 31 : 31 v. ; Ezek. 16:8 v. ; Isa. 54 : 10, 56:4,6, 59:21. The prophets have not been the creators of a new religion, of an ethical monotheism, Kuenen, Prof. II 335 v. The relation of Yahveh to Israel was nimeral to that of Kamos to Moab, Kuenen, Godsd. of Israel I 222. The prophets never mention such a contrast between their religion and that of the people. They acknowledge that the people have been guilty of idolatry almost throughout the ages; but they always and unanimously consider this to be infidelity and apostasy, and assume that the people knew better. They cling to the same revelation, the same theory, with the people. They speak out of the conviction that they have in common with the people the same service of God, that Yahveh has chosen and called them to His service. Therein they find their strength, and therefore they judge the people by the relationship that exists between them and Yahveh by right. 6:4, 8 ; Isa. 63 : 11 ; Jer. 7 : 25 etc., König, Die Hauptprobleme der altisr. Religionsgeschichte 1884 S. 15 f. 38 f. Torah not only denotes instruction from God in general, but is more-often the name for the pre-existing, objective revelation of Yahveh, Isa. 2:3; Mich. 4:2; Am. 2:4; Hos. 8 : 1, 4:6; Jer. 18 : 18; Ezek. 7:26; Zeph. 3 : 4. The covenant of God with Israel, on which basis the prophets stand with all the people, naturally includes all kinds of statutes and rights, and the prophets therefore repeatedly speak of commandments, Isa. 48:18; Jer. 8:13, statutes Isa. 24:5; Jer. 44:10,23; Ezek. 5:6,7, 11:12, 20, 18:9, 17, 20:11 v., 36:27, 37:24; Am. 2:4; Zech. 1:6; Mal. 3:7, 4:4; rights, Ezek. 5: 7, 11 : 12 etc. This Torah must have contained the doctrine of the unity of Yahveh, of His creation and government of all things, the prohibition of idolatry, and other religious and moral commandments, as well as all kinds of ceremonial (Sabbath, sacrifice, purity, etc.) and history (creation, exodus from Egypt, covenant, etc.) elements. There may be a difference in the scope of the Torah before prophethood, but the relationship between law and

prophets cannot be reversed without coming into conflict with the whole history of Israel and the nature of prophethood. The prophet under Israel was, as it were, die lebendige Stimme des Gesetzes und der Vermittler seiner Erfüllung (Staudenmaier). The most negative critics see themselves forced to accept the personality of Moses and his monotheism, the stay in Egypt, the exodus, the conquest of Canaan etc. as historical, although in their criticism of the Pentateuch they lack any basis for this, cf. e.g. Smend, Lehrb. der altt. Eel. S. 13 f. h) It is a priori probable, that with a people so long acquainted with the art of writing, Herzog² 13, 689 f., the law will also have existed long ago in written form. In Hos. 8 :12 this also seems to have been expressed, Bredenkamp, Gesetz und Proph. 21 f. König, Der Offenbarungsbegriff II 333 f. This Torah had authority among Israel from the beginning. Nothing is known of doubt or dispute. Moses occupied a wholly unique place among all the prophets, Ex. 33 : 11; Num. 12 : 6 - 8; Deut. 18 : 18 ; Ps. 103 : 7, 106 : 23 ; Isa. 63 : 11 ; Jer. 15 : 1 etc. He stood to Yahveh in a special relationship; the Lord spoke to him as a friend to his friend. He was the Mediator of the Old Testament. Everywhere the law attributes to itself a divine origin. It is Jahveh, who through Moses gave Israel the Torah. Not only the ten words of Ex. 20 and the book of Ex. 21-23, but also all other laws are derived from God's speaking to Moses. At every moment in the laws of the Pentateuch the formula: The Lord said or spoke to Moses. Every chapter almost begins with it, Ex. 25:1, 30:11, 17, 22, 31:1, 32:9, etc.; Lev. 1:1, 4:1, 6:1, etc.; Num. 1:1, 2:1, 3:44, 4:1, etc.; and Deut. And Deut- ronomy will give nothing but what Moses spoke to the children of Israel, Deut. 1:6, 2 : 1, 2, 17, 3 : 2, 5 : 2, 6 : 1 etc. i) The historical books of the O. T. were all written by prophets and in prophetic spirit, 1 Chron. 29 : 29 ; 2 Chron. 9 : 29, 34 : 20- etc. The prophets not only repeatedly refer in their speeches and writings to the history of Israel, but they are also the ones who have preserved it, edited it and passed it on to us. But they do not intend in any way to give us a true and connected account of the destiny of the people of Israel, as other historians strive to do. The prophets, too, in the historical books of the Old Testament, set themselves on the foundation of the Torah and consider and describe

the history of Israel from its standpoint. 2 : 6-3 : 6 ; 2 Kings 17 : 7-23, 34-41. The historical books are the commentary in facts of the covenant of God with Israel. They are not history in our sense, but prophecy, and are to be judged by a different standard than the history books of other nations. Their purpose is not to give us an accurate knowledge of Israel's history, but to help us understand God's revelation, His thought and His counsel in Israel's history. The prophets are always proclaimers of the word of Yahveh, both when they look back into history and when they look forward into the future. j) Finally, the poetic books in the narrow sense, which are included in the canon, all have a religious-ethical character just like the other O. T. writings. They presuppose God's revelation as their objective basis and show the elaboration and application of this revelation in the various situations and relationships of human life. The Preacher outlines the vanity of the world without and in opposition to the fear of the Lord. Job deals with the problem of the righteousness of God and the suffering of the pious. The Proverbs portrays true wisdom in its application to the rich life of man. The Song of Songs sings of the depth and power of love. And the Psalms, in the mirror of the experiences of the pious, show us God's manifold grace. Under Israel, lyrical and didactic poetry entered into the service of the revelation of God. According to 2 Sam. 23 : 1-3, David, the lovely one in songs of Israel, spoke by the Spirit of Yahveh and his word was on his tongue. k) As the various writings of the O. T. came into being and became known, they were also recognized as authoritative. The laws of Yahveh were laid in the sanctuary, Ex. 25 : 22, 38 : 21, 40 : 20 ; Deut. 31 : 9, 26 ; Jos. 24 : 25 v. ; 1 Sam. 10: 25. The poetic products were kept, Deut. 31 : 19 ; Jos. 10:13; 2 Sam. 1:18; the Psalms were collected early for the purpose of worship, Ps. 72:20; of the Proverbs, the men of Hezekiah prepared a second collection, Spr. 25:1. The prophecies were widely read; Ezekiel knows Isaiah and Jeremiah; later prophets refer to the previous ones. Daniel, cap. 9:2 has already a collection of prophetic writings, to which Jeremiah also belonged. In the post-exilic congregation the authority of the law and prophecies is established, as Ezra, Haggai and Zechariah clearly show. Jesus ben Sirach highly values law and

prophets, cap. 15:1-8, 24:23, 39 : 1 v. ; cap. 44-49. In the preface his grandson mentions three parts, into which the Scriptures are divided. The LXX contains several apocryphal writings, but these themselves testify to the authority of the canonical books, 1 Macc. 2:50; 2 Macc. 6:23; Wis. 11:1, 18:4; Baruch 2:28 ; Tob. 1:6, 14 : 7 ; Jesus Sir. 1:5, 17 : 12, 24 : 23, 39 :1, 46 : 15, 48 : 25 etc. Philo quotes only canonical books. The fourth book of Ezra cap. 14 : 18-47 has the division into 24 books. Josephus, c. Ap. 1, 8, counts 22 books in three parts. Omnium consensu was the Old Testament canon of Philo and Josephus equal to ours, G. Wildeboer, Het ontstaan van den Kanon des O. V. 1889 bl. 126 v. 134. Strack in Herzog² 7, 429.

10. This canon of the Old Testament possessed for Jesus and the apostles, as well as for their contemporaries, divine authority. This is clear from the following data: a) the formula, with which the O. T. is quoted in the N., is different but always proves, that for the writers of the N. T. the O. T. is of divine origin and carries a divine authority. Jesus sometimes quotes a place from the O. T. by the name of the writer, e.g., of Moses, Mt. 8:4, 19:8 ; Mk. 7:10; John 5:45, 7:22; Isaiah, Mt. 15:7; Mk. 13:14; David, Mt. 22:43; Daniel, Mt. 24:15, but many times also quotes with the formula: it is written, Mt. 4:4 v., 11:10; Luke 10 v. 26; John 6:45, 8:47, or: Scripture says, Mt. 21:42; Luke 4:21; John 7:38, 10:35, or also to the auctor primarius, i. e. God or the Holy Spirit, Mt. 15:4, 22:43, 45 , 24:15 ; Mk. 12:26. The Evangelists often use the expression: that which was spoken by the prophet, Mt. 1:22, 2:15, 17, 23, 3:3 etc. or by the Lord or by the Holy Spirit, Mt. 1 vs. 22, 2:15; Luke 1:70; Acts 1:16, 3:18, 4:25, 28:25. John usually quotes by den auctor secundarius, cap. 1 : 23, 46, 12:38. Paul always speaks of the Scriptures, Hom. 4:3, 9:17, 10:11, 11:2; Gal. 4:30; 1 Tim. 5 : 18 etc., which is sometimes even presented entirely personally, Gal. 3 : 8, 22, 4 : 30 ; Com. 9 : 17. The letter to the Hebrews mostly mentions God or the Holy Spirit as auctor primarius, 1:5 f., 3:7, 4:3, 5, 5:6, 7:21, 8:5, 8, 10:16, 30, 12:26, 13:5. This way of quoting teaches clearly that the Scriptures of the O. V. for Jesus and the apostles were composed of different parts and came from different writers, but nevertheless formed one organical whole,

which God said had an author. b) Several times this divine authority of the O. T. Scriptures is also spoken and taught definitely by Jesus and the apostles, Mt. 5:17; Luke 16:17, 29; John 10:35; Bom. 15 : 4; 1 Pet. 1 : 10- 12; 2 Pet. 1:19, 21; 2 Tim. 3:16. Scripture is a unity, which cannot be broken or destroyed either in its entirety or in its parts. In the last cited text the translation: every theopneust Scripture is also useful, is pressed by the objection, that then after ωφέλιμος thepraedikatet could not have been missing, Hofmann, Weiss, u. Erf. I 43. The transposition: every writing, in general, is theopneous and useful, is by the nature of the case excluded. Thus there remains only one choice between the two translations: all Scripture, or: every Scripture, n. 1. which is included in τα ἱερα γράμματα, v. 15, is theopneous. In practical terms this gives no difference, and in view of such places as Mt. 2:3; Hd. 2:36; 2 Cor. 12 vs. 12; Eph. 1:8, 2:21, 3:15; Col. 4:12; 1 Pet. 1:15; Jak. 1 :2 it seems that πᾶς without an article could also mean whole anyway. c) Neither Jesus nor the apostles are critical of the contents of the O. T., but they accept them completely and without reservation. In all parts, not only in the religious-ethical statements or in those places in which God Himself speaks, but also in its historical components, the Scriptures of the O. T. are unconditionally recognized by them as true and divine. Jesus, for example, regards Isaiah 54 as coming from Isaiah, Mt 13:14; Ps 110 from David, Mt 22:43, the prophecy of Daniel quoted in Mt 24:15, and attributes the Law to Moses, John 5:46. The historical accounts of the O. T. are repeatedly cited and unconditionally believed, e.g., the creation of man, Mt. 19:4, 5; Abel's murder, Mt. 22:35; the flood, Mt. 24:37-39; the history of the patriarchs, Mt. 22:32, Jn. 8:56; the destruction of Sodom, Mt. 11:23, Luk. 17:28-33; the burning bush, Luk. 20:37; the serpent in the wilderness, Jn. 3:14; the manna, Jn. 6:32; the history of Elijah, Luk. 4:25, 26; Naaman, ib, Jonah, Mt. 12:39-41 etc. d) Dogmatically, the O. T. is for Jesus and the apostles' sedes doctrinae, fons solutionum, πασης αντιλογίας πέρας. The O. T. is fulfilled in the New. It is several times so represented, as if everything had been done for the purpose of fulfilling the Holy Scriptures, ἵνα πληρωθῇ) το ρηϋ-ετ, Mt. 1:22 and passim, Mk. 14:49, 15:28; Luk. 4:2, 24:44; Jn. 13:18, 17:12, 19:24, 36; Hd. 1:16; Jn. 2:23

etc. Down to small details this fulfillment is noted, Mt. 21:16; Lu. 4:21, 22:37 ; Jn. 15:25, 17:12, 19:28 etc.; all that was done to Jesus was written down beforehand in the O. T., Lu. 18:31-33. Jesus and the apostles justify their conduct and prove their doctrine each time with an appeal to the O. Test, Mt. 12 : 3, 22 : 32 ; John 10 : 34 ; Com. 4 ; Gal. 3 ; 1 Cor. 15 etc. And this divine authority of Scripture extends so far before them, that even a single word, yea a tittle and iota is covered by it, Math. 5 : 17, 22 : 45; Luke 16 : 17 ; John 10 : 35 ; Gal. 3 : 16. e) Nevertheless, the O. T. in the N. T. is usually quoted after the Greek translation of the LXX. The writers of the N. T., writing in Greek and for Greek readers, generally used the translation which was known to them and accessible to them. The quotations can be divided into three groups according to their relation to the Hebrew text and to the Greek translation. In some texts there is a deviation from the LXX and agreement with the Hebrew text, e.g. Mt. 2: 15, 18, 8: 17, 12: 18-21, 27: 46; Joh. 19: 37; Rom. 10: 15, 16, 11: 9; 1 Cor. 3: 19, 15: 54. In others there is inverse agreement with the LXX and deviation from the Hebr., e.g. Mt. 15:8, 9; Hd. 7:14, 15:16, 17; Eph. 4:8; Heb. 10:5, 11:21, 12:6. In a third group of quotations there is more or less significant deviation both from LXX and Hebr. text, e.g. Mt. 2:6, 3 : 3, 26 : 31; Jn. 12 : 15,13 : 18; Rom. 10 : 6-9; 1 Cor. 2 : 9. It should also be noted that some of the books of the O. T. viz. Ezra, Neh., Ob., Nah., Zeph., Esth., I'ed. and Hoogl. are never quoted in the N. T.; that although no apocryphal books are quoted, yet in 2 Tim. 3:8; Heb. 11:34 v.; Jude 9 v. 14 v., names and facts are mentioned which do not occur in the O. T.; and that several times Greek classics are also quoted, Acts 17:18; 1 Cor. 15:33; Tit. 1:12. f). As for the material use of the O. T. in the N. T., here too there is great difference. Sometimes the quotations serve to prove and confirm some truth, e.g. Mt. 4:4, 7, 10, 9:13, 19:5, 22:32; Jn. 10:34; Acts 15:16, 23:5; Rom. 1:17, 3:10 v., 4:3, 7, 9:7, 12, 13, 15, 17, 10:5; Gal. 3:10, 4:30; 1 Cor. 9:9, 10:26; 2 Cor. 6:17. Very often the O. T. is quoted as proving, that it had to be and is fulfilled in the N. T. T. was to be fulfilled and has been fulfilled; either in a literal sense, Mt. 1:23, 3:3, 4:15, 16, 8:17, 12:18, 13:14, 15, 21:42, 27:46; Mk. 15:28; Luke 4:17ff; John 12:38; Acts 2:17, 3:22, 7:37, 8:32, etc., either in a

typical sense, Mt. 11:14, 12:39 v., 17:11; Luk. 1:17 ; John 3:14, 19:36 ; 1 Cor. 5:7, 10:4 ; 2 Cor. 6:16 ; Gal. 3:13, 4:21; Heb. 2:6-8, 7:1-10, etc. More-many times the quotations from the O. T. serve simply to clarify, explain, admonish, comfort, etc., e.g., Luk. 2:23; Jn. 7 : 38; Hd. 7:3, 42; Bom. 8:36; 1 Cor. 2:16, 10:7; 2 Cor. 4:13, 8:15, 13:1; Heb. 12:5, 13:15 ; 1 Pet. 1:16, 24, 25, 2:9. In this use we are often surprised by the sense in which the N. T. writers find in the text of the O. T.; so especially in Mt. 2 : 15, 18, 23, 21 :5, 22 : 32, 26 : 31, 27 : 9, 10, 35; John 19:37; Acts 1:20, 2:31; 1 Cor. 9:9; Gal. 3:16, 4:22 f.; Eph. 4:8 f.; Heb. 2:6-8, 10:5. This exegesis of the Old Testament in the N.T. suggests to Jesus and the Apostles that a word or phrase can have a much deeper meaning and scope than the writer suspected or placed in it. This is also often the case with classical writers. No one would think that Goethe, when writing his classical poetry, had everything in mind that is now found in it. Hamerling, in his *Epilog an die Kritiker*, *Poet. Werke*, Tiel Cam-pagne I 142 f. expressed this clearly. With Scripture this is even more the case, since, according to the conviction of Jesus and his Apostles, it has the Holy Spirit as auctor primarius and bears a teleological character, cf. also Valet on, *Theol. Stud.* 1887 aflev. 6. Theremin, *Die Beredsamkeit eine Tugend* S. 236. Not in those few places above mentioned only, but throughout the conception and interpretation of the O. Test, the N. Test, is carried by the idea that the Tsraelite has its fulfillment in the "Christian. The whole oeconomy of the O. V. with all its institutions and rights and' in all its history points to the dispensation of the N. Covenant. Not Talmudism, but Christianity is the rightful heir to the treasures of salvation promised to Abraham and his seed. Litt, on the O. T. in the N. T., *Glassius, Philologia Sacra*, ed. 6a 1691. Surenhusius, *Βίβλος καταλλαγης*, in quo sec. vet. theol. hebr. formulas allegandi et modos interpretandi conciliantur loca V. T. in N. T. allegata, Amst. 1713. J. Hoffmann, *Demonstr. evang, per ipsum scripturarum consensum in oraculis ex V. T. in N. allegatis*, Tub. 1773-81. Th. Ran-dolph, *The prophecies and other texts cited in the New Test. compared with the Hebr. Original and with the Sept, version*, Oxf. 1782. Dr. H. Owen, *The modes of quotation used among the evangelical writers explained and vindicated*, Lond. 1789. F. H. Horne, *An introduction*

to the critical study and knowledge of the holy Script. 4 vols. Lond. 1821 II 356-463. C. Sepp, The doctrine of the N. T. over the Holy Scriptures of the O. V. 1849. Tholuck, Das A. T. im N. 6th Aufl. 1877. Eothe, Zur Dogm. 184 f. Hofmann, Weissagung und Erfüllung im alt. u. n. Test. 1841. E. Haupt, Die altt. Citate in den vier Evang. 1871. Kautzsch, De V. T. locis a Paulo allegatis, 1869. E. Böhl, Forschungen nach einer Volksbibel zur Zeit Jesu 1873. Id. Die altt. Citate im N. T. 1878. K. Walz, Die Lehre der Kirche von der Schrift nach der Schrift selbst gepriift, Leiden 1884. Kuenen, The Pro-feten II 199 v. Caven, Our Lords testimony to the Old Test. Presb. and Eef. Eev. July 1892. A. Clemen, Der Gebrauch des A. T, im N. 1893. Kuyper, Encycl. II 378 v. Hans Vollmer, Die altt. Citate bei Paulus usw, Freiburg 1895.

11. For the inspiration of the N. T. we find in the writings of the apostles the following data : a) Jesus' testimony is regarded throughout the N. T. as divine, true, infallible. He is the Logos, who declares the Father, John 1:18, 17:6; ὁ μαρτυρῶν ὁ πῦτος καὶ ἀληθῖνος, Rev. 1:5, 3:14 ; cf. Isa. 55:4, the Amen, in whom all the promises of God are yes and amen, Rev. 3:14; 2 Cor. 1:20. There has been no deceit, ὁλος, in His mouth, 1 Pet. 2:22. He is the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, Heb. 3 : 1 ; 1 Tim. 6 : 13. He does not speak "κ τῶν ἰούων, like Satan who is a liar, John 8 : 44. But God speaks through Him, Heb. 5 : 1. Jesus is sent by God, Joh. 8:42 and speaks nothing but what He has seen and heard, Joh. 3 : 32. He speaks the words of God, Jn. 3 : 34, 17 : 8 and gives witness only to the truth, 5 : 33, 18 : 37. Therefore his testimony is true, John 8: 14, 14: 6, confirmed by the testimony of God himself, 5: 32, 37, 8: 18. Not only is Jesus ethically holy and without sin, John 8: 46, but intellectually he is without error, lie or deceit. It is absolutely true that Jesus did not work in the field of science in the narrow sense. He came to earth to explain the Father to us and to accomplish His work. But the inspiration of Scripture, about which Jesus speaks, is not a scientific problem but a religious truth. If He erred in this, He erred on a point which is most closely related to religious life, and He can no longer be recognized in religion and theology as our highest prophet. The doctrine of 'divine authority of Scripture forms an important

component in the words of God, which Jesus proclaimed. This infallibility, however, was not an extraordinary, supernatural gift to Jesus; not a *donum gratiae* and not an *actus transiens*, but *habitus*, nature. If Jesus had written something, He would not have needed the special assistance of the Holy Spirit. He did not need inspiration as an extra-ordinary gift, because He received the Spirit in moderation, John 3:34, was the Logos, John 1:1, and the fullness of God dwelt in Him bodily, Col. 1:19, 2:9. b) Jesus, however, left us nothing in writing, and He Himself passed away. So He had to see to it that His true testimony was presented to mankind in an unadulterated and pure form. For that purpose He chose the Apostles. The apostleship is an extraordinary office and a very special service in Jesus' church. The Apostles were given to Him by the Father. 17: 6, chosen by Himself, John 6: 70, 13: 18, 15: 16, 19, and prepared and trained by Him in various ways for their future task. That task was that they should act as witnesses later on, after Jesus' passing away, Luke 24: 48; John 15: 27. They had been ear- and eyewitnesses of Jesus' words and works; they had seen the word of life with their eyes and touched it with their hands, 1 Jn 1:1, and now had to bring this testimony about Jesus to Israel and to the whole world, Mt 28:19 ; Jn 15:27, 17:20 ; Rev 1:8. But all men are liars, God alone is true, Rom. 3:4. The apostles too were incapable of this witnessing task. They were not the actual witnesses. Jesus only uses them as instruments. The real witness, who is faithful and true as He Himself is the Holy Spirit. He is the Spirit of truth, and will testify of Jesus, John 15: 26, and the apostles can only act as witnesses after and through Him, John 15: 27. This Spirit is therefore promised and given to the apostles in a special sense, Mt. 10 : 20 ; Jn. 14 : 26, 15 : 26, 1(5: 7, 20 : 22. Especially Joh.14 : 26 teaches this clearly. The Holy Spirit ὑπομνησει νμας nance a tinov νμιν. He will take the youth with their persons and gifts, with their memory and judgment, etc., into His service. He will add to the revelation materially nothing new, which is not already contained in Christ's person, word, and work, for He takes everything from Christ and makes the apostles in that respect alone mindful and thus leads them into all the truth, John 14:26, 16:13, 14. And this witness of the Holy

Spirit through the mouth of the apostles is the glorification of Jesus, John 16:14, just as Jesus' testimony was a glorification of the Father, 17:4. c) Equipped with that Spirit in a special sense, John 20:22; Acts 1:12; and 2:12. 20:22; Acts 1:8; Eph. 3:5, the apostles also act as public witnesses after Pentecost, Acts 1:8, 21, 22, 2:14,32, 3:15, 4:8,20,33, 5:32, 10:39,51, 13:31. The meaning of the apostolate lies in testifying about what they have seen and heard. That is what they have been called and trained for. From that they derive their authority. That is what they call themselves to in the face of opposition and resistance. And God again attaches His seal to their testimony by signs and wonders, and spiritual blessing, Mt. 10:1, 9; Mk. 16:15ff; Rev. 2:43,3:2, 5:12-16, 6:8, 8:6ff, 10:44, 11:21, 14:3, etc.; 15:8, etc.; and so on, 15:8, etc. The apostles are from the beginning, jure suo, the leaders of the Jerusalem congregation, they have authority over the believers in Samaria, Acts 8:14, visit the churches, Acts 9:32, 11:22, take decisions in the Holy Spirit, Acts 15:22, 28, and enjoy a generally recognized authority. They speak and act by the power of Christ. And although Jesus nowhere gave an express command to write down his words and deeds - only in the Rev. 1:11, 19, etc. - the apostles speak in their writings with the authority of Christ. - The Apostles speak with the same authority in their writing; writing is a special form of witness. Also writing, they are witnesses of Christ, Lu. 1:2; John 1:14, 19:35, 20:31, 21:24; 1 John 1:1-4; 1 Peter 1:12, 5:1; 2 Peter 1:16; Heb. 2:3; Rev. 1:3, 22:18, 19. Their testimony is faithful and true, John 19:35; 3 John 12. d) Among the apostles, Paul again stands alone. He sees himself called to defend against the Judaizers his apostolate, Gal. 1-2; 1 Oor. 1:10-4:21; 2 Cor. 10-13. He maintains in the face of that opposition, that he was set apart from his mother's body, Gal. 1:14; was called an apostle by Jesus Himself, Gal. 1:1; saw Jesus Himself personally, 1 Cor. 9:1, 15:8; was delighted with revelations and visions, 2 Cor. 12; Rev. 26:16; received from Jesus Himself His Gospel, Gal. 1:12; 1 Tim. 1:12; Eph. 3: 2-8, and therefore as much as the other apostles is an independent and reliable witness, especially among the Gentiles, Acts 26:16; also His apostleship is confirmed with miracles and signs, 1 Cor. 12:10, 28; Hom. 12:4-8, 15:18, 19; 2 Cor. 11: 23 v.; Gal. 3:5; Heb. 2:4; and with

spiritual blessing, 1 Cor. 15:10; 2 Cor. 11:5, etc. He is therefore aware that there is no other gospel but his, Gal. 1:7; that he is faithful, 1 Cor. 7:25; has the Spirit of God, 1 Cor. 7 :40; that Christ speaks through him, 2 Cor. 13:3; 1 Cor. 2:10, 16; 2 Cor. 2:17, 5:23; that he proclaims God's word, 2 Cor. 2:17; 1 Thess. 2:13; even in the expressions and words, 1 Cor. 2:4, 10-13; and not only when he speaks but also when he writes, 1 Thess. 5:27; Col. 4:16; 2 Thess. 2 : 15, 3 : 14. Like the other apostles, Paul acts several times with apostolic authority, 1 Cor. 5; 2 Cor. 2:9, and gives binding commands, 1 Cor. 7:40; 1 Thess. 4:2, 11; 2 Thess. 3 : 6-14. And he does appeal once or twice to the judgment of the congregation, 1 Cor. 10:15, but not in order to subject his statement to its approval or disapproval, but on the contrary to be justified by the conscience and judgment of the congregation, which also has the Spirit of God and the anointing of the Holy One, 1 John 2:20. 2 : 20, to be justified by the conscience and judgment of the church, which also has the Spirit of God and the anointing of the Holy One. Paul makes himself so little dependent on the judgment of the congregation that he says in 1 Cor. 14:37 that if anyone thinks he is a prophet and has the Spirit, it will come out in his acknowledgment that what Paul writes is the Lord's command. e) These writings of the apostles had authority from the very beginning in the churches where they were known. They soon became widespread and thus acquired more and more extensive authority, Acts 15:22ff; Col. 4:16. The Synoptic Gospels show such a close affinity, that the one must have been wholly or partly known to the other. Judas is known to Peter, and 2 Peter 3:16 already knows many of Paul's letters and puts them on a par with the other Scriptures. Gradually translations of N. T. writings came to be read in the church, Just. M. Apol. 1 : 67. In the first half of the second century these must have already existed, Papias at Euseb. H. E. 3 : 39. Just. M. Apol. 1 : 66, 67. A dogmatic use is already made of them by Athenagoras, de resurr. c. 16, who there proves his reasoning with 1 Cor. 15 : 33; 2 Cor. 5 : 10. And Theophilus, ad Autol. 3 :4 cites texts from Paul with the formula, *οἰοᾶσκει, κελεύει ὁ ὑ-ειος λογος*. Irenaeus adv. haer. 3, 11, Tert, ad Prax. 15 and others, the Peschitto and the fragment of Muratori establish it beyond all doubt, that in

the 2nd half of the 2nd century most of the writings of the N. T. had canonical authority and enjoyed with the books of the O. V. an equal dignity. About some books, James, Judges, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, there remained differences, Euseb. H. E. 3 : 25. But the reservations against these antilegomena became less and less in the 3rd century. And the Synod of Laodicea in 360, of Hippo Regius in 393, and of Carthage in 397 were also able to take up these anti-legomena and close the canon. These decisions of the church were not an arbitrary and authoritarian act, but merely codification and registration of the law, which had long existed in the congregations with regard to these writings. The canon was not formed by a decision of councils. Canon non uno quod dicunt actu ab hominibus, sed paulatim a Deo animorum temporumque rectore, productus est, Loesch er at Herzog 2 7, 424. In the important struggle of Harnack and Zahn about the history of the N. T. canon, Harnack undoubtedly puts too one-sided an emphasis on the concepts, divinity, infallibility, inspiration, canon, on the formal establishment of the dogma of the N. T. Scriptures. Long before this took place in the 2nd half of the 2nd century, the N. T. Scriptures had come to be universally recognized as authoritative through the authority of the Apostles, the reading in the congregation, etc. Zahn rightly draws attention to this inner process. Verg, over deze strijd Koppel, Stud. u. Krit. 1891, les Heft, and Barth, Neue Jahrb. f. d. Theol. 1893, les Heft, f.) Which principles have led the congregation, both under the Old and New Testament, in this recognition of the canonicity of the O. and N. T. writings, cannot be determined with certainty. The apostolic origin cannot have been decisive because Mark, Luke and Hebrews were also included. Nor does the recognition of canonicity have its basis in the fact that there were no other writings about Christ, because Luke 1: 1 mentions many others, and according to Irenaeus adv. haer. 1 : 20 there was ἀμύητον πλη&ος απόκρυφων και νο&ων γραφών. Nor can the principle of canonization lie in its size and importance, for 2 and 3 John are very small ; nor in the familiarity of the writers, Mark, Luke, with the apostles, for letters of Clement and Barnabas were not included ; nor in its originality, for Matthew, Mark, and Luke ; Ephesians and Colossians ; Judas and 2 Petr. are one

dependent on the other. Nothing else can be said, but that the recognition of these writings without any agreement, took place automatically in all churches. With a few exceptions, the writings of the O. and N. T. were immediately, from their inception, accepted in their entirety, without a word of doubt or protest, as holy, divine writings. The place and time where they were first accorded authority is indeterminable. The canonicity of the books of the Bible is rooted in their existence. They have authority of themselves, *jure suo*, because they are there. It is the Spirit of God who guided their writing and brought them to recognition in the church. Harnack, D. G. I 304 f. 318 f. Wildeboer, *The Origin v. d. Kanon des O. V.* 107 v. Reuss, *Gesch. des N. T.* § 298 f. Herzog² art. Kanon. W. Lee, *The Inspiration of holy Scripture*, 3rd ed. Dublin 1864 p. 43.

12. The result of this examination of the teaching of Scripture concerning itself may be summed up in this, that it holds and publishes itself to be the word of God. The expression word of God or word of the Lord has various meanings in Scripture. Often it denotes the power of God by which He creates and sustains all things, Gen. 1:3; Ps. 33:6, 147:17, 18, 148:18; Bom. 4:17; Heb. 1:3, 11:3. Next, so is called the special revelation, by which God makes something known to the prophets. In the O. T. the expression in this sense occurs almost on every page; each time it is said there: the word of the Lord came to pass. In the N.T. we find it in this sense only in John 10:35; the word no longer takes place and does not come from above or from outside to the prophets a single time; it has taken place in Christ and remains. Furthermore, the word of God means the content of revelation; then there is the word or words of God, in addition to the rights, laws, commandments and statutes given to Israel, Ex. 9: 20, 21; Richt. 3 : 20 ; Ps. 33 : 4, 119 : 9, 16, 17 etc. Isa. 40:8 ; Rom. 3:2 etc. In the N. Test, such is called the Gospel, which was revealed by God in Christ and proclaimed by the apostles, Lu. 5:1; John 3:34, 5:24, 6:63, 17:8, 14,17; Acts 8:25, 13:7; 1 Thess. 2:13 etc. It is not improbable that the name word of God is used a few times in Scripture to refer to the written law, i.e. a part of Scripture, Ps 119:11, 105. Schultz, *Grundriss der ev. Dogm.* 4 f. In the N.T. such

a place cannot be indicated. Also Heb. 4 : 12 is not the word of God like Scripture. Yet the N. T. actually sees in the books of the O. V. nothing else than the word of God. God, or the Holy Spirit, is the auctor primarius, who spoke through, *ὕα c. gen.*, the prophets in the Scriptures, Acts 1: 16, 28: 25. The formal and material meaning of the expression is closely connected in Scripture. And finally the name Word of God is used for Christ Himself. He is the Logos in a completely unique sense, revelator and revelatio at the same time. All God's revelations, all God's words, in nature and history, in creation and re-creation, under O. and N. T., have their basis, their unity and their center in Him. He is the sun; the other words of God are His rays. The word of God in nature, among Israel, in the N. T., in Scripture, cannot for a moment be separated from Him and considered. There is only revelation of God, because He is the Logos. He is the principium cognoscendi, in a general sense of all science, in a special sense, as *z/o/oc SVGUQXOC*, of all knowledge of God, of religion and theology, Mt. 11 : 27.

D. Concept of inspiration.

13. Scripture nowhere offers us a clearly formulated dogma on inspiration, but it gives the case, the fact of theopneustia, and all the moments necessary for its construction. It teaches the theopneustia of Scripture in the same sense and in the same manner, just as clearly and just as unambiguously, but also just as little in the way of abstract concepts as the dogma of trinity, of the incarnation, of satisfaction, etc. This has been denied more than once. Every sectarian and haeretic direction begins almost with an appeal to Scripture against the Confession, and tries to make its deviation appear as if it were commanded by Scripture. But in most cases deeper examination leads to the recognition that orthodoxy has the testimony of Scripture on its side. The moderns now generally generously admit that Jesus and the apostles accepted the O. T. Scriptures as the word of God, Lipsius, *IJognr.* § 185 s. 141, Strauss I 79, Pfleiderer, *Der Paulinismus*, 2nd Aufl. Leipz. 1890 S. 87 f. Rothe, *Zur Dogm.* 178 f. recognizes this also with regard to the apostles, but

thinks that ecclesiastical dogmatics cannot appeal to Jesus for its doctrine of inspiration. However, this opinion stands alone and is shared by few. Jesus' positive statements about the O. T. Scriptures, Mt. 5:8; Luke 16:17; John 10:35, his citation and use, Mt. 19:4, 5, 22:43, etc., speak too strongly for this, and are no more free than those of the apostles. But this contrast, which Rothe makes between the teaching of Jesus and that of the apostles, does not exalt but actually undermines the authority of Jesus himself. For we know nothing of Jesus except through the apostles; so whoever discredits the apostles and presents them as unreliable witnesses of the truth, immediately contradicts Jesus Himself, who appointed His disciples to be perfectly reliable witnesses and who, through His Spirit, would guide them into all the truth. And this certainly includes the truth concerning the Holy Scriptures. The slogan: back to Christ, is deceptive and false, if it stands in contrast to the testimony of the Apostles.

Very common also is another contradiction, which is made in order to be freed from the self testimony of Scripture. Scripture, it is said, may teach inspiration here and there; but in order to build up the doctrine of Scripture concerning Scripture, the facts must also be taken into account, which Scripture makes known to us in its origin, genesis, history, substance and content. Only a theory of inspiration which is consistent with and derived from the phenomena of Scripture is therefore true and good. Very often it is made to appear that the other party is imposing its own, apriorical opinion on Scripture, and is forcing it into the straitjacket of scholasticism. And they claim that in the face of all these theories and systems, they want Scripture to speak for itself and to bear witness only to itself. Orthodoxy lacks respect for Scripture. It does violence to the text and the facts of the Scriptures, Dr. G. Wildeboer, *Letterk. des O. V. bl. V.* This idea sounds beautiful and plausible at first hearing, but proves untenable on closer consideration. In the first place, the contrast is not between some theory of inspiration and the self testimony of Scripture. Inspiration is a fact, taught by Scripture itself. Jesus and the apostles have given a testimony concerning Scripture. Scripture

contains a teaching about itself. Leaving aside all dogmatic or scholastic development of this doctrine, the question is simply this: whether or not Scripture, in this self-attestation, deserves faith. There may be differences as to whether Scripture teaches such a theopneustia of itself; but if it does, then it ought to be believed in it, as well as in its statements about God, Christ, salvation, etc. The so-called phenomena of Scripture cannot overthrow this self-explanation of Scripture, and they must not even be called into question. For he who makes his doctrine of Scripture dependent on historical research into its genesis and structure, already begins to reject the self testimony of Scripture and thus no longer stands in faith with that Scripture. He thinks he can better construct the doctrine of Scripture from his own research, than to derive it in faith from Scripture; he puts his own thoughts in place of and above those of Scripture. Furthermore, while the self-explanation of Scripture is clear and unequivocal, and is even recognized as such by its opponents, the consideration of the phenomena of Scripture is the result of lengthy historical-critical research, and changes in various forms according to the different points of view of the critics; the theologian who, on the basis of such research, wishes to arrive at a doctrine of Scripture, in effect sets his scientific understanding against the teaching of Scripture concerning himself. But in this way one never arrives at a doctrine of Scripture; historical-critical research can give a clear insight in the origin, the history, the structure of Scripture, but it never leads to a doctrine, to a dogma de S. Scriptura. It can only be built, of course, on the testimony of Scripture concerning itself. No one would think of calling a history of the origin and the main parts of the Iliad a doctrine. This method involves not only some theory of inspiration, but inspiration itself as fact and as testimony of Scripture. Inspiration, if one retains that word, then becomes nothing but the brief summary of what the Bible is, or rather of what it is thought to be, and can then be in direct conflict with what the Bible itself claims to be, and what it presents and advertises itself to be. The method followed is, in the essence of the matter, no other than that by which the doctrine of creation, of man, of sin, etc., is not built up from the testimony of Scripture in

these respects, but from the independent study of these facts. In both cases it is a correction of the doctrine of the Bible by one's own scientific research, a dependence of the testimony of Scripture on human judgment. The facts and phenomena of Scripture, the results of scientific research, may serve to explain, clarify, etc., the teaching of Scripture concerning itself, but they can never annul the fact of inspiration to which it testifies. On the other hand, while it is asserted that only such inspiration as corresponds to the phenomena of Scripture is plausible, it is the principle that the phenomena of Scripture, not as they are seen by criticism, but as they are in themselves, are existent with their own testimony.

14. The word *theopneustia* or inspiration usually summarizes what Scripture teaches about itself. The word *θεοπνευστος* 2 Tim. 3:16 does not occur before and may have been used first by Paul. Etymologically it can have both an active and a passive meaning, and thus can be translated as: God breathing, as well as: breathed by God. But the passive meaning is preferred, because it is most supported by the places where the word occurs outside the N. T. and is recommended by the teaching of the N. T., 2 Pet. 1:21. In the Vulgate it is rendered by *divinitus inspirata*. The word inspiration originally had a much wider sense. The Greeks and Romans ascribed an *afflatus* or *instinctus divinus* to all who accomplished something great and good. *Nemo vir magnus sine aliquo afflatu divino unquam tuit*, Cic. de Nat. D. 2, 66. *Est deus in nobis, agitante cales-* *cimus illo*, Ovid. Fasti 6, 5. The inspiration of poets, artists, vates, etc., may indeed also serve to elucidate the inspiration of which the H. S. speaks. Almost all great men have said that their most beautiful thoughts suddenly and unconsciously arose in their souls and came as a surprise to themselves. One testimony will suffice. Goethe once wrote to Ekkermann, quoted by Hoekstra, *Godg. Contr.* 1864, bl. 27, 28. *Jede Produktivitat höchster Art, jedes bedeutendes Aper^{ue}, jede Erfindung, jeder grosse Gedanke der Früchte bringt und Folgen hat, steht in Niemandes Gewalt und ist über alle irdische Macht erhaben. Dergleichen hat der Mensch als unverhoffte Geschenke von oben, als reine Kinder Gottes zu betrachten, die er mit freudigem*

Danke zu empfangen und zu verehren hat. In solchen Fällen ist der Mensch als das Werkzeug einer höhern Weltregierung zu betrachten, als ein würdig befundenes Gefäß zur Aufnahme eines göttlichen Einflusses. Carlyle, *On heroes, hero-worship and the heroic in history*, 4te ed. London 1854, has therefore pointed to the heroes or geniuses as the core of the history of mankind. In their turn, these geniuses have inspired the masses in every field. Luther, Baco, Napoleon, Hegel have transformed the thoughts of millions and changed their consciousness. This fact alone teaches us that there can be an influence from one mind on another. The manner varies, when one man speaks to another, when an orator animates his audience by his words, when a hypnotist plants his thoughts in the magnetized person, etc., but there is always a suggestion of thoughts, inspiration in a broader sense. Now Scripture teaches us that "the world is not independent and exists and lives by itself, but that the Spirit of God is immanent in all created things. The immanence of God is the basis of all inspiration and theopneustion, Ps. 104:30, 139:7; Job 33:4. Being and life are inspired by the Spirit in every creature from moment to moment. Still further, the Spirit of the Lord is the principle of all understanding and wisdom, Job 32:8; Isa 11:2, so that all knowledge and art, all talent and genius, flow from Him. In the church He is the Spirit of regeneration and renewal, Ps. 51:13; Ezek. 36:26, 27; John 3:3; the dispenser of the gifts, 1 Cor. 12:4-6. In the prophets He is the Spirit of foretelling, Num. 11 : 25, 24 :2, 3; Isa. 11 : 2. 42 : 1; Micah 3 : 8, etc. And so also in the composition of Scripture He is the Spirit of inspiration. This last activity of the Holy Spirit does not stand alone; it is connected with His entire immanent activity in the world and in the church. It is the crown and the pinnacle of everything. The inspiration of the writers in the production of the books of the Bible is built upon all these other activities of the Holy Spirit. It presupposes a work of the Fathers, by which the organs of revelation were prepared long beforehand, even before birth in their sex, environment, education, development, etc., for that task to which they would later be specially called, Ex. 3-4; Jer. 1:5; Acts 7:22; Gal. 1:15, etc. Inspiration, therefore, is not to be equated, as the moderns do, with the heroic, poetic, religious

inspiration; it is not a work of the *providentia Dei generalis*, not an action of God's Spirit to the same extent and in the same manner as in heroes and artists, even though this action of God's Spirit is often suggested in the prophets and biblical writers. The Spirit in creation prepares the Spirit in re-creation. Furthermore, a prior work of the Son is also assumed in the actual inspiration. The gift of theophany is only given within the circle of revelation. Theophany, prophecy and miracle precede inspiration proper. Revelation and inspiration are distinct; one is a work of the Son, of the Logos, the other of the Holy Spirit. There is truth in Schleiermacher's idea that the holy writers were under the influence of the holy circle in which they lived. Revelation and inspiration must be distinguished. But inspiration is not identical with revelation (cf. above, p. 300). It is rooted in it, but it rises above it. Finally, inspiration usually, though not always, presupposes the work of the Holy Spirit Himself in regeneration, faith, and conversion. The prophets and apostles were most holy men, children of God. Thus this idea of ethical theology also contains elements of truth. Yet inspiration is not identical with rebirth. Rebirth encompasses mankind, inspiration is an operation in the consciousness. God sanctifies and renews, it enlightens and teaches. God does not bring inspiration by itself, and inspiration is possible without rebirth, Num. 23:5; John 11:51; cf. Num. 22:28; 1 Sam. 19:24; Heb. 6:4. Rebirth is a *habitus permanens*, inspiration is an *actus transiens*. With all these mentioned work-activities of God, inspiration is therefore in the closest connection. It may not be isolated from them. It is included in all God's effects in all created things. But here, too, the evolutionary theory must be opposed, as if the higher were to arise from the lower only by immanent development. The working of God's Spirit in nature, in mankind, in the church, in the prophets, in the biblical writers is related and analogous, but not identical. There is harmony, not uniformity.

15. What does it consist of itself? The Scriptures shed light on this when they repeatedly say that the Lord speaks through the prophets or the mouths of His prophets. Of God the talking position *πρὸ* is used; He is the speaker, He is the real subject; but the prophets are

His speaking or writing organs, of whom the talking position $\Lambda\alpha$ c. gen. is always used and never ὑπο, Mt. 1:22, 2:15, 17, 23, 3:3, 4:14, etc.; Lu. 1:70; Rev. 1:16, 3:18, 4:25, 28:25. God, or the Holy Spirit, is the actual speaker, the spokesman, the auctor primarius, and the writers are the organs, through whom God speaks, the auctores secundarii, the scriptores or scribae. Further elucidation is given in 2 Peter 1:19-21, where the origin of prophecy is not sought in the will of man, but in the impelling of God's Spirit. The φε^εσῶ-αι, cf. Acts 27:15, 17 where the ship is driven by the wind, is essentially different from the ἀγεῖν of the children of God, Bom. 8:14 essentially different; the prophets were carried, driven by the Holy Spirit and spoke as a result. And likewise the preaching of the apostles is called a speaking (sV) πνευματι ἁγίῳ, Mt. 10:20 ; John 14:26, 15:26, 16:7; 1 Cor. 2:10-13, 16, 7:40; 2 Cor. 2:17, 5:20, 13:3. Prophets and apostles are therefore θεοφοβούμενοι; it is God who speaks in and through them. But Scripture itself leads us to understand this speaking of God through the mouth of the prophets as organically as possible. There is a distinction here between the prophets and the apostles, and between them again. Moses stands at the top of the prophets; God spoke to him as a friend to his friend. With Isaiah the impulse of the Spirit has a different character than with Ezekiel; Jeremiah's prophecies are distinguished by their simplicity and naturalness from those of Zechariah and Daniel. In all the prophets of the Bible, the impulse of the Spirit is more or less transcendent; it comes to them from above and from without, falls upon them and acts momentarily. With the apostles, on the other hand, the Holy Spirit dwells immanently in their hearts, leading and driving them, enlightening and teaching them. Thus there is a great difference also in the organic character of inspiration. Nevertheless, the whole of Scripture commands us to think of inspiration as organic rather than mechanical. Not, however, because mechanical inspiration in itself would be impossible and impermissible and contrary to the dignity of man. If it is not unworthy of a child to believe its parents and teachers on authority and simply to learn from them what it does not know; if it is not unworthy of a servant to receive commands from his master which he does not understand and has only to carry out, what

unworthiness would there be for man to have such a relationship with the Lord his God? But God has not taken this road; He has come down to man in revelation and inspiration and has accommodated Himself to the peculiarities and even the weaknesses of His human nature. That too has been a grace of the ἐνσαρκωσις. Just as the Logos did not invade a human being and unite him with himself, but entered into the human nature and prepared and formed it by the Spirit from whom it was received, so has the Spirit of the Lord acted by inspiration. He entered into the prophets and apostles themselves and thus engaged them and caused them to investigate and think, to speak and write. It is He who speaks through them; but it is they themselves who speak and write. They were thought by the Spirit, but they themselves spoke, ἐλάλησαν, 2 Peter 1:20: 16, 3:18, 4: 25, 28: 25 and always in Heb. 1:5 v., 4: 3, 5 etc., but just as often with the auctores secundarii, Moses, David. Isaiah etc., The moments of inspiration are not to be considered separately, but are in connection with all that has gone before: the prophets and apostles are prepared and qualified for their task from their youth; their character, nature, inclination, intellect, development, etc., are not suppressed, but, as they are, are the subject of a special study. Their whole person, with all their gifts and powers, is made subservient to the calling to which they are called. Research, Luke 1:1, reflection and memory, John 14:26, use of sources, etc., are therefore not excluded by inspiration, but are included in it. Virtually all the books of O. and N. T. are therefore in a certain sense also occasional writings. There is a direct command to write only in a few texts; they do not by any means cover the entire content of the Scriptures. But also those occasions which compelled him to write, belong to the guidance of the Spirit; it was through them that he urged on writing. The calling to be a prophet and an apostle naturally included that to speak and to testify, Ex. 3; Ez. 3; Am. 3:8; Acts 1:8 etc., but not that of writing. After all, many prophets and apostles did not write. From Mt. 28 :19 a special commandment to write is not to be inferred. Among the charismata, 1 Cor. 12 does not mention writing, Bellarm., de verbo Dei IV cap. 3-4. But the Holy Spirit has guided the history of the Church under Israel and in the N.T. in such a way that the deed had

to pass into the word and the word into the writing. From this guidance the calling to write, the impulsus ad scribendum, was born in prophets and apostles. And that writing is the highest, the most powerful, the most universal testimony, which does not evaporate at the breath of the wind but manets in aeternum. And precisely because the writings of the prophets and apostles did not originate outside, but rather out of and within history, there is a science in theology that examines and makes known all those occasions and circumstances under which the books of the Bible were created. When the prophets and apostles write in this way, they also retain their own character, their own language and style. At all times this difference in the books of the Bible has been recognized, but not always satisfactorily explained. It cannot be explained by the fact that the Holy Spirit arbitrarily wanted to write sometimes this way and sometimes that way; but entering into the writers, He also entered into their style and language, into their character and peculiarities, which He Himself had already prepared and formed. This also includes the fact that He chose Hebrew in the Old Testament and Hellenistic Greek in the New Testament as the vehicle for His divine thoughts. Here, too, there was no arbitrariness. Purism awkwardly defended a precious truth. Measured in terms of the Greek of Plato and Demosthenes, the N. T. is full of barbarism and soliloquy; but the marriage that took place in Hellenistic Greek between pure Hebrew and pure Attic, between the Eastern and Western spirits, was the realization in the field of language of the divine idea that salvation is of the Jews, but is destined for all mankind. The language of the New Testament is not the most beautiful, grammatically or linguistically speaking, but it is the most suitable for communicating God's thoughts. In this respect, too, the word has become truly and generally human. And finally, when the prophets and apostles wrote, their own experience and history often provided the material for their writings. In the psalms it is the pious singer who alternately complains and rejoices, sits down in sorrow or rejoices with joy. In Romans 7 Paul portrays his own life experience, and throughout the Scriptures it is always the persons of the writers themselves whose life and experience, their hope and fear, their faith

and trust, their complaint and misery are described and portrayed. That rich life, that deep experience, of a David, for example, was formed and guided by the Spirit of the Lord in such a way that it would be recorded in Scripture as a lesson for future generations, that we might have hope through patience and consolation in the Scriptures, Rom. 15:4. Organic inspiration alone does justice to Scripture. In the teaching of Scripture it is the effect and application of the central fact of revelation, the incarnation of the word. The Λογος became σαρξ, and the word became Scripture; these are two facts which not only run parallel but are also intimately connected. Christ became flesh, a servant, without form or glory, the most despised of men; He came down to the lowest parts of the earth, became obedient to the death of the cross. And so the word, the revelation of God, has entered into the creature, into the life and history of men and nations, into all human forms of dream and vision, of research and thought, even into the weak and despised and insignificant; the word has become scripture, and as scripture has submitted to the fate of all scripture. All this has happened so that the excellence of the power, even of the power of Scripture, may be God's and not ours. As every human thought and action is the fruit entirely of the action of God in whom we live and are, and at the same time the fruit of man's activity, so also the Scriptures are the product entirely of the Spirit of God who speaks through the prophets and apostles, and at the same time the product of the activity of the writers. Θεία παντα και αν'ρωπινα παντα.

16. This organic view, however, has been used several times to detract from the first, from the authorship of the EL Spirit. The incarnation of Christ demands that we search for her down to the depths of her humiliation, in all her weakness and reproach. The description of the word, of the revelation, invites us to recognize also in Scripture that weak and humble, that servant form. But just as the human being in Christ, however weak and humble, nevertheless remained free from sinfulness, so too Scripture is sine lege concepta. It is human in its entirety and in all its parts, but it is also 'Ji-ia παντα. Yet in many ways this divine character of Scripture has been

undermined. The history of inspiration teaches us that first it was extended up to the 17th century, to the vowels and points (*inspiratio punctualis*), and then that it was gradually contracted and limited, from the points to the words (*insp. verbalis*), from the *singula verba* to the word, the thought (Wort instead of Wörter- inspiration in Philippi, Kirchl. Glaub. 18, 252), from the word as thought to the things (*insp. realis*), from the things to the religious-ethical content, to what is actually revealed, to the word of God *sensu stricto*, to the special object of the beatific faith (*insp. fundamentalis, religiosa*), from these things again to the persons (*insp. personalis*), and from these finally to the denial of all inspiration as a supernatural gift. Now it is gratifying that even the most negative orientation is willing to secure a place for Scripture and to attribute some value to it in the religious life and thinking of Christendom. The doctrine of the Holy Scriptures is not an opinion of this or that school, not a dogma of a particular church or sect, but an *articulus iündamentalis*, an article of faith of the one holy universal Christian Church. Its significance for Christianity as a whole is more and more recognized; its indissoluble connection with Christian faith and life more and more. For a time referred to in dogmatics as the *media gratiae*, it has reclaimed its place in the entrance to dogmatics with honor, Nitzsch, Lehrb. der ev. Dogm. 212. The whole Roman and Greek church still stands unswervingly in the confession of the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. Many Protestant churches and denominations have hitherto resisted all violence in order to drive it away from this basis. The congregation continues to live and feed itself directly or indirectly from the Scriptures through preaching and teaching, reading and research. Even those who deny inspiration in theory often speak and act in the practice of life as if they fully accept it. The dualism of believing and knowing, in which, according to many, orthodoxy finds itself when it comes to the teaching of Scripture, cannot be compared with the ambivalent position of *Vermittelungs-Theologie*, which denies inspiration from the rostrum and actually confesses it from the pulpit. Radicalism comes more and more to the recognition that the inspiration of Scripture is taught by Scripture itself and must be accepted or rejected along with it. All this shows

that life is stronger than doctrine and that Scripture itself always responds to any naturalistic explanation. It claims to be the product of the Spirit of God and upholds this claim in the face of all criticism. Any attempt to strip it of the mysterious character of its origin, content and power, has so far ended with its abandonment and its being left as Scripture. Inspiration, therefore, is not an explanation of Scripture, and not really a theory; but it is and ought to be a faithful profession of what Scripture testifies concerning itself, in spite of appearances to the contrary. Inspiration is a dogma, like Trinity, the Incarnation, etc., which the Christian assumes, not because he sees its truth, but because God testifies to it. It is not a scientific statement but a profession of faith. With inspiration, as with any other dogma, the question is not primarily: how much can and may I profess without coming into conflict with science, but what is God's testimony and what, accordingly, is the statement of Christian faith? And then there is only one possible answer, that Scripture presents itself as the word of God and the Church of God has recognized it as such throughout the ages. Inspiration rests on the authority of Scripture and has received witness from the Church of all ages.

With this dogmatic and religious character of the doctrine of inspiration, the *inspiratio personalis* and fundamentals are in conflict. However, in these views also lies a good thought. For it has certainly been the persons, with all their gifts and powers, who have been engaged in the inspiration of the Holy Spirit; and those persons were holy men, men of God, skilfully equipped for this work. There is no doubt also a distinction in Scripture between more and less important portions; not all books of the Bible are of equal value. But both ideas of inspiration weaken the testimony which Scripture gives of itself, and are not born of the *plerophoria* of faith, but of transaction with science. Moreover, the *inspiratio personalis* runs up against these objections, that it erases the distinction between inspiration and illumination (rebirth), between the intellectual and the ethical life, between the *ysqsci&ai* of the prophets, 2 Peter 1:21 and the *ἀγασϋ-αι* of the children of God, Rom 8:14, between Holy Scripture and edifying reading. Furthermore, it reverses with Rome

the relationship between Scripture and the church, robs the church of the certainty it needs, and makes it dependent on science, which must decide what in Scripture is or is not the word of God. Many advocates of this theory of inspiration do try to escape these objections by appealing to the person of Christ as the source and authority of dogmatics, but this is of no avail, since the difference is precisely who Christ is and what He taught and did. If the apostolic witness concerning Christ is not reliable, no knowledge of Christ is possible. In addition, if Christ is authority, He is also authority in the teaching of Scripture; inspiration must then be taken on His authority. The above theory conflicts with the authority of Christ Himself. The *inspiratio fundamentalis* differs from the *inspiratio personalis* in that it assumes a special activity of the Spirit in writing, but only in certain portions of Scripture. This idea, however, is so deistic and dualistic that it is already implausible. Moreover, word and fact, the religious and the historical, what was spoken by God and by men, are so interwoven and interwoven in Scripture that separation is impossible. The history of Scripture is also a revelation of God. And finally, these two theories do not fail to meet the objections raised by science against Scripture and its inspiration. For these objections do not apply at all to some minor points in the periphery of Revelation, but touch its very heart and center. The *inspiratio personalis* and *fundamentalis* is by no means more scientific and rational, than the strictest *inspiratio verbalis*.

The other theories of inspiration, *inspiratio punctualis*, *verbalis*, *realis*, and also the *Wortinspiration* of Philippi, differ little from one another. The activity of the Holy Spirit in writing has consisted in the fact that, after having prepared the human consciousness of the scriptors in all kinds of ways, by birth, education, natural gifts, research, memory, reflection, life experience, revelation, etc., He now, in and under and during the writing itself, has raised in that consciousness those thoughts and words, that language and style, which could best express the divine thought for people of all ranks and classes and people and centuries. The thoughts contain the words and the words contain the vocals. But it does not follow that

the vocal signs in our Hebrew manuscripts come from the writers themselves. Nor does it follow that everything is full of divine wisdom, that every iota and every tittle has an infinite content. Everything has its meaning and significance, certainly, but on the spot and in the context in which it occurs. Scripture must not be viewed atomistically, as if each word and each letter, in isolation and as such, had been inspired by God with its own purpose and its own divine, infinite content. This leads to the foolish hermeneutical rules of the Jewish Scriptures and does not honor but dishonors Scripture. But inspiration must be conceived organically, so that even the most peripheral part has its place and significance and yet is at a much greater distance from the center than other parts. In the human organism nothing is accidental, neither the length nor the width, nor the color nor the hue; but therefore not everything is in the same close connection with the center of life. The head and heart have a much more important place in the body than the hand and foot, and these in turn have a much higher value than nails and hair. In Scripture, too, not everything is arranged equally close to the center; there is a periphery which moves widely around the center, but it too belongs to the circle of God's thoughts. Thus there are no types or degrees of inspiration itself. The hair of the head shares the same life as the heart and hand. It is one anima, which is *tota est in toto corpore et in omnibus partibus*. It is one Spirit, from which all Scripture has proceeded through the consciousness of the writers. But there is a difference in the way the same life is immanent and active in the different parts of the body. There is a variety of gifts, also in Scripture, but it is the same Spirit.

E. Objections to inspiration.

17. Against this inspiration of Scripture many and very serious objections are raised. They are derived from historical criticism, which disputes the authenticity and credibility of many books of the Bible; from the internal contradictions which are repeatedly found in Scripture; from the manner in which the Old Test is quoted and explained in the New; from unconsecrated history, with which the

narratives of Scripture are often inconsistent; The present form of Scripture, which, according to textual criticism, is lost in its autographs, corrupt in its apographs, and deficient in its translations, etc. It is a vain attempt to ignore these objections and to pretend that they do not exist. But in the first place the ethical significance of the struggle which has been waged against Scripture throughout the ages must be pointed out. If Scripture is the word of God, this battle is not accidental but necessary and perfectly understandable. Because they describe God's revelation in Christ, they must arouse the same opposition as Christ himself. He came into the world as a κρισις and is the fall and the resurrection of many. He separates light from darkness and reveals the thoughts of many hearts. And so the Scriptures are a living and powerful word, a judge of the thoughts and deliberations of the heart. It was not only inspired, it is still theopneist. As much goes before the act of inspiration, the whole activity of the Holy Spirit in nature, history, revelation, regeneration, so much follows after it. Inspiration does not stand alone. The Holy Spirit, after the act of inspiration, does not withdraw from the Scriptures and does not leave them to their fate, but He carries them and animates them, and brings their contents, in all kinds of forms, to mankind, to its heart and conscience. Through Scripture as the Word of God, the Holy Spirit continually wrestles with the thoughts and deliberations of the ψυχικός άνθρωπος. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Scriptures have always been opposed and contested. Christ bore a cross, and a servant is no more than his lord. Scripture is the handmaiden of Christ. She shares in His reproach. It awakens the enmity of sinful man.

From this, it is true, not all the opposition to Scripture can be explained. But still the attacks to which Scripture is exposed in this century cannot be considered in isolation. They are undoubtedly connected with the whole spirit of this century. It is not for us to judge of persons and intentions; but it would be superficial to assert that the struggle against Scripture in this century was entirely separate, was governed by quite different and far purer motives than in earlier centuries, that now only the head would speak and the

heart would remain entirely out of it. Every believer experiences that in the best moments of his life he is also strongest in his belief in Scripture; his confidence in Scripture increases with his belief in Christ, and conversely, *ignoratio Scripturarum* is of itself and to the same extent an *ignoratio Christi* (Hieronymus). The relationship between sin and error often lies deep under the surface of the conscious life. In another person it is almost impossible to detect, but sometimes it is discovered by the eyes of one's own soul. The struggle against Scripture is first and foremost a revelation of the enmity of the human heart. But that enmity can express itself in various ways. It is by no means only, and perhaps not even most strongly, expressed in the criticism to which Scripture is subjected in our time. Scripture as the word of God meets with opposition and unbelief on the part of every psychic. In the days of dead orthodoxy, disbelief in Scripture was as powerful in principle as it is in our historical and critical age. The forms change, but the essence remains one. Whether the enmity against Scripture is expressed in a criticism such as that of Celsus and Porphyrius, or whether it manifests itself in a dead faith, the enmity is fundamentally the same. For it is not the hearers, but the doers of the word, who are spoken into salvation. The servant who has known the will of his master and has not prepared himself nor done according to his will, he will be beaten with many blows.

That is why it remains the duty of every human being, first of all, to renounce this enmity against the word of God and to lead all thoughts to the obedience of Christ. Scripture itself makes this demand everywhere. Only the pure in heart will see God. Rebirth makes one see the kingdom of God. Self-denial is the condition for being Jesus' disciple. The wisdom of the world is foolishness before God. Scripture has such a high place with every man that, instead of submitting to his criticism, it rather judges him in all his thoughts and desires. And this has been the position of the Christian Church toward Scripture at all times. Humility, according to Chrysostomus, was the foundation of philosophy. Augustine said: *quemadmodum rhetor ille rogatus, quid primum esset in eloquentiae praeceptis, respondit: pronuntiationem; quid secundum, pronuntiationem; quid*

tertium, pronuntiationem; ita si me interrogas de religionis Christianae, primo, secundo et tertio semper respondere liberet: humilitatem. Galvin, Inst. II 2, 11, quotes this with approval. And Pascal, Pensées, Art. 8, calls out to mankind: humiliez-vous, raison impuissante, taisez-vous, nature imbécile écoutez Dieu!

This is how the church has stood against Scripture in every century. And the Christian dogmatist may not take any other position. For a dogma does not rest on the results of any historical-critical research, but rests solely on the testimony of God, on the self-explanatory nature of Scripture. A Christian does not believe because everything reveals God's love, but despite everything that raises doubt. Even in Scripture there remains much that gives rise to doubt. All believers know from experience how to speak from it. The men of Scripture criticism often present it as if the simple congregation knew nothing of the objections raised against Scripture and felt nothing of the difficulty of continuing to believe in Scripture. But that is an inaccurate representation. Certainly, simple Christians do not know the obstacles which science puts in the way of belief in Scripture. But they are more or less aware of the battle which is fought against Scripture in both mind and heart. There is not a single believer who has not learned in his own way to know the opposition between the σοφία του κοσμου and the μωρία του !)του. It is the same and it is an everlasting battle that must be fought by all Christians, learned or unlearned, to keep their minds under the obedience of Christ. No one here on earth can overcome this struggle. There remain cruces throughout the whole field of faith that must be overcome. There is no faith without a struggle. Believing is fighting, fighting against the appearance of things. As long as someone still believes something, his faith is challenged from all sides. Even the modern believer is not freed from this. Concessions weaken but do not liberate. Thus enough objections remain, even for those who submit childishly to the Scriptures. These need not be glossed over. There are cruces in Scripture which cannot be dismissed, and which will probably never be solved. But these difficulties, which Scripture itself offers us in relation to its inspiration, have for the most part not been newly

discovered in this century; they have always been noticed, and nevertheless Jesus and the Apostles, Athanasius and Augustine, Thomas and Bonaventure, Luther and Calvin, all Christians of all churches and through all ages have confessed and recognized Scripture as the word of God. Whoever wants to wait with believing the Scriptures, until all objections have been removed and all contradictions have been reconciled, will never come to faith. What a man sees, why should he hope for it? Jesus says blessed are those who have not seen and yet have believed. But moreover, in every science there are objections and difficulties. Whoever does not want to start believing will never come to know. The theory of knowledge is the principle of philosophy; but it is a mystery from beginning to end. Anyone who is unwilling to embark on scientific research before he sees the way opened up for us to attain knowledge will never get started. He who will not eat until he understands the process by which food comes to him dies of hunger; and he who will not believe the word of God until he sees all the difficulties resolved dies of spiritual want. It will not do to understand, but to grasp the misunderstood (Beets). Nature, history and every science offer as many cruces as the Holy Scriptures. Nature contains so many riddles that it can make us doubt menignlally the existence of a wise and just God. There are *εναρτιοφανη* in multitude on every page of the book of nature. There is an inexplicable remainder (Schelling), which mocks all explanation. Who, therefore, gives up faith in the providence of God, which governs all things? Mohammedanism, the life and destiny of uncivilized peoples is a crux in the history of mankind, as great and as difficult as the composition of the Pentateuch and the Synoptics. Who therefore doubts that God also writes that book of nature and history with His almighty hand? Of course, here, as with Scripture, one can fall into the arms of agnosticism and pessimism. But despair is a *salto mortale* also in the scientific field. With unbelief, the mysteries of his being do not diminish but increase. And the discontent of the heart becomes greater.

18. But the organic conception of inspiration offers many ways of meeting the objections raised against it. It implies, however, that the Holy Spirit, in describing the word of God, has not forsaken anything human in order to serve as the organ of the divine. The revelation of God is not abstract-supranational, but has entered into the human, into persons and situations, into forms and customs, into history and life. It does not float high above us, but has descended into our situation; it is flesh and blood and has become like us in everything except sin. It is now an ineradicable part of this cosmos in which we live, and continues its work of renewal and restoration. The human has become the organ of the divine, the natural the revelation of the supernatural, the visible the sign and seal of the unseen. In inspiration, use has been made of all the gifts and powers that lie within human nature. This explains, first of all, the difference in language and style, in character and individuality, which can be seen in the books of the Bible. Formerly this difference was explained by the will of the Holy Spirit, and no deeper consideration was required. But with organic inspiration this difference is perfectly natural. The use of sources, the writers' familiarity with earlier writings, their own research, memory, reflection and life experience are not excluded but included by the organic view. The Holy Spirit himself has prepared his scriptors in this way; he has not suddenly descended upon them from above, but has made use of their whole personality as his instrument. Here, too, the word applies that *gratia non tollit sed perficit naturam*. The personality of the writers is not erased but maintained and sanctified. Inspiration, therefore, in no way demands that we equate the style of Amos with that of Isaiah, either literarily or aesthetically, or that we deny all barbarism and soliloquy in the language of the N. T. In the second place, the organic concept of revelation and inspiration implies that ordinary human and natural life is not excluded but is also made subservient to the thoughts of God. Scripture is the word of God; it not only contains it but it is it. But the formal and material elements must not be separated in this expression. Inspiration alone would not make a scripture the word of God in the scriptural sense. For example, even if a book of geography were entirely inspired and dictated word for

word in the most literal sense, that would not make it theological in the sense of 2 Tim. 3:16. Scripture is the word of God, because the Holy Spirit testifies of Christ in it, because it has the Λογος ἐνσάρκος as its substance and content. Form and content permeate each other, and cannot be separated. But in order to paint this full-length picture of Christ as if it were before our eyes, it is necessary that human sin and the satanic lie are also depicted in all their horror. In the painting, the shadow is necessary in order to make the light stand out more clearly. Sin must also be called sin in Bible saints, and error must not be condoned in them either. And while the revelation of God in Christ thus takes in iniquity as its antithesis, it also does not disregard the human, weak and natural. Christ has not considered anything human alien, and the Scriptures do not forget the smallest concerns of daily life (2 Tim 4:13). Thirdly, the intention and purpose of Scripture are closely related to its content. Everything that has been written before has been written for our instruction. It serves to teach, to refute, to correct, to instruct, which is in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, perfectly equipped for every good work. It serves to make us wise unto salvation. Scripture has a thoroughly religious and ethical purpose. It does not want to be a manual for the different sciences. It is the principium alone of theology and demands that we read and examine it theologically. In all the disciplines that are grouped around Scripture, we must be concerned with the beatific knowledge of God. For this the Scriptures offer us all the data. In this sense it is entirely sufficient and perfect. But whoever wants to derive from Scripture a history of Israel, a biography of Jesus, a history of Israel or Old Christian literature, etc., will always find himself disappointed. Then there are gaps which can only be filled by guesswork. Historical criticism has completely forgotten this purpose of Scripture. It tries to give a history of the people of Israel, of their religion and literature, and it immediately makes demands on Scripture which it cannot meet. She encounters contradictions that cannot be solved, endlessly shifts sources and books, arranges and orders them in a completely different way, only to create hopeless confusion. No life of Jesus can be constructed from the four Gospels and no history of Israel from

the Old Testament. The Holy Spirit did not intend this. Notarial notation has not been the inspiration. The harmonistics of the Gospel narratives have failed, cf. Dieckhoff, *Die Inspiration und Irrthumslosigkeit der H. Schrift*, Leipzig 1891. Id. *Noch einmal über die Insp. u. Irrth. der H. S.* Rostock 1893. Herzog² art. *Evangelienharmonien and Synopse*. Exact knowledge, as we demand in mathesis, astronomy, chemistry, etc., is not met by Scripture. Such a standard may not be applied to it. That is why the auto-grapha are lost. That is why the text, to whatever small degree, is corrupt; that is why the congregation and indeed the laity possess the Scriptures only in a faulty and fallible translation. These are facts that cannot be denied. And they teach us that Scripture has its own standard, is of its own interpretation and has its own destiny. That purpose is none other than to make us wise unto salvation. The Old Testament is not a source for a history of Israel's people and religion, but it is a source for a *historia revelati-* onis. The Gospels are not a source for a life of Jesus but for a dogmatic knowledge of his person and work. Scripture is the book of Christian religion and Christian theology. It is given for that purpose. It is suited to that purpose. And therefore it is the word of God, given to us by the Holy Spirit.

19. From this the relationship between Scripture and the other sciences becomes clear at last. Much abuse has been made of the word of Baronius: Scripture does not say how heaven goes, but how we go to heaven. As the book of God's knowledge, Scripture has much to say, also to the other sciences. It is a light on the path and a lamp for the feet, also for science and art. It claims authority in all areas of life. Christ has all power in heaven and on earth. The limitation of inspiration to the religious-ethical part of Scripture is objectively untenable, and subjectively the separation between religious and other areas of human life cannot be maintained. Inspiration extends to all parts of Scripture, and religion is a matter for man as a whole. Much of what is mentioned in the *Schritt* is also of fundamental importance for the other sciences. The creation and fall of mankind, the unity of the human race, the Flood, the origin of peoples and languages, etc. are facts of the highest importance for

the other sciences as well. Every moment science and art come into contact with Scripture, the principles of all life are given in Scripture. Nothing can be done about this. Yet on the other hand there is also a great truth in the word of the cardinal Baronius. All those facts too are not communicated in Scripture in and of themselves, but with a theological purpose, so that we may know God for salvation. Scripture never intentionally interferes with science as such. Christ Himself, though free from all error and sin, nevertheless never moved in a narrow sense in the fields of science and art, of commerce and industry, of jurisprudence and politics. His was another greatness; the glory of the Unborn of the Father, full of grace and truth. But precisely because of that He has been a blessing for science and art, for society and state. Jesus is Saviour, that alone, but also completely. He did not come only to restore mankind's religious and ethical life and to leave everything else untouched, as if it had not been corrupted by sin and did not need restoration. No, the grace of Christ extends as far as sin. And so it is with the Scriptures. It too is thoroughly religious, the word of God for salvation, but for that very reason it is also a word for family and society, for science and art. Scripture is a book for all mankind, in all its ranks and classes, in all its generations and peoples. But for that reason it is not a scientific book in the narrow sense. Wisdom, not scholarship, is speaking in it. It does not speak the exact language of science and learning, but that of perception and daily life. She does not judge and describe things by the results of scientific research, but by intuition, by the first, living impression that phenomena make on man. That is why she speaks of the approach of the land, of the rising and setting of the sun, of the blood as the soul of the animal, of the kidneys as the seat of afflictions, of the heart as the source of thoughts, etc., and is completely unconcerned with the scientifically precise language of astronomy, physiology, psychology, etc. She speaks of the earth as the center of all things. She speaks about the earth as the center of God's creation and does not choose between the Ptolemaic and the Copernican world view. It does not decide between Neptunism and Plutonism, nor between allopathy and homoeopathy. The scriptors of the Holy Scriptures probably knew nothing more in all these

sciences, geology, zoology, physiology, medicine, etc. than all their contemporaries. Nor did they need to. For the Scriptures use the language of daily experience, which is always true and always remains true. If Scripture had instead used the language of the school and had spoken scientifically-exactly, it would have interfered with its own authority. If it had decided in favor of the Ptolemaic world view, it would have been implausible in a century which held the Copernican system. Nor could it have been a book for life, for humanity. But now she speaks in general human language, understandable for the simplest, clear for both learned and unlearned. She uses the language of observation, which will always exist alongside that of science and of the school. That is why it can last until the end of time. That is why it is old, without ever becoming old. It is always young and fresh; it is the talk of life. *Verbum Dei manet in aeternum.*

4. PROPERTIES OF SCRIPTURE.

A. The properties of Scripture in general.

1. The doctrine of the affectiones S. Scr. has developed entirely out of the struggle against Rome and Anabaptism. In the confession of the inspiration and authority of Scripture there was agreement, but otherwise in the locus de S. Scr. there was great difference between Rome and the Reformation. The relationship in which Rome had placed Scripture and the church was fundamentally changed in the Reformation. For the Fathers of the Church and the scholastics, Scripture, at least in theory, still stood far above the Church and tradition; it rested in itself, was αυτοπιστος and for the Church and theology the norma normans. Augustine said, *scriptura canonica certis suis terminis continetur*, with Harnack, D. G. II 85, and reasoned Conf. 6.5, 11.3 so, as if the truth of Holy Scripture depended only on itself. Bonaventura, *de sept. don. n. 37- 43*, quoted in the *Breviloquium* ed. Freiburg 1881 p. 370, declares: *ecclesia enim fundata est super eloquia Sacrae Scripturae, quae si deficient, deficit intellectus Cum enim*

ecclesia fundata sit in Sacra Scriptura, qui nescit eam, nescit ecclesiam regere. More such testimonies are cited by Gerhard, *Loci theol. I cap. 3 § 45, 46* cited from Salvianus, Biel, Cajetanus, Hosius, Valentia etc. Canisius says in his *Summa doctrinae Christ.*, in cap. de *praeceptis ecclesiae § 16*: *Proinde sicut scripturae propter testimonium Divini Spiritus in illa loquentis credimus, adhaeremus ac tribuimus maximam auctoritatem, sic ecclesiae fidem, reverentiam obedientiamque debemus.* And also Bellarminus, *de Verbo Dei, lib. 1 cap. 2* still declares: *Sacris Scripturis, quae propheticis et apostolicis litteris continentur, nihil est notius, nihil certius, ut stultissimum esse necesse sit qui illis fidem habendam esse negat.* All were of the opinion, that the Scriptures were sufficiently from and by She does not depend on the Church, but

conversely the Church on her; the Church with her tradition may be *regula fidei*, *fundamentum fidei* she is not yet. That is the Scriptures alone.

But the church with its office and tradition began to occupy an increasingly independent place with Rome and to acquire authority alongside the Holy Scriptures. The relationship of both was not defined at first, but soon demanded better regulation. And as the church grew in power and complacency, the authority was more and more shifted from Scripture to the church. Various moments in history indicate the process by which the church rose from the place below, to that beside, and finally also to that above the Scriptures. The question of which of the two, the Scriptures or the church, had the precedence, was clearly and consciously posed first in the time of the Reformation councils. In spite of the opposition of Gerson, d'Ailly, and especially Nicholas of Clémange, Rev. 3 : 247, it was decided in favor of the church. Trent sanctioned this against the Reformation. In the battle against Gallicanism the question was further discussed, and in the Vatican Council of 1870 it was resolved in such a way that the Church was declared infallible. The subject of this infallibility, however, is not the *ecclesia audiens*, nor the *ecclesia docens*, nor the bishops assembled in council, but specifically the Pope. And this one again not as a private person, nor as Bishop of Rome or Patriarch of the West, but as Supreme Pastor of the entire Church. Although he possesses this infallibility as head of the Church and not separately from her, he does not possess it through and with her, but above and in distinction from her. Even bishops and councils share this infallibility, not separately from, but only in unity with and submission to the Pope. He is above all, and makes only the Church, tradition, councils, and canons infallible. Councils without a pope can and have erred, Bellarmine, *de Conc. et Eccl.* II c. 10-11. The whole church, both *docens* and *audiens*, is only infallible *una cum et sub Romano pontifice*, Jansen, *Theol.* I 506. With this the whole relationship of church and Scripture is reversed. The Church, or more concretely the Pope, takes precedence and stands above Scripture. *Lbi papa, ibi ecclesia*, Jansen, I 511. The infallibility of the

pope makes that of the church, the bishops and councils, and likewise that of the Scriptures unnecessary.

The most important points of Scripture between Rome and the Reformation exist. They concern mainly the necessity of the Holy Scriptures, the apocrypha of the O.

2. From this Roman conception of the relationship between Scripture and the church flow all the differences which in the doctrine of the Test, the editio Vulgata, the prohibition of the Bible, the interpretation of Scripture and tradition. Formally, the change in the relationship between Scripture and the church is most evident in that the newer Roman theologians treat the teaching of the church in the *pars formalis* of dogmatics. The church belongs to the *principia fidei*. Like Scripture at the Reformation, the church, the *magisterium*, or rather the pope is the formal principle, the *fundamentum fidei* in Romanism, Jansen, I 829.

Against this, the Reformers placed the doctrine of the specifics of Scripture. It was entirely polemical in character, but because of that it was also essentially fixed from the beginning, Heppe, *Dogm. d. deutschen Prot.* I 207-257. Gradually it was also incorporated more or less systematically and methodically into the dogmatics, not yet with Zwingli, Calvin, Melancton, etc., but already with Musculus, *Loci Comm.* 1567 p. 374 sq. Zanchius, *de S. Script. Op.* VIII 319 sq. Polanus, *Synt. Theol.* 17 sq. Junius, *Theses Theol. Op.* I 1594 sq. etc., and in the Lutheran church by Gerhard, Quenstedt, Calovius, Hollaz, etc. But in the treatment there was difference. Sometimes all kinds of historical and critical material was discussed; the dogmatics took up almost the whole of the "Introduction", the canonical *generalis* and *specialis*. Also the number and the division of the characteristics were given unevenly. Authority, usefulness, necessity, truth, clarity, sufficiency, origin, distribution, content, apocrypha, council, church, tradition, *editio authentica*, translations, interpretation, proofs, *testimonium Sp. S'*., all this and much more was brought up in the teaching of Scripture and its properties. Gradually the subject

became more limited. Calovius and Quenstedt distinguished between *affectiones primariae* and *secundariae*; the former included *auctoritas*, *veritas*, *perfectio*, *perspicuitas*, *semet ipsam interpretandi facultas*, *judicialis potestas* and *efficacia*, and the latter included *necessitas*, *integritas*, *puritas*, *authenticitas* and *legendi omnibus concessa licentia*. Still simpler was the order many times followed: *auctoritas*, *necessitas*, *perfectio seu sufficientia*, *perspicuitas*, *semet ipsam interpretandi facultas* and *efficacia*, Hase, *Hutterus Rediv.* § 43 f. Schmid, *Dogm. der ev. luth. K.* S. 27 f. Herzog² 2, 365 f. Heppe, *Dogm. der ev. ref. K.* 9 f. Voigt, *Fundamental-dogm.* S. 644 f. But look so there is still simplification to be made. The historical, critical, archaeological material etc. does not belong in the dogmatics, but in the bibliological subjects of theology. The *authenticitas*, *integritas*, *puritas*, etc. cannot therefore be treated completely in dogmatics; they are only discussed there insofar as the teaching of Scripture also offers some data for its situation. The *veritas* does not need a separate discussion after inspiration and authority, and would be weakened rather than strengthened by it. The *efficacia* finds its place in the doctrine of the *media gratiae*. Thus only the *auctoritas*, *necessitas*, *perfectio* and *perspicuitas* remain. Among these there is still this distinction, that the *auctoritas* is not a property which is coordinated with the others, for it is given automatically with the inspiration; the *necessitas*, *perspicuitas* and *sufficientia*, on the other hand, do not flow in the same sense from inspiration. It is not disputed that an infallible Scripture must be supplemented and explained by an infallible tradition. Rome recognizes the authority of Scripture, but denies its other attributes.

B. The authority of Scripture.

3. The authority of Scripture has been recognized at all times in the Christian Church. Jesus and the apostles believed the O. Test to be the word of God and ascribed to it a divine authority. The Christian church was born and raised under the authority of Scripture. What the apostles wrote must be so accepted as if Christ himself had written it, Aug. *de cons. evang.* And Calvin, in his interpretation of 2

Tim. 3: 16, declares that we owe to Scripture eandem reverentiam as to God. That authority of Scripture stood firm in all churches and among all Christians until the last century. However, between Rome and the Reformation there came a serious difference about the basis on which that authority rests. Church fathers and scholastics still often taught the autopoiesis of Scripture, but the driving force of the Roman principle has increasingly put the church before Scripture. The Church, so is now the general Roman doctrine, temporally and logically precedes Scripture. She was there before Scripture, and does not owe her origin, existence and authority to Scripture, but exists in and by herself, i.e. through Christ, or the Holy Spirit who dwells in her. The Scriptures, on the other hand, originated in the Church and are now acknowledged, confirmed, preserved, explained, defended, etc. by the Church. So Scripture has the Church, but the Church does not need Scripture. Without the church there is no Scripture, but without Scripture there is a church. The church with its infallible tradition is the original and sufficient means of preserving and communicating revelation; Scripture was added later, is in itself insufficient, but is useful and good as a support and confirmation of tradition. In fact, with Rome, Scripture becomes entirely dependent on the Church. The authenticity, integrity, inspiration, canonicity, authority of Scripture is established by the church. However, this distinction is then made that Scripture does not depend entirely on the church quoad se, but quoad nos. The Church, by her recognition, does not make Scripture inspired, canonical, authentic, etc., but she is nevertheless the only one who can infallibly know these qualities of Scripture. The self testimony of Scripture does not indicate that these books of the Old and New Testaments, and no others and no less, are inspired; nowhere does Scripture give a catalog of the books which belong to it; the texts which teach inspiration never cover the whole of Scripture, 2 Tim. 3:16 refers only to the Old Test; moreover, an appeal to Scripture for inspiration is always only circular evidence. The Protestants are therefore divided among themselves as to which books belong to the Scriptures; Luther's opinion of James differs from that of Calvin, etc. The proofs of Scripture derived from the Church Fathers, etc., are

not sufficiently fixed and solid; they have great value as *motiva credibilitatis*, but they give only probability, human and therefore fallible certainty. Only the Church gives divine, infallible certainty, as Augustine said: *ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicae ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas*, c. epist. Manich. cap. 5. c. Faustum 1. 28. cap. 2,4,6. The Protestants have therefore also been able to accept and acknowledge Scripture as the word of God, because they received it from the hand of the Church, Bellarminus, *de Verbo Dei* IV cap. 4. Perrone, *Praelect.*

Theol. IX 71 sq. Heinrich, *Dogm.* I 775 f. Jansen, *Theol.* I 766 sq. The Vaticanum, sess. 3. cap. 2 recognized the books of the O. and N. T. as canonical, *propterea quod Sp. S^o. inspirante conscripti! Deum habent autorem atque ut tales ipsi ecclesiae traditi sunt.* Guided by these thoughts, Home stated at Trent' sess. 4 and in the Vatican sess. 3 cap. 2, included the apocrypha of the Old Testament, following the example of the Greek translation and the practice of the church fathers, and moreover declared the *editio Vulgata* to be the authentic text, so that it has decisive authority in church and theology.

4. Against this Koomsian doctrine the Reformation set the autopistion of Scripture, Calvin, *Inst.* I c. 7. Ursinus, *Tract. Theol.* 1584 p. 8 sq. Polanus, *Synt.* I c. 23-30. Zanchius, *de*

S. Scriptura, *Op.* VIII 332-353. Junius, *Theses Theol.* c. 3-5. *Synopsis pur. theol. disp.* 2 § 29 sq. Gerhard, *Loci theol.* I c. 3. etc. In this difference the question was not whether the church did not have a calling to fulfill in relation to the Scriptures. It was generally agreed that the church is of great importance to the Scriptures. Her testimony is of great importance and a *motivum credibilitatis*. The church of the first centuries has in her testimonies a strong support for the Scriptures. For each human being the church is the guide to the Scriptures. In this sense the word of Augustine is and remains true, that he was moved by the church to believe the Scriptures. Protestant theologians, *Calv. Inst.* I 7, 3. Polanus, *Synt.* p. 30. Turretinus, *de S. Scr. auctoritate, disp.* 3 § 13 s. Gerhard, *Loci theol.* I c.

3 § 51 have weakened this word of Augustine, by making it refer only to the past, to the origin of faith. But the reasoning of Augustine t. a. p. is clear. He puts his Manichean opponent in a dilemma: Either you say to me, "Believe the Catholics," but they are the ones who are warning me to believe you, or you don't believe the Catholics, but then you can't appeal to me with the Gospel, quia ipsi Evangelio, catholicis praedicantibus, credidi. For Augustine the Church is indeed a motive of faith, which he uses here against the manichester. But there is a difference between motive and last ground of faith. How he sees the Church as a motive of faith, he clarifies elsewhere, C. Faustum lib. 32 c. 19 when he says: cur non potius evangelicae auctoritati, tam fundatae, tam stabilitae, tanta gloria diffamatae atque ab apostolorum temporibus usque ad nostra tempora per successiones certissimas commendatae, non te subdis? Cf. de util. cred. c. 14. The church with its dignity, its power, its hierarchy etc. always made a deep impression on Augustine. It continually stirred him to faith, it supported and strengthened him in doubt and struggle, it was the firm hand that always guided him to the Scriptures. But Augustine does not mean by this that the authority of Scripture depends on the Church, that it is the final and deepest ground of his faith. Elsewhere he says clearly that Scripture has authority by itself and must be believed for its own sake, Clausen, Augustine S. Scr. interpre 1827. p. 125. Dorner, Augustine, Berlin 1873. S. 237 f. Reuter, Augustinische Studiën, Gotha 1887 S. 348 f. Schmidt, Jahrb. f. deut-sche Theol. VI 235 f. Hase, Protest. Polemik 5te Aufl. Leipzig 1891 S. 81. Harnack D. G. III 70 f.

The Church has and will continue to have a rich and deep paedagogical significance for every believer until his death. The cloud of witnesses that surrounds us can strengthen and encourage us in our struggle. But this is quite different from saying that the authority of Scripture would depend on the Church. Rome does not even dare to express this openly. The Vatican recognized the books of the Old and New Testament as canonical, propterea quod Spiritu S inspirante conscripti Deum autorem habent and as such handed down to the Church. And the Roman theologians make a distinction

between the authority of Scripture quoad se and quoad nos. But that distinction cannot apply here. For if the Church is the last and deepest ground on which I believe the Scriptures, then that Church, and not the Scriptures, is *αντοπιστος*. And now one of the two: Scripture contains a testimony, a teaching about itself, about its inspiration and authority, and then the church does nothing but accept and confirm that testimony; or Scripture itself does not teach such inspiration and authority, and then the dogma of the church about Scripture is judged for the Protestant. The Roman theologians therefore find themselves in no small contradiction. On the one hand they try to demonstrate the inspiration and authority of Scripture in its teaching; and on the other hand, when they come to the teaching of the Church, they try to weaken these evidences and to show that only the testimony of the Church gives an irrefutable certainty. If, on the other hand, the authority depends quoad se on Scripture itself, it is also quoad nos, the final ground of our faith. The church can only acknowledge what is there; it cannot make what is not there. The accusation that in this way a circle is formed and Scripture is proven by Scripture itself can be levelled at Rome itself, because it proves the Church by Scripture and Scripture by the Church. If Rome points out that in the first case she does not use Scripture as the word of God, but as human, credible and reliable testimony, then the Protestant theologian may also accept this remark: first, inspiration is derived from Scripture as reliable testimony, and then Scripture is proved with it as the word of God. But much more important is the fact that in every scientific discipline, and thus also in theology, the principia are established by themselves. The truth of a principium cannot be argued, but only acknowledged. *Principium creditur propter se, non propter aliud. Principii principium haberi non potest nee quaeri debet*, Gerhard, *Loc. theol.*

1 cap. Zanchius, *Op.* VIII 339 sq. Polanus, *Synt.* I cap. 23 sq. Turret. *Theol. el. loc.* 2 qu. 6. Trelocatius, *Schol, et method, loc. comm.* S. *Theol. Institutio* 1651 p. 26.

The Scriptures themselves, therefore, clearly teach that it is not the church but the word of God, written or unwritten, that is αἰτοπιστος. The Church has always been bound by the Word of God, inasmuch as it existed and in the form in which it existed. Israel received the Law on Horeb, Jesus and the Apostles submitted to the O. T. Scriptures, and the Christian Church from the beginning was bound by the spoken and written word of the Apostles. The word of God is the foundation of the church, Deut. 4:1; Isa. 8:20; Ezek. 20:19; Luke 16:29; John 5:39; Eph. 2:20; 2 Tim. 3 : 14 ; 2 Pet. 1 : 19 etc. The church can testify of the word, but the word is above her. She can give no one the faith of the word of God in their heart. This can only be done by the word of God, through itself and the power of the Holy Spirit, Jer. 23:29; Mk. 4:28; Luke 8:11; Rom. 1:16; Heb. 4:12; 1 Pet. 1:23. And by this alone the church appears to be below the Scriptures. Therefore, the church and the faithful can learn the inspiration, authority, and canonicity of the Scriptures from itself, but they can never proclaim and establish these on their own. The Reformation preferred some uncertainty to certainty, which could only be obtained by an arbitrary decision of the church. For indeed the Scriptures nowhere give a catalog of the books which they contain. There have been differences of opinion about some of the books in the oldest Christian Church and also later. The text does not possess that integrity which Luther and the Reformed theologians desired so much. But nevertheless the Reformation maintained the autopsy of Scripture against the claims of Rome, subordinated the church to the word of God, and thus saved the freedom of the Christian.

5. In addition to this difference between Rome and the Reformation concerning the authority of Scripture, in the 17th century there was in the Protestant churches themselves an important struggle concerning the nature of that authority. It was agreed that Scripture, because it had God as its author, was entitled to an auctoritas divina. This authority was further defined by the fact that Scripture had to be believed and obeyed by all, and was the only rule of faith and life. This description, however, led naturally to the distinction between an

auctoritas historica and an auctoritas normativa. The revelation of God is given in the form of a history; it has passed through various ages. Not everything that is recorded in Scripture has normative authority for our faith and life. Much of what was commanded and instituted by God, or prescribed and ordained by prophets and apostles, no longer concerns us directly and related to earlier living persons. The commandment to Abraham to sacrifice his son, the commandment to Israel to slay all Canaanites, the ceremonial and civil laws in force in the days of the O. T., the regulations of the synod at Jerusalem and so much more are certainly still useful as history for teaching and admonishing, but they cannot and must not be obeyed by us anymore. And not only that, but revelation has recorded in its description not only the good works of the saints but also the evil deeds of the wicked. So there are many words and actions in Scripture which are presented as historically true but not as normative; so far from being the rule for our faith and life, they should rather be rejected and disapproved of. The sins of the saints, of Abraham, Moses, Job, Jeremiah, Peter, etc., are also given as warnings, not as examples. And finally, with many persons, with the patriarchs, Deborah, the judges, the kings, the friends of Job, Hanna, Agur, the mother of Lemuel, the poets of some psalms, such as the curse psalms ps. 73 : 13, 14, 77 : 7-9, 116 : 11, and further with Zechariah, Simeon, Mary, Stephen, etc., the question must be asked, whether their words were inspired only formally, as regards their conception, or also factually, as regards their content. Voetius judged that many of these persons, like Job and his friends, could not be counted among the prophets, and maintained this opinion against Maresius, Voetius, Disp. I 31, 40-44. V 634-640. Maresius, Theologus paradoxus p. 83-87, and further Maccovius, Loci Comm. p. 31-32, Cloppenburg, de canone theol. disp. 3 Op. II 18-23. Witsius, Misc. Sacra I 316-318. Moor, Comm. in Marckii Comp. I 131-134. Carpzovius, Critica S. Vet. Test. I c. 2 § 3. This question, though it had no further consequences, was nevertheless important in many respects. It first brought into clear consciousness that there is a distinction between the word of God in a formal and the word of God in a material sense, and forced us to consider the relationship

between the two. Now, that relationship was certainly considered too dualistic by most of the above-mentioned theologians. The *auctoritas historiae* and the *historia normae* cannot be separated in Scripture in such an abstract way. The formal and material meaning of the word of God are far too closely related. Also in the lying words of Satan and the evil deeds of the wicked God has something to say to us. Scripture is not only useful for teaching but also for warning and exhortation. It teaches and corrects us, both by deterring 'and by exhorting, both by shaming and by comforting. But this distinction made it clear that Scripture cannot and must not be understood as a code of articles. Appeal to a text out of context is not enough for a dogma. Revelation, laid down in Scripture, is a historical and organic whole. That is how it should be read and explained. And therefore the dogma, which comes to us with authority and wants to be the rule for our faith and life, must be based on and derived from the whole organism of Scripture. The authority of Scripture is different from that of a state law.

6. The nature and basis of the authority of Scripture, however, have been the subject of discussion, especially in the newer theology. In former times the authority of Scripture rested on its inspiration and was given by that inspiration. But when inspiration was relinquished, the authority of Scripture could no longer be maintained. Various attempts were made, but it was necessary to change both the basis and the character of the authority of the Scriptures. The authority of Scripture, in so far as it was still recognized, was founded on the fact that it is the authentic record of Revelation; that it expresses the Christian idea most purely, just as the water is purest at its source; that it is the fulfilment of the Old Testament idea of salvation, and that it contains the Christian doctrine entirely, though also in its germ; and that it is the beginning and constant renewal of the Christian spirit in the church. These and similar considerations for the authority of Scripture can be found in theologians of the most diverse persuasions, such as Scholten. L.H.K. I 78 v. Saussaye, *mytheol. of Ch. d. 1. S. 53 v. Schleiermacher, Gl. § 129 f. Rothe, Zur Dogm. S. 166 f. Lipsius, Dogm. § 193 f. Biedermann, Dogm. § 193 f.*

Schweizer, *Christi. Gl.* I S. 178 f. Hofmann, Weiss, u. Erf. III 98 f. Ritschl, *Rechtf. u. Vers.* II 5 f. 9 f. etc. Yet all these grounds are not solid enough, to carry an authority, as religion needs. They may qualify as *motiva credibilitatis*, but as grounds they are untenable. For in the first place, by distinguishing between revelation and its record, between the word of God and Scripture, they render the authority of Scripture entirely illusory. For if not Scripture as a whole, but only the word of God within it, the religious-ethical, the revelation, or whatever one wishes to call it, has authority, then each one has to determine for himself what that word of God in Scripture is, and each one determines this as he sees fit. The centre of gravity is transferred from the object to the subject; Scripture does not criticize man, but man judges Scripture; the authority of Scripture depends on man's good will; it exists only insofar as one is willing to acknowledge it, and is therefore annulled altogether. But even if all these grounds could find some authority for Scripture, it would still be none other than a purely historical authority. And this is insufficient in religion. Here historical, i. e. human and fallible authority is not enough. Since religion touches our salvation and is connected with our eternal interests, nothing less than divine authority is sufficient for us. We must not only know that Scripture is the historical record of our knowledge of Christianity, and that it contains and represents most purely the original Christian ideas; but in religion we must know that Scripture is the word and truth of God. Without this certainty there is no comfort in living and in dying. And not only does every Christian need this assurance, but also the church itself as an institution cannot lack this certainty. For if a preacher lacks conviction of the divine truth of the word he proclaims, his preaching loses all authority, influence and power. If he has no divine message to bring, who gives him the right to perform for people of the same movements as he? Who gives him the freedom to place himself above them in the pulpit, to occupy them with the highest interests of the soul and of life and even to announce to them an eternal good or an eternal evil? Who would dare to do so, and who would be able to do so, except he who has the word of God to proclaim? Christian faith and Christian preaching both require a

divine authority on which they rely. *Titubabit fides, si divinarum scrip- turarum vacillat auctoritas*, Aug. de doctr. Christ. I 37.

Hence it cannot meet with approval either, when the nature of the authority of Scripture is described as moral. Lessing began by saying that something is not true because it is in the Bible, but because it is true. Since his plea for deliverance from the authority of the letter and the paper pope, belief on authority has been ridiculed in all kinds of ways. Christian theologians have allowed themselves to be influenced by this and modified or opposed the belief in authority. Doedes, for example, *Inl. tot de leer van God*, 1880 bl. 29-40 wants to know nothing of believing on authority and speaks only of moral authority in religion. Saussaye, *My Theol. of Ch. d. 1. S. 53 v.* explains that there is no other but moral authority and that the moral is entirely authority. There is no intellectual authority, but moral authority is morality, religion itself. One does not believe the truth on authority, but the truth has authority, i.e. the right to obey it. This idea, however, suffers from a confusion of concepts. Truth has authority, certainly; no one denies it. But the question is: what is truth in the religious sphere, and where can it be found? There are only two possible answers to this question. Either what the truth is, or who Christ is, as the apostles and Scriptures tell us, or it is determined by the judgment, reason and conscience of each individual. In the latter case, there is no longer any authority of the Scriptures; they are entirely subject to the criticism of the subject. Then it is of no avail, to say with Rothe, *Zur Dogm.* 287, that the Bible is the perfectly adequate instrument for arriving at a pure knowledge of God's revelation. For there is no objective standard in Scripture by which that revelation can be judged and found. Indeed, there is only one ground on which the authority of Scripture can rest, and that is its inspiration. If this is lost, the authority of Scripture is also lost. It then contains only human writings, which as such have no title to be normative for our faith and life. And with Scripture, for the Protestant, all authority in religion falls. All attempts to find some authority again, e.g., in the person of Christ, in the church, in religious experience, in reason or conscience, end in disappointment,

Stanton, *The place of authority in matters of religious belief*, London Longmans 1891. James Martineau, *The seat of authority in religion*, London Longmans 1891. C. A. Briggs, *The authority of H. Scriptures. Inaugural address*, 4 ed. New-York Scribner, 1892. L. Monod, *Le problème de l'autorité*, Paris Fischbacher 1892. E. Doumergue, *L'autorité en matière de foi*, Lausanne Payot 1892. E. Ménégoz, *L'autorité de Dieu, réflexions sur l'autorité en matière de foi*. Paris Fischbacher 1892. G. Godet, *Vinet et l'autorité en matière de foi*, *Revue de théol. et de philos.* Mars 1893 p. 173-191. They only prove, that a religion without authority cannot exist. Religion is essentially distinct from science. It has a certainty of its own; not such a one as is based on insight, but one that exists in faith, in trust. And this religious faith and trust can only rest in God and His Word. In religion, a *testimonium humanum* and a *fides humana* are insufficient; here we need a testimony of God on which we can rely in life and death. *Inquietum est cor nostrum, donec requiescat in Te!* Rightly then also says Harnack, *D. G.* III 73, es hat in der Welt keinen starken religiösen Glauben gegeben, der nicht an irgend einem entscheidenden Punkt sich auf eine aussere Autoriteit berufen hatte. Nur in den biassen Ausführungen der Religionsphilosophen oder in den polemischen Entwürfen protestantischer Theologen wird ein Glaube construiert, der seine Gewissheit lediglich den eigenen inneren Momenten entnimmt. Cf. also P. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Certainty and Doubt* 1893 p. 138 v. The right and value of authority in religion is slowly being recognized again.

7. But, even if religion alone can suffice with an *auctoritas divina*, the nature of that authority still needs to be further examined. Generally speaking, authority is the power of someone who has something to say; the right to have a say in some matter, hence in Dutch "geweld", "macht", "Woordenboek der Ned. Taal s. v." There can only be authority between unequals; it always expresses a relationship between a superior and his inferior, between a superior and his inferior. Because there is no equality among people but all kinds of difference, there can be authority among them. And because that inequality is so great and so manifold, authority occupies a very wide

place among men. It is even the foundation of human society. Whoever undermines it, works towards the destruction of society. It is therefore foolish and dangerous to put faith in authority in a ridiculous light. Augustine already asked: *Si quod nescitur credendum non est, quomodo serviant parentibus liberi eosque mutua pietate diligant, quos parentes suos esse non credant* *Multa possunt afferri quibus ostendatur, nihil omnino humanae societatis incolume remanere, si nihil credere statuerimus, quod non possumus tenere perceptum, de util. cred. 12.* In every area we live by authority. Under authority we are born and brought up in house–family, society and state. Parents have authority over their children, the master over his pupils, the government over its subjects. In all these cases authority is clear. It expresses a power that belongs to one person over another by right. It therefore acts with orders and laws, demands obedience and submission, and in the case of rebellion even has the right of coercion and punishment. But we extend this concept of authority further and also apply it to science and art. Here too there is a distinction between gifts, and the relationship between superiors and subordinates, between magistri and discipuli, arises. There are men who have acquired mastery in one area or another through their genius and diligent work, and who can therefore speak with authority in this area. From the discoveries of these magistri the lesser, the laymen, live and learn. Yes, because of the incredible expansion of science, even the best can only be magister in a very small area; in everything else he is a disciple and must rely on the research of others. This authority in science and art, however, is of a different nature from that of parents, teachers and government; it is not legal, but ethical; it cannot and should not coerce, it has no right to punishment. The persons who act with authority here may be so distinguished and important; their testimony is only as valid as the grounds on which they can give it. The authority therefore does not rest in the persons, so that an *ipse dixit* would be sufficient, but rests in the evidence on which their claim is based. And since all men have received some understanding and judgment, blind faith is impermissible here and the pursuit of independent insight, in so far as necessary and possible, is a duty.

This is also true of history. The knowledge of history is actually based entirely on authority, on the testimony of others, but these testimonies need not be believed blindly. In a word, in scientiis tantum valet auctoritas humana, quantum rationes.

We finally find this concept of authority also in religion and theology. Here authority is needed not to a lesser degree but to a much greater degree than in family and society, in science and art. Here it is a necessity of life. Without authority and faith, religion and theology cannot exist for a moment. But authority here has a character all of its own. It must of course be an *auctoritas divina*. And already this distinguishes it from authority in society and the state, in science and art. It differs from the latter mainly in that in science and art one's own judgement may be exercised and decisions taken. But in a *divina auctoritas* this is not appropriate. When God has spoken, all doubt is gone. The *divina auctoritas* is therefore not moral, at least not in the sense in which we speak of the moral supremacy of a person, because religion is not a relationship of an inferior to his superior, but of a creature to his Creator, of a subject to his Sovereign, of a child to his Father. God has the right to command man and to demand unconditional obedience from him. His authority rests in his being, not in the *rationes*. In this respect, the respect of God and His Word corresponds to that of the government in the state and of the father in the family. And there is nothing humiliating in it, and nothing that in any way diminishes man's freedom, if he listens childishly to the word of God and obeys it. To take God at his word, i.e., on authority, is as little in conflict with man's dignity as it is dishonoring for a child to rely on the word of his father with unlimited confidence. And so much the better, that the Christian should gradually grow beyond this authority, Schweizer, *Christi. Glaub.* I 186 f., that he will take God at his word, denying all his own wisdom. Here on earth the believer never surpasses the point of faith and authority. The more he grows in faith, the more firmly he clings to the authority of God in His Word. But on the other hand there is also a great difference between the authority of God in religion and that of a father in his family and of a government in the state. A father, if necessary, forces

his child and brings it to submission by punishment; and the government does not carry the sword in vain. Coercion is inseparable from the authority of earthly government. But God does not compel. His revelation is a revelation of grace. And in it He does not come to man with commandments and demands, with coercion and punishment, but with an invitation, with an exhortation, with the plea to be reconciled with Him. God could act as Sovereign towards mankind. One day He will judge as Judge all those who have disobeyed the Gospel of His Son. But in Christ He comes down to us, becomes like us in all things, deals with us as rational and moral beings; and then, again, in the face of hostility and unbelief, resumes His sovereignty, executes His counsel and prepares to receive glory from all creation. The authority with which God acts in religion is thus entirely peculiar. It is not human but divine. It is sovereign and yet works in a moral manner. It does not compel, and yet it knows how to maintain itself. It is absolute and yet is resisted. It demands and prays, and yet is invincible.

And such is the authority of Scripture. As the word of God it stands high above all authority of men in state and society, in science and art. For it everything else must give way. For one must obey God' more than men. All other authority is limited within its circle and applies only to its own domain. But the authority of Scripture extends over the whole of mankind. It is above reason and will, above heart and conscience; it is not to be compared with any other authority. Its authority is absolute, because it is divine. It has the right to be believed and obeyed by everyone at all times. In its majesty it far exceeds all other powers. But it does not call upon anyone to help it gain recognition and rule over itself. It does not need the strong arm of the government. It does not need the support of the Church. It does not call upon the sword and the Inquisition. It does not want to rule by force or violence. It wants free and willing recognition. And therefore she brings about that herself, in a moral way, by the working of the Holy Spirit. Scripture guards its own authority. That is why people used to speak of an *auctoritas causativa*

of Scripture, qua Scripture assensum credendorum in intellectu hominis generat et confirmat, Schmid, Dogm. der ev. luth. K. § 8.

C. The necessity of Scripture.

8. In the authority of Scripture there is great agreement among the Christian Churches, but in the three other characteristics which now follow there is considerable difference. Rome, because of the relation which it assumes between Scripture and church, cannot see or acknowledge the necessitas S. Scripturae. With Rome, the Church is αυτοπιστος, self-sufficient, living out of and through the Holy Spirit; it has the truth and preserves it faithfully and purely through the infallible teaching office of the Pope. Scripture, on the other hand, which springs from the Church, may be useful and good as norma, but it is not principium of truth. It is not necessarily ad esse ecclesiae. In fact, the Church does not have Scripture, but Scripture needs the Church for its authority, completion, interpretation, etc. The grounds for this teaching are found in it. The grounds for this doctrine are derived from the fact that the church before Moses and the first Christian congregation had no Scriptures, and that many believers under the O. and also still under the N. Test, never possessed and read the Scriptures but lived solely by tradition, Bellarminus, de verbo Dei IV c. 4. Heinrich, Dogm. I 735 f. Liebermann, Instit. theol. 1857 I p. 4-49 sq. Dieringer, Lehrb. der kath. Dogm. 4-e Aufl. 633. Gutberlet, Lehrb. der Apol. III 1894 S. 221 f. Jansen, Prael. theol. I 786 sq. etc.

But not only Rome disputes the necessity of the Scriptures in this way; all kinds of mystical directions have also weakened and misunderstood the significance of Scripture for the church and theology. Gnosticism not only rejected the O. T. but applied to the N. T. the allegorical method and thereby tried to bring its system into line with Scripture. The sensory forms and historical facts have only symbolic significance; they are a colouring, which is necessary for people from a lower point of view, but is not necessary for the more highly educated, the πνευματικοί. Scripture is not a source of truth,

but only a means to elevate oneself to the higher standpoint of gnosis, Herzog² 5, 209 f. Harnack, D. G. I 214 f. Montanism introduced a new revelation, which completed and improved that of the N. T. Montanism, especially in its moderate form with Tertullian, on the one hand wanted nothing new and to maintain the authority of Scripture in full; and on the other hand it welcomed in Montanus a prophet in whom the Paraclete promised by Jesus, the last and highest revelation, had appeared. In this way Scripture had to give way to the new prophecy, which Montanus proclaimed, Harnack, D. G. I 353 f. Herzog² 10, 258 f. The church condemned these directions, and the church fathers fought against this spiritualism. Augustinus wrote against it in the prologue to his book the *doctrina Christiana* ; but still Augustine also assumed that the pious, especially the monks, could be equipped with such a degree of faith, hope and love, that they could do without the Scriptures for themselves and live without them in solitude, the *doctr. christ.* I c. 39. Spiritualism emerged again and again, reacting against the pinching power of church and tradition. Several sects, the Cathars, Amalrik of Bena, Joachim v. Floris, the brothers and sisters of the free spirit and later the Libertines in Geneva, considered that after the era of the Fathers and the Sons, that of the Holy Spirit had arrived, in which all lived by the Spirit and no longer needed the external means of Scripture and the church, Kurtz, *Lehrb. der Kirchengesch.* § 108, 116. Reuter, *Gesch. der relig. Aufklärung im M. A.* II 198 f. Herzog² 2, 677. 6, 786. 8, 652 f. Hahn, *Gesch. der Ketzler im M. A.* II 420 f. III 72 f. Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, II, 2, 1826 S. 437 f. Hagenbach, *Kirchengesch. in Vorlesungen* II 1886 S. 480 f. Mysticism, which flourished in France and Germany in the Middle Ages, sought by means of askance, meditation and contemplation to attain a communion with God which Scripture could lack. Scripture was necessary as a ladder for climbing to this height, but became superfluous when unity with God, the *visio Dei*, was attained, Herzog¹ 12, 427 f. Harnack, D. G. III 374 f. The Anabaptists in particular elevated the inner word at the expense of the outer. Already in 1521 the opposition was made between Scripture and Spirit, and this opposition has become a lasting feature of

Anabaptism, Sepp, Kerkhist. Stud. Scripture is not the true word of God, but only a testimony and description; the real, true word is that which is spoken into our hearts by the Holy Spirit. The Bible is only a book of letters; it is Babel, full of confusion; it cannot work faith in the hearts, only the Spirit teaches us the true word. And if that Spirit teaches us, then we can do without Scripture; it is a temporary aid but not necessary for the spiritual man, A. Hegler, Geist u. Schrift bei Sebastian Franck, Freiburg 1892. J. H. Maronier, The inward word, Amst. 1890. Vigouroux, Les livres saints et la critique rationaliste, 3e ed. I 435-453. Hans Denck already identified that inner word with natural reason, and pointed out many contradictions in Scripture. Ludwig Hetzer did not consider Scripture necessary at all. Knipperdolling demanded at Munster that Holy Scripture should be abolished and one should live only by nature and spirit, Herz.2 10, 362. Mysticism turned into rationalism. The same phenomenon was seen later in the Anabaptist and Independent sects in England during the time of Cromwell, in the Quakers and in Pietism. The elevation of the internal over the external word has always led to the identification of the instruction of the Spirit with the natural light of reason and conscience, and thus to a complete rejection of revelation and Scripture. No one has more sharply contested the necessity of Scripture than Lessing in his *Axiomata* against Goeze. He, too, distinguishes between letter and spirit, Bible and religion, theology and religion, the Christian religion and the religion of Jesus, and now says that the latter existed and can exist independently of the former. Religion existed before the Bible. Christianity existed before the evangelists and apostles wrote. The religion they taught can exist, even if all their writings have been lost. Religion is not true because the evangelists and apostles taught it, but they taught it because it is true. Their writings may and must therefore be explained according to the internal truth of religion. An attack on the Bible is not an attack on religion. Luther liberated us from the yoke of tradition, who will liberate us from the even more unbearable yoke of the letter?

9. These thoughts about the non-necessity of Scripture were introduced into the newer theology mainly by Schleiermacher. In his Glaubenslehre § 128. 129 he says that faith in Christ does not rest on the authority of Scripture, but precedes the faith of Scripture and it is precisely Scripture which gives us a special prestige. For the first Christians, belief in Christ did not arise from Scripture, and it cannot arise from Scripture for us either. ground. Scripture, then, is not the source of religion, but it is the norm; it is the first member of the body of Christian writings, it is closest to the source, i.e., the revelation in Christ, and therefore was in little danger of containing impure elements. But all the writings of the evangelists and apostles, as well as all subsequent Christian writings, originated from one and the same Spirit, the Jointist of the Christian Church. The Church is not built on the Scriptures, but the Scriptures originated from the Church. Through Schleier-Macher these thoughts have become the common property of the newer theology. They seem so true and so self-evident that no doubt or criticism is thought of. Virtually all theologians hold the view that the church existed before Scripture and therefore can exist independently of it. The Church rests in itself; it lives by itself, i.e., by the Spirit who dwells in it. The Holy Scriptures, which originated from her in the freshness of her youth, are norma but not a source. The source is the personal, living Christ, who dwells in the congregation; dogmatics is a description of the life, an explanation of the religious consciousness of the congregation, and is guided by the Scriptures, which have first and most clearly expressed that life. Thus the church is actually the Verfasserin der Bibel, and the Bible is the Reflex der Gemeinde, Lange, Philos. Dogm. § 77. Rothe, Zur Dogm. 333 f. Frank, Syst. der chr. Gewissheit II 57 f. Philippi, Kirchl. Glaub. I 3 190 f. Hofstede de Groot, De Gron. Godg. 71 v. 97 v. Saussaye, mijne Theol. van d. 1. S. 49 v. Gunning and de la Saussaye Jr. The ethical principle of theol. 34. etc.

All these thoughts, of Rome, Anabaptism, Mysticism, Rationalism, of Lessing, Schleiermacher, etc., are closely related to each other. Schleiermacher in particular, by his reversal of the relationship between Scripture and church, has given Rome powerful support. All

agree that Scripture is not necessary but at most useful and that the church can exist of and through itself. The only difference is that Rome seeks the basis and the possibility for the continued existence of the Christian religion in the institutional Church, i. e. in the infallible Pope, Schleiermacher et al. in the congregation as an organism, i. e. in the religious community, and mysticism and rationalism in the religious individuals. All seek the continuity of the Church in the guidance of the Holy Spirit, in the indwelling of Christ, but this has with Rome its organ in the Pope, with Schleiermacher in the organism of the congregation, with Anabaptism in the believer head by head. It is easy to see that Rome occupies the strongest position here. Christ has risen from the dead, lives in heaven, and lives and works in His Church on earth. There is a mystical union between Christ and His body. The word alone is insufficient; the principium externum also demands a principium internum. Protestantism knew all this very well and professed it wholeheartedly. But the question was whether or not the church was bound by the word and the Scriptures for the conscious life of religion. Religion is not only a matter of the heart, the mind, the will, but also of the head. God must also be served and loved with the mind. For the conscious life, therefore, the church must have a source from which it draws the truth. Now Rome and its infallible Pope can claim that Scripture is not necessary. The infallibility of the church does indeed make Scripture superfluous. But Protestantism has no infallible body, either in the institution or in the organism or in the individual members of the congregation. When it denies the necessity of Scripture, it weakens itself, strengthens Rome, and loses the truth, which is an indispensable element of religion. That is why the Reformation insisted so strongly on the necessity of the Scriptures. Scripture was the Ἰὸς μοι πού στῶ of the Reformation. She succeeded, because vaj could set against the authority of church, councils, and pope the authority of God's holy word. Whoever leaves this standpoint of Reformation, unconsciously works on the construction of Rome. For if it is not Scripture but the Church that is necessary for the knowledge of religious truth, then the Church becomes the indispensable medium gratiae. The word loses its

central place and retains only a praeparate, pedagogical significance. Scripture may be useful and good, but it is not necessary, either for the Church as a whole or for the believers in particular.

10. Although the Reformation thus sought its power in Scripture against Rome and maintained its necessity, it did not deny that the church before Moses had existed for centuries without Scripture. It is also true that the church of the N. T. was founded by the preaching of the apostles and existed for a long time without a New Testament canon. Furthermore, the' church is still nourished and planted in the heathen world by the preaching of the gospel. The books of the Old Testament and the New Testament have also come into being gradually; they were distributed in small numbers before the advent of printing; many believers have died in earlier and later times without ever having read and examined the Scriptures, and religious life still seeks satisfaction for its needs not only in the Scriptures but at least as much in all kinds of edifying reading. All this may be fully acknowledged, without in any way undermining the necessity of the Scriptures. Indeed, God, had He pleased, could certainly have preserved the church from the truth in some other way than by means of a written word. The necessity of Scripture is not absolute but *ex hypothesi beneplacentiae Dei*.

But understood in this way, this necessity is nevertheless beyond all doubt. Man has always lived only by the word that goes out through the mouth of God, Mt. 4:4. The word of God has been the seed of the church from the beginning. Certainly, before Moses, the church existed without Scripture. But there was a *verbum áγραφον*, before it became *έγγραφον*. The church never lived by itself and rested in itself, but always through the word of God. Rome does not teach this either, but adopts a tradition that infallibly preserves the word of God. But this must be said against those who allow revelation to exist only in life, in the infusion of divine powers, in the awakening of religious emotions. The Church may thus be older than the written word, but she is nevertheless younger than the spoken word, Zanchius, Op. VIII 25

343 sq. Polanus, Synt. theol. I c. 15. Synopsis pur. theol., disp. 2. Gerhard, Loci theol. I cap. 1 § 5 sq. The common assertion, that the church of the N. T. existed for a long time without Scripture, must also be properly understood. It is true that the canon of the N. T. Scriptures was not generally recognized until the second half of the second century. But the Christian congregations had the Old Testament from the beginning. They were founded by the spoken word of the apostles. Very soon many congregations came into possession of Apostolic writings, which were also given to others to read, soon served for reading in the churches, and very soon became widespread. It goes without saying that, as long as the Apostles lived and visited the churches, no distinction was made between their spoken and written word; tradition and Scripture were still as it were one. But when the first period was over and the distance from the apostles increased, the writings of the apostles rose in importance, and their necessity gradually increased. Indeed, the *necessitas S. Scripturae* is not a stable but an ever-growing property. Scripture was not always necessary in its entirety for the whole church. Scripture was gradually created and completed. As revelation progressed, it also increased in size. Each period of the church had enough of that part of Scripture which existed at the time, just as it had enough of the revelation which had come so far. Scripture, like Revelation, is an organism that has grown; in the seed was the plant, in the germ was the fruit. Both, Revelation and Scripture, kept pace with the state of the Church and vice versa. Therefore, no conclusion for the present can be drawn from the past state of the church. Let the Church before Moses have been without Scripture; let the Church before the consummation of Revelation never have been in possession of the whole Scripture; from this follows nothing for that dispensation of the Church in which we live in which Revelation has ended and Scripture has been completed. For this dispensation Scripture is not useful and good only, but also absolutely necessary *ad esse ecclesiae*.

11. Scripture is the only sufficient means to preserve the spoken word unadulterated and to make it the property of all people. *Vox audita*

perit, littera scripta manet. The shortness of life, the unfaithfulness of the memory, the deceitfulness of the heart and all kinds of other dangers that threaten the purity of the tradition, make it absolutely necessary to record the spoken word for preservation and dissemination. This applies even more to the word of revelation. For the Gospel is not after man; it is diametrically opposed to his thoughts and desires; it stands as divine truth against his lie. Moreover, the revelation is not intended for one generation and one time, but for all peoples and centuries. It must complete its course through all mankind and to the end of time. The truth is one, Christianity is Universal religion. How else can this destiny of the word of revelation be achieved, than by its being recorded and described? The church cannot perform this service of the word. Nowhere is her infallibility promised. She is always referred in Scripture to the objective word, to the law and to the testimony. Actually, even Rome does not claim this. The Church, i.e. the assembly of the faithful, is not infallible with Rome, nor is the assembly of bishops, but only the Pope. The Pope's declaration of infallibility is proof for the Reformation of the unreliability of tradition, the fallibility of the Church, and even the necessity of Scripture. For this declaration of infallibility implies that the truth of the word of revelation is not or cannot be preserved by the Church as an assembly of the faithful, since it too is still subject to error, but can only be explained by a special assistance of the Holy Spirit, in which the Pope, according to Roman claims, shares. Rome and the Reformation thus agree that the word of revelation in and for the church can only be preserved purely by the institution of the apostleship, i.e. by inspiration. And the dispute is only about whether that apostolate has ceased or is continued in the pope. On the other hand, the claim of Vermittlungstheologie is completely untenable, that Scripture originated from the Church and that she is therefore the author of the Bible. This can only be claimed if one disregards the proper office of the prophets and apostles, identifies inspiration with regeneration, and completely separates Scripture from Revelation. According to the teaching of Scripture, however, inspiration is a special act of the Holy Spirit, a special gift to prophets and apostles,

by which they were able to transmit the word of God to the Church of all ages in a pure and uncorrupted manner. Thus, Scripture did not originate in the Church, but was given to the Church by a special activity of the Holy Spirit in the prophets and apostles. Scripture belongs also to the revelation, which was given by God to His people. In this Home and the Reformation are unanimous. But the Reformation holds against Home, that this special activity of the Holy Spirit has now ceased, i. e. that the apostolate no longer exists and is not continued in the Pope. The apostles have laid down their testimony regarding Christ completely and purely in the Holy Scriptures. Through them they have made God's revelation the property of mankind. The Scriptures are the Word of God given to the world in its entirety. It makes that word universal and eternal, it removes it from error and falsehood, from oblivion and transience. As mankind grows larger, life shorter, memory weaker, knowledge 'greater, error more serious and falsehood more triumphant, the necessitas S. Scripturae increases. In every field, writing and the press gained in significance. The art of printing was a giant step to heaven and hell. Scripture also shares in this development. Its necessity is becoming more and more apparent. It is spread and made common property as never before. It is translated into hundreds of languages. It comes under everyone's eye and into everyone's hand. More and more it appears to be the suitable means to bring the truth to the knowledge of all people. The fact that for many people religious literature remains the main food for their spiritual life, proves nothing against the necessity of the Scriptures. For all Christian truth is drawn directly or indirectly from it. Even the derived stream receives its water from the source. It is an untenable claim that any Christian truth can be reached today without the Scriptures. In the first century such a thing was possible, but now the currents of tradition and Scripture have long since flowed together and the former has long been absorbed into the latter.

Rome can only maintain this by its doctrine of the continuance of the apostolate and the infallibility of the Pope. But for a Protestant this is

impossible. The Christian character of truth can only be argued by the fact that it is rooted with all its fibers in the Scriptures. There is no knowledge of Christ except through Scripture, no communion with Him except through the word of the apostles. Cf. ũrsinus, Tract, theol. p. 1 sq. Zanchius, Op. VIII 343 sq. Polanus, Synt. Theol. i c. 15. Synopsis pur. theol., disp. 2. Turretinus, Theol. el. loc. 2, qu. 1-3. Heppe, Dogm. der ev. ref. K. 25, 26 etc.

12. Even if the necessity of Scripture is recognized, there may be differences as to how long it is needed. Even those who think that the Scriptures have had their day will readily agree that in their day they have been of great value to the education of men and nations. But in many ways the duration of that necessity has been limited. Gnosticism recognized her necessity for the ψυχικοί, but opposed it for the πνευματικοί. Mysticism considered Scripture necessary on the standpoint of cogitation and meditation, but no longer on that of comtemplation and visio Dei. The rationalism of Lessing and Kant gave revelation, Scripture and the statutory religion a pedagogical place, in order to prepare for the reign of the Vernunftreligion. Similarly, Hegel considered that the form of vision in religion was necessary for the people, but that the philosopher with his concepts no longer needed it. And again and again we hear it said that religion is good for the masses to keep them in check, but that the educated and civilized are far above that.

There is an unmistakable and glorious truth in this representation. Revelation, Scripture, the Church, the whole Christian religion, have indeed a temporary, praeparatal and paedagogic character. Just as the Old Testament economy of the foedus gratiae has passed away, so too this dispensation of the covenant of grace in which we live will one day belong to the past. When Christ has gathered His congregation and presented it to the Father as a pure bride, He will hand over the kingdom to God. Moreover, the duality of grace and nature, of revelation and reason, of authority and freedom, of theology and philosophy cannot last forever. The highest thing in religiQ consists in serving God without compulsion and without fear,

out of love alone, according to the verdict of our own nature. God himself in his revelation is concerned with forming human beings in whom his image is fully restored. He gave us not only his Son but also the Holy Spirit, that he might regenerate us, write his law in our hearts and make us capable of every good work. Rebirth, childhood, sanctification and glorification are the proofs that God raises His children to freedom, to a service of love that never fails. To that extent, the above-mentioned ideas can be called an anticipation of the future ideal. But they are nevertheless of a very dangerous nature. They are all based on a confusion between the present and the hereafter. Because the New Jerusalem will no longer need a sun or a moon, both will remain necessary here on earth. Because one day we will walk in beholding, faith remains indispensable in this dispensation. Although the warring church and the triumvirate are one, there are still differences in their situations and lives. The boundary cannot and must not be erased. We will never attain the heavenly life here on earth. We walk by faith and not by sight. We now see through a mirror in a dark place; only hereafter will we see face to face and know as we are known. The visio Dei is reserved for heaven. We will never be independent on this earth. We remain bound to the cosmos that surrounds us. The position of authority can never be overcome here on earth.

But furthermore, this doctrine of the temporal necessity of Scripture creates a deep chasm between the psychic and the pneumatic people, between the civilized and the masses, between the philosophers and the people. And such a gap has no right to exist in any respect. If religion consisted in knowledge, then the learned would enjoy a privilege over the uneducated. But religiously all men are alike; they have the same needs. In Christ there is no distinction between Greek and barbarian. Religion is the same for all men, however different their position, rank, education, etc., for in religion, that is, in the sight of God, all those distinctions of rank and privilege which make one among men stand out above others are worthless. The separation of these two types of people therefore testifies to a spiritual pride, which itself is in direct conflict with the nature of the

Christian religion, with the humility, humility, etc., which it demands. The tax collectors go before the Pharisees, and in the kingdom of heaven the least is most.

Then there would still be something to be said for this separation, if rationalism were right and revelation consisted of nothing but Vernunftwahrheiten. In that case they could be deduced later by thought from reason itself, although for the time being they are known from revelation. But Revelation has an entirely different content than rational teaching. It is history, it has grace as its content, the person of Christ as its center, the re-creation of mankind as its goal. All this can never be found by thinking or deduced from reason. To know such a revelation, Scripture remains necessary at all times. Even a revelation of God to each man, head by head, could not give what is given to all men by the revelation in Christ through Scripture. The historical character of Revelation, the fact and idea of the Incarnation, and the organic view of the human race demand a Scripture in which God's Revelation is contained for all mankind (cf. p. 299). Therefore it can now be decided, what was left open on p. 143, whether revelation comes to each person individually or is given to all by Scripture. As one sun illuminates the whole earth with her rays, so Christ is the ascendant from on high, appearing to those who sit in darkness and the shadow of death, and so the same Scripture is the light on all paths and the lamp for all feet. It is the word of God to all mankind. History itself bears powerful witness to this necessity of Scripture. The highly spiritual mysticism has time and again turned into the most vulgar rationalism; and the enthusiastic spiritualism has often ended in the coarsest materialism.

The necessitas S. Scripturae is demonstrated as strongly, in a negative sense, by the tendencies which oppose it as it is, in a positive sense, by the churches which profess it.

D. The clarity of Scripture.

13. Another important property that the Reformation ascribed to Scripture as opposed to Home was the perspicuitas. According to Home, Scripture is obscure, Ps. 119 : 34, 68; Luke 24 : 27 ; Acts 8 : 30; 2 Pet. 3 : 16. Also in those matters which are related to faith and life, it is not so clear that it can lack explanation. After all, it deals with the deepest connections, God, the Trinity, the Incarnation, predestination, etc., and even in the moral precepts, e.g., Mt. 5:34, 40, 10:27; Luke 12:33, 14:33, it is often so unclear that misunderstanding and misinterpretation has occurred at every moment in the Christian Church. To understand the Scriptures rightly it is necessary to have all kinds of knowledge of history, geography, chronology, archaeology, languages, etc., which is unattainable for laymen. The Protestants themselves write numerous commentaries and differ from one another in their exegesis of the most important texts. Therefore an interpretation of Scripture is necessary. This cannot be given by Scripture itself, it cannot be its own interpreter. Plato, Phaedrus p. 274, already said that the letter is mistreated and cannot help itself, and that it needs the help of its father. She is mute and cannot give a decision in a dispute. She is equal to the law, according to which the judge rules, but she is not law and judge at the same time. The learned Jesuit Jakob Gretser made a deep impression at the religious conference in Regensburg 1601 when he spoke thus: *Sumus in conspectu sacrae Scripturae et Spiritus Sancti. Pronuntiet sententiam. Et si dicat: tu Gretseri male sentis, cecidisti causa tua, tu Jacobe Heilbrunnere vicisti; tunc ego statim transibo ad vestrum scamnum. Adsit, adsit, adsit et condemnet me!* So there must be an interpreter and a judge, who gives a decision according to the Scriptures. If there is no such judge, then interpretation becomes entirely subjective; everyone judges according to his own will and considers his own individual view to be infallible. Every heretic has his letter. Everyone looks for the famous distich of Werenfels, in the Scriptures precisely his dogmata. Scripture is surrendered to all kinds of arbitrariness. Individualism, enthusiasm, rationalism, endless division is the end. And what is worst, if there is no infallible interpretation, then there is no absolute certainty of faith; the basis on which the hope of the Christian rests is

pious opinion, scientific insight, but not divine, infallible testimony. And so far removed from it is that anyone can form his own conviction or doctrine from the Holy Scriptures, that even the Protestants, like the Roman Catholics, live by tradition and rely on the authority of the church, synods, fathers, writers, etc.

Such an infallible, divine interpretation of Scripture, however, is given by God in His Church. It is not the dead, uncomprehended, obscure Scriptures left to themselves, but the Church, the living, ever-present, always renewing itself by the Spirit, that is the agent of truth and the infallible interpreter of the Scriptures. For each is the best interpreter of his own word. The true interpreter of Scripture is therefore the Holy Spirit, who is its author. And this has its infallible organ in the Church, or better still, in the Pope. The Church is in possession of the truth through tradition; she is guided by the same Spirit who gave birth to the Scriptures; she is related to them; she alone can understand their meaning; she is the pillar and anchor of the truth. So has the practice always been. Moses, the priests, Christ, the apostles declared and decided for the church, Ex. 18; Deut. 17:9ff; 2 Chr. 19:9ff; Eccles. 12:12; Hag. 2:2; Mal. 2:7; Mt. 16:19, 18:17, 23:2; Lu. 22:32 ; Jn. 21 :15 v.; Hd. 15:28 ; Gal. 2:2; 1 Cor. 12:8 v.; 2 Pet. 1:19; 1 Jn. 4:1, and popes and councils have followed suit. Therefore, the Trentsch council in sess. 4 it is established that no one is allowed to interpret Holy Scripture *contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesiae, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum Sanctarum, aut etiam contra unanimum consensum Patrum*, and thereby bound exegesis not only negatively, as some Roman Catholics try to interpret it, but very definitely positively as well. No one is allowed to give an exegesis other than the one given by the Church through her presidents, councils or popes. The *professio fidei* of Pius IV, by Denzinger, *Enchir. symb. et defin. n. 864* and the *Vaticanum sess. 3 cap. 2 alin. 4* leave no doubt in this regard. But not only through this doctrine of the obscurity of Scripture is scientific exegesis subject to the pope. Even more dependent and bound by it is the layman. Because of its obscurity, Scripture is not suitable reading for the laity. Without interpretation

it is incomprehensible to the people. That is why the transcription of Scripture into the vernacular and the reading of the Bible by the people has been increasingly restricted by Rome since the misuse that was made of it in the Middle Ages and later. Reading the Scriptures is not allowed to the laity except with the permission of the church authorities. The Protestant Bible Societies have been repeatedly condemned by the Popes, and in the Encyclical of 8 Dec. 1864 put on the same level with the socialist and communist societies, Denzinger, Enchir. n. 1566. And although the present pope in his Encyclical recommends the *studiis Sacrae Scripturae* the study of Scripture, but not to the laity, Vincentius Lerinensis, *Com-munitorium* cap. 3. Bellarminus, *de verbo Dei*, lib. III. M. Canus, *Loei Theol.* II cap. 6 sq. Perrone, *Praelect. theol.* IX 98 sq. Heinrich, *Dogm.* I 794 f. Möhler, *Symbolik* § 38 f. Jansen, *Prael. theol.* I 771 s. Herzog² art. *Bibellesen*.

14. The doctrine of the *perspicuitas S. Scr.* has been repeatedly misunderstood and misrepresented by both Protestants and Roman Catholics. It does not imply that the matters and subjects of Scripture are not mysteries far beyond the understanding of man. Nor does it claim that Scripture is clear in all its parts, so that no scientific exegesis is necessary. Nor does she mean that the Scriptures, also in their doctrine of salvation, are clear and unambiguous for every human being without distinction. But it only implies that that truth, the knowledge of which is necessary for salvation for everyone, is not presented on every page of Scripture with equal clarity, but is nevertheless presented throughout the whole of Scripture in such a simple and comprehensible form, that a person, whose concern is the salvation of his soul, can easily learn this truth from Scripture by his own reading and research, without the help and guidance of the Church or the priest. The way of salvation, not as regards the matter but as regards the *modus tradendi*, is clearly laid out for the longing reader. The *πῶς* he may not understand, the *οὐ* is nevertheless clear, Zwingli, *De claritate et certitudine verbi Dei*, Op. ed. Schuier et Schulthess I 65 sq. Luther at Köstlin, *Luther's Theol.* 2nd Ausg. 1883 II 58 f. Zanchius, *de Scr.*

Sacra, Op. Omnia VIII 407 sq. Chamier, Panstratia catholica 1626 Loc. 1 Lib. I cap. 13-32. Amesius, Bellarminus Enervatus. Amst. 1630, lib. 1 cap. 4 and 5. Turretinus, Theol. El. loc. 2 qu. 17. Trigland, Antapologia cap. 3. Synopsis pur. Theol. disp. 5. Gerhard, Loci Theol. loc. 1 cap. 20 sq. Glassius, Philologia Sacra 1691 p. 186 sq.

Thus understood, the perspicuitas is a property, which the Scriptures repeatedly praedicate of themselves. The Torah was given by God to all Israel, and Moses communicates all the words of the Lord to all the people. The law and the word of the Lord is not far from each one of them, but is a light on the path and a lamp for the foot, Deut. 30: 11; Ps. 19: 8, 9, 119: 105, 130; Spr. 6: 23. The prophets address themselves speaking and writing to all the people, Isa. 1 : 10 v., 5 : 3 v., 9 : 1, 40 : 1 v.; Jer. 2 : 4, 4 : 1, 10 : 1 ; Ezek. 3 : 1. Jesus speaks freely to all the multitudes, Mt. 5:1, 13 : 1, 2, 26 : 55, etc., and the apostles write to all the called saints, Bom. 1:7; 1 Cor. 1:2; 2 Cor. 1:1, etc., and take care of the propagation of their letters themselves, Col. 4:16. The written word is recommended for all to peruse, John 5:39; Acts 17:11 and is written precisely to give faith, patience, hope, consolation, instruction, etc., John 20:31; Rom 15:4; 2 Tim 3:16; 1 Jn 1:1ff. The faithful are themselves mature and able to judge, 1 Cor. 2:15, 10:15; 1 Jn. 2:20; 1 Pet. 2:9. The words of God are entrusted to them, Rom. 3:2. The Fathers of the Church therefore know nothing of the obscurity of Scripture in the later Roman sense. They often speak of the depths and mysteries of Scripture, cf. places with Bellarm. de verbo 'Dei III c. 1. Thus says Chrysostomus, hom. 3 de Lazaro, when he compares the writings of the prophets and apostles with those of the sages: Οἱ ὅτε ἀποστολοὶ καὶ οἱ προφῆται τουναντίον ἅπαν ἐποίησαν; βαφὴ γὰρ καὶ ὄηλα τὰρ αὐτῶν κατεῦθησαν ἀπαυτῶν, ἅτε κοινοὶ τῆς οἰκονομῆς ὄντες διδασκαλοὶ, ἵνα ἑαυτοὺς καὶ οἱ ἑάντου μαν!)ανεῖν ὄνηται ἐκ τῆς ἀναγνωσῆως μονῆς τὰ λεγομένα. And elsewhere, hom. 3 in 2 Thess. he says : πάντα <!αφὴ καὶ εὐ&εα τὰ naga τὰς &ειαὶς γραφαῖς, πάντα τὰ ἀναγκαῖα ὕηλα. Similarly, we read with Augustine, the doctr. chr. 2, 6 : nihil de illis obscuritatibus eruitur, quod non plenissime dictum alibi reperiatur, and ibid. 9 : in iis quae clare in scrip- turis tradita sunt, inveniuntur omnia, quae

continent fidem moresque vivendi. Known also is the word of Gregory I, in which he compares Scripture to a fluvius planus et altus, in quo et agnus ambulet et elephas natet. Even now Roman theologians must acknowledge that much in Scripture is so clear that not only can the believer understand it, but also the unbeliever, rejecting the clear sense, is inexcusable, Heinrich, Dogm. I 819. The Church Fathers did not think of forbidding the reading of Scripture to the laity. On the contrary, they always insisted on the study of the Holy Scriptures and told of the blessing they themselves received from the reading, Vigouroux, Les livres saints et la critique rationaliste, 3 ed. I 280 s. Gregory I still recommended the reading of Scripture to all the laity, Herzog 2, 376. The restriction of Bible reading only appeared when since the twelfth century various sects opposed to the church began to refer to Scripture. The opinion then prevailed that the Bible-reading of the laity was the main source of heresy. In self-defense Rome then taught the obscurity of Scripture more and more and bound its reading to the permission of the Church authorities.

15. Indeed, the Reformed churches have no more powerful weapon against Rome than Scripture. It deals the deadliest blows to ecclesiastical tradition and hierarchy. The doctrine of the perspicuitas S. Scr. is one of the most solid bulwarks of the Reformation. It most certainly brings with it its grave dangers. Protestantism is hopelessly divided by it. Individualism has developed at the expense of the community spirit. The free reading and examination of Scripture has been and is abused by all kinds of parties and directions in the worst way. Yet the disadvantages do not outweigh the advantages. For the denial of the clarity of Scripture implies the submission of the layman to the priest, and of the conscience to the Church. With the perspicuitas S. Scr. falls the freedom of religion and conscience, of the Church and theology. It alone is capable of maintaining the freedom of the Christian man; it is the origin and guarantee of religious and also of political freedoms, Stahl, Der Protest, als polit. Princip. 2nd Auü. 1853. Saussaye, Het Protest, als politiek be-ginsel, Rott. 1871. Kuyper, Het Calvinisme,

origine en waarborg onze constitutione vrijheden, Amst. 1874. And a freedom which cannot be obtained and possessed otherwise than with the danger of licentiousness and arbitrariness, is always preferable to a tyranny which suppresses all freedom. When He created man, God Himself chose this path of freedom, which brought with it the danger and indeed the fact of sin, over that of forced submission. And He still follows this royal road to freedom in governing the world and the church. That is His glory, that through freedom He still attains His goal, creates order out of disorder, light out of darkness, the cosmos out of chaos. Both, Rome and the Reformation, agree in this, that the Holy Spirit alone is the true interpreter of the word, Mt. 7:15, 16:17; John 6:44, 10:3; 1 Cor. 2:12, 15, 10:15; Phil. 1:10, 3 : 13; Heb. 5:14; 1 Jn. 4:1. But Rome believes that the Holy Spirit teaches infallibly only through the pope; the Reformation believes that the Holy Spirit dwells in the heart of every believer; every child of God has the anointing of the Holy One. It therefore gives the Scriptures into the hands of all, translates and distributes them, and uses no other language in the Church than the vernacular. Rome boasts of her unity, but this unity seems greater than it is. The division of the Reformation into Lutheran and Reformed has its analogy in the division of the Greek and Latin churches. Under the appearance of external unity, Rome hides an almost equal inner division. The number of unbelievers and indifferent people is no less in Roman countries than in Protestant ones. Rome has not been able to stem the tide of unbelief any more than the churches of the Reformation have. Even before the Reformation unbelief had spread in wide circles, for example in Italy. The Reformation did not call it forth, but rather thwarted it, and Rome itself aroused to vigilance and combat it. Cartesius, the father of rationalism, was "Roman." The German rationalists are weighed down by the French materialists; Rousseau by Voltaire, Strauss by Renan. The Revolution took its deepest root in Roman Catholic countries and bore its most bitter fruits. Furthermore, it remains to be seen whether the number of parties, directions and sects that appear at any given time would not be as great in Rome as it is in Protestantism, if Rome did not have the power and the courage to

suppress every direction by censorship, ban, interdict, if necessary by the sword. It is certainly not thanks to Rome that so many flourishing Christian churches have appeared alongside her. Whatever the downsides of Protestantism, it proves that religious life here is a force that constantly creates new forms and yet reveals a deeper unity in all its diversity. And in any case, Protestantism with its divisions is preferable to the terrible superstition, in which the people in the Greek and Roman churches are more and more entangled. Marial worship, reliquary worship, statuary worship, saint worship are more and more supplanting the service of the one, true God. Cf. Trede, *Das Heidenthum in der römischen Kirche*, Gotha, Perthes, 4 Theile 1889-92.

16. Because of these perspicuitas, Scripture also has the *facultas se ipsam interpretandi* and is */e supremus judex controversiarum*, Synopsis pur. theol. disp. 5 § 20 sq. Polanus, Synt. Theol. lib. I c. 45. Turret. Theol. el. Loc. II qu. 20. Amesius, Bellarm. enervatus Lib. I c. 5. Cloppenburg, De Canone Theol. disp. 11-15. Op. II 64 sq. Moor, Comm, in Markii Comp. I 429 sq. Gerhard, Loci Theol. loc. I c. 21, 22. Schmid, Dogm. der ev. luth. K. 6[®] Aufl. S. 42 f. The Scriptures explain themselves, the *duis-ter* places are explained by the clear ones, and the fundamental ideas of the Scriptures as a whole serve to elucidate the parts. This was the *interpretatio secundum analogiam fidei*, which was also advocated by the Reformers. The Reformers, too, did not come to the Scriptures *voraussetzungslos*. They adopted the teachings of Scripture, the Apostles' Creed, and the decisions of the first councils almost without criticism. They were not revolutionary and did not want to start from scratch, but only protested against the errors that had crept in. The Reformation was not the liberation of the natural man, but of the Christian man. So from the beginning the Reformers had an *analogia Hdei*, in which they themselves stood and according to which they interpreted the Scriptures. By this *analogia fidei* they originally meant the sense derived from the clear passages of Scripture itself, which was then laid down in the Confessions, Voetius Disp. V 9 sq. 419 sq. Moor, Comm. in Marckii Comp. I 436. VI praefatio. Turret, Theol. El. I qu.

Philippi, Kirchl. Gl. I 217 f. Zöckler, Handbuch I 663 f. Luz, Hermeneutik 154-176. In connection with this, the church also had a vocation in regard to the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. By virtue of the potestas doctrinae, conferred on it by Christ, and the gift of interpretation, given to it by the Holy Spirit, 1 Cor. 14:3, 29 ; Rom. 12:6; Eph. 4:11 ff. the church has the duty not only to preserve the Scriptures, but also to interpret and defend them, to formulate the truth in its confession and to expose and oppose error. So also the church is *judex controversiarum* within her circle and on her terrain, and has to test and judge all opinions by the Scriptures. It does not have to be infallible to do so, because even the judge in the state is bound by the law, but is fallible in his judgments. And so it is also in the church. Scripture is *norma*, the church is *ruler*. But here too there is a booger appeal. Rome denies this and says that the judgment of the church is the last and highest. From her even an appeal to divine judgment is no longer possible. She binds in the conscience. But the Reformation claimed that a church, no matter how venerable, could still go wrong. Its interpretation is not *magisterialis*, but *ministerialis*. It can only be binding in the conscience in so far as someone recognizes it as divine and infallible. Whether it is indeed in accordance with God's word, no earthly power can, but each one can determine for himself, Synopsis pur. theol. 5, 25 sq. The church can then expel someone as a heretic, but he stands and falls in the end his own lord. The simplest believer, with Scripture in hand, can and may oppose a whole church, as Luther did against Rome. Only in this way is the freedom of the Christian maintained, and at the same time the sovereignty of God. There is no higher appeal from Scripture. She is the highest court. No power or judgment stands above it. It is they who decide in the last instance, for each man in his conscience. And therefore she is *judex supremus controversiarum*.

E. The sufficiency of Scripture.

17. Finally, the Reformation also confessed the *perfectio* or *sufficiencia* S. Scripturae. The Roman Church believes that Scripture

is imperfect in partibus and must be completed by tradition. She declared at Trent, sess. 4, that she traditiones ipsas, turn ad fidem turn ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo vel a Sp. S°. dictatas et con- tinna successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu et reverentia suscipit et veneratur, and spoke at the Vatic, sess. 3 cap. 2, that supernatural revelation is contained in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quae ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptae, aut ab ipsis Apostolis Spiritu Sancto dictante quasi per manus traditae ad nos usque pervenerant. The reasons Rome gives for this doctrine of tradition are diverse. First, it points out that the church before Moses was entirely without Scripture, and that even after that time many believers live and die without ever reading or examining the Scriptures. The vast majority of God's children live by tradition and know little or nothing of Scripture. It would also be strange if this were different in the religious and church fields than in any other field. After all, in law and morality, in art and science, in family and society, tradition is the bearer and the nourisher of our lives. Through her we are linked to our ancestors, take over their treasures and also leave them to our children. Analogy already demands that there be a tradition in the Church too; but it must be so much more glorious and certain here than elsewhere, because Christ has given His Church the Holy Spirit and through him is infallibly guiding His Church in all truth (Mt 16:18, 28:20; John 14:16). To these are added many statements of Scripture, which recognize the rightness and value of tradition, John 16:12, 20:30, 21:25; Acts 1:3; 1 Cor. 11:2, 23; 2 Thess. 2:14; 1 Tim. 6:20; 2 John 12; 3 John 13, 14. Jesus taught his disciples many things orally and by his Spirit, which were not written by them but were passed down from mouth to mouth. Fathers of the Church, Councils, Popes have also recognized such an apos- tolic tradition from the beginning. In fact, the Church still lives from and by this oral, living tradition. Scripture alone is insufficient. For not only has not everything been written down, but various writings of prophets and apostles have also been lost. The apostles were commanded to bear witness, but not to do so in writing. They only wrote because of the circumstances, neces- sitate quadam coacti; their writings are

therefore mostly occasional writings, and do not contain everything that is necessary for the teaching and life of the church. Thus we find in Scripture little or nothing of woman's baptism, Sunday observance, episcopacy, the seven sacraments, purgatory, the immaculate conception of Mary, the salvation of many Gentiles in the days of the O. T., the inspiration and canonicity of the various books of the Bible, etc.; yes, even dogmas such as those of the Trinity, the eternal generation, the exit of the Holy Ghost, infant baptism, etc., are not to be found literally and in so many words in Scripture. In a word: Scripture is useful, but tradition is necessary, Bellarminus, *de Verbo Dei*, lib. IV. Melchior Canus, *Loei theol.* lib. 3. Perrone, *Praelect. Theol.* IX 228- sq. Klee, *Dogm.* I 277 f. Heinrich, *Dogm. Theol.* II S. 1 f. Jansen, *Praelect. theol. dogm.* I 788 sq. Möhler, *Symbolik* § 38 f. Kleutgen, *Theol. der Vorzeit* 2e Aufl. I 72 f. Dieringer, *Dogm.* § 126. Liebermann, *Instit. theol.* I p. 448 sq. For the Greek church, Kattenbusch, *Confessionskunde* I 292.

18. Against this Roman doctrine of tradition the Reformation placed that of the perfection and sufficiency of Holy Scripture. The rightness of this opposition to Rome has been brought into clear focus by the development of the concept of tradition itself. The first Christian congregations were founded by the preached word, just as congregations among the Gentiles are founded today. The teachings and practices which they had received from the apostles or their companions continued for a long time from mouth to mouth and from generation to generation. This understanding of tradition was clear; it indicated the teachings and customs received from the apostles and preserved and propagated in the churches. But as the distance between the churches and the apostolic era grew, it became more and more difficult to determine whether something was really of apostolic origin. The Arian Church therefore protested against the exaggerated value which was attached to this tradition, especially in the second half of the Gnostic era. Tertullianus, *de virg. vel. c.* 1 said, *Dominus noster veritatem se, non consuetudinem cognominavit.* Similarly, Cyprian, *Epist.* 74 opposed the tradition, on which the Bishop of Rome relied, to the texts Isa. 29 : 13; Mt. 15:9; I Tim. 6 : 3-

5 and said: *consuetudo sine veritate vetustas erroris est*. Christ did not call Himself the habit but the truth. Gene must give way to this one. Therefore, it became necessary to define the tradition more precisely and to list its characteristics. Vincentius Lerinensis found in his *Commonitorium* cap. 2, the criteria of an apostolic tradition are that something is *ubique, semper et ab omnibus creditum est*. *Hoc est etenim vere proprieque catholicum*. So at first the characteristic of tradition was that it was of apostolic origin. Now it is added that something may be considered to be of apostolic origin if it is truly universal and catholic. The *apostolicitas* becomes knowable by the *universitas, antiquitas* and *consensio*. The Tridentine, the Vatican, and also the theologians adhere to these criteria of Vincent in the determination of tradition. But there is a deviation; the consequence leads further. It could not be maintained that something was only apostolic when it was really believed always, everywhere, and by all. What doctrine or usage could prove such absolute catholicity? Thus the three criteria have been gradually weakened. The Church may not declare something new to be dogma and must adhere to tradition, but the preservation of that tradition is not to be thought of mechanically as a treasure in the field, but organically, as Mary preserved the words of the shepherds and considered them in her heart, Heinrich, II 12. Thus a truth may very well not have been believed, or not generally believed, in the past; yet it is infallible apostolic tradition, as long as it is generally believed now. The two criteria *antiquitas* and *universitas* are therefore not copulative but distributive characteristics of tradition; they are not both necessary together and at the same time; one of them is enough. In fact, the *antiquitas* has been sacrificed to the *universitas*. But the latter is also limited. The question arose as to who was the organ for preserving and recognizing tradition. This could not be the church in general. Möhler, *Symbolik*, 6th Aufl. 357, still identified the tradition with *das fortwährend in den Herzen der Gläubigen lebende Wort*, but this answer was much more protestant than Romanesque in thought. The task of preserving and establishing doctrine could not and should not be entrusted to the church in general, i.e. to the laity. In the Church there is a distinction between the *ecclesia audiens* and

docens. Both belong together and are imperishable, but the former possesses only an infallibilitas passiva, i. e. it is infallible only in its belief, because and as long as it remains connected to the ecclesia docens. But even the latter is not the actual body of doctrine. Gallicanism, the Old Episcopal clergy and the Old Catholics have maintained this position and attribute infallibility to the joint bishops. But this position is untenable. When are these bishops infallible ? Outside or only in the council ? If the latter, are they infallible only when they are unanimous, or is only the majority infallible ? How large must this be ? Is one-vote majority sufficient ? Is the council infallible without, and even in opposition to, or only in agreement with the pope? All questions with which Gallicanism was in serious difficulty. The papal system therefore went one step further and attributed infallibility to the pope. This primacy of the pope is the product of centuries of development, the consequence of a school of thought that was already present in the Church at a very early stage. Gradually the pope came to be regarded as the infallible organ of divine truth and thus of tradition. Bellarminus, de Verbo Dei, lib. 4 c. 9 included among the characteristics of tradition this rule: id sine dubio credendum esse, ex apostolica traditione descendere, quod pro tali habetur in illis ecclesiis, ubi est integra et continuata successio ab Apostolis. Now, he goes on to say, in ancient times there were many such churches apart from Rome. Now, however, she is left only in Rome. And therefore ex testimonio hujus solius. ecclesiae sumi potest certum argumentum ad probandas Apostolicas tradi- tiones. The church of Rome determines and makes up, what apostolic tradition is. Later theologians, especially among the Jesuits, developed this further. And on July 18, 1870, at the fourth session of the Vatican Council, infallibility was openly proclaimed as a dogma. Now it is certain that in this infallibility the Pope is not separated from the Church, especially not from the ecclesia docens. Moreover, the symbols, decrees, liturgies, patres, doctores and the whole history of the Church are so many monuments of tradition to which the pope adheres and with which he must take account when establishing a dogma. Yet tradition is not formally identical with the content of all these monuments. Tradition

is infallible; but what is tradition is decided in the last instance only by the pope, with, without, or, if necessary, in opposition to the Church and the councils. The judgment as to whether and to what extent something is believed *semper, ubique et ab omnibus*, cannot be left to the Church, nor to the *ecclesia audiens* nor to the *ecclesia docens*, but is of itself left to the infallible Pope alone. When the pope promulgates a dogma, it is *eo ipso* apostolic tradition. The criterion of tradition is thus sought, successively, in apostolicity, in catholicity, in episcopal succession, in papal decision. With this the end has been reached. The infallible pope is the *principium formale* of Romanism. *Roma locuta, res tinita*. Pope and Church, Pope and Christianity are one. *Ubi Papa, ibi ecclesia, ibi religio Christiana, ibi Spiritus*. From the Pope there is no higher appeal, not even to God. Through the pope God himself speaks to humanity, Perrone I 229 , IX 279. Jansen I 804, 822 s. 829. Heinrich I 726 note, II 148 f. 537. Maistre, *du Pape, Oevres Choiesies de Joseph de Maistre III*. Paris z. j. 71.

This result of the development of tradition shows the falsity of the principle that was active in it from the beginning. The infallibility of the Pope can only later be treated in detail in the teaching of the Church. But it is clear that the good and true element, which in the first centuries was the point of maintaining tradition, has been completely lost. At that time, the aim was to preserve that which was believed and customary in the congregations by virtue of the Apostolic institution. It was obvious that at that time great importance was attached to tradition and that the indispensability and necessity of the Apostolic Scriptures was not yet understood. But the characteristic of apostolicity, which then automatically characterized Tradition, had to disappear as people moved further away from the Apostolic Age. The relative independence of tradition from Scripture disappeared more and more. The streams of Scripture and tradition flowed into one another. And soon after the death of the apostles and their contemporaries, it became impossible to prove anything of apostolic origin except by an appeal to the apostolic writings. The apostolic origin of no dogma that the Roman church professes outside and without the Scriptures can be proven. The tra-

ditionary doctrine of Rome only serves to justify the deviations from Scripture and from the apostles. Devotion to Mary, the seven sacraments, papal infallibility, etc., these are the dogmas which tradition cannot do without. In bad taste, apostolic tradition has been identified with ecclesiastical customs and papal decisions. Tradition is with Rome die gemeine Superstition, das Heidenthum, Harnack D. G. III 559 note.

19. In fact, by this doctrine of tradition Scripture is deprived of all its authority and power. The Roman Catholics praise the infallibility of both, Scripture and tradition (pope), but recognize that between the two there is a great difference. For Rome understands very well that the infallibility of tradition cannot be derived from the believers as such, from the power and spirit of Christianity that lives and works in the believers. For there are many errors in the Church and among the faithful that often prevail for a long time and carry many away. The infallibility of the Pope is therefore explained, as well as that of Scripture, by an extraordinary working of the Holy Spirit on the basis of Mt. 16:18, 28:20; Jn. 14:16ff, 15:26, 16:12ff. Concil. Vatic, sess. 3. But there is nevertheless a distinction. The activity of the Holy Spirit in the apostles consisted in revelation and inspiration; that in the pope consists in assistance. The Vatican cap. 4 says: *neque enim Petri successoribus Spiritus Sanctus promissus est, ut eo revelante novam doctrinam patefacerent, sed ut eo assistente, traditam per Apostolos revelationem seu fidei depositum sancte custodirent et fideliter exponerent.* Scripture is therefore the word of God in a real sense, inspired, at least according to many theologians, right down to the *singula verba*; the decisions of councils and popes are the words of the Church, purely expressing the truth of God. Scripture is the word of God; tradition contains the word of God. Scripture preserves the words of the Apostles in their original form; Tradition reproduces the teachings of the Apostles only as regards their substance. The books of the prophets and apostles are often written without research, only from revelation; but with the *assistia divina*, promised to the church, the persons are always themselves active, researching, considering, judging, deciding. With inspiration, the

activity of the Spirit was strictly speaking supranational, but with assistance it often consisted of a complex of providential concerns, by which the Church was protected from error. And finally, inspiration in Scripture extends to all matters, including history, chronology, etc., but through the assistance of the Holy G. the pope is infallible only when he speaks *ex cathedra*, i. e. as Pastor and Doctor of Christendom, and when he is *doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa ecclesia tenendam definit*. Thus Scripture has with Rome still some *praerogatives* above tradition, Bellarminus, *de Conciliis et Ecclesia*, lib. 2 c. 12. Heinrich, I 726 f. II 220-245. Jansen, I 616.

But in fact tradition does great harm to Scripture. First, Trent decrees that Scripture and tradition are to be venerated *pari pietatis affectu et reverentia*. Next, the inspiration of Scripture is understood by most Roman theologians as an *inspiratio realis*, so that not the *singula verba* but the matters are inspired. Furthermore, the infallibility *quoad formam* and *quoad substantiam* are so closely connected that it is impossible to draw the line between them. Furthermore, the pope is, strictly speaking, infallible only in matters of faith and life, but to be so, he must also be infallible in the judgment of the sources of faith and in interpretation, i. e. in the determination of what is Scripture and tradition, in the determination of the authority of the church fathers, the councils, etc.; in the judgment of errors and heresies and even of the *facta dogmatica*, in the banning of books, in matters of discipline, in approbation of orders, in canonization of saints, etc. Heinrich, II 557 f. And though the pope is not infallible in all else in a strict sense, yet his power and authority also extends over all things, *quae ad disciplinam et regimen ecclesiae pertinent*, and this *potestas* is *plena* and *suprema* and extends over all *pastores* and *fideles*, Cone. Vatic, cap. 3. It is even demanded by many Roman Catholics, that the pope, in order to exercise this spiritual sovereignty, must be a temporal prince; and asserted that he, if not directly, yet indirectly possesses the *summa potestas disponendi de rebus temporalibus omnium christianorum*, Bellarm. *de Romano Pontifice* lib. 5. de Maistre, *du Pape*, livre 2. Jansen. I 651 sq. The power and authority

of the pope far exceeds that of Scripture. He stands above it, judges its contents and its meaning, and auctoritate sua establishes the dogmata of doctrine and life. Scripture may be the principal means of demonstrating the conformity of contemporary doctrine and tradition to the teachings of the apostles; it may contain much that would otherwise not be so well known; it may be a divine instruction in doctrine which surpasses all others, Heinrich, I 732 f.; yet for Rome it is always only an aid, useful but not necessary. The Church existed before Scripture, and the Church contains not a part but the whole truth; Scripture, however, contains only a part of the teaching. Scripture needs tradition, the confirmation of the Pope, but tradition does not need the Scriptures. Tradition is not an addition to Scripture, but Scripture is an addition to tradition. Scripture alone is insufficient, but tradition alone is sufficient. Scripture rests on the church, but the church rests in itself, Heinrich, I 730 f.

20. The development of tradition into papal infallibility and the consequent necessary degradation of Scripture, prove in itself the right of the Reformation to oppose tradition. But it did not stop at attacking, but opposed the doctrine of Rome with that of the perfectio or sufficientia Scripturae, Luther in Köstlin, Luther's Theol. 2nd Ausg. 1883 II 56 f. 246 f. Gerhard, Loci theol. loc. 1 c. 18. 19. Schmid, Dogm. der ev. luth. K. § 9. Calv. Inst.

IV c. 10. Polanus, Synt. Theol. I c. 46. 47. Zanchius, Op. VIII col. 369 sq. Ursinus, Tract. Theol. 1584 p. 8 sq. 22 sq. Chamier, Panstratia Cathol. Loc. 1 lib. 8 and 9. Amesius, Bellarminus enervatus, Lib. I c. 6. Turret., Theol. El. 10c. 2 qu. 16. Heppe, Dogm. der ev. ref. K. p. 11 f. Holtzmann, Kanon und Tradition, Ludwigsb. 1859. A. W. Dieckhoff, Schrift und Tradition, Rostock 1870. J. L. Jacobi, Die kirchl. Lehre von der Tradition u. h. Schrift, 1 Abth. Berlin 1847. P. Tschackert, Evang. Polemik gegen die röm. Kirche, Gotha 1885 § 23 f. Id. art. Tradition in Herzog2. Hase, Protest. Polemik, 5te Aufl. Leipzig 1891 S. 77 f. Harnack, Dogm. Gesch. III 593 f. 623 f. Hodge, Syst. Theol. I 104 etc. This feature of Holy Scripture, too, must be properly understood. It is not claimed thereby, that all that was

spoken or written by the prophets, by Christ and the apostles, is included in the Scriptures ; for many prophetic and apostolic writings have been lost, Num. 21 : 14 ; Jos. 10 : 13 ; 1 Kings 4 : 33 ; 1 Chron. 29 : 29 ; 2 Chron. 9 : 29, 12 : 15 ; 1 Cor. 5:9 ; Col. 4:16 ; Phil. 3:1, and Jesus and the apostles certainly spoke many more words and did many more signs than are described, John 20:30; 1 Cor. 11:2, 14; 2 Thess. 2:5, 15, 3:6, 10 ; 2 John 12 ; 3 John 14 etc. Nor does this characteristic imply that Scripture contains all the usages, ceremonies, provisions and regulations necessary for the organization of the Church; but only that it contains the *fidei articuli* in full, the *res necessariae ad salutem*. Nor does this characteristic of Scripture imply that these *fidei articuli* are literally and word for word, *αὐτολεῖξει* and *totidem verbis* contained in it, but only that they are so contained in Scripture, either explicitly or implicitly, that, without the aid of any other source, they can only be derived from it by comparative research and reflection. And finally, this *perfectio S. Scr.* is not to be understood as if Scripture had always been the same *quoad gradum*. In the different ages of the Church the Scriptures were unequal in scope until their completion. But in every age the word of God, which existed unwritten or described, was sufficient for that age. The Reformation, too, distinguished between a *verbum* "ἔχραφον and ἔγγραφον, Ned. geloofsbel. art. 3. But Rome accepts both next to each other, and considers them species of one genus; the Reformation sees in this distinction only one and the same word of God, which first existed for a time without being written down, and then was written down. So the dispute between Rome and the Reformation is only about whether, after Scripture is finished, there is still another word of God in an unwritten form next to it, i.e. whether the written word of God explicitly or implicitly contains all that we need to know for our salvation, and is therefore *regula totalis et adaequata fidei et morum*, or whether in religion and theology another principle *cognoscendi* must be assumed. But so stated, this question seems to be susceptible to almost no other answer. Even the Roman Church recognizes that Scripture is complete, that it forms an organic whole, that the canon is closed. However much she esteems tradition, she still has not dared in theory to put the decisions of the

church on a par with Scripture. She still distinguishes between *verbum Dei* and *verbum ecclesiae*. But how can the inadequacy of Scripture ever be taught, as long as one takes the *verbum Dei* seriously? Fathers of the Church did not think of it and speak clearly of the perfect sufficiency of the Scriptures. Irenaeus, *adv. haer.* III praef. and cap. 1 says, that we know the truth through the apostles, *per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos, quod quidem tunc praeconaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt fundamentum et columnam fidei nostrae futuram.* Tertullianus, *adv. Hermog.* c. 22, *de carne Chr.* c. 8 admires the plenitudo Scripturae, and rejects everything *quod extra Scripturam* is. Augustine, *Sermo de Past.* c. 11 testifies: *quidquid inde audieritis, hoc vobis bene sapiat; quidquid extra est respuite.* And similarly many others speak, cf. the places collected by Chamier, *Panstratia Cathol.* Loc. I lib. 8 cap. Besides, they certainly recognize tradition, but they include in it an element which undermines their conviction of the sufficiency of Scripture and which ended in the later Roman doctrine of *insufficiencia S. Scr.* and of *sufficiencia traditionis*. Both, Scripture and tradition, cannot be maintained side by side; what is withheld from the one is given to the other. Tradition can only rise if and as Scripture falls. It is therefore very strange that Rome, on the one hand, regards Scripture as completed and the canon as closed, yes, even acknowledges Scripture as the word of God, and yet regards that Scripture as insufficient and supplements it with tradition. Many Roman theologians today rightly say that Scripture is not the necessary but at best the useful complement of tradition.

21. But this doctrine is in direct conflict with Scripture itself. Never in the Old Testament and the New Testament is the congregation referred to anything but the word of God, whether written or unwritten, which is always available. Only there can mankind live spiritually. In the ever present Scriptures the congregation finds all that it needs. The following Scriptures underlie the previous one, are connected to it and built upon it. The prophets and psalmists underlie the Torah. Isaiah calls cap. 8 : 20 all to the law and the testimony. The N. T. considers itself to be a fulfillment of the Old,

and points back to nothing but the existing Scriptures. Even more evident is the fact that everything that lies outside Scripture is excluded as much as possible. Traditions are rejected as man's statutes, Isa 29:13; Mt 15:4,9; 1 Cor 4:6. The tradition that arose in the days of the O. Test has led the Jews to reject Christ. Jesus repeats to them His I tell you, Mt. 5, and joins again the Pharisees and scholars of the law and the prophets. The Apostles refer only to the O. T. Scriptures and never refer the congregations to anything other than the word of God, which was preached by them. Insofar as the tradition in the early days was intended to be nothing more than a preservation of that which was personally taught and instituted by the Apostles, it did not yet have a dangerous character. But the Roman tradition has completely degenerated from that. It is unprovable that any doctrine or usage originated from the Apostles, except insofar as it can be proven from their writings. The tradition of Rome, from which the Mass, Mariolatry, papal infallibility, etc. arose, is nothing but the sanction of the actual state of the Roman Church, the justification of the superstition which has penetrated it.

The sufficientia of the Holy Scriptures also derives from the nature of the N. T. dispensation. Christ became flesh and accomplished all the work. He is the last and highest revelation of God. He has explained the Father to us, John 1:18, 17:4, 6. He is the highest, the only prophet. Even the Vatic. Council cap. 4 recognizes, that the assistia divina, given to the pope, did not consist in revelation and in revelation of a new doctrine. And Rome still endeavors to argue its dogmata, however new, as far as possible from Scripture, and to present them as the development and explication of what is in seed in Scripture, Lombardus, Sent. III dist. 25. Thomas S. Theol. II 2 qu. 1 art. 7. qu. 174 art. 6. Schwane, Dogmengeschichte I 2nd Aufl. 1892 S. 7 f. Heinrich II 23 f. But it thereby wraps itself in no small difficulty. For either the dogmata are all, in the same sense as e.g. Trinity, the two natures of Christ, etc., explications of moments which are contained in Scripture, in which case tradition is unnecessary and Scripture sufficient; or they are indeed new dogmata, which have no support in Scripture, in which case the

assistantia divina of the Pope is essentially a revelation and revelation of new doctrine. The latter may be denied theoretically, but in practice it is accepted. That is why Roman theologians after the Reformation are generally more generous than before in recognizing that some dogmas are only grounded in tradition. And that is why today arguments for tradition are brought forward, which were not used before, or at least not in that sense and to that extent. Now the inadequacy of Scripture and the rightness of Tradition are shown by the fact that Prophetic and Apostolic writings have been lost, that Christ did not teach everything to His Apostles, that the Apostles also commanded the congregations orally, etc., but that some writings have been lost, and that the Apostles did not teach the congregations everything. But that writings have been lost, and whether they were inspired (Bellarm. de verbo Dei IV c. 4) or not (August, de civ. 18, 38), is immaterial. For the question is only whether the existing Scriptures contain all that is necessary for our salvation; and not whether they contain all that the prophets and apostles wrote, and Christ Himself spoke and did. Even if the writings of the prophets and apostles were found, they would no longer serve as Holy Writ. And so it is with the teaching of Jesus and the Apostles. They have spoken and done more than has been described to us. Knowledge of this would be historically important; but is religiously unnecessary. We have enough Scripture for our salvation, and do not need any other scripture, even if it came from Jesus himself. That was the doctrine of the Reformation. Quantitatively, revelation has been much richer and greater than Scripture has preserved for us, but qualitatively, substantially, Scripture is completely sufficient for our salvation. Rome, therefore, can cite no dogmas other than those of Mariolatry, the infallibility of the pope, and the like, which have arisen from tradition outside Scripture; but all those concerning God, man, Christ, salvation, etc., are, according to Rome, to be found in Scripture itself. What need have we then of witnesses. Roman tradition only serves to prove the specifically Roman dogmata, but the Christian, Catholic dogmata are, according to Rome itself, all founded in Scripture. This fact also shows that Scripture is sufficient, and that the nature of N. T.

dispensation brings and demands this sufficientia S. Scr. Christ revealed everything in full to the apostles, either personally and orally or by His Spirit. Through their word we believe in Christ and have fellowship with God, John 17:20 ; 1 John 1:3. The Holy Spirit no longer reveals new doctrine. He takes it all from Christ, John 16 :14. In Christ the revelation of God is complete. And so the word of salvation is fully comprehended in Scripture. It forms one whole; it makes the impression of an organism that has reached maturity. It ends where it begins. It is a circle that returns within itself. It begins with the creation, it ends with the recreation of heaven and earth. The canon of O. and N. T. was not closed until all the new Ansätze of salvation history were present, Hofmann, Weissagung u. Erfüllung I 47. The Holy Spirit has no other task in this dispensation than to apply the work of Christ and likewise to explain the word of Christ. He adds nothing new to either. The work of Christ need not be supplemented by the good works of the faithful; the word of Christ need not be supplemented by the tradition of the Church; Christ himself need not be succeeded and replaced by the Pope. The Roman doctrine of tradition is the denial of the perfect incarnation of God in Christ, of the sufficiency of His sacrifice, and of the perfection of His word. The history of the Roman Church shows us the slowly proceeding process, how a false principle penetrates and first of all places itself under Christ and his word, then places itself next to it, later raises itself above it, to end in a complete replacement of Scripture by tradition, of Christ by the Pope, of the church by the institution. The development is certainly not yet at an end. It seems an anomaly that the pope, who gradually elevated himself above scripture, church, council and tradition, is appointed by fallible men, even if they are cardinals. Who better than he who is infallible can appoint his successor? Thus it is quite possible that in the future the papal sovereignty will prove to be incompatible with the power of the cardinals. In any case, Rome has not yet completed the deification of mankind.

22. Yet all this does not negate the good and true that lies locked up in the doctrine of tradition. The word tradition has a wider meaning

than that given to it by Rome. Rome understands it to mean a teaching handed down by the Apostles, preserved by the Bishops, especially by the Pope, and established and promulgated by him; but this view has proved untenable. Tradition, however, can also be understood to mean all that religious life, thinking, feeling, acting, which is found in every religious community and finds its expression in all kinds of forms, manners, customs, habits, religious language and literature, confession and liturgy, etc. In this sense there is tradition in oak religion. The concept can even be extended further to all those rich and manifold ties that bind the following generations to the preceding ones. In this sense no family, no sex, no society, no people, no art, no science, etc. can exist without tradition. Tradition is the means by which all the treasures and goods of the past are transferred to the present and the future. Against the individualism and atomism of the earlier century, de Bonald, Lamennais et al. and Bilderdijk have once again placed the significance of community, authority, language, tradition, etc. in the brightest light. Such a tradition most certainly also exists in religion and in the church. Its very generality indicates that we are not dealing with an accidental phenomenon. We find such a tradition not only in the Roman Church, but also among the Jews, the Mohammedans, the Buddhists, etc. In the higher religions there is a tradition of the Holy Spirit. In the higher religions there is another reason for the necessity of tradition. They are all bound to a holy scripture, which was created at a certain time and in that sense becomes more and more distant from the present generation. The Bible, too, is a book written in centuries gone by and under all kinds of historical circumstances. The various books of the Bible bear the character of the time in which they were written. However clear the Scriptures may be in the doctrine of salvation and however much they are and remain the *viva vox Dei*, cf. above p. 305, they often require all kinds of historical, archaeological and geographical knowledge to be understood. Times have changed, and with the times the people, their lives and thoughts and feelings. Therefore a tradition is needed to preserve the coherence between the Scriptures and the religious life of our time. Tradition in the proper sense is the interpretation and application of

the eternal truth in the speech and life of the present generation. Scripture without such tradition is impossible. Many sects in earlier and later times have tried this. They wanted to know nothing but the words and letters of Scripture; rejected all dogmatic terminology not used in Scripture; disapproved of all theological training and science, and sometimes came to demand the literal application of the civil laws of Israel and the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount. But all these tendencies condemned themselves by this to an erasing ruin or at least to a fading life. They placed themselves outside society and lost all influence over its people and its century. Scripture is not there to be learned and imitated from outside, but to shape, lead and bring about independent activity in every field of human life. The Reformation therefore placed itself on a different standpoint. It did not reject all tradition as such; it was a reformation, not a revolution. She did not try to create everything new, but to cleanse everything from error and abuse according to the rule of God's Word. That is why she stood on the broad Christian basis of the apostolic symbol and the first councils. That is why she was in favor of a theological science that reflected the truth of Scripture in the language of the present. The difference in the understanding of tradition between Rome and the Reformation is this: Rome wants a tradition that runs independently alongside Scripture, a *traditio juxta Scripturam* or rather a *Scriptura juxta traditionem*. The Reformation recognizes only such a tradition, which is founded on and results from Scripture, *traditio e Scriptura fluens*, Moor, *Comm. in Marckii Comp.* I 351. Scripture was, according to the Reformation, an organic principle, from which the whole tradition, living on in preaching, confession, liturgy, cult, theology, religious literature, etc., rises and is nourished; a pure source of living water, from which all streams and channels of religious life are fed and maintained. Such a tradition is grounded in Scripture itself. When Jesus has finished his work, he sends the Holy Spirit, who, although he adds nothing new to the revelation, nevertheless leads the congregation into the truth, John 16:12-15, until she comes through all varieties into the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, Eph. 3:18, 19, 4:13. In this sense there is a good, true, glorious tradition. It is the way by

which the Holy Spirit transmits the truth of Scripture into the consciousness and life of the congregation. Scripture is only a means, not an end. The aim is that the church, taught by the Scriptures, proclaim freely and independently the virtues of the One who called her out of darkness into His marvelous light. The verbum externum is instrument, the verbum internum is goal. The Scriptures have reached their destination, when all are taught by the Lord and filled with the Holy Spirit.

Disclaimer Concerning Copyright.

This work was translated directly from the public domain Dutch edition, to English by computer generated auto-translation. No other English translation was consulted or referenced. While this work has been previously translated, and re-edited from a work with the name "Reformed Dogmatics" this is not a paraphrase, summary, rewording, re-edit, republication, or reflection of any previously published English translations; including the forementioned or otherwise. Any similarity is strictly coincidental, non-intentional, and specifically the output of a translation software algorithm. The text of this work is not copyrighted, nor can it be since it is not the work of a human author; except the author who originally wrote this work in the public domain Dutch edition. With the exception of hand-correcting a few obvious errors which were made by the translation software. this is a computer translated, verbatim production of that public domain work. The intention of this work is to re-release it to the public domain. For this publication; no

commercial, for-profit, trade for goods, are exchange of monetary value is intended in its distribution. This is a public domain, free, non-profit, non-exclusive, non-copyrightable translation of the original Dutch edition. This English production is not only not the work of a human mind in any capacity (except for the original Dutch edition that it is based on) but the exact translation can be mimicked innumerable times by simply imputing the same source document, in the same translation program; by anybody, at any time.

If you would like to report any errors found in the text or have any questions please contact Monergism at john@monergism.com or write us at PO Box 491, West Linn, OR, 97068