

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1936

Doctrine of Verbal Inspiration and Its Opponents

Wallace McLaughlin

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

McLaughlin, Wallace, "Doctrine of Verbal Inspiration and Its Opponents" (1936). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 244.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/244>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

The Doctrine of Verbal Inspiration
and its Opponents

Wallace H. McLaughlin

1936

10-19-60

GIFT

BV
4070

9534

THE DOCTRINE OF VERBAL INSPIRATION AND ITS OPPONENTS

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

	Page
SECTION I. Scripture as the only ^{C. 1} current Source and Norm of Christian Truth.	1
SECTION II. Holy Scripture in distinction from all other writings the Word of God.	18
SECTION III. Holy Scripture is the Word of God because divinely inspired.	26
1. Verbal Inspiration.	27
2. Not mere guidance, assistance, or government.	30
3. Inspiration extends to all Scripture.	31
Excursus I. Distinction between Revelation and Inspiration.	33
Excursus II. "Degrees of Inspiration" and "Divine-human Scripture".	34
Excursus III. Limitation of Inspiration to "Religious Truths".	42
4. Inerrancy.	49
5. The Inspiration of Scripture Includes the Impulse and Command to Write.	52
SECTION IV. The Relation of the Holy Ghost to the Writers of Holy Scripture.	54
SECTION V. Objections against the Inspiration of the Holy Scripture.	58
1. Differences of style in the individual books of the Scripture.	58
2. Appeal to historical research on the part of the holy writers.	59
3. The variaae lectiones in the extant copies of the New Testament manuscripts.	60
4. The alleged contradictions and other Scriptural difficulties.	60
5. Inexact quotations from the Old Testament in the New.	61
6. The Mention of trifles (levicula) unbecoming the dignity of the Holy Spirit.	61
7. Solecisms, barbarisms, anacoloutha, etc.	61
8. Individual passages of Scripture alleged against Inspiration.	62
SECTION VI. Summary Characterization of Modern Theology in its Rejection of Inspiration.	63
SECTION VII. Recent Developements in the Treatment of this Doctrine within the nominally Lutheran Church.	65
Notes to: THE DOCTRINE OF VERBAL INSPIRATION AND ITS OPPONENTS.	87
SECTION I.	87
SECTION II.	98
SECTION III.	104
SECTION IV.	113
BIBLIOGRAPHY	115

9534

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

THE DOCTRINE OF VERBAL INSPIRATION AND ITS OPPONENTS.

SECTION I

Scripture as the only current Source and Norm of Christian Truth.

The Church is older than the written Word (Gen. 3,15). Beginnings of public preaching are recorded Gen. 4,26 (Enoch a prophet, Jude 14, 15; Abraham "a prophet", Gen. 20, 7), Gen. 13, 4. These are included in Acts 10, 43. "The Name of the Lord", i.e., the redemption of the race from sin and its consequences through the Seed of the woman, Christ. Modes of communication (Baier):- 1). supernatural voice, Gen. 18,2; 19, 1 sqq.; 22, 1 sqq.; Exod. 3,2; Num. 12,6; Exod. 19,10 sqq.; 2). dreams, Gen. 28,12; Dan. 2,1; 3). visions, Ezek. 1,4; Dan. 10,15; Acts 10,10, etc.; 4). immediate illumination, 2 Tim. 3,16; 2 Pet. 1,21. After God had chosen the written communication of His Word, however, the Church of those times was strictly bound to the written and recorded Word. "But now, after God has determined to comprehend those revealed truths the knowledge of which is necessary to salvation in certain books, the theological habitude is ordinarily dependent upon those ancient revelations which were made immediately to the prophets and apostles and reduced to writing as its only principle" (Baier).*1.

The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent present at this point a four-fold antithesis by offering as the basis of faith not only the Holy Scripture but also oral tradition to be received "with an equal affection of piety and reverence", not only the canonical books but also the Old Testament Apocrypha, not the original texts but the Latin version of the Vulgate, not the Scriptures in their self-interpretation but "that sense which holy mother Church hath held and doth hold" and "the unanimous consent of the fathers". The relevant paragraphs as contained in the decrees of the Fourth Session (but omitting the list of Biblical books, which includes the writings of the Old Testament, of the Apocrypha, and of the New Testament) are here quoted in the translation of Waterworth, given by Schaff

in the second volume of "Creeds of Christendom":

"Decree concerning the Canonical Scriptures. The sacred and holy, œcumenical, and general Synod of Trent,- lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same three legates of the Apostolic See presiding therein,- keeping this always in view, that, errors being removed, the purity itself of the Gospel be preserved in the Church; which (Gospel), before promised through the prophets in the Holy Scriptures, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, first promulgated with His own mouth, and then commanded to be preached by His Apostles to every creature, as the fountain of all, both saving truth, and moral discipline; and seeing clearly that this truth and discipline are contained in the written books, and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand: (the Synod) following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament -- seeing that one God is the author of both -- as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated, either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession.

"And it has thought it meet that a list of the sacred books be inserted in this decree, lest a doubt may arise in anyone's mind, which are the books that are received by this Synod.....

"But if any one receive not, as sacred and canonical, the said books entire with all their parts, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and as they are contained in the old Latin vulgate edition; and knowingly and deliberately contemn the traditions aforesaid; let him be anathema. Let all, therefore, understand, in what order, and in what manner, the said Synod, after having laid the foundation of the Confession of faith, will proceed, and what testimonies and authorities it will mainly use in confirming dogmas, and in restoring morals in the Church.

"Decree concerning the Edition, and the Use, of the Sacred Books. Moreover, the same sacred and holy Synod, considering that no small utility may accrue to the Church of God, if it be made known which out of all the Latin editions, now in circulation, of the sacred book, is to be held as authentic,-- ordains and declares, that the said old and vulgar edition, which, by the lengthened usage of so many ages, has been approved of in the Church, be, in public lectures, disputations, sermons, and expositions, held as authentic; and that no one is to dare, or presume to reject it under any pretext whatever.

"Furthermore, in order to restrain petulant spirits, it decrees, that no one, relying on his own skill, shall, ⁱⁿ matters of faith, and of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine,-- wresting the sacred Scripture to his own senses, presume to interpret the said sacred Scripture contrary to that sense which holy mother Church,-- whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures,-- hath held and doth hold; or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers; even though such interpretations were never (intended) to be at any time published. Contraveners shall be made known by their Ordinaries, and be punished with the penalties by law established". *2.

The position represented by the Council of Trent and the arguments with which it has been supported by Roman theologians have been definitively refuted by Chemnitz in "Examen Concilii Tridentini", and of his argument we shall give copious extracts, all tending to establish the necessity and all-sufficiency of the canonical Scriptures over against the Roman claims for ecclesiastical tradition. After an introduction and a section in which he treats in general of the Sacred Scripture as rule of faith and of the reasons alleged by the Romanists for not accepting the written canon as the sole rule of faith, incidentally pointing out the ambiguity of the council's declaration, there follow sections treating the entire doctrine concerning the relation of Scripture and tradition in exhaustive detail, and first "concerning the Origin, Cause, and Use of the New Testament Scripture". Under this head he shows the corruptions and mutilations which the originally orally communicated

Word suffered under the guardianship of tradition in the patriarchal age, and proceeds to treat the introduction of written revelations at the time of Moses as follows:

"But this is worthy of consideration, that since through traditions the purity of doctrine was not preserved and God did not wish any longer to use that (former) method, namely that when corruptions arose He repeated, renewed, and preserved by new and peculiar revelations the purity of that doctrine which from the beginning of the world had been made known and handed down to the patriarchs,-- it is worthy, I say, of notice, that at the time of Moses He instituted and manifested a different method, namely, that by writings approved and confirmed by divine authority the purity of the celestial doctrine might be propagated and preserved, lest when questions or controversies arose concerning the old genuine and pure doctrine of the patriarchs new and peculiar revelations would always have to be sought and expected. Now this history must be diligently considered. For it usefully illustrates and explains the present controversy concerning Holy Scripture, by pointing out its first origin. Now history shows,-- which is the point that I judge is principally to be observed,-- that God did not only institute but Himself by His own deed and example when He first wrote the words of the Decalogue initiated, dedicated, and consecrated this way and method: that by divinely inspired Scriptures the purity of the celestial doctrine should be preserved and retained. Thus the first origin of Holy Scripture has God Himself for its author. But we are speaking of divinely inspired Scriptures.....

"And these things (rejection of hypotheses claiming an earlier origin of certain canonical writings) we have recited for this purpose, in order that it may be observed that of the divinely inspired Scriptures which God wished to be preserved and to remain unto posterity nothing was written before the tables of the Decalogue which were written by the fingers of God. For it avails much toward illustrating the dignity and authority of Holy Scripture that God did not merely institute and command this method, namely that the celestial doctrine should be comprehended in

writing, but Himself first initiated, dedicated, and consecrated it by writing the words of the Decalogue with His own fingers. For if the writing of sacred books had at first taken its origin from men the precedent of more than two thousand years when in the better times of the world and among the most illustrious patriarchs the doctrine of the divine Word had been handed down orally without writing might then have been opposed (against this later practice of writing the Word in in books). Therefore God Himself with His own fingers made the beginning of writing, in order that He might show how much was to be attributed to this method, that the purity of doctrine might be preserved unto posterity by means of writings; but that He took tables of stone in which He wrote the words of the Decalogue was for another reason, which is shown in 2 Corinthians 3. But lest those things which were either written by men of God adorned thereto with miracles and divine testimonies or having been written were thus authenticated might be held of little or no authority for the confirming of dogmas and the refutation of corruptions, God did not wish to write the entire Law Himself but having written the words of the Decalogue gave commandment to Moses that he should write the rest from His mouth. And that the people of God might be certain that that Scripture of Moses came not by human will but was divinely inspired, God by exceedingly many and stupendous miracles gave testimony to the authority of Moses both before the writing and after and in the very writing itself.....

"These testimonies of Scripture show how after the writing of those sacred books the Church of the children of Israel was the pillar and ground of truth, because, namely, unto them were committed the oracles of God, Romans 3. But not in such a way that they could either by their own arbitrary decree establish or from unwritten traditions impose upon the Church as dogmas of faith other and different things from those which were written; but rather because they should be guardians of the Scripture in which God had by his own inspiration taken care that the celestial doctrine which had both sounded in the Church from the beginning of the world, being handed down by the patriarchs, and also been manifested by Moses, should be

comprehended in writing; not that the sacred books should lie buried in^a corner of the tabernacle, but so that to inquirers or to those ignorant of what doctrine was divinely manifested and handed down to the patriarchs and to Moses they might show from that Scripture the true, genuine, and pure voice of celestial doctrine. And if they should turn aside from the commandments of God that that Scripture should be a testimony (against them), Deuteronomy 31. For so Moses commanded that a copy of the Law should be prepared in order that it might be a canon, norm, and rule, lest they should turn aside either to the right hand or to the left, Deuteronomy 17. And God adorned that custody of His Word with exceedingly brilliant magnificence and commended it by the construction, carrying about, and service of a most splendid tabernacle.

"...Now the sum and heads of their entire doctrine, so much as God judged necessary to posterity, they (the prophets) wrote down, which having been written down were placed with the sacred books of Moses, that is, in the side of the ark. For so it is written concerning Joshua, chapter 24, that he wrote all his words in the book of the law of the Lord, which was placed in the side of the ark of the covenant, Deuteronomy 31. And 1 Samuel 10, Samuel wrote the manner of the kingdom in a book and laid it up before the Lord, that is, where the ark of the covenant was. Isaiah 30, God says to the prophet: Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever. And the manner in which the prophets were accustomed to write the heads of their doctrine, which by the inspiration of God should go down to posterity, can be gathered from the second chapter of Habakkuk: Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it. And Isaiah 8: Take thou a great roll, and write in it with a man's pen. Similar examples are to be found in Jeremiah, chapters 36, 45, and 51". *3.

The following section is devoted to demonstrating the similitude and affinity between the papistical traditions and those of the Pharisees and the Talmud in which he emphasizes the fact that Christ in supporting His doctrines against them

appealed only to the written Word of the Old Testament and not also to oral tradition: "When Christ had to dispute with the Pharisees concerning traditions outside of and beyond the Scriptures He could easily have called attention to many other true sayings and deeds of the patriarchs and prophets more than are recorded in writing and He could have proved the trustworthiness of that reference by miracles. And undoubtedly He would have done so if He had not judged that all things which are necessary and sufficient are contained in the Scriptures..... Christ did not merely refute and reject those traditions of the Pharisees as false and vain, but He simply led them to the Scriptures without adducing other traditions concerning the doctrine of the ancients, as though they were necessary and to be received in addition to Scripture".*4.

There follows a section dealing with the Scripture of the New Testament which contains beside much valuable isagogical material, a refutation of the papistic claim that a written record of the teaching of Christ and the Apostles was superfluous, which they endeavored to support from Jeremiah 31, 33; 2 Corinthians 3,3, as follows: "The manner of the New Testament teaching is far different from that of the Old, for its characteristic peculiarity is so constituted by God Himself that it is written not upon paper nor with pen and ink, nor in any way consigned to writing, but is commended to the minds of the hearers only by word of mouth, and is thus preserved and handed down without writing. And this they wish to hold as the sense of that which is written, Jeremiah 31: I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts, and of what Paul says, 2 Corinthians 3: Ye are our epistle, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart". *5. This exegetical tour de force is so palpably confuted by the very fact that the proof-text is derived from a written epistle of New Testament Scripture that it will not be necessary to quote the paragraph in which Chemnitz answers it.

With the same definitive refutation Chemnitz handles the papistical sophism that since the Christian Church got along without a written Gospel during the first

twenty years of its existence the written Word of God is therefore not indispensable. Some important sentences of the argument on this point follow: "For the doctrine of the Gospel before it was written down should first be confirmed against the calumnies and contradictions of Jews and Gentiles by the preaching of the Apostles and by signs and wonders throughout the whole world, and be proved by the assent of believing peoples in all lands.... Irenaous: 'That which they then preached they afterwards by the will of God handed down to us in writings that it might be the pillar and ground of our faith'. For that is beyond all controversy the only true and saving faith which the primitive Church received from the Apostles and handed on to her sons. But that faith was conceived at the first from the preaching of the Apostles which they in turn had received from the teaching of the Son of God. But this teaching of Christ and the Apostles, from which the true faith of the primitive Church was received, the Apostles at first handed down without writing by word of mouth; afterwards, however, not by any human counsel but by the will of God, they handed it down in the Scriptures. What teaching then? That same teaching which, having been received from the Son of God, they had proclaimed by word of mouth, whereby the primitive Church had received the only true and saving faith from the Apostles and handed it on to her sons, to whom indeed the Apostles handed down the Gospel in the Scriptures". *6.

As the Old Testament Scriptures took their first origin from the writing of the Decalogue on tables of stone by the finger of God, so the New Testament Scriptures have their first origin in the letter of the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem: "I inquire, was there anything written by the Apostles before Paul gave forth his first epistles? And I find, Acts 15, that the Apostles and elders in the first and most celebrated Apostolic council, after the matter had been diligently considered, and by their common suffrages, wrote an epistle to the Churches gathered from among the Gentiles. Nor do I find that anything was ordered by the Apostles in writing prior to that epistle, if we follow the supposition of Andradius concerning ^{the} evangelists. This therefore was the first origin, this the first beginning

of divinely inspired Scripture in the New Testament; that this is so Andradius, according to his own supposition concerning Matthew (Andradius held that the Gospel of Matthew was written when Paul was already in Rome), is not able to deny. As we find, therefore, an exceedingly illustrious origin of Holy Scripture in the Old Testament, namely when God Himself first wrote out the words of the Decalogue with His own fingers on tables (of stone), so Andradius by his hypothesis affords me an occasion of investigating the magnificent and illustrious first origin of Scripture in the New Testament, that, namely, a beginning was made in consigning the Apostolic teaching to writing not by some individual of the Apostles by any private counsel, but when all the Apostles and also the elders of the Jerusalem Church were gathered in the first and most celebrated Apostolic council, by their common suffrages, and after the matter had been diligently considered, this epistle was written and given forth, embracing the opinion of the Apostles concerning a matter that was then in controversy. And that this was the first writing given forth by the Apostles in the New Testament Andradius if he wishes to be consistent with himself is not able to deny, (nor can he assert) that before that council of the Apostles any other divinely inspired Scripture of the New Testament had been written.....

"This was, therefore, as we have shown, the first origin of divinely inspired Scripture in the New Testament, inscribed with the emblem: 'It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us'. And like as at first by oral tradition the law went forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, so also the first Scripture of the New Testament went forth from Zion and took its beginning in Jerusalem, which adds not a little to the dignity and authority of Scripture". *7.

There follows a brief New Testament Isagogics, in which the origin, occasion, and purpose of the Gospels are first discussed, and from which we shall quote a few passages. "It is therefore to be proved that it was for this cause, with this in view, and for this use that the Evangelists wrote their histories, namely that those things which the Apostles judged it necessary that the Church of later times should know concerning the words and deeds of the Lord, by being committed to

writing might remain unto posterity.

"By common consent Matthew was the first among the four Evangelists to write his history. Now concerning the occasion of writing and the end in view, Eusebius notes, Book III, chapter 24, that Matthew, when he had first preached to the Hebrews and was now about to pass over to other peoples, committed his Gospel to writing in his mother-tongue in order that he might make up by letters whatever those whom he was leaving might desire in his absence. Nicephorus, Book II, chapter 45, expresses this opinion thus: 'Departing he compensated for his absence by the presence of his writings'.

"Thomas cites this description of Jerome: 'Matthew put forth a Gospel in Judea especially for the sake of those of the Jews who believed at Jerusalem. For when he had first preached the Gospel by word of mouth, wishing to pass over to the Gentiles, he first wrote a Gospel which the brethren from whom he departed might keep in memory, for just as it was necessary for the confirmation of faith that the Gospel should be preached, so also it was necessary for the confutation of heretics that it be written'.

"Chrysostom in the first homily on Matthew speaks thus: 'Matthew wrote for those who believed on Christ from among the Jews who came to him and asked that those things which he had taught them in words he would also leave to them in writing to be preserved'.

"The author of an unfinished work on Matthew which survives under the name of Chrysostom recites the occasion of writing thus: 'When there had been a severe persecution in Palestine so that all were in danger of being dispersed, lest lacking teachers they should also lack teaching, they petitioned Matthew that he would write them a history of all the words and works of Christ in order that, wherever they might be, they could have with them an account of the entire faith'.

"Thomas recites that opinion thus: 'They petitioned Matthew that he would set up in writing for those who were dispersed a sum of the whole faith such as he had handed down by word of mouth' etc.. And this narration concerning the persecution

agrees well with the time of writing according to Irenaeus. For Josephus is authority for the fact that about the twentieth year after the ascension of Christ Judea was miserably afflicted by magicians and thieves. Added to this was the captivity of Paul which seemed to threaten peril to all Christians.

"The causes, therefore, on account of which Matthew wrote his Gospel are the following: 1. That what he was not able to supply being present by word of mouth in teaching and confirming, that he might supply being absent by writing or through letters. 2. Because memory is frail and weak, that what he had taught that he might leave in writing for preservation. 3. That those who were not able to have the benefit of the spoken word of the Apostles might have an account and summary of the entire faith comprehended in writing. 4. On account of heretics it was necessary that the doctrine of the Gospel be written, lest false, ^{ti}suppositious, and adulterated (teachings) be imposed upon the Church under the name of Gospel. And Irenaeus cites the writing of Matthew as the first example of what he had said: 'That which the Apostles preached they afterwards by the will of God handed down to us in writings that it might be the pillar and ground of our faith'." *8.

specimen submitted above, Chemnitz directs his polemics against the After a thorough treatment of the other three Gospels similar to the/ assertion of Andradius that the evangelists had not recorded all the treasures of the Faith which are worthy to be known. This he does mainly in the words of Augustine and Irenaeus, as follows: "I add yet one opinion of Augustine, 'de Consensu Evangelistarum', Book I, chapter 35, where he confutes those who think the disciples of Christ that wrote the Gospels are to be contemned because no writings of Christ Himself are brought forward by us. 'Christ (he says), through the human nature which He assumed, is the Head of all His disciples as the members of His own body. Since then they wrote what He made known to them, it must not be said that He Himself did not write, inasmuch as the members performed that which they knew by direction of the Head. For whatever He wished us to read of His deeds and words, this He ordered to be written by them as His hands.' So far Augustine....Christ therefore did not will that we should read in other writers anything concerning His

deeds and words which is not contained among those things described in the four evangelists....Irenaeus is authority for the statement that those four written Gospels were in the primitive Church the norm, standard, and rule according to which all things, whatever was put forward by anyone as concerning the deeds and words of Christ, were tried, and what was found agreeing with them was received, but whatever either did not agree or was in conflict with them was freely repudiated". *9.

He adds a very interesting note concerning the respective localities in which each of the four Gospels was written: "It is a happy observation that the sum of the faith concerning the words and deeds of Christ that was held in the Jerusalem Church, from which the Word went out into all the earth, is consigned to writing in the Gospel of Matthew. And the teaching concerning the words and deeds of Christ which Peter transmitted by word of mouth to the Roman Church, whose faith was spoken of throughout the whole world during the life-time of the Apostles, was committed to the writing of Mark. Luke indeed himself affirms that he wrote those things which the Apostles transmitted concerning the words and deeds of Christ in the Antiochian Church (for of that city Luke was a citizen), which Church first gave to the Christians this name (of Christian), and these things were then held and professed with certain indubitable faith by those Churches of the Gentiles which he visited together with Paul. But what John transmitted to the Ephesian Church concerning the words and deeds of Christ he himself also set up in writing. And these Churches beyond all controversy were then the chief ones: the Jerusalem, Antiochian, Ephesian, and Roman Churches". *10.

Leaving the discussion of the Gospels, Chemnitz comes to speak of the Apostolic Epistles, and first establishes that there is no difference between the teaching of the Lord and that of His Apostles: "If we wish to speak accurately there is no difference between the teaching of Christ and the teaching of the Apostles. For Christ gives the power of preaching the Gospel to the Apostles in such a way that He expressly adds (Matthew 28,20): Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. John 14,26: The Holy Ghost shall teach you all things, and

bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. 2 Cor. 13,3: Since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me. 2 Corinthians 5,20: We are ambassadors for Christ, etc.....If, therefore, just as we have already proved concerning the teaching of Christ, we can show also concerning the teaching of the Apostles that so much of it as the Holy Spirit judged necessary and sufficient to us for (establishing) dogmas and morals was consigned to writing and comprehended in the Scriptures, then it will be evident that Holy Scripture is the canon, norm, rule, ground, and pillar of our entire faith; so that whatever ought to be received under the name and title of being the teaching of Christ and the Apostles will have to be proved and confirmed by Scripture; and according to this norm all things in controversies of religion will have to be so discerned and examined that that saying of Jerome may be in force: 'whatever has not its authority from Holy Scriptures can as easily be contemned as approved'..... And it is indeed certain that the Apostles did not at once write in the first years of their preaching. Lest, however, it should be necessary either to divine by conjecture or to seek from the rumors of traditions (which without a head are scattered abroad) what was the first and truly most ancient state of the Apostolic Church, it pleased the Holy Spirit that a certain authentic and canonical writing concerning these so necessary and useful matters should exist in the Church unto all posterity, since He was not ignorant how many uncertain, vain, supposititious and false things would be imposed upon the Church under this title (of Apostolic tradition). For Luke, when he had attained for himself trust and authority in the Church by writing the Gospel history, put together also a history concerning the Acts of the Apostles, starting from the first beginnings of Apostolic preaching. And this history abundantly supplies what is necessary and sufficient to know concerning these matters." #11.

Very significant is the denial of any personal peculiarities in the Apostolic teaching, thus anticipatively disposing of the fallacious constructions of Baur and the Tuebingen School: "For as to what pertained to the state of the Church, to the ministry, doctrine, faith, etc., the individual Apostles had nothing proper and

peculiar to themselves, but there was one faith, the same doctrine, and a common ministry, whereby they established one and the same state of the Church (as to what pertained to the substance of the Gospel religion): so that even though the acts of all the individual Apostles were written there would yet be nothing contrary, nothing diverse, nothing otherwise, but we would simply read one and the same thing more often recorded". *12.

Chemnitz's Loci Theologici, being a commentary on the Loci Communes of Melancthon, do not contain a Locus de Scriptura Sacra, but the first of nineteen sets of theses for disputations appended to Polycarp Leyser's edition of the Loci treats this subject in nineteen theses, of which we shall quote theses three to six:

"III. Since the knowledge of the being and will of God is necessary to man, that he may not be left in perdition, God Himself of His great mercy coming forth out of His secret light, revealed Himself and His will to the human race even from the beginning by giving a certain Word which He confirmed by illustrious miracles.

"IV. To this His Word which He has given God desires the Church to be bound, and not to apparitions of spirits or of the dead, Isaiah 8,19; not to the imagination of our own hearts, Deuteronomy 12,8; not to the traditions of men, Isaiah 29, 13.

"V. And that Word indeed was at first orally promulgated, propagated, and transmitted, as it were, from hand to hand. But when it had partly been lost by forgetfulness, partly adulterated by strange and supposititious doctrines, God manifested a certain method whereby He provided for the Church to all future times that it might not be driven about by any wind of doctrine (as though divinely revealed), namely that the Word of God, comprehended in writing through witnesses approved by divine authority and certain testimonies, might in this way be preserved and transmitted to posterity.

"VI. Now from the many and lengthy sermons of the patriarchs and prophets, of Christ and the Apostles, those things were selected by the judgement of the Holy Spirit to be written down which were judged by God Himself to suffice for

posterity unto penitence, faith, and rules of pious living; since indeed not other things, nor diverse, nor contrary to those things which had been handed down by word of mouth, but a brief and sufficient summary of them was comprehended in Scripture, God Himself being the Author." *13.

The Church, after the completion of the canon being bound, as aforesaid, to the written Word as the only source and norm of theological truth, as its principium formale, the distinction can no longer be made, after the manner of the papists, between "written and un-written Word", as though there were still an unwritten Word of God current at the present time, but can only be admitted as a historic distinction, in so far as the expression "unwritten Word" is understood to refer to the pre-Mosaic oral revelation made to the patriarchs. Hence Gerhard: "After the publication of the Scripture Canon, there can be no unwritten Word of God, as distinct from Scripture" (Gerhard in Schmid, tr. Jacobs and Hay, p. 42). *14.

The reasons why God desired His Word, at first orally promulgated, to be committed to writing are given by Gerhard as follows: "The chief and primary causes seem to have been: 1) the shortness of human life, 2) the great number of men, 3) the unfaithfulness to be expected from the guardianship of tradition, 4) the weakness of human memory, 5) the stability of heavenly truth, 6) the wickedness of man, 7) in the New Testament, the perverseness of heretics, which was to be held in check" (Gerhard in Schmid, tr. Jacobs and Hay, pp. 39,40). *15.

The enumeration of Baier, except for the transposition of 1) and 2) and the omission of 5) to 7), is practically identical with that of Gerhard. "Namely, 1) the multiplication of the human race, 2). and the shortened space of human life, no longer sufficient that all men could be personally instructed by word of mouth, as had been previously done by the patriarchs, who had received their instruction by immediate revelation of God; but also 3). various corruptions of doctrine which had been brought in, in addition to 4). the infirmity of the men to be informed and the weakness of memory, wherefore it was not without reason desired that there should be on hand a revelation recorded in writing to which one could securely flee in every

case of necessity. And so it seemed most advisable to divine providence that the chief points of the divine revelations should be comprehended in writing" (Baier, Compendium, Ed. Walther, I, 106). *16.

The supreme cause which impelled God to bestow His written revelation in the Scriptures is stated in the following sentence of Baier: "The internal impelling cause of the writing of Holy Scripture by the divine will is the goodness of God, the external is the need of the men to be saved" (Baier, Compendium, Ed. Walther, I, 105). *17. The written Word is the gift of God's redeeming love (2 Timothy 3, 15-17).

Quenstedt in his discussion of the question whether Holy Scripture was necessary derives the hypothetical necessity of the written revelation from the will and ordinance of God, from the condition of men (under which head he repeats and expands the reasons quoted above from Gerhard), from the fourfold usefulness of Scripture, and from the assertion of Paul in Philippians 3,1:

"The hypothetical necessity of Scripture is proved: I. from the divine will and ordinance; for God of His infinite wisdom and goodness ordained Scripture as a means of information for the Church, upon the cessation of immediate revelation, Luke 16,29; 2 Timothy 3,15.16.17; 2 Peter 1,19.

"II. From the condition of men: The Scripture was necessary 1) on account of the shortness of human life; 2) on account of the great number of men, or the expansion of the Church and its diffusion through the whole world; for the Church had at first been included among a few families and afterwards increased into an immense multitude of people; 3) on account of the inclination toward error. Human nature after the fall neither desires nor retains truth, but is inclined toward 'will worship' (Colossians 2,23), yea, even in act frequently lapses into errors, and hence is in need of a written Word; 4) the weakness of human memory; 5) the unfaithfulness to be expected from the guardianship of tradition; 6) the cessation of divine revelations made through direct appearances of God; 7) the fraud of Satan, through his 'divinations' simulating divine 'manifestations', and crazing

the minds of men with various superstitions; 8) the multitude of corruptions; 9) the 'certainty' and stability of heavenly doctrine, Luke 1,4 (graved upon tables which should be kept incorrupt for many ages, Job 19,24; Isaiah 30,8); 10) the firmness of faith; and finally (11) to hold in check the perverseness of heretics.

"III. The hypothetical necessity of Scripture is evident from its fourfold usefulness: 1) that it should be a rule for discerning true dogmas from false, Isaiah 8,20; 2) that from the prophecies concerning Christ, the Messiah promised in the figures and types of the Old Testament should be recognized in the New Testament, and that both the Jews as well as other heterodox (people) should not only be convinced but also drawn to the Christian faith; 3) that our faith should be confirmed and perfected by comparing the writings of each Testament; 4) that far distant Gentiles should be called and saved through the Scripture.

"IV. From the assertion of the Apostle Paul, Phil. 3,1: 'To write the same things ('the same', namely, which when I was present I have often and repeatedly taught) to you (and to inculcate them by an Epistle), to me indeed is not grievous, but for you it is necessary', as the Vulgate Version which is authentic for the Papists has it, 'safe' as the Greek has it, so that thus the hypothetical necessity, for the firmness (of faith) and greater assurance, is indicated" (Quenstedt, I, p. 63). *18.

Man dare neither add nor subtract anything (Joshua 23,6; Deuteronomy 4,2). Thus the canon of the Old Testament was complete (cf. Luke 16,29). For the Church of the New Testament God adds to the Word of the Prophets that of the Apostles (Eph. 2,20: ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν). The unity of Old Testament and New Testament canon is grounded in inspiration by the same Spirit, I Peter 1,10-12 (τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ—ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ). But with the Apostolic revelation of the New Testament the doctrinal revelation of God to His Church is completely closed. John 17,20: διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν. Our preaching is effective because not our own word but God's Word through the Apostles and Prophets.

Where can the New Testament Church assuredly find the Apostles' Word? The Apostles themselves direct us to their writings.-- 1). Their written Word identical with their preaching: 1 John 1, 3.4 (ἀπαγγέλομεν ὑμῖν... γράφομεν ὑμῖν); 2 Thess. 2,15 (εἴτε διὰ λόγου εἴτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν). 2). The Apostles already strongly insist on the sola Scriptura. And this over against a). pseudonymous prophecy or "Spirit" (1 Cor. 14,37: Εἴ τις δοκεῖ προφήτης εἶναι ἢ πνευματικός, ἐπιγινώσκετω ἃ γράφω ὑμῖν ὅτι κυρίου ἐστὶν ἐντολή, cf. 2 Thess. 2,2); b). pseudonymous Apostolic "Logia" or "Tradition"; and c). pseudonymous Apostolic Epistles (2 Thessalonians 2,2: μήτε διὰ λόγου μήτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ὡς δι' ἡμῶν. cf. 3,17).

SECTION II

Holy Scripture in distinction from all other writings the Word of God.

The statement made in the caption to this section of our discussion is expressed by Quenstedt in Chapter IV, Section I, Thesis V of his Theologia Didactico-Polemica, where, after distinguishing between internal and external form (the character of the speech or style and idiom), he defines the internal form of Scripture as follows: "The internal form, or that which gives Scripture its essence, namely that it is the Word of God, that is to say, which constitutes it and distinguishes it from any other writing, is the 'divinely inspired' sense of Scripture, which is in general the conception of the divine intellect concerning divine mysteries and our salvation which was formed from all eternity, revealed in time, and communicated to us in writing, or the 'divine inspiration' itself (2 Tim.3,16) as that whereby the divine Word is constituted and distinguished from any human word". (Quenstedt, I, p.56, quoted in Schmid, p.22). *19.

Scripture teaches the identity of Scripture and God's Word. a). The Old Testament is directly cited in the New Testament as God's Word, Matth. 1,22.23 (Is.7,14); Matth. 2,15 (Hos. 11,1); Acts 4,25.26 (Ps. 2, 1.2); Acts 28, 25-27 (Is. 6,9.10); Heb. 3,7-11 (Ps. 95, 7-11); Rom. 3,2; John 10, 35 (Ps. 82,6). All must take place

"as it is written" (ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῆ) Matth. 1,22; John 17, 12; Matth. 26, 54; Luke 24, 44 ff.. b). The New Testament is, equally with the Old Testament, God's Word, 1 Peter 1, 10-12 (The written Word the same as the oral proclamation, 1 John 1, 3.4; 2 Thess. 2,15); 1 Cor. 14,37; 2 Cor. 13,3; Gal. 1, 8.9.

The sense of the above Scripture passages is expressed by Gerhard when he says: "That between the Word of God and Holy Scripture (understood as to the material) there is no real difference is proved: 1) from the material of Scripture. The Prophets and Apostles wrote the same thing which, instructed by divine inspiration, they had previously preached by word of mouth, and nothing else than that, 1 Cor. 15,1; 2 Cor. 1,13; Phil. 3,1; 2 Thess. 2,15; 1 John 1,3; 2) from the 'equivalence' of phrases. The prophecies of the Old Testament are everywhere in the New Testament alleged with these words: 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet', Matth. 1,22; 2,15; 4,14, etc., etc.---Therefore, what the prophets spoke and predicted is the same as that which they wrote; 3) from the rule of logic: 'An accident does not change the substance of a thing'. It is a mere accident to the Word of God whether it is pronounced by word of mouth or reduced to writing. It is one and the same Word of God whether it is made known to us by way of preaching or by way of writing, since neither the principal efficient cause, nor the material, nor the internal form, nor the purpose is changed, but only the mode of communication, consisting in the organ used, varies; 4) from the 'demonstrative' particle used by the Apostles. For Paul, speaking of the Mosaic Scripture and of the similar books of the Old and New Testament 'demonstratively', says: 'this is the Word of faith', Rom. 10,8; Peter in 1 Peter 1, 25" (Gerhard in Schmid, p.22, and Baier, Compendium, Ed. Walther, I, 93). *20.

It is just on this point, that the Scripture is the Word of God, that Luther and our Symbolical Books speak with such unmistakable clarity. Emphasis has often been laid on the fact that the Lutheran Confessions, in contradistinction to the Reformed, contain no article concerning the inspiration of Scripture, and Luther has even been claimed as the champion of a "free attitude" toward Scripture. But

all such cavils willingly overlook the patent fact that while our Confessions, aiming to be confessions of faith concerning articles in controversy, not complete systems of dogmatics, and also Luther in his dogmatico polemical writings, do not offer an ex professo treatment of the subject in a chapter labelled "de Inspiratione", both Luther and the Confessions do both tacitly assume and explicitly state that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and in no instance would any such statement of Luther or the Confessions tolerate the qualification that the Scriptures merely "contain the Word of God".

It would be a work of supererogation, after the triumphant exposure of the unscholarly and unconscientious dealing with Luther on the part of modern misrepresentatives of Lutheran theology, which has been so abundantly brought to light by Walther in the Foreword to the thirty-second volume (1886) of *Lehre und Wehre* (especially pages 7 to 12) by Pieper, e.g., in the November number of the previous year (*L. & W.*, Volume 31, pp.329-333) and in his "Christliche Dogmatik", and by Rohnert, "Inspiration", pp.140-143, to again take up for discussion the arguments of Luthardt and Cremer, based on the mangled quotation of Luther by Tholuck. It will, however, be of profit to put together the translations of a few of the noteworthy confessions to Scripture as the Word of God, as "God's Book", of which Luther's writings are full. They will prove the truth of Dr. Walther's judgement (*L. and W.* Vol. 32, p.36): "As with regard to many other doctrines, so also for the construction of the doctrine of inspiration, Luther furnished the necessary building stones, which were then put together into a harmonious whole by the dogmaticians of the seventeenth century. There is no essential element in the inspiration-doctrine of our systematicians which could not be documented by clear utterances of Luther".

"Here (2 Sam. 23,2, where David says: 'The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His Word was in my tongue') David becomes too wonderful for me and mounts too high; may God grant that I may yet grasp a little of it; for he begins here to speak of the high and holy Trinity in the divine Essence. He first names the Holy Spirit,

to Whom he attributes all of that which the prophets prophesy. And St. Peter is thinking of this and other similar passages in his Second Epistle 1,21: 'The prophecy came not at any time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake by inspiration of the Holy Ghost'. Hence we sing in the article of the Creed (Nicene Creed) concerning the Holy Ghost thus: 'Who spake by the Prophets'. Thus we attribute to the Holy Spirit the entire Holy Scripture". *21.

On Psalm 40, 7.8: "In the volume of the Book it is written of Me, I delight to do Thy will, O My God", Luther says: "The Spirit speaks as if He knew of no other book (though the world is full of them) except only this Book, the Holy Scripture... That is the Holy Ghost's Book, wherein we must seek and find Christ". *22.

"We condemn the teachings of men, not because they have been spoken by men, but because they are lies and blasphemies against the Scripture, which, although it also was written by men, yet is not from men or of men, but of God". *23.

On Genesis 44, 1.2 (Joseph's cup in Benjamin's sack): "Thus also they dispute whether this trick which Joseph played upon his brethren could be well-pleasing to God, and by whose impulse or by what spirit he may have done it. To this I answer, that Joseph did this in order that we might learn therefrom how we ought to live before God, for which reason it was also described by the Holy Ghost". *24.

On Genesis 38: "It is surprizing what pains the Holy Spirit takes to describe this shameful and unchaste history.....Why has the most pure mouth of the Holy Spirit thus condescended?.... And so the Holy Spirit here descends with His most pure mouth and speaks of the horrible sin and abominable incest". *25.

On Genesis 38, 27-30: "It is true that this is quite a gross chapter; and yet it stands in the Holy Scripture and the Holy Ghost has written it". *26.

The Psalter is a little Bible, "so that I think the Holy Ghost wanted to take the trouble upon Himself and compile a brief Bible and example-book of all Christendom and all saints". *27.

"Here the text of Daniel (7,13.14) also powerfully teaches the article concerning the Godhead in three Persons and concerning the human nature of the Son; for

it must be one Person Who gives and Another Who receives it. The Father, namely, gives eternal power to the Son and the Son has it from the Father, and all this eternity, otherwise it would not be an eternal power; so also the Holy Spirit is present, Who speaks through Daniel. For no one could know such high and heavenly things if the Holy Spirit had not revealed them through the prophets; as it has often been said above, that the Holy Scripture has been spoken by the Holy Ghost". *28.

"Now what is written and proclaimed in the prophets, says Peter, has not been invented and thought out by men, but the holy men have spoken it by the Holy Ghost". So also he says in his Church-Postil: "When St. Peter assures us that the Spirit of Christ has borne witness in the prophets (1 Peter 1,11), then these are not the words of a fisherman or of an astute scribe, but the revelation of the same Holy Spirit Who before revealed it also to the prophets". *29.

"One who has his understanding from God without means, into whose mouth the Holy Ghost puts His Word, is called a prophet. For He (the Spirit) is the Source, and they have no other master than God". *30.

"The prophets bring not what they have thought out and what has seemed good to them, but what they have heard from God Himself, and what He Who made all things has showed and directed them either through dreams or through visions, that they reveal and demonstrate to us.... Thus they are real hearers of God; for the eternal almighty God, the Spirit of God, rules their heart and tongue". *31.

"They were breathed upon by the Holy Spirit, that they might speak". *32.

On Genesis 24,22: "What is here narrated seems to human reason like a very carnal and worldly matter; and I wonder also myself why Moses makes so many words about such trivial things, when he has previously spoken so very briefly about much higher things. But there is no doubt about it that the Holy Spirit wished to have this written for our learning. For in the Holy Scripture there is nothing presented to our attention which is trivial and vain, but all that is written is written for our learning". *33.

"The Holy Ghost is no fool or drunkard that He should speak even one tittle, much less a word, in vain". *34.

On Luke 2,37: "Let that be enough digression for this time, in order that we may see how not a tittle in the Scripture is written in vain, and how the dear old Fathers have given us an example with their faith, but with their works have always portrayed that on which we should believe, namely Christ and His Gospel, so that nothing concerning them is read in vain, but all their matters strengthen and better our faith". *35.

"When they (Jews and Turks) insist on the Scripture, that there is but one God, we on the other hand insist that the Scripture indicates just as strongly that there is a plurality of Persons in the one God. Our Scripture gives us as much as theirs; since no letter in the Holy Scripture is in vain". *36.

"One letter, yea, one single tittle of Scripture is of more and greater importance than heaven and earth. Therefore we cannot suffer that anyone should twist it even in the least". *37.

"If they were not such frivolous despisers of the Scripture, one clear text of Scripture ought to move them as much as though the world were full of Scripture, as indeed it really is, for it is so with me that a single text makes the world too narrow for me" *38.

"This I confess, that if Dr. Carlstadt or anyone else had been able to convince me five years ago that in the Sacrament there is nothing more than bread and wine, he would have rendered me a great service. But I am taken captive and cannot escape; the text is too mighty,....and will not permit itself to be torn out of the mind with words". *39.

"God forbid, God forbid, that there should be a single letter in Paul which the entire universal Church should not follow and hold". *40.

The Confessions of our Church do not offer as vast and comprehensive a quarry of building stones for the construction of a developed doctrine of inspiration as do the works of Luther, yet in their condensed brevity the statements of the

Confessions on this subject are as definite and unequivocal as those of Luther himself; and indeed even the claim that they contain no special article on inspiration, which we can afford to admit, could almost be disputed in view of the nature of the introductory paragraphs to the Formula of Concord ("Foundation, Rule, and Standard", etc.). Let us hear a few such testimonies.

"Therefore, in obedience to Your Imperial Majesty's wishes, we offer in this matter of religion, the Confession of our preachers and of ourselves, showing what manner of doctrine from the Holy Scriptures and the pure Word of God has been up to this time set forth in our lands, dukedoms, dominions, and cities, and taught in our churches" (Preface to the Augsburg Confession, Concordia Triglotta, p. 39).

*41.

"If bishops have the right to burden churches with infinite traditions, and to ensnare consciences, why does Scripture so often prohibit to make, and to listen to, traditions? Why does it call them 'doctrines of devils'? 1 Tim. 4,1. Did the Holy Ghost in vain forewarn of these things?" (Augsburg Confession, Art. XXVIII, Concordia Triglotta, p.91). *42.

"Our adversaries cry out that they are the Church, that they are following the consensus of the Church (what the Church catholic, universal, holds). But Peter also here cites in our issue the consensus of the Church: 'To Him give all the prophets witness, that through His name, whosoever believeth in Him, shall receive remission of sins', etc. The consensus of the prophets is assuredly to be judged as the consensus of the Church universal. (I verily think that if all the holy prophets are unanimously agreed in a declaration (since God regards even a single prophet as an inestimable treasure), it would also be a decree, a declaration, and a unanimous strong conclusion of the universal, catholic, Christian, holy Church, and would be justly regarded as such). We concede neither to the Pope nor to the Church the power to make decrees against this consensus of the prophets" (Apology of the Augsburg Confession, Art. XII (V), Concordia Triglotta, p.271). *43.

"For it will not do to frame articles of faith from the works or words of

the holy Fathers; otherwise their kind of fare, of garments, of house, etc., would have to become an article of faith, as was done with relics. (We have, however, another rule, namely) The rule is: The Word of God shall establish articles of faith, and no one else, not even an angel" (Smalcald Articles, Part II, Art. II, Concordia Triglotta, p. 467). *44.

"We believe, teach, and confess that the sole rule and standard according to which all dogmas together with (all) teachers should be estimated and judged are the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament alone... Other writings, however, of ancient or modern teachers, whatever name they bear, must not be regarded as equal to the Holy Scriptures, but all of them together be subjected to them, and should not be received otherwise or further than as witnesses..... In this way the distinction between the Holy Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament and all other writings is preserved, and the Holy Scriptures alone remain the only judge, rule, and standard, according to which, as the only test-stone, all dogmas shall and must be discerned and judged, as to whether they are good or evil, right or wrong". Introductory Statement to the Formula of Concord, Epitome, Concordia Triglotta, pp.777.779. *45.

"First (, then, we receive and embrace with our whole heart) the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the pure, clear fountain of Israel, which is the only true standard by which all teachers and doctrines are to be judged." Introductory Statement to the Formula of Concord, Thorough Declaration, Concordia Triglotta, p.851. *46.

SECTION III

Holy Scripture is the Word of God because divinely inspired.

For proof of the above thesis no more is required than simply putting into practice the formal principle of Christianity, that Scripture is the only source and norm of all doctrines, thus also of the doctrine concerning the inspiration of Scripture. Three passages are above all others the sedes doctrinae^a of verbal inspiration. 2 Timothy 3, 16: Πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος. 2 Peter 1, 21: ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι. 1 Corinthians 2, 13: ἂ καὶ λαλοῦμεν οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος πνευματικῶς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες. With regard to the first passage, Calovius in his "Biblia Illustrata" (N. T. Tom. II, p. 1031) clarifies the relation of subject and predicate by urging the force of the καὶ which connects θεόπνευστος with the second predicate adjective ὠφέλιμος, but cannot connect the subject with the predicate, as it would have to do if θεόπνευστος is to be reckoned to the subject and not to the predicate, after the example of Grotius and later translators and interpreters with whom dogmatic presupposition bears more weight than Greek grammar. (That Luther proceeded from no such dogmatic presupposition is evident, and his translation is probably to be explained by the influence of the Vulgate which fails to translate the καὶ, --"quam temere neglexit Vulgata", says Calovius, --but the omission, while not destroying the sense, is unfortunate). Calovius further calls attention to the verbal inspiration, "indicating that not only the thoughts but also the written words and the order and arrangement of the words are from God" ("innuens, non solum sententias, sed et verba scripta, ac verborum ordinem et dispositionem a Deo esse"). With regard to the "moving" (φωροῦ) spoken of in 2 Peter 1, 21 he explains that it comprehended both the internal illumination of the mind and suggestion of those things which were to be spoken or written and also the external motion, so that the tongue and pen no less than the mind and spirit did by that impulse whatever they did, so that not only the content or matter was suggested but also the words were put into

the mouths or dictated to the pens of the men of God, as His own amanuenses, by the Holy Spirit. "Biblia Illustrata" N. T. Tom. II, p.1547.

1. Verbal inspiration.--The inspiration taught in the sodes doctrinae is not "real-inspiration", nor "personal-inspiration", but "verbal-inspiration", since the Scripture of which inspiration is predicated (πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος) consists not of things (realia) or persons, but of written words. In 2 Peter 1,21 the holy men of God, ὑπὸ πνεύματος θεοῦ φερόμενοι, did not simply meditate or bring forth thoughts, but spoke (ἐλάλησαν) or brought forth words, "spoke from God" (ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ). That this "speaking" refers to the written words of Scripture is clear from verse 20, where the words that they spoke from God are defined as πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς. Cf. 1 Cor. 14,37: ἐπιγινώσκέτω ἅ γράφω ὑμῖν ὅτι κυρίου ἐστὶν ἐντολή. Thus the objects of inspiration are not men, writers (who are its instruments), but books, writings, words. Scripture says Scripture (which consists of words, verba) is inspired. For exhaustive discussion of the Scripture-basis for the doctrine, cf. the article "Was sagt die Schrift von sich selbst", L. & W. 32 (1886), pp. 161-168; 205-215; 249-257; 281-288; 313-323; 345-355.

Quenstedt is generally recognized as the clearest and completest exponent of the conception of inspiration held by the seventeenth century dogmaticians. A fair representation of his treatment of this doctrine will, however, lead the unprejudiced mind rather to the conclusion that the conception of inspiration held by Quenstedt in company with all the orthodox dogmaticians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is simply that taught by Scripture itself.

A fair conception of Quenstedt's treatment of the point at issue in this paragraph can, we believe, be obtained from some of his utterances on the subject of the real Author of Scripture and on the question whether the individual words of Scripture are inspired. The former is treated in the first seven theses of the first section (didactic) of Chapter IV ("Theologia Didactico-Polemica", I, pp.53-59) and the latter in Question IV of the second section (polemical) of the same chapter (ibid., pp.72-77).

The real author of Holy Scripture is God. "The efficient cause of the Scripture of the Old and New Testament is either principal or instrumental. The principal is the triune God, 2 Tim. 3,16; and specifically: The Father, Hebrews 1,1; the Son, John 1,18; and the Holy Spirit, 2 Samuel 23,2..... God is the principal efficient Cause of Holy Scripture in a twofold manner: 1) by antecedent decree, 2) by subsequent inspiration; or by commanding that the holy men of God should write and by inspiring what was to be written. As to the first, it is established that Holy Scripture is of God Who in a special manner moved and impelled the holy writers to write; as to the second, that God inspired not only the matter but also the words, and the order both of matter and of words" (Quenstedt, I, p.55). *47. Further utterances of Quenstedt on the subject of the real Author of Scripture, or the distinction between the principal and the ministerial or instrumental causes of Scripture, will be found in a later paragraph treating the relation of the Holy Ghost to the writers of Holy Scripture (SECTION IV, below). Compare also the translation of Quenstedt's Thesis V, above, under the heading: "Holy Scripture....is the Word of God" (SECTION II).

Statements bearing more directly on the verbal character of inspiration are made in discussing the question: "Whether the Individual Words were Inspired and Dictated by the Holy Spirit to the Sacred Writers?" ("An etiam singula verba inspirata et dictata sint a Spiritu Sancto sacris Scriptoribus?"):

"The Holy Spirit inspired and dictated to the Prophets and Apostles not only the matters and thoughts contained in Holy Scripture, or the sense of the words, leaving them to express or embellish them at will in their own manner of speech and with their own words, but specially supplied, inspired, and dictated the very words themselves and all the individual expressions" (Quenstedt, I, pp.72,73). *48.

"Nor does the Apostle say πάντα ἐν γραφῇ αὐτῶν θεόπνευστα (all things in Scripture are inspired) but πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος (all Scripture is inspired), that he may show not only the things written but also the writing itself is θεόπνευστος. And what he says of the whole Scripture, the same must also necessarily be

understood of the words as by no means the least considerable part of Scripture. For if even a little word occurred in Scripture which was not divinely suggested or inspired it could not be said that *πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος*" (Quenstedt, I, 74, quoted in Baier, Compendium, Ed. Walther, I, 98). Cf. Calovius (in Schmid, tr. Jacobs and Hay, p. 46): "If all Scripture be inspired (*θεόπνευστος*) then there can be nothing in the Holy Scriptures that was not divinely suggested and by inspiration communicated to those who wrote. For, if even a single particle of Scripture were derived from human knowledge and memory, or from human revelation, then it could not be asserted that all Scripture is divinely inspired". *49.

As to the words in particular, cf. 1 Cor. 2,13: *ἃ καὶ λαλοῦμεν οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρώπινης σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες* showing that the Apostles were not left to express the divine thoughts in their own words, but the words were supplied by God's Spirit: "In this passage the words are distinguished from the matters communicated through the words 'The words which man's wisdom teacheth', or human words even most wisely thought out, and 'words taught of God', words which the Holy Spirit teaches, suggests, and dictates (for the Genitive expresses the efficient Cause, as in John 6,45: 'They shall all be taught of God', i.e., taught by God, from Isaiah 54,13), are opposed to each other. The former are denied to the 'speaking' (*λαλεῖν*) of the Apostles, but the latter are attributed to it. For the Apostle wants to say: Even as from the Holy Spirit we have received that wisdom or knowledge of divine mysteries, even so by Him we were taught the very words in which we should speak it. The word 'to speak' (*λαλεῖν*) includes also writing as in Acts 3,24 and elsewhere, so that the same account is made of writing as of speaking so far as the present matter is concerned. Thus as the speech which the Apostles used in their preaching, even the hidden wisdom in a mystery, was taught them by the Holy Spirit through inspiration, so also they reduced the same to writing not in words taught by human wisdom but which the Holy Spirit taught them through inspiration, so that they used these and not other words, this and not another order and method

of inditing Scripture" (Quenstedt, I,74). #50.

The above is really exegetical dogmatics, not dogmatical exegesis; and shows that the conceptions of the seventeenth century dogmaticians with regard to inspiration were not independent speculative or scholastic constructions but simply the orderly exposition of the Scriptural teaching on this subject, arising not out of polemical necessity but out of exegetical fidelity.

2. Not mere guidance, assistance, or government.--Inspiration is not mere divine guidance, assistance, or government and prevention of error, but the divine giving of the words of which Scripture consists, 1 Cor. 2,13: ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος (sc. λόγους). Θεόπνευστος indicates not mere direction but inspiration.

Calixtus (d.1656) wanted to postulate mere direction of things already known or of secondary importance. By his theory Scripture would be merely the inerrant word of man. Quenstedt: "Antithesis: 1. of the papists, 2. of some Calvinists, 3. of the Socinians, 4. of the Arminians, and also 5. innovators (Calixtus and the syncretistic or Holmstedt party), who all assert that the Holy Spirit did not reveal, inspire, and dictate those things which could be known by natural reason or otherwise by personal experience and sense-perception (as those of which the writers themselves were 'eye and ear witnesses'-- οὐτόπται εἰ αὐτῆ κοοι) and those things which do not pertain to salvation but merely concern the circumstances of the deed or thing narrated, as also those things which seem less important, but only incited the writers to record these things and at the same time governed them by special assistance and direction, in order that nothing false, unseemly, or incongruous might be mingled nor any human weakness disclosed in the writing. So Bellarmine (liber primus de Verbo Dei, caput XV) says: 'God was present to the prophets in a different manner than to the historians. To those He revealed future things and at the same time assisted that they might not mingle anything false in the writing; to those He did not always reveal those things which they were to write, but only incited them to write those things which they either saw or heard, which they remembered, and at the same time assisted that they might

write nothing false, which assistance did not exclude labor (on their part)" (Quenstedt, I, pp.68.69). *51

"A distinction must be made between mere divine assistance and direction, by which the sacred writers were only guarded against departure from the truth in speaking and writing, and the divine assistance and direction which includes the inspiration and dictation of the Holy Spirit. Not the former but the latter renders the Scripture *θεόπνευστος*, and has place here" (Quenstedt, I, p.68). Hollazius draws this distinction in almost the same words: "*θεοπνοή* or *θεοπνευστία* denotes as well the antecedent divine instigation or peculiar impulse of the will to engage in writing, as the immediate illumination by which the mind of the sacred writer is fully illumined through the supernatural illumination of divine grace, and the conceptions of the things to be written are themselves suggested immediately by the Holy Spirit. This *θεοπνευστία* or divine inspiration differs from divine government; for the latter only takes care that nothing should be written which would not be true, seemly, congruous. But by the former the conceptions of the things to be written are suggested by dictation of the Holy Spirit. The latter is able to render the Holy Scripture infallible but not *θεόπνευστον*" (Hollazius, "Theologia Acroamatica", pp.92,93). *52. The former is taught in 2 Peter 1,21. The error (of Calixt and his party) is founded in failure to distinguish between revelation and inspiration. In the case of that which was already known to the holy writers no additional special revelation (in the narrowest sense of the term) was required to make it known to them, yet they were inspired to record these things, or (using the word in a broader sense, as equivalent to inspiration) it was revealed to the writers what words they should use and what circumstances they should adduce in recording them. This point will be specially treated in the excursus on the distinction between revelation and inspiration, below (Excursus I).

3. Inspiration extends to all Scripture.--Inspiration extends not only to a part (principal or essential matters, doctrines of faith, that previously unknown to the writers, etc.) but to "all Scripture", *πάντα γραφή θεόπνευστος*. The

proper scope of the Scripture is not to teach history, geography, natural science, but is given in John 5,39; 2 Tim. 3,15ff.; 1 John 1,4, etc.. When Scripture, however, incidentally touches upon these matters it is still inviolable truth (John 10,35), and to "interpret" the pronouncements of Scripture even on these matters in accordance with supposed knowledge derived from sources outside the Scriptures (human hypotheses) is to dishonor the divine and self-interpreting Word. "Es ist eines Christen unwuerdig, die heilige Schrift, die er doch als Gottes eigenes Wort erkannt hat, nach menschlichen Meinungen (Hypothesen), also auch nicht nach dem sogenannten kopernikanischen Weltsystem, umzudeuten oder sich umdeuten zu lassen" (Pieper, "Christliche Dogmatik", I, p.577). Scripture accomodates itself to human concepts, but not to erroneous human concepts.

Quenstedt: "Each and all of the matters which are contained in Holy Scripture, whether they were by nature totally unknown to the sacred writers, or indeed naturally knowable but nevertheless in fact unknown, or not only naturally knowable but even in fact known, whether by their own experience and sense perception or otherwise, were consigned to writing not only by assistance and infallible divine direction, but were received by special suggestion, inspiration, and dictation of the Holy Spirit. For all things which were to be written were suggested by the Holy Spirit to the sacred writers in the very act of writing and dictated to their intellect as to a pen, so that they were writton with these and not other circumstances, in this and not another mode and order.

"The matter of Scripture has a three-fold difference: 1. Such matters as were by nature totally unknown to the sacred writers, either on account of their exalted nature, as the mysteries of faith, or on account of their non-existence, as future contingencies, or on account of their imperceptibility to the senses, as the secrets of the heart. 2. Such matters as were indeed naturally knowable, but in fact unknown to the sacred writers due to ancientness and remoteness of times and places, unless perhaps they had otherwise been made known to them by rumor or tradition, or by some human writing, as the history of the flood

and of the slaughter of the Sodomites are described by Moses. 3. Such matters as were not only knowable but in actual fact known to the public secretaries of God by their own experience or sense perception, as the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt and their journeying in the desert to Moses, the history of the Judges to Samuel, the life and deeds of Christ to the Evangelists and Apostles. But not only the matters of the first, but also of the second and third classes, were in the very act of writing immediately dictated and inspired by the Holy Spirit to the sacred amanuenses, so that they were recorded with these and not other circumstances, in the mode and order in which they were written and not otherwise.

"It is one thing to make distinctions between the matter of Scripture in and of itself and another thing to make distinctions as to divine inspiration; we acknowledge no distinction in the mode of *θεοπνοή*, but assert that divinity inheres uniformly in the whole of Scripture" (Quonstedt, I, pp.67,68). *53. The point of this last sentence will be treated with special reference to recent denials of this position in the Excursus on "Degrees of Inspiration", below (Excursus II). The recent tendency to limit the extent of inspiration to the religious truths of the Bible after the manner of Calixt will be treated with reference to a noted exponent of this view in Excursus III.

Excursus I. Distinction between Revelation and Inspiration.--Quenstedt: "A distinction is to be made between divine revelation and inspiration. Revelation, formally and etymologically viewed, is the manifestation of things unknown and hidden, and can be made in many and various ways, viz., by outward speech, or by dreams and visions. (For 'to reveal', Greek ἀποκαλύπτειν, is to uncover what had been hidden). Inspiration is that act of the Holy Spirit, by which an actual knowledge of things is supernaturally conveyed to an intelligent creature, or it is an internal suggestion or infusion of conceptions, whether the things conceived were previously known to the writer or not. The former could precede the commitment to writing, the latter was always associated with it and influenced the writing itself.

With all this I do not deny that divine inspiration itself may be called revelation, in a certain sense; in so far, namely, as it is a manifestation of certain circumstances, as also of the order and manner in which certain things are to be written". (We must distinguish between divine revelation when by it the subject-matter itself is made known, and when it refers to the peculiar circumstances and time and manner and order in which the subject-matter is to be reduced to writing. The former was not always necessary, but the latter was." (I,72)) "And when, also, revelation concurs and coincides with divine inspiration, when, viz., the divine mysteries are revealed by inspiration and inspired by revelation, in the very act of writing. Thus Calovius very properly remarks: 'That all the particulars contained in the Sacred Scriptures are not, indeed, to be regarded as having been received by a peculiar and new revelation, but by the special dictation, inspiration, and suggestion of the Holy Spirit'." (Quenstedt in Schmid, tr. Jacobs and Hay, p.49). *54.

Excursus II. "Degrees of Inspiration" and "Divine-human Scripture".-- Modern Lutherans, notably Kahnis in Germany and H. E. Jacobs in the U. L. C. A., have spoken for "degrees of inspiration". Kahnis, in an elaborate attempt at classification, which takes up an entire page in Walther's "Baieri Compendium" (p.103), would divide all Scripture into writings of three grades or classes of inspiration and then further sub-divide these. Henry E. Jacobs, both in the classes in which I studied under him and in his dogmatical treatise, "A Summary of the Christian Faith", took up a confused and confusing position on this doctrine. I recollect his having told us in class that if anyone inquired whether verbal inspiration were taught at the Philadelphia Seminary we should say: "Yes, if by verbal inspiration you mean dynamic inspiration, it is". "Dynamic inspiration" is a non-descript phrase without Scriptural background but equivalent in usage to the similar phrase "plenary inspiration", of which Dr. Engelder properly says: "'Plenary inspiration' wird nicht immer als synonym mit Verbalinspiration genommen, sondern manchmal in Gegensatz dazu". In his "Summary of the Christian Faith" he speaks, on the one

hand, of the Scriptures as "an inspired and inerrant record of revelation" (p.267, Chap. XXIV, qu.7), and, on the other hand, he speaks of "discrepancies between the various human inspired writers" (p. 284, Chap. XXIV, qu.20). He says (ibid., p.283, qu.18): "The very variations and divergences in narrating the same event only show how the Holy Spirit, through no want of foresight, preserved the truly human framework of the record with all its limitations, while filling it with His own divine power as to the central facts presented." Even Dr. Jacobs's greater predecessor in the chair of dogmatics at the Philadelphia Seminary, Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth, highly revered as he properly is among us, was yet not free from this obsession of the divine-human character of Scripture. He is quoted by Dr. Jacobs (ibid.,p.267, qu.8): Scripture "is inspired for it comes from God; it is human for it comes through man. But remember that we do not say that the human is without the divine. The Spirit is incarnate in the Word, as the Son was incarnate in Christ. There is deep significance in the fact that the title of 'the Word' is given both to Christ the Revealer, and to the Bible, the revelation of God, so that in some passages great critics differ as to which is meant. As Christ without confusion of natures, is truly human as well as divine, so is this Word. As the human in Christ though distinct from the divine was never separate from it, and His human acts were never those of a merely human being, His toils, His merits and His blood were those of God, so is the written Word, though most human of books, as Christ, the Son of Man, was most human of men, truly divine. Its humanities are no accidents; they are divinely planned. It is essential to God's conception of this Book that it shall be written by those men and in this way. He created, reared, made and chose these men and inspired them to do this thing in their way, because their way was His way" (quoted from Krauth, "The Bible a Perfect Book"). We note that there is here no mention of limitations and discrepancies, although Jacobs refers to them in this immediate connection, continuing in the same paragraph: "The form of each particular book is determined in part by the freedom and the circumstances of each writer; but back of the human composers was the divine

Author who knows how to turn every element of the writer's freedom and limitations into account for his purposes, just as in Providence, not a sparrow falls without its significance in God's world-plan." It is refreshing to note a passage in a modern dogmatical work which calls God the "Author" of the Scriptures; but is this authorship merely analogous to that of Dumas with his staff of "composers"? It would almost seem so from the above sentence. Such statements leave room for divine guidance, direction, etc., as taught by George Calixt, but not for inspiration. As for Dr. Krauth, in the passage quoted above, he seems to be merely trying to adopt the current theological phraseology of his day and give it an explanation which perhaps means no more than our orthodox theologians mean when they say, quite correctly, that the Holy Spirit adapts Himself to the style of the individual writers ("accomodation"). So it would seem from Krauth's phrase: "to do this thing in their way, because their way was His way". Or does he show here something more than a mere terminological influence of Luthardt's "Kompendium" (which he used as the text of his lectures in Dogmatics) and of the American Committee for Bible Revision (of which he was a member)? We should not like to think so, for we reverence his memory as a devoted champion of the Confession of our Church. But Dr. Krauth would have done better to have left the "divine-human Scripture" ("Gottmenschlichkeit der Schrift") phraseology alone, to have abstained from employing the un-Biblical (though if rightly understood, with emphasis on the analogy between the sinlessness of the Lord and the inerrancy of the Scripture, permissible) analogy to the incarnation,--and thus to have avoided the consequences drawn and the applications made by Jacobs. Our own Dr. Walther, paraphrasing Luther on the "Alceosis" warns: "Huete dich, huete dich, sage ich, vor/dieser 'Gottmenschlichkeit der Schrift'; sie ist des Teufels Larve, denn sie richtet zuletzt eine solche Bibel zu, nach der ich nicht gern wollte ein Bibelchrist sein, naemlich ~~dass~~ die Bibel hinfort nicht mehr sei, denn ein anderes gutes Buch, welches ich mit steter ernster Pruefung lesen muesse, um nicht in Irrtum zu gerathen. Denn wenn ich das glaube, dass die Bibel auch

Irrthum erhalte, so ist sie mir kein Prüfstein mehr, sondern bedarf wohl selbst eines solchen. Summa, es ist unsäglich, was der Toufel mit der 'Gottmenschlichkeit der Schrift' suchet" (Vorwort zu Lehre und Wehre, 1886, p.76 f., the last but one of the articles contributed by Dr. Walther to L. & W.).

Dr. Jacobs makes confusion worse confounded in his six-fold answer to Question 8 (l.c., pp.267-274): "In what senses are the Holy Scriptures inspired? a) Through the activity of the Holy Spirit in and through the writers, when they were written. b) Through the activity of the Holy Spirit in preserving and gathering the Scriptures into one volume. c) The result attained was through the presence of the Holy Spirit in the communion of believers or Christian Church in its proper sense. The gradual formation of the canon of Scripture and its separation as something distinct from other books is, thus, the product of a true inspiration pervading the community of believers as a whole unto the end of time. d) Through the activity of the Holy Spirit in the divine truth which they contain, or which has been drawn directly or indirectly from these 'pure fountains of Israel'. e) Through the personality of Christ, in the Word, as this is brought into closest contact with the reader. f) Through the activity of the Holy Spirit with and in all who read or hear the Word to-day". Quite evidently only the first of these six could designate "inspiration" in the sense in which the Scripture uses the term, yet even this is not developed in a Scriptural manner. Throughout the long and involved discussion of this Question 8, covering more than six pages of his book, the author never attempts to draw the doctrine of inspiration directly from the Scripture-passages treating this point, nor does he even quote or refer to 2 Tim. 3,16 as the seat of the doctrine. Above in the first sub-division of our third section we characterized the treatment of Quenstedt, particularly with reference to 1 Cor. 2,13, as exegetical dogmatics; here in Jacobs we have an example of the opposite, Θεολογούμενον wild. According to this "definition", Θεοπνευστία would be indeed, as Delitzsch calls it, "ein Gottungsbegriff" (Baier, Compendium, Ed. Walther, I, p.104).

Thus Dr. H. E. Jacobs's ex professo treatment of inspiration serves only to show that he has properly no doctrine of inspiration, but only a human "theory" of inspiration (a θεολογούμενον), based on the impression which the critical examination of the characteristics of Scripture produces upon the investigating theologian; and even as to his theory he remains indefinite, being unable to give a clear and decisive answer to the question whether the Bible should be declared to be the Word of God or to contain the Word of God (l.c., qu. 20, pp. 283-285). In a certain sense we can say: "The Bible is the Word of God", namely, as an organism. "But", he continues, "there is a true sense in which we say not only that 'the Bible is', but 'that the Bible contains the Word of God'. This occurs when each part, even the most insignificant and seemingly trifling, even the discrepancies between the various human inspired writers, and all that pertains to the limitations of their nature and environment and age and language, are regarded as bearing on the one great end and one great theme of revelation and its clear and inerrant record" (pp. 284-285). No wonder, after this, that his son, Dr. C. M. Jacobs, who goes much further than the father did in the outspoken rejection of the inspiration of Scripture in the Scriptural sense, should declare himself, in his inaugural address as his father's successor in the presidency of the Philadelphia Seminary, clearly opposed to any "identification" of Scripture with God's Word, and add that this is the view for which the Seminary stands. Modernism in the U. L. C. A. thus rests upon the normal modernistic basis, the rejection of the inspiration of Holy Scripture and of its identification with God's Word.

Moreover, questions which have nothing to do with the inspiration of Scripture, as the historical question whether the Hebrew vowel-points were originally written and are essential to the writing of a complete Hebrew word (Gerhard) or nor originally written (Luther supported by all the historically demonstrable results of Hebrew scholarship), questions of canonicity, etc., are mixed into the discussion of inspiration, in order to show that "some of the most

conservative defenders of traditional theories of inspiration are also open to criticism", namely, "when they ignore or endeavor to conceal the human element in Scripture or, what is the same, raise the human factor to an equality with the divine, as when it is claimed that the Hebrew vowel points are inspired". This is followed by another quotation from Krauth concerning the claims made for the Greek style of the New Testament, as follows: "It was thought to border on the sin against the Holy Ghost to intimate that the Greek, in which He inspired Matthew to write was not as pure as that of Plato. These were monstrous suppositions at war with the facts, totally uncalled for by any interest of the cause they were destined to sustain, and rejected, even when they were most prevalent, by many of the profoundest minds and most pious hearts in all ages of the Church. Such a view contradicts every page of the Bible, a day's perusal of which presents more difficulties against the theory than any ingenuity would be able to solve in a thousand years. This view, however, mars the Bible and stultifies its very plan. It makes a question of life and death out of matters, that have no more connection with the life of revelation, than has the spelling of a word, with the grandeur of 'Paradise Lost'." As to the illustration used at the close of this extract, one has only to consult the accurate (Oxford) edition of Milton by Beeching and his investigations as to Miltonic spelling principles to perceive how unfortunate an illustration has been chosen and how much the Miltonic spelling really has to do with the grandeur of "Paradise Lost". Walther is correct when he states (Lehre und Wehre, I, 62, Note 4): "Nur die Ignoranz kann die Wichtigkeit der Orthographie leugnen". But much more serious exception must be taken to the thought so vehemently expressed in the above extract. It is true that Quenstedt (I, 84) quotes with full approval the judgement of the Hamburg Ministerium: "Dass Solocismi, Barbarismi und nicht recht Griechisch in der Heiligen Aposteln Roden und Schrifften zu finden, ist dem Heiligen Geist, der durch sie geredet, und geschrieben, zu nah gegriffen, und wer die Heilige Schrift einiges Barbarismi bezuechtiget, wie man heutiges Tages den

Barbarismum zu beschreiben pfeget, der begehret nicht eine geringe Gotteslaesterung." This judgement is sustained by the facts of the case for anyone who accepts the Biblical teaching that the Holy Spirit is the Author of Scripture (ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος λόγοις). But how does such a view imply comparison with Plato? It might indeed be held against such purists as would insist on the similarity of New Testament literary style to that of Plato and other classicists, that their viewpoint showed a lack of literary discernment. Yet a partial excuse might be found for them in their lack of the right standard of comparison (the remains of the Κοινή which had not yet been discovered). Quenstedt, however, did not regard the New Testament Greek as "classical" but acknowledged a strong Hebraistic coloring (stronger than modern scholarship would be willing to grant) and regarded it as purposive (as we must still do in case of a book like Revelation). "Aliud est ἑβραΐζειν, aliud βαρβαρίζειν". It remains true that the language of the New Testament as well as of the Old, being the organ of the Holy Spirit, is entirely perfect for the purpose it is intended to serve. Finally, be it said, that ill-grounded suppositions concerning the literary similarity of New Testament Greek with classical Greek, though mistaken, do not "mar the Bible and stultify its very plan", since there is abundant material for the comparative study of New Testament usus loquendi in accordance with the Bible's plan within the New Testament itself, and the question of the proper extra-Biblical standard of comparison is therefore a purely external one. Why, then, such vehemence in castigating a more linguistic misapprehension on the part of those who were right in the main point: the freedom of inspired Scripture from any linguistic vice or failing!

It is not in his dogmatical treatise, "A Summary of the Christian Faith", from which the above extracts have been taken, but in his introduction to a little book of Dr. J. A. W. Haas on "Biblical Criticism", published in 1903, that Dr. H. E. Jacobs brings his rejection of the Biblical doctrine of inspiration to its strongest expression: "A text from Genesis and one from John, one from the Psalms

and one from Romans, cannot stand on the same footing". "There are few theorists (sic) who would assign the same degree of inspiration to the statistics and rolls in Ezra or Chronicles as to those parts of the New Testament for whose reading the dying ask when all other earthly words have lost their interest. Even the distinction between the Petrine and the Pauline theology, which the Tuebingen school so greatly exaggerated, contains within it an element of truth, when the difference is found to be one of degree, but not one of kind" (Citation in Bente, "American Lutheranism", II, p.220). For further information see the above-mentioned volume of Bente, pp.220-222. Now we are not interested to deny the existence of any differences whatever between the various portions of Holy Scripture, such as differences of clarity and fullness, differences of effectiveness for the production of faith, differences of significance for the Christian life, differences of relative importance. Luther has drawn such distinctions with a fine tact and intimate understanding in his Prefaces to the Biblical books. The distinction between Old and New Testaments has been treated by orthodox theologians; the distinction between Law and Gospel lies at the heart of orthodox theology. But, as Quenstedt aptly remarks: "It is one thing to make distinctions between the matter of Scripture in and of itself and another thing to make distinctions as to divine inspiration". To draw distinctions here is simply to obliterate the Scriptural significance of inspiration, and indeed to preclude any intellectual apprehension or intelligible formulation of the concept at all. If God breathed His Word into the holy men, as 2 Timothy 3,16 tells us that He did, then inspiration admits of no difference in degrees. The proof-text just referred to does not assert merely that the writers were inspired, but that what they wrote was inspired, that their writing was the Word of God. Now either the Bible is in its totality and in its every word the Word of God, or else it is not. If the Bible is not in its every word the Word of God, then it is not inspired, according to the Biblical usage of the term. If it is in its every word the Word of God, then it is inspired in the fullest sense and in the "highest degree". To say that not all Scripture is

inspired, but that parts of the Bible are inspired and other parts are not inspired, is to fly in the face of Scriptural teaching; it is nevertheless an intelligible statement. It means something quite definite, namely, that parts of the Bible are the Word of God and other parts are not the Word of God. But to say that one part of the Bible is the Word of God to a greater extent than another part, or is inspired in a higher or lower degree than another part, is more God-breathed or less God-breathed,--means nothing at all. There can be no intermediate shade of inspiration between what is and what is not the Word of God, and all talk of higher and lower degrees of inspiration is a senseless beclouding of the issue. To speak of a lower degree of inspiration is to use words without any meaning. We know from clear passages of Scripture what the word "inspiration" means when the Bible uses the term, but we should like to have some modern theologian explain what significance he can possibly attach to such an unscriptural, illogical, and self-contradictory expression as "Degrees of Inspiration".

Excursus III. Limitation of Inspiration to "Religious Truths".--The U. L. C. A. has had at least one outstanding dogmatician since Dr. H. E. Jacobs, Dr. Joseph Stump, until his recent decease president of Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary, whose system of Dogmatics, "The Christian Faith", will bear comparison with his teacher's "Summary of the Christian Faith". While the doctrine of inspiration is treated by Dr. Jacobs only in connection with his chapter on the Word as a means of grace, Dr. Stump treats of the Bible as the Word of God both in his Prolegomena and in a special chapter (Chapter XXVII) on "The Written Word or the Holy Scriptures", a decided methodological advantage over Jacobs's more incidental treatment. The work also in its greater clarity of statement produces a favorable impression. Stump's dogmatics text-book does not strike one as particularly original; and does call to mind, for one acquainted with Jacobs, his relation to the elder teacher (Dr. Stump graduated from the Philadelphia Seminary in 1887, and thus studied under Dr. Jacobs during the latter's earlier years as professor at that institution). Since Christian doctrine is not a field

for the display of originality but for adherence to the truth, Dr. Stump's following in the footsteps of his teacher would be entirely commendable if he reproduced only the esteemed Doctor's virtues as a Lutheran dogmatician. Unfortunately this is not so. Stump reproduces rather faithfully, but with a little greater clarity and caution, also the aberrations of Dr. Jacobs. On the whole this recent dogmatics (1932) by Dr. Stump shows him to my mind as perhaps the most careful exponent of the "Lehrtypus" of the U. L. C. A., neither departing from it nor seeking to express it in its most "radical" form. He is neither a strictly Scriptural and Confessional conservative like Dr. Little of Waterloo, Ontario, nor a representative of the "radical" group, which will be delineated in section seven below, but rather stands with the elder Jacobs in a mediating position between the opposite tendencies at work in the U. L. C. A., which makes his presentation of the doctrine of inspiration very important for the characterization of that church-body.

In two important respects, however, one negative and one positive, Dr. Stump differs from the teacher with whom we have regarded him in such close relation. This dissensus, of course, is not stated by him but is derived from our own comparison of the two authors. Stump does not fall into the error of Jacobs and Kahnis with regard to "degrees of inspiration", which we have treated in the preceding excursus (II). When he comes to this point in his discussion of the written Word (under the paragraph headed: "For our Learning", in Chapter XXVII, p.321) he speaks of some books of the Bible having "greater value than others", but distinctly explains: "This does not mean that they are not all inspired, but that some books contain larger and more potent measures of distinctly religious truth", and in a note under this he quotes from Luther's Prefaces. A large step in advance indeed! But in one respect he goes beyond Jacobs in the wrong direction, namely in his concession to science falsely so called. This concession is contained not in specific proposals for the modification of certain Scriptural statements in favor of certain scientific postulates (as, for instance, the

evolutionary hypothesis is widely accepted in the U. L. C. A.) but rather in a general limitation of inspiration to the sphere of religious truth, a point so prominent in Dr. Stump's treatment of Scripture that the title we have given to the present excursus may practically be taken as the designation for the "specificum" in his view of inspiration. To this point we will return, but first proceed to consider some features in Stump's presentation of the doctrine which would seem to conflict with such limitation.

Dr. Stump professes to accept "verbal inspiration", and even the emergence of this term (which in most other U. L. C. utterances on inspiration either recedes into the back-ground, as in Jacob's treatment of the doctrine, or is definitely repudiated) may be taken as a hopeful sign. He says: "Inspiration....is in the right sense of the term verbal....The words themselves must be regarded as inspired words, and the exact shades of meaning in the original words are often a matter of the utmost importance in deciding questions of doctrine and life.....In 1 Cor. 2,13 Paul expressly claims for himself a verbal inspiration" (p.319). The editor of the "Lutheran Herald" (N. L. C. A.) of June 11, 1935 (quoted in "Concordia Theological Monthly", January, 1936, p.55), expressing apprehension at the trend away from verbal inspiration in the Church-body to which Dr. Stump belonged, accepts this statement of his at face value and ranks him among the champions of verbal inspiration. Yet we must regretfully contend that Stump's dogmatics does not accept the doctrine of verbal inspiration as the Scriptures teach it, and to rank him as a champion of this doctrine is misleading. The proof that he does not understand verbal inspiration as the Scriptures teach it is contained in the same paragraph from which we just quoted, namely, in the sentence: "They are inspired words because they are the words of inspired men". It is evident from a study of 2 Tim. 3,16 that the inspiration of the words ($\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\eta}$) is explicitly asserted, while the inspiration of the men can only be arrived at by a deduction. Even in 2 Peter 1,21, where $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota$ is the subject and the writers are said to be $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\delta\ \pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\ \phi\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\iota$, the participle modifying the subject describes

properly the "impulsus scribendi", and the "inspiratio" itself in the strictest sense must even here be ascribed to that which they spoke (ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ), while the phrase ἄνθρωποι θεόπνευστοι will be recognized as one which nowhere occurs in the New Testament, if not as one which is entirely inconsistent with Greek idiom. Also in 2 Cor. 2,13, while the subject is first person plural, the quality of being "taught of the Spirit" is not connected directly with the subject (as, e.g., διδασκτοὶ πνεύματος λαλοῦμεν) but with the words used by the subject: ἃ καὶ λαλοῦμεν.... ἐν διδασκαλίᾳ πνεύματος (λόγοις). Now we do not wish to deny that the writers of Scripture were "inspired men", nay, we affirm it; for since they were impelled by the Holy Spirit to speak inspired words they can for that reason be regarded, derivatively, as inspired speakers. But what we wish to bring out is that while the inspiration of the words is the clear and explicit teaching of Scripture the inspiration of the men is no more than a legitimate deduction therefrom. Now Stump says: "They are inspired words because they are the words of inspired men". Exactly the reverse is the case: They are inspired men because they speak inspired words. Does not this reversal on Stump's part, whereby a deduction becomes the premise and the clear teaching of Scripture is stated as a deduction, indicate a dissociation of Stump's "verbal inspiration" from the Scriptural roots of the doctrine? It does,--and such a dissociation as makes ample room for the "human element in Scripture". If the inspiration of the men is primary and that of their message only secondary, then there is still a possibility of mutual co-operation (συνεργισμός) between the inspired writers and the divine Author in the production of the message, and the inspired men may be regarded as not only receptive but as making their positive contribution, so that the result is a composite product, a "divine-human Scripture". Such is the result at which Stump arrives. He does not, like Jacobs, leave 2 Tim. 3,16 out of consideration, but he fails to do full justice to it. He does not neglect the sedes doctrinae, but he misses their point. His exegetical discussion is far superior to that of Jacobs, yet after all he does not give us real exegetical dogmatics; for the

"human element" does not figure in the sedes doctrinae, but it plays an important role in Stump's construction. Little ("Disputed Doctrines", pp.18-30) reaches a very different result. He also states with emphasis: "They were inspired men". But he follows this up immediately with the sentence: "But aside from this, it is of vastly more importance to have the absolute assurance of the divinity of the message than of the free agency of the comparatively few reporters who recorded it". And that is the important point in the Scripturo proof-texts: "the divinity of the message". In this we can recognize "verbal-inspiration", but in Stump's teaching we cannot.

The Holy Scriptures are defined as "the inspired and inerrant record of the supernatural revelation of God to men" (p.21). This conception of revelation as primarily a matter of historical events in the past of which Scripture is the "record" ("Urkunde"), rather than as an activity of God which coincidentally with inspiration produced the Scriptures, seems normative in all U. L. C. treatment of this doctrine, and is a constantly recurring formula of their theologians, learned by them from the nineteenth century German theologians. Our own conception of the relation between revelation and inspiration will not be misconstrued if the quotation from Quenstedt in Excursus I be understood as correctly expressing it. But, keeping in mind the necessary distinction there set forth, it is certainly true that the Scriptural account of how revelation and inspiration took place (as, e.g., in the last words of David, 2 Samuel 23) tends to keep these two divine activities together and show how they coincide in the production of the written Word of God (Rohnert correctly: "So ist denn das Gebiet der Inspiration mit dem der Offenbarung engverflochten; aber es will doch beides auseinandergelassen sein. Wohl ist jede Inspiration zugleich auch Offenbarung, aber nicht jede Offenbarung ist Inspiration"), while the U. L. C. dogmatics tends to keep them apart. Thus Stump does not understand the position of the old dogmaticians on this matter, but states that "they regarded revelation and inspiration as identical", which is certainly a misrepresentation of the case, as is evident from the clear statement

of Quenstedt already referred to. They did indeed regard revelation and inspiration as coinciding in the production of Scripture ("inspirando revelantur, et revelando inspirantur"), but they also drew the boundaries between these two concepts far more precisely than has been attempted by modern theologians. Stump also, like Jacobs, accepts both statements: that the Bible is the Word of God, and that the Bible contains the Word of God, which "modus docendi" does not produce clarity but confusion.

The chief point of objection, and that which we have designated as the "specificum" in Stump's teaching on inspiration, is the limitation of inspiration to "religious truths". This is a consequence of the "human element" in the composition of Holy Scripture as postulated by Dr. Stump. And this human element is not as carefully guarded as we have seen it in the utterances of Dr. Krauth ("Remember that we do not say that the human is without the divine"), for this human element has a very important function to perform in Stump's system. It must collaborate with the concessions to "science", and make room for those concessions under a view of "verbal inspiration" which would otherwise not admit of them. If there are "discrepancies" (for Stump seems to allow their possibility) they must be charged to the "human element". If "purely personal" matters (levicula) occur in Paul's letters to Timothy they are instances of the "human element". If, finally, the standpoint of modern science conflicts with statements of Scripture, the "human element" must again come into play. "On scientific matters the holy writers neither knew nor professed to know more than other men of their day" (p. 320). We pause to inquire whether Moses really "did not profess to know" how the world was created? Or was that ^amatter of common knowledge with the men of his day? And after all the question is not how much the holy writers knew on any subject, but whether the words which they penned by inspiration of the Holy Ghost are true, no matter what subject they touch. The Bible and science "operate in different spheres", Dr. Stump tells us. Yes, but when those "different spheres" impinge or overlap, and the words of Scripture conflict with that which calls itself

"science", then which is right? This Dr. Stump does not tell us. But he hints it. "Paul's inspiration, however, was an inspiration in matters of religion; and its purpose was to give us an infallible knowledge of the revealed will of God" (p.318) "Thus the Bible is the inspired and inerrant record of all that God has supernaturally revealed to man concerning Himself and the way of salvation" (p.319). "The holy writers were inspired with a supernatural knowledge of God and of His will; and on these subjects their words are final and infallible" (bottom of p.319). If Paul's inspiration was an inspiration restricted to "matters of religion", if the words of the holy writers are final and infallible "on these subjects" ("knowledge of God and of His will"), then what if they in the writing of Holy Scripture touch on other subjects? The last quotation is immediately followed by what seems to be the answer to this question: "On scientific matters they neither knew nor professed to know more than other men of their day" (top of p.320). Now 2 Tim. 3,16 does not say anything about how much the holy writers knew on one subject or another, but it does say *πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος*, and within the compass of *πᾶσα γραφή* there are a good many subjects touched upon (incidentally, indeed, but distinctly, and often with considerable detail) in addition to "supernatural knowledge of God and His will", and the words which treat of these things also, in so far as they are contained in *πᾶσα γραφή*, are *θεόπνευστος*. But, says Dr. Stump, it was "an inspiration in matters of religion". The text does not say so; it makes no limitation to the sphere of *θεόπνευστία* except *πᾶσα γραφή*. Dr. George Calixt of Helmstedt (1586-1656) did. He said: "The Holy Spirit did not reveal, inspire, and dictate....those things which do not pertain to salvation.... as also those things which seem less important, but only incited the writers to record these things and at the same time governed them by special assistance and direction, in order that nothing false, unseemly, or incongruous might be mingled nor any human weakness disclosed in the writing". Are we then unjust if we call Dr. Stump with regard to this matter a veritable "Calixtus Rodivivus" (and Calixt seems to have learned this "wisdom" from Bellarmine)? Certainly not unjust to Dr.

Stump. But perhaps to Dr. Calixtus. For Dr. Stump does not make as careful provision for the special assistance and direction of the holy writers outside the sphere of religion as the old Helmstedter syncretist did. Calixt taught that in the absence of inspiration God at least granted special assistance "in order that nothing false, unseemly, or incongruous might be mingled nor any human weakness disclosed in the writing". But in Stump's "theory" this is just the place where the "human element" comes into play, and not only inspiration but also infallibility are lacking to the holy writers outside the religious sphere, for it is within that sphere that "their words are final and infallible". Stump is like Calixt, except that he does not postulate the infallibility of the non-religious statements. No, Dr. Stump does not teach the verbal inspiration of "all Scripture".

4. Inerrancy.--Since inspiration extends not merely to a part of the Scripture but to the whole of Scripture, and since Scripture consists not of persons or things but of words, it follows that the Scripture is all of its words and in each of its words is completely inerrant. Instances of emphasis on a single word or form of a word: 1). Galatians 3,16: οὐ λέγει καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν, ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐφ' ἑνός· καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου, ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός (Gen. 22,18: טַיִל טַיִל, Singular). 2). Matthew 22,43.44: πῶς οὖν Δαυὶδ ἐν πνεύματι καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον λέγων· εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου κ.τ.λ. (Ps. 110,1: יְיָ יְיָ, one word, proving divinity). 3). John 10,35: εἰ ἐκείνους εἶπεν Θεοὺς πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή (Ps. 82,6: אֲנִי אֲנִי, title given to magistrates). The Scripture warns against adding anything to or subtracting anything from the Word of God: Deuteronomy 4,2; 12,32; Proverbs 30,5.6; Revelation 22,18.19.

The testimony of Christ, Matthew 5,17-19; Luke 16,17.

The testimony of Paul, Acts 24,14: πιστεύων πᾶσι τοῖς κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ τοῖς ἐν τοῖς προφήταις γεγραμμένοις.

The testimony of Luther: "The saints could err in their writing and could

sin in their life; the Scripture cannot err". *55.

"I do not reject it (the teaching of the Church), but since everyone knows that they have erred as men, I will not give them credence, except so far as they can offer me proof of their understanding from the Scripture, which has never erred. And that is what St. Paul enjoins, 1 Thess. 5,21, when he says: 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good'. To the same effect St. Augustine writes to St. Jerome: 'I have learned to do such honor only to the books which are called the Holy Scripture, that I firmly believe none of their writers have ever erred; but all others I read in such a way that I do not hold what they say to be true unless they prove it to me with the Holy Scripture or plain reason". *56.

"That deceived the good man Oecolampadius, that Scriptures which are against each other must indeed be harmonized and the one part receive an understanding which will be consistent with the other; for it is certain that the Scripture cannot be divided against itself. But what he did not notice and consider was, that he was the man who professed such disagreement of the Scripture and ought to prove it; but he took it for granted and brought it forward as though it were certain and already proved. That is where he made his mistake. But if they would first take heed to themselves, and see to it that they speak nothing else than God's Word, as St. Peter teaches, and would leave their own affirmations and assertions at home, then they would not occasion so much misfortune. The word: 'Scripture is not against itself', would not have misled Oecolampadius, for it is founded in God's Word, that God does not lie and that His Word does not lie".*57.

"I will let you keep on hostily crying that the Scripture is against itself, that it ascribes righteousness in one place to faith and in another to works. Nevertheless it is impossible that the Scripture should be against itself; except only that it seems so to the ignorant, coarse, and hardened hypocrites". * 58.

"I myself am heartily displeased with myself and hate myself, because I know that everything which the Scripture says of Christ is true, that which there can be nothing greater, more important, more pleasant, more joyous, and which

should intoxicate me with the highest joy, because I see that the Holy Scripture is harmonious in all its parts, so that one cannot entertain the least doubt of the truth and certainty of such an important matter", etc. * 59.

"So there are many passages in the Scripture which according to the letter are in conflict with each other, but when the causes are indicated then all is right". *60.

"We have the articles of our faith sufficiently well founded in Scripture; hold to that, and do not let it be twisted with glosses or interpreted according to reason, how it harmonizes or not; but, if any one wants to cheat you by reason and your own thoughts, then say: Here I have the plain Word of God and my faith; I will stick to that, and neither think, ask, or hear anything beyond it, nor speculate how this or that harmonizes, nor listen to you even though you bring another text or passage as though contrary to it, drawn out of your own head and smeared with your spittle; for they will not be contrary to each other nor to any article of faith, even though in your head they may be contrary and fail to harmonize". *61.

"I beg and faithfully warn every pious Christian not to stumble at the simplicity of the language and the stories that will often meet him there. He should not doubt that however simple they may seem, these are the very words, works, judgements, and deeds of the high majesty, power, and wisdom of God; for this is Scripture, and it makes fools of all the wise and prudent, and stands open to the small and foolish, as Christ says, in Matthew 11,25. Therefore let your own thoughts and feelings go, and think of the Scriptures as the loftiest and noblest of holy things, as the richest of mines, which can never be worked out, so that you may find the wisdom of God that He lays before you in such foolish and simple guise, in order that He may quench all pride. Here you will find the swaddling-clothes and the mangers in which Christ lies, and to which the angel points the shepherds, Luke 2,11. Simple and little are the swaddling-clothes, but dear is the treasure, Christ, that lies in them". *62.

The testimony of Quonstedt: "The Holy canonical Scripture in the original is of infallible truth and free from every error, or, which is the same, in the Holy canonical Scripture there is no untruth, no falsity, no error not even the least, whether in matter or in words; but everything, whatsoever is handed down therein, is most true, whether it is dogmatical, or moral, or historical, chronological, topographical, onomastical; no ignorance, oversight, or forgetfulness, no defect of memory, can or ought to be attributed to the amanuenses of the Holy Spirit in recording the sacred writings (Quonstedt, I, 77). *63.

The testimony of Calov: "No error, even in unimportant matters, no defect of memory, not to say untruth, can have any place in all the Sacred Scriptures " (Quoted in Schmid, tr. Jacobs and Hay, p.49). *64.

5. The Inspiration of Scripture Includes the Impulse and Command to Write.--

2 Peter 1,21: οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι.

"The opposite view is that held I. by Atheists and Epicureans, who either openly or covertly deny the divine origin of the written Word of God.

"II By the Papists, who foolishly assert that the Evangelists and Apostles did not write by any divine command, but were incidentally urged by some accidental circumstance originating elsewhere, or by necessity. And further: That God neither expressly commanded that they should write nor that they should not write. That the Apostles nowhere testify that they write by command of the Lord. So Bellarmino, liber IV de Verbo Dei, cap.3,col.169, where he says: 'It is false that God commanded the Apostles to write, for we read in the last chapter of Matthew that they should preach the Gospel, but that they should also write it we nowhere read. And so God neither expressly commanded that they should write nor that they should not write. Nevertheless we do not deny that the Apostles wrote what they wrote by the will and inspiration of God', etc.. Cap. IV SECTION III, secundo prob., he says: 'If Christ and the Apostles had had the intention of confining and restricting the Word of God to the Scripture Christ would openly

have enjoined especially a matter of such importance and the Apostles would somewhere have testified that they wrote by the command of the Lord, just as they taught in all the world by the command of the Lord, but this we nowhere read" (Quenstedt, I, p.65). To this Quenstedt answers: "An express command was not necessary, because the inspiration of the things to be written and the internal impulse to write are equivalent to a command. That the Apostles wrote by the will and inspiration and suggestion of God, and yet not by His injunction, involves a direct contradiction" (Quenstedt, I, pp.66,67). * 65.

The testimony of Gerhard: "In the holy men of God, the external command and the internal impulse correspond to each other. For what else is that divine impulse than an internal and secret command of precisely the same authority and weight with one that is external and manifest?"...."Those who were commanded to teach all nations, were also commanded to reduce their teachings to writing; for they could not teach all nations, even of the succeeding age, orally and without writing" (Gerhard in Schmid, tr. Jacobs and Hay, p.44). *66.

The testimony of Hollaz: "Did the sacred amanuenses write by command of God? That an express command to write was divinely given to some of the sacred amanuenses, Scripture plainly testifies (Exodus 17,14; Deuteronomy 31,19; Isaiah 8,1; 30,8; Jeremiah 36,2; Habakkuk 2,2; Revelation 1,11, etc.); from the same (Scripture) we validly infer that the rest wrote by the will and command of God. This is proved: 1. By the general command of Christ, Matth. 28,19. 2. By the impulse of the Holy Spirit, which Peter teaches, 2 Peter 1,21. 3. By the divine inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures, which Paul inculcates, 2 Tim.3,16. 4. By the apostolic office, in which these holy men became the ambassadors of God, 2 Cor. 5,20. Ambassadors are restricted by the commands of their sovereign. Peter, as an ambassador of God, did not undertake to preach to the Gentiles without a divine command; therefore still less would he dare to write an epistle unless commanded by God" (Hollaz, "Theologia Acroamatica", pp.89,90. Quoted in Schmid, tr. Jacobs and Hay, p.44). *67.

The testimony of Baier: "For partly the divine inspiration itself by which were suggested the things which should be reduced to writing brought with it the impulse to the exercise of the act of writing; partly also it is certain that the holy writers were incited to write by the express command of God, for instance, Moses, Deut. 31,19; Isaiah, 8,1; 30,8; Jeremiah, 30,2; John, Apoc. 1,11.19; 2,1.8. 12.18, etc., or other occasions and incentives to writing were presented through the special providence of God, by which they were rendered certain concerning the will of God" (Baier, Compendium, Ed. Walther, I,99). *68.

SECTION IV

The Relation of the Holy Ghost to the Writers of Holy Scripture.

The Scripture defines this relation very clearly when it states that the Lord, or the Holy Ghost, spoke "through" the human writers (Matth. 1,22 and 2,15: τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου; Acts 1,16: τὴν γραφὴν ἣν προεῖπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διὰ στόματος Δαυὶδ 4,25: ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυὶδ παιδὸς σου εἰπῶν; Luke 1, 70: καθὼς ἐλάλησεν διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ), and with the result that this Word spoken through men was not their word but wholly God's or the Holy Ghost's Word (τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, Romans 3,2). Paul witnesses both of his written and oral proclamation that it is the Word of God (1 Cor. 14,37: ἐπιγινωσκέτω ἡ γραφὴ ὑμῖν ὅτι κυρίου ἐστὶν ἐντολή; 1 Thess. 2,13: ἐδέξασθε οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἀληθῶς ἐστὶν λόγον Θεοῦ). Thus the holy writers were the organs or instruments of the Holy Ghost in communicating His Word to men in written form. To express this relation, the relation, namely of mere instrumentality whereby they wrote not their own but God's Word, the Church-Fathers and the old Lutheran theologians, in entire conformity with Scriptural teaching (compare the term στόμα, "mouth", used in the quotations above, and φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, "voice of one crying in the wilderness", whereby St. John the Baptist describes himself and his function, John 1,23) used the terminology: "amanuenses, secretaries

hands, pens" ("amanuenses, notarii, manus, calami").

Quenstedt: "Cyprian, Sermo de Eleemosynis , 'The Holy Spirit was the Scribe, the Prophets were His pens, to which the Holy Spirit dictated the things to be written'. Elegantly Augustine, lib. 1 de Consensu Evangelistarum, the last chapter: 'Whatever the Savior wished us to read of His deeds and words, this He ordered to be written by them (Evangelists and Apostles) as His hands'. God, therefore, alone, if we wish to speak accurately, is to be called the Author of the Sacred Scriptures; the Prophets and Apostles cannot be called the authors, except by a kind of catachresis, as those who were rather the pens of God, the Author, and the secretaries and amanuenses of the Holy Spirit, the ἀρχιγραμματεὺς (Arch-scribe), Who dictated and inspired the Word" (Quenstedt, I, pp.55,56). *69.

This is not a mechanical concept of inspiration. It is a hackneyed and moss-grown accusation against believers in the Bible's teaching concerning itself that they hold "a mechanical theory" of inspiration. This charge has been as tiresomely and meaninglessly repeated as the term "consubstantiation" used to be in characterizations of the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence by non-Lutheran writers. That term, however, representing as it does a sacramental theory which has never been taught by any church, has finally by persistent protest been fairly well eliminated from recent works of reference. Now the "mechanical theory" of inspiration is not a viewpoint which has never been held by anyone throughout the whole history of the Christian Church. It was held in the time of the ancient Church, not, however, by Cyprian, Augustine, and other orthodox Fathers, but by Tertullian and the Montanists. Indeed, even the pagans hold a mechanical theory of the inspiration of their oracles, and even Origen carefully warded off a possibility of misunderstanding the Christian doctrine of inspiration as analogous to that heathen concept. And though the false accusation of holding a "mechanical theory" has often been refuted since those days and by better theologians than Origen, for instance, by our Quenstedt, yet scarcely a theologian of the ancient or mediaeval church, except the heretical

sects and such individual stragglers away from the central path of ecclesiastical development as Theodore of Mopsuestia, Euthymius Zigabenus, and Abelard, will be exonerated of the charge by modern theologians. Those who take pride in calling themselves "Catholic" (Anglo-Catholics) reject at this point what they otherwise consider as the "consensus of orthodox antiquity"; and the "Modernists" seem to think the Bible was a sealed book to the Church until the advent of "modern critical methods" in the spirit of Fosdick's "Modern Use of the Bible". Worst of all, the charge of "mechanical theories" is repeated, parrot-like, by those who call themselves "Lutheran" theologians, and directed by them against the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, as something which must be purged away before real doctrinal unity can be attained among us. And this accusation is raised not only against the faithful "seventeenth century dogmaticians". Here is one of the latest occurrences, in a critique of Dr. Lenski's commentary on Revelation by Prof. E. E. Flack of Springfield, Ohio (U. L. C.), in the "Lutheran Church Quarterly", October , 1935 (quoted in "Concordia Theological Monthly", February and March, 1936, pp.148 and 222): "Is not the inspiration of Scripture too high and holy a reality to be defined in terms of stenography? Does one exalt the Word of God by dehumanizing it?" The question is rather: Have the champions of Scripture's teaching concerning itself, emphatically rejecting the "human element" in the sense in which it is interpolated by modern theologians, really "dehumanized" it in such a way as to represent the relation between the Holy Spirit and His human organs, or "secretaries", mechanically? "Omne simile claudicat"; yet some similes are particularly clear and apt, and among those we must count the comparisons used by the Church Fathers and our own theologians in illustrating the relation between the holy writers and the Holy Spirit. As we cannot repudiate the language of the Baptist when he identifies himself as "the voice of one crying in the wilderness", or regard this description as "dehumanizing" him, for it occurs in Holy Scripture itself; so also we cannot repudiate the language of Augustine or Quenstedt ("calami, notarii," etc.), because it agrees so well with the normative

usage of Scripture. We believers in verbal inspiration do not hold that the sacred writers wrote any part of the Scriptures as helpless, unthinking, unconscious tools of the Holy Spirit. No, they really believed and felt in their hearts the messages which the Holy Spirit gave them to write. That this was the position of Quenstedt will be demonstrated immediately. It is the position which we find expressed in Scripture itself and to which we confess ourselves. It is an honest conviction. Opponents may disagree with this doctrine, they may reject the testimony of Scripture concerning itself, but it would require an unusual degree of prejudice to designate it, after examining the evidence, as a "mechanical theory".

Quenstedt, in an exegetical disquisition on 2 Peter 1,19-21, expounds verse 21 in part as follows: "The verb 'to speak', which is used in this place and Acts 2,31;3,24 and frequently elsewhere concerning Holy Scripture, and the noun 'word' (verse 19) express the genus of Scripture, namely that it is a speaking or word. The specific differences are derived from the causes, and first, from the principal efficient cause, which is proposed here, *κατ' ἄρσιν θελήματος ἀνθρώπου* by excluding the will of man, not materially and subjectively viewed (as though these divine amanuenses wrote ignorantly and unwillingly, beyond the reach of and contrary to their own will; for they wrote cheerfully, willingly, and intelligently), but viewed as to the efficient cause and origin, that they did not speak and write according to their own human judgement, neither by their natural will by which man is moved to his ordinary works, not yet by their regenerate will, as that whereby the faithful are moved to works of piety, but by that (will) which the Holy Spirit excited by an extraordinary impulse..... They are said to be *φερόμενοι*. driven, moved, urged on by the Holy Spirit, not as though they were in a state of unconsciousness, as the Enthusiasts pretended to be, and as the heather feigned that there was a certain *ἐνθουσιασμός* in their soothsayers; nor, further, by any means, as though the prophets themselves did not understand their own prophecies or the things which they wrote, which was formerly the error of the Montanists,

Phrygastians or Cataphrygians, and Priscillianists; but because they wrote nothing of their own accord, but everything at the dictation of the Holy Spirit" (Quenstedt, I, p. 57). *69a.

Moreover the Holy Spirit is rightly said to have accom^{od}ated Himself (con-
descended) to the personal and individual literary styles of the holy writers, so
that the latter were preserved. Again we quote Quenstedt: "A distinction is to
be made between the manner of speaking and the very phrases, words, and vocables.
The writers owe their manner of speaking to daily use and custom, or also to edu-
cation, and hence also arises the diversity especially of the prophetic style.
For as they were educated and accustomed to a more exalted or a more colloquial
manner of speaking and writing, so the Holy Spirit willed to accommodate Himself
and condescend to the genius of men, and thus also to set forth the same things
through some more loftily, through others more simply; but that the sacred writers
employed these and not other phrases, these and not other vocables or synonyms,
this is alone from the divine instigation and inspiration. For the Holy Spirit
accommodated Himself to the capacity and genius of the sacred writers, so that
they recorded the mysteries according to their accustomed mode of speaking. Hence
the Holy Spirit inspired those words into the amanuenses which they would at
another time have used if they had been left to themselves" (Quenstedt, I, pp. 75,
76). *70.

SECTION V

Objections against the Inspiration of the Holy Scripture.

1. Differences of style in the individual books of the Scriptures.--

Difference of style is demanded by the doctrine of verbal inspiration, since God
spoke not only through one man, but through many men, of whom each had his own
style, which God used for the communication of His Word even as He found it in
each individual writer. There is no such thing as a human style in the abstract
but only in the concrete, as it is found in various individuals. But why did God

not use His own divine or heavenly style? Because this was not adapted to the understanding of men, as the Scripture expressly declares, 2 Cor. 12,4: ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἔξον ἄνθρωποι λαλῆσαι. See Quenstedt above (SECTION IV) for finely discriminating treatment of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the human styles of the writers. This condescension or accommodation has an analogy in Christ's state of humiliation. The opponents of inspiration constantly use the analogy of the incarnation ("Gottmenschlichkeit der Schrift"), which analogy is diametrically opposed to their own theory, since the incarnate Person of Christ is not characterized by a dual personality, partly divine, partly fallibly human, but by unio personalis and communicatio idiomatum. The human nature of Christ personality, but has been received into the divine Person. So the human is anhypostatical, that is, has no independent human/style of the writers (menschliche Seite der Schrift) has been used as organ of the divine Word. This analogy, though unbiblical, can thus be used for the sake of illustration if used in accordance with analogia fidei. The use of the analogy by opponents of verbal inspiration, however, corresponds neither with the Scriptural doctrine of inspiration nor of the Person of Christ, but with the denial of inspiration in the Scriptural sense and with the kenotic theory.

2. Appeal to historical research on the part of the holy writers.-- Luke 1, 3: παρηκολούθησάντων ἀναθεὶν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς. 1 Cor. 1,11: ἔδηλώθη ἡμεῖς μοι περὶ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῶν Χλόης. As the Holy Ghost used the style as He found it in the individual writers, so also the historical knowledge they possessed by their own experience or research or which others had communicated to them. Illustration from the events of Pentecost: The Apostles knew of the resurrection from their own experience, yet spoke of it καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐδίδου ἀποθεγγεσθαι αὐτοῖς (Acts 2,4). The suggestion that the Holy Ghost could not have dictated that which the writers felt in their own hearts, as in the Psalms, is equally futile. Only a truly "mechanical theory" of inspiration, such as has never been put forth by any Lutheran theologian, could lead to the denial of full emotional participation on the part of the Psalmists or other sacred

writers in the import of what they wrote as penmen of the Holy Spirit. David himself assures us in 2 Samuel 23, 1.2 of his own experience of inspiration in writing the Psalms: "David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob (Luther: "der versichert ist von dem Messias des Gottes Jakobs"), and the sweet Psalmist of Israel, said, The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue".

3. The variae lectiones in the extant ἀπόγραφα of the New Testament ἀυτόγραφα.--This consideration has nothing whatever to do with inspiration, as we do not claim inspiration of scribes and copyists but the inspiration of the original manuscripts. We know that we have a reliable Bible-text, that the Word of the Apostles or the Word of Christ is preserved to us,--1). a priori, from the promise of the Savior in John 17,20. If all believers unto the end of the world are to come to faith διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν (scil. τῶν ἀποστόλων), then it is certain that the Word of the Apostles must remain with the Church to the end of time. In John 8, 31.32 Christ exhorts all believers to abide ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ. If we are to continue in His Word, then we must have His Word. Christ gives us the same assurance concerning the Old Testament text (οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι, John 10,35). 2). a posteriori, through scientific research. We can establish by scientific investigation of the variants that none of them affects or alters in the least any Christian doctrine. The establishment of Christian doctrine is entirely independent of modern textual criticism. This belongs only to the external equipment of a theologian. In the rare cases where a proof-text for a certain doctrine, a "seat of doctrine", is rendered uncertain by a textual variant, there are always other passages of unquestioned authenticity from which the same doctrine can be proved.

4. The alleged contradictions and other Scriptural difficulties.--With any good will the possibility of a harmonization can be easily established in almost all cases, which is all that can fairly be asked. If a case should occur where we cannot discover such a possibility we as Christians must bring our

thoughts into captivity to the obedience of Christ Who has said: οὐ δύναται λυθῆ-
ναι ἡ γραφή (John 10,35).

5. Inexact quotations from the Old Testament in the New.--The only explanation is that the same Holy Spirit Who was in the prophets of the Old Testament, and spoke through them still in the New Testament, testified also through the evangelists and apostles. (1 Peter 1,10-12: τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ... ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ). The Holy Spirit quotes Himself, and in so doing has power over His own words, to alter and interpret the Old Testament in the New. Compare on this paragraph the article by Dr. Pieper in Lehre und Wehre XXXII (1886), pp.77-82.

6. The Mention of trifles (levicula) unbecoming the dignity of the Holy Spirit.--The two chief passages referred to in this connection are 2 Tim. 4,13 and 1 Tim. 5,23. The objection shows a mistaken view of the "ethical principles" of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit holds that faithfulness in small matters is quite becoming and necessary (Luke 16,10). Moreover the two passages mentioned contain salutary doctrine. They show Paul was no fanatic. Pieper: "Wer anbetend vor dem Wunder in der Krippe zu Bethlehem steht, der findet es nicht mehr befremdlich, sondern ganz in Ordnung, dass in der Schrift, die Gottes Wort ist, so viel 'menschliche Kleinigkeiten' erwahnt werden. Gott liebt ja die Menschen samt ihren Kleinigkeiten" ("Christliche Dogmatik", Band I, S.307). Compare on this paragraph Quenstedt, "Theologia Didactico-Polemica", Tom. I.p.71,col.2).

7. Solecisms, barbarisms, anacoloutha, etc.--If "solecism" be interpreted as an offense against the rules of Greek grammar, an investigation of the New Testament from this standpoint confirms the denial that such exist therein. If "solecism" be taken as synonymous with "barbarism" and applied to the use of a corrupt popular dialect, the modern investigations of the papyri and ostraca (at Oxyrhyncus, etc.) have rendered this objection utterly meaningless. No longer are the New Testament writings compared with the Greek classical writers and their literary quality estimated by their resemblance or dissimilarity therewith. It

is now generally recognized that to condemn Paul's literary style because it does not resemble Plato's shows as little understanding for the historical situation as it would to adjudge the Mandarin Bible as "poor Chinese" because it does not resemble the Wenli of Mencius. Wilamowitz of Berlin: "That this Greek of his has no connection with any school or with any model, that it streams as best it may from the heart in an impetuous torrent, and yet is real Greek,....makes him a classic of Hellenism. Now at last one can again hear in Greek the utterance of an inner experience, fresh and living." (Quoted in Dallmann's "Paul", p.345). The universal language of the Roman Empire (ἡ κοινὴ διάλεκτος) was a fitting organ for the proclamation of the universal Gospel, as the classical Greek was not. The "Hebraisms" of the New Testament, which have been reduced to a minimum by modern research ("Deissman is able to reduce the number of words peculiar to the New Testament to something like fifty, or about one per cent. of the whole vocabulary", according to Moulton and Milligan's "Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament", p.XV), are, where they do occur, entirely in order, as belonging to the divinely intended connection between the Old and New Testaments. ("Aliud est ἑβραϊζειν, aliud βαρβαριζειν," Quenstedt). The anacoloutha in Paul's writings are rhetorically effective and subserve clarity of expression. Compare on this paragraph Quenstedt, I pp.82-84 (Quaestio VI), and the remarks touching the Greek style of the New Testament writers in Excursus II, above (SECTION III); also the article in Theological Quarterly, I (1897), p.14 ff..

8. Individual passages of Scripture alleged against Inspiration.--a).

1 Cor. 7,10,12,25: τοῖς δὲ γεγαρηκόσιν παραπέλλω, οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ κύριος.... Τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς λέγω ἐγὼ, οὐχ ὁ κύριος.... Περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων ἐπιταγήν κυρίου οὐκ ἔχω. It has been suggested that St. Paul distinguishes here not between inspired and uninspired portions of his writing, but between inspired commandments of God which bind the conscience and inspired apostolic counsels which leave the conscience free. There is no objection to this explanation from the stand-point of the Scriptural doctrine of inspiration, but the interpretation

which appears to lie closest to text and context is that we have here simply the distinction between a λόγιον of Christ (quoted in verse 10, and hence making an apostolic decision of the question unnecessary at this point) and as inspired utterance of the Apostle (or, more accurately, of the Lord through the Apostle, in verse 12) on a particular aspect concerning which there was no previous utterance either in the Law or in the sayings of our Lord as recorded by the evangelists. It is to be noted that on this view of verses 10 and 12 the expositor will still revert to the distinction between command and counsel in the treatment of verse 25, which simply contains no command at all either direct in the "ipsisima verba" of the incarnate Lord or indirect of the Lord through His Apostle. This second exposition, which has here been preferred, is in substance that adopted by Dr. Lenski in his recent commentary (pp.291,295,296,316), as well as by Quenstedt ("Theologia", etc., I, p.77, the most precise treatment I have found). b). 1 Cor. 1,16: λοιπὸν οὐκ οἶδα εἴ τινα ἄλλον ἐβάπτισα. As inspiration did not make the Apostles personally sinless, so also not personally infallible or omniscient. Compare Quenstedt, I, p.78 and pp.80 and 81 (Quaestio V).

SECTION VI

Summary Characterization of Modern Theology in its Rejection of Inspiration.

Strahan in Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics: "Protestant scholars of the present day, imbued with the scientific spirit, have no a priori theory of the inspiration of the Bible.... They do not open any book of the Old or New Testament with the feeling that they are bound to regard its teaching as sacred or authoritative. They yield to nothing but what they regard as the irresistible logic of facts. They feel that, if they are not convinced of the inspiration of the Bible by its intrinsic merits, they cannot be legitimately convinced in any other way. And if in the end they formulate a doctrine of the divine influence under which the Scriptures were written, this is an inference

from the characteristics which, after free and fair investigation, they are constrained to recognize.....To sum up: the old doctrine of the equal and infallible inspiration of every part of the Old Testament....is now rapidly disappearing among Protestants. There is, in reality, no clear dividing line between what is and what is not worthy of a place in the Scriptures....There are not a few passages in the Bible which cannot be regarded by Protestants as in any true sense inspired".

This quotation certainly justifies Dr. Pieper's compendious account of the modern attitude toward the Scriptures as follows: "The modern theologians will not believe the Scripture in what it says of itself, but wish to determine the character of the Scripture a posteriori by way of human investigation and criticism. By this modus procedendi they come to the result that the Scripture is not God's inerrant Word but a historical record more or less under the influence of the Holy Spirit concerning God's revelation in the Word (record of revelation). In this historical record, since it is derived partly from the Holy Spirit and partly from men (the primitive Church), and is hence a 'divine-human' record, errors are naturally not excluded. Hence it is the office of modern theology, which possesses in an eminent measure the sense of 'reality', to exercise criticism on the content and literary form of the Scripture; even though it may not as yet have succeeded in establishing the boundaries between truth and error. In the chief point all are unanimous, namely that the Scripture is not to be viewed as God's inerrant Word, also that it cannot produce 'warm and living' Christianity, but that on the contrary 'intellectualism' is the natural consequence of the old view of Scripture. When modern theologians still speak of 'inspiration', they mean thereby not the unique divine act whereby God gave to the holy writers His Word, that it might be the foundation of the faith of His Church until the last day (Ephesians 2,20; John 17,20), but rather do they understand by 'inspiration' only such spiritual illumination, though perhaps in a higher degree, as is granted to all Christians. As the illumination which belongs to all Christians

does not include complete infallibility, so also the higher illumination of the holy writers does not make them infallible. It belongs also to the characteristics of modern theology that the majority of its representatives require that degrees are 'self-evidently' recognizable in the inspiration of the Scripture. But this admission of degrees in inspiration is as devoid of meaning as the admission of degrees in the Godhead. When subordinationists speak of the Son of God as 'God in the secondary sense of the word' they annul the concept of divinity, and when modern theologians speak of degrees of inspiration they thereby abandon the Scriptural concept of inspiration. Kahnis combines^e the two: degrees in the Godhead and degrees in the divine inspiration of the Holy Scripture"(translated from Pieper's "Christliche Dogmatik").

SECTION VII

Recent Developments in the Treatment of this Doctrine within the
nominally Lutheran Church.

At about the same time that the showers of God's blessing were crowning the labors of our fathers in planting a tender shoot from the sound old Lutheran stock in virgin soil with such marvellous fruitfulness, a promising spring-tide was also breaking the bleak winter of rationalism back in the land of Luther. One of the first voices of new life was that of Claus Harms as early as 1817. But as the first half of the nineteenth century wore toward a close the scattered voices were joining into a chorus of confessionalism which triumphed over the few belated representatives of eighteenth century rationalism and loudly proclaimed the glories of the Lutheran Church and the imperishable heritage of her Confessions. But there were almost from the beginning false notes in the chorus; a blight began to overspread the promise of the spring. Our fathers, who greeted with joy every indication of reawakening Lutheran faith, whether manifested in the midst of the corrupted State-churches of the old fatherland or in the return to confessional consciousness led by Dr. Krauth against the amorphous Lutheranism

of the eastern United States, began to sense a defection, a deviation, an incompleteness, in the theological reconstructions of those "dear men" who were recognized in Germany as "positive and confessional", yea as "conservative and old-Lutheran" theologians, which deprived their testimony of the spiritual power and decisive clarity of the Reformation faith and confession to which they claimed to be returning. At first it seemed (as on Walther's first visit to Germany) to be only that "with all this talk of Lutheran Church" there was still a "refusal to sit humbly at the feet of our old teachers". But the harm was soon manifest as lying much deeper. It was refusal to sit humbly at the feet of the Prophets and Apostles and learn to speak after them what they had been taught by the Holy Ghost. The theological lights among the "positive" and "believing" circles of Germany would be historical but they would also make their own original contribution to the development of doctrine; they wanted no "restitution". In fact, the "confessional" movement, under the leadership of the "Erlangen school" but also beyond its bounds, was becoming more and more a more eclectic historical renaissance rather than a return in faith to the divine sources of power. Rationalism had shown itself unreasonable, and an intellectual necessity for a sounder basis made itself felt, but lacking the religious power derived from the triumphant "it is written" with which Luther had cast down strongholds, the promising awakening drifted from the quest of mere historicity into a boundless subjectivity which was nothing less than the old rationalism under a new name. Our fathers, on the other hand, were seeking not a more historical background, nor the restitution of human systems (Dr. Walther notes with regard to Kahnis's demurrer against a return to all the definitions of the seventeenth century "scholasticism": "Moechte der hochverehrte Mann nur nicht mehr zu den Subtrahendis rechnen, als diese seine Worte sagen, wer muesste dann nicht vollkommen einstimmen", L. & W. I, 303), nor any intellectual satisfaction, but the peace of an assured conscience resting on the immoveable rock of God's Word. The revulsion produced in a Biblical theologian by the discovery that the "positive" theology

of the nineteenth century, with its quest for intellectual satisfaction, felt no need of this assurance, the discovery namely of that anti-Scriptural canker which was making "new Lutherans" out of "old Lutherans" and subjective speculation out of "confessional theology", can hardly be better illustrated than by the first book-review published in "Lehre und Wehre" (I, 1855, pp. 247-250), in which Dr. Walther, after an enthusiastic recommendation of the first edition of Kahnis's brilliant monograph, "Der innere Gang des deutschen Protestantismus seit Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts", comes to speak of the author's defection from the Lutheran doctrine of inspiration. Kahnis had stated: "Protestantism stands and falls with the principle of the sole authority of Scripture. But this principle is independent of the teaching on inspiration found in the old dogmatics. To take that up again as it was can only occur with hardening against the truth" (First edition, 1854, p. 253; second edition, 1860, p. 241). Dr. Walther comments: "We must admit that when we read these words we were heartily terrified. Who can go along with a new theology which introduces itself as a further development of the Old Lutheran theology, yet just in the doctrine concerning the principle of theology, the Holy Scripture, specifically concerning the ratio formalis Scripturae, that which constitutes Scripture as the Holy Scripture, deviates from the doctrinal type of our ancient Church?" (Lehre und Wehre, I, 1855, p. 248). The words quoted from this early work of Kahnis, written at a time when he was still considered a standard-bearer of confessional Lutheranism, are among the earliest clear utterances to this effect from within the "confessional" camp. They had been preceded by much of a similar tendency from the pens of writers who could never be claimed for confessional Lutheranism, from Schleiermacher to Tholuck, whereby the heritage of rationalism in this respect was carried forward into the age of confessional revival. They were followed not only by repetition in the second edition of the "Deutscher Protestantismus" (1860) wherein the author's apostasy from the Lutheran faith was clearly foreshadowed, but by the full accomplishment of that apostasy in his "Lutherische

Dogmatik historisch-genetisch dargestellt" (1861) in which he abandons or modifies almost all the fundamental positions of historical Christianity. The tragic downgrade development of Dr. Kahnis, in which he prostituted his illustrious gifts in the attempt to undermine the foundations of the church to which he professed to adhere, is well-known, nor did it fail to call forth in the course of its progress vigorous protests not only from a Hengstenberg but also from others whose theological position was more akin to his own, only not so far gone on the treacherous inclined plane of Biblical criticism. One effect, however, which might have been expected from such an example of the logical consequences ensuing from the abandonment of the Scriptural principle, it failed to produce: it did not awaken his contemporaries in the German universities to the wisdom of the warning: "Principiis obsta"; for they followed him so closely on the downward path that at the time of his death he could be celebrated as a faithful Lutheran theologian with only the unheeded voice of "Lehre und Wehre" (to our knowledge) giving the lie to such a eulogy. Already in 1873 the "Erlanger Zeitschrift" could report that "at least in Germany no-one any longer advocates the old-Church doctrine of inspiration". But this could be strictly true only of the university-theologians. Rohnert's excellent monograph, which certainly does advocate this doctrine, was published in 1889, the year after Kahnis's death.

So fully and so crassly does Kahnis state the results of the negative position toward Scripture, so keenly does he draw all the logical consequences, that we should like to give his views in extended quotation. But to fill several pages with this material would not subserve our main purpose, and indeed some of his blasphemous assumptions would make too repulsive reading, especially when divorced from the charm of his beautiful German style. This material may be found in the words of Kahnis incorporated in Dr. Walther's edition of Baier's Compendium, or in "Lehre und Wehre", vol. 21 (1875), pp. 258-260. A full exhibition of the views of the "new Lutherans" in Germany and their predecessors of the mediating school, in all their sad futility and bewildering variety is supplied

in Rohnert, "Die Inspiration der heiligen Schrift und ihre Bostreiter", Section 8, pp.211-278, and the vigorous article in "Lehre und Wehre", vol.17(1871), pp. 33-44; 65-76; 97-106; 129-141, entitled "Was lehren die neuere orthodox sein wollenden Theologen von der Inspiration". Here we have Schleiermacher, Hase, Schenkel, Nitzsch, Julius Mueller, Lango, Tholuck, Olshausen, Meyer, Beck, Dorner, Twisten, Martensen, Von Hofmann (the true import of whose position, deceptively clothed in churchly terminology, has been ably exposed by Kliefoth), Thomasius, Luthardt, Delitzsch, Dieckhoff (who rendered good service in opposing the Dorpat theologians, but whose own earlier assertions are not sound), Kurtz, Kahnis, and Philippi. Of the last, who to our sorrow cannot be omitted from the list of those who have confused this doctrine, we can at least say that he made progress in the opposite direction from Kahnis, honorably retracted his earlier admission of the possibility of error in Scripture, and came nearest to the Biblical doctrine of inspiration among the theologians who have not unqualifiedly accepted it. To this list of outstanding names in the antithesis to the doctrine of verbal inspiration Rohnert has added among older theologians of the mediating type, Marheinecke, De Wette, Hupfeld, Schweitzer, Beyschlag, and Rothe (we might further add in the exegetical field after Hupfeld, Hitzig, and indeed all the Old Testament commentators from Ewald to Gunkel, with the honorable exceptions of Keil and Hengstenberg); among more recent "confessional" theologians Volck (and Muehlau), Theodosius Harnack, Grau (who went to more radical extremes than most of these men in New Testament criticism), and Frank; finally, the prototype of all modernistic teaching and methodology, Ritschl, among whose followers most of the later German opponents of inspiration may be reckoned. The documentary presentation of the positions of these men in their own words, often prolix and very obscure, is given with sufficient fulness by Rohnert and in the above-mentioned series of articles in "Lehre und Wehre" (in the latter accompanied by refutation), but a very valuable account of the gist of these "new Lutheran" views in Germany is supplied in plain language together

with a concise and effective refutation by Brunn in his "Erklaerung des Kleinen Katechismus Dr. M. Luthers fuer reifere Christen", pp.20-30 (Steeden in Nassau, 1889). We refrain from detailed characterization of the personal views of these German writers in order that we may come to the consideration of what lies much closer to our present purpose, namely the extent to which American Lutherans have learned to echo the teachings of the "new Lutheran" leaders, especially Luthardt, and have popularized them in nominally Lutheran circles in this country.

But first we would insert a brief account of some events that transpired at Dorpat in and after the year 1884, and which possess peculiar significance as the earliest noteworthy effort of the "new Lutherans" to popularize the rejection of verbal inspiration in non-professional circles (previous information which had reached the Christian populace concerning the views which university-professors were instilling into the future pastors of their congregations had been communicated through exposures made by conservative theologians like Stroebel, Hengstenberg, and Muenkel, not by the avowals of the liberals themselves); also the subjects treated and the way in which they were handled are significant for the line of attack later adopted by men of similar views in this country. Fuller treatment may be found in Rohnert, pp.263-269 and in the weighty and powerful Foreword to "Lehre und Wehre" of the year 1886 (vol.32), the last from the pen of Dr. Walther. In February, 1884, Dr. W. Volck and Dr. F. Muehlau, both professors of theology at Dorpat, held public lectures in the hall of the University, which the educated lay-people of the city were invited to attend. The former treated the subject: "How far is Inerrancy to be Ascribed to the Bible?" the latter: "Do we Possess the Original Text of Holy Scripture?" Both solved their problems in a negative manner. We hear something of the lamentable effect of these lectures upon the audience and can surmise more, for what they offered tended only to unsettle the faith of hearers unequipped to apply the proper corrective from the actual facts of the case. From the theological faculties of the Universities, which were possessed of the technical knowledge necessary

to refute these professors on their own grounds, no protest was forthcoming; on the contrary the publication of the lectures was greeted with a commendatory review by Luthardt of Leipzig, and supported by a special tractate from the pen of their aged colleague, Theodosius Harnack in Dorpat, "Ueber den Kanon und die Inspiration der heiligen Schrift"(1885); for protest had been raised by a Synod on the Island of Oesel in Livonia (Dorpat was the educational center of Livonian Lutheranism). Harnack's defense was followed by the publication of further lectures by Volck, "Die Bibel als Kanon" (1885), "Zur Lehre von der heiligen Schrift" (1885). Dieckhoff opposed the Dorpat professors in "Das gepredigte Wort Gottes und die heilige Schrift" (1886), and "Das Wort Gotten" (1888). Volck's position has become very familiar, being based on the theories of Von Hofmann and Frank, but simplified for popular consumption.

He tries to represent the doctrine of verbal inspiration as distinctively Reformed in origin and imported into the Lutheran Church by the seventeenth century dogmaticians, an insinuation which, from the lips of a theological professor who could not be wholly ignorant that this doctrine was held by Luther and the entire ancient Church before him and presupposed by the Lutheran Confessions, cannot be regarded otherwise than as fundamentally dishonest. He (and after him especially Theodosius Harnack) emphasizes that our faith is founded on the Person of Jesus Christ, not on a book,--as though we could find Christ elsewhere than in the Book! But, he insists, Christ and faith in Him is brought to us by the living proclamation of the Church, not by Bible-reading,--as though the Church's current proclamation to-day had any validity other than that imparted to it by its written Source! or as though the dictum: "Faith cometh by hearing" (Romans 10,17a) were intended to restrict the effectiveness of the "Word of God" (17b) to the physical organ whereby it is received! His attempt to discredit the written Word as a missionary agency is disproved by experience. The Bible is said to be not the revelation of God (in which case its inerrancy would have to be postulated) but a record of revelation, and the revelation which it records is "not a super-

natural communication of doctrine (uebernaturliche Lehrmitteilung) but a course of history (Geschichtsverlauf)". The doctrine of inspiration which regards Scripture as supernaturally communicated is said to necessarily involve the mechanical view that the Biblical writers were to tally involuntary tools of the revealing God ("man muss die biblischen Schriftsteller zu voellig willenlosen Werkzeugen des offenbarenden Gottes machen")! Again an assertion which anyone who has studied the seventeenth century dogmatics on inspiration could hardly utter without conscious dishonesty (compare Quenstedt's exposition of οὐ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου 2 Peter 1,21, above in SECTION IV, with this "voellig willenlos"). Of course the Bible is described as "divine-human" ("ein von Menschen vorfasstes Gotteswerk") and therefore relatively fallible; and in proof of this Volck attempts to demonstrate its errors in historical, geographical, and other respects. It is reliable only in so far as it records the history of revelation; and the audience could no doubt perceive that they would need the scientific acumen of such keen exegetes as Dr. Volck and his ilk to trace the boundaries of this reliable portion of Scripture when he told them: "In order to accomplish the separation between the region of reliability and the region where error is possible--and furthermore the separation of the essential from the non-essential in the Bible, the expositor must judge every detail of its content in accordance with its relation to the salvation which is realized in the history it records. He must observe whether it stands in any connection with this (the history of salvation) and what relation it bears thereto". ("Um die Sonderung des Gebietes des Untruglichen von demjenigen, wo Irrtum moeglich ist, und weiter--die Scheidung vom Wesentlichen und Unwesentlichen in der Bibel vollziehen zu koennen, muss der Ausleger alles Einzelne ihres Inhaltes beurtheilen nach seinem Vorhaeltniss zu dem Heil, welches in der von ihr berichteten Geschichte verwirklicht vorliegt. Er muss zusehen, ob und in welchem Zusammenhang es mit domselben steht".)

Professor Muehlau disposed of his thome by referring to the facts that "none of the numerous doublets in the Old Testament are in full harmony as to their

words", and, as for the New Testament: "of the great mass of manuscripts not even two are fully in agreement with each other". Among the "numerous doublets" to which Muehlau refers he probably counts not a few which exist as such only in the critical imagination; but in those cases in which we actually have parallels exhibiting close verbal similarity with slight variants, the hypothesis of scribal error or textual corruption simply fails to afford a rational explanation of the actual facts in the case. Entirely aside from the truth that the Holy Spirit in repeating His own words is not bound to adhere to any canons of verbal identity which may be formulated by students of Old Testament literature, the very nature of the variants which occur is such as to preclude, even on naturalistic suppositions, the possibility of accounting for them by mere copyist's errors in one or the other text or both, or by postulating one text as pure and original, the other as a corrupted tradition. Take as a notable case in point the parallelism between Psalm 18 and 2 Samuel 22, to which we recently had occasion to devote very detailed study. Hengstenberg, who notes the variants quite minutely in his "Commentar ueber die Psalmen" (Berlin, 1842), makes out a very plausible case for the Psalm as the original Davidic form and the form in 2 Samuel as a Davidic variant of explanatory character. But even if the decision as to priority should be reversed, one thing is clear: the variations are intentional, not due to carelessness. For aside from a few cases where the variant readings are very close to each other either in sound or in the form of the letters but slightly different in meaning, such as might cause one to suspect, if they stood alone, the occurrence of a scribal error, there are so many other cases of undeniably interpretive variation, and in general pur-
positive variation, that only a refusal to yield to the logic of facts can regard any of them as accidental. Now we know from the study of New Testament textual criticism the general categories into which scribal errors tend to resolve themselves. The variations in these Old Testament parallelisms do not fit into those categories. And there is the additional fact that the Sopherim and Massorotes

have demonstrably exercised much more minute care in their guardianship of the text than the scribes who transmitted the extant copies of the Greek New Testament manuscripts. But to assume that the variations in the text before us are due to corruption in transmission would predicate either an unprecedented carelessness in copying or a freedom of alteration in editing which would be most culpably arbitrary on the part of a scribe or "redactor" though entirely legitimate on the part of the author. The only conclusion therefore which fits the facts in the case is that we have two authentic texts, each preserved in its own individuality with equal care and without harmonistic effort. The fuller information with regard to the nature of the New Testament variants which is penetrating into lay circles has robbed Muehlau's argument regarding the New Testament of much of the disturbing force it must have had when the layman viewed for the first time a critical edition,--four-fifths of the page covered with critical notes to a few lines of text at the top. Now that the vast manuscript material has been more carefully grouped into "families", the preferred readings more carefully discriminated, and the comparatively few major variations which are capable of exhibition in a translation are becoming familiar, the believer in verbal inspiration will hardly be alarmed by references to "the hopelessly corrupt text of Erasmus", or induced to believe that the original text of Holy Scripture has actually been lost to us. The patient labors of the textual critics (the collators of manuscripts, we mean, not the "conjectural" critics, for their labors are valueless) are making it increasingly clear that we do possess the original text of Holy Scripture in its integrity within the compass of the extant manuscripts, and the materials for a minutely accurate determination of just where the original reading is to be found in any given case are accumulating.

We have devoted so much space to the delineation and criticism of the Dorpat incident before passing over to the American scene because it seems to us that it is particularly in this form (and we refer rather to the themes handled by Volck and Harnack than to the text-critical questions raised by Muehlau) that the positions held by the nineteenth century German theologians have been imported during the

twentieth century into Lutheran circles in America. The radical attempts at criticism of individual books of the Bible as carried out by Kahnis in his famous classification of Scripture according to "degrees of inspiration" have found little favor in these circles (Prof. Alleman of Gettysburg is an exception). The opponents of verbal inspiration in the U. L. C. A. have been content to approach the doctrine from the dogmatic side, loosen the concept of inspiration from its Scriptural moorings in the *sedes doctrinae*, and popularize a free attitude toward the Bible in a priori assumptions, while the actual exegetical work done in the Lutheran Church in America has been of the most conservative type. That the Bible is not to be "identified" with the Word of God but rather "contains" that word, that it is a "divine-human record of revelation" in which the "human element" must be emphasized, that the possibility of "discrepancies" is to be admitted in matters which are regarded as lying on the periphery, that inspiration pertains primarily to men, not to writings, and hence is "dynamic", not verbal, and that a return to the old Lutheran doctrine of verbal inspiration means the adoption of a "mechanical theory" which is incompatible with the characteristics of Scripture as "theological science" has observed them,--these are the crucial elements of the antithesis which confronts us to-day in a nominally Lutheran body, some of whose spokesmen have contended that there is no major doctrinal issue separating the various Lutheran Synods in our country. Obviously these views are identical with those held by the Dorpat group and the Leipzig theologian, Christoph Ernst Luthardt, and it is doubtless significant that particularly the works of Dr. Kurtz of Dorpat and of Dr. Luthardt have been among the most popular in English translation in the eastern theological Seminaries of Lutheran name. A comparison of the German positions just outlined with the more or less classical expressions of the U. L. C. "Lehrtypus" delineated and criticized in Excursus II and III (SECTION III, above) will furnish all the guiding principles which have worked themselves out in this body over against the doctrine of verbal inspiration. It will only be necessary to exhibit some more recent expressions of these principles in order to gain a very practical view of the attitude our Missouri

Synod will have to maintain toward proposals for organic union emanating from such a body.

The "new Lutheran" rejection of verbal inspiration entered Lutheran circles in America in the early years of the twentieth century by way of the General Synod. In the year 1902 the "Lutheran Observer" and the "Lutheran World" felt that they could still boast the absence of any deniers of inspiration or higher critics in the General Synod, that though they had "a few disputed questions" among them, the doctrine of inspiration was not one of these. But in the same year Dr. Bente was able to point to utterances not only in the theological journal, "Lutheran Quarterly", but in the same "Lutheran Observer" (December 5, 1901, answered by A. L. Graebner, "Concordia Theological Quarterly", Vol. VI (1902), pp.37-45; March 28, 1902) which invalidated the boast (see article in "Lehre und Wehre", May 1902, vol.48, pp.129-138, from the pen of Dr. F. Bente). It was particularly the position of the well known Rev. Dr. Edwin Heyl Delk, for many years pastor of St. Matthew's Lutheran Church in Philadelphia (General Synod) and on occasion special lecturer at Gettysburg Theological Seminary, which caused alarm to those who earnestly hoped that the entire Lutheran Church in America would at least hold fast to the Scriptural doctrine of verbal inspiration. When he, therefore, stated: "Primarily it was persons that were inspired, and not their writings", this called forth well-grounded opposition from the General Council theological journal, "The Lutheran Church Review". A writer in this Review states the case correctly when he warns that if this theory is accepted then the Church might as well give up her doctrine of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper, as well as of the Incarnation (as taught in the first two chapters of Luke's Gospel), Baptismal Regeneration, and in general the distinctive position of the Lutheran Church on the Means of Grace, as all these doctrines will really be liquidated by surrendering the reliability of their only Source, the Word of God, if this principle is consistently applied. The General Council, therefore, was at that time minded to keep clear of this type of teaching. And even in the General Synod Dr. Delk's was for long a rather lone voice, but this voice was not

silenced, and Dr. Delk (like Dr. Kahnis before him) has lived to see the day when his extreme views are not only no longer deplored (by those in his own ecclesiastical fellowship) but when his fundamental position is either tacitly or outspokenly accepted by the majority.

The growth of such views in the General Synod did not leave the General Council permanently unaffected, but God of His great mercy had given the Council in 1903 a leader who would have naught of the "modern view of the Scriptures" and who was spiritually and intellectually equipped to combat it, Dr. Theodore Emanuel Schmauk. We cannot here refrain from quoting extensively the events and pronouncements of that period in the history of the Council and its President which his biographer correctly entitles "The Confessional High-Water Mark (1907)", a true "high-water mark" indeed whether we look backward or forward from that year and the great Fortieth Anniversary Convention at Buffalo which made it memorable. And though neither the position there taken, nor the Church-body nor the leadership which took that position, has survived the event of 1918, its contemplation ought at least to awaken those who should have owned the heritage of 1905-1907 to a realization of whence they have fallen. We quote the excellent biographical sketch of Dr. Schmauk by George W. Sandt, pp.124-126:

"There was a reason why the new President's first report partook of the character of a confession of his faith in the paragraphs quoted. His correspondence after the meeting of the General Conference of Lutherans in Pittsburgh, April 5-7, 1904, as well as an editorial in the July 'Review', show that he was apprehensive of a tendency among certain scholars within the General Council to yield somewhat to the rationalistic attitude of the negative critics toward the Scriptures. When at that meeting the question of inspiration was discussed, certain statements were made which leaned in the direction of the well-known dictum, that the Scriptures contain the Word of God but may not be spoken of as being the Word of God. A letter to Dr. Krotel reveals a deep feeling of depression. In it he speaks of being 'overpowered by a sense of loneliness and helplessness' as he believed himself to be standing almost

alone in counteracting with scholarly methods and arguments the leaven of the Higher Criticism that seemed to be working its way into the General Council, as he and others feared.....

"As much criticism of certain loose statements during the discussion on inspiration had come to his ears (for he himself was not present at the time), he felt that the General Council must embrace the earliest opportunity to place itself on record as still standing by the declaration of its founders, that the Scriptures are 'inerrant in letter, fact and doctrine', as the constitution states. What could be more conducive to a reassertion of the Council's faith as related to this and other important questions than the celebration of its Fortieth Anniversary? He was thus looking forward two years for a clear and unequivocal reaffirmation of that faith.

"Soon after the Pittsburgh Conference, he prepared a series of nine articles for 'The Lutheran' on 'Inspiration at Pittsburgh', but as he and the Editor agreed, that they might create the impression that the men who had made the unguarded statements at Pittsburgh were already dwelling in the tents of the negative critics, they were not published. It was deemed best to discuss the matter in the July 'Review', in which appeared an article by Dr. Leander Keyser and an editorial by Dr. Schmauk. The crucial point was the declaration which had been made, that 'Christ is primary, and the doctrine of inspiration secondary'. In a letter to Dr. Keyser he commends him for his answer to that statement, which reads: 'Do men who speak and write in that way realize that the Christ they exalt is only an ideal Christ, and not the historical Christ?' The point made was simply, where but in the Scriptures do we know of Christ? If the Scriptures, in spite of many textual errors that have been and are being corrected, but which do not affect its substance, are not infallible, even to its very words,-- if we must be uncertain there--what guarantee have we that we know a real, historic Christ? To quote Luther and place him among the subjective negative critics of modern times, when both he and the later dogmatists merely rested on the Scriptures and were not worried by any mechanical or any equivocal definition of inspiration, was to read sixteenth century thought through

twentieth century glasses.

"But for that Pittsburgh Conference, the report of the President at the Milwaukee Council would have read differently. Yea more, the Buffalo Council that followed would not have struck the high note of confessionalism it did, had not the soul of its President been stirred to the depth for fear of a drift away from the faith into the shoals and quicksands of rationalism".

The above paragraphs speak for themselves. With regard to the orthodox theses on the Scriptures presented by Dr. Benze at the Buffalo Convention see "Lehre und Wehre", Vol.53, pp.466 and 467. President Schmauk's own declaration on the Scriptures at that Convention can be read in the Biography, pp.132 and 133. It is only necessary to add that Dr. Schmauk's work in "counteracting with scholarly methods and arguments the leaven of the Higher Criticism" can be seen in his amazingly skillful book, "The Negative Criticism and the Old Testament", published already in 1894 and reprinted in 1903; that the position which cropped out at Pittsburgh in 1904 was an accurate echo of that enunciated by Voelck, Muehlau, and Harnack at Dorpat in 1884; and that the arguments with which Dr. Schmauk and his biographer opposed it are precisely those which we oppose against the same tendency among the theological leaders of the U. L. C. A. in 1936. Only now such testimony, if it is to be directly polemical (Dr. Little's testimony is true and timely, but lacks the nominal-elenchus), must be borne from without and not from within the erring Church-body, for the tendencies combatted by Dr. Schmauk until his death (March 23, 1920) have become predominant in the U. L. C. A..

The tragedy of Dr. Schmauk's last years, when forced against his will to take the helm in steering toward the merger of 1918, which, nevertheless, already in its organizing convention "dropped the pilot", is known to those acquainted with some of the unwritten history of that merger, in which the great ideals for which he stood, and particularly his position on the Scriptures, have been more and more "submerged". By its very nature the inner history of that movement can never be fully recorded, but what could be put in print only three years after its occurrence

is told with the utmost conscientiousness and an almost astonishing frankness by Dr. Sandt in his biography of Schmauk, a book worthy of repeated reading.

How has the situation developed since Dr. Schmauk's death? So far as the essential views advocated by the opponents of verbal inspiration within the U. L. C. A. are concerned, not at all. They are still the familiar Dorpat-Pittsburgh formulations. But so far as the number of these opponents is concerned, and the frankness and insistence with which they publicize their views, the situation has changed so tremendously since the cessation of the powerful stabilizing and restraining influence wielded by Dr. Schmauk, that the U. L. C. A. seems to have assumed a new theological complexion. The bars are down, so far as the inspiration of Scripture is concerned. That is not to say that all the other fundamental teachings of Scripture have been repudiated. "It is known that Mount Airy has refused to graduate members of the senior class who denied the Virgin Birth, the Atonement, and the physical resurrection. The New York Ministerium has decline to ordain a man who confessed modernistic views" ("The Problem of Lutheran Union", p.39). But we know what a wide door is left open by the denial of verbal inspiration. The "Lutheran Church Review" told us that already in 1902. And the doctrine of verbal inspiration, as taught in the proof-texts of Scripture which deal directly with that doctrine, is in the discard. Not that every pastor of the U. L. C. A. denies the Biblical doctrine of inspiration, much less the lay-people gathered in the congregations of that large Church-body. This, we assert, not only has not occurred, but never will occur as long as there is a pulpit proclaiming the "articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae" of justification by faith alone. But those theologians who are really "vocal" in the U. L. C. A. (with the exception of Dr. Little, whose book on "Disputed Doctrines", as I am informed at the United Lutheran Publication House in Philadelphia, is not in demand) are almost to a man ranged against the Scriptural doctrine of verbal inspiration. And especially at the Seminaries. That there should be an essential difference between Mount Airy and Gettysburg on this question is an historical anachronism. Not only the theological journals, which were formerly opposed to each

other on this very point, but the theological viewpoints of the two Seminaries have merged here. As to Mount Airy, we quote from "The Problem of Lutheran Union", pp. 29,30, what confirms our own observations as a graduate of that Seminary: "The position of President Jacobs of the Philadelphia Seminary is well known. When inducted into office (1927), he maintained that the Bible is not the Word of God, but merely contains the Word of God, a doctrine which he upheld as recently as 1933 in the 'Lutheran' (January 12), when he distinctly said regarding the terms 'Word of God and Scriptures': 'In Lutheran Theology they are not equated'. Surely one who refuses to identify Scripture with the Word of God no longer accepts the Bible as the divine authority. Elsewhere the 'Lutheran' has said editorially that inspiration is not a process uniquely limited to the Scriptures, but goes on continually (August 1,1929)". The pronounced higher critical tendency (and shallow scholarship) of the books by Professor Herbert C. Alleman, of the theological seminary at Gettysburg, "The Old Testament, A Study", and the more recent "The New Testament, A Study", is equally well-known. Dr. W. A. Maier has rendered a distinct service to the orthodox, not only of our own Church-body but of the other Lutheran bodies in America, by subjecting the former volume to such a thorough and searching criticism in his article "The Old Testament at Gettysburg", published in the April number of the 1935 "Concordia Theological Monthly" (Vol. VI, pp.267-276). The latter has also been reviewed by Dr. Arndt in the July number of the same year (pp.535-539). To quote or even list all the expressions of this kind which have been made public in the U. L. C. A. within recent years would be impossible without lengthening this section of our paper out of all proportion to the rest. Noteworthy is the fact that the publicizing of negative views on inspiration has not ceased or been modified since the issuance of the resolutions on Lutheran Church Unity by the U. L. C. convention at Savannah, Georgia, in 1934, but rather been greatly increased, and the doctrine of inspiration has been mentioned as a hindrance to the realization of this goal, not only by orthodox theologians who uphold the Lutheran and Scriptural doctrine, but by the opponents: "It may be confidently asserted that the achievement of closer

unity among Lutherans in this country, and indeed throughout the world, will require, for one essential, a higher view of Scripture than is represented by the "theory of inspiration by dictation", Prof. E. E. Flack of Springfield, Ohio, in "Lutheran Church Quarterly", October, 1935, p.417, quoted in C. T. M; Vol. VII, p.148, and p. 222. Thus the "human element in Scripture" is evidently made a criterion of Lutheranism, and the doctrine of verbal inspiration regarded as a hindrance to Church-unity. As above noted these strong demands for the abandonment of the Biblical doctrine are multiplying. The "Concordia Theological Monthly" for February 1935 supplies for orientation a list of articles and notes dealing with the situation in the various Lutheran bodies in America which had appeared in that journal up to that time (C.T.M.,Vol.VI, pp.138,139). We shall merely attempt to continue this list, with regard to the question of inspiration, up to the April number of this year (1936): VI, 267 ff., "The Old Testament at Gettysburg"; VI, 535 ff., "Let Us Get Together on the Doctrine of Verbal Inspiration"; VI,553ff., Review of "The New Testament, A Study by Herbert C. Alleman"; VI,825ff., "Die Vereinigte Lutherische Kirche und die Verbalinspiration"; VI,938 ff., "Concerning the Lutheran Union"; VII,p.55, "Lutheran Union and Verbal Inspiration"; VII,148ff., "Lutheran Union and the Doctrine of Verbal Inspiration"; VII, 221 ff., "Verbal Inspiration and the Lutheran Union"; VII, 300 ff., "Notes on the Question of Lutheran Union", especially the last being one of the most incisive and discriminating treatments of all points involved in the present state of the inspiration issue which we have seen.

Perhaps the most significant element in recent anti-inspiration activities within the U. L. C. A. has been the endeavor to popularize the negative viewpoint in the series of articles written by Professor Kantonen for the "Lutheran". Even Dr. J. A. W. Haas, who certainly agrees with Professor Kantonen in the rejection of verbal inspiration ("There must be a clear distinction kept in mind between the Word of God and the Bible. The Bible is the Word of God because it contains the Word of God", quoted from "What is Lutheranism?" p.176) has criticized these articles for disregarding "some of the work done by Krauth, Jacobs, Voigt, Schmauk, and Stump". Also

in "The Young People" section of the "Lutheran" an article by Amos J. Traver, D.D., inculcates the limitation of inspiration to that portion of the Bible which deals with the doctrines of salvation, quite in the manner of Stump (critically analyzed in Excurses III under SECTION III). And the books of Dr. Alleman referred to above are also designed particularly for laymen. They are two text-books of a series published by the official publication house as "The Lutheran Leadership Course" under the auspices of the Parish-and Church-School Board of the United Lutheran Church. Can the Church-body honestly disclaim official responsibility for publications of this kind? We are well aware that the U. L. C. refuses to admit such responsibility for the utterances even of its official organ, "The Lutheran", as our own Synod assumes with regard to its official publications. But it is another question whether the responsibility can actually be evaded either before God or man. And it is still another question whether any of the official representatives of the U. L. C. would be desirous of evading responsibility for these particular statements. We are sure that the contrary is the case. The refusal to identify the Bible with the Word of God is fully approved and every effort is made to bring this position before the people. The denial of verbal inspiration is no longer in any respect a more or less esoteric teaching (as it still was to some extent in the years when the present writer belonged to the U. L. C.). There is, therefore, really no longer any question of fixing responsibility or exposing the hidden implications of ambiguous language. The opponents of verbal inspiration are, as Dr. Engelder remarks in his notes on this subject in the February, 1936, "Concordia Theological Monthly", using "plain language". But this would imply that the U. L. C. A. is a body which officially denies verbal inspiration? Exactly! Yes, we know that according to U. L. C. theory only the statements of the constitution (which would rather favor the doctrine of plenary inspiration and inerrancy, and clearly accept the entire body of the Lutheran Confessions) and of Synodical Minutes (which, we may trust, contain no denials of this doctrine) can be held to promulgate the official teachings of the Church-body. But this theory bears no weight against the fact that inspiration (in

the sense in which Scripture uses the term) is actually quite generally denied in U. L. C., and this denial has certainly not been officially repudiated by that body (as it was by the General Council in 1907,--see the text of this repudiation in *Lehre und Wehre*, Vol.53,p.468). Let us then regard it as an established fact that and the United Lutheran Church (not merely certain scattered/irresponsible individuals in it, though of course also not every individual in it) denies verbal inspiration.

Now this body has made also to our Synod proposals looking toward organic union, or at least cooperation. But does the Church-body which we have just been characterizing both from our own knowledge as a former U. L. C. pastor and from the more recent published utterances of its spokesmen really desire union with a body which, like ours, heartily accepts as divine doctrine that form of inspiration which they regard as a dangerous "mechanical theory"? The present writer cannot possibly believe it. He does believe the emphatic statement to the contrary which he heard in class from the author of the Savannah resolutions on Lutheran union; and he does believe, with Dr. Flack, that agreement on the doctrine of the inspiration of the Bible is essential to Lutheran unity, which, according to Dr. Flack's view of the matter, would mean that the verbal-inspiration men must yield their position. One thing is certain: that no intention of yielding is entertained by those who refuse to equate Scripture with God's Word. There is to be no return to the General Council position at Buffalo in 1907. But could not these determined opponents of verbal inspiration be brought to alter their position by doctrinal discussions conducted in a spirit of candor and charity? The trouble is that there is really no common basis upon which such discussions could proceed. It is true that our Synod at Cleveland in June 1935 declared its willingness "to confer with other Lutheran bodies" (referring both to the American Lutheran Church and the United Lutheran Church in America)...."on the basis of the Word of God and the Lutheran Confessions". But those two Lutheran bodies occupy a very different position with relation to that basis. There are serious differences separating us from the American Lutheran

an agreement with them to the effect that a certain teaching is clearly contained in the Bible the matter can be considered settled by divine authority. But if representatives of the United Lutheran Church in America could become interested in doctrinal discussions on this basis, as we are well assured that they could not (the Merger of 1918 was not brought about by any such discussions), the very first point that our representatives would have to discuss with them would be the basis itself, namely: What is the Word of God? And the fact that the basis is stated as "the Word of God and the Lutheran Confessions" would not help matters, for it has become almost a truism in U. L. C. circles that the Confessions contain no doctrine of inspiration. The fundamental difference between us involves not simply one doctrine or another, but the formal principle from which all true doctrine is derived and by which it receives the divine sanction. If the doctrine of inspiration is not to be derived from the individual proof-texts which treat of this doctrine but rather from the theologian's observation of the general characteristics of Scripture, then what sanction have we for proving any other doctrine by the $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\alpha\pi\tau\alpha\iota$ ("it is written") with which alone we operate in theological discussions? Under these conditions, where it is the foundation (cf. Psalm 11,3) and not a part of the superstructure which is called in question, we cannot but give highest commendation to the declaration of the Wisconsin Synod (quoted C. T. M., VII,58): "These last-named conditions constitute obstacles to any early establishment of fellowship between the United Lutheran Church and our own body, which obstacles only the former itself can remove. Until this is done we must regretfully decline this invitation". Luther's advice concerning the treatment of those who come to us with the denial that the Bible is God's Word, namely that we should offer them only the Scriptural argument for our doctrine, and if that is not sufficient for them then break off the discussion, as we have nothing more to offer, must be put into practice also in this case. In Dr. Bente's article in the May, 1902, number of "Lehre und Wehre" to which we have already referred, he pictures hypothetically the hopelessness of Christian union in case the doctrine of inspiration should be surrendered by the Lutheran

Church of America. That hypothetical case has now become a reality in the United Lutheran Church, and his conclusion is valid with regard to the situation which confronts us. "As long as the doctrine of inspiration is held fast in the Lutheran Church, so long also the possibility of a Christian union in the articles of doctrine is not entirely excluded. The common basis for discussion is still at hand. But if once the doctrine of inspiration is surrendered, then the last gleam of hope for a Christian union of the American Lutheran Synods has vanished. For with the inspiration and inerrancy of Holy Scripture the Church gives out of her hand the one and only means of bringing about a union and surrenders every Christian doctrine to arbitrary caprice. Hence nothing could afford greater joy to Satan and the enemies of the Church than if, also in the Lutheran Church of America, this portion of the truth should be called in question or denied". "Solange in der lutherischen Kirche die Inspirationslehre festgehalten wird, so lange ist auch die Moeglichkeit einer christlichen Vereinigung in den Artikeln der Lehre nicht voellig ausgeschlossen. Die gemeinsame Boden fuer die Verhandlung ist noch vorhanden. Ist aber erst die Inspirationslehre preisgegeben, so ist damit auch der letzte Hoffnungschimmer einer christlichen Vereinigung der amerikanisch-lutherischen Synoden geschwunden. Mit der Inspiration und Unfehlbarkeit der heiligen Schrift gibt eben die Kirche das einzige Vereinigungsmittel aus der Hand und jede christliche Lehre der absoluten Willkuer preis. Eine groessere Froude koennte daher auch dem/Feinden der Kirche nicht bereitet werden, als wenn auch in der lutherischen Kirche Amerikas dieses Stueck der Wahrheit in Frage gezogen oder geleugnet wuerde."

On the Three Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the death of Chemnitz,

April 8, 1936.

Wallace H. McCaughey.

Notes to: THE DOCTRINE OF VERBAL INSPIRATION AND ITS OPPONENTS.

SECTION I

*1. "At nunc, postquam Deus ea, quae de rebus revelatis ad salutem cognitu sunt necessaria, certis libris comprehendi voluit; desinentibus novis revelationibus, theologiae habitus antiquis illis, quae ad prophetas et apostolos immediate factae atque ita in litteras relatae sunt, revelationibus, tanquam principio unico, ordinario nititur". Baieri Compendium.

*2. "Decretum de Canonicis Scripturis. Sacrosancta, oecumenica, et generalis tridentina synodus, in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata, praesidentibus in ea eisdem tribus apostolicae sedis legatis, hoc sibi perpetuo ante oculos ^oprophens, ut, sublatis erroribus, puritas ipsa evangelii in ecclesia conservetur; quod promissum ante per prophetas in Scripturis sanctis, Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Dei Filius, proprio ore primum promulgavit, deinde per suos apostolos, tanquam fontem omnis et salutaris veritatis et morum disciplinae, omni creaturae praedicari iussit; perspiciensque hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quae ab ipsius Christi ore ab apostolis acceptae, aut ab ipsis apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditae, ad nos usque pervenerunt: orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam **Veteris** quam Novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, necnon traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continua successione in ecclesia catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur.

"Sacrorum vero librorum indicem huic decreto adscribendum consuit, ne cui dubitatio suboriri possit, quinam sint, qui ab ipsa synodo suscipiuntur.....

"Si quis autem libros ipsos integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in ecclesia catholica legi consueverunt, et in veteri Vulgata Latina editione habentur, pro sacris, et canonicis non susceperit, et traditiones praedictas sciens et prudens contempserit, anathema sit. Omnes itaque intelligant quo ordine et via ipsa synodus

post factum fidei confessionis fundamentum, sit progressura, et quibus potissimum testimoniis ac praesidiis in confirmandis dogmatibus et instaurandis in ecclesiam moribus sit usura.

"Decretum de Editione, et Usu Sacrorum Librorum. Insuper eadem sacrosancta synodus considerans, non parum utilitatis accedere posse ecclesiae Dei, si ex omnibus Latinis editionibus, quae circumferuntur, sacrorum librorum, quatenus pro authentica habenda sit, innotescat; statuit et declarat, ut haec ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quae longo tot saeculorum usu in ipsa ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, praedicationibus et expositionibus pro authentica habeatur; et ut nemo illam rejicere quovis praetextu audeat vel praesumat.

"Praeterea, ad coercenda petulantia ingenia, decernit, ut nemo, suae prudentiae innixus, in rebus fidei, et morum ad aedificationem doctrinae christianae pertinentium, sacram scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens, contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, cuius est iudicare de vero sensu, et interpretatione scripturarum sanctarum, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum patrum ipsam scripturam sacram interpretari audeat, etiamsi huiusmodi interpretationes nullo unquam tempore in lucem edendae forent. Qui contravenerint, per ordinarios declarantur, et poenis a iure statutis puniantur." Scaff, Creeds, Vol. II, pp. 79-83.

*3. "Sed hoc dignum est consideratione, Cum per traditiones puritas doctrinae non conservaretur, et Deus non vellet amplius illa ratione uti: ut exortis corruptelis per novas subinde et peculiare revelationes repeteret, instauraret et conservaret puritatem ejus doctrinae, quae ab initio mundi Patriarchis patefacta et tradita fuerat: dignum inquam est observatione, quam aliam rationem tempore Moysis ipse instituerit et ostenderit: ut scilicet scriptis, divina auctoritate et testimonio approbatis et confirmatis, puritas doctrinae coelestis propagaretur et conservaretur: ne quaestionibus aut controversiis de veteri genuina et pura Patriarcharum doctrina exortis, semper querendae et expectandae essent novae et peculiare revelationes. Illa vero historia diligenter consideranda est. Utiliter enim illustrabit et explicavit praesentem controversiam de sacra Scriptura, monstrata prima

ejus origine. Ostendit autem historia, quod iudico praecipue esse observandum, Deum non tantum instituisse, sed ipsum suo facto et exemplo, cum primus verba Decalogi scripsit, initiasset, dedicasset et consecrasset viam illam et rationem: ut per Scripturas divinitus inspiratas conservetur et retineatur doctrinae coelestis puritas. Ita prima origo sacrae Scripturae, Deum ipsum habebit autorem. Loquimur autem de Scripturis divinitus inspiratis.....

"Et haec eo recitavi, ut observetur ex scripturis divinitus inspiratis, quas ad posteritatem Deus conservari et extare voluit, nihil scriptum fuisse ante tabulas Decalogi, Dei digitis conscriptas. Multum enim facit ad dignitatem et auctoritatem sacrae Scripturae illustrandum, quod Deus ipse rationem comprehendendi literis doctrinam coelestem, non tantum instituit et mandavit, sed quod illa primus, scriptis verbis Decalogi suis digitis initiavit, dedicavit et consecravit. Si enim ab hominibus primum scriptio sacrorum librorum inchoata fuisset, potuisset opponi praescriptio plus quam bis mille annorum: ubi in melioribus mundi temporibus et inter praestantissimos Patriarchas, sine scripto, viva voce tradita fuit doctrina verbi divini. Deus igitur ipse, suis digitis fecit initium scribendi: ut ostenderet, quantum huic rationi, ut doctrinae puritas ad posteritatem, tribuendum sit: Quod vero tabulas lapideas sumpsit, in quibus verba Decalogi scripsit, alia est ratio quae explicatur, 1(2) Cor. 3. Ne vero ea, quae per homines Dei, miraculis et testimoniis divinis ad hoc ornatos, vel conscriberentur, vel conscripta comprobarentur, minoris vel nullius ad confirmationem dogmatum, et refutationem corruptelarum, auctoritatis haberentur: noluit Deus ipse totam legem conscribere, sed scriptis verbis Decalogi, Moysi mandatum dedit, ut reliqua ex ore ejus conscriberet. Et ut populus Dei certus esset, Scripturam illam Moysis non humana voluntate allatam, sed divinitus inspiratam esse: Deus valde multis stupendis miraculis testimonio Moysis auctoritatem conciliavit, et ante scriptionem, et post, et in ipsa scriptione.....

"Haec Scripturae testimonia ostendunt, quomodo post conscriptos sacros illos libros, Ecclesia filiorum Israel fuerit columna et firmamentum veritatis: quia scilicet ipsis concredita fuerunt eloquia Dei, Rom. 3. Non autem ita, ut vel

quidvis arbitrato suo statuere, vel ex traditionibus non scriptis, pro fidei dogmatibus, alia et diversa ab illis quae conscripta erant, obtrudere possunt Ecclesiae: sed quia custodes esse debeant Scripturae, in qua Deus sua inspiratione doctrinam coelestem, et quae ab initio mundi Patriarchis tradita, in Ecclesia sonuerat, et quae Moysi patefacta fuerat, literis comprehendi curarat: non ut libri sancti in angulo tabernaculi sepulti jacerent, sed ita ut quaerentibus aut ignorantibus, quae doctrina Patriarchis, quae Moysi esset divinitus patefacta et tradita, ostenderent ex illa Scriptura, veram, genuinam et puram doctrinae coelestis vocem. Et si declinassent a mandatis Dei, ut Scriptura illa esset testimonium, Deut. 31. Ideo enim jubebat Moyses describi exemplar legis, ut esset canon, norma et regula, ne declinaretur vel in dexteram vel in sinistram partem, Deuter. 17. Et valde illustri magnificentia, Deus illam verbi sui custodiam ornavit et commendavit extruptione, portatione et circumseruatione splendidissimi tabernaculi.....

".....Totius vero suae doctrinae summam et capita, quantum Deus posteritati necessarium judicabat, ipsi conscribebant: quae conscripta, ad sacros Moysis libros, hoc est, in latere arcae collocabantur. Ita enim de Josue cap. 24. scriptum est, quod omnia verba sua scripserit in volumine legis Domini, quod positum erat in latere arcae foederis, Deut. 31. Et 1.Reg.30 (1 Sam. 10) Samuel legem regni scripsit in libro et reposuit coram Domino: hoc est, ubi arca foederis erat. Esa.30. Deus dicit Prophetae: Nunc ingressus scribe super tabulam, et in libro diligenter exara illud, et erit in die novissimo usque in aeternum. Et quomodo Prophetae soliti fuerint capita doctrinae suae, quae Dei inspiratione ad posteritatem pervenire debebant, conscribere, colligi potest ex 2.cap.Habacuc: Scribe visionem, et explana eam super tabulam, ut percurrat qui legerit eam. Et Esa.8.Sume tibi librum, et scribe in eo, stylo hominis. Similia exempla extant apud Joremiam cap.36.45.51." Chernitz, Examen, I, pp.9-11.

*4. "Vide autem cum de traditionibus extra et praeter Scripturam, Christo disputatio esset cum Pharisaeis, potuisset facile commemorare alia et plura Patriarcharum et Prophetarum vera dicta et facta quam quae scripta sunt: et potuisset illius

commemorationis fidem, miraculis comprobare. Et sine dubio fecisset illud, si judicasset non omnia quae necessaria sunt et sufficiunt, Scripturis contineri..... Christus non tantum ipsas traditiones Pharisaeorum, ut falsas et vanas refutat et abjicit: sed simpliciter deducit ipsos ad scripturam non substitutis aliis traditionibus, de doctrina veterum, tanquam praeter scripturam necessariis et amplectendis." Chemnitz, Examen, I, p.13.

*5. Ejus enim proprietatem, ab ipso Deo ita esse constitutam, ut nec in tabulis, nec in chartis, nec calamo, nec atramento, vel quovis alio modo literis consignetur: sed viva tantum voce, animis auditorum commendetur, et ita sine scripto conservetur, et per manus tradatur. Et hunc volunt esse sensum ejus, quod Jeremiae 31. scriptum est: Dabo legem meam in corda eorum, et in intimo eorum scribam eam. Et quod Paulus dicit 2Corinth.3.Epistola nostra estis vos, scripta a nobis non atramento, sed spiritu Dei vivi: non in tabulis lapideis, sed in tabulis cordis carnis." Chemnitz, Examen, I, p.15.

*6. "Doctrina enim Evangelii, antequam conscriberetur, erat prius contra Judaeorum et Gentium calumnias et contradictiones praedicatione Apostolorum, signis et prodigiis per totum terrarum orbem confirmanda, et assensione populorum credentium in omnibus terris comprobanda..... Quod quidem tunc praeconiaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem, in scripturis nobis tradiderunt fundamentum et columnam fidei nostrae futurum..... Illa enim extra omnem controversiam, sola est vera et vivifica fides, quam primitiva Ecclesia ab Apostolis accepit et filiis suis distribuit. Sed illa fides concepta initio praedicatione Apostolorum, quam ipsi ex doctrina filii Dei acceperant. Hanc vero doctrinam Christi et Apostolorum, ex qua vera primitivae Ecclesiae fides accepta fuit, Apostoli primum sine scripto viva voce tradiderunt, postea vero non humano aliquo consilio, sed per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis tradiderunt. Quidnam? Illam ipsam doctrinam quam a filio Dei acceptam, viva voce praedicaverant, ex qua solam veram et vivificam fidem, primitiva Ecclesia ab Apostolis acceperat, et filiis suis distribuerat. Quibus vero Apostoli Evangelium tradiderunt in Scripturis." Chemnitz, Examen, I, pp. 18,19.

*7. "Quaero autem, fuerit ne aliquid ab Apostolis conscriptum, priusquam Paulus primas suas epistolas ediderit? Et invenio Actor. 15. Apostolos et Seniores in primo et celeberrimo concilio Apostolico, re diligenter deliberata, et communibus suffragiis scripsisse Epistolam ad Ecclesias ex gentibus collectas. Nec reperio ante illam Epistolam, aliquid ab Apostolis literis mandatum fuisse, si Andradii supputationem de Evangelistis sequamur. Haec igitur erit prima origo, hoc primum principium Scripturae divinitus inspiratae, in novo Testamento, quod ita esse, Andradius juxta suam de Matthaeo supputationem, negare non poterit. Sicut igitur Scripturae sacrae in veteri Testamento, originem valde illustrem invenimus, cum scilicet Deus ipse primus, verba Decalogi suis digitis in tabulas exaravit, ita Andradius praebuit mihi occasionem sua supputatione, ad investigandam magnificam et illustrem primam originem Scripturae in novo Testamento, quod scilicet initium literis consignandi doctrinam Apostolicam fuerit, non ab uno aliquo ex Apostolis, privato quodam consilio, sed cum Apostoli omnes, et etiam presbyteri Ecclesiae Hierosolymitanae, in primo et celeberrimo concilio Apostolico congregati essent, communibus suffragiis, et diligenter deliberata, conscripta et edita Epistola, complectens sententiam Apostolicam, de qua tunc motae erant controversiae. Et hoc esse primum scriptum, ab Apostolis in novo Testamento editum, Andradius, si sibi constare voluerit, negare non poterit, ante concilium illud Apostolorum quicquam de Scriptura, divinitus inspirata, in novo Testamento conscriptum fuisse.".....

"Erit igitur haec, quam ostendimus, prima origo Scripturae divinitus inspiratae in novo Testamento, cujus hoc erit emblema: Visum est Spiritui sancto, et nobis. Et sicut primum traditione vivae vocis, Lex exivit ex Zion, et verbum ex Jerusalem, ita etiam prima Scriptura novi Testamenti exivit ex Zion, et principium coepit in Jerusalem, quod ipsum ad dignitatem et auctoritatem Scripturae, non parum facit."
 Chomnitz, Examen, I, pp. 19,20.

*8. "Illud igitur probandum est, Evangelistas propter hanc causam, hoc consilio et in hunc usum, historias suas conscripsisse, ut literis ad posteritatem commendarent, quae Apostoli de dictis et factis Domini, Ecclesiam ad posteritatem scirent.

necessarium judicarunt.

"Omniū autem consensu Matthaeus, primus inter quattuor Evangelistas, historiam suam conscripsit. De occasione autem et consilio scribendi, Eusebius hoc annotavit lib. 3. cap.24. Matthaeus cum primum Hebraeis praedicasset; et jam ad alios quoque transiturus erat, Evangelium suum patrio sermone literis tradidit, et quod subtracta sua praesentia desiderare possent illi, a quibus discedebat, per literas adimplevit. Nicophorus libr.2. cap.45. hanc sententiam ita expressit: Discedens absentiam suam scripto praesenti compensavit.

"Thomas citat hanc Hieronymi descriptionem: Matthaeus in Judaea Evangelium edidit, ob eorum maxime causam, qui Jerosolymis ex Judaeis crediderant. Cum enim primum praedicasset Evangelium viva voce, volens transire ad gentes, primus Evangelium conscripsit, quod fratribus a quibus ibat, in memoria dereliquit, sicut enim necesse fuit ad confirmationem fidei, Evangelium praedicari, sic et contra haereticos scribi.

"Chrysostomus homilia 1. in Matthaeum ita inquit: Matthaeus scripsit accedentibus, his qui ex Judaeis Christo crediderent, et rogantibus, ut quae verbis docuisset, haec eis in literis servanda dimitteret.

"Autor operis imperfecti in Matthaeum, quod sub Chrysostomi nomine extat, occasionem scribendi ita recitat. Cum facta esset gravis persecutio in Palaestina, ut periclitarentur dispergi omnes, ne carentes doctoribus, doctrinae etiam carerent, petierunt Matthaeum, ut omnium verborum et operum Christi conscriberet eis historiam, ut ubicunque essent futuri, totius seculi haberent fidei statum.

"Thomas illam sententiam ita recitat: Petierunt Matthaeum, ut dispergendis, totius fidei, quam viva voce tradiderat summam, scripto complecteretur, etc. Et haec narratio de persecutione, non male congruit ad tempus scriptionis juxta Irenaeum. Circa 20. enim ab ascensione Christi annum, Judaeam miserabiliter afflictam fuisse a magis et latronibus autor est Josephus. Accessit captivitas Pauli, quae videbatur omnibus Christianibus periculum minari.

"Causae igitur propter quas Matthaeus Evangelium suum conscripsit, hae sunt,

I. Ut quod propter discessum, praesens viva voce, docendo et confirmando praestare non poterat, id absens scripto, seu per literas praestaret. II. quia memoria fragilis et labilis est, ut quae docuerat, ea literis servanda dimitteret. III. ut totius fidei statum, et summam scripto comprehensam haberent, qui viva Apostolorum voce uti non possent. IV. propter haereticos necesse fuit doctrinam Evangelii scribi, ne Ecclesiae falsa, supposititia, et adulterina, sub nomine Evangelii obtunderentur. Et Irenaeus descriptionem Matthaei primum exemplum ponit ejus, quod dixerat: Apostoli quod praeconiauerunt per Dei voluntatem, postea in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostrae futurum". Chemnitz, Examen, I, pp.20,21.

*9. "Addam adhuc unam sententiam Augustini, de consen. Evangelist. libr. 1. cap. 35. ubi refutat illos, qui discipulos Christi, Evangelium conscribentes, ideo contemnendos putant, quia ipsius Christi nulla scripta proferantur a nobis. Christus (inquit) omnibus discipulis suis, per hominem quem assumpsit, tanquam membrum sui corporis, caput est. Itaque cum illi scripserunt quae ille ostendit, nequaquam dicendum est, quod ipse non scripserit, quandoquidem membra id operata sunt, quod dictante capite cognoverunt. Quicquid enim ille de suis factis et dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis tanquam suis manibus imperavit. Haec Augustinus.....Christus igitur non voluit, ut apud alios scriptores, de suis factis et dictis aliquid, quod in illis, quae apud quattuor Evangelistas descripta extant, non continetur, legamus.....Irenaeus autor est, quattuor illa conscripta Evangelia fuisse in primitiva Ecclesia normam, a ussum et regulam, ad quam exigebantur, a quocumque aliquid, quasi de factis et dictis Christi proponebatur: et quod illis consentaneum inveniebatur, recipiebatur, quod vero vel dissentiebat vel repugnabat, libere repudiebatur." Chemnitz, Examen, I, pp.24,25.

*10. "Jucunda enim est illa observatio, quae fuerit summa fidei de dictis et factis Christi in Ecclesia Jerosolymitana, ex qua verbum^{us} exivit in omnem terram, in Matthaei Evangelio literis consignatum est. Et quae sit doctrina quam de dictis et factis Christi, Petrus viva voce, Romanae Ecclesiae, cujus fides in

universo mundo, viventibus Apostolis celebratur, tradiderit, scripto Marci memoriae mandatum est, haec enim sunt antiquitatis verba. Lucas vero ipse affirmat, se ea conscripsisse, quae Apostoli de dictis et factis Christi, in Ecclesia Antiochena (ejus enim civis Lucas fuit) quae prima Christianis hoc nomen dedit, tradiderunt, quae Ecclesiae illae gentium, quas cum Paulo perlustravit, certa et indubita tunc fide tenebant et profitebantur. Quid vero Joannes in Ephesina Ecclesia de dictis et factis Christi tradiderit, ipse etiam scripto complexus est. Et hae Ecclesiae, extra omnem controversiam, tunc fuerunt praecipuae, Jerosolymitana, Antiochena, Ephesina et Romana". Chemnitz, Examen, p. 25.

*11. "Quando proprie loqui volumus, inter doctrinam Christi, et doctrinam Apostolorum, nulla est differentia. Ita enim Apostolis Christus dat potestatem annunciandi Evangelium, Matth. 28. ut discrete addat: Docentes ipsos servare quaecunque praecepi vobis. Joan. 16 (14). Spiritus sanctus docebit vos omnia, et suggeret vobis omnia quaecunque dixi vobis. 2. Cor. 13. An experimentum quaeritis ejus, qui in me loquitur Christus? 2 Corint. 5. Pro Christo legatione fungimur, etc.....Si igitur, sicut jam de Christi doctrina probavimus, de Apostolorum etiam doctrina ostenderimus literis consignatum, et scriptis comprehensum esse, quantum Spiritus sanctus nobis ad dogmata, et ad mores necessarium esse et sufficere judicavit; manifestum erit, sacram scripturam esse Canonem, normam, regulam, fundamentum et columnam totius nostrae fidei, ita quod ex Scriptura probandum et confirmandum erit, quicquid hoc titulo et nomine, quod sit Christi et Apostolorum doctrina, suscipi debet, quod ad hanc normam, omnia in controversiis religionis ita exigenda et examinanda erunt, ut valeat Hieronymi illud dictum, quicquid de Scripturis sacris auctoritatem non habet, eadem facilitate contemnitur qua probatur.Et certum quidem est, Apostolos non statim primis annis suae praedicationis scripsisse. Ne tamen opus esset, vel diu conjecturis divinare, vel ex rumusculis traditionum, quae sine capite sparguntur, petere quis fuerit primus, et vere antiquissimus Apostolicae Ecclesiae status, voluit Spiritus sanctus certum authenticum et canonicum de his tam necessariis et utilibus rebus, scriptum ad omnem posterita-

tem extare in Ecclesia, cum non ignoraret, fore, ut hoc titulo multa incerta, vana, supposititia et falsa obtruderentur Ecclesiae. Lucas enim cum descriptione Evangelicae historiae fidem et auctoritatem in Ecclesia sibi comparasset, contexuit etiam historiam de actis Apostolorum, exorsus a primis initiis Apostolicae praedicationis. Et haec historia abunde suppeditat, quae de his rebus necesse est, et sufficit scire." Chemnitz, Examen, I, pp. 25,26.

*12. "Quod enim attinet ad Ecclesiae statum, ad ministerium, doctrinam, fidem, etc. non habuerunt singuli Apostoli proprium aut peculiare aliquid, sed una fuit fides, eadem doctrina, et commune ministerium, quo unum et eundem Ecclesiae (quod ad substantiam Evangelicae religionis) statum constituerunt: ut etiamsi singulorum Apostolorum acta conscripta essent, non tamen contrarium, non diversum, non aliud, sed unum et idem saepius scriptum legere." Chemnitz, Examen, I, p.27.

*13. "III. Cum vero agnitio essentiae et voluntatis Dei homini, ne in perditione relinqueretur, necessaria esset. Deus ipse, immensa misericordia ex arcana sua luce prodiens, se et voluntatem suam dato certo verbo, quo illustribus miraculis confirmavit, generi humano inde usque ab initio patefecit.

"IV. Ad illud suum traditum Verbum Deus vult Ecclesiam alligatam esse, non ad spirituum vel mortuorum apparitiones, Isa.8.v.19. Non ad cordis nostri imaginationes, Deut.12.v.8. nec ad hominum traditiones, Isa.29.v.13.

"V. Et illud quidem verbum primo una voce promulgatum, propagatum et quasi per manus traditum fuit. Sed cum partim oblivione anitteretur, partim peregrinis et supposititiis doctrinis adulteretur, Deus ostendit certam rationem, qua Ecclesiae ad omnem posteritatem prospiceretur, ne quovis vento doctrinae quasi divinitus revelatae circumferretur: ut scilicet verbum Dei, per testes, divina auctoritate et certis testimoniis comprobatos, scriptura comprehensum, hoc modo ad posteritatem conservaretur, et transmitteretur.

"VI. Ex multis autem et prolixis concionibus Patriarcharum, Prophetarum, Christi et Apostolorum, iudicio Spiritus sancti quae conscriberentur, selecta sunt ea, quae ad poenitentiam, fidem et mores pie vivendi posteritati sufficere ab ipso Deo iudi-

cata sunt. Cum quidem nec alia, nec diversa, nec contraria essent, quae viva voce tradita fuerunt, sed eorum brevis et sufficiens summa in scriptura auctore ipso Deo, comprehenderetur." Chemnitz, Loci, Tom. III, p.234.

*14. "Post editum scripturae canonem nullum statui potest verbum Dei non scriptum, a scripto contradistinctum". Gerhard in Schmid, p.22.

*15. "'Quare Deus verbum suum, prius viva voce propagatum, in scripturas redigi voluerit?' Causae videntur fuisse praecipuae et primariae: 1) vitae humanae brevitatem. 2) hominum numerositas. 3) custodiae a traditione expectandae infidelitas. 4) memoriae humanae imbecillitas. 5) coelestis doctrinae stabilitas. 6) hominum improbitas. 7) (in N.T.) haeticorum perversitas, quae fuit reprimenda". Gerhard in Schmid, p.20.

*16. "Scilicet 1) multiplicato genere humano, 2) vitae vero humanae spatio abbreviato, non aequae ut olim a patriarchis, immediata revelatione Dei instructis, vivae vocae coram instrui poterant omnes homines, Sed et 3) in vestris variis doctrinae corruptelis, accedente 4) hominum informandorum infirmitate memoriae imbecillitate, ut tamen praesto esset revelatio, ad quam in omni necessitatis casu non abs re desiderabatur. secure confugi posset, litera scripta,/ Atque ita divinae providentiae consultissimum visum est, capita divinarum revelationum scripto comprehendi." Baieri Compendium, ed. Walther, I, 106.

*17. "Causa impulsiva consignatae ex voluntate divina Scripturae sacrae interna est bonitas Dei, externa hominum salvandorum indigentia". Baieri Compendium, ed. Walther, I, 105.

*18. "Probatur Scripturae necessitas hypothetica I. ex divina voluntate et ordinatione; Deus enim pro infinita sua sapientia et benignitate Scripturam ordinavit, ceu medium informationis Ecclesiae, cessante immediata revelatione, Luc. XVI. 29. 2 Tim. III. 15.16.17. 2 Petr. I.19.

"II. Ex hominum conditione; Necessaria fuit Scriptura 1) ob vitae humanae breviteratem. 2) ob hominum numerositatem, sive Ecclesiae dilatationem, et per totum Orbem diffusionem; quae enim primo inter paucas familias conclusa erat,

in ingentem postmodum populum excrevit. 3) ob ad errores proclivitatem, Natura humana post lapsum veritatis nec appetens, nec tenax erat, sed proclivis ad ἐθελοθρησκείας, imo actu in errores saepe prolapsa, adeoque verbi scripti indiga. 4) memoriae humanae infirmitatem. 5) custodiae a Traditione expectandae infidelitatem. 6) divinarum revelationum, per immediatas Dei apparitiones factarum cessationem. 7) Satanae, per μαντεῖα sua φανερώσεις divinas nentientis, et hominum animos variis superstitionibus dementatis, fraudem. 8) corruptelarum multitudinem. 9) Coelestis doctrinae ἀσφάλεια et stabilitatem, Luc. I. v. 3 (4) (tabulis insculpenda, quae multis seculis incorrupta servari debent, Job. XIX v. 27. (24). Es. XXX. 8.). 10) fidei firmitatem: et denique 11) ad reprimendam haereticam pravitatem.

"III. Elucescit Scripturae necessitas hypothetica ex quadruplici utilitate, quarum 1) est, ut sit regula discernendi dogmata vera a falsis, Esa. VIII. v. 20. et 21. 2) ut ex vaticiniis de Christo, figuris et typis V. T. Messias promissus, in N. T. agnosceretur, et tum Judaei, tum alii heterodoxi non solum convincerentur, sed etiam ad fidem Christianam traherentur. 3) ut fides nostra ex utriusque Testamenti scripti collatione confirmaretur, et perficeretur. 4) ut longe dissitae Gentes per Scripturam vocarentur et salvarentur.

"IV. Ex Apostoli Pauli assertione, Phil. III. 1. Eadem, τὰ αὐτά, (scil. quae vobis scribere, (et Epistola inculcare) ne quidem non piget, coram, crebro et frequenter docendo ingeminavi,)/vobis autem necessarium est, ut habet Versio vulgata Papistis authentica, ἀσφάλεια habetur in Graeco, ut ita necessitas hypothetica, ob firmitatem et certitudinem majorem indicetur". Quenstedt I, p. 63.

SECTION II.

*19. "Forma interna, seu quae dat esse Scripturae, ut scil. sit Dei verbum, h. e. eam constituit, et a quavis alia Scriptura distinguit, est sensus Scripturae Θεόπνευστος, qui in genere est conceptus divini intellectus de mystoriis divinis, et Salute nostra ab aeterno formatus, et in tempore revelatus, atque

scriptione nobis communicatus, sive ipsa *θεοπνευστία*, i.e. divina inspiratio, 2 Tim. III.16. utpote qua verbum divinum constituitur, et ab humano distinguitur." Quenstedt, I, p.56, quoted in Schmid, p.22.

*20. "Inter verbum Dei et scripturam sacram, materialiter acceptam, non esse reale aliquod discrimen, probatur 1) ex scripturae materia. Idem ac nihil aliud prophetae et apostoli scripserunt, quod divina inspiratione edocti prius viva voce praedicarunt. 1 Cor. XV, 1. 2 Cor. I,13. Phil. III, 1. 2 Thss. II, 15. 1 Joh. I,3. 2) ex phrasium *ἰσοδυναμία*. Vaticinia prophetica V. T. in N. T. quandoque allegantur his verbis: ut impleatur, quod dictum est per prophetam. Mth. I,22. II, 15.IV, 14 etc. etc. -- Ergo, quod prophetae dixerunt vel praedixerunt, idem est cum eo, quod scripserunt. 3) ex regula logica: 'Accidens non mutat rei essentiam'. Accidit Dei verbo, sive voce enunciatur sive in literas redigatur. Unum idemque Dei verbum est, sive praedicationis sive scriptionis modo nobis innotescat, cum nec causa efficiens principalis, nec materia, nec forma interna, nec finis mutetur, sed tantum modus patefactionis in usu organico consistens variet. 4) ex *δεικτικῆ* particula ab apostolis usurpata. Paulus de scriptura Mosaica et homogeneis V. et N. T. libris *δεικτικῶς* inquit: *τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ ἔργον τῆς πίστεως*. Rom. X, 8. Petrus 1 Ptr. I, 25". Gerhard in Schmid, p. 22 and Baieri Compendium, ed. Walther, I, 93.

*21. "Hier (2. Sam. 23,2, wo David sagt: Der Geist des Herrn hat durch mich geredet und seine Rede ist durch meinen Mund geschehen) will David mir zu wunderlich werden und zu hoch fahren; Gott gebe, dass ich es doch ein wenig erlangen moege; denn er faehet hier an, von der hohen heiligen Dreifaltigkeit goettlichen Wesens zu reden. Erstlich nennet er den heiligen Geist; dem gibt er alles was die Propheten weissagen. Und auf diesen und dergleichen Spruch siehet St. Petrus, 2 Epistel 1, 21: Es ist noch nie keine Weissagung aus menschlichem Willen hervorgebracht, sondern die heiligen Menschen Gottes haben geredet aus Eingebung des heiligen Geistes. Daher singet man in dem Artikel des Glaubens (Nicaenum) vom heiligen Geiste also: Der durch den Propheten geredet hat. Also gibet man nun

dem heiligen Geiste die ganze heil. Schrift" (Die letzten Worte Davids, Walch III, 2796, vom Jahre 1543).

*22. "Der Geist redet, als wuesste er von keinem Buche (so doch derselben die Welt voll ist), ohne allein von diesem Buche, der heiligen Schrift.....Das ist des heiligen Geistes Buch, darinnen muss man Christum suchen und finden" (Auslegung vieler schoener Sprueche, Walch IX, 1364).

*23. "Menschenlehre tadeln wir nicht darum, dass es Menschen gesagt haben, sondern dass es Luegen und Gotteslaesterungen sind wider die Schrift, welche, wie-wohl sie auch durch Menschen geschrieben ist, doch nicht von oder aus Menschen, sondern aus Gott ist" (Menschenlehre zu meiden, Walch XIX, 739, von 1522).

*24. "Desgleichen disputieren sie auch davon, ob dies Spiel, so Joseph mit seinen Bruedern getrieben, Gott auch koenne wohlgefallen, und aus wess Eingeben oder welchem Geist er das moege gethan haben. Darauf antworte ich also: Dass Joseph dies darum gethan und vom heiligen Geiste darum auch sei beschrieben worden, dass wir daraus lernen, wie man vor Gott leben solle" (Auslegung des ersten Buchs Mose, von 1536).

*25. "Es ist ein wunderbarlicher Fleiss des heiligen Geistes, diese schaedliche unzuechtige Historie zu beschreiben....Warum hat sich doch der allerreinste Mund des heiligen Geistes also herniedergelassen?.....Und also stoiget der heilige Geist da hernieder mit seinem allerreinsten Munde und redet von der scheuslichen Suende und greulichen Blutschande".

*26. "Es ist wahr, dass dies ist ein eben grob Kapitel; nun stohet es doch in der heiligen Schrift und hat es der heilige Geist geschrieben" (Predigten uober das erste Buch Mose, Walch III, 342, von 1527).

*27. Der Psalter ist eine kleine Biblia, "dass nich duenkt, der heilige Geist habe selbst wollen die Muehe auf sich nehmen und eine kurze Bibel und Exempelbuch von der ganzen Christenheit und allen Heiligen zusammenbringen" (Vorrede zum Psalter, Walch XIV, 23 vom Jahr 1531).

*28. "Hier gibt der Text Daniels (7,13.14) auch gewaltiglich den Artikel von

der Gottheit in drei Personen und von der Menschheit des Sohnes ; denn es muss eine andere Person sein, die da gibt , und eine andere, die es empfaengt . Naemlich der Vater gibt die ewige Gewalt dem Sohne und der Sohn hat sie vom Vater, und das alles von Ewigkeit her, sonst waere es nicht eine ewige Gewalt; so ist der heilige Geist da, der es durch Daniel redet. Denn solch hoch heimlich Ding koennte niemand wissen, wo es der heilige Geist nicht durch die Propheten offenbarte; wie droben oft gesagt, dass die heilige Schrift durch den heiligen Geist gesprochen ist"(Die letzten Worte Davids, Walch III, 2821).

*29. Was nun in den Propheten geschrieben und verkuendigt ist, sagt Petrus, das haben nicht Menschen erfunden noch erdacht, sondern die heiligen frommen Leute haben's aus dem heiligen Geiste geredet" (Auslegung der zweiten Epistel Petri, Walch IX, 858, von 1524). "Wenn der heilige Petrus versichere, der Geist Christi habe in den Propheten gezeugt (1 Petri 1,11), so seien das nicht eines Fischers oder eines klugen Schriftgelehrten Worte, sondern eben des heiligen Geistes Offenbarung, der es zuvor auch den Propheten offenbart habe" (Kirchenpostille, 924).

*30. "Ein Prophet wird genannt, der seinen Verstand hat von Gott ohne Mittel, dem der heilige Geist das Wort in den Mund legt. Denn er (der Geist) ist die Quelle und sie haben keinen andern Meister denn Gott" (Walch III, 1172, von 1524).

*31. "Die Propheten bringen nicht, was sie erdacht und gut gedaeucht, sondern was sie von Gott selbst gehoert und der, so alle Dinge geschaffen, ihnen entweder durch Traeume oder durch Gesichten gezeigt und gewiesen hat, dasselbige offenbaren sie und thun es uns dar.....Sind also rechte Zuhoerer Gottes; denn der ewige allmaechtige Gott, der Geist Gottes regiert ihr Herz und Zunge" (Auslegung Joels, Walch VI, 2169, vom Jahre 1545).

*32. "Mit dem heiligen Geiste sind sie angehaucht worden, dass sie redeten" (Auslegung des fuenften Buchs Mose, Walch III, 2080, von 1525).

*33. "Was hier erzachlet wird, scheint der Vernunft, als sei es gar fleischlich und weltlich Ding; und verwundere ich mich auch selbst, warum Moses von sol-

chen geringen Dingen so viel Worte machet, so er doch droben von viel hoeheren Dingen so sehr kurz geredet hat. Daran aber ist kein Zweifel, dass der heilige Geist hat haben wollen, dass dies zu unserer Lehre soll geschrieben werden. Denn in der heiligen Schrift wird uns nichts vorgehalten, das gering und vergeblich Ding sei, sondern alles, was geschrieben ist, das ist uns zur Lehre geschrieben"

*34. "Der heilige Geist ist kein Narr noch Trunkenbold, der einen Tuettel, geschweige ein Wort sollte vergeblich reden" (Die letzten Worte Davids, Walch III, 2804).

*35. "Das sei diesmal genug spaziert, auf dass man sehe, wie gar kein Tuettel in der Schrift sei vergebens geschrieben, und wie die lieben alten Vaeter mit ihrem Glauben uns haben Exempel vorgetragen, aber mit ihren Werken allezeit fuergebildet das, woran wir glauben sollen, naemlich Christum und sein Evangelium, also, dass nichts vorgebens von ihnen gelesen wird, sondern all ihr Ding unsern Glauben staerket und bessert"(Kirchenpostille, Sonntag nach Christtag, von 1521).

*36. "Wenn sie nun (Juden und Tuerken) pochen auf die Schrift, dass ein einiger Gott sei, so pochen wir wiederum, dass die Schrift eben so stark anzeigt, dass in dem einigen Gott viel Personen sind. Uns gibt unsere Schrift so viel als ihre; sintemal kein Buchstabe in der heiligen Schrift vergeblich ist" (Die drei Symbole, Walch X, 1229, von 1538).

*37. "An Einem Buchstaben, ja an einem einzigen Tuettel der Schrift ist mehr und groesser gelegen, denn an Himmel und Erde. Darum koennen wir es nicht leiden, dass man sie auch in dem allergeringsten verruecken wolle" (Erklaerung des Galaterbriefs, Walch VIII, 2662, vom Jahre 1535).

*38. "Wenn sie nicht so leichtfertige Veraechter waeren der Schrift, so sollte sie Ein klarer Spruch aus der Schrift so viel bewegen, als waere die Welt voll Schrift, wie es denn wahr ist, denn mir ist also, dass ein jeglicher Spruch die Welt zu enge macht" (Dass diese Worte Christi:das ist mein Leib, noch feststehen, Walch XX, 982, von 1527).

*39. Das bekenne ich, wo Dr. Carlstadt oder jemand anders vor fuenf Jahren

mich haette moegen berichten, dass im Sakrament nichts denn Brot und Wein waere, der haette mir einen grossen Dienst gethan. Aber ich ben gefange, kann nicht heraus; der Text ist zu gewaltig,...und will sich mit Worten nicht lassen aus dem Sinn reissen" (An die Strassburger, Walch XV, 2448, von 1524).

*40. "Das sei fern, das sei fern, dass ein einziger Buchstabe in Paulo sei, dem nicht nachfolgen und den nicht halten solle die ganze allgemeine Kirche" (Babylonische Gefangenschaft, Walch XIX,22, von 1520). "Absit, absit, ut ullus apex in toto Paulo sit, quem non debeat imitari et servare tota universalis ecclesia".

*41. Ideo, ut V.C.M. voluntati obsequamur, offerimus in hac religionis causa nostrorum concionatorum et nostram confessionem, cuiusmodi doctrinam ex Scripturis Sanctis et puro Verbo Dei hactenus illi in nostris terris, ducibus, ditionibus et urbibus tradiderint ac in ecclesiis tractaverint". Concordia Triglotta, p.38.

*42 "Si ius habent episcopi, onerandi ecclesias infinitis traditionibus et illaqueandi conscientias, cur toties prohibet Scriptura condere et audire traditiones? Cur vocat eas doctrinas daemoniorum? 1 Tim.4,1? Num frustra haec praemonuit Spiritus Sanctus?" Concordia Triglotta, p.90.

*43. "Adversarii nostri vociferantur se esse ecclesiam, se consensum ecclesiae sequi. At Petrus hic in nostra causa etiam allegat consensum ecclesiae: 'Huic', inquit, 'omnes prophetae perhibent testimonium, remissionem peccatorum accipere per nomen eius etc. Profecto consensus prophetarum iudicandus est universalis ecclesiae consensus esse. Nec papae nec ecclesiae concedimus potestatem decernendi contra hunc consensum prophetarum". Concordia Triglotta, p.270.

*44. "Ex patrum enim verbis et factis non sunt extruendi articuli fidei, alioquin etiam articulus fidei fieret victus ipsorum, vestimentarum ratio, domus, etc., quemadmodum cum reliquiis sanctorum luserunt. Regulam autem aliam habemus, ut videlicet Verbum Dei condat articulos fidei, et praeterea nemo, ne angelus quidem". Concordia Triglotta, p. 466.

*45. "Credimus, confitemur et docemus unicam regulam et normam, secundum quam

omnia dogmata omnesque doctores aestimari et iudicare oporteat, nullam omnino aliam esse quam prophetica et apostolica scripta cum Veteris tum Novi Testamenti.Reliqua vero sive patrum sive nootericorum scripta, quocunque veniant nomine, sacris litteris nequaquam sunt aequiparanda, sed universa illis ita subiicienda sunt, ut alia ratione non recipiantur nisi testium loco.....Hoc modo luculentum discrimen inter sacras Veteris et Novi Testamenti litteras et omnia aliorum scripta retinetur, et sola Sacra Scriptura iudex, norma et regula agnoscitur, ad quam ceu ad Lydium lapidem omnia dogmata exigenda sunt et iudicanda, an pia an impia, an vera an vero falsa sint". Concordia Triglotta, pp. 776.778.

*46. "Primum igitur toto pectore prophetica et apostolica scripta Veteris et Novi Testamenti, ut limpidissimos purissimosque Israelis fontes, recipimus et amplectimur et sacras litteras solas unicam et certissimam illam regulam esse credimus, ad quam omnia dogmata exigere, et secundum quam de omnibus tum doctrinis tum doctoribus iudicare oporteat". Concordia Triglotta, p. 850.

SECTION III.

*47. "Causa efficiens Scripturae Sacrae Veteris et Novi Testamenti est vel principalis, vel instrumentalis. Principalis est Deus unitrinus, 2 Tim.III.v.16. et quidem Pater, Hebr. I.v.1. Filius, Joh. I.18. et Spiritus Sanctus. 2.Samuel XXIII.2..... Est Deus Sacrae Scripturae causa efficiens principalis duplici ratione 1. mandato antecedente, 2. inspiratione subsequente, sive jubendo, ut scribant Sancti Dei homines, et inspirando scribenda. Quoad primum, constat, Sacram Scripturam esse a Deo, Sacros Scriptores ad scribendum peculiariter movente et impellente; quoad alterum, Deum non solum res, sed et verba, ordinemque tum rerum, tum verborum inspirasse". Quonstedt I, p.55.

*48. "Non solum res et sententias in Scriptura Sacra contentas, seu sensum verborum, Prophetis et Apostolis inspiravit Spiritus Sanctus quas suo idiomate, suisque verbis, pro arbitrio vel efferent, vel exornarent, sed etiam ipsamet verba, et voces omnes ac singulas individualiter Spiritus Sanctus sacris Scrip-

toribus suppediavit, inspiravit et dictavit". Quenstedt I, pp. 72,73.

*49. "Neque enim dicit Apostolus, πάντα ἐν γραφῇ sunt θεόπνευστα, sed πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος, ut ostendat, non modo res scriptas, sed etiam ipsam scriptionem esse θεόπνευστον. Et quicquid de tota Scriptura dicitur, idem etiam de verbis, ceu parte Scripturae non postrema, necessario intelligendum est. Si enim vel verbulum in Scripturis occurreret, non suggestum vel inspiratum divinitus, πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος dici non posset". Cf. Calovius: "Si omnis scriptura θεόπνευστος est, nihil in scriptura sacra esse potest, quod non sit scriptoribus divinitus suggestum et inspiratum. Nam si ulla tantum particula scripturae esset e notitia et memoria vel revelatione humana deprompta, non omnis scriptura dici posset universaliter divinitus inspirata". Calovius in Schmid, p.26.

*50. "Hoc loco verba a rebus per verba communicatis distinguuntur.....
Opponuntur λόγοι διδασκτοῦ ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας, et λόγοι διδασκτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, verba, quae docet humana sapientia, sive verba humana etiam sapientissime excogitata et verba, quae docet, suggerit et dictat Spiritus Sanctus (Genitivus enim causam efficientem exprimit, ut Joh. VI. 45. Erunt omnes διδασκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, docti a Deo, ex Es. LIV. 13.) Illa a λαλιᾷ Apostolica removentur, haec vero ipsi tribuuntur. Vult enim dicere Apostolus: Sicut a Spiritu Sancto sapientiam illam, sive notitiam mysteriorum divinatorum accepimus, ita quoque ab eo ipsa verba, quibus eam eloquimur, edocti sumus. Vox λαλεῖν ipsam quoque scriptionem complectitur, ut Actor. III. 24. et alibi, ita ut scriptionis et locutionis eadem, quoad praesens negotium, sit ratio. Quapropter sicut sermones, quibus inter praedicandum usi sunt Apostoli, docuit eos Spiritus Sanctus perinde ut sapientiam in mysterio reconditam, per inspirationem; sic quoque eam in literas retulerunt verbis, non quae humana docet sapientia, sed quae eosdem docuit Spiritus Sanctus per inspirationem, ita ut his et non aliis verbis, hoc et non alio ordine ac modo ad Scripturam consignandam uterentur". Quenstedt, I, p. 74.

*51. "Ἀγτιθεσις. 1. Pontificiorum, 2. Nonnullorum Calvinianorum, 3. Soci-
nianorum, 4. Arminianorum, denique 5. Novatorum, qui omnes ea, quae naturali ratio

et aliunde, vel per experientiam propriam, et sensuum ministerio cognosci poterunt, (vel quorum scriptores ipsi *αὐτόπται* et *αὐτήκοοι* extiterunt) quaque nihil ad salutem faciunt, et facti, vel rei narratae circumstantiam spectant, itaque leviora videntur, non revelasse, inspirasse et dictasse Spiritum Sanctum sed solum ad haec consignanda Scriptores excitasse, et simul gubernasse per assistentiam et directionem singularem, ne quid falsi, indecori, aut incongrui admiscerent, vel aliquid humani in scribendo paterentur; Sic Bellarminus lib. I. de V. D. cap. XV. ait; 'Aliter Deus adfuit Prophetis, aliter Historicis. Illis revelavit futura, et simul astitit, ne aliquid falsi admiscerent in scribendo; his non semper revelavit ea, quae scripturi erant, sed excitavit duntaxat, ut scriberent ea, quae vel viderant, vel audierant, quorum recordabantur, et simul astitit, ne quid falsi scriberent, quae assistentia non excludebat laborem'." Quenstedt, I, pp.68,69.

*52. "Distinguendum est inter assistentiam et directionem divinam nudam, quae tantum cavetur, ne Scriptores Sacri in loquendo et scribendo a vero aberrant; et inter assistentiam et directionem divinam, quae includit Spiritus Sancti inspirationem et dictamen; non illa, sed haec Scripturam officit *θεόπνευστος*, et hic locum habet". Quenstedt, I, 68. Hollazius: "*θεόπνοή* sive *θεόπνευστία* notat, tum antecedentem motum divinum, sive peculiarem impulsum voluntatis ad scribendum, tum immediatam illuminationem, qua intellectus Scriptoris sacri supernaturali; eoque extraordinario Lumine Gratiae divinae collustratur, et conceptus rerum scribendarum Ipsi a Spiritu Sancto immediate suggeruntur. Differt haec *θεόπνευστία* sive Inspiratio divina a Gubernatione divino; Nam hac tantum cavetur, ne quicquam scribatur, quod non sit ex vero, decoro, congruo. Illa autem a dictante Spiritu Sancto conceptus rerum scribendarum suggeruntur. Illa praestare potest Scripturam sacram infallibilem, sed non *θεόπνευστος*". Hollazius, pp.92.93.

*53. "Omnes et singulae res, quae in Sacra Scriptura continentur, sive illae fuerint Sacris Scriptoribus naturaliter prorsus incognitae, sive naturaliter

quidem cognoscibiles, actu tamen incognitae, sive denique, non tantum naturaliter cognoscibiles, sed etiam actu ipso notae, vel aliunde, vel per experientiam, et sensuum ministerium, non solum per assistentiam et directionem divinam infalibilem literis consignatae sunt, sed singulari Spiritus Sancti suggestioni, inspirationi, et dictamini acceptae forendae sunt. Omnia enim, quae scribenda erant, a Spiritu Sancto sacris Scriptoribus in actu ipso scribendi suggesta, et intellectui eorum quasi in calamus dictitata sunt, ut his, et non aliis circumstantiis, hoc et non alio modo, aut ordine scriberentur.

"Res Scripturae sunt in triplici differentia: 1. quaedam fuerunt Sacris Scriptoribus naturaliter prorsus incognitae, vel propter suam excellenciam, ut fidei mysteria, vel propter non existentiam, ut futura contingencia, vel propter absentiam a sensibus, ut cordis secreta. 2. Quaedam naturaliter quidem cognoscibiles fuerunt, sed Scriptoribus Sacris actu incognitae, ob vetustatem et remotionem temporum, aut locorum, nisi aliunde forte illis innotuerint, sive per famam, sive per traditionem, sive per Scripturam aliquam humanam; ut historia diluvii, Excidii Sodomitici, a Mose descripta. 3. Quaedam non tantum naturaliter cognoscibiles, sed et naturaliter actu ipso cognitae fuerunt publicis Dei notariis, per propriam experientiam, et sensuum ministerio; ut Exitus Israelitarum ex Aegypto, et iter in deserto, Mosi; historia Judicum, Samueli; vita et facta Christi, Evangelistis, et Apostolis. Verum non tantum res primi, sed etiam secundi, et tertii ordinis, in ipso actu scribendi, a Spiritu Sancto immediate sunt dictatae et inspiratae Sacris amanuensibus, ut his, et non aliis circumstantiis, hoc, et non alio modo ac ordine, quo scriptae sunt, consignarentur.

"Aliud est, res Scripturae inter se et ratione sui distingui, et aliud, distingui ratione divinae inspirationis; ratione Θεοπνεύσις, nullum discrimen agnoscimus, et divinitatem Scripturae toti uniformiter inesse asserimus". Quenstedt, I, pp.67,68.

*54. "Distinguendum est inter divinam revelationem, et inspirationem; Revelatio formaliter, et vi vocis, est manifestatio rerum ignotarum et occultarum;

et potest fieri multis et diversis modis, scil. vel per externum alloquium, vel per somnia et visiones. (Nam Revelare Graece ἀποκαλύπτειν, est id, quod occultum erat, retegere.) Inspiratio est actio Spiritus Sancti qua actualis rerum cognitio intellectui creato supernaturaliter infunditur; seu, est interna conceptum suggestio, seu infusio, sive res conceptae jam ante Scriptori fuerint cognitae, sive occultae. Illa (Revelatio) potuit tempore antecedere scriptionem, haec cum scriptione semper fuit conjuncta, et in ipsam scriptionem influebat. Interim non nego ipsam Θεοπνευσίαν, sive divinam inspirationem dici posse revelationem secundum quid, quatenus scilicet est manifestatio certarum circumstantiarum, item ordinis et modi, quibus res consignandae et scribendae erant." ("Distinguendum est inter revelationem divinam, quae ideo fit, ut res cognoscatur, et eam, quae ideo fit, ut res his, et non aliis circumstantiis, hoc, et non alio tempore, modo et ordine in literas referatur; non illa semper, sed haec fuit necessaria." (I,72)) "Quandoque etiam revelatio cum ipsa inspiratione divina concurrit, atque coincidit, quando scilicet divina mysteria inspirando revelantur, et revelando inspirantur, in ipsa scriptione. Hinc recte monet Dn. D. Cajovius Tom. I. System. Theol. loc. citando quaest. 4. Conclus. 2. 'Omnia et singula, quaecunque in Sacris Literis habentur, non quidem revelationi peculiari novae,-- sed singulari Spiritus Sancti dictamini, inspirationi et suggestioni accepta ferenda esse'." Quenstedt, [p.68 (in Schmid, pp.27,28).

*55. "Die Heiligen haben in ihrem Schreiben irren und in ihrem Leben suendigen koennen; die Schrift kann nicht irren" (Missbrauch der Messe, Walch XIX,1309, von 1522).

*56. "Ich verwerfe sie (die Lehre der Kirche) nicht, aber dieweil jedermann wohl weiss, dass sie geirrt haben als Menschen, will ich ihren nicht weiter Glauben geben, denn so fern sie mir Beweisung ihres Verstandes aus der Schrift thun, die noch nicht geirrt hat. Und das hoisset auch St. Paulus 1. Thess. 5, 21, da er sagt: Pruefet und bewaehrt zuvor alle Lehre; welche gut ist, die behaltet. Desselbengleichen schreibt St. Augustinus zu St. Hieronymo: Ich habe

erlernet, allein den Buechern, die die heilige Schrift heissen, die Ehre zu thun, dass ich festiglich glaube, keiner derselben Beschreiber habe je geirrt; alle anderen aber lese ich dermassen, dass ich's nicht fuer wahr halte, was sie sagen, sie beweisen mir's denn mit der heiligen Schrift oder oeffentlicher Vernunft" (Walch XV, 1758, vom Jahre 1520; vergleiche Walch XVI, 2635 f.)

*57. "Das hat den guten Mann Oekolampad betrogen, dass Schrift, so wider einander sind, freilich muessen vertragen worden und ein Teil einen Verstand nehmen, der sich mit dem andern leidet; weil das gewiss ist, dass die Schrift nicht mag mit ihr selbst uneins sein. Aber er merkte und bedachte nicht, dass er der Mann waere, der solche Uneinigkeit der Schrift fuergeben und beweisen sollte; sondern er nahm es an und trug es vor, als waere es gewiss und schon ueberwiesen. Da faellt und fehlet er. Wenn sie aber sich bedaechten zuvor und saehen zu, wie sie nichts reden wollten, denn Gottes Wort, wie St. Petrus lehret, und liessen ihr eigen Sagen und Setzen daheim, so richteten sie nicht so viel Ungluecks an. Das Word 'Schrift ist nicht wider einander' haette den Oekolampad nicht verfuehrt, denn es ist in Gottes Wort gegrundet, dass Gott nicht leuget, noch sein Wort nicht leuget" (Dass diese Worte: das ist mein Leib, noch feststehen, Walch XX, 994).

*58. "Ich lasse dich immerhin feindlich schreien, dass die Schrift wider einander sei, an einem Orte die Gerechtigkeit dem Glauben, am andern den Werken zuschreibe. Wie wohl es unmoeglich ist, dass die Schrift wider sich selbst sein sollte; ohne allein, dass die unverstaendigen, groben und verstockten Heuchler so duenket" (Erklaerung des Galaterbriefs, Walch VIII, 2140, von 1535).

*59. "Ich selbst habe ein herzliches Missfallen an mir selbst und hasse mich selbst, weil ich weiss, dass alles dasjenige, was die Schrift von Christo sagt, wahr sei, ausser welchem nichts Groesseres, Wichtigeres, Angenehmers, Froehlicheres sein kann und, das mich in hoechster Freude trinken machen sollte, weil ich sehe, dass die heilige Schrift in allen Stuecken uebereinstimme, also dass man an der Wahrheit und Gewissheit einer so wichtigen Sache nicht das Geringste

in Zweifel ziehen kann", usw. (Zu Jesaias, Walch VI, 268, von 1532).

110.

*60. "Also sind viel Sprueche in der Schrift, die nach dem Buchstaben wider einander sind, wo aber die Ursachen angezeigt werden, ist's alles recht" (Von den Conciliis und Kirchen, Walch XVI, 2668, von 1539).

*61. "Wir haben die Artikel unsers Glaubens in der Schrift genugsam gegruendet, da halte dich an und lasse dir es nicht mit Glossen drehen und nach der Vernunft deuten, wie sich's reime oder nicht; sondern wenn man dir anders aus der Vernunft und deinen Gedanken will hinan schmieren, so sprich: Hier habe ich das duerre Gotteswort und meinen Glauben, da will ich bei bleiben, nicht weiter denken, fragen oder hoeren, noch kluegeln, wie sich das oder dies reime, noch dich hoeren, ob du gleich einen andern Text oder Sprueche herbringst, als dem zuwider aus deinem Kopf gezogen, und deinen Geifer daran geschmieret; denn die wird nicht wider sich selbst noch einigen Artikel des Glaubens sein, ob es wohl in deinem Kopfe wider einander ist und sich nicht reimet" (Predigt von der christlichen Ruestung, Walch IX, 452, von 1532).

*62. "Ich bitte und warne treulich einen joglichen frommen Christen, dass er sich nicht stosse an der einfaltigen Rede und Geschichte, so ihm oft begegnen wird, sondern zweifele nicht daran, wie schlecht es sich immer ansehen laesst, es sind eitel Worte, Werko, Gerichte und Geschichte der hohen goetlichen Majestaet und Weisheit. Denn dies ist die Schrift, die alle Weisen und Klugen zu Narren macht und allein den Kleinen und Albernern offen steht, wie Christus sagt Matth. 11,25. Darum lass deinen Duenken und Fuehlen fahren und halte von dieser Schrift als von dem allerhochsten edelsten Heiligtum, als von der allerreichsten Fundgrube, die nimmer ganz ausgegruendet werden mag, auf dass du die goettliche Weisheit finden moegest, welche Gott hier so alber und schlecht vorleget, dass er fallen Hochmut daempfe. Hier wirst du die Windeln und Krippe finden, da Christus innen liegt, dahin auch der Engel die Hirten weiset, Luk.2,11. Schlecht und geringe Windeln sind es, aber teuer ist der Schatz; Christus, der darinnen liegt" (Vorrede auf das Alte Testament, Walch XIV, 3, von 1523).

*63. "Sacra Scriptura Canonica Originalis est infallibilis veritatis omnique erroris expers, sive, quod idem est, in Sacra Scriptura Canonica nullum est mendacium, nulla falsitas, nullus vel minimus error, sive in rebus, sive in verbis, sed omnia et singula sunt verissima, quaecunque in illa traduntur, sive dogmatica illa sint, sive moralia, sive Historica, Chronologica, Topographica, Onomastica, nullaque ignorantia, incogitantia aut oblivio, nullus memoriae lapsus Spiritus Sancti amanuensibus, in consignandis Sacris Literis, tribui potest aut debet." Quenstedt, I, 77.

*64. "Nullus error, vel in leviculis, nullus memoriae lapsus, neque mendacium ullum locum habere potest in universa scriptura sacra (Calov, quoted in Schmid, p.28, and in Rohnert, p.207).

*65. "ANTI~~THE~~OS. I. Antheorum et Epicureorum, qui Verbi Dei scripti originem divinam esse, vel aperte, vel operte negant.

"II. Pontificiorum, qui nugantur; Evangelistas, et Apostolos nullo divino mandato ad scribendum accessisse, sed incidenter, ex occasione quadam accidentaria, aliunde oblata, aut necessitate coactos. Item: Deum nec mandasse expresse ut scriberent, nec ut non scriberent. Apostolos nullibi testari, se ex Domini mandato scribere. Ita Bellarminus Lib. IV. de V. D. cap.3. Col.169. ubi ait; 'Falsum est, Deum mandasse Apostolis, ut scriberent: Legimus enim Matthiae ultimo mandatum, ut praedicarent Evangelium, ut autem scriberent, nusquam legimus. Itaque Deus nec mandavit expresse ut scriberent, nec ut non scriberent. Nec tamen negamus, quin, Deo volente et inspirante, Apostoli scripserint, quae scripserunt etc. cap. IV. Sectio 3. secundo prob. inquit; Si Christo et Apostolis fuisset propositum, Verbum Dei coarctandi et restringendi ad Scripturam, imprimis rem tanti momenti Christus aperte praecepisset, et Apostoli alicubi testarentur, se ex Domini mandato scribere, quemadmodum ex Domini mandato in toto orbe docuerunt, at id nusquam legimus". Quenstedt, I, p.65. "Expressum mandatum non fuit necessarium, quia inspiratio scribendorum, et impulsus internus ad scribendum mandato aequipollent. Implicatur contradictio in adjecto, Apostolos scripsisse Deo

volente, et inspirante, et suggerente, et tamen non praecipiente". Quonstedt, I, pp. 66,67.

*66. "In sanctis Dei hominibus mandatum exterius et impulsus internus aequiparatur. Quid enim aliud est divinus ille impulsus, quam mandatum internum et occultum ejusdem omnino auctoritatis ac ponderis cum mandato externo et manifesto?""Qui jubentur docere omnes gentes, illi etiam jubentur doctrinam suam scripto complecti, neque enim omnes gentes, etiam secuturi temporis, viva voce absque scripto docere poterant". Gerhard in Schmid, p.24.

*67. "An ex mandato Dei scripserunt Amanuenses sacri? Quibusdam Amanuensibus sacris expressum Mandatum ad scribendum divinitus datum fuisse, aperte testatur Scriptura (Exod. XVII, 14. Deuter. XXXI, 19. Esaias VIII, 1. XXX 2 (8). Jeremias XXXVI, 2. Habac. II, 2 Johannes Apoc. I, 11. etc.) ex eadem valide colligimus, reliquos volente et jubente Deo scripsisse. Probatur 1) Ex mandato Christi generali, Matth. XXVIII, 19. 2) Ex impulsu Spiritus Sancti, quem docet S. Petrus 2. Ep. c. I, 21. 3) Ex divina sacrarum Literarum inspiratione, quam inculcat S. Paulus 2. Tim. III, 16. 4) A munere Apostolico, in quo sancti illi viri fuerunt Legati Dei. 2. Cor. V, 20. Legati ad mandatum Principis adstricti sunt. Petrus Legatus Dei absque mandato divino Evangelium praedicare gentibus non sustinuit: Ergo minus Epistolam conscribere, a Deo non jussus, ausus est." Hollaz, "Theologia Aeroamatica", pp.89,90, in Schmid, p.24.

*68. "Partim enim ipsa inspiratio divina, qua suggeruntur, quae in literas referri debeant, importat influxum ad exercitium actus scriptiois; partim etiam certum est, scriptores sanctos expresso Dei mandato ad scribendum fuisse excitatos, e. gr. Moysen, Deuter. 31,39., Esaiam, c.8, 1.30,8., Jeronian, c.30.2., Johannem, Apoc. 1, 11. 19. 2,1.8.12.18-etc., aut alias occasionem et incentiva ad scribendum per peculiarem Dei providentiam fuisse objecta, quibus de Dei voluntate certi redderentur". Baieri Compendium, ed. Walther, I, 99.

SECTION IV.

*69. "Cyprianus serm. de Eleem. 'Spiritus Sanctus erat Scriba, Prophetæ erant ejus calami, quibus Spiritus Sanctus scribenda dictabat'. Eleganter Augustinus lib. I. de consensu Evangel. cap. ult. 'Quicquid Servator de suis factis et dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis (Evangelistis et Apostolis) tanquam suis manibus imperavit'. Solus ergo Deus, si accurate loqui velimus, Sacrae Scripturae autor dicendus est, Prophetæ vero et Apostoli autores dici non possunt, nisi per quandam catachresin; utpote qui potius Dei autoris calami, et ἀρχιγραμματέως Spiritus Sancti Verbum dictantis et inspirantis, notarii et amanuenses fuerunt". Quenstedt, I, pp.55,56.

*69a. "Verbum λαλεῖν, quod hoc loco, et Actor. II. 31. cap. III.24. et alibi passim de Sacra Scriptura usurpatur, et vox λόγος, v. 19. expriment Scripturae genus, quod scilicet sit Sermo vel Verbum. Differentia a causis desumitur; et quidem a). a causa efficiente principali, quae proponitur hic κατ' ἔρσιν θελήματος ἑνθρώπου, per remotionem voluntatis humanae, non materialiter et subjective sumptae (ac si citra et contra voluntatem suam inscii ac inviti scripserint divini amanuenses, sponte enim, volentes, scientesque scripserunt,) sed efficienter et originaliter acceptae, quod non pro humano suo arbitrio, et naturali sua voluntate, qua ad communia sua opera movetur homo, nec etiam voluntate re-genita, qualis est illa, qua fideles moventur ad pietatis opera; sed ea, quam Spiritus Sanctus extraordinario motu agitat, loquuti sint et scripserint..... Dicuntur autem φερόμενοι, acti, moti, agitati a Spiritu Sancto nequaquam, ac si mente fuerint alienati, uti prae se ferunt Enthusiastae, et qualem ἐνθουσιασμόν in suis Prophetis fingunt Gentiles: Nequaquam etiam, ac si ipsi quoque Prophetæ suas Prophetias, aut ea, quae scriberent, non intellexerint, qui Montanistarum, Phrygastarum, aut Cataphrygarum et Priscillianistarum olim error fuit, sed quia nihil ex suo sensu scripserunt, sed omnia Spiritus Sancti dictamine". Quenstedt, I, p.57.

*70. "Distinguendum est inter genus loquendi, et inter ipsas phrases, verba et voces: Genus loquendi debebant Scriptores Sacri quotidiano usui et consuetudini, vel etiam informationi, et hinc quoque diversitas styli praesertim Prophetici oritur. Nam prout informati aut assuefacti erant ad sublimius, humiliorve loquendi, scribendique genus, sic eodem usus Spiritus Sanctus sese indoli hominum attemperare et condescendere voluit, atque ita res easdem per alios magnificentius, per alios tenuius exprimere; quod vero has et non alias phrases, has et non alias voces, vel aequipollentes adhibuerunt Scriptores sacri, hoc unice ab instintu et inspiratione divina est. Spiritus Sanctus enim ad scriptorum sacrorum ~~captum~~ ~~ae~~ indolem sese attemperavit, ut mysteria secundum consuetum dicendi modum consignarentur. Adeoque ea verba Spiritus Sanctus amanuensibus inspiravit, quibus alias usi fuissent, si sibi fuissent relictis". Quenstedt, I. pp.75.76.